

The University of Vermont History Review



Volume XXVIII
2017-2018

The UVM History Review is an annual publication of the University of Vermont History Department. It seeks to publish scholarly essays and book reviews of a historical nature written by UVM students and alumni.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor	Kiara Day
Assistant Editor	Hunter Colvin
Assistant Editor	Stuart Hackley
Faculty Advisor	Francis Nicosia
Faculty Advisor	Susanna Schrafstetter

Lauren Fedewa

Hannah Johnson

Jesse Keel

Weiqing Kong

Samantha Sullivan

For ordering information, please contact Kathy Carolin at
The University of Vermont History Department
201 Wheeler House
133 South Prospect Street
Burlington, Vermont 05405

Cover: “Wheeler House Study,” UVM Building Photos Series, Box 15, Wheeler House: Photos Folder, UVM Special Collections and Archives, Bailey/Howe Library.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Letter from the Editor</i>	iii
<i>The Adams Pedigree and the Pseudoscience in Vermont Eugenics</i>	
Katherine Becker	1
<i>Legion’s Work, France’s Credit: The French Foreign Legion During World War II</i>	
James Dancho	15
<i>Under the Influence of Domesticity: The Fleming Museum’s Drinking Objects and the American Relationship with Drinking in the Nineteenth Century</i>	
Wes Dunn.....	31
<i>Jewish Youth and Education in Nazi Germany: Reversing Integration</i>	
Sebastian Hanna.....	48
<i>In Concern of Animal Welfare, or with Xenophobic Intent: An Analysis of State-Decreed Bans on Non-Stun Halal Slaughter in Europe and the Threat to Religious Freedom</i>	
Zachary Heier.....	61
<i>The Precedent of Christian Violence: An Analysis of Bernard of Clairvaux’s Use of Biblical Passages in Support of the Knights Templar</i>	
Maria Koutsouris.....	75
<i>2017 Phi Alpha Theta Inductees, UVM Chapter, Alpha Alpha Psi</i>	89
<i>History Department Faculty News</i>	90
<i>Author Biographies</i>	93
<i>Editor Biographies</i>	94

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Readers,

It is my pleasure to share with you the 2017-2018 *University of Vermont History Review*. This annual journal showcases exceptional historical research and writing from undergraduate and graduate students. In this volume I am delighted to present six articles from a wide range of historical periods and subject areas, displaying the breadth of study within UVM's history department.

Notable in this collection is the use of diverse historical approaches including local, cultural, social, biographical, and military history. Furthermore, authors have utilized a variety of primary sources including material objects, traditional text sources, and digital content. Overall, this volume speaks to extensive methods of historical inquiry.

As chief editor, I am grateful to have worked with an outstanding editorial board whose collaboration and relentless efforts have produced this volume. This group has worked tirelessly to assist the authors with multiple rounds of revision in order to perfect their articles for publication. The board has gone above and beyond to carry out editorial duties, all while juggling their own course loads and busy lives. The editors' careful attention to detail can be found within the following pages.

I'd like to thank both the authors and editors who made this publication possible. In addition, a special thank you to Professor Frank Nicosia and Professor Susanna Schrafstetter for serving as encouraging and knowledgeable faculty advisors for the *History Review*. Their input has been invaluable. Last, but not least, Kathy Carolin and Kathleen Truax have provided the continuous logistical assistance that all publications require.

Kiara Day, 6 June 2018

The Adams Pedigree and the Pseudoscience in Vermont Eugenics

Katherine Becker

Vermonters have always had a distinctive identity. The northern state is shielded by the Green Mountains, home to Lake Champlain, and shares a border with Canada. In 1777, Vermont declared itself an independent republic with universal male suffrage, public schools, and the abolition of slavery, but became the thirteenth state in 1791.¹ Vermonters revere a history of rugged individualism shaped by a belief that they live in the untouched, unruly countryside. In the period after World War I, many working-age Vermonters were abandoning their rural farms for cities or the Western frontier and French-Canadians began to inhabit these farms. Although seventy-one percent of Vermonters were Anglo-American, French-Canadians quickly became the largest minority group.² The feeling that the rural Vermont stock was aged and urbanized became the perfect breeding ground for the eugenicist idea of human betterment to take hold.

This essay will examine the methodology of pedigrees, which are similar to family trees, that were compiled as a part of the Vermont Eugenic Survey, beginning in 1925. Specifically, this essay will look at how the research was conducted, who did the research, the racial and economic bias within the research methods, and why families were chosen to be researched. It will also attempt to show how the pedigrees became a tool for the Eugenics Survey to pass the voluntary sterilization law of 1931.

Nancy Gallagher's in-depth research and book on Vermont eugenics, the first and only of its kind, spurred this inquiry. Gallagher's book not only mentions the pedigrees, but gives an overview of the entire Vermont Eugenics Survey and the founder of the movement in Vermont, Harry (Henry) Perkins.³ Perkins stated that his goal with the Survey was "to make the waste places of the state bloom like a rose."⁴ My research complements Gallagher's book as it scrutinizes one specific pedigree and delves into the methodology and terminology in the pedigree. Gallagher discusses the pedigrees and the social worker that compiled them, but the scope of her book does not allow for the investigation of specific pedigrees, such as the Adams family focused on in this paper.⁵

The following case study of the Adams family will examine the pedigree methodology and the bias that influenced the "purely scientific" eugenic study. The Adams pedigree is useful to study because it is one of the Survey's most substantial and detailed pedigrees, and it reveals the

¹ Vermont Historical Society, "1750 to 1820," Vermont History Explorer, <https://vermonthistory.org/explorer/this-day-in-history/vermont-timeline/1750-to-1820>.

² Nancy L. Gallagher, *Breeding Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1999), 43-45.

³ Gallagher, *Breeding Better Vermonters*, 72.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ The names of the family members in this study have been altered to protect privacy.

Survey's interest in documenting factors such as miscegenation, French-Canadian decent, and divorce. In light of these interests, this paper shows that prejudice heavily influenced the compilation of the pedigrees, demonstrating how pseudoscience and willful inaccuracy in the research helped to make the case for the sterilization law of 1931.

The Emergence of Vermont Eugenics

Interest in eugenics in Vermont arose after the Army Draft Board Exams in World War I revealed that Vermont draftees had the second highest defect rate in the nation. The Vermont Eugenic Survey was founded in 1925 in the midst of the population changes and when fears about immigration were widespread. President Calvin Coolidge, a Vermont native, passed the 1924 immigration law that created the quota system in the United States.

The 1920s were also a time of economic prosperity and Vermont was looking to become an ideal destination for affluent white vacationers. The Vermont Board of Agriculture released tourist literature that promoted Vermont country life in order to attract a "higher class of people."⁶ It was believed that if they marketed the state to the "right people," it would restore and reinvigorate Vermont's rural economy. The tourist economy began to grow in 1910 and became an even larger source of revenue for the state after World War I.⁷ With tourism on the rise in Vermont, the state began to spend more on social services and continued to fear that French-Canadians were replacing the rugged Vermonters that gave the state a sense of identity. These tensions over immigration, race, and the state's identity created the opportunity for University of Vermont professor Harry Perkins to make his name with the Eugenics Survey.

The work done by the Eugenics Survey included the compilation of pedigrees, a plan for rural revitalization called the Vermont Commission of Country Life, the promotion of sterilization legislation, and finally, the Ethnic Survey of Vermont. In 1931, the law for voluntary sterilizations called "An Act for Human Betterment by Voluntary Sterilization" passed in the Vermont State Legislature.⁸ 253 voluntary sterilizations, of which two-thirds were administered to women, were performed between 1931 and 1941. The 1931 sterilization law was Perkins' second attempt, for his proposal in 1927 had failed. The National Eugenic Movement faced a similar test in 1927 with the Supreme Court Case *Buck v. Bell*, although in Virginia the involuntary sterilization law was deemed constitutional. In Vermont, the failure of the first sterilization law was a major setback because the "purely scientific study" lost credibility and came to be seen as politically motivated.⁹

One of the major factors that allowed the 1931 Vermont sterilization law to exist was the prior compilation of defective gene information into traceable pedigrees. Perkin's goal was to "turn the social records of families registered in the Vermont Children's Aid Society and the State Social Service Exchange into pedigrees of degeneracy that would help support a campaign for legalized

⁶ Ibid., 48-49.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ *Laws of Vermont*, 31st biennial sess. (1931), no. 174, pp. 194-96—An Act for Human Betterment by Voluntary Sterilization.

⁹ Gallagher, *Breeding Better Vermonters*, 87.

sterilization.”¹⁰ These traceable pedigrees gave a “scientific” and economic reason for Vermonters to support such a law.

From 1925 to 1928, social worker Harriot E. Abbott collected data on over six thousand individuals and sixty families.¹¹ Abbott’s criteria when selecting a family to study included a long family history in Vermont; availability of sources; access to neighbors; community or family members who were willing to share information; and documentation of poverty, time in jail, or time in a mental institution. Abbott researched specific Vermont families, compiled their pedigrees, and estimated the cost of the families to the taxpayer which helped to make the case for sterilization. Abbott graduated from the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, where she had developed skills in social diagnosis and been trained in social research. After graduation, she worked in child welfare for twenty years before she was commissioned by Harry Perkins and the Eugenics Survey.¹² Her job in the Eugenics Survey was to trace alleged defects through families by making detailed pedigree charts, which she accomplished through hometown visits, assessments of mentality and home conditions, as well as family size, and information from her “informants,” who were neighbors, friends, family members, town clerks, and other community members.

The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy was a seminary that trained women to become social workers, a field that had been created in the mid-nineteenth century by Jane Addams and her settlement houses. These students were meticulously trained in social research and were taught how to conduct themselves as “charity visitors.” In *The Charity Visitor: A Handbook for Beginners* (1913), which was published by the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy during Abbott’s time at school, clear instructions are given on how to gather relevant information on a family.¹³ The handbook instructs the social workers to take notes down in worksheets like the ones Abbott uses in her pedigree research. The handbook also discusses much of the terminology that Abbott later used when labeling people in her pedigree research. However, the handbook encouraged the social workers to examine all parts of a problem and always confirm their statements with testing or multiple sources, something Abbott and her pedigree research lacked.¹⁴

Examining the Adams Pedigrees

The pedigrees that Abbott compiled in Vermont were created through a mix of death, marriage, and birth records, as well as interviews with family members, the actual person in question, and other informants. Each pedigree could be hundreds of pages long and include multiple worksheets on each person. Every personal worksheet lists the source of information at the top. The cover page of the pedigrees gives a comprehensive summary of “defects,” the number

¹⁰ Ibid., 71.

¹¹ Ibid., 77.

¹² Ibid., 75.

¹³ Amelia Sears, *The Charity Visitor: A Handbook for Beginners* (Chicago: Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, 1913), 18.

¹⁴ Sears, *The Charity Visitor*, 32.

of family members, and the number of “defective” family members. The substance of the pedigrees is the individual worksheets, but the information was compiled into a summary at the end of the pedigree. The summary lists every member of the family, their corresponding defect, the way they died, and any institution to which they were committed during their life.¹⁵

The case study of the Adams family is important for understanding the Vermont Eugenic Survey because the family was primarily made up of French-Canadian immigrants, a group that was seen as “different” to native Vermonters. The overarching defects assigned to the family were syphilis, tuberculosis, and degeneracy, which were never elaborated on in the pedigree worksheets.¹⁶ The first generation of the Adams in the Vermont Survey is Francis (Frank) Adams. Frank was married first to Louise Stevens and later to Eliza Lee, after Louise died of a heart attack. Louise, Frank, and Eliza were all born in Canada and immigrated to Vermont.¹⁷ Frank and Louise had six children: Fanny, Frank, Henry, Celestia, Sophia, and Elizabeth. Frank and Eliza were found to have lived in Burlington in 1852, they had five children together: Lewis, John, Fred, George, and Edward. When Frank Sr. was killed by a falling tree, Eliza remarried Stephen Baker. The eleven children of Frank Adams make up the second generation of the Adams pedigree.

In addition to the fact that the Adams were French-Canadian, the pedigree research has a strong focus on the interracial marriage of Celestia Adams. Celestia’s birth is recorded as 1845, and she married her first husband, Thomas Learner, before the start of the Civil War. Celestia and Thomas had two daughters, Jennie and Hannah Learner. Thomas died in the Civil War, and Celestia married Warren Edmund in 1876 in Hinesburg, Vermont. Celestia was considered a dependent of the state because she collected her first husband’s Thomas Learner’s pension. Celestia was recorded as being “below average mentally” or “maybe high-grade feebleminded,” but the comments note that she was “respected and liked in her community.”¹⁸ The pedigree worksheets also note that her family rejected her in social engagements because her second husband, Warren Edmund, was “colored.”¹⁹ Warren Edmund, born in Hinesburg in 1844, was a farmer who also worked as a laborer for the state. Warren’s mentality was considered “fair.” Neighbors stated that it was a “pity [Celestia] married a colored man [Warren].”²⁰ Warren and Celestia had three daughters -- Alice, Agnes, and Sarah Louisa -- who were listed as being “colored” or “mulatto.”

Celestia and Warren’s daughter, Alice Edmund, was married twice. Her first husband, Gilbert Filmore, was labeled as “colored,” and his occupation was listed as florist. The pedigree worksheets also reported that Filmore was convicted and went to jail for killing a colored woman after she refused to run away with him.²¹ Alice and Gilbert had no children together. Her second husband, Arthur Pierce, was also listed as being “colored.” The pedigree suggests that Alice did

¹⁵ Special Pedigrees Incomplete, 1926-1930, Pedigrees X-XXIX. Box 9, Folder 1, “The Adams Pedigree,” Vermont State Archives, Middlesex, Vermont, United States, 1-4.

¹⁶ “The Adams Pedigree.”

¹⁷ “The Adams Pedigree,” Francis Adams.

¹⁸ “The Adams Pedigree,” Celestia Edmund.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ “The Adams Pedigree,” Gilbert Filmore.

not officially divorce Gilbert Filmore before marrying Arthur Pierce. Arthur Pierce washed windows and performed other odd jobs. The pair had no children.²²

PEDIGREE: [REDACTED] GENERATION: III
DEFECT: Syphilis, degeneracy, tuberculosis

INDIVIDUAL: Alice [REDACTED] #14⁵ (Colored)

SOURCE OF INFORMATION: Alice [REDACTED]

RESIDENCES: Hinesburg, Bristol.

DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH: Hinesbur g.

DATE AND PLACE OF MARRIAGE: Bristol, 1918.

PARENTS:

FATHER: Warren [REDACTED]

MOTHER: Celestia [REDACTED]

SIBLINGS: Sarah Louisa [REDACTED]

HALF-SIBLINGS: Jennie [REDACTED]
Hannah [REDACTED]

HUSBAND: Arthur [REDACTED]

CHILDREN: None

OCCUPATION: Housewife

HEALTH RECORD: Good

MENTALITY: (Noted by F. E. C. Average, except for the unmistakable humble deferential attitude of the old-fashioned colored person who has not shaken off the manner which is the result of slavery, and who, therefore, still acts, to some degree, as tho ~~they~~ ~~he~~ ~~was~~ ~~owned~~ by, and subject to, the white race.) This attitude may have been intensified, so as to discount the white blood evident.

EDUCATION AND SCHOOL GRADE: Literate - common school education.

PERSONALITY, APPEARANCE, AND BEHAVIOR: Mrs. Alice [REDACTED] was neat and clean in appearance, and her home showed that she is a careful and orderly housekeeper. She is a tall slender woman and carries herself well. Her white blood is shown in her light to medium brown complexion, and straight, fairly gray hair.

She readily volunteered information (which later proved to be incomplete). She did not seem to be at all embarrassed or sensitive about the race mixture in her family, unless her humble attitude meant that she did not wish, in any way, to presume to be at all superior because of her white blood. She showed none of the mulatto's typical readiness to take offense. She only remarked that she knew little about the white branches because she had nothing to do with them, and except for [REDACTED] and family, rarely saw or heard of them.

Figure 1 SEQ Figure (* ARABIC 2. An example pedigree worksheet

Alice's sister Agnes Edmund was married to Bernard Eaton, who was listed as being white. They had five children together but only two were known: Nora and Paul Ernest Eaton.²³ The third sister, Sarah Louisa, worked as domestic help until her marriage to Laverette Dunbar, a white carpenter. Sarah Louisa and Laverette Dunbar had three children: Llyod, Lois, and Alfred.²⁴ Llyod Dunbar's comments said he "shows distinct traces of his colored blood," while Alfred was said to

²² "The Adams Pedigree," Arthur Pierce.

²³ "The Adams Pedigree," Agnes Edmund.

²⁴ "The Adams Pedigree," Sarah Louisa Dunbar.

be sensitive about his colored blood, and Lois showed “no trace of his colored blood.” The Dunbar boys were very young and the pedigree worksheets noted how much they liked school and their attendance records at school.²⁵

In addition, the three Edmund sisters had two step-sisters: Hannah and Jennie Learner. Jennie died at age eighteen from pneumonia. Hannah died at twenty from influenza, but not before she married a farmer, George Stewart, and had two children, George and Jennie.²⁶

Bias in the Pedigree Research

As discussed, the pedigrees not only contained factual information on the place of birth, siblings, parents, and spouse, but also more in-depth comments on the subject’s personality, appearance, mentality, and health. The race or ethnicity of the person in question influenced the social worker’s perception of them, which was apparent in the pedigree notes. For example, Alice Edmund, who was listed as “colored” or “mulatto,” had worksheets riddled with comments on the traces of her “white blood” and with questions about the “shame” she felt about the race-mixing in her family. She was tracked down and interviewed for her worksheet, which was rare for this pedigree because many of the Adams were old, dead, or impossible to track down. Even though she was providing the information for her worksheet, the comments on her mentality said she had not “shaken off the manner which is the result of slavery, and who, therefore, still acts, to some degree, as though they were owned by, and subject to, the white race.”²⁷ This illuminates the methodology of the pedigrees, showing that the bias of the interviewer and their focus on race dominated the results of the “scientific study.”

Not only was the racial bias of the interviewer a driving theme within the pedigree project, but gossip and hearsay were accepted as fact in the pedigrees. In Agnes Edmund’s nuclear family, there was scarce information found about her husband Bernard Eaton. It was discovered, through gossip, that someone with a last name similar to Eaton and no known first name had been spotted visiting a young pregnant white woman. Because of this, Bernard Eaton was recorded in the pedigrees as a sex offender.²⁸ The source for one of Agnes Edmund’s worksheets was Mrs. A. Parker of Starksboro, whose relationship to the Adams family or Agnes was not documented. The comments in Agnes’ worksheet noted that she was poor, and that Mrs. A. Parker said that Agnes was “not nice” but did not say why. Parker admitted that she did not know Agnes well and directed the interviewers to Mrs. Will Wright.²⁹ Although it was never elaborated on, Mrs. A. Parker’s “not nice” comment became central to the eugenic analysis of Agnes Edmund.

The pedigree worksheets, like those of Bernard and Agnes Edmund, were dense and many were incomplete. The information gathered in these worksheets was then compiled into a pedigree summary, which made the defects easily traceable and more compelling. These summaries

²⁵ “The Adams Pedigree,” Llyod, Lois and Alfred.

²⁶ “The Adams Pedigree,” Hannah Stewart.

²⁷ “The Adams Pedigree,” Alice Edmund.

²⁸ “The Adams Pedigree,” Bernard Eaton.

²⁹ “The Adams Pedigree,” Agnes Edmund.

included every family member and their defects, cause of death, and any mental institution they visited. Here, next to Agnes' name was the defect listed as "called immoral," which paraphrases Mrs. Parker's comments.³⁰ Parker's "feelings" toward Edmund are listed as a defect. Agnes was biracial and was married to a white man, which would explain why Mrs. Parker, who did not know Agnes well, but was willing to make negative comments about her. Agnes' husband, Bernard Eaton was listed as a "sex offender" because of the loose connection the Eugenics Survey drew between him and the unnamed man from Bristol, Vermont. In general, the summary defects included terms like "feeble-minded," "below average mentally," "odd," "always weak," "insane," "suspected tuberculosis," "some eye defect," and more.³¹ The labels given in the final summary are informative because the compilation of one family and its many perceived defects made a convincing argument for eugenics. These final misleading summaries from the findings of the family research made the pedigrees essential to the Vermont eugenic cause. The defects listed in the summaries overwhelmingly supported the eugenic claim that degeneracy was hereditary.

-2-					-3-				
[REDACTED]-(CONTINUED)					[REDACTED] (Continued)				
Name	Gen. & No.	Defect	Cause of Death	Institution	Name	Gen. & No.	Defect	Cause of Death	Institution
Lewis [REDACTED]	III #9	Dependent Alcoholic	Cancer of tongue		Hellie C. [REDACTED]	III #61		Murdered at 17	
#Gilbert [REDACTED]	#13	Killed a woman		W. S.P.	John [REDACTED]	#65		Marasmus, at 7 months	
Agnes [REDACTED]	#17	Called immoral			Peter [REDACTED]	#66		Lung disease at 10 months	
#Bernard [REDACTED]	#18	Sex offender			Fred [REDACTED]	#67	Adultery Never strong	Tuberculosis of lungs	H. of C.
Sarah Louisa [REDACTED]	#19		Tuberculosis of bowels		Louis [REDACTED]	#69	Non-support Tuberculosis General Paralysis		V. S. P. V. S. H.
Hannah [REDACTED]	#22		Grippe at 20		Mary T. [REDACTED]	#70	Immoral Neglected children		
Jennie [REDACTED]	#23		Pneumonia at 18						
Mary [REDACTED]	#29		Shock following operation at 31						
Helen Belle [REDACTED]	#30		Grippe at 32						
Willie [REDACTED]	#34	"Always weak"	Tuberculosis Meningitis		Beaul [REDACTED]	IV #27		Buried in a sandbank, at 3 years	
Frank H. [REDACTED]	#35		Heart attack		J. [REDACTED] (male)	#28	Paramour		
#Edly [REDACTED]	#36	"Mentally below average"			Helle [REDACTED]	#29	Had illegitimate child		
#Louisa [REDACTED]	#43	Dependent at one time(?)			Ray Harold [REDACTED]	#38		Marasmus	
Frank [REDACTED]	#44		Tuberculosis of lungs		[REDACTED] (male)	#45		Cholera, at 7 months	
#Joseph [REDACTED]	#45	Insane	Gen'l Parosis		[REDACTED] (female)	#46		Stillbirth	
Missie [REDACTED]	#47		Quick Consumption and dropsy		Madeline [REDACTED]	#47	"Street walker"	Tuberculosis	H. of Correction
J. [REDACTED]	#51		Dysentery at 4 months		Alice Mary [REDACTED]	#52	Dependent	Tuberculosis of lungs	
James [REDACTED]	#53	Shotlegger, etc. Alcoholic Beat wife			J. [REDACTED]	#53	"Non-support of wife" Imprisoned for rape		House of Correction
#Margaret [REDACTED]	#54		Committed suicide		Bertha [REDACTED]	#54	"Incorrigible child" "Street walker"		V. I. S.
[REDACTED]	#55		Stillbirth		Dorothy [REDACTED]	#56		Delinquent Court record	

Figure 2. A defect summary page-Adams pedigree

³⁰ "The Adams Pedigree," 2.

³¹ "The Adams Pedigree," 1-4.

Pedigree Labels

In order to understand the methodology of the pedigrees, the defect labels must be understood. The 1931 Vermont voluntary sterilization law stated its purpose as being “to prevent procreation of idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded or insane persons.”³² Feeble-mindedness referred to mental retardation or mental deficiency,³³ but the extent to which feeble-mindedness was scientifically definable changed in the early twentieth century. Testing for the feeble-minded became popular at the Vineland Training School for the feeble-minded. Henry H. Goddard was the expert on feeble-mindedness and introduced the Binet-Simon intelligence scale in 1910 as a standard way to test for feeble-mindedness. The Binet Scale, created by Alfred Binet, tested for reaction time, muscular strength, memory, and the senses. Earlier mental tests did not compare scores with people of similar age groups or create a holistic view of the person tested so, there were no baseline standards. The Binet Scale, on the other hand, created five tests, one for each age from three to fifteen (not including eleven, thirteen, and fourteen) and defined feeble-mindedness as well as graded it. Binet defined feeble-mindedness as two years below age level.

The other label categories from the sterilization law were “idiot” and “imbecile.” An “idiot” was not expected to pass an exam for age three and an “imbecile” was not expected to pass the tests for age eight. One of the tests was for memory and included repeating a set of numbers to see how a patient grasps their surroundings. The Binet test looked to see if they could recall familiar objects or recognize strange statements. Some tests were based off learning in school. The mental age would not be given until after an individual interview with a child. At the Vineland Training School, Goddard recommended that “Idiots” had a two-year-old mental age, “Imbeciles” had a seven-year-old mental age, and “Morons” (a newly created category) had twelve-year-old mental age.³⁴

The tests were believed to be objective and did not question children on subjects from school because not all children had access to schooling. However, this objectivity was not achieved, as the Binet tests had specific sections that tested for school learning and the classification for idiots, imbeciles, and feeble-minded were determined in two different ways: some used the Binet Scales and some used other measurements. The tests were also open to the racial or economic prejudices of the interviewers because they relied on interviews with the subjects. Variables included the way the questions were asked, the rapport built between the interviewer and the child, and the child’s willingness to comply or take the test seriously. In an attempt to standardize the system, Stanford University created a revision which used an Intelligence Quotient (IQ) in 1916. This system had ninety tests, of which fifty-four were from the original Binet test, but thirty-six were new and included things like vocabulary. It also used a more mathematical

³² *Laws of Vermont—An Act for Human Betterment by Voluntary Sterilization.*

³³ Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 98.

³⁴ Haller, *Eugenics*, 98.

approach to evaluating a child's mental level. This revision solved many of the problems, but there was still no clear way to determine what number (now out of 100) qualified as feeble-minded.³⁵

Though the Adams pedigree has summary labels of "feeble-minded," it makes no mention of any tests for feeble-mindedness being performed on the members of the family. Furthermore, many members of the family were not able to be reached, as many had died by the time the pedigree research was being done. Three of the Adams that were labeled as a form of feeble-minded or mentally below average were in the second generation of Adams studied, which meant that they were in their seventies or eighties and that the Binet test would not be applicable to them. This means that although the eugenics literature had a relatively standard way of measuring intelligence by the 1920s, if it was used for the Adams pedigree, it would not have been an accurate testing tool, forcing Abbott to rely more on the biased interviews for her research.

In addition to feeble-mindedness, the Adams pedigree had three overarching defect labels across all the generations: tuberculosis, syphilis, and degeneracy.³⁶ Tuberculosis was not as common in the eugenic literature. Eugenicists were more focused on the issues of immorality and mental deficiencies, but some were studying the heredity of diseases such as tuberculosis. In 1921, the Second International Congress of Eugenics compiled articles and essays about their research on the hereditary of various traits. One of the sections discussed tuberculosis. There was a debate in the scientific community on the topic because they were not sure if the disease was passed through blood, was infectious, or both. One study found that the children of tuberculosis patients were more likely to get tuberculosis than the spouse of a patient, which suggested that the disease was hereditary rather than infectious. However, another study found that once tuberculosis was established in a family, it was found in other members due to the amount of contact between family members and the contagiousness of the disease. Support for heredity was weakened by the fact that other "medical men" in 1921 could not understand the experiments done to prove the heredity of the disease, and the scientific community suspected that environmental factors were not considered in the experiment and that, the conclusions were not valid.³⁷

In the Adams pedigree, the overarching summary labels included one for tuberculosis, but only a few members of the family had been documented as dying of tuberculosis and one member of the family was even labeled as "suspected tuberculosis."³⁸ Therefore, the way the pedigree was advertised or organized was misleading. This inaccuracy contributed to the false picture of hereditary defects created by the Eugenic Survey of Vermont. The overarching defects were the ones that were written at the top of every family member's worksheet. It is unclear how it was decided that those three labels were the most important or most common defects in the Adams family, revealing further "scientific" inaccuracy and manipulation within the Eugenic Survey research.

³⁵ Ibid., 95-100.

³⁶ "The Adams Pedigree."

³⁷ Dr. Paul A. Lewis, "The Relation of Heredity to Tuberculosis," in *Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Second International Congress of Eugenics, 1921* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 178-81.

³⁸ "The Adams Pedigree."

Another one of the top Adams labels was degeneracy, which was a broad term that meant morally “in decline.” This moral decline included alcoholism, sexually transmitted diseases, and miscegenation.³⁹ Degeneracy was divided into “superior” and “inferior” categories. The “superior” degenerate would not have possessed below average intellect, but would be “ill-balanced or markedly eccentric.”⁴⁰ The “inferior” degenerate was a feeble-minded, idiot, imbecile, or moron that was seen as having below average intelligence. A family was considered to have degenerates if there were miscarriages, stillbirths, or infant deaths.⁴¹ It was said that degeneracy revealed itself if a person contracted a contagious illness during transition periods in their life like puberty or pregnancy. There was also a subcategory within degeneracy for “imperative ideas” or morbid fears which had characteristics of some mental illnesses now classified as autism, OCD, or schizophrenia. In the 1920s, however, the scientists were very confident that degeneracy was a hereditary condition.⁴²

Since the pedigree research was compiled without evidence proving that members of the Adams family were feeble-minded, idiots, imbeciles, or morons, the label of degeneracy indicated the “superior” class of degenerates. This is likely because the race-mixture in the family which would have been considered an “eccentricity.” The use of racial and ethnic bias in the comments on the individual worksheets is apparent. These biases would have influenced the diagnoses of feeble-minded individuals in the Eugenics Survey, because there is no clear evidence of mental testing on the Adams and any mental testing that could have been done still relied on the discretion of the interviewer, who was susceptible to the prejudices of the time.

Another recorded defect in the Adams pedigree, mental disease, was studied in the 1921 International Congress of Eugenics. Mental disease was categorized by what caused the problem which included: alcoholism, drug use (morphine, cocaine, heroin), pregnancy, having infectious diseases, questionable personality traits, and old age. These symptoms apparently indicated insanity or psychosis, which were broad and not defined clearly. The research noted that fifteen to twenty percent of alcoholics suffered from insanity. Others defined dementia and other issues that often occur with old age as insanity. The theory proposed in 1921 was that insanity was hereditary, because mental diseases were found most often in offspring of parents with mental diseases. This theory was not confirmed, as there were only two studies done on the subject at the time. Dr. Myerson offered a counterargument that marriage restrictions were not necessary for the insane because insane people often had mentally healthy offspring.⁴³ Alcoholism and insanity were defect labels for some members of the Adams family, but the eugenic theory regarding symptoms of mental diseases was not specified in the summary sheet. This suggests that mental disease was less

³⁹ Herman Lundborg, “The Danger of Degeneracy,” *The Eugenics Review* (Jan. 1922), 531-39.

⁴⁰ W. Duncan McKin, “The Dark Side of Human Existence” in *Heredity and Human Progress* (New York: Garland Publishing Inc: 1984), 42.

⁴¹ McKin, “The Dark Side of Human Existence,” 42.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 42-47.

⁴³ Dr. A. Meyerson, “Inheritance of Mental Disease” in *Eugenics, Genetics and the Family: Second International Congress of Eugenics, 1921* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 218-25.

important to Abbott and the Eugenic Survey, which, as the Adams family pedigree shows, tended to favor issues of moral degeneracy.

The terminology in eugenic literature more broadly helps explain the methodology of the Adams pedigrees as well as the others compiled by Harriett E. Abbott in Vermont. These defect labels, especially the ones given in the final pages of the Adams pedigrees, such as “called immoral” and “sex offender,” are misleading. The assessment of defects relied on the judgments and the biases of the interviewers as well as their sources of information. Agnes Eaton, for example, was “called immoral,” which is in no way representative of the information provided by her interviewer’s source, who called her “not nice.” Even the “not nice” label came with a caveat, as the woman who gave this opinion also admitted to not knowing Agnes at all.⁴⁴ Furthermore, her husband was labeled a “sex offender” because too little was known about him. Finally, Alice Edmund was not listed in the final summary of defects, so it is hard to know what Abbott’s final assessment of her was. However, what was written about her in the comment section of her worksheet clearly shows how important her biracialness was to Abbott in her evaluation of Alice. Her worksheet reveals the bias intertwined within the Eugenics Survey. Although the Eugenics Survey’s mission was to look into poverty and mental health, and although race was hardly ever mentioned, it is clear that race and ethnicity were noteworthy within the assessments of those they chose to study.

Who Was Chosen for Research

There is little documentation about how families were selected for the Survey and to what degree race was a deciding factor in who was chosen to be researched for a pedigree. The Eugenics Survey was responsible for the information that was released, which means that crucial sources related to the recommendations for sterilizations are not available for historians. For this reason, it is hard to know definitively the extent to which race and ethnicity propelled pedigree research. However, from the Adams pedigree alone, it is clear that French-Canadians and African Americans were concerning to Vermonters. Specifically, the perception that the Vermont stock was aging and weakening in the countryside because of replacement by the French-Canadians posed a threat to many. Immigration was considered a pressing issue to whites in the 1920s, and Vermonters were no exception. French-Canadians were disliked for many reasons, including the fact that they were immigrants, Catholics (the quintessential Vermonters being Protestants), and French-Speaking. In addition, French-Canadians were the poorest members of the white population in Vermont. Since the state’s eugenic work was justified economically, they were particularly susceptible to being targeted by the Eugenic Survey. Part of the pedigree work was determining how much each family cost the taxpayer. Social service spending was on the rise in Vermont, and the defense of sterilizations came from arguing that ending a family line, and thereby stopping the spread of

⁴⁴ “The Adams Pedigree,” Agnes Eaton.

degeneracy, would save the taxpayers money. It was appealing that Vermonters would not have to support future state wards who would be offspring of these families.⁴⁵

Perkins was explicitly interested in researching pockets of degeneracy based on geographic location or race, and took a particular interest in the French Canadians.⁴⁶ In 1932, Perkins wanted to create a separate study to determine whether the increase of French-Canadians in rural Vermont was the cause of the high rate of defect in Vermont. Perkins begged eugenicist Charles Davenport to spearhead this research. Davenport refused and concluded, without evidence, that the only reason he could explain the “high rate of defect in Vermont” was the replacement of native Vermonters with “some special alien stock, such as French Canadians.”⁴⁷ Another reason that the French-Canadians were examined in large numbers by the Eugenics Survey was because of the anti-immigration and anti-Canadian sentiments of their neighbors and community members. Abbott could only complete pedigrees on families for which she had informants.⁴⁸ This meant that if neighbors were biased against French-Canadians, they would be more willing to talk to Abbott about them, allowing her to complete the research. This explains why the Adams pedigree relied on gossip from people who had little to no relationship with the members of the Adams family. The degeneracy breakdown by ethnicity was not undertaken explicitly until the Ethnic Survey of Vermont in the 1930s, but implicitly, due to racial biases and economic incentive, French-Canadians were examined by the researchers in high numbers beforehand.

Beyond the Pedigrees

The Adams pedigree included many examples of how bias, misleading labels, and inaccurate or missing information made the diagnosis of degeneracy in a pedigree persuasive to a 1920s reader. However, by examining a pedigree like the Adams family’s, one can see how the research was not methodologically valid. Examining racial bias in the Adams pedigree does not entirely explain why some Vermonters were targeted by the Eugenic Survey. Abbott was looking to research families who were wards of the state and many French-Canadians and other minorities were extremely impoverished in the 1920s and 1930s. This cycle of poverty led some to become bootleggers, criminals, or prostitutes just to survive. Therefore, the economic factor of being a state ward became a driving force for the Eugenics Survey, which inherently targeted minority groups such as French-Canadians and African Americans.

The eugenics movement focused only on the aspects of nature in the human condition and ignored environmental factors, making “the disturbing claim that human traits could be accurately measured, quantified, and assessed for social desirability.”⁴⁹ It is more likely for a person born into poverty to remain impoverished themselves, as it is a product of their environment rather than their

⁴⁵ Gallagher, *Breeding Better Vermonters*, 77.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 73.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 76.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Aaron Gillette, *Eugenics and the Nature-Nurture Debate in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 3.

genes. The Eugenics Survey ignored access to school, proper hygiene, and nourishment, which would all have been factors in the reoccurrence of poverty across several generations in a family. In the 1928 meeting of the Vermont Rural Survey, the Commissioner of Education, Clarence Dempsey, voiced concern that the nurture piece of the nature-nurture debate was being ignored by Perkins and his team.⁵⁰ Legally, however, the Vermont eugenics movement was prepared to forge ahead with support from the nature argument.

Before 1931, there was already a law on the books which restricted marriages between Vermonters who were seen as “mentally deficient.”⁵¹ This law was one way that legislation worked to prevent procreation of those deemed degenerates. This law, passed in 1915 as the first attempt to legalize sterilization, was deemed unconstitutional in 1913 and 1927. Yet even with its many shortcomings, the Eugenic Survey worked well enough to get the voluntary sterilization law, or the “Act for Human Betterment by Voluntary Sterilization,” passed in 1931.

Though the sterilization law was voluntary, those in power manipulated it to enact the eugenic recommendations from the previous pedigree research. One way to keep those who were considered mentally deficient from procreating was to confine them in a mental institution or jail for life.⁵² As an example, the Vermont Native American population, the Abenaki, were severely affected by the 1931 law. The Abenaki people were sterilized because consent procedures were often ignored, and the doctors who performed the surgeries were usually eugenicists themselves. Therefore, just like in the pedigree research, there was little objectivity in the sterilization recommendation process.⁵³ Through the use of mental institutions, marriage restriction laws, and the manipulation of the consent procedures that made the sterilization law voluntary, the eugenic platform was coercive in Vermont. Recognizing the other ways through which the procreation of some Vermonters was hindered helps explain how the 253 sterilizations is not the whole story of the eugenic presence in Vermont.

Conclusion

At the end of World War II, as information about the Holocaust and the Nazi eugenic program gained national attention, the American Eugenics Survey lost popularity. In Vermont, the Eugenics Survey lost funding after the war. Although the last sterilization occurred in 1957, the 1931 Sterilization Law was not repealed until 1978.⁵⁴ Because the Vermont Eugenics Survey refused to publish their sterilization records, there is still much to be uncovered about the Survey.

This paper has shown, however, that individual pedigrees, such as the Adams pedigree, can provide a multitude of important insights into the “science” behind the passage of the 1931

⁵⁰ Gallagher, *Breeding Better Vermonters*, 93.

⁵¹ Randall Hansen and Desmond King, *Sterilized by the State: Eugenics, Race, and the Population Scare in Twentieth-Century North America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 87.

⁵² Ian Robert Dowbiggin, *Keeping America Sane: Psychiatry and Eugenics in the United States and Canada, 1880-1940* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997), 110.

⁵³ Hanson and King, *Sterilized by the State*, 89.

⁵⁴ Lutz Kaelber, “Vermont.” Vermont Eugenics, <http://www.uvm.edu/~lkaelber/eugenics/VT/VT.html>.

Sterilization Law. The pedigrees were created by talking to neighbors and community and family members, as well as by consulting birth, marriage, and death records. The biases of these “informants” and the social workers who conducted the research led to the reclassification of eugenics as a pseudoscience after World War II. The terminology used by Abbott to label members of the Adams family reflected that used within the broader eugenics movement. Although the extent to which proper IQ testing was used remains unclear, it is apparent that bias, subjectivity, and Abbott’s own prejudices had an impact on the results of the Adams pedigree.

In Vermont, French-Canadians and African-Americans were frequent targets of the Survey because of the availability of informants who were willing to speak against them. Vermonters’ concerns about immigration, the overall poverty of the French-Canadian population, and Perkin’s own specific eugenic interest all worked against these minority groups. Although only 253 sterilizations were performed in the state of Vermont, and although the sterilization law was voluntary, there were other means used to enact negative eugenics through marriage restriction laws, mental institutions, and a doctor’s own eugenic agenda. After the 1931 Sterilization Law, these measures disproportionately affected the Abenaki and French-Canadian population, showcasing the implicit bias within the “scientific” research behind the entire eugenic movement.

There is no record of the effects of the Adams pedigree on the Adams family themselves. Most of the Adams would have been very old or dead, and the recommendations for sterilizations were not released by the Eugenics Survey. Even so, the Adams pedigree gives a glimpse into the pseudoscience of eugenics and reveals how the research was manipulated to conform to the eugenic thesis of heredity, and ultimately support sterilization. When examined at the level of a case study, the differences between the individual worksheets and the culminating family summary of defects show how simple labels were motivated by racial and economic bias, creating a false image of genetic degeneracy for Vermonters to combat.

As the Adams family pedigree shows, summaries about hereditary defects had the potential to be very convincing when taken out of context. The pseudoscience of the Vermont Eugenic Survey created an inaccurate picture of degeneracy and allowed the eugenics movement in Vermont to gain credibility and compile “evidence” in the 1920s. This research helped facilitate the successful passage of the 1931 Sterilization Law, and although it is not clear to what extent the pedigrees affected those who were coerced into sterilization, the family research was an important tool for pushing the broader eugenic agenda. The ramifications of these biased actions are still felt in Vermont, especially on the University of Vermont’s campus today.

Legion's Work, France's Credit: The French Foreign Legion During World War II

James Dancho

Cutthroats, thieves, and vagabonds are but a few terms that are used to describe members of the French Foreign Legion. However, they have also been described as heroes, saviors, and ones with honor. Founded in 1831, The French Foreign Legion is an elite organization that primarily consists of foreigners.¹ They have struggled with disbandment since their formation but necessity has preserved their existence. Their mission, until the mid-twentieth century, was the preservation of France's colonial empire. Once France lost its colonial possessions, the French Foreign Legion faced an identity crisis. Its original responsibility was repurposed from colonial preservation to a more offensive role in support of France. In both cases, the French Foreign Legion continued to be an expendable force at the government's disposal that was called upon to uphold its agenda. Its disposability led to high risk situations whose outcome, for good or bad, created reputable accomplishments that have been duly noted and commemorated throughout France's history. But, for all its history and glory, the French Foreign Legion has maintained a certain anonymity where sources can only tell pieces of what occurred. As historian Douglas Porch stated,

While many national armies contain or have contained regiments or units with long and, at times, even heroic pasts, none has captured world imagination in quite the same fashion, or to such a degree, as the Legion. No corps is surrounded by romance, by legend, by mystery.²

The unrecognized credit of the French Foreign Legion drives this inquiry. World War II has been heavily researched and analyzed by many scholars. Unfortunately, even with the wealth of research, the French Foreign Legion is not centrally present in any of that research. The current French accounts include every aspect of life under occupation from resistance to collaboration. However, a crucial part of the story is missing because the French Foreign Legion was a key player during the occupation years from 1940-1944, whether Free French or Vichy. While resistance members were still attempting to figure out what role they would play, and while collaborators were trying to understand their position under the new regime, the Legion was ceaselessly carrying on their duties.³ The goal of this paper is to shed light on the French Foreign Legion's story so that it can take its rightful place within the French narrative and receive proper historical credit.

¹ Hugh McLeave, *The Damned Die Hard* (New York: Saturday Review Press, 1973), x.

² Douglas Porch, *The French Foreign Legion* (New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1991), xi.

³ It must be noted that when the term Legion is used in this paper it solely refers to the French Foreign Legion.

This study begins with the formation of the French Foreign Legion. From humble beginnings, the Legion was sent to the far corners of the French empire. Suspicion and success in equal measure perpetuated myths around this mysterious organization. The next step will be a brief explanation of the French Foreign Legion during World War I. The primary focus of this examination occurs during the inter-war years from 1918-1939, as this period created the traditions and images of the Legion that are still recognized today. The pinnacle of their popularity and recognition created the body of men that fought during World War II. That period and those men led to 1940, where the French, including the Legion, fought the Nazis creating division within the organization. The years between 1941 and 1942 were years of strife between both the Free French Legion and the Vichy Legion. To avoid confusion this section will be broken up into two parts. The first will cover the Free French Legionnaires and the second will examine the Vichy Legionnaires. After 1942, the Legion became whole again. The years between 1943 and 1945 showcased the Foreign Legion's exemplary actions that set them apart from the rest of the French troops. The conclusion will properly credit the men of the Legion who did considerably more than most of French society during the occupation years. For too long the French Foreign Legion has remained proud and silent about their deeds. The goal of this work is to vindicate their honorable service.

The Beginnings

“Il sera formé une Légion composée d'Étrangers. Cette Légion prendra la dénomination de Légion étrangère. (It will be formed a Legion composed of Foreigners. This Legion will be called Légion étrangère.)”⁴ On March 10, 1831, King Louis Philippe of France created the French Foreign Legion. Out of the remnants of previous foreign regiments from the Bourbon dynasty, emerged the first members of the French Foreign Legion. Around this time France and Europe were consumed with revolutions. Many of those failed revolutionaries, who could no longer stay in their home country, fled to France. As a result of revolution and an open-door policy toward foreigners, the Bourbon dynasty collapsed in 1830. This open-door policy toward foreigners angered the people who carried proud national sentiments. Out of the collapse emerged the Orleans constitutional monarchy of King Louis Philippe. The king and his monarchists reacted and “the tradition of foreign troops in the service of France had been broken, both by law and in the spirit of the Frenchmen, by the revolution of 1830.”⁵ The Bourbons incorporated numerous foreign mercenaries to protect their throne. Philippe, like all monarchs, aimed to preserve his throne but could not use the help of foreign regiments. To use foreigners would mean to neglect the cause of the previous dynasty's demise. A year later, in 1831, the French Foreign Legion was formed.

France had long been known as an asylum for those who could no longer live in their own country. However, although the French promoted themselves as a country that welcomed

⁴ “French Foreign Legion: 185th Anniversary,” *foreignlegion.info*, last modified March 10, 2016, <https://foreignlegion.info/2016/03/10/french-foreign-legion-185th-anniversary/>.

⁵ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 5.

foreigners they could not afford to care for the influx of newcomers. As Colonel Paul Azan of the Armée d’Afrique stated, “The foreign legion was formed with the only purpose of creating an outlet and giving destination to foreigners who flooded into France and could cause trouble. This corps is simply an asylum for the misfortunate.”⁶ The Legion was sent far from France. The government decided to station the Legion in its newest colonial conquest, Algeria. Algeria needed reconstruction and security that the Legion could provide. The Legion were despised and untrusted which left them friendless in their founding years. Porch wrote, “The Legion was an illegitimate child...an embarrassment, at once acknowledged and shunned, whose meager patrimony was to be the right to die for France in the wastes of her empire.”⁷

France had temporarily solved one issue but created another in the process. The Legion was full of untrained volunteers who lacked discipline. Although the Legion integrated ex-foreign soldiers, they could not become officers. Only French citizens were allowed to command the Legion, which created two issues. First, after the 1830 revolution, the French army broke into factions. Some were pro-Bourbon, some were pro-Orleans, and some were neither. The Orleans faction were the predominate members of the armed forces. With only Orleans patriots the national army faced a manpower crisis. The second problem was the undesired position of commanding the Legion. Many Frenchmen saw it as a punishment. One inspecting general in Bone, Algeria wrote in 1833, “Today as officers are sent into the Foreign Legion as punishment, they serve reluctantly, are humiliated to be there and look for anyway to return to France.”⁸ Inevitably, France had to accept foreign officers. However, this had its own complications such as language barriers and lack of respect from the nationalities they commanded. As a result, a lack of discipline prevailed among units which created poor morale. The first duties of the new Legion were menial. They consisted of construction and infrastructure repair, which is still an unbroken tradition of the legionnaires today. The non-existent pay and exile to Africa did not help improve their moods. René Savary, Duke de Rovigo, commanding general of Algeria, in 1832 stated, “...it would take only one drunken binge to touch off an insurrection.”⁹

Fortunately, an insurrection never came. The combination of poor training, lack of skilled officers, and bad morale led to many failures during the Legion’s first engagements. The Legion constantly faced the threat of disbandment but France’s aspiration for a global empire preserved them. Frenchmen did not have the desire to participate in colonial conflicts and the monarchy did not risk conscripting French nationals for the job. The reputation of the Legion took a turn in 1863, at the Battle of Camarón. This battle took place in a Mexican village where a contingent of legionnaires held out against a superior Mexican force. Although the legionnaires lost the battle, it demonstrated their staunch resolution and determination. French troops arrived days later to find the battleground still littered with the bodies of the legionnaires.¹⁰ No longer would the Legion be

⁶ Colonel Paul Azan, *L’Armée d’Afrique, 1830 a 1852* (Paris: Plon, 1936), 124.

⁷ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 5.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁹ Azan, *L’Armée d’Afrique*, 80.

¹⁰ Tony Geraghty, *March or Die: A New History of the French Foreign Legion* (New York and Oxford: Facts on File Publication, 1986), 73.

solely perceived in a negative light. The Legion still suffered, like any force national or international, with desertions and poor conduct, but from this point forward, the Legion's reputation began to climb.

By 1871, the Legion's golden years commenced. The expansion of the French empire significantly necessitated their services. The Third Republic of France refused to use national conscripted troops for their imperialistic ventures. As a result, colonial troops and the Legion were the only forces used. The constant engagements these forces participated in had unforeseen positive effects. What grew out of the constant military preparedness "made legionnaires like chained dogs ready at any moment to be unleashed."¹¹ This attribute would have increased significance by 1914.

World War I

World War I was the result of a national militaristic buildup in Europe. Countries raced to produce and create arms to keep pace with their rivals. Everything came to a head with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand. France, like other countries, joined their allies in a declaration of war. These declarations caused much enthusiasm around the world. France alone received an unprecedented number of foreign volunteers that would not be matched until World War II. Many were outraged at the Germans and Austro-Hungarians while others "feared they would miss the most exciting world event."¹²

During this time, France had no idea what to do with such a large number of volunteers. The policy since 1830 had been that no foreigners were allowed to serve in the national French army nor to allow the French Foreign Legion to serve on French soil.¹³ Although this was the written law it had been broken once before in 1870 with the Franco-Prussian war. By 1915, with a shortage of manpower, the national French army began making exceptions for foreigners to serve within its ranks. Until then, all new foreign recruits were directed to enlist into the Legion. The Legion saw its greatest increase in manpower since its founding. A number of 44,000 has been generally agreed upon by scholars.¹⁴ Many of these numbers came from reluctant foreign volunteers who hoped that France would allow them to form their own separate national units.

On top of that, foreigners resented joining their ranks because "the Legion had a grim reputation—fostered by pre-war German propaganda—as brutalized colonial mercenaries recruited from the scum of Europe."¹⁵ 'Old' Legionnaires, men who served before World War I, were not welcoming toward the new recruits. A Bulgarian volunteer by the name of Kosta Todorov noted one example in his memoir, "Sergeant-Major Pontacier...teased us. 'Fools! So you've come

¹¹ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 202.

¹² David Jordan, *The History of the French Foreign Legion from 1831 to Present Day* (Guilford: The Lyons Press, 2005), 56.

¹³ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 345.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 337.

¹⁵ Marin Windrow, *French Foreign Legion: 1914-45* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing Ltd, 1999), 4.

to fight for freedom and civilization? Words, empty words!’ ‘Then why are you here?’ I asked him. ‘Orders of course, we’re professional soldiers. We don’t give a damn what we fight for!’¹⁶ This only managed to deter recruits, increase desertion, and resulted in soldiers reverting to their national armies. Just like its formation, the Legion had a rough start at the beginning of the war. The vast number of new troops forced the Legion to disregard one of its important rules and allowed regiments to consist entirely of one nationality. This exception had positive effects in the case of the German legionnaires who were predominately left in Africa so they would not have to fight their fellow countrymen. However, the negative effect of congregating foreign regiments of the same nationality resulted, in some cases, to mutinies. For example, a Greek regiment in 1915 mutinied because it wanted to fight the Turks, not the Germans.¹⁷

The French learned their lesson and began to make changes. Regiments became multinational forces again. The lack of manpower in the national French army allowed room for foreign volunteers to be integrated into French units. At the same time, the French government no longer had to worry about mutinies. These changes successfully eased the tension within both the Legion and the army. After 1915, the Legion fought hard to prove its worth. The French used the Legion more often than could be expected of any unit, especially the French army. Time and time again they proved that they could carry out orders and effectively complete missions. The Battle of Artois of 1915, the Somme campaign, and the Second Battle of the Marne were but a few of the many battles the Legion participated in.

Although many of the battles the French fought turned out to be stalemates or losses, this did not mean that the Legion was not successful. Where many units failed in their objectives, the Legion succeeded and were forced many times to retreat because they lacked support from the national armies. All of these endeavors built up the Legion’s reputation and trust. France’s trust in the Legion was especially evident during the mutinies of 1917. While a third of the French army began to mutiny “the Legion found itself with the task of sealing off roads to prevent desertions and ultimately, returning the mutineers to the front.”¹⁸ By the end of the War, the Legion had become the most decorated unit of the entire French army. World War I is a necessary chapter to consider in order to understand the Legion during World War II, where they faced many similar challenges. The Legion ended the war in a poor physical state that concerned pro-colonial politicians, but their reputation was at an all-time high.

The Inter-War Years

World War I brought Legion manpower to 44,000 strong, but by the end of the war, the Legion had lost roughly 33,000 men. The inter-war years appeared to be the end of the Legion; However, three reasons allowed it to continue. First, the Great War displaced many people. Many countries fell into economic hardships, individuals lost their national armies, their identity, and

¹⁶ Kosta Todorov, *Balkan Firebrand: The Autobiography of a Rebel, Soldier and Statesman* (Chicago: Ziff-Davis, 1943), 50.

¹⁷ Jordan, *The History of the French Foreign Legion*, 58.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 63.

revolutions kicked out certain groups from their home countries. The Legion worried that their numbers would not recover, but in fact their “losses were swiftly made up from a large pool of men displaced in the war’s aftermath.”¹⁹ Famous Legionnaire, Colonel Nicolas Tokhadze, was a famous prince from Georgia who, in 1921, “after failing to halt the Bolshevik advance...decided to immigrate to Europe.”²⁰ After his immigration to France he enlisted in the French Foreign Legion. The largest contingents of new legionnaires came from Germany or from the White Army in Russia. Legionnaires were so desperately wanted that enlistment and reenlistment bonuses were offered to entice men to join up. The people of France were ready for peace but still wished to maintain their empire. Historian, Douglas Boyd, wrote, “France needed foreign soldiers in the colonies, to avoid spilling anymore French blood.”²¹ France still had Morocco, Algeria, Guadeloupe, Madagascar, Indo-China, and the newly acquired Syria. Though, as usual, France needed the influx of volunteers while remaining skeptical of them.

A second way the Legion was able to maintain its existence after the War was through the revitalization of old traditions and the creation of new ones. World War I took 90% of the ‘Old’ legionnaires. The ‘Old’ legionnaires were necessary individuals who carried on traditions of the Legion. As mentioned earlier, World War I saw many new ideological recruits who were considered duration only legionnaires. As can be assumed by their name they served for the duration of the war and were to be disbanded after. They were never fully accepted into the Legion because they never experienced what the ‘Old’ Legion had. Ideally, to be considered an ‘Old’ legionnaire one would have to experience time in North Africa, feel the hardships of marching long distances, get into local drunken brawls with compatriots, and stand guard at a desert outpost with a lack of amenities.²²

While honoring many of the old traditions, General Paul-Frédéric Rollet reconstructed the Legion with a new identity that is still carried today. Rollet justified the need for a new identity by stating, “The losses of the ‘Old Legion’ during the war are not compensated for by the glory of the RMLE (French Foreign Legion regiment).”²³ Another source, General Hubert Lyautey noted in 1920, “The postwar Legion was not equal to that of its predecessor.”²⁴ Rollet had a tough job in rebuilding the Legion from the ground up. Some of Rollet’s contributions were the iconic white kepi, the Legion anthem “Le Boudin,” and implementation of the Legion holiday, Camerone Day, when past actions of the Legion are honored and celebrated.²⁵ Rollet made due with what was at his disposal and crafted a Legion that merged old traditions and new ones. Thanks to Rollet’s dedication and efforts, “the Legion, of all the French army, is...the only troop which is purely

¹⁹ Adrian Gilbert, *Voices of the French Foreign Legion: The History of the Worlds Most Famous Fighting Corps* (New York: Herman Graf Book Skyhorse Publishing, 2010), 174.

²⁰ Alexander Mikaberidza, “*With Honor and Fidelity*”: *Life and Career of Colonel Nicolas Tokhadze of the French Foreign Legion* (Tbilisi: Javakhishvil Institute of History and Ethnology, 2015), 15.

²¹ Douglas Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Ltd, 2006), 302.

²² Boyd, *The French*, 305.

²³ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 382.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 384.

²⁵ Boyd, *The French*, 308-309.

professional”²⁶ noted one army commander. It is no surprise that Rollet was honored with the title ‘Father of the Foreign Legion.’

The final savior of the Legion was the increased popularity it garnered during the Great War. Romanticized accounts were produced by the dozens in both film and literature. Titles like *Beau Geste* or *Adventure in the Sahara* filled public imagination with stories of heroism, love, and adventure. This added a significant number of recruits filled with romanticized thoughts of grand adventures in North Africa. However, what the new generation of legionnaires were looking for would not be found. Although the Legion had a reputation as a great fighting force and an organization filled with adventure, the Legion also carried a reputation for hardship. Rollet and other Legionnaires had conflicting attitudes towards this new celebrity status. Boyd stated, “Although Rollet and other Legion colonels resented the many films, novels and autobiographical accounts of the inter-war period that sensationalised the legionnaire’s life, they were really his best advertisements.”²⁷ One recruit “saw a film glamourising the Legion in London and walked straight from the cinema to volunteer at the French consulate on Brompton road.”²⁸ The Legion did not need to provide its own propaganda when so many were willing to provide it freely.

The Legion’s continued existence after World War I helped France maintain its empire so that French citizens could enjoy peace and focus on homeland issues. As legionnaire Maurice Magnus put it, “They fought when the rest of the world thought of peace, in arduous colonial wars, of whose causes they knew little or nothing...War and peace are so alike.”²⁹ The inter-war years saw conflict in both Morocco and Syria. In Morocco, the Legion and the Spaniards fought the Rifs who were local tribes that banded together to oust their colonial rulers. For a time, they gained momentum. The French and Spanish stuck close to major cities and ports with a few forts throughout the region. The outposts that lined the countryside were no more than mounded sand and mud outposts.

During this time the French government did little to aid the legionnaires with money and resources.³⁰ Although the French government saw the Legion fit for expansion in manpower and technology, the latter tended to be ineffective, causing more problems. Rollet and senior legionnaires saw these shortcomings as a detraction from the legionnaire’s primary role in infantry, but they reluctantly accepted.³¹ The Legion obtained an artillery unit with a few outdated artillery pieces, a cavalry unit with mules, not horses, for every other man, and a motorized unit with few trucks that frequently broke down. None of the technological advances assisted the Legion during the Rif insurrection. It would take many years and help from the French army to suppress the Rif rebellion. During this time Petain had the second pleasure of having the Legion under his command. The first occurrence was at Verdun. Petain’s experience with the Legion would assist

²⁶ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 409.

²⁷ Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion*, 307.

²⁸ Brian Stuart, *Adventures in Algeria* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1936), 18.

²⁹ As quoted, Zosa Szajkowski, *Jews and The French Foreign Legion* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc, 1975), 4.

³⁰ Jordan, *The History of the French Foreign*, 68.

³¹ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 391.

in their survival later, during World War II. Aside from Morocco, Syria had its own colonial rebellion that was suppressed thanks to assistance from the Legion. Overall, this time period reformulated, popularized, expanded, and hardened the Legion. While the French army was focused on peace with no emphasis on extra training or build up, the Legion was in a constant state of readiness. The experiences of the inter-war years prepared the Legion for the next war.

World War II

Throughout the inter-war years, a new threat was brewing in Europe. In Germany, Adolf Hitler and his Nazi party came to power. He continually pushed the bounds of comfortability for world leaders. As the late 1930s came to a close, France slowly began preparing for another international conflict. Unfortunately, their overconfidence and lack of preparation would equal their downfall. France and the Foreign Legion faced many of the same problems it had faced in 1914. Arguably, the problems they faced in 1939-1940 were much worse than they had been during The Great War.

The 1930s displaced many groups of people from numerous countries. The refugees were more ideological than they had been in the past. Unlike before, these ideas and feelings could not be left out of the Legion. There were anti-fascists and communists from Spain, Sudeten-Germans from Czechoslovakia, anti-Nazis from Germany, and Jews avoiding anti-Semitism from all over. They all looked for a place to stop their running and a hope to fight back. Like World War I, the foreigners were given the option to join the Legion or be interned in camps. Along with the influx of foreigners, the Great Depression coincided with the progression of war. France faced numerous internal problems with world markets collapsing while simultaneously trying to recover its own economy in the process. The massive flow of refugees made care more difficult. The best option was the employment of a cheap foreign force. Douglas Porch acknowledged,

Violent fluctuations of recruitment that began in March 1932, when the government, in the throes of the Depression and desperate to economize, ordered a 25 percent reduction in strength...With war looming in 1938, Paris reversed its policy and began to encourage enlistments, even to the point of placing advertisements in foreign newspapers, alerting frontier police to be on the lookout for prime recruitment prospects.³²

Although France was begging for foreign volunteers, the government acted hypocritically by making it difficult for any foreigner to join while harassing those who were not in military service. Zosa Szajkowski, a Jewish immigrant who served in the Legion during World War II, remembered,

Refugees were victims of confused policies—French police carried out frequent identity checks, and offered men of military age without enlistment papers the choice between

³² Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 443.

enlistment, expulsion or internment. However, many foreigners who attempted to enlist found recruitment bureaus closed to them.³³

The French army did not want foreigners in their army, although they were technically allowed. Also, the French did not want an overwhelming Legion full of Europeans who were ideologically motivated. This was an era of skepticism during which no one could be trusted. This left the French no choice but to be picky during a time when that was unrealistic.

The French decided to keep the Legion where it was suited best, in its colonies. New recruits were trained in France but were later shipped out as soon as possible. The Legion were just as skeptical as the French about the new recruits.³⁴ They believed the unequal numbers of certain foreign recruits could influence changes after many years of working to recreate traditions and values during the inter-war years. As a result of these conflicts, many groups of newcomers, including the Spaniards and Jews, were treated very harshly. Also, France compromised and created foreign units who were not legionnaires but served under Legion officers.

While France was waiting for the inevitable to come, it decided to take initiative in other areas. A great deal of faith was placed on the Maginot Line, as it was believed to be impenetrable.³⁵ With this safety buffer in place, France looked toward Scandinavia. Finland was invaded by the Russians, who were allied with the Germans at the time. France, and Britain, promising aid to Finland, sent what they could afford to send. France sent what would become the infamous 13e Demi-brigade de Marche de la Légion Étrangère (13th Demi Brigade). The French were “toying with a number of interventions elsewhere in the hope that they would delay the German invasion.”³⁶ This Legion unit, which trained for mountain warfare, began its journey to Finland. However, before the expedition could set off it was canceled due to an armistice between Russia and Finland signed on March 12, 1940.

France and Britain scrambled to find the next move they could make. Due to the Swedish resources that were delivered through Norwegian ports to Germany, their eyes were set on Norway. Hitler beat the Allies to the punch and invaded Norway in April of 1940. Soon after the invasion the Allies attacked. The Battles of Narvik and Bjervik commenced with British, French, and Polish assistance. The 13th Demi Brigade played a crucial role in driving the Germans out of both ports. No thanks to French citizens, the Legion played a “major part in the first French victory” over the Germans before the Battle of France.³⁷ Unfortunately, while the Legion was generating glory for France in Norway, France was creating shame for itself.

On May 10, 1940, the Battle of France commenced. The long-anticipated battle not only came knocking, but blew down the door of France. The impenetrable Maginot Line was flanked and the French were beaten back rapidly. All reserves were called to the front. The Legion, which was skeptically looked at, was thrown to the front. Legionnaires with outdated equipment were

³³ Szajkowski, *Jews and The French Foreign Legion*, 60.

³⁴ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 442.

³⁵ Christopher Gravett, *The History of Castles: Fortifications Around the World* (Guilford: Lyons Press, 2001), 187.

³⁶ Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion*, 329-30.

³⁷ McLeave, *The Damned Die Hard*, 183.

thrown against German tanks with no hope to stop them, only to delay. To great astonishment, Legion units managed to pin down German units. As had always been the case for the Legion, it “served in the most dangerous positions on the front” and in this case “where the retreating flank of the French army had to be defended.”³⁸

Almost all animosities carried before the battle disappeared among fellow legionnaires. The ideological recruits who the Legion doubted proved themselves in battle, but also held grudges. Legionnaire Szajkowski recalled being abandoned stating, “The Legionnaires passed me by. I knew almost every one of them from the times when we were active in the Communist movement. But I had left the movement.”³⁹ However, his sergeant, an ‘Old’ legionnaire who despised Jews, “looked for me, and when he was told that I was wounded he came back to pick me up.”⁴⁰ Szajkowski’s who had detested the ‘Old’ legionnaires began to understand what could not be understood before. He realized what it meant to be a true legionnaire and not one who served for only the duration.

The Legion held out against their German adversaries. They exemplified bravery in many sectors of the front. The 22nd Legion unit managed with only a few months of training to fight against tanks and Stuka bombers with nothing but outdated machine guns and rifles. The 12th Legion unit, equipped similarly to the 22nd, fought in Aisne until the day the armistice was signed. When retreating French soldiers asked, “Why fight? Why get yourselves killed before the armistice?” The reply from a Belgium legionnaire was “the Legion dies on its feet.”⁴¹ While the French retreated the Legion attacked. This over-confidence was all for not. The Legion efforts to stop the German advance led to numerous casualties. The price for their ego was their life. Sergeant Francois was quoted, “with equal arms, we were easily worth our adversaries.”⁴² Although the Legion was initially despised by the Germans they were well respected by the end of the battle. A Major Herman was quoted, “At least we had the satisfaction of seeing confirmed in the last days of combat that it was worth of its forebears (past legionnaires) because even its adversaries (Germans) rendered homage to its valiance.”⁴³ The men of the 13th Demi Brigade were rushed back to France but “no sooner set foot ashore than the port officer announced, ‘the Germans entered Paris this morning’.”⁴⁴ Most French units were waiting for the armistice, but the 13th left for England instead. Once the armistice was signed, military units, including the Legion, were disbanded, divided, and or returned to Africa.

In Asia during this time the Japanese attacked French Indo-China. Considered the jewel of the French empire in the Far East, the newly created Vichy government was not prepared to lose it. In order to preserve its colony, the Vichy government signed an agreement with Japan, allowing full access to the region but still maintaining French control. The French had little choice due to

³⁸ Szajkowski, *Jews and The French Foreign Legion*, 73.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 74.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ McLeave, *The Damned Die Hard*, 188.

⁴² As quoted, Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 462.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 462.

⁴⁴ McLeave, *The Damned Die Hard*, 184.

their weak position in Asia and their failures during the Battle of France.⁴⁵ The Legion stationed there were even more poorly equipped than their counterparts in Europe. Petain and other government officials desperately wanted to keep the colonies under Vichy influence. The Germans obliged and during the armistice commission the colonies remained under Vichy control. As historian Eric Jennings stated, “Vichy France would present imperial booty to the Third Reich. It included Vichy’s enforced colonial neutrality which could only benefit Hitler, and an especially advantageous supplying of colonial products to the Nazi German War effort.”⁴⁶ Men like Jules Brevie, who would become Vichy colonial secretary, realized that “German officials wanted to avoid running French colonies because of the administrative costs involved.”⁴⁷ The only pride and leverage France had left laid in its colonies. Those colonies needed to be protected and through that reasoning alone the French Foreign Legion remained in existence. The year 1940 was an embarrassment for all Frenchmen. The following years fashioned bitter feelings toward the newly created divisions in society between Free French and Vichy.

When the 13th Demi Brigade arrived in Britain they faced a tough choice: to return to Vichy North Africa with the other legionnaires left behind or remain in London with De Gaulle and continue the fight with the Free French. Each legionnaire, for the first time in their history, “was now asked to choose his own destiny.”⁴⁸ The result was that half of the Legion returned to North Africa. The other half remained with De Gaulle and created the bulk of his Free French forces. Bitterness between both factions never ceased until the end of the war.

Free Legion

In England, the legionnaires that stayed were confronted with inhospitable behavior. The British saw the Free French forces as cowardly men who only wished to flirt with their women. On the other hand, the French were engulfed in Anglophobia. They saw the British as poor allies that left France out to dry. Tensions in their relationship only grew worse. De Gaulle sensed the strain amongst the troops and left for North Africa in an effort to improve his reputation. He sought to win battles but more importantly increase his forces.

So, in February 1941 De Gaulle left with his forces and his first stop was Dakar, Senegal. An American legionnaire at Dakar, John Hasey, described, “A white flag of truce and a French flag had been raised on the motor launch...The launch chugged away toward the harbor...there were white puffs on the shore; water spurted around the launch.”⁴⁹ The Vichy French did not conform to the Free French and remained loyal to Vichy. This first engagement for the Free French was not costly but it was also not a victory. The Free French moved further south to other areas

⁴⁵ Mikaberidze, “*With Honor*,” 58.

⁴⁶ Eric Jennings, *Vichy in the Tropics: Petain's National Revolution in Madagascar, Guadeloupe, and Indochina, 1940-44* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 14.

⁴⁷ Jennings, *Vichy in the Tropics*, 16.

⁴⁸ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 471.

⁴⁹ John Hasey and Joseph Dineen, *Yankee Fighter: The Story of an American in the Free French Foreign Legion* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1942), 201.

within the French colonies. Gabon and other smaller ventures were easy successes for the Free Legion and De Gaulle. With hardly any casualties, the southern African colonies pledged their allegiance to De Gaulle. But, it was not enough. The next phase led them to Eritrea, an Italian colony above Ethiopia. De Gaulle's words were, "we will get at the Italians on the East Coast by invading Eritrea. We have a score to settle with the Italians for plunging a dagger into the back of France."⁵⁰ From this point forward the British would call the shots and what little autonomy De Gaulle had disappeared and he was forced to comply.⁵¹ British priorities trumped De Gaulle's priorities. Britain wanted to protect the Suez Canal while also obtaining small victories for themselves. The Free Legion in Eritrea fought only for a short period of time and finally gained a victory over the Axis forces.

The Free Legion's first major engagement came on June 7, 1941 in Syria. Known as the Levant Affair, the British sought to protect Iraq oil fields, protect Egypt, and stop the Germans who used Syria as a staging point. At this stage there was no doubt that the Free French believed "that the Vichy government had become more than a hostage to Hitler; it was a willing collaborator. And nowhere was this more obvious than in Syria."⁵² The British were weary to allow the Free French Legion to aid in the attack. A Vichy Legion was stationed in Syria which the British believed would cause a conflict of interest. Never before in history had the Legion faced off against its own 'brothers.' The first tradeoffs were verbal and political. Leaflets were dropped over Syria in an attempt to convince the garrison to join the Free French.⁵³ The Free French argued that Vichy had admitted defeat and was the lackey of Hitler. The Vichy countered that the Nazis were winning the war, the Free French were being taken advantage of by the Allies, and De Gaulle was a traitor against the established authority. Negotiations ended, and on June 20, combat ensued. Although both sides were hesitant to fire first, the British fired the first shot. In the end, the Free French secured Syria but gained little from the victory. Most of the Vichy legionnaires chose to return to North Africa rather than fight on with the Free French.

The Free Legion licked its wounds and carried the fight to North Africa. On January 20, 1942, Erwin Rommel attacked Libya and Egypt. In order to stop the Germans, the British attempted to set up a defensive line near Tobruk. At the southernmost tip of said line the Free Legion was placed at a location called Bir Hakeim. As had been the case during the Battle of France, the Free Legion was poorly equipped and asked to do the impossible. They inherited poor positions that had defenses set up to repel colonial cavalry attacks but not those of tanks. When the time came for Rommel to attack he feigned a frontal assault and flanked around Allied lines smacking into the Free Legion at Bir Hakeim. For Rommel this should have been an easy task as he was quoted saying, "That they should be able to neutralize its heterogeneous garrison in about fifteen minutes."⁵⁴

⁵⁰ As quoted, Hasey and Dineen, *Yankee Fighter*, 211.

⁵¹ McLeave, *The Damned Die Hard*, 190.

⁵² Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 476.

⁵³ Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion*, 345.

⁵⁴ Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion*, 341.

Unfortunately for Rommel, he was sadly mistaken. The Free Legion held out for five days which created a positive reputation. The Free Legion allowed for the Allied army to escape encirclement during the allotted five days they created. Porch stated, “The immediate aftermath of Bir Hakeim was undoubtedly the high point for the Legion in World War II.”⁵⁵ Maurice Schumann, future French foreign minister, saw Bir Hakeim as a “symbol of the spirit of Free French patriots, on par with that of Verdun in 1916.”⁵⁶ Free French propaganda played up the battle to its fullest. Even though it was considered an Allied loss it was a victory to Free Frenchmen everywhere. When the unit returned to Alexandria, Egypt they were greeted with cheers and salutes from both British and French.

After pleasantries faded, the Free Legion was thrown back into battle at an outpost called El Alamein. The Free Legion was given the unwanted task of a diversionary attack. Thrown at the end of the line, they were to feign an attack so Rommel would commit his forces to that area. Unfortunately, the Free Legion were not successful in maintaining the reputation that it fought so hard to make. Poor intelligence and lack of support caused issues which made the Free Legion fall back. Historian James Wellard wrote, “French commanders felt that their troops were being neglected, not provided with proper arms and vehicles, and, more sinister, were being used for the most dangerous assignments.”⁵⁷ Although, General Bernard Montgomery was successful during the battle, the French allies were looked down upon from then on out. Overall, “the period between the fall of Syria in the summer of 1941 and the end of the North African campaign in May 1943, was the golden age of the 13th Demi Brigade.”⁵⁸ After North Africa, the 13th went on to fight in Italy and Europe but were outshined significantly by the other Allied armies. However, their key actions in North Africa created French honor and helped prevent the Allied armies from destruction.

Vichy Legion

The other side of this story entails that of the Vichy Legion. The Vichy Legion had significantly more manpower than the Free Legion. The Vichy Legion remained in its colonies after the Fall of France in 1940, but those who were in France during the armistice were demobilized. The legionnaires in North Africa fared no better due to it “being starved of recruits and equipment, and subjected to periodic harassment by German authorities.”⁵⁹ One of the first actions taken by Vichy’s allies were the repatriation of German and Italian nationals. In March of 1941, Dr. Goebbels wrote, “We demand the return of our people from the French Foreign Legion. They will be formed into units for Africa.”⁶⁰ These same men would be formed into Rommel’s 90th light infantry division who would end up fighting the 13th Demi Brigade at Bir Hakeim. The

⁵⁵ Ibid., 483.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ James Wellard, *The French Foreign Legion* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1974), 105.

⁵⁸ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 481.

⁵⁹ Windrow, *French Foreign Legion*, 34.

⁶⁰ Geraghty, *March or Die*, 177.

Germans and Italians were successful in some cases but not all. The Vichy Legion in certain situations altered rosters, changed legionnaire's names, or shipped legionnaires to other postings. Edmund Murray, Winston Churchill's future bodyguard, noted: "before Vichy France and the Nazis could do anything about us, we were on our way to relieve the 5th regiment in Indo-China."⁶¹ Although the Vichy government claimed it only handed over specifically named legionnaires it still showed the willingness of the government to accommodate their conquerors.

The rest who managed to stay in North Africa faced the German war effort which did not care for its foreign workers. France needed workers, and cheap ones at that. In order to meet German demands the French demobilized most foreigners and sent them to African camps. Szajkowski remembered that "most of them were demobilized and interned in labor camps."⁶² The Trans-Saharan Railway was the project these interned laborers were forced to build. The French tried numerous times to begin this project before the war but could not find willing workers. The government found "construction gangs in the French Foreign Legion, the refugees, and other aliens."⁶³ To guard these men the Vichy legionnaire became overseers, legionnaire guarded former legionnaire. Before concerns about the concentration camps emerged, the labor camps of North Africa were headline news. However, even with the Allied victory in North Africa in 1943, the labor camps still continued.

While the Free French were gaining victories and increasing morale, the Vichy Legion were doing the opposite. When the legionnaires from Syria returned to North Africa they were greeted with open arms and complained bitterly about the Gaullists. They still believed they had chosen the right side and that the Free French were sacrificing themselves to a lost campaign. However, there were thoughts of dissent within the ranks. Poor treatment by the Vichy government and the Germans led many Vichy legionnaires to question their stance in the war. All they wanted was to be fed appropriately, given proper equipment, and to have an enemy to fight, but none were offered. Further, the perpetuation of slave labor did not help the Vichy cause.

By the time of the American invasion in November of 1942, a division occurred within the Vichy Legion ranks. When the Allies came to shore, artillery batteries "adopted a passive attitude of not firing at the Americans, or firing wide."⁶⁴ On the other hand, pro-Vichy legionnaires from the Syria battle "left Bel-Abbes with the conviction that they were going to do some good work."⁶⁵ Even with allied victory in North Africa both Legions had a difficult time rectifying the division created by the armistice of 1940. Men agreed that they no longer served Vichy but disputes between De Gaulle and Henry Giraud plagued the camp. De Gaulle's camp was seen as a bunch of deserters, while Giraud's camp was seen as the legitimized commander of Free French forces.⁶⁶ Divisions were so prevalent that the Free Legion wore the green berets of the Norway campaign

⁶¹ Mikaberidze, "With Honor," 60.

⁶² Szajkowski, *Jews and the French Foreign Legion*, 77.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁶⁴ Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 492.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 492.

⁶⁶ Robert Gildea, *Fighters in the Shadow: a New History of the French Resistance* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 2015), 258-59.

while the traditional white kepi represented the former Vichy Legion. It would not be until the invasion of Italy that the two forces began to merge back together.

Conclusion

With Africa finally closed in 1943, the next step for the Allies was Italy. By this time the reunited Legion was properly equipped and manpower was at an acceptable strength. Manpower was always a constant problem in the Legion. The terrible treatment of foreigners before the war and during occupation left the Legion recruiting offices empty. Another issue was the lack of manpower overall in the French army. Foreigners could now choose to serve in the national army instead of being forced into the Legion. In order to maintain its existence, the Legion had to be folded into all French forces who were then assimilated into the Allied armies. The amalgamation process was so effective that to know a soldier was French was not by his uniform, but by the French patch worn on the Allied uniforms.

When the Legion arrived in Italy they realized they landed in chaos. The Allies made only small progressions and were constantly bogged down by mountainous warfare. The Germans prepared numerous defensive lines to stop the Allied invasion up through Italy. However, where the Allies failed, the Legion succeeded. The “rusticity and backwardness, which initially was much derided by Allied officers in 1942, in fact proved a great advantage in the rugged terrain of Italy, which so resembled North Africa.”⁶⁷ Italy proved to be a redeemer of Legion credibility after it had lost some during the Battle of El Alamein.

The last campaign the Legion fought was the French campaign. The Legion participated in ‘Operation Anvil’ in southern France with U.S. General George S. Patton. There the Legion again faced great odds without nearly the same resources allotted to their Allied counterparts. They were constantly sent ahead even when manpower was short and the tactical situation was not considered. The government in Paris was compensating “for the lost prestige that flowed from the 1940 defeat.”⁶⁸ To compensate for the lack of manpower the Legion looked to any place they could to find a group willing to fight for them. One example in 1945 entailed, “An SS unit of 650 Ukrainians. They were enlisted en masse in the Legion.”⁶⁹ The Legion used other tactics when manpower was not available. Sergeant Major Moulin “issued orders by telephone to Wehrmacht units...he told them where and when to assemble...Every time, the men paraded only to find themselves surrounded.”⁷⁰ All this aided in the ultimate Allied victory.

On the other side of the world in Indo-China, the Legion there remained loyally Vichy even when Vichy no longer existed. This segment of the Legion enjoyed a temporary reprieve during the war until 1945. Once the Japanese sensed that the Allies would use the region as a platform to attack Japan the legionnaires were driven out of the region or taken captive. After the war, De Gaulle had that specific Legion disbanded for its strong ties to Vichy.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 497.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 501.

⁶⁹ Boyd, *The French Foreign Legion*, 367.

⁷⁰ Geraghty, *March or Die*, 195.

By the end of the war, the Legion's identity had transformed, once again, from the inter-war years. World War II created a unique situation which escaped the purview of many, including the Legion itself. The French took all the credit for what the Legion had predominately done. The Resistance and national French armies already made themselves the heroes before the liberation of France had taken place.⁷¹ In the post-war years they were considered the only saviors of France. As Porch stated, "It was embarrassing for the French people to be reminded of that salvation and honor had been purchased in large measure by the blood of foreigners."⁷² The French people wanted a victory they could call their own.

The Legion, who had been praised in 1918 and glorified in the Bastille Day parade of 1939, were now unwanted and despised. For all the work they put in, they received little to no recognition. With no time for a break, they were sent back to their colonial duties in Africa and prepared for another colonial war in Indo-China. The Legion picked up where it left off. Like post-World War I, the Legion recruited its former enemies into its ranks without regard for past affiliations. Reinventing itself again, the stark division that occurred within the Legion disappeared in order to preserve it.

Overall, the legionnaires were key players on both sides of the battlefield. The Free Legion, comprised originally of the 13th Demi Brigade, delivered France's first victory in Narvik and Free France's victory in Syria. Their aid to Allied battles saved numerous lives and assisted in the continuance of the war. The Vichy Legion continued to provide security for its colonial possessions and provided workers for the labor camps. Unfortunately, the end of the war was not willing to receive any of these men as heroes or even as Frenchmen. Their legacy was preserved within the Legion but was lost to the outside world. Whether the French wish to acknowledge it or not, the Legion's contribution cannot be disputed. They did the dirty work so France would not have to. Despite relentless criticism, they effectively fulfilled a need that other Frenchmen refused to satisfy. Few historians have attempted to set their historical record straight within the French narrative. Other non-Legion historians do not acknowledge the significant role the Legion played. However, a brief look at its history from the founding through World War I, the inter-war years, and World War II proves the vital role of the Legion in the twentieth century. The Legion was made up of men who were left in the shadows, the scapegoats, the ones you could both love and hate. For too long, their work has been France's credit.

⁷¹ Gildea, *Fighters in the Shadows*, 178.

⁷² Porch, *The French Foreign Legion*, 503.

**Under the Influence of Domesticity:
The Fleming Museum's Drinking Objects and the American Relationship
with Drinking in the Nineteenth Century**

Wes Dunn

The Victorian movement of the mid-nineteenth century in America valued the single-family home as the wellspring of societal morality. In the well-maintained household, religious and moral ideals could be inculcated and defended; it was the fulcrum point where cultural values could be advocated and enacted. The ideal home was where the American heart was — and perhaps the liver as well. In the nineteenth century, the relationship between alcohol and the domestic realm was characterized by conflict and contradiction as drinking was swept up in the wide broom of domestic/cultural reform. Growing backlash against the intemperate excesses of public drinking culture saw the formation of a divide in which some forms of drinking were acceptable and others were not. Acceptable drinking came under the purview of the domestic ideal, in the form of sophisticated drinking vessels and etiquette practices to match.

Yet the domestic ideal, when applied, never seems to take full hold of what it tries to grasp. Seeming is not being, and a veneer of gentility could never hope to entirely restrain a substance as dynamic as alcohol. But this movement around temperate drinking nevertheless made a significant impact on how Americans drank by means of the vessels from which they drank—a story that is aptly illustrated across the five drinking-related objects I've selected from the Fleming collection.

A part of that story is that alcohol in the home was certainly never a new phenomenon; nor did it migrate in a major fashion from the public to the private sphere. Yet, what is striking about the nineteenth century domestic reform culture is how it made such concerted attempts to take something with an increasingly bad reputation and dress it up nicely in the hopes of thus elevating the practice of drinking to a more restrained, genteel state. In this, the American Victorians were not necessarily unsuccessful; the growing urban class of the mid to late nineteenth century was accompanied by a plenitude of etiquette manuals and catalogues advertising the latest and greatest in material objects. Whether these efforts made the larger societal impact that they might have hoped for, however, is more in question.

To understand the story of the interaction between alcohol and the nineteenth century domestic ideal, I will first explore how the American relationship with alcohol began and developed up to that point. I will then consider the history behind the objects with which the aspiring American upper classes hoped to refine the practice of drinking. Just as one cannot drink without a vessel to drink from, an understanding of the objects themselves is essential to taking in the scope of the American relationship with alcohol. They are what drive the story, illuminating aspects of the nineteenth century domestic ideal that would otherwise remain hidden in intangibility. In the end, the five objects housed in the Fleming collection are surprisingly

representative harbingers of the major themes — regarding class, nationalism, and gender dynamics — that characterized this tumultuous and lastingly influential period in American drinking culture.¹

Part 1: The American Relationship Between Alcohol and Domesticity

Entering into the twentieth century, the American relationship with alcohol would reach a new height of tension with the ratification of the doomed eighteenth amendment (prohibition) in 1919. Such an animus, however, would have been unbelievable a century prior. To understand how nineteenth century America bridged this chasm and how attempts were made during that time to restrain and domesticate alcohol, one needs to consider the wilds from whence it came.

The American relationship with alcohol was extensive and embedded. Of all the concerns regarding societal and cultural reformation going into the nineteenth century, one of the most crucial was, as the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance put it, “the excessive and intemperate use of spirituous liquors.”² Officially convened in 1811, this early temperance group “languished... some of its members, at length, advocated its dissolution; and others... seeing no happy results, retired from the field in despair.”³

At least one reason for this was not simply the sheer ubiquity of alcohol, but its intrinsic link with American history and culture. America was founded in “an age that considered alcohol safer than water,” owing to the prevailing sanitation practices of the day — and not just safer, but practically essential.⁴ Describing the history of alcohol in England, Brian Harrison explains that “it comforted the criminal about to be flogged, indispensably assisted dentists and surgeons before the days of anaesthetics, quieted crying babies as effectively as the popular Godfrey’s Cordial [one grain of opium in each two ounces],⁵ and ‘kept up’ the system against the ravages of child-bearing.”⁶ It brought relief from daily drudgery and stressful struggles and greased the social gears of society. “The bonds between drink and every aspect of life in a predominantly agricultural society,” Harrison continues, “had hitherto made teetotalers as rare as atheists. Indeed, in the early Victorian period, religion and drink were often abandoned together by the same individuals.”⁷

Though he is describing English history, this background applies just as fruitfully to the American story for two main reasons. First, early American culture was largely derived from its English roots — and secondly, whether in emulation or opposition, Americans continued up through the nineteenth century to look across the Atlantic for cultural standards (this transatlantic gaze also applied to material culture, as I will describe in part two). It is not surprising then, that

¹ The drinking objects I will analyze are from the American collection in the Fleming Museum of Art, Burlington, Vermont.

² *Fourth Report of the American Temperance Society* (Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1831), 68.

³ *Ibid.*, 68.

⁴ Mark Edward Lender and James Kirby Martin, *Drinking in America: A History* (New York: Free Press, 1982), 2.

⁵ T.E.C. Jr, “What Were Godfrey’s Cordial and Dalby’s Carminative?,” *Pediatrics* 45, issue 6 (1970).

⁶ Brian Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1971), 41.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 44.

in an early American culture which administered rum, brandy and/or opium to infants as a matter of practice and embraced wine as either the transsubstantive presence of Jesus or the diametrically opposite emblem of “rational self-determination,” initial attempts to restrict alcohol use did not achieve “happy results.”⁸ An English teetotaler, preparing to sign an oath to that effect in 1834, was restrained by his friend, who exclaimed, “Thee mustn’t, Richard, thee’ll die.”⁹

Americans continued this foundation of strong health and social bonds with alcohol, and also inscribed it into their civil history. A lord in England opined in 1872 that as much of his nation’s history had “been brought about in public-houses as in the House of Commons.”¹⁰ This was evidently the same in America, where “colonial taverns offered not only food and drink but also lodgings and a forum for public gatherings.”¹¹ Bostonians organized the Tea Party at the Green Dragon Tavern, the Minutemen’s Lexington headquarters was Buckman’s Tavern, Ethan Allen and the Green Mountain Boys gathered at Bennington’s Catamount Tavern. The “great gathering place for members of Congress,” where John Adams and George Washington first met, was Philadelphia’s City Tavern. Thomas Jefferson penned the Declaration of Independence in the nearby Indian Queen Tavern with “a brimming glass of Madeira next to his bottle of ink.”¹² Indeed, Madeira (a Portuguese wine fortified with “neutral grape spirits — think a sort of modified vodka or eau de vie”) became “identified with the American struggle for independence”¹³ after a riot erupted in Boston (preceding the Tea Party by five years) when John Hancock refused British attempts to tax his shipment of 3,150 gallons of it.¹⁴ Perhaps a few ounces of that shipment made it into the Fleming’s glass goblet, crafted only fifteen years after the last battle of the Revolution.

The owners of this glass goblet, who inscribed their initials — FLL and ELL — over the date “1799,” likely drank more than just a few ounces, however. Mark Lender and James Martin estimate in their impressive index of the “apparent consumption of alcoholic beverages 1790-1985”¹⁵ that “by the 1790s an average American over fifteen years old drank just under six gallons of absolute alcohol each year.”¹⁶ That’s not six gallons of beer, cider, distilled liquors or wine. That’s the *absolute* alcohol, which represents “some thirty-four gallons of beer and cider, slightly over five gallons of distilled liquors, and under a gallon of wine.”¹⁷ Keep in mind as well that this is a tempered average of “the entire drinking-age population, including nondrinkers.”¹⁸ According to Lender and Martin’s index, the lamenting tone of the American Temperance Society regarding their Massachusetts forebears was reasonable: in the decade following the founding of the

⁸ Robert C. Fuller, *Religion and Wine: A Cultural History of Wine Drinking in the United States* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1996), 23, 44.

⁹ Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians*, 45.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 45.

¹¹ Lender and Martin, *Drinking in America: A History*, 13.

¹² Eric Burns, *The Spirits of America: A Social History of Alcohol* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004), 7.

¹³ Steven Grasse, *Colonial Spirits: A Toast to Our Drunken History* (New York: Abrams Image, 2016), 76.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Lender and Martin, *Drinking in America: A History*, 205.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, the average American consumed more alcohol than ever before: a full seven gallons of absolute alcohol.¹⁹

From 1810 to 1840, this level of consumption remained stable — but then it dropped by more than half. In fact, the average American would never come close to drinking this much again; two to three gallons became and remained the standard for the rest of American history.²⁰ What happened? One could perhaps argue that the American relationship with water improved from its colonial beginnings, but why such a sudden and precipitous drop? Going from seven to three gallons all at once took effective organization, effort, and concentrated force of will, and in some cases, just force: the fledgling temperance movement had finally gained its footing.²¹

Temperance

By the mid-nineteenth century, anti-alcohol advocacy was no longer the languishing field of despair that the early Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance described. The key leverage for this new relevance was a combination of religious and scientific appeal, in which esteemed preachers and doctors lent gravitas to the growing movement. Indeed, the rhetoric sometimes combined the two: the fourth report of the American Temperance Society rejoices that the “desperate disease” of intemperance “is at last yielding to the power and skill of the great Physician above.”²² It is an interesting reversal, in which alcohol’s shifting sway is most starkly laid out; medical authorities had previously been prescribing opiates and alcohol with abandon, and now they railed against it.

Charles Jewett, M.D., chides in the preface to his 1872 work *A Forty Year’s Fight with the Drink Demon*, “Had the temperance enterprise, commenced substantially in 1826, received from the American people a support... commensurate with its importance... the promise... of a speedy triumph would have been realized.”²³ This substantial commencement he refers to is a series of six sermons that Harriet Beecher Stowe’s father, the pastor Lyman Beecher, gave to his congregation in Litchfield Connecticut. The American Temperance Society report also cites these sermons, saying that “they exerted a powerful and extensive influence in aiding its operations.”²⁴

It seems that these six polemic sermons, which were published in 1829, broke the ice in order to let the temperance movement move forward. The book, in which Beecher compelled his readers to “resolve upon reformation by entire abstinence, before you close this,” achieved this strong impact by giving the temperance movement a set of organizing principles and a platform upon which to firmly campaign, all wrapped in a crucial sense of urgency.²⁵ “No sin has fewer

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 205.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Fran Grace. *Carry A. Nation: Retelling the Life* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2001), 10.

²² *Fourth Report of the American Temperance Society*, 68.

²³ Charles Jewett. *A Forty Year’s Fight with the Drink Demon* (New York: National Temperance Society and Publishing House, 1872), iii.

²⁴ *Fourth Report of the American Temperance Society*, 70.

²⁵ Lyman Beecher, *Six Sermons on the Nature, Occasions, Signs, Evils and Remedy of Intemperance* (Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1829), 105.

apologies than intemperance,” Beecher argued. “The suffrage of the world is against it; and yet there is no sin so naked in its character, and whose commencement and progress is indicated by so many signs, concerning which there is among mankind such profound ignorance.”²⁶ In other words, Beecher sought to dispel “the undefined nature of the crime in its early stages” so that responsibility and blame could be firmly stuck upon intemperate individuals who might otherwise forever claim that they were simply having a normal few sips. And he solidified the urgency that the movement needed: “The fire [of intemperance] has burst out, and is blazing around us. If it cannot be extinguished, we are undone. Our sun is fast setting, and the darkness of an endless night is closing in upon us.”²⁷ The means of extinguishing such a fire, as we can guess from the Beecher name, would end up having a lot to do with domestic reform — the cause for which Lyman’s daughter Harriet would become a household name. After all, one of the main trends in the Victorian period of the mid to late nineteenth century was a vision of the home as the space wherein values regarding cultural and societal morality could be most effectively leveraged.

The temperance movement waxed and waned throughout the nineteenth century - with crescendos in 1873 and 1884, in which “hundreds of thousands of women, in a paroxysm of activity and prayer, closed thirty thousand saloons,” and in the second wave compelled states to enact antiliquor laws.²⁸ But in each case, the saloons re-opened once fervor died down, and “most of these laws were soon repealed or diluted.”²⁹ The women striving for this sort of societal reform found that their public efforts were often diluted or washed away like sand castles too close to the surf. The site that seemed to hold more promise for enduring reform was the one where women had the home field advantage, so to speak. The domestic space, culturally assigned to women as their sphere of influence, emerged as the leverage point where the temperance effort could find the most traction. This isn’t to paint a picture of some mass retreat from the public realm to the private, but rather to emphasize that the domestic space offered a site for reform struggle that was less boom-and-bust. And while public temperance efforts would resume with fervor in the early twentieth century, the effort to domesticate drinking in the home played a significant concurrent role in the nineteenth century.

Domesticating Drink

After all, alcohol was not only firmly embedded in the story of America, but specifically in its homes. When it came to alcohol, the borders of the domestic space had always been highly permeable. This can be seen in the example of the aforementioned Lyman Beecher. His polemic preaching ended up being practiced within his own family. His grandson Frederick, son of the preeminent nineteenth century domestic advisor Harriet Beecher Stowe, “was wounded in the civil

²⁶ Beecher, *Six Sermons*, 6.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 59.

²⁸ Catherine Murdock, *Domesticating Drink: Women, Men, and Alcohol in America, 1870-1940* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 18-19.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

war and became an alcoholic.”³⁰ Whereas Lyman Beecher took the broad view, decrying the “great and evil” effect of intemperance “upon the military prowess of a nation,” Major General Edmund Gaines hit the nail more on the head, describing how “most of the soldiers who enter the army as sober men, acquire habits of intemperance.”³¹ “I have known sober recruits,” he recounted, “whose constant intercourse with tipplers would soon induce them to taste a *little*, and, in time, a *little more*, until they became habitual drunkards.”³² Such was the case with Frederick, and despite Harriet enrolling him in “an extensive rehabilitation program,” he left home for San Francisco and then disappeared.³³

The case of Harriet Beecher Stowe’s son is just one keen example of how factors external to the domestic space came through its doors. Women weren’t just concerned about their children, however; the primary issue was their husbands — particularly in connection to domestic violence. Catherine Murdock explains how, “barred by law or custom from divorcing inebriate husbands, unable to earn a living wage themselves, isolated in a society with few mechanisms to reform drinkers or aid their families, drunkard’s wives faced brutality, poverty and abandonment.”³⁴ Though simply bringing drunken behavior out of the tavern and into the home would not address domestic violence but potentially even worsen it, the temperance movement backed itself into that corner by relying strongly upon the rhetoric of ideal womanhood and the Victorian ideal of the power of the domestic space to inculcate morality. In order to cut off the source and “counteract the amoral public world of nineteenth century men,” temperance efforts “promoted an image of woman as pious, pure, domestic and submissive” in an appeal to pathos - hoping it would be strong enough that “men would abandon public drinking spaces for the comforts of fireside and family.”³⁵

Not all crusaders played up the role of the ideal woman — Carry A. Nation (Hatchet Carry) famously took a much more active approach, transgressing gender boundaries in the process and incurring the wrath of northeasterners in particular, “who believed that such a blurring of gender roles would destroy Anglo Saxon civilization.”³⁶ Murdock explores this class and cultural divide within the temperance movement—exploring how dry movements in particular came to be seen as “awfully countrified and bigoted,” arising mostly from the working classes.³⁷ In contrast, the growing urban middle class of the nineteenth century saw drink as “an indicator of urbanity and sophistication,” as so much of socializing and entertaining in that context revolved around or at least firmly included alcohol.³⁸ So instead of a Hatchett-like movement to eradicate the vice of drinking at its root, the focus in the more elite urban sites (wherein the American cultural ideals were exercised) instead distinguished intemperance from “respectable” drinking. The question in

³⁰ Clifford Edward Clark Jr. *The American Family Home* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1986), 67.

³¹ *Fourth Report of the American Temperance Society*, 71.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ “Frederick William Stowe: The Story of a Personal Tragedy,” *Maine Legacy*, accessed November 9, 2017. <http://www.mainelegacy.com/8.html>.

³⁴ Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 16.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 17.

³⁶ Grace, *Carry A. Nation*, 224.

³⁷ Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 65.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 64-65.

this context was not so much the alcohol itself, but how it was consumed. As Murdock notes, this concern played out in the “profusion of etiquette manuals, the formality of middle-class dinners, and the inexpensive household goods such as glassware that were fashioned after elite objects and rituals.”³⁹ By cloaking drinking in the veneer of refinement, the Victorian domestic reform movement sought not necessarily to curb drinking but to refine alcohol and those who drank it.

The Victorian reasoning that themes of virtue and morality could be made tangible by means of elegant objects and household decorations was thus applied to alcohol as well. By associating alcohol with ornate, civilized drinking vessels, the whole enterprise of drinking could become as domesticated and respectable as the women who campaigned against taverns and saloons. The Fleming’s ornate wine glass, cordial set, hunting-themed wine pitcher, and beer stein are in this sense examples of what Murdock calls the “mind-boggling enterprise” of Victorian formal dinners and home entertaining in which there were “as many task-specific objects as possible.”⁴⁰ The 1873 *New Cyclopaedia of Domestic Economy* “recommended that aspiring housekeepers obtain ‘three dozen wine glasses, two dozen champagne glasses, two dozen claret glasses, three dozen goblets, six water carafes, six decanters, one liqueur stand, twelve liqueur glasses...’”⁴¹ and the list goes on. By this standard, the Fleming’s cordial set falls short; it contains just six glasses. Perhaps the owner’s strategy was to have a second set.

It is important to note, of course, that by placing faith in refined objects and ideal womanhood, the Victorian ideals of domestic morality opened the door to other forms of elitism; to base arguments on moral high ground and purity is to open a dangerous door. Kristin Hoganson describes how the Women’s Christian Temperance Union formed a “Department of Purity in Literature and Art that campaigned against ‘parisian indecency’ and Oriental dancers at carnivals and fairs.”⁴² Later, they took up the General Federation of Women’s Clubs’ call to “concentrate on Americanization” of immigrant groups⁴³ — a precursor to the nationalism employed by the ASL. The major rationalization for this was the vague banner of “home protection.”⁴⁴ Even Carry Nation employed this rhetoric, signing in to New York’s Hotel Victoria as “Carry Nation, Your Loving Home Defender, Kansas.”⁴⁵ Home protection and defense could mean a lot of things — not just protection from domestic violence, but also “boundary-building efforts aimed at keeping difference at bay.”⁴⁶ With “respectable women” leading the temperance charge, this was a slippery slope.⁴⁷ If temperance was an attempt to domesticate alcohol, we can see how these efforts were class-based, with respectable ways to be (affluent, pious, white, American) and respectable ways to drink (not much, out of specific dedicated serving objects at home).

³⁹ Ibid., 65.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 57-58.

⁴² Kristin L. Hoganson, *Consumer’s Imperium: The Global Production of American Domesticity, 1865-1920* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 2007), 21.

⁴³ Ibid., 210.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 204.

⁴⁵ Grace, *Carry A. Nation*, 225.

⁴⁶ Hoganson, *Consumer’s Imperium*, 21.

⁴⁷ Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 16.

Part 2: The Production and Marketing of Refined Objects

Looking for a definition of “refined,” nineteenth century Americans with upper-crust aspirations consulted the dictionary of British and European taste, and we can track this etymology in the systems of production and marketing behind the objects that met that standard. By considering how these objects were made and marketed, we get a better glimpse at the dynamic behind this domestication project. To begin, when we examine how the Victorian domestic ideal sought to achieve respectable drinking via refined drinking objects, another key and inextricably linked dynamic arises — the ongoing American gaze across the Atlantic. Of course, alcohol itself traveled the Atlantic — consider the importance of rum in the triangle slave trade, or the aforementioned role of imported Portuguese Madeira in the American Revolution. But the stylistic values that governed the objects by which alcohol was domesticated were also transatlantic. Elegance implies a standard by which objects could be assessed and compared, and for Americans of a higher social status, that standard was their English forebears and continental European counterparts. With the Fleming objects as a guide, we can see how this dynamic let up to and played out across the nineteenth century.

The first production aspect to consider is glassware, which, like many of the objects valued in Victorian domestic culture, originated from an artisanal production process — unlike the industrial standardization that would come to the fore in the twentieth century. The Fleming’s 1799 wine glass, embroidered with gold flower-motif panels, along with the initials “FLL” and “ELL,” is an impressive example of glasswork. In addition to the engraved and gilded panels, the stem bulges in the middle in a style known as ballustroid, and features two opaque helix swirls within it.⁴⁸ Finally, there is a pontil mark on the base, which evidences that it was made free-hand, rather than molded. This mark comes from a pontil rod, the long iron rod which glassblowers would attach to the base of a hot piece of glass in order to work on it. When the piece was done, the rod would be sharply tapped to break it off (known as “cracking off”), and the evidence of its use is permanent — any glass product held with a pontil rod “will almost always retain some evidence of the pontil rod attachment.”⁴⁹ Industrial methods, by contrast, relied on a more efficient process of standardized, pre-made molds.

The individual attention and artisan production suggested by the use of a pontil rod was the standard for how glassware was produced up until the later nineteenth century, when this method was mostly phased out.⁵⁰ The site for this kind of production was the glasshouse— much like a smithy, this was a small operation with expert craftspeople dedicated to working with a specific kind of material. This was the first industry to be imported to the Americas from European origins. Spanish conquerors established glasshouses in Mexico and Argentina as early as the

⁴⁸ Ivor Noel Hume. *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1969), 193.

⁴⁹ Bill Lindsey, “Bottle Bases: Pontil Marks of Scars” last modified March 9, 2017.

https://sha.org/bottle/pontil_scars.htm

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

sixteenth century, and the London Company of Virginia built a glasshouse as part of its first Jamestown colony attempt in 1608.⁵¹ Several Germans were brought expressly to operate it, but they ended up stealing weapons from the English colonists and defected to the Powhatan Confederacy.⁵²

The first successful commercial glasshouse enterprise in America was also a German affair, and also defiant of British power. Caspar Wistar, a German immigrant, “defied a British policy forbidding manufacturing in the colonies by opening a window- and bottle-making company, Wistarburgh Glass Manufactory, with four German glassblowers,” in 1739.⁵³ The British government banned all manufacturing at this point; the colonies were to be expressly reliant on imports. Wistar skated under the punitive radar due to the quotidian nature of his products — window panes and basic utilitarian vessels. The next major player on the scene was another German. Henry William Stiegel, who founded the town of Manheim in Pennsylvania and, “encouraged by the patriotic adoption of a boycott of British imports” in the runup to the Revolutionary War, began a glasshouse in 1768 where he branched out from window panes, importing “Venetian, German, and English glassworkers, to make utilitarian vessels and fine tableware.”⁵⁴

Despite the fact that American production was becoming *de rigueur*, the standard to which this production was compared was still decidedly British — the fledgling American identity was keen to prove its worth in relation to its colonial motherland. In 1771, the *Boston News-Letter* reported that Stiegel’s wine glasses were judged by the “American Philosophical Society” to be “equal in beauty and quality to the generality of Flint glass imported from England.”⁵⁵ The journalism of colonial Boston shines light on exactly how German the production of American glassware was — the next year, the *Boston Evening Post* announced the arrival of “300 Germans, Men, Women and Children, some of whom are going to settle at Germantown (a part of Braintree),” specifying that “among the artificers come over in this ship, there are a number of Men skilled in making of glass, of various Sorts, and a House proper for carrying on that useful manufacture, will be erected at Germantown as soon as possible.”⁵⁶ This glasshouse was apparently such a big deal that the next year, the *Boston Gazette* put out a notice that “for the future none will be admitted to see the new manufactory at Germantown, unless they pay one shilling lawfull money” and urged its readers who still chose to go “not to ask above three or four Questions, and not to be offended if they have not a satisfactory answer to all or any of them.”⁵⁷

⁵¹ Hugh Wakefield, Robert Jesse Charleston, and Thomas S. Buechner, “Glassware,” *Encyclopedia Britannica* (2010), <https://www.britannica.com/art/glassware/Mid-15th-to-mid-19th-century#toc74246>.

⁵² James Horn, *A Land as God Made It: Jamestown and the Birth of America* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), 127.

⁵³ Tammy La Gorce, “How South Jersey Shaped Glass, and Vice Versa” *The New York Times* (May 30, 2014), <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/06/01/nyregion/how-south-jersey-shaped-glass-and-vice-versa.html>.

⁵⁴ “Henry William Stiegel,” *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1998), <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Henry-William-Stiegel>.

⁵⁵ George Francis Dow, *The Arts & Crafts in New England 1704-1775: Gleanings from Boston Newspapers Relating to Painting, Engraving, Silversmiths, Pewters, Clockmakers, Furniture, Pottery, Old houses, Costume, Trades and Occupations* (Topsfield: Wayside Press, 1927), 102.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

Glassworks seldom seemed to last very long - this popular Germantown glasshouse was struck by lightning and burned down the following year, Stiegel went bankrupt and was thrown into debtor's prison, and numerous other glassworks rose and quickly fell into bankruptcy. Helen and George McKearin argue in their work *Two Hundred Years of American Blown Glass* that glasshouse founders "habitually underestimated the amount of capital necessary to launch and maintain a glassworks," and even when they had them up and running, "in most instances the founders overestimated the demand for American-made glass."⁵⁸ Customers in the major population areas of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Charleston had no qualms about purchasing imports over domestic products — "the majority of customers perversely preferred the crown glass and tablewares imported from England and even from the continent."⁵⁹ Sometimes these customers wanted American-made glassware that proudly rivaled that of England and Europe, but one could also display American prowess by purchasing products from across the Atlantic; now that they no longer had to, choosing to do so was a way of displaying autonomous American economic power.

If the Fleming wine glass was American-made, the most likely maker would be John Frederick Amelung's New Bremen Glass Manufactory, founded in the 1780's and known for its engravings and its "Bremen Pokal" (German for goblet).⁶⁰ But it seems more likely that it was imported from England, where opaque enameled glass in the Venetian style came into favor in the 1750's. The swirling helix design in its ballustroid stem was a major trend in that period, developed in response to an excise tax on the weight of glassware.⁶¹ To make their wares lighter, glass blowers aimed for thinness (certainly an attribute of the Fleming's wine glass) and inserted "air traps," into the stems, pulling them into spiral patterns in a style known as "air twist stems."⁶² Advertised in the *Boston News-Letter* as "worm'd glasses,"⁶³ they became very popular in the years leading right up to the Revolution — and if the Fleming's wine glass is any indication, this style remained present at least soon afterwards as well.

The Fleming's cordial set, also blown glass, likely originated in the mid-nineteenth century. The McKearins describe how at that time, "the continuously broadening base of consumption created a demand for and made profitable a tremendous expansion in the variety of glass articles and wares."⁶⁴ *The Britannica* corroborates, citing how "the taste of the newly prosperous bourgeoisie favoured elaborate decoration" in their household objects during the "second quarter of the 19th century."⁶⁵ As technologies advanced or finally became financially viable, color became the main obsession, and new ones were being constantly sought as what was formerly exciting became common. The Fleming's cordial set is made in its entirety — from tray to decanter to cordial glasses — of a dark ruby glass, with thin gold bands and ornamentation. "The most

⁵⁸ Helen and George McKearin, *Two Hundred Years of American Blown Glass* (New York: Crown, 1950), 50-51.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁶⁰ Wakefield, Charleston, and Buechner, "Glassware."

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Hume, *A Guide to Artifacts of Colonial America*, 193.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 193.

⁶⁴ McKearin, *Two Hundred Years*, 132.

⁶⁵ Wakefield, Charleston, and Buechner, "Glassware."

avored colors,” the McKearins explain, “were light and dark ruby, for the making of which cheaper means than gold had been rediscovered in Bohemia in 1827.”⁶⁶ Indeed, the term “bohemian” became “a potent sales adjective just as ‘English,’ ‘French,’ ‘Irish’ and ‘Dutch’ had once been,” and mid-century advertisements typically listed decanters among their fancy “bohemian ware.”⁶⁷ The *Britannica* confirms that the most popular colors of this period were “ruby red, blue, or opaque white.”⁶⁸ So it seems that even if the Fleming’s cordial set is not from this bohemian surge, its influences were likely felt in the production process.

The story of glasshouse founders was often that of a German entrepreneur seeking to prosper in what was seen as a burgeoning new frontier of commerce. As they often found, they emulation of English or European styles was sometimes lauded, but consumers were fickle. Americans, hoping to display their class status with ornate objects, gazed across the Atlantic in order to judge their own stylistic standards. In doing so, these consumers sometimes did not favor acquiring an American-made product that rivaled its transatlantic counterparts, but sought instead to get their hands on the real thing from the source.

The Fleming’s German beer stein provides a good example of this dynamic. It is a product of the Villeroy and Boch company, which was founded in 1748 when Francois Boch elected to transition (putting the “domestic” in domestication) from his job as the royal cannon founder for France to making ceramic crockery.⁶⁹ He soon merged with a competitor and the consolidated company, after starting a kilnworks in Luxembourg, settled for good in Mettlach, Germany in 1809.⁷⁰ By the time the Fleming’s stein arrived in the U.S., it was part of major surge in the consumption of beer, driven in large part by German immigrants⁷¹ — no longer just producing the vessels, but also the drink to fill them with. The average American drank about five gallons of beer per year during the 1860’s, but two decades later, that figure had more than tripled.⁷² By the time the Fleming’s origin estimate for the stein runs out, its owner was liable to have imbibed almost thirty gallons of beer from it in one year.⁷³ As American beer consumption rose in the later nineteenth century, companies like Villeroy and Boch met the demand stemming from secondhand imperial ambitions that swept through the U.S. upper-classes at the same time, providing an excellent way to display one’s status by acquiring continental European products.

“Things Never Before Shown in America!” began an advertisement for Villeroy and Boch’s products in *The Pottery and Glass Salesman*. “I have recently returned from Europe,” attests E.R. Theller, the “Sole representative for U.S. and Canada” for Villeroy and Boch, “where I closed arrangements with numerous factories... for exclusive sale in the United States of their

⁶⁶ McKearin, *Two Hundred Years*, 133.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸ Wakefield, Charleston, and Buechner, “Glassware.”

⁶⁹ “The Company’s History,” *Villeroy and Boch* (2015), <https://www.villeroyboch-group.com/en/company/our-stories/history.html>.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ Ken Burns, “Roots of Prohibition,” *PBS*, last modified 2011, <http://www.pbs.org/kenburns/prohibition/roots-of-prohibition/>.

⁷² Lender and Martin, *Drinking in America: A History*, 205.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

distinctive and original productions.”⁷⁴ “Mettlach” is emblazoned in large print in the middle of the page, as Theller invites buyers to come see the German (in addition to his Dutch, Danish and Swedish) wares — “They must be seen to be appreciated... this should interest every buyer at this time.”⁷⁵ Many buyers had already been interested in the Mettlach name for some time. *Glass and Pottery World* explained in 1896 how ten years ago, the dealers say, the only persons in New York who bought the Mettlach stoneware were the keepers of German barrooms, but latterly a vast number of citizens have bought steins and other vessels and given them places of honor in their dining-rooms, where their presence among sparkling glassware and fine porcelain helps to give an effect of homelike cheer that may have been lacking before.⁷⁶ Here we can clearly see how, in a sort of gentrification, German beer steins like the one in the Fleming collection made the move from “German barrooms” to the “places of honor” in American dining rooms — a clear example by which to discern how drinking objects were domesticated.

As objects from public spaces like taverns made their way into the domestic space, they brought their masculine trappings into this traditionally feminine realm. An object like the Fleming’s beer stein shows how men in the nineteenth century may have become more domesticated, but were concerned with exhibiting that they had not in the process been emasculated. The enameled decoration of the stein depicts a sort of meta-image of an aristocratic hunting party sitting down to drink beer. Beer itself was already a masculine bastion, but the imagery of hunting was also a popular way to portray ideal masculinity.

Jane Perkins Claney, writing on the use of Rockingham ceramic ware in nineteenth century America, explains how statements of class identity could also be imbued with statements of gender identity. Hunting motifs and imagery were a “key ingredient in the nineteenth-century concept of masculinity,” allowing men of the “new urban middle classes” to assert their masculinity in the domestic sphere.⁷⁷ In this sense, the beer stein has a great deal in common with the Rockingham wine pitcher in the Fleming collection, which is decorated with images of a stag hunt. These sorts of images, Claney explains, “Carry class allusions, referring to royal game preserves of the Middle Ages and, later, to deer parks of the wealthy.”⁷⁸ She identifies “hunting pitchers” as a veritable genre; one that provides a keen glimpse at gender and class dynamics. Objects that bore such images speak to the “perceived need” of mid-nineteenth century “upper-status groups to maintain the contrast in consumer choices between themselves and lower-status groups,” even if the products were all coming from the same source.⁷⁹ With task-specific objects like these, affluent urbanites of the mid-nineteenth century were more concerned about serving their guests reminders of their class status than the food itself. Claney explains how, during this time, “Status was no longer a stable condition, but had to be maintained constantly by a quick grasp and speedy adoption

⁷⁴ *The Pottery & Glass Salesman vol. 15* (New York: O’Gorman Publishing Company, 1917), 2.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Glass & Pottery World vol. 4* (New York: Trade Magazine Association, 1896), 22.

⁷⁷ Jane Perkins Claney, *Rockingham Ware in American Culture, 1830-1930: Reading Historical Artifacts* (Lebanon: University Press of New England, 2004), 111.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 110.

of the newest material goods.”⁸⁰ Such was the case with “middle-class men living in cities” who “formed the market for Rockingham-ware pitchers decorated with hunt scenes.”⁸¹

American Made

While the Fleming’s Villeroy and Boch beer stein and Rockingham wine pitcher carry the same class and gender connotations through their hunting imagery, their principal distinction is in their origins. As described, the stein allowed its owner to display a sense of exclusivity and foreign allure, having acquired a product directly from its continental European source. The Fleming’s wine pitcher, on the other hand, was an American affair — likely a product of Christopher Webber Fenton’s U.S. Pottery Company. Fenton, an American-born potter, began producing Rockingham pottery in 1847 in Bennington, Vermont.⁸² Rockingham was an English pottery style with a long tradition, but Fenton had no desire to be part of it. His Americanization effort was to call his Rockingham works “dark lustre” in his price lists, though he conceded to the powerful marketing effect — English production being dominant in the American pottery market — by adding “or Rockingham Ware.”⁸³ Fenton’s U.S. Pottery Company had by far the most “ambitious inventory” of this period, “offering sixty-two different forms” of Rockingham-ware vessels in 1852, compared to his New Jersey counterpart Swan Hill Pottery’s nineteen.⁸⁴ Fenton represented the U.S. at the first world’s fair at New York’s Crystal Palace in 1853 with a “cascade” pitcher “inspired by the torrents of Niagara Falls.”⁸⁵

In this way, we can see how the Victorian desire for a plethora of specific and ornate objects was met both domestically and from abroad. But when we consider Bennington pottery we can see another side of the story. Another Bennington ceramic vessel in the Fleming collection, a “cider pitcher,” reminds us that not all alcohol needed to be reigned in from the wilds of the tavern — some kinds, like cider, has always been a homemade affair. As Claney explains, Rockingham ware was not traditionally an elite product — in the U.S. it was commonly found in rural sites, in the form of “a preponderance of food preparation vessels” such as mixing bowls. Less-affluent rural domestic settings favored these large vessels that could serve many purposes and many people at once. More single-purpose and ornate vessels characterized the urban sites in Claney’s study: “The most numerous forms found on urban sites” were teapots and pitchers.⁸⁶ Following this analysis, it would seem that rather than an upper-class urban parlor or dining room, the Fleming’s “cider pitcher” likely originated from a farm site — because even though it is listed as a “pitcher,” it has a vastly different shape than that of the hunting pitcher. It is open and wide-brimmed — the equivalent of a modern-day mixing bowl with a pouring spout. Though it has a similar “dark

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid., 13.

⁸² Ibid., 57.

⁸³ Ibid., 44.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 74.

⁸⁵ Allison Meier, “Resurrecting the First World’s Fair in the US Through Its Relics” *Hyperallergic* (May 10, 2017) <https://hyperallergic.com/373117/crystal-palace-bard-graduate-center/>.

⁸⁶ Claney, *Rockingham Ware in American Culture, 1830-1930*, 112.

lustre,” as Fenton would say, it is unclear if it is in fact Rockingham ware, and it lacks any decoration - which suggests that it was not a display object like the hunting pitcher, but more likely intended to be used often.

Claney explains that in rural settings, with large families and their farmhands or boardinghouse communities, the key factor for Rockingham and other ceramic kitchen/tableware was that it facilitate “serving large quantities of food from which diners could help themselves.”⁸⁷ Claney found dedicated pitchers to be relatively rare in rural settings — out of twenty-nine samples she found, twenty-three were from urban sites, with three from rural and village sites respectively.⁸⁸ So this “cider pitcher” presents a stark contrast to the hunting pitcher: its lack of ornamentation and much more utilitarian design indicate that its owners were less interested in the question of “will this object portray my class and gender identity effectively” than “will this object serve cider to a large group of people effectively.”

Another factor at play, of course, is that the Fleming dates the production of this “pitcher” to the period of the Civil War, when, much like the Revolutionary War, production regimes were interrupted and/or altered. Just as glassware was not produced in the same way afterwards, moving from free-hand use of pontil rods to more efficient molding techniques, the production of ceramic wares and the ways they were advertised and used shifted during this time. Interestingly, the contemporary company that goes by the name of “Bennington Potters” — the name that the Fleming listing has for the cider pitcher — says that their forebears went out of business in 1858.⁸⁹ This is corroborated by William Ketchum in his book *American Country Pottery*: Bennington was an “important center” of production “from about 1844 until 1858.”⁹⁰ This either suggests that Bennington was not the site of origin for this unadorned vessel — there were production sites in Burlington and St. Albans as well — or that it was not made under the purview of a company, but on a much smaller scale. Either way, this object speaks to the less glamorous aspect alcohol’s domestication — the sense in which it was an established part of the rural home economy.

Alcohol had, of course, always been in the home. As mentioned earlier, the early attitude towards the health benefits of alcohol compared to water saw alcohol administered to pregnant women and their babies; it filled what today is the role of coffee in many households. Products like beer and cider, which Lender and Martin’s index indicates as forming the bulk of American alcohol consumption, were often made at home, in the DIY spirit of early America. Like Bennington pottery’s Rockingham ware, this was carried from an English background, where “home methods equalled or perhaps surpassed” the amount of cider produced commercially.⁹¹ In the mid-nineteenth century, as alcohol consumption plummeted overall, “apple raising and cider

⁸⁷ Ibid., 119.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 126.

⁸⁹ “Our History,” *Bennington Potters* (2004) https://www.benningtonpotters.com/our_history.

⁹⁰ William C. Ketchum, Jr., *American Country Pottery: Yellowware and Spongeware* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987), 18.

⁹¹ Vrest Orton, *The American Cider Book: The Story of America’s Natural Beverage* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973), 12.

making reached a peak in the United States.”⁹² This is an essential aspect of alcohol in the home: the fact that it had always been an integral part of the domestic economy.

Conclusion

From what initially may have appeared to be a disparate set of objects drawn from the Fleming collection based on visual appeal, a fairly representative narrative emerges, chronicling some of the major trends regarding alcohol in the nineteenth-century American domestic space. The glass goblet, reflecting newly independent Americans’ allegiance to wine (potentially Madeira, which played a huge role in American history) is a harbinger of the specialized and extravagant drinking objects of Victorian domesticity — which sought to domesticate alcohol and those who drank it. The ruby glass cordial set and enameled porcelain beer stein represent this movement to tame alcohol under a respectable veneer. The two Bennington pottery pitchers exemplify this class and culture-based dynamic — juxtaposing one such Victorian piece with a more every day, likely multi-use vessel that relates to the foundational American practice of producing alcohol at home.

The fact that alcohol had always been produced and consumed within the domestic realm in a manner that was considered temperate provided a basis for temperance movements to regroup after their setbacks in the public realm. Men were still able to express their ideals of masculinity in the form of ornate vessels decorated with hunting imagery, and the growing plethora of these sorts of task-specific objects expressed the overall ideal of reigning in the effects of taverns and public drinking culture run amok. By basing their argument around the home, advocates for temperance were able to build upon that unassailable platform and ultimately make a larger societal impact. Temperance gained sharper teeth, and by the time the nineteenth century merged into the twentieth, prohibition was the goal.

This transition is immediately evident in the name of one of the most prominent prohibition advocacy organizations. The “Anti-Saloon League” suggests right away that the enemy was not primarily alcohol itself, but bars, taverns and saloons — the public edifices of intemperance. The Fleming’s beer stein, originating somewhere in the range of 1885-1910, attests to the fact that alcohol had not been fully tamed by domestication efforts. The growing tide of beer consumption had seen Villeroy and Boch’s steins spread from “German barrooms” to “places of honor in dining-rooms,”⁹³ but this was ultimately just that: a spread, not a migration. German barrooms were still bustling.

This actually turned out to be the leverage that the Anti-Saloon League⁹⁴ leaned on most heavily to get the eighteenth Amendment passed: “as anti-German fervor rose to a near frenzy with the American entry into the First World War, ASL propaganda effectively connected beer and

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ *Glass & Pottery World*, vol.4, 22.

⁹⁴ ASL from here on.

brewers with Germans and treason in the public mind.”⁹⁵ The ASL had been “willing to form alliances with any and all constituencies that shared its sole goal: a constitutional amendment that would ban the manufacture, sale and transportation of alcohol.”⁹⁶ Nothing was ruled out; they worked with “Democrats and Republicans, Progressives, Populists, and suffragists, the Ku Klux Klan and the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People], the International Workers of the World, and many of America's most powerful industrialists including Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Andrew Carnegie.”⁹⁷ But ultimately, it seems that the very thing that resisted temperance efforts — proud German beer brewers — was what helped the prohibition movement clinch its doomed victory. Capitalizing on xenophobia was not a strategy that happened overnight for the ASL; the temperance movement itself had laid these foundations.

Curiously, despite this trend towards xenophobia, American consumers always had their gaze across the Atlantic — whether their concern was to replicate and compete with British or Continental European products or to forge their own distinct styles in opposition. What drove this was a desire to forge an elite class identity — as Murdock explains, it was “values that defined standing, not the other way around.”⁹⁸ In other words, class identity was malleable — there was no firm upper crust that controlled societal standards; Americans hoping to ascend the class ladder could signal those aspirations through the material goods they possessed. When it came to drinking objects, depending on the political and cultural milieu, it could be more desirable to have American-made vessels that, like Stiegel’s glass or Fenton’s pottery, signified that American producers could rival their transatlantic counterparts. Towards the later part of the nineteenth century, however, imports took precedence—getting the real thing from the source became *de rigueur*. Even an American producer like Fenton had to bow to that concern, marketing his Rockingham ware as both “dark lustre” (his preferred term) and “Rockingham.” And producers like Fenton seem to be the minority, as least as far as these several objects from the Fleming are concerned. Overall—from glassware to stoneware—the history of American drinking vessels has been distinctly German, initially importing Germans themselves and later their Mettlach-made products. German glassblowers initially supplied the products that were used to cloak alcohol in a semblance of civility, and the scapegoating of German brewing helped the ASL push for the eighteenth amendment. Prohibition, of course, is a complex story of its own right — suffice to say that alcohol yet again refused to be tamed. Yet the predominant effect of the nineteenth century remains: Americans have never drunk more alcohol on a per capita basis than they did in 1840. As Murdock attests, “Victorian women’s moderate, at-home drinking formed the foundation of alcohol consumption patterns in the twentieth century,”⁹⁹ and this phenomenon has had an indelible impact on the American relationship with drinking. Today, the average American drinks

⁹⁵ Burns, “Roots of Prohibition.”

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Murdock, *Domesticating Drink*, 64.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 52.

only a third of what they did back then, and the mid to late nineteenth century domestication of alcohol is no doubt largely to thank (or blame).¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰ “Alcohol consumption per capita from all beverages in the U.S. from 1850 to 2015 (in gallons of ethanol),” *Statista* (2017) <https://www.statista.com/statistics/442818/per-capita-alcohol-consumption-of-all-beverages-in-the-us/>.

Jewish Youth and Education in Nazi Germany: Reversing Integration

Sebastian Hanna

“I am a German, and I am a Jew, one as intensely and as completely as the other, inextricably bound together.”¹ Novelist Jakob Wasserman, like the great majority of German Jews in the 1920s, believed that separating these two components of his identity was nearly impossible. From their emancipation in 1871, Jews had increasingly assimilated into German society, blurring the line between the “German” and the “Jew.” This trend is particularly well reflected by the increased enrollment of Jews in German schools, the decline of segregated Jewish schools, and the anti-Eastern European Jewish sentiment amongst the liberal German Jewish community.

The blurring of lines between Jewish and German life began to change with the rise of Nazism in the early 1920s, leading to the emergence of two distinct groups. Under the Nazi regime all those seen as ethnically Jewish faced growing pressures and were progressively ostracized in their everyday lives. Nowhere was this more apparent than in German schools, where the far-ranging effects of Nazi policy greatly impacted Jewish students after 1933. This paper will show how the Nazis identified the classroom as an important medium for socialization and accordingly targeted schools to further their agenda of separation. Through a variety of means, such as laws concerning the German education curriculum and the encouragement of selective classmate interactions, the Nazis isolated Jewish individuals in academic settings. These policies sought to reverse the assimilation that had been taking place in schools and in broader German society for generations. By examining the resurgence of Jewish schools and the popularity of Zionism among young Jews, this paper will explore how the Nazis were largely successful in their efforts to destroy the long established notion of German-Jewish identity.

Early Jewish Education in Germany

Since their emancipation in 1871, Jews became fully assimilated into German society. This shift becomes apparent by examining the Jewish interaction with the German school system before and after their emancipation. In 1780, well before they gained citizenship, the vast majority of Jews in Germany could not read or write German script.² During this time period, Jews received traditional education either in private schools (known as *hadarim*), or through private tutors. Jews who attended private schools generally did so at the home of their teachers, and the curriculum of these schools centered around the Talmud. Other secular subjects, including German writing, arithmetic, and a few hours of Hebrew writing, supplemented with the occasional other language, were also taught.³ Eventually, these *hadarim* were abolished, leaving many of the older teachers unable to pass state examinations for recertification, and subsequently many became jobless. This was indeed the case for a Jewish teacher in Pomerania. In this case, he taught for two years until 1826 and received only a temporary teaching license after passing the certification exam in Hebrew language, Jewish religion, and arithmetic, but failing in history, science, natural history, and

¹ Donald Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001), 100.

² Marion Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany: 1618-1945* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 118.

³ *Ibid.*, 120.

geography.⁴ Besides these Jewish schools, several large, privately run Jewish primary and secondary schools also existed. These schools possessed their own buildings, boasted considerable staff, a well-developed curriculum, and sometimes even had dormitory facilities.⁵ Indeed, early Jewish education in Germany was quite separate from the wider German system.

In addition to their Jewish schooling, however, there was a strong desire among many Jewish students to acquire tenets of German high culture and to self-assimilate. Before 1830, the primary means of doing so was through private reading and study. From this period there are accounts of Jews memorizing long passages of Schiller and Goethe to achieve a degree of German cultural education. Determined to blend in, young German Jews dressed like German Christians and also sought to develop a more “German” dialect in their everyday speech.⁶ In 1834, in an attempt to eliminate Jewish linguistic habits the Supreme Council of Jews in Baden declared that “the gradual elimination of such peculiarities [the so called Jewish-German dialect] of the lower classes of the Israelite believers...is an urgent demand of the time.”⁷ Throughout the nineteenth century, the Jewish community within Germany gradually attempted to assimilate to the majority.

Up until this point, it is fair to conclude that Jews had not thoroughly integrated into German society. However, much of the assimilation process occurred within the realm of academia. Indeed, many Jews yearned to become part of the more prestigious *Bildungsbürgertum* (the educated bourgeoisie). Jewish men could earn this status by attending a humanistic *Gymnasium*, an academic high school that emphasized classical languages, and by subsequently acquiring a university doctorate. Jewish women, conversely, could not attend German universities before the turn of the twentieth century, but nonetheless benefitted from increased access to education. Though coeducation beyond the *Volksschule* (elementary) level was virtually unheard of, public and private schools for females, known as *Höhere-Töchterschulen*, *Höhere Mädchenschulen*, or *Mädchen-Lyzeen*, allowed Jewish women to complete their formal education by the age of sixteen.⁸ The first *Gymnasium* for women eventually opened in Karlsruhe in 1893.⁹

As early as 1851, the proportion of Jewish enrollment in secondary schools and universities had risen so high that the government felt the need to reintroduce a fifteen percent Jewish quota in the Posen *Realschule* (a type of secondary school). This quota was not dropped until 1872.¹⁰ Despite this, virtually every German Jew born in the middle of the nineteenth century could claim to have received an elementary German education and could read and write in German. The *Volksschule*, in particular, were instrumental in facilitating this, as they were “open to any person of good character.”¹¹ For nineteenth century German Jews the school system was the primary place for assimilation to occur.

Continued Integration and the Formation of an Identity

To know the extent to which Jews had begun to assimilate into German society, the continued examination of their educational experience is essential. By the turn of the twentieth

⁴ Ibid., 125.

⁵ Ibid., 123.

⁶ Harriet Pass Friedenreich, *Female, Jewish, and Educated* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002), 2.

⁷ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 128.

⁸ Friedenreich, *Female, Jewish, and Educated*, 5.

⁹ Ibid., 14.

¹⁰ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 126.

¹¹ James E. Russell, *German Higher Schools: The History, Organization, and Methods of Secondary Education in Germany* (New York: Longsman, Green, and Co., 1916), 171.

century, Jewish children were attending secondary schools in increasingly large numbers. For example, in 1901, fifty-six percent of Prussian-Jewish children continued beyond a rudimentary *Volksschule* education. Also in Prussia, twenty-two percent of Jewish boys attended the upper schools in 1886, a proportion that grew to twenty-five percent in 1901.¹²

Being Jewish in these Christian-dominated schools often meant being seen as different. Certainly, the extent to which Jews felt their otherness in such environments varied depending on the school and its location. The inevitable result of their sustained attendance, however, meant that friendships with non-Jews unfolded. In the village of Nonnenweier, where six out of forty first-graders were Jewish, both Jewish and non-Jewish children played together after school. Walter Eliassow, a Jew born in 1891, attended a school in Königsberg where ten percent of the students were Jewish. He recalled that he had more Christian friends than he did Jewish friends.¹³ In assessing these statements, it is important not to develop a false idea of a completely harmonious reality for these Jews. A German educator in 1899 observed that “the astonishing persistency of the Jews...in pushing their way into the high places [of academia], is a source of much anxious thought in the kingdom.”¹⁴ In their pursuit to earn a German education, most Jewish children did experience occasional moments of prejudice. However, only a small minority endured inhospitable environments, and children were able to maintain friendships in the face of animosity. Recalling his childhood, the Jewish scholar Victor Klemperer felt that he did not experience any overt anti-Semitism in school, commenting “officially, definitely not, and unofficially, hardly.”¹⁵

If the increasing proportion of Jewish individuals in German schools gives weight to the assertion that Jews were blending into society, the decline of Jewish students in Jewish schools is also informative. By the imperial era, the vast majority of Jewish children attended non-Jewish public schools rather than Jewish (public or private) schools. Jewish education required skilled professionals but struggled under the combined burden of inadequate funding and lagging interest. In Prussia, where two-thirds of the German Jewish population resided, fifty percent of Jewish children attended Jewish schools in 1864, a percentage that dropped to approximately twenty percent by 1906.¹⁶ The declining interest in Judaism as a component of schooling is particularly noteworthy, as it was another manifestation of Jewish integration into German society. By the early twentieth century, many Jews in Germany had distanced themselves from an exclusively Jewish identity.

This integration can be traced all the way up to the university level, where despite the occasional undercurrent of anti-Semitism, many Jews insisted they could be Germans. A Jewish fraternity proclaimed, “We Jews are and feel German, and will not let anyone rob us of our dear Fatherland...[T]he German language is our other tongue...and our spirit is filled with German spirit.”¹⁷ Not content with just vocalizing their thoughts, such Jewish fraternities did everything they could to integrate with their non-Jewish counterparts. Examples of this include repeatedly challenging Christian fraternities to duels in an effort to showcase their German honor, drinking heavily to demonstrate their “manliness,” and giving themselves old Germanic names such as “Friburgia, Sprevia, and Thuringia.”¹⁸ The existence of denominational fraternities might belie the idea that assimilation was progressing. What this view fails to consider, however, is that any form

¹² Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 202.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 205.

¹⁴ Russell, *German Higher Schools*, 173.

¹⁵ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 206.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 207.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 213.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 207.

of societal amalgamation is always going to be met with some resistance. And, in both their words and actions, Jewish students were sincerely making an effort to immerse themselves in the German education system, and subsequently gaining a German identity.

The Weimar Era German-Jew

After World War I, the Weimar era brought progressive ideas which many German Jews welcomed. The great majority of Jews, around three-quarters of them, identified as liberals.¹⁹ Amongst this majority, apostasy and religious indifference plagued communities, no doubt a symptom of assimilation into a liberal-minded Weimar society. In 1928, only 0.1 percent of Jewish students were studying to be rabbis, as compared to the 2.7 percent of Catholic students and 2.6 percent of Protestant Students who were preparing for the clergy.²⁰ Jewish schools continued to decline in the Weimar Republic, as eighty-five percent of Jewish children attended non-Jewish schools in these years.²¹ It was further estimated that three times as many Jewish elementary school children attended public schools as attended Jewish schools. Of one hundred and ninety-five prewar Jewish elementary schools in Prussia, only ninety-nine were left in 1927. This trend was also seen in Bavaria, where only half of its eighty-four Jewish schools survived.²² This ailing interest in Jewish schools reached a point where Jewish elementary schools were only able to remain open in major cities.

By this period the secularization of society aided in the shift from religious Judaism to a tradition-based and culture-oriented Jewish identity. A scenario exemplifying this occurred when Ernst Herzfeld, a prominent lawyer and congregation leader in Essen, convinced one of his sons to go through with his bar mitzvah solely as an affirmation of his bonds with Jewish ethnicity and history.²³ It is worth mentioning that there were other congregations of Jews who still strongly clung to their religious beliefs, such as the Orthodox Jews, along with recent immigrants from Eastern Europe. Zionists, while more secular as a whole, were critical of Jews who lacked any connection to their Jewishness.²⁴ The commitment of these groups to a vision of an overwhelmingly Jewish identity was an obstruction to German-Jewish assimilation, and subsequently in opposition to many liberal or assimilationist opinions. Some Jews took an extreme stance, saying that they did not see themselves as German. Jewish novelist Georg Herrmann believed that World War I and its dispiriting outcome had laid bare “organic disparities and incompatibilities” between Germans and Jews.²⁵ But, throughout the Weimar years, these beliefs were in the minority and were not a significant representation of the canonical “German-Jew” who was more secular and liberal leaning.

Overall, liberal Jews were much less ambiguous about the German component of their assimilated identities. To them, being Jewish might involve a mixture of religion, descent, and tradition in varying combinations and emphases. But no matter how they defined their Jewishness they strongly believed in identifying as German. This might be expressed as enthusiasm for German culture, an interest which had already been budding since the 1800s. Additionally, it was

¹⁹ Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, 96.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 103.

²¹ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany: 1618-1945*, 292.

²² Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, 113.

²³ *Ibid.*, 104.

²⁴ Jonathan C. Friedman, *The Lion and the Star: Gentile-Jewish Relations in Three Hessian Communities, 1919-1945* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1998), 57.

²⁵ Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, 106.

embodied in a respect for its legitimate policies and an intense German patriotism. After the outbreak of World War I, prominent Jews joined other distinguished German intellectuals, scientists, and artists in signing the “Manifesto of the Ninety-Three,” which denied charges of German atrocities and violations of Belgian neutrality while affirming united German support for the Kaiser and the army.²⁶ The great Jewish chemist Fritz Haber was amongst these signers. During that time as well, Kurt Alexander said “German and Jewish are fused into oneness in our souls, and never can any power on earth tear the German, the love of our homeland, out of our hearts.”²⁷ These examples of German-Jewish nationalism reveal that for many Weimar era Jews their German identity was equally as important as their Jewish identity.

To ensure the most effective propagation of German patriotic and cultural values to their children, an overwhelming majority of Weimar Jewish liberals insisted on sending their offspring to public schools, as opposed to Jewish schools. There were four types of public secondary schools in Weimar Germany which Jews could attend. These were the *Gymnasium* which centered on the classics, the *Realgymnasium* which focused on European civilization, the *Deutsche Oberschulen* which emphasized German culture, and the *Oberrealschulen* which extensively covered the natural sciences.²⁸ Common to all of these schools was the teaching of German culture.

Jewish liberals feared that being in Jewish schools would alienate their young people from Germans, and Germany as a whole. Feeling the need to completely authenticate their commitment to assimilationism and to oppose Zionists who were against such an outcome, Jewish liberals took a hardline stance when it came to education. They distanced themselves from Eastern European Jewish refugees, often prioritizing funding to older German-Jewish communities over their coreligionists. This was strikingly apparent in the cities of Berlin, Breslau, and Duisburg, where liberal Jews on community councils denied funds and the use of community buildings to private Jewish schools.²⁹ In agreement with a 1920 edict of the Prussian Ministry of the Interior calling for the severe punishment of illegal immigration, Rabbi Golmann said, “The question of the Eastern Jews is not only a Jewish problem, but also a German problem...today it is the best Jews who speak out as Germans against immigration into Germany.”³⁰ On one hand, these actions could be viewed as a forcible acquiescence to anti-Semites who might accuse German Jews of identifying, and even conspiring with, their undesirable Eastern brethren. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these liberal Jews identified as Germans more strongly than they did as Jews. By placing German interests ahead of the perceived foreign problem embodied by the Eastern European Jews, the liberals, who comprised most of the Jews in Germany, demonstrated a near-total integration into German society and consciousness in the Weimar era.

German Schools: Tools for Separation

When the Nazis came to power in January 1933, it was difficult to discern a comprehensive policy towards Jews. Of primary concern to the regime was the elimination of Marxist parties, the overall *Gleichschaltung* (coordination) of German political life, and the establishment of *Lebensraum* (“living space”) for Germans in Europe.³¹ If one were to cobble together the diverse

²⁶ Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, 107.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 108.

²⁸ Lisa Pine, *Education in Nazi Germany*, (Oxford, GB: Berg, 2010), 11.

²⁹ Niewyk, *The Jews in Weimar Germany*, 113.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 118.

³¹ Francis R. Nicosia, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 77.

legislation and actions of the Nazis towards the Jews from 1933-1938, however, a major goal becomes apparent. The reversal of Jewish emancipation and assimilation and the promotion of Jewish emigration from Germany was a primary focus for the Nazi party.³²

Because of the past century of successful assimilation, Hitler and the Nazis identified schools as a crucial setting where so-called Aryans could mix with Jews and form lasting bonds. As such, these environments were where they focused much of their efforts to reverse Jewish assimilation. On 12 February 1933, less than a month after Hitler was appointed as chancellor, the Reich Commissioner for the Prussian Ministry of Science and Education boldly promised to “cut away with every bit of brutality dictated by duty whatever was un-German [and] did not belong in German schools.”³³ If there remained any doubt that this Nazi definition of “un-German” was referring to Jews, the next law concerning schools resolved any ambiguities. On 25 April 1933, the “Law Against Overcrowding of German Schools and Universities” was authorized, stating that the enrollment of Jewish children in schools and universities could not exceed 1.5 percent of the total student body in any educational institution. This law did exclude children of war veterans who had fought on the front line, most likely a conciliatory move to President Hindenburg, who himself was a veteran of the World War and still alive during this time. With the passing of this law, the first official Nazi decree regarding Jews in education had been put in place. The imposition of quotas for Jewish children in education was by no means a novel idea presented by the Nazis as they had existed before Jewish emancipation in 1871. Their return, however, signified the Nazi desire to reverse Jewish assimilation and set the precedent for what was to come.

In order to determine the effectiveness of Nazi policies and evaluate their endeavors to isolate and subsequently extirpate Jewish students from Germany, a school-level analysis is necessary. Namely, it is worthwhile to examine the social interactions between Jewish students and their teachers, Jewish students with their non-Jewish “Aryan” classmates, and Jewish students with their family members when not at school. It should also be noted that these relationships overlapped, as the teachers often communicated with parents, and additionally set the tone for classroom interactions among children.

Entering into 1933, German teachers had for the most part been open to, and accommodating of, the many Jewish pupils in their classes. As a result, an atmosphere of anti-Semitism did not pervade the classroom. An observation by a Jewish teacher who was a faculty member in a German school confirms as much: “German elementary school teachers of the last decades of the previous century and the first of this one were definitely liberally and democratically minded.”³⁴ In some schools, Jews were even excused from class on Saturdays with the obligation to make up any missed work at a later date. Even then this was really only an issue for Orthodox students who were not willing to miss the Sabbath.

The Nazis made sure that any such amicable relations between Jews and non-Jews would not persist after 1933. They compounded the official legislation mentioned earlier with more informal measures to ensure that Jewish youth felt as isolated and miserable as possible while in school. When considering the behavior of teachers towards their Jewish students, two factors must be taken into account. First, a fair amount of the liberally-oriented and empathetic teachers tended to be on the older side. As the years passed under the Third Reich, these older teachers were phased

³² Ibid., 75.

³³ Werner T. Angress, *Between Fear and Hope* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 8.

³⁴ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 295.

out due to the hiring of new, younger teachers.³⁵ These more youthful instructors espoused Nazi philosophy and ideals, and were more apt to target Jewish students. Second, teacher behavior (and the Jewish experience overall) varied depending on the location of a school. Children were more likely to be victimized if they were situated in small town or village schools, than if they attended an urban institution.³⁶

To meet Nazi ideals authorities pressured teachers not to give Jews and “non-Aryans” the best grades, even if they were deserving of them. Sometimes, teachers would involve parents in cases where they were to give grades below their actual achievement level. In a small city in Baden, a female teacher sent Verena Hellwig a sympathetic letter regarding her daughter’s grade, saying “Today we were informed at a teachers’ meeting that Jews could no longer receive prizes for their achievements. Because your little daughter is the best pupil in the class, she will be affected by these measures.”³⁷ Additionally, in a school sports festival in 1934, the Jewish boy Gerhard Beck was the final runner in a relay race and was the first to cross the finish line. He was barred by school administrators from standing on the victory platform in the ceremony with his team.³⁸

While some teachers may have been sympathetic towards Jews early on, many did not miss an opportunity to disparage Jews when they could. In one small town, an elementary school teacher insisted that Jewish children give the Nazi salute. In order to coerce them, the teacher threatened the Jewish children with the wrath of their “Aryan” schoolmates if they refused his command. In another school, a Jewish student by the name of Valentin Senger recalled having to endure hate tirades that his music teacher unleashed against Jews: “There, I sat in silence and had to listen to the crimes allegedly committed by my people---all delivered in the music teacher’s oily voice.”³⁹

The interactions between teachers and their Jewish students were not exclusively confined to the teacher and the student. Through their daily examples, teachers set a standard for behavior that was imbibed and emulated by non-Jewish students. The overall conduct of “Aryan” children toward their Jewish peers fluctuated with the development and strength of anti-Semitism, and from 1933 to 1938, the general trend was the worsening of relationships. For example, in the classroom, Jewish children sat apart from non-Jewish peers. One Jewish student said, “nobody [non-Jews] wanted to sit next to me, nobody wanted to play with me during recess...we had come to accept that we were non-Aryan and were prohibited from playing with any Aryan child.”⁴⁰ Private contacts and friendships between Jewish and non-Jewish students were rapidly nullified, causing many Jews to associate only with each other. Non-Jewish students often antagonized their Jewish acquaintances, contributing to what became a markedly hostile environment for Jews. Some students experienced beatings simply because they were “different” from their “Aryan” classmates.

Moreover, gender differences impacted the Jewish student experience. Overall, Jewish girls reported less harassment than their male counterparts did, with one female Jewish student commenting that her situation “could be regarded as [more] tolerable” when compared with the boys’ schools.⁴¹ This did not seem to hold as true at the university level as it did at the elementary or secondary level, where Jewish university women were particularly prone to the consequences

³⁵ Marion Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair: Jewish Life in Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 97.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 95.

³⁷ Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 100.

³⁸ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 297.

³⁹ Angress, *Between Fear and Hope*, 10.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Kaplan, *Jewish Daily Life in Germany*, 297.

of intensified anti-Semitism and Nazi legislation against women. It was not a secret that the Nazis saw no place in universities for any females and made this position clear by establishing offices of vocational counseling (*Berufsberatungsstellen*) which tried to discourage female high school graduates from pursuing further academic studies.⁴² Jewish women already enrolled in universities in 1933 were subject to an intersection of discrimination, due to their gender and because of their Jewish origin. They generally received minimal support from their non-Jewish female counterparts, compounding the isolation they suffered. On the whole, Jewish women were forced out of universities sooner than their Jewish male counterparts and a Jewish woman was extremely fortunate if she was able to complete her university studies under the Nazis.⁴³ Nazi legislation widely targeted women in education and consequently, Jewish women (and soon after Jewish men) aspiring to receive a degree beyond high school would have to leave Germany or make alternative plans.

The unpleasant situation Jewish youth found themselves in at school also seeped into their family lives and created tension in the home. When children came home from school, it was their mothers who were the first to hear the latest stories and respond to them because women tended to deal with their children's' anguish more directly than men. One boy remembered returning home many times to his mother's admonition, "don't talk to your father," as he was very upset. Small children (ages six, seven, and eight) were more likely to share their distress with parents than older children who quietly internalized their pain.⁴⁴ The school situation deteriorated so much for Jewish students that many started making clear their desire to leave German schools, and even Germany. Confrontations with their parents regarding this desire heightened family discord and gendered responses amongst parents were observed. Mothers were naturally more likely to empathize with their children, as they were the ones who were more aware of their children's troubles at school. The fathers were typically not as willing to let their children leave school and might tell them to "tough it out."⁴⁵ Youths would also entertain the thought of leaving Germany behind all together, and sought to do this through training programs which will be discussed in the final section of this paper.

Irrespective of whether or not separating Jews was an ancillary goal of the Nazis in 1933, the statistics regarding school experience indicate that this was the result. In Berlin, 5,931 Jewish youths attended German secondary schools in May 1933. The following May, 2,777 were left and two years later only 1,172 remained.⁴⁶ The *Reichsvertretung der Deutschen Juden* (The Reich Representation of German Jews) published a report as early as 1934, saying that Jewish children and adolescents who attended non-Jewish institutions of learning were suffering psychological damage to their personality development.⁴⁷ The rapid decrease of Jews in German schools was no doubt exacerbated by the complete elimination of school fee reductions and lingering exemptions that aided certain Jews following President Hindenburg's death in 1934. Now, exceptions were no longer permitted for former frontline soldiers.

⁴² Jacques R. Pauwels: *Women, Nazis, and Universities: Female University Students in the Third Reich, 1933-1945* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1984), 21.

⁴³ Friedenreich, *Female, Jewish, and Educated*, 165.

⁴⁴ Marion Kaplan, "Changing Roles in Jewish Families," in Francis R. Nicosia & David Scrase (eds.), *Jewish Life in Nazi Germany: Dilemmas and Responses* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2012), 24.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁴⁷ Angress, *Between Fear and Hope*, 9.

Curriculum in German Schools

To effectively exclude Jewish children from the German community, the Nazi regime put a nationwide curriculum in place at German schools. The Nazis imposed a curriculum that stressed warning “Aryan” children about the devastating consequences of race mixing with Jews. In redesigning school curricula, the Nazis were often inspired by the ideologies of *völkisch* (racist) forebears. Woven into the new curriculum was the concept of the German struggle to regain territory, a major tenet of Nazi policy pushed on teachers by the Reich Education Ministry. These philosophies were taught in the framework of heavily emphasized conventional subjects, such as history, geography, and biology.

In 1933, a curriculum directive specifically devoted more attention to history than to any other traditional school subject.⁴⁸ On paper, history was given two hours of instructional time per week for grades five and six, and subsequently increased to three hours for grades seven and eight.⁴⁹ Of course, this was a history invariably reframed by the Nazis in order to inculcate stronger anti-Semitic viewpoints and progress the removal of Jews from Germany. A sample teaching outline shown in Table 1 was used in German elementary schools to link specific historical events and their relationship to the Jew as a cultural and racial outsider.⁵⁰

Table 1: Teaching Plans on “State Policy” for Elementary Schools of the Third Reich (1934)

Week	Content Area	Relationship to Jews
1-4	Germany before the war. Class struggle, profit, strike.	The Jew plants himself.
5-8	From agrarian state to industrial state. Colonies.	The farmer in the claws of the Jews.
9-12	Conspiracy against Germany, isolation, barrage around Germany.	The Jew rules. War companies.
13-16	German struggles—German distress, blockade.	The Jew becomes prosperous. Exploitation of distress.
17-20	Stab in the back. Collapse.	Jews as leaders of the November revolt.
21-24	Germany’s Golgotha. Ezberger’s Crimes. Versailles.	<i>Ostjuden</i> migrate. The Jew triumphs.
25-28	Adolf Hitler. National Socialism.	The opponent of the Jews.
29-32	Bleeding boundaries. Enslavement of Germany. Free Corps.	The Jew pulls out profit from German distress. Loans.
33-36	National Socialism in a struggle with the underworld and criminality.	Jewish instigators of murder. Jewish press.
37-40	Germany’s Youth forward. The victory of the faith.	The final struggle against the Jews.

Source: Gregory Paul Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling under the Third Reich* (London: Routledge, 2014), 124.

⁴⁸ Gregory Paul Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling under the Third Reich* (London: Routledge, 2014), 119.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 120.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 124.

The table shows how the Nazis viewed the Jew as a non-German outsider, starting off the curriculum with the central idea that the Jew “planted” himself in Germany. This point would have been a brutal strike to the young German Jews sitting in class, who along with their parents, considered themselves to be just as German as they were Jewish. Within the curriculum are also more traditional anti-Jewish depictions that echoed old *völkisch* sentiments. These included the classical stereotypes of Jews as money-hungry and as cunning intellectual conspirators. The invocation of the above-mentioned recurring tropes further legitimized the “otherness” of Jews, and in effect, served to isolate Jewish children from their “Aryan” peers.

Geography was another subject emphasized in German classrooms under the Third Reich. Key topics included love of the fatherland, an idealization of bucolic life, security of German borders, and Germany’s requirement for *Lebensraum*.⁵¹ The concept of *Volk ohne Raum* (“people without space”) was used to justify Nazi policies of expansionism as they sought more land. Of course, Jews were not considered a part of the *Volk* and the Nazis sought to integrate anti-Semitic ideologies whenever possible into geography lessons. The image of the eternally wandering Jew was a particular favorite.⁵² Another scenario where Judaism came up in geography was in juxtaposing the Nazi ideal of healthy peasantry and love for the soil, with the city-dwelling Jew who loathed peasants and advocated urbanization.

Above all, biology attained a great deal of prestige in the Nazi school curriculum. It clearly reflected the central tenets of the Nazi worldview, and was an ideal subject through which the racial separation of Jews from “Aryans” could be rationalized. Six months after Hitler’s rise to power, the race biologist and teacher Jakob Graf delivered a lecture before a convocation of science educators from Hessen. He said “teachers, especially those of us in biology, are under the obligation to establish the deep associations between hereditary science, the *völkisch* world view, and the life of our people.”⁵³ Hitler himself was explicit regarding the role of biology in education, saying that “no boy and no girl must leave school without having been led to an ultimate realization of the necessity and essence of blood purity.”⁵⁴ The earliest Nazi curriculum policy statement to reach the Prussian school administrators, issued in August of 1933 by Rudolf Benze, underlined the importance of race biology as the basis for all school studies. At the secondary level, two instructional hours for biology were offered weekly for males and females.⁵⁵ Schools did this at the expense of mathematics, foreign languages, and other natural sciences. In classroom discussions, teachers stressed the Nordic racial composition of the present-day German people, and contrasted such a biological make-up with the different bloodlines represented by foreign peoples, especially the Jews.

The process of restructuring the curriculum to reflect these race-based views permeated down to the elementary level. Unlike in secondary schools where biology was a single standing subject, the elementary curriculum consisted of general science, which like history and geography, integrated concepts from Nazi racial ideology relating to science. Regarding elementary-age children, a Nazi curriculum directive in 1939 stated the following: “There is to be...the necessity to emphasize insistently and dutifully the preservation and care of the racial values of our

⁵¹ Pine, *Education in Nazi Germany*, 48.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 49.

⁵³ Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling*, 67.

⁵⁴ Pine, *Education in Nazi Germany*, 56.

⁵⁵ Wegner, *Anti-Semitism and Schooling*, 68.

people.”⁵⁶ Making it abundantly clear that the kind of teaching in Nazi schools was first and foremost rooted in race biology, the same directive called for “an understanding of essential differences between the races and dangers of race mixing.”⁵⁷

Perhaps no group receiving Nazi education experienced quite the same humiliation as did the “*Mischlinge*” (“half-breed”). These children of mixed Jewish and “Aryan” descent were often targeted in Hitler’s Germany. A headmaster in Baden, Alfred Vogel, published a teacher resource book in 1937 called “Heredity and Race Science for the Elementary and Main School.” In this source, he constantly made associations between cross-breeding in plant biology, and the development of race in human culture. Vogel encouraged instructors to repeatedly reinforce the notion that Gregor Mendel’s famous biology experiments actually demonstrated the weakening of plant life through cross-breeding. Managing to tie in the concept of mixed children, he wrote about the strengths of *reinrassige* (purebred plants) versus the less desirable and impure “*Mischlinge*.”⁵⁸ The implications of such comments are not negligible. The “*Mischlinge*” embodied everything the Nazis loathed: a literal mix between an “Aryan” German and a Jew, or the undesirable endpoint of an assimilated Jew. This attack on the very identity of a mixed child was representative of Nazi attitudes towards German Jews as a whole, and their absolute desire to undo the integration that had occurred for over a century.

Resurgence of Jewish Schools

During the nineteenth century, German Jewry’s assimilation into German culture reduced the importance of Jewish schools. Of the roughly seventy Jewish elementary schools still operating in 1933, only about twenty to twenty-five had a curriculum quality comparable to those of the state schools.⁵⁹ However, the decline of these schools halted in 1933. As the Nazis began limiting Jewish enrollment in public schools and simultaneously pushed them out through other means, there was a reemergence of Jewish schools. Zionists immediately responded to the situation by sending their children to Jewish schools. Liberal Jews, on the other hand, were much more reluctant to do so, as negative stigmas of these institutions persisted.⁶⁰ However, given the atmosphere in public schools it was not uncommon for children to wish to enter Jewish schools, even against their parents’ wishes.

To try to alleviate the psychological pressure experienced by Jewish children in state schools, the *Reichsvertretung* made a tremendous effort to create more Jewish schools. Jewish women often played a large role in this, as several who had been studying at universities and could not find employment established their own schools.⁶¹ For the most part, Jewish children did see a veritable difference after transferring to these schools, one reason for their renewed popularity. In 1933, twenty-five percent of Jews subject to compulsory education attended Jewish schools, a number that increased to sixty percent by the end of 1937.⁶²

The Nazis tended not to interfere with Jewish schools during these years. As an example, *Theodore Herzl Schule* was not inspected by German authorities from 1933-1936, and the Nazis

⁵⁶ Ibid., 69.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 70.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 76.

⁵⁹ Angress, *Between Fear and Hope*, 12.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Friedenreich, *Female, Jewish, and Educated*, 169.

⁶² Angress, *Between Fear and Hope*, 9.

never interfered with the way it was run.⁶³ And, logically, why would the Nazis even want to intervene? The resurgence of these Jewish schools, where only Jewish students were enrolled, fit perfectly into the Nazi goal of isolating Jews from Germans and tearing their German-Jewish identity apart. A Jewish school was often described as a world unto itself, and the Nazis had no need to fear its existence, let alone its influence, on the non-Jewish population.

The curriculum and environment of Jewish schools facilitated a new understanding of Jewish identity for many students. They gained a deeper understanding of their Jewish origins, but many also clung to German aspects of their identity. The school curriculum epitomized this. In 1934, the *Reichsvertretung* released “Guidelines for the Draft of Lesson Plans for Jewish Elementary Schools.” In these guidelines, emigration was never mentioned. Instead, students learned about Judaism and Jewish history and culture, but also continued learning traditional German subjects.⁶⁴ Retaining German subjects in these schools indicated that many of the Jews in Germany still considered themselves to be just as German as they were Jewish. And, even with the inclusion of Hebrew and Jewish subjects, the religious aspect of many Jewish schools was seen as somewhat reserved. Some even questioned the religious fervor of the instructors, noting that teaching was done “without religious conviction.”⁶⁵

Nevertheless, increasing enrollment in these separate schools exemplified the success of Nazi intentions. Jewish observers remarked that through the resurgence of these institutions, “the anti-Semites had achieved their goal, alienation and separation from the surrounding Christian world.”⁶⁶ If there is any comfort to be taken from this situation, it is that the Nazis, in forcibly bringing Jewish students together, did not succeed in eliciting complete misery. These schools allowed for an environment in which Jewish children could find some happiness in a tragic period of history, free from the taunts and new difficulties in public schools. Because of this, the personalities of many Jewish children enrolled were left unimpaired.

In addition to the resurgence of Jewish schools, another avenue for Jewish education emerged in light of Nazi rule. An option for Jews being forced out of German schools were the Zionist *Hachschara* (“retraining camps”). Retraining camps aimed to train Jews in agriculture, to create a new and viable economic existence for German Jews, and ultimately provide young Jews with skills to emigrate to Palestine.⁶⁷ These schools offered a different approach to Jewish education as they cultivated a Zionist vision in which German identity was completely abandoned. The *Hachschara* provided an alternate form of education, one that was more of the body than of the mind. This can be seen in the lesson plans and education schedules. About six hours of work a day were devoted to physical work and the remaining two hours were devoted to intellectual work.⁶⁸ In the two hours, a combination of Hebrew, area studies of Palestine, history of Zionism, and Judaic studies were addressed.

Unlike the Jewish schools, Zionist retraining camps were purely geared towards establishing a Jewish identity and facilitating an eventual emigration from Germany to Palestine. However, in 1936, the first non-Zionist retraining camp opened thirty kilometers north of Breslau in Gross-Breesen.⁶⁹ This camp was distinct from the Zionist camps because it prepared young

⁶³ Hans Gaertner, “Problems of Jewish Schools in Germany during the Hitler Regime” *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* I (1956), 131.

⁶⁴ Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 103.

⁶⁵ Gaertner, “Problems of Jewish Schools in Germany during the Hitler Regime,” 131.

⁶⁶ Kaplan, *Between Dignity and Despair*, 104.

⁶⁷ Nicosia, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany*, 210.

⁶⁸ Angress, *Between Fear and Hope*, 29.

⁶⁹ Nicosia, *Zionism and Anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany*, 225.

German Jews for emigration to destinations other than Palestine, including other European as well as South American countries.⁷⁰ In establishing Gross-Breesen, the assimilationist Jews in Germany had confronted the reality that they were no longer considered German. The retraining experience cultivated a singular and distinct Jewish identity, and in effect, shattered the mixed German-Jewish identity that they had clung to.

Conclusion

Following the *Kristallnacht* (“Night of Broken Glass”) pogrom on 9-10 November 1938, Nazi legislation officially barred Jews from all public schools and universities.⁷¹ By 1939, eighty-two percent of children aged fifteen and under and eighty-three percent of youths aged sixteen to twenty-four had fled Germany.⁷² In less than a decade, the Nazis were able to successfully reverse Jewish integration that had taken place for over a century. Through encouraging ostracization of Jewish students, modifying the school curriculum to fit their narrative, with special priority given to history, geography, and biology, the Nazis were able to portray the Jews living in Germany as outsiders.

Because of Nazi school policies, Jakob Wasserman’s idealized existence of the German-Jewish identity being “inextricably bound together” had been nullified; for many Jewish youths, the pressures of the Nazi regime forced this fused identity to dissolve. During the 1930s, the increased popularity of both Jewish schools and occupational retraining programs were a reaction to Nazi policies, curriculum, and the overall harsh environment in public schools. The existence of and curriculum in these new centers of education for Jewish youth are a testament to an identity shift which occurred amongst many German Jews. Margarete Bieber, a former academic at the University of Giessen, demonstrates this shift best. After leaving Germany she wistfully declared, “Until now I have considered myself German. I believe, however, that...I am a Jew. I will in any case...no longer be a German”⁷³

⁷⁰ “September 1941, Jews in the Gross Breesen Training Farm, Germany,” *Yad Vashem*, accessed on December 9, 2017. <http://www.yadvashem.org/holocaust/this-month/september/1941.html>.

⁷¹ “Antisemitic Legislation 1933-1939,” *Holocaust Encyclopedia*, accessed on December 9, 2017. <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007901>.

⁷² Herbert Strauss, “Jewish Emigration from Germany I,” *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook XXV* (1980): 318; *JWS*, 1937: 163

⁷³ Friedenreich, *Female, Jewish, and Educated*, 167.

**In Concern of Animal Welfare, or with Xenophobic Intent:
An Analysis of State-Decreed Bans on Non-Stun Halal Slaughter
in Europe and Their Threat to Religious Freedom**

Zachary Heier

The status of Muslims as one of the most sizeable and influential minority groups in Europe has stirred up much debate and controversy in nearly every state on the continent. Much of the controversy in modern-day Europe surrounds the increasing influx of Muslim migrants from the Middle East and North Africa. Traditionalist segments of populations in Europe are frightened and wary that the European Union's lax stance on immigration and multiculturalism can threaten the survival of many national customs and traditions. While this fear of outsiders is by no means a new phenomenon in Europe, the responses of individual member states of the EU and their citizens to Muslim neighbors have manifested in a particularly virulent form of nationalism and xenophobia. The current undertones of xenophobia and religious intolerance are reminiscent of the anti-Semitic attitudes that plagued much of mainland Europe prior to and into the twentieth century. The most recent attacks by nativist segments of the population against Muslim newcomers have found a new way to express their disdain, and that is through the animal rights movement.

The animal rights/animal liberation movement, largely initiated by the ethicist Peter Singer with the publication of *Animal Liberation* (1975), heralded the beginning of a worldwide movement with the objective of recognizing the plight of animals and their often-neglected concerns in modern society. The means by which the animal liberation movement has sought to recognize the rights of animals has largely been through the promotion of ethical vegetarianism, the call to abandon unnecessary and painful animal experimentation, and especially the call to recognize and minimize the suffering of animals. Since the call to action began over forty years ago, the movement has gained traction and popularity as people across the world have started to perceive animals not as beings that exist solely for human benefit, but rather as beings that have a unique worth in and of themselves. As these concerns for nonhuman animals have amplified in recent decades, there has been an uptick in state-sanctioned laws across the European continent prohibiting cruelty towards animals, specifically targeting minority populations who do not practice pre-stun slaughter.¹ Consequently, the status of minority groups practicing non-stun religious slaughter has come under greater scrutiny by animal rights advocates, many of whom perceive the act of religious slaughter as "inhumane" in comparison to the "humane" modern European practices.

¹ Pre-stun slaughter requires that an animal be stunned or rendered incapacitated before it is slaughtered. This is a conventional practice under most state laws in Europe.

As animal rights advocates have galvanized the lay public through campaigns condemning and calling for the ban of religious animal slaughter, a second party comprised of ardent nationalists and xenophobes has banded together with animal rights groups. While animal rights advocates attack the practice of religious slaughter on the grounds of the cruelty and pain that it causes to animals, these far-right groups take issue with Muslim traditions. Far-right groups have used the animal rights movement as an avenue for furthering their nationalist agenda, and they have started to voice similar concerns on behalf of animal rights.

Thus, a new phenomenon has begun in modern Europe, where there is a convergence of both the animal liberation movement and far-right political groups who are campaigning hand-in-hand to ban the Muslim practice of non-stun slaughter. While these animal rights groups frequently claim to have a separate agenda from their far-right counterparts and proclaim that they are anti-Muslim, the connection between the two arises all too frequently throughout Europe. Thus, these far-right political groups have successfully co-opted the agenda of the animal rights movement, thereby hiding their ulterior nativist and Islamophobic political agenda under the guise of concern for animal rights. This unique development poses a great threat to the guarantee of religious freedom in European states because the anti-slaughter agenda threatens the cultural practices of Muslims.

Requirements for Islamic Ritual Slaughter and the Debate over the Religious Legitimacy of Stunning

Halal slaughter is central to Islamic identity, and its practice is central to Islamic dietary requirements. Religious slaughter must be performed in a specific fashion for the meat Muslims consume to be considered *halal* (permissible). Any practice that deviates from the required method can render meat *haram* (impermissible), which is the subject of heavy debate among Muslim legal circles. The basic requirements are that the animal must first be in a state of consciousness, then the butcher must slit the animal's throat via one end of the jugular vein across the neck to the other jugular vein while simultaneously invoking the name of Allah.² Then all blood must be emptied from the slaughtered animal or else it will be considered haram. This method, practiced by Muslims since the age of Prophet Muhammad, is deemed to be the most painless form of slaughter for the animals concerned, by decree of Allah.³ Historically, the practice of halal slaughter has been carried out traditionally, without a major emphasis on prior stunning. Over recent decades, however, the permissibility of introducing stunning prior to slaughter has gained some traction amongst Muslims. Conservative Muslims, though, have raised ethical questions about stunning and the impact it has upon animals.

Non-stun halal slaughter has been attacked by animal rights advocacy groups and other concerned individuals who consider it to be an “inhumane” method of slaughtering in comparison

² Qazi Mujahidul Islam Qasmi, *The Islamic Concept of Ritual Slaughter* (New Delhi: Islamic Fiqh Academy Publications, 2005), 34.

³ *Ibid.*, 40.

with more “modern” standards. Most European Union member states exempt Islamic ritual slaughter from animal farming laws that would otherwise require stunning prior to slaughter, since most states defend halal slaughter as a religious practice—protected under the statute of religious freedom.⁴ Despite these legal protections, animal-rights groups have demanded that the practice of halal stop. One suggestion raised by animal rights groups is to introduce the stunning of animals before slaughter, which is nevertheless a controversial topic amongst the Muslim community.

To understand the stunning controversy, one must first examine the physically painful toll that stunning can take upon certain animals. Much of the controversy over pre-stun slaughter stems from the question of whether the shock kills the animal or merely renders it unconscious. If such a shock were to kill the animal prior to slaughtering, then the meat would become haram, and Muslims would not be able to consume it.⁵ A Qur’anic passage that confirms this notion decrees, “Prohibited to you are dead animals. . . and [those animals] killed by strangling or by a violent blow” (Q 5:3). If, however, the shock merely rendered the animal unconscious, then pre-stun slaughter could potentially be considered halal.

There is a lack of a clear consensus among the lay Muslim public and Islamic jurists on the legality of pre-stun slaughter. Islamic conservatives reject the practice of pre-stunning, arguing that it can cause additional and unnecessary pain to animals.⁶ Conversely, more liberal and secular Muslims argue that pre-stunning can be permitted because it can reduce the amount of pain an animal feels prior to slaughter, which they claim effectively conforms with the *hadith*: “God prescribed kindness in any thing. If you kill, do it with kindness, and if you bleed an animal, do it with kindness.”⁷ On the other hand, traditionalists refer to the entirety of the *hadith* to support their claims. For instance, the hadith states that the Prophet Muhammad said, “Indeed Allah has decreed *Ihsan* [to be good in] everything. So when you kill, then do the killing well, and when you slaughter, do the slaughtering well. Let one of you sharpen his blade, and let him comfort his animal (before slaughtering).”⁸ Those that refute this point argue that pre-stunning runs the risk of killing the animal and also reduces bloodshed, insisting that it “fails to conform to the prescription that the animal must be bled completely, and consequently should be prohibited.”⁹ Thus, there is a clear conflict present: first, pain experienced during slaughter is not fully understood, and second, the religious legitimacy of pre-stun slaughter is likewise just as ambiguous.¹⁰

Some legalistic interpretations by renowned jurists have deemed pre-stun slaughter permissible. Sheikh Muhammad Al-Najjar of Cairo’s Al-Azhar University issued a *fatwa* that said that pre-stunning was not an illicit practice itself, but only becomes illicit if it results in the death

⁴ Florence Bergeaud-Blackler, “New Challenges for Islamic Ritual Slaughter: A European Perspective,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 33, no. 6 (August 2007): 977.

⁵ Qasmi, *The Islamic Concept*, 39.

⁶ Florence Bergeaud-Blackler, “New Challenges,” 974.

⁷ Bergeaud-Blackler, “New Challenges,” 975.

⁸ Jami’ at-Tirmidhi, “Hadith – The Book on Blood Money (Book 16, Hadith 25),” Sunnah.com, <https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi/16/25>.

⁹ Bergeaud-Blackler, “New Challenges,” 975.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 975.

of the animal.¹¹ Another interpretation by the Islamic Fiqh Academy of India has likewise argued that pre-stunning can be permitted only when it does not kill the animal and specifically renders it unconscious prior to slaughter. The resolution produced by the Academy states,

If such a practice is prevalent at some place and the animals are being slaughtered after rendering them unconscious, and if it is ensured that electric shock or other methods used cause a state of unconsciousness for a brief period only and does not cause death and it is ensured that the electric voltage has been so carefully adjusted that the shock administered by it is capable of nothing but a temporary loss of consciousness only; in such a situation the animals slaughtered in this manner shall be *halal*.¹²

While this resolution argues in favor of permissibility, it must be noted that not all legal interpretations agree, so the more liberal position taken by these scholars cannot be used for the opinion of the entire Muslim population. As these dissenting viewpoints clearly show, there is no consensus, which has left this matter unresolved and up for continuous debate.

The contentious debate and diversity of opinions amongst Muslims regarding the permissibility of pre-stunning prior to slaughter means that the practice is not uniformly accepted, so while some may adopt the practice for the sake of concern for the wellbeing of animals, not all Muslims will adhere. Therefore, the animal rights-based objections to the traditional practice of non-stun halal slaughter methods that are employed by conservative Muslims must be examined.

Animal Rights-Based Objections to Non-Stun Halal Slaughter

Animal rights activists routinely criticize the practice of non-stun Islamic ritual slaughter, arguing that it is a cruel and inhumane method of killing animals in comparison with European conventional standards, an argument which forms the basis for campaigns levied at banning the practice outright.¹³ The invocations of the adjectives cruel and inhumane to describe ritual slaughter are frequently used in the arguments of animal rights activists to arouse the attention of the public and garner increased sympathy towards the exploited animal population. They also use this rhetorical tactic to shock the public and make them aware of the unseen horrors of the meat industry, so that they can successfully mobilize a campaign against cruel forms of slaughter. Although these anti-halal slaughter campaigns defend their actions on the grounds of benevolence and empathy towards animals, there is an implicit “us” versus “them” dynamic embedded in the very rhetoric animal rights groups use to categorize non-stun halal slaughter, their specific campaigning tactics, and the arguments that they employ. This is problematic because all too

¹¹ Ibid., 968.

¹² Qasmi, *The Islamic Concept*, 40-41.

¹³ I will refer to political campaigns led by animal rights groups against “non-stun halal slaughter” or “Islamic ritual slaughter” as “anti-halal slaughter campaigns” for purposes of clarity.

frequently it invites far-right nativist and xenophobic sentiments to rally behind these causes, posing a major threat to these minority populations and their right to religious freedom.

Throughout the twentieth century, most European states have accepted the practice of non-stun halal slaughter as an expression of religious identity, thus entailing that animals slaughtered in accordance with Islamic tradition are exempt from specific EU legislation that otherwise protects animals, such as the Convention for the Protection of Animals for Slaughter (1979) and Directive 93/119 of 1993 (Protection of Animals at the Time of Slaughter or Killing).¹⁴ Countries that permit religious slaughter do so on the basis of a compromise between two conflicting principles: the awareness of animal welfare and the protection of the human right to religious freedom.¹⁵ To this very day, Islamic religious slaughter has been maintained as a legal practice in many EU member states. For instance, the Italian National Commission on Bioethics decreed in its report “Ritual Slaughter and Suffering” on 19 September 2003 that Jewish and Muslim slaughter is “an expression of the freedom of religion, a basic value of human life.”¹⁶ This Commission also stated that there is a difference between “the respect for certain universal values [animal rights] and the proper consideration for the uniqueness of each individual culture.”¹⁷ So, one of the perspectives brought to the table by those in favor of religious freedom and tolerance of minority cultures has been the argument that while animal rights need to be respected, they should not override the religious or cultural practices of minority groups. This perspective has been recognized by quite a few European states, such as France, Italy, Spain, England, Scotland, Germany, the Netherlands, and Finland. These states have recognized that laws against animal cruelty need to be adapted to give some leeway to minority religious groups, maintain the balance between religious freedom and the protection of animals.¹⁸ Despite this recognition, some European states have banned the practice outright, and those that have traditionally permitted the practice have recently begun to reconsider such tolerant policies.

From the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century, five European states (Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Liechtenstein, and Iceland) introduced anti-ritual slaughter prohibitions, which were initially aimed at curtailing the practice of kosher slaughter by Jews. These prohibitions were grounded in the belief that such a form of slaughter caused unnecessary levels of pain to animals.¹⁹ At the time, Jews were the most prominent and, in some cases, distinct religious minority throughout Europe. As such, these arguments initially directed at banning *shechita* (the kosher slaughter method) were, over the course of the late twentieth century and into the twenty-first century, used to curtail the practices of Muslim populations in Europe.

Like halal slaughter, kosher shechita requires that a butcher “severs the animal’s gullet and wind-pipe with one slash,” which has, historically speaking, been traditionally practiced without

¹⁴ Pablo Lerner and Alfred Mordechai Rabello, “The Prohibition of Ritual Slaughter (Kosher Shechita and Halal) and Freedom of Religion of Minorities,” *Journal of Law and Religion* 22, no. 1 (2006-2007): 13, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27639037>.

¹⁵ Silvio Ferrari and Rossella Bottoni, “The Institutionalization of Islam in Europe,” in *Oxford Handbook of European Islam*, ed. Jocelyne Cesari (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 639.

¹⁶ Lerner and Rabello, “The Prohibition of Ritual Slaughter,” 16.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 12-13.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

any prior stunning.²⁰ Like current defenders of non-stun halal slaughter, the kosher method of ritual slaughter was also considered by its Jewish practitioners to be the least painful method of slaughter for animals. The famous Jewish philosopher, Moses Maimonides, in fact argued that the shechita specifications call for the least painful death of an animal. He wrote: “As it has become necessary to eat the flesh of animals, it was intended by the above regulations [kosher shechita] to ensure an easy death. . .”²¹ Thus, a common thread unites Jewish and Muslim slaughter methods, as both religious groups utilize similar forms of butchering, which they consider to be the least painful to animals. As will be shown, however, the practice of religiously-sanctioned slaughter has been highly discouraged by the dominant populations. Since Jews comprised the first major religious minority group in Europe with a history of persecution, they were, consequently, the first to be targeted by the native Christian populations, meaning that one of the most distinctive aspect of Jewish culture, kosher slaughter, came under heavy fire.

Some of these early pieces of legislation used to ban kosher slaughter were built upon the anti-Semitic undertones of the dominant native and Christian populations. In 1893, kosher shechita was banned in Switzerland by a referendum motivated in part by a vocal movement of anti-Semites.²² In 1929, Norway followed suit, and while the legislation did not explicitly mention Jews or of religious ritual slaughter, the law passed because “those who exerted the most pressure were Norway’s anti-Semites.”²³ These early bans thus set the precedent by which a majority (native European Christians) imposed its beliefs and customs upon a minority — vis-à-vis religious identity. Subsequently, the construction of an “us” versus “them” dichotomy developed: Christian Europeans set in-group standards and imposed them upon the out-group, which happened to be comprised of a religious minority, who were, in these early cases, Jewish populations.²⁴

Consequently, the xenophobic sentiments once reserved for the minority Jewish population have found a way to manifest in modern Islamophobic trends against the practice of traditional non-stun halal slaughter. In recent years, there has been an increase of European anti-halal slaughter campaigns led by animal rights groups. In early 2013, animal rights activists pressured the Polish government into banning the production and exportation of halal meat, driving a stake through Poland’s meat industry.”²⁵ The following year, on 17 February 2014, Denmark followed suit with the passage of its own anti-halal slaughter bill.²⁶ The bill was introduced by Dan Jorgenson, the Danish Minister of Food, Agriculture, and Fisheries, out of an alleged concern for animal rights, as he was quoted saying that “animal rights come before religion.”²⁷ After passage

²⁰ Ibid., 10-11.

²¹ Ibid., 10.

²² Audun Lunga, “Butchery Law with Anti-Semitic Roots,” *ScienceNordic*, November 6, 2013, accessed April 17, 2017, <http://sciencenordic.com/butchery-law-anti-semitic-roots>.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Lerner and Rabello, “The Prohibition of Ritual Slaughter,” 26.

²⁵ Clare Speak, “EU: Slaughter Ban Harms Halal Butchery Industry in Poland,” *Prague Post*, June 24, 2013, accessed April 4, 2017, <http://halalfocus.net/eu-slaughter-ban-harms-halal-butchery-industry-in-poland/>.

²⁶ Line Elise Svanevik, “Denmark Bans Non-Stun Slaughter,” *Global Meat News*, February 20, 2014, accessed April 4, 2017, <http://www.globalmeatnews.com/Industry-Markets/Denmark-bans-non-stun-slaughter>.

²⁷ David Charter, “Jews and Muslims Unite to Condemn Danish Ban on Halal Meat,” *Times* (London, England), February 20, 2014.

of the controversial bill, Jews and Muslims led protests against the new legislation, arguing that it was a clear infringement upon Jewish and Islamic religious freedom in Denmark. Danish Halal, a group which lobbied against the passage of the bill, writes,

The new order is a clear violation of religious freedom and limits the Muslims' and the Jews' right to practise their religion in Denmark. It is a procedure that is done under the guise of animal welfare, despite the fact that scientific studies show the animal suffers less with properly performed ritual slaughter than when it gets a blow to the head with a nail gun.²⁸

A report from the *Times* of London reaffirms Danish Halal's statement that this law was passed by subtle prejudices under the guise of animal welfare, contending "the ban in Denmark comes at a time of increasing anti-Islamic rhetoric..."²⁹ It becomes clear that these laws were not filed out of widespread concern for animals, but were passed by populations resentful of non-native communities.

These newly introduced bans against non-stun halal slaughter are not unique to Denmark or Poland, but rather are representative of a widespread phenomenon that is beginning to take hold of Europe.³⁰ While the animal rights movement is targeting the practice of non-stun halal slaughter on the grounds of the supposed "cruelty" and needless "suffering" that it causes to animals, these groups have unwittingly created a highly volatile arena through their campaigning tactics and rhetoric, where the "us" versus "them" dichotomy has gone to new extremes. These secular Europeans have appropriated the rhetoric of the animal rights movement to fulfill their own humane agendas, which has struck a blow to the religious freedom of these minority groups. Pablo Lerner and Alfred Rabello summarize this point quite well, arguing,

Those who oppose ritual slaughtering use their scruples about the suffering of animals as an excuse not to enter into a dialogue with religious minorities about the limits of tolerance in liberal and democratic societies. . . The sweeping prohibition of religious slaughter is problematic both because of its results and also because it is based upon an unjust distinction based on religion which is not rational from the aspect of cruelty to animals.³¹

This reaffirms the point that secular Europeans are using the animal rights movement's rhetoric to impose what they perceive to be their "correct" agenda on the "incorrect" practices of the minority Muslim and Jewish populations. Once again, this is a simple dichotomy of "us" versus "them," where "us" equals "compassionate" and "them" equals "cruel."

²⁸ Svanevik, "Denmark Bans Non-Stun Slaughter."

²⁹ Charter, "Jews and Muslims Unite to Condemn Danish Ban on Halal Meat."

³⁰ Poland overturned the ban in 2014 after a court found the ban to be in violation of religious freedom. See "Polish Ban on Kosher Slaughter of Animals is Overturned," *BBC*, December 10, 2014.

³¹ Lerner and Rabello, "The Prohibition of Ritual Slaughter," 29-30.

The animal rights campaigns have demanded new legislation that curtails non-stun halal slaughter by legally requiring the practice of stunning. These demands from animal rights groups come largely out of concern for the plight of animals, but nevertheless, these propositions threaten the religious liberties of these minority groups—which is a highly dangerous trend. The danger of these emotionally inspired campaigns is that their rhetoric has been appropriated by nationalist/nativist and xenophobic groups, who use it to disguise and legitimize their prejudicial convictions within the public sphere.³²

The Convergence of the Far-Right and Animal Liberation

The hostility fueled by the animal rights movement against the religiously-sanctioned practices that conflict with their agenda has been shown to fuel an insider/outsider dichotomy in many cases throughout Europe. With alarming frequency, whenever animal rights activists attempt to set the boundaries of ethical behavior and influence public opinion on matters such as religious slaughter, they wind up attracting far-right groups comprised of xenophobes, nativists, and nationalists who happen to endorse the same agenda, albeit for different proclaimed reasons. While these far-right groups are not always as ecologically minded as their animal rights counterparts, they often endorse the same positions because they also seek to exclude minority groups whose practices do not align with those of the majority. This phenomenon is not isolated, but rather is found in many instances throughout the European continent, where it even appears in some of the most liberal and secular states including Denmark, France, and Britain. What is informative about this phenomenon is that the convergence of the animal rights movement and far-right political groups is not just the work of happenstance. These are two groups with separate visions, however, the far-right groups have manipulated the agenda of the animal rights movement for their own self-serving purposes.

In France, a predominantly secular state that has permitted religious slaughter, the animal rights agenda and the far-right agenda were fused together during an anti-halal slaughter campaign in November 2010. This campaign, which brought together all the major parties of the animal welfare movement in France and many far-right sympathizers, was an “unveiling” campaign that aimed to uncover the “hidden suffering of animals, [and provoke] dread, contempt and anger regarding the ‘deviants’ who mistreat animals.”³³ This campaign was led by a coalition of the major French animal welfare organizations and the highly controversial far-right sympathizer and animal rights advocate, Brigitte Bardot.³⁴ Here we see the partnering of concerned animal rights advocates and citizens with xenophobic attitudes within a campaign that blatantly to the public’s fear of the “deviant” behavior of “outsiders” (the Muslim community).

³² I will use the terms “nativist” and “nationalist” interchangeably throughout the remainder of the paper.

³³ Florence Bergeaud-Blackler, “Animal Rights Movements and Ritual Slaughtering,” in *Islam and Public Controversy in Europe*, ed. Nilüfer Göle (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2013), 194.

³⁴ Bardot has made Islamophobic statements and has been found guilty of inciting racial hatred against Muslims. For more on Brigit Bardot, see Bergeaud-Blackler, “Animal Rights Movements and Ritual Slaughtering,” 189.

The campaign launched in November 2010 was a denunciation of non-stun ritual slaughtering, a practice that seemed to the campaigners to be oddly out of line with established norms in French society. For the majority of French people non-stun slaughter qualifies as animal cruelty, and believe it should be forbidden. Yet much of the rhetoric in the French anti-halal slaughter campaigns focused on the fact that the practices were carried out by someone who was different. Bergeaud-Blackler writes,

It is the ritual itself they [animal welfare organizations and far-right groups] attack, identifying its alien characteristics, pitting *them* (Jews and Muslims) against *us*. . . the mainstream being carefully stripped of its Jewish and Muslim components. They resort to an ancient and rather common anthropological archetype, the ruthless executioner being presented as a stranger, which is one of the many ways to obscure animal death.³⁵

The association of non-stun slaughter with the “outsider” or the “deviant” is what has enabled these two seemingly disparate groups to join forces. While these animal welfare groups continue to base their claims on the grounds of “animal liberation,” their aggressive campaigns single out certain groups, subtly inviting certain far-right groups to enter the dialogue. As the dialogue becomes nationalistic, the threat to the status of minorities grows. Bergeaud-Blackler writes,

The move towards a strategy of unveiling, based on emotional anger against “deviants,” is, however, highly dangerous. . . . By assigning to a cultural and religious specificity. . . they might end up putting the blame on a religion (Islam). . . . [F]ar from being desired by the very wide political spectrum of animal welfare groups, the stigmatizing effect is largely taken up and used by a new Islamophobic trend. . . . The rhetoric used to describe the way in which animals are treated reflects the logic of “identity” supply and demand, which appears to be not only counterproductive in terms of animal protection, but also likely to arouse xenophobic feelings.³⁶

The tactics employed by animal welfare groups, while used to raise concern for the plight of animals, have inadvertently invited xenophobic and racist elements from the fringe to join the mainstream. This has legitimized and popularized the growing trend of “anti-Islamization” movements across Europe, which are a major threat to the religious freedom of Muslims.

Far from being a “French problem,” the convergence of animal welfare organizations and far-right groups can also be found in cases that expand to the modern day United Kingdom. In Britain, the “us” versus “them” and “civilized” versus “backwards” dynamics have been equally pervasive and influential in the animal rights/far-right anti-slaughter campaigns. Controversy arose

³⁵ Ibid., 197-98.

³⁶ Ibid., 200.

in the 1980s when a local school board decided to serve halal meat to Muslim students in the public schools. The school board's decision outraged the British animal welfare organization Compassion in World Farming (CIWF), as well as far-right political parties and groups, such as the National Front (NF). In other terms, the case for animal welfare brought together the largely secular-influenced CIWF and the far-right nationalists of the NF in an anti-ritual slaughter political campaign that revealed the interlocking relationship between animal rights concerns and xenophobic stances.³⁷

Like the French campaign, the British campaign argued that ritual slaughter was a “barbaric” and “inhumane” practice incompatible with the ethics and social norms of a “civilized country” like modern Britain.³⁸ Thus, this the anti-slaughter campaign imported the separatist vocabulary by employing the terms “civilized” and “backwards” and gave the majority (those who belong to the “civilized” camp—i.e., Christian Britons) the authority to set the standards for what constituted acceptable and proper behavior in British society. As such, the target of the campaign was the British Muslim population, since their slaughter practices were viewed as foreign and incompatible with the more humane methods practiced by the native Britons. Klug writes,

The antithesis between “humane” and “ritual” is continued in a variety of synonyms. “Humane slaughter” is also known as the “Western”, “Christian”, “British”, or “English” method. “Ritual slaughter” is called “Jewish”, “Muslim” and “Semitic.” *Thus the very labels lend themselves to a polemic which opposes Us to Them, Our methods to Theirs* [emphasis added].³⁹

The British campaign forged an attack on religious minorities, assigning Muslim communities with a deviant social status that made them appear unwanted in the larger community.

While the CIWF approached the case purely from an animal-rights standpoint, the constant intermingling with the NF and associated nativist groups revealed a xenophobic tendency. During the 1988 campaign, the CIWF repeatedly tried to distance itself from the far-right NF, proclaiming that it had no such xenophobic agenda. Yet the fact remains that the two groups depended on each other for the success of animal rights initiatives. In January 1988, for instance, animal rights were prioritized when the NF backed an anti-ritual slaughter candidate for the local council by-election in Havering, Essex. The candidate, M. Griffin, attacked ritual slaughter and cited the work of the CIWF to support his case.⁴⁰ Thus, the criticism leveled against halal slaughter practices of Muslims on behalf of animal rights was distorted by the far-right in order to justify their prejudiced and racist stances. In a similar fashion, animal rights groups like the CIWF have employed far-right rhetoric in their animal welfare campaigns. On this, Klug writes,

³⁷ Brian Klug, “Ritual Murnur: The Undercurrent of Protest against Religious Slaughter of Animals in Britain in the 1980s,” *Patterns of Prejudice* 23, no. 2 (Summer 1989): 18.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 16-17.

CIWF accuse[s] Muslims of using religious freedom as “a cloak for big business”; they say that *dhabh* [halal slaughter] “should certainly not be called religious slaughter” because it is “just a diehard tradition, nothing more”; that the Jewish and Muslim methods “mock the name of religion”; that “ritual slaughter is a cruel and savage custom”; that Muslims who insist upon it are “a minority of fanatics” who “defile their religion and aggravate racism”; and so on.⁴¹

The xenophobic language employed by the CIWF shows how the concerns of an eco-conscious group can so easily become manipulated and subverted by radical and xenophobic attitudes when they are trying to pursue a controversial agenda.

If the language employed by these animal welfare organizations is used in such a fashion as to denigrate the name of Islam and the legally protected practice of ritual slaughter, then when it comes to such campaigns, there is conceivably no separation between the agendas of the far-right and certain animal rights. The fact that the CIWF-initiated campaign attracted support from nationalists on the far-right goes to show how the rhetoric employed in the animal rights movement can be just as problematic as that employed by these far-right political groups. The CIWF sees itself as trying to promote a more ethical agenda, but instead it is helping foster divisiveness and disrespect for non-native traditions. This brings out the prejudices instilled in nativist Britons and invites far-right nationalists to join them, making the statement to religious minorities that “You are different, your practices disgust us, and you do not belong here.” On this Klug writes,

The movement for animal rights sees itself as appealing to the best in people. But the evidence shows that the campaign against “ritual slaughter” tends to bring out the worst, tapping what Angela Lambert has recently called “the forces of prejudice lying below the surface of a civilized society.” And it seems disingenuous for CIWF to say “We want nothing to do with the National Front” whilst at the same time pursuing a campaign which effectively invites them to climb on board.⁴²

Such testimony proves that the language, rhetoric, and tactics employed by any group (no matter their political affiliation) in anti-ritual slaughter campaigns threatens non-native persons and religious minorities. The fact that the left-leaning CIWF and the far-right NF coalesce under the banner of “concern for animal rights” reveals a growing trend in popular opinion against the legal protections for religious freedom of non-native persons—especially when such practices are deemed by the majority to be barbaric or deviant simply because they do not mesh well with the social norms of the majority.

Far from being an issue of years past, the question of the permissibility of halal slaughter in Britain remains a heated and controversial topic for debate within the animal rights community in the present day. On 26 February 2015, the British Veterinary Association (BVA), the premier

⁴¹ Ibid., 23-24.

⁴² Ibid., 25.

organization for animal health and welfare in the UK, issued a statement calling on parliament to end the practice of non-stun slaughter following a parliamentary debate on the same issue.⁴³ John Blackwell, president of the BVA, argues that,

While the Government clearly agrees with the scientific evidence that slaughter without pre-stunning allows animals to feel pain and compromises animal welfare, it has yet to take any action to reduce the suffering of the animals involved. This delay to act in the face of overwhelming evidence is completely unacceptable.⁴⁴

As much an issue today as it was thirty years ago, the legitimacy of non-stun slaughter in European states is still a matter of controversy and debate, and with a rising nationalist fervor sweeping across Europe, it will likely remain a hot-topic issue for years to come.

The Right Balance: How to Ensure Religious Freedom and Animal Rights Can Coexist

Thus far, this essay has examined the ways in which the practice of religious slaughter and the protection of animal rights appear to be two diametrically opposing, if not contradictory, forces. The current dialogue, reflective of the incompatibility of the two, has been shown to curtail the possibility of compromise and contribute to the spread of xenophobic attitudes. Even so, there is an understanding amongst animal rights groups that they must determine a line where religious freedom ends and animal rights concerns take precedence. This understanding has been used frequently to justify anti-halal slaughter campaigns and legislation in Denmark, France, and Britain, as well as in the cases of longstanding statewide bans in nations such as Sweden, Iceland, Switzerland, and Norway. Nevertheless, the invocation of animal rights has been shown to be frequently misused by nativists to disguise their xenophobic sentiments and gain legitimacy by invoking a topic of concern to many people (that being the wellbeing of animals). What becomes clear is that this method of hard-line campaigning and rhetoric does not work, as it only serves to further divide up society and trample upon the religious freedoms of minority groups. Society must find a new way to interpret animal rights and religious freedom, one which presents the two ideas not as diametrically opposed forces, but rather as two ideas that can coexist.

As was previously mentioned, some interpretations of the Qur'an have prescribed legitimacy to stunning prior to slaughter, which provides some hope that there can be a reconciliation between animal rights groups and Muslims who consume halal meat.⁴⁵ Since some important figureheads in the Muslim community have begun to accept the permissibility of

⁴³ John Blackwell, "BVA Calls on Government to End Non-Stun Slaughter Following Parliamentary Debate," British Veterinary Association. accessed May 11, 2017, <https://www.bva.co.uk/News-campaigns-and-policy/Newsroom/News-releases/BVA-calls-on-Government-to-end-non-stun-slaughter-following-Parliamentary-debate/>.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See Sheikh Al-Najjar in Bergeaud-Blackler, "New Challenges for Islamic Ritual Slaughter," 968; and the statement by the Islamic Fiqh Academy (India) in Qasmi, *The Islamic Concept of Ritual Slaughter*, 40-41.

stunning, it is therefore likely that more followers of the faith may begin to accept the practice, and perhaps even adopt it on a larger scale. Such an initiative could prove that Muslims are *not* “deviants” or “outsiders” with explicitly foreign agendas, and if more Muslims were to accept pre-stun slaughter as a convention, then perhaps Europeans and animal rights activists might begin to view them in a more positive light (since they would reflect the norms of their society). Of course, since there is no unanimous opinion in Islamic practice, or single religious figurehead for the nearly one billion Muslims on this planet, it is unrealistic to expect that all Muslims will heed the interpretations of a few leading scholars and start practicing pre-stun slaughter. In fact, this is something that the animal rights community must recognize before advancing their agenda.

While the animal rights community certainly has positive intentions, they must come to recognize a few things: one, that halal slaughter comprises a small fraction of meat production, and also that religious freedom is a legal protection meant to defend the interests of the minority from the majority. According to the BVA, for instance, over 80 percent of halal meat in Great Britain is the product of pre-stunned animals, which means that just under 20 percent of the halal meat in the UK is the product of non-stun slaughter.⁴⁶ Thus, in Great Britain it can be deemed that an overwhelming majority of halal meat meets the prerequisite of stunning prior to slaughter. While animal rights advocates will likely continue to lead aggressive campaigns directed at ending non-stun slaughter, they must realize that this is ineffective, because the diversity of opinions in Islam entails that there will never be unanimous agreement within the non-stun slaughter debate. If they fail to recognize this and continue to pursue these aggressive campaigns to outright ban the practice, then these campaigns will continue stimulate divisiveness and xenophobia.

If there is to ever be a balance between animal rights and religious freedom, animal rights groups must abandon their emotional “unveiling” campaigns and divisive rhetoric and should instead seek to build social bridges with their fellow Muslims. First, animal rights advocates should not force their Muslim neighbors into strict conformity with their own expectations and norms. Instead, they should readily acknowledge the cultural differences of Muslims and accept them for what they are. Second, they need to recognize that religious freedom legislation protects the practices of the minority (in this instance, Muslims) from the prejudices of the majority (mostly secular European Christians) and direct their energies towards compromise.

Finally, these groups must recognize that disagreement between the practitioners of non-stun halal slaughter and animal rights groups does not mean that the two groups cannot coexist. If the animal rights and Muslim communities can come together to open a dialogue where they can debate and hear the unique perspectives that each has to offer, much could be achieved. Animal rights advocates should abandon the failed tactics of marginalizing and persecuting Muslims for failing to abide by the in-group’s norms and they could instead try to approach the Muslim community with an open mind. Then, perhaps, the two sides could make compromises or even reach an agreement on the boundary between religious practices and animal rights concerns. On the other hand, if the two parties fail to change or open a dialogue, then mutual distrust will linger, and divisiveness will persist, especially in a current climate where nationalism and xenophobia has

⁴⁶ Blackwell, “BVA Calls on Government to End Non-Stun Slaughter.”

swept across the continent. Likewise, if animal rights groups continue to aggressively pursue halal bans with their typical virulent rhetoric, then they will also continue to invigorate xenophobes and nationalists, who pose the greatest threat to Islamic religious freedom in Europe to date.

The Precedent of Christian Violence: An Analysis of Bernard of Clairvaux's Use of Biblical Passages in Support of the Knights Templar

Maria Koutsouris

St. Bernard of Clairvaux was one of the most influential men in twelfth-century Europe. He lived from 1090 to 1153 and founded and led, as abbot, a powerful Cistercian monastery at Clairvaux. The Cistercians were a relatively new monastic order founded by Benedictine monks in 1075. They left their original monastery in protest of the lavishness of the community and created their own abbey with a reforming agenda focused on poverty, austerity and internal spiritual contemplation.¹ They followed a stricter lifestyle than Benedictine monks, including long and demanding fasts, eating nothing more than bread and stewed vegetables, living with minimal heating, and focusing on continuous and prayerful mindfulness. The order was known for attracting men who wanted to join for spiritual rather than worldly purposes. Bernard was a leader of the order and advocated for “pure faith and simple love.”² Although he was committed to his vocation, he was actively involved in diplomacy and secular affairs.³

St. Bernard's Involvement with the Templars and the First Crusade

Bernard's political involvement is clearly seen in his contribution to the legitimization of The Poor Fellow Soldiers of Christ and of the Temple of Solomon, a military order more commonly known as the Knights Templar. Bernard's first assistance to the Templars occurred at The Council of Troyes in January 1129, when he advised and instructed in the creation of the Templars *Rule*.⁴ All monasteries were required to adhere to a written set of instructions following the Benedictine or Augustine Rule. The creation of a rule for the Knights Templar helped solidify them as an authentic monastic community.

When the Templars were recognized officially in 1129, the state of affairs in Jerusalem was turbulent. This regional instability was a result of the nature of the Crusades themselves. The origins of the crusade began with an invitation from Eastern Roman Emperor Alexius I Comnenus calling for Western troops to help defend the Byzantine border.⁵ Pope Urban II transformed this appeal into an opportunity to revive religious zeal in the West.⁶ While the Crusades did use Constantinople as a meeting station, crusaders were not content with just defending the Anatolian border. They also made their way to Holy Land, conquering Antioch in 1098 before they laid siege

¹ Judith Bennett, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 11th ed. (New York: McGraw Hill Companies, 2011), 201-2.

² *Ibid.*, 202.

³ *Ibid.*, 203.

⁴ Malcolm Barber, *The New Knighthood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 15.

⁵ Christopher Tyerman, *The Crusades: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 19.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 21.

of and conquered Jerusalem in 1099.⁷ Although the West was victorious, crusaders struggled after their initial defeat to maintain control over Jerusalem, because many of the soldiers had returned home. The act of fighting was itself penance, so the crusaders did not have any motivation to remain in the cities.⁸ The chaotic atmosphere of the Holy Land after the First Crusade is most apparent in the fact that traveling, even to holy sites such as the River Jordan, was incredibly dangerous for pilgrims, due to the presence of raiding parties and enemy forts dotting the landscape.⁹ The men that ended up joining the Knights Templar stayed in Jerusalem after the crusade and, as Malcolm Barber explains, “the formation of the Templars arose from a desire to provide protection for such pilgrims.”¹⁰ Hugh of Payns, the Grand Master and leader of the Templars, traveled to Europe, where he attended the Council of Troyes and secured papal approval for his unconventional monastic order.¹¹ The order was unconventional because while it continued certain monastic traditions such as fasting, prayer, and charity, its members were also authorized to use violence to protect Christians and the Holy Land.

In the 1130s, Bernard galvanized public support for the order by writing *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. In his work, Bernard aimed to persuade his audience of the Templars’ righteousness, for the monastic military order lacked theological precedent. He needed to demonstrate how this order not only fulfilled the traditional roles of a monastic order by following a rule focused on piety, charity, strict religious observance, chastity, fasting, and worldly renouncement, but also how the members fulfilled their unprecedented role of being soldiers for Christ without transgressing doctrines of Christian morality. He embarked on this task by comparing and contrasting the Templars to secular knights and by employing biblical passages to give this order a scriptural precedent since they lacked a historical one. He asserted that the Templars were not fighting for vain glory like normal knights, but rather for Christ. To make this argument, he included passages from the Old and New Testaments with violent and militaristic language in order to demonstrate how the Templars symbolized a manifestation of spiritual warfare in the physical realm. In the context of the Crusades, such warfare entailed actual fighting against supposed manifestations of evil, in order to protect the recently recaptured Jerusalem.

This paper compares Bernard’s use of biblical passages in his work *In Praise of the New Knighthood* with their original context and the established understandings of the passages by other important ecclesiastical thinkers, in order to assess the extent to which Bernard deviated from these traditions. It is important to note that the medieval Catholic Church did not believe that any man, even any cleric, had the authority to interpret biblical passages according to their own personal understanding. Instead, the Church’s understanding of the intended meanings of these passages was based on the accumulated writings of Church Fathers, important figures in the Church whose ideas were deemed canonical and fundamental to Catholic knowledge of God and the Universe. This paper will refer to these canonical interpretations grounded in traditional exegesis as the

⁷ Ibid., 23.

⁸ Barber, *The New Knighthood*, 2.

⁹ Ibid., 3.

¹⁰ Ibid., 6.

¹¹ Ibid., 14-18.

biblical passages' "original meaning," since it is the meaning that Bernard's contemporaries understood to be true through historical precedent.¹² While Bernard stayed consistent with the original context and meaning of the biblical passages from the Epistles when depicting the Templars' daily life, he strayed from the canonical interpretations when he attempted to use New Testament references to defend Christian violence, as well as when he ventured to portray contemporary Jerusalem as the "new Jerusalem" referred to in the Book of Isaiah.

Bernard's Use of the Epistles

Bernard references biblical passages from the Epistles to compare the lifestyles of the early Christians to the Knights Templar, and his use of the passages stays consistent with their original meanings. Paul wrote the Epistles to guide communities to live according to God, in the same way that Bernard helped craft the Latin Rule to guide the Templars to live a monastic lifestyle. Bernard explains how the knights lived as brothers in Christ, stating that,

They live as brothers in joyful and sober company...with no personal property whatever (RB 55:16-18), careful to keep the unit of the spirit in the bond of peace (Ephesians 4:3). You may say that the whole multitude has but one heart and one soul (Acts 4:32) to the point that nobody follows his own will, but rather seeks to follow the commander.¹³

Bernard emphasizes how they share a brotherhood, staying consistent with Ephesians 4:3, which states that Christians should be "careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,"¹⁴ and with Acts 4:32, which illustrates how "believers had one heart and one soul: neither did anyone say that aught of the things which he possessed, was his own; but all things were common unto them."¹⁵ Bernard keeps the original message of these passages intact, but also considers their context by highlighting their didactic nature.

The Epistles are didactic because Paul wrote them as letters to early Christian communities, educating believers on Christ's deeds, and instructing them on how to apply Christ's teachings to their daily life. Bernard emphasizes the passages' didactic nature by referencing them when he discusses the Knights' Rule, a document meant to instruct the Templars on how to live according to Christ's will. He also stresses the didactic nature of the passages by juxtaposing them with the Benedictine Rule, the main document that taught monks how to behave in monasteries. By referencing Benedict's *Rule for Monasteries*, which he used as a model for *The Rule of the Knights Templars*, Bernard reveals to the reader a reasonable theological evolution: the Templars follow

¹² Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1983).

¹³ Bernard used St. Benedict's *Rule for Monasteries* (abbreviated in this paper as RB) as a model when he composed the *Rule of the Knights Templar*. Bernard of Clairvaux, *In Praise of the New Knighthood in The Works of Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. Conrad Greenia (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977), 139.

¹⁴ Ephesians 4:3 DRV Biblical citations are drawn from the 1899 American Edition of the Douay-Rheims Bible, accessed at <https://www.biblegateway.com>.

¹⁵ Acts 4:32 DRV.

Benedictine monastic guidance, which adheres to the wisdom of the Apostles; therefore showing how the New Knighthood is righteous and grounded in established Christian monastic and apostolic principles.¹⁶ Bernard also wanted to highlight the Templars' work ethic by stating, "On the rare occasions when they are not on duty, they are always careful to earn their bread (2 Thessalonians 3:8)."¹⁷ In 2 Thessalonians 3:8 Paul also warns against idleness and presents himself as a role model of diligence stating, "Neither did we eat any man's bread for nothing, but in labour and in toil we worked night and day."¹⁸ Bernard purposely draws parallels between the Templars' industriousness and Paul's example to demonstrate how the Templars have adopted an apostolic lifestyle. Bernard follows this biblical passage by referencing *Benedict's Rule for Monasteries* to show how all the knights are "guided by the common needs and by the orders of their masters (RB 48:3-11)."¹⁹ When explicitly citing *Benedict's Rule* in relation to epistolical verses, he acknowledges the original purpose of the Epistles as instructions to Christian communities. It is important that Bernard honored the original context because it shows his awareness of scriptural precedent in patristic theology, as well as his understanding of the history of exegesis and biblical application in monastic rules.

Bernard also illustrates scriptural tradition of the Templars' meritocracy by affirming that, "there is no distinction of persons among them (Romans 2:11), and deference is shown to merit rather than to noble blood (RB 2:20-22; 63:1, 7-8)."²⁰ Bernard first defends the Templars' virtuousness by relating them to the early Christians through a reference to Romans 2:11 which states, "For there is no respect of the persons with God."²¹ Bernard's ecclesiastical predecessors, such as Origen Adamantius of Alexandria, Ambrosiaster, and John Chrysostom, all have understood this to mean that God does not discriminate based on one's earthly status, but rather judges based on the context and content of one's life.²² Origen, writing in the second and third centuries, and Ambrosiaster, a commentator on Paul's Epistles in the fourth century, understood "status" to signify if one was a Jew or a Gentile, for that was the most pressing divide in their time.²³ John Chrysostom, a Church Father and Archbishop of Constantinople writing in the fourth and fifth centuries, expands upon this by explaining that one is not judged by their ethnicity but rather on their good works.²⁴ Bernard does not use this scriptural reference to show meritocracy between Jews and Gentiles, instead he adopts the meaning of the passage to fit the twelfth century, while recognizing the original biblical context as a letter of instruction to promote a community based on merit. Bernard acknowledges contemporary prejudices by specifying that nobles should

¹⁶ Bernard, *The New Knighthood*, 138.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 139.

¹⁸ 2 Thessalonians 3:8 DRV.

¹⁹ Bernard, *The New Knighthood*, 138.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Romans 2:11 DRV.

²² J. Burns and Constantine Newman, *Romans: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012), 37.

²³ *Ibid.*, 43-45.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 45.

not be advanced due to their aristocratic title.²⁵ Following the pattern set by these examples, Bernard then references the *Rule for Monasteries* to emphasize how theologically grounded the new knighthood is.

Bernard also uses New Testament passages to illustrate how the Templars' relationships with one another reflect early Christian communities. Early Christian communities were instructed by Paul to be selfless, loving, steadfast, and charitable. He declares, "They rival one another in mutual consideration (Romans 12:10; RB 72:5), and they carry one another's burdens, thus fulfilling the law of Christ (Galatians 6:2)." He references Roman 12:10, which states, "Loving one another with the charity of brotherhood," stressing the importance of both love and service in the brotherhood. Bernard elaborates on this concept by describing how they "carry one another's burdens." Church intellectuals, such as Origen, believed that Romans 12:10 exhibits the fundamentality of the principle of love. He explains how God first told us to love him and one another, even those who wrong us, for "Christ came into the world to save sinners."²⁶ Ambrosiaster claims that it is not enough to love, for one must also serve humanity.²⁷ This twofold system of love and service is a key aspect in monastic life. Benedict's *Rule* explains how monks will inevitably struggle, and it is the task of their brothers to stay committed and "endure one another's infirmaries."²⁸ These examples show how Bernard's understanding and use of Romans 12:10 stayed consistent with what Origen, Ambrosiaster, Benedict, and other Church scholars understood its original meaning and context to be. Bernard uses all of these biblical examples in his fourth chapter – the chapter dedicated to exemplifying the daily lives and religious nature of the Templars. He wrote the *Rule* while keeping in mind the monastic virtues that mirror not only the Benedictine Rule, but also the "contemporary ascetic drive."²⁹ The *Rule* and the values of poverty and love that defined the Cistercian Order are grounded in early Christian community models established and recorded by the Apostle Paul. Therefore, Bernard's consistent usage and understanding of these passages reflects a transmission of daily moral precedents passed from the Church Fathers to the Templars.

Biblical Passages and Military Practice

While Bernard's use of scriptural passages stays consistent with the Templars' daily monastic routine, Bernard's attempt to connect the militaristic aspects of the Knights Templar with scriptural verses alters what Bernard's ecclesiastical predecessors understood as the verses' original meaning, and oftentimes ignores the context of the passages and their historical reception by previous Christian writers. He references biblical passages to defend the idea of Christian

²⁵ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 139.

²⁶ Burns and Newman, *Romans*, 301.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 302.

²⁸ Benedict, *Saint Benedict's Rule for Monasteries*, trans. Leonard J. Doyle (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2001), 72:6. <http://www.osb.org/rb/text/toc.html>.

²⁹ Barber, *The New Knighthood*, 15.

violence, yet the New Testament verses he referenced were only vaguely related to his defense. For example, in chapter one, Bernard introduces the idea of holy warriors,

Who would not consider it worthy of all wonder, the more so since it has been hitherto unknown? He is truly a fearless knight and secure on every side, for his soul is protected by the armor of faith (1 Thess. 5:8), just as his body is protected by the armor of steel.³⁰

Bernard references 1 Thessalonians 5:8 to illustrate how the Templars are protected by their faith in battle. On the surface, the quote appears to relate, for 1 Thessalonians 5:8 states, “But let us, who are of the day, be sober, having on the breastplate of faith and charity, and for a helmet the hope of salvation.”³¹ However, Paul uses imagery of weapons to show the power of Christian faith, not to encourage the weaponization of faith. The context clarifies Paul’s intended meaning, for in this section, Paul discusses the end of time and calls on Christians to be “sober” and aware. By referencing 1 Thessalonians 5:8’s military language alongside the justification of the Templars’ militaristic actions, Bernard makes it seem as if the biblical reference offers a defense of their violence, but the passage is only a metaphorical call for spiritual preparation before the apocalypse.

Bernard continues this trend of referencing weakly related quotes to justify the aims of the Templars, when he argues,

Why should he fear to live or fear to die when for him to live is Christ, and to die is gain (Phil 1:21) Gladly and faithfully he stands for Christ, but he would prefer to be dissolved and to be with Christ, by far the better [sic] thing (Phil 1:23). Go forth confidently then you knights, and repel the foes of the cross of Christ (Phil 3:18).³²

Bernard tries to convince his readers that the Knights are safe from damnation by explaining that they are with Christ even in death, and that it is better to die for Christ than to live, yet the biblical verses he quotes, Philippians 1:21 and 1:23, do not explicitly include any salvific guarantee to those dying in combat for Christ, but rather discuss the beauty of uniting with Christ in death. Bernard references Philippians 3:18 when he tells the Templars to “go forth confidently” to “repel the foes of the cross.” One would imagine, then, that Philippians 3:18 *must* confirm that those fighting for Christ are absolved of sin, but Philippians 3:18 only acknowledges that there are enemies of the cross: “I have told you often...that they are enemies of the cross of Christ.”³³ In Philippians 3:15-21, Paul does not explain how to treat these enemies or say if it is moral to kill them; instead, he urges the letter’s recipients to follow his example and not think of worldly matters, but to look to heaven and “look for the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ.”³⁴ Bernard’s

³⁰ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 130.

³¹ 1 Thess 5:8 DRV.

³² Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 130.

³³ Philippians 3:18.

³⁴ Philippians 3:20.

reference to Phillipians 3:18 reveals how misleading his biblical citations are, for his interpretation leads the reader to believe a false precedent of Christian violence.

To defend this supposed precedent, Bernard applies another New Testament passage out of context. He asserts that the Knights should “know that neither death nor life can separate you from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ and in every peril repeat, ‘Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord’s’ (Romans 14:8).”²² Bernard references Romans 14:8 as a way of encouraging imperiled Templars. By associating this biblical passage with military risk, he suggests that this passage applies unequivocally to Christians in combat. Yet, the context of this passage does not relate to Christians dying in war. This passage belongs to a series of verses, wherein Paul educates the Roman communities on proper eating and drinking habits and on if and how Christians should follow the Old Testament dietary laws. Paul begins by discussing different fasting choices and then admonishes members of the community who judged others for not fasting, arguing that “whether we live, or whether we die, we are the Lord’s,” as a way of showing how each member of the community is attempting to do their best and will be judged individually to discourage judgement amongst themselves.³⁵ The original context does not include any reference to dying in battle, and in one thousand years of biblical exegesis, Bernard’s ecclesiastical predecessors did not associate this verse with war. For example, Origen stated, “The death which Paul refers [to] is that in which we were buried with Christ; in this baptismal death we died to sin.”³⁶ Early Christians understood baptism as a form of death, because when one is baptized one symbolically dies with Christ. This interpretation is influenced by Paul in Romans 6:4: “For we are buried together with him by baptism into death; that as Christ is risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also may walk in newness of life.”³⁷ Origen viewed this passage as a reminder that one should not live for worldly desires but live for God. Augustine of Hippo, writing in the fourth and fifth centuries, interpreted this passage similarly to Origen. He emphasized how one is not separate from Christ in death, because Christ redeemed humanity “by the price of his blood.”³⁸

Previous Church scholars focused on the eschatological meaning of this quote, and how symbolically we unite with Christ after death in our own resurrection.³⁹ By contrast, Bernard employs this passage in a discussion of why Templars do not need to fear death in battle, arguing that their death will be holy, since they died for the Lord. In its original context, the passage is not connected to martyrdom, but instead discusses how Christian daily habits, like eating and drinking, should be done with Christ in mind. Origen interpreted the death described in Romans 14:8 as symbolic, but even if one interprets the death in this passage as literal, Bernard’s use of the verse remains suspicious, for the Church Fathers never associated this passage with the absolution of sins. In Augustine’s interpretation, the meaning of being with Christ and the Lord after death is

³⁵ Romans 14:8.

³⁶ J. Burns and Constantine Newman, *Romans: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators*, ed. and trans. J. Burns, and Constantine Newman (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2012), 342.

³⁷ Romans 6:4 DRV.

³⁸ Burns and Newman, *Romans*, 342.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 342.

more general and expresses the universality of Christ's sacrifice and how that has given all humanity eternal life.⁴⁰ The inclusion of this passage in reference to knights fighting and dying for Christ and receiving a holy death is not consistent with the passage's original context, function, or its historic interpretations. Bernard attempts to use New Testament passages in the first chapter of *In Praise of the New Knighthood* to glorify the new monastic military order, but in doing so, he alters the traditionally accepted meaning of the biblical verses.

The New Testament and Violence

Bernard continues this trend of using New Testament passages out of context in the third chapter to defend the militaristic role of the New Order. Bernard's language regarding violence and death becomes even more extreme as his claims grow more extraordinary. For example, Bernard claims, "The knight of Christ (2 Tim 2:3) I say, may strike with confidence and die yet more confidently for he serves Christ when he strikes, and serves himself when he falls."⁴¹ One might imagine, since Bernard is writing with such "confidence," that the biblical passage he quotes relates to Christian violence, but the passage's only connection to Christian warfare is the word "soldier:" "Labour as a good soldier of Christ Jesus."⁴² The passage appears in the introduction of Paul's second letter to Timothy, in which Paul encourages Timothy to stay strong in his faith. The use of the word "soldier" is merely a metaphor to demonstrate how committed he should be to the Lord. Yet by referencing this passage while stating how confidently a knight should feel when dying in battle, Bernard dangerously misleads the reader. Instead of serving Christ through military death, "the knight of Christ" must "be strong in the grace which is in Christ Jesus" and not "entangleth himself with secular businesses," as Paul explains in the second letter to Timothy.⁴³ Bernard's use of this passage out of context demonstrates how he was not opposed to stretching the original meaning of the biblical verses to justify his claims.

Bernard furthers his assertions by describing the Templars as Christ's personal avengers, when he states, "Neither does he bear the sword in vain, for he is God's minister, for the punishment of evildoers and for the praise of the good... He is evidently the avenger of Christ towards evildoers (Romans 13:4)."⁴⁴ Romans 13:4 does indeed have violent language, for the passage states, "For he is God's minister to thee, for good. But if thou do that which is evil, fear: for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is God's minister: an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil."⁴⁵ At first glance, Bernard's use of this biblical passage seems consistent with the original meaning, but one must interpret the verse within its context. Bernard uses this passage to defend the idea of a monastic order of knight vigilantes, but Romans 13:1-7 describes the ideal relationship a Christian should have with the state and state authorities. This part of the Epistle

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 134.

⁴² 2 Timothy 2:3 DRV.

⁴³ 2 Timothy 2:1-4 DRV.

⁴⁴ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 134.

⁴⁵ Romans 13:4 DRV.

deals with questions such as how Christians should behave as members of a state, and how rulers should punish citizens for crimes against God. As Origen explains, Paul claims that state officials do have the authority to punish crimes against God, because many crimes against God are already illegal.⁴⁶ He references Acts 5:28-29, in which the apostles forbid certain actions but exclude important sins such as murder and homosexuality, because the state already had criminalized those actions, and it was the task of the state to punish offenders of those crimes, and not the task of the bishops and priests.⁴⁷ While this might seem like a trivial difference to modern readers, establishing which body holds jurisdiction over which legal proceedings and crimes was critically important at the time. This continued to be important into the Middle Ages, as illustrated by the Trial of the Templars in which Pope Clement V and King Philip IV of France argued over judicial jurisdiction.⁴⁸ Both Ambrosiaster and Theodoret of Cyrus, a Christian scholar writing in the 4th century, also understood this passage as a description of state authority.⁴⁹ Chrysostom even pointed out how Paul purposely portrayed the ruler with a sword to instill fear of sinning in the reader, but then tries to calm the reader by showing how rulers are servants of God. All of Bernard's predecessors interpreted this passage as directly and *solely* concerning the power of the state. While one could argue that the Templars acted as a "state-like order, because of their organization and landholdings, none of Bernard's predecessors interpreted soldiers as being servants of God or being the personal avengers of Christ.⁵⁰ The previous discourse about this passage referred to laws, administration, and judicial punishment, rather than violent martial rule. Bernard uses this passage twice in the beginning of chapter three while describing the Templars' right to kill without sinning and die without fear. Yet this passage only loosely applies because of its use of the word "sword" and "avenger." Thus, Bernard's employment of this passage strays from the original biblical meaning and context.

Bernard likewise modifies the meaning of Luke 3:14, when he uses the verse to justify holy war. Bernard asserts, "If it is never permissible for a Christian to strike with the sword, why did the Savior's precursor bid the soldiers to be content with their pay and not rather forbid them to follow this calling (Luke 3:14)?"⁵¹ Bernard's language suggests to the reader that John the Baptist permitted, and even encouraged, soldiers to follow a militaristic vocation, but the content of original biblical quotation differs from Bernard's claim, as described in Luke's Gospel, "and the soldiers also asked him, saying: And what shall we do? And he said to them: Do violence to no man; neither calumniate any man; and be content with your pay."⁵² Bernard includes the fact that John the Baptist instructed the soldiers to be content with their pay, but he conveniently ignores the fact that John also instructed the soldiers to do "violence to no man." Bernard is accurate in stating that John did not tell the soldiers to abandon their profession, but by referencing this

⁴⁶ Burns and Newman, *Romans*, 315.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 315.

⁴⁸ Barber, *The Trial of the Templars*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 89.

⁴⁹ Burns and Newman, *Romans*, 318, 321.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 314-333.

⁵¹ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 135.

⁵² Luke 13:14 DRV.

passage to defend a Christians' right to "strike with the sword," Bernard manipulates the intended meaning of this biblical passage to further his own argument.

This blatant misappropriation of New Testament passages occurs once again when Bernard states, "Let both swords of the faithful fall upon the necks of the foe, in order to destroy every high thing exalting itself against the knowledge of God (2 Corinthians 10:4-5) which is the Christian faith lest the Gentiles should then say, 'where is their God?'"⁵³ Bernard justifies the Templars' violence by comparing it to spiritual warfare arguing that since Jerusalem is a holy city, it should be defended to honor God and Christ. Yet a comparison of Bernard's argument with 2 Corinthians 10:4-5 reveals that the biblical passage actually contradicts his claim, for the passage upholds the immaterial nature of spiritual warfare, stating that,

The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels, and every height that exhalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ.⁵⁴

Paul explicitly states that the weapons are not material but spiritual.

Bernard also uses this passage to defend violence against those who exalt themselves against the knowledge of God and portrays them as the external enemy, the Muslim. Yet the biblical passage alludes to an internal struggle, not an external one. What is threatened in this passage is "knowledge" of God, suggesting an internal conception of spiritual awareness of the divine. Paul does not mention *actions* against God, but rather focuses on a Christian's transformation from being ignorant to having an understanding of God. This struggle of moving from a life of spiritual ignorance an existence lived in obedience to Christ is the spiritual warfare Paul refers to 2 Corinthians 10:4. To underscore the purely incorporeal quality of this combat, Paul prefaces his discussion of Christian warfare by stating in 2 Corinthians 10:3, "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh."⁵⁵ Bernard neglects the original context of 2 Corinthians 10:4-5 in order to defend the Templars' violence in the Holy Land. Bernard utilized a number of New Testament references in *In Praise of a New Knighthood*, but when defending Christian material war, he ended up altering the original meaning of the passage and discounting its context.

Bernard and the "New Jerusalem"

Bernard misuses not only New Testament verses to defend Christian violence, but also Old Testament passages from the Book of Isaiah to defend the Templars' reconquest of Jerusalem. Bernard references Isaiah, but he applies the metaphoric and symbolic language in this book to

⁵³ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 135.

⁵⁴ 2 Corinthians 10:4-5 DRV.

⁵⁵ 2 Corinthians 10:3 DRV.

literal contemporary Jerusalem, and therefore, he ignores the association of this text with prophetic visions of the afterlife. Bernard applies the metaphoric walls of the “new Jerusalem” in Isaiah to the literal walls of contemporary Jerusalem, therefore ignoring the original context of the verse. To give another example, Bernard states,

But if it is permitted to all those so destined by God, as in indeed the case provided they have not embraced a higher calling, to whom, I ask, may it be allowed more rightly than to those whose hands and hearts hold for us Sion, the city of our strength (Isaiah 26:1).⁵⁶

Bernard cites this passage to show how the Knights are worthy to “strike with the sword,” because they defend “the city of our strength.”⁵⁷ By referencing Isaiah, Bernard suggests to the reader that the Templars are fulfilling a prophetic mission, but Isaiah 26:13-27 is dedicated to Isaiah's prophecies about the afterlife. The text reads, “In that day shall this canticle be sung the land of Juda. Sion the city of our strength a savior, a wall and a bulwark shall be set therein.”⁵⁸ Earlier ecclesiastical writers have all understood this passage as either a reference to the afterlife or as a metaphor for Christians’ relationship with the Church and God. Cyril of Alexandria, patriarch of Alexandria and a Church Father writing in the fourth and fifth centuries, viewed this passage as illustrating how the city is symbolic of the people of God who are protected by metaphoric walls, which are in fact Christ and the Church.⁵⁹ Jerome viewed this passage as a way of explaining the twofold path of Christianity, and an idealized representation of how Christians should live. He thought the walls symbolized “good works” and the bulwark “true faith.”⁶⁰ Meanwhile, Gregory the Great also viewed the city in this passage as symbolic and not literal, deeming it a metaphor for the Church and its teachings. He wrote, “In the holy Church the Lord was placed as a wall for us and the prophets were its bulwark because their words were a support for the faith.”⁶¹ All three of these Christian scholars understood this passage as symbolic and idealized, not as literal reality.

Bernard continues to make corporeal the visionary concepts of “new Jerusalem.” Bernard states, “Thus when the transgressors of divine law have been expelled, the righteous nation that keeps the truth may enter in security (Isaiah 26:2).”⁶² The transgressors in this quote are the Muslims in the Holy Land. Bernard wants to have them expelled so that the righteous nations, the ones Bernard believes to be the nations of Christendom, may rule Jerusalem. Isaiah 26:2 does indeed call just nations to enter, but it refers to the Second Coming, when all the righteous can enter the Kingdom of God, symbolized by the New Jerusalem: “Open ye the gates, and let the just

⁵⁶ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 135.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ Isaiah 26:1 DRV.

⁵⁹ Robert Wilken, *Isaiah: Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators*, ed. Robert Louis Wilken, Angela Russell Christman, and Michael J. Hollerich (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007), 217-18.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 219.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 222.

⁶² Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 135.

nation, that keepeth the truth, enter in.”⁶³ Cyril of Alexandria described this passage as symbolic. In accordance with conventional exegetical interpretation, Cyril of Alexandria understood this passage as the Holy Spirit speaking through the prophet to encourage individuals to enter in a relationship with Christ, so that they may enter the Kingdom of God.⁶⁴ Bernard applies this passage to contemporary Jerusalem, disregarding its original role within Isaiah’s eschatological prophecy, which is critical for understanding the message in the Book of Isaiah.

Bernard references this “new Jerusalem” when he discusses the right to strike with a sword, but this passage does not condone physical defense of Zion. In the original passage, Isaiah emphasizes a spiritual, rather than a worldly, reward for the people of Zion. For example, part of Isaiah’s prophecy is that Jerusalem must be conquered and destroyed by the Assyrians and Babylonians in order to purge the city of their sins.⁶⁵ Isaiah describes how Israel will be left as a burnt stump and from that stump a new seed will grow.⁶⁶ The hope of Israel after this destruction will be the son of a virgin named Immanuel, and the salvation of Israel will be spiritual, not corporeal.⁶⁷ Isaiah assures the people of Zion that the physical destruction of Israel is under God’s command, for God employs the King of Assyria to enact this carnage.⁶⁸ The message of Isaiah demonstrates how biblically unfounded it is to view intended spiritual promises as worldly rewards, for when Hezekiah, the King of Judah, attempts to make an alliance with Babylon to secure the city’s physical protection, the King is betrayed by Babylon, as part of God’s plans to cleanse the Israelites of sin, just as Isaiah predicted.⁶⁹ In the eyes of God, the physical defense of the city is not as critical as the spiritual lesson. Therefore, Bernard’s use of Isaiah 26 as a way to justify the physical protection of contemporary Jerusalem seems deceptive, when one considers that in Isaiah, God uses unbelievers as a tool for the spiritual improvement of the Israelites. God punishes kings like Hezekiah who focus on the worldly protection of Zion at the expense of its spiritual growth, so Bernard’s use of the passage appears unsubstantiated.

To give further context, Isaiah 26 is part of a sequence in the book that contrasts two cities: the Lofty City, whose citizens exalt themselves above God, who ultimately destroys the city and replaces it with the “new Jerusalem.” It is the walls of this “new Jerusalem” which Bernard refers to in his work, but earlier Christian scholars understood the “new Jerusalem” as a metaphor for the newly created world after the Second Coming of Christ.⁷⁰ The language describing the city is idyllic and post-apocalyptic, for it states, “He shall cast death down headlong forever: and the Lord God shall wipe away tears from every face...for the Lord hath spoken it.”⁷¹ Casting down death directly corresponds with Christian ideas about the afterlife. Christ’s victory is the triumph over death, and Christ shares it with humanity through his self-sacrifice. This triumph is realized

⁶³ Isaiah 26:2 DRV.

⁶⁴ Wilken, *Isaiah*, 218.

⁶⁵ Isaiah 6-7 DRV.

⁶⁶ Isaiah 6:11-13.

⁶⁷ Isaiah 7:14.

⁶⁸ Isaiah 7:20 DRV.

⁶⁹ Isaiah 38:20.

⁷⁰ Wilken, *Isaiah*, 209.

⁷¹ Isaiah 25:8 DRV.

through the resurrection of the dead at the end of times.⁷² The belief that this passage describes a post-apocalyptic Jerusalem is so fundamental, it is referenced in Revelations when John describes the “new heaven and earth” and the “new Jerusalem” where God dwells “among the people,” : “And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be anymore, for the former things are passed away.”⁷³

On the whole, Isaiah’s description of “new Jerusalem” is deeply spiritual, metaphoric, and post-apocalyptic. The main moral of Isaiah is to trust in the long-term plan of God and not to focus on material Jerusalem, for God will not hesitate to destroy it to teach spiritual lessons. Bernard however uses Isaiah to present contemporary political issues. In addition, Bernard claims that Isaiah's prophecy predicted the Templars’ reclamation of Jerusalem, stating, “Do you not see how frequently these ancient witnesses foreshadowed the new knighthood? Truly, as we have heard, so we have now seen in the city of the Lord of armies.”⁷⁴ Bernard asserts that Isaiah's prophecy foretold the success of this military order, but when one considers the context and content of the Book of Isaiah, it becomes clear that Isaiah was prophesying about a post-apocalyptic Jerusalem, not earthly Jerusalem. In claiming that the Templars are fulfilling a prophecy that most ecclesiastical scholars have understood as eschatological, Bernard disregards the book’s intended meaning as well as earlier interpretations by previous Church Fathers.

Bernard’s Intentions

Bernard’s frequent misuse of scripture leads one to wonder if he misapplied the Old and New Testament passages deliberately. Did he realize he was stretching the meaning of these passages, or did he truly believe they defended his claims regarding the New Knighthood? It is hard to imagine that a man who dedicated his life to theological studies would be unaware of the context and traditional interpretations of these biblical verses. Bernard even seems to hint to the reader that he is presenting literal interpretations of the Bible:

Of course we must not let these literal fulfillments blind us to the spiritual meaning of the texts, for we must live in eternal hope in spite of such temporal realizations of prophetic utterances. Otherwise the tangible, material poverty would threaten spiritual wealth and present possessions would forestall future fulfillment. Furthermore, the temporal glory of the earthly city does not eclipse the glory of its heavenly counterpart, but rather prepares for it.⁷⁵

Bernard gives the reader this disclaimer after claiming that Isaiah’s prophecy is fulfilled by the Templars. While he maintains that the prophecies are being fulfilled, he acknowledges that there exists a spiritual meaning in these texts. The placement and wording of this disclaimer suggests

⁷² Wilken, *Isaiah*, 209.

⁷³ Revelations 21:1-4.

⁷⁴ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 137.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

that Bernard was indeed aware that he was manipulating the meaning and context of certain passages to buttress his claims. Although, he elaborates on how the “temporal glory of the earthly city does not eclipse the glory of its heavenly counterpart, but rather prepares for it,” suggesting that perhaps he did believe that by protecting, honoring, and worshipping in Jerusalem, Christians could better prepare themselves for the “new heaven and earth.”⁷⁶

One has to situate Bernard in the context of his time. In a society of Christians that believed material objects like relics could hold potent religious power, a city like Jerusalem, where Christ physically walked, exuded incomparable spiritual energy, for the entire landscape was a relic. A relic, in their minds, not from any ordinary saint, but from the one true God, who made himself man in order to die for their salvation, as Bernard himself believed: “His death has delivered me from death.”⁷⁷ The emotional power of such a myth cannot be underestimated when reading Bernard’s work, for in the eyes of a twelfth-century believer, the Templars’ ability to regain the city in which Christ lived and breathed might be considered a miracle so great, it would have *had* to be prophesied and explained in the Bible.

Bernard remained loyal to the original meaning and context of biblical passages from the Epistles which he used to illustrate the monastic lifestyle of the Knights Templar. Yet Bernard strayed from the original meaning and context when he attempted to justify Christian violence with New Testament passages, as well as when he ventured to apply Isaiah’s prophecy of the “new Jerusalem” to contemporary Jerusalem. While it might be tempting to pass judgment on Bernard’s use of scriptural verses, it is important to remember the context in which he was writing. Twelfth-century believers were enamored with and spiritually drawn to the Holy Land. The magical quality of Jerusalem even struck Church writers like Bernard, who saw the reconquest of the city as nothing short of a miracle and a fulfillment of prophecy. This paper highlights the fluidity of biblical exegesis, and how even the most faithful men are the products of historical circumstance, which inevitably influences their theological understanding of not only the Word, but also the world.

⁷⁶ Revelations 21:1.

⁷⁷ Bernard, *New Knighthood*, 154.

2017 Phi Alpha Theta Inductees, UVM Chapter, Alpha Alpha Psi

Mathieu Tyler Bergeron	Franco A. Paz
Erin M. Dunne	Miranda E. Post
Lauren E. Fedewa	Stephen Noah Reck
Madelene M. Freitas-Pimentel	Zachary James Restelli
Mattie A. Friberg	Benjamin S. Shefner
Hunter M. Heberg	August H. Slater-Dixon
Hannah Elizabeth Johnson	David J. Smith
Jesse M. Keel	Samantha Sullivan
Weiqing Kong	John Roberts Suozzo
Maria Christina Koutsouris	Margaret Mary Tamulonis
Hayley O'Hara Malloy	Simon Kaufman Wolfe
James T. Mooney	

Phi Alpha Theta is a professional society, established in 1921, whose mission is to promote the study of history through the encouragement of research, good teaching, publication, and the exchange of learning and ideas among historians. There are 860 chapters nationwide and a membership of 350,000. A national biennial convention and thirty-five annual regional meetings held each spring provide a forum for undergraduate and graduate students to present papers and exchange ideas. In addition, over twenty-five scholarships and prizes are awarded annually to both undergraduate and graduate students. The society publishes *The Historian*, one of the most widely circulated scholarly historical journals published in the United States.

Our chapter at the University of Vermont, Alpha Alpha Psi, was chartered in 1982. Undergraduate students who have completed at least fifteen credit hours in History courses at UVM, with a 3.6 grade point average and an overall GPA of 3.4 are eligible for membership. History master's students are required to maintain a 3.75 GPA in their graduate studies. Induction ceremonies are held annually in April.

History Department Faculty News

Andrew Buchanan has spent the year writing a textbook entitled *World At War: A Global History of WWII* for Wiley-Blackwell. He is now doing the final editing and securing photo permissions, and he expects the book to be published early in 2019. In June last year, he gave a presentation on the main themes of the book at the Second World War Research Group conference in London.

Paul Deslandes has been reappointed as Chair of the Department for a second term. In addition to his administrative work, he has been writing quite a bit in 2017-18, completing three essays (one on the history of hair and hygiene in the 20th century, one on approaches to the history of gender and education, and one on the global history of pornography), all of which will be published in 2018 or early 2019. Most significantly, he has been writing a new book titled *The Culture of Male Beauty in Britain: From the First Photographs to David Beckham*, that will be published by University of Chicago Press. Within the profession at large, he finished a five-year term, in late 2017, as Executive Secretary of the North American Conference on British Studies and, in June 2018, he will complete his term as Chief Reader for the College Board's AP European History Program.

In 2017-2018 **Sean L. Field's** publications included *Visions of Sainthood in Medieval Rome: The Lives of Margherita Colonna by Giovanni Colonna and Stefania* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2017), edited and translated with Larry F. Field and Lezlie S. Knox; and *Late Medieval Heresy: New Perspectives. Essays in Honor of Robert E. Lerner* (York: York Medieval Press, forthcoming October 2018), edited with Michael D. Bailey.

Associate Professor of History and Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Science **Abigail McGowan** was recently awarded a Fulbright-Nehru Research Award for spring semester 2019 for a project called "Designing Interiors: Kamdar, Inc. and Design in Practice in Bombay." *Designing Interiors* explores the history of design in India through an iconic Bombay firm: Kamdar, Ltd. Founded in 1934, Kamdar is one of the oldest interior design firms in Bombay, and one of the first Indian-owned firms with a national reach. This project uses the case of Kamdar to push design history in India beyond stories of individual objects, star architects, or design institutions, to see how objects, spaces, and ideals come together in commercial practice. Through the story of one firm, the project explores how Indian designers negotiated changing opportunities in cosmopolitan Bombay and helped to define the post-colonial built environment.

Francis Nicosia finally saw in May of this year the publication of his edited volume of 208 German documents from 23 archives in Germany, Israel, the United States and Russia. The volume will appear shortly under the title, *Dokumente zur Geschichte des deutschen Zionismus 1933-1941*.

It is published as part of the Leo Baeck Institute's long-standing series "Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts," Volume 77. The publisher is Mohr Siebeck Verlag in Tübingen, Germany. With our History Department colleague Bogac Ergene, Frank also saw the publication of their co-edited book, *Nazism, the Holocaust, and the Middle East: Arab and Turkish Responses*, in January of this year. The essays in this book are based on the lectures presented by a group of international scholars at the 7th Miller Symposium at UVM in April 2015. The book, published by Berghahn Books, is part of Berghahn's series "Vermont Studies on Nazi Germany and the Holocaust." Professor Nicosia also gave two talks in Germany in October 2017. In Hamburg, he gave a public lecture at the Institut für die Geschichte der deutschen Juden, with the title "Deutsche Juden oder Juden in Deutschland?" A few days later, he participated in the international conference at the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in Berlin and co-sponsored by the Miller Center for Holocaust Studies at UVM and other institutions. This conference commemorated the life and the path-breaking Holocaust scholarship of UVM's Raul Hilberg. The title of Frank's presentation was, "Raul Hilberg und die Opferperspektive: Persönliche Erinnerungen." He also continued to serve as a member of the Academic Council of the Holocaust Educational Foundation at Northwestern University.

Nicole Phelps was awarded the inaugural UVM College of Arts & Sciences Distinguished Service Award. She also joined the editorial board of *Diplomatic History* and the advisory board for the Botstiber Institute for Austrian-American Studies and she served as the co-organizer of the 2018 Austrian Studies Association annual conference. Phelps spoke on "The Habsburg Consular Service in Comparative Perspective," at the conference "Looking for the National Dream: Austro-Hungarian Migrants in the Americas in Comparative Perspectives," which was held at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. She participated on a featured roundtable on "Reinterpreting the Nineteenth-Century State: Digital History's Intervention" at the Organization of American Historians 2018 conference. Her chapter on "One Service, Three Systems, Many Empires: The US Consular Service and the Growth of US Global Power, 1789-1924," is in press and will appear later this year from Duke University Press in *Powering Up the Global: Taking U.S. History into Transimperial Terrain*, edited by Kristin Hoganson and Jay Sexton. She is currently at work on a US diplomatic history textbook that will be published by Cognella.

Susanna Schrafstetter held a fellowship from the Institute for Contemporary History in the summer of 2017 to conduct research for her new project about German-Jews who fled from National Socialist persecution to Fascist Italy. She drafted an article on the subject, which has been accepted for publication by the *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*. She has been awarded the Judith B. and Burton P. Resnick Invitational Scholarship for the Study of Anti-Semitism at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington and will spend the Fall 2018 semester in Washington, DC. She also won a fellowship from the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure (EHRI) to conduct research at the *Fondazione Centro di Documentazione Ebraica Contemporanea* in Milan, Italy during the summer of 2018.

Alan E. Steinweis completed his second term as Director of the Miller Center and looks forward to a life of less bureaucracy and more teaching. He wrote a historical introduction to *My Opposition*, the English language edition of the diary of Friedrich Kellner, published by Cambridge University Press, and continued work on a general history of Nazi Germany, which will also appear with Cambridge. He was awarded the Ida Levine Senior Invitational Fellowship from the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, which he will hold in the Fall 2018 semester.

Author Biographies

Katherine Becker is a sophomore undergraduate majoring in History with a minor in English. She gives campus tours of UVM and interns at a law firm in Burlington. Next year, she will be studying abroad in Wales, and after graduation, she plans to go on to law school. She ultimately hopes to work in the US but continue to travel the world.

James Dancho is a graduate student majoring in History. He served four years in the United States Marine Corps, after which he went to University of Missouri-St. Louis for his BA in history. He aims to continue his education by obtaining a dual degree with a major in Latin American studies and a minor in Native American studies. Ultimately, James hopes to serve a community within an educational institution.

Wes Dunn graduated from the English M.A. program in 2018. He worked as a consultant for the UVM Graduate Writing Center and a research assistant for the Writing in the Disciplines Program. Following graduation, he joined the crew of Maple Wind Farm, and hopes to eventually pursue a career in agriculture, teaching, and/or writing. Contrary to what his paper here might suggest, his personal interest in alcohol does not extend much farther than a glass or two of cider.

Sebastian Hanna is an undergraduate senior double majoring in Biochemistry and History. He conducts research in a pharmacology lab as he works towards completion of his honors thesis, and also works as a teaching assistant for general chemistry labs. When he is not in the lab, he enjoys reading about history and Europe in the 20th century particularly interests him. He is fascinated by topics such as Fascism, Communism, World Wars I and II, and the Cold War. After graduation, he plans on applying to medical school.

Zachary Heier is a 2017 graduate of the University of Vermont, where he majored in History and minored in Political Science while also competing as a member of the University's Division I Cross Country and Track and Field teams. He hopes to continue on to graduate school to study either Middle Eastern history or law.

Maria Koutsouris is an undergraduate senior double majoring in German and History and minoring in Art History. After graduation she will be attending Boston College to study medieval Christianity and earn a Master's degree in Theological Studies. After that, she plans on getting a Ph.D. specializing in medieval popular religion.

Editor Biographies

Kiara Day is an undergraduate senior and a first-year accelerated master's student in History from Gorham, Maine. Her areas of focus are modern German and American history with an emphasis on Holocaust studies. She just completed her undergraduate thesis on journalist Dorothy Thompson's activist mission to awaken Americans to the Nazi threat and to aid Jewish refugees. Next year Kiara is excited to continue her graduate studies at UVM.

Hunter Colvin is from North Hero, Vermont, and is a second-year graduate student in the History Department. Her academic interests include early modern Britain, gender and sexuality studies, and colonial American book studies. After graduation, Hunter hopes to get a job as an Editorial Assistant in a publishing house.

Stuart Hackley is a second-year graduate student from Conifer, Colorado. His research interests focus on the cultural and intellectual history of late 19th and early twentieth-century Germany, as well as gender and LGBT history more broadly. He also holds a research assistantship with UVM's Writing in the Disciplines Program, and works for the Graduate Writing Center. He is planning to return to teaching high school after graduation.

Lauren Fedewa, BA, History and Germanic Studies, 2015 University of Maryland. Lauren Fedewa is a native of St. Johns, Michigan and a second-year MA student at the University of Vermont. Her research focuses on the experiences of female Eastern European forced laborers and the establishment and operation of German foreign childcare facilities during the Second World War.

Hannah Johnson hails from Milton, Vermont, and graduated this spring with a BA in History and English. While she loves to learn about all places and periods, she has a special place in her heart for the history and literature of Victorian Britain. This summer, Hannah has been assisting the faculty and staff of UVM Special Collections with moving preparations, as the department prepares to move into its newly-renovated quarters in the Billings Library. When she finds herself with free time, she enjoys reading, writing stories without endings, and spoiling her nephew.

Jesse Keel is a junior History student from Sandgate, Vermont. Her interests in history are focused on 19th-century American and British history. She is also an English major and Critical Race and Ethnic Studies minor and will be starting the Accelerated Master's Program in English at UVM next fall.

Weiqing Kong is from Chongqing, China. He studies history and economics and his interests in history include modern Tibet during Chinese occupation, political slogans in the Chinese Cultural

Revolution, and American economic history. Weiqing is also interested in mathematical economics and econometrics and wants to attend graduate school for further study in economics and statistics. Outside of school, he likes road trips and camping in the desert.

Samantha Sullivan is a junior with a double major in history and political science and a minor in French. She enjoys studying modern French history, especially as it relates to World War II. Next year, she will be writing a thesis on how the interpersonal relationship between Charles de Gaulle and Winston Churchill impacted British-Free French relations in 1940. When she is not in the library, Samantha can be found working at the UVM Chatty Cats or watching *The Office*.