Border States

Journal of the Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association

No. 5
1985

Published by Middle Tennessee State University

Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association 1984

CONTENTS

EDITOR'S NOTES

The papers in this issue of Border States were made available to the editors by some of the panelists at the last two meetings of the Kentucky-Tennessee American Studies Association. These meetings were held at Shakertown, Pleasant Hill March 25-26, 1983, and at Fall Creek Falls State Park, March 30-31, 1984.

The publication of this issue of Border States was made possible by a grant from the Oral History Center at Eastern Kentucky University. The editors wish to express their gratitude for this support. The editors wish also to thank Mrs. Shirley Reed for her dedication in the preparation of the manuscript. It was printed at Middle Tennessee State University under the direction of James B. Booth.

Michael Dunne
Sarah Howell

MARY ROWLANDSON'S THE SOVERAIGNTY AND GOODNESS OF GOD: THE FIRST INDIAN CAPTIVITY NARRATIVE

Judy Simpson
Tennessee State University

According to a checklist being compiled by the Newberry Library, the canon of American Indian captivity narratives consists of around two thousand items, excluding poems and frontier romances which incorporate the captivity theme. These pieces, factual or intended to be accepted as factual, record the experiences of more than five hundred captives of American Indians, beginning in the early sixteenth century and continuing through the 1870s.[1]

Though a case is sometimes made for John Underhill's being the author of the first Puritan captivity narrative, Mrs. Mary Rowlandson is generally considered to be the first. Her narrative was originally entitled The Soveraignty and Goodness of GOD, together With the Faithfulness of His Promises Displayed: Being a Narrative Of the Captivity and Restauration of Mrs. Mary Rowlandson. Commended by her, to all that desires to know the Lords doing to, and dealings with Her. Especially to her dear Children and Relations. The second Addition Corrected and Amended. Written by Her own Hand for Her private Use, and now made Publick at the earnest Desire of some Friends, and for the benefit of the Afflicted. Deut. 32.29. See now that I, even I am he, and there is no God with me; I kill and I make alive, I wound and I heal, neither is there any can deliver out of my hand.[2] None of the first edition copies exists, but the work was published three times in 1682, once in Boston and later in Cambridge and London.[3] This narrative is an autobiographical account of Rowlandson's eleven-week and five-day captivity among the Algonquin Indians which began February 20, 1676, when she was taken by a contingent of Narragansetts who attacked her community of Lancaster, Massachusetts, during what is commonly known as King Philip's War. Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative is not only usually considered the first of the Indian captivities but is also commonly thought to be one of the best. Not only was it popular on both sides of the Atlantic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it continues to appear in scores of editions and anthologies.

Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative skill certainly contributes to the effectiveness of her work. Her writing is characterized by being descriptive, detailed, and fast-paced. The opening section of the narrative, for example, is representative of the descriptive nature of the narrative as she records how

> There were five persons taken in one house; the father and the mother and a sucking child, they knocked on the head; the other two they took and carried away alive. There were two others, who being out of their garrison upon some occasion were set upon; one was knocked on the head, the other escaped; another there was who running along was shot and wounded and fell down; he begged of them his life, promising them money (as they told me), but they would not hearken to him but knocked him in [the] head, and stripped him naked, and split open his bowels.[4]

Not only does she give a vivid description of what happened generally in Lancaster, but she explicitly describes what happened to the thirty-seven people who were in her house at the time of the attack. Of them she says that "None escaped either present death, or bitter captivity save only one. . . . There were twelve killed, some shot, some stabbed with their spears, some knocked down with their hatchets" (35). Of her own wounding she writes that one of the bullets "went through my side, and the same . . . through the bowels and hand of my dear child in my arms" (34). She concludes, "Thus were we butchered by those merciless heathen, standing amazed, with the blood running down to our heels" (34).

These passages also attest to Mary Rowlandson's use of a great amount of detail, as well as to her descriptive forte, which serves to make her narrative powerful. Rowlandson structures her narrative by dividing it into twenty sections which she calls "removes." These removes record the times her captors moved from place to place in a successful attempt to elude the English army. There is certainly some question of how Mrs. Rowlandson remembers so very much about each move when they came, on an average, every four days and when, according to her own testimony, she was so lightheaded and faint that she reeled as she walked. Nevertheless, Mrs. Rowlandson records most of the removes quite explicitly. She records such seemingly insignificant events as not wetting her foot in the "Sixth Remove" as well as such important occurrences as the death of her daughter Sarah in the third and her audiences with King Philip in the eighth and twelfth. According to the account, she often has at least some idea of where she is geographically and records these facts in the narrative.

Despite repeated use of the scriptures and comments on the ways of God, Rowlandson's narrative is fast-paced and thus keeps the reader's interest. While many details are given, they are chosen wisely so that they advance the narrative and give valuable insight into either Mrs. Rowlandson or the Indians, often both. Mrs. Rowlandson's use of the scriptures could seriously hamper the pace of her narrative and perhaps does for some modern readers;

yet, by and large, she incorporates the scriptures into her account smoothly and unobstrusively. For example, in the "Nineteenth Remove" when she is traveling through a large swamp, up to the knees in mud and water, she fears that she will fall and not be able to get up because she is so "spent." Typically she incorporates the scripture into her comment on this situation as she writes, "But I may say, as in Psalm 94:18, 'When my foot slipped, thy mercy, O Lord, held me up'" (60).

An incident involving King Philip is indicative of how Mrs. Rowlandson inserts didactic materials into her work. In her recounting of King Philip's offering her tobacco on one occasion, she moralizes that

> though I had formerly used tobacco, yet I had left it ever since I was first taken. It seems to be a bait the devil lays to make men lose their precious time. I remember with shame how formerly, when I had taken two or three pipes, I was presently ready for another, such a bewitching thing it is. But I thank God, he had now given me power over it; surely there are many who may be better employed than to lie sucking a stinking tobacco-pipe. (47)

While the seventeenth-century reader expected this sort of teaching and though twentieth-century readers do not expect it or perhaps enjoy it, Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative skill prevents her moralizing from seriously affecting the pace of her narrative.

When Mrs. Rowlandson penned her adventure, she was influenced by several Puritan literary forms, such as the spiritual autobiography, the sermon, and the jeremiad.[5] Her narrative is reminiscient of the spiritual autobiography, first of all, in its didactic purpose. And while it deals not with Rowlandson's battle with the devil for her soul, it certainly recounts her battle with what, as we will see later, she considers the devil's agents. Although Rowlandson views her calamity as a result of her failure to be all that God wanted her to be, she comes to redemption because she acknowledges that "It is good for me that I have been afflicted" (75). Similar to the Puritan sermon, Rowlandson's narrative is a well-structured account that attempts to justify God's ways to man by citing at least forty-two direct scripture citations, not to mention hundreds which she paraphrases. While this characteristic of her work makes it representative of the sermon, it also is indicative of how completely the Puritan absorbed the scriptures and was able to use them for his comfort when the occasion arose. Finally, like the jeremiads of her Puritan associates, Rowlandson believes that the backslidden condition of the Puritan community has caused God to allow the Indians to prosper and persecute

them.[6] She believes that "our perverse and evil carriage in the sight of the Lord have so offended Him that instead of turning His hand against them the Lord feeds and nourishes them up to be a scourge to the whole land" (69). On one occasion, when the English army almost overtakes the Indians but fails to do so, Mrs. Rowlandson's evaluation is that "we were not ready for so great a mercy as victory and deliverance" (44).

More important than the literary types which influenced her, however, are the Puritan concepts which caused Rowlandson to react to her captivity as she did. The passages quoted above reflect the general Puritan concept that they were the "New Israel." They found many biblical parallels between themselves and Israel, and Rowlandson reflects this. The Indians, in contrast, were the "New Canaanites" who were to be destroyed. In fact, however, the Indians became more than the "New Canaanites"; they were devils or, at best, the agents of the devil. Mrs. Rowlandson clearly reflects this view when she describes the first night of her captivity. It was, she writes, "the dolefullest night that ever my eyes saw. Oh, the roaring and singing and dancing, and yelling of those black creatures in the night, which made the place a lively resemblance of hell" (36). She describes their devilish cruelty, their hellish manner, and she calls them "hell hounds" (35). This view of the Indians is commonly seen in Puritan writing and clearly influences Rowlandson's views, as do other common beliefs about the purpose of the Puritans in the new world.

Although Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative is interesting and worth consideration for the reasons discussed above, this autobiographical account primarily continues to be studied because of its ethnographic materials, or at least because of Mrs. Rowlandson's perceptions of the Southern New England Indians by whom she was captured.

Despite the testimony of historical records that Lancaster, Mrs. Rowlandson's village, was attacked by the Nipmucks and the Wampanoags, Mrs. Rowlandson was actually captured by the Narragansetts, and her master, Quanopin, was Narragansett. From Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative, we learn something, first of all, about the battle tactics of these Indian tribes. When they attacked her home in Lancaster, "some of the Indians got behind the hill, others into the barn, and others behind anything that could shelter them; from all of which they shot against the house. . . " (33). Eventually they set fire to the house. We have already seen how they shot, hatcheted, stabbed, and stripped their victims. Mrs. Rowlandson concludes that "it is a solemn sight to see so many Christians lying in their blood all of them stripped naked by a company of hell-hounds, roaring, singing, ranting, and insulting" (35). After the battle the Indians celebrated their victory by continued "roaring, singing, dancing, and yelling" and made,

according to Mrs. Rowlandson, a "miserable waste of horses, cattle, sheep, swine, calves, lambs, roasting pigs, and fowl" (36).

One of the most detailed descriptions in American literature of Indian preparation for battle appears in the account when Mrs. Rowlandson vividly records the powwow that took place before the attack on Sudbury, Massachusetts, on April 18, 1675. She writes:

> Before they went to that fight, they got a company together to powwow; the manner was as followeth. There was one that kneeled upon a deerskin with the company round him in a ring, who kneeled, and striking upon the ground with their hands and with sticks, and muttering or humming with their mouths; besides him who kneeled in the ring, there also stood one with a gun in his hand. Then he on the deerskin made a speech, and all manifested assent to it, and so they did many times together. Then they bade him with the gun go out of the ring, which he did, but when he was out, they called him in again. Then they all sang. Then they gave him two guns, in either hand one. And so he on the deerskin began again, and at the very end of every sentence in his speaking, they all assented, humming or muttering with their mouths and striking upon the ground with their hands. Then they bade him with the two guns go out of the ring again, which he did a little way. Then they called him in again, but he made a stand; so they called him with greater earnestness, but he stood reeling as if he knew not whether he should stand or fall or which way to go. Then they called him with exceeding great vehemency, all of them, one and another. After a little while he turned in, staggering as he went, with his arms stretched out, in either hand a gun. As soon as he came in, they all sang and rejoiced exceedingly awhile. And then he upon the deerskin made another speech unto which they all assented in a rejoicing manner, and so they ended their business and forthwith went to Sudbury fight. (63)

Mrs. Rowlandson also recounts what sometimes happened to captives of Southern New England Indians, such as Ann Joslin, who was nine months pregnant, and her two-year-old child. Because Mrs. Joslin kept begging the Indians to release her, they finally "gathered a great company together about her and stripped her naked and set her in the midst of them and when they had sung and danced about her (in their hellish manner) as long as they pleased, they knocked her on [the] head and the child in her arms with her. When they had done that, they made a fire and put them both into it" (42). Generally, however, while the treatment of the captives was unpredictable, it was not usually so cruel as this incident would indicate. Mrs. Rowlandson says of her own treatment

that sometimes she met with "favor and sometimes nothing but frowns" (50). She was often threatened and put out of her master's wigwam, but the most serious physical injury she ever received was when a squaw threw ashes into her eyes (52). Of course, she was always hungry, but so were the Indians, and she acknowledges that often she fared better than many of them.

Contrary to what one might suppose, Mrs. Rowlandson was not sexually abused by her captors. Although some Indian groups, such as the Plains Indians, did rape their victims, the social and military mores of the Algonquins forbade such conduct.[7] Mrs. Rowlandson, herself, is amazed at this and, like the good Puritan she is, attributes this to God's protection. On one occasion, she writes that "though I was gone from home, and met with all sorts of Indians, and those I had no knowledge of, and there being no Christian soul near me; yet not one of them offered the least imaginable miscarriage to me" (49). Evidently she feared that people in the Puritan community might suspect that she had been abused, for near the end of the narrative she reiterates that she was not abused during her captivity when she writes that

> I have been in the midst of those roaring lions and savage bears, that feared neither God nor man nor the devil, by night and day, alone and in company, sleeping all sorts together, and yet not one of them ever offered me the least abuse of unchastity to me in word or action. (70)

She adds here that some say she speaks this to her own glory. The only occasion on which she feared possible sexual abuse was near the end of her captivity when her master got drunk, the only Indian she saw drunk during her entire captivity, she says. When her drunken master called her to come to him, she says that "I trembled to hear him, yet I was fain to go to him, and he drank to me, showing no incivility" (67).

While we do not learn a great deal about Indian family life, we do learn something about the structure of the family. Mrs. Rowlandson's master, for example, had three wives. Sometimes he lived with one, and sometimes with another. The master's chief wife, though not his youngest, was Weetamoo, who was King Philip's sister. This wife had two maids, but she had daily tasks, such as making girdles of wampum, which she was expected to perform. We also learn something of the Indians' great respect and concern for their elderly. When they traveled, which they did often, moving twenty times while Mrs. Rowlandson was with them, they carried the old men and women on their backs. On the other hand, Mrs. Rowlandson remembers that an Indian baby whose parents had been killed was put out to die on "a bitter cold day, without fire or clothes" (54).

Perhaps the one element of Indian life we learn most about is food. Of course, obtaining and preparing food looms large in Mrs. Rowlandson's mind because, though she did get enough to eat on occasion, she says that her hunger was never satisfied. Basically this appears to be true of the Indians also. The meat they had, as little as it was, was obtained from "all sorts of creatures," such as birds, bears, deer, beavers, frogs, squirrels, dogs, skunks, horses, and rattlesnakes. If there was no fresh meat available, the Indians did not hesitate to pick up old bones, scald them to make the maggots come out, boil them, and drink the broth. In desperation, they also ate horse guts and ears (69). Mrs. Rowlandson soon learned that half-raw horse liver is very "savory" (45). She admits that "though I could think how formerly my stomack would turn against this or that and I could starve and die before I could eat such things, yet they were sweet and savory to my taste" (44). Despite the near-starvation conditions under which the Indians lived, Mrs. Rowlandson records that she did not see one of them die of hunger (69).

Although Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative is not a vehicle for Indian-hatred, as some others are, it is very clear that she is very human, as well as Puritan, in her perceptions of her Indian captors and their culture. When Weetamoo's child dies, she confesses that she cannot "much condole with them" and concludes that there was "one benefit in it--there was more room in the wigwam" (55). She will move a sick English child to a fire who has been put out to die, but it never seems to cross her mind to do the same for an Indian baby, near death, who was put out with the English child and who "stretched out with his eyes and nose and mouth full of dirt, and yet alive and groaning" (54). She is amazed that the Indians carried their old on their backs. Neither can she understand how "they mourned (with their black faces) for their own losses, yet triumphed and rejoiced in their inhuman and many times devilish cruelty to the English" (69). She is also very surprised when the Indians are ashamed that there is a thief among them. The Indians said that some matchit or bad Indian had stolen most of the food that Mr. John Hoar had brought to provide a dinner for the Indians on the occasion of Mrs. Rowlandson's ransom (66). At least two times when Mrs. Rowlandson violates mores of the Indians and is reprimanded, she seems completely unconcerned that she has done so and speaks with disdain about the custom.

Mrs. Rowlandson, nevertheless, does recount that on many occasions the Indians were kind to her. Numerous times the Indian people gave her food, asking nothing in return, and they shared with her the warmth and protection of their wigwams although she admits that these were often strangers that she never saw before. Quanopin's oldest wife was especially kind to Mrs. Rowlandson, telling her that if she needed food or lodging at any time, she could come to her for help (61). Another Indian couple "refreshed" her, Mrs. Rowlandson records, five or six times. In truth, Mrs.

Rowlandson's master was particularly kind to her, and she admits as much. On one occasion, near the end of the narrative, when she had not had a bath in a month, Quanopin "fetched me some water himself and bid me wash and gave me the glass to see how I looked" (60-61). In spite of these facts, Mrs. Rowlandson never revises her feeling that "there was a vast difference between the lovely faces of the Christians and the foul looks of those heathens" (59). They never ceased to be for her "roaring lions and savage bears that feared neither God nor the devil" (p. 70). This contrast between what Mrs. Rowlandson often records about the Indians and what she feels about them produces a certain tension which makes the narrative intriguing. In all fairness to Mrs. Rowlandson, however, it is clear that she has good insight into at least one of her captors, her mistress. The entire narrative bears out Mrs. Rowlandson's physical and psychological profile of Weetamoo as "a severe and proud dame . . . bestowing every day in dressing herself neat as much time as any of the gentry of the land: powdering her hair and painting her face, going with necklaces, with jewels in her ears and braclets upon her hands" (61). At the same time, this description reveals Mrs. Rowlandson's condescension toward Weetamoo. In general, Indian captivity narratives contain few ethnographic materials, in large part because Puritan legal and social structure forbade imitating, or even admiring, Indian culture.[8] Even though Mrs. Rowlandson certainly does not admire nor imitate the Algonguin culture, we do get a fascinating glimpse of it and of Mrs. Rowlandson's perceptions of it.

During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, women captives were, by and large, considered very strong and resourceful during their captivities. By the end of the eighteenth century, however, these women, such as Mrs. Rowlandson, were being portrayed as passive and submissive during captivity.[9] In truth, in some ways Mrs. Rowlandson exemplifies both types.

She is certainly strong physically. She recovers from her wound and usually carries the load she is assigned as the Indians travel, despite the fact that she is nearly always faint from hunger. She continually finds moral and spiritual strength from her study of the Bible, though sometimes she admits that she can find "no comfort here neither" (53). Mrs. Rowlandson is resourceful too. She takes advantage of the Indians' desire for cloth clothing and barters her skill with her needle for food and other objects which she then trades for food. She does not hesitate to search for food or to beg for it if necessary. Mrs. Rowlandson also manifests plenty of spirit. One rather amusing incident occurs when King Philip's maid demands a piece of her apron for a baby's flap. Mrs. Rowlandson refuses to give it to her; and when the maid threatens to tear a piece off, Mrs. Rowlandson retorts that she will do some tearing also (53-54). On another occasion when Weetamoo reprimands her for begging and tells her that she will

be knocked in the head, she snaps that they had as good knock her in the head as starve her to death (60).

Although Mrs. Rowlandson is strong, resourceful and spirited, she is properly submissive, for she realizes that in submission lies her survival. For example, the end result of her confrontation with King Philip's maid is that she gives her the entire apron. Though Mrs. Rowlandson and Weetamoo never do more than endure each other, Mrs. Rowlandson is very submissive to her master. Once when she earns some money, she offers it to him. Another time she gives him a knife and comments that she "was not a little glad that I had anything that they would accept of and be pleased with" (48). Once when she gets a quart of peas, she invites both her master and Weetamoo to dinner. Weetamoo's refusal to eat truly insults her.

A final characteristic of Mrs. Rowlandson's narrative, but one of the most interesting, is the fact that the author, despite all of her piety, emerges quite vividly as a real human being who reveals weaknesses any of us would under similar circumstances. She can be greedy, as when she takes a piece of meat away from another captive, a child, without the least bit of remorse (60). When her son, who was a captive of another group but whom she saw rather regularly, tells her that he is as much grieved for his father, who was not captured, as for himself, Mrs. Rowlandson admits that "I wondered at his speech, for I thought I had enough upon my spirit in reference to myself to make me mindless of my husband and everyone else" (54). We also see that Mrs. Rowlandson is changed by her captivity. She learned right away that though she always said she would die rather than be taken captive by the Indians, she changed her opinion very quickly (35). She is no longer at peace after her captivity as she was before. No longer can she "sleep quietly without working in my thoughts whole nights together" (74). She also continues to grieve not only because her child died in the wilderness but also because she was in "no way able to relieve" its suffering (72). She no longer envies Christians who suffer persecution as she once did. She concludes that "affliction I wanted, and affliction I had, full measure (I thought) pressed down and running over" (75). She has learned not to be concerned with trivial matters, for they are but a "shadow, a blast, a bubble, and things of no continuance" (75).

A close study of Mary Rowlandson's The Soveraignty and Goodness of God, the first Indian captivity narrative, clearly reveals why it is also the most famous of the New England captivity narratives. Its narrative skill, its revelation of Puritan thought, its glimpse of Indian culture, and its vivid portrayal of its author lead one to conclude that it deserves an even greater audience and deeper appreciation than it has heretofore enjoyed.

NOTES

[1]James Leverner and Hennig Cohen, ed., The Indians and Their Captives (Westport, 1977), xiv.

[2]For a copy of the title as it appeared in the second edition, see Original Narratives of Early American History: Narratives of Indian Wars, 1675-1699, ed. Charles H. Lincoln (New York, 1913), 112.

[3]Original Narratives, 11.

[4]Mary Rowlandson, "The Soveraignty and Goodness of God," in Puritans Among the Indians: Accounts of Captivity and Redemption, 1676-1724, ed. Alden T. Vaughan and Edward W. Clark (Cambridge, 1981), 33. All other references to this work will appear in the text.

[5]Vaughan and Clark, 4.

[6]A good study of the jermiads of the Puritans is The American Jeremiad by Sacvan Bercovitch (Madison, 1978).

[7]See Vaughan and Clark, 70.

[8]Vaughan and Clark, 17.

[9]See the discussion in Vaughan and Clark, 25.

MUSICAL DIVERSITY DURING THE FEDERALIST ERA: A SAMPLING OF SONGS AND MUSICIANS

Lewright B. Sikes
Middle Tennessee State University

A beauteous Starling late I saw
On lovely Sylvia's hand;
To check his flight around his leg
She ti'd a silken band.
In vain he strives to break the band
And can't untie the Knot.

Cease! Cease! she cried--here you
shall feed
And in my bosom rest:
No bird that ever wing'd the air,
Was half so much caress'd:
If from my hand you should escape,
You may perchance be shot:
Then cease to peck--'tis all in vain--
You can't untie the knot. . . .

One evening youthful Damon sat,
With Sylvia by his side;
Reward my love at last, said he,
Tomorrow be my bride.
Her blushes in his favour rose;
Yet she consented not;
For 'ere she spake, the Starling cri'd
You can't untie the Knot.[1]

So read the lyrics of a popular song that appeared in a Philadelphia newspaper in 1795. According to cultural historian Kenneth Silverman, between 1763 and 1789 America "acquired the elements of a modern metropolitan cultural life."[2] Music was one of the elements of this process which broadened in impact and significance during the Federalist Era. From 1789 to 1800 Americans wrote, taught, published, organized, and performed with a new intensity and thereby contributed to the emerging nationalism of the era.

The music was as varied as the people of the new nation. More than two hundred composers published over five hundred works. Published and unpublished material included hymns, slave songs, anthems, psalm tunes, military, patriotic, and political songs, tavern ditties, songbooks or songsters, operas, orchestral works--indeed the list is long and varied.[3]

Some works set against the backdrop of political tensions roused the spirits of listeners. "Never was anything received

with applause so hearty and so general,"[4] wrote a Federalist newspaper editor after what he considered to be a stirring performance of Joseph Hopkinson's "Hail Columbia."[5] War songs such as "The White Cockade," "Hearts of Oak," "Chester," and "God Save the Thirteen States" continued to draw much enthusiasm from audiences large and small, as did individual adulatory tunes. In "Ode for American Independence," published in 1789, independence is described as being decreed by heaven and confirmed by John Hancock. President Washington is praised as a hero "with thousands in his train."[6]

Benjamin Franklin's death in 1790 drew musical attention throughout the decade:

> The fairest flowrets bring
> in all their vernal bloom
> and let the sweets of Spring
> adorn great Franklin's tomb. . . .
>
> While rapid lightning fly,
> While awful thunders roll,
> While meteors gild the sky
> and dart from Pole to Pole,
> Mankind shall still admire
> When Franklin's name they hear. . . .

Yet even Franklin could not outdo his commander-in-chief:

> And when she [history] counts
> her sons who earn'd immortal fame
> Will next to Washington
> Record our Franklin's name.[7]

Other themes were also popular during the decade: nature, romance, classical figures, events, and places, European heroes, American traitors, religious motifs, and what might arbitrarily be called "fun songs." A delightful example of the latter is a tune by a popular Irish composer Michael Kelly entitled "Last Week I Took a Wife":

> Last week I took a wife,
> and when I first did woo her,
> I vow'd to stick thro' life,
> like cobbler's wax unto her. . . .
>
> My wife without her shoes,
> is hardly three feet seven
> And I to all men's views
> am full five feet eleven.
> So when to take her down
> some pegs, I drubb'd her meat
> and clever,
> She made a bolt right thro my legs,
> and ran away for ever.

Then let her go, I've got my stall [cobbler's shop]
which may no cobbler rifle.
Twou'd break my heart to lose my awl
To lose my Wife's a trifle.[8]

Few songs dealing with romance were as popular as "Crazy Jane," a work by an English composer Harriet Abrams. The lyrics are melodramatic. An unfaithful swain, Henry, is responsible for Jane's insanity:

Why fair Maid in every feature
are such signs of fear express'd.
Can a wand'ring wretched creature
with such terror fill thy Breast. . . .

Dost thou weep to see my anguish
mark me and avoid my woe.
When men flatter sign and languish
think them false. I found them so. . . .

The Youth I lov'd so dearly
stole the Wits of Crazy Jane. . . .

He was false and I undone.
From that hour has Reason never
held her empire o'er my brain.[9]

In later verses Jane dies and Henry returns to her grave to mourn her death.[10]

Songs could be purchased individually or in songbooks, often called songsters. For example, in 1789 Alexander Reinagle, a Philadelphia musician and musical promoter, published A Collection of Favorite Songs. He assured potential customers that the book included many popular airs. The price was fifteen shillings.[11] At about the same time Francis Hopkinson advertised the sale of some new songs for harpsichord and forte piano. His dedication to George Washington boasted of his own accomplishment: "However the Reputation may be that I shall derive from this Work, I cannot, I believe, be refused the Credit of being the first Native of the United States who has produced a Musical Composition."[12] A number of American periodicals regularly included songs. The Massachusetts Magazine published at least one song with each of its twelve issues in 1789. The songs covered practically the entire spectrum of musical themes that were popular during the Federalist Era. Newspapers like the Philadelphia Minerva also printed lyrics.[13]

Concerts and ceremonial affairs were often held during the decade. In the late 1780s Reinagle offered a concert series that included twelve fortnightly productions at the City Tavern in Philadelphia. They began at seven o'clock in the evening and were well attended. European as well as American composers were regularly heard, and the cost was only a few shillings for an

entire series. Orchestras were employed, and programs were printed. Often a promoter like Reinagle would include his own works on programs he arranged. Composers and/or performers were listed on the right side of the program and it was not uncommon to have a variety of musicians on the same concert bill, as is this example from February 7, 1793:

"Grand Concert, of Vocal and Instrumental Music"

Act Ist

Grand Overture.....Haydn:
Song.....Mr. Chambers:
Concerto Violin.....Master Dupont:
Duetto (for two voices).....Mrs. Morris and Mr. Reinagle
Hunting Song "While over the mountain's brow".....Mr. Harper
Sonata Piano Forti.....Mr. Reinagle
Glee, "Lightly tread 'tis hallow'd ground"

Act 2d.

Quartetto, Pleyel.....Mess. Petit, Boulay, Mallett and Jehot:
Duetto, "From Morn till Night".....Mess Chambers and Reinagle:
Song, "Poor Tom Bowling".....Mr. Harper:
Glee, "Sigh no more Ladies".....Mess. Harper, Chambers and Reinagle

Act 3d.

Overture.....Mr. Reinagle:
Song, "Wives and Sweethearts".....Mr. Harper:
Concerto Violin.....Mr. Pettit:
Song, "The Traveller benighted".....Mrs. Morris:
Finale.....Stamitz[14]

Great musical ceremonies were also held to honor outstanding figures both alive and dead. The following is a description of a scene at Wignell's Chestnut Street Theatre in Philadelphia shortly after the death of President Washington:

> At seven o'clock the orchestra played the "Washington March," then several dirges. The curtain rose showing a tomb in the centre of the stage. There was a portrait of Washington encircled with oak leaves. Under this were swords, helmets, flags and military trophies. On

> top of the catafalque these were arranged in pyramid form surmounted by an eagle weeping tears of blood. Black banners bearing the names of the states were at the side of the stage.[15]

Bands, orchestras, and chamber ensembles were usually well received. Benjamin Bache, a prominent Republican newspaper editor, described the band at a premier concert for the Philadelphia Chestnut Street Theatre as being "well chosen and full." He did not, however, care for the kettledrums and wanted more "simple tunes" performed in the future.[16]

Good musicians--particularly instrumentalists--were readily available in the 1790s. A selective sampling includes Alexander Reinagle, Henri Capron, Raynor Taylor, Benjamin Carr, Mary Ann Pownall, and, of course, Francis Hopkinson and William Billings. Reinagle, as noted earlier, was a promoter and manager. An Englishman who lived in America from 1786 until his death in 1809, he also composed, performed, and conducted.[17] Capron was a prominent French cellist who lived in New York and performed with the Old American Company Orchestra. He must have been highly regarded since he was promised a salary of one hundred pounds per year to come to New York from South Carolina. He later resided in Philadelphia, promoted subscription concerts, and published well-received songs such as "Come Genius of Our Happy Land. . . ."[18]

Taylor, Carr, and Hopkinson were renowned Philadelphia organists. Taylor, born and trained in England, played at St. Peter's Church and was a principal founder of the Musical Fund Society. This organization aided needy musicians and furthered the cause of chamber music in America. Taylor was an accomplished singer and composer of operas, operettas, and short songs. The latter include "The Wounded Sailor" and "The Wand'ring Village Maid."[19] Carr was a pianist, singer, and organist at St. Joseph's Church. Like Taylor, he was an Englishman who came to America after receiving excellent musical training. He opened what may have been the first music shop in America, was instrumental in the founding of the Musical Fund Society, and wrote a popular opera, The Archers, based on the legend of William Tell. The Old American Company Orchestra first produced this work in 1796.[20]

Hopkinson was the most famous of this group. Student of the Scottish musician James Bremner, Hopkinson was a supply organist at Christ Church. Unlike Carr and Taylor, he was a Philadelphian by birth who spent his entire life in the city, serving in a variety of different capacities--signer of the Declaration of Independence, lawyer, harpsichordist, Secretary of the Navy, concert promoter, federal court judge, and composer. He was probably the most versatile of all the Federalist musicians and, like a number of his colleagues in Philadelphia, often preferred private musical soirees over public performances.[21] In a delightful letter to an English bishop written in 1792, Hopkinson admonished organists to remember that they were church music leaders rather than recitalists or congregational entertainers:

> Unless the real design for which an organ is placed in a Church be constantly kept in view, nothing is more likely to happen than an abuse of this noble instrument. . . . Give me leave, sir, to suggest a few rules for the conduct of an organ in a place of worship . . . 1st. The Organist should always keep in mind, that neither the time or place is suitable for exhibiting all his powers of execution; and that the congregation have not assembled to be entertained with his performance . . . . All sudden jirks, strong contrasts of piano and forte, rapid execution, and expressions of tumult should be avoided. . . .[22]

Mary Ann Pownall was an English artist who came to America after 1788. She lived in Boston and sang with the Old American Company Orchestra. Later she moved to New York where she composed and published a number of popular songs including "Kisses Sue'd for" and a collection of songs for the harpsichord or piano forte. She died in Charleston and was probably the only woman living in America to publish songs during the Federalist Era.[23]

The most famous of all the late eighteenth century composers was the physically deformed William Billings from Boston. He was blind in one eye, had a lame leg, a withered arm, and stammered. Billings was self-educated and by profession a tanner. Yet he produced the first musical work composed and published in America: The New England Psalm Singer (1770), a series of psalm tunes and rules for singing them. In his Continental Harmony (1794) he attempted to revolutionize the rules of harmony. Although many choral musicians disliked his "fuguing tunes," his influence was far reaching in America. Even so, he died sick and impoverished in 1800.[24]

Even though William Penn believed that "Plays, parks, balls, treats, romances, musics, love-sonnets, and the like [would] be a very invalid plea . . . at the revelation of the judgment of God,"[25] there was a broad area of musical activity in the major cities of the new country. In this respect the new world resembled the old. An essay entitled "On Music" published at the outset of Washington's administration relates Euterpe's art to public virtue--a dominant concern of Revolutionary and Early National America:

> [Music is] an article of education, useful as well as ornamental. . . . What advantage may society derive from the softening harmony of choirs of voices, celebrating the praises of social virtue. Happy days! When false taste and false opinions shall vanish before the progress of truth. . . . [26]

This concern was manifested in the society itself. The number of songs published, the popularity of concerts advertised in leading

newspapers, the many musicians who actively pursued their talents, and the existence of music shops[27] in the largest cities of the new nation are indicative of a substantial and diverse musical culture during the Federalist Era. While not on a par with that of Europe, the culture was significant and contributed to the growing nationalism and optimism of the period.

NOTES

[1]Philadelphia Minerva, May 2, 1795.

[2]Kenneth Silverman, A Cultural History of the American Revolution (New York, 1976), xv.

[3]Donald Hixon, Music in Early America: A Bibliography of Music in Evans (Metuchen, N.J., 1970), 1-397, passim. I found no references to slave songs during the Federalist Era. However, there are late eighteenth-century and early nineteenth-century references to these songs. See The Journal of Nicholas Cresswell, 1774-1777 (Port Washington, N.Y., 1968), 19.

[4]Porcupine's Gazette (Philadelphia), April 28, 1798.

[5]Joseph was the son of the illustrious composer Francis Hopkinson. Not all men were stirred. Republican editor Benjamin Bache described the song as "ridiculous bombast, the vilest adulation of the Anglo-Monarchial party," quoted in Joseph Kelly, Jr., Life and Times in Colonial Philadelphia (Harrisburg, Pa., 1973), 121.

[6]"Ode for Independence," Massachusetts Magazine 1 (July 1789), 453-54.

[7]"Ode on the Death of Dr. Franklin" in Betsy Henry's Music Book, MSS, 1796, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa; hereafter HSP.

[8]"Last Week I took a Wife" in Eliza Henry's Music Book, MSS, 1800, HSP.

[9]"Crazy Jane" in Betsy Henry's Music Book, MSS, 1800, HSP.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Alexander Reinagle, A Collection of Favorite Songs . . . (Philadelphia, 1789), 1.

[12]Francis Hopkinson, Seven Songs for the Harpsichord or Forte Piano (Philadelphia, 1788), 1-10. Hopkinson was probably the first native American composer to write secular songs.

[13]Massachusetts Magazine 1 (1789), passim; Philadelphia Minerva, May 2, 1795.

[14]Kelly, 106-09; "A Grand Concert of Voice and Instrumental Music," cited in Harold Eberlein and Cortlandt Van Dyke Hubbard, "Music in the Early Federal Era," The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 59 (April 1945), 110-11.

[15]John Curtis, "One Hundred Years of Grand Opera in Philadelphia," Unpublished MSS. (HSP, 1922), 51.

[16]General Advertiser, February 19, 1794.

[17]Kelly, 118-19; Hixon, 371-72.

[18]Hixon, 312-13; Louis Hallam to T. Bradford, n.d., Bradford Collection, HSP.

[19]Hixon, 385-86.

[20]Hixon, 313. Carr studied with one of England's greatest organists, Samuel Arnold.

[21]Kelly, 115; Oscar G.T. Sonneck, Francis Hopkinson . . . and James Lyon (New York, 1967), passim.

[22]Francis Hopkinson to Bishop William White, quoted in Eberlein and Hubbard, 118-19.

[23]Hixon, 153-54, 368.

[24]David McKay and Richard Crawford, William Billings of Boston (Princeton, 1975), passim.

[25]William Penn, quoted in Kelly, 103.

[26]"On Music," The American Magazine (June 1788), 448-49.

[27]Michael Hillegas, the first treasurer of the United States, owned the largest music shop in America. See Kelly, 115-16. I know of no detailed studies that deal singularly with music in the Federalist Era. There are a number of works that treat some

aspect of the period or a larger time span. In addition to the works cited in the notes, see Helen Cripe, Thomas Jefferson and Music (1974); Robert Gerson, Music in Philadelphia (1940), Priscilla Heard, American Music 1698-1800: An Annotated Bibliography (1975); John Tasker Howard, Our American Music (1954); Russell B. Nye, The Cultural Life of the New Nation: 1776-1835 (1960); Oscar G. T. Sonneck, Early Concert Life in America (1969 reprint); Albert Stoutamire, Music of the Old South: Colony to Confederacy (1972).

THE KENTUCKY MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT: AN EARLY APPEAL FOR JUSTICE

Martha Carson
Richmond, Kentucky

To borrow a phrase from our grinning television neighbor, Ernest, some things "Don't take no mental heavyweight to figure out." Men and women are different from one another; culture and society have always recognized and elaborated on that difference to varying degrees. Historically, even "blindfolded" justice has unfailingly peeked to determine the gender of the appellants who sought relief before her--even when a seemingly neutral issue was to be decided.

Our modern society generally accepts the proposition that the exercise of ownership rights and the right to alienate and dispose of one's property should not depend on the biological fluke of one's sex, but this was not always a legal truism. A quite different view was articulated by the eighteenth-century jurist, Blackstone, in his commentaries on the English common law, the principles of which were effective in Kentucky until 1848:

> By marriage the husband and wife are one person in law: that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least incorporated . . . into that of the husband, under whose wing, protection, and cover, she performs everything. . . . If the wife be injured in her person or her property, she can bring no action for redress without her husband's concurrence, and in his name, as well as her own: neither can she sue or be sued without making the husband a defendant.[1]

Justice Blackstone then goes on to negate the possibility of an enforceable contractual relationship between a husband and wife as tantamount to contracting with oneself. The common law also compensated the husband for the additional responsibility of his wife's economic and personal interests:

> The husband also, by the old law, might give his wife moderate correction. For, as he is to answer for her misbehavior, the law thought it reasonable to entrust him with this power of restraining her, by domestic chastisement. . . within reasonable bounds.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The disabilities which the wife lies under are for the most part intended for her protection and benefit: so great a favorite is the female sex of the laws of England.[2]

Two distinct premises underlie Blackstone's analysis of the common law: first, that women are incompetent to handle business affairs, and secondly, that the husband would, in fact, deal with the wife's property to her benefit. The first premise might seem to have had, at some historical point, a kind of validity since women were excluded from the educational process available to men. Yet, the economic reality of the American new world was vastly different from that of feudal England. In England, at common law, the entire political and economic structure of the country was based on land and its ownership. Military necessity required land and purse strings to be held by men who could fight and support wars. But no equivalent system had ever been entrenched in the United States. Women in Kentucky, as well as elsewhere in the states, participated in taming the wilderness and frequently carried on their husband's business after his death or departure to points west. American women were, in fact, much more independent than their English sisters: the rough colonial life and Indian wars made widowhood almost a certainty; and the United States had a chronic labor shortage without taboos to keep women idle.[3] In spite of this rough equality of men and women on the frontier, the obviously mistaken presumption of women's incompetency created no pressure to displace English common law. Indeed, the stereotype of the woman incompetent in business was not legally abolished until Reed v. Reed, a 1971 U.S. Supreme Court case, which held a legal preference for males over females in selection of an estate administrator to be violative of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Instead, it was the obvious and increasingly frequent abuses by husbands in dealing with their wives' property that fueled the fire for legislative reform. Mrs. Josephine K. Henry, in her pamphlet Married Women's Property Rights Under Kentucky Law: An Appeal for Justice, presented a worst-case scenario:

> The following is an instance of the justice dealt out to married women by Kentucky law: a woman worth one hundred thousand dollars, that has not been settled upon her as her separate estate, married a man not worth a penny and it all becomes his the instant he promises "with all my wordly goods, I thee endow."
>
> The woman comes from the marriage altar not even the legal possessor of the clothes she has on her back. She cannot make a will, and if the husband dies one week after the marriage, fifty thousand dollars of the wife's money goes to his nearest male relative, unless he generously wills the defenseless wife her own estate.[4] [emphasis added.]

As Mrs. Henry acknowledged in this passage, affirmative action by a grantor was needed to create a separate estate in property for a married woman. At common law, the wife's interest in property was presumed to be a general one, subject to control of her husband and avilable to his creditors. Relief from this harsh result of the common law was originally obtained by the use of legal fictions:

> As a father would not have married his daughter without insisting on some provision, so a court of equity, which stands in loco parentis, will insist on it.[5]

The fiction employed is that a married woman is in the same position as an orphan and the court is simply acting as the prudent parent. However, the fiction had a very limited application, because courts usually invoked it only when the husband needed possession of the wife's property to give her a divorce settlement.[6] Since divorces were available only for the most egregious behavior, the practical result was that very few women benefited from the use of legal fictions.

The device more frequently employed to ameliorate the effect of common law was the equitable trust of "sole and separate" estates.[7] Generally, the language embodied in the instrument conveying an interest to a married woman had to reflect the grantor's intention that she should hold the property as a separate estate.[8] Since women were contractually incompetent, legal title was usually placed in a third-party trustee who would presumably act for the benefit of the woman. The husband-wife scuffle over the woman's property was therefore expanded to include the trustee in cases where the husband was not the trustee. What began as a two-way fracas could easily become a three way fracas--if the trust was a valid one.

The determination of whether a trust was valid was an issue that frequently confronted and perplexed the Kentucky courts. The specific language of the conveying instrument had to be interpreted; the circumstances of each transfer had to be analyzed--often on the basis of the subject of the trust, realty or personalty and the specific acts of the parties had to be construed in each particular case. The result was that Kentucky case law often appeared contradictory, to attorneys practicing in the field as well as to potential grantors.[9] For example, in the case of Griffith v. Griffiths Adm'r. 5 B. Mon. 116, and Johnston v. Ferguson, 2 Met. 506, expressions almost identical were differently construed.[10] Kentucky attorneys and their clients, the fathers of married women, were victims of the common law as pointed out in an analogy by Jeremy Bentham:

> When your dog did anything you want to break him of, you wait until he does it, and then you beat him for it. This is the way you make laws for your dog, and this is the way judges make laws for you and me.[11]

Moreover, the highest court in Kentucky could not be noted for its liberality in construing separate use trust instruments. In Johnston v. Ferguson, supra, a conveyance to a trustee for a

married woman, her heirs and assigns, "to their only property use, benefit, and behoof forever," was held not to create a separate estate. It was no surprise then, when the Court held in Guishaber v. Hairman, 2 Bush. 320, that a conveyance to a husband in trust "for the use, benefit, and behoof of his wife" did not create a separate estate. Finally, the Kentucky high court approached the oracular when, in Belknap v. Martin, 4 Bush. 43, it declared that a provision that a trustee shall sell, and hold the proceeds as separate estate, does not impress that character upon the land to be sold.

Ramifications of the common law disability of women were presented to the Kentucky court in Mitchell v. Berry, (Metcalfe's Reports, 602, Winter, 1958). In that case a Kentucky colonel had the misfortune to die in a duel leaving as only heirs three daughters. Each daughter, over a period of years, was in and out of marriage, a legal disability. Finally all daughters and their husbands joined in an action against the trustee of the family estate for self-dealing in the sale of the property. The trustee raised a defense of expiration of the statute of limitations, and the court was nearly overwhelmed by the complexity of permutations and combinations by which the statute could be stayed. The trustee won his case when the court decided that periods of disability could not be cumulative.

It should be noted that, not only were the avenues for judicial relief narrower in Kentucky than in other states, the disabilities were more significant. The state constitution of Kentucky, §59, provided that the General Assembly was not to pass acts to relieve married women of their disabilities. As Mrs. Henry points out in her pamphlet, Kentucky was the last state in the union that did not allow women to make a will.[12] New England states were more progressive toward women's issues because of the influence of women in a highly commercialized economy; the western states, with community property laws, had been less subject to common law strictures since admission to the union; and the southern states had had a more liberal position imposed by reconstruction constitutions. In Kentucky, the agrarian, plantation economy was far from universal, but its social code, which kept women largely within the domestic circle, was dominant.

Critics of the legislative reform represented by married women's property acts through the nation predicted a decline in morality and chastity:

> Husband and wife having their separate property . . . have also their separate amours and intriques; each interfering as little with the other in this matter as they do in pecuniary matters. A lover separate from the husband

> becomes almost a necessary appendage to the wife; and this laxity of morals, beginning as it does from this cause, is not confined to the circle within which it has its origin, but it extends by its example through all classes.[13]

Trusts, by their more limited applicability, were not supposed to have such dire consequences.

Which arguments finally prevailed most persuasively upon the Kentucky legislature to pass the Married Women's Property Act on March 15, 1894, can not be determined with any degree of certainty. A veil of accumulated dust shrouds a paucity of primary sources. It may be supposed that the legislature intended to insulate wives and children from certain of the husband's creditors. This is plausible in light of the nationwide economic distress of 1839.[14] But it is notable that women's economic status did not change as a result of the Married Women's Property Act. The total amount of wealth held by women and children continued to amount to less than ten percent of that held by men.[15] Perhaps the legislature was belatedly caught up in the codification movement and intended to democratize law applicable to Kentucky women so that the same law would apply to all without reference to social status.[16] Mrs. Henry had decried the disparity between the daughters or heirs of rich relatives who, forewarned of the common law, would will property to them in a separate estate, and the far larger class of women who, at best, became pensioners on humble farms that they or their fathers worked to buy. By virtue of the ignorance of consequences of the common law, Kentucky law operated to deprive many women of the privilege of providing for her own children:

> . . . As the . . . [husband] may [after the wife's death] marry again; as in numberless cases, bring a second wife to live on the real estate of the first wife, and turn the first wife's children adrift. . . .[17]

Perhaps Mrs. Henry's appeal to the chivalry and gallantry of the Kentucky legislature was effective. She presented a paradox that Kentucky legislators, "known the world over for their chivalry, gallantry, and exhaulted [sic], regard for women," should allow statutes to remain on the books "which almost make it a crime to be a married woman."[18] But Mrs. Henry's appeal was on a higher plane in her pamphlet: "Chivalry and gallantry are graceful characteristics of highly civilized nations, but justice is a law of god. . . ."[19]

Perhaps the Kentucky legislature felt the hot breath of angry Kentucky feminists upon their collective necks. In 1890, Mrs. Henry and her young co-founder of the Fayette County Equal Rights Association (1888), Laura Clay, presented the Kentucky legislature

with a petition bearing ten thousand names, urging passage of a married women's property act. Yet, women in Kentucky were not voters except on school board issues under certain circumstances,[20] and most women throughout the states would not and did not sign petitions. Ernestine Rose struggled to get five names on a petition that she presented to the New York legislature in 1836. Once the Married Women's Property Act was passed there she recounted:

> No sooner did. . . [the Married Women's Property Act] become legal than all the women [who refused to sign] said, "Oh'" That is right." We ought always to have had that."[21]

Nonetheless, regardless of which argument won the day, the Married Women's Property Act passed in Kentucky on March 15, 1894, and it was dubbed the Weissinger Act. Like most legislation, in derogation of the common law, it was narrowly construed. The Married Women's Property Act affected some of married women's rights in property, but not all. Married women obtained the right to hold and dispose of property and make wills but they were still considered legally incompetent to contract. Although a husband no longer had a right to do as he wished with his wife's realty, he had to sign a deed in order to make his wife's conveyance effective. Until 1942, Kentucky law provided that a married woman "may not make an executory contract to sell or convey or mortgage her real estate, unless her husband joins in the contract." And in a 1924 case (prior to repeal), Brown v. Allen, 204 Ky. 76, 263 S.W. 717, the court decided that the executory contract of a married woman was void for all purposes, even to a purchaser, without the husband joining in the deed, although the contract was made in contemplation of divorce and the divorce was obtained before the date of performance of the contract. Moreover, the Kentucky Married Women's Property Act was not retroactive in result. Women who lost property to husbands prior to the passage of the Act could not seek judicial relief: Schaengold v. Behen, 306 Ky. 544, 208 S.W.2d 726 (1948). Even when, in 1949, the court stripped the last vestige of common law disability from married women in regard to real property, the decision was not retroactive: May v. May, 311 Ky. 74, 223 S.W. 2d 362.

Married women's rights in personalty were clouded, statutorily, until 1974. The legislature presumed that women were too easily intimidated by their husbands into signing as a surety. Therefore, Kentucky women, until 1974, could not sign as a surety on notes. Repeal of this law, which led to discrimination against women in obtaining credit, probably resulted from federal legislation.

Although the effects of the Married Women's Property Act in Kentucky were delayed and narrowly interpreted in some respects,

other results were more direct. The Married Women's Property Act initially benefited the fathers of married women, but all women benefited by a lesson. This piece of legislation prepared the way for the early women's rights movement and it showed how women's status ought to be changed and how to do it. Nineteenth-century women well perceived their inevitable direction:

> What is property without the right to protect that property by law? It is mockery to say a certain estate is mine, if, without my consent, you have the right to tax me when and how you please, while I have no voice in making the tax gatherer, the legislator, or the law. The right to property will, of necessity, compel us in due time to the exercise of our right to the elective franchise, and then naturally follows the right to hold office.[22]

NOTES

[1]Blackstone, Commentaries on the Law of England (1765); rpt. in Sex-Based Discrimination, by Kenneth Davidson, Ruth B. Ginsburg, and Herma H. Kay (St. Paul, Minnesota, 1974), 442-445.

[2]Ibid.

[3]See Charlotte L. Levy, "Vestiges of Sexism in Ohio and Kentucky Property Law: A Case of De Facto Discrimination," Northern Kentucky State Law Review, 1 (1973), 202-3.

[4]Josephine K. Henry, Married Women's Property Rights Under Kentucky Laws: An Appeal For Justice (Versailles, Kentucky, 1889), 3; Wilson Collection, Special Collections, University of Kentucky Library.

[5]J. Story, Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence (1836) §1407.

[6]I. Loeb, The Legal Property Relations of Married Parties (1900) §125.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Since personal property could be transferred by parol, circumstances surrounding the transfer of title, or the conduct of the parties, could create a separate estate.

[9]H. Marshall Buford, The Property Rights of Married Women Under The Law of Kentucky (1871), 10. Buford presented his paper to the Lexington bar in 1871 as a basis for discussion for attorneys to decipher current cases affecting married women's property.

[10]Mr. Buford points out (Ibid.) that the distinction between the two cases is apparently the subject matter of the trust: In Griffith, personalty consisting of a slave, and in Johnston, Reality [sic]. This is apparently a Kentucky wrinkle to established trust law where the words of conveyance are interpreted independently of the res. Moreover, cases outside the trust context occasionally considered slaves as realty.

[11]Jeremy Bentham, The Works of Jeremy Bentham, ed. J. Browning (1843), 5:235.

[12]Henry, 9.

[13]N.Y. Assembly Doc. No. 96, 67 Sess. at 9 (April 12, 1842), cited in "The Origin of Law Reform: The Social Significance of the Nineteenth Century and its Contribution to the Passage of the Early Married Women's Property Acts," by Peggy A. Rabkin, Buffalo Law Review, 24:683. In the highly charged religious atmosphere of Kentucky during the great revival period, there can be no doubt that the same sentiments in Kentucky were expressed but unrecorded.

[14]Richard H. Chused, "Married Women's Property Law: 1800-1850," Georgetown Law Journal, 71 (1983), 1361.

[15]Ibid., 1362.

[16]Rabkin, 683.

[17]Henry, 9.

[18]Paul E. Fuller, Laura Clay and The Women's Right Movement (Lexington, Kentucky, 1975), 40.

[19]Henry, 3.

[20]Fuller, 39. Widows and spinsters who owned property subject to school tax could vote in a county on limited matters, e.g., school boards, school trustees, etc.

[21]Recounted in The History of Woman Suffrage, by E. Stanton, S. Anthony and M. Gage (1889), p. 99. Any similarity to the current debate on ERA and future sentiments possibly expressed by followers of Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly are purely intentional.

[22]Address by Elizabeth Stanton, Legislature of New York, adopted by the Woman's Rights Convention, Albany, N.Y. February 14, 1854, quoted in Rabkin, 760.

THE SEARCH FOR ALICE LLOYD

Nancy Forderhase
Eastern Kentucky University

Scholars, educators, and others familiar with the Appalachian region have long been aware of the work of a New England woman, Alice Lloyd, who established a school at Caney Creek in Knox County, Kentucky, in the early twentieth century. Mrs. Lloyd, who spent the last half of her life working with youth in the isolated mountain regions of the state, received national publicity when she appeared on a national television program, "This Is Your Life." That public appearance helped to raise considerable sums of money for her school. During the 1960s, in appreciation of her work, the trustees named the institution, Alice Lloyd College.[1]

Students and scholars of Kentucky history, working with the papers of prominent politicians and other important figures in the Commonwealth, have reported finding an occasional, and usually opinionated, letter from a Miss Alice Lloyd. Several Alice Lloyd letters appeared in the papers of Robert Worth Bingham, prominent Louisvillian and publisher of the Courier-Journal. The letters in the Bingham collection disclosed Miss Lloyd's frank and colorful statements on political events of the 1920s as well as her requests for financial assistance to support her crusade for reform of Kentucky's primary law in 1926.[2]

A further investigation of the elusive Alice Lloyd reveals that there were two Alice Lloyds, the dedicated woman who worked for education of mountain children and youth, and the "other" Alice Lloyd who was an articulate spokeswoman for a variety of reform causes during the first three decades of the twentieth century. This Alice Lloyd has been confused with the more prominent educator and ignored by historians, even though she was well known in Democratic Party circles and among women's groups in the state.[3] Most of her personal papers were destroyed at the time of her death; however, her contributions to reform causes can be traced through her frequent correspondence with others in Kentucky.

Mary Alice Lloyd was born in Mason County, Kentucky, in 1865. She was one of five children in the Evan Lloyd family from the Germantown area in Mason County. The Lloyds were a prosperous farm family, and Mr. Evan Lloyd gained local fame as the founder of the Germantown Fair, an import event in the lives of local Mason Countians.[4]

She received her early educational training in Mason County and later attended Daughters' College in Harrodsburg, now the site of the Beaumont Inn. She must have made a lasting impression there because, at the time of her death, the Harrodsburg Herald

published a tribute to her memory. This editorial, written by D. M. Hutton, editor and publisher of the newspaper, lauded her work in suffrage and other reform activities in the state.[5]

After her graduation from Daughters' College, Alice Lloyd followed the path of many other young women of her generation: she became a teacher. Beginning her career at Miss Park's School in Maysville in Mason County, she also taught at Hamilton College in Lexington and Ward-Belmont in Nashville, and became principal of the Madison Female Academy in Richmond, Kentucky, in the 1890s.[6]

In 1908 Alice Lloyd became active in efforts of tobacco growers to form a marketing pool. As the daughter of a tobacco farmer, she was well aware of the economic difficulties faced by tobacco growers in the early twentieth century. In letter after letter to newspapers across the state she championed the cause of the individual tobacco farmer in the struggle against the tobacco trust and strongly supported the formation of the Kentucky Burley Society.[7] Although tobacco growing was usually considered a man's business and it was a man's world in the early twentieth century, the leaders of the Burley Tobacco Society soon recognized her talents and hired her as press agent. She worked closely with Clarence LeBus, president of the Burley Tobacco Cooperative, who frequently relied upon her advice and considerable journalistic talents.[8]

During the first two decades of the twentieth century Kentucky women began to play a more active role in public issues and reform causes. Laura Clay, a prominent Kentuckian and leader of the woman's suffrage movement in the state, had led the fight for women's rights in Kentucky for many years. In 1912 Kentucky women secured the right to vote in school elections, and efforts to mobilize support for the general suffrage accelerated. During these years all of the leading women's clubs in the state, including the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs, announced their support for the suffrage.[9] This, however, was just one of many issues important to women. The W.C.T.U. was working hard to win a victory for prohibition in the Commonwealth, and the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs sponsored a broad program of progressive reforms.[10]

Alice Lloyd was a participant in all of these efforts. She served as president of the Mason County Equal Rights Association. The Kentucky Equal Rights Association hired her as a field worker to travel around the state, speaking and organizing new chapters.[11] Apparently choosing to ignore that tobacco was a narcotic, she strongly supported prohibition and was a member of the W.C.T.U. Finally, she worked for many of the reform causes espoused by the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs.[12]

In 1920, Kentucky women, jubilant over the recent suffrage victory, prepared to vote in a presidential election for the first time. The Democratic Party recognized the potential power of women's votes in this election and began to enlist female support. Party leaders chose Mrs. Samuel M. Wilson, a prominent Lexington woman, as head of the Democratic Women's Clubs in the state.[13] Furthermore, for the first time they also selected seven women to serve with seven men on an executive committee of the Democratic Party. One of the honored women was Alice Lloyd. Her selection showed that she was well known and respected around the state.[14]

Alice Lloyd did not play an active part in that campaign--surprising because she worked enthusiastically in behalf of all her causes. Mrs. Samuel Wilson became concerned about Miss Lloyd's inactivity and asked Mrs. Stanley Reed, wife of a prominent Maysville Democrat. Alice Lloyd's account revealed the plight of a single woman without independent means of support:

> . . . I have spent much time, strength, and even money in proportion to what I have, in the last 36 yrs and particularly in the last 3½ years in gratuitous public service that I am completely aground. You see I have without compensation fought to make majorities out of minorities on so many issues, local, state and national that my resources physical and financial are exhausted. Mrs. Reed knows by actual observation what I could not take time to write . . . . I have not one ounce of reserve strength. I have for so many years overdrawn my physical account--and financially I have for years forgone all except the barest necessities to help causes in which I believed--until my income will barely pay rent, food that I prepare myself and laundry. I am still covering myself with clothing from three to ten years old. When that gives out--well--they say the Lord will provide. But at present He is not providing traveling and platform costumes.[15]

Miss Lloyd went on to reassure Mrs. Wilson that she believed in the Democratic Party and was working hard at the local level to compaign for the Democratic ticket through letters to local editors and distribution of campaign literature.[16]

Alice Lloyd was fifty-five years old in 1920. Other women her age might have retired from active public life; however, for this vigorous reformer, the decade of the 1920s proved to be one of the most active of her life. During the Progressive Era, the first two decades of the twentieth century, Kentucky women, like other women throughout the nation, had supported reform causes and legislation which would improve American society. This enthusiasm for reform began to wane in the 1920s; nevertheless, Alice Lloyd's support and leadership for her favorite causes never wavered.

In the early 1920s the Maysville reformer served on the state board of the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs. She was chairman of its Department of Social Hygiene. One of the issues of interest to the K.F.W.C. was the age of consent, the age at which a young girl could engage in carnal relations with the opposite sex. In 1922 Alice Lloyd organized a campaign to change the law and successfully lobbied before the state legislature to raise the age of consent from sixteen to eighteen years.[17] This law, endorsed by the K.F.W.C. and the Kentucky League of Women Voters, was regarded as a model for other states. At a national convention of the League of Women Voters, Kentucky women were praised for their efforts.[18]

A year after her work for the age of consent bill, Alice Lloyd wrote to Laura Clay that she had not been reappointed to the state board of the Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs. In this letter she seemed disappointed, but her disappointment did not dampen her enthusiasm for reform causes.[19] In that year, 1923, she carried on a long correspondence with Robert Worth Bingham, publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal, and urged him to run for governor. When the newspaperman politely declined to run, Miss Lloyd suggested that he support one of her favorite Kentucky politicians, Alben Barkley.[20]

In 1925 Miss Alice became the state educational director of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, a post which she held until 1929. Although Prohibition and the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment were primary issues for the organization and its educational director, Alice Lloyd used the structure of the W.C.T.U. for other reform purposes. She believed in an educated, well-informed public and continually lectured the women of the W.C.T.U. about their obligations to study government.[21]

When Kentucky's legislature met in 1926, Alice Lloyd launched a campaign to convince the legislators to vote for reform of the primary law. This law, passed in 1914, required that citizens who wished to vote in the party primary, if challenged, must swear that they had voted for their party candidate in the last general election. If a citizen falsely swore before an election judge, he could be fined. Alice Lloyd argued that the law was unenforceable because the secret ballot entitled the voter to privacy. Furthermore, she believed the present law encouraged perjury, for those who wanted to vote in the primary could lie about their previous voting record. Finally, she felt that this provision tended to keep honest people away from the polls during primaries.[22]

Although Alice Lloyd realized that the primary law encouraged party regularity, she also believed that it discouraged voters from voting for the best candidate, regardless of party affiliation. For example, W.T.C.U. members voted for candidates who supported prohibition and its enforcement. If a Democratic W.C.T.U. voter cast a vote for a Republican dry candidate in the general election,

she would be ineligible to vote in the Democratic primary in the next primary election.[23]

Because of her deep convictions, the Maysville reformer raised money from the W.C.T.U. membership, wrote articulate pamphlets in support of a new law, and lobbied in Frankfort for the bill's passage. In a lengthy correspondence with Robert Worth Bingham, she convinced the publisher of the righteousness of her cause, and he contributed one hundred dollars to finance her work. Her efforts to reform the primary law were unsuccessful, but she vowed to try again.[24]

Another 1926 Lloyd project was the promotion of Alben Barkley for senator. She wrote numerous letters in behalf of his candidacy and campaigned for him in Mason County. One of the prime reasons for her enthusiasm was that he had been an early supporter of prohibition.[25] Although Alice Lloyd was delighted when Alben Barkley was elected to the Senate in 1926, that enthusiasm did not last. In 1928 Barkley became the Kentucky manager for the Al Smith presidential campaign. This was a difficult assignment because Kentucky Democrats were well aware that Smith would not be a strong candidate in the Commonwealth. He was urban, a Roman Catholic, and a wet. All three of these factors hurt his popularity among Kentucky voters.[26]

Barkley's support of Smith in 1928 meant the end of his friendship with Alice Lloyd. As the educational director of the W.C.T.U., she organized a massive campaign to defeat Smith. Always an effective pamphlet writer, she outdid herself in this effort by sending out thousands of circulars from the W.C.T.U. with the slogan, "A Vote for Hoover is a Vote for the Home."[27] One of her pamphlets, found among the Barkley papers, included a notation from one of his campaign workers: "I am enclosing . . . a circular letter Alice Lloyd is sending out. Please read my reply and forward same to 'Miss Alice' who seems to have gone wrong." In this pamphlet Miss Alice concluded with the following:

> Women have no power in nominating conventions. They have the power of ratification and veto in elections. To party leaders they say: If you put up dry men
> We will ratify your action
> If you put up wet men
> We will veto the transaction.[28]

Al Smith probably could not have carried Kentucky in 1928 under any circumstances; however, Alice Lloyd certainly must have contributed to his overwhelming defeat. She sent out approximately 97,000 letters and spent $7491 to defeat him.[29] When the campaign was over, Senator Barkley may have wished that he had never heard of Alice Lloyd.

In 1929 the reformer from Maysville announced her intention to resign as educational director of the W.C.T.U. For five years she had been commuting between Lexington and Maysville, and she felt

an obligation to return to Mason County to care for her aged mother. In a remarkable memorandum she outlined some of the major issues that needed to be addressed in the local branches of the W.C.T.U. Among those mentioned were: textbook work educating the youth about the evils of alcohol, local citizenship projects, publicity for enforcement of prohibition, and active involvement in local politics. Although she viewed temperance as the leading issue of the W.C.T.U., Alice Lloyd also focused on broader social and political issues, which meant that the Kentucky W.C.T.U. in the 1920s would show an interest in a wide variety of reform causes.[30]

By the early 1930s Alice Lloyd was in her late sixties, and most of her public activities ceased. She spent part of the year with relatives in Nashville and maintained an apartment in Maysville. She continued to correspond with reformers and other interested citizens. One of her last political letters appeared in the papers of Happy Chandler in 1938 as she lectured the colorful politician on using good manners in political campaigns:

> . . . But the main purpose of this letter is to say that I believe political opponents always lose ground and make the judicious among their supporters grieve when they condescend to bad manners and fail to speak respectively of their opponents--I have known Senator Barkley ever since he entered public life. He is not a great statesman--he is simply a faithful party man; but I know nothing that warrants the contemptuous way in which you speak of "that fellow" or "the other fellow" --I prefer the pardonable duplicity of the term "my distinguished opponent" or "the gentleman whom I have the honor to oppose." The effort to belittle a man always reacts against him. . . . The country needs the consecrated service of men too big to stoop to bad manners and unworthy treatment of honorable opponents.[31]

Alice Lloyd's efforts to reform the colorful Kentucky politician did not have any permanent effect on his campaign style. However, Chandler responded to her letter in a somewhat chastened way: "My Dear Miss Lloyd. . . . I am glad to have your criticism of my statements with reference to the present Senator from this Commonwealth. I shall remember that you feel that it would be better to handle the references to him with respectful dignity."[32]

When Alice Lloyd died in 1951, local Maysville newspapers praised her contributions to suffrage work and her support for tobacco farmers during the opening years of the twentieth century.[33] Those obituaries, however, told only a partial story of her tireless efforts in behalf of social and political reform in Kentucky. Alice Lloyd may not have ranked in stature with the Laura Clays and Madeline Breckinridges in the annals of Kentucky history; nevertheless she deserves more than a passing footnote for her unceasing efforts to improve the Commonwealth.

NOTES

[1]Barbara Sickerman and Carol Hurd Green, eds., Notable American Women: The Modern Period (Cambridge, 1980), 423-24.

[2]Alice Lloyd-Robert Worth Bingham Correspondence, 1923-26, Robert Worth Bingham Papers (Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.). Hereafter cited as Bingham Papers.

[3]See, for example, Paul E. Fuller, Laura Clay and the Woman's Rights Movement (Lexington, 1975), 157, 163. In a conversation with Paul Fuller, I discovered that he was unaware of the existence of two Alice Lloyds.

[4]Interview with Daniel Lloyd and Mrs. Evelyn Lloyd Dowdy, Richmond, Ky., January 30, 1982; see also, 100th Anniversary "Old Reliable" Germantown Fair (Germantown, Ky., 1954) for additional information about the Lloyd family.

[5]Mr. Hutton's editorial was reprinted in the Maysville newspaper, The Daily Independent, February 13, 1951.

[6]Interview with Daniel Lloyd and Mrs. Evelyn Lloyd Dowdy, Richmond, Ky., January 30, 1982; Minutes of the Madison Female Seminary (J. G. Crabbe Library, Eastern Kentucky University).

[7]Minutes of the Kentucky Burley Tobacco Society, Burley Tobacco Records, 1904-1923 (Special Collections, University of Kentucky).

[8]See, for example, the coverage of her trip to Washington, D.C., with Clarence LeBus in support of the demands of Kentucky tobacco growers, Lexington Herald, January 4, 11, 12, 15, 23, 24, 1910; Louisville Courier-Journal, December 18, 1909, January 4, 21, 23, 24, 1910.

[9]Mrs. Chyron Wallen, ed., K.F.W.C. from 1895: Resolutions (Louisville, Ky., 1972), 9.

[10]Ibid., 1-14.

[11]List of County League Presidents, Laura Clay Papers, courtesy of Esther Bennett (Special Collections, University of Kentucky). Hereafter cited as Laura Clay Papers, E.B.; K.E.R.A. expenses for June, 1916, Laura Clay Papers (Special Collections, University of Kentucky). Hereafter cited as Laura Clay Papers.

[12]Laura Clay to Lily S. Durham, October 20, 1913, Laura Clay Papers.

[13]Louisville Courier-Journal, August 19, 1920.

[14]Louisville Courier-Journal, September 5, 1920.

[15]Alice Lloyd to Mrs. Samuel M. Wilson, October 20, 1920, Wilson Manuscript Collection, Democratic Party Papers, 1896-1952 (Special Collections, University of Kentucky).

[16]Ibid.

[17]Acts of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky ([Frankfort], 1922), 65-67; Alice Lloyd to Laura Clay, January 1, 1922; Laura Clay to Arch Hamilton, March 6, 1922; Alice Lloyd to Laura Clay, March 10, 1922; Alice Lloyd to Laura Clay, April 21, 1922, Laura Clay Papers, E.B.

[18]Wallen, ed., Resolutions, 7; Alice Lloyd to Robert Worth Bingham, February 27, 1926, Bingham Papers.

[19]Alice Lloyd to Laura Clay, May 20, 1923, Laura Clay Papers, E.B.

[20]Alice Lloyd to Robert Worth Bingham, March 30, 1923; Robert Worth Bingham to Alice Lloyd, March 24, 1923; Alice Lloyd to Robert Worth Bingham, March 26, 1923, April 21, 1923, Bingham Papers.

[21]Alice Lloyd, memorandum to State Officers Kentucky W.C.T.U. and Officers, Lexington, Ky., May 14, 1929, Linda Neville Papers (Special Collections, University of Kentucky). Hereafter cited as Linda Neville Papers. The memo provides an overview of Alice Lloyd's numerous activities for the cause of prohibition and other reform issues. See also Minutes of Maysville W.C.T.U., 1924-25 (Mason County Historical Society, Maysville, KY.) and Minutes of Lexington W.C.T.U., 1928-32 (Special Collections, University of Kentucky) for insight into her work with local chapters.

[22]Undated pamphlet, "To Kentucky Voters," Bingham Papers.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Alice Lloyd to Alben Barkley, February 23, March 15, 1926, Alben W. Barkley Collection, Political File (Special Collections, University of Kentucky). Hereafter cited as Barkley Collection. Alice Lloyd to Robert Worth Bingham, January 29, February 2, 24, 27, March 8, 1926, Bingham Papers.

[25]Alice Lloyd to Alben Barkley, February 23, March 16, April 5, 1926; Alben Barkley to Alice Lloyd, March 1, 19, 1926, Barkley Collection, Political File.

[26]It is apparent from the Barkley papers that Senator Barkley undertook this assignment with considerable reluctance. For additional information, see Barkley Collection.

[27]Pamphlet, "Hoover for President," from W.C.T.U. Campaign Committee Headquarters, Lexington, Ky., October 1, 1928, Barkley Collection, Political File. The Barkley Collection contains several other pamphlets and letters written by Alice Lloyd against Smith's candidacy in 1928.

[28]Open letter to Kentucky Democratic Nominees for Congress and Senator Barkley, September 10, 1928, Barkley Collection, Political File.

[29]Alice Lloyd memorandum to State Officers Kentucky W.C.T.U. and Officers, Lexington, Ky., May 14, 1929, Linda Neville Papers. This memo gives a detailed account of Alice Lloyd's organizational skills and massive efforts to defeat Smith in Kentucky.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Alice Lloyd to Governor Chandler, May 26, 1938, Albert B. Chandler Collection (Special Collections, University of Kentucky.)

[32]A. B. Chandler to Alice Lloyd, June 2, 1938, Chandler Collection.

[33]The Daily Independent, January 23, February 13, 1951.

SUSAN CLAY SAWITZKY, KENTUCKY POET: A STUDY IN PATERNALISM AS OPPRESSION

Gwen Curry and Lindsey Apple
Georgetown College

On first encountering Susan Clay Sawitzky's poetry, the reader is struck immediately by several conflicting responses--astonishment, wonder, a sense of betrayal. Henry Clay's great-granddaughter Susan Clay is no mere regional "poetess," no dabbler in romantic verse, no socialite writing poems between dances and parties. On first reading Clay's poetry one's hair begins to rise and one is reminded of Emily Dickinson's definition of real poetry: "If I read a book and it makes my whole body so cold no fire can ever warm me, I know that it is poetry. If I feel physically as if the top of my head were taken off, I know that it is poetry."[1]

Susan Clay, in fact, reminds one of Dickinson in several ways. Why, for example, is she being published only now, three years after her death? Like Dickinson, a surviving female relative--a sister in Clay's case--is pushing the publication for her. Until now most of her poetry has lain in a drawer somewhere--as Emily Dickinson's did throughout her lifetime. The recent slim edition of Susan Clay Sawitzky's poetry, The Circling Thread, edited by Woodridge Spears and published in a special edition of Kentucky Poetry Review, merely scratches the surface. Out of several hundred in manuscript, The Circling Thread includes only forty-two of the shorter poems.

Susan Clay is as toughminded as Dickinson. Her mature poems face some of the largest themes in literature--death, birth, creation, the nature of God. Of course significant theme alone does not insure good poetry--the most common versifiers typically attempt to write about God and the trees; however, Susan Clay's treatment of theme is original and difficult. Nothing is over-simplified for her. For example, in an unpublished poem, "Strange Universe,"[2] she treats the question of Einstein's theory of relativity and the "big bang" theory in relation to the idea of God as creator. In this poem, God, "absorbed and mortal-deaf," needs more room and so creates the universe. He

> Bends out eternal walls
> For roomier heaven;
> Worlds take root
> And ravel leafy fire,
> And star grain
> Germinates the dark
> In crops
> Of powdery light.

Great beasts
Pinned out in stars
On zodiac path,
Or treading round the poles,
Are fed by Him,
And comets come to nuzzle at His hand,--
Their beam-haired tails
Adrift, behind. . . .

She somehow manages in this poem, through the image of the comets nuzzling at God's hand like horses with their "tails adrift behind," to convey a sense of God's infinity in an infinite universe without, however, domesticating the concepts.

This poem deals not only with the creation of the universe, but also with the whole sweep of history. It explores existentially the question of human meaning and examines the relationship of human life to God. In "Strange Universe" Susan Clay also describes the awesome destructive power unleashed in an atomic explosion. Instead of the usual mushroom cloud comparison, the poet uses a metaphor of a "hideous tree . . . in roar of instant growth":

And now, behold
The hideous tree,
Split huge
From ultimate seed
Of Eden fruit:
Of mighty trunk
And bulging head,
And roots curled lightly over death:
With mimicked faces
Peering from its mass
Of swelling foliage,--
New joke
Of ancient fiend.

In moment grown,
Butting the sky
And spreading over world;
Knotted and dripped with age
Like candle stump,--
Older than time;
Milleniums spent
In roar of instant growth,
And rage at secret
Bounding from the dark,
In genitals
Too small
For mortal sight,
But not for mortal probing,
Mortal quest
For self destruction.

Yet Susan Clay's view of humankind is not simply one of destruction pitted against God's creation. In "Strange Universe" she portrays astronauts as:

> New prophets
> Lusting God;
> And riding
> Giant arrows
> Feathered white
> With drool of cloud,
> Great hunters leap
> In arc of sky
> To chase the fleeing moon.

One must ask why--even yet--this poem is unpublished? Why was it not included in The Circling Thread? The answer is implicit in the very length of the poem--six manuscript pages treating the most difficult questions ever posed. Her bold attempt to explore such questions in one poem rivals Milton's effort to "justify the ways of God to man." It is very hard to hang on--to ride with the poet into space, to the outer edges of the universe where Susan Clay seems to feel very much at home by the end of her life. Few readers are equipped to accomplish such a voyage.

Yet Susan Clay's ability to encompass the largest of themes is matched by her ability to depict quite graphically the specifics of experience. Consider these lines from "Winter Dusk," a poem describing a Kentucky horse farm:

> The young colts stamp and shift
> And their small hooves thud against confining wall-boards
> The darkness smells of straw
> And of fresh manure steaming on the straw bedded floor.
> Soft noses and lips, loosely moving,
> Sprinkled with delicately perceiving hairs,
> Feel for hidden oats pushed into [trough] cracks
> And jerk upward startled
> At a damp release of breath.
>
> Now stooping through a fence
> I feel the jolt
> Of warped, black cypress boards between my knees;
> And my gloves catch the roughness
> Of rain bitten grooves.
>
> The cold is imperceptibly still:
> It holds its breath and does not stir,
> But ground water swells and hardens
> In clods beneath my feet.

I lift my face to feel the hurrying feet of snow.
They touch my cheek timidly
Like small, cold paws:
A great host of them
Come down from the deep Arctic of the skies,
Down from the jammed, cloudy ice floes,--
Little furry, strange things
Padding through the dusk. . . .[3]

In her poems about death, Susan Clay combines these two poetic skills--ability to treat a vast theme complexly, and ability to render the specifics of experience concretely. Throughout her life Susan Clay repeatedly returns to the theme of death in her poetry. Her brother, Charley, was killed in 1922[4] and his death greatly affected his sister. The poem "A Coat" focuses on the "faint odor" clinging to her brother's coat after his death:

In the sweet, dark hollows of these sleeves,
In the folds of these sleeves,
In this rubbed collar,--you cling.
The faint odor of you is here,
In its creases your young movements.
Yours only, like the lines in your hands.

How can the scent of you, the look of you be here
And you not here?
My brother, my friend, deeper than I knew. (CT, 47)

In "The Alienated," another poem about loss through death, Susan Clay treats the effect the dead have on the living, thereby giving the dead more freshness, more freedom, more purity, much as James Joyce does in "The Dead":

Through cold, dividing window panes of change you peer,
O wistful dead,
Pushing your eager faces close:
Your soundless moth words flutter
Against the invisible, chill wall.

You come
With soft, insistent clamor,
Seeping like flakes of snow into our lives
Through loose, unguarded cracks of consciousness.
You are the white swirl of snow
That stands within the threshold
Of a closed door.

And there is a freshness thrust into a world
Of thoughts too thickly breathed;
But we are unacclimated to freedom
And stifled
With the purity of death. (CT, 27)

The poem entitled "An Equivocal Answer" projects the individual self into union with all the earthly elements in the final dissolution:

Let us lie too, where the moist, healing ointment
May touch our lips and hands
And willing flesh;
Feel ground-drip seep
--Digestive juice of earth--
Loosening, building us
Into vast body wall.
Let us go down
Into lower places of sleep,
In company of disintegrating things;
Part of all forest floors
Holding the roots' cold claws,
Part of bogs
With their thick, primordial brewing;
Of graves and gardens feeling the crunch of spades,
And fields upturned
In silvered dark,
Corded and coiled like heavy rope
By winding plow in spring. . . . (CT, 42)

In this poem the poet imagines the literal decomposition of the body in a specific and concrete way rivaled only by some of Emily Brontë's recently discovered poetry. Even the "graveyard poets" did not push so far. Yet through Susan Clay's poetic imagery the potentially disgusting details of rotting flesh take on a sensuousness which transforms death into a mystic union with earth like Whitman's vision in Leaves of Grass.

Through her poetry Susan Clay becomes as comfortable with the idea of death as she does with the idea of infinity of space. In her poem "Belief" Clay deals with immortality of the soul after death:

I cannot lie in that great hush forever,
Hard as the clods of a Winter field
With ice swollen tight in its veins.
I know that death will relax at last
Like a rough hand fallen asleep. (CT, 46)

These poems do not deal in cliché. Their vision is original; their poetic voice is very strong.

Some of Susan Clay's most poignant poetry deals with the loss of her baby through miscarriage. In "The Flight," "Unfinished One," and "Lullaby," all poems about this experience, the reader detects a Wordsworthian kind of Platonism based on a belief in the pre-existence of the soul. First consider "The Flight":

> You came to me as quietly
> As a star,
> Spirit unhurt by birth;
> Rapid as light,
> Like light unmoving,--
> Leaning out of your orbit
> Bending a new path toward me;
> Feeling the pull of me
> Swung steep about your side.
>
> I saw you against the earth brightness
> Whiter than noon,
> Making its mid-day dusk.
> You seemed englobed against a pale sky.
> Nucleated with darkness,
> Holding an alien seed
> Misted in light.
>
> You gazed at me with wondering, stern eyes,
> --Perceiving, not interpreting me,--
> As bird flown downward from the North
> Looks first at man,
> Across the barriers of its innocence;--
> Fearless, and Arctic mild;
> And in this look
> Of him I love,
> (Before his blood and bone
> inherited)
> I knew you for my child.
>
> So you approached me
> Flooding full my face.
> And then some doubt,
> Some vague unreadiness,
> Loosened you from me:
> And icy tracks of space
> Feel still your burning feet
> Unshod with flesh. (CT, 19)

In "Unfinished One" Susan Clay unites the Platonic idea of the soul's coming down from a prior life in a distant star and her pain at the loss of fleshly existence for her child. The last

stanza of this poem expresses this idea:

> Could I have rounded you
> In earth, to cope with earth,
> To understand the baseness of the gift
> And all its humble, helpless tenderness,
> The blundering loss of you
> Had hurt you less. (CT, 29)

In an unpublished poem, "The Leonids," she treats this same idea of unborn children in the image of the meteor shower:

> Tonight, where our roads cross in the sky
> You will pass, wild band of little children;
> Orphaned from what you were, and know no more;
> Unclaimed by mortal name or destiny.
>
> What suddenly lights your beings as you run,
> --Soundless as fireflies as they streak the grass,-
> To see the earth go by?
> I look at you and wonder which is my child
> I can never call.[5]

This star imagery is quite romantic, yet one is struck by the quality of mind which can encompass and incorporate both this Platonic star imagery and Einstein's theories about the universe. In many ways Susan Clay Sawitzky may be considered a romantic poet who points back to the nineteenth century. There are certainly many romantic elements in her poetry: a love of nature, an interest in the supernatural, a mystical perception of death, a concern with identity and ego; yet, in other ways she seems to be ahead of her time in her subject matter and in her use of sharp metaphor and graphic visual image.

The most poignant of the poems about the loss of her baby is "Lullaby." In this one, the physical sense of loss is emphasized:

> That day a tide rose warm and measureless
> Out of the deep,
> And life lay dim over a loosened world:
> Then sinking, left me like a sea cast pool
> Hold you close,--a lowly clump of being.
>
> I soothed you in gentle brine,
> I cupped a cradle softly in my flesh.
> My blood went round you hushed
> With pulsing step;
> I fed you with the singing of my heart,
> And no one heard but you.

It was a time when all the simple ones
Of water and earth became my child.
[I] was the mother of cleft, creeping things,--
Cold fingered, weedy lunged,
That strain the thick, archaic slime for breath,
And held my arms to little helpless bodies
Matted with hair.
I told the knotted rosary of time
For you were all in holy pantomime,
The children of all else
Though not yet child.

How safe I thought you in this wet foot print
Of ebbing sea.
And then the flood returned,--the buoyant flood--
And you were gone,
Broken, small fragment of eternal dream.
But like the sh-h-h of pebbles swinging softly,
I tend you still,
Holding beneath my heart its emptiness.
(CT. 17)

In her treatment of the woman's experience of miscarriage, Susan Clay reminds one of contemporary feminist poets such as Anne Sexton, Sylvia Plath, or Adrienne Rich. Clay is well ahead of her time in treating the female experience of pregnancy as she does in 1928. Such imagery did not become acceptable until the second feminist wave of the late 1960s freed women to speak and write of their bodily functions. Her creation imagery in a long, unpublished late poem, "The Shifting Void," reflects the woman's perspective in a way that rivals any contemporary feminist poet:

Some think that earth was made
From spurting of the sun's side,
Wrenched by the passing
Of a mightier star;
Like burst of bulb
Its golden stuff grew high,
Waving in space:
But a sun, more terrible, plucked it
To form a world.

Cold now, and unmolested in its path
It moves;
But molten blood
Wells up in breasts of stone:
Slow heaving,
Shifting weight of self
On rigid heart.

Like knuckled, hollowed fist
Levelled to sphere
In brim of oceans huge,
It grips sidereal violence within,
Remembering womb of sun, and giant birth,
And kidnapped babe of world:
Abandoned in black fields
To cool,
And weep its bitter seas.[6]

Such imagery as birth from the "womb of sun," earth as a "kidnapped babe," "molten blood . . . in breasts of stone" not only places Susan Clay far ahead of her time in using female sexual imagery in poetry, but also it incorporates the mystical perception of the universe with her own particular experience as a woman.

In addition to the expansiveness of theme and her skilled use of imagery and figures, Susan Clay Sawitzky's rhythms and cadences are sure and unerring. Most of her poems are in free verse, but there is not a doubt that this is real poetry.

So why did this woman remain unpublished during her lifetime? Prior to the posthumous collection, The Circling Thread, and one self-published collection in 1923 modestly entitled Poems, her single published poem, "Mariner," appeared in Poetry magazine in 1941 in company with poems by Robert Penn Warren, Theodore Roethke, Babette Deutsch, and I. A. Richards.[7] It is an oversimplification to say that she was not good enough to compete with such distinguished company of twentieth century poets as Warren, Eliot, Pound, Williams, Stevens, and Roethke. Feminist literary criticism has demonstrated that many women (other than Emily Dickinson) were denied publication for reasons other than their literary quality. Furthermore, any student of literature can see that in many ways Susan Clay Sawitzky's poetry is superior to that of some poets who were published. We must go beyond that simple, easy answer.

Susan Clay's family heritage and cultural milieu undoubtedly affected her poetic destiny in many ways. Her upbringing and social conditioning must have shaped the way she thought about herself as a woman and as a poet, as well as the way the world looked at her.

A young woman born into the Bluegrass gentry in 1897 entered the world to fulfill a role prescribed for her by that society. She would learn to write a letter, participate in a conversation, serve as a hostess at social affairs and attract a husband from her own class who would provide a comfortable life for her. She would provide, in return, a family raised with those same values.

Susan Clay was born on July 21, 1897, the daughter of Charles D. and Maria Clay. She was expected to be the stereotypical gentry

daughter, but the Clay family made several miscalculations. Susan Clay was taught that she was special. She was first a Clay, the great-granddaughter of Henry Clay. Her father and paternal uncles recalled, and embellished, family traditions around winter fires and Aunt Lucretia, known as Teetee within the family, brought to the family circle old letters with the signatures of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Buchanan, and other historical figures. The binoculars taken to the Arctic by Uncle Harry Clay and the bridle allegedly given to Uncle Tom Clay by Geronimo were on the mantel out of the reach of children but not out of sight.[8] Second, Susan was the first child of an aging generation. Doting adults showered her with attention and encouraged her curiosity and self-confidence.[9] She was encouraged to read, and the family heritage easily led to a love of romantic history and the classics of literature. Long walks with her mother encouraged a love of nature. The young Clay honed analytical skills in the study of insects, plants, and wildlife on their Bluegrass farm.[10]

By the time Susan reached her teens she had far surpassed her peers in intellect. She enjoyed the parties and the social life of the Lexington gentry, but in the privacy of her own rooms she expressed on canvas and in writing deeper thoughts which could not be shared in that society.[11] It was her poetry in particular which became the mirror of her thoughts. Her poems combined the emotions of her imagination with an extremely analytical use of language. The result was therapy for a mind confined by social mores, and Susan Clay began to think of herself as a poet.

A clear distinction must be drawn, however, between the belief in oneself as a poet and the desire to share that work with other than the most intimate friends. Although her writing was done in the twentieth century, Clay exhibits many of the anxieties of authorship described by Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination. She believed her work was good; at the same time, she feared the rejection entailed in attempts to publish.

Throughout her life Clay thought about publishing her work. In 1921, for example, she sold an inherited diamond ring to finance a trip to New York for the express purpose of finding publishers for her prose and poetry. She met the editor of a friend's poetry, and Witter Bynner, the President of the Poetry Society of America. Both men praised her work and Bynner gave her letters of introduction to a number of magazine editors.[12] Letters from friends such as Ann Cesare of Connecticut and the poet Hortense Flexner King encouraged her to seek publication, and in her letters to her mother and her sister Elizabeth, Clay often spoke of her desire to publish. She wrote also about the typing of manuscripts for

the purpose of publication and about poetry contests or magazines which might accept her poetry.[13] Finally, her notebooks contained names and addresses of numerous magazines and editors and rough copies of letters offering her poetry for publication.[14]

Nevertheless, her bibliography is a short one. The evidence strongly suggests that Clay submitted her poetry only when there was significant encouragement in that direction. As shall be shown, the New York trip of 1921 swept Susan Clay into a world of glamour and excitement sufficient to make her forget any fears of rejections. Furthermore, it was William Sawitzky, the man whom she most wanted to impress, who suggested that she submit her work to Town and Country Magazine, the first major publisher of her poetry. The same type of encouragement existed on the other occasions of Clay's publication. In 1923 she was actively involved in a writers' group at the University of Kentucky called the Scribbler's Club. The 1941 publication of "Mariner" occurred when Hortense King was living in New York, close enough to Susan Clay's home in Stamford, Connecticut, to apply more consistent pressure than their normal written correspondence afforded.[15]

Generally, Clay allowed the enthusiasm which such encouragement created to wane before anything was accomplished. Around family and friends, Clay was outspoken, shrill in debate, quick to speak, but with regard to her poetry she was timid and lacked self-confidence.[16] Her friends often pleaded with her to publish. On one occasion an admirer of her work urged her to "muster courage to place your efforts in critics' hands." True talent would "overcome any barrier that discouragement [might] present."[17] Clay questioned her ability to see the weaknesses in her work and worried about triteness.[18] In 1935, for example, when her sister was encouraging her to seek publication, she wrote,

> I am always completely at sea as to what to do with my work, but it seems to me that it would be wiser not to try to publish anything for the present. I am trying to reshape all my poems a little; they have awkward hitches, and have never satisfied me.[19]

Finally, Clay sought the help of a higher power to overcome her timidity with regard to publication. A Christian Scientist, Clay frequently asked her friend and practitioner Mrs. Clinkenbeard, for help in this area.[20] The following request of another practitioner is found in Clay's papers of the 1930s:

> Help us find a right place and reception for poems today, and know honesty and protection as they are not copyrighted. Also help skin condition.[21]

Clay's timidity, however, applied only to efforts at publication. Her papers indicate without question that she thought of herself as a poet. For example, near the end of her life she collected and catalogued many of the versions of each poem. Fifty years of poetic effort, approximately two hundred poems and numerous fragments, were thus collected in her notebooks. It was as if she wanted to show some future editor the evolution of her work.

Like many female writers of the nineteenth century, Susan Clay experienced a strange relationship to her work. She believed in her ability and wanted to publish her poems yet retreated behind a mask of timidity and dissatisfaciton with her efforts. The question, then, is why? The answer to a great degree lies in her background and her relationship with family and community.

Susan Clay grew up in a time and place in which women were protected by father, brother, or husband. Community ethics and etiquette also restricted their activities. In 1927 she escaped some of those restraints by marrying Vassili Sawitzky. However, escape from one patriarchal situation merely placed her in another. Neither patriarchy was explicitly oppressive. The paternalism of both father and husband was of the more subtle variety, affecting her attitude toward her own person and limiting both the importance of her work and the attention she could give it.

The values of the Clay family were those of the nineteenth century southern aristocracy. Col. Charles Clay was a gentleman and a soldier. Additionally, he carried the name of Clay with great pride and responsibility. Honor and duty were more than mere words to him. For example, while fighting in the Philippine insurrection, Clay was shot in the neck, the bullet lodging dangerously close to his spine. He refused to have the surgery recommended by his physicians until his wife gave birth to their second child and had adequate time to recover. Nearly six months after he was wounded, the bullet was removed.[22] Southern women in Rita Clay's condition had to be protected from traumatic experiences, and her husband intended to provide that protection even at serious personal risk.

His role as father was governed by the same principles. He sought to educate his children formally and at home to the class and the family of which they were members. The greatest attention was given to the education of his two sons. In return for the expense of that undertaking, they were made aware of their responsibility for the well-being of their mother and sisters should anything happen to Colonel Clay. The education of the girls, though certainly not overlooked, was considered secondary. They were educated in private schools of Lexington with emphasis on

the social graces and a knowledge of cultural activities. They were expected to marry into the same class and therefore were not taught to cook, sew or to perform the other chores expected of women from the lower orders.

Young ladies especially were to be protected from the harsh realities of life. Business or family finances were not discussed in their presence. Clay's business interests included the breeding of thoroughbred horses. Talk of such a delicate nature was not to be overheard by women. Consequently when he was involved in "horse talk" over the telephone, his wife and daughters were required to retire to the dining room, closing the large doors behind them.[23]

Charles Clay took seriously his role as family provider and protector. However, it led to serious and frequently heated disagreements with his oldest daughter. The 1920s were a time of changing values, and she chafed under the restrictions of a family which honored the past. This was particularly true of the restrictions on her social life. Susan Clay was not only a brilliant young woman but an extremely beautiful one as well. Young men began to call on a regular basis. All went well until Susan or her younger sister became too interested in a particular young man. At that point, the Colonel, Mrs. Clay, and at times even the uncles and aunts, were apt to step in. On one occasion Susan asked her father what he would do if a particular man, one of whom the Colonel did not approve, came to call. The Colonel calmly replied, "I would shoot him." If he was joking, there is no evidence that Susan saw the humor. She automatically assumed her father's "interference" in matters of the heart. The younger sister, Elizabeth, believes to this day that no man would have ever suited Papa.[24]

The patriarchal family was enhanced and reinforced by the social requirements of the Bluegrass gentry as well. More southern in manners than any other Kentucky area, the city had historically prided itself on its social and cultural standing, and its class mores were deeply entrenched. During the early 1920s, Lexington held to the old values more tightly than most areas, a rigidity explained in part by the fact that the world of the Bluegrass gentry was under attack. The Bluegrass farms were rapidly being purchased by outsiders; as Clay herself put it, by "oil, near-beer and coca-cola kings, and the monarchs of other sudden dynasties."[25] The gentry attempted to close its doors to the intruders and consequently clung tenaciously to its mores. Any false step could set tongues wagging from one end of Lexington to the other.

Letters written between Clay and her mother during the New York trip in 1921 indicate the burden of social and family values. In New York, she met exciting people--editors, artists, poets.

Their conversation was much more stimulating than that found in Lexington. She particularly enjoyed the spontaneity of these people. They might dine at a famous restaurant or decide to eat at a quaint cafe where the Bohemian set congregated. Intoxicated by such heady freedom, Susan revealed all in a letter to her mother. Marm's reply was both quick and revealing:

> Susan:
> Your interesting letter telling me of the interesting people you have been meeting through Helen Lowry came yesterday after six days of anxious waiting. Now Susan I am much afraid that you are infringing on your rights and your reputation in going around with the "childish old Swede" and the editor, etc. unchaperoned. (her emphasis) You must keep faith and do not ease your conscience by doing doubtful things and then mentioning them casually.
>
> I do hope that you can find a publisher for your poetry and prose, but keep your dignity and remember "noblesse oblige" (if this is the way you spell it) and do not abuse the blessings that God has given you.
>
> Remember that the fashionable Twentieth Century girl is a godless girl and an unfaithful creature to self, to parents and pretty near everything else in life. (7/12/21)

Susan Clay was nearly twenty-four years old when this letter was written.

One of the New York editors called Clay a "true thoroughbred," and the thoroughbred now wanted a free rein. Clay openly rebelled against the community and family values which restricted her. Upon her return from New York she became a reporter for the Louisville Herald. Her columns reveal the rebellion occurring. Her writing style can only be described as that of the "fashionable Twentieth Century girl"--satirical, flippant, and defiant of social mores. In column after column she attacked convention. She noted with mock horror, for example, the practice of some women openly placing wagers at Churchill Downs. On another occasion she lamented the scarcity of debutantes for the 1921 season. Comparing them to flower buds, Clay noted that so many had been "plucked so ruthlessly in recent months," only "seven wise virgins had resolved to be old fashioned."[26] Her writing seemed intent upon defying the conventions of her social circle. She also complained in her personal correspondence of the shallowness and narrow views of the members of that society.

That same year, 1921, she met William, or Vassili, Sawitzky. Sawitzky came to Lexington in March with a collection of paintings from the Milch Galleries of New York. A man of considerable knowledge, he took Lexington by storm.[27] He was urbane, cosmopolitan, a gifted speaker on a variety of topics. Susan invited him to the Clay home to evaluate the family portraits, and they met again in July 1921 in New York. Their similar interests led to a rapid development of the relationship despite the fact that he was a married man.[28] In New York she spoke to him of her sense of entrapment. She continued to share her fears in correspondence after her return and to seek Sawitzky's advice. His response indicates again the sense of entrapment she felt. He wrote:

> Don't let the others tame you. Keep forever your fire and hunger! Never, never throw yourself away!! (9/17/21)

If Susan Clay did not sense that she was falling in love, her mother did. Mrs. Clay exacted from her a promise not to see or correspond with Sawitzky. The promise was kept for several years due to a family crisis, the death of her oldest brother, Charley. In 1926, however, Susan and Vassili, now divorced, renewed their correspondence, and in May 1927 they eloped. In one swift act Susan Clay violated most family and social norms. Sawitzky was eighteen years older than she, a divorcé and a Russian emigré. (Lexington gossip erroneously believed him a Polish Jew.)[29] The couple had run away without her family's approval and been married by a justice of the peace rather than a minister.

Clay's struggle with home and community is equally apparent in her poetry. Gilbert and Gubar see that struggle as central to women writers of the nineteenth century:

> Literally, women like Dickinson, Brontë, and Rosetti were imprisoned in their homes, their father's houses; indeed, almost all nineteenth-century women were in some sense imprisoned in men's houses.[30]

Gilbert and Gubar see the man's house not only in a practical but in a literary sense. Women writers found it as difficult to escape the male-dominated character of literature as they did their fathers' homes, and thus their poetry contains spatial imagery of confinement and the desire for freedom. In one of Clay's best early poems, "Fire-Fly," the theme is apparent:

> The sky and valley hold me close tonight
> like cupped hands,--
>
> But I shall crawl to the verge of them
> and lift my wings to you.[31]

In a poem entitled "The Inland Sea," Clay is a small body of water which

> Looks upward always
> Wistful, Silent
> At the Knees
> Of tall mountains. (Poems, 16)

The confinement of cupped hands, the lifting of wings, and the wistful looking toward freedom certainly illustrate the point of Gilbert and Gubar. In "To Elizabeth" (Poems, 20) Clay places blame for this confinement on society, and in the poem, "Portrait," she speaks of the confinement of family and tradition:

> The head of this aged mandarin is like a
> tea-pot
> Soaking, in the warm fluidity of thought,
> All the written wisdom of his race.
>
> Each twisted symbol is an ancient rolled-up
> word,
> A pinch of tea leaves, dry and enigmatical,
> Uncurling, with an acrid fragance,
> The mummied dreams of distant dynasties.
>
> The mind of this learned mandarin is like
> black tea
> That has grown bitter, steeping knowledge. (Poems, 31)

Who was the aged mandarin who glared down from his frame and made her feel a prisoner of past family greatness? Was it great-grandfather Henry? The chargé d'affaires James B.? Or Matthew Jouett's Uncle John? There is no doubt of her subject here. In an article published in the New York Times on 18 December 1921, Clay spoke of her family as one "mummified by tradition."[32] The family portraits spoke of tradition and noblesse oblige, of great accomplishments that must have seemed beyond the grasp of Susan Clay. At least half the poems of the small book published in 1923 spoke to this struggle between confinement and the desire for freedom.

In the 1930s after the loss of her own child, Clay returned to the theme. The rebellion of child against parent was the subject of a number of her poems, including the harshest of all her work, "Child and Father":

> Storm calls to ocean.
> "You know me to be black and miserable,
> I see it in your grey glance,
> I will strike you, I am filled with rage,

> I will cry out, jolt you to anger,
> I will stripe your face with sorrow:
> But I am you,--I will return."
> Fatherhood, however, is scatheless,
> Though its forehead wrinkles, it knows no deeper hurt,
> It has so many times been storm cloud. (CT, 38)

Despite resistance to confinement, escape was never complete. The child-father relationship also brought images to her mind of a strong benevolent father figure. In "Prodigal," a poem dedicated to her parents,[33] the child forsakes its parents in anger but realizes the need for parent love and returns:

> The patient father whose effacing brightness
> Has never known recession or return,
> Yet grants eternal charters of new freedom
> That man may go exploring at his will,--
> Grooving his own ellipses
> On tranquil planes of mind. (CT,25)

Other evidence from the early 1930s speaks clearly to the internalization of the paternal limitations. As she grew older, Clay's rebellion was tempered and she found "comfort and peace in traditional and familiar things."[34] In letter after letter she apologizes to her parents for her disobedience and stubborn nature as a child.[35]

There can be little doubt that Clay's early life and work was influenced by the protectiveness of family and society. She was aware of the confinement and tried to break its chains, yet it influenced her poetry into the 1940s. In her ultimate effort to win freedom, her marriage to Sawitzky, she traded one form of protection for another.

Susan Clay loved Vassili Sawitzky. He brought her a happiness which rivals that of fiction rather than reality. She wrote her parents two days after their marriage:

> Vassili and I have for each other a complete devotion and understanding and our love penetrates so deeply into our spiritual backgrounds, that we could not fail to be lastingly happy. We seem to have almost identical preferences and dislikes so we can go in and out of each other's minds without disagreeable surprises. (5/7/27)

They did indeed share so many things that it was a simple matter for her to assume that his analysis was hers as well. In 1938 she wrote her mother that because of her respect and love for Vassili she found it perfectly natural to obey him in all things. In short, in virtually every matter she gave to Vassili a control over her which

she had struggled to keep from family and community.

Vassili loved Susan equally, but he accepted without question a protective role. In response to a highly critical letter from Colonel Clay shortly after the elopement, Vassili justified his failure to ask for Susan's hand by speaking of her "fragile nature." He had determined that "Susan didn't have the strength to confront a discussion of [the marriage] at home." Consequently, he had to disregard conventionalities or "expose the beloved one to new hurts and pains which could have scarred her oversensitive nature beyond repair" (5/14/27). His paternalism is apparent in other letters. He wrote to Mrs. Clay, for example, "I have acquired the habit of an English governess, telling her to put on this warm thing and that warm thing, to button up her coat, not to forget her gloves, etc., etc." (1/12/28).

In writing to Mrs. Clay, Sawitzky referred to his wife most prophetically as a wonderful "help-mate" (7/8/27). It was that role which most limited her writing. He trained her to assist him professionally. He taught her to research information for his articles on art history and to evaluate the authenticity of paintings. She also copied his notes, filing and retrieving them as he requested. Her willing efforts to facilitate his (their) work obviously limited the time she spent writing. To borrow a phrase from Gilbert and Gubar, Clay lived in a man's house. The idea of equality never arose despite the quality of her work and its importance to her.

Sawitzky's occupation created other difficulties for her writing as well. Although the first three years of their marriage was an exciting time of travel in Europe, Canada, and the eastern states, by 1931 the Depression had destroyed the market for art. With no work, they suffered severe financial hardship. Her notebooks from this period contain fragments of poems, interrupted by lists of anticipated expenditures as her mind wandered to monetary matters.[36] They were forced eventually to accept money from her parents, exacting a significant cost in pride and mental well-being.[37] Given her background and her nature, Clay found it difficult to cope, much less to write in this period.

In February 1947 Susan's beloved Vassili died. Yet, even in death he made sure her time was occupied by "their work." Susan believed he intentionally left his work to fill her long days of grief after his death, and for fifteen years she labored to complete it. In virtually every letter her frustration showed. She complained of the tortoise pace at which she progressed, of her inadequacies, and of the illnesses which plagued her.[38] A letter of 18 March 1962, from Hortense King reveals as nothing else the internalized paternalism that so limited Susan Clay Sawitzky:

> I certainly bless Mrs. Ann Cesare ... for persuading you to take out your poetry, to read it again, and to lose yourself in writing (and re-writing) ... I was never more delighted than to read how this--your own personal preoccupation re-asserted itself. . . .
>
> It does not mean you will give up his work, but maybe you will feel more alert and able to do the task you have been occupied with for 15 years if you give time to what can only be called inspiration of your own. . . . So, do not reproach yourself--there has never been anybody so faithful and careful as you. But make full use of this spurt of joyous excitement . . . feed it, keep on working on his and your tasks together.

This most revealing letter, in referring to Clay's own fears and self-reproachment, indicates the pervasiveness of the paternalism in her life. In 1962 the men in her life were dead, yet the very memory confined her. She fought against the desire to turn to her own "inspiration," her poetry, trying instead to complete her husband's work and feelign guilt and shame when it went slowly. Her friends begged her to write. Temporarily encouraged, she wrote; she compiled collections of poems; she retyped manuscripts for submission to publishers. All remain, neatly bound or in notebooks. Clay could not bring herself to publish. She remained daughter and wife. Only in her specially created world, the world of her poems, did Susan Clay, the mental equal of Papa, or even the beloved Vassili, reveal herself. Only there could she give full reign to a creativity otherwise confined by a time and social style.

NOTES

[1]Dickinson's famous definition is often quoted and is included in Thrall, Hibbard, and Hollman's A Handbook to Literature (New York, 1960), 366.

[2]An unpublished manuscript in the Susan Clay collection belonging to Elizabeth Clay Blanford.

[3]Susan Clay Sawitzky, "Winter Dusk," The Circling Thread, ed. Woodridge Spears (Louisville, 1984), 20-21. All further references to poems published in The Circling Thread will be given parenthetically in the text using the abbreviation, CT.

[4]Woodridge Spears, Introduction, The Circling Thread, 7.

[5]"The Leonids," an unpublished manuscript in the Susan Clay collection belonging to Elizabeth Clay Blanford.

[6]"Shifting Void," an unpublished manuscript in the Susan Clay collection belonging to Elizabeth Clay Blanford.

[7]Poetry, 57, 306-7.

[8]Susan Clay Sawitzky to Thomas Clay, 11 February 1934 in Elizabeth Clay Blanford's La Petite, a brief unpublished account of their youth.

[9]Mrs. Robert P. Pepper to Rita Clay, 4 Sept. 1899; Rita Clay to Charles Clay, 22 July 1892; Rita Clay to Charles Clay, 11 August 1898; Lucretia Clay to Charles Clay, 11 July 1898; Lucretia Clay to Rita Clay, 31 January 1899.

[10]As a youth Susan Clay was not a disciplined learner, but her curiosity led to intense and lengthy study. Fascinated by butterflies, she would spend weeks studying their life cycles and drawing sketches of each stage. Mrs. Elizabeth Clay Blanford, Susan Sawitzky's sister, has given the authors access to the extensive collection of letters, papers and manuscripts.

[11]Susan's retreat to the privacy of her own thoughts was precipitated by a trip with her grandmother to Atlanta to spend the winter with relatives. At fifteen years old, she wrote home ecstatically of seeing William Faversham in the Fawn, Julia Marlowe reading Shakespeare, French plays, and the famous Caruso in concert. Susan Clay to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 10 February 1912.

[12]Susan Clay to Mrs. C. D. Clay, Telegram, 16 July 1921. Interview, Elizabeth Clay Blanford, 3 March 1984; Susan Clay to Mrs. Charles D. Clay, N.D. (Contents indicate letter was written before 2 July 1921.)

[13]Susan Clay to her mother, 8 March 1939; Susan Clay to Elizabeth Clay, N.D. (Contents indicate the letter was written in fall or winter, 1938); Hortense King to Susan Clay, December 1921; Hortense King to Susan Sawitzky, 23 June 1962.

[14]There is no evidence that the rough copies were ever completed and mailed. Addresses for The New Yorker, Century Magazine, and Poetry are penciled onto the inside covers of several notebooks.

[15]Hortense King and her husband lived in New York in the late 1930s, a period when Susan Sawitzky submitted several poems or manuscripts to publishers. Susan Clay Sawitzky to Mrs. Clay, 14 June 1938.

[16]Susan Sawitzky to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 23 December 1932.

[17]N. G. Terrell to Susan Clay, 21 April 1924.

[18]Susan Sawitzky to Elizabeth Clay, 13 December 1932.

[19]Susan Sawitzky to Elizabeth Clay, 3 August 1935.

[20]Susan to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 23 December 1932.

[21]See Susan Clay Sawitzky, Ms. Notebook.

[22]Elizabeth Clay Blanford Interview, 17 July 1984. The information is supported by numerous letters in the collection.

[23]Elizabeth Clay Blanford Interview, 18 July 1984.

[24]Elizabeth Clay Blanford, Interview, 2 October 1983; Susan's letters to William Sawitzky in April 1927, just prior to their elopement, reveal the fear quite clearly. At times it was not only the parents who intervened but the uncles and aunts as well.

[25]An untitled article on pari-mutual gambling in Kentucky, Susan Clay Sawitzky Papers.

[26]Louisville Herald, "Season's Buds," III, 23 October 1921.

[27]The Lexington Herald contained articles on Sawitzky and his exhibit for several days running. See issues of 19, 20, 21, 22 March 1921.

[28]Susan Clay to her mother, 2 July 1921.

[29]Vassili Sawitzky to Susan Clay, 14 April 1928.

[30]Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination (New Haven, 1979), 83.

[31]Susan Clay, Poems. (Chicago: Ralph Fletcher Seymour, n.d.), 12. Hereafter cited as Poems.

[32]The New York Times, "An Apology of a Small-Town Poetess," 18 December 1921, 10.

[33]Susan Sawitzky to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 23 December 1932.

[34]Susan Sawitzky to George Clay, 18 October 1933.

[33]Susan Sawitzky to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 23 December 1932.

[34]Susan Sawitzky to George Clay, 18 October 1933.

[35]Susan Sawitzky to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 23 December 1932. The theme can be seen throughout the 1930s in letters to parents, and her uncles, Tom and George Clay.

[36]See Susan Sawitzky notebooks.

[37]The letters of the 1930s are filled with references to gifts of money from Col. and Mrs. Clay, Tom and George Clay, and other relatives. The Colonel asked Sawitzky on at least one occasion to bring Susan and live in Lexington until the financial difficulties were over. See Col. Charles D. Clay to William Sawitzky, 23 May 1932; Col. Charles D. Clay to Susan Sawitzky, 19 Sept. 1935; Susan Sawitzky to Col. and Mrs. Clay, 15 December 1934; Susan Sawitzky to Tom Clay, 31 January 1935.

[38]Susan Sawitzky to Elizabeth Clay Blanford, 19 July 1948; 11 January 1950; 18 May 1950.

THE COURTS AND AMERICAN EDUCATION: 1971-82

Lyman Burbank
Vanderbilt University

Decided by the Supreme Court of California on August 30, 1971, the case of Serrano v. Priest appeared, at the time, to be a turning point in the history of American education. To have read the current news accounts in the autumn of 1971, one would have thought that the judiciary had come to the rescue and that the great inequity of educational opportunity in America, from one school district to another, was about to come to an end. The villain was the property tax, and the California Supreme Court had come to the rescue with its interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment. Endless articles told Americans that the importance of the local property tax--the most important tax in the United States for the financing of education--was about to diminish significantly.

Twelve years later, the local property tax was still the most important tax for financing American public education, and the inequalities in educational opportunity, both among the states and within the individual states, were as great as ever. What, indeed, had happened? Why should Serrano have nurtured the hope of great changes, and why should such hope never have come into being?

The facts in the Serrano case cannot be disputed. Beverly Hills, California, had few homes with a value of less than $50,000, and it could boast of an oil well pumping away right next to the high school playing fields. The community spent $1,638 for each of its 5,732 public school students. From Beverly Hills to Baldwin Park is but a short distance. But, in 1971, a $15,000 house in Baldwin Park was considered expensive. Each of the 12,809 students in Baldwin Park cost the community $690, and to obtain these funds the citizens had to tax themselves at nearly twice the rate of Beverly Hills. On a $16,000 house in Baldwin Park, a school tax of approximately $230 a year was required. To get the $1,638 for each student in Beverly Hills, a tax of $215 was required on a $40,000 house.

These facts, not really very different from the educational inequalities in a great many other states, were turned into a great constitutional debate when, on August 30, 1971, the California Supreme Court, by a vote of 6-1, found that the state's system of financing public education, based largely on each community's support of schools by local property taxation,"invidiously discriminates" against the poor because it makes the quality of a child's education dependent upon the wealth of the school district in which he happens to live. This situation, existing in almost

every state, was in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which prohibits any state from denying any person, within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the law.

So spoke the California Court, and the public press had a field day. But the writing was vague about any new type of financing to replace the system a substantial segment of the press now proclaimed to be in a state of decay. However, in a strange sort of manner, two ideas prevailed. The first seemed to be that, throughout the Union, there would now be a substantial increase in state aid to education and the second suggested state financial systems of taking from the "have" school districts and giving to the "have nots."

Many perplexing problems soon arose. The main ones were:

1. Since the United States Constitution does not mention the word "education," had not the California Supreme Court stretched the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment beyond credibility? The California Court had, in fact, said the importance of education in American life was such that it should be treated as a "fundamental interest," and in support of its view it quoted the 1954 desegregation case of Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483, 74 S. Ct. 686.98 L. Ed. 873 (1954).

2. When it became clear, in one state after another, that court suits of a Serrano type were imminent, the forces which resisted greater state control of education began to organize their resistance.

3. Legislators in many states began to hear from constituents in wealthy school districts, or in districts which had been willing to tax themselves heavily for good schools. Why, they asked, should the state redistribute school funds in such manner that those who have been willing to pay for good education should now be penalized? By March, 1983, there were 53 cases in 31 states which challenged the validity of existing methods of financing American public education.

It was in Texas that Serrano thinking met its defeat. In the case of San Antonio Independent School District et al. v. Rodrigeuz et al. (1973), appellees had brought a class action on behalf of children residing in districts having a low property tax base, claiming that the Texas system's reliance on local property taxes favored the more affluent and was a violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. This had the appearance of another Serrano case. However, the United States Supreme Court in the 5-4 decision held that education, although it be recognized as

one of the most important services rendered by a state, was not among the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution. The Supreme Court, having lectured the State of Texas on the folly of some aspects of its school legislation, then, in effect, said that Texas should choose its own method of financing its schools.

An article in the Yale Law Review, published just prior to the Rodriguez decision, had opened with the startling statement that the judiciary in the United States was "at the threshold of dismantling the educational finance system of almost every state."[1] Recent federal and state courts, said the article, had condemned five state finance systems as being in violation of the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Regarding the Rodriquez case, the authors thought the courts would remand "the task of restructuring educational finance to the legislatures rather than doing it themselves." In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Court actually did say that those who urged the invalidation of the present system of school financing offered "little guidance as to what type of school financing should replace it."[2] According to the New York Times of December 19, 1972, the Rodriguez case indicated to the court that property-rich districts in the existing scheme of things would pose a substantial barrier to legislative reform of educational finance. The course of events had been profoundly altered by the Rodriguez decision. Henceforth, any judicial attempts to reform the methods by which Americans financed their public schools would have to be carried out by state courts in accordance with the dictates of state constitutions.

Opponents of Serrano in the 1970s were questioning the traditional American assumption that there was a relationship between educational expenditures and the quality of education. In support of their views they frequently quoted and misquoted one of the best-known, and most controversial, products of educational research in recent years--namely, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," known widely as the Coleman Report, published in 1966.[3]

The Coleman Report was a political football from the very beginning. It had been undertaken after nearly a year of bureaucratic indecision in the United States Office of Education, and in the final analysis, such major cities as Chicago and Los Angeles, perhaps fearing that the final report might be used by the Office of Education to prove they were engaged in de facto segregation, refused to cooperate in the research effort. Be that as it may, the anti-Serrano group was quick to note, among other things, the report's failure to establish a thorough and valid cause-and-effect relationship between insufficient school resources and low academic achievement. The researchers found reason to believe that children learned more from each other than from their teachers. The central conclusion of the report--lost in the political shuffle--was that

the most important determinant of academic success was a student's family and background.

Whatever may have been the merits of the valuable research, the anti-Serrano group soon had another volume to add to it. Once again, this one was quoted and misquoted freely, and led to glib arguments that "schools don't matter." Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America was published in 1972.[4] The message this time was that better schooling was not likely to do very much to alleviate poverty. There is no question that educational conservatives found in these two volumes many arguments to support the view that recent liberal reforms in education, and recently expanded school expenditures, ought to be rolled back.

Soon after Serrano, the state of Maine introduced revisions aimed primarily at replacing the property tax as the prime source of school funds. Hailed by many as one of the nation's most progressive school finance laws when it was adopted in 1973, the state sought to equalize per-pupil spending, regardless of the tax base in each school district. The 1973 law called for a uniform levy of $11.50 per $1,000 of property value, statewide by 1976; this supplied nearly one half of the state's approximately $252 million educational budget. Collected statewide, the funds were then doled out to school districts in such manner that poor districts would be able to equal the educational outlays of richer districts. According to the Wall Street Journal of December 8, 1977, the Director of Research of the Education Commission of the States remarked that people don't like "the Robin Hood syndrome" of having wealthier neighborhoods supporting poorer ones. The situation in Maine reflected this syndrome. For roughly thirteen percent of Maine's 479 communities, the 1973 law meant that they were contributing to the state more than they were getting back. The state was, in fact, forcing them to pay into the system for the benefit of poor communities, wrote The New York Times on December 7, 1977. The law was repealed by a state referendum in 1977.

In 1970, Kenneth Robinson, seven years old and a resident of Jersey City, New Jersey, had petitioned the courts in the search for equal educational opportunity. In the case of Robinson v. Cahill the Supreme Court decided unanimously that the system by which the state financed its public schools--a system which relied to the extent of over seventy percent of its revenue from local property taxes--was a violation of that provision of the State Constitution of 1875 which, in very vague language, had required the legislature to operate a "thorough and efficient" system of schools. The state provided only seventeen percent of the total of $1.4 billion devoted to public education in 1971.[5]

To say the least, the Supreme Court was perplexed with regard to finding a remedy for the harm caused to Kenneth Robinson. By March, 1976, the case had come before the court six times, and each time the Court had backed away from a solution of its own in the hope that the legislature would solve the problem. At one point Governor Cahill had produced a proposed tax reform package which would have reduced property taxes considerably, and would have enabled the state to assume all the local operating costs of public education. The governor's program received a total of six votes in the Assembly, according to the New York Times on April 18, 1973. Subsequently, and under significant judicial pressure, the legislature increased state aid to local schools by $330 million and gave to the Commissioner of Education sweeping power over school financing decisions at the local level. In early 1976, the Supreme Court found that this law, if fully funded, would meet the 1875 constitutional test of a "thorough and efficient" school system. Yet the law was not fully funded; it was not funded at all.

One cannot read this sordid story without being impressed by the remarks of a writer for the Wall Street Journal. On June 22, 1976, he suggested that the large disparities in New Jersey's school expenditures came largely from differences in tax rates, and not from the differences of district wealth. This, he said, suggested that the court was dealing with a tax problem, and not a school problem. It would, he added, be difficult to argue that anything positive had been contributed by the state's judicial activism, either in the interpretation of law or in the policy of the state.

In fact, the court took a new turn, and prohibited further state spending under the existing system of financing schools after July 1, 1976. The schools would not be permitted to open until the legislature had passed a $378 million measure to finance a new state school-aid formula. For a week, beginning July 1, 1976, public schools remained closed, with about 100,000 summer school students and 4,000 teachers affected. On July 9, 1976, the governor of New Jersey signed an income tax law which, he said, responded to the Supreme Court's mandate that "we constitutionally fund our educational system." The new law was, in fact, an extremely regressive tax, which provided a two percent tax on incomes of $20,000 or less, with two-and-a-half percent on higher incomes.

Events in Connecticut developed differently. Probably inspired by the Serrano and Rodriguez cases, a Connecticut parent in one of the state's poorer towns complained, in 1974, that his child was receiving an education inferior to that offered in wealthier towns because school support was geared primarily to property taxation. In the case of Horton v. Maskill (1977), the State Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Hartford Supreme Court, to the effect that the existing funding practices of the state were discriminatory

and illegal. The answer of the State Board of Education was to create a twenty-five member commission, charged with developing a long-term plan for educational and fiscal reform. After eighteen months of work, the commission's efforts finally resulted in an "Act Concerning Equalization of Educational Financing and Equality in Educational Opportunity."[6] When she signed the law, Governor Ella Grasso spoke of better schooling through better financing. The new law guaranteed to all towns, regardless of wealth, access to the same resources to pay for schools as the ninth wealthiest town in the state. That happened to be Easton, with an ability of $31,334 per capita.[7] Any community falling below this wealth standard was assured of the necessary state aid. The law also prescribed a somewhat complicated method to be used as an incentive to stimulate local tax effort. However, the law also recognized a factor hitherto neglected in educational finance--namely, the additional costs of educating students from economically disadvantaged families. To compensate for this, Connecticut law now stipulated that one half the number of children who were in the federal program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children were to be added to the pupil count. It needs to be noted at this point that this somewhat novel method of financing public education more equitably did not originate in Connecticut. In 1974, Levittown, and twenty-six other relatively poor New York school districts had brought suit in court, arguing that New York's method of financing was discriminatory.[8]

The Connecticut law of 1979 also established the so-called Minimum Educational Expenditure (MER) requirement for local school districts. This figure would be determined by the state's median per-pupil expenditure for the fiscal year two years prior to the grant year, and adding to that one quarter of the cost of each student in the federal Aid to Dependent Children program. The MER was viewed as being variable from year to year and as being a device that could respond to inflationary forces. It was not, however, viewed as a minimum figure and did not limit a community wishing to limit its school expenditures.[9]

Added to Connecticut's new fiscal responsibilities by the 1979 law were some new burdens placed upon the Department of Education. The state's programs for instruction were carefully spelled out, and the state itself was required to provide technical assistance to districts developing the newly required programs. When Connecticut's new equity plan is phased in for full funding in 1984, it may well be that the state will be in a major political uproar over its tax structures.

In California, by 1983 many changes had taken place since the Serrano decision. On June 6, 1978, the state's voters called overwhelmingly for property tax relief, and Proposition 13 was passed. Few Californians predicted accurately or clearly the rather awesome changes in school control that would soon result from the June 6

vote. Equality of expenditure among school districts had become a household expression in the California school finance fraternity, but Proposition 13 may have rendered the issue moot.[10] Property tax rates were limited by Proposition 13 to one per cent market value. In fact, this proved to be such a drastic reduction that nearly every school district has become an "equalization aid" district dependent upon state revenues. Wilson Riles, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, made the statement in 1979, that by 1983-84, all unified school districts in California would have a per-pupil expenditure gap of no more than $150.[11]

Battered by Proposition 13, and by court decisions which have drastically limited their ability to raise school revenue, many California communities have now chosen to take the route of the tax-exempt foundations. The people of Beverly Hills have raised $400,000 each year, over a five year period, through dinners, "jogathons," sales of a school guide and calendar, and movie premieres. According to a report in the Wall Street Journal (11/11/82), these funds, reinstated seven teachers; kept average class size of 27 students; and saved a special classroom for children with psychomotor difficulties. A recent conference on the foundation movement, sponsored by the San Francisco Educational Fund, was attended by representatives from 150 school districts in the State. In addition, school board members were present from New York City, Pittsburgh, the District of Columbia, Kansas City, Florida, North Carolina, Oregon, and Arizona. Although court cases involving the foundation system of raising money for public schools have not yet surfaced, one needs only to be reminded that the Serrano ruling called for equal spending per student by local school districts throughout the state.

American opinion about equalized per-pupil expenditure took a roller-coaster ride in the decade of the seventies. The decision in New York's legislature case in 1982 suggests a conclusion to the chapter in the history of American Education which began with Serrano[12] Further attempts to achieve equalized per-pupil expenditure will have to be carried out by other means.

In an effort to document the heavy burden of urban municipal services, the city of Rochester argued before the lower court that it was required to spend more than four times as much, per-capita, as was paid in the surrounding suburbs for such non-educational services as public safety, sanitation, health, welfare and recreation. New York City's per-capita non-educational outlays were shown to be double those of the state as a whole. According to the New York Times, April 19, 1976, New York City, with approximately ninety per cent of the state's non-English-speaking children in its public schools, cannot by any equitable standard, be placed on the same level as communities classified, for purposes of state aid, as relatively poorer. During the Levittown legal battles in the lower

courts, the big cities further argued they were severely penalized by virtue of the allocation of state aid on the basis of daily pupil attendance, rather than on a basis of pupil enrollment.[13] In New York State, as in other states, high absenteeism is much more common in large cities than in smaller communities.

On June 23, 1982, the New York Court of Appeals, overturning two lower courts, found the state's system of financing public schools to be constitutional. In this Levittown case, the court said the existing system of financing schools in New York state "does not violate the equal protection clause of either the Federal or the State Constitution nor is it unconstitutional under the education article of our State Constitution." Among other things, the New York Court reviewed the Rodriguez case, and stated simply that "the conclusions reached in that case dictate a similar result in the present litigation." There being no federal issue, the Court then took up the matter of the state constitution. Noting that New York's 1894 constitutional language made "no reference to any requirement that the education to be made available be equal or substantially equivalent in every district," the final sentence of the Court's opinion stated that the existing New York system of financing public education did not violate either the federal or state constitutions.[14]

Prediction is often a risky business. About the only thing that can be said for sure about the period from Serrano to Levittown is that the dream of using the Fourteenth Amendment to reform American educational finance has been shattered beyond repair. Furthermore, to find any consistency in state court decisions on the matter of equality of educational opportunity is almost impossible. One is tempted to suggest that whatever takes place in the future in this area of education is more likely to be legislative rather than judicial. Considering the complexity of school finance issues in each state, one can understand the statement of the New York Court of Appeals when, having pointed to these complexities, it concluded that it would normally be inappropriate "for the courts to intrude upon such decision-making."

NOTES

[1]"A Statistical Analysis of the School Finance Decisions: On Winning Battles and Losing Wars," 81 Yale Law Review, 1303 (1972).

[2]San Antonio Independent School District et al. v. Rodriguez et al., 411 U.S. 41 (1972).

[3]James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, 1966).

[4]Christopher Jencks, Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schoolilng in America (New York, 1972).

[5]"Thorough and Efficient Education: School Reform in New Jersey," The Phi Delta Kappan, October 1978, 121.

[6]"School Finance Reform in Connecticut," The Phi Delta Kappan, December 1980, 250-251.

[7]Ibid. In Connecticut, the method of determining local tax-paying ability included a personal income tax measure, along with equalized property valuation. This was very different from the usual method of determining a community's wealth exclusively by using equalized or assessed real property valuation.

[8]New York Times, June 24, 1982.

[9]"School Finance Reform."

[10]James W. Guthrie, "Proposition 13 and the Future of California's Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1978, 13.

[11]Gary Hoban, "The Untold Golden Gate Story: The Aftermath of Proposition 13," Phi Delta Kappan, September 1979, 21.

[12]Board of Education Levittown Union Free School District v. Nyquist; 57, N.Y. 2d 27 (1982) Henceforth referred to as the Levittown case.

[13]"Levittown v. Nyquist," Phi Delta Kappan, February 1978, 433.

[14]The Court pointed out that, in 1894, there were 11,000 school districts in the state, and that they offered "disparate educational opportunities." In 1982 the number of school districts was closer to 700.

WOMEN IN A RURAL KENTUCKY CHURCH: REFLECTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Sharon F. Whitehead
Somerset Community College

The United Baptist Church of Christ on Big Sinking was constituted on the eighth day of January, 1804. The eight members chose Richard Barrier as their minister, Isham Burnett as moderator, George Rogers and Thomas Dodson as deacons. The church survives as the oldest existing Baptist church in Wayne County, Kentucky. Just as the church building has stood for many years--the current structure dating from 1853--the church as a body has witnessed many historical and social developments.

Important questions arise from the fact that the Big Sinking Baptist Church has held for almost one hundred and eighty years to the original Articles of Faith as well as to a system of unwritten rules and mores. Through the years, how was this church related to the surrounding culture, a rural community that has been changing more slowly than, but just as surely as, the wider American society? To what extent has the church maintained its traditions in the midst of broad cultural changes?

The extant church minutes begin with Book III in 1893, the first two books having been destroyed by fire. The Articles of Faith reflect the church's beliefs:

1. We believe that the Bible was written by Divinely inspired men & that it reveals the Principles by which God will Judge the whole humane race & Therefore is & will remain until the End of time the tru center of Christian union & the supreme Standard By which all Human Conduct Creeds & Opinions of men will be Judged.

2. We believe that there is One & Only One Tru and living God revealed under the Personal Distinction of the Father Son & Holy Ghost Equal in evry Divine Perfection & Executing Distinct but Harmonious offices in the grate work of man.

3. We believe by nature the whole Humane family are fallen & depraved creatures.

4. We believe that Salvation Regeneration, Sanctification & Justification are by the Life, Death Resurrection & Assension of Jesus Christ.

5. We believe that the Saints will finally Persevere throug Grace to Glory.

6. We believe that Baptism by Emersion is necessary & that it is a Prerequsite to taking the Lord's Supper.

7. We believe that the Salvation of the Righteous & the Punishment of the wicked will be Eternal.[1]

That the Articles of Faith attended by Rules of Decorum appear at all may be a concession to the Regular Baptists' concern for doctrine and discipline.[2] No vestige of Calvinism appears in the Articles, and points in the Terms of Union pertaining to the relationship of the church with other churches are deleted. In the latter ways, the Separatist influence may also be seen.

The members of the United Baptist Church of Christ on Big Sinking did associate with sister churches, even though the Articles of Faith did not dictate such relationships. The church has entered into four associations as a charter member, the latest being the Wayne County Association of United Baptist Churches organized in 1906.[3] The church also affiliates, although minimally, with the Southern Baptist Convention.

Baptist church life in the Big Sinking community was formulated early in the nineteenth century. Members might be received by "Experience and Baptism."[4] Members might be received or dismissed by "Letter" from or to churches of "the same faith and order."[5] When members united with churches of other denominations, they were thought to have departed from the faith,[6] and the church would withdraw fellowship from them.[7] Members might be "excluded" in a disciplinary action and might be later "restored" to fellowship.[8] Members might be dismissed to form other churches.[9] A final category existed for those members who were "dead."[10]

Big Sinking Baptist Church began as a quarter-time church, meeting once a month on Saturday for preaching and conducting business, then again on Sunday for preaching.[11] The church continues to conduct business monthly on a Saturday[12] so as not to break the Sabbath by doing so on Sunday.[13] The members also gather every Sunday morning for the weekly worship service.

The worship service and evangelistic preaching reflect the Separatists' influence. The church members and pastors dwell upon the conversion experience. The most effective speakers are those who can stir the people to repent and "get right with the Lord." The revival, a week or more of nightly services, continues to be the principal way through which the church gains members.

The pastor and church clerk are elected yearly. Historically, the members appointed a "teller,"[14] usually a disinterested and trustworthy person, a respected member of a neighboring church. Each member of the Big Sinking Church would walk past and whisper to the teller his or her choice for pastor. After the vote had been cast, the teller announced the choice of the majority. Currently, the church members vote by a show of hands.

Bi-vocational pastors serve the Big Sinking Church. Two factors dictate such an arrangement. Because tenure is never certain beyond the one-year term, the pastor's other vocation provides a degree of financial security and stability. Second, the church does not financially support a full-time pastor. The church members take a weekly collection for the preacher, but the pay is minimal. The pastor's other employment must therefore provide the major part of his income. The current pastor, Darrell Simpson, forty years of age, lives in Monticello, the county seat, and works in construction. His predecessor, Dale Rose, twenty-four years of age, owns and operates a shoe store in Monticello.

The primary role of the pastor is to preach at the worship services and to conduct the monthly business sessions. Other responsibilities are not clearly defined, but the pastor dare not "quit preaching and go to meddling." In fact, Dale Rose, who served the church for two years, says he encountered opposition when he began to do more than preach.[15] He attempted to bring the membership roll up to date and dared to challenge some long-standing traditions, including the separation of the sexes in the worship services--men on one side of the church, women on the other. According to Rose, the resultant conflict led to the termination of his pastorate in January, 1983.

The current clerk of the church, Homer Roberts, sixty-three years of age, comes from one of the respected families in the community. He joined the church in 1937 and has served as church clerk since 1963.[16] He keeps the minutes of business meetings and takes care of any written correspondence.

Through the years, business has been conducted much as it was when the church was organized. When preaching preceded the business session, business began with a call for members. The clerk recorded the names of those people who responded. They were received either by experience or by letter.

After members were received, the church called for "fellowship."[17] Either all were in "peace" or charges were made against members for unchristian behavior. Members were disciplined for a variety of sins. Men were charged more often with drunkenness, swearing or fighting, women with lewdness or unladylike demeanor. One man was charged for "giving a check and having no funds in the bank." Two young women were charged with "disorderly walking."[18] When a member had been charged, a committee appointed by the church would visit the one charged and "cite him to church." If he did not appear or did not make satisfactory restitution, the church would withdraw fellowship from him. One example is the case of a young woman charged with fornication. Two "sisters" notified her of the charge. The young woman sent her "acknowledgements" in writing to the church at its next meeting, but the church insisted that she appear in person. She did so at the following meeting and made "reconciliation with the church."[19]

There were occasional exceptions and one longer period of four years from October 8, 1955, to November 14, 1959, when no one called for fellowship. The church resumed the practice in 1959, and the call for fellowship continues to the present time, even though no disciplinary action has been taken in recent years. Current members express ambivalent feelings about the lapse in church discipline, bemoaning looser moral standards, yet questioning the effectiveness of disciplinary action in an increasingly secularized society.[20]

After dispensing with matters of discipline, the church turned to routine business matters. Some of the business dealt with the care of the church and its property. The church might authorize the sale of five white oak trees within its boundaries or the purchase of coal to provide heat.[21] The minutes make few references to events in the "world." No war is mentioned, but the entry for March 22, 1919, refers to another type of catastrophe--"No church meeting for Seven-Months on the account of the Influenza Epdenicte."[22]

The ordaining of deacons and ministers and the designation of messengers to the Association constituted the weightier concerns of the church. Without exception, these important offices were and are filled by male members of the congregation. The members of the ordaining committee and the trustees have been and continue to be men.

The men of the church conduct the business: "No business done March 14, 1981 not enough male members present."[23] In the past, prominent and respected men led in conducting the church's affairs,[24] but one current member bemoans the fact that presently the church suffers from a lack of decisive leadership.[25] Male members only are permitted to speak or vote, although women may shout and sing in worship and vote in the election of a pastor.[26] The Old Testament and Pauline injunctions about the silence and submissiveness of women provide the basis for the restrictions upon the activities of women in the Big Sinking Church and, indeed, in the Wayne County Baptist Association as a whole.[27]

Built in 1853, the church building itself encourages separation of the sexes and other class distinctions. There are two doors in the front, reminiscent of Shaker architecture, and a door in the rear. As in the Shaker tradition, men enter by one front door and sit to one side. Women enter by the other and sit opposite the men. At one time in the church's history, the slaves of the Dick family entered by the rear door.[28]

Women influence the life of the church even though they do not voice their opinions in business meetings. Ideally, they speak their views to men in the congregation who in turn represent those views before the church. Gifford Walters, former Associational Missionary for the region in which Wayne County is located, has found that before an issue is brought to a vote in the rural

Baptist church, the church members have discussed it thoroughly among themselves. Brother Walters has noted that only when a consensus has been reached does the matter come before the church.[29] Perhaps in indirect ways, women and men alike share in the decision-making process.

Women assume official positions of leadership as teachers in the Sunday School, and a woman has served as Sunday School secretary. Although they do not teach adult men, the women assume full responsibility for the teaching of children. It is significant that the adult men in Sunday School use the Bible as their only resource, while the women use the literature published in Nashville by the Southern Baptist Convention.[30]

Big Sinking Baptist Church has to a limited degree supported the S.B.C. and its mission activities. Southern Baptist women have found in mission work an outlet for their leadership abilities. The same must have been true when the Big Sinking Church on September 23, 1916, selected Sister Ida Jones "as a committee to colect meanes for the Baptist Children home."[31] Currently, the minutes of the Wayne County Baptist Association record the name of one officer/member of the Women's Missionary Union in the Big Sinking Church.[32] The future of the organization may be uncertain since the members assisted the former pastor in the ill-fated review of the membership roll.[33]

One irony becomes apparent from the study of the role of women in the Big Sinking Church. Throughout the church's minutes, clerks use the feminine pronoun to refer to the church: "By Motion and Second the Church says she will elect her a pastor."[34]

Equally important as the history, beliefs and procedures of the Big Sinking Baptist Church is its geographic and sociological context. The church is located in a rural community called Big Sinking by the residents (after the name of the nearby creek) and called Pueblo by the postal service. The community is removed from the more densely populated areas of Wayne County, being approximately fifteen miles east of Monticello, Kentucky, the county seat.

The remoteness of the community delayed major changes in living patterns and hence church affairs until the 1920s and 1930s when improved transportation and communication made the outside world more accessible. Then outmigration during the 1940s, 50s and 60s took the young men and women, even entire families. Economic necessity contributed to changes in the prescribed roles for men and women. Women experienced greater independence and, in later generations, were more likely to work outside the home. Men were more likely to hold a job and farm part-time, a pattern that was not new to the Big Sinking community.[35] Families are now smaller, farms are larger--both a result of improved "technology" and economic necessity.

The church, like the family and community in general, is confronted by the changes in rural society. Traditional rural values, such as family loyalty, conservatism and fatalism, have been emphasized in the religious teachings of the rural church.[36] Those values have been gradually modified and in some cases replaced by urban, secular values. Such changes accord with larger patterns. Edward Hassinger and John Holick have classified churches in Missouri according to their reactions to the increased secularization of rural life. "Sect-type" congregations (Freewill Baptist, Pentecostal, Assembly of God) withdraw from secular society and stress the spiritual superiority of their group to "church-type" congregations (Southern Baptist, Disciples of Christ, Protestant Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic). The latter churches adjust to secular society. These sociologists conclude:

> Therefore, even in denominations such as the Baptist, where great responsibility devolves upon the local congregation, there is an awareness of overall denominational activity and a sense of being part of a large organization seeking to advance a particular religious point of view and specified religious practices. In the church-type group, members are exhorted in various ways to try to change their social environment to make it more Christian in character.[37]

The impact of secular society upon religion in rural society becomes apparent in "Religious Thought and Beliefs in the Southern Appalachians as Revealed By an Attitude Survey," a study conducted by Thomas R. Ford in 1958. Ford discerned that strict fundamentalism had given way to modified fundamentalism. Secular attitudes were being incorporated while sectarian attitudes were declining.[38]

Partly as a result of such external influences, the Big Sinking Baptist Church, like other rural churches, is beset by internal problems. The out-migration over the previous three decades is partially responsible for the declining membership. The church building, once full, now holds fifty people when attendance is good. As in other rural churches, more men work a full-time job and farm part-time, more women work outside the home, and neither may find the time for church activities. Rural areas are "overchurched" and rural ministers underpaid. Facilities, programs and finances are often inadequate. The conservatism of rural society often hampers adaptation to change, and the independence of the farmer has often encouraged isolation and lack of cooperation.[39]

The members of the Big Sinking Church have responded to the gradual changes in circumstance and values and to the problems besetting them by looking to the past. They harken to the fundamental, "old fashioned" preaching and preserve the traditional

forms of worship. The members cling tenaciously to traditional rural values and established mores, as when they segregate the sexes and adhere to the restrictive views of women in the church. The membership emphasizes the autonomy of the local congregation and participates minimally in the programs of the Southern Baptist Convention, behaving more like the "sect-type" than the "church-type" congregations described by Hassinger and Holick. Thus, the church has not developed a meaningful affiliation with a larger organization, the denominational resource that could help it deal with the changes taking place in the larger American society.

The Big Sinking Church has changed in one important respect, the discipline of members. At one time, church discipline exemplified the members' efforts to shun "wordly behavior." According to J. H. Spencer in A History of Baptists from 1789-1885, through their strict disciplinary measures, "the doctrines and morals of the churches were preserved in a good degree of purity."[40] The discontinuance of the Big Sinking Church's discipline signals an identity crisis. The Big Sinking Church may have made a major concession to the values of a secular society. The church may simply feel impotent when dealing with the changes in values. The church with a declining membership may feel that it cannot afford to exclude anyone.

The challenge confronting the Big Sinking Baptist Church and every church, whether rural or urban, encompasses more than the role of women in the church or adaptation to changing patterns of population or adjustment to a secularized society. The church need not change simply because change has occurred in the surrounding culture. In fact, it must draw from its rich religious and cultural heritage. If Big Sinking Baptist Church and churches like it are to survive in the mdoern world, however, they must confront the present, define their relationship to a changing society, identify their unique purpose, and look to the future.

NOTES

[1]Minutes of the Big Sinking Baptist Church, Books III-VII (Pueblo, KY, 1892-1982), III, frontispiece.

[2]For a distinction between Regular and Separate Baptist churches, see Sydney E. Ahlstrom, A Religious History of the American People (New Haven, 1972), 318-322.

[3]Gifford Walters, Interview with Sharon F. Whitehead, Monticello, KY, 10 December 1982.

[4]Minutes, III: 4-5.

[5]Minutes, III: 61.

[6]Minutes, VI, 8 October 1960.

[7]Minutes, VI, 27 May 1916.

[8]Minutes, III: 4-5.

[9]Minutes, III: 83.

[10]Minutes, III: 4-5.

[11]Minutes, III: 43.

[12]Minutes, VII, 9 February 1980.

[13]Issac Hucaby, Recorded Interview with Sharon F. Whitehead, Monticello, KY, 25 February 1983, on file in the Archives, Eastern Kentucky University.

[14]Gifford Walters, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Monticello, KY, 23 October 1982, on file in the Archives, E.K.U.

[15]Kenneth Dale Rose, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Monticello, KY, 11 March 1983, on file in the Archives, E.K.U.

[16]Homer Thomas Roberts, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Pueblo, KY, 12 March 1983, on file in the Archives, E.K.U.

[17]Minutes, III: 43.

[18]Minutes, V, 9 October 1926; III: 50.

[19]Minutes, V, 15 April, 12 May, 9 June 1923.

[20]Lola Corder, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Whitley City, KY, 28 October 1982; Dorothy Morrow, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Pueblo, KY, 22 September 1982, on file in the Archives, E.K.U.

[21]Minutes, VI, 14 March 1959.

[22]Minutes, IV, 22 March 1919.

[23]Minutes, VII, 14 March 1981.

[24]Gifford Walters Interview.

[25]Homer Roberts Interview.

[26]Herbert O. Corder, Recorded Interview with S.F.W., Whitley City, KY, 28 October 1982, on file in the Archives, E.K.U.

[27]Gifford Walters Interview.

[28]Lola Corder Interview.

[29]Gifford Walters Interview.

[30]Dorothy Morrow Interview.

[31]Minutes, IV, 23 September 1916.

[32]Wayne County Association of Baptists, Minutes of the 78th Annual Session (Wayne County, KY, 1981), 40.

[33]Kenneth Dale Rose Interview.

[34]Minutes, VI, 8 January 1955.

[35]Dorothy Morrow Interview.

[36]Irwin T. Sanders, Rural Society (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977), 82.

[37]Edward Hassinger and John Holick, "Changes in the Number of Rural Churches in Missouri, 1952-1967," Rural Sociology, 35(1970), 354-66.

[38]In The Sociology of Religion: An Anthology, ed. Richard D. Knudsen (New York, 1967), 103.

[39]Roy Don Whitehead, "A Critical Analysis of a Rural Church in Statistical Decline, With Implications for Future Ministry," unpublished research (Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, KY, 1980), 30-43.

[40]J.H. Spencer, A History of Kentucky Baptists From 1789-1885 (1885; rpt. Lafayette, TN, 1976), I: 491.

CLASS, ETHNICITY AND SECTIONALISM:
SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ISSUES THAT HAVE DIVIDED THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Richard B. Drake
Berea College

In Carl Degler's Presidential address to the meeting of the Organization of American Historians in San Francisco in April of 1980, he noted that

> Contrary to the Marxists' assertion, it seems to me that the principal conflicts in American Society have more often been related to racial and ethnic consciousness than to class consciousness. I suspect . . . there is considerably more evidence available from which to write history of the United States with racial conflict as the motive force than with class consciousness and class conflict.[1]

I think Degler is right. While it may be that in Europe, class-consciousness was the more important factor, the American experience is vastly different. Our supreme struggle, the Civil War, seems much more ethnic, racial, and sectional than based on any sense of class struggle. Charles Beard has argued that the Civil War was basically an economic conflict, but between elites of an industrial North and a plantation South.[2] The separate laboring classes, in fact, generally supported their respective war efforts, though with the usual grumbling about "a rich man's war and a poor man's fight."

Clearly one of the characteristics of life in Appalachia has been conflict. In the period before 1750 when the area was held by Indian nations, the Cherokee in the South and the five nation Iroquois confederacy in northern Appalachia, the ethnic division seemed predominant. Indian fought desperately with European, and racist rationales reinforced by religion justified dispossession of "savage lands." Surely there was economic repression, but a class solidarity that transcended racial divisions was entirely lacking. Further, there were "back country" revolts within the British colonies, such as Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia, the Anti-rent movement in New York, and the Regulator movement in the Carolinas. But those inter-British struggles were largely ethnic also. On closer examination of these revolts, it appears that waves of Europeans came to the colonies at different times and occupied different regions. The initial migration of south-eastern Englishmen established in the South the country gentleman ideal and a plantation system. This group of Englishmen was very different from later waves of border and north country Englishmen and Scotch-Irish who attempted to realize the yeoman ideal on their frontier farms. In New York, the earlier Dutch patroons established a feudal system in a land surrounded by small yeoman farmers

inspired by Yankee ideals.[3] Clearly some class-consciousness was evident in such struggles, but more apparent was ethnic and cultural separateness.

In that period during which the citizens of Appalachia found it necessary to relate to the new United States government in the two generations before the Civil War, the principal conflicts were, early on, with the new federal government. The major issue was taxation, and the major conflict was the Whiskey Rebellion. Though economic issues were predominant, the solidarity of the western country for the plight of the rebels was clear. The major responsible spokesman for the Whiskey rebels, however, was the unlikely patrician, Albert Gallatin, graduate of the University of Geneva, owner of a princely acreage in western Pennsylvania, and later Secretary of the Treasury and leader of American banking.

The glee with which most Appalachian yeomen fell upon the lands made available by Cherokee removal can be explained in basically racist terms, though, of course, simple greed was important. Though the open struggle with the Indians of the Southeast largely had ended by 1825, until separate Indian nations were removed from Appalachia, individual acts of blatant violence were frequent. The rationale was clearly ethnic, even racist.

When the Civil War came, many mountaineers were forced into the armies of both sides, most against their will. Ample evidence of repressive drafting policies, and horrendous desertion rates, especially in the Confederate Army, reinforce the impression that the poor were being made to fight for the rich.[4] Yet the fact that very many of those who were poor and who deserted were mountain whites also demonstrates an ethnic division. The mountaineer was, for the most part, an opponent of slavery, and had long been resentful of the over-representation of the prosperous, plantation counties and their control of the politics of the slave states. A separatist sentiment of mountain counties had been a traditional part of the ante-bellum politics in Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Kentucky.

Concerning the post-Civil War years, many recent scholars have deplored the fact that Appalachians, because of the lack of class consciousness, have been pushed aside in the corporate quest for control of the region's resources. Ronald D. Eller, for example, in his recent Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers, sees Appalachia as "only the quiet back-country of the 'Old South'" which suddenly found itself "a new frontier for expanding capitalism."[5] By 1930 most mountaineers, he says, "had become integrated within the new industrial system and economically dependent upon it as well",[6] and hopelessly caught in "poverty and powerlessness". Eller suggests that "the failure of modernization in the mountains raises the fundamental question of our time" about corporate greed and regional ineffectiveness.[7] The clear plea is for an Appalachian consciousness based upon the region's shared lack of wealth and power which will right the wrongs brought by corporate exploitation.

Lewis, Johnson, and Askins, Colonialism in Modern America: the Appalachian Case, are much more specific than Eller concerning sources of Appalachian poverty and powerlessness. Outside corporations have acquired our resources, and power to make decisions. Warren Wright and John Gaventa claim that these resources were stolen from us.[8] Mike Clark, Jim Branscome, and Don Askins suggest a kind of educational/literary/media conspiracy to develop Appalachian institutions, literary heroes, and entertainment stereotypes which were basically fraudulent, and which prevent a proper consciousness.[9] According to the Lewis, Johnson, and Askins studies, governmental programs have also been counterproductive in Appalachia. Thus, the best solution to the region's problems seems to be for scholar workers to suggest new models of social science analysis that will provide "the Appalachian people" with a program for action. Dennis Lindberg sees the region presently as a "colony within a colony," while David Walls develops his "internal perifery model" to account for some of the difficulties of a simplistic Leninist analysis. Tom Plaut, an anthropologist, reminds us, finally, that there are deep cultural assumptions that separate Appalachian America from exploitive, corporate America, two communities that still do not understand one another.[10]

It is exemplary that so many have been drawn into Appalachian studies from a burning desire to do something about the region's poverty and powerlessness. Most of our best recent scholarship, clearly action-oriented, sees the Appalachian problem as a lack of class awareness.[11] Yet over-dependence on class analysis does both scholarship and the region itself a disservice. If our call to action takes precedence over our attempt to understand a historical situation accurately, we can be led into serious misunderstandings and serious misapplication of energies. Howard Zinn, bitter opponent of slavery and segregation, once said that he would not "tangle with the cause, because once you acknowledge cause as the core of the problem, you have built something into it that not only baffles people, but, worse, immobilizes them".[12] Terrible though Jim Crow segregation was, the failure to tangle with the ambiguities of historical events merely divides and dilutes the whole effort of understanding and improvement. Though ideology and myth can be great mobilizers, they can be counterproductive if they are built upon error. Serious scholarship needs to be as honest and as holistic as possible in order to guard against abuse either left-or right-leaning politicians.

Yet Appalachian Studies is not the only part of American Studies that has been guilty of simplistic analysis and action-oriented research. Howard Zinn's concern, in fact, was for black history, not Appalachian history. His hatred was focused on segregation, not on corporate exploitation that has been so much a part of the Appalachian story. But since the collapse of consensus analysis in the 1960s-- even as American society itself began to fracture--an amazing array of studies centering on conflict and separation have emerged in recent years. As American

life became more fractured, William L. O'Neill celebrated this division by entitling his history of American society in the 1960s Coming Apart.[13] No sooner had Galbraith's Affluent Society identified plenty as the force which united us, than Michael Harrington charged that there were several "other" Americans who did not share in the nation's affluence--in Appalachia, among Delta blacks, ghetto Puerto Ricans and among the elderly -- all citizens of the The Other America.[14]

The rise of Black Studies was probably more important than any other movement in encouraging the growth of ethnic and class-based views that have challenged the consensus view which dominated social science writing in the 1940s and 1950s. We have come to discover various "ethnicities" (a term unknown until 1941) based on race, sexual,and religious-recency-of-arrival bases, or on perceived differences. So great has been the recent outpouring of writing on ethnicity, in fact, that one scholar was led to remark that any attempt to draw up a bibliography of "ethnology at this time is like taking a snapshot of an avalanche."[15]

In these same years, the 1960s and 1970s, perhaps due to questions raised about the American system of government and economy, our foreign policy, and university research related to it,a renewal of interest has emerged in Marxian and class-conflict analysis. Marxian analysis was never absent from the American academy, of course, even in the consensus years. Herbert Aptheker and Louis Hacker in history, and C. Wright Mills in sociology, for example, presented different, but clearly Marxian-based analyses of the American experience. But in the days of the early Cold War, most scholars were reluctant to pursue class-conflict analysis. So great was the general suspicion of any analysis that suggested economically based, class antagonism that recognized scholars such as Charles Beard and Harry Elmer Barnes were derisively labelled as "Marxian ," even though their presentation of economic influences was far more Populist, even Progressive, than Marxian. Yet the suggestion that class divisions were crucial to understanding the nature of American conflict far antedated the arrival of Marxian analysis in America. For example, the writings of William Gouge provided a class-conflict basis for Jackson's attack on the U.S. Bank, and "Coin" Harvey's criticism of the gold standard in the 1870s,and provided the background for the Populist, agrarian-based attack on Wall Street. Even George Fitzhugh's defense of the slave system was an analysis predicated on class-conflict assumptions, while bitterly criticizing the free-labor system. And writers as diverse as James Madison and John C. Calhoun were convinced that economic differences provided the real basis for political conflict.

The 1960s and 1970s have seen the emergence of an impressive neo-Marxian literature in America. Perhaps not the avalanche in quantity that describes ethnic analysis, but both the quantity and quality of neo-Marxian writing is impressive. Such historians as Eugene Genovese, William Appleman Williams, Staughton Lynd,

Christopher Lasch and others have created an analysis of American history that must be taken seriously. A general review of this neo-Marxian literature, in fact, has recently appeared, entitled "The Left Academy," an analysis of Marxist scholarship on American university campuses, edited by Bertell Ollman and Edward Vernoff.[16]

Scholars now seem caught up more in an analysis of the forces and issues which divide Americans than in a search for unifying themes. But so partisan have some of the practitioners of conflict analysis become, that occasionallly they have been led to attack one another. Sharp divisions have developed largely between those who believe that class-based issues are the most fundamental, and those who believe that ethnic issues have been the most significant. And one does not have to search very far to find evidence of this bitter exchange in present-day conflict analysis. Many who emphasize the importance of ethnic divisions flay those who see class-awareness as the most crucial and Marxian and un-American, as if to impose such labels in our neo-Cold War era is to place such analysis outside serious consideration. On the other hand, a disturbing number of those emphasizing the importance of class and economic divisions label those who conclude that ethnic divisions are more crucial as "romantic" or "neo-conservative."[17] The debate is nationwide, and is present in literally all arenas of analysis that involve American minority and/or ethnic groupings that may have suffered exploitation. Whether the analysis involves blacks in slavery, women in the work-force, Amerind removal, discrimination against Catholics and Jews, or the exploitation of Appalachian resources, the structure of the models of conflict analysis is remarkably similar.

Appalachian scholars such as Dwight Billings, David Whisnant, and Helen Lewis, all most impressed with the class-conflict analysis, have on occasion joined scholars such as Gunnar Myrdal and Andrew Hacker in making the charge that ethnic analysis is misleading politically and "romantic." Concerned as they are with a scholarship that will support progressive and action-oriented programs, such scholars seem to have little patience with analyses that may tend to blur the divisions that identify the groups they are trying to mobilize. Such charges may have some validity in some cases, but clearly the mere emphasis on ethnic or racial divisions is not sufficient grounds to conclude that such analysis is diversionary.

On the other hand, some able scholars dismiss out-of-hand any suggestion that there may be a parallel between the exploitation of Appalachian mineral resources by American corporations on the one hand, and the Leninist-Marxian analysis of third world imperialism on the other. They label it as "sheer ideology, and betraying the blindness of a variety that takes its lead straight from Moscow." One such scholar recently refused to read a paper by an undergraduate who had developed the concept of Appalachia as a colony of corporate interests, a comparison that many well-published scholars of the region have developed fully. To him, the idea was so absurd that he refused to dignify it with his time.

It may be that the very complexity of the issues which divide us involves both horizontal (or class) divisions as well as vertical (or ethnic) ones. It is my contention in this paper that the issues that have divided us in the past have in literally all cases been at least partly ethnic as well as partly class-based. In fact, in the United States, the most bitter class-based struggles in the labor movement have always had important ethnic dimensions. When struggles have been less violent, the class and ethnic divisions were generally not working in the same direction. Herbert Gans and others have even suggested that class and ethnicity can best be considered as somehow mingled, and has suggested the phrase, "working-class ethnicity."[18] Most of our significant class conflicts have indeed been reinforced by ethnic divisions, as with the Irish Catholicism of the Molly McGuires, and the racial basis of chattel slavery. Even today, many of the most aggressive advocates of class struggle make a great use of ethnic identification and folk expressions in song, language, dialect,and religious style for the purpose of raising "working-class consciousness."

It may be that a unified theory of conflict needs to be developed which will take into account both ethnic and class divisions. One could, for example, present a picture of the manner in which ethnic and class divisions mix in certain struggles on an x - y axis. If the major struggles in American history were to be plotted on such an x - y axis, it seems that all of them would have to be assigned values that involved both class and ethnic dimensions. Whether or not the specific values I have assigned are totally accurate is subject to debate. But to attempt such an exercise is meaningful. Even our great labor strikes have all had very important ethnic dimensions. These largely class-based conflicts have often had a Protestant-Catholic dimension or other ethnic dimension that has often been nearly as important in setting capital against labor as the income differentials that separated them.

For example, the West Virginia mine difficulties of the post-World War I period involved a strong "insider-outside" dichotomy which involved suspicions of damn-yankees, and even suspicions of "agitators with a foreign ideology," Marxism in America, in fact, has had to struggle with the ethnic disadvantage that Marx was Jewish and European. Even in Harlan, Bell, Letcher, and Pike counties in the desperate strike of the 1930s which involved the Communist-dominated National Miners' Union, the "insider-outsider" separation was used by both sides. Attacks were made on "foreign ideology," the interference of "outside missionaries," and the fact that "un-American conditions" were forced on American miners. Even in this perhaps most classical Marxian of our labor struggles, the ethnic dimension was considerable.

It has long been observed by scholars that one of the characteristics of the American labor movement has been its very un-Marxian basis: American labor has not been sympathetic to the

Socialist Party. Most American socialists have in fact, been intellectuals, reform-minded Christians, or old-line Populists. Furthermore, most successful American labor leaders have approached their jobs in the tradition of Samuel Gompers, following his approach of "safe and sane unionism." In other words, such a labor leader approaches the sale of his commodity - labor - in an essentially business-like way: he wants to get as high a price (wages, working conditions) for his commodity as possible. In this case, the consumer is management, and he bargains in a kind of market for as good a price as he can get. The American labor movement itself then has really not brought the reality of class-struggle. Labor accepts the concept of opposition, to be sure. But this is more in the tradition of a general adversarialism which permeates American law, and business competitiveness.

The scholarship of recent years has made its point--that we are a diverse nation, in which the "blessings of industry" have been distributed unevenly. With the many issues that divide us, however, we do not need the further bitterness of a scholarship that attacks unseemly, and is over-insistent upon its own conclusions. To paraphrase Robert Burns:

Gently scan your brother man.
Tho' to disagree is human
So too is to step back,
and consider - carefully.

NOTES

[1]Carl N. Degler, "Remaking American History," Journal of American History, 67 (1980), 17. This article is Degler's presidential address to the Organization of American Historians meeting in San Francisco, April 10, 1980.

[2]See Charles A. Beard, The Rise of American Civilization (New York, 1936), II, 3-13, 28-37.

[3]See Bernard Bailyn, "The Challenge of Modern Historiography," American Historical Review, 87 (1982), 14-17.

[4]The standard book on Civil War desertion is Ella Lonn, Desertion During the Civil War (New York, 1928).

[5]Ronald D. Eller, Miners, Millhands, and Mountaineers (Knoxville, 1981), xix.

[6]Eller, xxiii.

[7]Eller, xxvi.

[8]John Gaventa, "Property, Coal, and Theft," in Helen Matthews Lewis, Linda Johnson, and Donald Askins, Colonialism in Modern America: the Appalachian Case (Boone, North Carolina, 1978), 141-160; Warren Wright, "The Big Steel," 161-176, in the same book.

[9]See Mike Clark, "Education and Exploitation," 199-208; Jim Branscome, "Annihilating the Hillbilly," 211-228; and Don Askins, "John Fox, Jr.," 251-258; all in Lewis, Johnson, and Askins, eds., Colonialism in Modern America.

[10]Dennis N. Lindberg, "Appalachia: A Colony Within a Colony?" 309-318; David Walls, "Internal Colony or Internal Perifery? A Critique of Current Models and an Alternative Formulation," 319-350; and Tom Plaut, "Extending the Internal Periphery Model: the Impact of Culture and Consequent Strategy," 351-364; all in Lewis, Johnson, and Askins, eds., Colonialism in Modern America.

[11]Most of the recent Weatherford Award books have shared this vision of the region's problems. In 1981 David Corbin's Life, Work and Rebellion in the Coal Fields won the award; in 1980 it was John Gaventa's Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in An Appalachian Valley; and in 1979 John Hevener's Which Side Are You On?

[12]Howard Zinn, The Southern Mystique (New York, 1964), 7.

[13]William L. O'Neill, Coming Apart: An Informal History of America in the 1960's (Chicago, 1971).

[14]Michael Harrington, The Other America: Poverty in the United States (New York, 1962).

[15]Apparently Lloyd Warner first used the term in 1941. See Werner Sollers, "Theory of American Ethnicity," American Quarterly, 33 (1981), 257, 259-260.

[16]Bertell Ollman and Edward Vernoff, The Left Academy: Marxist Scholarship on American Campuses, (New York, 1982).

[17]See Gunnar Myrdal, "The Limits of Ethnicity," New Republic, 25 June 1977, 19.

[18]Herbert Gans, in the Foreword to Neil C. Sandberg, Ethnic Identity and Assimilation (New York, 1974).