

FROM FOUNDING FATHER TO SACRIFICIAL SON
THE TRANSFORMATION OF JOHN BROWN

In the course of the final assault on the enginehouse of the Harper's Ferry Federal Arsenal in which John Brown had barricaded himself with the remaining members of his raiding party on the morning of October 8, 1859, Lieutenant Israel Green struck the old man with his sword before trying to run him through with a savage underthrust that raised him completely from the ground; the blade was deflected and bent double, but the assailant continued, beating his victim on the head with the hilt of his sword. John Daingerfield, one of the hostages, who was "not two feet from Brown at the time", supposed that the old man's skull was split and "did not know till some time later that Brown was not killed".(1) As chance would have it, Lieutenant Green had left his battle sword in the barracks and was armed, at the time of the attack, with only a light dress sword - a detail that no doubt saved John Brown's life and rendered possible the prison coda that was to follow, altering in the process public perception of the meaning of the raid. For it is clear that there are two separate parts to the Harper's Ferry expedition; the first comes to a close when the United States Marines storm the enginehouse on October 18, the second ends in the apotheosis of John Brown, hung from the gallows on December 2. Between these two dates he calmly received a stream of newspapermen and visitors in his cell (Oates (2) cites Coppoc's claim that no less than 800 people visited the jail in a two-day period) and kept up a voluminous correspondence with family, supporters, critics, and the simply curious. The Virginia authorities, by allowing uninterrupted access to the prisoner, and by postponing his execution so that he faced death alone, seemed perversely intent on facilitating martyrdom. His letters, writes Villard, "were a far - for them - more dangerous weapon than the Sharp's rifle they had taken from him at Harper's Ferry".(3) "No theatrical manager," remarked Thoreau, "could have arranged things so wisely to give effect to his behavior and words." (4) Later historians such as Nevins,(5) hostile to John Brown, will begrudge him his unerring instinct for finding and keeping the center of the stage, as if he should have had the common decency to keep passion out of the cold and calculating business of real politics. But as to the nature of the public conversion, there is no question. Immediately after the event the Northern press is almost unanimous in condemning the invasion as misguided if not simply crazy. On the day after Brown's capture Thoreau notes that he has "seen no hearty approbation for this man in any abolition journal".(6) On the day of the execution, however, church bells are rung throughout the North, prelude to a wave of idolatry that was to spread not only by the written word (and song) but by images as well - from nine-color chromos

of his life sold by newspapers as a promotion gimmick to Victor Hugo's imaginative sketch of the gallows scene.

The highly lyric effects achieved during the reprieve which Lieutenant Green unintentionally granted his victim inevitably color our perception of the hero, especially as the "miraculous", "meteor-like"(?) character of John Brown's intrusion into the ongoing debate about slavery tends to rob him of historical density.(8) History books reduce him to a single act that strikes out of nowhere, and the Harper's Ferry raid is treated as an overture to the Civil War rather than as a product of the 1850's. Brown did indeed consider himself as a man marked for a transcendent destiny, but his conception of his role (and the manner in which the acting out of this role was rendered possible by others) must be viewed in the light of pre-Harper's Ferry expectations as to the nature and possibilities of heroism. Leaving aside for the moment the prison sequel - during which Brown, instinctively grasping the new demands that public opinion was making on him, shifts his stance from war leader to solitary martyr - let us see what sort of figure he cut against the background of the 1850's. A number of recent historians (Michael Rogin, George Forgie and Dwight Anderson(9) among others) have argued convincingly that the period prior to the Civil War was lived in the shadow of the Founding Fathers and that however dramatic contemporary events appeared they were inevitably dwarfed by a past incarnate in the towering figures of the Revolutionary pantheon. Anderson has traced the widespread influence during this period of the cult of George Washington as codified in Parson Weems's celebrated *Life*, and in particular the forming effect the image of Washington exercised on Lincoln's career. Forgie pinpoints the 1850's as a decade in which nostalgic filio piety is intensified, stifling the nascent Young America movement epitomized by Stephen Douglas and forcing the debate to return to exegeses of the Founders' true intentions.

Accepting, for immediate purposes, the legitimacy of this analysis of the period, how does John Brown fit into the temper of a time so concerned with the applicability of past models? Contemporary portraits of Brown invariably single out the anachronistic quality of his presence as a leading source of his charisma. The newspaperman James Ked-path, major architect of the John Brown legend, who had begun mythologizing Brown well before the Harper's Ferry raid, introduces him as the "old Puritan type of Christian".(10) Emerson is quick to claim him as an original settler "fifth in descent from Peter Brown who came to Plymouth on the Mayflower in 1620", (11) and Thoreau adds the Revolutionary note, comparing him to "the best of those who stood on our bridge once, on Lexington Common and on Bunker Hill".(12)

The qualifier "Old" that adheres so naturally to his name simply reinforced the patriarchal element, as did the fact that Brown was constantly surrounded - and seen as surrounded - by his sons, no fewer than three of whom were to accompany him on the Harper's Ferry raid.

If, on the other hand, Brown himself slipped so easily into this role it is because the circumstances of his life had so to speak prepared him for it. Brown's biographers have amply informed us of the multiple failures that marked his pre-Harper's Ferry career - to the extent that some of them (Boyer for instance) are tempted to see in his militant abolitionism a compensatory activity. Perhaps. But we would stress rather the fact that the setbacks which John Brown experienced in the marketplace economy forced him to return to more traditional manual occupations that served to reinforce his image as holdover from a previous age. At certain periods of his life he exhibited the booster mentality of a thoroughbred Yankee entrepreneur. Take for instance his ventures in land acquisitions. Hard up for ready cash, John Brown invested borrowed funds in the Franklin Land Company counting on the coming construction of the Ohio and Pennsylvania Canal to bring about a dramatic rise in land prices. The sequel is a classic American unsuccessful story: the canal company modified its route and the recession of 1837 created a credit pinch, with the result that by 1842 John Brown was forced to declare bankruptcy. His career as a speculator (he was even for a brief period a bank director!) was cut short. It is in great part this failure that will lead the Brown sons to stake out claims for Federal lands in Kansas, reverting to the role of frontier farmers in which they will be joined by their chastened father. Brown's subsequent foray into the wool business follows the same pattern; incensed by what he considered the unfair practices of wool purchasers he attempted to protect the farmers' interests by forming a cooperative company that would buy and hold available wool production, thus forcing the merchants to pay a reasonable price. The complexities of the market (and the erratic tariff policies of the Federal government) combined to do him in. A last-minute attempt to bypass middlemen and sell directly on the English market only compounded the financial disaster which ended in liquidation and acrimonious lawsuits. As a result John Brown retreated once again from the deceptive world of marketplace manipulation to a more traditional occupation - that of sheep and cattle breeder. However well-intentioned his try at stabilizing wool price may have been, in economic terms it represented an attempt to create a horizontal monopoly. Land speculation and monopoly building will fuel the post-Civil War economy; in these terms John Brown is a portent of the future, but a portent only since he proves spectacularly unfit for the world of the "moneylenders" and reverts to manual roles.

In yet another domain John Brown encountered defeat.

At the age of sixteen while living in the frontier town of Hudson, Ohio in the house of his father for whom he worked as foreman in the family tannery, Brown, despite his scant schooling, decided to prepare for the ministry, which meant going east to study Greek and Latin at Plainfield Academy in Massachusetts with the idea of going on subsequently to Amherst. There is no doubt as to the genuineness of his sense of vocation; there is no doubt either that in so doing he was conforming to the American pattern of social advancement. Some fifteen months later, however, he was on his way home again, ostensibly because of the inflamed condition of his eyes, in reality because he was ill-suited to the intellectual preparation that the ministry required. The humiliation must have been extreme - so extreme, as Boyer points out, that he makes no mention of the incident in his autobiography. For another, such a downfall might have resulted in a rejection of religion; in John Brown's case it only drove him to reaffirm his faith, but in a nonintellectual, resolutely naive manner. Had he acceded to the ministry Brown would doubtless have been influenced by the liberal interpretation of the Scriptures that was part of the Unitarian current so eloquently personified by Theodore Parker. As it was, he fell back on an extraordinarily literal interpretation - not only did he learn by heart entire pages of the Bible (which he quoted abundantly in his correspondence) but he read his own actions in terms of Biblical figurae. He was a Moses whose mission it was to lead God's people out of bondage in Egypt - a term which figures frequently in his correspondence as synonym for the South. (The fact that blacks also read the Bible in this spirit no doubt confirmed him in his ways). Brown habitually criticized the modern approach to the Gospel, witness his letter of 1853 to his oldest son: "I forgot to say that my younger sons (as is common in this 'progressive age') appear to be a little in advance of my older, and have thrown off the old shackles entirely; after THOROUGH AND CANDID investigation they have discovered the Bible to be ALL a fiction." (13) Whatever else he might do John Brown was not one to throw off the old shackles in order to advance into his own age. Unlike other abolitionists (overwhelmingly liberal in religious terms) for whom the emancipation of the negroes was a progressive social issue, Brown had derived his abolitionism directly from the sacred text.

The anachronistic figure that Brown cut, however, far from alienating militant abolitionists, proved to be a decisive factor in the spell that he cast over them. Nevins and Woodward, both relying heavily on James Malin's anti-Brown work, John Brown and the Legend of '56, mistakenly treat the enthusiasm of Brown's Northern supporters as a nineteenth-century form of 'radical chic', a desperate middle-class search for the exotic. (14) In a recent study Jeffery Rossbach (15) argues that the 'objective' intention of Brown's supporters was - through the catalytic effect of the violence that they knew he was prepared to unleash - to eradicate

slave docility and propel black men into the nineteenth century as full-fledged participants in the emerging industrial economy. Although his approach is at times tendentious Rossbach brings us much closer to the true nature of the relationship that bound Brown to the Secret Six, the band of intellectual reformers who financed his arms buying. To begin with, Brown appeared not as exotic but as a familiar figure cut from the same (social) cloth as they were. They, like John Brown, were descended from old New England families, and, with the sole exception of Gerrit Smith who had inherited a fortune in landholdings, they were born of families whose fortunes were in decline (George Stearns is the only one to make good as a businessman). John Brown represents for them a reminder of their origins - brought humanly closer by his evident insolvency. At the same time, Brown presented additional guarantees of reliability for these hesitant conspirators. He was a family man (abolitionism is closely linked to defense of the family as reading H.B. Stowe reminds us); moreover he retained (perhaps the only holdover from his ill-fated encounter with the business world), an accountant's turn of phrase that calmed whatever doubts may have assailed Sanborn, the chief bookkeeper of the group's funding enterprise. John Brown offered them a unique opportunity to reenter the world of the Fathers, to reestablish contact with the primal sources of national energy (it is in this sense that Brown is literally radical). James Redpath will supply the additional link when, in his portrait of John Brown, he evokes the latter's Indian prowess, a sure sign that a genuine American hero is in the making.

Undoubtedly as well - in the eyes of the Secret Six - John Brown, tough and unyielding, stood for the Act as against the Word - or rather words. Their support for him assuaged their misgivings as to the real hold that their ideas had on national consciousness and behavior. Brown's curt dismissal of politicians, his condemnation of all forms of compromise, his belief in the virtues of insurrection recalled an earlier age when - instead of talking (16) their ideas and engaging in Garrisonian shilly-shallying about moral 'suasion' (as the contemporary term would have it) - men had acted on their beliefs. And this nostalgia was accompanied by a solid dose of the intellectual's anti-intellectualism, which is but another expression of their uncertainty as to their status in society. John Brown, as he appeared in front of his Concord audience, holding up for all to see the chain with which the Missouri ruffians had bound and dragged his son, reassured them that they were indeed in touch with the cruel realities of the world.

An integral part of Brown's public image was his reputation as a Kansas fighter. It was as Captain John Brown, the hero of the Battle of Black Jack, that he toured the East in 1857 and 1858 in quest of support for his Great Plan. Kansas, in the second half of the decade, was the

theater not only of clashes between proslavery border ruffians and Free Soil immigrants; it was as well the seat of conflict between two conceptions of the anti-slavery cause. To Eli Thayer, the wealthy Worcester manufacturer and founder of the New England Emigrant Aid Society, antislavery was business antislavery; he had no quarrel with the slaveholders who remained south of the border. To Thomas Wentworth Higginson, later to figure as Brown's most loyal supporter among the Secret Six, it was a political and moral crusade, the last chance for the nation to make good on its initial promise of equality for all. To Higginson, who tried to raise an army for Kansas, and who held the rank of brigadier general in James Lane's troop, "a single day in Kansas makes the American Revolution more intelligible than all that Sparks and Hildreth can do". (17) This militant minister makes it a point when preaching in Lawrence (Kansas) on a September Sunday of 1856 to choose as text for his sermon the very Biblical verses the Reverend John Martin had preached on his return from the Battle of Bunker Hill. When in January of 1857 Higginson finally met John Brown face to face it produced a shock of recognition.

I saw in Kansas the history of the past [...]
 And if I wanted a genuine warrior of the Revolution
 where could I find him better than in the old
 Vermonter, Captain John Brown, the defender of
 Osawatimie... Old Captain Brown, the Ethen Allen,
 the Israel Putnam of today? (18)

+ + + +

An autobiography is the record of the manner in which an individual recombines the events of his life in terms of the response he intends to elicit; the autobiography of an historical figure can reveal the attempt to situate and define a public image. In the case of John Brown, unfortunately, the autobiographical record is slim. The account of his Kansas adventures, which he began in the third person, is cut short after only a few pages; we are left with the celebrated autobiographical letter addressed to George Stearn's son Henry but in fact intended for George Stearns himself. Dated July 1857, this letter - which recounts Brown's early life up to the time of his marriage - is designed to build confidence in the writer as a man who can be trusted in a matter as perilous as a direct attack on Southern slavery. The most dramatic moment is the account of young John's encounter with a black boy. While staying "with a gentlemanly landlord once a United States Marshall", (19) he meets a slave "near his own age very active, intelligent and good feeling" to whom he is under obligation "for numerous little acts of kindness". But whereas John is complimented on his smart behavior and quick speech, the black boy, his equal in every respect, is "hardly clothed", "poorly fed", and "beaten before his eyes with Iron Shovels or any other thing that came to hand". There

is no way of knowing whether or not this incident actually took place; true or not, the scene is given as the origin of his abolitionist sentiments, "a circumstance that in the end led him [i.e. John Brown, the text is in the third person] to declare and swear: Eternal War with Slavery". Childhood experience here provides the terrain for fundamental political decisions which are thus assimilated to reactions in a domestic (patriarchal) setting. In his autobiographical letter John Brown adheres to the pattern set down by Parson Weem's Life of George Washington (also written for young readers but aimed through them at their elders) whereby the stories of childhood (apocryphal or not) are seen as sure signs of future greatness.

The autobiography presents as well another curious aspect. While on one hand the author insists on his early ambition "to excel in doing anything he undertook to perform" and on the fact that he habitually expected to succeed in what he undertook, the account itself chronicles a series of losses which cast him in the role of victim. When he was six an Indian gave him a "Yellow Marble" which he lost "beyond recovery"; subsequently his pet squirrel wandered away or was killed leaving him "in mourning" for over a year; finally a ewe lamb, "perhaps" a gift from his father, sickened and died. These incidents - which John Brown sees fit to recall along with the loss of his mother at the age of eight, a loss that was "complete and permanent" in that he never "adopted in feeling" his stepmother - constitute what he refers to as "the school of adversity". Losses are interpreted as elements in a didactic process. Moreover the passage which describes the loss of the marble and the squirrel is followed immediately by the admission that, on occasion, he told lies; reversing the order of reading would suggest that the double loss is chastisement for uttering falsehoods. Could this not be further interpreted as an oblique reference to the punishment administered (in the form of financial ruin) when he abandons the Biblically sanctified profession of sheep and cattle breeder and ventures out into the false world of the moneylender? That such issues are not far from his mind is suggested by the fact that, in the course of a paragraph which discusses the right of minors to own animals, he adds that "older people have sometimes found difficulty with titles" (a reference to the dispute with Chamberlain over ownership of the Westland farm?). Be this as it may, in the context of the autobiography the misfortunes that he endures are treated as part of a plan, of a "much needed course of discipline" by which the "Heavenly Father sees it best to take all the little things out of his hands which he has ever placed in them". The only adversity recorded which is not considered as part of the Almighty's plan is that meted out to the black boy; only in so far as John Brown takes up the cause of the black boy (a boy of his own age and - according to the description given - of like abilities) is revolt legitimized. Here we can refer to another text written by Brown himself, this

time in the first person, in which the 'author' - a black man - makes public confession of his errors. "Sambo's Mistakes", (20) intended for the negro journal Eam's Horn, presents the portrait of a conventional Sambo (given to laughter, good times and ostentatious behavior) who repents of his ways. Incongruously Brown has included in the catalogue of Sambo's shortcomings certain traits that are far more characteristic of his own failings, namely obstinacy and dogmatism, creating thus a composite portrait which suggests in yet another way the extent to which Brown (unlike his contemporaries) has interiorized the image of the black man, experiencing the injustice done them as done to him, confirming the necessity of his/their revolt. (21)

+ + + +

But what form was revolt to take? Although John Brown as a young boy was disgusted (as he recounts in his autobiographical letter) by what he witnessed of military training, he was not a man to tolerate disorder. On frequent occasions in the course of his career he adopted the stance of a lawgiver setting down in writing the code that was to bind the members of the group of which he was undisputed leader. The "Covenant and Bylaws of the Free-State Volunteers of Kansas" (1856) and the "Articles of Agreement of Shubel Morgan's Company" (1858) - both of which he drew up - go far beyond a mere set of working rules for frontier fighters. (22) Brown elaborates, in both cases, a social contract as if he had felt called upon to establish the charter of a new state. The 1856 Covenant stipulates how officers are to be elected, creates a court of justice, regulates personal behavior (no "vulgar talk" or alcohol) and specifies how amendments can be adopted. And this is not the first text of this nature. Already in 1850, immediately after passage of the Fugitive Slave Law, Brown, who was then living in Massachusetts, had organized among the black population of Springfield a "Branch of the U.S. League of Gileadites" (no other branch existed or was to exist) for which he wrote an "Agreement" (signed by 44 blacks) and some stirring "Words of Advice". The Gileadites were to band together to rescue fugitive slaves from the law; but John Brown's text hints at something more far-reaching, for after remarking that "personal bravery" always "charms" the American people (and is thus more effective than the spectacle of "the sufferings of more than three millions of our submissive colored population") he goes on to cite the example of "the Greeks struggling against the oppressive Turks, the Poles against the Russians, the Hungarians against Austria and Russia combined", (23) as if he were prefacing a Declaration of Independence for the black nation. In a sense such a declaration was unnecessary; it would suffice simply to interpret the American declaration literally - in the same manner as Brown was accustomed to read the Scriptures.

But to John Brown no literal reading of the United States Constitution could make up for the obvious inadequacies of that document which afforded blacks no basis for protection. Thus - as a part of his preparation for Harper's Ferry - he sent out a call for a Provisional Constitutional Convention which was held under the auspices of the black nationalist Martin Delany in Chatham, Ontario in May of 1858. Brown delivered the keynote address and then submitted for approval his draft of the "Provisional Constitution and Ordinances of the People of the United States", which was adopted article by article (there were 48 of them in all) and signed by the assembled company after administration of an oath "not to divulge any of the secrets" (24) of the convention. This extraordinary document merits fuller treatment. In some respects - for instance separation of powers - it is modelled on the United States Constitution, but in other respects it inclines toward a far more authoritarian régime (the Commander-in-chief of the army - who is not the President - is given broad authority) and some provisions (obligation to labor, prohibition of "unlawful intercourse between the sexes") appear frankly despotic. But it is not the contents that concern us here as much as the fact that Brown, burdened as he was by the material and financial organization of his expedition, should consider such a step a necessary prelude to action. Harper's Ferry was not to be a hit-and-run raid on slave country but the first act of the process of substitution of one system of government for another - in other words a revolution, another one, or rather a return to the true meaning of the first.

Turning now to the Harper's Ferry attack itself, how can one account for the ignominious failure of so grand a design? For failure it was; Brown's expeditionary war, launched on a Sunday evening is over and done with by Tuesday morning. Brown's tactics seem to have been uncertain, badly prepared, and based on miscalculation of both black and white reactions. Villard considers that Brown has hesitated so long between alternative strategies that at the time of the attack he was "without any clear and definite plan of campaign". (25) Other historians (Nevens, Oates) point to the unsuitability of the terrain for guerilla warfare and the lack of any previous reconnoitering or logistic preparation. (Only W.E.B. Dubois approves of Brown as military commander, laying the blame on his men for tardy execution of his orders). (26) It would appear indeed that Brown never arrived at a satisfactory synthesis of the three strategies that he had, at one time or another, envisaged: guerilla warfare, open insurrection, and slave stampedes. Yet however justified these critiques of Brown's leadership may be, they do not provide an explanation of his conduct in the early hours of Monday morning. For at this moment, with several courses of action still open to him, John Brown - who certainly knew from his Kansas campaigns the danger, for a small force such as his, of losing the initiative - inexplicably

vacillates, lingering in the armory when all about him called for a rapid move. On this point all accounts agree.(27)

Shortly after taking possession of the armory and the rifle works on Sunday night, Brown had sent a detachment of six men to fetch Colonel Lewis Washington, great grand-nephew of George Washington, from his plantation five miles south of Harper's Ferry; the party, which returned in the early hours of the morning, had specific instructions(28) to bring back - in addition to the colonel - a pistol presented to George Washington by Lafayette and a sword supposedly given to him by Frederick the Great of Prussia, sword which was immediately appropriated by Brown himself. Washington's sword in hand, Washington's descendant on the premises, and a new Constitution in pamphlet form ready to be distributed: such symbols were signs the significance of which drowned out the desperate messages he received from his second-in-command, Kagi, calling for retreat to the mountains. Brown treated Colonel Washington more as a distinguished visitor than as a hostage, taking the trouble - and time - to send out to the local inn for breakfast, despite the fact that the alarm was by then spreading and the townsmen arming for the counterattack. But there was more to it than this. John Brown was well aware that Harper's Ferry (as well as all the other towns that had figured on his list of possible targets) was Federal ground.(29) As long as he remained there his revolt was a nationwide revolution. Were he to leave Harper's Ferry he would be but a renegade by Virginia or Maryland law. His dealing in traditional symbols (Washington, the Constitution) was a form of fidelity to the heroic image in which he was cast; but it was as well the expression of a fundamental political fact of the moment. The anachronistic return to the past carried with it a modern message that Brown was one of the few to have grasped: slavery would not disappear unless the Federal government was forced to intervene.(30) That intervention was all the more certain the longer he remained in the Harper's Ferry arsenal, reason enough to hesitate before abandoning the enginehouse.

In the hours following his capture John Brown plays out his role to the full, stating that his intention was to arm the slaves(31) and demanding that his constitution be read aloud in its entirety to the assembled company. He seems also to have invited discovery of incriminating evidence, having left in a carpet bag at the nearby Kennedy farm, letters implicating his Northern supporters and maps pinpointing the Southern counties in which the slave population was in the majority.(32) But in the course of the trial and the imprisonment Brown shifts his stance.(33) Abandoning the role of leader of a revolt he denies in his November 2 address to the court - probably his most telling speech in the light of the later legend - that he

never intended "treason, or the destruction of property or to excite or incite slaves to rebellion, or to make insurrection", (34) and he makes no mention either of his Northern supporters or of his plans for excursions further south. The Harper's Ferry raid is no longer the first act in a revolution, but a solitary form of moral witness that requires failure to succeed. By depoliticizing his invasion John Brown gives up the role of Founding Father for that of sacrificial son...only to be resurrected two years later by the armies of the North.

John Atherton
Université de Tours

REFERENCES:

- (1) John Drinkerfield, "John Brown at Harper's Ferry", Century Magazine, June, 1885, p.267.
- (2) We have relied on two excellent studies for background material: Stephen B. Oates, To Purge this Land with Blood, New York: Harper & Row, 1970, and Richard O. Boyer, The Legend of John Brown, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973. Other sources (primary and secondary) are given below.
- (3) Oswald G. Villard, John Brown, 1800-1859, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1911, p. 538.
- (4) The Writings of Henry David Thoreau, 20 vols, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1906, vol.IV, p. 442.
- (5) Allan Nevins, The Emergence of Lincoln, 2 vols, New York: Charles Scribner's, 1950, vol.II, chaps. 1,3.
- (6) Thoreau, Writings, vol. XVIII, p. 405.
- (7) Thoreau, Writings, vol. IV, p. 441.
- (8) Nevins - followed by C. Vann Woodward in "John Brown's Private War", The Burden of Southern History, rev. ed. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1968 - treats Brown as insane (Nevin's term is 'monomania'). Oates convincingly refutes this line of argument by showing how the affidavits on which Nevins and Woodward base their case, were drawn up when there was question among Brown supporters of trying to prevent the execution by a plea of insanity, and have been read out of context.

- (9) Michael Rogin, Fathers and Children: Andrew Jackson and the Subjugation of the American Indian, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1975; George Forgie, Patricide in the House Divided, New York: W.W. Norton, 1979; and Dwight Anderson, Abraham Lincoln: the Quest for Immortality, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.
- (10) James Redpath, The Public Life of John Brown, Boston: Thayer & Eldridge, 1860, p. 39.
- (11) Ralph Waldo Emerson, Complete Works, 12 vols, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1888, vol. XII, p. 249.
- (12) Thoreau, Writings, vol. XVIII, p. 436.
- (13) John Brown to John Brown Junior, Aug. 26, 1853, in Franklin B. Sanborn, The Life and Letters of John Brown, New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969, reprint of 1885 edition, p. 46.
- (14) Malin himself sounds at times like a Tom Wolfe minus the humour: "Is it merely a strange paradox, or is it a form of practical or even a necessary balancing of social forces, that such a national Legend, grounded in a doctrine of violence, should become to such a degree an escape mechanism for a class of society which would be most injured by its application?" (James C. Malin, John Brown and the Legend of '56, Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1942, p. viii)
- (15) Jeffery Rossbach, Ambivalent Conspirators: John Brown, the Secret Six and a Theory of Slave Violence, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982.
- (16) A remarkable example of contemporary verbal acrobacy is to be found in Joshua Gidding's testimony on the relevance of the "Higher Law" to the "condition of African slavery in this country", given before the Senate Select Commission on the Harper's Ferry Invasion (U.S. Senate Committee Reports, 2 vols, 36th Congress, 1st Session, 1859-60, vol. II, pp. 152-153).
- (17) Higginson article, Tribune, Oct. 17, 1856, cited in Tilden Edelstein, Strange Enthusiasm: the Life of Thomas Wentworth Higginson, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968, p. 189. Sparks and Hildreth were contemporary historians of the American Revolution.
- (18) Higginson's speech printed in the Liberator, Jan. 16, 1857, cited in Edelstein, p. 196.
- (19) The text of the letter is given in Redpath, pp. 24-35.
- (20) The article is cited in full by Villard, pp. 659-61.
- (21) For black opinion of John Brown see Benjamin Quarles, Allies for Freedom, New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- (22) Villard gives both texts (pp. 661-64 and 666-67). "Shubel Morgan" is none other than John Brown himself, who also went under the name of Nelson Hawkins.

- (23) "Words of Advice", in Louis Luchames, ed. A John Brown Reader, New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1959, p. 76.
- (24) The text of the "Provisional Constitution" and the minutes of the Chatham meeting are given in U.S. Senate Committee Reports, vol. I, pp. 45-59.
- (25) Villard, p. 427.
- (26) W.E.B. DuBois, John Brown, New York: International Publishers, 1972, reprint of 1909 edition, chap. 11.
- (27) Oates considers that Brown has "mysteriously delayed" (p. 293); Boyer refers to his "fatal indecision" (p. 4); and Redpath concludes that "the delay was fatal to his plans". (p. 251) Osborne P. Anderson, one of the members of the expedition writes in his account of the invasion that Brown appeared "somewhat puzzled". (A Voice from Harper's Ferry, Freeport (N.Y.): Books for Libraries Press, 1972, reprint of 1861 edition, p. 36) Brown himself ascribes his delay to "my desire to spare the feelings of my prisoners and their families". (Redpath, p. 282)
- (28) See Allan Keller, Thunder at Harper's Ferry, Englewood Cliffs (N.J.): Prentice-Hall, 1958, p. 41. Brown knew of the existence of these two weapons in Colonel Washington's house from John Cook, one of his men, who had previously gained entry to the plantation by posing as a door-to-door booksalesman peddling ... a life of George Washington.
- (29) This point will emerge in the debate as to whether or not John Brown should have been tried in a State or Federal court, debate which the Virginia authorities foreclosed by their haste in bringing him to trial. Brown's defense counsel will plead that Brown was not a citizen of Virginia and that the events took place outside the court's jurisdiction - from which one can draw the conclusion that the only treason he could have been charged with was Federal treason. See The Life, Trial and Execution of Captain John Brown, New York: Da Capo Press, 1969, reprint of 1859 edition, "The Fifth Day", pp. 84-94.
- (30) On this point see Albert Fried, John Brown's Journey: Notes and Reflections on his America and mine, New York: Doubleday, 1978, chap. 5, "Black and White".
- (31) "He was particularly inquired of ... as to his intending to stampede slaves off, and he promptly and distinctly replied that that was not his purpose. He designed to put arms in their hands to defend themselves against their masters, and to maintain their position in Virginia and the South". (Testimony of Andrew Hunter, U.S. Senate Committee Reports, vol. II, p. 62) John Brown does, however, in the course of the long Tuesday afternoon interview with Governor

Hason, on occasion avoid admitting outright that he intended to set off a general uprising among the slaves, but the details that he provides are such as to leave no doubt in his hearers' minds. Hunter finds it "very singular" - as do others - "that he should enter into his plans immediately". (U.S. Senate Committee Reports, vol. 11, p.60)

- (32) That John Brown foresaw the possibility of failure appears highly likely to his biographers, for instance Oates: "... even if his invasion failed (as he probably knew it would)". (p.310) Thus the fact that John Brown should have left incriminating evidence where it could so easily be captured is tantamount to an attempt to implicate others in a nationwide revolt. Sure enough, the front page of The New York Times of October 22, 1859 broadcasts the news: "But the most valuable discovery was a trunk belonging to Capt. Brown, containing a great number of highly-important papers, documents, plans and letters from private individuals throughout the Union - all revealing the existence of an extensive and thoroughly-organized conspiracy, whose leaders were Capt. Brown and J.F. Cook....". There follow extracts from the correspondence.

The New York Times also publishes a "Vindication of the Invasion". This document, written in the past tense, Oates takes to be a vindication of the Harper's Ferry expedition, written by Brown "as though the raid had already failed and he was facing a jury and a divided nation beyond". (Oates, p.283) In our opinion - although we agree that Brown half expected to fail - Oates' reading is a misinterpretation; the document more probably refers to the Missouri slave raid and thus dates from the Kansas period (other Kansas papers were found in the same lot). Sanborn is also of the latter opinion (see Sanborn, p.489).

- (33) The shift did not go unnoticed. See Andrew Hunter's testimony (U.S. Senate Committee Reports, vol. 11, p. 62) and Brown's letter in which he tries to reconcile the two versions (ibid., pp. 67-68).
- (34) John Brown's speech to the Court, Nov. 2, 1859, The Life, Trial and Execution of Captain John Brown, p.94.

1894: ENGLISH WOMEN PROTEST
The Revolt of the Daughters
and the New Woman

The 1890s witnessed the birth of the modern movement for the emancipation of middle and upper class English women. This was of course not the first time that middle class women had demanded political, social or economic rights. Nor was it a successful movement, for by the end of the century it appeared to have lost momentum, only to spring to renewed and virorous life early in the new century in the suffragette campaign.

The emancipation movement of the 1890s was the culmination of trends which had been gathering ground for several decades. The growth of business and government, banking and finance, and the development of modern forms of communications created a demand for lower-middle class jobs, particularly in teaching, clerical work and the civil service. The result, as Lee Holcombe has shown, is that the numbers of women in these occupations rose steadily between 1861 and 1891, a rise whose pace was to quicken in the two subsequent decades.¹ During the same period the educational opportunities of middle-class girls improved greatly, many high schools being founded or reformed and the first women's institutions of higher education making remarkable progress against heavy odds. The increased self-confidence brought about by educational change and economic independence was an important stimulus to the women's protest movement. The cynical exploitation of women professional workers, whose hours of drudgery were rewarded by inadequate salaries and poor conditions, probably did more to encourage the movement than to dampen its enthusiasm.

The later nineteenth century witnessed a growing sex imbalance, the result of predominantly male emigration to the colonies and to the United States. In 1891 there were over 300,000 more women in their twenties than men,² and a calculation made by Clara Collet, a close student

f women's economic and social problems, suggested that one woman in six would remain unmarried. In London the ratio was one in five and the position was particularly marked among the educated middle class. This sex imbalance increased the exploitation of women in poorly paid jobs of all kinds, but it also meant that many women unwilling or unable to become wives poured their energies into careers and into the movement for women's emancipation.

The economic demand for the cheap labour of educated women and the sex imbalance were important causes of the women's movement, which reinforced the pressures inherent in the continued growth and development of an industrial, urban society. The movement was fostered by other features of the times. There was a great deal of talk in the 1890s about the spirit of "fin de siècle", which flouted social conventions and feverishly searched for novelty. Men and women seeking new fashions and forms of living were bound to make relations between the sexes an early target.

The remarkable literary flowering of the 1890s gave a powerful fillip to the women's protest. The most influential figure was Henrik Ibsen, whose A Doll's House created a sensation when first publicly performed in London in 1889. It was followed by more plays by Ibsen and by writers like A.W. Pinero and H.A. Jones, and by the books of many novelists of both sexes. Although many topics were tackled the works shared a common theme; women's social oppression, their economic demands, their sexual needs. The school included major novelists like Thomas Hardy and George Gissing: its female members, highly influential in their own day, were almost forgotten until their reputations were revived in the 1970s.

Protest was also furthered by an apparently unlikely factor, the bicycle. Although various forms of cycle had been popular among men for some years and many women tricycled, it was not until the safety bicycle and the pneumatic tyre had been perfected in the later 1880s and mass produced in the early 1890s that popularity became a craze. The sense of freedom made possible by the bicycle was unprecedented and its importance difficult to

exaggerate. Certainly it finds an affectionate place in most of the autobiographies of contemporary women, and there were frequent claims during the period of the cyclone boom that it had done more for women's emancipation than any other single factor.⁴

It was in this context that daughters revolted and the New Woman was born.

In January 1894, Blanche Alathen Crackanthurpe, the wife of a barrister and the mother of a promising writer, published an article in the Nineteenth Century which quickly became a sensation. It was entitled: "The Revolt of the Daughters". "These are the days of strikes", Mrs. Crackanthurpe began, with a reference to a wave of industrial turmoil which had recently reached a climax in a violent miners' strike. The daughters' demands were presented as modest. They centred round the right of the unmarried girl to be considered as "an individual as well as a daughter". She should be able to make her own errors, travel freely, visit the music hall (with her brother!) and enjoy improved education. Boys were unrudgerly prepared for a variety of professional careers, while girls were to enter a single profession - marriage. The daughter who asked for a fraction of the expenditure laid out on her brother and who was refused on the ground that a woman should remain in the parental home until called from it by a husband had real cause to protest against her lot. But the conventional thinking behind Mrs. Crackanthurpe's support for the striking daughters was indicated by the reason which she gave for supporting professional training for women: "Marriage is the best profession for a woman; we all know and acknowledge it; but, for obvious reasons, all women cannot enter its strait and narrow gate." She also took the opportunity to denounce the "double standard" of sexual morality then generally accepted, which dictated that before marriage a wealthy man should keep a mistress or visit prostitutes, while a respectable girl saw no more of her lover's body before marriage than his hands and face.

The "hurricanes" and "thunderbolts" which, Mrs. Crackintheorne wrote, followed the publication of her article,⁶ indicated the sympathy with which many readers viewed her case and the opposition felt by others to potentially dangerous changes in social and sexual behaviour. The Nineteenth Century itself printed a number of other articles on the same subject and the series was widely commented on and copied. Emily Harrison, the wife of the writer Frederic Harrison who was no friend of women's freedom, contributed a short story whose heroine told of friends whose parents had inhibited their efforts to paint, study history or (in the absence of an escort) attend economics classes. One mother had given her daughter a novel but had carefully censored a section with a carefully placed bonnet pin.

Mrs. Crackintheorne contributed a second article attacking the "matrimonial hunt", the target of which was the capture of a husband in a girl's own social class or above it, and pointed out that mothers had themselves contributed to the new ferment by working in a variety of "good causes" unknown to earlier generations. These included "slumming in the East" (social work with the poor in the East End of London), membership of School Boards or Boards of Poor Law Guardians, running clubs for working girls, taking part in organising women's trade unions and similar activities.⁸ (Incidentally she, like other educated writers of the time, liberally sprinkled her articles with French phrases: ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte; autres temps autres mœurs; pour tout potage, and so on.)

Two of the daughters were given an opportunity to speak for themselves. The American Alys Fearsall Smith, soon to marry the mathematician and philosopher Bertrand Russell, claimed the right of a daughter to "belong to herself" in terms which pointed to the influence of Ibsen.⁹ It was left to Kathleen Cuffe, daughter of the Earl and Countess of Dysart, to "speak in the name of the average more or less unemployed, tea-drinking, lawn-tennis playing,

ball-going damsel" of the upper and upper-middle class. Lady Kathleen mentioned some common symbols of the revolt, such as the music hall and possession of a latchkey. But her principal demand was the abolition of the chaperon in all normal circumstances. Unmarried women of her class could not visit a friend two or three streets away, walk in the park, attend a tea party, play or concert, or even church unaccompanied, although a young married sister could freely do all of these things. Social work was out of the question, for "who has ever heard of anyone 'slumming' under the protecting care of a chaperon?... Perhaps", she concluded wistfully, "we may even see the day when a chaperon will be as little known as a great auk or other creature of a past era."¹⁰

Of the articles stimulated by the Nineteenth Century's series one need mention only a short rejoinder which appeared in the Westminster Review. The author, Gertrude Hemery, announced that at the age of 18 she had her own latchkey and was never chaperoned. Surely, she commented, was the result of knowledge rather than ignorance, a belief she intended to put into practice if she became a mother, bringing up sons and daughters without differentiation on grounds of sex.¹¹

By this time the revolting daughter was giving way to the more enduring phenomenon of the New Woman, a term often used by modern writers without reference to its origin. In early 1894 the demands of educated women had reached such a pitch that it was fairly common to write in terms of a "new" womanhood.¹² However, the creation of the New Woman as a heroine or bogey figure was the result of an interchange between two prominent women writers in the pages of the North American Review.

The first of these writers was Sarah Grand, as Frances Elizabeth Bellenden Clarke (1854-1943) called herself, apparently oblivious of the fact that another woman using the same name had achieved some notoriety before her marriage to Talleyrand. She struggled as

a writer after leaving her dissolute husband in 1800, but with the publication of The Heavenly Twins in 1803 she achieved a literary sensation and sudden fame. The book dealt with marriages of convenience and ignorance and with venereal disease and its consequences, putting a powerful plea to end the double moral standard. Sarah Grand wrote other works of fiction, none of which achieved the success of the earlier book, but she had a long and varied life and in the 1890s in particular she was lionised, interviewed and regarded as a principal feminist authority on relations between the sexes.¹³

The second author was 'Ouida', the pen name of Louise Kamef (1839-1908). She was a romantic novelist of an older generation, whose best-known book, Under Two Flags, had been published as long before as 1867. She now made her home in Italy and her living by writing articles on a variety of topics, among which was a virulent anti-feminism which sought to convict women of being a "drag on the wheel of the higher aspirations" of men, and possessing "a sleeping potentiality for crime" and "a curious possibility of fiendish evil".¹⁴

In an article in the North American Review in March 1894 entitled "The New Aspect of the Woman Question", Sarah Grand asserted that men understood traditional types of women, whom she referred to as "the cow-woman" and "the scum-woman". But, she added, "the new woman is a little above him". This was the woman who would have to hold out her hand to man and to educate him out of his moral infancy.¹⁵

In good journalistic fashion Ouida saw her opportunity. Her article "The New Woman" took up the term perhaps carelessly used by Sarah Grand and created a new species. Like Mrs. Crackanthorpe she coupled the rise of the women's movement with the rise of labour, insisting that both were "unmitigated bores":

"The Workingman and the Woman, the New Woman, be it remembered, meet us at every page of

literature written in the English tongue: and each is convinced that on his own especial Whens the future of the world."

This was a perceptive if bad-tempered sentence, for the history of the twentieth century in every industrial society has in fact largely been written in terms of these two Ws.

Ouida went on to attack the New Woman's alleged lack of humour, her preference for public life, sport and study of medicine to her proper vocation as wife and mother. She compared the New Woman to a farmer who coveted his neighbour's field instead of tilling his own: "The New Woman will not even look at the extent of ground indisputably her own, which she leaves unweeded and untilled."¹⁶

As soon as the May number of the North American Review reached Britain (the British Museum's copy is dated 12 May 1894) the New Woman became a stock phrase of every journalist and commentator. The Times augustly disregarded the phenomenon, but it made its first appearance in the Daily Telegraph on 12 May, in the Daily Chronicle on the 14th and the Ball Ball Gazette on the 16th. Once Punch took hold of the topic on 26th May it refused to let it go; as late as 10 January 1900 it asked whether the New Woman was living or dead.

The New Woman was largely the creation of the press, but it was a creation easily recognised in the fiction and the social life of the period. The critic Edmund Gosse wrote testily in 1895:

"Things have come to a pretty pass when the combined prestige of the best poets, historians, critics and philosophers of the country does not weigh in the balance against a single novel by the New Woman...An intelligent foreigner, I suppose, visiting our country in this year of grace, would be more struck with the ebullition of chatter about the New

A Study in Backs.



THE SPORTING BACK.



THE LADYLIKE BACK.



THE HORSEY BACK.



THE NEW-WOMAN BACK.

Lady's Realm March 1900, p. 643

woman than with anything else."¹⁷

Dora Montefiore, a socialist and feminist, was one of the few emancipated women ready to accept the title, for the term, she pointed out, had been invented by its enemies. She encapsulated many of the views of advanced women of the period in a poem entitled "The New Woman":

"She is pondering social problems
Which appeal to heart and brain.
She is daring for the first time
Both to think - and then to act...
Centuries she followed blindfold
Where her lord and master led
Lived his faith, embraced his morals;
Trod but where he bade her tread."¹⁸

women's movements in England have always had to face the weapon of ridicule. Both men and women have disguised their apprehension and fear by professing to find amusing the prospect of women challenging the existing pattern of relations between the sexes. A period in which women outnumbered men was thought particularly appropriate to characterise the New Woman as manlike, dowdy, flighty, incompetent and so on. Punch's first comment was typical:

"There is a New Woman, and what do you think?
She lives upon nothing but Foolscap and Ink!
But, though Foolscap and Ink form the whole of her diet,
This nagging New Woman can never be quiet!"¹⁹

As the journalist Hulda Friederichs asked:

"Is there in all this world a creature that has been slandered like her? Slandered, ridiculed, calumniated, scorned, mocked, caricatured, and abused, till you can hurl no more insulting epithet at any girl or woman than to call her a New Woman."²⁰

Yet the New Woman like the revolting daughter was much more than the creature and the victim of press and fiction. The mid-1890s were marked by a revolt



PAST AND PRESENT.

symbolised, not created, by the New Woman. The demand for the parliamentary vote, now nearly a generation old, could easily be contained by flippancy or obstruction in the House of Commons. The employment of middle-class women, though it caused some concern to the conservative, was as useful to employers seeking cheap, docile labour as it was essential to women themselves. But social and sexual revolt was another matter; it threatened, like the later women's liberation movement, to overthrow established institutions of male supremacy. Many real husbands, like a fictional one in a short story of 1896, must have felt that their wives had suddenly jumped "to the middle of the twentieth century!"²¹

Women refused to accept the previous image of themselves as weak and incapable of physical exertion. This was true not only of cycling but of many other forms of sport and recreation, including hockey and golf.²² Some courageous women, especially cyclists, adopted "rational dress", a kind of knickerbocker outfit which was a shocking, though commonsensical alternative to long, trailing skirts.

Increasing numbers of women took up smoking, a curious but nonetheless potent symbol of emancipation.²³ An amusing case was reported to the Daily Telegraph by a man whose railway carriage was invaded by four young women, one whom produced a "smoking" label which she fixed to a window. His protests were met by the reply that the smoke would be good for him.²⁴

The requirement of the wedding service that brides should promise to obey their husbands was questioned by bold spirits. The Young Woman stage a correspondence entitled "Should Brides Promise to Obey?", and though they disappointingly refrained from publishing an analysis of replies, the fact that hundreds of them were received made clear that the subject raised strong feelings.²⁵ A clergyman reported that some brides,



PAST AND PRESENT.

"No, thanks; I never smoke before ladies!"

unwilling to say 'obey', promised to 'love, honour and so on', words with an amusingly changed connotation to a later generation.²⁶ When married some women insisted on keeping their own first names, being known as 'Mrs. Arabella Smith' rather than 'Mrs. John Smith' as convention dictated.

Objection was voiced to a woman's marital status being public property, a remarkable foreshadowing of the later use of the abbreviation 'Miss' and an even closer approximation to French practice. The journalist Ella Day wanted the term 'Miss' to be reserved for the young; women should be known as 'Mrs.' regardless of whether or not they were married. She asked:

"Why should a woman be, as it were, branded on the forehead? Why should her luggage, when she travels, proclaim her domestic condition to every railway porter? Why should the announcement of her name at a public dinner or a reception indicate to every ear that she is somebody's property, or is still available for somebody else?"²⁷

This type of striving for emancipation, though indicative of widespread feeling, had little chance of triumphing over the overwhelming pressures of convention and respectable opinion of the day. But the movement, amorphous and leaderless as it was, raised issues which were not forgotten. Each generation builds on the shoulders of its predecessor, and the determination and single-mindedness of the suffragette movement owed at least an indirect debt to the courageous and forgotten women who had raised much wider issues in the previous decade.

NOTES

- 1 Lee Holcombe, Victorian Ladies at Work (Newton Abbot, 1973), pp. 203-7 and passim.
- 2 Royal Commission on Population, P.P. 1949, vol. XIX, Cmd 7695, p. 14.
- 3 Clara Collet, "Prospects of Marriage for Women", Nineteenth Century, vol. 31, April 1892, p. 540.

- 4 I have discussed this subject in "Cycling in the 1890s", Victorian Studies, vol. 21, Autumn 1977, pp. 40-51.
- 5 B.A. Crackanthorne, "The Revolt of the Daughters", Nineteenth Century, vol. 27, January 1894, pp. 23-24. I have drawn the reference to a lover's hands and face from a similar comment made by Vera Brittain in Testament of Youth (London, 1933), p. 166.
- 6 B.A. Crackanthorne, "A Last Word on the Revolt", Nineteenth Century, vol. 35, March 1894, p. 424.
- 7 E.B. Harrison, "Mothers and Daughters", Nineteenth Century, February 1894, p. 317.
- 8 B.A. Crackanthorne, *op. cit.* (note 5), p. 425-7.
- 9 Alys Pearsall Smith, "A Reply from the Daughters", Nineteenth Century, March 1894, pp. 447, 450.
- 10 Kathleen Cuffe, "A Reply from the Daughters", Nineteenth Century, March 1894, pp. 437-42.
- 11 Gertrude Hemery, "The Revolt of the Daughters. An Answer - by One of Them", Westminster Review, vol. 141, June 1894, pp. 679-81.
- 12 The writer Robert Buchanan, for example, made three references to New Womanhood in a letter in the Daily Chronicle on 15 January 1894.
- 13 The first published biography of Sarah Grand, Gillian Kersley's Darling Madame, was published in 1933.
- 14 Ouida, Views and Opinions (London, 1895), pp. 319, 324. None of the published biographies of Ouida is of assistance in discussing the New Woman controversy.
- 15 Sarah Grand, "The New Aspect of the Woman Question", North American Review, vol. 153, March 1894, pp. 271-3.
- 16 Ouida, "The New Woman", North American Review, vol. 158, May 1894, pp. 610-19. An article in the comic paper Judy for 18 April 1894 (p. 186) discusses the New Woman. I have found no other which predates Ouida's.
- 17 Edmund Gosse, "The Decay of Literary Taste", North American Review, vol. 161, July 1895, pp. 116-17.
- 18 Dora B. Montefiore, "The New Woman", "Singsings Through the Dark": Poems (London, 1898), p. 62.
- 19 Punch, 26 May 1894, p. 252. Punch was so pleased with this verse (or so short of copy) that it virtually repeated it on 21 September 1895, p. 136.
- 20 Hulda Friederichs, "The 'Old' Woman and the 'New'", Young Woman, vol. 3, March 1895, p. 200.
- 21 Walter Larke, "How Mrs. Newman Became a New Woman", Atalanta, vol. 9, January 1896, p. 250.
- 22 Marie C. Linton discusses these and related subjects in her Manchester University H. Ed. thesis "The Growth of Women's Sport in Late Victorian Society as Reflected in Contemporary Literature" (1978).
- 23 "Should Ladies Smoke?", Lady's Realm, February 1900, pp. 513-18.
- 24 Daily Telegraph, 1 May 1894.
- 25 Young Woman, vol. 6, April 1898, pp. 253-4.
- 26 E.J. Hardy, Love, Courtship and Marriage (London, 1902), p. 91.
- 27 Ella Day, "Letters to the Harassed", Young Woman, vol. 5, May 1897, p. 313.

INTELLECTUALS, PROTEST AND NUCLEAR WEAPONS: THE DONS OF WAR

Stephen Kirby

October 1983

