

The Luther Skald

Luther College History Department's Journal of Student Research

Vol. 1 No. 3

Summer 2014

Table of Contents

<i>Birth Control among the British Working Class, 1900-1930: Destigmatization and Expansion</i>	<i>1</i>
Rachel Selvig ('14)	
<i>Louis-Philippe's Impartiality in Fragmented Paris, 1832</i>	<i>23</i>
Chelsea Tegels ('13)	
<i>False Frozen Hopes: The Sources of Potential Victory and Ultimate Failure of the Invasion of Quebec During the American Revolution</i>	<i>43</i>
Nathan Schmidt ('14)	
<i>From Balfour to Oslo 2: Roots of the Modern Arab-Israeli Conflict</i>	<i>60</i>
Katherine Ashcraft ('17)	

Birth Control among the British Working Class, 1900-1930: Destigmatization and Expansion

Rachel Selvig ('14)

For years, historians have attempted to understand the mystery of the “fertility revolution” in England in the beginning of the twentieth century. Beginning in the late 1800s, fertility rates dropped drastically and use of contraceptive practices markedly increased, particularly among the working class. A range of factors have been used to explain these social and demographic trends. These include changing social, political, and scientific attitudes and developments, but perhaps most notably the introduction of birth control publications, advertisements, and facilities into British society on a new scale. A critical period of study to explain these intense shifts in British history is 1900 and 1930. At the turn of the century, birth control was not openly discussed in public and use was low—especially among the working class. However, in 1930, use of birth control for the working class peaked with almost two-thirds of the married population utilizing various birth control methods. The influx of public sources of birth control information is an obvious place to look for the root causes of this shift; however, the content and popularity of such sources alone does not account for the trends seen in the lived experience of working men and women. Thus, while the spread of public birth control information impacted many areas of British society, the increased use of birth control among married, working-class men and women between 1900 and 1930 is more a reflection of the destigmatization of birth control in British society than the direct result of birth control publications and advocacy.

Until recently, contraception has largely been ignored as a topic of study by historians and demographers. Not until the 1970s and 1980s did historians begin to acknowledge the importance of contraceptive practices in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century England. During this time, historians’ study of birth control focused mostly on macro-level analysis of how birth control practices fit within greater historical, social, and economic trends; the relationship between public organizations and figures and public perceptions of birth control; and the study of the family as a cohesive unit.¹ Many scholars focused their study on the British fertility decline of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, using birth control as one component of that analysis rather than studying birth control itself. One example of this type of historical analysis is Richard Allen Soloway’s *Birth Control and the Population Question in England, 1877-1930*, published in 1982.² Soloway’s book is not a history of contraception, but an analysis of the rapid demographic changes that took place during this time and how the population perceived and reacted to those changes, of which contraception was a significant part. Soloway does this by exploring the impact of public organizations and figures—most prominently the Malthusian League and Marie Stopes—on the population and public perceptions of the demographic changes of the time.

In the 1990s historians shifted their study away from birth control’s relation to social and demographic trends and towards the study of the lived experience of birth control. Historians began to focus on the experiences of individual husbands and wives and split

¹ See Audrey Leathard, *The Fight for Family Planning: The Development of Family Planning Services in Britain, 1921-74* (London: Macmillan, 1980); Rosanna Ledbetter, *A History of the Malthusian League, 1877-1927* (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1976); Angus McLaren, *Birth Control in Nineteenth-Century England* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1978).

² R. A. Soloway, *Birth Control and the Population Question in England, 1877-1930* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982).

families into the analysis of their separate units.³ Women and men were seen to have different desires and motivations regarding family affairs, and different abilities to act on those desires. A prime example of this shift in scholarly attention is Wally Seccombe's article "Starting to Stop: Working-Class Fertility Decline in Britain," published in 1990.⁴ While Seccombe's study remains focused on the relationship between birth control practices and larger historical trends such as the "fertility revolution," Seccombe diverges from previous scholarship by acknowledging the importance of women and men's differing experiences and desires related to family limitation, and how that influenced the decline of the birth rate in England. The decisive factor in the fall of fertility rates for Seccombe was that, until this time, women's desire to limit births outweighed men's desire, and it was not until economic, social, and political factors warranted a limitation in family size through birth control *for men* that a population-wide reduction took place. Seccombe's writing is representative of a significant shift towards a personal, gendered analysis of the family and contraceptive practices.

Seccombe's article also reflects the growing influence of feminist ideas on the historical interpretation of changing birth control practices. Starting in the 1990s and continuing into the 2000s, women and gender historians put forth the argument that the decline in fertility and rise in birth control use was due to women's increased freedom that was brought on by the feminist movement.⁵ It was proposed that the gains made in women's rights through politics and other areas of British society influenced their social position in public and within the family, and therefore women were more able to assert their demands for family limitation. For example, Seccombe outlines women's increased ability to speak out about their own experiences and call for more information about birth control information during this time, as seen in the letters written to birth control advocate Marie Stopes. Seccombe also asserts the prominence of female contraceptive devices and women's increased insistence on using them, despite the difficulty of obtaining and using these types of methods. The changing position of women, according to Seccombe and other historians in the 1990s, is one of the main contributing factors to the rise in birth control use and decline of fertility during the beginning of the twentieth century.

In the past few years, a significant challenge to these historical trends of analysis has been proposed by Kate Fisher with her micro-level analysis of English birth control practices in the first half of the twentieth century.⁶ Fisher's book is revolutionary within the field in terms of methodology (she uses new oral histories), approach (analysis of traditional

³ See Karl Ittmann, *Work, Gender, and Family in Victorian England* (Washington Square, N.Y.: New York University Press, 1995); David Levine, *Reproducing Families: The Political Economy of English Population History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Wally Seccombe, "Weathering the Storm. Working Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline," *Social History of Medicine* 8, no. 1 (1995): 140; Simon Szreter, *Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain, 1860-1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁴ Wally Seccombe, "Starting to Stop: Working-Class Fertility Decline in Britain," *Past & Present*, no. 126 (1990): 151-88.

⁵ See N. F. R. Crafts, "Duration of Marriage, Fertility and Women's Employment Opportunities in England and Wales in 1911," *Population Studies* 43, no. 2 (July 1, 1989): 325-35; Davey C, "Birth Control in Britain During the Interwar Years: Evidence from the Stopes Correspondence," *Journal of Family History* 13, no. 3 (1988): 329-45; Ittmann, *Work, Gender, and Family in Victorian England*; Michael Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); Elizabeth Roberts, *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890-1940* (Oxford; New York: B. Blackwell, 1984); Ellen Ross, *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Seccombe, "Weathering the Storm. Working Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline"; Szreter, *Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain, 1860-1940*.

⁶ Kate Fisher, *Birth Control, Sex and Marriage in Britain, 1918-1960* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006).

practices and gendered roles), and conclusions (the shift in birth control use did not necessarily reflect a 'fertility revolution'). Despite the unique qualities of the book, Fisher does reflect some recent trends in the historiography of birth control and the family. First, Fisher follows the movement away from viewing birth control practices within the larger social and political trends. In fact, Fisher argues that birth control practices did not reflect a significant "revolutionary" change in attitudes toward fertility, in contrast to the majority of historical writing on the topic prior to the 2000s. The most significant cause for this difference is that, in *Birth Control, Sex, and Marriage in Britain: 1918-1960*, Fisher uses oral histories of men and women who lived during the time period. This new level of specificity takes recent historians' increasing trend of using individual lived experience to understand greater historical concepts (seen somewhat in Seccombe's writing) to a new level, and consequently provides new conclusions to the birth control and population questions. Some of these new conclusions include the continuity of opinions about birth control instead of a revolution in how society thought about fertility and reproduction, and a resurgence of traditional gendered birth control knowledge and responsibilities instead of a progression towards women's dominance of the issue.⁷

Instead of seeing these trends in historiography as distinct and mutually exclusive, the assets of each can be combined to enhance the understanding of the use and perception of birth control in the beginning of twentieth-century England. It is important to use both macro- and micro-level analysis to understand what caused the shift in working-class birth control practices. Social, political, and scientific trends have a great impact on individual life and must be examined. However, so too must the lived experience be dissected in to be used in comparison with these larger trends. Further, comparing these two realms to actual practice can result in a new way to understand the increase in birth control use through 1930.

Many scholars that argue for the importance of lived experience focus their studies on the spread of birth control information and publications and the role of popular birth control advocates such as Marie Stopes; however, the comparison of the information proposed by these sources to reports of actual practice shows that their specific messages were less important than their contribution to larger developing social and political trends. This conclusion is significant in that it combines the analysis of specific, public dissemination of information and lived experience with larger societal trends typically the focus of earlier scholarship.

In order to understand this conclusion, it is necessary to attain an overview of the process of destigmatization occurring in British society through law, medicine, and government, followed by an analysis of the information available to the working class through books, newspapers, and clinics. These two realms then allow for a contextualization of reports of actual birth control practice, leading to the conclusion that publications and advocates had a less direct effect on practice than the general destigmatization of British society.

Understanding the trends in birth control use during this time first requires a recognition of its place within British history. The first thirty years of the twentieth century in England was a period of tremendous domestic and social reform. Global war, economic

⁷ For examples of other historical works that deal with men's knowledge of and responsibilities with issues of family limitation in British scholarship, see: Wendy Harcourt, *Power, Reproduction and Gender: The Inter-Generational Transfer of Knowledge* (London; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books, 1997). For other examples studying men's roles in fertility from societies outside Britain, see: Zeynep Angin and Frederic C. Shorter, "Negotiating Reproduction and Gender During the Fertility Decline in Turkey," *SSM Social Science & Medicine* 47, no. 5 (1998): 555-64; F Nii-Amoo Dodoo, Ye Luo, and Evelina Panayotova, "Do Male Reproductive Preferences Really Point to a Need to Refocus Fertility Policy?," *Population Research and Policy Review* 16, no. 5 (1997): 447.

pressure, social and racial inequality, and the growth of the feminist movement molded the character of Britain's society and birth control movement.

Married men and women commonly justified birth control use by economic hardship and the inability to support more children, a struggle that disproportionately fell on the working class especially before 1930. Indeed, a major domestic concern in Britain during and after the Great War was lessening the inequality and suffering of the lower classes.⁸ Much of the policy and social reform in this period focused on reducing unemployment and improving working conditions for the working class, which fluctuated drastically. In the years leading up to 1900, the working class achieved better working conditions and compensation, followed by a period of industrial stagnation where the steady increases in wages stopped and price inflation balanced out any smaller increases in wages. Conversely, with the beginning of WWI, the need for materials and resources caused unemployment to disappear and wages to rise sharply.⁹ This positive mindset lasted for a few years after the war, as workers held on the feeling of confidence and importance from helping the war effort. However, the global economic depression had a dramatic effect on Britain's economy and employment; the number of unemployed rose from 1,336,000 in November of 1929 to 2.5 million in December of 1930, severely impacting the working class.¹⁰ Facing the rising unemployment rates and the economic hardships they caused, working-class couples were often unable to provide for large families, but at the same time were not able to afford contraceptive books and methods.

During this period of class inequality, integration of international affairs, and population concerns, the British upper and middle classes became increasingly concerned with racial purity, expressed by the popularity of the eugenics movement in England in the early twentieth century. The large population losses from WWI and the perceived need to maintain the British population both domestically and throughout the British colonies only exacerbated the issue. Census data revealed that middle- and upper-class fertility was dropping at a much higher rate than for the working class; so much so that by 1911, the middle and upper class birthrate was half of what it was for the working class.¹¹ The unequal decline of the birthrate came as a shock and threat to the upper classes, who were concerned that the working class was 'less fit,' and that their rapid reproduction rates would cause the deterioration of the English race.

Eugenicists thought that the characteristics of people and social classes were hereditary, and since the upper classes were thought to possess superior traits such as talent, intelligence, and culture, the increase of the inferior working class would only dilute the positive characteristics of the race and, thus argued the eugenicists, their reproduction rates had to be curbed.¹² As a result, many eugenicists, including prominent birth control advocate Marie Stopes, adamantly pushed for the importance of family limitation to the working class.

The first half of the twentieth century also included a surge in the feminist movement in Britain, and women increasingly asserted themselves as political and social actors. In the first few decades of the twentieth century, the women's movement focused on gaining the right to vote; when they succeeded in 1918 with the passing of the Representation of the People Act and in 1928 the Equal Franchise Act, the women's movement turned to other

⁸ Henry Pelling, *Modern Britain, 1885-1955* (Edinburgh: T. Nelson, 1962).

⁹ *Ibid.*, 80.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 111.

¹¹ R. A Soloway, *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 11. The census data concluded that married couples in the upper and middle classes had on average 3.4 children, while working-class couples had 6.1.

¹² The founder of eugenics was Francis Galton, who was inspired by Darwinist evolution. For an overview of Galton's eugenics, see chapter two of Soloway's *Demography and Degeneration*.

initiatives. In the interwar period, the women's movement focused on issues of social reforms and welfare, many of which related to their roles as mothers. As a result, advancements were made in maternity services, the availability of birth control information through birth control clinics, and reforms in the divorce law by the end of the 1930s.¹³

While the women's movement made significant legislative advances, the predominant idea that women's primary role was to care for their husbands, children, and home remained intact.¹⁴ Nevertheless, the prominence of the feminist movement signaled an emergence of women's voices in the public sphere, a presence that is reflected in women's increasing ability to talk of personal matters in publications, letters, and correspondence.

These changes relate to the challenges and successes the birth control movement experienced during the early years of the twentieth century. The working class's economic hardships prevented them from accessing many of the publications and methods that were available for purchase. However, the eugenics and feminist movements made up for these barriers to the working class. By 1930 eugenicists, despite questionable intentions, greatly contributed to the availability of information and appliances to assist the working class. Feminists made great strides on women's ability to speak and represent their aspirations, which often included the dissemination of birth control information, in government and society.

The destigmatization of birth control in British society was a long and arduous process. At the beginning of this time period, there were many barriers to the public acceptance of birth control. Birth control publications were often in discordance with the prohibition of "obscene" materials in the legal system, the medical profession was stubbornly resistant to taking any part in the controversy, and the government was slow to accept change. However, by 1930 all three of these public spheres made great strides in favor of birth control and greatly contributed to its destigmatization in British society.

The legal stance against public birth control information can be traced back to 1857 with the passing of the Obscene Publications Act. Also known as Lord Campbell's Act,¹⁵ the proposed law prohibited the possession, publication, or distribution of "obscene" materials "written for the single purpose of corrupting the morals of youth, and of a nature calculated to shock the common feelings of decency in any well regulated mind."¹⁶ The Act, however, did not provide a thorough definition of "obscenity." By the time the bill was passed into law, classifying something as obscene remained up to the discretion of a judge or jury.¹⁷ While the Obscene Publications Act remained in effect in England until it was revised in 1959, the flexibility of its interpretation meant it was not uniformly enforced, and its enforcement only slackened as time went on. Two legal cases related to birth control publications illustrate the weakening of the social stigma against birth control in the public sphere: *Regina v. Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant and Stopes v. Sutherland*.

In 1877, Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant were brought to trial for publishing *Fruits of Philosophy*, a book written by Charles Knowlton on how to limit conception for married people. In the trial, Bradlaugh and Besant were accused of publishing an "obscene" book and "depraving public morals." While the book itself was condemned, the jury "entirely

¹³ Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska, *Women in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Harlow: Longman, 2001), 269.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 275–276.

¹⁵ Lord Chief Justice Campbell introduced the bill to the House in June, 1857

¹⁶ Lord Campbell, (3 Hansard, vol. 146 [25 June 1857], c. 329), as quoted in M. J. D. Roberts, "Morals, Art, and the Law: The Passing of the Obscene Publications Act, 1857," *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 4 (July 1, 1985): 613.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 629.

exonerate[d] the defendants from any corrupt motives in publishing it.”¹⁸ The trial thus excused the actions of Bradlaugh and Besant in publishing the book, but remained firm on the notion of public dissemination of birth control information as “obscene.”

Despite the verdict, the Bradlaugh-Besant trial caused a radical shift in the attitudes surrounding birth control in British society. The trial proceedings were covered by most English newspapers—the first time that newspapers approached the topic of birth control, let alone endorsed it.¹⁹ As a result, information about birth control appeared in public discourse for the first time, and was accessible not only to the upper classes, but to all British people. In a sense, “The trial marked the beginning of the democratization of birth control knowledge.”²⁰

A little over thirty years later, another legal case brought up issues of public birth control information and community acceptance with *Stopes v. Sutherland*. Marie Stopes received her education in botany but became a prominent birth control advocate when she began publishing books about marriage, sex, and family limitation in 1918. Among her most popular titles were *Married Love, a New Contribution to the Solution of Sex Difficulties* and *Wise Parenthood: The Treatise on Birth Control for Married People*. At the height of Stopes’ popularity, Catholic doctor Halliday G. Sutherland wrote a book critiquing the contraceptive methods Stopes promoted as harmful and claimed that Stopes had been “experimenting on the poor.”²¹ Stopes consequently sued him for libel. In the course of the trial, Stopes’ beliefs and practices were scrutinized in order to prove or disprove the claims made by Sutherland.²² The jury concluded that Sutherland’s comments were unfair and he was fined one hundred pounds for libel. Similarly to the Bradlaugh-Besant trial, during the *Stopes v. Sutherland* case, public coverage of the birth control issue skyrocketed, and Stopes’ sales soared. While the trial was not explicitly about the nature and “obscenity” of Stopes’ publications on birth control, the case shows a great step toward public acceptance of birth control information.

If the public was moving towards an acceptance and eagerness for discussions of birth control, the medical profession lagged behind. Until the mid to late 1920s, the medical profession remained silent on many aspects of the birth control discussion. Indeed, there remained a distance between contraception and the scientific field in general. Very few scientific studies had been done on the subject, and as a result, birth control activists such as Marie Stopes and Margaret Sanger in America were free to craft the scientific literature as they desired.²³ Most medical publications barely discussed birth control in the 1920s, if at all.²⁴ As such, the publications of these popular birth control figures were the basis of the “scientific” information about birth control into the mid-1920s.

These popular publications even served as guides for medical personnel. The vast majority of medical schools did not cover contraception in their curriculum, and as a result, medical professionals were often very ill-informed about the subject and were seen by the

¹⁸ *In the High Court of Justice: Queen’s Bench Division, June 18, 1877: The Queen v. Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant* (London: Freethought Publishing Co. [1877]), 255. As quoted in S Chandrasekhar, “A Dirty, Filthy Book”: *The Writings of Charles Knowlton and Annie Besant on Reproductive Physiology and Birth Control and an Account of the Bradlaugh-Besant Trial* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 40.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 46.

²¹ Halliday Sutherland, *Birth Control; a Statement of Christian Doctrine against the Neo-Malthusians*, (New York: P. J. Kenedy & sons, 1922).

²² Muriel Box, ed., *Trial Of Marie Stopes* ([S.l.]: Femina, 1967).

²³ Peter Neushul, “Marie C. Stopes and the Popularization of Birth Control Technology,” *Technology and Culture* 39, no. 2 (April 1, 1998): 247.

²⁴ Soloway, *Birth Control and the Population Question*, 260.

many people as a frustrating and unreliable source of birth control information. This is displayed in countless letters sent to Marie Stopes by women asking for advice.²⁵ Stopes herself acknowledges the frustration in her *Letter to Working Mothers*:

I advise you to go to the District Nurse, and if she does not know, go to the hospital of District Officer of Health, and ask to be shown not only how to put on the cap, but to be allowed to try different sizes. I am afraid that if you do this you *may* find that they refuse.²⁶

Even when facing such requests from working women and popular birth control advocates, the medical profession continued to resist the incorporation of family limitation methods into medical practice.

Formal medical organizations such as the British Medical Association were a driving force behind this resistance. While public opinion gradually leaned more in favor of birth control, medical organizations retreated from the controversy. The *British Medical Journal* discontinued its columns dedicated to the open discussion of views on family limitation for the rest of the 1920s.²⁷ Given this willful silence from the medical field, some physicians also took to reading the popular literature on the subject, such as Stopes' *Contraception* (1923) to fill the gap.²⁸ Even so, the medical community did not officially begin to admit the benefits of contraception until closer to the end of the 1920s.²⁹

This medical dispute was happening at the same time that the government began debating the political position on public birth control resources. The debate centered around the state's role in providing funds for welfare institutions to become resources of birth control information. In the beginning of the 1920s, public officials and the Ministry of Health were not inclined to provide the funds necessary to use current welfare institutions as clinics for birth control, even prohibiting them from distributing birth control information in 1924 with the Ministry's issuance of a circular on maternal morality.³⁰ Finally in 1929, birth control at public health facilities was officially made to be at the local expense with the new interpretation of the Local Government Act.³¹

The change in the political attitudes led to a shift in the medical profession as well. While initial reaction from medical professionals remained lackluster, leaders in the field of medicine began to realize as time went on that their silence on the issue was causing the profession to miss a great opportunity. Many doctors expressed concern that the issue of family limitation was being left to those without medical expertise, and that the medical profession could provide valuable knowledge on the issue.³² With the Ministry of Health's willingness to finally allow doctors in public facilities to give advice on contraception after 1930, the structure of the medical profession changed. In the fall of 1930, the Royal Institute of Public Health offered the first course with lecturers such as Stopes, and the first recurring

²⁵ Marie Carmichael Stopes, *Mother England, a Contemporary History* (London: J. Bale, Sons & Danielsson, 1929). See 5, 17, 20, 24, 49, 63, 79, 80, 83, 94, 100, 101, 108, 111, 115, 121, 124, 125, 132, 134, 137, 142, 150, 154, 157, 170, 171, 172, 173. Some doctors did give advice, but women were unsatisfied with the methods they suggested or they became pregnant anyway: 64, 153, 163.

²⁶ Marie Carmichael Stopes, *A Letter to Working Mothers on How to Have Healthy Children and Avoid Weakening Pregnancies* (Elmer, Leatherhead, Surrey [England]: Published by the author, 1919), 15.

²⁷ Soloway, *Birth Control and the Population Question*, 259.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 265.

²⁹ The National Council of Public Morals' medical committee came out in 1927 as saying that contraceptives should be allowed when needed for medical reasons, poverty, or "excessive child-bearing." *Ibid.*, 276.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 284.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 309.

³² *Ibid.*, 259, 265, 313.

course was given at the British Post-Graduate Medical School in 1936.³³ Physicians began to publicly support the birth control movement and it became a serious scientific subject, consequently weakening the resistance shown earlier by the medical field with the turn of the new decade.³⁴

The changes seen in the legal system, the medical profession, and politics through 1930 were slow and faced significant resistance, but they reflect a gradual shift in public attitudes about birth control towards greater acceptance. By the 1920s and 30s, publications were no longer prosecuted as “obscene,” doctors started to abandon their refusal to consult on issues of birth control, and even birth control clinics finally received some governmental support. These developments both promoted and reflected the destigmatization of birth control in British society.

Another critical component to the prominence of birth control in British society between 1900 and 1930 was the influx of publicly available information about birth control through books, pamphlets, newspapers, and clinics. The spread of these forms of information slightly predated the evolution of political and medical acceptance, and their public success showed a great potential to influence behavior among the working class.

Beginning in the late 1910s, there were many publications available for purchase on the topic of sex and birth control. The first major publication was Marie Stopes’ *Married Love*. Stopes stated purpose for writing *Married Love* was in response to the suffering she endured in her first marriage due to sexual and marital ignorance. She published the book because she felt “that knowledge gained at such a cost should be placed at the service of humanity.”³⁵ Stopes used her own reading and research into the topic to create a description of how to have a happy marriage, including topics such as desire, sex, sleep, romance, children, etc. Among other reasons, the book was a landmark because it was the first publication to acknowledge that both men and women experienced sexual desire, and to discuss the details of sex and intimate relations within marriage.

After the publication of *Married Love*, Stopes became an overnight sensation. The book sold 2,000 copies in the first two weeks, and was reprinted seven times in the first year alone.³⁶ *Married Love*’s overwhelming success made it a revolutionary book, and Stopes became a public figure to whom women looked for advice on marriage and birth control.

Stopes received an overwhelming number of letters from women and men following *Married Love*, particularly about the need for more information about preventatives, a topic which was only briefly mentioned in *Married Love*.³⁷ In response, Stopes published her second book in November of 1918, *Wise Parenthood: the Treatise on Birth Control for Married People: A Practical Sequel to Married Love*. Stopes described *Wise Parenthood* as “the only scientific and critical consideration of the practical aspects of [birth control].”³⁸ *Wise Parenthood* included very specific advice on when family planning was appropriate,³⁹ what methods to use, instructions on how to use them, and where they could be purchased.

³³ Ibid., 316 n. 55.

³⁴ Ibid., 315.

³⁵ Marie Carmichael Stopes, *Married Love, a New Contribution to the Solution of Sex Difficulties*, 19th ed. (New York; London: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1931), 156. Author’s Preface to the First English Edition.

³⁶ Soloway, *Birth Control and the Population Question*, 211.

³⁷ See *Married Love* chapter VIII: Children. There Stopes brings up the idea of waiting to have children until a few years after marriage (p. 98-99). She also suggests waiting a full year between the birth of a child and the conception of the next (p. 105).

³⁸ Marie Carmichael Stopes, *Wise Parenthood: The Treatise on Birth Control for Married People: A Practical Sequel to Married Love*, 11th ed. (London: Putnam, 1923), xi.

³⁹ Stopes give seven stipulations for when a couple should use preventatives, including right after marriage, after the birth of a child, disease, during times of economic hardship, and if the mother has already born six children. Ibid., 21–22.

In *Wise Parenthood* and later publications, Stopes generally favored female methods of birth control over male because she believed they allowed for a more natural and pleasurable experience. Her preferred suggestion for couples was to purchase what was known as the “Check Pessary”—a small rubber cap that was placed over the cervix to prevent semen from entering the uterus. This, Stopes instructed, could be inserted before bedtime and left in for two to three days after a union, taken out, cleaned, and reinserted.⁴⁰ To make conception virtually impossible, Stopes also suggested using the cap in combination with the quinine pessary to plasmolise the sperm, which should be slipped in a few minutes prior to coming together.⁴¹ The benefits of this method, according to Stopes, were that it did not have to interrupt the sexual act and did not destroy marital romance, but could allow for spontaneity. It was also so comfortable that it could be completely forgotten about after it was inserted. Thus, Stopes promoted this method above all others because it allowed for a more natural and enjoyable experience for both partners.

Stopes did not recommend all female methods of birth control. As opposed to other prominent birth control figures, such as Margaret Sanger, Stopes did not approve of douching.⁴² From the technical side, she explained that douching cannot completely prevent conception since it is done after the “event,”⁴³ and it destroys healthy bacteria in the vagina.⁴⁴ Stopes also rejected the idea from an “aesthetics” point of view, arguing that the need to get up after the fact to douche robs women of the comfort of sleep and a warm bed after completing the act.⁴⁵

Aesthetics considerations were also why Stopes rejected the common male methods of birth control. First, Stopes separated herself from other birth control figures in that she did not recommend “sheaths” or condoms.⁴⁶ Stopes insisted that it “reduces the closeness of contact and thus destroys the sense of complete union which is not only pleasurable, but is definitely soothing to the nerves and physiologically and spiritually advantageous in every way.”⁴⁷ Stopes also thought that the male seminal fluid was beneficial to a woman if absorbed through the vaginal canal.⁴⁸ Similar reasons were given against withdrawal, or coitus interruptus. For one, Stopes recognized the technical failures of this method, as active sperm cells which can cause pregnancy could be present before as well as during ejaculation.⁴⁹ But more importantly, Stopes argued that withdrawal is harmful to both men and women: “This method has without doubt done an incredible amount of harm, not directly, but through its reactions on the nervous systems of both man and woman.”⁵⁰ Stopes explained that the harm to the nervous system was caused by the stress the man experienced to restrain himself and the anxiety of the wife that the husband would successfully withdraw

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 31. Stopes also says that some women may choose to leave the cap in for three weeks and only take it out during menstruation, but that this should only be done in cases of *perfect* health, which Stopes suggests is the absence of any discharge.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 33.

⁴² Margaret Sanger was the prominent American birth control figure during this time. In the publication *Family Limitation*, douching and condoms are first two suggestions, followed by the cap pessary.

⁴³ Stopes, *Wise Parenthood*, 50.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 51.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ See Margaret Sanger, *Family Limitation*

⁴⁷ Stopes, *Wise Parenthood*, 44.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 43–44. Stopes acknowledges that not enough is known concretely about the topic, but there is a “physiological advantage” to the woman if the seminal fluid is at least partially absorbed through the vaginal wall, and that such absorption plays a significant part in the health and character of many different parts of the female body.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

in time.⁵¹ Again, Stopes also brought in an argument similar to the one she used against douching—that the prevention method takes away from the couple’s peace of mind and enjoyment: “the local support and nerve-soothing contact which are supplied mutually to both when the act is completed normally are destroyed.”⁵² Thus, Stopes gave technical explanations for their rejection, but it is primarily due to Stopes’ desire for the act to be as natural as possible that caused her to dismiss male methods.

Married Love and *Wise Parenthood* were both written for middle- and upper-class audiences, and their price often meant that they were out of reach of the working class. However, as a eugenicist, a major concern for Stopes was the replication of the “less thrifty and the less conscientious” working class.⁵³ In response, Stopes’ wrote *A Letter to Working Mothers on How to Have Healthy Children and Avoid Weakening Pregnancies* in 1919. A smaller, simpler version of *Wise Parenthood* specifically addressed to working-class women, the *Letter* dissuaded women from abortions and outlined the benefits of the cap pessary over other forms of birth control, similarly to *Wise Parenthood*.

Stopes insisted on the vital importance of obtaining the cap for working women, even if money was tight: “...you will find it wise to give up something, whatever it may be, until you get that rubber cap pessary, for it is so important. If I myself were very poor and already had several children, I should give up even bread and butter until I could buy the things to save me and unborn children from further births.”⁵⁴ She explained where they were available, but acknowledged that obtaining them may have been difficult considering the inability and unwillingness of medical professionals to discuss birth control methods. She ended the *Letter* by encouraging women to remain strong in their quest:

Be brave, and think that, even by asking for this information you are helping other women in the end to get it, because until all the women in the country ask for this knowledge, until they insist on getting this knowledge, women and unwanted babies will go on suffering as they have suffered in the past, and are suffering now. Therefore be brave, ask again and again, even if you get rude answers.⁵⁵

Despite Stopes’ efforts to reach the working class through these publications, many working-class couples remained ignorant of the methods she advised, as can be seen in the letters she received asking for more information about birth control methods. In 1928 Stopes published a compilation of letters written to her by working-class men and women from 1926 called *Mother England*.⁵⁶ In these letters, many men and women were unaware of Stopes’ suggestions. Of the 176 letters published, only four reference having read Stopes’ books.⁵⁷ Even more surprisingly, only two letters mention Stopes’ most direct attempt to reach working-class women, the *Letter to Working Mothers*.⁵⁸ Many more were unable to get a hold

⁵¹ Ibid., 46–47.

⁵² Ibid., 47.

⁵³ Ibid., 19.

⁵⁴ Stopes, *A Letter to Working Mothers on How to Have Healthy Children and Avoid Weakening Pregnancies*, 11.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 15.

⁵⁶ Stopes, *Mother England*.

⁵⁷ See Ibid., 37, 42, 61, 156.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 12, 144.

of these publications, either for economic reasons or because they did not know where to find them, and instead wrote directly to Stopes for the information.⁵⁹

Instead of books and pamphlets, the letters in *Mother England* show that newspapers were a much more successful method of getting the word about birth control to the working class. Stopes often wrote articles for newspapers, especially *John Bull*. However, these articles were not as explicit as her books at explaining methods or how to purchase them. Instead of specific advice on use or locations where methods could be attained, those who mention the articles in the *Mother England* letters reference Stopes' denial of other commonly believed ideas about conception and her invitation for correspondence from the working class.⁶⁰ Most of the people who referenced the articles also requested specifics about methods, how to use them, and where they could be purchased.

While Stopes' newspaper articles were not as explicitly helpful as her books, they were in fact an effective way to integrate the topic of birth control into everyday life and discussion for the working class. Because newspapers cost much less than books, articles published in newspapers had a much better chance of reaching a greater portion of the working class. Indeed, a much larger number of letters reference the articles than Stopes' books; in *Mother England*, eighteen letters mention having seen Stopes' articles, and thirteen specifically reference *John Bull*.⁶¹ While the articles may not have been the most direct source about birth control methods, the frequency to which they are referred in the *Mother England* letters shows that they had a great impact on the widespread knowledge and acceptance of the topic in general.

Stopes was not the only birth control advocate to utilize newspapers, nor was *John Bull* the only newspaper to publish writing on birth control aimed at the working class. Newspapers such as the *Gloucester Citizen* and *Chelmsford Chronicle* ran ads for family limitation publications which were offered post free: "Methods fully explained in three books M. Stopes, M. Graham and M. Sangster, given away post free, together with illustrated catalogue of appliances. To married people these books are of vital importance."⁶² In some cases, women simply had to send in their name and address to have the publication sent back to them, as seen in this ad from the *Gloucester Citizen* in 1927:

Free advice to married women. Frank outspoken talk on Family Limitation to serious-minded people and those about marry, giving most valuable information, recommending safe and non-injurious Surgical Appliances. No married woman should be without this wonderful work. Send name and address (plainly written) to Mars Medical and Surgical Supply (Dept. H.), SO7, Birchfield Road Birmingham.⁶³

⁵⁹ Examples of letters asking for birth control advice occur so often in *Mother England* that to cite all examples would be too extensive. For examples of letters that give economic reasons for being unable to get Stopes' books, see Stopes, *Mother England*, 50, 75, 99, 105, 145. For letters that ask where to attain methods, see *Ibid.*, 48, 117, 133.

⁶⁰ Three letters specifically reference an article where Stopes disputes the common belief that conception was impossible while breast feeding or at certain times of the month, Stopes, *Mother England*, 62, 128, 166. Three other letters refer to a *John Bull* article where Stopes called for letters from the working class, *Ibid.*, 105, 116, 171.

⁶¹ References to general "articles": Stopes, *Mother England*, 19, 55, 128, 136, 166. References to *John Bull*: *Ibid.*, 23, 26, 47, 60, 62, 70, 75, 105, 110, 116, 171, 174.

⁶² *Gloucester Citizen*, Saturday 21 May 1927, 11. See also *Gloucester Citizen*, Friday 19 February 1926, 7, and Thursday 23 June 1927, 2.

⁶³ *Gloucester Citizen*, Saturday 21 May 1927, 11.

For a population that often could not afford to purchase books about this information, newspapers thus served as a valuable source of information.

For personal interaction and a physical place to access birth control and fertility information, women could go to birth control clinics. These clinics distributed birth control information to women who came, including some of the same pamphlets that were advertised in newspapers. The first birth control clinic, founded by Marie Stopes and her husband, Humphrey Roe, was called the Mothers' Clinic. Opened in Holloway on March 17, 1921, the Mothers' Clinic was an attempt by Stopes to bring birth control information to working class women, because "They, of all others, need it... and they know not where to go for it."⁶⁴ Stopes recognized that her published books would "only be of use to the educated and more thoughtful people," and because of her concern to maintain racial purity, she sought a way to "bring this knowledge to the poorest and least literate section of the community."⁶⁵

The Mothers' Clinic was the first of its kind, as it was the "first in the world to be open all day and every day and devoted solely to a serious scientific consideration of the application of means of controlling conception."⁶⁶ This was in contrast to the only other birth control clinic at the time, the Women's Walworth Centre, which was initially only open two afternoons a week.⁶⁷ The Walworth Centre was originally opened by the Malthusian League in 1921 and reopened two years later by the Society for the Provision of Birth Control Clinics.⁶⁸ Both the Walworth Centre and the Mothers' Clinic served as new, valuable refuges of information about family limitation.

In spite of their connection with medical issues, birth control clinics were not medical offices. The Mothers' Clinic was not associated with a hospital, but was staffed by nurses under the direction of midwives. These nurses examined women, fitted them with rubber caps, and told them how to use other spermicidal solutions in order to prevent pregnancy.⁶⁹ The Mothers' Clinic also consulted with a gynecologist for unusual cases.⁷⁰ Similarly, while the Society for the Provision of Birth Control Clinics was more insistent that all patients at the Walworth Centre see a physician, the Centre was also independent of medical institutions.⁷¹

Other birth control clinics opened sporadically after the first two. When Stopes and the Malthusian League realized that the government was not going to provide funds and facilities for birth control, more private, independent clinics opened.⁷² Between 1924 and 1926, clinics opened in North Kensington, East London, Wolverhampton, Cambridge, Manchester, Salford, Birmingham, Aberdeen, Glasgow, and Oxford.⁷³ These clinics serviced many working-class women. In studying the North Kensington Clinic in 1927, for example, Norman Himes found that "anywhere from one-third to one-half of the women who sought assistance were the wives of unskilled workers."⁷⁴ While by 1930 there were still only sixteen birth control clinics in all of Great Britain, the number of clinics was still growing.⁷⁵

⁶⁴ Marie Carmichael Stopes, "The Mothers' Clinic: History of the Clinic," in *Wise Parenthood*, 7th ed. (London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, Ltd., 1921), <http://books.google.com>.

⁶⁵ Stopes, *Wise Parenthood*, xi.

⁶⁶ Peter Fryer, *The Birth Controllers* (New York: Stein and Day, 1966), 229.

⁶⁷ Soloway, *Birth Control and the Population Question*, 215.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 193.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 266.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 300-301.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 301.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 302.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 277.

These public sources of information for married, working-class couples reflected certain themes. Their introduction to British society reflected a surge in the promotion of “non-traditional” birth control methods, such as the cap, spermicides, douching, or the sheath (condom). And these sources were incredibly popular. Marie Stopes’ books sold thousands of copies and were reprinted several times. Birth control information in newspapers was commonly referenced in letters written by working-class men and women, and clinics were popping up around Great Britain despite the lack of government support.

Given the popularity of these sources, it would be expected that birth control practice among working-class couples would reflect their ideas; however, reports of actual practice are not consistent with the information provided in the public sources. Birth control use still increased greatly, however, suggesting that public sources contributed to the process of destigmatization surrounding birth control through 1930 in Britain.

Two types of sources are available from this time to explain the actual practice of birth control among the working class. The first is E. Lewis-Faning’s *Report on an Enquiry into Family Limitation and its Influence on Human Fertility during the Past Fifty Years* for the Papers of the Royal Commission on Population.⁷⁶ Published in 1949, the report was commissioned by the Royal Commission on Population to better understand the national fertility decline at the end of the first half of the century. The survey was carried out by the Council of the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists and given to married female patients of all social classes in the general wards of hospitals. The report provides detailed statistics on the extent to which birth control was used, what types were used, the effectiveness of different methods at preventing pregnancy, and women’s motivations for using birth control. These conclusions are organized depending on the decade married, social class, and period of marriage. Social class is divided into three subgroups, with the working class included in class III.⁷⁷

Another important source are the letters written by working women to the Women’s Cooperative Guild at the beginning of the century and to Marie Stopes in the 1920s. *Maternity* is the compilation of 160 of the letters the Guild received prior to World War I after sending a request to current or past Guild officers to explain their experiences with motherhood and childbirth.⁷⁸ A second set of letters were sent to Marie Stopes in the 1920s and can be found in a chapter of *Dear Dr. Stopes* entitled “The Lower Classes” and in the book *Mother England, a Contemporary History*.⁷⁹ In contrast to the *Maternity* letters, the letters sent to Stopes were written completely voluntarily by women and men, detailing their struggles and asking for Stopes’ advice on the issues of sex and contraception. Both sets of letters provide insight into the lived experience of working women from the turn of the twentieth century through the late 1920s, and serve as a balance to the statistical material of the Lewis-Faning survey.

⁷⁶ E Lewis-Faning, *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population* (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1949).

⁷⁷ The three subgroups are based on a modified grouping of the Registrar-General’s Social Class grouping. Each class was determined by the husband’s occupation. Class I included white collar, clergy, shopkeepers, and assistants. Class II included skilled manual workers. Class III consisted of unskilled manual workers.

⁷⁸ The Women’s Co-operative Guild was a social, economic, and political organization founded in Britain in 1883 that advocated for good working conditions and respect for mothers.

⁷⁹ *Dear Dr. Stopes* is a representation of the letters sent to Stopes between 1918 and 1928 and separated out into the different social and occupational classes, edited by Ruth Hall. *Mother England* is a collection of letters that Stopes received and compiled into a book to be published in 1929. The letters represent the ones she received in 1926 alone from surnames beginning with the letters A-H.

At the beginning of the century, public awareness and use of birth control was limited. Lewis-Faning reports that only four percent of women in social class III married before 1910 used birth control at some time during their married life.⁸⁰ Of all social classes, the percentage was higher at fifteen, but still relatively low.⁸¹

The rarity of intentional family restriction is evident in the *Maternity* letters written by working women. While the majority of the women explain the extreme hardships of pregnancy, childbirth, and caring for large families, of the 160 published letters, only five reference family limitation.⁸² Of those five, none of the women discuss methods, but only mention the idea of limitation or preventatives vaguely: “I determined that this state of things should not go on any longer, and if there was no natural means of prevention, then, of course, artificial means must be employed, which were successful.”⁸³ One woman simply stated, “We never had any more children.”⁸⁴ Only one woman revealed where she came by the information to prevent conception—a friend.⁸⁵

These women also speak to the social stigma against any reference to unnaturally limiting family size during the early years of the twentieth century. One woman admitted that talk of these ideas was met with hostility, even within the Women’s Co-operative Guild: “I have disgusted some of our Guild members by advocating restrictions.”⁸⁶ Another woman maintains the importance of limitation despite its unpopularity: “There is one thing—as to mechanical prevention of family. I know it is a delicate subject, but it is an urgent one.”⁸⁷ The five vague references to preventatives, as well as the lack of mention from the remainder of the letters, show both the very limited use of birth control before 1910 and the intense stigma against its use and discussion.

Beginning in the next decade, birth control use among the working class increased greatly. The Lewis-Faning report concludes that between 1910 and 1919, newly married couples’ birth control use jumped to 33 percent for social class III.⁸⁸ This continued to increase during the 1920s. Lewis-Faning splits the decade into two halves in order to show the trend more specifically: marriages from 1920 to 1924 reported to 54 percent use of birth control, and marriages from 1935-1929, 63 percent for social class III.⁸⁹ These results show that birth control use doubled in a single decade for working-class women, representing a significant change in practice.

The letters written to Stopes reflect the nature of this shift in social acceptance and knowledge. *Dear Dr. Stopes* includes letters written from starting in 1918, the year *Married Love* and *Wise Parenthood* were published. Many of the letters request advice on birth control and fertility, many others ask general sex questions, and some are letters of support

⁸⁰ Lewis-Faning, *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*, 10 (Table 7).

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 7 (Table 2).

⁸² This is consistent with Lewis-Faning’s results at 3%.

⁸³ Women’s Co-operative Guild and Margaret Llewelyn Davies, *Maternity: Letters from Working-Women* (New York: Norton, 1978), 60–61.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 131.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁸⁷ She goes on to cite economic hardship as the reason for limitation, as well as briefly mentioning the need to maintain a race “worthy of England.” *Ibid.*, 89–90.

⁸⁸ Lewis-Faning, *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*, 10 (Table 7).

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

for Stopes' cause.⁹⁰ However, not all the letters are positive; some of the earlier letters express hostility to Stopes and her books and show that support and use of birth control publications was still in the beginning stages. One letter took offense to Stopes' message: "Do you really think that my wife and I and our poverty-stricken friends... are sadly in need of such dirty advice as you offer?"⁹¹ The disdain for Stopes is clear in the language. Another letter personally attacks Stopes and the religious implications of her work by posing two questions to her: "1. What did Christ put you on this Earth for? 2. What did Christ make in his Commandments? Did he say, did he make birth Control?"⁹² Written in 1919 and 1923, respectively, these letters show that the early years of Stopes' public career in birth control advocacy was still met with some hostility and resistance.

As the 1920s continued on, letters written to Stopes became more consistently positive, inquisitive, and explicit. In contrast to the letters published in *Maternity*, the forthcoming nature of the letters from 1926 published in *Mother England* show a dramatic growth in public acceptance of birth control, its use, and discussion of personal matters through the end of the 1920s. The *Mother England* letters were comprised overwhelmingly of women and men expressing interest in Stopes' suggestions for birth control in light of their economic, marital, and family struggles.⁹³ There also seems to be in these letters a new willingness to admit ignorance in sexual matters, sexual desire, and to discuss the explicit details of sex and contraception, both in terms of asking for advice and talking about personal experiences.

Another important aspect to consider in the birth control trend when attempting to understand the influence of public sources of information on practice are the methods used. The vast majority of available public information about birth control (i.e. Stopes' books and similar publications from other authors, birth control clinics, etc.) recommended appliance methods such as the cap, tablet (spermicides), diaphragm, and "sheath," (condom), but evidence, including the Lewis-Faning survey and personal letters, reveals that the use of non-appliance methods (i.e. coitus interruptus) had a much greater increase for the working class than appliance methods.⁹⁴

To examine the growth in appliance methods over the period, Lewis-Faning used the percentage of use of any birth control, non-appliance, and appliance methods in marriages

⁹⁰ *Dear Dr. Stopes* only includes 28 letters from the years before the *Mother England* letters were written, and thus, cannot be a truly representative example of all the correspondence Stopes received during those years. However, the letters appear to be more varied in content in Ruth Hall's edition than in Stopes' self-compiled collection, including letters of dissent and opinions of Stopes' cause. In contrast, *Mother England* focuses mainly on lived experience of the working men and women. Indeed, Stopes states in the preface to *Mother England* that she omitted the opening apologies for writing, pleadings, or references to her own works in the letters, even though "such preliminaries occur in most letters."

⁹¹ Marie Carmichael Stopes, *Dear Dr. Stopes: Sex in the 1920s*, ed. Ruth E Hall (London: Deutsch, 1978), 16–17.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 22. It is also interesting to note that all the letters of dissent included in this section were written by men.

⁹³ Stopes does not include any negative letters in *Mother England* like the ones seen in *Dear Dr. Stopes*. This is not surprising given that the book was compiled by Stopes; however, it is important to recognize that this does not mean negative letters did not exist.

⁹⁴ The Lewis-Faning survey divides birth control into two types, "appliance" methods and "non-appliance" methods. In non-appliance methods, the Lewis-Faning survey includes coitus interruptus, abstinence, and the "safe period." However, Lewis-Faning also clarifies that the number of respondents that used abstinence and the "safe period" were negligible and therefore non-appliance methods can be taken to mean coitus interruptus. In contrast, appliance methods are meant to include any other methods that include the use of an appliance, such as the cap, tablet (spermicides), diaphragm, and "sheath," (condom). Lewis-Faning, *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*, 8.

from all time periods using 1910-1919 as a base. Using this calculation, Lewis-Faning concluded that appliance methods showed an increase of 200 percent in 1920-24 and a 244 percent increase in 1925-1929 from 1910-1919 levels, an incredible increase.⁹⁵

Despite the astounding numbers, this increase in appliance methods was still small compared to the use of non-appliance methods during this time. In social class III, especially, this difference is most notable. Appliance methods remained at only 5, 15, and 15 percent used for 1910-1919, 1920-1924, and 1925-1929, respectively.⁹⁶ Compared to 28, 39, and 48 percent for the same three time spans for non-appliance methods only, the increase indeed seems minor. While the trend is different in classes I and II, the general increase in birth control use in class III was most strongly due to an increase in non-appliance methods, in combination with a slight increase in appliance methods.⁹⁷

This pattern is also expressed in the Marie Stopes letters written in 1926. Relatively few admit to having used preventatives: only eight of 176 letters.⁹⁸ Many more used non-appliance methods such as coitus interruptus or abstinence.⁹⁹ Given that these letters were written almost ten years after Stopes began publishing books, the survival of these “traditional” methods in spite of the public promotion of appliance methods is surprising, yet consistent with the Lewis-Faning report.

This finding is significant in understanding the motivations for the shift towards a more wide-spread use of birth control for the working class. If the publications were in fact directly influencing working-class behavior, the survey and letters would report that the use of their suggested methods, appliance methods, increased at greater rates than the “traditional,” non-appliance methods. Non-appliance methods, i.e. coitus interruptus, were not advertised in the public sphere. Thus, the growth of non-appliance over appliance methods suggest that it was not the public information that influenced working-class married couples most directly, but the growing prominence and acceptance of birth control in British society.

Another factor that supports this finding is the concept of gendered birth control practice. Much of the emerging birth control publications during this time were geared at empowering women, often through the promotion of female methods of birth control. Given this correlation, many scholars have interpreted the complementary trends in birth control use and publications that encourage women’s empowerment to mean that the increased use of birth control was caused by women’s increased agency and knowledge. For example, in “Starting to Stop,” Wally Seccombe argues that in the early twentieth century, women’s desire to limit family size outweighed men’s, but that women were unable to assert their own practices. Thus, according to Seccombe, the fertility decline (and the increased use of birth control) in the beginning of the twentieth century was due to the “convergence of men’s and women’s interests in limitation, and to women’s increasing capacity to obtain some male co-

⁹⁵ All social classes combined. *Ibid.*, 54.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁹⁷ In class I for example, non-appliance methods only decreased after 1919, so that the use of appliance methods actually overtake non-appliance by 1925. *Ibid.*

⁹⁸ See Stopes, *Mother England.*, 4, 16, 57, 58, 61, 81, 90, 128. Most authors do not specify the method used, but simply called them “preventatives.” Only one mentions using the cap pessary but was unsatisfied because her medical condition prevented it from working effectively (90). A couple said they used condoms, also called “French letters” (58, 81). It is important to note that most of these men and women wrote to Stopes because they were unsatisfied with preventatives or thought them unnatural or unsafe and wanted an alternative (58, 128).

⁹⁹ Withdrawal: *Ibid.*, 14, 98, 160. Abstinence: *Ibid.*, 2, 16, 18, 22, 31, 37, 52, 59, 63, 66, 68, 83, 91, 101, 104, 117, 120, 147, 150, 161, 164, 165. Some letters are unclear whether they are referring to abstinence or withdrawal, but simply said something like they were “careful” or that they did not allow the “natural process”: 41, 50, 61, 144, 168.

operation to this end.”¹⁰⁰ For the latter half of this conclusion, Seccombe references the new variety of public sources available to women, such as Marie Stopes’ books and writings. This emphasis on women’s increasing agency with birth control is the focus of much scholarly writing prior to 2000.¹⁰¹

However, this feminist-type analysis of birth control motivations and practice is not explicitly clear given the relationship between married men and women expressed in society. While the available information to women greatly increased during this period, men were traditionally able to access birth control from a much earlier age without the social stigma associated with it. In Kate Fisher’s analysis of birth control, sex, and marriage from 1918-1960, the oral testimonies of men and women who lived during this time attest to the continued gendered practice and understanding of birth control.¹⁰² The testimonies show that while for women it was considered proper to remain ignorant about matters of birth control and sex, men had no such social restriction. It was considered acceptable and even encouraged for men to talk about sex and birth control with each other. Fisher goes so far as to say that “it is worth entertaining the possibility that the discussion of, and perhaps also the use of, contraception became a way in which men demonstrated their masculinity.”¹⁰³

Men also had greater access to information about sex and birth control even before the publication of books like *Married Love* and *Wise Parenthood*. Men often wrote to *The New Generation*, a newsletter published by the Malthusian League, asking for information about birth control methods.¹⁰⁴ Urinals also commonly posted this information, as well as railway stations.¹⁰⁵ In fact, even birth control clinics were often first found by husbands, who subsequently would send their wives.¹⁰⁶ As a result of their more developed sources, husbands were “important if not sole repositories of birth control information.”¹⁰⁷ Further, women acknowledged and embraced this role. Based on her oral histories, Fisher concludes that “Most women cited their husband as the key provider of information and, indeed, to many women it was important that they could confidently rely on their husband to find out about available birth control options.”¹⁰⁸

Both men’s and women’s perception of birth control thus favored men’s roles and responsibilities. Fisher asserts that “contraception was viewed by both men and women... as part of a male world.”¹⁰⁹ In fact, most women were “pleased” that men took the lead role in the matter because they saw it as more of a burden than an empowering position.¹¹⁰ This contrasts greatly with the previous scholars’ conclusions that it was women’s desire to limit

¹⁰⁰ Seccombe, “Starting to Stop,” 187.

¹⁰¹ See e.g. Brookes, “Women and Reproduction 1860-1939”; Davey, “Birth Control in Britain”; Faulkner, “‘Powerless to prevent him;’”; Gittings, *Fair Sex*; Ittman, *Work, Gender and Family in Victorian England*; Mason, *The Making of Victorian Sexuality*; McLaren, *A History of Contraception*; E. Roberts, *A Woman’s Place*; ead., *Women and Families*; E. Ross, *Love and Toil*; W. Seccombe, *Weathering the Storm*; Crafts, “Duration of Marriage, Fertility and Women’s Employment Opportunities”.

¹⁰² Fisher’s book is based on the oral testimonies of 193 men and women from South Wales, Oxford, Hertfordshire, and Blackburn who were born between 1899 and 1931. Fisher, *Birth Control, Sex and Marriage in Britain, 1918-1960*.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁰⁴ *The New Generation* had a regular column, called “Letters from Struggling Parents” for this purpose. *Ibid.*, 58.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 58.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* See quotes from Wyn (59) and Catherine (59-60)

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 191.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.* Fisher references the public and social opinion that held that women should remain passive and ignorant in matters of sex and contraception as the cause of these attitudes.

family size and their increasing ability to enforce their actions that drove the trend in birth control use.

While Fisher's conclusions were based largely on the inclusion of her own, new source material, there are hints of these gendered roles in the traditional sources. For example, in *Dear Dr. Stopes* and *Mother England*, many of the letters are written by men wishing to obtain birth control information for their wives.¹¹¹ In *Mother England*, twenty one of letters are written by men, all of which are primarily concerned with finding healthy and effective methods of family limitation for their marriage.

The Lewis-Faning report also shows a preference of male methods of birth control over female. As discussed above, of all birth control methods in the Lewis-Faning survey, non-appliance methods for class III couples were consistently used more commonly than appliance methods.¹¹² Since Lewis-Faning explains that non-appliance methods are to be understood as coitus interruptus, it is clear that male methods continued to dominate birth control practice. Even within the appliance methods, The Lewis-Faning survey concludes that the male method, the "sheath" was by far the most commonly used method.¹¹³

As with the appliance and non-appliance debate, the continued prevalence of male methods of birth control, despite the emphasis in many sources on female methods and women empowerment, suggest that the influence of said public sources was less direct than previously believed.

The reports of actual practice among the working class between 1900-1930 show that the introduction of public sources of information about birth control was most importantly a significant contribution to the destigmatization of family limitation in British society rather than a direct effect of birth control information promoted by publications and advocacy. Many advances were made for the birth control movement before 1930 regarding the legality of birth control publications, the compliance of the medical profession to provide medical oversight, and the government's provision of public resources for family limitation facilities. Public sources of information similarly had significant influence on British society. However, given that the main content of the public sources, such as the promotion of appliance and female methods and women's responsibility in birth control practice, was not reflected in the practice of working-class families as told by the men and women themselves, the conclusion emerges that the role of publications was more symbolic: destigmatizing ideas of family limitation within English society.

1900-1930 was a dynamic time in British history, including the first Global War, colonization, British feminism, as well as countless other historical areas of study. Among these, the mystery of the "fertility revolution" in Britain has been a popular topic for historians, and continues to be an area of debate. While some insist on the increased agency of women or the influence of birth control publications, analysis of the statistical data and lived experience of working-class men and women, compared to social processes and available publications, shows that trends in behavior were most directly a reflection of the social destigmatization of birth control happening in British society between 1900 and 1930. The trend in birth control practice among the working class is complicated topic to understand. But for historians, the widespread increase of birth control use before 1930

¹¹¹ See Stopes, *Dear Dr. Stopes*. 21, 29, Stopes, *Mother England*. 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 31, 42, 44, 46, 47, 57 (two), 65, 73, 75, 99, 103, 108, 127, 129, 171, 173.

¹¹² See Table 37, Lewis-Faning, *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*, 52.

¹¹³ See Table 6b, *Ibid.*, 9.. The table portrays the months of exposure while using specific methods, expressed as percentages of the total exposure with all appliance methods (Table 6a), during the first, second, and third five years of marriage. The sheath was listed as having percentages in the 40s for all periods of marriage (43, 40, and 41 for the first, second, and third five years, respectively). Next was the tablet with 19, 19, and 13 percent, followed by caps and combinations with 18, 20, and 23. This table combines all social classes and years, but can still be used to get a general idea of the popularity of various appliance methods.

reflects an important change in the way British society viewed the family, marital relationships, and family limitation—a development that cannot be ignored.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

The Gloucester Citizen, Friday 19 February 1926, 7.

———. Saturday 21 May 1927, 11.

———. Thursday 23 June 1927, 2.

Lewis-Faning, E. *Papers of the Royal Commission on Population*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1949.

Stopes, Marie Carmichael. *A Letter to Working Mothers on How to Have Healthy Children and Avoid Weakening Pregnancies*. Elmer, Leatherhead, Surrey [England]: Published by the author, 1919.

———. *Dear Dr. Stopes: Sex in the 1920s*. Edited by Ruth E Hall. London: Deutsch, 1978.

———. *Married Love, a New Contribution to the Solution of Sex Difficulties*,. 19th ed. New York; London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1931.

———. *Mother England, a Contemporary History*. London: J. Bale, Sons & Danielsson, 1929.

———. "The Mothers' Clinic: History of the Clinic." In *Wise Parenthood*. 7th ed. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, Ltd., 1921. <http://books.google.com>.

———. *Wise Parenthood: The Treatise on Birth Control for Married People: A Practical Sequel to Married Love*. 11th ed. London: Putnam, 1923.

Women's Co-operative Guild, and Margaret Llewelyn Davies. *Maternity: Letters from Working-Women*. New York: Norton, 1978.

Secondary Sources:

Angin, Zeynep, and Frederic C. Shorter. "Negotiating Reproduction and Gender During the Fertility Decline in Turkey." *SSM Social Science & Medicine* 47, no. 5 (1998): 555–64.

Box, Muriel, ed. *Trial Of Marie Stopes*. [S.l.]: Femina, 1967.

Chandrasekhar, S. "*A Dirty, Filthy Book*": *The Writings of Charles Knowlton and Annie Besant on Reproductive Physiology and Birth Control and an Account of the Bradlaugh-Besant Trial*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.

Crafts, N. F. R. "Duration of Marriage, Fertility and Women's Employment Opportunities in England and Wales in 1911." *Population Studies* 43, no. 2 (July 1, 1989): 325–35.

- Davey C. "Birth Control in Britain During the Interwar Years: Evidence from the Stopes Correspondence." *Journal of Family History* 13, no. 3 (1988): 329–45.
- Dodoo, F Nii-Amoo, Ye Luo, and Evelina Panayotova. "Do Male Reproductive Preferences Really Point to a Need to Refocus Fertility Policy?" *Population Research and Policy Review* 16, no. 5 (1997): 447.
- Fisher, Kate. *Birth Control, Sex and Marriage in Britain, 1918-1960*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Fryer, Peter. *The Birth Controllers*. New York: Stein and Day, 1966.
- Harcourt, Wendy. *Power, Reproduction and Gender: The Inter-Generational Transfer of Knowledge*. London; Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Zed Books, 1997.
- Ittmann, Karl. *Work, Gender, and Family in Victorian England*. Washington Square, N.Y.: New York University Press, 1995.
- Leathard, Audrey. *The Fight for Family Planning: The Development of Family Planning Services in Britain, 1921-74*. London: Macmillan, 1980.
- Ledbetter, Rosanna. *A History of the Malthusian League, 1877-1927*. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1976.
- Levine, David. *Reproducing Families: The Political Economy of English Population History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Mason, Michael. *The Making of Victorian Sexuality*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- McLaren, Angus. *Birth Control in Nineteenth-Century England*. New York: Holmes & Meier, 1978.
- Neushul, Peter. "Marie C. Stopes and the Popularization of Birth Control Technology." *Technology and Culture* 39, no. 2 (April 1, 1998): 245–72.
- Pelling, Henry. *Modern Britain, 1885-1955*. Edinburgh: T. Nelson, 1962.
- Roberts, Elizabeth. *A Woman's Place: An Oral History of Working-Class Women, 1890-1940*. Oxford; New York: B. Blackwell, 1984.
- Roberts, M. J. D. "Morals, Art, and the Law: The Passing of the Obscene Publications Act, 1857." *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 4 (July 1, 1985): 609–29.
- Ross, Ellen. *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870-1918*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Secombe, Wally. "Starting to Stop: Working-Class Fertility Decline in Britain." *Past & Present*, no. 126 (1990): 151–88.

———. “Weathering the Storm. Working Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline.” *Social History of Medicine* 8, no. 1 (1995): 140.

Soloway, R. A. *Birth Control and the Population Question in England, 1877-1930*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

———. *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Sutherland, Halliday. *Birth Control; a Statement of Christian Doctrine against the Neo-Malthusians*. New York: P. J. Kenedy & sons, 1922.

Szreter, Simon. *Fertility, Class and Gender in Britain, 1860-1940*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Zweiniger-Bargielowska, Ina. *Women in Twentieth-Century Britain*. Harlow: Longman, 2001.

Louis-Philippe's Impartiality in Fragmented Paris, 1832

Chelsea Tegels ('13)

On June 5, 1832, Republicans rose up against the government, and violence broke out on the streets of Paris. Thirty years later, this uprising was used as the backdrop of the climax in Victor Hugo's masterpiece, *Les Misérables*. He justified the violence against the government by arguing that revolts can be seen either as valid insurrections or purposeless riots, also called *émeutes*: "if insurrection in given cases may be . . . the most sacred of duties, *émeute* is the most deadly of crimes . . . With this explanation given, what for history is the movement of June 1832? . . . It is an insurrection."¹ Unfortunately, the Insurrection of June 5 and 6 failed, resulting in a return to the status quo of the July Monarchy, led by King Louis-Philippe. While Louis-Philippe was put on the throne because of an earlier revolution, he never committed to a liberal or conservative side. This caused the more extreme parties to rebel against him, but also gave the king the support he needed to keep control of the government. Louis-Philippe played to each of the factions in Paris, which caused the people to rise up against him but also ultimately allowed him to crush the rebellion and keep his power.

The previous half-century in Paris had been one of the most eventful in its history. The violent Revolution and Napoleon's great empire had concluded in a return of the Bourbon monarchy in 1815. Fifteen years later, the brother of the beheaded Louis XVI, Charles X, was on the throne, ruling a very dissatisfied country. Tensions began to rise in June 1830 when Charles X issued four unpopular ordinances, two of which were questionably legal: the censorship of the periodic press and a change of the electoral law. The people began to protest, so that by July 27, Paris was in full revolution.² Over the next three days, known later as *Les Trois Glorieuses*, there were a total of 7,000 to 8,000 casualties.³ When the rebellion broke out, Charles X was at Saint-Cloud; he decided not to return to Paris in order to try and stop the revolution.⁴ His daughter-in-law, the Duchesse de Berri, tried to get him to keep power for the sake of her son, Henri, the heir to the throne.⁵ She was not able to convince him, and Charles X saw that his throne was lost. On August 3, Charles X abdicated in favor of Henri, known as Henri V, but the Revolutionaries would not take his grandson. Thus, Charles V's deposition meant the end of Bourbon rule, which had been the ruling family since Henri IV, 240 years earlier.⁶ The Revolutionaries looked for an alternative government, and many believed the answer was Louis-Philippe, the Duc d'Orléans, a distant member of the royal family. Naturally, a king from the royal family was not what many Republicans had fought for; a proclamation issued on July 30 tried to convince the doubters that Louis-Philippe was the right choice:

Duc d'Orléans is a prince who is devoted to the Revolution cause. The Duc d'Orléans has never fought against us . . . The Duc d'Orléans is a citizen king. The Duc d'Orléans has carried the standard *tricolore* into battle and he, alone,

¹ Victor Hugo, *Les Misérables* (New York: Signet Classics, 1987), 1052, 1055.

² *Historical Dictionary of France from the 1815 Restoration to the Second Empire*, ed. Edgar Leone Newman and Robert Lawrence Simpson (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987), 895-96.

³ *Biographical Memoires of Louis-Philippe the First, Ex-King of the French* (London: Cracock & Co., 1848) <http://books.google.com> (accessed October 29, 2012), 40.

⁴ Alistair Horne, *Seven Ages of Paris* (New York: Vintage Books, 2004), chap. 13, 222.

⁵ Agnes Barron Stoeckl, *King of the French: a Portrait of Louis Philippe, 1773-1850* (New York: Putnam, 1958), 202.

⁶ Horne, 222-223.

can still uphold it . . . He will have the crown from the French people themselves.⁷

Ultimately, no other option seemed feasible, so the crown was offered to Louis-Philippe “on terms of a revised charter.”⁸ This new charter gave the French people more rights and made the government more Republican. On August 9, Louis-Philippe took the civil oath, and became *Roi des Français*, King of the French.⁹

The new king was the son of Louis Philippe Joseph, Duc d’Orléans, and Marie Adelaïde de Penthièvre, a great-granddaughter of Louis XIV and his mistress, Marquise de Montespan. On his father’s side, he was a descendant of Louis XIII; Philippe, the brother of Louis XIV; and Philippe, regent to Louis XV.¹⁰ On his mother’s side, he was the great-great-grandson of Louis XIV himself, albeit illegitimately. Louis-Philippe’s father, while part of the royal family, was very liberal, and when the French Revolution started in 1789, he went along with it. He changed his name to Philippe Egalité, and became a deputy to the States General and to the National Convention.¹¹ Most importantly, he voted against Louis XVI, which sent the king to the guillotine.¹² Louis-Philippe, meanwhile, took after his father by joining the Jacobin Club and the Parisian National Guard; from 1792 to 1793, he even served in the Republican armies. Louis-Philippe then became involved in 1793 with General Charles-François Dumouriez’s “plotting against the Republic.”¹³ However, it was his father, Philippe Egalité, who was charged with aiding Dumouriez’s conspiracy; Philippe Egalité was then sent to the guillotine. After his father’s death, Louis-Philippe spent twenty-one years in exile; he came back to France in 1814, quickly fled to England when Napoleon returned, and then came home to Paris permanently in 1817.¹⁴

Being a distant relative of a king with an heir, Louis-Philippe had little reason to expect the crown before the events of July 1830. But as an elder son in the royal family, he was raised to have ambition. Influential French writer and royalist, François-René Chateaubriand, asserted, “Monsieur le Duc d’Orléans had the desire, throughout his life, that all high-borne spirits have for power.”¹⁵ Still, accepting a throne is never a simple task. Paris had just had its three bloodiest days of the nineteenth century, resulting in the ex-king’s loss of crown and country. Louis-Philippe “could no longer hold back, but had to choose between the throne—that is to say, the everlasting ambition of their race—or exile, which was the perpetual terror of his life.”¹⁶ When Louis-Philippe chose to take the challenge, “he wore a tri-coloured cockade from his buttonhole: he was off to steal an old crown from the store.”¹⁷ He accepted the Republican’s gift, and in doing so, he became the greatest man in France.

Louis-Philippe was just one part of the new government, the so-called July Monarchy. At its establishment, the July Monarchy was seen as liberal, a government of the people and a Republican monarchy. The star of this new administration was General Lafayette, lover of

⁷ Alexandre Dumas, *My Memoirs, 1830-1831*, Vol. IV, trans. E.M. Waller (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908) <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 25, 2012), 245.

⁸ *Biographical Memoires*, 44.

⁹ *Historical Dictionary*, 895-96.

¹⁰ Stoeckl, xii, xiii, 1.

¹¹ *Biographical Memoires*, 8.

¹² Stoeckl, 29.

¹³ *Historical Dictionary*, 648.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ François de Chateaubriand, *Mémoires d’outre-tombe*, trans. A.S. Kline (2007) <http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Chateaubriand/Chathome.htm> (accessed October 23, 2012), 32:13:1.

¹⁶ Dumas, “My Memoirs,” Vol. IV, 262.

¹⁷ Chateaubriand, 32:13.

France, Republicanism, and the United States. He was involved in American Revolution, and later brought those ideals to France. He aided the French Revolution in its beginnings, and became the commander of the National Guard, but opposed the radical Jacobins. He left the country before the Reign of Terror, and later refused to return to Paris to join Napoleon's government. Then came the Revolution of 1830, in which he played an important role through organizing the National Guard. Afterward, Louis-Philippe asked him to be the Commanding General of the National Guard of the Kingdom. Lafayette took the position in order to properly handle the security of Charles X's arrested ministers; when that was taken care of, Lafayette resigned. He held numerous other positions in the government until 1832.¹⁸

Another key early figure in the government was Jacques Laffitte. During Charles X's reign, he had been the head of Bank of France, but lost his job due to his opposition of the Bourbons. After the Revolution of 1830, he was the biggest proponent for giving Louis-Philippe the crown. Lafitte then served as a minister in the government from 1830 to 1831.¹⁹

The Revolution brought more than a new government and a different man on the throne; it was a change in the way the French people thought of their country. One alteration was apparent all across Paris: the white Bourbon flag was traded in for the *tricolore* – blue, white and red – which was a symbol of the Revolution of 1789 and the Republic.²⁰ *Les Trois Glorieuses* also gave the idea of the reconciliation of all people: all classes and ages, military and civilians, the old and the new regime, coming together as French.²¹ The revolutionary thought that all people were equal was a part of this. This new belief in the unification of all France is shown in Delacroix's *Liberté guidant les peuples*, depicting the July Revolution.²² This painting portrays Liberty personified as a woman, leading the Revolutionaries of different ages and classes to victory against the old regime.

Unfortunately, this unifying idea and hope for France did not last long, and the honeymoon period brought by the successful Revolution and the crowning of Louis-Philippe faded. For one, the economic crisis that had begun in 1827 did not end with the July Monarchy.²³ The crisis produced widespread unemployment and high bread prices, which naturally led to dissatisfaction.²⁴ However, given that the new government had been in power less than two years, most of the populace was still willing to believe in the ideas of *Trois Glorieuses* "Most of France and most Frenchmen were reasonably contented with life under the restored monarchy. It was . . . turbulent Paris where the trouble lay."²⁵ It was the Parisians' tendency to break out in riots and cause dangerous disturbances that led to the statement in the 1832 novella, *Le Colonel Chabert*, "I shall move to the country with my wife; Paris frightens me."²⁶

This was the Paris that Louis-Philippe inherited, and he worked to control it. Louis-Philippe gained the crown through a Revolution, making it a gift from the people. He was seen as the perfect compromise for France, the transition from a Bourbon monarchy to a Republic. Even his name, "the Bourbon Louis and the Orléanist Philippe fused into a single

¹⁸ *Historical Dictionary*, 565-540.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 571-572.

²⁰ *Biographical Memoires*, 45.

²¹ Jean-Claude Caron, "Louis-Philippe face à l'opinion publique, ou l'impossible réconciliation des Français, 1830-1835," *French Historical Studies*, 30, no. 4 (2007): 597-621, 10.1215/00161071-2007-009 (accessed September 16, 2012), 601.

²² *Ibid.*, 601, 604.

²³ Pamela M. Pilbeam, *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France, 1814-1871* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 115.

²⁴ *Historical Dictionary*, 577.

²⁵ Horne, 221.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 217.

man,”²⁷ represented the current political climate of France. Louis-Philippe played up this view, and very early on he earned the title of “Citizen King,” or *Roi Citoyen*. This title came from the ideas of the *Trois Glorieuses* and of the new charter. Louis-Philippe, while king, was considered one of the people, a citizen just like the rest of them, and not above. Contemporaries saw him as seeming “to abolish the distinction between private and public character in the image of *roi citoyen*.”²⁸

Unlike previous kings, scared for their throne and their lives, Louis-Philippe was a “close sovereign, making the rounds on foot or on horseback, with or without an escort.”²⁹ This was part of his attempts to instill the confidence in his people that he was a rightful king, and that, even though he gained power through a violent Revolution, he could keep Paris calm and safe. He helped further the image, telling Republicans, “the gold crown was too cold in winter and too hot in summer; a scepter too heavy or bunchy to be used as a weapon, and too short for a staff, and that a round felt hat and a good umbrella, were much more useful in these days.”³⁰ By seeming to reject traditional extravagant symbols of the overbearing old regime, he endeavored to distinguish himself from the defeated Bourbons while still maintaining his authority.

However, not everyone believed in this image of the king. Heinrich Heine, a German writer who spent a lot of time in Paris during this time, had a more cynical view of the king’s comment: “As for Louis-Philippe, he always plays his part of *roi citoyen*, and wears the citizen dress appropriate to it; but it is generally known that under his modest felt hat he wears an altogether unpretentious crown of the usual pattern, and that in his umbrella he hides the most absolute scepter.”³¹ In regards to his “closeness,” Louis-Philippe had his own tricks for dealing with the common people: “He in those days shook hands with every grocer and workman, wearing for this purpose, it is said, one particular dirty old glove, which he always drew off and replaced with a new and clean ‘kid’ when he climbed again into the higher regions inhabited by his ancient nobility, bankers, ministers, intriguers, and scarlet lackeys.”³² While the king was clearly more willing to appeal to the average Frenchman than any ruler in the past, he was far from being a true representative of the people.

These varying opinions of the king illustrate the downfalls of the dual-view of *roi citoyen*. On the one hand, one contemporary argued that Louis-Philippe was tolerated, “because the people more easily support the tyranny of a government they have created than the legal rigour of institutions which are not their work.”³³ While Louis-Philippe’s government was not really an improvement for most Frenchmen, it was still the government they created, so they were more willing to endure it. On the other hand, another Frenchman countered, “a true Frenchman has always scorned a method of electing kings that makes them at one masters and servants.”³⁴ Louis-Philippe was given the throne from the people in order to rule them, so he had to juggle the duties of following the people’s will and keeping them in line. His very title of *Roi des Français*, King of the French, showed this. He was in debt to the people for giving him the throne, but as a king, he now had power and the ability to do as he pleased.

²⁷ Caron, 604. Author’s translation.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 601-02.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 602. Author’s translation.

³⁰ Heinrich Heine, *The Works of Heinrich Heine*, vol. VII, trans. Charles Godfrey Leland (London: William Heineman, 1906) <http://books.google.co.in/> (accessed October 21, 2012), 40-41.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 135.

³² *Ibid.*, 41.

³³ Chateaubriand, 34:14.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 13:14:1.

Above all, Louis-Philippe sought to maintain his throne and have power in the government. Heine observed, "Louis-Philippe is a king whose chief interest is to keep his crown."³⁵ He also believed that Louis-Philippe had "created a provisional presidency" and gave it to men who "have no independence and act as mere countersigning puppets."³⁶ Victor Hugo saw the king as "governing too much and not reigning enough; his own prime minister."³⁷ Being his own prime minister is more than just a metaphor; Alexandre Dumas, a famous French writer and Republican who fought on the barricades of 1830 and 1832, claimed that Louis-Philippe had said about the Prime Minister, "M Casimir Perier was but an instrument in my hands, strong, and yet pliant like steel; my will has always been, is now and ever shall be immovable."³⁸ While this quote may not be entirely accurate, later events show that it was not far from the truth. Perier's illness and then death on May 16, 1832 weakened the government and allowed Louis-Philippe to play a more active role and essentially become Prime Minister.³⁹ In short, as the first few years passed, Louis-Philippe was able to gain more control and become more like an absolute monarch.

Yet, no matter what he did, Louis-Philippe was still a king dependent on the people, and so he did what he could to appease everyone. In his policies, "he would do his utmost to be all things to all sides."⁴⁰ Almost immediately after taking the throne, he began balancing all the factions in Paris and playing to each side. Chateaubriand claimed that he "never says or does anything fully, always leaving the door open for evasion,"⁴¹ and "from Louis-Philippe's character one would assume that he made no decisions, and his political timidity, shrouded in duplicity, waited on events as a spider waits for a fly to be caught in its web."⁴² Hugo viewed his faults in an affectionate way, but the king's imperfections are still apparent: "Louis-Philippe was too fatherly as a king; this incubation of a family that is to be hatched into a dynasty is afraid of everything, and cannot brook interference, hence excessive timidity, annoying to a people."⁴³ Even the *Edinburg Review* in Britain picked up on Louis-Philippe's varying policies, saying he had taken up an "intermediate position . . . between two irreconcilable extremes."⁴⁴

These two irreconcilable extremes were the Royalists and the Republicans. Louis-Philippe bore "within himself the contradiction of the Restoration and the Revolution." He was a king crowned by revolution, "a mixture of the noble and the bourgeois which suited 1830."⁴⁵ Unfortunately, this mixture no longer suited 1832. Still, instead of being overwhelmed by these opposing components of his position, Louis-Philippe used them to appease both sides and assert his power. He "wore the uniform of the National Guard, like Charles X, and the ribbon of the Legion of Honor, like Napoleon."⁴⁶ In short, he did his best to be both things at once.

When being both didn't work, Louis-Philippe stepped into whatever role helped him at the moment. On the one hand, he took up the role of Royalists Leader; he even became an

³⁵ Heine, 262.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 223.

³⁷ Hugo, 832.

³⁸ Alexandre Dumas, *My Memoirs, 1832-1833*, Vol. VI, trans. E.M. Waller (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908) <http://books.google.com> (accessed October 17, 2012), 314.

³⁹ André Jardin, and André-Jean Tudesq, *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-1848*, trans. Elbrog Forster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 109.

⁴⁰ Horne, 223.

⁴¹ Chateaubriand, 32:13.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 32:13:1.

⁴³ Hugo, 833.

⁴⁴ Vincent E. Starzinger, *Middlingness: Juste Milieu Political Theory in France and England*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1865), 6.

⁴⁵ Hugo, 834, 832.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 832.

absolute king to gain the support of other European monarchs. In a letter to the Czar Nicholas of Russia in 1830, he sided with the Royalists: “*the very vanquished party itself felt me to be necessary to its salvation*; I was the more necessary probably, in order to prevent the conquerors from taking immoderate advantage of their victory; I have, therefore, accepted this noble and painful task.”⁴⁷ He explained that the Royalists were defeated, but he had done what he could to keep Republicans from taking too much advantage of their win. He also removed the death penalty when four of Charles X’s ministers were condemned to death.⁴⁸ Policies like these incited Lafitte to tell Louis-Philippe that he was “less severe with respect to the Legitimists than towards the Republicans.”⁴⁹ Louis-Philippe naturally denied this, and certain policies of his supported this statement.

While sometimes siding with Royalists, Louis-Philippe was also compelled to work with the party that had given him the crown. When a rumor began that the king stayed in the Palais Royal because “he remained at heart devoted to his legitimate lord, Charles X, for whose return he was preparing;” he moved to the Tuileries to disprove the gossip.⁵⁰ He also “suppressed the name of Henri V,” who could justifiably claim his throne.⁵¹ He did “not attach much importance to being a legitimate king,” knowing that his power did not come from God or from his bloodline, but from the people he ruled.⁵² Finally, his greatest way of pleasing the majority of people was by keeping them safe from violence and war. He told them, “I will use all my endeavors to preserve you from Civil War and anarchy.”⁵³ This meant stopping all riots and revolutions, even ones by the same people who had brought him the throne in the first place.

The cause for these uprisings lay mostly with the two opposing ends of the current political spectrum, the Royalists and the Republicans. The Royalists, also known as Legitimists or Carlists, believed in the legitimate line of kings; they fought for the restoration of the Bourbons, either through Charles X or his grandson, Henri V. Many agreed with Chateaubriand, that the majority of Frenchmen would have been in favor of Henri, and “some Republicans would even have accepted him, while appointing Lafayette as his mentor.”⁵⁴ They were not wrong in that many Frenchmen would not have cared if it were Louis-Philippe or Henri V who was on the throne, as long as he gave them a better life. For Royalists, however, it was not about personal gains, but respect for a tradition that Louis-Philippe had broken. The first big disturbance they caused was the Rue de Prouvaires conspiracy in the beginning of February 1832. Legitimists held a supper where they planned the assassination of Louis-Philippe.⁵⁵ Before any action could be taken, the plot was found out and broken up by the police.⁵⁶

Another important scheme was led by the Duchesse de Berri, the widowed wife of the Duc de Berri. Her husband was the nephew of the king at the time, Louis XVIII; son of the future king, Charles X; and third in succession of the throne. In 1820, he was assassinated because of the murderer’s hatred of the Bourbon family.⁵⁷ After her father-in-law lost the

⁴⁷ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. IV, 421. Emphasis in the original.

⁴⁸ Horne, 224.

⁴⁹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 314.

⁵⁰ Heine, 46-47.

⁵¹ Chateaubriand, 33.3.

⁵² Heine, 240.

⁵³ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. IV, 268.

⁵⁴ Chateaubriand, 33.3.

⁵⁵ Jo Burr Margadant, "The Duchesse de Berry and Royalist Political Culture in Post-revolutionary France," *History Workshop Journal*, 43 (1997): 23-52, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289490> (accessed October 28, 2012), 40.

⁵⁶ Chateaubriand, 33.14.

⁵⁷ Horne, 212.

crown, the Duchesse lived in Scotland, but she had not lost hope that her son, Henri V, would take his rightful place on the throne. She remembered having visited the Vendée and been cheered as mother of the future King of France, so she decided to return there to get support. On May 7, 1832, she reached the Vendée, where she issued a proclamation in support of her son; she did the same in Nantes.⁵⁸ Royalists in the Vendée began wandering the countryside, collecting money and weapons, considering them taxes due to Henri V.⁵⁹ When the army first marched into the Vendée, it could not suppress the insurrection; Louis-Philippe's prime minister, Casimir Perier, then refused to use further force to suppress the insurrection, not considering it to the point of a civil war.⁶⁰ His judgment proved correct; the French did not follow the Duchesse, and she was forced to hide away in Nantes, where she was arrested on October 30, 1832.⁶¹

On the other end of French politics were the Republicans, made up of mostly the young and idealistic of Paris, though many older veterans of 1789 remained. The Republicans tended to gather themselves either in universities or societies, the more prominent ones being the *Société des Amis du Peuple* or the *Société des Droits de l'Homme*. Many of these Republicans were those who had fought in the Revolution of 1830, and were now repaid with another monarchy. Alexandre Dumas described their position accurately when he said, "Those who had risked their heads had done so for France and not for Louis-Philippe."⁶² Still, most Republicans in 1830 did not believe that the crowning of Louis-Philippe meant the failure of their Revolution. An 1832 pamphlet by the *Société des Droits de l'Homme* explained, "A Republic is a state, what ever its form of government, where law is the expression of the general will. All legitimate governments, in which public interest is predominant, are Republican."⁶³ Therefore, many hoped the July Monarchy would bring a Republic, where a king ruled in the interest of the citizens of France.

Unfortunately, the brave and inspiring new administration was not to last. As the liberal government became more like a traditional monarchy, the Republicans became disillusioned. Louis-Philippe had refused to live up to the Republican ideals that had given him his throne, and in doing so, he lost the Republican's support. Heine condemned the king as deceiving the Republicans: "Louis-Philippe, who owed his throne to the people and to the paving-stones of July, is an ungrateful man, whose apostasy is the more distressing as we perceive day by day that we are grossly deceived."⁶⁴ Heine also remarked on how the Republicans now hated Louis-Philippe even more than Charles X because at least the earlier king had never given them false hope: "The spirits of the Revolution bear [Louis-Philippe] ill will even more than they hate and make war on him in every way. This strife is at all events more just than was the feud against the previous Government, which owed nothing to the people."⁶⁵ This new hatred led the Prefect of Police, Gisquet, to observe, "Louis-Philippe's government, having wisely repelled the dangerous assistance of revolutionary propaganda, had also lost by this act, the popularity and the power he had momentarily found."⁶⁶ And so, the king "by his own fault lost his best support. He has committed the common error of

⁵⁸ Stoeckl 202-03.

⁵⁹ *The Annual Register, Or, A View of the History, Politics, and Literature of the Year 1832* (London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1833) <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012), 316.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 316.

⁶¹ Stoeckl, 203

⁶² Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. IV, 292.

⁶³ Pilbeam, 106.

⁶⁴ Heine, 46.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁶⁶ Joseph-Henri Gisquet, *Mémoires de M. Gisquet, ancien préfet de Police*, Vol. I (Paris: Marchant, 1840) <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012), 214.

hesitating, half-hearted men, who wish to be well with their enemies, and so offend their friends.”⁶⁷ Louis-Philippe had compromised with the Royalists, so the Republicans broke with him for good.

This disillusionment had disastrous consequences. For one, the government became less liberal as Republicans withdrew their support from the king. Lafitte resigned in March 1831, charging that Louis-Philippe “had betrayed the Revolution of 1830.”⁶⁸ Lafayette lasted another year, but formerly resigned in 1832; he protested the harshness of the government suppression of the June 5 insurrection, and “publicly accused Louis-Philippe of not fulfilling the promises he had made to him.”⁶⁹ By losing two heroes of 1830, the government could no longer keep up the charade of following the Republicans.

The July Monarchy lost the support of the Republicans in other ways. In January, 1832, one of Louis-Philippe’s ministers, Montalivet, was poorly defending the king when he made an even bigger error: “Luxury, one of the elements of the prosperity of civilized nations, must not be driven from the habitation of the king of the French, or it will soon be banished from those of his subjects.”⁷⁰ This statement was followed by cries of, “There are no more subjects in France since the Revolution of July—go to Spain and be subjects—It is an insult to the nations—We invoke the charter—We are all citizens—It was we who made the king—We will never be subjects. It was Charles X who had subjects.”⁷¹ The minister’s use of the term “subjects,” as well as using at times “King of France” instead of the more Republican “King of the French,” incited Republicans to print an official protest. They reminded the government that those “expressions which were struck out from our charter of 1830 as irreconcilable with the principle of the national sovereignty,” so they as French citizens “owe to themselves and to their country, to protest solemnly against those expressions, which tend to alter the new public French right.”⁷² The ideas of *Les Trois Glorieuses* were still firmly in the minds of the French, but Louis-Philippe was not willing to see them through if it meant limiting his power.

In response to this governmental betrayal, some Republican protests were done less peacefully. A year earlier, in 1831, on the anniversary of the death of the Duc de Berri, a memorial mass was held, where the Bourbon flag was flown. Republicans rioted and tore down the flag. The royal government did little to stop the uprising, and revolts followed in Conflans, Lille, Angoulême, Dijon and Nîmes.⁷³ Republicans also rioted when Louis-Philippe abolished the death penalty because he did not want to kill four of Charles X’s ministers.⁷⁴ Subsequently, in the early months of 1832, Republican leaders tried to organize workers, grouping them in local sections to take advantage of a loophole in article 291, that police authorization was needed for groups over twenty.⁷⁵ This readied Parisian Republicans as a new insurrection began to unfold.

While these two groups believed in two very opposing political ideas, they agreed that the current government wasn’t helping anyone, which led to possible alliances. One Republican supposedly told Royalists, “We may not have the same Paradise, but we have the same Hell.”⁷⁶ The two parties agreed “that Louis Philippe had no title, and that the existing

⁶⁷ Heine, 138.

⁶⁸ *Historical Dictionary*, 571-72.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 570.

⁷⁰ *Annual Register*, 308.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*.

⁷² *Ibid.*.

⁷³ *Historical Dictionary* ., 940.

⁷⁴ *Biographical Memoires*, 48-49.

⁷⁵ Jill Harsin, *Barricades: The War of the Street in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), chap. 3, 65.

⁷⁶ J. Lucas-Dubreton, *The Restoration and the July monarchy*, trans. E. F. Buckley (New York: G. P.

title ought to be dismissed, though they differed from them immensely as to what ought to replace it.”⁷⁷ This agreement led some to think that a temporary partnership may be beneficial; the Republican newspaper, *La Gazette*, wrote, “The Republicans and the Carlists are beaten on all points because they act alone: unifying our forces, we will be certain of victory?”⁷⁸ Theory turned into reality in some cases, as can be seen in the arrested rioters of Rue de Prouvaires Conspiracy, which included typical Royalists as well some Republicans, like members of the *Société des Amis du Peuple*.⁷⁹ These circumstances led some to pronounce “Carlist and Republican discussions took place in every corner of Paris,” and “the heroes of July, whom the happy medium had robbed of a Republic, asked nothing better than to enter into an accord with the Carlists to take vengeance on a common enemy.”⁸⁰ Gisquet believed that in preparing for the June insurrection, “the Carlists had given the order to their men to follow and help all the Republican movements.”⁸¹

However, while Republicans and Royalists may have been at the same uprisings against Louis-Philippe, it is doubtful that they were working together. Their so-called alliances were mostly the doing of the government, in order to vilify both sides: “It was the policy of ministers to hold out both parties to odium as engaged in a common plot for the destruction of public tranquility, and as sufficiently unprincipled to make common cause with their bitterest enemies.”⁸² They even tried both parties in court together, as was the case of a trial of three newspapers:

The editors of the Republican, a Republican journal, and of the Gazette de France and the Courier de l'Europe, two Carlist journals, were tried together for an article which had appeared in the first, and had been copied, with comments, in the other two, setting for that the present king had broken promises which accompanied his accession, and that only the son of Napoleon could give republican institutions to France. The two Royalist journals had concurred in all of the article that was directed against Louis Philippe, though they did not agree in the benefits expected from the reign of Napoleon III.⁸³

Considering the government's attempts to connect the two opposing groups for their own gain, it is even more unlikely that the Royalists and Republicans were joined together beyond being involved in some of the same riots. They both knew that if a plot between the two succeeded, one group would be left even worse off as the other took the place of Louis-Philippe's government.

Economic depression and popular uprisings aside, Louis-Philippe faced his worst crisis when cholera struck Paris in early 1832. The first victim was reported on February 19; by April 5, there were over 500 cases, and by April 12, there were over 1,000.⁸⁴ The disease first peaked in May and finally began to recede, only to peak again in late June.⁸⁵ In all,

Putnam's sons, 1929), 225.

⁷⁷ *Annual Register*, 313.

⁷⁸ Joseph-Henri Gisquet, *Mémoires de M. Gisquet, ancien préfet de Police*, Vol. II (Paris: Marchant, 1840) <http://books.google.com> (accessed October 9, 2012), 195.

⁷⁹ *Annual Register*, 314-315.

⁸⁰ Chateaubriand, 34.13.

⁸¹ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 202-203. Author's translation.

⁸² *Annual Register*, 313.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 313.

⁸⁴ Horne, 218.

⁸⁵ Catherine J. Kudlick, *Cholera in Post-Revolutionary Paris : a Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 194.

18,402 Parisians died of cholera.⁸⁶ Most harmful in Louis-Philippe's case, however, were *whom* cholera hurt. On the one hand, there was a very unequal distribution of cholera cases. Poor neighborhoods were more hurt by the disease: in rich areas, eight in every 1,000 died; in poor areas, fifty-three in every 1,000 died.⁸⁷

Conspiracy theorists claimed the government was poisoning the wells, propelling M Gisquet, head of the police, to send a statement to the police in April. He countered rumors that the government was poisoning the wells in Paris, but he did so by blaming others of spreading poison:

[P]eople have dared to say that the cholera is nothing short of poisoning affected by the agents of those in authority in order to decrease the population and to turn aside the general attention from political questions . . . *to give credit to these atrocious conjectures, certain wretches have conceived the project of going through the public houses and butchers' shops with bottles and packets of poison, either to throw into the fountains the wine casks or onto the meat, or seem to.*⁸⁸

Unfortunately, this only increased panic, as people began to actually believe the water was being poisoned. Dumas considered the prefect's statement to be an insult, and that "M Gisquet answered a blunder by a libel."⁸⁹ Gisquet was seemingly blaming the poisoning on the Republicans, when it was most likely just gossip.

The other great tragedy of cholera was that, although it struck hardest in poor areas, it did not leave the upper crust untouched; government officials were hit hard. At one point during the outbreak, "there was no prime minister, no foreign secretary, no home secretary."⁹⁰ In addition to dealing with mass panic and trying to organize care for cholera victims, the government had to also replace its own ministers. This was a lot of work to do, and the administration's failures just served to show its enemies how useless a government it was.

Cholera also led to the most violent twenty-four hours of the year. On June 1, 1832, General Lamarque died from the disease.⁹¹ Lamarque had been a hero of Napoleon's empire and the July Revolution; he was a proud Republican and a great leader. His death marked a huge loss for Republicans, because it meant one less of their party in the government. He also was a hero to many Republicans. It spread that his last words had been, "I die regretting not having avenged France for the infamous treaties of 1815."⁹² Hugo wrote that he died, "pronouncing the word *patrie*," or homeland.⁹³ Lamarque's funeral, which started as a citywide procession of mourning, led to another fight for justice, echoing 1830. Chateaubriand summed up best: "General Lamarque's cortege led to two blood-stained days and the victory of the Quasi-Legitimacy over the Republican Party. The latter, fragmented and disunited, carried out a heroic resistance."⁹⁴ The direct causes of this uprising reach back to when Louis-Philippe first began his rule, but the days before the violence made it one of the bloodiest of his reign.

⁸⁶ Horne, 218.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 118. Emphasis in the original.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.118.

⁹⁰ *Annual Register*, 319.

⁹¹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 260.

⁹² Horne, 224.

⁹³ Hugo, 1056. Emphasis in the original.

⁹⁴ Chateaubriand, 35.2.

Tensions were high in Paris in the summer of 1832, as cholera still stalked the streets and riots had regularly taken place throughout the king's less than two-year reign. To make matters worse, the trouble in the Vendée with the Royalists had caused Louis-Philippe to issue a Royal Ordinance on June 3, which placed under Martial Law the departments of Maine, Loire, Vendée, Loire Inférieure et Deux Sèvres.⁹⁵ This set the precedent for how the king would deal with an uprising in Paris. Two days earlier, *La Tribune* called on the people of Paris to "Strike, strike again, madman! Your knocks resemble the alarm. *Announce the peril for your cause, the triumph of ours. Strike again; in a few days it only rests to save what you can.*"⁹⁶

That night, on June 1, many notable Republicans, among them the principal members of the *Société des Amis du Peuple*, met and were found out by Gisquet and the police; many were arrested, though others escaped.⁹⁷ When news of Lamarque's death arrived, the Republicans faced a decision; most decided not to fight at the funeral, though the *Société Gauloise* was one that wanted to revolt. The *Société des Amis du Peuple* decided on June 4 not to fight unless the soldiers fired first.⁹⁸ Still, the societies made sure to be prepared, just in case. The order of events of Lamarque's funeral was published by the newspaper, *National*.⁹⁹ This allowed for the Republicans, even if they didn't want to start a riot, to plan for one. At the funeral, the *Société des Amis du Peuple* was ready for an uprising, and the Law and Medical students joined them along the funeral route.¹⁰⁰ Also, Louis-Philippe and the government had been warned about the insurrection, though officials believed they could keep the funeral under control.¹⁰¹ The stage was set, though there was still a chance of a violence-free procession.

Lamarque's funeral procession was to begin at St. Honoré, go past the Place de la Bastille, hold funeral orations at Pont d'Austerlitz, and finally continue to the town of Saint-Sever, where Lamarque was from and where he had wished to be buried.¹⁰² Chaos started when the horses were removed from the hearse, which was then taken to the Place Vendôme and passed the Place de la Bastille, where shouts of "To the Pantheon" rang out. At this point, authorities diverted the crowd, reattached the horses to the car, and set it on the right course.¹⁰³ But unrest had appeared in other parts of Paris. At the Théâtre de Variété, "when the funeral procession passed the column of Les Amis du Peuple, and many called 'Vive la République,' a police sergeant attempted to interfere, but the mob fell on him."¹⁰⁴ At the Pont d'Austerlitz, the crowd sang the Marseillaise and shouted "Vive la République."¹⁰⁵

Then, a legend appeared: many different accounts speak of a man carrying a red flag. Gisquet said that it was a young man who was on a horse and holding a red flag, which said "Liberty or Death!"¹⁰⁶ Dumas described him as, "A man clad in black, tall, thin, and as pale as a ghost, with dark moustaches, holding in his hand a red flag edged with black fringe and mounted upon a horse which he had difficulty in steering through the crowd, waved his blood-coloured flag, on which was written in black letters—'LIBERTY OR DEATH.'"¹⁰⁷ The

⁹⁵ *Annual Register*, 324.

⁹⁶ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 163. Author's translation. Emphasis in the original.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 171.

⁹⁸ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 268.

⁹⁹ Harsin, 58.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 50.

¹⁰¹ Lucas-Dubreton, 224/ Kudlick, 198.

¹⁰² *Annual Register*, 326.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 325-26.

¹⁰⁴ Heine, 302.

¹⁰⁵ Lucas-Dubreton, 224.

¹⁰⁶ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 211. Author's translation.

¹⁰⁷ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 278-79.

Annual Register, which relates what had happened across Europe each year, said that, as shouts of “To the Pantheon” rose up, “a red flag was displayed, bearing the inscription, ‘Liberty or Death.’”¹⁰⁸ This red flag is interesting, because, since 1789, the usual flag of the Revolution had been the *tricolore*. However, the *tricolore* was now a symbol of the July Monarchy, which the insurgents were fighting against. The red flag then served to lift the spirits of the Republicans and show their divergence from the reigning government. It struck fear into the army: “With regard to the National Guard, the appearance of the man with the red flag had flung it into a state of consternation.”¹⁰⁹ General Exelmans, present at the funeral procession, reportedly exclaimed, “Not the red flag! The flag of terror; we only want the *tricolore*, which is that of glory and liberty.”¹¹⁰ But it was too late; the signs had risen and the insurrection was about to begin.

Flags of every nation were on the barricades—Polish, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese—and the German Union flag was seen in Paris for the first time.¹¹¹ These show the difference between the Republican’s desires and the king’s. Louis-Philippe stood for France, as all kings stand for their country, but the Republicans wanted liberty for all people and all nations. As the funeral orations finished, one prominent Republican, Etienne Arago, rose to speak: “We have had enough of that kind of speech! Few words are needed and they are *Vive la Republique!* It was to that cry General Lamarque began his military career, it is to that cry we should follow his remains. *Vive la Republique!* Follow me, those who agree with me!”¹¹² Gisquet sent the order to bring out the dragoons, which were light cavalry units.¹¹³ The mob at Place de la Bastille/Faubourg Saint-Antoine began firing; the cavalry retaliated, and barricades were raised up, resulting in loss on both sides.¹¹⁴ The insurrection had begun; Dumas later commented in his memoirs, “It needed only a single shot to lead to a general slaughter.”¹¹⁵

The National Guard was called as the insurgents made barricades of omnibuses and wagons, then filled them with stones by digging up the streets.¹¹⁶ Within three and a half hours of starting the insurrection, Paris was “in the hands of the insurgents,” of which there were an estimated 2,000 to 3,000.¹¹⁷ Not long after the fighting had begun, many Republicans saw victory: “pere Louis Philippe is at his last gasp and the Republic is proclaimed. *Vive la Republic!*”¹¹⁸ Alexandre Dumas, who was also taking part in the rebellion, was a skeptical onlooker: “The triumph seemed to us too complete for the short time it had taken to happen in.”¹¹⁹

As the battles raged on and bullets flew through the streets, frequent cries of “Liberty or Death, Long Live Liberty, Our Unfortunate Brothers of Poland” were heard.¹²⁰ A fourteen year-old fighting at the barricade on the rue Saint-Merri later wrote down his observations, and how “On each barricade a red flag floated. One citizen held it up in his left hand, whilst brandishing a sword in his right.”¹²¹ The battle lasted all day. At 6:00 pm, on the Rue de

¹⁰⁸ *Annual Register*, 326.

¹⁰⁹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 290.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 279.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 278.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 280.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 279.

¹¹⁴ *Annual Register*, 326.

¹¹⁵ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 268.

¹¹⁶ *Annual Register*, 327, 306.

¹¹⁷ Lucas-Dubreton, 224; Horne, 224.

¹¹⁸ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 278.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ Kudlick, 193.

¹²¹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 301.

Saumon, Victor Hugo “had gone to get a close view of the volcano” and “found himself caught in the arcade between two fires. He had nothing but the protection of the pilasters that separate the shops to protect him from the bullets; he spent close to an hour in this delicate situation.”¹²² Clearly, the Republicans' early success did not last, but they held their own throughout the first day. Around midnight, the insurgents concentrated their force at three places: Rue Montmartre and Rue Montorgueil, Cloître Saint-Merri, and Faubourg Saint-Antoine.¹²³

As June 5 drew to a close, the Republicans still expected success, but the seeds of their defeat were already growing. At the onset of the insurrection, the Republicans had thought that the parliamentary opposition, of almost 130 people, might be sympathetic to an uprising.¹²⁴ Many were sympathetic, but not enough to support the rebellion. When violence had broken out during the funeral procession, Lafayette had fled.¹²⁵ Later that evening, Dumas found him and Lafitte, and discussed the prospects of the rebellion with them, but neither seemed keen to do anything; he left them to converse for the rest of the night.¹²⁶

There was also a lack of support from the rest of Paris. Heine wrote that the people cried, “C'est un coup manqué,” meaning it was a failed or lacking coup.¹²⁷ They could see its failure by the fact that it lacked support from the average Parisian. He later observed that after the insurrection had been crushed, “as the news had just been received that the defeat of the patriots was certain, the sweetest content was seen in every face.”¹²⁸ The Parisians were not ready for violence so soon after the Revolution of 1830; they were willing enough to put up with the government if it meant dying to change it. Dumas also noticed the lack of support from the Parisian women; upon seeing a mother scold her child for throwing a stone at an officer, he exclaimed; “The women are not with us this time, we are lost!”¹²⁹ Without the support of the average people, especially without women, the rebellion could not hope to last.

Meanwhile, Louis-Philippe had been alerted of the insurrection, and his return brought the well-meant insurrection to a devastating end. The king had been at Saint-Cloud, which was where Charles X had been when the July Revolution had broken out. Unlike Charles X, Louis-Philippe immediately set off for Paris to stop the fighting. He arrived at the Tuileries around 9:00 pm on June 5. He then went through the ranks of the National Guard and other regiments, where he “was welcomed with enthusiasm, received or fortified the confidence of everyone, and gave hope of a prompt and favorable outcome.”¹³⁰ Simply by his presence, he sought to show that his government still had power. He was also very confident that he could end the insurrection. He told the Prefect of Police, “M Gisquet, you just had a very painful day: try to rest a little; tomorrow, things will be better.”¹³¹ He then aided in the plans to end the fighting. In addition to the Municipal Guard and National Guard that were already in Paris, Louis-Philippe “brought regular troops into the city.”¹³² He also “appeared frequently during the fighting to supervise operations.”¹³³ Then, at 3:00 am on June 6, “troops attacked the positions of the insurgents at various points at once.”¹³⁴

¹²² Hugo, 1065.

¹²³ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 224.

¹²⁴ Pilbeam, 120.

¹²⁵ *Historical Dictionary*, 577.

¹²⁶ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 292.

¹²⁷ Heine, 306.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 307.

¹²⁹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 287.

¹³⁰ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 223-24. Author's translation.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 223.

¹³² *Historical Dictionary*, 577.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ *Annual Register*, 327.

Fighting continued so that by late morning, Saint-Merri was the last holdout. A delay of fighting at Saint-Merri was then caused by Louis-Philippe riding out through Paris.¹³⁵ At noon on June 6, Louis-Philippe left the Tuileries, rode to the Place de la Concorde, then the Champs-Élysées, passed his troops, next headed to the Rue Royale, the Place Saint-Antoine and Faubourg Saint-Antoine, the Pont d'Austerlitz, the quays and finally returned to the Tuileries.¹³⁶ Along the route, "he stopped and held out his hand to a group of armed National Guards."¹³⁷ He even went to where the last barricade was, and at the Cloître Saint-Merri, "the king arrived, calm and even smiling."¹³⁸ In doing this ride, he was able to "assure the [l]oyal population his safety, and encourage their confidence."¹³⁹ Dumas witnessed a part of the king's ride, and even he, who fought to bring the king down, could see his bravery: "With reference to the manner in which he possessed himself on the throne, he was by no means audacious but he had great courage."¹⁴⁰ This ride brought hope to the army, and crushed the spirits of the Republicans. Heine could see the end: "I am told that two hours ago the people had great hope of victory, but now their only hope is to die heroically."¹⁴¹ Still, the last Republicans fought. Arago remarked, "Is not everything at an end now?" to which another man disputed, "No, they are waiting for the tocsin from the Church of Saint-Merri, *for so long as a sick man's death rattle can be heard, he is alive.*"¹⁴²

At this point, the prominent Republicans saw the end clearly, and they fell to their last resort. Three representatives were sent to the king, "not to make apologies in the name of the insurrection, but to implore the clemency of the king in favor of those who were still held."¹⁴³ This had little effect, as the king was in no mood to be lenient. By 4:00 pm, the rebellion was crushed.¹⁴⁴ The casualties were never exactly recorded, though there were an estimated 800 to 900 dead or wounded, in less than twenty-four hours of fighting.¹⁴⁵ The losses were about even on both sides, with 386 casualties on the king's side and 300-400 casualties for the Republicans. The rebellion had ended as quickly as it started, and it had brought little change to the world. Its tragedy pushed the royalist Chateaubriand to remark, "In June 1832, they shot the men who brought them victory in July 1830."¹⁴⁶

The fighting was over, but Louis-Philippe had not finished his campaign against the Republicans. He knew that the dead rebels could become martyrs, inspiring others to rise up again, and he sought to crush all rebellion. During the night of June 6 to 7, "the agents of the police entered the printing-offices, stopped the journals and sealed up the presses" of any newspapers that they thought would write anti-government reports of the rebellion.¹⁴⁷ The next day brought an even worse tragedy from the king, as "on the morning of the seventh, he greeted his subjects, with an ordinance, signed in the sixth, declaring Paris in a state of siege, and establishing martial law."¹⁴⁸ He also imposed court martial for arrested insurgents.¹⁴⁹ This was the equivalent of kicking Paris while it was down. The insurrection had been clearly

¹³⁵ Harsin, 60.

¹³⁶ Gisquet, *Mémoires*, Vol. II, 232.

¹³⁷ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 311.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 294

¹³⁹ *Annual Register*, 327.

¹⁴⁰ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 295.

¹⁴¹ Heine, 307.

¹⁴² Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 300. Emphasis in the original.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 299-300

¹⁴⁴ Lucas-Dubreton, 225.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 226; Kudlick, 193.

¹⁴⁶ Chateaubriand, 35.2.

¹⁴⁷ *Annual Register*, 329.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 328.

¹⁴⁹ Jardin, 110.

stopped, the fighting was over, but Louis-Philippe needed to make sure no more fighting began. He wanted to finish off the Republicans, and show that above all, he was the King.

One Republican bemoaned this change, saying, "The seventh, everything returned to order; and it is the seventh that the already mutilated charter, the charter in rags after two years rule, is without ceremony *put out of the law!*"¹⁵⁰ He was referring to the charter that Louis-Philippe had accepted as his condition for becoming king. His ministers had already ignored many of its points with their talk of subjects, and now the king was showing that he was more "absolute" than "citizen." The horror continued as a royal parade was announced on June 9, to celebrate the crushing of the rebellion.¹⁵¹ Now the king was mocking the Republicans.

Over the next few weeks, the bloodless war continued. The government again made the rebellion the joint work of Royalists and Republicans, even though the following trials did not suggest that this was the case.¹⁵² By doing this, Louis-Philippe could get rid of his two worst enemies in one fell swoop; with the Royalists and Republicans gone, he would have two less groups to pander to. The Polytechnic School was closed by a royal ordinance, and later reestablished only when all the guilty were expelled; the Veterinary School met the same fate.¹⁵³ The *Société des Amis du Peuple* was forced to close after the June 5 insurrection, though many of its members simply joined the *Société des Droits de l'Homme*.¹⁵⁴

Not long after the rebellion was crushed, trials were held. There were an estimated 1,000 prisoners in city jails after the insurrection.¹⁵⁵ The Revolutionaries from the list of the accused from the barricades at the Cloître St. Merri were mostly workers and young, people with an idealistic view of life and hope for a better world.¹⁵⁶ Nineteen members of the *Société des Amis du Peuple* were tried for "having been leaders and administrators of a political meeting of over twenty persons," but were acquitted.¹⁵⁷ Not all the revolutionaries were freed, however: A man name Geoffrey, a painter, was found guilty of possessing the "Liberty or Death" flag, as well as supplying ammunition to insurgents, and under martial law he was condemned to death. Another, Colombat, a lodging-house-keeper, was found guilty of firing upon troops, and was also sentenced to death.¹⁵⁸ In all, eighty-two sentences were handed out, with seventeen death sentences.¹⁵⁹ One lawyer solicited for clemency of his client, begging, "King of the barricades of July, pardon the barricades of June."¹⁶⁰ This was a less than subtle reminder that the men on trial were the same ones who had fought in 1830, and who had allowed Louis-Philippe to take the throne. In the end, the death sentences were changed to deportation.¹⁶¹ Newspapers were also tried, though both *Le Corsaire* and *La Tribune* were acquitted.¹⁶² Yet, while Louis-Philippe attempted to wipeout the Republicans, they did not

¹⁵⁰ W.D. Demay, "Ma Défense devant le conseil d'Enquête." Reprinted in "Les Révolutions du XIXe Siècle," *Écrits*, Vol. 7, (Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6825>, 17. Author's translation. Emphasis in the original.

¹⁵¹ Thomas Bouchet, "Le cloître Saint-Merry (5-6 juin 1832). Histoire d'un cheminement vers l'oubli (1832-1862)," *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 47, no. 1 (2000): 113-130, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20530531> (accessed September 16, 2012), 18.

¹⁵² *Annual Register*, 327.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 328.

¹⁵⁴ Pilbeam, 99.

¹⁵⁵ Harsin, 60.

¹⁵⁶ Kudlick, 194.

¹⁵⁷ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 503.

¹⁵⁸ *Annual Register*, 329.

¹⁵⁹ *Historical Dictionary*, 577.

¹⁶⁰ Harsin, 61.

¹⁶¹ *Historical Dictionary*, 577.

¹⁶² Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 503.

entirely give up. A petition to forgive the insurgents was given to the government, showing that the fallen Republicans still had a voice.¹⁶³

On June 29, the martial court was ended by a “judgment of the Court of Cassation, the Supreme tribunal of the country, that their very existence was illegal.”¹⁶⁴ The following day, the *Moniteur* had a royal ordinance that the state of siege in Paris was over and ordinary law was returned.¹⁶⁵ Still, the laws had done their work: they ended any immediate desires to start a revolution. The defeat of the uprising, along with the November arrest of the Duchesse de Berri, all gave the impression that the July Monarchy was more secure than ever.¹⁶⁶

Of course, Louis-Philippe could not completely eliminate conflicts; on November 19, on the way to deliver a speech to his government, he was shot at, marking the first actual assassination attempt.¹⁶⁷ He was not hurt, and went to give his the speech anyway. He spoke in order to confirm the solidity of his reign. He remarked, “The days of the 5 and 6 June have made manifest the perversity and the imbecility of the friends of anarchy,” breaking once and for all with the now defeated Republicans.¹⁶⁸ He also kept his image of the *roi citoyen*, “King of the French,” by connecting himself with the people, together against the Republicans: “It has been seen what force a constitutional king may find in the support of the nation when compelled to have recourse to arms to defend the crown which he has been called to wear and the institution which he has sworn to maintain.”¹⁶⁹ He then officially announced the end of his enemies and their insurrections: “Let, therefore, the culpable authors of civil war, who have so many times desolated our districts lose all hope of a counter-revolution, as impossible in my eyes as in yours,” and finally, “Republicanism and Counter-Revolution have both been vanquished.”¹⁷⁰ And so, the horrific year of 1832 drew to a close: Louis-Philippe was safe on his throne and the French people were making do with no hope for a better future.

Despite Louis-Philippe’s efforts, Republicanism could never be totally eradicated from France. Dumas represented the despair they felt after the failed insurrection. He wrote about Louis-Philippe’s ride on June 6 in his memoirs:

When I saw him pass, calm and smiling and unconcerned about the danger he was incurring, I felt a sort of moral vertigo, and I asked myself if the man who saluted to these many cheers was not verily a man elect, and if one had the right to strike a blow at a power with which God himself, by declaring for him, seemed to side. And at each fresh assassination attempt made against him, from which he escaped safe and sound, I put the same question to myself.¹⁷¹

But Dumas also showed how even the king’s worst actions against the Republicans would never end their fight; he concludes that “each time, my conviction got the better of my doubt, and I said, ‘No, things cannot remain as they are!’”¹⁷² Over the next few years, the

¹⁶³ “Souscription en faveur des condamnés des 5 et 6 juin.” Reprinted in “Les Révolutions du XIX^e Siècle,” *Fuilles Populaires et documents divers, 1830-1834*. Vol. 12, (Milan: L’Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6825>, 225.

¹⁶⁴ *Annual Register*, 330.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ Jardin, 110.

¹⁶⁷ *Annual Register*, 337.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, *Biographical Memoires*, 52.

¹⁷¹ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 311.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*

Republicans rose back like a vengeance. One Parisian remarked at how strange France was by the end of 1832: "The situation of France was then truly extraordinary: the events of June, the violation of the charter, the presence of the Duchesse de Berri in the Vendée, the eminent war in Belgium, the personal intervention of the king in the government, all united to excite the most lively alarms."¹⁷³ Conflict in Paris was not over. The city saw another insurrection on April 13, 1834, and again in 1839.¹⁷⁴ Finally, 1848 arrived, and Paris was once again ready to rebel. The result of the Revolution of 1848 was the exile of Louis-Philippe, and a (albeit temporary) new Republic. Louis-Philippe abdicated the throne in 1848, and then fled to England, where he lived until his death in 1850.¹⁷⁵

Louis-Philippe was the last king of France, and one of its greatest politicians. For eighteen years, he balanced the many opposing parties in France, and did his best to be king to them all. This refusal to stand for a cause pushed Republicans and Royalists to rise up against him, but it also gave the king the support to defeat them. Still, Louis-Philippe's impartiality to all was pleasing to none and could not last forever; it secured his throne in 1832, but it could not stop the people from continuing to rise up against him.

¹⁷³ "Poursuites du Government contre M. Cabet." Reprinted in "Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle," *Cabet et Les Publications du Populaire*, Vol. 2 (Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6826j>, 27. Author's translation.

¹⁷⁴ Lucas-Dubreton, 226.

¹⁷⁵ Dumas, *My Memoirs*, Vol. VI, 503.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

The Annual Register, Or, A View of the History, Politics, and Literature, of the Year 1832. London: Baldwin and Cradock, 1833. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

Biographical Memoires of Louis-Philippe the First, Ex-King of the French. London: Cracock & Co., 1848. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 29, 2012).

Discours, Allocutions et Réponses de S. M. Louis-Philippe, roi des Francais. Paris: Imprimerie de Madame Veuve Agasse, 1833. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 21, 2012).

Chateaubriand, François de. Mémoires d'outre-tombe. Translated by A. S. Kline. Published electronically, 2005-2007. <http://www.poetryintranslation.com/PITBR/Chateaubriand/Chathome.htm> (accessed October 23, 2012).

Demay, W.D. "Ma Défense devant le conseil d'Enquête." Reprinted in Les Révolutions du XIXe Siècle. Ecrits. Vol. 7. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k68257> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Dumas, Alexandre. My Memoirs. 1826-1830. Vol. III. Translated by E.M. Waller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 25, 2012).

_____. My Memoirs. 1830-1831. Vol. IV. Translated by E.M. Waller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 25, 2012).

_____. My Memoirs. 1831-1832. Vol. V. Translated by E.M. Waller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 25, 2012).

_____. My Memoirs. 1832-1833. Vol. VI. Translated by E.M. Waller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 17, 2012).

Gisquet, Joseph-Henri. Memoires de M. Gisquet, ancien prefet de Police. Vol. I. Paris: Marchant, 1840. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

_____. Memoires de M. Gisquet, ancien prefet de Police. Vol. II. Paris: Marchant, 1840. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

Heine, Heinriche. The Works of Heinrich Heine. Volume VII. Translated by Charles Godfrey Leland. London: William Heineman, 1906. <http://books.google.co.in/> (accessed October 21, 2012).

Hugo, Victor. Les Misérables. New York: Signet Classics, 1987.

Ledieu, Louis. A ses concitoyens sur les evenemens des 5 et 6 juin. Paris: Imprimerie de

Bellemain, 1832. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

Pepin, Alphonse. *Deux ans de règne. 1830-1832*. Paris: Imprimerie de Dezauche, 1833. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed September 29).

_____. *Les Barricades en 1832*. Paris: Imprimerie de Dezauche, 1832. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed September 29).

“Poursuites du Government contre M. Cabet.” Reprinted in *Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle. Cabet et Les Publications du Populaire*. Vol. 2. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6826j> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Procès des vingt-deux accuses du cloître St. Mery. Imprimerie de Auguste Mie: Paris, 1832. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k55408588> (accessed October 9, 2012).

Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle. Les Associations républicaines: 1830-1834. Vol. 1. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k68196> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle. Les Republicaines devant les tribaneaux. Vol. 11. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6829g> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Les Révolutions du XIXe Siècle. La Societe des Amis du Peuple. Vol. 2. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6820p> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle. La Societe des Droits de l'Homme. Vol. 3. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k68210> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Rittiez, F. *Histoire du Regne de Louis-Philippe 1er*. Vol. 2. Edited by V. Lecou. Paris: Libraire de la Société des Gens de Lettres, 1856. <http://books.google.com/> (accessed October 9, 2012).

“Souscription en faveur des condamnés des 5 et 6 juin,” reprinted in *Les Revolutions du XIXe Siecle. Les Feuilles populaires et documents divers: 1830-1834*. Vol. 12. Milan: L'Imprimeur Leschiera, 1974. <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k6830z> (accessed November 3, 2012).

Secondary Sources

Athanassoglou-Kallmyer, Nina. "Delacroix, Paganini, and the Cholera Epidemic of 1832." *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 4 (2001): 686-710. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3177228> (accessed September 16, 2012).

Bouchet, Thomas. "Le cloître Saint-Merry (5-6 juin 1832). Histoire d'un cheminement vers l'oubli (1832-1862)." *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*. 47. no. 1 (2000): 113-130. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20530531> (accessed September 16, 2012).

- Caron, Jean-Claude . "Louis-Philippe face à l'opinion publique, ou l'impossible réconciliation des Français, 1830–1835." *French Historical Studies*. 30. no. 4 (2007): 597-621. 10.1215/00161071-2007-009 (accessed September 16, 2012).
- Duveau, Georges. 1848, the Making of a Revolution. Translated by Anne Carter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1967.
- Harsin, Jill. *Barricades: The War of the Street in Revolutionary Paris, 1830-1848*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Historical Dictionary of France from the 1815 Restoration to the Second Empire*. Edited by Edgar Leone Newman and Robert Lawrence Simpson. New York: Greenwood Press, 1987.
- Horne, Alistair. *Seven Ages of Paris*. New York: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Jardin, André, and André-Jean Tudesq. *Restoration and Reaction, 1815-1848*. Translated by Elborg Forster. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Larrère, Mathilde. "Ainsi paradait le roi des barricades. Les grandes revues royales de la garde nationale, à Paris, sous la Monarchie de Juillet." *Le Mouvement social*. no. 179 (1997): 9-31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3778923> (accessed September 16, 2012).
- Lucas-Dubreton, J. *The restoration and the July monarchy*. Translated by E. F. Buckley. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1929.
- Kudlick, Catherine J.. *Cholera in Post-Revolutionary Paris: a Cultural History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Margadant, Jo Burr. "The Duchesse de Berry and Royalist Political Culture in Post-revolutionary France." *History Workshop Journal*. 43. (1997): 23-52. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289490> (accessed October 06, 2012).
- Pilbeam, Pamela M. *Republicanism in Nineteenth-Century France, 1814-1871*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- "La politique étrangère de la France au début de la monarchie de juillet." *Revue d'histoire diplomatique* 122, no. 1 (2008): 11-29.
- Starzinger, Vincent E. *Middlingness: Juste Milieu Political Theory in France and England*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1865.
- Stoeckl, Agnes Barron. *King of the French: a Portrait of Louis Philippe, 1773-1850*. New York: Putnam, 1958.

False Frozen Hopes: The Sources of Potential Victory and Ultimate Failure of the Invasion of Quebec During the American Revolution

Nathan Schmidt

The American Revolution ranged across many different battlefields, some victorious for the Americans and others disastrous. One campaign that has long been ignored by most scholars is the expedition into British-held Canadian Quebec. In 1775, the Continental Congress of America sent armies north into Quebec to take it from the British. There were initial successes in the invasion, and the British were forced to retreat to Quebec City. The Americans held the remaining British under siege throughout the winter. However, at this point the campaign began to fall apart. Most sources attribute the downfall to a lack of adequate supplies, the outbreak of smallpox, and the inability to gain sufficient aid from the increasingly alienated Canadians. By the end of 1776, the Americans had retreated in all but an utter rout back to the colonies. The American army had suffered heavy casualties and lost over 5,000 men in the attempt to take Quebec.¹

The ill-fated expedition largely became an ignored footnote in the history of the American Revolution. Many history textbooks, even ones of professional standing, do not even mention the campaign. When considered, it is usually dismissed as a foolish, imperialistic adventure that overextended the army's reach and alienated the native Canadian population. The textbook *Out of Many* illustrates this widespread opinion, as it relegates the campaign to one small paragraph and concludes that, due to "their aggressive expansionism", the Americans were feared by the Canadians and rejected.² That textbook also adds a secondary motivation: the military strategy of eliminating "any possibility of a British invasion from that quarter".³ Another book, *Compact History of the Revolutionary War* confidently asserts that a third goal was to "check the spread of Catholic Church influence...was most important".⁴ Few sources are surprised at all that the expedition failed, and do not go into further detail. In general, many historians interested in the American Revolution tend to gloss over the rather embarrassing campaign and focus on more prominent and victorious fronts.

Yet other works challenge the assumption that the Quebec campaign was minor and hopeless in the American Revolution. The Canadian invasion was not considered a minor or haphazard part of the war at the time. Instead, the plan was supported by key American leaders such as John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, and George Washington, who all worked vigorously to see the campaign reach victory. They strongly advocated the invasion and made it a national priority. Their support reflects the colonies' overall views of Canada as the American Revolution unfolded. As historian Christopher Ward notes in his extensive history of the American Revolution, "Canada had long been a word of ill omen to the American colonies" for decades, and the plan to conquer it had extensive roots in the revolutionary cause. The answers behind the failure were not clear-cut. The Americans did have considerable advantages over the British in the campaign. When Quebec City was under

¹ Charles Royster, *A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character, 1775-1783* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979), 100.

² Susan H. Armitage, *Out of Many: A History of the American People* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994), 165.

³ Armitage, *Out of Many*, 165-166.

⁴ R. Ernest Dupuy, *The Compact History of the Revolutionary War* (New York: Hawthorn Books Inc., 1963), 66.

siege, the American forces seemed to be victorious, making the later reversal of fortune all the more startling. More importantly, the motivations behind the Canadian campaign also formed the basis of the revolutionary movement as a whole. Historian John Miller, of whom fellow historian Douglas R. Cubbison says his "*Origins of the American Revolution* remains the premier study of the outbreak of the War of Independence",⁵ put great emphasis on how the Quebec Act, which helped intensify American fears of tyranny: "It was Great Britain itself which now was seen to be preventing the spread of...English liberties over the American continent".⁶ This paper is intended to address the alternative interpretations of the Quebec campaign that contradict the common assertion of it as an isolated, imperialistic blunder in the American Revolution. To explain the source of the early success and ultimate defeat, the paper will explore the early relationship between the American colonies and Quebec. I plan to show how the American view of Quebec changed in the years leading up to the American Revolution with the growing concept of liberty, and how this changed the goal for the Canadian campaign from conquest to freeing Quebec. I will then explain how the earlier factors continued to influence American policy and how this and the physical and cultural rift between the two regions inhibited Canadian support. The paper will conclude by considering the impact of the American Revolution on Canadian identity and how the Quebec expedition followed patterns that influenced the course of the American Revolution as a whole.

The American campaign into Quebec was fueled by paranoia towards the British and Catholic threat posed by the province, yet there was also a sincere belief that the Canadians and Americans could find common rapport and brotherhood against Britain. This hostility stemmed from the post-Seven Years War efforts of Anglo-American settlers to colonize Canada and displace the French-Canadian colonists. British efforts to protect the welfare of the majority of the Canadian inhabitants led to the restoration of French civil law and religious toleration, which upset the American minority seeking to control Quebec and led to growing American opposition to the current government in Quebec. These feelings of discontent were transformed during the opening stages of the American Revolution into part of the ideology of liberty and therefore led to a view that Quebec needed to be freed from the British tyranny. However, due to the rifts between the American colonies and Quebec, particularly the Americans' misinterpretation of the Quebec Act as means of asserting social and religious tyranny, the American ideology failed to make a full impact on the Canadians and the habitants of Quebec maintained a sympathetic yet neutral stance towards the American invaders. In addition, the retention of the anti-Canadian factors initially behind the interest in Quebec led to tensions between the Americans and Canadians. Therefore, while the inhabitants of Quebec were willing to offer support for some time, the inability of the Americans to expel the British on their own and the growing hostility with the Canadians led to a lack of true support by the populace. The inability of the revolutionary ideals to penetrate the Canadians and the inhabitants' ultimate reaction to the Americans helped define Canadian identity. The American campaign into Canadian Quebec reflects critical themes of the American Revolution as a whole. The difficulties with sufficient supplies and men along with the challenges to the revolutionary ideology were common issues in the American Revolution, and as a result the Canadian campaign signifies these important aspects of the Revolutionary War.⁷

⁵ Douglas R. Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army in 1776: The Ruin and Reconstruction of the Continental Force* (Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2010), 6.

⁶ John C. Miller, *Origins of the American Revolution* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1943), 374-375.

⁷ Victor Coffin, *The Province Of Quebec And The Early American Revolution* (Madison: University, 1896); Lanctot, Gustave, *Canada and the American Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967); Miller, *Origins*.

The origin of the American interest in Quebec and Canada began at the end of the Seven Years' War with France in 1763. After defeating France, Britain gained the previously-French colony of Quebec in Canada. The region had many natural resources and still had much open land for settlement. The potential opportunities in Canada and its relative proximity in the American colonies encouraged many to attempt settlement there. After the land passed over to Britain, there was quickly an influx of American and English settlers into the region to reap the economic benefits waiting there. Because of the uncertainty in moving to a foreign land with a different farming system, those who went were generally "merchants rather than farm-colonists"⁸, who were more interested in profiting from the resources in Quebec than actually settling into the new culture. These perceived opportunities would come at the expense of the current inhabitants though: the many French Canadians who remained in Quebec despite the change in government. Even with a growing number of new arrivals, the French Canadians were still the large majority in Quebec. Yet the new Anglo-American group had little respect for the traditional culture in Quebec and wanted to bring their own culture with them. The tensions were further increased due to the prevalence of Catholicism in Quebec in contrast to Protestant England and America. As a result, when the English-American settlers began to advocate for the establishment of representative government akin to other British colonies, their proposals were designed to ensure their dominance over the other, numerous inhabitants. For them, "liberty meant freedom to interpret the law to suit their own interests, while others were privileged only to obey".⁹ The newcomers were also Protestant, and highly aggressive toward Catholicism, which was the religion of most French Canadians.¹⁰ Therefore, the new settlers took steps to suppress the power of Catholics in Quebec.

The Anglo-American group showed its intent to dominate Canada when the new Quebec government's first jury convened in October 1764. The jury quickly proceeded to declare itself the sole representative body in Canada and create documents that would exclude Catholics from holding office.¹¹ Because these assemblies would exclude most of the people in Canada, Britain's Parliament found it necessary to prohibit this form of legislature, not to restrict the people of Quebec but to actually help them be freer. Instead of the Anglo-American demands, the British reestablished French civil law in Quebec so the majority could still keep their accustomed rights. The efforts to protect the rights of the French Canadians of Quebec culminated in the Quebec Act of 1775. The Act allowed for the continuance of French civil law and ensured that the majority of people in Quebec would not have their rights taken away by the English-American minority. It also tolerated Roman Catholicism and prevented them from being forced into Protestantism. The main promoter of the Act, British Governor Guy Carleton of Quebec, was later praised for having "first formulated the principle of that liberty that is larger than English liberty and became vital to the later Empire – the British liberty of non-English people to retain their distinctive character".¹² He took great interest in Canadian culture and was the greatest advocate for their protection. This shows that the Quebec Act was intended to protect the Canadians at the cost of slighting outside Anglo-American interests, which led to further discontent in the lower colonies.¹³

⁸ Cameron Nish, "The 1760s," in *Colonists And Canadiens*, edited by J.M.S. Careless (Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1971), 9.

⁹ Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 12

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 13-14.

¹² Alfred Burt LeRoy, *Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester, 1724-1808, Revised Version* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association Booklets, 1968), 5.

¹³ Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Metzger, Charles H., S.J., *The Quebec Act: A Primary Cause of the American Revolution* (New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1936).

However, the actual course of enacting the legislation for Quebec took longer than initially expected. There was a change in the political body of parliament, leading to the election of new members who were not as certain about the Canada issue. In addition, there continued to be debate on the proposed Quebec Act. Many were concerned that not applying full British law to Quebec would go against customary British government and could set a precedent for other parts of the British Empire. Carleton was recalled to London and had to defend his position to parliament. As a result, the Quebec Act was delayed for almost a decade.¹⁴ During that time period, new developments in the American Colonies led to new views on the situation in Canada. The American resistance to the new taxes imposed by Great Britain had primarily been economic at first. However, by the time the Stamp Act had been repealed in 1766, the resistance had reached a new stage. At some point around that time, the matter became less about the economics and more about perceived threats to liberty. According to the textbook *The American People*, John Adams wrote that because of the Stamp Act “the people have become more attentive to their liberties...and more determined to defend them”.¹⁵ A new ideology of liberty began to emerge, and the American Revolution became a struggle for common freedom against Britain.

As a result of the shift in the American Revolution’s objectives, the events in Canada were cast in a different perspective. The Anglo-American arguments for a representative assembly had been based on the concept of invalidating the French Canadian majority. Under the new circumstances though, the Americans ignored the previous issues about the proposed assembly and instead focused on its absence. It did not help that by the time the British legislature succeeded in enacting the reforms through the Quebec Act, it was already 1774. Due to the distance between the discussions at Parliament and events in North America, many falsely believed that the British only passed the Act to keep better order in America; that this belief has been upheld by multiple historians despite contrary evidence shows the deep roots of this conclusion.¹⁶ It should also be noted that there was opposition to the Quebec Act even within Canada, as it denied access to habeas corpus and trial by jury. These measures were implemented under the assumption that the acting governor would in fact reduce the harshness of the law in practice, but unfortunately “Carleton withheld this information, fearful of the French attitude toward the British Empire”.¹⁷ These misunderstandings helped perpetuate the myth that the Quebec Act was in fact designed by Britain for tyrannical subjugation of the New World colonies, and the American colonists used the Quebec Act as a key icon of the threat the British posed on their liberty. In fact, the Quebec Act was one of the strongest charges against Britain brought up by colonists in the years leading up to the revolution, and proved to be a dividing line as the revolution escalated. For instance, in 1775 Reverend William Edminston of Baltimore angered many when he publicly stated his support for the Quebec Act; later, following various charges from revolutionary officials, he publicly apologized and recanted on his stance, showing how the Quebec Act came to be seen as an outright enemy to the American Revolution.¹⁸

Because of the confusion over the Quebec Act, the colonists saw it as yet another attempt to dominate them. The toleration of Catholicism in Quebec further increased American paranoia about their threatened liberty. The American Colonies were

¹⁴ Philip Lawson, *The Imperial Challenge: Quebec and Britain in the Age of the American Revolution* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1989), 85-88.

¹⁵ Gary B. Nash, *The American People: Creating a Nation and a Society* (New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, 1998), 159

¹⁶ *Ibid*, 85.

¹⁷ Walter S. Dunn Jr., *Choosing Sides on the Frontier in the American Revolution* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2007), 109.

¹⁸ Vernon P. Creviston, ““No King Unless It Be A Constitutional King”: Rethinking The Place Of The Quebec Act In The Coming Of The American Revolution,” *The Historian: Sigma Tau Delta* (2011), 463-464.

predominantly Protestant and had a deeply ingrained fear of Roman Catholicism. The Pope was seen as both a tyrant and the anti-Christ. Therefore, the colonists interpreted the allowance of Catholicism in Canada as the promotion of a religion that threatened both Protestantism and liberty. In addition, the continuation of the French feudal system in Quebec was seen as support of a tyrannical system of government that could easily be enforced in the American colonies as well. The French system of law was still based on an absolutist, feudalist concept of vassalage and nobility, and the power of the nobility and clergy over the lower classes in Canada created some discontent within Canada, showing that the American fears were somewhat valid. In addition, King George III's apparent failure to protect Protestantism, as he was considered England's last defense against popery, made many fear that England would descend into Catholicism.¹⁹ What the American colonists failed to recognize was that such tolerance for the antiquated practices was a compromise, a lesser evil that would allow the Quebec people to retain their local customs instead of being dominated by an Anglo minority. When General Benedict Arnold traveled to Quebec, he wrote to the Continental Congress that the Canadians had been "long habituated to slavery".²⁰ His words betray the widespread assumption that the Quebec Act was reinforcing a state of oppression on the habitants. Because of this developing ideology of freedom and the growing opinion that Canada was oppressed in ways similar to how the colonies saw themselves as oppressed, the plans to attack Canada turned in a new direction. The Americans saw Canada as a brother nation that they needed to liberate from the British and draw into the fold of the American Revolution. A letter mass-sent to Canada in May 1775 warned that their rights and religion depended "on a legislature in which you have no share, and over which you have no control".²¹ Admittedly this and much of the other messages into Quebec are primarily propaganda pieces, but there appears to be sincere belief that Canada and America were bound to the same cause. In November 1775, General George Washington forbade his troops from participating in Guy Fawkes Day, a traditional anti-Catholic celebration in Massachusetts, saying that it was "not to be tolerated, especially when the friendship and help of the Canadians was being sought"; he added that "it is our duty to address public thanks to these our Brethren, as to them we are much indebted to every late happy Success over the common Enemy in Canada".²² These words, given to men in Massachusetts rather than recruits in Canada, show that Washington believed in a common cause among America and Canada. When the campaign into Canada turned into retreat in 1776, both John and Samuel Adams asserted that the plans would have been successful if the Declaration of Independence had been created and signed earlier.²³ They assumed that the source of the source of the expedition's failure was that they were unable to demonstrate the full spirit and commitment of the revolutionary cause to the Canadians. This reflects the belief held by many of the supporters for the Canadian invasion that the matter of expelling the British from Quebec involved the same common issues of liberty that the colonies were fighting for.²⁴

Although the motivations for attacking the British in Canada changed with the ideological development of freedom as a primary cause for the Americans, the transformation

¹⁹ Creviston, "No King Unless It Be A Constitutional King", 469-470.

²⁰ Eller, McNeill, ed., *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*, Vol. 3 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), 731.

²¹ "Letter to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec" (*Journals of the Continental Congress*, Vol. I, 105-113) as found in Gustave Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 47.

²² *The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745-1799*, Vol. 4, 64-65, as in Allan S. Everest, *Moses Hazen and the Canadian Refugees in the American Revolution*, 33-34.

²³ Justin H. Smith, *Our Struggle For The Fourteenth Colony*, Vol. II (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1907), 454.

²⁴ Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Smith, Justin H., *Our Struggle For The Fourteenth Colony*, Vol. I-II (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1907).

did not occur in Canada. A large degree of this difference was due to the physical isolation between Canada and the American colonies. This distance can be seen with the results of the “Address to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec”, one of the main propagandist messages to the Canadians. The message was distributed to the north through leaflets, but the path of the distribution was limited due to the lack of paths into Canada. As a result, while the Montreal area received many of the letters, “Quebec, far down the St. Lawrence, was most aloof”²⁵ and did not receive all of the messages. Even when the Americans got the papers through to the Canadians, there was still the issue of communicating the ideas. The reception often depended on the audience’s class in Quebec society. The educated elite, with the exception of a few Anglo-American intellectuals and merchants, were French Canadians who felt indebted to Britain for allowing them to maintain rights that would be oppressed if the Anglo-American minority was successful in dominating legislation. The elite could be subdivided into a couple of categories. The seigneurs- French Canadian nobles- owed the retention of their positions to the British and with few exceptions supported them. The clergy too were loyal for having their rights protected, but were even more pro-British because of the anti-Catholic threats from the American Protestants. In addition, the elites in general were literate and well-educated in legal matters. This allowed them to understand the Quebec Act and the benefits it provided the Canadians. As a result, they were not persuaded by the American arguments and were in fact the strongest source of counter arguments. Both the seigneurs and the clergy had some influence on the common people, and their opinions had increasing impact as the invasion progressed. They were particularly effective in countering American propaganda within the cities, as the intellectuals would translate important texts in French and explain them to gathered crowds. This allowed them to explain the true purpose of the Quebec Act and expose anti-Catholic tracts the Continental Congress was publishing for other targets such as Great Britain. Yet those cities were scattered throughout Canada and separated by vast wilderness. The real battle for support would be in the countryside, where the true heart of Canada’s population lived.²⁶

The majority of Canadians were habitants- rural peasants-farmers who mostly kept to themselves. They disliked the authority of the seigneurs and clergy, but also retained some degree of loyalty toward them. Most of all, they simply wished to be left alone. Because of their lack of education, they were largely illiterate. On the one hand, this illiteracy hindered the attempts by the Canadian elites to counter the American arguments, but on the other hand it limited the ability of the American propaganda to permeate into the majority. More than that, the general isolation of the habitants made it difficult for them to fully grasp or emphasize with the Americans. They were primarily interested in protecting their relative autonomy in the wilderness and defending their farms and families, not in fighting a war that would have high costs.²⁷

The limited sympathy of the Quebec habitants and their neutral stance helped the Americans, as they assisted the invasion through passive methods. It is important to note that while the American expedition was ultimately a failure, there were early successes on the part of the Americans. This was partially due to the subtle resistance the Canadian habitants gave to the British. Also, Canada lacked sufficient troops to either enforce order in Canada or stop the invading Americans. In 1774, Quebec governor Guy Carleton sent the majority of the British soldiers down to Boston in order to reinforce General Gage. Carleton expected to supplement his remaining forces by recruiting militias from the local population. Not only did he use British recruiters, but he also called upon the loyal seigneurs and clergy in Quebec to

²⁵ Thomas H. Raddall, *The Path of Destiny* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1957), 15.

²⁶ Coffin, *The Province of Quebec*; Wrong, George M., *Canada And The American Revolution: The Disruption Of The First British Empire* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1935).

²⁷ Coffin, *The Province of Quebec*; Wrong, *Canada And The American Revolution*.

summon troops from the habitants attached to them. However, the recruitment fell short due to defiance from the habitants. The British supporters of the Quebec Act assumed that the law would help make the Canadian people feel more comfortable with obeying Britain by retaining their traditional laws, but this was only partially correct. In actuality, the habitants were used to function autonomously in the countryside and were not strongly affected by the Quebec Act. As historian George M. Wrong put it succinctly, “It was not the Act that kept the Canadians French and Catholic; what did this was the enduring devotion to their ancient culture...and this the presence or absence of formal law could affect but slightly”.²⁸ In fact, in some ways they objected to the Act, which reinforced the hierarchical French social order. The habitants disliked the authority the clergy and nobility held over them and the duties they were expected to carry out. Plus, they did not want to fight in a war. As a result, they resisted the recruitment attempts.²⁹

There are many recorded cases of Quebec habitants defying their social superiors when ordered to provide men and supplies for the British defense. When the seigneur Cuthbert of Berthier summoned his tenants for the army, the habitants stated, “Not a man will follow you”, and after his departure “took an oath...never to bear arms against the Provincials...and to meet force with force, in case the Governor should try to coerce them”.³⁰ Likewise, the priests had difficulty rallying their parishes. One report on efforts to recruit the parish of St. Joseph highlighted the problems facing the recruiters: “this parish unanimously revolted and refused to acknowledge the King’s authority, despite the good counsel of their priest. He used all of his influence...and was insulted several times on this occasion”.³¹ The British concessions to the upper classes backfired by reducing support from the lower classes that made up the majority of the population – and the potential fighting force. It is important to keep in mind, as noted in the *Journal of the Historical Society*, that rebellions by habitants in physically isolated areas such as the Chaudiere Valley began before the American forces arrived, signifying personal initiative on the part of the Canadians.³² With the problems harrying the British, the Americans were confident of victory, and managed to place Quebec City and Governor Carleton under siege.

The habitants also provided much needed aid to the Americans by means of supplies. For example, when General Arnold led his men out of the Maine wilderness into Canada, the first contacts with habitants were very promising, as “provisions were plentiful – indeed, even too much so, for some men made themselves ill by indulging”.³³ Although the residents naturally asked for money in gold in exchange for the food, it does not change the fact that the decision by many Canadians to give much-needed food to the Americans rather than turn them away outright signifies that they were somewhat sympathetic to the revolutionary cause. It is perfectly reasonable that they would expect some sort of reward for their trouble, and their aid was vital to the soldiers as they spent long months in the cold climate. Even after the cash ran short, they continued to support the Americans for some time by accepting receipts. Historian Victor Coffin asserts that without this allowance for loans in trust, “The American

²⁸ Wrong, *Canada And The American Revolution*, 259.

²⁹ Justin H. Smith, *Our Struggle For The Fourteenth Colony, Vol. I* (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1907).

³⁰ Michael P. Gabriel, ed. And S. Pascale Vergereau-Dewey, trans., *Quebec During the American Invasion, 1775-1776* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005); Rodrigue, Barry Hadfield, “An Album in the Attic: The Forgotten Frontier of the Quebec-Maine Borderlands During the Revolutionary War,” *Journal of the Historical Society* 3.1 (2003); Smith, *Our Struggle I*, 352.

³¹ Gabriel, *Quebec During the American Invasion*, 63.

³² Barry Hadfield Rodrigue, “An Album in the Attic”, 56.

³³ Justin H. Smith, *Arnold’s March from Cambridge to Quebec* (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1903), 243.

force could not have existed in amity a month".³⁴ These actions by the people of Quebec helped the American invasion achieve its initial victories against the British in Canada and show that the habitants were partially open to the revolutionary ideals.³⁵

Despite the changes in the American ideology in regards to Canada, certain elements of the earlier motivations remained and fueled the desire to take it from the British. Regardless of claims of brotherhood, many Americans did not fully appreciate Quebec culture, particularly that of the French Canadians. The English-American faction, which had wanted to control Quebec at the expense of the already settled French-Canadian inhabitants, transformed as the ideal of liberty emerged, but did not fully forget or close the rift it had with the French Canadians. This division is clearly seen in the initial sympathizers to the American Revolution in Canada, prior to the spreading of propagandist messages. There were a number of intellectuals in Canada that were interested to the American Revolution and offered support. It was through them that the Americans built a following in Quebec, sending letter to them and having them distribute the propaganda to the rest of the population. However, the majority of these leaders were English, with very few French Canadians involved. Carleton made an extensive log of notable Canadians collaborating with the Americans, yet did not note many French Canadians in the list; "The only French name worth putting into it, Pelissier, belonged to the old country".³⁶ This quotation illustrates that the main Canadian supporters stemmed from the Anglo-American minority and suggests that the motivations had not fully changed.

There continued to be a strong anti-Catholic reaction towards Quebec, which the Americans were unable to fully cover up through more conciliatory propaganda. On October 21, 1774, just four days before passing "An Address to the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec," a propagandist letter to reassure Canadians that America wished to unite with them against tyranny, the Continental Congress had passed "An Address to the People of Great Britain". In that letter they accused the British of using the Quebec Act to support the growth of Catholicism in America, a religion that they asserted was spreading "impiety, bigotry, murder, and rebellion through every part of the world".³⁷ When copies of that letter eventually reached Canada, the educated elites held public readings of the letter to demonstrate the double-sided nature of the American idealism and used it as one of the primary counter-arguments against the invasion. As historian Charles H. Metzger notes, "It was only natural that...they would not expect the two addresses, originating in the same legislative body...to be in open contradiction. What was their amazement at hearing themselves denounced and their religion disparaged and travestied!"³⁸ The open readings and discussions on the document, done in many cities throughout Canada by pro-British intellectuals, galvanized opposition to the Americans and countered the propaganda the invaders brought with them. The letter shows that Congress still considered religious tolerance one of the main grievances against Britain's governance of Canada, which they considered "dangerous in an extreme degree to the Protestant religion".³⁹

In addition, there was a large degree of paranoia towards the threat posed by Canada as a whole to the Americans, not only on a religious and social basis but also in regard to the military. There were realistic fears that Britain would use Canada as a vantage point for a

³⁴ Coffin, *The Province Of Quebec*, 517.

³⁵ Coffin, *The Province of Quebec*; Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army*; Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Rodrigue, "An Album in the Attic"

³⁶ Smith, *Our Struggle II*, 213.

³⁷ *Letter to the people of Great Britain, from the delegates...* (*Journals of the Continental Congress*, Vol. I, 82-90) as found in Gustave Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 245.

³⁸ Metzger, *The Quebec Act*, 160

³⁹ John Ferling, *Almost A Miracle: The American Victory In The War Of Independence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 86.

march south against the colonies. That was in fact a key strategy of the British as the war continued, especially in the aftermath of the failed invasion. In 1776, the British planned to enact a pincer movement to trap the rebel army: “The main British army would land at New York while another army would push south from Canada, thus separating New England from the rest of the other colonies”.⁴⁰ The plan fell apart, but was repeated in 1777; although the strategy was stymied by the American victory at Saratoga, the tactics show the critical role Canada played in the war. Quebec also had valuable natural resources such as furs, which had been the incentive for the Anglo-American attempt to resettle the area, and that wealth would only help to support the British. When diplomat Charles Carroll of Carrollton was sent as part of a team to Canada to boost support for the invasion, he spent much of his journal noting the natural resources in the land, and how he believed that Canada would be economically beneficial for America. For instance, he wrote that “if America should succeed... I have not the least doubt that the lands bordering on Lake Champlain will be very valuable in a short time, and that great trade will be carried on over Lake Champlain, between Canada and New York”.⁴¹ This shows that a primary interest in Quebec remained in material wealth, and how it could strengthen America. Likewise, if the Americans took Quebec, “Britain’s strategic situation in vitally important Canada would be imperiled, thus imperiling the outcome of the war against the rebels to the southward”.⁴² This harkens back to the material interest the English-American faction had in Quebec early on. The continued prevalence of these earlier interests limited the extent of the idealistic vision to free Canada.

As a result, these ulterior interests remained ingrained in the expedition and gradually created friction with the Canadians they were supposedly freeing. The conflict was already present before the invasion as the Anglo-American merchant class in Quebec collaborated with Americans to promote the revolutionary cause in Canada. There was considerable tension between the English-speaking merchants and the French-Canadian habitants in spite of efforts to bring the latter into the fold. This division was visible in May 1775 when a statue of George III was vandalized and relabeled “Pope of Canada and the fool of England.” There was a large public outcry against the action, and fierce arguments between the two factions ensued.⁴³ This shows that the support present in Quebec was already limited, and that those working with America were at odds with the majority of the population due to conflicting goals. When the Americans arrived, tensions gradually rose despite the propaganda about liberty and brotherhood. The counter arguments by educated Canadians, which demonstrated frequent cases of anti-Catholic diatribe in the American colonies, helped show that the idealistic aspects of the American cause were limited and partially simply propaganda. Many of the habitants were staunchly Catholic, so “the anti-clerical fulminations of the First Continental Congress nullified the later overtures of the Second”⁴⁴ and chilled relations with the habitants.

The early instances of hostility on the part of the American forces were limited at the beginning, as the commanding officers did not wish to dampen the habitants’ hospitality. As conditions worsened, however, desperation prevailed, leading to increased hostility towards the people of Quebec. When General Wooster arrived to reinforce the American army, he established draconian measures toward Canadian resistance, warning that the Canadians

⁴⁰ Joseph B. Mitchell, Lt. Col., *Decisive Battles of the American Revolution* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1962), 44.

⁴¹ Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, *Journal of Charles Carroll of Carrollton During His Visit to Canada in 1776, As One of the Commissioners From Congress* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1876), 88.

⁴² Paul David Nelson, *General Sir Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester: Soldier-Statesman of Early British Canada* (Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000), 80.

⁴³ Paul R. Reynolds, *Guy Carleton: A Biography* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1980), 57.

⁴⁴ Dupuy, *The Compact History of the Revolutionary War*, 66.

should not “talk of the affairs of the Americans” and threatened “that men even suspected of co-operating or corresponding with Quebec [City] should suffer close imprisonment and exile”.⁴⁵ Looting and seizures of supplies became frequent, often with official support, and aggravated relations with the Canadians. Likewise, the American soldiers became increasingly hostile towards the Catholics. American Captain Goforth recorded some of the abuses in a letter: “A priest’s house has been entered with great violence, and his watch plundered from him. Women and children have been terrified, and forced, with the point of the bayonet, to furnish horses...without any prospect of pay”.⁴⁶ Some of the habitants may have supported such measures, but others still had strong connections with their local priests, and too offense at the Americans’ actions. More importantly, the priests were hardly the one people singled out for resources, and many habitants found themselves facing the same plight. It is important to keep in mind that a large factor behind the initial support for the Americans was from their resistance to attempts at domination from the British and the elite classes in Canada. They disliked the continuation of the tithes payments to the Catholic Church and the special privileges afforded to the seigneurs. Likewise they did not want to be forced into military service for the British. This led them to support the Americans, who said they had come to liberate them from such problems. When the Americans came to demand similar costs though, the warmth quickly froze. These aspects of the American conquerors stained their image as liberators and compelled the Canadian people to shift their neutrality to passively resisting the Americans as well.⁴⁷

The physical isolation of Quebec from the American colonies also limited the ability of the Americans to fully immerse themselves in the Canadian setting and provide adequate support to match their convictions for the cause. The habitants were neutral and passive yet also showed some degree of support for the Americans. However, because of their overall neutrality in the conflict they chose to stay out of the fighting until they were certain the Americans could live up to their promise of taking Canada. After all, the resistance to British conscription in the war was a key factor behind the American support to begin with. This made the planned invasion more difficult than anticipated. Britain had sent most of Quebec’s troops south, but reinforcements could be sent in from London. Therefore, America needed to take Canada quickly before the thawing of the ice after winter let the British ships in with troops that would outnumber the Americans.⁴⁸

At first glance, the time limit on the campaign into Quebec did not appear to be a problem. The initial plans for the invasion operated under the assumption that the Canadians would flock to the Americans and offer support. This belief was partially borne out, as the habitants resisted the British and offered food to the American troops. On the other hand, the Quebec people were equally unwilling to fight for the Americans, and American recruitment on that end was minimal. As a result, the Americans were largely forced to rely on themselves for victory. A couple of military officers concluded that “10,000 men will be necessary to secure the Colony and engage the Canadians heartily in the cause”.⁴⁹ This matter was hindered due to the difficulty in maintaining continuous connections with the American colonies to the south. The passages northward were difficult, and the same winter conditions expected to limit British reinforcements also stalled American support. It did not help that

⁴⁵ Smith, *Our Struggle II*, 232-233.

⁴⁶ *American Archives*, Vol. V, 869, as found in Victor Coffin, *The Province of Quebec and the early American Revolution*, 519.

⁴⁷ Coffin, *The Province of Quebec*; Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army*; Metzger, *The Quebec Act*.

⁴⁸ Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army*; Ferling, John, *Almost A Miracle*; Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*.

⁴⁹ *Letter from Colonel McDougall to John Jay* (Jay Papers) as found in Ernest McNeill Eller, *Naval Documents*, 225.

support for the expedition wavered time to time, and varied between different colonies. For instance, a request for soldiers from New York was denied for some time, with the explanation that “our troops can be of no service to you; they have no arms, clothes, blankets, or ammunition... It is in vain to complain”⁵⁰

The lack of support also applied to the financial situation, leaving the American soldiers mostly broke when trying to purchase food from the farms. Instead, they “paid” using fraudulent receipts and worthless paper money.⁵¹ Such methods had been commonplace in Quebec in the last war, and some still remembered the empty rewards such monetary promises bought them in the end. This made the Canadians further doubt the ability of the Americans to uphold their lofty promises. In addition, the lack of sufficient American support cast doubt on the sincerity of connecting Quebec with the American ideal of brotherhood and liberty. Following the initial victories in Canada in late 1775, the Continental Congress prepared a committee of three delegates to go north and work with the Canadians to establish legislative government in Quebec as the first step to initiating the region into the American cause. However, because of the poor travel conditions, the delegation stayed behind in America and representatives would not reach Canada until 1776, by which point the campaign was crumbling.⁵² As a result, the habitants began to question the seriousness of the American interest in Quebec. When the delegation actually arrived in 1776, Charles Carroll, one of the delegation’s members, observed that “The frequent breaches of promise the inhabitants have experienced” had led them “to trust our people no further”.⁵³ Because of this, the attempts to establish elections and assemblies in Quebec ended in failure just like the military side of the invasion. The people of Quebec realized that the Americans lacked a sufficient connection to Canada to truly seize it, and withdrew their support.⁵⁴

Because of the lack of support, the American army in Quebec suffered a severe deterioration in its strength and health. The soldiers were unused to the frigid winter climate of Canada, and quickly found themselves in desperate need of supplies, which was instead dwindling. This in turn led to an epidemic as smallpox spread through the camp. As historian Douglas R. Cubbison notes, “Given the weakened condition of his army and the poor hygienic conditions in which they were squatting... the appearance of smallpox was almost inevitable”.⁵⁵ The lack of proper supplies not only made the Americans more vulnerable to disease, but also prevented them from taking adequate measures to stop the outbreak once it started. For instance, “there was only a single surgeon at Quebec... and great shortages of bandages, medical instruments and medicines”.⁵⁶ With the lack of sufficient support from either the Canadians or the Congress, the army crumbled further, as countless died or were otherwise incapacitated by the illness. At the time of the final retreat from Canada, one soldier wrote that there were “3,000 of our men sick with the small pox, those who were most healthy like so many walking apparitions”.⁵⁷

Disease alone was not enough to entirely destroy the army, but it did not occur on its own. It was instead the result of many malignant factors weighing down on the American forces, each contributing in turn to the others. The already dismal conditions in the American camp allowed the disease to thrive, and created an additional blow to the expedition’s

⁵⁰ Ward, *War of the Revolution*, 136.

⁵¹ Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 125.

⁵² Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 103-104.

⁵³ K.M. Rowland, *The Life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton: 1737-1832, Vol. I* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1898), 154-156.

⁵⁴ Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Smith, *Our Struggle I-II*.

⁵⁵ Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army*, 33.

⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 148.

⁵⁷ Thomas C. Armory, *Military Services and Public Life of Major General John Sullivan of the American Revolutionary Army* (Boston: Wiggin and Lunt, 1863), 300-301.

strength. While the disease could have come from a number of sources, it would not have destroyed the army as thoroughly had the living conditions been better. On the flipside, the outbreak increased the urgency for supplies, and likely contributed to more looting and seizures, which would then build tensions with the Canadians and create even more problems. Overall, there were many different factors contributing to the Americans' ultimate defeat in the north, but they were all connected to each other, and the most important link was in the social and physical divides between the American soldiers and the Canadians they were supposed to "liberate."⁵⁸

By examining the Canadian invasion, it is possible to discern key elements in the Revolutionary War, not simply in Quebec but in the war as a whole. The opposition to the British in Quebec evolved from economic interests to the concept of liberty, and this transformation is a reflection of the change in the American stance towards Britain in the years leading up to the war. The initial objections to the British by the revolutionaries focused on the taxes and other economic issues, but by the start of the revolution there was more focus on social and political freedom. Likewise, the events in Quebec that contributed to the early successes and later failures in the campaign form common patterns seen in the American Revolution. The American Revolution was never a single, unified unit against the British. This fragmentation is most commonly noted in the loyalist Tories, who were forced into exile after the war. According to the textbook *Out of Many*, "About a fifth of the population, perhaps as many as half a million people, remained loyal to the British crown".⁵⁹ In addition, the ideal of freedom had to be revised as the war progressed due to the necessity of maintaining solid control of the people. When the war proved to be long and arduous, many began to stop supporting the rebellion in order to protect their own personal interests. Eventually, these objections were swept away due to the growing prevalence of the evolving liberty ideology. Nevertheless, dissidents were frequent. Many refused to sacrifice their personal wealth for the common good and refused to provide goods to the soldiers in hard times. This reflects sentiments similar to the habitants in Quebec, who simply wanted to be left alone on their farms and came to distrust the leeching effect the Americans had on their livelihoods. The American colonies were able to unite because they shared overall goals and ideals. In contrast, Quebec and Canada were largely isolated from the revolutionary ideas. Therefore, the problems that were setbacks in other fronts to the south became core reasons for the Canadian campaign's collapse.⁶⁰

The Quebec expedition also shows how the American Revolution as a whole was a precarious struggle that was never fully certain. Canada was not the sole defeat for the Americans. For example, following the British victories in New York and the subsequent desertion of Revolutionary troops as morale plummeted, George Washington is said to have written, "I think the game is pretty near up".⁶¹ The focus of many historians on the victorious fronts of the war prevents people from fully understanding and valuing the great struggles necessary to win the full fight. The usual area of difficulty emphasized in those works is the time spent in Valley Forge. The poor winter conditions in that setting are similar to the challenges posed in Canada, but there are significant differences as well. The American troops in Valley Forge could still count on some degree of nearby aid, even if the support dwindled at times. In contrast, the American armies in Quebec had no steady connection to the American colonies and had even more difficulty obtaining resources locally. Therefore,

⁵⁸ Cubbison, *The American Northern Theater Army*; Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Smith, *Our Struggle I-II*

⁵⁹ Armitage, *Out of Many*, 178.

⁶⁰ Coffin, *The Province of Quebec*; Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*; Raddall, *The Path of Destiny*.

⁶¹ Armitage, *Out of Many*, 180.

while the Americans in Valley Forge survived and continued to fight in the war, the forces in Canada were forced to retreat. In both case though, the key factors leading to difficulty were the same and show that the Quebec expedition was not an isolated anomaly in the Revolutionary War. Canada is a key campaign in the American Revolution and therefore helps establish several important patterns that determined the war's course.

The American invasion of Quebec reflected not only patterns in the American Revolution but also developments in Canada, and marked an important stage in the development of Canadian national identity in Quebec. Quebec was already undergoing critical shifts in its identity following the Seven Years' War, as it had shifted from part of France's empire to part of England's. The people of Canada were still wary of the British – both the British soldiers and the British colonists. The tensions caused by this shift were meant to be alleviated by the Quebec Act, but the turmoil continued to boil. The majority of the population distrusted the Quebec Act's adherence to the old social order, particularly the continued control of the clergy and nobility. This made them more open to the American calls for rebellion. They took interest in the concept of determining their own lives free from the elites' domination and began to resist the institutions in Canada. However, this growing idea was centered on localized concerns for the habitants in the countryside of Quebec. When the Americans began to threaten them like the nobility and clergy, they chose to resist the invading army as well. In addition, they recognized that the Americans were too different due to culture and distance to truly hold merge with Canada, and chose to function apart from America. As Bannister and Riordan write, although the British and the American colonists mutually celebrated the conquest of Quebec in the Seven Years' War, “they told themselves different stories and created different meanings of loyalty”⁶² that would hinder their understanding of where Quebec stood in the revolution. This gap was deepened further as the loyalist Tory population in America largely immigrated north to Canada after the war. As a result, a new sense of identity emerged in Quebec.⁶³

A similar pattern of divergence from the American Colonies occurred in other Canadian provinces such as Nova Scotia, where final vestiges of American influence were shed off. Nova Scotia was notable for having a large New England population, leading some to conclude that it would join the American Revolution. Instead, it sat out of the conflict. This was because the New England immigration mostly occurred in the 1760s and had stopped by the 1770s. As a result, they missed the turning point in the American ideology from economic discontent to a crisis of liberty, and therefore could not understand or condone the new ideas emerging from New England.⁶⁴ Likewise, the American hopes of brotherhood with the Quebecois were shattered during the course of the campaign, and the failure to hold Canada showed that the Canadians had by the large already diverged from American culture, creating a growing rift. The later War of 1812 further proved the distancing from America, as the American invaders had even less success with the invasion of Canada then. The people and militias of Canada, “far from receiving the invaders as brethren, were out to fight them”⁶⁵, with no early assistance like the last time. That campaign, unlike the one during the American Revolution, was doomed to fail, as there was no local support for the distant expedition north into Canada. The original invasion marked a turning point for Canada, and once the American army lost that momentum they lost any chance of claiming the territory for themselves. More importantly, the reaction of people in Quebec to the American Revolution

⁶² Jerry Bannister and Liam Riordan, *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 7.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ George Rawlyk, “The 1770s,” in *Colonists And Canadiens*, edited by J.M.S. Careless (Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1971), 29.

⁶⁵ Raddall, *The Path of Destiny*, 198.

helped signify the direction that Canada as a whole was taking. There were still sources of tension within Quebec, of course, but by the end of the American Revolution Quebec and Canada had taken considerable steps towards establishing their own national identities separate from America.

The invasion of Quebec was an important event in the histories of America and Canada. The establishment of the Quebec Act and the growing American opposition to it and the perceived implications of tyranny were a strong contributor to the emergence of the American Revolution and made Quebec an ideological and strategic target for America. The American Revolution in turn brought new ideas about liberty to Canada and encouraged the habitants to resist the British and the elite classes in order to protect their individual freedoms. However, the original American opposition to the British administration of Quebec was due to material interest in the region and rejection of the dominant Catholic faith in the province. These ambitions were not silenced by the growth of the opposition into the ideal of liberty, and emerged as the invasion progressed. The hostility towards the inhabitants of Quebec discouraged them from fully cooperating with the Americans. In addition, they became uncertain of the ability of America to truly combine with Canada due to isolation. The Canadians adopted a neutral stance that helped the Americans achieve early victories against the British, but that same neutrality made them refuse to fully join forces with the Americans, especially once the Americans became forceful with demands. This gradual rejection of an American alliance helped form a piece of Canadian national identity in Quebec and marked a significant step in its growth. The factors behind the Canadian invasion and the sources of its downfall are hallmarks of the American Revolution as a whole and make the Canadian campaign an integral part of the Revolutionary War.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Carroll, Charles, of Carrollton. *Journal of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, During His Visit to Canada in 1776, As One of the Commissioners from Congress*. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1876.

Force, ed. *American Archives*. Washington D.C.: 1837-1846.

Ford, Worthington Chauncey, ed. *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, 1904-1937.

Jay Papers. New York: Columbia University Library.

Washington, George. *The Writings of George Washington From the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745-1799*. Ed. John C. Fitzpatrick. Washington D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1816.

Secondary Sources:

Armitage, Susan H., Daniel Czitrom, Mari Jo Buhle, and John Mack Faragher. *Out Of Many: A History of the American People*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1994.

Armory, Thomas C. *Military Services and Public Life of Major General John Sullivan of the American Revolutionary Army*. Boston: Wiggin and Lunt, 1863.

Bannister, Jerry and Liam Riordan. *The Loyal Atlantic: Remaking the British Atlantic in the Revolutionary Era*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.

Careless, J.M.S., ed. *Colonists And Canadiens: 1760-1867*. Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1971.

Coffin, Victor. *The Province of Quebec and the early American Revolution: A Study In English-American Colonial History*. Madison: University, 1896.

Creviston, Vernon P. "“No King Unless It Be A Constitutional King”": Rethinking the Place of the Quebec Act in the Coming of the American Revolution." *The Historian: Sigma Tau Delta*, (2011).

Cubbison, Douglas R. *The American Northern Theater Army in 1776: The Ruin and Reconstruction of the Continental Force*. Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.

Dunn, Walter S., Jr. *Choosing Sides on the Frontier in the American Revolution*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2007.

Dupuy, R. Ernest, Colonel and Colonel Trevor N. Dupuy. *The Compact History Of The Revolutionary War*. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1963.

- Eller, McNeill, F. Kent Loomis, and William James Morgan, ed. *Naval Documents of the American Revolution*. Vol. 3: 1775-1776. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- Everest, Allan S. *Moses Haxen and the Canadian Refugees in the American Revolution*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1976.
- Ferling, John. *Almost A Miracle: The American Revolution In The War Of Independence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Gabriel, Michael P., ed., and S. Pascale Vergereau-Dewey, trans. *Quebec During The American Invasion, 1775-1776: The Journal of Francois Baby, Gabriel Taschereau, & Jenkin Williams*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005.
- Lanctot, Gustave. *Canada and the American Revolution*. Trans. Margaret M. Cameron. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Lawson, Philip. *The Imperial Challenge: Quebec and Britain in the Age of the American Revolution*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989.
- LeRoy, Alfred Burt. *Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester, 1724-1808, Revised Version*. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association Booklets, 1968.
- Metzger, Charles H., S.J. *The Quebec Act: A Primary Cause of the American Revolution*. New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1936.
- Miller, John C. *Origins of the American Revolution*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1943.
- Mitchell, Joseph B., Lt. Col. *Decisive Battles of the American Revolution*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1962.
- Nash, Gary B. and Julie Roy Jeffrey. *The American People: Creating a Nation and a Society*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, 1998.
- Nelson, Paul David. *General Sir Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester: Soldier-Statesman of Early British Canada*. Cranbury: Associated University Presses, Inc., 2000.
- Raddall, Thomas H. *The Path of Destiny: Canada from the British Conquest to Home Rule: 1763-1850*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1957.
- Rawlyk, George A., ed. *Revolution Rejected 1775-1776*. Scarborough, Prentice-Hall of Canada, Ltd., 1968.
- Reynolds, Paul Revere. *Guy Carleton: A Biography*. New York: William Morrow And Company, Inc., 1980.
- Rodrigue, Barry Hadfield. "An Album in the Attic: The Forgotten Frontier of the Quebec-Maine Borderlands During the Revolutionary War." *Journal of the Historical Society* 3.1 (2003).

Royster, Charles. *A Revolutionary People at War: The Continental Army and American Character, 1775-1783*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979.

Smith, Justin Harvey. *Arnold's March from Cambridge to Quebec*. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1903.

Smith, Justin Harvey. *Our Struggle For The Fourteenth Colony: Canada, and the American Revolution*. Vol. 1-2. New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1907.

Ward, Christopher. *The War of the Revolution*. Vol. 1. Ed. John Richard Alden. New York: Macmillan Company, 1952.

Wrong, George McKinnon. *Canada and the American Revolution: The Disruption of the First British Empire*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1935.

From Balfour to Oslo 2: Roots of the Modern Arab-Israeli Conflict

Katherine Ashcraft ('17)

As the desire for a Jewish homeland grew in the late nineteenth century, the British used the opportunity to uphold their presence in the Middle East by promising the Jews a national home in Palestine.¹ While the British attempted to appease both the Jews and Arabs involved in the process, eventually they withdrew from the region when a solution seemed impossible. Even as Jews, Arabs, and international forces gained more direct control in settling the Arab-Israeli conflict, violence and political discord were defining features of Palestinian-Israeli relations.² Despite the peace agreements of the 1990's and 2000's, this conflict persists because of the flexible interpretations and general vagueness surrounding negotiations.

At the onset of World War I the British saw the promise of a Zionist state as strategically important which led to the issuing of the Balfour Declaration, a statement of support for the Zionist cause. Although support of the Zionist cause was deemed necessary to gain the support of the United States and renew Russian dedication to the war effort, the British also had to uphold relations with the Arab states.³ This balance is apparent in a comparison of the first draft of the Balfour agreement which was written in July 1917 and the final version passed by the British parliament on October 31 of the same year. While the first draft reflected Zionist proposals by guaranteeing that the British would help the Jewish people in securing Palestine as a national state, the final draft promises "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."⁴ By using this wording the British could support the creation of a Jewish state without completely jeopardizing relations with the Arab states. Furthermore, the addition of the statement "that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine" suggests a British dedication to the international focus on "self-determination" in the Arab territories, a sharp contrast to the August draft of the declaration which promised the British would "use their best endeavors to secure the achievement of this object" and "be ready to consider any suggestions on the subject which the Zionist Organisation may desire to lay before them."⁵ The changes between the earliest and later versions of this declaration demonstrate Britain's conflicting interests in the region. Although committed to Zionism, the British recognized the importance of the Arab states in their foreign policy and therefore made unspecified promises to gain Arab acceptance of the creation of Israel. One of the major issues with the final declaration was not only the general nature of Britain's stated commitments but also the many interpretations that resulted from these statements; while the Zionists understood the declaration to promise the establishment of a Jewish state, the Arabs could interpret the document otherwise. England's attempts to appease both groups demonstrated the trend of ambiguity that would undermine peace agreements in the next century and prolong the Arab-Israeli conflict.

After the 1993 negotiations between the PLO and the Israeli government in Oslo created ideals for a peace agreement, Oslo 2 attempted to detail how this agreement would

¹ Charles D. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: a History with Documents 8th ed.*, (Boston: Bedford St. Martin's, 2013), 65.

² *Ibid.*, 219-49.

³ *Ibid.*, 69-70.

⁴ Leonard Stein, "Drafts and Final Text of the Balfour Declaration," in *The Balfour Declaration*, (Jewish Chronicle Publication, 1969) reprinted in Charles D. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*, 8th ed. (New York: Bedford St. Martin's, 2013), 93-4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 94.

work. The subsequent agreement was a thorough 307 pages and while this seemingly left little room for ambiguity, the document managed to leave certain conditions open to interpretation.⁶ For instance, while the document clearly states that the Palestinian Interim Self Governing Authority (PISGA) will gain authority over areas A and B of Palestinian territory “during the first phase of redeployment,” it becomes less specific when it states that powers “will be transferred gradually” in zone C.⁷ The wording of this section was meant to appease the Palestinian leadership while gaining land for Israel whose military was not obligated to withdraw from zone C at any specific time. Other clauses like clause 9 in Article XXXI which specified times for the Palestinian National Congress to meet were undermined not necessarily by ambiguity in wording but rather by the political realities of Israeli-Palestinian relations. While Yasser Arafat and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) were diminishing in domestic and international influence, Israel enjoyed a higher status in part because the end of the Cold War meant the United States no longer needed to form alliances with Arab states and could focus support on Israel.⁸ Overlooking this power imbalance meant that while guidelines were set in the Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement, Israel could ignore or misinterpret certain terms and the Palestinians could do little to stop it. The main example of Israel’s ability to overlook many of the terms of the peace agreements is Binyamin Netanyahu’s platform in the May 1996 elections that opposed the implementation of the agreements reached at Oslo 2.⁹ While Palestine also had groups oppose the Oslo 2 terms, like Hamas, these groups were dependent upon Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian areas and although they disagreed with Arafat’s methods of regaining Palestine they were not in the same position as Israeli politicians were to completely invalidate the peace accord.

Oslo 2 differed from the Balfour agreement in many ways, including the nature of the document, the parties involved, and the conditions it set. While another difference may seem to be the specificity of each document, especially when comparing the thoroughness of the Oslo 2 accords to previous peace efforts, the reality is that all parties involved in the conflict used ambiguity to make peace between two groups with completely conflicting interests. While this unclearness was first utilized by Western powers like the British, who wanted to assert some form of imperial power in the region and therefore had to appeal to both Jews and Arabs, it later became a tool used mainly by the nation of Israel but also the PLO in coming to settlements on paper that would not greatly affect land claims or power in reality. Throughout the 20th century much would change including the global balance of power and national claims to sovereignty and land. What remained constant in prolonging the Arab-Israeli conflict, however, was the equivocal nature of the promises made by groups with conflicting ambitions.

⁶ Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 480.

⁷ “The Israeli-Palestinian Interim Agreement (Oslo 2) on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip,” in *Journal of Palestine Studies* 25, 2 (Winter 1996), 123-37, reprinted in Charles D. Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents*, 8th ed. (New York: Bedford St. Martin’s, 2013), 482.

⁸ Smith, *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, 442.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 457.

Bibliography

Smith, Charles D. *Palestine and the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A History with Documents* 8th ed.
New York: Bedford St. Martin's, 2013

The Luther Skald

Editor: Richard Mtisi

Production Assistant: Andrew Ruud ('14)

History Department Faculty

Lauren Anderson

Brian Caton

Robert Christman

Victoria Christman

Richard Mtisi

Marvin Slind

Edward Tebbenhoff

Jacqueline Wilke

The Luther Skald is published twice annually, February and October, and is intended to provide a venue for outstanding student history writing, which may also serve as a model for students working on history essays during their undergraduate careers. Although Luther's History faculty recommend student work for publication, The Luther Skald accepts submissions, in the forms of book reviews and essays, from Luther alumni and current students. Manuscript submissions should follow the style guidelines established in the American Historical Review and should be sent to the editor. Manuscripts received by January 1 will be considered for the February issue, and those received by August 1 will be considered for the October issues. The Luther Skald will also print, from time to time, news of the honors and achievements of History students, faculty, and alumni.