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“I OFTEN HEARD HIM SAY HIS HEALTH WAS BROKEN WHILE IN THE ARMEY”:
THE SOCIAL PROFILE AND MEDICAL AGING OF WISCONSIN VETERANS

“I DON’T THINK HE HAS BEEN HALF THE MAN SINCE THE WAR”

In 1889, J. E. Murha, MD recalled medical experiences of some soldiers who served in the Eighth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry during the Civil War. As the Assistant Surgeon for the regiment, Murha was asked to provide his knowledge of the circumstances of Private Daniel Wyman’s illness and the medical treatment Murha offered. His account, a brief affidavit, provides the first view into the health experience of an ordinary Union soldier.

During the Fall of 1861 the 8th Regt Wis Infty Made a March from Pilot Knob Mo [Missouri] to the Arkansas Line, while on the March Measles broke out among men. I was then Asst [Assistant] Surgeon, there was no [unclear: “attendants”?] to care for so many sick. Cohort tents and exposed to cold of frosty night; [caused] to many [to] suffer from Pneumonia. Bronchitis. among them was D. Wyman of Co. C 8th Regt On the return of the Regt he was sent to the Post Hospital at Ironton Mo.¹

A fellow member of Company “C,” Eighth Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, Francis Schmidtmenter, amplifies Wyman’s story in his affidavit: “…Said Wyman rejoined his regiment while stationed at Sulphur Spring Mo. [Missouri] from Christmas 1862. That in the spring of 1862, said Wyman was sent north sick. That he was a good soldier and a brave man and a man of good and temperate habits.”² After Daniel took sick furlough for his severe illness, he slowly recovered enough to return to service with his company. His affidavit introduces another component of his medical experience in the U. S. Army: “Affiant also says that he was wounded in a charge on Vicksburg on May 22nd 1863, by a ball in the breast which cause him to bleed profusely inside and to spit large quantities of blood from the mouth, and that he was treated for

¹ Daniel A. Wyman, Certificate No. 440493, Case Files of Pension Applications of Veterans Who Served in the Army and Navy Mainly in the Civil War and the War with Spain (“Civil War and Later Survivors’ Certificates”), 1861–1934; Civil War and Later Pension Files; Records of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Record Group 15; National Archives Building, Washington, DC.

² Ibid.
Despite his gunshot wound which occurred in his side, slightly above his cartridge belt, Wyman served through the end of his enlistment in 1864, and reenlisted with members of his veteran company which served until mustering out in September 1865.

Wyman’s military pension file, containing over 100 documents detailing his military service, medical conditions, family, and death, provides an indication of the extent to which the war impacted his life. At enlistment, Daniel Wyman was a Maine-born 22-year-old, single man residing in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin. As a lumberman, Wyman regularly engaged in manual labor in the Chippewa Valley’s growing lumber industry. Joseph Crowley, a friend of Wyman’s and a fellow former lumberman noted the changes between prewar and postwar Wyman in a letter to the Pension Office:

Chippewa Fall, Apr 27 1888
I worked in the wood with him in 1857 + 58 and knew him up to the time he went into the Armey during all of which time he was a very healthy Stought young Man. I remember during the war that he came home on sick leav to die as we supposed, he was very bad but got beter and returned to the army. when he returned from the army at or about the Close of war he was in poor health and has been every time I have seen him since. I don’t think he has been half the man since the war he was before and I remember he claimed his sickness was Caused by Sickness in the army.
Yours Resp
Joseph Crowley

Crowley’s testimony clearly shows the process of a healthy young man entering the army, catching a disease, and then living with a related debility for the rest of his life. At the time of Crowley’s letter in 1888, Wyman was indeed near the end of his life. His pension claim, active through his last eight years, chronicles the extent to which the effects of his disease in service and subsequent aging contributed to his disability. Almost a year after Crowley’s letter, Wyman’s business associate, George Jones, also commented on his friend’s deteriorating condition and inability to do physical labor:

Madison Wis April 12 1889
Comorade Lammer
Yours of 2 inst [the second instant] reaches me at Madison. In reply would say I have knew D A Wyman ever since 1866 with the exceptions of while he was five years in Florida and during that five years I often wrote to him and attended to his business he left in My hands. So I can say that I have knew him since 1866 almost continuously. All of which time he has not been a able bodied man. I often heard him say his health was broken while in the armey. I was in his town and cauled on him about 10 days ago. he is so poorly that he was hardly able to get around the house. I don’t think he will live long.

Ibid

Ibid
He is a good man and I have no doubt but he is one of the deserving and long neglected soldiers of the late war…
Yours Respectfully
Geo L Jones

Unfortunately for Wyman, he expired soon after Jones’ letter, but under surprising circumstances. In a strange twist of fate, Wyman died from being struck by a train in 1890 at the age of 55. The incident, though unique among Wyman’s fellow company members, raises many more questions that it provides answers. It is unclear why he was walking the railroad tracks near his residence, whether he had any mental conditions which may have contributed to the accident, or if his condition had improved drastically between Jones’ visit and Wyman’s death. However, physicians’ reports indicate that during the eight years prior to his death, Wyman was experiencing various life-threatening ailments associated with the pneumonia and bronchitis he contracted in the army. The unexpected circumstances of his demise prevent the examination of his death as an indicating of the aging process, but they do not preclude his life and aging from study.

Most of Wyman’s fellow company members’ pension files (PF) share stories of aging similar to Wyman’s, although most record deaths as the result of “natural” causes or illness. The choppy fragments and thoughts of the examining physicians present evidence of aging less clearly than the story described in Wyman’s files, but the PF still provide the facts which illuminate the postwar experiences and aging process nonetheless. In her book, This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War, Drew Gilpin Faust draws her readers’ attention to the impact of the war in human terms:

“Killing produced transformations that were not readily reversible: the living into the dead, most obviously, but the survivors into different men as well, men required to deny, to numb basic human feeling at costs they may have paid for decades after the war ended, as we know twentieth- and twenty-first-century soldiers from Vietnam to Iraq continue to do.”

Her statement applies to transformations aside from the psychological effects resulting from the grisly work of war; physical transformations resulted as well, and were by no means limited to death. Men who volunteered for war physically removed themselves from their communities, families, region of effective immunity from disease, and relative safety of civilian life. The work

5 Ibid
6 Ibid
7 Drew Gilpin Faust, This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War (New York: Random House, Inc., 2008), 60.
of survivors was to repair that rupture, or find other means of recovering some semblance of their former lives. The impact of this process is widely under-studied by historians of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Instead of focusing solely upon the soldiers’ postwar lives, it is important to understand their characteristics at enlistment and wartime experience. Before exploring the topic of aging, it is necessary to know the background and characteristics of the unit from which they came. This provides the information required for comparative analysis of other samples, as well as allows for meaningful comparison among the subjects of this particular study. Although social profiles sadly do not tend to result in riveting text for readers, they are an invaluable tool to those engaging in the under-conducted longitudinal and comparative studies on the postwar experience of Civil War Veterans.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

Prior to 1990, few historians showed interest in the experience of the “common soldier.” Despite John Keegan’s groundbreaking book, The Face of Battle, published in 1976, military historians seemed to avoid the methods and views of increasingly-popular social history which had permeated many other areas of the discipline. Nearly fifteen years later, Maris A. Vinovskis disparaged the lack of social history conducted by military historians when he wrote in Toward a Social History of the American Civil War (1990), “Indeed, most of the so-called new social historians have ignored the possible influence of the Civil War on the life course of nineteenth-century Americans.”

Prior to Vinovskis’ publication, only a handful of historians had made efforts to use social history methods to analyze Civil War history. Since his publication of Toward a Social History, many more historians have taken up the challenge of contributing to the growing cache of enlistment and community data.

The construction of a particular unit’s social profile has become one of the most popular ways of exploring the social history of the Civil War. From enlistment profiles to community profiles, historians have made great strides in accumulating data regarding Americans’ wartime experiences. John Robertson’s article “Re-enlistment Patterns of Civil War Soldiers,” published in 2001 in The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, is an example of the value of social profiles. His study, which concludes that rural origin of Pennsylvania soldiers positively influenced their decision to re-enlist in the army, addresses an under-discussed topic by using a variety of statistical analyses to thoroughly explore reenlistment patterns. Such profiles of soldiers and companies continue to provide much insight into the characteristics of those who participated in

the war and suggest the possible impacts of their service on communities throughout the nation. They form groundwork which historians can use to re-visit the truth of many assumptions about the common soldier, his army, and his community.

While enlistment profiles of soldiers are valuable contributions to a growing collection of data, the narrow view of Civil War history as a pre-war and war-time snapshot of soldiers and communities fails to expand the social history of the Civil War to its full potential. The war itself and experience of its participants while in the service are important, but the effects of the war did not cease with hostilities in April 1865. Drew Gilpin Faust’s This Republic of Suffering: Death and the American Civil War, published in 2008, thoroughly the process through which the nation engaged in the work of mourning the dead in the decades after the surrender. Although This Republic of Suffering only provides cursory references to disabled, aging veterans, many of her conclusions regarding the mourning of the dead apply to the nation mourning and accepting the soldiers who returned from war as changed, men. The experience of war left a deep and lasting scar, literally and figuratively, on individuals, families, communities, and the nation. Many soldiers returned to civilian life unable to work at the full capacity of other young men. Other families adapted to life without a husband, father, or son.

Even the government felt the effects of the war as it took military and legislative measures to re-unify the country. Financially, states and the federal government re-worked the military pension system to more effectively meet the needs and demands of a large number of disabled veterans and their families, and continued prioritize meeting the needs of these veterans and their dependents as they aged. The records left by what became the first large-scale national welfare system provide social historians with a plethora of data collected by Department of the Interior’s Pension Bureau.

However, historians did not begin to commonly utilize military pension files to examine the lives of veterans until studies in nineteenth-century government welfare policies and aging became influential topics in the late 1990s. Robert Fogel, the famed economic historian at the University of Chicago’s Booth School of Business, led an incursion into the field of Civil War veterans’ aging with his groundbreaking Union Army data set (UAS). The data set includes data from 35,570 soldiers, combining information from pension, military, and medical records. Fogel and other UAS scholars’ work on the changes in aging throughout the past two centuries constantly moves toward the greater goal of understanding the connections between economics, aging, and public policy.

The National Institute for the Humanities and National Science Foundation-funded “Early Indicators of Later Work Levels, Disease and Death” project led by Fogel has resulted in a

---

variety of data on aging in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Several of Fogel’s former graduate students have explored different aspects of aging, using Civil War veterans in a comparative study with a modern data from the National Health Interview Survey and the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey I samples. Dora L. Costa’s work in the late 1990s focused on the relationship between health and retirement, whereas Chulhee Lee tended to focus on early life predictors of disease, mortality, and aging. Such studies provide what Clayne L. Pope and Larry T. Wimmer summarize as “both a well-founded understanding of long-term trends in human health and a solid empirical basis on which to make policy decisions about the future require development and analysis of longitudinal data sets.” While such studies are incredibly valuable for understanding the aging process in the United States and possible future trends that may influence public policy, they do not focus on the veterans’ experiences to more thoroughly understand nineteenth century history.

This study bridges the generations of Civil War social history by examining aspects of veterans’ aging with a local, rather than national focus. Fogel’s “Early Indicators…” project addresses veterans’ aging on such a grand scale that it neglects how war and aging impacted the individual, his family, and community. Earlier studies of companies and communities like those found in Vinovskis’ Toward a Social History have collected useful data, but extend no farther than the end of the war. Unlike most unit social profiles, this study relies heavily on data from the Military Pension Files (PF) affiliated with the company. Because the PF contain enlistment information and other data which have been vetted by the Pension Office, War Department, and Surgeon General’s Office, they have a much greater level of accuracy than Muster Rolls (MR), which contain data reported by the soldier without verification.

The methods I have employed to examine the data for Company “C” are similar to those found in studies by Robertson, Costa, and Lee, but others are methods selected for their ability to analyze variables I was able to identify through working closely with a relatively small sample. Rather than strictly adhering to an earlier study as a template, I chose methods of analysis which best fit the data available. Although such an approach allows a greater degree of freedom for exploring traits of the company, the unfortunate consequence of this approach is that there is not immediately comparable data available from other units. The lack of longitudinal studies on the severity of veterans’ war-related disabilities limit conclusions drawn from such data to the veteran samples studied until enough comparative data exists to support broader conclusions. Since this study focuses on a single company instead of the hundreds of companies represented in the UAS, the conclusions may not reach as broadly, but the analysis runs deeper like the earlier studies to provide greater meaning than statistics alone.

---


12 See Appendix B for further explanation of the pension files and their accuracy.
Even though the recent wave of interest in constructing unit social profiles has generated many sets of data, they are mostly confined to confederate units and federal units from eastern states. Enlistment and reenlistment data published in works such as Samuel Bates’ History of Pennsylvania Volunteers, 1861-1865 contain a wealth of information attractive to social profilers seeking large, easily-navigable data sets.\textsuperscript{13} Possibly because of their lack of large organized compilations of data, states which were being settled shortly before and during the war are underrepresented in the current publication of social profiles. The constant re-shuffling of life in places such as Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa can make it difficult to gain an accurate sense of a home community’s population. Although populations constantly ebbed and flowed as people moved, population movement was not so much of a gentle fluctuation as it was a great influx. For young communities, such as Eau Claire, Wisconsin, changing location names and the sudden creation of new towns throughout the early 1860s make understanding the county’s population difficult. However, instead of shying away from social histories of frontier units, historians should embrace the challenge and seek more creative means of obtaining the desired data.

\textbf{PREWAR EAU CLAIRE}

At the start of armed hostilities in 1861, Eau Claire County, Wisconsin was home to a small, but growing frontier settlement. Although the frontier line was quickly pushing north and westward as new towns settlers began to establish new communities, Eau Claire was still quite young with a raw frontier flavor at the opening of hostilities. Established five years earlier in 1856 with only a handful of residents, the county had a population of 3,160 by the time of the 1860 United States Federal Census.\textsuperscript{14} Although the modern City of Eau Claire did not receive its charter until 1872, the three towns that later became the City of Eau Clare had already begun to prosper at the confluence of the Eau Claire and Chippewa Rivers.\textsuperscript{15} The three cities, hereafter called “Eau Claire” or “the towns of Eau Claire,” were home to a wide array of people one might expect to find in a frontier town.\textsuperscript{16}

From teamsters and lumbermen to printers and attorneys, Eau Claire’s residents together made it simultaneously a frontier town and one connected with the more established parts of the nation. In his local history, Early Eau Claire (1926), William W. Bartlett surprisingly describes the town as having an Eastern United States air, rather than a strong frontier flavor. He writes,

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 20.

\textsuperscript{14} 1860 Federal Census.

\textsuperscript{15} W. F. Bailey, History of Eau Claire County, Wisconsin, past and present: including an account of the cities, towns and villages of the county (Chicago: C.F. Cooper and Company, 1914), 364.

\textsuperscript{16} Concluded from the MR and W. F. Bailey. The most common distinction seems to be between Eau Claire and North Eau Claire, possibly due to the lumbering population of North Eau Claire.
“During its earlier years Eau Claire had many of the same characteristics of a typical New England Village. The ever-increasing lumber business brought in a rougher element, which for some years was very much in evidence, but in the main, this original New England contingent was the dominating force.”\textsuperscript{17} While his description of Eau Claire as a New England village likely romanticizes the town’s history and stretches beyond reality, Bartlett does identify an important aspect of its population. The state’s and the town’s relatively young age meant that few residents claimed Eau Claire, or even Wisconsin, as their birthplace. Instead, the town was primarily comprised of transplanted New Englanders, East Coast residents, and immigrants.\textsuperscript{18}

The work opportunities available largely shaped the county’s population distribution, especially for single young men. All three of the Eau Claire towns have significant populations of single young males, but the lumber mills in the Town of North Eau Claire attracted more of the residents, which Bartlett describes as the city’s “rougher element” of the city’s population, than either of the other villages. Males outnumbered females in both agricultural and business areas of the county, but more notably within the city. The 1860 census indicates that males represented an average of 58 percent of the county’s total population, with females filling in the remaining 42 percent. As shown in figure 1.1, the county’s male population distribution varied by location. In the agricultural townships, which include all but the three towns of Eau Claire, males accounted for 55 percent of the population, and females for 45 percent. Within the towns of Eau Claire, males represented 60 percent of the population. The lumber industry, though it had not yet reached the boom years of the 1870s, employed many young men, especially in the town of North Eau Claire. There, males comprised a far greater proportion of the population, 65 percent. For North Eau Claire, the county’s census schedules show long lists of single males, whereas single young males in the agricultural townships tend to either live throughout the countryside with families or on their own.\textsuperscript{19} The opportunities for labor in the recently-settled county brought men to the area in greater numbers than women, as one might expect in a frontier county. Later in the summer of 1861, when companies began forming for the war, many of the single young men filled the ranks.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{17} William W. Bartlett, Early Eau Claire (Eau Claire: Eau Claire Historical Society, 1926), 18.
\item \textsuperscript{18} Eau Claire County Population, Chippewa Valley Museum Archives, Eau Claire, WI.
\end{itemize}

Calculated from data on images of original census manuscripts. The images for the Town of Half Moon’s schedules were missing the last page, according to page enumeration. Comparison between the calculated census data and that listed by the Chippewa Valley Museum in Eau Claire, Wisconsin suggest that the missing page was blank.
C8WI ENLISTMENT AND MILITARY HISTORY

By the summer of 1861, a patriotic wave swept full-force through Wisconsin as towns across the state enthusiastically responded to the governor’s request for troops. Like many towns, Eau Claire held town meetings and ceremonies in order to enlist residents in its own company, carefully considering and proudly discussing its intended contribution to the war effort. When the first group of Chippewa Valley\(^{20}\) men hoping to serve were notified that they would not be enlisted due to eager volunteering by men throughout the state, the Eau Claire Free Press

\(^{20}\) The Chippewa Valley is the region of Wisconsin in which Eau Claire and surrounding cities are located. It generally refers to the area of Wisconsin which contains the Eau Claire and Chippewa Rivers.
observed that it was all for the best, since six men had stolen company property and left to enlist in other units. The editor noted that Eau Claire should only want to send “gentlemen” to the front.21 Only a month later men from Eau Claire successfully raised a company of recruits which were mustered into the United States Army, though it is not clear whether they were the “gentlemen” Eau Claire expected. The Eau Claire “Badgers” steamed down the Eau Claire River with their famous live eagle mascot to join the Union Army in early September. On September 13, the 101 members of the “Badgers” mustered into three years of army service as Company “C” of the Eighth Wisconsin Infantry (C8WI) on September 13th.22

Over the course of the war, C8WI’s numerical strength fluctuated as the company encountered disease and battle. New recruits joined the unit each year, but in far smaller numbers than the original enlistment, as shown in table 2.1. Sergeant Francis Schmidtmayer’s enlistment campaign in Eau Claire in the summer of 1862 yielded sixteen recruits, with three joining the company in subsequent years. Because post-1861 enlistment numbers are too small for clearly identifying trends, analysis of post-1861 enlistees is unsuitable for statistically significant comparison. However, that does not mean that examination of the data should be avoided. It is curious that, of the 1862 enlistees, only five recruits under the age of 20 enlisted, whereas the same number of recruits 30 years and older joined, which is an older population than the 1861 enlistees. In “Community and War,” John R. Kemp finds that in both New Hampshire towns at the focus of his study, half of those enlisting in 1863 were too young to legally enlist in 1861.23 If the trends he identifies hold true for frontier communities, one would expect nearly half of the 1862 enlistees to belong to the youngest cohort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2.1</th>
<th>C8WI ENLISTMENT BY YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Enlistees</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of a western regiment, C8WI campaigned throughout Mississippi, Tennessee, and Louisiana during the war. The regimental history in Quiner’s Military History of Wisconsin, published in 1866, and various local histories lovingly list numerous engagements credited to the unit’s name. However, only two battles in the company’s history seem particularly noteworthy for the members of the company. Aside from Urial Steuksbury, who was killed when he encountered guerillas in Mississippi, all five other battle-related deaths in C8WI resulted from the Battles of Farmington and Corinth, Mississippi.24 As was typical of most Civil War units, disease took a far greater toll on the company than battle, killing nineteen percent of the

21 Eau Claire Free Press, June 7, 1861. From Bartlett, Early Eau Claire, 62.
23 Kemp, 61.
24 Charles F. Estabrook, ed., Wisconsin Losses in the Civil War
regiment. During training and between bouts of fighting, many soldiers contracted various fevers and diarrheic illnesses which left lasting effects on the health of those who survived. Of the company’s total strength of 120 men, 26 percent chose to reenlist upon expiration of their first term in September 1864. Figure 2.1 shows the discharge status of C8WI.

![Fig. 2.1: Status at Discharge](image)

### SOCIAL PROFILE OF C8WI ENLISTEES

The value of the company social profile is twofold. The most broadly applicable value of the social profile is that it adds weight to other similar social history projects, strengthening and broadening the field. Secondly, the social profile provides a baseline for other types of studies. Understanding the company’s characteristics and enlistees around the time of enlistment greatly increases the value of postwar analysis because it serves as a foundation upon which one might document change.

The C8WI’s prewar social profile incorporates data from Muster Rolls (MR), Pension Files (PF), and the 1860 United States Federal Census. Because the 1860 Census records information for the year before a vast majority of the C8WI members enlisted, it can serve as a

---

25 MR and PF,
26 See Robertson, “Reenlistment Patterns,” for a clear example of this type of analysis.
proxy for the categories of data missing from enlistment records. The MR, a collection of enlistment information, provides data for each soldier in the company. Unlike the MR, the PF do not contain information for the entire company. Instead, the record is focused on individual soldiers affiliated with pension claims. Even though they do not contain data for the entire company, many soldiers applied for pension and have PF records. In C8WI, pension records have been linked to 73 percent of the company, with 68 percent having accessible files. Fifty five percent of soldiers received pension payments, for which group more data was accumulated in the PF. Both PF and MR detail soldiers’ place of birth, year of birth, age at enlistment, occupation, marital status, city of residence, county of residence, reenlistment, and type of discharge from service. The census data supplements the MR and PF by showing living situations, household organization, age, occupation, and most importantly, property values for a significant and representative portion of the company. Of the 120 members of C8WI, 57 have corresponding census records, which is 48 percent of the company.

The C8WI members matched to the 1860 Federal Census are a representative sample of the entire company. By comparing the corresponding MR and PF data for the census sample and non-census sample, I found that, with one exception, none of the characteristics describing soldiers in the MR and PF data appeared underrepresented or overrepresented among the census sample. The only variable for which the census did not produce values similar to the MR and PF was occupation category, but the differences are easily reconciled and explained. The percent of farmers in the census sample is much smaller than in the PF and MR sample, and the percent of unskilled workers far greater in the census but smaller in the PF and MR sample. Further inspection of both sets of data reveals the origin of the difference in reporting and wording. Many of those listed as farm laborers in the census self-reported their occupation as farmers at enlistment. Because only the wording is different between the samples, but is reconcilable, the census data regarding occupational category should be considered representative of the company for all characteristics present in the MR. It is unclear whether property owners are overrepresented in the census sample because only the census recorded the variable. Although the property data from the 1860 census may not be representative of the company’s actual property holding, analysis of the census samples’ property values can lead to valuable conclusions regarding socioeconomic status.

Family Organization

Analysis of the census returns for members of C8WI shows that the data divides easily into three clear categories of the soldier’s status within their place of residence: the single individual, junior household member, and head of household. Census manuscripts list many men as individuals, who are not the head of a household or listed as a family member within an established household. Because these men are not married and listed individually, they are hereafter referred to as “single individuals.” Those listed within the household of a family
member might be dependent children of the household, but many are young men who are also financial contributors to the family. As such, calling the group “dependents” misrepresents their roles within the family. Therefore, I have chosen to call the group “junior household members.” The category “heads of households” retains its traditional meaning. Each of the three categories has its own characteristics which provide insight into the greater identity of the unit.

Single Individuals

Single men are the most numerous and have the greatest socioeconomic distribution of the three family status groupings in the 1860 Census. Single men appear to have had the most flexibility in living conditions, since they were not living with or supporting other family members. Ranging from poor laborers to a well-propertied attorney, members of the single individuals group lived in a great variety of locations and situations. Men holding occupations such as lumberman and farm laborer usually lived near their place of work. If not working for their own family, farm laborers tended to reside with their employing family, usually listed after all of the household’s children. For many lumbermen, but also city laborers, boarding houses near the sawmills in North Eau Claire provided convenient housing. Fifty percent of all men listed individually in the census resided in the three towns of Eau Claire, many of them in boarding houses. Some lived in the same boarding houses, and were acquaintances, if not friends, prior to enlistment. One boarding house, dwelling number 413 in the Town of North Eau Claire, held four future comrades-in-arms: Max Worth, Alfred Tuttle, Myron Briggs, and James Hooper. Of the nineteen city-dwelling men, the 1860 census lists thirteen with unskilled occupations, most of which were laborers, a slightly higher ratio than the 61 percent representation of unskilled workers in the entire single individual category.

The age distribution of the individual single men in C8W closely mimics the distribution curve of the entire company, as shown in Figure 1.1. Over half of the single enlistees were between the ages of fifteen and 24 at the time of the 1860 census, with peak representation in the age 20-24 cohort. Because the census was taken only one year before a vast majority of the men enlisted, the same 20-24 year-old age-at-enlistment cohort contains the greatest number of soldiers. Such an age distribution among single individuals suggests that single individuals were not influenced by age differently than the unit as a whole in their decision to enlist.

\[27\] 1860 Federal Census
Junior Household Members

While many young men were living in boarding houses or other dwellings containing large numbers of individually listed men, the label “single” for many soldiers is misleading at the time of the 1860 census, and probably also at the time of enlistment. Of the 57 company members located in the 1860 census, nineteen are listed with family members: eleven as part of a parental household, and eight as head of their own household. Although the junior household members varied as dependents and providers, they share several other characteristics. Table 3.1 contains information derived from the census for all eleven junior household members.

---

28 1860 Census.

Since the census schedules do not usually specify the relationship between household members, I used the schedules’ layout and contextual information to determine whether a soldier was a junior member of the household or head of the household. All heads of household are listed on the same line as the dwelling and family numbers, whereas dependent members are named on the subsequent lines.
Table 3.1
JUNIOR HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS C8WI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation Category</th>
<th>Value of Family Real Estate</th>
<th>Value of Family Estate</th>
<th>Head of Household Occupation Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>McCauley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphonse</td>
<td>Beeman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Riley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ritger</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Thiel</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Fuller</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>McLain</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ritger brothers’ story poignantly illustrates the role of some junior household member soldiers as workers upon which families relied. Andrew and John, who enlisted in separate units in 1862 at the ages of 22 and 20, respectively, were contributing junior members of their household prior to enlistment. Their father, Jacob, had been disabled by heart disease since 1861, and unable to support the brothers’ minor siblings. Andrew, recorded in the 1860 Census as a farm laborer, enlisted in 1862 as a blacksmith. While the pension file does not explain the process of his movement from an unskilled into a skilled occupation, it is clear that both he and his brother were supporting the family until their deaths. Remarkably, both brothers died in the
service within the same week during the summer of 1863; Andrew of typhoid on June 29, and John of a gunshot wound at Gettysburg on July 1.29

The letters and depositions in their dependent mother’s pension file indicate the intentionality with which the brothers contributed to their family while serving in the army. Catharine Ritger wrote to the commissioner of pensions about her sons’ contributions as part of her pension claim in 1881:

Your Honor, it is very difficulty for me to elect [which son upon which to base the pension claim], because it would look as though I loved one of my sons better then the other, which is not the case; both assisted me, I was dependant upon both of my sons, for support….The letters hereto attached, I received from both of my sons, in which you will be convinced, that I have been entirely dependant upon my sons’ for support.30

Although her words of gratitude for her dead sons may be shaped by her possible intent to tug at the heartstrings of a bureaucrat, her message is clear. Her sons regularly sent money home to the family in Wisconsin. The letters she mentioned in her reply to the Commissioner detail the amount of organization required to send money home from the army, and suggest that the checks were not an occasional help, but a necessary source of income. Andrew Ritger wrote home shortly after joining his company in the fall of 1862 to detail how his payment would arrive in Eau Claire:

Corinth Sep 28th 1862
My Dear Father and Mother and Brothers and Sister i will write a few lines lines to you to let you no whare i am. i am in Corinth Mississey….i have send a check home from Madison. it was direct to John Mire. the check will go to Schleisinger Vill by Express the letter that i direct to John Mire. the check is not in the letter but reciats [receipts?] of the check and trunk is in it. i will close my let[ter] and send my Best Respects to you all.
Andrew Ritger
Corinth Miss
…write whare John is.
write soon. Amen.31

As time went on, the instructions for his parents receiving the money became shorter, likely as the process had been repeated for many paychecks.

The subject of money seems quite prominent in Andrew and John’s correspondence with their family in Eau Claire. In a letter from the spring of 1863, Andrew jumped to the point just after assuring his family of his receiving their last letter the day before. He wrote from Young’s Point, Louisiana, “i will send twenty three dollars. i and Cristian Shellcuph [Christian Scholkoff]

29 Andrew Ritger, Certificate 255859, Pension File.
30 Ritger PF.
31 Ibid.
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and Max Worth will send it together. we will Express it to Schleisinger Vill. our Captain will go to Eau Claire on a ferlow. his wife is sick and he will send it to Schleisinger Vill.” Unlike Andrew Ritger, Max Worth was listed individually as a laborer in the 1860 census, not with family members. However, even as a single young man, Worth was sending money to Eau Claire, possibly to relatives. None of the documents show whether Worth and Scholkoff were sending money to family members. Andrew’s familiar tone toward Worth and Scholkoff and lack of explanation regarding the details of the men sending money together suggests that doing so was fairly standard for them. Although only the handful of dependent mothers’ and fathers’ pensions document men sending money home from the front, Ritger’s letter suggests that more men were helping to support their families than pension files indicate.

In contrast to the Ritger brothers’ support of their family, about half of other dependents lived within financially secure households. Of the eleven soldiers who were junior members of their household in 1860, five lived in families credited with over $1,000 real estate value. Unlike George Riley, the eldest son of a widowed mother who had replaced his father as a farmer, three other company junior household company members did not have a listed occupation and originated from households with over $1,000 real estate value (see Table 1.1). The pension files show little evidence of their parents’ or society’s expectation of such young men, but parents’ property and personal values suggest that at least some came from financially comfortable homes.

The members of Company “C” who were junior household members in 1861 are a small, but not insignificant portion of the company. The census shows that about 19 percent were junior household members in 1860. With ages raging from fifteen to 23, they were members of the company’s largest age cohorts: soldiers in their late teens and early twenties at enlistment. Except for their age and residence with family, the junior household members’ experiences and characteristics vary greatly, especially regarding economic status. However, despite the differences, the junior household member soldiers such as the Ritger brothers may have had similar psychological experiences when leaving for war from the family home.

---
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When compared with the combined PF and MR data, no factors are underrepresented, or over represented by those in the census sample, suggesting that it is representative of the company.
MORTALITY AND MEDICAL AGING

Since most Civil War soldiers enlisted as healthy young men, many of the survivors had decades of civilian life ahead when mustering out of the service. There are many variables within a soldiers’ lifetime upon which wartime service could have an impact, but aging seems to have had the most potential for producing the greatest impacts on society and social policy. Scholars including Dora L. Costa have directly linked developments in the military pension system as a welfare program to the retirement, aging experiences, and lobbying of Civil War veterans.\(^{35}\) During war, the soldiers of C8WI encountered disease, demanding physical work, poor food and water, exposure to elements, and participation in battle. Such wartime experiences, which were vastly different than most encountered in civilian life in Wisconsin, had the potential to greatly impact a soldier’s aging process and ability to function within the workforce.

John Hill of Eau Claire enlisted with his older brother, Thomas, in 1861. A healthy boy of sixteen before the war, John received a severe gunshot wound at the Battle of Corinth in 1862 and was left lying under an artillery piece when the Union Army fell back, as his company members presumed him dead.\(^ {36}\) Philip Burke, a fellow member of C8WI described the event in his affidavit:

> On the 3d of Oct. 1862 he was wounded, gun shot wound through the body, between 2d + 3d ribs on right side, + broke 3d rib on left side. I was present at the time. He laid under field piece and between the wheels. Lay there most of the afternoon Oct. 3d. I next saw him at hospital of Corinth Miss. The ears were swollen both of them and bleeding. He was deaf from such time [unreadable]. He was prisoner about four days + uncared for and the days was hot, the nights cold + he was much exposed.\(^ {37}\)

Burke’s description of John’s wound shows that even a relatively simple injury as a bullet wound could easily incorporate several conditions in addition to the wound itself. Exposure, lack of immediate care, and secondary maladies such as infection could quickly compound and produce lasting, if not fatal, effects. Remarkably, Hill recovered enough to rejoin his unit after remaining in the hospital for about three months.\(^ {38}\) However, the wounds had a drastic impact on Hill’s life and ability to work. Physician Charles Alexander detailed his condition from an examination in 1879, when Hill was 34 years old:

> I found a cicatrix [scar of fibrous tissue] of a bullet wound in the right side over the second floating rib, the bullet passing across the back, making its exit on the left side a

\(^{35}\) Pope and Wimmer, 218.

\(^{36}\) John Hill, Certificate 73641, PF.

\(^{37}\) Ibid., (IMG_7016).

\(^{38}\) Ibid.
little below the inferior floating rib, wounding the left elbow in its course. The exit
wound is about four inches from the spine. The bullet in its course probably fractured the
10” or 11” dorsal vertebrae, possibly only the spinous process. He states that he was
unable to pass urine for seven weeks, the catheter being used. There is great tenderness in
the right side and especially over the spine. Pain greatly aggravated by manipulation
along the course or track of costal nerves, especially from pressure on spine. Cannot
perform any labor where motion of the spine is necessary. Suffers from constipation and
piles—probably the result of injury to spine. The sympathetic effect upon the nervous
system is gradually on the increase. This disability may be estimated 12/18 “total,”
$12.00 per month.\(^{39}\)

In addition to his back injury, Hill unsurprisingly continued to experience severe hearing
difficulties for the rest of his life. Rather than focus on Hill’s wound and hearing, however,
Alexander noted the mentally traumatic experience’s impact on Hill’s deteriorating health. He
writes, “the gradual increase of this condition seems to me the result of nervous sympathy. I can
detect no organic lesion, no obstruction or but slight inflammation. the whole nervous system has
evidently suffered severely from direct and indirect shock.”\(^{40}\) Although few other physicians
describe medical experiences and their progression over time for wounded or diseased soldiers
with such intensity as Alexander, even the most dispassionate physicians note the distressing
process of soldier’s conditions worsening with age throughout the pension files.

While many physicians’ descriptions detail the natural course of bodily deterioration, files
such as Hill’s raise the question of whether war disabilities accelerated veterans’ aging. Hill, who
had been shot through the chest and endured an unimaginably traumatic experience, lived well
into the twentieth century. According to his death certificate, he was 78-years-old when he died
in 1923.\(^{41}\) His fellow company member, Harry White, did not fare as well. Seven years older
than Hill, White died prematurely in 1886 at the age of 48. A neighbor detailed his misfortune in
an affidavit, stating:

Said soldier came home from the army in the fall of AD 1865. Suffering with chronic
diarrhea, piles, heart disease, disease of kidney, and general debility; and was greatly
prostrated and reduced in health at said time, to such an extent that he could not perform
any manual labor. he has continued to suffer with chronic diarrhea, piles, heart disease,
disease of kidneys, and general debility during each year since said date, and is still

\(^{39}\) Ibid.

\(^{40}\) Ibid.

\(^{41}\) John Hill, PF.
suffering with said debilities, and has had frequent attacks during each year since his discharge.42

White’s disease, the results of fever and diarrhea contracted during his army service certainly weakened him significantly, likely contributing to his death. Hill’s and White’s stories, though they lie toward the ends of C8WI’s longevity spectrum, are by no means outliers in the C8WI pensioner’s aging and death rates. Aside from the premature expiration of 23 company members who died while enlisted, the vast majority of C8WI’s remaining members survived beyond 1880.

Mortality

Even with the existence of comparative samples as wide-ranging and detailed as the UAS created by Robert Fogel and other economic historians, comparative studies of nineteenth-century mortality do not exist. The wealth of data found available in the 1900 and subsequent Federal Censuses seems to have attracted scholars’ attention away from the nineteenth century, and the unavailability of the 1890 Federal Census does little to entice historians and economists to fill the gap in the country’s economic and social history. Even actuarial studies which focus on the nineteenth century lament the lack of accurate mortality reporting among census-takers. In his article, “Decennial Life Tables for the White Population of the United States, 1790-1900,” J. David Hacker explains the problem of studying nineteenth century mortality rates: “given the high short-term variability in mortality rates that was characteristic of the nineteenth-century United States, it is also unclear whether life tables based on a single year of data can be used to represent mortality in a year other than the one for which it was constructed. He adds, “Researchers have been forced to make crude assumptions about long-term mortality trends to conduct their analyses.” 43 The nearly-complete absence of pre-twentieth-century life expectancy data used for comparative studies strongly suggests its limited usefulness in its current state.

Historians working in the field of veterans’ aging have carefully avoided using the date of death provided in the PF to represent veterans’ mortality as a population because of their representational bias. Dejun Su’s 2009 article, “Risk Exposure in Early Life and Mortality at Older Ages: Evidence from Union Army Veterans,” published in the Population and Development Review examines the impact of early life risk factors on mortality of veterans in the Union Army sample. In the article, Su observes that the UAS likely has a sample selection bias for veterans who died prior to 1890. The Disability Act of June 27, 1890 lowered the requirements for obtaining a military pension to 90 days of service and a ratable disability. Since

42 Harry White, Certificate 345670, PF.

43 J. David Hacker, “Decennial Life Tables for White Males in the United States, 1790-1900.” Historical Methods, 21.
the 1890 law brought forth a wave of pension applications from those previously ineligible for benefits, veterans surviving after 1890 are more likely to be over-represented. 44

Because the PFs supply year of death data, it is impossible to determine if, or the extent to which, the UAS data and the data used in this study of C8WI represent living veterans without pensions. Due to unknown representation, it is unwise to use the dates of death gleaned from the PF as a representation of the company’s mortality over time. Although the dates of death available in the PF do not represent the company as a whole, they do provide information about a large group of Civil War veterans which had a great impact on society and public policy: pensioners. Among the men of C8WI, 65 percent have a known age at death from pension records. As shown in Figure 4.1, of the 65 percent, a majority lived to the age of 75, with a sharp decline thereafter. Most soldiers in the first two year ranges died as a result of war. Whereas Andrew Ritger died at the age of 23 in 1863 from sickness while in the service, 25-year-old Charles Parker died a year after his muster out in 1864 as a result of chronic diarrhea contracted as a soldier.45 The year of death histogram, shown in figure 4.2, indicates that half of C8WI soldiers affiliated with pensions expired prior to 1910, with the greatest number of soldier deaths between 1915 and 1919. 46 Since death marks the end of the aging process, the distribution for years of death can function as a valuable tool for analyzing aging. However, the lack of comparative data, even among similar veterans’ groups is significantly lacking. Until more data exists for pensioned veterans’ ages of death, such figures remain un-contextualized numbers waiting for further analysis.


45 Andrew Ritger PF, Charles Parker PF.

46 All C8WI PF.
Fig. 4.1: Age Range at Death

Fig. 4.2: Year of Death
Aging

Although the lack of comparative data prevents the use of year of death as a meaningful indicator of the aging process, the wealth of medical information in the PF provides insight into the process of veterans’ aging experiences. The system of disability ratings for Old Law pensions allows for a long-term, standardized means of chronicling severity of disability over time. Because revisions to the Old Law added an additional system of severity grades to the original system allowing for $2, $4, $6, or $8 compensation, rate of payment for Old Law pensioners is the best quantification of soldiers’ disability over time. Until 1903, the government maintained $8.00 per month for enlisted men as the rate of compensation for total disability, defined as being equivalent to the acrolysis, or fixation, of the wrist. Between 1862 and 1890, the system added and updated rates for specific conditions requiring financial support in addition to payment for total disability, such as the loss of a hand or foot. Because the system with $8.00 total disability remained in effect through the 1890s for Old Law pensioners, it is not necessary to account for inflation increasing rates of pension for a given soldier over decades. Only the ratable disabilities specified by the bureau were subject to increase over time. Since, as figure 4.3 shows, nearly all of C8WI’s pensioners remain almost entirely within the $8.00 rate schedule for the first few decades after the war and received rates for specified disabilities as their conditions worsened with age, increase in pension rate is more indicative of increased disability than it is of increases in the rate schedule.

Eliminating outliers further minimizes the effect of the few pensioners receiving the higher schedule-specified rates prior to 1880, and for unusual cases thereafter. Only two C8WI soldiers were pensioned for schedule-specified rates prior to the year 1880 when other pensioners’ disabilities quickly became increasingly limiting and required greater financial support. John Hill, the soldier who had been shot through the body and fell under an active field piece, received the total disability rate of $8.00 per month from 1864 until 1873, when his condition became increasingly debilitating. By 1884, Hill’s condition had worsened further, and his pension had increased to $24 due to his severely limited ability to bend his upper body forward or backward and total deafness in the right ear. After Hill’s examination, the surgeon concluded, “His disabilities are equal to the loss of a hand or foot.” Even though Hill’s pension rate falls
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50 Between 1880 and 1884, the number of active pensioners with schedule-specified disability rates increases from one pensioner, John Hill, to six.
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above that of his fellow invalid veterans, his medical reports reflect his worsening condition with age. The only other C8WI veteran pensioned at a specified rate above total disability before 1880, drops out of view immediately after receiving his rate increase in 1867 from $8.00 to $15.00 per month for his right arm amputated above the elbow. Unfortunately, his documentation ceases after 1867, so his file is too limited to show any distinguishable signs of aging.

Since pension increases can occur for a soldier in any given year, or even multiple times in a given year within the pensionable range, approaching pension rates by intervals is best way of tracking disability over time for comparison among veterans. Because the bureau pensioned only chronic, debilitating conditions, soldiers’ pension rates do not decrease. A soldier’s highest pension rate within each five year interval represents the severity his condition reached by the end of the interval. The Pension Bureau did not issue Civil War pensions prior to 1862, so the first pension rating interval only covers the two wartime years from 1862-1864. Thereafter, five-year intervals reach until just prior to the 1900-1904 interval in which Old Law pensioners began receiving pension or age rather than particular disabilities.
The box plot in figure 4.3 shows the disability rate percentiles among Old Law invalid pensioners of C8WI from 1862 until 1899. Outliers are marked by dots above the data. Although the general upward trend of the data pales in comparison to the great increase made by the outlier at $72.00 per month in the 1895-1899 interval, the median rate constantly increases after the handful of severely injured and diseased die out of the sample during or shortly after the war. The trends in figure 4.3 show how the process of aging among veterans impacted the severity
war-related disabilities, changing little in the first two decades after the war, and then increasing steadily through the end of the examined period.

Jacob Aaron’s pension file exemplifies the process of aging shown in figure 4.3. According to his original invalid pension 1865, Aaron suffered half disability, pensioned at $4.00 per month from 1865 for chronic diarrhea attributed to “coarse diet, bad water and exposure” while serving near Vicksburg in July 1864.\footnote{Jacob Aaron, PF.} He remained at the same rate until the late 1880s without significant change. In 1882, Edmund Baker, a physician, described Aaron’s condition, having known him for at least four or five years. He wrote, “I have examined him again today and find his condition unchanged. he is broken down in health and the disease is aggravated whenever he heats his blood, or is exposed to cold.”\footnote{Ibid.} By 1888, when his application for increase yielded a rate of $10.00 per month, Aaron’s disability had worsened further to include “disease of rectum” in addition to his diarrheic condition. He listed his miserable condition before his medical evaluation in 1888:

- Have attacks of diarrhea most of the time –
- Pass blood and have pain –
- Have piles\footnote{“Piles” is the former name for hemorrhoids.} bad –
- Have to make water often
- Have to be careful in diet—have sour stomach a good deal.\footnote{Ibid.}

As he passed through his fifties, his condition worsened with the natural physical deterioration of aging, as shown by another rate increase to $12.00.\footnote{Ibid.} He eventually died in 1907 at the age of 79.\footnote{Ibid.}

**CONCLUSION**

Although their circumstances of death differ greatly, Jacob Aaron, the unfortunate soldier with worsening chronic diarrhea, and train victim Daniel Wyman’s enlistment characteristics and aging experience have many commonalities with those of their fellow former comrades-in-arms. As single men in their late twenties and early thirties, Aaron and Wyman were slightly older than the majority of the company, but were by no means outliers. As a company, the men of C8WI
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were an overwhelmingly young, single population. Having a small majority of native-born men and a significant minority of foreign-born, the company reflects the frontier population from which it came. Both Aaron and Wyman originated from the eastern United States, but many of their neighbors and fellow soldiers hailed from Germany and Canada. Charles Wheeler, the supposedly Scottish boy soldier, served with plenty of company members with which he chattered in German, as Sergeant Schmidtmayer recalled tongue-in-cheek. With nearly half of the company owning no property and about 60% reporting the occupation of farmer or unskilled worker, the unit is relatively typical for its rural and lumbering origins. A smattering of older men such as the artillery veteran Victor Wolf added experience and leadership to the young ranks, if not fleetness of foot.

After the war, the survivors re-entered civilian life, with many suffering from various ailments originating in the service. Although Wyman was killed in an accident, his postwar disabilities follow the pattern of aging shown by pension rates Aaron, Hill, and their comrades. Like Aaron, Wyman’s disabled condition upon discharge from the army worsened significantly between 1882 and 1886, jumping from half disability of $4.00 per month to total disability of $8.00. Their fellow pensioners, most of which were in their late 40s and 50s, were beginning to experience the effects of aging through their disabilities at about the same time, reflected by the distribution of their pension rates. However, because of the lack of comparable data, it is impossible to determine the extent to which Aaron and Wyman’s aging progression are typical for Union veterans.

The study of Civil War veterans’ aging and mortality is a complex field, fraught with the challenges posed by the nature of pension files and availability of comparable data, but further study of the topic is greatly needed for a more complete understanding of late-nineteenth and twentieth-century America. The influence of the Grand Army of the Republic upon the federal government’s social policies and of the veterans upon their communities necessitates investigation extending from the end of hostilities in 1865. With the sesquicentennial of the Civil War, Americans and scholars are paying greater attention to the social and cultural history of the conflict, but the aftermath of soldiers’ lives sadly receives little discussion. Employing life transition analysis and quantifying the aging of veterans would greatly contribute to our understanding of an event and its aftermath that continues to impact and intrigue Americans. The postwar experience and aging of veterans is an area of study which offers many research possibilities to historians, and requires attention similar to that given to the creation of social profiles twenty years ago. If it is explored, the field will likely provide verification or correction to questions with answers that have been assumed for decades.

58 Wyman, PF.
Appendix A:
Rules for Determining Age from Combined Sources

Because a combination of Pension Files, Blue Muster Rolls, and Red Muster Rolls provide the information for the social profile at enlistment, an explanation of the hierarchy I applied to the sources in determining soldiers’ age at enlistment and other data may be helpful. Each of the sources has its own strengths and weaknesses, since each has a different purpose and origin. Both sets of muster rolls, actually large ledgers rather than rolls of paper, originated from the rolls completed upon a company’s muster into the service. In addition, the Blue Rolls include information gathered from the paperwork generated by monthly and bi-monthly returns. The Red Rolls, compiled in 1866, have information on the place of birth and occupation which is not included in the Blue Rolls and not systematically presented in the Pension Files. While the Blue Rolls do not contain as much information about a soldier’s prewar life, they do summarize the soldiers’ wartime experience. Besides noting rank changes, the Blue Rolls also indicate when and why a soldier was absent from the unit or serving on detached duty.

The Blue Rolls tend to provide more accurate information than the Red Rolls when discrepancies occur, but both documents rely on soldiers’ self-reporting. As such, both sets of documents do not correct aliases or false information provided by some soldiers at enlistment. The PF are the most accurate of the three sets of documents, but least accessible. Aside from not representing every soldier in the unit, the pension files do not present data in a systematic manner, making it difficult to locate, if it exists in the file at all. In order to account for these differences while gathering data, I followed the following rules:

1. Age given in Blue Rolls always takes precedent over that given in Red Rolls if no pension file exists. If a PF exists, enter age from Blue Rolls and note age from Red Rolls in the soldier’s record, and then consult Pension File for confirmation.

2. If the PF provides an exact birthdate, accept the age at Enlistment calculated from the year of birth and year of enlistment, regardless of Muster Roll data. Because the Pension Examiners often check the consistency of age and birthdate given and reliability of the documentation, this is more accurate than the unverified Muster Roll dates.

3. If the PF consistently list multiple years deviating from the muster roll by up to 2 years, use the year from the PF closest to that of the MR.

4. For cases in which the previous rules do not provide a number, and neither the PF or MR suggest which number is the most accurate, use the PF number closest to that found in the MR.
APPENDIX B:
Search Criteria for Federal Census Manuscripts

Often a search of the United States Federal Census returns many similar results, making it necessary to determine which, if any, match a given soldier. Because this study includes information obtained from MR and PF regarding year of birth, place of birth, and occupation, it was possible to find more probable matches in the census data. Since even the most definite matches can contain information that differs slightly from that provided in the MR and PF, I have included my census search criteria and hierarchy of information in determining the accuracy of returns.

The C8WI’s affiliation with a particular county made it possible to find matches without manipulating search criteria. Before conducting a computerized search of the census, I did a manual search of the manuscript images for all townships in the county. For all computerized searches, I began with First and last name, Year of Birth ± 2, and location of birth (if known). The modifier “Wisconsin, USA” accompanied all searches, not because it limited the number of results, but made it easier to locate Wisconsin-related results for those who were living in the state in 1860. All name searches initially included soundex, phonetic, and similar name matches.

When determining whether a result matched a soldier, the least important criteria are year of birth and place of birth. As shown in the MR and PF, soldiers frequently give a range of ages and dates, possibly because in a culture that did not emphasize birthdays, some may not have known their actual age, year, or place of birth. In other cases, inaccuracies are an inherent problem with the census. A study published by Peter R. Knights in the *Historical Methods Newsletter* 4.3, (1971), 79-83, shows that the Federal Census Manuscripts from 1850 and 1860 report ages a year greater in 12 to 25 percent of cases, due to the “leisurely pace of census-taking.” Given the ±2 year search criterion, the inherent inaccuracies of the census should not greatly impact results, except that it can enhance the inaccuracies from reporter error or the clerical errors. Both place of birth and year of birth can add strength to a match, but are not necessary for a soldier’s positive identification in the census.

While name is the most important way of identifying a person in census manuscripts, exact name is not. Over the course of time, several men signed their names with different spellings. Even more of the men in C8WI had German or other non-English names which clearly and frequently caused problems for census-takers. Such unique names, if they match census entries, greatly add strength to results. However, they have many pitfalls in census-taking and study. German men such as Francis Schmidtmayer and Christian Scholzoff of C8WI do not appear among those linked to the census, possibly because they had not yet entered the country, but also possibly because the census-taker’s creative spellings made locating their names through a computerized search impossible. Mark Sibbald’s name appeared in the census with information...
clearly corresponding to his enlistment, but was spelled “Sibble,” possibly due to poor enunciation or hearing.

The strongest indicator of a match is a person’s place of residence. Men with common names or multiple results strongly link to the C8WI roster when their place of residence matches or is nearby that listed at enlistment.
APPENDIX C:

Pension Files and Accuracy

The original purpose of the PF was to document and track claims for payment, ensuring that payments were justified and fair. To achieve this end the Pension Office (PO) employed a variety of methods to determine the veracity of claims. Since applicants supplied most of the information proving the basis of their claims, the PO’s main task was to judge the information’s accuracy and seek more accurate versions if necessary. The review processes in place meant that officials were constantly checking and re-checking information so that federal money would not fall into undeserving hands.

The requests for additional information and notes of discrepancies in files indicate that, while not perfect, the pension system did correct problematic data. In the case of Robert Dodge, the PO made an inquiry and required multiple affidavits confirming his identity when he began consistently signing his name with his middle initial. Dodge’s case, an extreme example of the Pension Office’s meticulousness, is just one of the many inquiries made by Pension Office officials among C8WI’s pensioners. The most common requests for further evidence are more mundane in nature. Birth records, marriage certificates, and proof of disability are all common requests which provide invaluable information for social historians.

For Old Law invalid pensioners, the PO required periodic physical exams by a board of physicians, which are included in the PF. Most invalid files contain multiple examination reports, meticulously documenting medical condition over time. In addition to periodic examination reports, the PO often requested applicants submit multiple physicians’ affidavits detailing their treatment over time. The importance of linking an Old Law pensioner’s medical experiences while enlisted with the veteran’s claimed disability generated documentation which readily makes connections between conditions at various times and provides historians with quality longitudinal data.

Certainly, the PO did not succeed in uncovering every inaccuracy or false claim, but the checks it employed resulted in an astonishingly accurate and detailed record. However, its verifications and judgments do not replace the work of an historian. The value of PF for correcting documents lies not in the rulings of the PF regarding the proof of claims, but in their meticulous collection of evidence.
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APPENDIX D

Pension Law

One of the greatest difficulties in using pension files is efficiently navigating the intricacies of pension law. Time, changing public policy attitudes, and additional wars all contributed pension law revision throughout the time in which Civil War pensions were active, starting in 1862. From 1864 through 1904, the Pension Bureau’s handbook, published in 1915, lists eighteen changes in rates for specific disabilities under the 1862 law.60 The Act of July 14, 1862 and the Act of June 27, 1890 provide the most basic division in pension law by distinguishing between the payment for disability from service and pension for general disability. Each law requires different evidence, which means that the laws are affiliated with different types of documentation. Understanding the basic shifts in pension law and policy prevent one from becoming bogged-down in complex pension law, and help researchers anticipate what information they are likely to encounter.

The Act of 1862, commonly referred to as the “Old Law,” requires that soldiers prove their disability resulted from service. In order to prove the connection of their disability to service, applicants frequently include testimony from fellow service members in their claims. Mandatory medical examinations verified soldiers’ conditions as chronic, and prevented continued payment to veterans without chronic debilitating conditions. Under the Act of 1890, pensions began their transition to a form of welfare and old-age support. The new law no longer required that soldier’s prove the origin of their disabilities, but rather created a new table of rates for the aging veteran population. By 1890, all surviving members of the 20-24 age cohort had reached their fifties. In order to accommodate the aging population, the Pension Bureau set pensionable rates for those claiming disability from general aging. The Bureau’s policy became law in 1907, when soldiers who had served for 90 days could claim an old age pension starting at age 62, and increasing at ages 70 and 75.61 Because soldiers pensioned under the act of 1890 were not required to prove the origin of their disability, Disability Act pensions contain fewer medical reports. However, the increasing importance of age placed a greater importance on proving date and place of birth. Notary-copied information from family bibles and church records are less rare in Disability Act pensions.

Both laws allowed for widows and dependents to claim pension from a deceased soldier. Although dependent parents’ pensions rarely met the burden of proof required for establishing dependency, pensions for widows who had not remarried and their children are common.

60 Pension Bureau Handbook, 85.

61 Ibid., 87.
Because the primary conditions of such pensions are proof of soldier’s service and proof of his death, they are a valuable source for death certificates, hospital bills, and funeral service receipts.
RESISTANCE: EMPOWERING NORWEGIANS AND CREATING SOLIDARITY UNDER NAZI OCCUPATION

Cassie Holstad

April 9, 1940 began a period considered by Norwegians as the darkest period in their long history. On that date, Adolph Hitler’s Nazi forces invaded Norway, and the Norwegian people became subject to Nazi occupation until May 8, 1945. During this time, many Norwegians participated in various forms of defiance, including civil, institutional, and military resistance. With each of these efforts, the oppressed Norwegian people were able to undermine the control the Nazis had on their country, but it is with civil and institutional opposition that one notices the efforts put forth by ordinary people to preserve Norwegian culture and morals. Civil resistance deteriorated the morale of the German soldiers and collaborators, while institutional resistance efforts, coupled with an illegal press, eroded the primary Nazi tool for suppression, the ability to instill fear. As fear weakened, the Nazis lost some of their ability to control the Norwegian people. More than anything else, civil and institutional resistance brought Norwegians together in solidarity under the common mission of working to free Norway from Nazi occupation. Each successful confrontation further empowered the Norwegians. The solidarity gained through resistance efforts bolstered the Norwegians’ ability to combat nazification throughout the period of German occupation. Nazification was the political indoctrination of Nazi ideals; Norwegians in all groups across society worked to resist the efforts of nazification.

While many Norwegians participated in resistance efforts, there were some who chose to cooperate with the Nazi regime. Perhaps the best-known collaborator was Vidkun Quisling, a man with his own political aspirations. In 1933, Quisling had founded the fascist political party, Nasjonal Samling (NS), in Norway. He was a former Minister of Defense of Norway, and he wanted to overthrow the Norwegian government. Quisling created a plan for Hitler to help him with his coup d’etat and to establish his own government in Norway. Skeptical of this plan, Hitler decided to invade for his own reasons.

Hitler viewed the Norwegians as Nordic cousins to the German people, and Norway was thus a logical country to invade. Because of their deep waters and natural inlets, the fjords were favorable for naval bases along the coast. These bases would provide an access to the North Atlantic Ocean, making a blockade and offensive attacks on Great Britain more feasible. Also of strategic value, control of the waters around Norway would allow German freighters to carry Swedish iron ore safely to Germany. Iron ore was of vital importance for the continuance of the German arms buildup. Without the iron, many of the weapons the Germans needed could not be made.²

Hitler had plans to invade Norway, but it was not until February 1940 that he began to implement them. A relatively insignificant incident with a supply ship started the chain of events that led to the invasion of Norway. A German supply ship, the Altmark, was carrying British prisoners and crossed into Norwegian territorial waters. A Norwegian gunboat halted the ship and conducted a lax inspection of the vessel, concluding that it carried no prisoners or weapons. The British knew better, and crossed into Norwegian waters to confront the ship. Hitler was furious that Norway would allow this breach of neutrality, and after the Altmark incident, Norway’s neutrality was questioned by both the Nazis and the British. Hitler expedited his plans to invade Norway, and the Weserübung plan was quickly drafted. Once Germany’s intentions for Norway were known by the British, a plan for British invasion was quickly developed. The British plan, called Operation Wilfred, was scheduled for April 5, 1940, but it was not implemented then.³ Even with intelligence of German movements, the British did not act early enough, and the Germans successfully invaded Norway on April 9.

In many ways, the Norwegians were not prepared for the invasion, and they were incapable of defending their country. With only three million citizens, it was difficult for the Norwegians to field a strong military force. Norway also depended heavily on trade; over half of the food consumed by the Norwegians was imported at the time. Communication and transportation infrastructures throughout Norway were poor, and it could take days for information, supplies or manpower to cross the country. Also a detriment, their fortifications were all outdated and not sufficiently equipped with the necessary weapons to fight an invading force.⁴ As Major O. Munthe-Kaas wrote during the war, “To defend successfully the drawn out Norwegian coast would be a tremendous problem even for a well-prepared, well-armed mobilized nation. For an unprepared, peace-loving people to defend it against a superior enemy who comes like a murderer in the night is an insurmountable task.”⁵ There was no way for
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Norway to defend itself against a larger and stronger army. Because of this, the Norwegians were forced to use creative resistance efforts instead of engaging in direct combat.

The German invasion of Norway on April 9, 1940 came as a surprise to many Norwegians. In general, the invasion went smoothly for the Germans, and most targets were captured quickly, but the Norwegians were able to create a few obstacles for them. The German plan called for the heavy cruiser *Blücher* to sail up the fjord to Oslo and for troops to seize the King and the Norwegian government. Norwegians were able to damage the *Enden* and *Lützow*, the escort ships for the heavy cruiser, and destroy the *Blücher*. Because of this German setback, the King, Royal Family, Cabinet, and members of the *Storting* (parliament) gained time to flee Oslo and eventually escape the country. Stalling the Germans also provided time for the Norwegians to load twenty-three trucks to carry most of Norway’s gold supply out of Oslo, and for confidential documents to be safely removed from the Foreign Office.6

The fate of Norway was ultimately decided on the first day of the invasion, but the determined Norwegians fought on for two months. During those two months, over forty thousand men joined General Ruge to defend Norway. Many of the volunteers lacked any combat experience, and many had only their weapons from home. Fierce battles occurred in Northern Norway with the British and Norwegian troops fighting the Germans. The two months of fighting cost 9,957 lives for Germany, Great Britain, Norway, France, and Poland on land and at sea in the battle for Norway. Because of poor planning, a lack of communications and support, the troops could not continue to fight, and on June 10, 1940, an armistice was negotiated with General Dietl.7

As previously mentioned, the King, Crown Prince, and the Cabinet were able to flee from Oslo on April 9th. They traveled north, and the next day the King met with one of Hitler’s Ministers, Dr. Braüer. Braüer presented the King with the ultimatum of appointing Quisling as Prime Minister, or else face the horrors of war against the Germans. The King said to his Council of State afterward,

That responsibility for the misfortunes that will come to the country and its people if this demand is refused be laid upon me, has made a profound impression upon me. It is a heavy responsibility, so heavy that I shudder to bear it. The decision must be with the Government, but my attitude is clear. I cannot agree to the German demands. … I have searched my heart and considered my attitude, and I cannot appoint Quisling, whom I know to enjoy no confidence either with the

---
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people as a whole, nor with the people’s representatives, the Storting and Ministers of State.\(^8\)

The government members, who had fled with the King, voted unanimously that the German ultimatum should be rejected. The King inspired his Ministers to rise to the challenge of their responsibilities and set forth in organizing the Norwegian resistance.\(^9\) On June 7, after sixty days in hiding, the King and the Government left Norway for England.\(^10\)

In June 1940, the members of the Storting who remained in Norway appealed to King Haakon to abdicate the throne. The Storting was under tremendous pressure from the Nazis to force the King into doing so.\(^11\) King Haakon refused to abdicate, and with this refusal, Norwegians began resistance efforts in earnest. The King established a government-in-exile in London, and it provided financial support for resistance efforts, and kept hope alive. It was difficult for the King to decide to leave Norway, but he believed it was the best course of action for his country. The King believed in the government-in-exile and what they were working to accomplish. In a broadcast on August 29, 1940, the King advised the nation on how they should conduct themselves:

Avoid everything which is inconsistent with our national dignity; remain Norwegian in mind and thought, even if your thoughts in existing circumstances cannot be translated into speech, writing or action. That this should be done is an absolutely necessary condition for preserving that strong national feeling which is distinctive mark of our people, and which finally will render impossible every attempt to wipe out Norway as an independent kingdom.\(^12\)

Many citizens believed that the “hope of recovering freedom and national independence was embodied in the King.”\(^13\) Before the war King Haakon was not a popular ruler, but after his refusal to abdicate, the country believed in him, and pro-Haakon sentiment was prevalent across the country.\(^14\)


\(^9\) Ibid., 155.

\(^10\) Ibid., 168.


\(^12\) Greve, 153.


Fortunately, King Haakon and the government-in-exile left Norway with many resources. The Norwegian gold reserves that were saved from Oslo were shipped to Great Britain and later on to the United States. The government had £36 million in gold, and they had the Norwegian merchant fleet of over a thousand ships. Because of the fleet and gold, Norway was able to pay off all of her debts throughout the war.\textsuperscript{15}

With the Nazi invasion on April 9, and the Norwegian government displaced, Quisling made the radio announcement that he was the new Prime Minister, and that all powers of government were transferred to the NS Party.\textsuperscript{16} The Norwegian civilians felt abandoned by the government-in-exile, but the act of Quisling taking control alleviated the ill-feeling of the Norwegian population. When faced with the choice to support the government-in-exile or support the traitor Quisling, the choice was made easy for most Norwegians.\textsuperscript{17} Quisling made himself Prime Minister without first consulting with the Nazis, and when they realized Quisling had no real support, they soon demoted him. Hitler appointed \textit{Reichskommissar} Josef Terboven to oversee all Norwegian civil affairs, and with Terboven’s leadership, Norway was soon functioning with German efficiency.\textsuperscript{18} Terboven had two main objectives for Norway: to advance Germany’s war effort by whatever means and to establish a new legitimate Norwegian government. On September 25, Terboven gave up on creating the legitimate government and outlawed all other parties besides the NS. On October 4, he issued an ordinance dismissing any public servant who refused to work with the NS. Before long, Terboven had regulated every part of the Norwegians’ life, from food and work to the amount of light visible at night.\textsuperscript{19}

Quisling was appointed Minister President of Norway on February 1, 1942. He created a bodyguard unit of young men called the \textit{Hird} that was modeled after Hitler’s SA. The \textit{Hird} was a violent group that had the support of the police. It instilled fear in the citizens of Norway through havoc in the streets and gang violence. The NS reached its peak membership in 1943 with nearly 43,000 members, out of the three million wartime population. Many joined for economic or

\textsuperscript{15} Michael, 176.
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material advantages available only through party membership, or they were impressed with the German military machine and the discipline of the German regime.\textsuperscript{20}

Hanna Helmersen, who was a young girl living in Northern Norway during the war, wrote, “Our national existence was threatened, as were the values we held high: rule of law, intellectual and spiritual freedom, our special cultural heritage, all those aspects of life which made it worthwhile.”\textsuperscript{21} The Norwegians were fighting for their very way of life, and resisting the Nazis was the only way to preserve everything they valued. The resistance movement was organized primarily in two parts: the individual civilian groups called Civorg, and the military organization, Milorg.\textsuperscript{22}

After April 9, 1940, over 4,000 people fled Norway to join intelligence and military groups. Many felt that this course of action would help Norway the most because it was obvious that liberation could only happen with the assistance of Great Britain. It is estimated that 3,500 people crossed the North Sea in small boats and around 500 people went east to Sweden, and eventually made it to Great Britain, the United States, or Canada for training.\textsuperscript{23} In most cases, the Norwegians were trained quickly as intelligence agents, wireless operators, saboteurs, or instructors for paramilitary resistance groups, and then sent back to Norway for their missions. The three groups that were the most active in resistance efforts were the Special Operations Executive (SOE), British Secret Intelligence Service (SIS), and the Norwegian Military Organization (Milorg).\textsuperscript{24}

The SOE was established by Winston Churchill in July 1940 to train émigrés from occupied countries in sabotage activities. These secret groups were trained to inflict damage on the Nazis from behind enemy lines. Since Norway had more émigrés than any other country, Great Britain provided them with the most support. The SOE worked independently from both Norwegian authorities in London and the local leadership. This created conflicts with Milorg, the main Norwegian military group. The Milorg group did not support raids and sabotage, the primary missions for SOE, because these events usually hurt the Norwegian people more than they helped. Following sabotage incidents, the Germans usually punished the Norwegians in the area for the act. The sabotage also seemed to yield more destruction of Norwegian property than German setbacks.\textsuperscript{25}
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\textsuperscript{23} Fuegner, 110. The escape east was a difficult route, differing for most Norwegians. Some of the countries Norwegians passed through on their way to Great Britain or other Allied countries included Finland, Russia, China, India, Turkey, and various countries in Africa.
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After training in Allied countries, people re-entered Norway either by the Shetland bus, a group of Norwegian sailors who sailed missions across the North Sea from the Shetland Islands to the coast of Norway, or by parachuting into the country. During 1941, the Shetland bus carried forty-nine SOE agents to Norway, while twenty-one were air dropped. One of the most significant missions of the SOE was the destruction of the Norsk Hydro hydroelectric power-plant above the town of Rjukan. The plant produced a chemical fertilizer byproduct called heavy water. Heavy water was being shipped to Germany for use in plutonium production reactors for the production of the atomic bomb. Knut Haukelid, along with a crew of SOE agents, endured some of the harshest conditions in Norway to carry out the mission to destroy all of the heavy water. On February 28, 1943, the agents planted explosives in the plant and managed to destroy 1,000 pounds of heavy water and some machinery. It was thought that the plant would be out of commission for two years, but it was up and running again within two months. On February 20, 1944, some of the same agents finished the job by sinking a ferry in Lake Tinnsjø that was carrying the heavy water to Germany. This last mission ended all German experimentation with heavy water, most likely preventing Germany from creating an atomic bomb.26

SIS agents worked on secret missions and the training of small groups in Norway to support Milorg. The agents were trained in a variety of fields to be competent in all areas of the missions. Hugo Munthe-Kaas set up local radio agents along the coast of Norway to report the location of the Tirpitz, a German battleship. These agents nicknamed the ship bestemor (grandmother) and themselves barnepiker (babysitters). The agents were able to report to Great Britain all movements of the Tirpitz, and on November 12, 1944, the largest ship in the German navy was sunk.27

The Milorg group was created to keep able bodied men in a defense mindset, and to give the young men training and experience so that when an Allied invasion occurred, the group would be ready to assist. The groups were quickly created across the country because an Allied invasion was thought to be imminent. In their haste, they initially made security mistakes that enabled the Germans to arrest many Milorg members. These security mistakes were the primary reason that the SOE refused to work with Milorg. Security measures were soon implemented so that Milorg members were not allowed to contact or know the identity of more than three other members, unless a member was in a training area. This security measure was implemented as a stop-gap to prevent the whole organization from being exposed and arrested if someone released membership information during interrogation. After security was increased, Milorg was recognized in November 1941 by the Norwegian government-in-exile, and after that the group was given direction by the British Supreme Command.

On February 22, 1943, Quisling introduced a new law for a national labor effort, as previously mentioned. Men between the ages 18 and 55, and women between the ages 21 and 40

27 Scott, 203-204.
would be registered for work. Resistance leaders sent out a directive telling Norwegians to refuse to register. It was soon discovered by resistance leaders that the labor effort was a front for military conscriptions. Milorg was given clearance from London to act to destroy the registers containing Norwegian names. On May 18 and 19, 1943, the Oslo Gang, a sabotage group led by Gunnar Sönsteby, a liaison officer to Milorg and SOE, blew up the punch machines. The machines were responsible for making the registration cards, and in June the last of the machines was destroyed. In reaction, NS police began roundups of anyone in the age group able to work. Young men went into hiding with families in rural communities or in the woods. Entire communities worked together to get food for the “forest lads.” It is estimated that around five thousand men were living in the woods to avoid being mobilized for the Eastern Front. Soon, a new NS law was instituted requiring each individual to get their own ration card instead of a family member getting cards for all of the adults. The Germans thought this action would starve the men in the forests and force them out of hiding. Milorg tried to print ration cards, but challenges arose. Instead, the Oslo Gang was able to steal 70,000 to 80,000 ration cards on August 9, 1944. After this action the NS never again used food as a weapon.28

In addition to the military groups, several civilian groups were active in the resistance effort. The R-Group or “Norwegian Front,” was created in 1940, and played an active role in the resistance movement until the autumn of 1941. It was a resistance network started by trade unionists, journalists, academic leaders, and business leaders. The group was not formed to organize direct resistance, but to establish a communication channel between the Norwegian government-in-exile and the Norwegian people. They managed this by establishing contact with a few key people inside a number of organizations, and creating a chain of contact across the country. The R-Group was replaced by the Co-ordination Committee (KK) and the “Circle” (Kretsen) in 1942. The main responsibility of the KK was the issuance of paroles. A parole was a secret directive from the home front that called for a unified attitude for various groups or all civilians in an operational situation. With the majority of the citizens working together on an issue, a solid front against nazification was created, and paroles became essential for the civil struggle. Throughout the course of the war, it is estimated that over fifty paroles were issued to various groups.29 The “Circle” group worked to establish contact between resistance groups and the government-in-exile. The main goal was to deal with the misunderstandings and disagreements between the home front and the government-in-exile.30

Any type of resistance against the NS was considered an action against the state.31 Despite the danger, individuals and groups risked their lives and the lives of others to create an
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important resistance front against the nazification effort. Civil passive resistance was the first sign of opposition across Norway. The “cold shoulder policy” was distinctly felt by the Germans immediately: “One German officer who had taken part in the Polish campaign said that it was bad enough to see the furious hatred in the eyes of the Poles, but it was even worse to face the cold contempt of the Norwegians.” It soon became apparent that an occupied country is not the same as a conquered country. The “cold shoulder policy” entailed ignoring the Germans and NS members in as many ways as possible. Many Norwegians refused to speak German even if they knew the language, and in most cases pretended they did not understand what German soldiers were saying to them. The Germans often received bad directions, and their orders were often not followed by Norwegian citizens. Shop owners and restaurant entrepreneurs intentionally messed up orders or refused to serve the Germans. So many Norwegians refused to sit by German soldiers or NS members that it became a punishable offense if one moved away from a soldier or NS member on public transit. Even with this new law, the Norwegians still found ways to shun soldiers and NS members outright.

*Jössing* Codes or Patriotic Codes, soon emerged from resisters. They were social codes for civilians to follow that demanded that all NS members and sympathizers be ignored and treated like traitors. The term *Jössing* originated as a condescending term for those who opposed Nazism. The *Altmark* incident occurred in Jössing Fjord, and a pro-Nazi paper in Sweden termed the Norwegians who did not shoot at the British, *Jössings*. The negative connotation was quickly switched by Norwegians using it with pride. *Jössing* soon stood for,

*Jeg ønsker Staten Styrt Ifølge Norges Grunnlov*
(I want the state ruled according to Norway’s Constitution.)

The *Jössings* saw themselves as supporting the prewar Norwegian status quo with a focus on the Norwegian Constitution and independence. The Germans considered them as British inspired traitors.33

Derogatory comments about the NS or Nazi party were a punishable offense, and any negatively spoken or written remarks about Hitler were capital offenses. Civilian resistance was strengthened by new rhetoric and anti-German jokes, even with the great risks to personal safety. The jokes portrayed the frustrations of living under Nazi occupation that the Norwegians could not safely express publicly. As Kathleen Stokker notes, “wry comments about shortages, restrictions, terrorism, and other wartime hardships raised consciousness as it fanned indignation about the extent of Nazi political, spiritual, and material oppression. In its own time this heightened awareness prevented an unthinking infiltration of Nazism into Norwegian society.”34
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By poking fun at the Nazi regime, Norwegians were able to dispel some of the fear tactics associated with the Germans. The jokes and rhetoric gave the illusion that everyone was resisting nazification, which consequentially lifted the Norwegians' morale while diminishing that of the Germans. The illusion also helped remove the feeling of isolation, which was the Nazis’ infamous terror tactic. Joking became a way of making the unbearable situation of occupation a little more bearable.  

Civilians also found visual ways to keep the spirit of resistance alive. Throughout the war, patriotic symbols and anti-German symbols appeared everywhere. It became common practice for youngsters to deface propaganda posters and paint H7 signs around communities on houses and store fronts, both of which were punishable offenses. (H7 was a symbol that stood for King Haakon VII, and displayed loyalty to the King of Norway and the government-in-exile in London.) V for Victory, adopted by the Norwegians from the British, became another visual sign. It was written so prevalently that soon German propaganda stated it was for the German Viktoria. The V for Victory was overpowered by the German propaganda on the Continent, but not in Norway. The German word for victory is wiktoria, and the clever Norwegians stated that the German V stood for verlieren (to lose). The way Norwegians distinguished between the German V and the V for Victory was by also adding the H7 monogram. By adding this symbol, there was no confusion about whom the graffiti was supporting.

Clothing and accessories became another visual way to show support for the resistance movement. Red woolen caps, some with the bulls-eye, were worn by civilians supporting the resistance. Other resisters wore medallions with the motto “All for Norway.” Paper clips on coat lapels and cuffs carried the meaning of “keeping together,” and wooden match sticks in the breast pocket of a shirt or coat were a sign of “flaming hate.” Combs visible in the breast pocket stood for “We’ll manage by ourselves.” Pulling a coat lapel through a buttonhole was a way to stick out one’s tongue at the Germans. Another symbol was to wear a watch on the underside of one’s wrist; this symbolized “down with the New Order.” While these little symbols do not seem significant, they were visual signs of resistance and solidarity which lifted the Norwegian morale. An occupation survivor wrote about the clothing symbols: “What was done often seemed ridiculous, but it had the effect of uniting all the opposition forces. These were acts that if ignored by the authorities would have had no effect, but because the Regime protested so vigorously, these little things became important symbols of resistance.”

---
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and jokes eroded the morale of the German soldiers, and promoted a sense of resistance and hope for the Norwegian people. These clothing choices carried a risk as well; they became an open invitation for a beating by the Hird.\textsuperscript{38}

Individuals were able to resist enough to create a feeling of solidarity between the occupied people, but it was the various civilian groups that made significant differences and inspired hope. Ship-owners in Norway were one of the first groups to feel the pinch of Nazi control. Soon after occupation the ship-owners were affected by economic penalties and taxation. The Nazis commandeered their boats because many of the Norwegians were using them to flee to Great Britain, which reduced the fishing industry. In the summer of 1940, Nazis demanded that the Norwegian ship captains broadcast a message to their fellow captains who had fled Norway, to return. The ship-owners formed a unified front against the Nazi demand, and refused to contact the escaped captains. The NS put additional pressure on the Ship-owners Association by arresting the President and the Administrative Director of the Association, but the Association membership remained strong and refused to elect NS members for the open positions. The ship-owners group quickly became an example of resistance for other types of civilian groups.\textsuperscript{39} As Gjelsvik notes, “by choosing a line of resistance on principle, which at the same time strengthened the resistance front in the nation as a whole, the ship-owners set an example for others to emulate.”\textsuperscript{40} This example was followed by groups like athletes, doctors, actors, teachers, and the church.

Athletes followed the example of the ship-owners, they also resisted the NS’ demands and attempts to Nazify the sports organizations. In the fall of 1940, Quisling believed that if the NS increased financial support for sporting activities, the young population would support the “New Era.” He organized the various sports associations of Norway into a Norwegian Athletic Association, but the association required NS membership. It was a large miscalculation on Quisling’s part. Soon after this, the athletes and spectators began to boycott all local, national, and international sporting matches that were set up by the “New Order.” Some of the major athletes were arrested. Other athletes joined resistance groups, or stopped playing sports for the duration of the war. Quisling did not achieve the support he wanted for the “New Order,” but achieved quite the opposite, as 300,000 young athletes took a stand against the NS.\textsuperscript{41}

Doctors faced a similar situation with the NS in 1940. The NS demanded declarations of loyalty from public servants, and those who did not declare their loyalty to the NS were threatened with dismissal. Doctors and teachers were the first groups under NS pressure. The NS
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tried to get the Norwegian Medical Association to join the NS Guild for Health and Hygiene, but the association vote was a clear majority of “no.” As a reprisal, the NS had four doctors in the Directorate of Medicine dismissed on political grounds. In February 1941, the NS tried to have the superintendent doctor at the Oslo Municipal Hospital removed and arrested. All of the senior doctors at the hospital and at other Norwegian hospitals threatened to walk out in protest. The NS was forced to back down.\(^{42}\)

Early in 1941, the NS also put pressure on the acting community to perform on the radio, at NS meetings, and at special NS festivities. Most actors refused, but in May, six of the leading actors, from the National Theater, were threatened with dismissal from their jobs unless they performed on the radio. Soon a sympathy strike was started by actors across the country. German theater companies came to replace the actors on strike, and in many cases they would perform sold out shows with few in the audience.\(^{43}\) The strike lasted for six weeks, and managed to increase the awareness of resistance efforts among ordinary citizens. Once the NS and Nazi propaganda censored all media, including cinema, the Norwegians quickly started to boycott the NS controlled media. The films soon became German propaganda, and Norwegian citizens would boycott them for weeks at a time.\(^{44}\)

In November, 1940 the NS changed the age limit for public officials from the age of seventy to sixty-five. The new law took effect immediately so that members of the Supreme Court would be dismissed and NS members could be appointed. The Supreme Court stated that the law was in violation of Norwegian law. Terboven responded by telling the Court that they had no authority on matters decided by NS officials. The Justices collectively resigned from office in protest on December 12.\(^{45}\) This protest, like others around Norway, became another inspiration for other groups to resist.

The groups that civilians really followed as an example for resisting nazification were the teachers and the church. The NS replaced the Central Advisory Board and local school boards, thus infiltrating all of the schools. A new curriculum was introduced in less than a year after occupation, and the teachers were threatened with dismissal if they did not join the NS and swear an oath of loyalty. In response, a pamphlet was drafted by resistance leaders, informing the teachers that they had the right to refuse the oath of loyalty. The R-Group managed to distribute the pamphlet so that most teachers saw the directive urging teachers to refuse. Teachers sent out a counter declaration to the NS, stating, “With reference to the enquiry received, I hereby declare that I will remain true to my teaching vocation and my conscience, and that on that basis I shall, in the future as the past, carry out the decisions relating to my work which are lawfully given by
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my superiors.” After this response, the NS lessened the pressure on teachers, and the teacher’s counter-declaration became a model for other groups to follow when a declaration of loyalty was demanded of them. The group front created solidarity among the teachers that remained strong until the end of the Nazi occupation. Soon four cardinal points were established for teachers against the NS: reject demands of membership of, or declaration of loyalty to the NS; reject every attempt at NS propaganda in the school; reject every order from unauthorized sources; and reject every demand for participation in the NS Youth Company.

On February 20, 1942, teachers across the country received a parole from the KK to refuse membership to the new Laerersamband (Nazi Teachers Association). The union was established by Quisling, and to be a part of the union, one had to become a member of the NS. It was his next attempt to control the teachers and the education of Norway’s youth. Teachers who did not join the union were threatened with dismissal, no salaries, or forced labor. Teachers received support from the church and parents to reject the new union. Within three weeks, thousands of protest letters were sent to the NS from parents. In an attempt to squash the protests, the NS closed the schools for a month and refused to pay the teachers. On March 20, 1,100 teachers (about one out of ten) were arrested and placed in concentration camps. The rest of the teachers wanted to strike to support the imprisoned teachers, but a directive was sent by resistance leaders to continue teaching because the protection of the Norwegian youth was of upmost concern.

The NS attempts to inject Nazi propaganda into education rallied the resistance efforts to center on protecting the children of Norway, as noted by Fuegner, “there can be no doubt that the Nazi attempts at mobilizing Norwegian children for purposes of nazification more than anything else solidified the Home Front.” Throughout the course of the war Nazis were never able to introduce a single Nazi textbook into the schools due to the protest of teachers and parents. It was important for good teachers to remain in the schools as long as possible. The teachers set aside two to five percent of their salaries to create a fund to help support the families of imprisoned teachers. The government-in-exile supported the fund by providing money for unpaid teachers’ salaries. The fund lessened the financial impact of the NS on the teachers and their families, reduced the fear of isolation, and made resistance easier, because the teachers understood that the Norwegian people would work to protect them and their families from NS control. The NS quickly realized that nothing could break the teachers will and decided that the teachers who refused to join the Laerersamband would be reinstated in the schools. Hanna Helmersen recalls that, “The schools and the churches provided the firm backbone to resist, and
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guided the parent organizations in how to preserve the children. It was a spiritual battle for Norway’s soul which the Nazis could never win.\(^{50}\) During the most disheartening time of the war for occupied countries, the teacher protests provided inspiration to the nation.\(^{51}\)

The battle with the NS that the teachers faced, professors and students also faced at the University of Oslo. November 12, 1941, Ragnar Skancke, the Minister for Church and Educational Affairs, required all students to attend the convocation or face immediate and permanent expulsion. The convocation announced the new policy on student organizations. No longer would students be elected to committees, but they would be named; this was a ploy to Nazify student committees and organizations. After Skancke relinquished the podium to the leader of the NS student organization, every student who was not a Nazi left the auditorium. Two days later protests started; the protesters were divided into two courses of action. One group wanted to find a way to coexist with the NS groups and the other followed the teachers’ leadership and rejected the new action. It was voted to keep the University open, but to go on strike. The strike was ended after one day for fear of the consequences, as they seemed to outweigh the gains. The situation at the university was strained but remained fairly calm until 1942 when Skancke again attempted to influence university policy. He wanted to admit NS students based on party affiliation instead of on academic merit. NS propagandists also claimed that students at the University of Oslo supported the National Labor Service. This caused protest across the university, and twenty-five hundred letters were written to university authorities stating that they would under no circumstances support the NS campus organization or the new labor service.

The fate of the university was sealed on November 28, 1943. A small fire was set on campus by a group of saboteurs. Terboven used this as an excuse to close down the university for the duration of the occupation and round up his opposition much like Hitler did after the Reichstag fire. He ordered that all university students be rounded up and sent to concentration camps. The KK learned of Terboven’s plans and sent out warnings to university students to leave Oslo and go into hiding. On November 30, 1943 three hundred German troops marched through the university and rounded up all students who did not flee, resulting in the capture of over twelve hundred students, almost half of the student body. Most died in concentration camps, and very few ever made it back to Norway.\(^{52}\)

The church fought alongside other resistance groups, but the main focus for the church was to prevent the indoctrination of Nazi ideology. The Norwegian Church is a state institution, and officials knew that it would not be long until the Nazis or NS would begin making changes. Not long after occupation started, church leaders gathered and formed a “Joint Christian Council
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for Deliberation”; the council was the foundation for a common church resistance front. One of Skancke’s actions as Nazi Minister for Church and Education first was to request the removal of the intercession for the King and the Storting and have them replaced with an intercession for the NS. (Intercessions are the prayer petitions within a larger church prayer.) As a united front, the church agreed to omit politics from prayer altogether rather than praying for the NS. Some ministers paused during this part of the prayer and the congregation would recite it. The omission of the prayer for the King and the government did not have the desired affect the Nazis expected. Instead it drew the minds and hearts of the Norwegians closer to the King and their government.

The next change the NS tried to make was to abolish the clergy’s Oath of Silence, which bound clergy to honor and keep secret anything told to them in confidence. The NS threatened to imprison clergy if they did not tell authorities confidential information. The bishops would not stand for the removal of the Oath of Silence. Not long after Skancke attacked the Oath of Silence, he decided that all religious broadcasts had to be approved by Propaganda chief Gulbrand Lunde. In response, all clergy except a few NS clergy boycotted religious radio. These attempts by the NS to control the clergy helped to solidify the church front against the Nazi occupation. Evidence of the position of the church began to appear early in 1941 when Norwegian bishops showed support for the Supreme Court by sending a letter of protest to Skancke protesting the violence the NS had been supporting. The letter focused on the activities of the Hird. Skancke’s reply was unsatisfactory to the church, so a pastoral letter was written, and 50,000 copies were quickly circulated to all congregations. The letter articulated the church’s opposition to the NS activities throughout the country, which made the stance of the church well known. After Hitler attacked the Soviet Union in June 1941, the NS demanded the church make a proclamation to the Norwegian people to support the “holy war” against Bolshevism. The church leaders recognized this as a ploy to increase manpower for Nazi forces, and refused to endorse the war against Russia as a “holy war.”

When Quisling was made Prime Minister of Norway in 1942, to celebrate the act of state occurring at the Akershus Castle, a Nazi minister was called upon to preach in Nidaros Cathedral. Arne Fjellbu, the Dean of the cathedral, protested the service by holding another service in the cathedral a few hours later. The cathedral was filled to capacity and overflowed into a crowd gathered outside of the church to worship. Police were there to control the crowd, but it was a peaceful protest. The church service became one of the largest group protests to occur in Norway during the time of Nazi occupation. Dean Fjellbu was within his rights to hold
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the service, since he did not receive a telegram informing him to cancel it. Nonetheless, a few weeks later he was removed from his clerical office.\textsuperscript{58}

The church stood by the schools when Quisling issued decrees about the \textit{Laerersamband} and the Youth Service Association. The bishops sent a letter to Skancke voicing their concerns with the decrees, but Skancke responded in support of Quisling. Soon thereafter, the group decided it was not worth trying to work with Skancke to stop the decrees, and on February 24, 1942, the bishops submitted their resignations. The Church Front had previously decided that if the bishops resigned, no one would be elected to replace them.\textsuperscript{59} After the bishops resigned, the clergy were exposed to interrogations, hearings, arrests, confiscation of properties, threats of deportation, dismissals without explanations, and threats of death. Their sermons were subjected to increased censorship, to the point that it became difficult for them to preach at all. On Easter morning 1942, more than 90\% of the pastors and clergymen resigned. In June of 1942 a Free Church Manifesto was issued by the remaining church leaders establishing a Temporary Church Leadership to function separate from the state. Quisling tried to dissolve the new church leadership, but Hitler told him to leave the church alone in order to maintain order in Norway. By this time, most of the original church leadership had either been arrested or had fled the country, but the resistance message of the church remained strong.

Throughout the occupation, the Norwegians relied on the illegal press and radio broadcasts as important sources of information, and these contributed to lifting the morale of the Norwegian people. Through information obtained from these sources, Norwegian civilians were able to see the difference between what the Nazis were doing and what they claimed to be doing. The disparity between the truth and the propaganda was extreme; and because the Norwegians knew this, the Germans lost their credibility rapidly. Joseph Goebbels, the Reich Minister of Propaganda, wanted to control and Nazify the Norwegian press. By only allowing German approved items to be mentioned, Goebbels tried to shift the Norwegians’ thought processes toward the Nazis’ political agendas. Topics that were forbidden in newspapers and radio broadcasts included: criticism of the NS or German policies, announcing the arrivals of German officials in Norway, ship arrivals or departures, rationing, news of the enemy, strikes, weather predictions, national holidays, any mention of the government-in-exile in London, religious topics, and obituaries of people who had been executed by the Germans.\textsuperscript{60} Regular newspapers either ceased printing to avoid printing the Nazi propaganda, or they were shut down by the Nazis.

A Norwegian “illegal” press formed to fill the communication void; “illegal” meant that the publication was in conflict with the Nazi imposed laws, but not with native Norwegian law.
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The illegal press was started in 1940 by people who were generally inexperienced in the newspaper business. The illegal papers started as small bulletins, leaflets, pamphlets, and then stenciled sheets. Soon the distribution numbers of these printed materials rose to the hundreds and thousands. After the King refused to abdicate his throne, the illegal press volumes soared, and a more aggressive approach was taken in the distribution of illegal papers.

The illegal press became even more important to the Norwegians after all the radios in Norway were confiscated by the Nazis in the fall of 1941. The only radios permitted were those belonging to NS members and German soldiers. The punishment for possessing an unauthorized radio often included fines and imprisonment. After 1942, illegal possession of a radio was punishable by death. Even so, some Norwegians still risked punishment in order to hear the news from Great Britain. In 1943, Gunnar Høines stole a radio from a German officer’s hotel room to bring his family a bit of news and hope. The family managed to keep it hidden until the end of the war. This exemplified the failure of the Germans to prevent all contact between the Norwegian people and the exiled government. Confiscating all radios became a self defeating strategy for the Nazi Propaganda. By attempting to block the connection with London, they also cut off their main method to deliver their propaganda. After the radios were gone, the illegal papers became the only source of information from the rest of the world to the Norwegian people. Information for the papers generally came through a person who was creatively hiding a radio, and the printed information came from the radio news reports. The circulation of papers was carried out by a variety of individuals who had mobility, such as postal workers, union workers, seamen, bus, truck, and taxi drivers.

It is not known how many different illegal papers existed during the occupation, though the estimated numbers vary between 250 and 500. While the information for the papers came primarily from radio reports from London, there were a variety of other sources that contributed information, including municipal government posts, police departments, tapped phone lines, teletype lines, and the editorial staffs of legal papers. Many of these sources wanted the real news to be printed, but they did not dare print it themselves.

Besides news reports from London, the illegal press provided information on resistance efforts in Norway and served as a means of communication between resistance leaders. Directives for the country from resistance leaders were published in a variety of newspapers to spread the word to the people. Whenever a newspaper publisher was shut down by Germans, other Norwegians either took up the task or started a new paper for the area. NS members worked to infiltrate the network of illegal press, and the Gestapo interrogated people related to the illegal press.
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Peter Moen edited and worked on the *London News*, one of the most widely read illegal newspapers. He was arrested on February 2, 1944 and sent to 19 Møllergaten, a Norwegian prison in Oslo under NS control. While he was in prison, he kept a diary which was written by poking holes in toilet paper with a tack. The diary remained hidden in a wall vent until the end of the war. On February 16 he wrote, “I cannot bear my guilt. I should have been ten times more careful with other people’s safety. Because of my carelessness and weakness many must suffer and the free press in Norway is destroyed. Oh comrades—I deserve all your contempt.” Moen was afraid that his contacts and comrades at the paper would be arrested and tortured as he was, and that the paper would not continue. The paper did continue, but Moen died while being transferred to another prison. In the course of five years, the Germans apprehended between 3,000 and 4,000 people for involvement with the illegal press. Of these, 212 people were either killed by German execution or died from torture. Regardless of the risk, thousands of people remained involved in the illegal press to support the resistance effort and lift the morale of their countrymen.

Norway’s Liberation from Nazi occupation occurred on May 8, 1945. After scorched earth tactics were used by the Nazis in Northern Norway, it became imperative to prevent the same from occurring in Southern Norway. Milorg was put in charge of disarming the Germans and preventing further scorched earth tactics by the Nazis. Milorg provided instructions on how to act following liberation: Norwegians were to avoid gathering in crowds; accurately distribute the news of liberation; continue with precautions because the Gestapo were still present in the country; follow new directives; and maintain dignity, calm, and discipline. Quisling thought he was the legitimate Head of State even after the German surrender; it was not until May 9 that Quisling surrendered. On May 14, the Home Front transferred all authority back to the exiled Norwegian government. June 7, 1945 was a day of great celebration across Norway; the King returned on the five year anniversary of his departure from the country.

Throughout the war, many Norwegians risked their lives trying to free Norway and help the Norwegian people. It is estimated that approximately 40,000 Norwegians were arrested for political reasons or for “threatening manners” toward the occupational forces. Close to 9,000 Norwegians were held in German work camps and prison camps. Official sources state that 2,091 members of the Resistance lost their lives during the five year period, and of those, 366 were executed, 162 were killed in an open conflict, 93 died trying to cross the North Sea, and 130 died in Norwegian prisons. The Norwegian people risked their lives for the sake of their countrymen and for the freedom of Norway. Against a superior military and political force, the
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citizens of Norway did all that they could to resist nazification during five years of Nazi occupation. In doing so they managed to unite the people in solidarity, and retain their patriotism, pride, and identity.
Starting after Constantine’s conversion to Christianity around 312 C.E., the Roman Catholic Church grappled with establishing and maintaining authority. While maintaining its role as Europe’s moral authority was a challenge in itself, another challenge developed simultaneously. Political control of the laity was imperative for the success of the Church as an organization, regardless of faith and theological issues. In order to preach the Christian religion to all Europeans, the Church believed it needed to be the greatest influence in their lives. Starting in the eleventh century, the Church faced a changing landscape where external religious groups increasingly acted or were perceived as threats to its authority. Heretical groups were unifying and gaining momentum in a way unseen before. The Church was effectively put off of its balance by the groups.\(^1\) The eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries witnessed a Church that constantly evolved while attempting to quash heretical movements.

Arguably the reigning authority of medieval Europe, the Church sought to cement its authority in a variety of ways during this period. At first, heretical groups across western Europe were encouraged to return to Catholicism without much use of force. Excommunication was the most severe punishment.\(^2\) However, this policy, known as caritas, no longer functioned when dealing with groups like the Cathars who refused to back down. As a result of its desire to maintain authority over the heretical movements, the Church altered its policy towards heresy starting in the late twelfth century. As caritas became less efficient, the Church resorted to full-out suppression through Inquisition or violent episodes like the Albigensian Crusade.\(^3\) Church policy changed decisively to severe and sometimes violent reprisal against challenges to Catholic authority. In this change, the Church developed a suspicious and defensive mentality.\(^4\) It was in this atmosphere that Church policy towards Jews also took a decisive turn.

Similarly to heretics, a shift in Church policy emerged from the need to keep authority over the vast lands of Europe. Fueled by centuries-long tension, Christians used many different means of undermining and demonizing the Jewish population during this time. Christians’ accusations that Jews “murdered” Christ continued to color relations. Somewhat attached to that
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belief, the twelfth century witnessed the likely start of accusations of blood libel. Blood libel, the belief that Jews crucified young Christian boys during an annual ritual, ran rampant across Europe. There were also accusations of Jews “desecrating the host,” or doing foul things to the communion materials.\(^5\) After the first crusade, another accusation developed out of a recent change in Jewish social roles. Though not necessarily more powerful than blood libel or host desecration, the claim of Jews as devious usurers was based in a historically accurate rise in Jewish moneylending instead of being based in legend or assumption.

However, instead of changing policy towards violent repression as it had with heretics, the Church changed how it portrayed the Jewish population to its laity. The idea that the Jew evidenced the truth of Jesus Christ held most of Church policy together before the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. However, in its quest to continue solidifying power over Europe, the Roman Catholic Church created law and used rhetoric that placed the Jewish population beneath Christians in a new fashion. Through various policies and decrees, the Church endorsed a popular perception of the Jew as a usurer and an economic threat. The Church used its authority to manipulate an already present stereotype, further perpetuating deep-seated fear of a plotting Jewish population. This projected identity functioned as a means to keep Jewish Europeans from creating a meaningful counter-force to the Church. Though medieval anti-semitism was based in other theological and social ideas such as the “murder” of Christ and blood libel, the portrayal of the Jew as an economic threat also played deeply into the fear of a “Jewish threat.” It attached an abstract fear of Jewish plotting to an increased practice of Jewish moneylending. By focusing on the Fourth Lateran Council and the pope behind it, it is apparent how the new rhetoric in thirteenth century law diverged from past discussion of Jewish-Christian relations. It simultaneously ossified a latent but lasting image by connecting fear to everyday practice by a relatively small number of Jews.

As with previous centuries, the balance of power in Europe during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries was characterized by Roman Church seeking to establish itself at the top. Europe developed prior to these centuries as the Church created its structure and orthodoxy, many times in response to opposing forces like fringe groups of heretics.\(^6\) It also faced a constant power struggle with secular rulers, particularly the Holy Roman Emperor.\(^7\) As time progressed towards the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Church made gains in both building and then protecting its power. While the Concordat of Worms of 1122 left the Investiture Controversy between church and state officially dealt with, the results were troublesome for the Church’s
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claim to power. The Church still sat on the edge of security in its power. The uncertainty was only heightened by the new external threats.

After inheriting the centuries long struggle between church and state in 1198, Pope Innocent III guided the Church into the start of the thirteenth century by forcefully asserting the preeminence of the Church. He played a major part in the Church's push for supreme authority. In his “Papal Decree on the Choice of a German King,” in 1201, he writes that, “It is the business of the pope to look after the interests of the Roman empire, since the empire derives its origin and its final authority from the papacy; its origin, because it was originally transferred from Greece by and for the sake of the papacy...its final authority, because the emperor is raised to his position by the pope who blesses him, crowns him, and invests him with the empire.”

In the letter, Innocent III directly addresses the power struggle with the secular ruler of the empire. He boldly asserts that the empire only derives its power from the authority of the Church, indicating a lack of fear of the Empire’s power. His rhetoric demonstrates that the Church was certain in its authority, but still insecure enough to need to reassert it over secular rulers when possible.

Adding to the uncertainty, Innocent III's papacy and its bishops faced a threat unlikely seen before their time along with increasing pressure to choose how to address it. After presenting a major threat to Catholic authority in France and surrounding areas for several decades, a heretical group called Cathars continued to submit. The danger they created for the Roman Church was new to Church leaders. Cathars were widespread, fairly organized, and largely unafraid to practice their unorthodox beliefs unlike previous weak, sporadic heretical movements. Some historians have argued that Catharism functioned as the first legitimate counter-church, not only because of divergent theology but also its ability to stand on its own.

The Roman Church moved to violent reprisal soon following the turn of the century after decades of attempting to win back Cathars' faith to the “true church.” Innocent III was at the helm of the decision. In 1207, he granted the privileges for the Albigensian Crusade against the Cathars. In the decree, he writes:

Since those who fight for liberty of the church ought to be fostered by the protection of the church, we, by our apostolic authority, have decided that our beloved, who in obedience to Christ are signed or are about to be signed against the provincial heretics, from the time that they, according to the ordinance of our legates, place on their breasts the sign of the quickening cross, to fight against the heretics, shall be under the protection of the apostolic seat and of ourselves, with their persons and lands, their possessions and men, and also all of their other property; and
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until full proof is obtained of their return or death all the above shall remain as they were, free and undisturbed.\textsuperscript{10}

In his statement, Innocent III describes those who had formerly been Catholics as a now completely external group. This call to arms resulted in an incredibly violent episode which greatly decreased Cathar power and population. The Church had not previously struck out with such force against a heretical movement before this Crusade.

The Albigensian Crusade marked a major change in papal policy towards heresy. No longer would the Church support attempts to simply convince heretics to return to Catholicism. Instead, the Church had fully turned to violence as reprisal for any insistence on “unorthodox” belief.\textsuperscript{11} The papacy’s decision to encourage violence against former Christians demonstrates the weighty importance of maintaining its authority throughout Europe. The change in policy was not made lightly. However, in choosing to label the Albigensian Crusade as a “fight for liberty of the church,” it is clear that papacy believes the Cathar threat is one that must be destroyed for the Church to rule as it is intended. Facing struggles with both of the secular authorities and increasingly threatening heterodoxical movements, the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries were influenced by the Church’s decreasing patience and increase of repression of questions to its authority.\textsuperscript{12} Innocent III acted boldly in his duty as pope and set a major theme for his papacy -- to protect the Roman Church’s authority as the one true church and faith.

In the midst of secular and heretical struggles, there was another group that functioned as a perceived threat for the Church to address: the Jews. As the papacy struggled to address the growing heretical groups in the south of France and across the continent, it also faced a Jewish population developing a new role in society. A major shift in Church policy and sentiment towards Jews occurred beginning in the eleventh century. Partially on account of restrictions on employment, a substantial portion of the Jewish population turned to moneylending in comparison with Christian moneylenders. The creation of guilds in part kept Jews from taking other jobs to support their families. Additionally, some scholars have devoted study to difference in religion’s role in predisposition of some to lend money and peddle goods.\textsuperscript{13} After the Third Lateran Council banned Christians from lending, Jews played a major role in financing a developing Europe. Though they condemned it, Christian monarchs relied on funding from
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larger Jewish moneylenders for projects of cathedrals and wars.\textsuperscript{14} Though a new role, the scope of Jewish moneylending reached its pinnacle between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries. However, soon leaders in the Church recognized that by controlling money, the Jews exercised agency.\textsuperscript{15} Though it would be a dangerous misconception to apply this role to all medieval Jews, a major increase in Jewish moneylending was a major force in prompting the Church to respond to the newly perceived threat.

Prior to the thirteenth century, the strained relationship between Christians and Jews had little to do with rare Jewish moneylending. Much of anti-Jewish sentiment in the Church until the twelfth century developed out of the belief that the Jews were guilty for Jesus’ death.\textsuperscript{16} From the fourth century on, Church policy on Jews often fluctuated depending on who was pope. However, a balance of limiting Jewish rights while offering some protection was a common theme. Soon after Christianity became the recognized religion through Constantine’s conversion, the Christian Church denied Jews certain rights and seriously limited their freedoms. As early as the sixth century, Jews faced discrimination by Christian authority. Pope Gregory I and most of his successors preached that by not worshiping Jesus, the Jews separated themselves from the society around them. However, Gregory I and others also encouraged toleration of the Jews because they served as a reminder of the truth behind God’s promises and Christ’s existence.\textsuperscript{17} Gregory I developed a careful tradition of protection of Jewish basic rights in the 500s that continued for centuries. Though his protection decrees guaranteed due process and no forced conversion, the extent to which these rights were protected changed with each new pope.

As the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries arrived; the Church’s leaders faced a changing Jewish population with increasing possibility of power yet unseen in Europe. However, the Church responded to these changing Jewish social roles in a different manner than it reacted to the simultaneous growth of heretical groups. While the papacy turned to organized, violent repression against attempts at counter-church movements, the Church initially responded to the Jews in an unorganized fashion. While the precedent of protection was kept, the way leaders wrote about Jewish relations changed dramatically. Scholars acknowledge a change in anti-Jewish themes discussed in Church policy. Instead of anti-heretic violence, the new anti-Jewish themes were demonstrated namely through rhetoric.\textsuperscript{18} The eleventh and twelfth centuries saw a major increase in polemics describing the Jew as the worrisome and treacherous enemy of the Christian.\textsuperscript{19}
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From the 1000s to the 1100s, various powerful clergymen wrote in ways that slowly established the idea that Jews represented a physical threat to the church. Many writings promulgated the idea that Jews should be presented on the same level of danger as heretics. Though not necessarily connected directly to the increase in moneymaking occurring at the same time, the idea of Jews being a danger to Christian society functioned well alongside the new trend. Additionally, the twelfth century saw the election of an antipope of Jewish descent, Anacletus II in 1130. Though unsuccessful in countering Innocent II, Anacletus’ rise to counter-power may have heightened fears of Jewish power. Though the clergy men’s ideas spread, there was no unifying voice among them yet. In return for these developments, late twelfth and thirteenth century Judeo-Christian relations were influenced by a deep-seated, yet fairly abstract notion of the Jewish “threat.”

This foundation for anti-Semitic sentiment that was understood as fact across Christendom was scattered, but powerful. As the thirteenth century arrived, the sporadic writings depicting Jews as a threat were somewhat widespread and encouraged by anti-Semitic feelings of the laity. At that time, the belief that Jews were plotting against Christian society did not have authoritative backing beyond the level of clergymen. Along with developing the abstracted Jewish “threat,” the century preceding Innocent III’s papacy had been spent reinforcing the stereotype of Jews as usurious, conniving money-thieves. The papacy of Innocent III (1198-1216) and the Fourth Lateran Council would cement both ideas irreversibly. Though likely unintentional, the Church’s quest for authority resulted in rhetoric within laws of the thirteenth century that melded the economic stereotype with the idea of a Jewish “threat.” The authority of the most powerful people in Europe gave base to the laity’s prejudice and ascribed an unwanted identity to Jews. R.I. Moore argues in “The Formation of a Persecuting Society,” The identification of the Jews as the particular enemies of Christ, and therefore of Christians, has been the central and cruelest threat of European anti-Semitism. Norman Cohn puts it like this: As I see it the deadliest kind of anti-Semitism, the kind that results in massacre and attempted genocide, has little to do with real conflicts of interest between living people or even with racial prejudice as such. At its heart lies the belief that Jews -- all Jews everywhere -- form a conspiratorial body set on ruining and then dominating the rest of mankind. And this belief is simply a modernized, secularized version of the popular medieval view of Jews as a league of sorcerers employed by Satan for the spiritual and physical ruination of Christendom.

Essentially, the Church’s solidification of the identity of dangerous moneylender did immense damage to the Jews, even though it lacked violence at the time. However, Moore does not deeply explore how Jewish economic identity also played into the fear of a “conspiratorial
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body set on ruining and then dominating the rest of mankind.” The demonization and stereotype of Jewish usurer as this conspiring body grew into a larger issue for Jews largely because sporadic writings in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were replaced by a unified high-church front in the thirteenth century, giving ultimate authority to a previously unconfirmed, popular fear. Furthermore, their rhetoric combined Jewish “threat” with real moneylending practice done by some Jews, applying to all Jews a connection that sharply weakened Jewish agency.

As the concept of the Jewish “threat” grew among clergy and their laity, Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) used his authority to fortify and promote fear of Jews to undermine them. Before addressing the Jewish population, he addressed a major problem within the Catholic Church -- the “sinful” practice of usury. Immediately upon taking office in 1198, he issued a letter on usury to French bishops. In it, he wrote, “We believe that you know how pernicious the vice of usury is, since, in addition to the ecclesiastical laws which have been issued against it, the prophet says that those who put their money out at interest are to be excluded from the tabernacle of the Lord [Psalms 15:5]. And the New Testament, as well as the Old, forbids the taking of interest, since the Truth [Christ] himself says: ‘Lend, hoping for nothing again.’[Luke 6:35].”\(^\text{23}\) The letter functioned as a warning to the bishops not to allow such activity in their dioceses in general.

Innocent III’s letter did not implicitly charge Jews with the acts of usury. Instead, Innocent III initially addresses the problem as a whole. His use of scripture from the New Testament speaks more directly towards Christian usurers. The Third Lateran Council had similarly come down on non-Jewish usurers. By limiting Christians’ ability to lend money, Innocent III unintentionally created more demand for Jewish moneylenders.\(^\text{24}\) As he wrote the letter, Innocent III faced a changing Europe that needed capital to grow\(^\text{25}\) Though his action was intended to serve the purpose of cleansing the Church of the unwanted behavior of lending money out at profit, he essentially encouraged more Jewish moneylending. As a result, Jewish participation in loaning money likely became more visible.

While Church leadership increasingly demeaned the Jews for their alleged “usury,” Innocent III maintained previous Church policy of protecting the Jewish population. Though not the first pope to respond ambivalently to Jews, Innocent III denounced them for declared financial practices while also issuing orders that they not be forced into Christianity. In his Letter on the Jews in 1199, he wrote, “We decree that no Christian shall use violence to compel the Jews to accept baptism...For anyone who has not of his own will sought Christian baptism cannot


\(^{24}\) Michael, A History of Catholic Anti-Semitism, 55.

\(^{25}\) Ibid., 54.
have the true Christian faith.” While this served as meaningful protection against coerced conversion, Innocent III did not rule out other types of persecution. Later in the letter, he wrote, “No Christian shall do the Jews any personal injury, except in executing the judgments of a judge, or deprive them of their possessions, or change the rights and privileges which they have been accustomed to have.” Innocent III deemed forced conversion as unacceptable, but the deprivation of possessions and loss of rights did not seem to worry him.

His words in this letter almost define his position on Christian relations with Jews in general -- while the Church may have protected them in some respects, they were still to be held beneath Christians. The Church’s position on Jews was nuanced, not purely abusive. As they pushed the idea of Jews as threatening to their constituents, persecution was not their main desire. In a time when crusaders sometimes took it upon themselves to attack area Jews before going to Jerusalem, Innocent III was the first in a chain of individual proclamations of papal protection that lasted until 1245. The Church did not necessarily wish for outright violence against the Jews, but still the Pope deliberately enacted policies to maintain Christian authority over them.

Though the Jewish policy did not actively change, Innocent III was able to maintain this authority over the Jewish population largely by molding public sentiment against them. Even within the decree of papal protection, Innocent III’s tone differed from those preceding it. Along with more disparaging and colorful language, he even added a new paragraph which reinforced fears of the abstract Jewish “threat.” In the decree, he wrote, “Although the Jewish perfidy is in every way worthy of condemnation, nevertheless, because through them the truth of our own Faith is proved, they are not to be severely oppressed by the faithful.” Innocent III’s focus on being “worthy of condemnation” demonstrates a change in rhetoric from the papal decrees of previous popes. Within the additional paragraph, he included commentary on the believed dishonesty of Jews that exhibited a changing Europe and promoted the always increasing suspicion.

While widespread perception that Jews constituted a threat to Christian Europe was first popularized a century earlier by well-respected clergy, Innocent III was the first pope of this
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period to comment on it himself. Namely, the last words of his order for protection of the Jews stated, “We wish, however, to place under the protection of this decree only those [Jews] who have not been presumed to plot against the Christian faith.” In previous orders of protection, popes did not insinuate so bluntly that Jews were in the business of “plotting” against Christians. Innocent III played deeply into the belief that Jews were treacherous though he presented the document as a protection for them. He continued precedent of Jewish protection, but broke precedent by intimating throughout the decree that the Jews were not to be trusted. Innocent was the first pope to encourage his flock to develop fear of the Jewish population. His incredible authority as pope empowered the perception of Jews as plotting threats as he continued this fearful rhetoric throughout his correspondence.

After letters on usury and protection of Jews against conversion in 1198 and 1199, Innocent III came out more forcefully against specifically Jewish usury by asserting authority over both Jews and secular authority. He was the first pope to act against Jewish usury. His letter to Philip Augustus of France in 1204 continued to lay the foundation for Church rhetoric to validate the idea of Jews as economically threatening. As king of France, Philip Augustus imprisoned, exiled, and demanded ransom from French Jews in order to make enormous profits. However, these ransoms often allowed the Jews to reenter France even after being accused of usury. Innocent III viewed this as protection of usury and wrote,

But if sometimes those to whom they entrusted their money at interest produce Christian witnesses to the fact of repayment, more credence is placed in the document which the indiscreet debtor has left with his creditor through negligence or carelessness than in the witnesses he produces. Nay, in such a matter witnesses are not permitted against the Jews, so that their insolence has gone so far that-we refer to it with shame-the Jews of Sens built next to a certain old church a new synagogue, not a little higher than the church, in which place they celebrate their services in the Jewish rite. This they do, not as was the case before they were ejected from the kingdom, i.e., in a low tone, but with a great clamor, not scrupling to avoid disturbing the more holy celebrations in the church (of the Christians).
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Though he is chastising Philip Augustus, his words also indicate his disdain for Jewish moneylending. Within the larger remarks on usury, Innocent III demonstrates how deeply his argument against Jews is based in authority issues by writing about the synagogue. While the letter encourages the French king to suppress Jewish moneylenders, the pope devotes time in the letter to worrying about a synagogue being taller than a church. Innocent III’s response to the height of worship buildings shows that his concern was based deeply in authority. His previous letter against solely Christian usury had lacked this critical theme. Though a small group, the Jews were a threat to a Church that wanted to “purify” Europe. In order to take away any influence the Jews had, the Church continued to paint an increasingly vivid picture of the Jew as a dangerous usurer not to be trusted.

Near the end of Innocent III’s life and papacy, church leadership held the Fourth Lateran Council and cemented his policy and rhetoric towards Jews into canonical law. Though the Church had vacillated between protecting and persecuting the Jews for centuries, the year 1215 marked an important solidification of Church policy towards Jews. In 1215, the Lateran Council gathered and issued seventy canons. In the canons, the council included definitions of confirmation and transubstantiation, plans for another crusade, and other new rules for the laity it discussed many major issues of the time, including Christian relations with the Jewish population. Of these seventy canons, four were dedicated to restricting the Jewish population’s rights. The last three canons discuss restriction of Jews from holding public office, sexual norms and distinguishing dress codes, and status of baptized Jews in the Church. The first, however, directly correlates with conception of Jew as usurer and threat to Christian Europe.

Canon sixty-seven, the first about Jewish policy, addresses the fear popularized by Innocent III and twelfth-century clergymen and lays out restrictions against usury. It is likely built off of the rhetorical work of Innocent in the decades preceding the Council. Instead of attacks on moneylending that Innocent III often infused into his correspondence, the Council speaks to alleged Jewish usury directly. The canon states:

The more the Christians are restrained from the practice of usury, the more are they oppressed in this matter by the treachery of the Jews, so that in a short time they exhaust the resources of the Christians. Wishing, therefore, in this matter to protect the Christians against cruel oppression by the Jews, we ordain in this decree that if in the future under any pretext Jews extort from Christians oppressive and immoderate interest, the partnership of the Christians shall be denied them till they have made suitable satisfaction for their excesses. The Christians also, every appeal being set aside, shall, if necessary, be compelled by ecclesiastical censure to abstain from

all commercial intercourse with them. We command the princes not to be hostile to the Christians on this account, but rather to strive to hinder the Jews from practicing such excesses.\textsuperscript{40}

Though the law itself restricts Jewish behaviors, it more importantly strikes an accusatory and colorful tone in its castigation of alleged Jewish character. The language painting the Jew as an oppressor is particularly forceful. It is used in the first two sentences and develops the fear that Jews plotted to ruin Christians financially. By using language that insinuates an increase in usury and “oppression” of Christians, the canon affirms fears that Jews will destroy Christian livelihoods. Beyond confirming fears, the Church plays the victim by casting the Jew in the role of oppressor.\textsuperscript{41} Instead of portraying Jews as incorrect in theology, the language in the canon plays directly into fear and places the Church in a role of protecting its flock from imposing Jews. By putting these ideas into canons, the Church cemented the projected identity of Jewish usurer into both law and the laity’s understanding of acceptable Christian behavior. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Church endorsed an increasing stereotype of Jewish identity as treacherous and usurious.\textsuperscript{42} In defining the Jew, just as it was defining the heretic, the Church decided what it was not while simultaneously keeping any counterforce from developing. Some scholars argue by becoming more anti-Semitic during the development of the “other,” the Church also aided in the basic realization of a European self.\textsuperscript{43} In its struggle to maintain its power in a changing Europe, the Church solidified a popular idea of the Jew as an “other” into their projected identity.

Essentially, the Church connected the papacy’s campaign against Jewish usury with the fear of Jewish threat encouraged by Innocent III and past religious writers. Not only is the Church feeding the laity the idea that Jews are charging interest at levels that “oppress” Christians, but it is also wholeheartedly confirming the misconception that Jews were “treacherous” and “cruel.” Instead of turning its flock against Jews through encouragement of violence, the Church turned Christians against Jews by solidifying popular stereotype and presenting it as truth. No longer would Christians understand the Jews as a vague threat to them, instead they connected this threat with a widespread stereotype of Jews as dangerous, wily usurers. The connection of the two was especially forceful because it was grounded in a visible practice. As a result of increases in moneylending by Jews, Christian laity likely felt the Church’s rhetoric matched their own perception of Jewish neighbors. The threat was now presumed to be the Jewish population waiting to ruin them financially and poison the Christian religion. The inclusion of this canon in the Fourth Lateran Council marks a transition within the
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Church’s policy from disunited clergy writings, to papal correspondence, to unified canon law. The council demonstrated the Church’s dedication to actively using their portrayal of the Jews to suppress them.⁴⁴

Though it certainly was not the end of anti-Jewish rhetoric and policy within the Church, the Fourth Lateran Council marked a major solidification of belief that the Jewish threat was also characterized by usury. After several centuries of gaining ascendancy, rhetoric portraying Jews as plotting Christian economic demise was written into canonical law. In doing so, the Church established how it would respond to the changing social role of Jews as moneylenders that began as late as the tenth century. Though the development of Church policy towards Jews occurred side by side with its authority struggle with heretics, the Church leadership’s decision to undermine Jewish agency through rhetoric affected the Jewish people in a different way.

Vitriolic rhetoric that inspired fear in the laity was written into clergy writings, papal correspondence, and finally law. Instead of invoking violence against them, the Church maintained its active policy of some restriction and some protection for Jews, but dramatically altered the way in which it discussed the Jewish population. By giving authority to popular stereotype of the Jew as usurer and encouraging fear of a Jewish “threat,” the Church undermined any possibility of Jewish agency in Europe. By appealing directly to a fear of a plotting Jewish population, the Church disallowed any possibility of a Jewish challenge to Church authority. However, while claims like blood libel worked within a framework presenting the Jews as a bizarre, “league of sorcerers,” the Church’s focus on the Jew as “treacherous” usurers also added substantially to fears of Jewish conspiracy. The presence of some Jewish moneylending resulted in what likely seemed to be concrete evidence of usury to the laity. However, the result of promulgating this fear was centuries-worth of oppression for the Jews. The use of a projected Jewish identity as a treacherous financial threat became a common means for different groups to solidify their own authority in Europe, from the medieval Church to Hitler’s anti-Weimar Germany in the 1920s and 1930s.

Inquisitions during the medieval and early modern period were undoubtedly used for social control. The main goal of any inquisition during this time period was to manipulate the entire population to behave in a common manner or believe a certain set of doctrines. Historians of inquisitions debate which of these two goals was primary for the institution: uniformity of practice or uniformity of beliefs, with a vast majority of scholars arguing for the former, that inquisitions were established to control the behavior of their subjects. With regards to the inquisition in Mexico, the debate seems also to lean toward the consensus, with scholars such as Nora Jaffar and John Chuchiak arguing that the Mexican Inquisition sought to control the ways in which the population acted rather than what they believed.\(^1\) While these are possible interpretations of the goals of the Mexican Inquisition, the Inquisition seems to have had a genuine concern for doctrinal uniformity as demonstrated in the persecution Lutheran heretics.

Lutherans and Protestants more generally, were never popular nor extremely populous in the Spanish New World, which is why it is interesting that accusations of this sort are made. The Spanish arrived in the New World at the end of the fifteenth century and brought with them their own religion, Catholicism, and forced it on all those whom they encountered. Near the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Protestant Reformation started to gain traction in Europe and eventually spilled over into these new territories, contaminating the once pure Catholic lands. With the presence of these rebellious beliefs, as well as a general misunderstanding of central Catholic teachings among the population of New Spain, an inquisition was necessary in the New World. A loosely organized inquisition headed by monastic orders began to operate under the approval of the papacy and began to persecute those found to be in defiance of Church doctrine. Most important during these early years were the Protestant Lutherans, whose rebellion was felt not only in the New World, but in Europe as well. It was therefore paramount that these individuals be stopped and brought back into the Catholic Church.

From the first mention of a Lutheran in this loose, episcopal inquisition in 1537 until the Inquisition's official establishment in Mexico in 1571, there was an incomplete understanding of what Lutheranism or Protestantism actually was.\(^2\) The Spanish clergy did not make a distinction between what doctrines were considered Lutheran and which were other Protestant beliefs, such


as Calvinist or Anglican. Instead, they decided to label all heretical, deviant, and unorthodox ideas Lutheran. Even after the official establishment of the Mexican Inquisition, Spanish authorities still made no distinction among Protestants and continued the tradition of referring to all dissenters as Lutherans. The only change in stance toward Lutherans after the Inquisition's founding was that it pursued the Lutherans more vigorously and with greater means. In using the term “Lutheran” indiscriminately against all those suspected or convicted of preaching or believing in heretical doctrines, Mexican authorities were able to provide some clarity on theological issues. They were able to clearly establish the orthodox Catholic beliefs against the unorthodox Lutheran ones, and in so doing, the inquisition in Mexico at all of its stages functioned as a mechanism to create, establish, and maintain doctrinal homogeneity among all members of society in New Spain.

During the years closely following the conquest of the Americas, there existed a pseudo-inquisition that operated in Mexico. This inquisition was very loosely organized, with official papal sanction granted to religious orders for its operation in the New World. With power in the hands of individuals from different religious orders, there was naturally little national cohesion in Mexico. There was, however, a single recognized “head,” or chief inquisitor, who was typically appointed by the Church. However, this is not to suggest that this chief inquisitor was recognized to be the official head of the inquisition by all people. At this point, the Mexican inquisition was still largely regional or local and these localities had no obligation to answer to a higher authority. Regional or local emphasis led leaders to interpret papal decrees and Church doctrines more liberally than they would have in other conditions, causing confusion and an incoherent orthodoxy. Also due to the regional differences and the lack of a firmly established head of the inquisition, Franciscans and Dominicans fought for control over the head inquisitor position so that they could impose their theology and orthodoxy upon their Mexican subjects.

Geographic distance from the ultimate authority of the Supreme Council of the Inquisition, or Suprema, on the Spanish Peninsula necessitated that the inquisition be granted much wider interpretative freedom. This is because it would not have been a good economic or social choice to consult the Suprema on every case of heresy, as communication between the two continents was a long and costly process. Therefore, with this wider interpretation came a wider jurisdiction, including during these early years not only the legal prosecutions against baptized Catholics, but also cases against native populations, Christians of different denominations, and those of different religious traditions, such as Islam or Judaism.
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One well-known transgression of these jurisdictional bounds was the verdict of the case of Robert Tomson in 1559. This case demonstrates that the population had no idea what Lutheranism was yet were taught to fear it by example. Robert Tomson was an Englishman who went to New Spain and became involved in government there. He served the Crown faithfully until accusations of heresy were brought against him. Tomson was accused for not being a good, practicing Catholic and for spreading thoughts about reform, so he was tried as a Lutheran heretic for his reform-minded beliefs, ultimately being convicted in 1560. He was given a prescription for reconciliation, which included parading around the town with other convicted heretics “while thousands of people watched, folk who had no idea of what Lutheranism was.” There was no understanding among the populace of what Lutheranism was, yet they understood it to be bad, for Tomson was convicted of charges and forced to walk around town to pay for his errors. As further penance for his heretical beliefs, Tomson was deported to Spain after paying court fees and other fines for his stay in Mexico. The inquisition's treatment of Tomson is evidence that they wished to set an example for the people to follow, for the harsher the punishment, the less likely others would follow or duplicate the crime in the future.

A contemporary and cell-mate of Tomson was Agustín Boacio, who was also convicted of believing in Lutheranism and was sentenced in a similarly strict manner. Boacio was a Genoese merchant found in Zacatecas, Mexico. He was reported to the inquisition for having believed that there was no scriptural basis for purgatory, his rejection of the doctrine of original sin, his critical beliefs about the pope, and his belief that priests should be allowed to marry. All of these beliefs were blatantly contrary to the doctrines held by the Catholic Church and so Boacio needed to be persecuted for dissenting. He was sentenced in Zacatecas as a Lutheran heretic and so his case was sent to the offices in Guadalajara to be reviewed there. While in Guadalajara, Boacio met and shared a cell with Robert Tomson, and was deemed not to be a heretic so long as he did penance, paid fines, and then returned to Europe with the provision that if their offices were to meet him again in similar circumstances, he would immediately be sent to the stake. His penance was similar to Tomson's, in that they both were required to parade around the town to pay for their sins and in turn demonstrate for the rest of the population what happens
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when wrong beliefs were chosen instead of orthodox ones. Boacio's punishment, like Tomson's, was further made an example by the inquisition in their requirement that Boacio leave the New World.

While other individuals tried as Lutherans were not handled as severely as the cases of Tomson and Boacio, the inquisition seemed to target specific demographics. One demographic, which includes Tomson and Boacio, were foreign merchants or sailors while the other was Spanish doctors. As for the first examples, it would have made sense that foreigners were suspected to be practicing something other than Catholicism as they were from other lands and were not necessarily under the spiritual guidance of the Church. However, the cases of doctors is curious, for these men were typically of Spanish or Iberian origin and therefore were more likely to have been instructed in the doctrines of the Church.

For example, Dr. Pedro de la Torre was accused of being a Lutheran because he believed that God and nature were one and the same. He further was accused of practicing black magic and indulging in the use of profane language. All of this led to his trial, which resulted in him paying fines, renouncing his views and being exiled from New Spain. It is not clear whether he was forced to leave the New World entirely and return to Europe, but he was definitely required to leave Mexico. Another case was against Dr. Pedro de Santander, who disliked papal supremacy and is claimed to have said “that the bulls of the Pope should be used as toilet paper.” He was convicted as a Lutheran heretic for this view and was therefore sentenced to penance, payment of fines, and jail time. All of these men were doctors, learned intellectuals who had access to resources other individuals in society did not, which suggests a certain anti-intellectual disposition.

All of these examples are from the laity, but they were not the only ones suspected of being capable of committing a Lutheran heresy, for the clergy was under scrutiny too. The Council of Trent (1545-1563), during which the Church reviewed and reestablished its central doctrines in response to the Protestant Reformation, prompted a clerical investigation in Mexico. This Council realized that one should not disregard any religious office as a seed of heresy, as the Reformation itself was started by a member of the clergy. Thus, during this period, the
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Mexican Church was interested in making itself a more unified institution in terms of theology and also patterns of behavior and enforcement.\textsuperscript{16}

One of the first clerical cases was against Bishop Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan inquisitor from 1527 until 1543, at which time he was stripped of his title and office for harsh treatment of the native population. While he was not considered to be a heretic while alive, he and his theological works were closely examined in the 1560s, years after his death. The Dominican inquisitor Alonso de Montúfar, was the one responsible for Zumárraga's investigation. Zumárraga believed that the blood of Christ was collected after Christ's crucifixion so it could be restored to the body after resurrection. These and his other views were factors in the Inquisition's decision to label him an Erasmian, at this time an adjective synonymous with Lutheranism and thus dissension. These views were recorded in books in circulation in New Spain, which was the primary concern of Montúfar during his time as inquisitor, who took very seriously his charge to eradicate all traces of Protestantism and dissenting ideas among the clergy.\textsuperscript{17}

Montúfar even made incursions into convents, a very unlikely seed of heresy. He visited the Monastery of the Immaculate Conception where Elena de la Cruz was brought forth for her views on the authority of the pope and other ecclesiastical officials and also the nature of salvation. She believed that the pope's power ought to have been much more limited than it actually was such that he could not increase the number of deadly sins. She also believed that Montúfar, although official ordained by the papal office and the Church, had no authority to dispense judgment on divine matters. Her sentence was rather harsh, including a payment of fines and imprisonment, with the provision that if she were to speak again of similar matters in direct contradiction of the Church there would be no leniency.\textsuperscript{18}

All of these cases point to the desire of the inquisition to impose doctrinal hegemony over its subjects during the years prior to the official establishment of the Mexican Inquisition. The inquisition tried Lutheran heretics of both the laity and the clergy, pronouncing them heretics against the Church in order to firmly establish orthodoxy in New Spain. Through the use of harsh punishments against Lutherans, such as imprisonment, fines, and even exile or banishment, against Lutherans, the inquisition was able to send a message to the people: transgressions of doctrine were extremely serious and not taken lightly, and unless they desired to suffer a fate similar to those convicted of Lutheran heresy, they ought to obey orthodox doctrine.

Having started the process of purifying the religious authorities, the time was then ripe for the establishment of an official inquisition in the New World so that these strange and
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unorthodox beliefs could not be preached to wider audiences and to further unify belief among authority figures. This sentiment was only intensified during the next stage of inquisitorial activity in New Spain after the official pronouncement and establishment of a unified Mexican Inquisition in 1571. With an official status came new tools and means of enforcing doctrinal homogeneity among all members of society. First, priests regularly read Edicts of Faith, which included basic tenets of the faith that the Catholic Church considered to be common knowledge to all. Closely connected to these Edicts were official and elaborate autos-de-fe, or readings of the sentences against prosecuted heretics who were led throughout the town so that all could understand the errors they had committed. Finally, and most importantly, were the controls enforced on book migration and censorship, which involved both sides of the Atlantic, and effectively functioned as controls of orthodoxy of New World beliefs.

An order was issued in January 1569 from King Philip of Spain which provided royal support for the official establishment of the Mexican Inquisition in 1571. There were many goals Philip had in mind when he issued and commissioned this Inquisition. The first of these was “that our Holy Faith be expanded and exalted throughout all the world . . . [and] that the Faith be conserved in all the purity and completeness necessary.” Philip found the establishment of the Inquisition to be necessary in the New World so that a completeness and purity of faith might be attained. It seems here that he was also alluding to the fragmented nature of Christian flock as well as the clergy thanks to the Reformation, making it seem that a strict treatment of Protestants and other rebels was necessary. Furthermore, he declared that the goal of the Inquisition was “to conserve, free from errors and false and suspicious doctrines” as well as “giving them [inhabitants of New Spain] knowledge of the true God.” Again, Philip is here interested in saving the doctrines of the Catholic faith from perversion and total replacement of established doctrines with false or erroneous ones. In order to enforce a unity of belief, Philip suggests that “the true remedy consists in turning aside and excluding all communication with the heretics and suspicious persons . . . shunning and obstructing what causes great offense to the holy faith and Catholic religion.” Throughout the entirety of this document that officially founded the Mexican Inquisition, there is an emphasis on the unity and purity of belief amongst not only the populace, but perhaps more importantly the clergy responsible for implementing and operating the Inquisition. A final reason for Philip's decision to implement an inquisition in New Spain,
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was because of the large influx of printed materials from Spain.\textsuperscript{22} Having all of these reasons in mind, it seems that the main concern was for the preservation of orthodox doctrine.

This newly established Inquisition adopted many of the policies that had been followed during the episcopal inquisition and also drew key doctrines and practices from its Peninsular counterpart. Firstly, as it was officially established by King Philip, it now directly answered to the monarch in power and was subject to the judgments of the Suprema. Further, as the Mexican Inquisition was more centralized, the institution became much more hierarchical. Local and regional authorities were still authoritative within their own locales, but there existed an ultimate central Mexican authority. This newly established Inquisition, like its predecessor, retained interpretive freedom as the geographic distance between the Suprema and Mexico was still burdensome. As the papal office did not have direct control over the Spanish Inquisition, by extension it did not have control over that of Mexico. Rather, the Spanish monarchs had the power to appoint bishops and establish tribunals at their own discretion. Just below the monarch was a Grand Inquisitor who served as the head of the Suprema, which itself consisted of various members. Just below this council were usually two or three Inquisitor Generals (IG) who were appointed by the Crown and approved by the pope. Below these individuals came the inquisitors, whose main function was to serve as judges in matters of religious heresy, determining sentences of convicted heretics.\textsuperscript{23}

In terms of jurisdiction, it is interesting to note that on the Peninsula there were, at its height, eleven different tribunals to cover both the Peninsula and the Canary Islands just off its eastern coast. The singular Mexican Inquisition's jurisdiction, in contrast, covered the entirety of Central America, the Caribbean and the Spanish-controlled Philippines, making up a territory geographically larger than the Peninsula. Even though the geographic size of the Mexican Inquisition's jurisdiction was larger than that of Spain, all residents were subject to one centralized tribunal headquartered in modern-day Mexico City.\textsuperscript{24} Demographic jurisdiction differed between the two Inquisitions as well, for the Spanish Inquisition was only legally allowed to try professed and baptized Catholics, whereas the Mexican Inquisition transgressed these laws by frequently bringing forth cases against non-Catholics.

In order to get at these non-Catholics, an Edict was issued in November of 1571 stressing the importance of the compliance of the population of New Spain in combating doctrinal heresies. Keeping Philip's objectives in sight, one can understand why this oath was required, for the Inquisition only could have tried and investigated heresies about which they knew, but there
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were heresies which were secretive and not known to everyone. Maintaining the purity of the faith was a communal effort, one in which all shared in interest. It is for this reason that this decree stated: “You will favor the said Holy Office, Officials, and ministers of it [the Holy Office], giving all the favor and help that they may ask of you, and that you do not help nor favor the heretical enemies of our Catholic faith.”

This oath of obedience allowed for the Inquisition to expect loyalty from its subjects while at the same time established a strong statement of orthodoxy. Furthermore, the populace was urged the following:

And that you all will not favor the heretics, infamous and suspects of the crime of heresy and apostasy, nor their believers, favorers, receptors, nor defenders of them nor to the disruptive ones nor those who impeded the said Holy Office and its free and upstanding army, you shall be those who pursue, accuse and denounce them to the Holy Mother Church and to us the Inquisitors and to our successors just as to its ministers to whom, for their Holiness and Apostolic Seat, it is reserved the knowledge of such causes, and that you shall not harbor, receive nor admit amongst you nor your families, company, service, nor council, before you know something of them.

A plea for compliance is overwhelmingly evident in this excerpt. The Crown was asking for assistance in maintaining orthodoxy in New Spain, a goal which could not be achieved without cooperation amongst all members of society.

The Mexican Inquisition inherited from the Spanish Inquisition the tradition of issuing and reading Edicts of Faith to the people at regular, typically yearly, intervals to articulate the minimum level of knowledge of the Catholic faith required of their subjects. It seemed that people were either expected to know what it was they ought to have believed or that the people

25 “favorecereis al dicho Santo Oficio, Oficiales y ministros de él, dandoles todo el favor y ayuda que os pidieren, y que no favorecereis á los hereges enemigos de nuestra fé católica” from “Extract from the Edict of November 10, 1571 Issued by the Inquisition of Mexico to the Population of New Spain Embodying the Oath of Obedience,” in Henry Charles Lea, The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies: Sicily-Naples-Sardinia-Milan-The Canaries-Mexico-Peru-New Granada, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922), 534-5, here at 534. NB: Translation from the Spanish is my own. It should further be noted that in the translation that the word “you” is plural in the original Spanish.

26 “y que no favorecereis á los herejes, infamados y sospechos del crimen de herejía y apostasia, ni á sus creyentes, favorecedores, receptadores ni defensores de ellos ni á los perturbadores ni impedidores del dicho Santo Oficio y de su libre y recto ejercicio, antes sereis en los perseguir, acusar, y denunciar á la S. Madre Yglesia y á nos los Ynquisidores y á nuestros sucesores como á sus ministros á quien por su Santidad y Sede Apostólica está reservada el conocimiento de las tales causas y que no lo encubriereis recibireis ni admitireis entre vosotros ni en vuestra familia, compañía servicio ni consejo, antes luego que de ello algo supieredes” from “Extract from the Edict of November 10, 1571,” in Lea, The Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies, 535. NB: Translation from the Spanish is my own. It should further be noted that in the translation that the word “you” and “your” is plural in the original Spanish.
would learn what was orthodox through persecution of other individuals, as in the cases of Robert Tomson and Agustín Boacio. However, the expectations were now being declared clearly to all of the inhabitants so that no mistake could be made concerning what was orthodox and what was heretical. Common issues addressed in these documents were mysticism, medicine and prohibited books. At the end of the Edict, there was a clause or sentence in which the people were encouraged to bring forth information concerning possible heretics within a grace period of a certain number of days.²⁷ By issuing and reading these decrees, the Inquisition was trying to establish what it had been attempting to accomplish all along: uniformity of belief.

Closely tied to these Edicts of Faith were the autos-de-fe. These were grand ceremonies in which the sentences of those tried for and convicted of heresy were read to the population. Generally these were fairly large occasions, with an entire mass being said and a parade of the heretics around the village square as part of their penance.²⁸ There were a few functions for these proclamations: first, to inform the inhabitants of New Spain of the criminals in their midst and secondly to inform people of unorthodox beliefs. In so doing this second function, the people also gained a sense of what was orthodox belief.

These were perhaps more helpful than the Edicts of Faith, as there seem to be concrete examples of what people were doing wrong and levels of severity attached to them as well. In sentencing, there were three different levels of severity: de leví (literally “of light”) was the least severe form of charge that could be brought against someone; de vehementi (literally “of vehement, violent) was the middle form of severity and was usually brought against someone who was strongly suspected of being a heretic; and finally was de formali (literally “of formal, theoretical”), the most severe form of punishment reserved for those considered to be formal or notorious heretics.²⁹ For example, in one of the first autos-de-fe in the New World in 1574, Juan de Valderrama was convicted de vehementi “for having said that the sacrament of confession and the Eucharist are just ceremonies, and not sacraments, and for saying that he could moralize about the gospels like any other theologian.”³⁰ In this case, it was to be understood that the sacraments of the Church are sacred, not just ceremonies or formalities, and that ordinary, unlearned people were to not and could not preach about the gospels. Belief in or performance of these activities was not lightly punished. Another example was that of Pedro de Trejo, who was convicted of “trying to amend two verses of the psalms of David . . . he also tried to amend another prayer which is also commonly sung by the church . . . as well as for reading several

books which treated of profoundly deep spiritual things of the Faith and mysteries of the Holy Trinity, all of which, as an ignorant person, he should abstain from doing.\textsuperscript{31} From this example came a few beliefs which the Church held strongly: firstly, that emendation of anything, whether it was scripture or simple prayers, was strictly forbidden; while secondly, unlearned people should not be participating in the interpretation of scripture.

One final way in which the Inquisition attempted to establish and control beliefs was through the policies enacted concerning books. While both the Edicts and the autos-de-fe were effective modes of communicating orthodox doctrines to the population of New Spain, the most effective method of controlling beliefs in the New World was the regulation of book movement and censorship. This medium was even more threatening to orthodoxy because, as Francisco Peña, a compiler of inquisitorial manuals said: “heretical books were more dangerous than heretics themselves because books, rather than people, could be widely dispersed and therefore read by more people.”\textsuperscript{32} In fact, it has been argued that the failure of Spain to control the migration of heretical persons and materials was one reason for the official establishment of the Mexican Inquisition.\textsuperscript{33}

There were two ways in which Spain controlled the circulation of printed material, beginning on the Peninsula with the Crown. If any printing company desired to print anything religious, they first had to apply for and be granted a license to do so by the Crown. It was responsible for issuing licenses to printing companies and it was therefore culpable for what got published in the first place. However, the Crown rarely denied licensure to anyone, so it therefore fell upon the Inquisition to censor the books being published.\textsuperscript{34} A license was also needed to transport books from Spain to the New World.

Given this lack of discrimination of petitions for printing licenses, it was then up to the individual inquisitions to censor books since the Crown was not prohibiting them from being published altogether. Therefore, the Peninsular Inquisition issued regulations concerning

\textsuperscript{31}Ibid, Chuchiak Document 19, 155.


censorship of books in the form of Indices of prohibited books, which were in turn adopted and followed by the Mexican Inquisition. These proclamations included specific authors, titles of books, and even themes or ideas.\textsuperscript{35} In clear transgression of these prohibitions were the Protestant reformers and their texts. The first of these Indices was issued at the Council of Trent and was amended various times in subsequent years as the need arose.\textsuperscript{36} Included on the list were people considered to be heresiarchs, or leaders of heretics, such as Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.\textsuperscript{37} Certain themes or theologically divergent ideas were also included in this list. Vernacular translations of scripture or any other religious materials were prohibited as well.\textsuperscript{38} Ultimately, it was up to local authorities to determine what was banned and what was not, a feature acquired by the Mexican Inquisition on account of the distance between the Suprema on the Peninsula and the tribunal established in Mexico City and also because of the distance between this tribunal and the localities where heresy took place.\textsuperscript{39} Moreover, it should be noted that the Indices were clear that it was not only those who possessed books on the Index that were to be punished for their transgressions, but also anyone who had read, distributed, or had knowledge of the books on the Index.\textsuperscript{40} People were encouraged to bring before the Inquisition anyone they knew to be in clear violation of the Index or other regulations.\textsuperscript{41}

The first purge of prohibited books was initiated by Inquisitor Pedro Moya de Contreras shortly after the official establishment of the Inquisition in New Spain in 1571. During this raid, it was not the works of heresiarchs Luther or Calvin that were most frequently confiscated, but rather those of Erasmus, a figure who was viewed by those in the New World as more noxious to

\textsuperscript{35} The Indices were even so detailed as to include only certain years or editions of books. This then made enforcement of these prohibitions more difficult because not entirely titles were banned, just certain years of certain titles. See Nesvig, “Cordon Sanitaire,” in \textit{Ideology and Inquisition}, 229-30

\textsuperscript{36} Nesvig, “Heretical Plagues” 16-22.

\textsuperscript{37} Partial text selected and translated from the original \textit{Novus Index librorum prohibitorum et expurgatorum, editus auctoritate & iussu D. Antonii Zapata} (Sevilla: Francisco de Lyra, 1632) folios 24-33, available digitally online courtesy of the Biblioteca de la Universidad de Sevilla’s Fondo Antiguo at http://fondodigitales.us.es/fondos/libros/462/10/nouus-index-prohibitorum-et-expurgatorum, in Chuchiak, \textit{The Inquisition in New Spain}, 98-104, here at 98. NB: Henceforth referred to as Chuchiak Document 5.

\textsuperscript{38} The only exception to these rules were good, pious, learned men who desired to use these heretical materials for learning purposes. Even in such cases, however, extreme caution was advised, as a translated text that fell into the wrong hands could bring devastation in the form of perversion of the text’s original sense or rebellion against the established authority.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ibid.}, Chuchiak Document 5, 98-102.

\textsuperscript{40} Nesvig “Cordon Sanitaire,” 230 and also Chuchiak, 319.

Catholic hegemony than either of the other two reformers. There seems to be a lack of concern for the works of Luther or Calvin even though accusations of Lutheranism were frequently employed. This is because even though there were accusations of Lutheranism, the term was merely a label for deviant behavior and individuals. It has even been suggested that either the Mexican laity had accepted the condemnation of Luther and others or the ban on his works was a great success. Of these two explanations, the former is more credible as the populace was exposed to examples of what happened to people who believed in dissident ideas, such as Protestantism. For this, they were discouraged from having any connection to the movement. For this reason, the ban on Luther’s works in the Indices was merely redundant and reinforced the popular sentiment of dislike for him.

To further regulate books and their migration, there was a large effort to control the main Spanish port of Veracruz. This port was the major port on the Gulf of Mexico and was therefore responsible for the majority, if not all, of incoming trade and commerce in New Spain. Officials were prepared in this city to take inventory of what was on the ships and confiscate what was not supposed to be there and what was considered heretical. Items on the Index of Prohibited Books were taken and anything else that the local authorities deemed heretical, given their great amount of freedom from central authorities, was confiscated. While port control was a good idea and a manner by which authority was established, the practice was largely ineffective in barring entrance of certain materials. Given local autonomy, the officials in charge of controlling the influx of materials took personal liberties and deviated from the Index, viewing it as locally but not universally authoritative. Furthermore, ports were difficult to control, for there were always ways to get around authorities and typically money was more motivating than strict adherence to religious ordinances. People regularly came and went in the port, which made tracking and therefore precisely accusing a much more difficult enterprise.

The Mexican Inquisition was also interested in preventing future issues in the ports in their treatment of sailors and corsairs, as there are several cases in which sailors are charged with adhering to and preaching heretical Lutheran beliefs. These men were frequently coming and going from various parts of the world, whether from Europe directly to the New World or within parts of the New World controlled by different foreign powers such as the French or English.

42 This transition is interesting to note because while Erasmus was viewed somewhat favorably in the 1530s, by the 1570s and the official operation of the Mexican Inquisition, many of his works and thoughts were being scrutinized by the traditionally conservative Dominican friars. During this later period, there was extremely widespread equation of Erasmus with Luther and Lutheranism, the most heretical of all dissenting Christians. See Nesvig, “Heretical Plagues,” 16-17.

43 Nesvig, “Heretical Plagues,” 36-7. Here, Nesvig even offers the idea that the laity in Mexico had a “genuine fear of or hatred for Luther and Calvin.”


45 Nesvig, “Heretical Plagues,” 13
Therefore, the Mexican Inquisition viewed these individuals as a threat to the security and homogeneity of belief. Many of these sailors were English or French and faced severe punishments for being caught spreading Lutheran beliefs as the spread of beliefs further subverted the Church's power. Many cases involved life imprisonment, banishment from the New World, burning at the stake, or working on Spanish galleys for a certain number of years.\textsuperscript{46} These men were treated harshly and serve as more evidence for the desire of the Inquisition to maintain a uniformity of belief amongst the population in New Spain. Had they not handled these cases in such a strict manner, these men would have continued to spread their dissident views.

This is not to suggest that the regulation and censorship of books entering and leaving the New World was wholly effective. Total control was never attained, but the large amount of control that was exerted and the success that followed made these policies mostly successful insofar as they completed their goals to some degree. The volume of confiscated material is a testament to the success and effectiveness of these port regulations. Regional or local interpretation of the religious decrees was one reason why heretical materials continued to enter New Spain in spite of official legislation. Those who controlled the ports were often largely apathetic to the rules and so did not pursue individuals with as much fervor. Economics was often a more important motivating factor than religious decrees in the ports as well. Moreover, distance from the central authority was an issue, as it was much easier to control subjects geographically closer to Mexico City than those which were farther away.

While there are many cases in which the Mexican Inquisition pursued individuals because of their incorrect or deviant behavior, this was not their only nor primary concern. Their primary concern, especially in the post-Reformation period, was on creating, establishing, and maintaining doctrinal homogeneity. Prior to the official establishment of the Inquisition in 1571, religious authorities pursued deviant foreigners, sailors, and doctors, denouncing their beliefs as heretical. After being tried for their heresy, the inquisition sentenced them harshly, usually in the form of banishment or exile. In so making an example of these convicted Lutherans, the inquisition was making a statement that any and all challengers of the Catholic Church were considered Lutherans and ought to be punished in extreme ways for their behaviors. This use of the term “Lutheran” continued even after the papacy and Spanish monarchy officially established an Inquisition in New Spain. Pursuit of Lutherans did not diminish after this, but rather increased as there were more ways in which the institution was able to persecute them. Edicts of Faith, autos-de-fe, and most importantly book regulation and censorship were the new tools utilized by the Mexican Inquisition to pursue and condemn Lutheran heretics. The first two made the population aware of both orthodox doctrine and unorthodox individuals, while the latter

\textsuperscript{46} Greenleaf, \textit{The Mexican Inquisition}, 162-72. Here Greenleaf enumerates at least seven different cases of indictment of sailors and corsairs in the New World. While this is not a significant number, it is significant that the Inquisition decided to persecute these sailors.
attempted to control what information entered the New World. This was important to the goal of the Inquisition in Mexico because the written words of a heretic were often considered to be much more potent and far-reaching than any heretic him/herself. While it was extremely difficult to control both the outflow of books from Europe and also the influx of books into New Spain, the Spanish Crown was overall successful in its endeavor to regulate these phenomena. Provided with all of this evidence, it seems that there ought to be a rethinking of the importance of beliefs in New Spain, as the assertion that they played very little role is no longer definitive.
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