

ARCHIVE



AN UNDERGRADUATE JOURNAL OF HISTORY

Volume 23, May 2020

University of Wisconsin-Madison

ARCHIVE

AN UNDERGRADUATE JOURNAL OF HISTORY

Volume 23, May 2020

Editor-in-Chief

Isabelle Cook

Editorial Board

Mingcong Bai

Madeline Brauer

Jack Hayes

Matt Kass

Alison Kukowski

Alex Moriarty

Adam Storch

Emma Ward

Faculty Advisor

Professor Elizabeth Lapina

Published by
The University of Wisconsin-Madison



We dedicate the 23rd edition of *ARCHIVE* to the healthcare workers serving on the frontlines of the COVID-19 pandemic. Their courageousness and selflessness will be the brightest spot in this period's history.

Cover Image

This photo depicts the Wisconsin Union Theater in 1948.

Image courtesy of

University of Wisconsin-Madison Archives Collections

Table of Contents

Editor's Note	8
Holy Healthcare	10
<i>Oral Roberts and the Rise and Fall of the City of Faith, 1960–1990</i>	
Benjamin J. Young	
Baylor University, Class of 2021	
“If They Break This Union, They Will Break My Heart”	38
<i>Hamilton, Burr, Pickering, and the Northeastern Secessionist Movement of 1804</i>	
Sebastian van Bastelaer	
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Class of 2019	
A Rose in the Wilderness	58
<i>The Challenge of Melchiorre Cafà's Blessed Rose (1665) in the Atlantic World</i>	
Taylor Rossini	
Middlebury College, Class of 2020	
Scandal and the City	72
<i>Laetitia Pilkington's Critique of British Mid Eighteenth-Century Gender Norms</i>	
Tori Paige	
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Class of 2020	
Rewriting Chapters	86
<i>Resistance to Addressing Discriminatory Practices in University of Wisconsin-Madison</i>	
<i>Fraternities and Sororities, 1947-1962</i>	
Angela Peterson	
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Class of 2020	
Editors' Biographies	114

A Note From the Editor

The 2020 Editorial Board is proud to present Volume 23 of *ARCHIVE*. For more than two decades, history students at the University of Wisconsin-Madison have published this journal to highlight the extraordinary historical research of undergraduates from around the world. This spring is no exception. Our board has worked tirelessly, first in person and then remotely, to ensure the publication of Volume 23 amid the shutdown of campus caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite the challenges this presented, we have prepared five pieces for publication that we hope will both entertain and inform our readership. We extend our sympathies to those authors whose pieces we selected, but who were unable to engage in our extensive editorial process due to the pandemic.

Our journal begins with Benjamin J. Young's account of televangelism in America during the twentieth century. He tells the incredible story of Oral Roberts, whose interest in faith-based healing spurred the creation of the Oral Roberts University School of Medicine and the sixty-story high City of Faith hospital. From here, we turn to Sebastian van Bastelaer's piece that explores an often overlooked chapter of early American history, the Northeastern Secessionist Movement of 1804, and the fearless fight of Alexander Hamilton to keep the country together.

The next chapter takes us from Lima, Peru to Rome and back. We hear the story of Melchiorre Cafà's 1665 marble sculpture *Blessed Rose* and the saint whose likeness it bears from Taylor Rossini. The journal continues with Tori Paige's account of Laetitia Pilkington, the pioneering author whose memoirs challenged gender norms in eighteenth-century Britain. These four articles highlight trailblazers in history who upheld their principles in the face of serious obstacles.

The journal ends on UW-Madison's own campus with Angela Peterson's history of racial discrimination in our university's Greek system. Angela chronicles the challenges of removing discriminatory clauses from fraternity and sorority constitutions and the troubling tradeoff these institutions made in order to remain on campus and preserve homogeneity. This piece follows in the *ARCHIVE* tradition of unearthing stories of marginalized groups at UW-Madison. While progress has been made toward acknowledging our university's disturbing past of racial discrimination, countless stories are yet to be told. With this piece, our journal is contributing to this ongoing effort.

We would like to thank our faculty advisor, Elizabeth Lapina, whose commitment to quality and expertise in historical writing elevated our standards as a board. Elizabeth never missed a thing. Without her encouragement and determination, this journal would not be what it is today.

Finally, we would like to congratulate the Class of 2020, whose achievements cannot be eclipsed by the cancellation of commencement ceremonies. To our editors and authors from the Class of 2020, this journal is testament to the exceptional writing, reading, and critical thinking skills you have developed through the study of history.

-Isabelle Cook, *ARCHIVE* Editor-in-Chief

Holy Healthcare

Oral Roberts and the Rise and Fall
of the City of Faith, 1960–1990

Benjamin J. Young



City of Faith Hospital, P.W. Hatcher, accessed [online](#).

Benjamin J. Young is a junior at Baylor University majoring in history and religion. He is interested in the histories of religion, culture, migration, and urban life, with a particular focus on the intersection of these themes in American history. This article is an expanded version of an essay written under the guidance of Dr. Philip Jenkins for his Spring 2019 course, “Late Modern U.S. History, 1975-2010.”

Rising from humble origins in southern Oklahoma, Oral Roberts (1918–2009) was the latest in a long pedigree of Christians known as “evangelicals.” Evangelicals had historic roots in the transatlantic Protestant revivals of the mid-eighteenth century and were characterized by their emphasis on individual conversion, the authority of the Bible, and the working of the Holy Spirit.¹ A faith-healing evangelist based out of Tulsa, Oklahoma, Roberts commanded a sprawling evangelical ministry empire that thrived from the 1950s until the 1980s. The Oral Roberts University School of Medicine (ORUSM) emerged in the late 1970s as an outgrowth of the Oral Roberts University, the crown jewel of Roberts’s massive ministry. Roberts envisioned ORUSM as a distinctly Christian medical school committed to fostering the dual healing power of modern medicine and prayer. When Tulsa medical centers refused to cooperate with his venture, he raised funds and built the \$150-million City of Faith Medical and Research Center to serve as the medical school’s teaching hospital. Reality quickly caught up with his grandiose vision. Few beds in his dramatically overbuilt hospital were ever filled, while the complex’s immense financial strain and Roberts’s own mercurial behavior forced the closure of the medical school and hospital in 1989.

The rise of ORUSM and City of Faith is illustrative of the potency that folksy revivalism and charismatic fervor could have during the coming of age of American evangelicalism in the 1970s and 1980s. Moreover, Roberts’s two healthcare initiatives—housed in a skyscraper complex in downtown Tulsa—serve as emblems of how the provincial South’s transformation into the dynamic Sun Belt powered the dramatic surge of the Religious Right in American society. Yet the spectacular failure of Roberts’s mission to bring Christian healthcare into the cultural mainstream illuminates the difficulties that American evangelicals, as members of a populist, diffuse, and personality-driven movement, have faced in effectively channeling their collective resources to form enduring institutions.

Oral Roberts, Sun Belt Religion, and the Origins of the City of Faith Project

The trajectory of Oral Roberts’s life was all too common in twentieth-century America. Born and raised in the agrarian poverty of the American South, his ministry took off soon after

World War II, catapulting him and his image into the cultural life of the burgeoning American middle class.² Roberts's parents belonged to the first generation of converts to Pentecostalism, a movement within evangelicalism that championed ecstatic worship and miraculous healing. At the time of Roberts's birth in rural Pontotoc County, Oklahoma, in 1918, Pentecostalism was just twelve years old, having proliferated across the United States and the world in the wake of the Azusa Street revival of 1906 in Los Angeles. At age seventeen, Roberts experienced what he believed was divine healing from a bout of tuberculosis through the hands of a traveling revivalist. He identified this supposedly miraculous restoration of health as the single most formative moment of his life.³ In 1947, Roberts perceived a spiritual calling to resign his pastorate in rural Oklahoma and become a traveling faith healer. He and his wife Evelyn (1917–2005) moved to Tulsa in that same year to set up the headquarters for his newly-founded ministry, the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association. Tulsa remained his home for the rest of his life.

Through the decades, Tulsa proved to be a fortuitous home for Roberts's ministry. The city found itself on the leading edge of one of the most important megatrends of twentieth-century American history: the explosive growth of a constellation of cities stretching along the southern third of the United States from Charlotte, North Carolina to Los Angeles, California. This region was dubbed the Sun Belt. Scholars debate which factors lie behind the Sun Belt's emergence as an economic titan, pointing to various developments including New Deal-era investment in the rural South, oil and gas reserves in Texas and Oklahoma, interstate highways, the GI Bill, the booming military-industrial complex, and weak labor unions.⁴ Yet none deny that over the course of fifty years, the South quickly transformed from a stratified agrarian society into a region marked by industrial, suburbanized metropolises like Tulsa. Roberts's home state of Oklahoma did its best to market itself as a Sun Belt state, going so far as to emblazon its license plates with the image of a rising sun beginning in 1982.⁵ Put together, these cities rivaled the Northeast, America's long-standing locus of power, in terms of economic vitality, demographic brawn, and cultural influence.⁶

There has been a significant amount of scholarship on how the rise of the Sun Belt has shaped American economic, cultural, and political life. However, few scholarly works have assessed the Sun Belt's rise and its effects on American Christianity, particularly

American evangelicalism.⁷ The career of Oral Roberts is key to understanding the passage of traditional southern evangelicalism (inflected by Pentecostal overtones) into the American mainstream. The growing prominence of evangelical Christianity on the American religious landscape of the 1940s and 1950s went hand in hand with the South's postwar economic transformation. As shall be seen, one crucial historical aspect of the Oral Roberts University School of Medicine was the way it symbolized a form of southern "old-time" evangelical Christianity that adapted itself to the new realities and exigencies of Sun Belt America.

After settling in Tulsa, Roberts took advantage of the South's increasing convergence with the rest of America to become a national celebrity. Roberts's circuits of faith-healing tent revivals quickly spread beyond the South and across the country during the 1940s and 1950s, attracting large audiences seeking supernatural alleviation for their medical ailments. Pentecostalism had always emphasized physical healing through the power of the Holy Spirit, but Roberts elevated it to the singular focus of his ministry. At each tent revival, Roberts would preach a sermon calling on his audience to convert or recommit themselves to Christianity, before inviting invalids to form a line leading to the front of the tent. One by one, he laid hands upon the sick or disabled and prayed that they would receive divine deliverance from their ailments. Many (but, Roberts readily conceded, not all) of those who passed through the prayer line demonstrated apparent evidence of immediate healing. Standing before Roberts's audience, stutterers suddenly spoke with clear diction, the deaf professed a newfound ability to hear, and polio-stricken children walked without crutches.⁸ Roberts used the postwar era's new media formats, particularly radio and television, to capture and publicize these rapturous moments. He also flooded the presses with pamphlets, periodicals, and books that promoted his image as America's faith healer. His early ministry paralleled another giant of twentieth-century American evangelicalism, Billy Graham (1918–2018), who shared Roberts's birth year. Like Roberts, Graham rose to prominence in the late 1940s with a series of revivals across America. If Graham channeled the staid, composed element of evangelical Christianity, Roberts embodied its frenetic, enterprising streak. Both Graham and Roberts, who were friends, became celebrities and thus central contributors to evangelical Christianity's swelling prominence in American public life in the 1950s.⁹

Though Roberts became famous as a conduit of divine healing power in the 1950s, he never disavowed the efficacy of traditional medicine. In fact, from his ministry's beginnings he sought to integrate medicine and prayer-based spiritual healing, a combination that he believed could make the human "whole." The phrase "wholeness" peppered his writings in the 1950s and would become his defining ethos in later decades. At a 1958 revival, Roberts presciently told reporters, "I hope God lets me live another thirty years, for I think by then we'll see an unbelievably close alliance between science and the kind of healing I encourage."¹⁰ Early on, Roberts was contemplating how his faith-healing ministry could be reconciled with modern medicine to achieve human "wholeness."

As attendance at his revivals waned in the early 1960s, Roberts began a new project from which his medical school would emerge. In the summer of 1961, having received what he claimed was a divine charge, Roberts bought 180 acres of farmland at the outskirts of Tulsa, planning to build the Oral Roberts University of Evangelism, an unaccredited, "boot camp" style training center for young soul winners. Roberts's vision for the property quickly changed when his son Ronald (1945–82) began attending Stanford in 1962. Worried about Ronald's exposure to secularism, his plan shifted towards the far more ambitious aim of creating a fully accredited Christian research university.¹¹ When Oral Roberts University (ORU) was established on November 27, 1962, with the Board of Regents culled largely from Roberts's wealthiest ministry supporters, it punctuated a two-decade long proliferation of evangelical institutions. Organizations like the National Association of Evangelicals (1942), Fuller Theological Seminary (1947), World Vision (1950), and Christianity Today (1956) constituted an evangelical renaissance that sought interdenominational unity and a fresh articulation of Protestant orthodoxy more attuned to American cultural life. When Roberts outlined ORU's long-term strategic plan at the initial regents' meeting, a plan that included founding not only the medical school, but also a seminary, law school, and dental school by 1980, he was planning perhaps the most ambitious evangelical institutional undertaking of the century.

Roberts's commitment to keeping his proposed medical school fully tethered to his evangelical convictions made it an unparalleled venture in American medical education at the time.¹² In the early 1960s, evangelical denominations in the United

States operated extensive networks of bible institutes, liberal arts colleges, and seminaries, but medical education remained an untapped field. Baylor University College of Medicine, although attached to a Southern Baptist university, had operated on a strictly nonsectarian basis since its founding in 1903 and would sever its Baptist connections when it became an independent institution in 1969.¹³ Wake Forest University School of Medicine maintained only loose ties with the Southern Baptist Convention.¹⁴ With its sectarian hiring practices and inclusion of evangelical teachings within its curriculum, Loma Linda University School of Medicine, a Seventh-day Adventist institution in California, was the only medical school comparable to what Roberts envisioned.¹⁵ Roberts hoped his university would birth a distinctive medical school with a robust evangelical ethos that trained doctors through a curriculum of both clinical and spiritual healing. His goal was to transition his healing ministry from revival tents to hospital corridors, ushering in a new era in healthcare.

Although American medical schools and hospitals largely maintained a formal, professional distance from organized religion throughout the first half of the twentieth century, by the 1960s a subtler intellectual movement called New Thought had made inroads into American culture and paved the way for Roberts's vision of Christian healthcare to penetrate the mainstream. Having first emerged in the closing decades of the nineteenth century, New Thought attracted writers and theologians from across the spectrum of American Christianity. It offered a fresh spiritual metaphysic: God was fundamentally a Mind, and humans through their own minds could participate in and shape God's action in the physical world. Proponents of New Thought taught their followers that through the power of "right thinking" they could modify the physical world to their liking. Discarding the traditional theological view of salvation as an "external" work of God upon the individual, Christian thinkers influenced by New Thought redefined salvation as the harnessing of the inner spiritual potential of the individual. This view subordinated the material to the spiritual, and thus physical health and wellness became but a reflection of one's inner spiritual vitality, one's ability to make contact with the Divine Mind. In the early decades of the twentieth century, New Thought took root within two very distinct Christian milieux: elite New England Mainline Protestantism and the populist Pentecostalism of the South and Southwest.¹⁶

Bill Reed (1922–2010), an Episcopalian surgeon with close ties to a New Thought-inspired physicians' group in his denomination, became a close friend of Roberts in the early 1960s. By applying New Thought principles to medical care, he helped Roberts hone his vision for a Christian medical school and, eventually, a Christian hospital. Reed evinced his New Thought pedigree in elevating the human being's spiritual condition over their physical condition and arguing that physical illness could not be fully treated without addressing the health of the patient's soul. To cure modern medicine's truncated view of healthcare, Reed prescribed whole-person medicine, a method in which spiritually-regenerated medical personnel administered care, mindful of the spiritual realities that might underlie their patients' illnesses.¹⁷ Through his close friendship with Reed, Roberts himself reached for New Thought vocabulary as he began to articulate how a future evangelical medical school, teaching a prayer-infused form of medicine, could offer holistic healing to the patient's mind, body, and soul. Speaking with Reed to a group of medical professionals in 1964, Roberts stated:

[J]esus goes ... an eternity further [than medical science]. ... he gives life. He heals the person. ... he imparts something, he gives an entire new life. He heals the being. ... I've known of Dr. Reed's vision and your vision for a Christian medical hospital, and I just said, "Well Bill, have you thought about what we plan here? Because I've always thought that spiritual and divine medical healing should be brothers, they should not be alien. ... we're hopeful that there can be some sort of merging of the two groups, that we can have a tremendous medical program in this university so that someday we will have a medical college and we will turn out Holy Ghost-filled medical doctors."¹⁸

Roberts and Reed rejected the notion that physical illness was strictly a physiological phenomenon. The influence of New Thought had expanded their intellectual horizons, and they became convinced that mental activities, like prayer, tapped into a divine dimension that could enact physical healing within the patient. This steadfast belief served as the ideological backbone for Roberts's future forays into healthcare, namely ORUSM and City of Faith.

Mindful of this goal, in ORU's early years, Roberts steered his school towards research university status. He sought to expand its reach beyond the confines of his sectarian Pentecostal

upbringing to encompass the rest of American evangelicalism. As Billy Graham put it when he preached at ORU in 1967, “Evangelical Christendom can be proud today of this university and what it will mean to the future of this country.”¹⁹ Roberts sought to give ORU credibility by courting students and faculty from non-Pentecostal denominations who were sympathetic to ORU’s mission. Whereas for decades, theological, regional, and class distinctions kept Pentecostals an arm’s length away from America’s Christian mainstream, the interdenominational Charismatic Movement, which spread Pentecostal practices into Mainline Protestant and Catholic churches in the 1960s and 1970s, served to bridge this gap. ORU became an institutional hub and refuge for these “Charismatic” Catholics and Protestants, who had come under heavy criticism within their own denominations for selectively adopting euphoric Pentecostal customs like speaking in tongues.²⁰ As if to reinforce the broader ecclesiological trajectory his university was taking, in 1968 Roberts left the Pentecostal Holiness Church, the denomination he was raised in, and joined the well-regarded United Methodist Church.²¹ His efforts to grow his influence in the wider Christian community provided the foundation of support and cooperation he knew would be necessary to establish graduate schools in the future.²²

“An Emotional, Irrational, Religiously-Oriented Campaign”

On April 28, 1975, Roberts caught the attention of many across America when he formally announced that ORU would establish a medical school, alongside law and dental schools. The *Tulsa World* called the announcement a “Breath-Taker,” while the *Tulsa Tribune* called it “An Amazing Plan.”²³ The *New York Times*, noting Roberts’s career as a faith healer, singled out the medical school as the most interesting development among his broader efforts to transform ORU into a research university.²⁴ Roberts’s announcement heralded a deeper, subterranean transformation in American culture. The late 1970s was, as Philip Jenkins notes, an era of Protestant revival in which evangelicals took centerstage after a half century at the edges of American life.²⁵ Jimmy Carter (b. 1924) self-identified as “born-again” during his 1976 presidential campaign, while Christian activists began to coalesce behind increasingly successful grassroots movements to oppose abortion, gay rights, and drug use. In 1979, hardline conservative evangelicals began a takeover of the Southern

Baptist Convention, America's largest Protestant denomination.²⁶ Roberts's announcement placed his budding research university at the vanguard of this growing evangelical presence in American politics and society, extending its institutional reach into fields of law and medicine.

Yet in the months after announcing his plans, the daunting realities of starting a medical school began to present themselves. Roberts struggled to find a hospital partner in Tulsa for the clinical portion of the medical school curriculum, a prerequisite for accreditation. Negotiations between ORU and local hospitals stalled because of widespread opposition among Tulsa's medical community to the proposed medical school. Many Tulsa doctors viewed it as unwelcome competition for Tulsa's existing medical school in the University of Oklahoma system and health regulators speculated that ORU's religious mission would jeopardize its adherence to the established norms of the medical profession.²⁷ The contentious negotiations frustrated Roberts, especially as the medical school's scheduled opening in the fall of 1978 approached. In January of that year, he met with ministry associates to discuss the possibility of ORU constructing its own medical clinic which could eventually be expanded into a hospital.²⁸ Days after, Roberts fantasized aloud at ORU's chapel service, saying "I dream that the hospitals of Tulsa will affiliate with us. Two have turned us down, one is talking favorably. ... But I dream far beyond that ... I dream about those hundred acres across the street, for a great medical center to be erected. ... a healing center, spiritual and medical."²⁹ Roberts strongly believed his Christian medical school would satisfy a great demand for spiritually minded healthcare, but the resistance from Tulsa hospitals indicated that few in the medical establishment agreed.

By Roberts's reckoning, a divine revelation occurred in the height of negotiations that made the Tulsa hospitals' resistance to ORUSM irrelevant. On February 11, 1977, Roberts's daughter and son-in-law died in a small aircraft crash in Kansas. In the aftermath, a grief-stricken Roberts travelled to Palm Springs, California for respite. In his retelling, God spoke to him one evening in his hotel room, instructing him to "build a new and different medical center for Me" in which "[t]he healing streams of prayer and medicine," would merge.³⁰ Furthermore, God purportedly commanded Roberts to name this medical monument "THE CITY OF FAITH."³¹ Roberts immediately made plans for a massive medical complex of three skyscrapers: a thirty-story,

777-bed hospital (later downsized to 294), a sixty-story medical clinic, and a twenty-story medical research center. His plans for the sixty-story clinic were staggeringly audacious. At 648 feet tall, it was slated to be (and remains to this day) the tallest medical building ever built.³² Plans to construct the City of Faith remained confidential until September 1977. Roberts's associates, recognizing the need for a hospital arrangement that could sustain ORUSM until City of Faith was built, continued to negotiate for an affiliation agreement with Tulsa hospital representatives.³³

When Roberts publicly announced his plans to build the City of Faith Medical and Research Center seven months later in September 1977, Tulsa's hospitals immediately pulled back from negotiations with ORU and began to lobby actively to prevent Oklahoma's medical regulators from certifying City of Faith's construction. They feared that City of Faith would exacerbate the already low occupancy rates at existing Tulsa hospitals. As one opponent argued, "the proposed City of Faith hospital ... will have a major deleterious, harmful effect on our health care system in Tulsa and in the surrounding areas of Oklahoma primarily because it will increase health care costs and present us with absolutely staggering manpower problems in this area."³⁴ Debate surrounding the necessity and practicality of Roberts's lavish plans quickly escalated and bitterly divided the city of Tulsa.

In response to their critics, Roberts's ministry prepared a twenty-page brochure, intended for healthcare regulators and prospective financial supporters, that claimed the integration of healthcare with spiritual care would "produce a more potent force for healing than either prayer or medicine alone."³⁵ City of Faith's distinctive integration of evangelical faith and healthcare, they argued, would attract clients from across America. "We're not trying to meet the needs of a specific geographic location," an associate of Roberts explained, "we're trying to meet the needs of a constituency of people."³⁶ Indeed, this optimism about meeting the needs of a "constituency" was not all together misguided. In 1979, Roberts was the most watched televangelist in America, averaging a weekly audience of 2.1 million people.³⁷ His ministry calculated his total audience to be 3.1 million households and 9.3 million people.³⁸ A 1980 survey found that Roberts had 84.1 percent name recognition among the American public, second only to Billy Graham in the religious figures category.³⁹ Nineteen percent of American adults, or 29 million people, identified as Pentecostal or Charismatic in that same year.⁴⁰ Roberts, cognizant

of the rising tide of evangelical fervor, thought he could leverage this nationwide demographic as a continuous reservoir for his hospital's patient base, as well as his medical school's faculty and student body.

Roberts placed great faith in the generosity and enthusiasm for the City of Faith project. He decided to build the \$150 million complex, all at once and debt-free, from charitable donations alone. His supporters responded enthusiastically with both their wallets and their political activism. When it appeared in April 1978 that the Oklahoma Health Planning Commission was going to deny City of Faith's certification of need, his followers flooded the commission's office with more than 400,000 letters.⁴¹ To Roberts's supporters, any resistance on the part of state medical regulators to the City of Faith project, even on financial and logistical grounds, was a coded manifestation of anti-Christian bias. They perceived Roberts's struggles against the Tulsa medical community and the State of Oklahoma as inseparable from growing battles over the spiritual, moral, and political direction of the United States.⁴² For his part, Roberts feigned to reporters that he was, in his own words, "probably the most naïve person politically and of that nature that you've ever met."⁴³ In reality, he lobbied his growing number of contacts in Washington D.C. for support. Crucially, President Jimmy Carter ordered federal health regulators to back off from the pressure they had previously applied on the State of Oklahoma to reject City of Faith's application.⁴⁴ Although an attorney for the Tulsa Hospital Council called Roberts's efforts "an emotional, irrational, religiously-oriented campaign the likes of which the United States has probably never witnessed," the fight over City of Faith was merely an early skirmish in America's intensifying culture wars.⁴⁵ Roberts eschewed the overt partisan activism that many of his fellow evangelical leaders embraced in the lead-up to the 1980 presidential election. However, he took full advantage of the growing association of the evangelical movement with conservative politics in order to rally financial and political support for his vision of Christian healthcare.

With the encouragement of these grassroots movements, the Oklahoma Health Planning Commission certified City of Faith's construction on April 26, 1978, giving a green light for Roberts to enact his sweeping vision of Christian healthcare.⁴⁶ With a long-term hospital affiliation assured through City of Faith, his medical school had crossed a major hurdle to accreditation. In September 1978, the medical staff at Saint John's Hospital in Tulsa

begrudgingly voted by a narrow margin to affiliate with ORUSM, giving the medical school a short-term clinical arrangement until City of Faith was finished.⁴⁷ Moreover, in February 1979, the Liaison Committee on Medical Education officially accredited ORUSM, and it opened to its first full class of students in the following fall.⁴⁸ Robert's ministry took in \$38 million in donations between July 1977 and July 1978, funneling the vast majority of it into City of Faith's construction. Money continued to pour in from donors through 1981 as scaffolds and cranes ascended into the sky. City of Faith's tripartite form increasingly dwarfed the Tulsa skyline. Roberts was ever the capable fundraiser. In September 1980, he told supporters that a few months prior he had seen Jesus, 900 feet tall, staring intently at him beside the unfinished City of Faith complex. Roberts's followers received this revelation as evidence of divine favor, giving an astounding \$88 million in 1980 alone.⁴⁹ Roberts's aspirations for City of Faith were ambitious and grandiose, but his expertise in garnering financial backing for these aspirations ensured their viability, at least in the short term.

Part of Roberts's fundraising success stemmed from the friendships he nurtured with a network of evangelical businessmen across the Sun Belt. In the early decades of the Sun Belt's rise, the fiscally deregulated atmosphere of the region fostered the increasing control of chambers of commerce over the political life of cities stretching from Los Angeles to Atlanta. These tight networks of wealthy, unelected, and staunchly anti-communist businessman held immense power over the municipal governments of rapidly growing cities like Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, and Oklahoma City.⁵⁰ By the 1970s and 1980s, these conservative businessmen were turning their attention to funding evangelical institutions. ORU prized many of them with honorary degrees during the late seventies; in turn, many became avid fiduciary backers of the City of Faith. Without the financial support of these conservative business leaders, beneficiaries of the meteoric rise of the Sun Belt economy, City of Faith's near-miraculous construction would not have been possible.⁵¹ When the complex finally reached completion in November 1981, City of Faith stood as a towering monument to Roberts's effusive evangelicalism, which had migrated from the margins of American society to its center just as millions like Roberts had migrated from the dusty rural South to the glittering cities and suburbs of the Sun Belt.⁵²

Decade of Discontent: City of Faith's Collapse

In its early years, ORUSM was expanding and thriving, attesting to Roberts's ability to recruit enthusiastic students and faculty from across the spectrum of American evangelicalism. Students, like their professors, were eager to embrace Roberts's ethos of integrating medicine with the Christian faith. As one student remarked, "there is a sense of closeness, of common vision [at ORUSM] that I don't think you could find anywhere else. ... everyone has a real sense of cooperation, instead of cutthroat competition."⁵³ Many students planned to serve as medical missionaries after graduating and thus opted to pursue a generalized family medicine track. In fact, family medicine students made up a higher percentage of ORUSM's student population than any other medical school in America.⁵⁴ School officials sought international mission opportunities for students. In 1981 James Winslow chartered a deal with Kenya's president to allow ORU "healing teams" to serve in the country.⁵⁵ The medical school had found its niche and its identity as an evangelical, missions-oriented institution, and it embodied Roberts's New Thought-inspired belief that spirituality was an essential component of effective healthcare.

City of Faith did not share in ORUSM's initial success, however, and quickly fell from the soaring heights of expectation, threatening to bring the medical school down with it. The complex operated at an astounding \$26 million loss in 1982 as officials quickly realized that they had dramatically overestimated the number of patients the hospital would attract.⁵⁶ In the lead-up to City of Faith's construction, the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association had predicted 1.2 million visitors a year,⁵⁷ but in 1982 hospital occupancy dropped to as low as forty-four beds out of 294 total.⁵⁸ What caused this dearth of patients? One observer surmised that City of Faith's purported nationwide patient base was unlikely to come to Tulsa for routine treatments and procedures. At the same time, when these same potential patients developed more serious ailments, few elected to leave behind family and friends in order to travel to City of Faith. The fact that close to 80 percent of City of Faith's patients were local residents suggests that this apparent catch-twenty-two was the root of its patient population problem.⁵⁹ City of Faith was constrained to serving a local population that was already well served by its competitor hospitals in Tulsa. Expanding the flow of patients into City of Faith was

crucial. Without a sufficient population to serve in its affiliate hospital, ORUSM risked losing accreditation.

As the Roberts ministry descended into financial chaos, ministry officials searched for ways to raise the patient population while dissent festered and grew across the university. City of Faith placed ads in the Saturday Evening Post and flooded ministry supporters with direct mail appeals.⁶⁰ “I must confess to you my greatest disappointment,” a newsletter from Roberts chided, “that so many of you who have sent money, planting your seeds of faith in the City of Faith, have not come for your healthcare needs.”⁶¹ Meanwhile, dissensions began to divide ORU faculty outside of the medical school, particularly over a perceived concentration of power in the hands of medical school administrators well-connected to Roberts. Contentious relations within ORUSM, between administrators and medical school faculty, prompted a revolving door of university personnel.⁶²

Perhaps resigning himself to lower-than-expected patient numbers, Roberts, in an attempt to bolster fundraising, turned increasingly to claims that God would produce a comprehensive cure for cancer through ORUSM. Such rhetoric was not entirely out of place, given Roberts’s Pentecostal roots. Pentecostalism had exploded onto the American religious landscape at the beginning of the twentieth century, espousing the efficacy of supernatural healing even when regular medical practices were powerless. Yet Roberts’s boldness was still jarring to observers. In a January 1983 television appearance, Roberts appealed to his followers to donate to ORUSM’s up-and-coming cancer research center, stating that God had promised “a supernatural breakthrough for cancer.” “This is not Oral Roberts talking,” he added, “but the spirit of God through him.” In response to Roberts’s divine invocation, national media interviewed an American Cancer Society spokesman, who opined that “what they’re dealing with is religious beliefs, we’re dealing with science.” Even as mainstream medicine distanced itself from ORUSM, Roberts’s supporters donated \$5 million to the research center, \$1.4 million of which purchased one of the first MRI machines ever developed.⁶³ Despite established medical organizations like the American Cancer Society shunning the City of Faith project, Roberts’s faithful supporters continued to donate to his Christian healthcare mission to keep it, at least momentarily, afloat.

Amidst the turmoil, students and faculty at ORUSM persisted in pursuing a Christian mission. Reflecting the profound influence

of New Thought on Roberts's ministry, staff and students perceived the gathering of minds in prayer to be as effective an instrument for medical care as the scalpel. Surgical staff prayed together before every procedure, and as one physician later recalled, "throughout the operation you'd hear 'amens' and 'hallelujahs.'"⁶⁴ Pharmacists prayed over individual medications as they prepared them for shipment.⁶⁵ Demonstrating Roberts's pro-life commitments, City of Faith opened a birthing center in 1984, built for women considering abortions and offering care "regardless of their ability to pay."⁶⁶ Roberts even fielded questions at staff meetings concerning whether exorcisms should be a component of City of Faith's medical practices. "I'd say there should be, but I don't think we've arrived at that place yet," he commented.⁶⁷ City of Faith's posturing as a distinctively Christian hospital was not mere sloganeering. The institution operated from a different set of premises than mainstream medical institutions. Thus, even as many professors at ORUSM and doctors at City of Faith resigned, having soured on the unpredictability of Roberts's management style, many more eagerly joined the venture to fully unite medicine and faith.

Yet by 1985 sober financial realities had taken hold. Despite Roberts's best efforts to draw in patients, City of Faith continued to linger around 20 to 50 percent occupancy.⁶⁸ Roberts's constant appeals for financial support seemed to weigh on his television audiences, and they began to decrease in size. As a result, he received just \$58 million in contributions in 1985, down from \$88 million in 1980.⁶⁹ Budgets were tightened; several hundred positions at City of Faith were eliminated. Roberts closed ORU's dental school and sold its law school, but held on tightly to the medical school, stating that the university was "drawing a fence around campus here. This is it. We'll not give up anything else."⁷⁰ Fears that the medical school would lose accreditation because of City of Faith's low patient population continued to smolder. Even marketing gimmicks like free American Airlines tickets to out-of-state patients could not reverse low occupancy.⁷¹

Roberts took steps to shore up the medical school's long-term viability. ORU secretly began negotiating with a neighboring hospital to take over management of the City of Faith complex as a cost-cutting measure.⁷² When these covert talks proved unfruitful, Roberts resorted to more overt methods. In March 1986, Roberts claimed to have received a vision from God asking him to raise money for a medical school scholarship program. Roberts had

noted before that many ORUSM students wanted to be medical missionaries after graduation but were prevented by student loan debt. Now, God had prompted him to raise \$8 million to provide full-tuition scholarships for every entering ORUSM student who promised four years of medical missionary service after graduation. However, God purportedly inserted a caveat: if Roberts failed to raise the money in one calendar year (by March 1987), God would “call him home.”⁷³ By January 1987, Roberts was still \$4.5 million away from reaching his goal. His pleas for money became, understandably, increasingly fervent. National media turned Roberts into a punchline, a caricature of dishonest televangelism. In March’s final days, Roberts ascended ORU’s Prayer Tower, vowing to stay there until the total was raised. He warned an ORU chapel audience that failure to reach the fundraising goal would instigate “another twenty centuries without Paul and Luke coming together,” referring to the biblical figure of Luke, the physician who accompanied the apostle Paul on his journeys to spread the Christian faith.⁷⁴ On March 21, a dog-racing track owner from Florida donated a crucial \$1.3 million, explaining to reporters that he “did it in order to save the guy from going to heaven in a hurry.”⁷⁵ Roberts descended from the Prayer Tower on April 1 very much alive and with the \$8 million raised. When he reached the ground and spoke with reporters, he implored the public for another \$8 million.⁷⁶ This was an impossible goal: by now he has lost much of his credibility with supporters and the public alike.

Roberts’s infamous fundraising campaign aligned with two other scandals in 1987, a truly disastrous year for televangelism. In that same year, celebrity televangelists Jimmy Swaggart (b. 1935) and Jim (b. 1940) and Tammy Faye Bakker (1942–2007) were marred by sexual and financial indiscretions. When pressed by reporters about his friendship with Roberts, Oklahoma Governor Henry Bellmon (1921–2009) distinguished Roberts’s increasingly peculiar form of ministry from other scandal-ridden televangelists by calling his friend’s approach “salesmanship.”⁷⁷ Nevertheless, observers had a hard time differentiating between Roberts’s behavior and that of Swaggart and the Bakkers. Roberts himself admitted that a “growing skepticism” of televangelists had dampened his fundraising totals.⁷⁸ Nationwide surveys reflected this skepticism, as one poll in the following year found Roberts had just a 27 percent favorability rating among the public.⁷⁹ As a result of his own theatrics and the snowball effect of the Swaggart and Bakker debacles, Roberts’s donations declined from an average

of \$5 million per month in 1987 to an average of \$2.7 million per month in the early months of 1989.⁸⁰ Built upon his own charisma, Roberts's ministerial empire could only crumble as his reputation declined.

As if in alignment with Oral Roberts's declining fortunes, the situation at ORUSM, although it had once boasted high morale and a clear spiritual mission, began to deteriorate after 1987. In February 1988 medical students learned through a memo that the \$8 million that Roberts had raised in the previous year had not been earmarked for their promised scholarships. It was invested into operating costs, forcing the medical school to strip them of all financial support. Many, unprepared to meet their sudden tuition debts of seventy-one thousand dollars, transferred to other schools in disgust at Roberts's broken promises. Some faculty members resigned in protest as well.⁸¹ Accreditors like the Association of American Medical Colleges and the Liaison Committee on Medical Education circled ORUSM like sharks.⁸² Roberts responded with another \$8 million fundraising campaign to start the program anew.⁸³ A special accreditation visit in the summer of 1988 revealed concerns about high faculty turnover, low funding, decreasing morale, and low occupancy.⁸⁴ Roberts's ministry began mortgaging properties in the Tulsa area to compensate for rapidly decreasing donations, while managerial dysfunction plagued the medical school.⁸⁵ Such dysfunction was on display in September 1988 when the *Miami Herald* revealed that ORU had hired a Florida neurosurgeon with fourteen malpractice lawsuits, including one stemming from a fatally botched procedure that a member of the Florida Board of Medical Examiners called "essentially ... homicidal."⁸⁶ Seventeen medical school professors brought their concerns to the ORU Board of Regents in February 1989, citing the "dictatorial" leadership of Roberts and high-level administrators. The administration doubled down and ten of the seventeen were fired or resigned by July 1989. These firings exacerbated an already tense situation.⁸⁷ If doctors and medical students had once flocked to Roberts's medical ventures, expressing faith that his financial resources and prophetic leadership would inaugurate a new, Christianized era of medicine, their departures signaled a growing apprehension that this vision could not be realized.

Financial circumstances reached a crisis level in the spring of 1989. On March 27, Roberts announced that his ministry needed \$11 million by ORU's graduation ceremonies on May 6 to prevent

creditors from repossessing the university and its holdings.⁸⁸ Roberts's all-or-nothing fundraising campaign attracted concern from locals who, while tiring of his theatrics, understood the economic boon ORU had become to Tulsa. Despite their concerns, the reality was that Roberts's following had decreased markedly from its heights in the late 1970s. By 1989, only half of Roberts's ministry partners from 1985 still gave any money to the ministry.⁸⁹ Somehow, even with a shrunken donor base, Roberts managed to raise \$11 million to keep the medical school and hospital open for the immediate future, often using rhetoric of an impending secularist takeover to galvanize support.⁹⁰

Nevertheless, Roberts's efforts to save the medical school and hospital could not stem the exodus of students. Even though each incoming class at ORUSM numbered only forty-eight students, by May 1989 the Class of 1990 had dropped to twenty-seven. Multiple residency programs were promptly disbanded to free up money for operating costs, embittering the remaining students. "I came to ORU because I liked the ideals of Oral Roberts," said one student, adding "this is a Christian institution, and you'd expect a much higher code of conduct and honor."⁹¹ By August 1989, ORU could no longer financially sustain either the medical school or City of Faith. The \$11 million bandage offered little healing as budget cuts failed to keep pace with plummeting monthly donations.

Besieged by a scarcity of patients, a lack of funding, a demoralized faculty, and a dwindling student body, the ORU Board of Regents scheduled a meeting on September 12 to consider the future of ORUSM and City of Faith. On September 11, Roberts spoke late into the night over the phone with an individual contemplating a \$50 million gift to form a permanent endowment for the medical school, a gift that would have saved ORUSM from financial extinction. In the course of their conversation, however, the individual backed away from the offer. The next morning, on September 12, the Board of Regents voted to close both Oral Roberts University School of Medicine and City of Faith, citing the \$25 million debt that both enterprises had accumulated. Nearly fourteen years after his ambitious announcement and nearly thirty years after he had first conceived of the idea of an evangelical medical school in the Pentecostal faith-healing tradition, Roberts's dream collapsed.⁹² This was the first medical school closure in American in forty years. Within weeks, other medical schools accepted nearly all of ORUSM's students (with the exception of fourth-year medical students, who stayed on to graduate).⁹³ The

remaining doctors at City of Faith quickly resigned their positions and transitioned into private practice in the Tulsa area.⁹⁴ On October 16, 1989, the last patient was discharged from City of Faith.⁹⁵ In the coming years, ORU downsized into a teaching-focused institution, a significant shift from its short-lived golden age as a research university.⁹⁶ Roberts sold the City of Faith facilities to a real estate investment group in 1992, the same year he retired from active ministry.⁹⁷ Currently a mixed-use facility housing independent medical clinics and commercial office space, the former City of Faith complex stands on the Tulsa skyline as an ostentatious reminder of one of the great evangelical institutional endeavors of the twentieth century.

Conclusion

Taken together, Oral Roberts University School of Medicine and City of Faith represent the paradoxical position of strength and weakness of American evangelicalism in the late twentieth century. Oral Roberts harnessed the profound populist energy of this egalitarian and personality-driven movement. This peculiar religious dynamism that stretched far back into American history was born of an age of circuit riders and camp meetings, illiterate preachers and ecstatic worship. Roberts embodied an evangelicalism that came of age in the twentieth century, which eschewed its rural, sectarian, anti-elitist roots and embraced the new middle-class sensibilities of the Sun Belt and technologies like radio and television. Increasingly in the latter half of the century, Roberts and other evangelicals fought for a place at the table of an American political, economic, and cultural elite that seemed increasingly antagonistic to their values. ORUSM and the \$150 million City of Faith complex were twin emblems of this fight, bold expressions of hope that the evangelical gospel (albeit augmented by the novel metaphysics of New Thought) could, should, and would transform the practice of medicine. Built by the contributions of a television-watching congregation scattered across the nation that was attracted to the magnetic personality and bold vision of a folksy preacher from backwoods Oklahoma, ORUSM exemplified how an ever-potent evangelicalism expressed its fervency in a more prosperous, more connected, and more technologically advanced America.

At the same time, the rapid and unceremonious financial downfall of Roberts's healthcare project revealed the inherent

fragility of evangelicalism's newfound cultural power. In the absence of the rigid, hierarchical denominational structures present in Catholicism and Mainline Protestantism, Roberts's singular, magnetic persona was the only locus around which his ministry could coalesce. Beyond the issues of patient recruitment, Roberts's reliance on his own celebrity status meant that as his reputation faltered, the stream of fundraising capital flowing into ORUSM and City of Faith slowed to a trickle, and the long-term viability of his Christian healthcare initiatives declined. To invert the idiom, the ship went down with its captain. These attributes were not limited to Roberts, however, but rather are endemic to American evangelicalism, a diverse trans-denominational movement built on captivating personalities, informal relationships, and fragile coalitions. For all their economic capital, demographic brawn, savvy messaging, and grassroots organizing, American evangelicals failed to firmly grasp the levers of power and cultural influence in the late twentieth century, just as Roberts failed to inaugurate a new era of spiritualized healthcare. In this regard, the story of ORUSM and City of Faith represents the story of American evangelicalism in the late twentieth century as the movement simultaneously thrived and struggled in a rapidly changing nation.

1. This definition of evangelicalism draws from David W. Bebbington's enduring (albeit contested) four-pronged description of the evangelical phenomenon. David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, UK: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1989), pp. 2-17.
2. Despite his outsized influence, only one academic biography of Roberts has been published. See David Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).
3. Oral Roberts, "1964 Talk on Healing and Medicine at ORU" (lecture, Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1964), Oral Roberts University Collection. <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/communities.html>; Oral Roberts, "Oral Roberts Answers Questions on the City of Faith," interview by Jeff Rosser, KTUL, March 14, 1978, transcript, <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/cof/6/>.
4. Matthew D. Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 3-10; Richard M. Bernard and Bradley R. Rice, eds., *Sunbelt Cities: Politics and Growth Since World War II* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1983), pp. 11-16.
5. Bernard and Rice, *Sunbelt Cities*, p. 6.
6. Byron E. Shafer and Richard Johnston, *The End of Southern Exceptionalism: Class, Race, and Partisan Change in the Postwar South* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), p. 12.
7. One excellent treatment of this phenomenon, though limited in geographic scope to Southern California, is Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2011).
8. Oral Roberts, *The Call: An Autobiography* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1972), pp. 49-56; Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 89-97.
9. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 170.
10. "Oral Roberts Despises 'Faith-Healer' Label," *Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent*, February 3, 1958, quoted in Harrell, Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 460.
11. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 207-11.
12. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 365.

13. Charles T. Morrissey, "Baylor College of Medicine," in *Handbook of Texas Online* (Austin: Texas State Historical Association, 2016). <https://tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/kbb07>.
14. "North Carolina Baptists Sever Ties to Wake Forest," *New York Times*, November 12, 1986.
15. "History," Loma Linda University School of Medicine, accessed March 26, 2019, <https://medicine.llu.edu/about/history>.
16. Kate Bowler, *Blessed: A History of the American Prosperity Gospel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 4-26; Donald Meyer, *The Positive Thinkers: Religion as Pop Psychology from Mary Baker Eddy to Oral Roberts*, 2nd ed. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 77.
17. William Standish Reed, *Healing the Whole Man* (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1979), p. 46.
18. Oral Roberts, interview "1964 Talk on Healing and Medicine at ORU."
19. Oral Roberts, *Don't Give Up! JESUS Will Give You That Miracle You Need!* (Tulsa, Oklahoma: Oral Roberts Evangelical Association, 1980), p. 105.
20. Bowler, *Blessed: A History*, pp. 72-73; John Wigger, *PTL: The Rise and Fall of Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker's Evangelical Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 61-62.
21. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 298.
22. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 422-29.
23. "Breath-Taker at ORU," *Tulsa World*, April 30, 1975; "An Amazing Plan," *Tulsa Tribune*, April 29, 1975.
24. "Oral Roberts U. To Train Doctors: \$60-Million Medical School Is Planned for 1980," *New York Times*, May 4, 1975.
25. Philip Jenkins, *Decade of Nightmares: The End of the Sixties and the Making of Eighties America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 83-85.
26. For an overview of the rise of the Religious Right in the late 1970s, see William Martin, *With God On Our Side: The Rise of the Religious Right in America* (New York: Broadway Books, 1996).

27. Helen Parmley, "Oral Roberts' Medical School: God's Will vs. Tulsa's," *Dallas Morning News*, April 6, 1978; Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 375-78.

28. Jerry Sholes, *Give Me That Prime-Time Religion: An Insider's Report on the Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1979), pp. 192-93.

29. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 334.

30. Oral Roberts, "I Will Rain Upon Your Desert," *Abundant Life*, October 1977, 5.

31. Roberts, "I Will Rain Upon Your Desert," 5.

32. Based on publicly available data from the Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat, accessed April 27, 2019, <http://www.skyscrapercenter.com/search?q=hospital>.

33. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 333-35.

34. Dr. C.T. Thompson and Dr. James Winslow, "Channel 8 Interview About the City of Faith with Dr. C.T. Thompson and Dr. James Winslow," interview by Bob Hower, KTUL, January 30, 1978, transcript, <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/cof/1/>.

35. Oral Roberts, "Why We Are Building the City of Faith," (Oral Roberts University, 1977). <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=cof>.

36. Thomas and Winslow, interview "Channel 8 Interview About the City of Faith with Dr. C.T. Thompson and Dr. James Winslow."

37. Peter Applebome, "Troubled Times for Pioneer TV Preacher's Empire," *New York Times*, June 23, 1986.

38. Roberts, "Oral Roberts' Medical School: God's Will vs. Tulsa's."

39. "Survey Bolsters TV Evangelists," *Los Angeles Times*, July 5, 1980.

40. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 421-22.

41. Parmley, "Oral Roberts' Medical School: God's Will vs. Tulsa's."

42. An example of this grassroots support can be found in the writings of a close confidant of Roberts, William Reed; William Standish Reed, "Washington for Jesus," *Lifeline*, February 1980, M.D., Collection, http://digitallibrary.regent.edu/archives/CMFI-Newsletters/1975-1986/1980_0200_CMFI%20Newsletter.pdf.
43. Roberts, "Oral Roberts Answers Questions on the City of Faith," March 14, 1978, Oral Roberts University Collection, <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=cof>.
44. Oral Roberts, interview by John Erling, *Voices of Oklahoma*, August 11, 2009, transcript, <http://www.voicesofoklahoma.com/interview/roberts-oral/>; Meyer, *The Positive Thinkers*, p. 350.
45. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 384-85.
46. Sholes, *Give Me That Prime-Time Religion*, p. 197.
47. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 378.
48. "ORU City of Faith," *Tulsa World*, February 11, 1979.
49. Oral Roberts, "My Journey Into Healing for Millions," *Abundant Life*, September 1980, 10; Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 388-89, 415-20; Applebome, "Troubled Times for Pioneer TV Preacher's Empire."
50. Bernard and Rice, *Sunbelt Cities*, pp. 21-22.
51. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 421-22.
52. Joseph Crespino, "Ronald Reagan's South: The Tangled Roots of Modern Southern Conservatism," in *Living in the Eighties*, eds. Gil Troy and Vincent J. Cannato (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), pp. 44-47; Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 358, 389-90.
53. Kay Johnson, "Students, Hospital Workers Keeping 'Faith' Despite Cutbacks," *Tulsa World*, September 14, 1989.
54. Cathy Milam, "Family Practice Studies Popular With ORU Students," *Tulsa World*, April 23, 1989.
55. 55. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, pp. 379-95.
56. Bernadette Pruitt, "Controversy Plagued Center from Conception," *Tulsa World*, September 14, 1989.

57. "Oral Roberts: Faith in the City of Faith," *Christianity Today*, May 19, 1978.
58. Chris Adams, "City of Faith: A Promise Unfulfilled—National Patient Lure Failed," *Tulsa World*, September 30, 1989.
59. "Fiasco on 81st Street—Miscalculations Doomed Oral Roberts' City of Faith," *Tulsa Tribune*, October 2, 1989.
60. "Major COF Marketing Thrust Begins," *Lifeline: People and Events of the City of Faith Medical and Research Center* 1, no. 1 (October 1982): 1-10; Michael Kerrigan and Mary Hargrove, "Born in Battle - Roberts Fought Medical Community, State to Build Hospital," *Tulsa World*, September 14, 1989.
61. "We are Two Years Old!," *Abundant Life* 37, no. 11 (November 1983): 17.
62. Roger Olson, e-mail message to author, March 19, 2019.
63. Bart Ziegler, "\$5 Million Sent to Fight Cancer," *The Oklahoman*, May 28, 1983; "City of Faith Prepares for NMR Unit," *Lifeline: People and Events of the City of Faith Medical and Research Center* 1, no. 5 (June 1983): 1-8.
64. Mary Ellen Matava, "Doctors Find Peace with God Assisting," *Tulsa World*, January 1, 1995.
65. "Pharmacists Pray and Believe," *Lifeline: People and Events of the City of Faith Medical and Research Center* 2, no. 4 (April 1985): 1-2.
66. Kay Johnson, "City of Faith Delivers Its Last Baby—Lisa Marie Hart Born 7 Hours Before Doors Closed," *Tulsa World*, October 5, 1989.
67. Harrell Jr., *Oral Roberts: An American Life*, p. 454.
68. "Fiasco on 81st Street—Miscalculations Doomed Oral Roberts' City of Faith."
69. Applebome, "Troubled Times for Pioneer TV Preacher's Empire."
70. Cathy Milam, "Roberts to Close Hospital, Medical School," *Tulsa World*, September 14, 1989.
71. Kerrigan and Hargrove, "Born in Battle - Roberts Fought Medical Community, State to Build Hospital."

72. Kerrigan and Hargrove, "Born in Battle - Roberts Fought Medical Community, State to Build Hospital."
73. Randy Frame, "Did Oral Roberts Go Too Far," *Christianity Today*, February 20, 1987.
74. Oral Roberts, "ORU Chapel" (speech, Tulsa, Oklahoma, March 18, 1987), Oral Roberts University Collection. <https://digitalshowcase.oru.edu/cof/22/>.
75. "Track Owner Pledges \$1.3 Million to Roberts," *New York Times*, March 22, 1987.
76. "Oral Roberts Vigil Ends in New Plea for Funds," *New York Times*, April 1, 1987.
77. Jim Myers, "Bellmon Expresses Regret Over Roberts Announcement," *Tulsa World*, September 15, 1989.
78. Cathy Milam, "Med School Was Ministry's Soul," *Tulsa World*, September 17, 1989.
79. Wigger, *PTL*, p. 300.
80. Mary Hargrove, "Richard Roberts Says Ministry in Jeopardy," *Tulsa Tribune*, March 28, 1989.
81. Randy Frame, "\$8 Million Worth of Unanswered Questions," *Christianity Today*, July 15, 1988.
82. Teresa Watanabe, "Oral Roberts Scholarship Money Gone, Students Say—Medical School Freshmen Embittered, May Have to Foot \$71,000 Bills," *Dallas Morning News*, March 27, 1988.
83. Julia Duin, "Roberts' Latest Goal: \$8 Million for School," *Houston Chronicle*, June 11, 1988.
84. Cathy Milam, "Doctors Say ORU School in Trouble," *Tulsa World*, July 23, 1989.
85. Chris Adams, "ORU Took Mortgages in '88 to Pay Bills?," *Tulsa World*, March 29, 1989.
86. Rosemary Goudreau, "Embattled MD Hired by Oral Roberts," *Miami Herald*, September 1, 1988.

87. Chris Adams, "ORU: Departures in Med School—Some Faculty, Students Cite Frustrations," *Tulsa World*, July 17, 1989.
88. Gil Broyles, "Roberts Ministry Needs \$11 Million, Roberts Says," *Tulsa World*, March 28, 1989.
89. Cathy Milam, "Roberts Hurt by Faltering Donations," *Tulsa World*, April 2, 1989.
90. Janet Pearson, "Roberts Says Goal Met—More Funds to Be Sought," *Tulsa World*, May 17, 1989.
91. Adams, "ORU: Departures in Med School—Some Faculty, Students Cite Frustrations."
92. Milam, "Roberts to Close Hospital, Medical School."
93. "ORU Medical Students Seek Transfers to OU, California School," *Tulsa Tribune*, September 22, 1989.
94. Matava, "Doctors Find Peace with God Assisting."
95. Cathy Milam, "City of Faith Releases Its Last Patient," *Tulsa World*, October 17, 1989.
96. John W. Kennedy, "Healing ORU: \$70 million and Mart Green's business acumen are repairing a scandal-scarred school," *Christianity Today*, September 2008. <https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2008/september/8.76.html>.
97. Cynthia Dees, "City of Faith Complex Sold—Amount of Sale Undisclosed," *Tulsa World*, March 20, 1992.

“If They Break This Union, They Will Break My Heart”

Hamilton, Burr, Pickering, and the
Northeastern Secessionist Movement of 1804

Sebastian van Bastelaer



John Lord, *Beacon Lights of History*, vol. 11 (London: James Clarke and Co Ltd., 1902).

Sebastian van Bastelaer graduated in May 2019 from the University of Wisconsin-Madison with a B.A. in History and Political Science. He is now the program manager of the Constitutional Sources Project in Washington, D.C. This is his third time publishing in *ARCHIVE*. His work has also appeared in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* and the *Journal of the American Revolution*.

In July of 1804 Alexander Hamilton lay dying, surrounded by relatives and close friends, in a bed at the house of merchant William Bayard at 82 Jane Street, Greenwich Village. Despite his dire physical condition, Hamilton remained cheerful and eloquent. As his son later recounted, Hamilton freely discussed the current state of American politics and the future of the nation. Contemplating a secessionist movement in the northeastern states, one he had committed himself to thwart no matter the personal or political cost, he spoke with his dying breaths: "If they break this union, they will break my heart."¹

Alexander Hamilton's death at the hands of Aaron Burr had a considerable impact on the American political landscape. Eliminating the standard-bearer and intellectual bellwether of the Federalist Party, the duel was, in essence, the death blow to the faction that had ruled the country throughout the 1790s. Thus, Burr strengthened the Democratic-Republican Party, founded by Thomas Jefferson (all the while destroying any chance of furthering his career within it).

Hamilton and Burr, two former army officers steeped in the honor-conscious norms of the day, partook in an affair of honor at Weehawken, New Jersey, on July 11, 1804. Burr, who was still vice president at the time, faulted Hamilton for his own continued professional failures—having lost the deadlocked presidential election of 1800 in the House of Representatives and, especially, failing to secure the governorship of New York in 1804. Hamilton, the voluble former secretary of the treasury, still had significant influence over Federalists in the Northeast, and used his cachet to secure Burr's defeat on both occasions. In private conversations, Hamilton criticized his fellow New Yorker as dangerous and unprincipled.² Catching wind of this criticism, Burr demanded (and did not receive) a satisfactory explanation in a rapidly escalating exchange of letters, ultimately resorting to a fatal duel.

Scholars have long questioned Hamilton's actions in setting in motion the affair of honor. Given the stakes, why did Hamilton fight so persistently to stunt Burr's political advancement and harm his reputation? Some historians point to Hamilton's long history of personal feuds, his jealousy, and his wariness of Burr's unscrupulousness and lack of a consistent ideology. Yet this generally accepted theory is short on specifics and fails to illustrate the desperation that impelled Hamilton to obstruct Burr professionally. One cannot simply ascribe his actions to pique or self-serving envy. An oft-overlooked explanation pertains to an

abortive secession plot hatched in the northeastern United States in 1804. Disgruntled Federalists, displeased with the South's dominance in Congress, the spread of slavery made possible by the Louisiana Purchase, and the ascendancy of Jeffersonianism, mulled the possibility of creating their own confederacy separate from the United States. This scheme, promoted in large part by former Secretary of State Timothy Pickering, anticipated the Hartford Convention of 1814 and later southern secessionist movements. It threatened the tenuous harmony that had prevailed since the ratification of the Constitution in 1788. The specter of secession still alarmed Hamilton. He had fought for a strong national government and harmonious union throughout his days in the army and in government.

Hamilton's staunch support for the union motivated his opposition to northeastern secessionist movements and, by extension, Aaron Burr's gubernatorial campaign (more on this later). The movement, which Hamilton perceived as a portent of national ruin, was what spurred him to action; his efforts to prevent its consummation led, indirectly, to his death. Yet even after the fateful morning in Weehawken, his words helped to preserve the union and forestall the creation of a northern confederacy, ensuring the United States would remain—for a time—united.

Pickering's Gambit

The election of 1800, often called the "Revolution of 1800" due to the political sea change it signaled, was a truly unprecedented event. The first peaceful, democratic transfer of power in recorded history, it was a triumph for Thomas Jefferson, who had helped direct the opposition to the administrations of Washington and Adams from his Virginia home. This Revolution came as a result of an expanding franchise, which brought previously ineligible middle- and lower-class whites into the electorate. Resentful towards the Federalists' elitism, Anglophilia, and censorship of critics, these voters flocked to Jefferson's side. His election reaffirmed Virginia's predominant status within the union and removed the Federalists from power for good.

As with the American Revolution that had preceded it, however, the Revolution of 1800 produced discontents. Believing themselves the keepers of the American Revolutionary legacy, Federalists "saw their party's defeat in the 1800 presidential

election as a harbinger of the demise of the American republic.”³ Many Federalists, whose base was primarily concentrated in the Northeast, bewailed the rise of southern politicians, particularly those from Virginia. Recent developments had only made this anxiety worse.

Already mourning their loss of power, northerners cast a suspicious eye on the unbridled western expansion that the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 had enabled. Already frustrated by Virginia’s dominance in national politics, the Federalists saw in the Purchase the specter of a nation perpetually ruled by an ever-expanding slave interest.⁴ The largely poor settlers streaming into newly purchased areas tended to be recent immigrants searching for cheap or free land. These tramontane pioneers hated the strengthening federal government and its taxes, and thus predominantly voted for the Democratic-Republicans. New states were created in the West; at the same time, legislatures in the original states liberalized property requirements for suffrage, granting less educated and less wealthy white males the right to vote. These new voters, too, were likely to support Jefferson’s party. It was easy to imagine a government permanently ruled by the planters of the South and the West. Rendering these changes more detestable was the potential addition of more slave states, which promised an expansion of a system many northerners loathed.

The Federalist Party bewailed their lot. As historian Hervey Putnam Prentiss writes, “The continued triumphs of the Republicans threw the Federalists into a condition of hopeless despair. ... As the prospects for a revival of Federalism and a reassertion of New England’s influence in the Union grew blacker, the Federalist leaders turned to desperate measures.”⁵ One of these leaders was Timothy Pickering of Massachusetts. A disciple of Hamilton’s, Pickering had exerted considerable influence as the secretary of state under Presidents George Washington and John Adams. With the rise of the Jeffersonians, however, Pickering’s fortunes waned. In a rapidly shrinking Federalist Party, there were few leaders willing to act decisively to break the southern Democratic-Republicans’ stranglehold on power in the government. President Washington had died, while an aging John Adams had recently endured the humiliation of being denied a second term. Meanwhile, Hamilton, with his proclivity for self-inflicted damage, had created nemeses throughout the nation with his belief in big government. Given to incurring self-inflicted

damage, he also further embarrassed himself by publishing an exposé on his own marital infidelity.

Starved for options, many in the Northeast looked to Pickering for leadership. After his departure from the cabinet, he was elected to be a U.S. senator from Massachusetts and became a vocal opponent of the Jeffersonians. Writing to Judge Richard Peters of Pennsylvania in late 1803, he mourned the fate of their party—and, by extension, the nation. “The end of all our Revolutionary labors and expectations, he wrote, “is disappointment. . . . our fond hopes of republican happiness are vanity, and the real patriots of ’76 are overwhelmed by the modern pretenders to that character.”⁶ A month later, Pickering struck a similar note in a letter to merchant and politician George Cabot: “The Federalists are dissatisfied, because they see the public morals debased by the corrupt and corrupting system of our rulers. Men are tempted to become apostates, not to Federalism merely, but to virtue and to religion and to good government.”⁷ By blaming his rivals for social degradation, he hoped to claim the moral high ground for the Federalists.

In March 1804, the complaints persisted. To Rufus King, who was then running for senator from New York, Pickering confessed, “I am disgusted with the men who now rule, and with their measures. At some manifestations of their malignancy, I am shocked.” He likened Jefferson to a “Parisian revolutionary monster,” equating the Democratic-Republicans with the radicals of the French Revolution. With respect to Jefferson, Pickering concluded: “We have too long witnessed his general turpitude, his cruel removals of faithful officers, and the substitution of corruption and looseness for integrity and worth.”⁸

As one of the principal leaders of his party, Pickering elected to take matters into his own hands. While nearly all leaders of the party, Hamilton and Adams included, freely criticized the Jeffersonians, Pickering and some colleagues in New England went a step further and concocted a radical plan: they would induce their states to break away from the United States. This was not the first of such conspiracies—in 1796, when Jefferson ran to replace Washington, the standard-bearers of Federalism also pondered effecting a separation—but this movement can be considered the first serious essay to split from the union since the ratification of the Constitution.⁹

In writing to King, Pickering had endorsed secession. Absent such a break, he predicted, the Northeast would be ruled

permanently by the slave-holding states in Congress, whose power in the federal government was augmented by their large number of enslaved people, according to the terms of the Three-Fifths Compromise. Referring to politicians elected by swollen slave-state electorates, Pickering asked, "Without a separation, can those [northern] States ever rid themselves of negro Presidents and negro Congresses, and regain their just weight in the political balance? ... You notice this evil. But will the slave States ever renounce the advantage?" This "Democratic phalanx," as he called it, seemed unbeatable.¹⁰ It was time to break the union. "The people of the East cannot reconcile their habits, views, and interests with those of the South and West," he asserted. Pickering also entertained optimistic visions of a peaceful split, predicting, "That this can be accomplished, and without spilling one drop of blood, I have little doubt."¹¹

Federalists such as Pickering claimed, paradoxically, that by breaking the union, they would be preserving the liberal ideals on which it was founded. Historian James M. Banner wrote that the party "grew convinced that the country would split apart and, what is more, that it would have to split apart for its own survival. Disunion, they came to believe, would preserve not only New England but the entire republican experiment."¹² Pickering argued that the South had perverted the revolutionary cause, which must be kept alive, even at the cost of disunion: "The principles of our Revolution point to the remedy—a separation."¹³

Pickering also argued that his opponents had violated and misused the Constitution from which the Revolution had sprung, rendering a secession legitimate. He argued, "paper constitutions are become as clay in the hands of the [Democratic-Republican] potter. ... it will be made to assume any shape as an instrument to crush the Federalists."¹⁴ By couching his appeals in the language of the Revolution and the Constitution, Pickering grasped at a legitimate legal justification for secession. It was the Democratic-Republicans, not the Federalists, who had betrayed the founders' vision; it was thus incumbent upon the northeastern states to keep the revolutionary spirit of independence and liberty alive, even if it meant rupturing the very union that the Revolution had birthed.

Pickering spoke with colleagues in Washington and throughout the Northeast to buttress the scheme. His most active coconspirators included James Hillhouse, Uriah Tracy, William Plumer, and Roger Griswold.¹⁵ Griswold, a lawyer from Connecticut, enjoined others to back secession. In a letter to Oliver

Wolcott Jr., the former secretary of the treasury under Adams, he groused, "The balance of power under the present government is decidedly in favor of the Southern States; nor can that balance be changed or destroyed." Next, he asked, "Can it be safe to remain under a government in whose measures we can have no effective agency?"¹⁶ Struggling for the first time with being a political minority, Federalists considered a break.

To Griswold, Pickering, and others, the insidious southern supremacy in Washington posed an existential threat. "There can be no safety to the Northern States *without a separation from the confederacy*," Griswold summarized.¹⁷ Thus, that separation must be executed immediately. Stephen Higginson, a merchant from Boston, also wrote to Pickering, "We all agree there can be no doubt of its being desirable. ... It is dangerous to continue under the Virginia system."¹⁸

Hoping to cultivate allies throughout the region, Pickering pondered his options. Reflecting on the practicability of secession, he wrote to Cabot, "It must begin in Massachusetts. The proposition would be welcomed in Connecticut; and could we doubt of New Hampshire?"¹⁹ Due in part to New England's commercial ties, he envisioned a confederacy established with British backing, and predicted

the British Provinces in Canada and Nova Scotia, at no remote period, perhaps without delay, and with the assent of Great Britain, may become members of the Northern league. ... A liberal treaty of amity and commerce will form a bond of union between Great Britain and the Northern confederacy highly useful to both.²⁰

The Anglophiles in the Northeast, frightened by the ascendancy of a Francophile Jefferson administration, viewed Great Britain as a vital ally in their scheme.

Pickering and his partners understood, however, that earning the approval of New York was paramount. The second most populous state and home to the biggest city in the nation, it exerted tremendous political and commercial influence on the nation's affairs. Its ports and navigable rivers provided numerous opportunities to trade with peoples all over the continent and throughout the Atlantic world. Pickering understood that New York was the linchpin of the scheme; as it went, other states would follow. He wrote, "New York must be associated. ... She must be made the centre of the confederacy. Vermont and New

Jersey would follow of course, and Rhode Island of necessity.”²¹ While southern politicians could blithely dismiss the prospect of New England splitting, a new confederacy that included wealthy and populous New York at the helm would terrify the southern and mid-Atlantic states. Even the prospect of such a move would, Pickering thought, shake the southern states from their political course. To Cabot, he added, “if a Northern confederacy were forming, our Southern brethren would be seriously alarmed, and probably abandon their virulent measures.”²²

Lacking enough strength to effect separation on their own, and needing the assent of New York to execute their vision, the resolute Federalists sought allies in the Empire State. They tried to induce Rufus King to vouch for secession in New York; the scrupulous King ultimately declined. In the end, they found the champion of their cause in a most unexpected place: the heart of the Jefferson administration.

Burr’s Greatest Humiliation

Aaron Burr, born in New Jersey in 1756, hailed from a family of intellectuals and spiritual leaders. The grandson of Jonathan Edwards, the fiery preacher who gained fame during the First Great Awakening (1730s-40s), Burr had entered the College of New Jersey (now Princeton), of which his father was president, at the age of thirteen. Taking the American side in the Revolution, he became an officer in the Continental Army. After the war, he had become a lawyer and made a foray into politics. An expert at understanding and exploiting popular sentiment, Burr had the reputation of switching sides on a whim. Originally a Federalist, he had been elected senator in 1790 and ran for president in 1796 and 1800 as a Democratic-Republican. In return for his efforts in ensuring New York’s support for Jefferson in 1800, Burr was promoted to the vice presidency. When an electoral college tie forced a vote in the House of Representatives, however, Burr appeared poised to become president, as many in the Federalist-controlled chamber feared Jefferson. It is unclear to what extent, if at all, he actively campaigned for votes in the House. Yet Burr refused to bow out entirely, to the chagrin of the Democratic-Republican leaders. Hamilton, though calling Jefferson “a contemptible hypocrite,” conceded that the Virginian was “by far not so dangerous a man [as Burr] and he has pretensions to character.”²³ In the end, a frightened Alexander Hamilton

and his allies convinced their colleagues to hand Jefferson the presidency—a principled man with whom they disagreed was preferable as president to a man with no principles. Burr’s ambition and apparent betrayal of Jefferson during the vote rendered him persona non grata in Washington, excluded from inner circles and certainly cut out of the 1804 ticket. Ostracized and isolated, he sought redemption. He found his chance in his home state of New York.²⁴

Burr sought to trade places with outgoing governor George Clinton, who was Jefferson’s presumptive second-term vice president. Now excluded from most Democratic-Republican circles which had promoted him four years prior, he turned to the very Federalists whom he had beaten in 1800 (and who had denied him the presidency). The Democratic-Republicans had gained a strong advantage in New York; both Burr and his main opponent, State Supreme Court Chief Justice Morgan Lewis, ran under that party’s banner. Burr thus understood that in order to win he would have to not only earn a fair share of that party’s supporters, but also court votes from the remaining New York Federalists.

Burr and his former rivals each saw the other as the only hope to save their flagging fortunes. Leaders in the state rightly distrusted Burr but detected no other suitable options. Roger Griswold wrote that “I have been induced to look to New York; and, as unpleasant as the thing may be, to consider a union in the election of Colonel Burr as the only hope which, at this time, presents itself of rallying in defence of the Northern States.”²⁵ He later sighed, “In short, I see nothing else for us.”²⁶ Many of the disaffected in New York thus began to coalesce behind Burr. In late February, the *New York Morning Chronicle* avowed that only he could redeem the North’s cause.²⁷ Though Cognizant of Burr’s ambition and mutability, Federalists nevertheless saw in him a charismatic and politically deft leader who could help bring about New York’s secession.²⁸

Burr understood the role he could play for the Federalists; he also grasped that they, in turn, were necessary to fulfill his own ambitions. In private meetings with some leaders, the vice president railed against his old allies in Washington, by whom he had been effectively excluded. This offered hope of New York’s accession to the secession plot. Griswold wrote to Oliver Wolcott Jr. that Burr “speaks in the most bitter terms of the Virginia faction, and of the necessity of a union at the northward to resist it.”²⁹ Ron Chernow, author of an authoritative

biography on Hamilton, writes, "Without committing himself, the inscrutable Burr kept alive hopes that, as New York governor, he might encourage state residents to forge a union with the New England states."³⁰ Burr refused to tip his hand while appeasing the leaders whose aid he sorely needed. Emboldened by this apparent encouragement, separatists planned a meeting of regional delegates to be held in Boston. Jefferson would, they assumed, win reelection; with Burr as the governor of New York, though, they could finally create a new nation, one that could redeem the revolutionary values they believed had been sullied.

In order for Burr to win, he needed the backing of a unified Federalist bloc. That would prove impossible without the sanction of the de facto head of the party in New York, Alexander Hamilton. Burr and Hamilton knew one another quite well. Like Burr, Hamilton had served with distinction in the Continental Army; they both viewed military glory as a means to further their own political careers in a newly meritocratic society. Hamilton also became a lawyer, arguing landmark cases both with and against Burr. In the courtroom he was long-winded and eloquent, Burr, clear and succinct. In spite of their commonalities, there was a strong rivalry between the two. Hamilton, who had been Jefferson's arch nemesis in the Washington administration, feared Burr's duplicity. Emboldened by his success in influencing the election of 1800, he flew into the fray in 1804, intending again to stymie Burr.³¹

As he was accustomed to do, Hamilton pursued this goal with gusto. He still held considerable sway in his home state, and "threw all his weight against Burr."³² Sending letters and giving speeches at his usual frenzied pace, he denounced Burr as shift and untrustworthy.³³ Hamilton's surrogates duly abandoned Burr, penning attacks in Federalist newspapers. What resulted was a new record for the worst defeat in a gubernatorial election in the (albeit brief) history of New York. Though Burr narrowly won New York City, Morgan Lewis took the election by a final tally of 30,829 to 22,139.³⁴

The ignominy of defeat was too much for Burr. Soon after the loss, he wrote to a friend that he was "determined to call out the first man of any respectability [who was] concerned in the infamous publications concerning him."³⁵ Quickly, he set his sights on Alexander Hamilton. Burr's fury, mingling with the status-conscious Hamilton's touchiness, created a crisis that quickly spun out of control, culminating in a request to duel.

This challenge was not uncommon; duels (or threats thereof) were commonplace in the early United States. Eighteenth-century America was a place in which honor was an invaluable social currency. Since there was no established gentry, the wealthiest and most powerful members of society were fearful of losing their rarefied place in society. Joanne Freeman, an expert on politics in the days of the Early Republic, summarizes: “the code of honor did more than channel and monitor political conflict; it formed the very infrastructure of national politics, providing a governing logic and weapons of war.”³⁶ Impelled by Hamilton’s obstruction and frustrated by the collapse of his political career, Burr was bound to commence an affair of honor. On July 11, at dawn, Burr and Hamilton exchanged shots at Weehawken. While conflicting reports emerged regarding who was the first to fire—whether Hamilton had missed the mark prior to Burr, shooting, or had reflexively pulled the trigger upon being wounded—Hamilton was mortally wounded, dying hours later.³⁷

Hamilton’s Fatal Heroism

Given the nature of early-nineteenth century society, why would Hamilton so willfully undermine Burr? Hamilton was conscious that his meddling might have led to a duel, having witnessed a number of such affairs and nearly partaken in others himself. Though notoriously sensitive, he was also shrewd, conscious of the implications of his attempts to undermine Burr. Why, then, would he venture to humiliate his colleague? Some contemporaries and historians give a rather simple explanation: Hamilton, especially insecure about his station given his impoverished upbringing, could not stand witnessing the ascent of one of his rivals in New York. His jealousy and animosity towards Burr, they argue, motivated his actions. At the time, a Federalist congressman admitted that he “consider[ed] Hamilton’s antagonism to Burr as springing from personal resentment.”³⁸ Prentiss claims, “The elevation of his arch-enemy to a post of such importance was for him an unbearable thought.”³⁹

Yet this argument falls short. While the former treasury secretary was certainly ambitious and considered Burr a rival, their prior personal history was far from exceptional; Hamilton had had several rivals throughout his life. He had sparred with such noted figures as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Adams, and James Monroe. Hamilton and Monroe had nearly fought a

duel themselves in 1797; none other than Aaron Burr interceded to prevent the exchange of bullets.⁴⁰ Though he had on multiple occasions stood in his path, Hamilton's relationship with Burr was certainly not unique: the man had many enemies. While frequenting the many social circles they shared, the pair was often friendly with one another. In later years, Burr merrily referred to "My friend Hamilton, whom I shot."⁴¹

If Burr thought the election of 1804 an opportunity for vindication, Hamilton saw in it a situation pregnant with danger. Burr's candidacy in the election, given the potential implications it had for national harmony, was a tocsin. Despite his own disdain for Jefferson and the southerners' rule, he had a personal and emotional stake in the salvation of the union. It was his lifelong commitment to national solidarity, rather than petty personal envy, that proves a more satisfying explanation for Hamilton's comportment in the first half of 1804. The northeastern conspiracy was, he deemed, a grave peril to the national unity he had forged during his military and political careers. Throughout the war with Great Britain, he had promoted a strong central government with sufficient powers to maintain peace, establish strong financial footing for the new nation and act as a bulwark against the occasionally violent impulses of the populace. He later joined the very Congress whose impotence he had scorned. Hamilton's record of service in legislative capacities and as secretary of the treasury demonstrates an unshakable commitment to bolstering the union. While Burr was intriguing in state and national politics in the 1790s, Hamilton had been tirelessly setting in motion the wheels of the federal government.⁴² As historian Broadus Mitchell affirms, "His every action and advocacy was premised upon national solidarity."⁴³

Specifically, no better example of Hamilton's longstanding and firm commitment to unity exists than his work on *The Federalist* (later called *The Federalist Papers*). Written in concert with John Jay and James Madison in the late 1780s to advocate adopting the Constitution, this work is considered a cornerstone of American political theory. In these writings, Hamilton expounded his theory on the benefits of a large, strong government, which he deemed categorically superior to smaller confederacies. His opposition to a balkanized system of smaller polities helps to explain the vigor with which he opposed the Northeastern Secessionist Movement of 1804.

To Hamilton, the futility of a system of small, regional confederations was irrefutably self-evident. He touched on the subject in over a dozen installments of *The Federalist*. In the sixth article, he wrote:

A man must be far gone in Utopian speculations who can seriously doubt that, if these States should either be wholly disunited, or only united in partial confederacies, the subdivisions into which they might be thrown would have frequent and violent contests with each other. ... To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighborhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages.⁴⁴

In the eighth essay, he elaborated, citing “an established truth that the several States, in case of disunion ... would be subject to those vicissitudes of peace and war, of friendship and enmity, with each other.” Further, in the fourteenth installment, he opined, “a separation would be not less injurious to the economy, than to the tranquility, commerce, revenue, and liberty of every part.” Evidently, separation portended violence and devastation to Hamilton.⁴⁵

Convinced of these truths, Hamilton set out to avert the election of Burr, hoping to salvage national unity. That Aaron Burr was the separatist movement’s champion was not what mattered; given Hamilton’s demonstrated commitment unity, one imagines he would have employed similar tactics against any other figure in Burr’s place. His correspondences and public addresses in the prelude to the election focus primarily on the danger Hamilton detected.

Hamilton capitalized on his own high standing in the party to dissuade Federalists from uniting behind Burr, who had come to personify secessionism. At a meeting in Albany in February 1804, Hamilton addressed his Federalist colleagues. He acknowledged that Burr could, in theory, be a desirable candidate, given his pedigree and experience. Yet the elevation of Burr, he argued, would only encourage the conspirators. If New Yorkers, who understood the implications of his election, gave their endorsement, it would seem an implicit approval of the entire scheme. By electing Burr, they would be pledging their support for any scheme he may propose: “This will give him fair play to disorganize New England if so disposed.”⁴⁶ Given

Burr's opportunism and narcissism, the approval of his peers and constituents could encourage him to seek more power, potentially as the president of a new nation.

While still in Albany, Hamilton encountered his friend and former fellow soldier, Adam Hoops. Hoops broached the subject of secession, at which point the excitable Hamilton immediately grew anxious. As Hoops recounted, "The idea of disunion he could not hear of without impatience ... and expressed his reprobation of it *using strong terms*." He continued to protest until legal business drew him away; according to Hoops, "The subject had taken such fast hold of him that he could not detach himself from it until a professional engagement called him into court."⁴⁷ On another occasion, when approached by Major James Fairlie of New York, Hamilton emphasized his deep-rooted antipathy. According to Fairlie, he recalled that "he had been applied to in relation to that subject by some persons from the eastward." Despite his disdain for the current government's tack, he stressed, "I view the suggestion of such a project with horror."⁴⁸

In a letter to Robert G. Harper, a Federalist from Maryland, Hamilton revived a favorite political strategy, linking his opponents to the Jacobins, the main perpetrators of the bloody Reign of Terror of the French Revolution: "You will conclude from this that I do not look forward to [Burr's] success with pleasure. The conclusion will be true. It is an axiom with me that he will be the most dangerous chief that *Jacobinism* can have." Much like Pickering had done in maligning Jefferson, Hamilton sought to link Burr to chaos, anarchy and the specter of an American Reign of Terror. He concluded, "a dismemberment of the Union is likely to be one of the first fruits of his elevation, and the overthrow of good principles in our only sound quarter, the North, a result not very remote."⁴⁹ Hamilton went beyond fearmongering; there was a clear moral component to his rhetoric.

In the same letter to Harper, Hamilton demonstrated his uncompromising resolve to preserve the nation. Remarkably dispensing with the partisan rancor that had characterized his political style, he declared that he would prefer the destruction of the Federalists to the establishment of a confederacy in the Northeast. Thus, he promoted Chancellor John Lansing Jr. for governor, a remarkable move given Lansing's status. Lansing, who in the event was not elected governor, was a Jeffersonian who had been an unflinching Anti-Federalist during the constitutional debates of 1788, sparring with Hamilton in the process. Hamilton

framed his choice as one borne of patriotism, rather than mere politics: "I had rather see Lansing governor and the party broken to pieces. This will be no bad state of things for those who really love their country & understand its true interest."⁵⁰ Hamilton had been the leader of the party since the Constitution had been ratified, and he had been its most articulate defender. Yet his role as a party chief, evidently, was disposable to Hamilton, given the stakes.

Even after Morgan Lewis' victory, Hamilton strove to destroy the fading conspiracy. In the period leading up to the duel, Hamilton continued to speak out. At a dinner party, he conferred with his friend John Trumbull, who was planning on attending the assembly in Boston in the fall: "You are going to Boston. You will see the principal men there. Tell them from ME, at MY request, for God's sake, to cease these conversations and threatenings about a separation of the union. It must hang together."⁵¹ His final political letter, written to Theodore Sedgwick of Massachusetts on the eve of his fateful meeting with Burr, naturally pertained to disunion: "I will here express but one sentiment, which is, that Dismembrement [*sic*] of our Empire will be a clear sacrifice of great positive advantages, without any counterballancing [*sic*] good."⁵² Hamilton's persistence in stopping the plot, even as he was preparing for a violent encounter he had provoked with his intermeddling and insults, demonstrates his nationalistic ardor. His vocal support for unity was a key factor in his decision to oppose Burr, and thus ensured his own death. Taking precedence over personal rivalries and transcending the 1804 gubernatorial election, this passion had the effect of saving a nation even if it meant sacrificing one of its most able exponents.

In the end, it was Hamilton who played the most significant role in heading off disunionism, in life and in death. As Mitchell concludes, "Hamilton was a sacrifice to his national loyalty."⁵³ That sacrifice was vital in keeping the United States together. Shaken by the death of their ideological leader, and by now resigned to the futility of secession, Federalists ended up calling off their meeting in Boston. Thus, the 1804 plot met with failure. Hamilton's last political gamble had worked, vindicating his mortal struggle with Burr.

Conclusion

Years later, even his former political enemies, who had spent much of their careers deriding the upstart immigrant, begrudgingly recognized Hamilton's loyalty to his country. Their writings reveal a shared belief that it was his pro-union sentiment, rather than personal resentment, that led him to oppose Burr. John Quincy Adams, a longtime critic of the treasury secretary's character, later acknowledged that Hamilton would likely have survived absent his stand in defense of the nation.⁵⁴ Even Jefferson later referred to "the known principle of General Hamilton never, under any views, to break the Union."⁵⁵ When members of the Revolutionary generation dredged up the 1804 secession controversy in the late 1820s, James Madison discussed Hamilton's commitment to attend the meeting in Boston, rejecting the notion that his former nemesis had advocated disunion. He asserted that Hamilton only would have ventured to go to the meeting in Boston "to dissuade his party and personal friends from a conspiracy as rash and wicked, and as ruinous to the party itself as to the country."⁵⁶

We now see, then, that Hamilton's uncompromising backing of the union, rather than personal enmity, was the true motivating factor in his relations with Burr. The task of convincing his colleagues to disavow the vice president transcended the petty personal politics of the day; indeed, it was rooted in his patriotism. In a rather ironic twist, Hamilton's willingness to risk his life hastened the decline of the Federalist Party that he had shepherded during the fledgling nation's early years. Roundly defeated in 1804, they never regained the presidency or control of Congress. Southerners ruled continually from 1801 until 1825. Even John Quincy Adams, a northerner whose father had been a Federalist, ran as a Democratic-Republican in 1824. As his letter to Harper illustrates, however, Hamilton likely would have accepted this fate for the nation. He preferred to see his party collapse if it meant preserving the union. While his personal rivalry with Burr had bearing on his conduct in 1804, it was this decades-long pursuit of union that drove him to frustrate the ambitions of his rival, even at the cost of his own life.

1. John C. Hamilton, *The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States*, p. lxxxix, quoted in Ron Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton* (New York: Penguin Books, 2006), p. 708.
2. Joanne Freeman, *Affairs of Honor: National Politics in the New Republic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), p. xviii.
3. Andrew Siegel, "Steady Habits' Under Siege: The Defense of Federalism in Jeffersonian Connecticut," in *Federalists Reconsidered*, eds. Doron Ben-Atar and Barbara B. Oberg (Charlottesville: UVA Press, 1998), pp. 203, 205.
4. Samuel Henry Wandell and Meade Minnigerode, *Aaron Burr; a biography written, in large part from original and hitherto unused material* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1927), p. 256.
5. Hervey Putnam Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering as the Leader of New England Federalism, 1800-1815* (Salem, MA: Essex Institute Historical Collections, 1933), p. 24.
6. "Timothy Pickering to Richard Peters, Dec. 24, 1803," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism, 1800-1815*, ed. Henry Adams (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1905), p. 338.
7. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, January 29, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 339.
8. "Timothy Pickering to Rufus King, March 4, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 351.
9. Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering*, p. 23.
10. "Timothy Pickering to Rufus King, March 4, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 352.
11. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, January 29, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 339.
12. James M. Banner, *To the Hartford Convention: The Federalists and the Origins of Party Politics in Massachusetts, 1789-1815* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970), p. 110.
13. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, January 29, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 339.

14. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, January 29, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 339.
15. Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering*, p. 25.
16. "Timothy Pickering to Oliver Wolcott, March 11, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 361.
17. "Roger Griswold to Oliver Wolcott, March 11, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 356.
18. "Stephen Higginson to Timothy Pickering, March 17, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 361.
19. Wandell and Minnigerode, *Aaron Burr*, p. 257.
20. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, March 4, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 341.
21. Wandell and Minnigerode, *Aaron Burr*, pp. 256-257.
22. "Timothy Pickering to George Cabot, March 4, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 341.
23. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 632, 634.
24. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 191-92, 616-28, 650-72.
25. "Roger Griswold to Oliver Wolcott, March 11, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 355.
26. Wandell and Minnigerode, *Aaron Burr*, p. 259.
27. *New York Morning Chronicle*, February 22, 1804, in Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering*, p. 30.
28. This intuition was borne out by events only a few years later; in 1807, Burr was tried for treason for allegedly attempting to foment a violent rebellion in the West and creating a new nation of which he would be president; only John Marshall's strict definition of treason saved the erstwhile vice president from the gallows.
29. "Roger Griswold to Oliver Wolcott, March 11, 1804," in *Documents Relating to New England Federalism*, p. 354.
30. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, p. 672.

31. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 190-94.
32. E.P. Powell, *Nullification and Secession in the United States: A History of the Six Attempts During the First Century of the Republic* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1897), p. 131.
33. David O. Stewart, *American Emperor: Aaron Burr's Challenge to Jefferson's America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2011), p. 29.
34. *Interview in Weehawken: The Burr-Hamilton Duel as told in the Original Documents*, eds. Harold C. Syrett and Jean G. Cooke (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1960), p. 35.
35. *Interview in Weehawken*, p. 29.
36. Freeman, *Affairs of Honor*, p. xviii.
37. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, Chapter 42.
38. *Interview in Weehawken*, p. 35.
39. Prentiss, *Timothy Pickering*, p. 29.
40. Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 537-41.
41. Roger G. Kennedy, *Burr, Hamilton, and Jefferson: A Study in Character* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 81.
42. Broadus Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure, 1788-1804* (New York: Macmillan, 1962), p. 522.
43. Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure*, p. 522.
44. Alexander Hamilton, James Madison and John Jay, *The Federalist* (1787-1788).
45. Hamilton, Madison and Jay, *The Federalist*.
46. Alexander Hamilton, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 26, eds. Harold C. Syrett and Jean Cooke (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961), p. 189.
47. "Letter from Adam Hoops to James A. Hamilton, March 30, 1829," in *Library of Congress Alexander Hamilton Papers*, reel 30, in Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, p. 678.

48. "Letter from Major James Fairlie to John Church Hamilton, March 21, 1829," in *Library of Congress Hamilton Papers*, reel 30, in Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, p. 678.

49. "Alexander Hamilton to Robert G. Harper," in Hamilton, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 26, pp. 191-92.

50. Hamilton, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 26, pp. 191-92.

51. Hamilton, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, vol. 26, p. 310.

52. "Alexander Hamilton to Theodore Sedgwick, July 10, 1804," in Hamilton, *Papers of Alexander Hamilton*, p. 309.

53. Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure*, p. 522.

54. Mitchell, *Alexander Hamilton: The National Adventure*, p. 521.

55. Dumas Malone, *Jefferson and His Time*, vol. 4, p. 430, in Chernow, *Alexander Hamilton*, pp. 678-79.

56. James Madison, *Letters and other writings of James Madison*, vol. 4 (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott and Co., 1865), pp. 31-32.

A Rose in the Wilderness

The Challenge of Melchiorre Cafà's
Blessed Rose (1665) in the Atlantic World

Taylor Rossini



Image courtesy of Shawon Kinew.

Taylor Rossini is a senior at Middlebury College, where she majors in art history. Her interests center on the early modern Spanish world with particular focus on Baroque sculpture and court culture. Taylor had the opportunity to delve into Spanish visual culture during her junior year abroad at the University of Oxford. This article is Taylor's senior thesis, for which she received Middlebury's Christian A. Johnson Thesis Prize, awarded annually to a senior in the art history department.

On June 15, 1670, Melchiorre Cafà's marble *Blessed Rose* arrived at the port city of Callao on the coast of Spanish Peru, thousands of miles from its place of production in Rome. Upon receiving the sculpture at the dock, the people of Callao carried the enormously heavy, nearly life-size Carrara marble as far as the city's royal chapel. Women trailed the procession carrying lit candles and crossing Callao's many canals "without stopping for anything, [even though] they had shoes and stockings on."¹ The viceroy sent carts and mules to relieve the people of their burden and transport *Blessed Rose* into Lima. The people were reluctant to give her up, however, and threw stones at the mules. On August 26, 1670, Cafà's marble was feted with great pomp in Lima and installed in the city's Convento de Santo Domingo. *Blessed Rose* arrived in the convent just over fifty years after the death of the woman whose likeness it carried—St. Rose of Lima (1586–1617).

St. Rose, born Isabel Flores y Oliva in Lima in 1586, was rechristened after her mother experienced a vision of a rose blooming over the child's face.² According to her hagiographers, Rose sought to emulate the Dominican mystic St. Catherine of Siena from her earliest years. She reportedly took a vow of chastity at the age of five and subjected her body to intense self-flagellation in imitation of her spiritual mentor. A vigorous campaign by Peruvian Dominicans led to her beatification in 1668. She was canonized just three years later in 1671. St. Rose became the first canonized saint to have been born in the New World.

At the heart of this paper is the contention that moving objects mean different things in different places. Using Melchiorre Cafà's sculpture *Blessed Rose* (1665) as a case study, this paper examines how one devotional object negotiated two discrete epistemological frameworks. Produced in Rome in anticipation of Rose's beatification, the sculpture conforms to a recognizably Roman aesthetic. At the same time, the marble was commissioned with a transatlantic journey in mind. While earlier scholarship has viewed Cafà's marble as a European superimposition—transplanting the spiritual legitimacy of the Roman "center" to the South American "periphery"—this paper instead approaches *Blessed Rose* as a material agent within the larger "Catholic Atlantic." This framework, proposed by Allan Greer and Kenneth Mills, treats the Atlantic Ocean as a link rather than a gulf, allowing us to recognize more easily the shared aspects of Catholic culture on both sides of the Atlantic.³ Ultimately, this paper argues that Cafà's marble served as a successful mediator between the micro-Christendoms

of Rome and colonial Lima. In her role as a link between both sites, *Blessed Rose* assumed a status nearly equivalent to the body of the saint itself.⁴

The Burden of Idolatry: Cafà's Marble in Rome

The relationship between the spiritual and material had preoccupied the Catholic world for centuries. This debate about the appropriateness of material props for worship resurfaced in the sixteenth century in response to the iconoclastic polemic of northern reformers like Martin Luther. Luther's Reform church likened Catholic use of devotional imagery to idolatry, as worshippers could confuse *representations* of saints with the saints themselves. The Catholic response, codified in the edicts of the Council of Trent (1645–63), argued that such images were not idols, but rather visual aids to contemplation and devotion. Cafà's marble was commissioned at a time when the aftershocks of this debate continued to ripple through Roman artistic discourse.

Sculpture was, however, a particularly problematic medium for the Catholic Church. Three-dimensional devotional art was capable of intense naturalism, able to evoke a human presence through the skill of the artist. Some movements within the Catholic Church, such as the Jesuits, made use of this naturalism for highly sensory, experiential modes of worship. Yet, this naturalism had the potential to provoke accusations of idol-worship. This tension between useful and dangerous naturalism was implicit in the artistic landscape in which Melchiorre Cafà worked. *Blessed Rose* was perhaps commissioned as early as 1663, when a papal committee for Rose's beatification was summoned. The sculpture would ultimately serve as a visual addendum to the Dominican campaign for Rose's sanctification.

Melchiorre Cafà (1636–67) was a sculptor uniquely situated to inform a Dominican aesthetic program in the mid-seventeenth century. Cafà's brother Giuseppe was an active member of the Order of Preachers, and it was through this familial connection that Cafà's forged his relationship with the Dominicans. Born in Birgu (Vittoriosa), Malta, Cafà entered Ercole Ferrata's (1610–86) workshop in Rome in the late 1650s, where he began a stellar career in emulation of Bernini's. Unfortunately, Cafà "accomplished little, and lived shortly," according to his biographer Lione Pascoli, as he tragically died in a fatal workshop accident at the age of thirty-one.⁵

Blessed Rose conforms to an ideologically “safe” sculptural type. The reclining female saint, often depicted at the moment of her death, escapes the assertive vertical presence of the idol. Rose recline—incontestably horizontal—upon an austere, rocky pedestal. The resemblance between the rocky ground and the ridges of Rose’s garment aligns the thrust of her body to the earth, neutralizing any idolatrous agency in the marble. The sculptural type of the recumbent female saint, however, offers more than just a rebuttal to the vertical idol. The recreation of the physical body of Rose transforms the marble itself into a relic, blurring the distinction between the physical and sculpted bodies of the saint. Thus, objects like *Blessed Rose* could simultaneously function as both a representation and a relic of the saint. It is perhaps telling that the Council of Trent addressed both relics and sacred images in the same decree, entitled “On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics, of Saints, and on Sacred Images.”⁶

Although Cafà’s marble was ultimately destined for the New World, *Blessed Rose* occupied this dual role of representation and reality in Rome. Cafà’s marble was displayed in Rome for two years during the proceedings for Rose’s sanctification, which offered a material supplement to the campaign for Rose’s beatification. Cafà’s treatment of Rose conforms to a markedly Roman aesthetic, contextualizing an “exotic” figure within the stable visual genealogy of European sanctity. During the campaign for Rose’s beatification, the Dominican Order harnessed the rhetorical clout of Rose’s imitative spirituality, emphasizing her similarity to St. Catherine of Siena in particular.⁷ Pre-beatification documentation misidentified the date of Rose’s birth (April 20) in order to coincide with Catherine’s feast day (April 30).⁸ Furthermore, during the solemnities surrounding the formal proclamation of Rose’s beatification in the cathedral of Lima in 1669, a Dominican preacher noted that if Rose was not greater than Catherine, neither was the latter “holier (*más santa*) than the Virgin Rosa.”⁹

The liturgical theatre surrounding Rose’s sanctification situated the aspirant Peruvian saint within a recognizable Catholic hierarchy of sanctity. The festivities for Rose’s beatification, which lasted for a month, began on April 15, 1668 in St. Peter’s Basilica, reportedly in the presence of as many as nine thousand devotees. A *relazione* by Claude Bouillaud, the procurator of Rose’s saintly cause, describes the ephemeral architecture constructed for the celebration, which was reported throughout the continent. The spectacle included the ceremonial unveiling of Cafà’s marble

on the main altar of St. Peter's Basilica.¹⁰ By May 13, 1668, the festivities transitioned to the Dominican setting of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, recycling visual and textual materials from the celebrations at St. Peter's. An ephemeral structure erected in front of the main altar was buttressed by columns carrying statues of female Dominican saints and *beatas*—including St. Catherine of Siena—all crowned with Rose's eponymous wreath of roses.¹¹ The altar at the center of the apparatus was surmounted by "Rose sleeping, with an angel about to wake her up"—Cafà's marble.¹² This visual contextualization within a Roman pantheon of sanctity was strategic on the part of the Dominican Order. Rose's visual equation with the Virgin and St. Catherine of Siena detached her from the unstable religious context of Spanish Peru—in which Catholic missionary efforts clashed with indigenous religious practices—and inserted her into a stable visual genealogy of European sanctity. The Dominican festive program thus employed Cafà's marble in order to rationalize and legitimize Rose's claim for official recognition. Furthermore, because Rose's physical body was interred in Lima, Cafà's marble served as a surrogate, functioning as a relic of marble rather than flesh.

Coordinated transatlantic Dominican efforts ensured a successful campaign for Rose's canonization just three years later, in 1671. Cafà's marble, however, was absent from the sanctification ceremony at Santa Maria sopra Minerva on August 4, as the statue had been shipped to Lima the previous year. Similarly, the tomb for the Jesuit St. Francis Xavier (1506–52) by Giovanni Battista Foggini (1652–1725) was displayed for two years in Florence before its relocation to Xavier's resting place in Goa. Likewise, *Blessed Rose* was shown in Rome, the spiritual center of Catholicism, before its deployment to the so-called "religious periphery."

St. Rose Returns to Lima

Josephe de Mugaburu (d. 1686), a peninsular Spaniard and military man living in Lima, describes the arrival of *Blessed Rose* in Peru in his personal diary. The grandeur of *Blessed Rose's* reception reveals the significance of the occasion for the population of colonial Lima. Rose herself, as the first person from the New World canonized in the Roman Catholic Church, was the trophy of Dominican missionary success in the Spanish Americas. Its arrival on Peruvian shores not only signified the Roman

legitimation of a fervently adored local mystic, but also the return of the holy body of Rose to Lima. Because papal edict precluded the veneration of Rose's relics before her canonization, the procession of Caf 's marble from Callao into Lima denotes Rose's physical return to Lima, despite her relics' interment there for over fifty years. *Blessed Rose* thus receives the ceremonial treatment of a relic rather than simply a representation of a holy figure.

Like the arrival of Caf 's marble, Rose's death produced a fanatically zealous response in her native Lima. She died around midnight on August 24, 1617 in the private home of Gonzalo de la Maza (1563–1628), an educated member of the local religious elite who had ties to Rose and many of her spiritual contemporaries. By the next morning, people of all classes in Lima thronged to her corpse, creating such havoc that de la Maza required the assistance of the viceregal guard to maintain order as the population of Lima flooded his house.¹³

During her lifetime, Rose had been a highly visible figure in her native Lima. Unlike cloistered nuns, the religious lives of *beatas* like Rose existed at least partially in the public eye, creating an audience for their displays of piety. Rose's notorious self-flagellation was largely hidden from the public. The intensity of her devotion nevertheless permeated public discourse. Members of her family regularly heard the "uproar of her scourgings," referring to the sounds of her self-flagellation. Rose was a frequent presence in the house of de la Maza where she "could not contain her screams" of divine ecstasy, often in the presence of other guests. A fluctuating cadre of confessors, intercessors, hagiographers, and civic figures—often linked to de la Maza and his residence—mediated between Rose's highly private mysticism and a public hungry for evidence of the miraculous. Rose's spiritual stature among de la Maza's circle was complemented by a zealous popular following.

Upon her death, Rose's body, highly valued for its relic potential, was fervently pursued by her followers in Lima. The corpse's ceremonial procession to the Convento of Santo Domingo—the plans for which had included a ritual prayer for the dead at each of the eight blocks between the house and the church—was cut short for fear that the processional party "could not pacify the huge crowd" and only "a small part of her corpse" would reach its tomb.¹⁴ The pursuant mob stole flowers from her crown, pulled out her hair, and cut off pieces of her habit. One especially fervent devotee reportedly even managed to acquire a finger, either "with a knife or with their teeth."¹⁵ When the

adoring crowd prevented Rose's burial the next morning, the prelate postponed the funeral and ordered Rose to be buried secretly within the convent's private monastery.¹⁶ Rose remained interred within the monastery until 1619, when her body was moved to the chapel of St. Catherine of Siena within the Convento de Santo Domingo.¹⁷

Meanwhile, the Peruvian Inquisition, growing ever more wary of female mystics, ordered her papers, clothes, and relics to be confiscated in an attempt to suppress her burgeoning cult. They feared that, if left unregulated, her followers could potentially foster improper devotional practices.¹⁸ It was not until fifty years later, when Rose's beatification became official, that her relics were allowed by papal bull to "be exhibited for public veneration by the faithful."¹⁹ In August 1669, Rose's relics and remains were returned to the convent. Caf  's *Blessed Rose* arrived in Santo Domingo the next year.²⁰ Thus, the arrival of Caf  's marble, in concert with official recognition of Rose's sanctified status, denoted access to the physical body of the saint. Rose's body, rendered incomplete by the ardor of popular veneration at the time of her death, was symbolically and spiritually made whole with Caf  's marble.

The so-called "relic-sculpture," in which the materiality of the object is conflated with the divine flesh of the depicted holy person, had assumed great discursive potency in seventeenth-century Europe. In the Catholic world, sculpture was continuously dogged by the ideological burden of close proximity to the idol. However, as discussed above, the convention of the prostrate female saint, to which Caf   adheres, curbs the idolatrous agency of an ideologically precarious medium and, as such, was well-suited for the destination of a New World so "afflicted" by idolatry. The tension between useful and dangerous naturalism, implicit in Europe, became explicit in the Spanish Americas.

By Rose's lifetime, Peru had spent "centuries subjected to the tyrannical yoke of the Idols."²¹ The Dominicans were the first to enter the region in their holy mission and take up scriptural arms against the "idolaters." Missionary guidebooks cast the Andean people as devious, relentless idolaters. In his manual for "inspectors" of idolatries, the Jesuit Pablo Jos   de Arriaga warns that some Indians hid their "idols" inside pedestals of statues of saints, in altars, or at the foot of a monstrance. Others used the same cloth to make a robe for the Virgin Mary and a cloak for their sacred objects or *huacas*.²² Between 1617 and 1618—the year immediately following St. Rose of Lima's death—idolatry

extirpator Fernando de Avendaño (d. 1655) discovered, in a single inspection of a handful of villages in the archdiocese of Lima, 679 “ministries of idolatry” (Catholic churches harboring idolatrous forms of worship), sixty-three practicing sorcerers, and 603 *huacas* as well as other evidence of the residents’ polytheistic and syncretic practices.²³ These locals and their sacred objects were brought to Lima, where their “idols” were burned alongside embalmed bodies of their ancestors in an *auto de fé* (“act of faith”) in the Plaza Mayor.

Perhaps even more than native conversion, the absence of the ruling Spanish monarch from New Spanish soil posed the central ideological challenge of the colonial project. Unlike their colonial contemporaries, peninsular subjects could hope to see their king at least once in their lives, and his unseen presence could thus be corroborated by corporeal evidence.²⁴ Such sightings might take place when the monarch made triumphal entries into European cities, took part in public religious rituals, or participated in *autos de fe* in Madrid’s Plaza Mayor. In contrast, the physical body of the king would never be present in the New World, and thus his presence was constructed through the mediation of material surrogates.

When, in 1622, King Philip IV ascended to a temporary throne on the center stage of Lima’s Plaza Mayor in celebration of his proclamation ceremony, it was not His Majesty, but rather a “lifelike copy of the King” measuring two yards tall by one and a half yards wide (with an additional half yard for its frame).²⁵ Adorned with gold trimmings, chains, diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and topaz and inscribed with the words, “Long Live the Catholic King Philip IV for Many Happy Years,” the full-length portrait of the Spanish monarch surveyed his remote dominions with a half smile and expressive eyes, “which undoubtedly communicated a look of authority.”²⁶ The *audiencia* stood and removed their hats as the “King” climbed the stage with the assistance of four men. Once His Majesty was seated under a royal canopy, the royal magistrates took their seats and again covered their heads. French cultural theorist Jean Baudrillard notes, “Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being, or the concept. It is the generation by models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal.”²⁷ For a colonial public who would never experience the physical presence of Philip IV, royal simulacra—in this case, a life-size portrait—created a reality reliant on absence.

Baroque metaphysics allowed for the conflation of symbol and the symbolized. Bernard Cohn has argued that in seventeenth-century India

the body of the ruler was literally his authority, the substance of which could be transmitted in what Europeans thought of as objects. Clothes, weapons, jewels and paper were the means by which a ruler could transmit the substance of his authority to a chosen [person].²⁸

In Peru, the Spanish monarch was known to his subjects primarily through emblems, royal insignia and signatures, and other “relics” of kingship. But, it is the *wholeness* of an object like the King Philip IV who ascended the stage in Lima in 1622—life-size and representative of the entire royal person—that truly reconstructs his presence on foreign soil.

Cafà’s *Blessed Rose* likewise created a reality reliant on absence. While Rose’s physical relics had been inaccessible, and thus absent, for the decades preceding her sanctification, the procession of Cafà’s marble into Lima denoted the return of the holy presence of the saint. Rose’s body had been rendered incomplete by her frenzied followers at the time of her death. Thus, even after Rose’s true relics were installed in the Convento de Santo Domingo in 1669, her body was symbolically reconstituted in whole with Cafà’s marble, just as the king’s body was reconstructed on New Spanish soil with a material surrogate.

The Materiality of *Blessed Rose*

Cafà’s sculpture was, by virtue of its very materiality, an anomaly in the Spanish Americas, as the lustrous white Carrara marble from which it was carved is not found in the New World. The Convento de Santo Domingo, where *Blessed Rose* would ultimately reside, was home to a marble *Christ at the Column*, and the Lima Cathedral housed a marble *Virgin and Child*.²⁹ Despite their medium, neither object exhibits the overwhelming whiteness that so distinguishes *Blessed Rose* in the Peruvian landscape. The *Christ at the Column* was carved from heavily veined, yellow Siena marble; the *Virgin and Child*, although also Carrara marble, is dull and mottled. Pure white materials like ivory or Huamanga alabaster (a stone indigenous to the Ayacucho region of Peru) were used to adorn wooden polychrome devotional figures in the New

World. Such materials offered a pallor and smoothness considered appropriate for the representation of holy flesh. This equation of whiteness and holiness almost inevitably assumed racial connotations within a Spanish colonial context. It is important to note, however, that such objects were not wholly composed of either ivory or Huamanga alabaster, but often only utilized the whiteness of the ivory or stone for the figure's face, hands, and feet. In contrast, the entirety of *Blessed Rose's* figure is Carrara marble, suggesting a unity of form that lends itself to conflation with the body of the saint.

Rose's contemporaries would have been more familiar with another type of sacred sculpture, such as the vibrantly polychromed (painted) wooden *Virgin of the Rosary* in Santo Domingo, to whom Rose herself was a fervent devotee. Saturated with texture and color, Balduc's *Virgin* reflects a taste for colorful naturalism, which flourished in the Spanish Americas. The New World preference for polychromed wood makes it all the more extraordinary that Cafà produced a marble sculpture for the Peruvian Dominicans who commissioned *Blessed Rose*. Cafà had already proven himself more than capable of sculpting in wood, as is evident in a *Virgin of the Rosary* for the Church of St. Dominic in Rabat (Malta) created only a few years before.³⁰ Ultimately, the uniqueness of Cafà's white marble "transcends [the sculpture's] own making."³¹ The foreignness of the medium and craftsmanship, in a sense, erases the sculptor's hand. It is as if *Blessed Rose* were dropped into Lima from another, holier realm. Sanctity was thus constructed through inimitability, rather than conformity to the local idiom.

Conclusion

When *Blessed Rose* arrived in Lima, it became the first monumental Roman Baroque sculpture to enter the New World. In Rome, she was widely considered one of Cafà's masterpieces, a demonstration of great artistic potential halted by the artist's tragic, early death. It is perhaps more difficult to assess the success of Cafà's marble in the New World. Tristan Weddigen notes *Blessed Rose's* failure as a self-proliferating prototype in Lima, suggesting that Cafà's marble was uniquely incompatible with the aesthetic of Peruvian worship.³² However, as this paper argues, it was the singularity of Cafà's marble within its ultimate context that furthered the impression of its sanctity.

That Cafà's marble was not replicated in any medium in the New World is remarkable. The seventeenth-century world, and the Spanish Americas in particular, participated in a culture of copies, in which compositions were continually, if not incessantly, reworked across styles and media. The lack of emulation of *Blessed Rose* in the Spanish Americas attests to the sculpture's status as a relic rather than an art object. The statue was not a type to be copied, but rather a uniquely sacrosanct object. In contrast, in Italy, Cafà's composition was widely replicated in bronze. As discussed above, material surrogates for unseen presences were fundamentally embedded within the colonial order of the Spanish Americas, establishing an ideological framework for the local understanding of Cafà's *Blessed Rose* as the saint herself. Indeed, the devotional fervor with which it was greeted—which rivaled the violently fanatic public reception of Rose's physical body upon her death in 1617—attests to the Peruvian perception of *Blessed Rose's* sanctity.

While there exist no known direct iconographic descendants of Cafà's marble in the New World, St. Rose of Lima pervaded the transatlantic Christian visual landscape across culture and media. By the eighteenth century, Giovanni Battista Tiepolo (1696–1770) painted Rose into a *sacra conversazione* with fellow Dominican mystics at roughly the same time as an anonymous Peruvian craftsman carved depictions of episodes from her life in Huamanga stone. In a testament to the relentless circulation of people and objects throughout the Catholic Atlantic, the Peruvian artist derived his iconography from an illustrated seventeenth-century life of Rose authored by a Spanish Jesuit and engraved by a Flemish printer. Such disparate expressions of Rose's saintly identity attest to a shared visual culture of the Catholic Atlantic.

Ultimately, one devotional object mediated the ideological challenges of two distinct cultural frameworks an ocean apart. As this paper argues, Cafà's marble served as a surrogate for the holy body of St. Rose of Lima. This role positioned *Blessed Rose* as an object of shared devotion in Rome and Lima, bridging the transatlantic divide. Cafà's marble does not supersede the practices or aesthetic of Peruvian worship; rather, it exists in dialogue with them as an active material agent, not a monolithic Roman statement. The sensuously Roman *Blessed Rose* took root in an unlikely home thousands of miles from her native land, a testament to the fluctuation of meanings attached to objects as they travelled through the early modern world.

1. Josephe de Mugaburu, *Chronicle of Colonial Lima; the Diary of Josephe and Francisco Mugaburu, 1640-1694* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1975), p. 159.
2. Frank Graziano, *Wounds of Love: The Mystical Marriage of Saint Rose of Lima* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 85.
3. Kenneth Mills and Greer Allan, "A Catholic Atlantic," in *The Atlantic in Global History, 1500-2000*, eds. Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra and Erik R. Seeman (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007).
4. Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000* (Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), esp. Introduction and Chapter 16.
5. J. Waterworth, *The Council of Trent The Twenty-Fifth Session: The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent*, trans. H. J. Schroeder (London: Dolman, 1848), p. 235.
6. Waterworth, *The Council of Trent*, p. 235.
7. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, p. 53.
8. Ronald J. Morgan, "Heretics by Sea, Pagans by Land: St. Rosa de Lima and the Limits of Criollismo in Colonial Peru," in *Spanish American Saints and the Rhetoric of Identity, 1600-1810* (Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 2002), p. 79.
9. Fr. Juan de Isturizaga, *Sermón en la publicación de la beatificación de la Beata Rosa de Santa María, Patrona del Perú. Predicó en la Santa Iglesia Metropolitana de Lima* (Madrid: Domingo García Morrás, 1670), p. 5.
10. Morgan, "Heretics by Sea, Pagans by Land: St. Rosa de Lima and the Limits of Criollismo in Colonial Peru," 104; Shawon K. Kinew, "New Sources for Melchiorre Cafà's 1665 Sculpture of Rose of Lima," *The Burlington Magazine* 158, no. 1358 (2016): 345-348.
11. Anonymous, *Relazione...per La Beatificatione Della b. Rosa Di S. Maria Indiana Del Terzo Ordine Di S. Domenico* (Rome: n.p., 1668).
12. Tristan Weddigen, "Materiality and Idolatry: Roman Imaginations of Saint Rose of Lima," in *The Nomadic Object: The Challenge of World for Early Modern Religious Art*, eds. Christine Göttler and Mia M. Mochizuki (Boston: Brill, 2018), p. 105.
13. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, pp. 111-12.

14. Cayetano Bruno, *Rosa de Santa María: La Sin Igual Historia de Santa Rosa de Lima, Narrada Por Los Testigos Oculares Del Proceso de Su Beatificación y Canonización* (Quito: Librería Espiritual, 1992), p. 178; Leonard Hansen, *La bienaventurada Rosa peruana de S. Maria de la Tercera Orden de Santo Domingo, su admirable vida y preciosa muerte* (Melchor Sanchez, 1668), p. 341.
15. Hansen, *La bienaventurada Rosa*, pp. 345–46.
16. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, pp. 112–13.
17. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, p. 115.
18. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, pp. 115–16.
19. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, p. 118.
20. Graziano, *Wounds of Love*, p. 118.
21. Leonard Hansen, *Vida Admirable de Santa Rosa de Lima*, trans. Jacinto Parra (Vergara: Centro Católico, 1895), p. 55.
22. Pablo José de Arriaga, *Extirpación de la idolatría del Pirú* (Lima: Gerónimo de Contreras, 1621), p. 58, quoted in Ramón Mujica Pinilla, “Hell in the Andes: The Last Judgment in the Art of Viceregal Peru,” in *Contested Visions in the Spanish Colonial World*, ed. Ilona Katzew (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 186–87.
23. José de Arriaga, *Extirpación de la idolatría del Pirú*, p. 8, in Mujica Pinilla, “Hell in the Andes: The Last Judgment in the Art of Viceregal Peru,” p. 187.
24. María José del Río Barredo, *Madrid, urbs regia: la capital ceremonial de la Monarquía Católica* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2000), pp. 23–32, 44–82, 199–234.
25. “Relacion de la solemnidad y fiestas . . . en el nombre del Rey nuestro Señor Felipe quarto . . . [1621],” *Cédulas y Provisiones*, vol. 3, Archivo Histórico Municipal de Lima (AHML), in Alejandra Osorio, “The King in Lima: Simulacra, Ritual, and Rule in Seventeenth-Century Peru,” *Hispanic American Historical Review* 84, no. 3 (August 1, 2004): 447.
26. “Relacion de la solemnidad y fiestas . . . en el nombre del Rey nuestro Señor Felipe quarto . . . [1621],” cited in Osorio, “The King in Lima: Simulacra, Ritual, and Rule in Seventeenth-Century Peru,” 448.

27. Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), p. 1.
28. Bernard S. Cohn, "The Command of Language and the Language of Command," *Subaltern Studies* 4 (1985): 279.
29. Weddigen, "Materiality and Idolatry: Roman Imaginations of Saint Rose of Lima," p. 137.
30. Louise Rice, "Cafà's Conclusion," in *Melchiorre Cafà: Maltese Genius of the Roman Baroque*, ed. Keith Sciberras (Valetta: University of Malta, 2006), pp. 140–41.
31. Weddigen, "Materiality and Idolatry: Roman Imaginations of Saint Rose of Lima," p. 144.
32. Weddigen, "Materiality and Idolatry: Roman Imaginations of Saint Rose of Lima," p. 145.

Scandal and the City

Laetitia Pilkington's Critique of British Mid Eighteenth-Century Gender Norms

Tori Paige



Image courtesy of Clark Young, accessed [online](#).

Tori Paige is a graduating senior at the University of Wisconsin-Madison majoring in English and history. Her studies focus on Soviet history, and she has recently completed her senior honors thesis on Soviet women in World War II. After graduation, she will spend a year working with AmeriCorps before pursuing a graduate degree in Russian history. This article was written for Professor Suzanne Desan's capstone seminar, "Identity and Autobiography in Eighteenth-Century Europe," in Spring 2019.

Describing her husband's affair years later, Laetitia Pilkington recalled that although his actions seemed "an odd manner of Life for a Clergyman," she said nothing, "being unwilling to offend him."¹ Pilkington (1712-50) was a typical member of Dublin's Anglo-Irish upper class, which meant that, as a woman, she held a subordinate position in her marriage. While she maintained the image of a content wife to family and friends, she pretended not to be aware of her husband Matthew's affairs. Pilkington was not opposed to committing her own marital affair; she was caught alone in her chamber with another man, Robert Adair, in 1737. Whereas a husband's infidelity was not legal grounds for divorce, a wife's was. Left without income or shelter, Pilkington eventually found a way to support herself by publishing memoirs.

After her divorce, Pilkington relocated to London. During the eighteenth century, Ireland was a satellite state controlled by Great Britain. A minority group of Anglo-Irish, social elites who followed British cultural and religious practices, governed the nation. Members of this Anglo-Irish class described themselves as "British," and for the sake of simplicity, this essay will employ the label "British" to encompass characters and high society in both Ireland and England.

Pilkington's memoirs, which she published in three volumes, chronicled her marriage and her interactions with the British upper class. In 1748, Pilkington published her first volume that exposed her husband's unfaithfulness during their marriage. The second and third volumes, published in 1748 and 1754 respectively, focused more broadly on the hypocrisy of gender relations in British society. She discussed the mistreatment of her and other women by prominent men. Her memoirs sometimes deviated from the truth; she undoubtedly invented parts of conversations and perhaps even fabricated entire accounts in her later volumes. Pilkington shifted from the standard "scandalous memoir" style in her first volume to more novelistic writing in her later two volumes.² Her original aim was to obtain an income and to clear her name. During the eighteenth century, a number of women accused of adultery published memoirs to defend their honor.³ Pilkington, alongside Teresia Constantia Phillips (1709-65), represented early writers of this style. Memoirists rejected allegations of their extramarital affairs and portrayed themselves as their husbands' victims. In her first volume, Pilkington followed this pattern in order to garner sympathy from her audience. In Pilkington's second and third volumes, she innovated as she began

to employ common features of the eighteenth-century novel, digressions and satire, to critique the duplicity in British high society. In these two volumes, she both explored double standards in marriage and challenged narratives of women triumphing through virtue that were portrayed in novels of manners, a popular genre of fiction that taught young women how to behave in society. Pilkington turned to novelistic techniques of digression and satire in her later volumes, using both to criticize double standards between men and women. In contrast with novels of manners that were intended for young women, she aimed for her memoirs to educate men.

Turning Scandal into Salary

In eighteenth-century British society, women received harsher punishments for extramarital affairs than men. Although Pilkington knew of her husband's indiscretions, she could hardly contemplate a divorce. Upon marrying, a woman transferred her property and inheritance to her husband.⁴ If a couple divorced, the husband retained his ex-wife's monetary holdings and paid alimony.⁵ A husband's infidelity did not alter these terms. However, if a woman committed adultery, she lost her right to alimony, and her husband immediately gained child custody.⁶ With no alimony or income of their own, divorced women had few options to avoid poverty. Friends and family members, wary of tarnishing their own reputations, often denied monetary assistance and distanced themselves from the divorcees. In 1738, Pilkington's husband divorced her and denied her alimony. Ten years later, she got revenge and improved her financial standing by publishing the first volume of her memoirs.

Emerging in the mid-eighteenth century, scandalous memoirs provided divorcees accused of adultery a venue to assert their virtue while earning an income. Pilkington penned her first volume in the late 1740s when the scandalous memoir was still a relatively new literary trend. The style gained more attention in the 1770s and 1780s when George Anne Bellamy (1731-88) and Elizabeth Gooch (1757-1807) published their works. These memoirists discussed the scandals that caused their societal disgrace, yet they refigured the narratives to present themselves as victims. They denied accusations that they started their affairs by maintaining that they had been seduced or tricked by men. In actuality, many of these memoirists had willingly taken up lovers.

By framing themselves as victims, however, women could appeal to the public for sympathy and funds.⁷

Pilkington's first volume contained a linear timeline that depicted her life before she moved to London. She described her marriage with Matthew and his mistreatment of her. Pilkington returned to Dublin before publishing this volume, intending to market her writings to her former social circles. She named old acquaintances but did not cite their position in society, probably expecting that the majority of her audience would be able to identify them. Wishing to restore her reputation, Pilkington addressed the people who had known her and Matthew and had witnessed her "fall" from society. Pilkington utilized the memoir to clear her name and help her obtain a salary.

After she was accused of adultery, members of high society ostracized Pilkington. During her marriage, many admired Pilkington for her intellect, and she often read poems aloud to visitors at social gatherings. In particular, Pilkington referred to her literary mentor and renowned Irish satirist Johnathon Swift (1667-1745) frequently throughout her memoirs. During her marriage, Pilkington and Swift often met. Swift admired Pilkington's quick wit and helped her to improve her writing. After the divorce trial, however, her social circles shunned her. Swift even dubbed Pilkington "the most profligate whore in either kingdom."⁸ In her memoirs, Pilkington appealed to her former companions' sense of compassion. She wrote that she hoped "none of the honorable Persons mentioned in them as having once been my Friends will be offended at [her first volume]."⁹ In entreating her former social circles to not take offense, Pilkington hoped her acquaintances would be forgiving; however, no reconciliation between Pilkington and her former friends was possible.

After her divorce, Pilkington had no source of income. She attempted to receive alimony from Matthew by threatening to sue him in a church court. Church courts would sometimes force the husband to take back his former wife or to pay alimony if the wife could prove that he too committed adultery.¹⁰ Reluctant to undergo another court case, Matthew privately settled with Pilkington and promised to pay her a small annuity.¹¹ The only amount she ever received from him, however, was sixpence and a note in which he reminded her of "the Temptations to which Want exposes [her] helpless Sex."¹² Thus, while in London, Pilkington became a professional writer of poems and pamphlets.

Pilkington, like many writers, could not afford to publish her works and relied on printing through subscription publishing. This method entailed creating interest around future writings and finding subscribers who would promise to buy the finished product. However, finding subscribers for her work proved difficult because the process involved one-on-one meetings in which Pilkington often ended up receiving propositions for sex. Therefore, in order to earn a comfortable living and avoid the indignities of searching for subscribers, Pilkington required a wealthy patron. She called upon many potential candidates, but no one was willing to financially support her. At one point, she pinned her hopes on Sir Hans, a reputed patron of the arts.¹³ After she implored him for patronage, he taunted her, "Poor Creature! I suppose you want Charity; there's Half a Crown for you."¹⁴

As she often received potential subscribers in her lodgings, Pilkington had to maintain the image of a wealthy poet. She purchased furniture and kept on a servant. These expenses put a considerable strain on her finances, and she was eventually sentenced to debtor's prison for failing to pay her rent. When she beseeched her subscribers for help, most proved reluctant to offer assistance. Her distant relative, Dr. Meade, replied, "I have so many Applications for Charity, that it is impossible for me to relieve all; those from your Country alone are very numerous."¹⁵ Pilkington remained in prison for nine weeks, until Colley Cibber, a fellow writer, raised enough funds for her release. Her imprisonment, along with the snide responses to her pleas for help, prompted Pilkington to write her experiences as a scandalous memoir.

In her first volume, Pilkington detailed her childhood, her married life with Matthew, and the period that followed her divorce before she moved to London. She presented herself as a victim, who was abused not only in marriage, but by her family. Pilkington described her childhood as miserable. She claimed to have taught herself how to read because her mother had cared more for "the Beauty of the Face, than the Improvement of [her] Mind."¹⁶ When Pilkington had asked for clarification on spelling or vocabulary, her mother had often slapped her or boxed her on the ears.¹⁷ Additionally, Pilkington insisted that her mother had rejected every man, other than Matthew, who had made her a marriage offer.¹⁸ Pilkington said that she had not even had a say in her own wedding. She claimed that her mother had wanted the wedding to be a secret, presumably so people would assume the two had eloped. Pilkington alluded that, as Matthew had had

a lower social standing, her mother had not wanted people to think she had encouraged her daughter's marriage. Pilkington had rejected her mother's request, yet she had been forced to marry Matthew the next morning with her parents as the only witnesses.¹⁹ Most likely, Pilkington married Matthew willingly and had merely objected to having such a small ceremony. In her description of events, however, Pilkington maintained that she had never wanted to marry Matthew, suggesting that she was not responsible for the marriage gone awry.

Pilkington claimed in her first volume that Matthew was the only one who had committed adultery in their marriage, rejecting accusations of her own affair. Pilkington claimed that Matthew had wanted a divorce, and thus had encouraged his acquaintances to make sexual advances on her.²⁰ However, Pilkington never admitted to having an affair. She instead maintained that Robert Adair had only entered her chamber to borrow a book.²¹ Throughout her first volume, Pilkington depicted herself as having no control over her life. Trying to garner sympathy, she told her readers that the divorce was simply too difficult for her to recall: "I have even thought it impossible to be true, and have vainly hoped to wake, as from some hideous Dream."²²

Even though she initially presented herself in her memoirs as someone deserving of pity, Pilkington's descriptions of men revealed her frustration and hinted at her eventual shift away from the image of a helpless victim. After she was forced out of her home, Pilkington found lodgings at a local Dublin inn. Without a husband or guardian, she soon realized that she was unprotected from men's advances. A maid at the inn assumed Pilkington could not afford the bill, and consequently propositioned her to a visiting gentleman. Assuming Pilkington had turned to prostitution, Mr. B—k, a Parliament member, entered her chambers and hastily removed his clothes. When Pilkington refused his offer, he claimed, "I had a full History of you from the Maid of the House, who said . . . a Companion would not be disagreeable to you, especially as she was apprehensive you had no Money."²³

Similar episodes occurred before Pilkington's move to London. Men, including married men, situated themselves before her door, entreating her to let them in.²⁴ When Pilkington refused Mr. Donnellan, an ensign, he spread the rumor that she was the "most notorious common Strumpet."²⁵ After describing several of these occasions in her writing, Pilkington made it clear that she was not entirely powerless. She threatened these men by claiming she

would include their names in her memoirs if they did not subscribe to her work.²⁶ In warning her readers that she would uncover their indiscretions, Pilkington revealed a sense of authority.

The Truth in Fiction

After the publication of her first volume, Pilkington quickly gained a patron, Lord Kingsborough, and a number of subscribers.²⁷ Pilkington finished her second volume in 1748, only a few months after the publication of her first one. In her second and third volumes, Pilkington employed literary techniques commonly found in the eighteenth-century novel, such as digressions and satire. In novels, digressions functioned as departures from the plot that caused the narrative to seem non-linear. Despite appearing like unnecessary additions, digressions reiterated the main theme of the novel. Alongside digressions, many authors used satire, or humor meant to criticize socially accepted practices and behavior. Pilkington employed these two literary techniques to condemn hypocritical expectations in marriage.

Pilkington's second and third volumes contained several digressions from her underlying narrative of working as a writer in London. She shifted from a linear style in her first volume to a series of stories and anecdotes about the various people who crossed her path. These digressions included events in both England and Ireland, as well as interactions with members of both upper and lower classes. Pilkington used digressions to criticize the unbalanced power dynamic in eighteenth-century marriages. In one digression, she discussed meeting an abandoned pregnant woman at a Dublin inn. The woman told Pilkington that her husband had pretended that their marriage never took place and wedded another woman. Additionally, the woman's husband convinced her to agree to this and to refrain from suing him. Now that they believed her to be an adulteress, her friends refused to help her financially or provide her with lodgings. In response, Pilkington confronted the husband and requested money for the unborn child; however, the man denied his connection to the pregnant woman. After Pilkington forced him to provide money, she returned to the inn to find that the woman had died in childbirth. As Pilkington never disclosed the woman's name nor provided any identifying information, this tale was most likely fabricated. Nonetheless, this story reinforced Pilkington's notion of

women's dependence on their husbands' ever-changing affection.

Pilkington also used digressions to argue that society often blamed women for sexual assault. While searching for subscribers, Pilkington's petition for patronage was repeatedly mistaken for prostitution. In her second volume, Pilkington described how a man named Mr. Spencer locked himself in a room with her. Spencer told Pilkington, "I don't come to pay you one visit, but to make you mine forever."²⁸ When Pilkington refused his proposal for sex, Spencer attempted to rape her.²⁹ Another subscriber, Lord Galway, saved her by threatening to break the door. Pilkington escaped rape, yet the incident further damaged her reputation when Galway accused Pilkington of planning an affair with Spencer. Even when Pilkington told him what had actually transpired, Galway refused to believe her. He only changed his mind after Lord Middlesex attested that he believed her story. However, instead of demanding that Spencer be punished for attempting to rape Pilkington, Galway and Middlesex decided to forget about the matter completely.³⁰ Not only was Pilkington's account originally not believed, but even when it was, the entire affair was ignored. At the same time, no one questioned Spencer's actions, and his reputation did not suffer.

Within her memoirs, Pilkington also exercised satire. In the opening lines of her third volume, she wrote, "Truly I mean to give both Pleasure and Offence ... I should be sorry to write a Satire which did not sting."³¹ She demonstrated in her memoirs that women lived at risk of abandonment and sexual assault. Instead of settling for a somber tone to discuss these topics, she developed a satiric voice in both her writing and her actions. When a ballad opera was performed for Matthew, Pilkington penned a scathing prologue and attended the show. At the theater, Pilkington encountered her former acquaintances. They soon abandoned their seats as they did not want to be spotted with an adulteress. Pilkington presented this instance as an amusing anecdote, writing, "My *Gorgon* Face, instead of turning my Enemies into Stone, clapped Wings to their Feet, and made them fly down Stairs. ... by their precipitant flight, I got the front row."³² Whereas her old friends' reactions originally marked Pilkington as a social pariah, she highlighted the absurdity of their conduct. By adopting a satiric tone, Pilkington converted scenes meant to embarrass her into moments of mortification for others.

Pilkington used these techniques to transform her self-image from a miserable wife to a person of influence and authority. Her

anecdotes featured the full names and titles of men who had abused her and other women in order to tarnish the men's reputations. For example, when Pilkington entreated the Bishop of Salisbury to become a subscriber, he rejected her with disdain: "Yaw are a Foreigner, and we have Beggars enow of our own."³³ Pilkington disclosed his discourtesy in the second volume of her memoirs. She attested that the Bishop had initially accepted her petition and changed his mind only after she arrived at his estate. Therefore, the story portrayed him not only as rude, but as someone who went back on his word. Pilkington did not temper her opinions of men she found offensive, as her depiction of the Bishop of Salisbury amply demonstrates: "His great Belly swagger'd in State before him, and his little gouty Legs came limping after."³⁴ During her marriage, Pilkington had no choice but to submit to Matthew's will. Through these memoirs, she reclaimed power for herself.

Educating Men through Memoirs

In the second and third volumes of her memoirs, Pilkington responded to—and challenged—the narrative of a young woman succeeding in society due to her virtue, as is depicted in Samuel Richardson's *Pamela* (1740) and other novels of manners. Richardson's *Pamela*, considered to be the first English novel, details a young servant girl who is able to marry her master by impressing him with her morality. Richardson's depiction of a young woman elevating herself in society through virtuous behavior launched the novel of manners genre. Throughout the rest of the eighteenth century, novelists, especially women, made their own novels of manners. The standard plot presented the actions and blunders of a young woman entering society. Readers learned how to behave by watching the protagonist learn proper customs and values. The heroine often encountered several dishonest gentlemen in her journey. By rejecting their immoral advances and protecting her virtue, the young woman was rewarded in an advantageous marriage to the aristocratic hero.

In her first volume, Pilkington initially conformed to the common novel of manners as she counseled young women on how to behave in society. She introduced her first volume as being "instructive to the *Female Part of my Readers*," quoting Othello that "*Reputation is the immediate Jewel of their Souls, And the loss of it Will make them poor indeed!*"³⁵ Much like *Pamela*, Pilkington positioned herself as a learning mechanism for her readers. She advised,

"Reputation once gone is never to be retriev'd ... gain'd without Merit, as lost without a Crime."³⁶ Typical novels of manners, like *Pamela* and Frances Burney's much later *Evelina* (1778), positioned women as responsible for protecting their virtue. Even if men tried to seduce them or threaten them into submission, writers held women responsible. Only a few pages into her original volume, Pilkington demonstrated that her message was very different from the one found in a typical novel of manners. She aimed to take revenge on the wrongdoers and to warn others not to imitate their actions.

By featuring the names and titles of men in her narrative, Pilkington threatened their reputations. For example, Mr. Spencer and the Bishop of Salisbury witnessed their faults revealed to Pilkington's entire audience. Just as Pamela served as a model for young women, these two men became examples of ill conduct. Whereas Pamela was rewarded for her virtue, the men in Pilkington's digressions received punishment for their immorality. Spencer and the Bishop of Salisbury's reputations became associated (or so Pilkington hoped) with their misdeeds. Through her satiric voice, Pilkington ridiculed her abusers and warned other men to reconsider their own social behavior. By her second volume, Pilkington's audience even worried about whether "she'll put [them] down in her *Memorials*!"³⁷ Pilkington expected that her male readers, afraid of being included in her memoirs and disgusted by the miscreants she described, would carefully consider their own behavior in society. Rather than holding women responsible for not protecting their virtue, as traditional novels of manners did, Pilkington portrayed men as accountable for their own actions. Furthermore, Pilkington focused on the consequences of men's behavior by presenting abandoned and disgraced women in a sympathetic light.

Pilkington was one of very few women to publish "scandalous" writings. Given the reception of her memoirs, it is easy to understand why few women who found themselves in a similar situation dared to do the same. One pamphleteer wondered how Pilkington, "long stigmatized as an incorrigible *Prostitute*, should now dare to make a publick Appearance."³⁸ Despite purchasing her volumes, Pilkington's peers considered her a spectacle. At one of Pilkington's lodgings, the landlady often invited acquaintances to peek in her room and marvel at the adulterous writer.³⁹

Pilkington's inability to restore her reputation with her writings led to her eventual descent into poverty. Much of Pilkington's

audience, although eager to purchase her memoirs, worried about associating themselves with the writer. Part of the appeal of subscription publishing was that subscribers could see their names printed in the works they supported. Pilkington was originally unable to attract a large number of subscribers because they did not want their names published in her volumes. Her subscriptions only started pouring in after Pilkington promised not to reveal her patrons.⁴⁰ Even the success of her first volume was unable to inspire respect among her readers. When Pilkington dedicated her second volume to Lord Kingsborough, her main financier, he ceased providing funds.⁴¹ Soon after losing her most influential patron, Pilkington fell gravely ill. Unable to pay rent, Pilkington received an eviction notice. Despite publishing two popular volumes of memoirs, Pilkington had few resources, and none of her acquaintances or subscribers offered aid. She died at the age of thirty-eight without seeing her third volume in print, which was published by her son Jack in 1754.⁴²

Although to many of her contemporaries Pilkington was little more than an adulteress who wrote memoirs, she was in fact a pioneer who brazenly discussed the hypocrisy in affairs and relationships and openly critiqued eighteenth-century British society. The novel of manners of Pilkington's time routinely held women accountable for men's actions. Pilkington, however, shifted the blame from victims to their abusers. Although the concept itself did not exist until hundreds of years after the publication of Pilkington's memoirs, victim blaming was very much a part of Pilkington's world. She was one of the first women to denounce it vocally and publicly.

1. Laetitia Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, ed. A.C. Elias Jr. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1997), p. 64.
2. The term “scandalous memoir” has emerged in recent studies of eighteenth-century women’s writings. Lynda M. Thompson’s *The ‘Scandalous Memoirists’: Constantia Phillips, Laetitia Pilkington and the Shame of ‘Publick Fame’* was the first detailed work on the subject. Multiple other historians, such as Felicity Nussbaum and Amy Culley, have also greatly contributed to the topic of scandalous memoirs.
3. Lynda M. Thompson, *The ‘Scandalous Memoirists’: Constantia Phillips, Laetitia Pilkington and the Shame of ‘Publick Fame’* (Manchester: Manchester University Press; distributed exclusively in the USA by St. Martin’s Press, 2000), p. ix.
4. Lawrence Stone, *Broken Lives: Separation and Divorce in England, 1660-1857* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 24.
5. Stone, *Broken Lives*, p. 24.
6. Stone, *Broken Lives*, p. 172.
7. Caroline Breashears, *Eighteenth-Century Women’s Writing and the ‘Scandalous Memoir’* (Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 7.
8. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. xvii.
9. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 25.
10. Stone, *Broken Lives*, p. 21.
11. Norma Clark, *Queen of the Wits: A Life of Laetitia Pilkington* (London: Faber, 2008), p. 135.
12. Clark, *Queen of the Wits*, p. 136.
13. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 196.
14. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 197.
15. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 203.
16. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 13.
17. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 13.

18. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 14.
19. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 21.
20. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 64.
21. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 88.
22. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 57.
23. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 90.
24. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 92.
25. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 92.
26. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 93.
27. Clarke, *Queen of the Wits*, p. 272.
28. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 187.
29. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 187.
30. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 188.
31. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 263.
32. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 222.
33. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, pp. 146-47.
34. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 147.
35. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 9.
36. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 264.
37. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 233.
38. Thompson, *The 'Scandalous Memoirists,'* p. 116.
39. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 178.
40. Clark, *Queen of the Wits*, p. 266.

41. Nachumi, *Acting Like a Lady*, p. 121.

42. Pilkington, *Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington*, p. 259.

Rewriting Chapters

Resistance to Addressing Discriminatory Practices in
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Fraternities and Sororities, 1947-1962

Angela Peterson



The ties found on Langdon St. . . .

Badger, vol. 70 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1960), p. 33.

Angela Peterson is a graduating senior majoring in history and music at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Her studies focus on twentieth century American history. She wrote this article for Professor Stephen Kantrowitz's capstone seminar, "Difference, Exclusion, and Resistance at UW-Madison" in Fall 2019. After graduation, Angela will attend Northwestern Pritzker School of Law.

As the Civil Rights Movement took to the streets in the early 1960s, the University of Wisconsin-Madison had protestors of its own marching through the center of campus. Gathered under umbrellas in the pouring rain, members of the Greek community marched shoulder to shoulder with a firmness of purpose not unlike that of protestors challenging racial discrimination across America. Despite a similar outward appearance, the students at UW-Madison had a goal that clashed with the Civil Rights Movement's cause: to ensure that a sorority chapter retained the right to stay on campus despite the discriminatory practices of its national organization.

In 1962, Delta Gamma, a national sorority, put its chapter at Beloit College on probation after that chapter attempted to pledge its first African American member. This action came after chapters of Greek organizations at UW-Madison had petitioned their national organizations to remove all discriminatory clauses from their national constitutions. The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents had ruled that the clauses must be removed before the start of the 1961 fall semester. Fearing that the Delta Gamma national organization would punish its UW-Madison chapter if they were to pledge a person of color, like it had done to their Beloit chapter, a faculty-led Human Rights Committee recommended the university to require the sorority to cease all operations by June 30, 1963.¹ In response, over one thousand UW-Madison students marched in pairs to demand Delta Gamma remain on campus, despite the Beloit incident that clearly showed that black students were not allowed into their organization.

In the fifteen years before the Delta Gamma march, many Greek organizations sought to keep their constitutions the same as always—with preexisting discriminatory clauses intact. When faced with deadlines to petition their national organizations to remove every discriminatory clause from their constitutions, Greek-affiliated students did not defend a right to discriminate in their chapters. Instead, these students took calculated steps to delay the removal of discriminatory clauses, advocating for their right to choose members without any university-imposed actions (which, in practice, translated to them defending the right to discriminate). They called for member education over policy change, ultimately challenging continued university involvement in this civil rights issue. The mostly-autonomous governance body born out of this period continues to underlie the functioning of the UW-Madison Greek system to this day.

“What is the problem?”

To understand why Greek-affiliated students exercised this method of protest, it is crucial to know the codes of homogeneity and exclusion that were once commonplace in the national constitutions of many Greek organizations. These constitutions govern the local chapters of Greek organizations at universities across the nation, and all chapters must abide by them. Constitutions reflect each organization's traditions, with language varying from one document to another. The Sigma Chi Fraternity, in continuity with the traditions of one of the organization's first chapters consisting entirely of Confederate veterans, restricted its membership to “bona fide white” students.² Another fraternity with a chapter on UW-Madison's campus, Phi Delta Theta, limited membership to “white persons of full Aryan blood” since its founding in 1912.³ In a confidential report to the Student Life and Interests Committee in 1949, which was not shared with the press or public, former president of the Wisconsin Inter-Fraternity Association Burt Hiller cited remarks by Pennsylvania State University Dean A. Ray Warnock in regards to the nature of fraternities. In his comments, Warnock determined that these clauses existed thanks to the “highly respected, dominant personalities” that founded each organization.⁴

The wording of these clauses suggests that many fraternities excluded not just African Americans and groups that are presently considered racial minorities, but others as well. For example, Phi Delta Theta's reference to the necessity of all members not only to be “white,” but also of “full Aryan blood” excluded Jewish students from membership. At the same time, many Jewish students flocked to Greek organizations specifically for Jewish students as early as the 1920s and 1930s due to anti-Semitic leasing practices in areas surrounding campus.⁵ Additionally, what was considered “white” differed during the era preceding the removal of discriminatory clauses. Italian-Americans in particular were not believed to be “white.” Members of this group were caricatured much like African Americans, Asians, and Jews in campus humor publications during the early 1900s.⁶ Italian students lived mostly in “Little Italy” in the Greenbush neighborhood rather than in Greek housing.⁷ According to Warnock's comments cited in the 1949 report, these exclusions in individual constitutions were not meant to be discriminatory towards racial and religious groups, but rather designed to keep “preserving homogeneity in fraternities,” noting

that this was accomplished with separate fraternities for African Americans, Jews, Catholics, and Italians.⁸ He further outlined how Greek systems could contain members of almost every color and creed while maintaining these exclusionary clauses:

On the campuses of most large universities there are fraternities of sufficient diversity to provide one or more membership opportunities to any qualified student of any race, color or religion; but not every student of fraternity calibre [*sic*] would find himself eligible for membership in every fraternity there represented.⁹

The discrimination question affected a significant portion of the UW-Madison Greek community. A report citing a confidential message sent by the former president of the Wisconsin Inter-Fraternity Association to the faculty-led Committee on Student Life and Interests revealed that at least twenty out of the fifty-two Greek organizations present on campus contained some discriminatory clause in their constitutions.

By the 1940s, debate over the exclusive homogeneity of these organizations had reached public forums. In the mid-1940s, the widow of former UW-Madison President Glenn Frank publicly criticized this culture of homogeneity.¹⁰ In her article, "Heartache on Campus," published in *Women's Home Companion* in 1945, Frank found the basis of her critique not in the exclusionary practices of local Greek chapters, but in the "heartache" felt by those denied a bid to a Greek organization more generally, and felt excluded students experienced a "deep sense of inferiority" when they were not selected for membership.¹¹ Another article published in the same year in *Reader's Digest*, entitled "Fraternities and Sororities Must Go, Says Mrs. Glenn Frank," took a more explicit jab at the discriminatory nature of membership, which garnered Frank more specific objections from the Greek community. George Starr Lasher, the Editor-in-Chief of *The Rattle of Theta Chi*, admitted the existence of "unwritten rules" that barred minorities' access to sororities and fraternities, but decried Frank for not presenting any statistical data on minorities being denied access, relying on anecdotes instead.¹²

As World War II veterans began returning home to attend UW-Madison, increasing enrollment figures revitalized Greek organizations on campus. Twenty-four fraternity chapters were active on campus in January 1947 compared to only six

chapters that continued operations in wartime.¹³ As of a 1952 report, 30 percent of UW-Madison undergraduates belonged to a Greek-letter organization (more than double the 14 percent of students currently affiliated on the campus).^{14, 15} Cognizant of the prominence of Greek institutions on campus, independent students and faculty at UW-Madison began to prod at the Greek system for answers regarding these clauses and potential discriminatory practices of these organizations. Particularly, the Students for Democratic Action (SDA), a registered student organization, and subcommittees on human rights in the Wisconsin Student Association fought for the end of all discriminatory practices in any university-affiliated organization or housing. Facing mounting pressures, the Wisconsin Inter-Fraternity Association created the Inter-Racial Committee to address these criticisms in November 1947.¹⁶ Membership on this committee was quite large, consisting of a general assembly, steering committee, and executive directors. Additionally, members of the committee did not represent individual organizations and any interested Greek member could join.¹⁷ While the committee's notes deny the notion that outside influence contributed to its creation, it formed just as Students for Democratic Action began making formal demands for change in the Greek community.

In November 1948, Students for Democratic Action made the first significant move against discriminatory clauses in Greek organization constitutions. It recommended the removal of all organizations from campus that did not remove their discriminatory clauses by 1952.¹⁸ In response, the Inter-Racial Committee issued a confidential 1949 report to Dean of Students Paul Trump that revealed their hesitation to grant the Greek community only so little time to make such a change.¹⁹ The report indicated that the eradication of racism and discrimination was a long-term goal for these institutions, and that organizations could not reach it as quickly as the SDA demanded.²⁰

Later that winter, the Inter-Racial Committee began research into what members of Greek organizations thought of integration and discrimination in their fraternities and sororities. These research efforts led to a series of reports in 1949 that indicated the opposition of local chapters to the continued presence of discriminatory clauses in national constitutions. However, these reports also illustrated an internal opposition to the forced removal of these discriminatory clauses, even among members of organizations where no discriminatory clauses were in place.

One study looked at what members of Greek organizations felt proud of within their community and what aspects members felt needed improvement. When anonymously surveyed, some Inter-Fraternity Council members took great pride in the steps that the Inter-Racial Committee took towards education in the Greek system and hoped for the eventual removal of all discriminatory clauses.²¹

Even as these collective statements appeared to support the removal of exclusionary clauses, some individual sentiments landed on the other end of the extreme, particularly when the individuals in question felt their words were not being recorded. When investigative journalist Howard Whitman visited a session at UW-Madison filled with fraternity men in late 1948, just as the Students for Democratic Action began their push to eliminate exclusionary clauses, one member cried, "To hell with this talk of democratization! [African Americans] got their own fraternities!"²² Various Greek organizations, including those without discriminatory clauses, offered official opinions in a confidential 1949 report. Most were vehemently opposed to the forced elimination of discriminatory clauses. One statement from a member of Pi Beta Phi likened the Students for Democratic Action's campaign to contemporary authoritarian regimes, noting that "One of the first attacks made by Hitler, the Communists and other dictators has been made against similar groups whose membership is voluntary and whose basis is friendship of a close type."²³ The Pi Beta Phi representative also noted in her statement that while there was no formal exclusionary clause in the organization's constitution, it had "an unwritten policy of including only members of the white race."²⁴

The report defined underlying racism and discrimination, rather than discriminatory clauses, as the main problem.²⁵ Thus, organizations focused their recommendations on ways to educate members about the impacts of these discriminatory clauses rather than pursuing actual change to the language of their constitutions.²⁶ With this new focus, local chapters avoided confronting the tensions that would result from petitioning their national headquarters to remove discriminatory language.

Because Greek organizations saw the removal of discriminatory language as a complicated endeavor, only possible to achieve in the long term, the Inter-Racial Committee recommended member education as a more feasible and immediate solution. The committee sent educational materials to Greek houses,

each of which held various orientation workshops and training to promote awareness of exclusionary issues and problematic racial stereotypes.²⁷ With one set for fraternities and another for sororities, these materials focused on different minority groups and varied in tone and content. For example, sorority women received blotter cards with anti-discrimination statements such as “I am so an American ... You bet Sonny! No matter what your race or religion,” on them, while one pamphlet distributed to fraternities, titled “Minorities,” featured a large caricature of a Native American looming over two frightened pilgrims.²⁸ Beyond this “educational” effort, it appears the committee did little else to curb discriminatory behaviors in the exclusively white Greek community.

With this approach, the Inter-Racial Committee knew that results from these efforts “would not be produced overnight,” yet refused to acknowledge the need for a more comprehensive plan to eliminate discrimination from Greek institutions.²⁹ Still, in 1949 UW-Madison faculty approved the SDA’s demand for an elimination of all discriminatory clauses by 1952 and sent the resolution along to the Board of Regents. Potentially facing defeat, fraternity and sorority leaders passed a resolution seemingly in support of the Students for Democratic Action’s demand. According to an article published in the *New York Times*, UW-Madison Greek organizations professed their intention to put “every possible pressure on their national organizations” to eliminate discrimination, yet also stated the power to end discrimination can ultimately only come from the national organization.³⁰ This reduced the perceived power vested in local Greek organizations to incite change. In fact, in the aforementioned 1949 report to the Committee on Student Life and Interests, a note about this statement explicitly says that while the Wisconsin chapters of Greek societies frown upon these clauses, the body upholds “the right of selective membership” for all organizations.³¹ Selective membership allowed organizations to perpetuate their homogeneity. All the while, these organizations were claiming that an educational process was taking place internally to eradicate racism.

The *New York Times* article celebrating the efforts to curb discrimination at UW-Madison proved premature. The decision to pass the resolution ultimately came down to the university’s Board of Regents, a board of individuals appointed by the state governor for seven-year terms to regulate the University of

Wisconsin System.³² Despite the SDA's effort and faculty approval to set a 1952 deadline for the removal of discriminatory clauses, the Regents ultimately rejected the resolution.³³ They took Greek organizations' changed definition of the "problem" from clausal restrictions to educational issues to heart. No concrete action for removing discriminatory clauses from the Greek system began until the next decade.

Distraction with No Action

After the failure of Students for Democratic Action's proposal to force the elimination of discriminatory clauses from Greek constitutions, UW-Madison President Edwin Fred appointed the university's first faculty-led Human Rights Committee in 1950. The committee, composed of three faculty members and two students, investigated human rights complaints on and adjacent to campus, particularly in regard to housing. As fraternity and sorority houses were university-approved units, this put Greek organizations under the purview of both the Human Rights Committee and the Student Life and Interests Committee.³⁴

The Human Rights Committee moved within the first three years of its existence to create an exact deadline for the removal of discriminatory clauses found in Greek organizations' constitutions. On May 19, 1952, UW faculty voted to approve Faculty Document 1041, which featured the Human Rights Committee's demand that all university-approved housing units, including fraternities and sororities, may not have discriminatory language in their foundational documents by July of 1960.³⁵

While headlines of a Langdon Street "panty raid" initially eclipsed news about the "1960 Clause," temporary distractions did not stall long-term progress on the measure. With the makeup of the Board of Regents significantly changed due to several term expirations since their rejection of the SDA-backed proposal in 1949, the Regents approved the "1960 Clause" by a vote of five to three in August 1952.³⁶ The Inter-Fraternity Council immediately announced its ire for the Regents' decision, declaring that, "the most desirable and effective method of the removal of restrictive clauses is the action of the individual fraternity without any coercive threat."³⁷ In addition to announcing their disapproval, Greek organizations affected by the decision did not immediately seek action to remove discriminatory clauses. A survey conducted by the Human Rights Committee in 1954 revealed that fourteen

fraternities still held discriminatory language in their constitutions. This indicated that a majority of the clauses stayed in place even after Greek organizations had held national conventions where they could have been overturned.³⁸ At this point, no sorority had a discriminatory clause in its constitution, but historically white sororities at UW-Madison still had not pledged any non-white members.³⁹ In this discrepancy, it becomes clear that “unwritten rules” continued to exist, providing fuel for the Inter-Fraternity Council’s argument for continued “education.”

“Dixie Bashes,” Confederate Flags, and Persian Kitties

While many UW-Madison fraternities maintained the belief that member education was more important than larger organizational change, the social practices of the organizations demonstrated that this education was ineffective in making progress towards racial inclusion. Social gatherings used controversial stereotypes of various minority groups as inspiration for costumes and party activities. Many of these portrayals showed naivety at their best and blatant racism at their worst.

Beginning in the 1951 edition of the *Badger* yearbook, different houses in dormitories and Greek organizations could submit a paragraph about their activities. While the first *Badger* of this era displayed few aspects of Greek life, the 1952 edition had a sudden increase in content describing its activities. Published in the same year as the passage of Faculty Document 1041 and the infamous “1960 Clause,” these descriptions revealed that racial subject matter was still being used in various social activities.

One social activity was the “traditional” Blackface party at Delta Kappa Epsilon.⁴⁰ The 1951 party, occurring after the supposed “education” of Greek organizations through the Inter-Racial Committee’s pamphlet crusade, featured Delta Kappa Epsilon members costumed as Blackface performers and caricatures of “famous colored personalities.” This practice was certainly not unique during this period; it is only a few decades removed from a time when “Blackface acts” were mainstream campus entertainment.⁴¹ It is worth noting, however, that in the same period that these caricatures were being shown, fraternities were defending the role of member education in reducing prejudice within their organizations. In a similar albeit less overtly questionable vein, Sigma Phi, whose representative claimed in the 1949 Inter-Racial Committee report that the organization

was “conducting an active program of education on a sound and realistic basis,” held a traditional send-off for its seniors in the form of a “Persian Kitty” party, and allowed the campus at-large photographic glimpses into the affair in the *Badger*.⁴² This party, where members and their dates dressed up as Persians “amid weird and mysterious oriental splendor,” lasted as a tradition throughout the “1960 Clause” era and beyond, with mention of the party still appearing in the *Badger* in 2001.⁴³

Due to the southern heritage of many Greek organizations, fraternities and sororities used symbols and vernacular associated with exclusionary portions of southern history in conjunction with social practices. When Alpha Tau Omega opened their new house around 1951, a large Confederate flag hung by the front door.⁴⁴ This flag goes along with the fraternity’s heritage, as it was founded at the Virginia Military Institute in 1865.⁴⁵ By this time, however, the flag had already attracted ire across the UW-Madison campus as an exclusionary symbol. For example, when it became public knowledge that President Fred had a Confederate flag over his fireplace in 1949, the story immediately became subject to newspaper scrutiny and ridicule in the *Wisconsin Octopus*, a campus humor publication.⁴⁶ This did not stop Alpha Tau Omega from continuing to bring out the flag for their annual “Southern Comfort” party, which sought an antebellum south atmosphere. Across Langdon Street, many fraternities also persisted in organizing southern-themed parties, though they did not describe these “Dixie bashes” in detail.⁴⁷

Perhaps the most interesting fact about these social practices is the openness with which Greek organizations shared them with the broader campus community. The fact that they continued to air their prejudicial social practices makes it easier to understand why they advocated for the continuance of discriminatory policies throughout the decade, while outwardly stating goals of inclusive policy changes.⁴⁸ As traditional discriminatory social practices continued despite a growing acceptance of the implications of the “1960 Clause,” it remained clear that the implicit systems which upheld exclusionary cultures within Greek life stayed locked in place.

Buying Time and Taking Over

With the 1960 deadline inching closer and little action being taken by the fourteen organizations still containing discriminatory

clauses in their constitutions, the mid-1950s marked a shift: instead of ignoring or opposing the ruling, these organizations now began pleading for an extension. As the deadline loomed, the National Inter-Fraternity Council voiced their adamant opposition to such enforced sweeping changes across national constitutions imposed by the Board of Regents. With the strict 1960 deadline only three years away, however, the problem became too large for the national entity to ignore. In November of 1957, the National Inter-Fraternity Council maintained the position that selective membership practices facilitated friendships between individuals in these organizations. The national organization put forth a statement declaring: "the choosing of one's own friends is a social right which cannot be confused with civil rights, and therefore, is not subject or amenable to edicts, regulations, laws and legislative fiats abridging that social right."⁴⁹ The official stance of national fraternity groups provided both support for Greek-affiliated students resisting change, as well as an additional hurdle for those students pursuing it.

At UW-Madison proper, the most striking call for an extension or elimination of the deadline came in 1957 with a report from the Anti-Discrimination Committee of the Inter-Fraternity Association delivered to the faculty-led Student Life and Interests Committee. The report did not try to hide its purpose; the first point of order called for "trying to secure limited extensions for affected fraternal groups."⁵⁰ Additionally, the report once again brought up the argument of fraternities' autonomy without university interjection as the best solution to breaking racist practices within fraternities and sororities. It claimed that "the elimination of discrimination rests with the fraternities themselves." While the report advocated for the removal of the 1960 deadline altogether, it did acknowledge the problem of racism in the university fraternal system. The report suggested that the "continued approval of local chapters be conditioned solely upon a determined effort on their part to secure the elimination not only of discriminatory clauses but all discriminatory practices in the selection of their members." However, the deadline was a "looming danger" that impeded the fraternities from cohesively working towards social change. After viewing the report, the faculty-led Human Rights Committee agreed that "determined efforts" were necessary to eliminate discrimination in the Greek system. They did not, however, see the need to extend the deadline, as representatives of the now nine UW-Madison fraternities that still

retained restrictive clauses were confident in their ability to strike down the clauses by 1960.⁵¹

Eventually, all but one fraternity on campus met a slightly altered September 1, 1960 deadline. Finally, in July 1961, the last fraternity joined the rest. After two failed attempts, UW-Madison Sigma Chi members successfully petitioned at the organization's national convention to strike down the discriminatory clauses in its national constitution.⁵² Sigma Chi became the last Greek organization on campus to comply with the "1960 Clause."⁵³

In some histories, the "Michigan Plan" is championed as the first successful move towards the elimination of restrictive clauses in fraternity and sorority constitutions. This was not the case. The "Michigan Plan" used ideas of "deadline-for-clauses" in 1950, two years after the UW-Madison Students for Democratic Action issued their deadline demand. Two presidents of the University of Michigan declined to establish a deadline, with one noting that he "believed that the processes of education and personal and group convictions" would move the organizations towards equality more than any deadline would.⁵⁴

Because the UW-Madison Human Rights Committee, in contrast to similar committees at its peer institutions, did not grant a waiver for any Greek organization beyond a one-year extension for a single offending group, it was UW-Madison's policy that incited legislative change for many national Greek organizations. While the faculty-led committee's deadline drove change, student members of these Greek organizations did much of the groundwork to remove these clauses at their organizations' national conventions. For example, Wisconsin members of Sigma Chi instigated a national vote on removing the "bona fide white" clause in three consecutive national conventions to finally get this clause replaced with one based on loosely defined "social acceptability."⁵⁵

This was a large feat, especially since most efforts to create change happened in a condensed time between 1957 and 1961. Given the timeframe most students spend in college, it follows that some Greek members had never experienced a time when their national organization was not vehemently combatting their chapter's ability to stay on UW-Madison's campus. With such conflict plaguing these students' college years, the Greek community aired their grievances to the public following the deadline. On the header page for "Greek Life" in the 1960 *Badger*, the introductory paragraph launches an attack on the "1960

Clause,” noting it left the organizations “wondering why others had to question [their] way of life.” The section further notes that the “selective membership” these Greek organizations practiced was a way to find “companionship” on a campus that can often feel lonely.⁵⁶

Despite misgivings over the situation, Greek organizations did not shy away from taking credit for this large achievement. An editorial in *Newsgreek*, the official publication of the UW-Madison Inter-Fraternity Council, described how some university students and administrators viewed the University of Minnesota and the University of Michigan’s anti-discrimination policies, which were similar in structure with deadline-based goals to Wisconsin’s plan, as direct descendants of the “1960 Clause.”⁵⁷ In an unusual turn that potentially overestimated the effects of the clause, the editorial also proclaimed “discriminatory practices have been eliminated from practically all houses on the University of Wisconsin campus.” Yet this self-congratulation was misplaced. The faculty’s insistence on seeing the “1960 Clause” come to fruition without extensive delay, contrasted with the wavering and lenient administrations like those at the University of Michigan and the University of Minnesota, ultimately made these policies successful.⁵⁸

Consuming Bodies

Due to their sluggish response to the “1960 Clause,” the Greek system at UW-Madison developed a rather questionable image. Fraternities and sororities faced a “P.R. disaster” after what many perceived as lack of enthusiasm about letting go of the discriminatory clauses. A few Greek voices were concerned that new members would not want to join their organizations as a result.⁵⁹ With their reputation tarnished, Greek organizations tried to craft a more appealing image to combat the system’s association with discrimination and make the Greek community appear to stand for justice. Greek-affiliated students accomplished this by pursuing positions on various student committees, where they were able to spread a new narrative of social justice and acceptance.

Greek-affiliated students had been a substantial part of other student organizations for years. One report, published just after the approval of Faculty Document 1041, found that Greek-affiliated students held the majority of the positions in the Wisconsin Student Association, the *Daily Cardinal*’s business staff, and elected

class offices.⁶⁰ With large amounts of control over general student life, Greek-affiliated students could improve their image within the framework of university institutions while also assuming the special privilege of setting their own timetable to address discrimination.

In the Wisconsin Student Association, what began as a small, seven-member Human Relations Committee in 1953 grew into a much different committee by the end of the decade.⁶¹ While the growing number of students in this committee can be attributed to the growing interest in civil rights nationwide, the makeup of this body drastically changed as it grew in size. Many members were a part of Greek organizations, and the committee grew to become almost as homogenous as the Greek community itself. This change can be directly attributed to the Inter-Fraternity Council and the Panhellenic Council encouraging their members to join this body.⁶² The first small committee consisted entirely of independents, including an African American member and several Jewish students, who were previously excluded under many Greek organizations' restrictive clauses.⁶³ Some of these students were also writers for the *Daily Cardinal*, whose editorial board almost always favored the faculty-led Human Rights Committee and progress towards abolishing discriminatory clauses during this period. As the group grew larger, the committee morphed to reflect the dominant cultures of campus life. Greek members also took high-level positions in other activist groups on campus. Fred Kessler, for example, a member of Theta Delta Chi and future Wisconsin state assemblyman, headed the campus division of the NAACP.⁶⁴ By doing this, Greek organizations could not only project a more progressive image by boasting about their members' involvement in the Human Relations Committee, but gained a bigger say in university policymaking regarding discrimination.

Claiming Autonomy

With the "1960 Clause" fulfilled by all fraternities and sororities on campus, it seemed for a brief period that Greek life no longer had to fret over matters of discrimination and exclusion.⁶⁵ However, national incidents of discrimination against African American pledges thrust the issue back into UW-Madison's spotlight. The aforementioned case at Beloit College, just an hour away from UW-Madison's campus, led the Human Rights Committee to suspect the changed provision in Delta Gamma's

constitution had not created an environment where minority students felt included. This event led to the Faculty Senate recommendation to end the chapter's operations.⁶⁶

This case brought into question whether or not the "1960 Clause" was proving effective. Living unit photos found in the *Badger* between 1960 and 1963 displaying the entire memberships of fraternities and sororities show that neither the Inter-Fraternity Council nor the Panhellenic Council organizations had a single African American member.⁶⁷ The fallout from the clause's passage showed that social discrimination on campus was far too complex to fix with a simple university mandate.

The 1962 case surrounding the Beloit incident began less than a year after every Greek organization on UW-Madison's campus complied with the clause. This presented an opportune time for the Greek community to provide a uniform, cohesive response to assertions that the system was still discriminatory. Greek chapters felt the need to remain in lockstep with each other during the Delta Gamma case, fearing that the entire system may be eradicated if one chapter was removed.⁶⁸ In the wake of the announcement of Delta Gamma's elimination, the Inter-Fraternity Council called for the Greek community to act together to address this pressing situation.⁶⁹ Rather than combatting issues of racial integration within Greek organizations, they focused on fighting the administration's decision to punish Delta Gamma.

Given the lack of fraternity records in the weeks immediately preceding and following the October march, it is possible that this time was used to construct, determine, and assess the protest away from the university's watch. In this construction, "complete local autonomy" remained central. Under the definition of local autonomy, all fraternities and sororities at UW-Madison could argue that pressure from their national fraternity or sorority to avoid rushing African Americans did not impact their decisions to rush or decline to rush individuals.⁷⁰

Greek-affiliated students delivered their demand for local autonomy in a massive display. The university granted these protestors a special privilege. While the planning happened behind closed doors, the organizers notified the administration of the protest before it took place due to the sheer number of protestors there would be. A typical demonstration would have necessitated at least forty-eight hours of advanced notice, but the university waived this requirement for the Delta Gamma protest.⁷¹

On October 4, 1962, the secretive planning came to fruition. Donning raincoats and carrying umbrellas, protestors marched in pairs from the traditional Langdon Street houses of Greek organizations to Dean of Students Leroy E. Luberg's office and back. When asked about the riots and protests of the 1960s on UW-Madison's campus in a 1975 interview, this incident was the first that came to Luberg's mind:

There must have been 1,000 of them, very orderly, but very serious and brought a proclamation to the front of Bascom Hall, which I received, the proclamation being that we at the University shall allow Delta Gamma to continue even if the national charter was unchanged, that the local group were free, they were open, they were nondiscriminatory, and we at the University should be strong enough and broadminded enough to allow them to continue.⁷²

The protest was a bold assertion by members of UW-Madison's Greek system that the decision to eliminate Delta Gamma was an extreme and unnecessary step. This protest, while outwardly showing acceptance of African American membership, can also be seen as an extension of the Greek community's resistance to university imposed action. Luberg's description highlights the protest as a massive effort demonstrating the sorority's desire to be free from the influences of both their national organization and the university itself.

Ultimately, Delta Gamma remained on campus. Against the Board of Regents' wishes, the Faculty Senate voted to allow Delta Gamma to continue operations in December of 1962.⁷³ While Delta Gamma had been freed from the university's mandate, there was still the possibility of pressures from their national organization to limit membership. No African American member appeared in the photos on Delta Gamma's page in the *Badger* for nearly half a century after the protest, until 2009.⁷⁴

By choosing to fight for local autonomy rather than the right to discriminate, as many people affiliated with the Greek system had in the previous decade, the new stance of the Greek community disregarded the danger of prioritizing tradition over equality. These protestors attempted to preserve the autonomy of the Greek system's structure rather than create a campus environment where organizations could be removed for discriminatory practices. The Delta Gamma march showed Greek organizations' outward acceptance of minority membership, but it also attempted to

perpetuate the social practices and national influences that kept membership homogeneously white.

Closing Off

While discriminatory behavior continued to occur, Greek life began to close off its relationship with broader campus life, thereby lessening the probes into their social practices.⁷⁵ Humorology, a student-produced collection of sketches originally open to participation for all student living quarters, became an exclusively Greek event in 1954, with a resulting decline of non-Greek members among the audience.⁷⁶ Furthermore, some skits immediately following the culmination of the “1960 Clause” featured some controversial subject matter. One premise in the 1963 show included students dressed as “dancing raindrops” exercising revenge for “Daddy Custer” by defeating the “Indians.”⁷⁷ Closed parties with a strict guest list also became standard practice for these organizations.⁷⁸

The emphasis on autonomy and self-governance on Langdon Street contributed to the closed, exclusionary environments of these institutions throughout the following decades. At Inter-Fraternity Association meetings after the Delta Gamma case, members suggested a policy to fix racial issues with “faculty help, not faculty dictation,” yet struggles to define this relationship left both parties stranded with little progress.⁷⁹ Available archival materials also point to the break between the Greek community and faculty guidance after the Delta Gamma incident. The Dean of Student Affairs’ Records only hold Inter-Fraternity documents until early 1964, a sign of a lost relationship between the Greek community and the broader university.

The breakdown in the relationship between the university and Greek row returned to the forefront of campus conversation in the coming decades as racial issues continued to manifest in Greek organizations. After a series of racially charged events in the late 1980s, from a “slave auction” conspicuously parodying famous African American personalities at Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity and a “Harlem” room at a party featuring watermelon jugs at Kappa Sigma Fraternity, UW-Madison Chancellor Donna Shalala created a new investigative committee.⁸⁰ The Commission on the Future of Fraternities and Sororities represented the first probe into Greek life since the events surrounding the elimination of discriminatory clauses.⁸¹ Professor of Journalism James Hoyt, who

led the commission, argued that these acts of continued racism were the result of Greek life's distancing from the university. At this point, fraternities and sororities had been mostly self-governed since the 1970s. Despite their suspicions of the risks of self-governance, the commission eventually decided that autonomy worked best for the fraternal government, strengthening the power of the Inter-Fraternity Council in the process. In response to these racially charged events, Greek organizations instituted mandatory racism and sexism workshops for all pledges. All other initiatives for change cycled back to the autonomous Greek system. With cautious optimism, one editor of the 1993 *Badger* felt this reallocation of power into the hands of the Greek chapters themselves may allow the Greek system to move forward from its racist past. In a nod to another controversial incident in the 1980s, where members of the Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity placed a "Fiji Islander" statue outside of their house for a party, the editor remarked that "the university Greek system may prove that it indeed is finally getting off the island."⁸²

An Issue Unsolved

As various organizations and committees consistently denied the need for outside intervention within the Greek system, many organizations continue to exist with a status quo of racial homogeneity.⁸³ As of the 2014 *Badger*, it is still possible to spot sorority group pictures featuring the entire membership where every member appears to be white.⁸⁴ In 2019, an external review of UW-Madison's fraternities and sororities examined the problems that UW-Madison's Greek community faced. Despite being under the umbrella of Greek life, students from multicultural and historically African American Greek organizations found Langdon Street to be "not a welcoming place for them."⁸⁵ With little else on Langdon Street besides the Inter-Fraternity Council and Panhellenic Council houses, the survey highlights the continued discomfort minorities experience with these organizations which once advocated for remaining racially segregated. Concerned with the lack of diversity within the Inter-Fraternity Council and National Panhellenic Council organizations, the working group who conducted the external review recommended to "place singular focus and attention on UW's history, structures, policy and practices and how they lead to or inhibit the recruitment, retention, and belonging of students, faculty, and staff of

color.”⁸⁶ While UW-Madison continues to strive to increase the insufficient presence and involvement of minority groups in campus life, many students of color continue to feel unwelcome.

The problem of racial exclusion in Greek life is not unique to UW-Madison. At the University of Alabama, versions of technically unwritten but widely known rules barring sorority membership for African American pledges lasted until 2013, when the university president ordered an end to the system’s formal discrimination.⁸⁷ As of 2012, only three sororities out of nine at the University of Mississippi had accepted African American members.⁸⁸ It is easy to point to an extended period of segregation of the entire education system and the resistance to integration as the root cause for segregation in these southern Greek systems, but these arguments do not hold water at traditionally integrated universities like UW-Madison; some other force has kept the system exclusionary. Instead of explicit segregation, implicit racism extending beyond the removal of discriminatory clauses in the mid-1950s continues to keep UW-Madison’s Greek system from becoming fully representative of all students.

A disregard for racial equality can be seen in the newsworthy incidents of exclusion that enter the community’s narrative every few years, most recently in 2016. The Committee on Student Organizations suspended Sigma Alpha Epsilon Fraternity after white members continued to use “racist and bigoted slurs” even after a black member told them to stop.⁸⁹ While much progress has been made, this and other incidents show that change happens at a glacial speed within the Greek system and much remains to be done.

1. "Sorority Ban Raises Unfair Play Charge," *Wisconsin State Journal*, September 22, 1962.
2. Merrill E. Prichard, *The Norman Shield: Pledge Manual of the Sigma Chi Fraternity*, 17th edition (Illinois: Sigma Chi Fraternity, 1952), pp. 25, 141.
3. Kathleen G. Donohue, *Liberty and Justice for All?: Rethinking Politics in Cold War America* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012), p. 218.
4. Arthur R. Warnock, n.d., [comments on fraternities], quoted in Burt Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," in Dean of Student Affairs-Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, series no. 19/2/6-7, box no. 1, Reports on Discrimination Clauses folder, January 1949, 1-4 University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
5. Johnathan S. Z. Pollack, "Jewish Problems: Eastern and Western Jewish Identities In Conflict At the University of Wisconsin, 1919-1941," *American Jewish History* vol. 80, no. 2 (June 2001): 163.
6. Timothy Messer-Kruse, "The Campus Klan of the University of Wisconsin: Tacit and Active Support for the Ku Klux Klan in a Culture of Intolerance," *The Wisconsin Magazine of History*, vol. 77, no. 1 (Autumn 1993): 17-18.
7. Messer-Kruse, "The Campus Klan of the University of Wisconsin: Tacit and Active Support for the Ku Klux Klan in a Culture of Intolerance," 29.
8. Warlock, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 2.
9. Warlock, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 2.
10. Nicholas L. Syrett, *The Company He Keeps* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009), pp. 235-36.
11. Frank's wife exclusively published under the name Mrs. Glenn Frank. Mrs. Glenn Frank, "Heartache on Campus," *Women's Home Companion*, April 1945, 41; Syrett, *The Company He Keeps, A History of White College Fraternities*, pp. 236-36.
12. George Starr Lasher, "Fraternities Will Continue to Serve American Youth," *The Rattle of Theta Chi*, 1945, 13.

13. Peter H. Murphy, "Fraternities Come Back," *Wisconsin Alumnus*, February 1947, 10-11.
14. Confidential Report Binder, in Dean of Student Affairs-Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, series no. 19/2/6-7, box no. 2, Report on Discrimination folder (1952-1953), University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
15. Haidee Chu, "Night and Day: As Greek Life Works to Serve Community, Counter-culture of Drinking, Sexual Assault Pervades," *Badger Herald*, October 11, 2017.
16. The Inter-Fraternity Association is just one iteration of the name of the joint governing body of all fraternities on campus, as this group is sometimes referred to as the Inter-Fraternity Council. The confusion over the name of this body is not tied to time, as the terms are often used to refer to the group in the same school year. Perhaps to conform to national naming expectations, the group is now definitively called the Inter-Fraternity Council. The terms are used interchangeably in this paper dependent on which term the corresponding documents used. The Panhellenic Council is the joint governing body for all sororities on campus. The Inter-racial Committee also took on different names, including the "Interracial Relations Committee."
17. Inter-Racial Committee Constitution and By-laws, in Dean of Student Affairs-Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, series no. 19/2/6-7, box no. 1, Inter-Racial Committee folder, 9 March 1948, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
18. John Farber, "Letter to Dean Paul Trump," in Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, Report on Discrimination Clauses folder, 23 November 1948, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
19. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 1-4.
20. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 5.
21. "IFC Questionnaire Responses," in Dean of Student Affairs records, Inter-Racial Committee folder, 1949, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
22. Alfred McClung Lee, *Fraternities Without Brotherhood; A Study of Prejudice on the American Campus* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), p. 127.

23. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," enclosure B.
24. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," enclosure B.
25. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 5.
26. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions," 5.
27. Jack Shurman, "Educational Materials Enclosure to Dean Paul Trump," in Dean of Student Affairs records, Inter-Racial Committee folder, May 1948, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
28. Shurman, "Educational Materials Enclosure to Dean Paul Trump."
29. Richard (?), "President's Correspondence to Dean Paul Trump," in Dean of Student Affairs records, Inter-Racial Committee folder, 1 February 1949, 4, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
30. "Wisconsin Students Act to Curb Discrimination," *New York Times*, June 5, 1949.
31. Hiller, "Report to the Committee of Student Life and Interests Concerning Discrimination Clauses in Fraternity Constitutions."
32. "About the Board," University of Wisconsin System Board of Regents website, accessed April 26, 2020. <https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/>.
33. "That Last Act Was a Killer," *Daily Cardinal*, November 1950 in Human Rights Committee records, series no. 5/47, box no.1, Racism, Newspaper Clippings Scrapbook 1934-1954 folder, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
34. "Correspondence from SLIC to HRC," in Human Rights Committee Records, box no. 1, folder no. 3, 4 May 1955, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.

35. Faculty Document 1041, "Report of the Committee on Human Rights," in Human Rights Committee records, box no. 3, folder no. 1, 19 May 1952, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
36. "Discriminatory Clauses Out! Regents Rule Against Clauses After 1960," *Daily Cardinal*, August 12, 1952.
37. "Regents to Consider Faculty Proposal on Human Rights," *Daily Cardinal*, August 7, 1952.
38. Edmund David Cronon and John W. Jenkins, *The University of Wisconsin: A History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), p. 398.
39. "Living Units," *Badger*, vol. 70 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1955), pp. 312-26.
40. The expanded information is in an article in the *Daily Cardinal* from April 1951 which was removed or relocated from the University of Wisconsin Digital Collections sometime during this paper. Basic support for the existence of this party can still be found in *Badger*, vol. 67 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1952), p. 345.
41. Messer-Kruse, "The Campus Klan of the University of Wisconsin: Tacit and Active Support for the Ku Klux Klan in a Culture of Intolerance," 17.
42. *Badger*, vol. 73 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1958), p. 352.
43. *Badger*, vol. 71 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1956), p. 360; *Badger*, vol. 114 (Mission, Kansas: Herff-Jones, Inc., 2001), p. 214.
44. *Badger*, vol. 68 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1953), p. 301.
45. "Expansion," Alpha Tau Omega National Fraternity website, archived from original on May 29, 2014, <https://web.archive.org/web/20140529210701/http://www.ato.org/alphatauomega/Expansion.aspx>.
46. John Stillman, "The Freds Eat Out," *Wisconsin Octopus*, January 1950, 8.
47. Theta Delta Chi records, series no. 20/3/12/3/14 48E7, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.

48. To make an exhaustive list of possibly discriminatory parties on campus during this era is an impossible task. In currently available materials alone, evidence of “Cherokee Chug-a-lugs” and “Skid Row” parties factor in prominently.
49. Kathy Ascher, “Campus Chronicle,” *Wisconsin Alumnus*, February 1958, 27.
50. Richard Urfer, “1957 I-F Anti-Discrimination Committee Report,” ND, I-F Reports, series no. 20/2/16/00/4 48L9, Spring 1957(?), University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
51. “Response to I-F Report,” ND, Human Rights Committee Records, box no. 1, folder no. 3, Spring 1957, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
52. “Sigma Chi Hearing 1966,” in Dean of Student Affairs records, Human Rights Committee records, box no. 3, folder no. 5.
53. “Sigma Chi Hearing 1966,” in Dean of Student Affairs records, Human Rights Committee records, box no. 3, folder no. 5, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
54. Lee, *Fraternities Without Brotherhood*, pp. 62-67.
55. “Sigma Chi Hearing 1966,” Human Rights Committee records.
56. *Badger*, vol. 75 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1960).
57. Dick Hill, “The University, The Fraternities and Discrimination,” *Newsgreek*, May 1960. I-F Reports file.
58. Margaret Lynn Freeman, “To Seek the Good, the True, and Beautiful: White, Greek-Letter Sororities in the U.S. South and the Shaping of American ‘Ladyhood,’ 1915-1975” (PhD diss., College of William & Mary, 2011), 347.
59. Kathy Schneider, “The Right Kind of P.R.,” *Newsgreek*, I-F Reports file, Fall 1960.
60. Confidential Report Binder.
61. While photos of the organization’s size are not found in the yearbooks after 1957, repeated mentions to join the committee suggest it became much larger than seven people.

62. "IFC Meeting Minutes, March 15, 1960," in Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternal Relations records, box no. 3, unsorted, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
63. University of Wisconsin, *Badger Nineteen-Fifty-Five* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1955), 89, University of Wisconsin Digital Collections, accessed on December 17, 2019, <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/UW.UWYearBk1993>.
64. *Membership Record Book*, Theta Delta Chi Records.
65. "U Fraternities Surpassing Gophers in '60 Clause Fight," *Daily Cardinal*, November 4, 1960, 1.
66. Stuart D. Levitan, "The Silent Greek March," in *Madison in The Sixties* (Madison: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2018).
67. *Badger*, vol. 75-78 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1960-1963).
68. "Inter-Fraternal Council meeting minutes, Sept. 23, 1962," in Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, box no. 3, unsorted, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
69. "Inter-Fraternal Council meeting minutes, Sept. 23, 1962," in Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, box no. 3, unsorted, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
70. By this time, many organizations began to claim they were not exclusively based on race by pledging Jewish and Asian students. In both the Delta Gamma case and a later 1966 case against Sigma Chi, both defenses used the presence of Asian pledges as evidence for an end to discriminatory practices. See "Sigma Chi Hearing 1966," in Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, Human Rights Committee records, box no. 3, folder no. 5, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.
71. Levitan, "The Silent Greek March."
72. Transcript, *Interview with Leroy Luberg (Excerpt – Tape 2)*, Interviewed by Donna Taylor, timestamp 89:55, (UW-Madison Campus Voices, University of Wisconsin Digital Collections: <https://ohms.library.wisc.edu/viewer.php?cachefile=Luberg.L.66.xml>) Accessed on December 17, 2019.

73. "Faculty Lets Delta Gamma Stay," *Wisconsin State Journal*, December 4, 1962.

74. "Delta Gamma," *Badger*, vol. 124 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 2009), p. 133.

75. For more information on the Sigma Chi case, see Dean of Student Affairs Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, Human Rights Committee records, box no. 3, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.

76. Humorology subject file, UWDC.

77. *Greekspeak*, Spring 1963. I-F Reports file.

78. "President's Reflections," Theta Delta Chi records, series no.20/3/12/3/14 48E7, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.

79. "I-F Meeting Minutes, September 25, 1962," in Dean of Student Affairs- Inter-Fraternity Affairs records, box no. 3, unsorted, University of Wisconsin Archives, Madison, Wisconsin.

80. *Minority Groups, Fraternity Incidents* (Madison, Wisconsin), pp. 4, 79, University of Wisconsin Digital Collections. <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/UW.MinorityFrat>.

81. Kristen Bowden, "Finally Getting off the Island," *Badger*, vol. 106 (Madison, Wisconsin, 1993), pp. 128-29, University of Wisconsin Digital Collections, <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/UW.UWYearBk1993>, accessed on December 17, 2019.

82. Phi Gamma Delta often is shortened to "FIJI," hence the party and subsequent play on words.

83. Beyond the UW-Madison campus, Greek life remains a predominantly white institution. For further reading on modern examples of discriminatory behavior, see Lawrence Ross, *Blackballed: The Black and White Politics of Race on America's Campuses* (New York: Macmillan, 2016) and John Hechinger, *True Gentlemen: The Broken Pledge of America's Fraternities* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2017).

84. "Greek Life," *Badger*, vol. 129 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 2014), pp. 59-70. University of Wisconsin Digital Collections. <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1711.dl/UW.UWYearBk2014>.

85. L. Osteen, S. Centellas, K. Foriska, J. Jones, and A. Vojta, *University of Wisconsin Fraternity & Sorority Life External Review Report Spring 2019*, p. 8. Accessed online on December 15, 2019. <https://fsl.cfli.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/158/2019/08/University-of-Wisconsin-FSL-External-Review-Report.pdf>.
86. Osteen, Centellas, Foriska, Jones, Vojta, *University of Wisconsin Fraternity & Sorority Life External Review Report Spring 2019*, p. 8.
87. Matt Ford and Abbey Crain, "The Final Barrier: 50 Years Later, Segregation Still Exists," *Crimson White*, September 11, 2013. <https://cw.ua.edu/16498/news/the-final-barrier-50-years-later-segregation-still-exists/>.
88. Lauren Ferguson, "In Sororities, Integration Still Elusive" *Crimson White*, October 24, 2012. <https://cw.ua.edu/13204/news/in-sororities-integration-still-elusive/>.
89. "Wisconsin fraternity suspended over racist, bigoted slurs," *Chicago Tribune*, May 18, 2016.

Editors' Biographies

Isabelle Cook (Editor-in-Chief) is in her third year at UW-Madison; her majors are history, economics, and Russian. This is Isabelle's second year on the *ARCHIVE* editorial board and her first year as editor-in-chief. Her academic interests include the Second World War, the Soviet Union, United States monetary policy, and the international financial system. Isabelle grew up on the East Side of Milwaukee before moving to Berlin, Germany, where her family currently resides. She enjoys travelling, and was grateful for the opportunity to study Russian language at the Herzen State Pedagogical University in St. Petersburg, Russia last summer. For her senior honors thesis, Isabelle plans to research the effects of Keynes's *General Theory* on American fiscal policy throughout the twentieth century. In her freetime, she enjoys ballet and the *New York Times*. Next year, she is beginning her new job as an academic advisor in our university's Department of History.

Mingcong Bai is a graduating senior at UW-Madison majoring in history and Russian. His historical interests focus on state-owned enterprise reforms and the rural experience in reform-era China. Mingcong is currently completing his senior honors thesis on the unintended effects of state-owned enterprise restructuring in China in the 1980s and beyond, using the Guangzhou Telecommunication Equipment Factory as a case study. In his free time, he is an open source software enthusiast, a part-time book and software translator, and an amateur cook. This fall, Mingcong will attend the University of California-San Diego to study modern Chinese history as a Ph.D. student. There, he plans to research the Chinese Reform and Opening Up as experienced by the "inlanders" in the Chinese Northwest. His research will be conducted with special focus on the impoverished population, as state projects for oil, coal, and natural gas extraction transformed their lifestyle and their surrounding environments in the twentieth century and beyond.

Madeline Brauer is a first year student at UW-Madison majoring in history. Her academic interests include Christianity in early modern Europe, the First World War, and the Cold War era. Madeline is currently completing her first college-level historical research seminar on the July Crisis of 1914. As a freshman, she is still undecided about her post-undergraduate plans; however,

she is considering graduate school to either extend her historical studies or teach high school education. In the event of the latter, she would hope to pursue a master's degree from UW-Madison's School of Education.

Jack Hayes is a graduating senior studying economics and history. Jack credits the amazing classes he has taken at UW-Madison in helping develop his interests in unique historical topics such as contemporary Scandinavian history and medieval legal studies. Jack is also interested in British history, which he explored during his semester abroad in London last spring. Over the past two years, Jack has interned with a variety of small and large businesses doing quantitative research, but he intends to pursue a career where he can incorporate the skills he has gained in both of his majors. In the future, Jack hopes to move back to his hometown of Denver, where he can spend his weekends hiking and skiing.

Matt Kass is a graduating senior at UW-Madison majoring in economics and history. His historical interests focus on the development of the common law tradition in the western world, and how its core tenants can be traced throughout history to explain how we arrived at the current moment. He also enjoys learning about the Second World War and the postwar period, where the American way of life faced its toughest test and prevailed. In his free time, he enjoys reading thriller novels, playing hockey and golf, and running. In the fall, he will attend Marquette University Law School with the hope of researching how the law can be structured to facilitate the efficient exchange of goods, services, and ideas, which he suspects can lead to better outcomes for many in both the city of Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin.

Alison Kukowski is a graduating junior at UW-Madison majoring in history. Her historical interests include the study of Medieval Europe, the Holocaust, and post-1945 America. Throughout her collegiate years, Alison worked as a program intern at the Wisconsin Conservation Voters, promoting state politicians and policies that supported conservation legislation. Following graduation, Alison looks forward to moving back to her home in New York and beginning a professional career on the East Coast. Alison is also interested in eventually pursuing a Ph.D. in History.

Alex Moriarty is a sophomore at UW-Madison majoring in sociology and history. His historical interests are in LGBTQ+ history, specifically the gay rights movements of the 1970s and its intersectionality with the Civil Rights Movement. Alex is undecided about his future plans, but hopes to pursue higher education someday. Whatever the future holds, he will always be a student of history and an avid reader and writer in his free time.

Adam Storch is a junior at UW-Madison majoring in history and Italian. His historical interests include early modern Europe, the United States Civil Rights Movement, and the Second World War. Last Summer, Adam interned with the Wisconsin Historical Society, conducting research with the artifacts of Old World Wisconsin, a state historical site. Next year, Adam will be completing an honors thesis examining the development and effects of the Civil Rights Movement at UW-Madison. In his free time, Adam loves to rock climb, camp, and read. He hopes to pursue a Ph.D. in History following the completion of his undergraduate studies.

Emma Ward is a graduating senior majoring in history with certificates in material culture and classical humanities. Emma's interests focus on social and cultural history. She has used literature and the arts as primary sources for her most successful research projects. Emma has worked as a legislative intern for Representative Jill Billings, a collections policy intern at the MacLean Collection map gallery, and a research intern at the Frances Willard House. Moving forward, she hopes to pursue a career that allows her to utilize the research and writing skills she has spent the past four years cultivating at UW-Madison.

Elizabeth Lapina (Faculty Advisor) is an Associate Professor of History at UW-Madison. She got her B.A. from UW-Madison with majors in history, art history, and French and a Ph.D. from the Johns Hopkins University. Elizabeth's research and teaching interests have to do with the Middle Ages and, more specifically, with the crusades. Her monograph, *Warfare and the Miraculous in the Chronicles of the First Crusade*, was published by Penn State University Press in 2015. Elizabeth spends as much of her spare time as possible exploring the great Wisconsin outdoors with her husband and their three kids, Beatrice, Constance, and Martin.

For more information on how to contribute to *ARCHIVE*, please visit our website, uwarchive.wordpress.com. Please direct any questions about submitting a piece or becoming an editor to uwarchive.hist@gmail.com.