The Student Historical Journal

Loyola University New Orleans
Volume 38, 2006-2007

The Student Historical Journal

Loyola University New Orleans
Volume 38, 2006-2007

Faculty Advisor and Editor..Dr. David Moore
Layout and Design................................Kelly Amstutz & Jason Straight
Student Editors....................................Kelly Amstutz & Jason Straight
Cover Design...................................Mitch Wallace (www.7towers.net)

The Loyola University Student Historical Journal is published annually by the Pi chapter of Phi Alpha Theta International History Honor Society. Each year the Journal serves as the culmination of the chapter's scholarly activities. Since 1966, the Loyola Unversity Student Historical Association and Phi Alpha Theta have published the Journal to encourage scholarly activity by students and make public the best research efforts. The papers selected for publication were chosen from among those submitted to an editorial committee that included members of Loyola's history faculty and officers of Phi Alpha Theta. The papers were judged on scholarship and writing. Students who wish to submit a paper for the next publication should contact the Department of History at Loyola University, 6363 St. Charles Avenue, New Orleans, LA, 70118

Special Thanks to the faculty of the Loyola University History Department and College of Humanities and Natural Sciences, Absnth Inc., and Phi Alpha Theta International Honor Society in History Member, Association of College Honer Societies.

PAT Officers 2006-2007
President...Alaina Willett
Vice-President..Jennifer McDonald

LOYOLA
UNIVERSITY
NEW ORLEANS

Contents

Winner Outstanding Senior Thesis

Dissecting the Russian Idea of Greatness 5
Julie Unger

Winner Outstanding Semester Research Paper

'Excess of Democracy' or Rule of Aristocracy: The Role of Socio-Economic Class in Shaping Anti-Federalist Thought 61
Jason Straight

Oh Cold and Misery: The Dichotomy and Evolution of the Windigo in Indian and White Cultures 83
Rachel Henderson

Laywomen Deriving Power from their Piety and Involvement with the Medieval English Church 103
Danielle Smith

Julie Unger

Dissecting the Russian Idea of Greatness

Great men are those who have noble purposes to achieve, great tasks to perform, or mighty causes to vindicate. A high expression of self-mastery is but the reflection of these great purposes upon personality and character. The demand upon character molds the essential self-mastery; the goal forges the strength needed to achieve it… 'Great minds have purposes, others have wishes.'…Great purposes demand and endow strong minds; wishes need only weak minds. The soundness of this principle is found in the fact that men are not great until they have achieved great things. The strength is the product of the struggle; the endowment follows the achievement.[1]

Russia, Land of the Czars, a mystical, romanticized land of fur clad boyars and bearded priests, is a far cry from the reality of what ancient Russia truly was and is a stark contrast from the stereotyped Communist Russia of the second half of the 20th century. Russia's leaders like the very land from which they came were often very different from the image that has lived on after their death. But what makes a great leader? And why are some remembered as founders and creators, people who pushed their country forward and expanded her boarders, and others are regarded as degenerates, people who broke down Russia and are not only notorious, but infamous. Russia is a land of contradictions, a people warmed by the cold and comforted by pain; to be remembered as a great leader, to be put among the echelons of the absolute, one must break with tradition in a land where tradition reigns supreme, and seek inspiration for a people nostalgic for the past. Four of Russia's most legendary leaders were Ivan IV or Ivan the Terrible, Peter I or Peter the Great, Catherine II or Catherine the Great, and Stalin. These four are representative of Russia's extremes; examples of those remembered for their accomplishments and those remembered for their atrocities. Yet these four are more similar than they are different; their personalities and behaviors are far more reflective of each other than their reputations would lead people to believe. Catherine II and Peter I are regarded as admirable "parent" like guardians of the country, while Ivan IV and Stalin are seen as villains. Why is there this chasm? Why has the good that Ivan and Stalin did for Russia been forgotten and the atrocities of Peter and Catherine lost to time? History is always written by the victors, and therefore,

they choose in what light to cast the memorable characters of the past. But no matter how history has painted these four, it is undeniable that in order to be among Russia's great leaders one must be strong, determined, even cruel; to preserve the honor and dignity of the Russian empire and sacrifice everything, for mother Russia demands all from her people.

Ivan IV, Peter I, Catherine II, and Stalin all had traumatic childhoods, which inevitably affected their outlook on life and the ways in which they chose to handle life's circumstances. They all lacked strong parental figures in their adolescent years which in turn left them to fend for themselves; they were isolated, and forced to protect themselves, even violently at times. They had to focus on self preservation instead of childhood fantasies and pleasures. They grew strong and impenetrable, but at the cost of their ability to feel true and healthy emotions. They were robbed of their childhoods; they witnessed monstrosities so horrendous, that they could never really recover. They were the victims of a society who sought power and cherished succession.

Ivan IV lost his father at a very young age and his mother was not strong enough to protect him from the war in which he became a pawn; a power struggle which resulted in Ivan's desolation: "[d]eprived of his mother's protection, and by her of the protection of his maternal and paternal uncles, the young Ivan's life seems now to have entered a particularly unhappy period."[2] He learned from a young age to distrust the wealthy boyar families which controlled his realm. His wellness was disregarded; he had no friends for he was kept in complete isolation, "his good friends were sent away, his best toys destroyed, and he often went hungry."[3] He, "received no human care from any quarter"[4] and he once noted, "nothing was done as I wished…I…recall one thing: whilst we [Ivan and his brother Iuri] were playing childish games in our infancy Prince Vasily Vasil'evich Shuisky was sitting on a bench, leaning with his elbows on our father's bed, and with his legs upon a chair."[5] Ivan's once royal, regal position and the respect that had been due him was lost to prideful, avaricious boyars. Ivan was only important for the blood that ran in his veins. Ivan developed cruel and bestial habits, a way of evoking power over some life, when he had no control over his own, he would drop live animals from high windows in the Kremlin's towers,

> [a]t first, from the age of twelve, his victims were dumb animals that he hurled from the upper stories of houses; at fifteen he turned his sadistic attention to people, beating and robbing his subjects in public places as he rode past with his rowdy young noble companions. Subsequently

> his counselors made use of him in order to settle scores among themselves; and only finally did he start to order executions on his own initiative.[6]

Ivan's childhood was denied him and the environment in which he was forced to grow up, shaped him into a shadow of a man, who only through fear and terror felt he could control his life which he never thought of as truly his own.

Peter I's father also died when he was a young child and the clash of wealthy strel'tsy families that engulfed his childhood years, left Peter with not only emotional problems but a nervous tick which would haunt him until his death. "The shaking head and other alarming twitches have been attributed to the horrors Peter endured in 1682."[7] Peter's mother like that of Ivan was unable to protect Peter from the atrocities of the warring strel'tsy families. Peter was witness to a horrendous revolt which swept through the palace. He watched as his uncle was torn from his side and thrown to the riotous strel'tsy crowd below,

> 15-17 May [1682] the strel'tsy settled personal grudges by butchering some of their own commanding officers and unpopular government officials and also singled out members of the Naryshkin clan [Peter's mother's family]… possibly with the help of a list drawn up by Sophia [Peter's half sister]. About forty persons fell victim to axe and pike, including Peter's uncle Ivan Naryshkin…who was hacked to pieces. Peter witnessed several of these brutal murders…His experience-terror for his personal safety as he witnessed people close to him slaughtered…must have been psychologically damaging.[8]

Peter never wanted to be czar, he wanted to be a soldier, a sailor, a common man, but his destiny was greater than that for which he hoped. However, the atrocities that he had been witness to took their toll and while his childish fantasies were met, they had a perverted twist. He formed a play army with real canons and other armory, where he could be in control, but which resulted in the deaths of several young boys, "actual cannons were brought to satisfy young Peter, but while pleasing his fancy, they resulted in several deaths of his conscripted comrades."[9] Peter's adolescence was again shaken before he was 16 years old, when he was betrayed by Sophia, who led a second strel'tsy revolt

against him, "he ran away to a monastery, but he had armies that could defend the monastery and he eventually won out and sent Sophia to a nunnery."[10] Peter's often mercurial childhood was full of animosity and insecurity and his only way to ensure his own preservation was to force others to abide by his will.

Catherine II was born a German princess in a family of the lower ranks of German nobility. Her father loved her, but her mother was obsessed with her position in society and her lowly noble status which she felt was insufficient for her. Catherine's mother never truly loved her; she was not a boy and so was undeserving of her mother's affections. "Johanna [Catherine's mother] at last gave birth to a boy…She lavished upon the infant the affection and pride she had denied her daughter. Sophie [Catherine's Lutheran name] still very young, suffered bitterly from her mother's preference for the newcomer."[11] Catherine later wrote in an early version of her memoirs, "I was merely tolerated, and often I was scolded with a violence and anger I did not deserve…My father, whom I saw less often, thought I was an angel; my mother did not pay much attention to me."[12] Catherine was separated from her one loving parent at a young age, never to see him again, so that her mother could live ambiguously through her:

> [s]he [Catherine] felt that she would never see this kindly, simple man again. She was not mistaken. As for Christian Augustus, [Catherine's father] overcome with emotion, weeping, he could only repeat, 'Be true to your faith, my child! Do not forget to read my instructions!'"[13]

Johanna pushed her daughter to the brinks of sanity, so as to attain the Russian empress' favor. Catherine learned quickly that life in a foreign court was anything but friendly. She was isolated and watched incessantly, even sabotaged. Her mother was no help and only brought her shame and humiliation.

> Elizabeth was so enraged at Johanna that she threatened to call off the betrothal and send both Johanna and Catherine back home. She ordered Johanna brought before her and shouted at her accusingly, reducing the frightened Johanna to tears. For two hours the empress stormed and the princess suffered, doing her best to plead her case and beg for forgiveness. Too late Johanna realized that her clumsy

> and transparent maneuvering had placed her daughter's great prospects in peril.[14]

Eventually, even Johanna left Catherine to her lonesome, "[s]uddenly she missed this woman whom she had so often criticized. Despite all her faults, she had been her only friend. Without her, the atmosphere of the court became intolerable. Never had Catherine felt more isolated."[15] Catherine discovered that the only way she could survive was self preservation and determination; from the beginning, resulting from her mother's abuse and indifference, Catherine became steadfast in her perseverance to become empress. "My heart did not foresee great happiness; ambition alone sustained me. At the bottom of my soul I had something, I know not what, that never for a single moment let me doubt that sooner or later I would succeed in becoming the sovereign Empress of Russia in my own right."[16] Catherine's lost childhood resulted in her becoming numb to emotion, a regal ruler driven by pretentious initiative.

Stalin grew up in a house where his father was emotionally unavailable and an extremely abusive drunk; he eventually disappeared, leaving Stalin and his mother alone to provide for themselves. N. Kipshidze a friend of Stalin's mother remembers, "'[o]ne day when his father was drunk he picked him up and threw him violently to the floor. There was blood in the boy's urine for days afterward.' The big fistfights with no holds barred-that was what little Soso [Stalin's Georgian nickname] saw from the day he was born."[17] In Stalin's father's absence, his mother took to abusing him,

> [t]he time came when she [Keke-Stalin's mother] fearlessly exchanged blow for blow and Beso [Stalin's father] began feeling more and more uncomfortable at home, where he was no longer lord and master. It was more than the morose Beso could bear…His [Stalin's] mother was head of the family now, and the fist which had subdued his father was now applied to the upbringing of her son. She beat him unmercifully for disobedience.[18]

His miserable home life left him acidulated, "he was an embittered, insolent, rude, stubborn child with an intolerable character."[19] He was prideful, and secretly sensitive; the questions of his mother's infidelity and Stalin's illegitimacy, left him questioning himself, his very existence seemed clouded in mystery. Stalin had an insipid hatred of money and all material things, most likely stemming from the memories of feeling pitied by the wealthy and his

questioning of himself. His feelings were reinforced by jealousy and resentment; he could not allow himself to feel grateful or indebted. His mother's pious vows to God were fulfilled when she forced him to attend seminary, even though he had no need for God or his mercy. Innate feelings of love and compassion were beaten out of Stalin during his childhood as a result of his father's intoxicated rage, and in an attempt to satisfy his mother's blind devotion.

This lack of parental protection and support created a rift in these four sovereigns' comprehension of life and its worth; they developed a complete disrespect and disregard for human life. They were seemingly resentful of other people and their somewhat normal lives; their lost childhoods damaged their later relationships resulting in unhealthy and grotesque displays of indifference. The most exemplary instances of these are their relationships with their spouses and their own children. The perversions that they suffered in their youths remained with them their entire lives and were passed on to their children.

Ivan the Terrible is the epitome of the idea of the atrocities suffered in childhood, shaping and eventually leading to his demise. Ivan grew up to be a greatly disturbed young man. He "would ride at full gallop through the busy streets of Moscow trampling over men, women and children alike merely for his own pleasure."[20] He evolved from dropping live animals from high Kremlin windows to having one of his mother's known lovers thrown to hungry dogs when the man publicly said something that Ivan found offensive. "Prince Andrei Mikhailovich was killed: according to the official chronicler of Ivan's reign, he was thrown to the court kennelmen on the orders of the young grand prince himself."[21] Ivan's true cruelty did not surface until after the death of his first and beloved wife, Anastasia Romanovna. Ivan believed that she had been poisoned by the plotting boyars of whom he had become weary, and infact whom he had hated since he was a young child. Ivan's paranoia was his ultimate cruelty; it led him to see disloyalty and abomination where mere anxiety may have been the truth. When several boyars refused to take an oath of allegiance to his eldest son, then an infant, Ivan responded with brutal reprisals and many murders of innocent people including Metropolitan Philip and Prince Alexander Gorbatyi-Shuisky. Ivan in 1565 divided his realm in half and created the Oprichnina, which was mostly Northeastern Russia, directly ruled by Ivan and policed by his Oprichniki, who were originally his personal servicemen and later became murderous thugs, under Ivan's continuously deteriorating mental state and growing paranoia: "they [the *oprichnik*i] first bite like dogs, then sweep everything superfluous [that is, 'treason'] out of the country."[22] They "pillaged not only the commercial premises and warehouses but also the homes of the townspeople. Anyone who tried to oppose the

violence was killed on the spot."[23] Under Ivan, Russia was a powder keg of high emotions, terminal disease, and devastating starvation. When war torn Ivan looked to wealthy Novgorod for help and they refused, he released his most infamous anger upon them. Ivan literally massacred Novgorod in 1570,

> [o]n 2 January the vanguard of the oprichniki reached Novgorod. They sealed up the property of the monasteries, churches and the houses of wealthy individuals, and carried out arrests. On the evening of 6 January Tsar Ivan himself arrived in Novgorod…The victims were set alight with a mixture of inflammable substances, tied to sledges and taken to the Vokhov, where they were thrust alive beneath the ice. It was not only adult men who were put to death in this way, but also their wives and children.[24]

Ivan ordered his Oprichniki to murder the inhabitants of Novgorod, the estimates for the number of victims is as high as 10,000-15,000; after Ivan's pillage of the city; it never again reached its previous glory. Ivan's ultimate cruelty was however to his own son. In 1581, Ivan attacked his son's pregnant wife for wearing immodest and inappropriate clothing. His son came to her rescue. During the confrontation, Ivan hit his son on the head with his large staff, causing severe head trauma and ultimately death. Ivan lost not only his son but his grand child in the same instant for Ivan's son's wife miscarried because of Ivan's attack. Ivan's anguish as a child led to his instability as an adult and ultimately to the end of his family's dynasty. Ivan's cruelties could be in part to his alleged illness, many feel that Ivan suffered from syphilis. But the horrors of his childhood imprinted on his increasingly feeble mind resulted in a man torn from within.

Peter I also held on to the horrors he had undergone while a young child and the murderous impulses that had racked his dreams as a child continued into his adult years, materializing in grotesque diversions and cruel amusements. A contemporary of Peter, a Frenchman by the name of Foy de la Neuville who visited Russia in 1689 said,

> He amuses himself by making his favourites [sic] play tug o'war with each other, and often they knock each other out in their efforts to pay court. In the winter he has large holes cut in the ice and makes the fattest lords pass over them in sleds. The weakness of the new ice often causes them to fall

> in and drown. He also likes having the great bell rung, but his dominant passion is to see houses burn.[25]

Prince Boris Kurakin, who later became the ambassador to Holland, spoke of how,

> [F]at men were dragged through chairs, people's clothes were torn off and they were made to sit on ice with bare bottoms; they had to suffer candles being shoved up their backsides and air blown up them with bellows, resulting in at least one death. Even when he was a grown man, Peter continued to enjoy inflicting similarly humiliating physical violence on his friends as a joke and they had little choice but to grin and bear it.[26]

Peter's enjoyment of other's pain also manifested in his throwing tomatoes and other fruit at people to see their reaction, and having grandiose, exorbitant balls where he would force people to drink extremely strong alcohol to the point of severe intoxication resulting in not only sickness, but often death for if a person were to vomit he would be forced to drink more. His subjects were not people to Peter but his playthings in his game of life, and people were not human beings to Peter, but pawns in his farce of the world. Peter's treatment of those closest to him was the most tragic of all. His mother forced him to marry Evdokia Lopukhina in 1689. Despite her giving Peter an heir, the marriage was an utter failure and ten years later he had her sent to a convent. Peter had numerous mistresses, notably Anna Mons, but in 1703 he met Martha Skavronska a lowly servant girl who later became Peter's wife and took the name Catherine I. Peter later had his first wife and former mistress Anna Mons dragged from their homes and arrested on false charges of adultery. Peter's eldest and only surviving son Alexis was very much Peter's opposite; he was opposed to war and military life and Peter saw Alexis as worthless and undeserving of Peter's affections. Peter wrote, "Everyone is well aware of the wickedness, just like that of Absalom, with which our son Alexis was filled and of how his schemes were foiled not by repentance but by God's mercy towards our country."[27] After Alexis' return from an attempted flee to Austria, Peter had Alexis arrested and personally tortured him.[28] While the official report attributes Alexis' death to a seizure, "the violent Passions of the Mind, and the Terrors of Death, had thrown the Czarewitz into an apoplectick [sic] fit,"[29] rumors ran rampant that the young Czarewitz really met his death at the hands

of his father either by poison or Peter physically strangling Alexis.[30] Life was not sacred to Peter, he had been taught from a young age that people were expendable and that only through self preservation by keeping others at a distance and exposing their weaknesses could he protect himself.

Catherine II learned from a young age to disregard true emotions that despite her lusts for physical pleasures, people were of little worth to her, and that even her own son could never meet her ideals or fulfill her demands; people were instruments with which Catherine would meet her potential. Catherine's avidity for power made her relinquish all of her childhood beliefs and fervors, disavowing her roots and transforming herself into an empress, and while Catherine's exploits may have been less savage than those of Ivan IV, Peter I or Stalin, her indifference towards others remained strong. Catherine took advantage of her husband's, Peter III, impotence and weakness of mind and with the aid of her lover, Gregory Orlov and his brothers, Catherine overthrew her husband. She was proclaimed empress in her own right on June 28, 1762, in St. Petersburg. Peter who was not in the capital at the time, abdicated his thrown and was taken to an estate near St. Petersburg; a few days after his abnegation Peter was killed:

> It was officially stated that he had died of an attack of haemorrhoids [sic], but it is known that he died at the hands of Aleksey Orlov [Gregory Orlov's brother]…he was killed in the course of a drunken brawl, but there is no doubt that it was in the interests of the Orlov brothers to make him disappear, and that Catherine's position on the throne as empress in her own right was thus made secure. According to the available evidence she was not informed of the plot to murder her husband; on the other hand she must have realized that if he remained alive he would be a constant threat to her hold on the throne, and that her supporters were unlikely to let him live.[31]

However, the death of Peter was not the only murder that benefited Catherine, and while she was not officially implicated in the killing of ex-Emperor Ivan VI, her orders were the compelling force behind his death, "that if he [Ivan VI] fell sick, he was not to be sent a doctor (only a confessor). Furthermore, if any person whatever tried to approach No. 1 without an express order from the Czarina, the guards were to 'kill the prisoner and let no man seize him alive.'"[32] Ivan VI was killed in 1764, after an attempted

coup d'etat against Catherine to restore Ivan to the throne. Catherine wrote in response to his death, "[t]he ways of God are wonderful and unpredictable… Providence has clearly shown me its favor by bringing this affair to a successful conclusion…there were circumstances in which reason must dominate morality…the advantages of this affair far outweighed the disadvantages."[33] Catherine was cold and calculating in much of her affairs and the needs of the state far surpassed those of the individual. Catherine's methodical approach to state business is also clearly evident in her suppression of the surf rebellion in 1774, and her dealings with its leaders, most prominently Emelyan Pugachev. The leaders were taken to Moscow and tried in December of 1774: "[f]ive of them were sentenced to the barbarous forms of execution common at the time throughout Europe and the remaining eighteen to various forms of mutilation, corporal punishment, exile to settlement, or hard labor…On the secret orders of Catherine herself, Pugachev, and the others sentenced to be quartered, were beheaded first."[34] And while Catherine's mercy for Pugachev may appear to be benevolence, her true intentions were to maintain her appearance and protect her image on the world stage, "Catherine wanted to appear more humane than Louis XV had been with Damiens."[35] Catherine's occasional altruism was rooted in her artful mastery of Russian and European politics of the time, yet her ultimate miscalculation was her relationship with her son. From Paul I's birth Catherine had been uninterested in his life and posterity, "[t]he truth was that Catherine was more preoccupied with her own future at court than with the future of her child."[36] Catherine grew more indifferent toward Paul and even to hate him, seeing him more as a rival to her power than a beloved child of her womb:

> [S]he grew progressively colder toward this cunning, hate-filled adolescent. She knew too well that behind her back he cursed and insulted her with impotent rage. He reminded her of Peter III, and she regarded him as the enemy of her peace of mind, perhaps her throne…For him she always has the tone and manner of a sovereign, and this attitude is often combined with a coldness and neglect that disgust the young prince. She has never treated him as a mother treats a son. Therefore the Grand Duke behaves with her as if he stood before a judge.[37]

Catherine kept Paul away from the capital and out of politics until he was forty-two years old. She had hoped to keep him from ascending the

throne and even wrote a manifesto in which she passed succession to her grandson Alexander I. Alexander was however torn between love of his father and adoration of his grandmother. The combination of Catherine's premature death, mere days before the proclamation was made official, and Paul's abolition of the document resulted in Catherine losing her final battle with her son, and imbuing in him the same hate and horrors that had plagued her throughout her life.

Stalin, like his predecessors, had a fateful mix of paranoia and legitimate fear that haunted him from his childhood into his adulthood. His agonizing childhood left Stalin scarred and unable to cope with opposition, and when threatened he completely annihilated any hazard real or imagined. Stalin's more legendary exploits included the Great Fear where he ordered the deaths of thousands of Russians; sent others to hard labor camps, Gulags, which were death sentences in themselves; his purges of party officials where high ranking party members would be tried by NKVD troikas and sentenced to death; and his forced collectivization where he necessitated mass starvation. Vasily Grossman, a famous Russian poet said, "[t]he decree required that the peasants of the Ukraine, the Don and the Kuban be put to death by starvation, put to death along with their little children."[38] These were preceded by his terrorist attacks during the final hours of Czarist Russia. Yet his more private atrocities are far more heinous and they further reflected the pain and anguish that he suffered as a child: Stalin imposed both fear and admiration in his wives and children. Stalin's first wife Ekaterina (Ketevan) Svanidize was the love of his life; the only person who could soften this man of steel. Yet his work took precedent over her and their infant son, Yakov. He was rarely home, just like the father he barely knew. "His wife sat at home with no money and a wailing infant, and Koba [Stalin] had no money to pay for treatment [Ketevan was sick],"[39] Stalin lived and died a pauper; he detested money and riches, yet even to save the woman he loved he could not bring himself to break with his prideful disdain for money, "[t]hat was how he killed his first wife."[40] However, Stalin could not contain the remorse and sadness he felt at her passing, "this being softened my heart of stone; she's passed away and with her have gone my last warm feelings for people!"[41] The death of Ketevan further hardened Stalin and pushed him down his path of murderous revenge, as observed by Iremashvili a previous friend of Stalin, "I knew that thereafter Koba was bereft of any moral restraint and that he would from then onwards surrender himself entirely to his fantastic plans, which were dictated solely by ambition and vengeance."[42] Stalin's second wife, Nadezhda Alliluyeva, met with a similar fate to that of Ketevan, death at the unmerciful hands of Stalin; the death of

Ketevan was from neglect while Nadya's demise was more dubious. Nadya's life with Stalin was anything but peaceful, both were hot tempered and violent, Stalin with his curmudgeonly egotism and Nadya with her mental volatility. Nadya's life was strenuous, both working for the party and tending to her domestic duties, but it was too much, and the added pressure from Stalin broke her; "[t]he double role was very heavy and the lack of support from Joseph made it scarcely bearable. He was frequently late in getting back to the Kremlin flat. He was uncouth in manners and had an obscene tongue when irritated…Hating to be contradicted, he used the foulest swear-words on his wife."[43] The fights had been continuous and when combined with the probability of Nadya's mental instability (Schizophrenia, which had been documented to have affected previous generations on her mother's side) their life together was extremely capricious. Stalin wanted a meek wife and Nadya would not obey; finally on November 7, 1932, Stalin and Nadya had their final argument. The official belief was that after seeing Stalin flirt with the wife of Alexander Yegorov, Nadya was, "seized with jealousy and stormed out of the gathering."[44] Polina Zhemchuzhina ran after her and comfortingly walked around the Kremlin complex with Nadya trying to calm her nerves. Later Nadya returned to her Kremlin apartment and Polina to the party, but instead of resting Nadya took out the pistol her brother, Pavel, had previously given her as a present and, "Nadya's thoughts plunged into existential darkness…Seating herself on the bed, she pointed it [the pistol] at her heart and shot herself."[45] Stalin was unaware of the consequences of his behavior or the horrors that had occurred in their apartment until the next morning when he was roused by doctors and servants. However, great speculation surrounds the death of Nadya Alliluyeva and other accounts of that fateful night raise questions of how much the great dictator actually knew. Other versions of Nadya's death state that she,

> sat waiting [in their apartment], ready for a furious argument with him, to avenge herself by pouring out her resentment. He arrived the worse for drink. There was an argument in her room, then he, inevitably, treated her to a few soldier's oaths and went off to bed. She threw her rose after him. In her rage and despair, she seized Pavel's present…When he heard the shot he knew at once what had happened. He saw her on the bed, covered with blood…She was beyond help. So he decided to pretend that he was sleeping…The housekeeper went into her room.

> They woke him up. He realized that his enemies might say that he had killed her. It would be difficult to explain why he had not heard the shot in the silence of the night. It was then that he thought up the story, which everyone would have to repeat…'Even you, Comrade Kalinin, know that Comrade Stalin was with Comrade Molotov out of town at his dacha that evening.' The servants knew that he was in the apartment. And it was this strange divergence from the official version that gave rise to dreadful rumors.[46]

The death of Nadya was a trifle of a matter for Stalin he had her quickly buried along with the speculation and rumors. Stalin's distance and callousness towards his family was a direct result of his own adolescence and he passed that apathy onto his own children. Stalin's relationship with his eldest son Yakov from his first marriage was a mirror image of his relationship with his own father, distant and non-existent. Yakov could not measure up to Stalin's wishes and he did not wish to gain merits because of his father's rank and position. Yakov attempted suicide, but survived and furthered his father's shame; Stalin is quoted as saying, "he can't even shoot straight." Yakov served in the Red army during World War II and was captured by the Nazis and held captive in Sachsenhausen concentration camp. The Germans offered to trade Yakov for a field marshal who had been captured by the Soviets, but Stalin replied, "We don't trade ordinary soldiers for field marshals."[47] Yakov knew he had brought great disgrace not only upon his father but his country. He committed suicide shortly afterward by disregarding Nazis guards' warnings and threats. He ran toward an electrified fence surrounding the perimeter of the concentration camp he was then shot and fell upon the fence. Not even Stalin's most beloved child Svetlana Alliluyeva was safe from the venomous hatred that ran in his veins nourished by the horrors of his childhood. She had been the "apple of his eye," but with time and age, the vindictiveness seeped in. At his death, Svetlana was torn by feelings for the father she knew and loved and the dictator she loathed and feared and said,

> 'I was unable to sit or do anything but stand in the presence of what was occurring, I realized that a deliverance of some kind was under way. I had no idea what kind of deliverance it was or what form it was going to take, but I knew that for me and for everyone else it would be a release from a

> burden that had been weighing on the minds and hearts of us all.[48]

The anger, fear and hatred that had usurped Stalin's childhood turned him into a vengeful despot with no regard for the sacred nature of humanity.

These four rulers of Russia not only share similar characteristics in their childhood traumas, parental abandonment issues, and lack of respect for human life, but they shared a deeply ingrained need to further secure Russia's borders and glory sparing no expense. They spent their entire reigns investing in the future of a country that as children had shown no mercy or interest in their posterity, yet they sacrificed everything for the good of Russia, for an idea that their legacy would live on in the formation of a country larger than life and more distinguished than any before; they sought immortality for Russia and for themselves at any price: Ivan IV had the Livonian War, Peter I had the Great Northern War, Catherine II had the Russo-Turkish Wars, and Stalin had World War II. Their successes and failures in these helped to later shape the images held of them by history.

Ivan found himself fighting the Livonian War where he faced the Swedes, Lithuanians, Poles, and the Livonian Teutonic Knights. This devastating war dragged on for twenty-four years, brought economic and military hardships upon Russia, and succeeded in gaining her no new land. Russia was brought to her knees in destitution and misery, from drought and famine, Tartar attacks, Polish-Lithuanian raids, and the Swedes and Poles blockading her sea trade. The plague also ransacked Russia killing more than 10,000 in Novgorod and in 1570 between 600-1000 a day in Moscow. Yet, Ivan pushed forward determined to secure Russian gains no matter how great the sacrifice. He turned to Novgorod the oldest, and at the time, wealthiest city in Russia, yet when they would not yield to his demands he ordered the infamous Massacre of Novgorod. Ivan was so focused on the gains he wished to make, he could not be bothered with the horrendous toll it was taking on the people of Russia; Ivan cared so much to secure her borders that he was blind to her interior needs.

Peter I fought the Great Northern War during his reign. He declared war on Sweden led by King Charles XII, for his, "failure to give satisfaction for the insult inflicted on the Czar at Riga in 1697[49] and its illegal occupation of the Russian provinces of Ingria and Karelia."[50] But, in reality, the motivation, the true driving force behind Peter's war with Sweden was "dynastic considerations in the case of the famous 'warrior king' Charles XII, by his lifelong quest to maintain if not expand the Baltic empire he had inherited from his

predecessors of the Vasa dynasty…Peter, in turn, inherited their [Charles and the Vasa dynasty's] claim to certain Baltic territories that had been occupied for a century or more by Sweden."[51] The Great Northern War was a tumultuous effort for the Russians from disastrous defeats in the Battle of Narva in 1700 and Golovchin in 1708 to victories in the Battles of Lesnaya and Poltava on June 27, 1709. Peter then foolishly attacked the Ottoman Empire in 1711, after they harbored King Charles XII, which resulted in a massive loss for Russia, having to return to the Ottomans their Black Sea ports that Russia had acquired in 1697. Russia suffered other hardships due to the pressure which Peter placed upon his people, he spread them thin from fighting in the north and the south to building a new capital for his country; he cared not for the people, but for the glory of Russia and his own greed. It was not until 1721, that the Great Northern War finally came to an end with the Treaty of Nystad, where Russia received Ingria, Estonia, Livonia, and a large portion of Karelia, but had to pay two million riksdaler and surrender most of Finland. Peter had pushed his people until,

> Swedish forces had been soundly defeated at sea (1714), the Swedish warrior king, Charles XII, killed in battle (1718), and the Swedish homeland itself threatened with invasion. But meanwhile Peter hastened the buildup of St. Petersburg (and his Baltic fleet), sparing no expense…between 1703 and 1725 anywhere from 10,000 to 30,000 workers labored annually on the construction of the city.[52]

Peter sought the glory of Russia at the expense of the people. He would accept nothing less than perfection, perhaps a means by which to overshadow his own shortcomings, for what Peter saw lacking in himself was paid for by the people.

Catherine II had to deal with the Russo-Turkish Wars, epidemics and serf rebellions during her reign. Yet no matter the cost, she triumphed and allowed no obstacles to stand between her victory and the glory of Russia. The first Russo-Turkish War against the Ottoman Empire in 1768-1774 resulted in some of the greatest defeats in Turkish history and some of Russia's most decisive battles: the Battle of Chesma on June 25, 1770, the Battle at Larga in July 1770, and the Battle at Kagul on July 21, 1770. These great victories allowed Catherine to found new cities such as Odessa, Nikolayev and Kherson; she also obtained access to the Black Sea. The Ottomans started a second Russo-Turkish War, during Catherine's reign, 1787-1792, which

proved to be cataclysmic for the Ottoman Empire and legitimized Russia's claim to the Crimea. But in between these wars, Catherine had to deal with the serf rebellion, which reared its head and threatened her country's stability and tranquility. Serfdom reached its peak during Catherine's reign for to abolish serfdom would alienate her benefactors, the nobles whom she had to appease in order to secure her power. But the serfs called for change and to anger the serfs who made up the majority of the Russian peasantry could result in an outbreak of revolution similar to that in France. Catherine walked a fine line between peace and war, division and solidarity,

> Two years ago, in the center of the Empire I had the plague; now, on its borders, I have a political plague that is causing as much concern…With the help of God we will prevail, for this bunch of beggars have neither reason nor order nor cleverness on their side; they are only brigands come from everywhere, headed by an imposter as bold as he is shameless. It will all certainly end with the rope. But what a prospect for me, who do not like the gibbet! European opinion will think we have gone back to the days of Ivan Vassilievich [Ivan the Terrible].[53]

Catherine's concern was not for the people themselves, but for the state of her empire and the way in which the world viewed Russia. She proceeded, on all accounts, no matter what the deprivation, to ensure her country's security and expanse.

Stalin led the Soviet Union through World War II, seen by Russians and many other Eastern Europeans as the Great Patriotic War. Stalin had originally signed a secret pact with Germany, the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, a non-aggression pact; however in 1941 Hitler broke that agreement with Operation Barbarossa and invaded western Russia. Many theorists believe that Stalin knew the attack was coming, but that he wanted to use Germany's aggression as a means to legitimize the war and anger the Russian people so as to rally support for the war effort. As a result of Stalin's hesitation, after the initial attack, German troops made huge advances into Russian territory killing and capturing millions of Soviet troops. Stalin feared that Hitler would be able to use enraged Gulag prisoners against the Soviet Union as he pushed further into Russia. Stalin, therefore, gave the order to the NKVD (later KGB) to take care of the situation by executing hundreds of thousands of prisoners and deporting others. Stalin used a scorched earth policy, destroying infrastructure

and food supplies so as to hinder German troops, but at the cost of thousands of Soviet civilians who suffered and starved. He issued Order No. 227 on July 27, 1942 which read, "any commander or commissar of a regiment, battalion or army, who allowed retreat without permission from above was subject to military tribunal. The Soviet soldiers who surrendered were declared traitors."[54] According to the historian Alan Bullock,

> The huge number of Russian troops taken prisoner in the first eighteen months of the war convinced Stalin that many of them must have been traitors who had deserted at the first opportunity. Any soldier who had been a prisoner was henceforth suspect…All such, whether generals, officers, or ordinary soldiers, were sent to special concentration camps where the NKVD investigated them…Twenty percent were sentenced to death or twenty-five years in camps; only 15 to 20 percent were allowed to return to their homes. The remainder were condemned to shorter sentences (five to ten years), to exile in Siberia, and forced labor-or were killed or died on the way home.[55]

Stalin left his soldiers no choice but to fight to the death, he cared not for the number of casualties, but only that Russia remain a power so as to further its strength after the war, "to weaken both the Western nations and Nazis, to make them suitable for 'Sovietization.'"[56] Stalin wanted to ensure that Russia was the ultimate power after the war and keep open the possibility of spreading the Soviet ideals to eastern and parts of central Europe. The war, however, left Russia feeling the brunt of the casualties; they suffered the second highest number of civilian loses, roughly 20 million, and the highest number of military loses more than 8 million. But Stalin kept pushing his young soviet comrades into battle, knowing that the large population and land mass of Russia could survive with massive losses of life; he felt no remorse for the soldiers and civilians killed; he felt they were a necessary loss for the great war effort and the continued survival of Russia.

These four sovereigns have been shown to possess similar core characteristics, that they are more alike than different and that perhaps history has painted an unfair picture of them. That while the stereotypes of these four do have credence and are rooted in truth, that there is more to them than people realize. However, a difficult childhood does not give one license to be abominable and in truth all of Russian society, from peasants

to nobility had to deal with incredible amounts of violence and hatred. But what distinguishes between "great" and "tyrannical"? Why has history chosen to cast aside certain follies and highlight others? The answer lies in that greatness is subjective, people from different walks of life will see and regard distinguishing characteristics adversely; no two people are exactly alike and therefore their interpretation of others can never be identical. Yet who is to say that greatness has pleasant or appealing connotations, it can also refer to the size and magnitude of an object or person. So perhaps with this definition, greatness refers not merely to exceptionally benevolent, generous rulers, but to those whose impact has far surpassed that of others, that their presence and power can in many ways still be felt today. In that light Ivan IV, Peter I, Catherine II, and Stalin are all deserving of the title of great. History is indeed the final judge and only after inspection of a person's entire life can the impact of their reign be fully appreciated, therefore further inspection of each of these distinguished persons' lives is needed. Their actions, their legacies are the true testament to their lives.

Ivan IV Vasilyevich, Ivan the Terrible

According to Pavlov and Perrie,

> Like Peter the Great-with whom he had much in common-Ivan has acquired a cultural significance which transcends that of most other historical figures, however eminent. Peter symbolizes all the dilemmas of Russia's relationship with the West: the need for economic modernization in order to ensure political survival, at the cost of cultural deformation; and the employment of barbaric means in order to bring about supposedly civilizing ends. Ivan is associated with the contradiction of state building. He has been seen as the founder of an autocratic monarchy which subordinated all of society to itself, sacrificing the freedom of the individual in the interests of the strength, security and order of the realm.[57]

Ivan IV or Ivan the Terrible was a man of contradiction and like in life, his memory in death is just as incongruous. Was he, Ivan the awesome of Kazan or Ivan condemned the terrible? He walked a fine line between madness and sanity, and led his country to order through chaos. He descended from grace to aberration, but his ultimate goal had always been to strengthen Russia's worldly standing. So who was the man behind the mask of stern autocracy? Was he a wise ruler or a mad despot? The reality is that the truth lies somewhere

in between.

The union of Ivan IV's parents Vasily III and Elena Glinskaya was a union condemned by the church and seemingly damned by the heavens. Before Ivan was even born, he was said to be a curse upon his father, an elderly peasant woman shouted to Vasily while he walked to church in the early weeks of his wife's pregnancy, "[y]ou shall have an evil son, your nation will fall pray to terror and fears, rivers of blood will flow." The very night that Ivan IV was born, August 25, 1530 lightening struck the Kremlin, announcing to all, that he had arrived. Ivan's childhood was racked by trials and tribulations; in complete isolation, he fell prey to his own outlandish and fearsome imagination. His only companion, his younger brother, Iuri, born October 30, 1533, was of little comfort for he was born mentally disabled. Ivan's father died February 4, 1533. Ivan became czar at three years of age with his mother as his regent, however, with her death five years later, Ivan fell victim to the covetous wills of the wealthy boyar families, primarily the Shuisky clan, who fought viciously for control and power over ancient Russia. Ivan was left with nothing, but deafening silence and blistering seclusion. In his solitude, he taught himself, "he was a very studious child, very bright, he read a lot, and he was extremely religious."[58] In 1544, Ivan assumed control from the Shuisky boyars and on January 16, 1547 he had himself crowned czar at the Cathedral of the Dormition, a monumental step in Russian history for Ivan was the first grand prince to proclaim himself a czar.

Ivan's destructive and cruel impulses resulting from his horrific childhood were silenced by the Great Fire in 1547, which caused Ivan to repent for his sins and try to atone for the evil he had done. This phase in Ivan's life and reign was peaceful and productive (1547-1560); he surrounded himself with young, idealistic people, not members of the wealthy classes of Russian society, but those who hoped to revolutionize Russia and create a land of opportunity. Ivan decided that he needed to marry as was dictated by Russian Orthodox tradition and he chose Anastasia Romanovna Iur'ieva Zakhar'ina. They were wed on February 3, 1547. Later in that same year, Ivan made connections with Great Britain and brought over scientists and other intellectuals so as to help modernize Russia's intelligentsia. In 1549, he created the Zemsky Sobor or the 'assemblies of the land' which "brought together selected (or elected) representatives of the various estates, the Boyar Council, the Church Council, the higher court ranks and the top level of the merchantry."[59] Ivan saw its formulation and summons as, "an indication that the Russian state had now been converted into a 'monarchy governed by representative estates.'"[60] It was seen as a young and blossoming constitutional state, a step toward a

country where legislation and constitutional changes had to be approved by a representative body. Yet the czar could still issue orders at will, and therefore, Russia was still far way from a constitutional or even parliamentary monarchy. Ivan broke with tradition when he abandoned the established order of precedent dictated positions, where prominent families were recorded, and if the czar chose to dishonor a family, they were demoted; Ivan re-organized so that merit determined appointments, a system of meritocracy and order. He created the first prikaz or order, which was in keeping with his evolving form of leadership. Ivan's prikaz was the law which governed Russia and also the governing body which administered that law. He in essence, established the first Russian government.

Ivan continued to foster new and innovative advancements for Russia throughout the 1550's, ranging from a new law code, to a standing army, to fixed taxes, and the unification of the Orthodox Church's teachings. In 1550, Ivan introduced the new law code known as the Royal Law Code or Sudebnik which,

> significantly improved the system of regulation of judicial proceedings, limited the powers of the namestniki [Moscow appointed servicemen who govern the provinces] and extended the rights of elected representatives of the local population in administrative and judicial affairs. It introduced for the first time a system of punishments for officials who abused their powers. The Code established strict forms of state supervision over the activities of officials, which was to be exercised by members of the newly formed bureaucratic apparatus of the chancelleries-the secretaries. Taking into consideration the interests and demands of various sectors of society, especially the nobility and the townspeople, the compilers of the Code introduced a number of important new statutes…The Code also took into account the special interests of the townspeople.[61]

The code clearly reflected the direction and nature of the reforms of Ivan's new government. He created a standing army, the strel'tsy, and by creating a fixed tax, abolished the old system of feeding, where government officials would leach off of the people. Ivan also had a hand in reorganizing the Church, reaffirming its position, and unifying its rituals and regulations through the entire country during the Council of a Hundred Chapters which convened in January-February 1551. At the council, Ivan,

> denounced the moral vices of the secular and ecclesiastical authorities, and called upon society to mend its ways. Apparently the young tsar, who vividly remembered the abuses committed by the boyars in the years of his minority, was greatly impressed by the idea of the moral reconstruction of society, and the introduction of order and legality into the land for which he was accountable to God.[62]

Ivan overall sought structure and orderliness for his country and his people through all of his reforms. He wanted to establish Russia as a world power, to learn from advanced countries and to one day surpass their prodigiousness.

On October 2, 1552 Ivan conquered Kazan', one of his greatest accomplishments leading to great land expansion and new freedoms for Russia, but it was not without its price. The siege of Kazan' and the resulting wars with the Khanates took its toll on Russia. Ivan decided, "to put an end for ever to the instability on her [Russia's] western and southern border and to the perpetual and damaging Tatar slave-raids to which she was so vulnerable."[63] He saw the "opportunity for intervention," when the Khan of Kazan' died in 1549: he began his first campaign against Kazan' in that year, but "it became bogged down owing to an unseasonable thaw which prevented Ivan's forces from crossing the river Volga."[64] In 1550, he embarked on a second attempt but it was as indecisive as the first due to similar circumstances. Ivan decided then to follow his father's example and build a fort above the city dominating the river at Sviiazhsk, which resulted in many Tatars deserting to Moscow. With so many losses in man power and other pressures, and hoping to avoid further war, Suiunbek (wife of the late Khan) and her son the baby Khan abdicated and agreed to the restoration of a previous Russian nominee for their czar, Shigali, Khan of Kasimov. Suiunbek and her son were sent to Moscow, "weeping… and lamenting her sad fate."[65] However, once in power Shigali began to make trouble for Ivan and despite Ivan's attempts at negotiations, Shigali refused, "to act as Ivan's Trojan Horse within the city"[66] and war became inevitable. On June 16, 1552 Ivan began his fourth crusade against Kazan', "the Russians were well supplied with artillery, while the Tatars were unable to use more than their muskets and arquebuses. The twenty-two-year-old Tsar was in theory the commander in chief of the Russian forces and he had been very active in their inspection and in the various councils of war in Moscow."[67] On August 23, 1552, the seven week long siege of Kazan' began, and when fighting did break out it was horrendous, and heavy casualties were suffered on both sides.

However, after the fierce fighting the city fell to Ivan in October 1552 and, "the Russians turned aside for a while to indulge in killing and looting, in spite of Ivan's orders. The principality of Kazan' collapsed…Ivan marked the occasion by further prayer."[68] Shortly afterward, Ivan returned to Moscow to return to his wife, many of his officers felt that the security and stability of Kazan' required that he stay, but Ivan missed his wife deeply. Open revolt and un-subdued riots continued in the area for years, requiring Russia to keep troops stationed to try to maintain the peace, which "lead to many casualties on both sides."[69] Ivan had St. Basil's Cathedral erected on Red Square in 1555-61, to commemorate his triumph over Kazan'. St. Basil's Cathedral remains a lasting monument to not only the conquest of Kazan' but to Ivan himself. For like the Cathedral, Ivan inspired awe and fear in the hearts of his enemies, and it was from his triumph over Kazan' that Ivan received his infamous title of Groznyi which translates to Terrible. But it is not used in the sense commonly accepted today; it meant that Ivan was formidable, threatening, dangerous or awesome. One of the final joys in Ivan's life, before his legendary decline, was the birth in 1554 of Czarevich Ivan, Ivan's only son who lived to maturity. Ivan's early reign was characterized by religious piety, revolutionary zeal, and a genuine love for his country.

In 1560, however, the legendary Ivan IV appeared as his sanity slowly drained away and was replaced by an ever growing, overpowering paranoia and dementia. The catalyst for this change was the death of his beloved wife, Anastasia in August 1560. She died mysteriously and Ivan became suspicious, believing she had been killed. The veil of peace and tranquility was quickly torn away and Ivan began to remember all the pain and suffering of his childhood, and how people had been displeased with Anastasia's low birth. He felt the isolation creeping back as the icy breath of cynicism and distrust grabbed hold of him. Ivan plunged into darkness and despair and Russia went with him. In 1558, Russia found herself fighting the Livonian War which would drag on for twenty-four years and result in no great acquisitions, just pain and suffering and numerous deaths. Russia was also devastated by droughts and famines and the plague swept across the country claiming thousands of souls. During this time of great anguish, Russia needed Ivan more than ever to pull himself out of his continual downward spiral and restore Russia to her former glory, but he responded with violence unleashing his Oprichniki, who were once his personal servicemen. They became assassins, bandits, and murderers following down the same path of hate and destruction. In 1570, Ivan ordered the Massacre of Novgorod. He pillaged, plundered, raped and murdered the inhabitants of the once illustrious city. Ivan had a perverted spirituality, the

more blood on his hands the more devout he became. His atrocious behavior culminated in the death of his only surviving son Ivan Ivanevich on November 16, 1581 following an altercation with his father over the treatment of Ivan Ivanevich's pregnant wife. Ivan lost both his son and grandchild in one night, his family, his country, his very sanity had slowly slipped away from him and his goal, his dream to transform Russia into a modern power, rivaling Europe had vanished from his sight forever.

On March 18, 1584 Ivan IV died, after fifty-one years as Czar of Russia. His death is clouded in suspicion as is customary with controversial and epic leaders. The day of his death had been foretold by soothsayers and Ivan had been warned much like Caesar had been told to "beware the Ides of March." Ivan said, "'I am poisoned with disease; you see they [turquoise and other semi-precious stones, believed to change color in the presence of poison] show their virtue by the change of their pure color into pall; declares my death.'"[70] Later that afternoon,

> Ivan looked over his will…ordered his physician and his apothecary to attend him to the bath, and then sent for a report from his witches, because the day foretold for his death was coming to an end. But he was warned that there was still time, for the day only ended when the sun went down. In the afternoon he went to the bath, 'solaced himself and made merry with pleasant songs as he useth to do.' He then went to bed well refreshed, in his loose gown, shirt and linen hose, and sent for a chess board.[71]

The final moments of Ivan's life are shrouded in mystery. Was Ivan murdered or did he die a natural death? The most reliable source is the memoirs of Jerome Horsey who wrote, "[s]uddenly the tsar 'faints and falls backward'. A great commotion ensued. They sent for alcohol, and also for his confessor and physicians. 'In the mean [time]…he was strangled and stark dead'-clearly hinting that Ivan Groznyi suffered a violent death."[72] But the ambiguous language of Horsey leaves open to interpretation whether Ivan choked or was suffocated by his supposed friends and confidants. Despite the circumstances of Ivan's death, the nature was undeniably agonizing, and they brought with them the close to a long and arduous chapter in Russian history, the life and reign of Ivan IV a man of contradictions, who walked a fine line between compassion and cruelty and found redemption in defiance and greatness in tears.

Peter I Alexeyevich Romanov, Peter the Great

> We could enthuse forever about the greatness of Peter's actions and still not depict in all its fullness, brilliance and worth everything that he accomplished…But in creating, he destroyed. He caused pain to all in whom he came into contact. He disturbed the safety, peace, prosperity, interests, strength, well-being, rights, and dignity of everyone he touched. He made things unpleasant for everyone. He did harm to everyone. He touched intellectual, political, social, financial, family, moral, and spiritual interests. Is it possible to love such a statesman? In no way. Such men are hated.[73]

Peter I, a formidable ruler, pushed Russia forward, forced great strides in modernization and never looked back. He created a Russia that externally rivaled Europe in culture, style and accomplishments, but internally the ramifications were cataclysmic; such drastic reforms effected so quickly, shook Russia to her foundations and caused great resentment. A country as diverse and encompassing as Russia, one whose people yearn for tradition, could not just forget her past. Yet Peter's achievements brought Russia to the forefront of European politics and world affairs; he converted Russia from a backward medieval society to a nation of possibility. Peter's contributions to Russia's progression took a heavy toll on Russia and her people, but he was a man of vision, and he aimed to surpass the world's expectations for Russia no matter what the cost. But was Peter a hero or a villain? Is Peter deserving of the legacy that history has bestowed upon him? Like Ivan before him and Catherine and Stalin yet to come, Peter's image, his memory, his ultimate greatness has been greatly shaped by history, and the lies and truths that it has allowed to flourish.

On May 30, 1672, Peter Alekseevich was born in Moscow to Czar Alexis Mikailovich and his second wife, Natalia Kyrillovna. However, the exact place of his birth is disputed since most children of the czars were born in the Kremlin, yet rumors abound that he was born, "in the royal palace at Kolomenskoe to the south of Moscow (which a Russian poet later dubbed the 'Russian Bethlehem') or at the significantly named village of Preobrazhenskoe (Transfiguration)."[74] No matter what the reality, Peter I would later live up to these legends, because for many he was Russia's savior. In 1676, Czar Alexis died and was succeeded by his eldest son Fyodor III, but his reign was short lived and he died in 1682 leaving no heir. The turmoil in Peter's life began when disputes erupted over who would follow Fyodor. Peter's older brother Ivan V was the next in

line, but he was mentally disabled and the Duma chose the ten year-old Peter to succeed Fyodor. In 1682, Peter became czar with his mother as regent. But in April, the strel'tsy rebellion engulfed the capital, and Peter became a joint czar with Ivan V and his half sister Sophia Alekseevna as regent. Peter remained permanently scarred from the atrocities that he witnessed during the uprising, and his comprehension of the dignity and worth of human life was completely destroyed. Sophia reigned as an autocrat for seven years, keeping, Peter, her only rival for power, far away from the Kremlin, and not allowing him to become inducted into court life or Muscovite society. However, Peter's mother pushed for Peter to embrace Russian tradition and on January 27, 1689, he was forced to marry Evdokia Lopkhina, a devout orthodox Christian and a woman deeply rooted in custom. In the summer of 1689, he planned to take power away from Sophia, whose strength and support had weakened due to two unsuccessful Crimean campaigns. Sophia hearing of this began to conspire with the strel'tsy to attack Peter, but Peter was warned by loyal strel'tsy officers and he fled to Troitsky Monastery. From the monastery, he gained power and force and overthrew Sophia. He maintained his position as a joint czar with Ivan V, with whom he never had bad relations, and sent Sophia to a convent. In 1694, Peter's mother died and with her his ties to the past. "[S]he [his mother] was the person who had provided what security and continuity Peter had known. With her death, many links to the past were broken and lip-service to the old ways could be abandoned more easily."[75] In 1696 Ivan V died and Peter was left as the sole ruler of Russia.

Peter grew to be a giant of a man, although not a healthy man, he would not allow his imperfections to undermine his ambition and determination. Filippo Baltari, a young Italian who visited Russia during Peter's reign commented,

> Tsar Peter was tall and thin, rather than stout. His hair was thick, short, and dark brown; he had large eyes, black with long lashes, a well-shaped mouth, but the lower lip was slightly disfigured…For his great height, his feet seemed very narrow. His head was sometimes tugged to the right by convulsions.[76]

The traumas of Peter's childhood left mental complications, which physically manifest in facial tics. The Russian artist Valentin Serov described Peter as,

> He was frightful: long, on weak, spindly little legs and with a head so small in relation to the rest of his body…he looked more like a sort of dummy with a badly stuck on head than a live person. He suffered from a constant tic and was always making faces: wrinkling, screwing up his mouth, twitching his nose, wagging his chin.[77]

Yet despite his physical and health problems, Peter sought glory for Russia. He wanted Russia to be a maritime power and thus needed more sea ports. His White Sea harbors were not enough to satisfy his lust, and he turned his attention to the Baltic Sea, in the north, controlled by Sweden and the Black Sea, in the south, controlled by the Ottoman Empire. Peter was forced by an agreement with Poland, which ceded Kiev to Russia, to declare war on the Crimean Khan and the Ottoman Sultan; his primary goal was to take the fortress of Azov, near the Don River. In the summer of 1695, he embarked on his Azov campaigns, but they failed miserably. In November of that year, he returned to Moscow and built up his navy.

> Early in 1696 he implemented a number of measures, characterized by what was to become the typical 'Petrine' use of speed, technology, mass recruitment and command from above. The prime example was the preparation of the galleys at Vonexh on the Don for a renewed campaign in 1696, a huge effort in which thousands of the tsar's subjects were expected to do their bit, from the leading churchmen and merchants who reluctantly supplied the cash to the hapless laborers drafted to hack ships out of green wood At the end of May 1696 Peter's land and water-borne forces—46,000 Russian troops, 15,000 Ukrainian Cossacks, 5,000 Don Cossacks and 3,000 Kalmyks—laid siege to Azov.[78]

His siege was successful and in July of that year, he took the fortress of Azov. Peter was very persistent. He knew what he wanted and went after it with great zeal. However, he was not a foolish man and he knew that Russia could not fight the Ottoman Empire alone, and in 1697, he left Russia for Western Europe with his "Great Embassy" in hopes of allying with the monarchs of the west in a combined effort against the Ottomans. However, the Europeans were not interested in war with the Turks and they declined Peter's requests. The Great Embassy, however, continued on its tour of Europe, traveling for

eighteen months. Peter visited England, the Holy Roman Empire, France and the Netherlands, learning about western culture and European society. He became immersed in the new and foreign experience; he absorbed all the knowledge he could learning about shipbuilding in Deptford and artillery in Königsberg. He gained practical experience at the Dutch East India Company shipyard in Amsterdam, the largest private shipyard in the world. He studied with skilled workers in areas such as lock making and fortress and ship building; he learned and perfected over twenty-five different trades. However, his enlightening tour of Europe was cut short, when he was forced to return home because of another strel'tsy rebellion. The rising tide of the strel'tsy rebels was easily calmed and the rebellion was over before Peter even returned. However Peter remembered the horrors of the strel'tsy rebellions during his childhood and he unleashed his hatred and rage upon these strel'tsy, "1,182 strel'tsy were executed and 601 flogged and banished. Men were broken on the wheel, heads were displayed on poles, corpses strung up. The execution of the stel'tsy, some beheaded by Peter himself."[79] Peter also questioned Sophia because of her involvement in the previous strel'tsy revolt.

> On 27 September Peter went in person to the convent to question Sophia, the first recorded meeting between them for nine years…In the end Peter made do with inflicting a symbolic death on his troublesome half-sister, who was forced to take the veil under the name Suzanna and to live under a stricter regime. To rub it in, a few corpses of executed strel'tsy were strung up just outside the windows of her living quarters and left there to rot.[80]

Peter rid himself of the strel'tsy burden once and for all by having them disband. He also freed himself of his traditional bondage by divorcing his wife Evdokia in 1698 and forced her to take the veil in 1699. Peter then turned himself to his revolutionary aspirations, inspired by western thought and practice.

Peter was disgusted at his antiquated country, and decided that radical changes were needed. He looked to his mentors in the west and received the revelation of reformation. He reformed three major areas of Russian society: military, domestic, and administrative. He forced his country to accept the west through ruthless, even brutal means; he was determined to shatter tradition. No matter what actions became necessary, Peter would dim the

light of Russia's past and illuminate the future which lay in advancement and westernization.

Peter's military reforms centered on a new vision for Russia based primarily on Prussian, British, and Danish models, which drastically modernized Russia's army and navy. "[T]he general trend in the Muscovite military since the sixteenth century had been modernization and change. Peter regarded Ivan IV (the Terrible)…as his 'forerunner and example.'"[81] In 1699, he greatly enlarged his army and made it a professional unit; he had a clear and definite vision for his foreign policy and he needed a strong, organized army to see it through. All of his soldiers received similar training creating a cohesive, uniform unit; he created two elite regiments, "the Preobrazhensky and Semeovsky which were to be the personal troops of the czar."[82] Peter in 1705 opened the ranks of the army to nobles and serfs alike, making conscripted service a possibility for all Russians. The navy was Peter's most prized creation and he based it at the mouth of the Don River. By the time of his death in 1725, "Russia had 48 major war ships, 800 auxiliary craft, and 25,000 sailors; they were a force sufficient enough to unnerve Britain's King George I."[83] Peter's new military and wars were an expensive undertaking, which put great stress on the Russian people who had to finance the operation through their blood, sweat, tears and most importantly taxes, because Peter would do anything to fund his military reforms.

Peter's domestic reforms were the most expansive and encompassing. They ranged from church and education reforms, to travel, economic and industrial reforms. In 1700, the Patriarch Adrian died and Peter did not replace him; he wanted complete control over every aspect of his kingdom and would allow no exceptions. Yet the people of Russia were devoutly religious and pleaded for a patriarch, someone to save their immortal souls, but Peter, "tired of being pestered with requests to fill the vacancy, beat his breast and yelled…flinging a dagger on the table: 'Here's your patriarch.'"[84] He completely abolished the church hierarchy in 1721 with the Ecclesiastical Regulation, which placed the church under the control of the Holy Synod or a collective patriarch. They were 10 to 12 clerics, elected by the clergy, who dictated the function of the church, but who were directly under the supervision of the czar himself.

> By creating the Holy Synod to replace it [the patriarch] he [Peter] had incorporated the administration and revenues of the church into those of his reformed state. 'Secularization' in this quite specific sense of the term, meaning significant institutional and legal enlargement of the state's wealth and

> authority at the expense of those of the church, and the political subordination of the latter to the former, has long been regarded as a major aspect of political modernization.[85]

Peter bent the clergy to his will, thus furthering his hold over the population of Russia and ensuring his position by gaining complete and total subordination. Peter's reforms in education and travel were another way of enriching his country and bringing them closer to European standards. Peter knew that in order for his military to be strong the officers had to be educated; he had seen, while in Europe, the importance of math and science for military success. In 1701, he founded the School of Navigation and Math in Moscow, similar schools for languages and artillery were also created. In 1707, a School of Medicine was created and in 1715, a School of Engineering. In 1724, a School of Science was founded, but the lack of Russian scientists required that the professors be foreign. Peter understood that not only the nobility needed to be educated, but that in order for Russia to distance herself from her barbaric reputation, every Russian must be educated. Peter decided to erect elementary schools or math institutions in every province and by the time of his death forty-two such schools had been built. He also stressed travel for all of his people; Peter did not fear new ideas or insightful learning, rather he encouraged it. He wanted his people to learn about the latest technologies, economic theories, and political science; Peter felt that expanding knowledge would serve as a great asset to Russia and did not see it as a threat to his reign. He also created an environment in which women could have social lives. "He acted to raise the status of women, declaring that they must not remain secluded in the terem, but should be present with men at dinners and on other social occasions."[86] He wanted his court to follow western society, which opened many doors for people's rights and freedoms.

> He banned the old Muscovite system of arranged marriages in which bride and groom had no choice in the matter… and that the bridegrooms symbolic wielding of the whip at wedding ceremonies be replaced by a kiss. Peter forbade the killing of newborn infants who were deformed…he prohibited the unrestricted sale of herbs and drugs by street vendors…and he forbade the wearing of daggers or pointed knives which turned drunken street brawls into bloody massacres.[87]

All of these resulted from Peter's social reforms. He also reformed Russia's economy. He increased taxes with a direct tax on households, and in 1718 a soul tax on all males, except clergy and nobility, and additional taxes on Old Believers and beards, Peter's way of further emphasizing the disdain he felt for tradition. He increased industrial production, allowing serfs to work in factories with permission of their owners. However, despite all of his domestic accomplishments, Peter failed to create an industrial revolution, which would not come to its full fruition until the twentieth century under Stalin.

In 1703, Peter began construction on St. Petersburg, the "window to the west" and the ultimate tribute to himself:

> St. Petersburg remains the great monument to Peter's revolution in Russia. The straight streets, broad avenues, and intersecting canals of the central city, its oldest parks and buildings, its Peter-Paul fortress and church, its celebrated statue of the Bronze Horseman [actual erected under Catherine II, in honor of Peter], are all potent reminders of the city's founder. This is particularly true of St. Petersburg's very location, on the Baltic Sea at the extreme western edge of the Russian heartland. Its choice as the site of Russia's capital, which it remained for two hundred years, is explicable only in terms of Peter's vision of making Russia an integral part of Europe-of bringing Russia into the modern world.[88]

St. Petersburg was officially made Russia's capital in 1712 and would remain so for two hundred years until 1918. However, Peter's reforms broke the country into provinces and created localized governments which reported to the czar. He also re-organized the central government establishing a governing senate in 1711, which evolved into a chief executive and eventually the highest court of appeals. In 1718, he abolished the Prikaz, originally founded by Ivan IV, replacing it with twelve colleges run by ten to twelve men, whose decisions were collective and who specifically functioned to oversee all of Russia, but they received their direction from Peter, who was in every aspect a true autocrat. Another of Peter's administrative reforms was his Table of Ranks. The system was a table with fourteen steps in the military promotional scale and eight in the civil and administrative scales, those who reached the top steps in each of the scales were granted noble status. It stated that,

> promotion was based on merit and length of service instead of social standing or family connections [similar to Ivan IV's merit system], which had been the Muscovite custom. According to the Table, hereditary noble status was automatically conferred on any man who reached the rank of major or its equivalents in the navy and the civil and court services (royal court, not judicial court).[89]

Peter's final administrative reform was his alteration of the inheritance and succession laws. Peter had been very unhappy in his first marriage to the beautiful but miserable Evdokia. When he fell in love with a fourth-rate Lithuanian noble woman turned servant, Martha Skavronska (later Catherine I after she converted to the Orthodox Church and secretly married Peter in 1707), he decided to change inheritance rules to spite the nobility who found their relationship distasteful. He made it so that the czar could name his successor, not have one dictated to him.

In 1700, Peter declared war on Sweden in an attempt to finish the goals he had set at the beginning of his reign, to establish more sea ports for Russia; he also sought lands that he felt inherently belonged to Russia, but had been stolen by Sweden. The Great Northern War lasted until 1721, when the Treaty of Nystad was signed resulting in land gains for Russia but at great economic and human costs. On October 22, 1721, following a speech by the archbishop of Pskov in commemoration of the victory over Sweden, Peter received his illustrious title of, "the Great, Father of His Country, Emperor of All the Russias" from Gavrilla Ivanovich Golovkin, the State Chancellor, who continued to sing Peter's praises with, "he has brought us out of the darkness of ignorance onto the stage of glory before the eyes of the whole world and, as it were, transformed us from non-existence into being, bringing us into the society of political nations."[90] These happy times were a far cry from the atrocities that Peter had carried out only a few years previous. In 1704, he had had Evdokia and his former mistress arrested on false charges, and in 1718, he had brutally tortured and killed his only surviving son, Alexis Petrovich.[91] Peter's vicious, heartless, impervious nature often reared its ugly head even amidst his greatest glories; in Peter's life there could be no time completely devoid of animosity, he had been raised where love and hate were interchangeable and therefore had to continually remind himself and others of the ugly side of fate.

In 1723, Peter began to suffer from urinary and bladder problems, and while he had never been a healthy man these problems would lead Peter to

his death. Peter had Catherine crowned empress in 1724, even though he still remained the true ruler of Russia. It was his final attempt at dishonoring the previously entrenched customs of old Russia; by having a common servant as an empress, Peter had finally severed all of Russia's former ties. One of Peter's last contributions to Russia was the construction of Peterhof "the Russian Versailles" the lavish summer palace, known for its cascading fountains and panoramic view of the Finnish Gulf. In the summer of 1724, a team of doctors performed a necessary surgery on Peter, releasing more than 4 lbs. of blocked urine. Peter remained bedridden until late autumn. At the beginning of October, feeling that he was healed he began a lengthy inspection of various projects. Rumor has it that in November while at Lakhta on the Finnish Gulf, Peter saw a couple of drowning soldiers so he waded out into the freezing water to help them, however this act of heroism exacerbated his condition and he succumbed to uremia on January 28, 1725. An autopsy of Peter done shortly after his death revealed that his bladder had become infected with gangrene. Peter died without naming a successor and legend says, "shortly before losing consciousness, he is said to have scrawled a note: 'Leave all to…' and summoned his daughter Anna."[92] Peter was fifty-two years old and had reigned for forty-two years; he had forged an idea of continual competition with the west that would evolve into an eventual distrust and never really fade; his rule was a time of constant change with an atmosphere of uncertainty. People are and always have been creatures of habit, they seek stability and routine predictability, yet while Peter did not understand this nor recognize the dignity of human life, he did recognize people's potential and pushed it to the extreme, completely revolutionizing Russia in just thirty years through force and fear, and in that lies the true greatness of Peter I.

Catherine II Alexeyevna, Catherine the Great

> [Catherine] had 'the soul of Brutus combined with the charms of Cleopatra.'[93]

Catherine II was a woman of immense power and prestige in a time when women's rights were just beginning to emerge; she expanded Russia's borders exponentially and shaped Russia's history and destiny more so than any ruler before or after her with the exceptions of Peter I and Stalin. She sought honor and triumph for Russia and exaltation for herself. She was a woman obsessed with her image and legacy; she would wrench every drop of pertinacity and insurgency from her people, then lavish upon them ideals of enlightenment and philosophical piety. Catherine knew that only by releasing Russia from its

shackles of darkness, could she emerge a sovereign of elevated thinking and refined wisdom and appear to the world to be a benevolent empress. Catherine was a shrewd politician and a formidable queen, but she was only human and susceptible to mortal whims. Therefore the truth about Catherine is that she was not the god-like figure that had been fabricated for her by many of the leading enlightenment thinkers of her day, but a woman of flesh and blood who aimed for immortality and achieved greatness.

On April 21, 1729, at Stettin in Pomerania, Sophie Friederike Auguste von Anhalt-Zerbst, was born to Prince Christian Augustus of Anhalt-Zerbst, a Prussian general and governor, and Johanna Elizabeth of Holstein. Little "Figchen" as her father affectionately called her grew up in a devout Lutheran home, from which her father was often away and where her mother who abhorred her low ranking position in society took all of her bitterness and self-pity out on Figchen. She, however, was a brilliant child, whose intelligence far surpassed her years. Taught by a French governess and other foreign tutors, she had a very liberal education; she spoke both German and French fluently. She was chosen as a potential wife for the prospective Russian Czar, Peter of Holstein Gottorp, because of the political dealings of Count Lestocg, a French adventurer and advisor to Empress Elizabeth of Russia, and Frederick II of Prussia. They hoped that with Figchen and Peter's union the bond between Prussia and Russia would be strengthened. Figchen was torn away from the only parent who showed her any love or attachment in the interests of the state, because of her mother's hope that with her daughter's high match, she would finally be awarded the honors that her birth was due. Yet while Empress Elizabeth Petrovna grew very fond of Figchen, she began to hate her mother. Johanna's arrogance infuriated the empress, and she was exiled and banned from Russia. The diplomatic intrigue of Prussia failed due largely to Johanna's exploits and interventions. Figchen knew that the only way for her to survive in this foreign court was to fully immerse herself in the culture; she dedicated herself to learning the Russian language and would stay up late at night, pacing in the freezing cold till she memorized her lessons. Her efforts resulted in March of 1744 in a severe case of pneumonia to which she almost succumbed. However, she made up her mind that she would become the Empress of Russia no matter what the cost; at fifteen years old she had already seen more than people twice, even three times her age and her worldly outlook and maturity would benefit her greatly. She knew where she wanted her life to lead, and would allow no obstacles to hinder her. The Baron de Breteuil, the French ambassador to Russia, said that, "[s]he [Catherine] has told me that from the

moment she set foot in Russia, she had always been concerned with ruling there alone."[94]

On June 28, 1744, she bid farewell to her little Figchen identity and with her all the pain of her past and ushered in her future, her destiny. She was officially accepted into the Russian Orthodox Church and took the name Catherine II Alexeyvna. On August 21, 1745, she married the Grand Duke Peter in St. Petersburg and they moved into the palace at Orienbaum, where the "young court" would reside for the next sixteen years. On January 5, 1762, Empress Elizabeth died and Peter took the throne as Peter III of Russia and Catherine became the Empress Consort of Russia. Their marriage was a failure for they were complete opposites, Catherine was mature and refined and Peter was impotent and childish; Peter took a mistress Elizabeth Voronstova and Catherine began her long line of liaisons starting with Sergei Saltykov, Stanislov Poniatowski, and Gregory Orlov. They totaled twenty-one in all including her favorite Gregory Alexandrovich Potemkin, whom she was rumored to have married in 1774 and who, after their physical attraction faded, provided her with other consorts.

> Potemkin examined and tested all of Catherine's potential lovers. For she never lost her sex drive…she would lavish her lovers with gifts and when they had run their course, they would be provided for by Catherine and Potemkin-with endowments, land, and serfs…her last lover was twenty six years old and after two faithful years of service died of exhaustion.[95]

Catherine also made several influential and powerful friends, who were dissatisfied with Peter's policies and eccentricities, including Princess Ekaterina Vorontsova Dashkova, the wife of the brother of Peter's mistress. Peter's admiration for Frederick II of Prussia and his insistence on assisting his native Holstein in an unpopular war sealed his sad fate. In July 1762, Peter left for Orienbaum with his Holstein relatives and his mistress, leaving Catherine alone at the Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. On July 13 and 14, the Leib Guard revolt led Catherine to overthrow Peter and claim the Russian throne as her own:

> [t]he crowds were so dense on the Nevsky Prospect that, wide as it was, the avenue was completely blocked. From all over the city townspeople had come to join the soldiers

> in acclaiming the heroine of the day. A sea of joyful faces surrounded the barouche. Above the mass of heads danced sabers and rifles held aloft at arm's length.[96]

The people cried out to her saying, "[l]ong live our Little Mother Catherine! We are ready to die for her!"[97] The Baron de Bruteuil, described the juxtaposition between Peter and Catherine. "Everyone hates the emperor…The empress has courage in her soul and in her mind; she is loved and respected as the emperor is hated and despised."[98] And Claude Carloman de Rulhiere, the Baron's secretary also commented on how Catherine had the true air of a sovereign. "Nature seemed to have formed this Princess for the highest state of human elevation…Her figure is noble and agreeably impressive; her gait majestic; her person and deportment graceful in the highest degree…Every feature proclaims a superior character."[99] Peter abdicated the throne and was taken to Rapsha; where three days later on July 17, 1762, he was murdered by Alexei Orlov. Catherine claimed not have ordered the killing, but she did benefit greatly from it, just like with the deaths of Ivan VI and Princess Tarakanova,[100] which eliminated all threats to her reign and secured her throne. Catherine knew she was not the legitimate Empress of Russia, but she followed the precedent put forth by Catherine I who succeeded Peter I in 1725. The nobility believed she usurped the throne and they tolerated her reign solely as an intermediary until her son Grand Duke Paul was old enough to take power: "[f]or the time being, the frail child with blond curls served to legitimize her conduct in the eyes of her subjects. But he must not supplant her in the favor of the public. She meant to rule not only during her son's minority but for as long as she had strength to do so."[101] Catherine knew the nobility's wishes, but she was determined to govern Russia until her death so she kept Paul far away from the capital in seclusion and practical imprisonment in Gotchina and Pavolovsk. She could not dispose of Paul without a horrendous uprising, but she did keep him in constant fear. "[H]e was afraid she would have him poisoned or stabbed. The mere sight of her made him think of death, the breath of the tomb hung about her."[102] Catherine was an empress first and foremost, a mother second; she would not allow her child who reminded her so much of her indolent, infantile ex-husband to take what was rightfully hers.

Catherine's faults as a mother were overshadowed by her triumphs for Russia. She highly subscribed to the enlightenment teachings and believed herself to be a "philosopher on the throne." She was an enlightened ruler, but one who often filled the role of a tyrant. She proclaimed her love for the ideals of liberty and freedom, "liberty, the soul of everything, without you all

is dead. I want the law to be obeyed, but I want no slaves. I want the general aim of making people happy, but no caprice, no fantasies, no tyranny which might undermine it,"[103] but under her serfdom reached its peak. "[S]he spread serfdom in Russia, increasing it two-fold."[104] She silenced the serf rebellion lead by Emelyan Pugachev, but showed mercy in the sentencing of its leaders, trying to appear fair and humane. She became a patron of arts, education and literature. The Hermitage Museum in the Winter Palace began as her personal collection. She wrote a manual for the education of young children for which she drew inspiration from John Locke and other enlightenment scholars. She founded Smolny Institute for the young daughters of the nobility, which became the best of its kind in all of Europe; she even opened its doors to the daughters of wealthy merchants. In 1783, she founded the Russian Academy of the Languages and, "showed a degree of originality in her appointment of a director most unusual in eighteenth-century Europe."[105] Catherine appointed her old friend Princess Dashkova as director, while this was a revolutionary move, placing a woman in a role of such prestige, it was not unusual for Catherine. She had years earlier appointed Dashkova as director of the famed Academy of Science in St. Petersburg. While Dashkova was not a scientist, she was well traveled and acquainted with high ranking people all over Europe and she, "set about organizing the setting down of the rules of Russian grammar and spelling, and she co-opted the leading Russian writers of the day to work with her in preparing the first dictionary of the Russian language, which began to appear in 1788." Catherine also wrote plays and novels, comedies and fictions; she cultivated lasting friendships with renowned enlightenment thinkers such as D'Alembert, Diderot and Voltaire. They all thought very highly of this enlightened monarch, Voltaire wrote,

> Oh God, who takest from me eyes and ears,
> Return them to me and I leave tonight!
> Happy the man who Catherine's discourse hears,
> Who looks upon her marvels with delight!
> Your talent, Catherine, is to charm and rule;
> I find the first more touching, I admit.
> The sage, who wonderingly admires your wit,
> Would, but on seeing you, become a fool.[106]

She called together the Grand Commission consisting of 652 members from every class and a multitude of nationalities to consider the needs of the Russian empire and rectify them using the enlightenment ideals. Catherine

prepared the Instructions for the Guidance of the Assembly, which she imbued with the teachings of Montesquieu and Cesare Beccaria. However, after over two-hundred meetings the commission had only discussed the theoretical and philosophical possibilities and was eventually abolished in response to the Pugachev serf rebellion. Catherine had laid the groundwork and opened the doors for great writers such as Pushkin, who wrote many works dedicated to Catherine. However, she was not completely radical and freethinking; she was not without her censorship. In 1790, with the publication of his work Journey from St. Petersburg to Moscow, about the harsh conditions of the peasants and serfs and the potential for uprisings, M. Radishchev was exiled to Siberia for publishing inflammatory materials intent on inciting an uprising against the crown.

Catherine's contributions to the arts are without rival, but her advancements for Russia go far beyond poetry and enlightenment beliefs, she also introduced healthcare and a more liberal and tolerant government. Catherine brought in German physicians. She knew that having a healthy populace would ensure a more prosperous and peaceful country. She introduced inoculations, and set the precedent by being among the first to be vaccinated.[107] In 1785, she created two new charters the first: the Charter of the Nobility, which allowed the nobility to approach the court with their concerns and voice their opinions; the court would listen and consider ways in which to better serve the people. The second was the Charter of the Municipality, which allowed towns to have self-governments resulting in the local people having more control of their lives and the conditions in which they lived. Catherine loved her country, and knew its improvements were reflections on her role as its monarch; she therefore would tolerate no failures and always had her eye on the future, she lived by, "life consisted of looking straight ahead, not back."[108] Catherine looked to perfect her country inside and out.

Catherine's external achievements and foreign policies resulted in extensive expansions of Russia's borders and its solidification as a European power. Under Catherine, Russia gained: Belarus, Crimea, Courland (modern day Latvia), Lithuania, New Russia (modern day southern Ukraine and part of southern Russia), and Right-Bank Ukraine. The Russo-Turkish Wars in 1768-1774 and 1787-1792 gave Russia access to the Black Sea, control of southern Ukraine and legitimized Russia's claim to Crimea. Catherine remained ever conscious of her legacy and longed for the monarchs of Western Europe to accept her and recognize her as an enlightened ruler. Russia's relations with Western Europe flourished, and established Catherine as a power among their ranks. Catherine served as an international mediator in disputes that could have

and most likely would have led to war, such as between Prussia and Austria in the War of Bavarian Succession (1778-1779). In 1780, she created a group to defend neutral shipping against Great Britain during the American Revolution, and she refused to intercede on behalf of Great Britain in the matter. In 1788-1790, she found herself fighting the Russo-Swedish War against her cousin Gustav III of Sweden, which resulted in a huge defeat for Sweden. After the Battle of Svensksund in 1790, they signed the Treaty of Värälä on August 14, 1790, and all territories conquered by both Sweden and Russia were returned to their original ruling counties and peace resounded for the next twenty years because of Catherine's excellent diplomatic abilities. Catherine was also very instrumental in the destiny of Poland. In 1763, she put her ex-lover, Stanislav Poniatowski, who was still in love with Catherine, on the Polish throne. She did this as a way of politely disposing of her former lover as well as keeping Poland under her control. In 1790, she took the lead role in the partitioning of Poland. She feared that the enlightenment ideas that she use to foster would cause a huge reaction after the model set forth in the French Revolution. She supported the Targowica Confederation, a Polish anti-reform group, which wanted to stop modernization in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. With the defeat of the Polish loyalist forces in the War in Defense of the Constitution in 1792 and the silencing of the Kosciuszko Uprising in 1794, Catherine concluded the final partitioning of Poland between Russia, Prussia and Austria in 1795. Catherine made her presence felt not only within Russia, but throughout Europe; she was feared and respected throughout the world. A diplomat of unmatched poise and a global advocate the likes of which had never before been seen.

On November 5, 1796 Catherine suffered a stroke while in the bath and died at 10:15 pm the following evening, never having regained consciousness. Catherine's final wish was to keep her repugnant son, Paul from becoming czar, and while she drafted a manuscript officially naming her grandson the future Alexander I as her heir and successor, she died mere days before the document was made public. Catherine was sixty-seven when she died and had spent her life trying to fully immerse herself into a country that had once been a foreign enigma to her; Voltaire explained Catherine as, "unique in this world. She has sent forty thousand Russians to preach tolerance, with bayonets at the end of their muskets…She has sent armies on the march…in order to force [people] to tolerate each other."[109] Catherine's incongruity manifest itself in her love for Russia,

> [she] loved Russia's faults, even as she swore to reform them. Fundamentally Western in her lucidity, her penchant for classification, her practical sense, her indomitable vitality, she was both annoyed and charmed by the dreaminess, the nonchalance, the fatalism and sudden extravagances of this people that had become hers.[110]

Catherine was an autocrat and self proclaimed liberal, who held a great aversion to rustling the social fabric; she was a woman of contradiction. Yet, a character of such epic magnitude could not go quietly into the night. Several rumors, some blatantly false and others with hints of truth surround the death of the mighty empress. Attempts at tarnishing Catherine's image, her most precious possession, centered on her legendary voracious sexual appetite. They stated that Catherine really died attempting to engage in sexual intercourse with a stallion, but the harness holding the heavy beast broke and she was crushed under the weight, however such rumors are obvious malicious concoctions and scholars lend them no credence. Yet, speculation that Catherine was murdered by a vengeful servant while indisposed inspires more belief, since she did die from complications while in the lavatory. Pushkin wrote in an untitled poem, "Decreed the orders, burned the fleets / And died boarding a vessel" or the last line can be translated, "And died sitting down on the toilet." However, Pushkin's poem was not to promulgate the rumors but to make fun of their absurdity and that of those who believe in them. Catherine was not as revolutionary as Peter I or as destructive as Ivan IV, she did not blindly force policies on a reluctant society; she understood the delicate balance in which her power lay, she said, "what I despair of overthrowing I undermine" and she was not willing to sacrifice her absolute power. While she could be ruthless in her quest for preeminence, Catherine found her greatness in her sensitivity to possibility and her vision for change.

Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, Stalin

A Prince must possess the nature of both man and beast.[111]

Stalin industrialized Russia, revolutionized her government and took the world by storm. He inspired both fear and awe in the most powerful men and the lowliest peasants.

He was gripped by an omnipotent paranoia, and an obsession to surpass the west; he forced his comrades into submission through coercion, and then

sentenced them to an agonizing death in his hard labor camps. A man isolated by choice, yet longing for companionship, his fate was a never ending fear of failure and a continual self-loathing that haunted him until his death. Stalin is a character cloaked in mystery by his own doing and one that the world wishes it could forget, but continually remembers. His atrocities can not be denied, but his contributions to Russia must not be forgotten. He knew, "that the Reformer Tsar, Peter the Great, had also brought countless of his countrymen to their graves. Yes, millions had perished. But with their bodies he had paved the way to tomorrow, and brought the Great Dream [beating the west] closer to realization."[112] Stalin is remembered for his murderous tyranny and ruthless cunning, but who was the man behind the enigmatic name (Stalin from the Russian word for steel)? Was he a cold, hard monster or a man damaged by circumstance? Should all the horrors that he put the people through negate his accomplishments? Stalin is an ambiguous character, perhaps the most idiosyncratic of the four discussed; cost and benefit had no significance to him, the means were irrelevant, the end was all that mattered. Thus to label Stalin as one thing or the other is a mistake; he can not be defined nor can his worth or greatness be ubiquitously measured.

December 21, 1879, Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili was born in Gori, in the province of Tiflis in Georgia. His father, Vissarion Ivanovich, was a poor Georgian peasant from the village of Didi-Lilo and his mother, Yekaterina Georgievna Dzhugashvili, was from the village of Gambareuli. Vissarion was a cobbler and a drunk, who beat his wife and son in his drunken fits. A childhood friend of Soso's (Stalin's Georgian nickname) once wrote, "those undeserved and fearful beatings made the boy as hard and heartless as his father."[113] But Soso never cried, he closed himself off and erected distancing boundaries between himself and the outside world, a means of self-preservation. In 1888, his father left, but the beatings continued as his mother took his father's place. That same year, Soso entered the Gori Spiritual School. He was fascinated by literature, especially stories of Georgian mountaineers who bravely fought to defend Georgia; his favorite was Koba, a name he would later adopt as his pseudonym in the communist network. Soso graduated first in his class and was awarded a scholarship to attend the Orthodox seminary in Tiflis in 1894. He did so not because of his own spirituality, which was sorely lacking, but for his mother and out of a lack of other options. While in seminary, he was introduced to the socialist movement and joined the Georgian Social-Democratic Organization. In 1899, he was expelled for behavior unbecoming of a priest. He had fathered a child out of wedlock, but the party would later cover it up and deem that he was expelled for "socialist tendencies."[114] He then

joined the terrorist underground networks in the Caucasus and took the name Koba. Between 1902-1917, Koba was arrested seven times for terrorist attacks, such as robbing banks to finance the Bolshevik Party, and exiled to Siberia; each time, he escaped and returned more determined than before.

Koba's personal life was marred with death, betrayal and minimal failure. His first wife, Ekaterina Svandize, who he married in 1903, passed away in 1907 and any sentiment of love or affection that he had died with her. They had one son Yakov Iosifovich Dzhugeshvili, who Koba barely knew and found to be a disappointment. Yakov died in a Nazis concentration camp in 1943, after shaming both his father and country. On March 24, 1919, Koba married Nadezhda Allileyva, who died in 1932 under mysterious circumstances. They had two children together, Vasili Iosifovich Stalin born March 21, 1921, who rose among the ranks of the Soviet air force and died in 1963 from alcoholism, and Svetlana Alliluyeva born February 28, 1926, who immigrated to the United States in 1967. In 1937, his mother died and while relations between them had been strained since he left the seminary, he held his mother in very high esteem. Koba did not attend her funeral, nor had he seen her in many years, but they often wrote and in 1935 he did visit her,

> 'Why did you beat me so hard?' he asked his mother. 'That is why you turned out so well,' Keke answered. And 'Joseph-who exactly are you now?' his mother asked him. It was difficult not to know who her son had become, when his portrait was displayed on every street… 'Remember the tsar? Well, I'm like a tsar." To which she said… 'You'd have done better to have become a priest.'[115]

He provided for his mother and honored her as he should, but he could not bare the torment of seeing her often, the memory of his dark childhood was too imposing.

Koba rose through the ranks of the communist party quickly. In 1912, he was placed on the Central Committee and adopted the name Stalin. While, Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders were in exile in 1917, he was the editor of Pravda, the official magazine of the communist party. In May of that year, he was elected to the Politburo of the Central Committee, the governing body of the Communist Party, a powerful position which he never relinquished. From 1917-23, he served as the People's Commissar of National Affairs, for which he may have been nominated in part because of his work discussing an orthodox Marxist position entitled, Marxism and the National Question.

From 1919-22 he was the People's Commissar of the Workers and Peasants Inspection, and from 1920-1923 he served as a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic. On April 3, 1922, he was appointed the general secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party. Stalin then began to plot his ultimate triumph by filling the party ranks with his supporters and people indebted to him. Before his death in January 1924, Lenin had tried to expel Stalin from the party's leadership, but after suffering from strokes he was unable to communicate his concerns effectively. After Lenin's death, Stalin took a moderate stance in the ensuing power struggle between Leon Trotsky and Nikolai Bukharin, joining for the time in opposition with Lev Kamenev and Grigori Zinoviev. Stalin would later betray them by manipulating and juxtaposing them against one another, both dissolving their power and legitimacy in the eyes of the people and opening the way for him to "reluctantly" assume control of Russia. Stalin was very manipulative; he used and betrayed his comrades, elevating them to power and then when it most benefited him taking that power away by exposing their secrets to the Russian people. Stalin preached a policy of "Socialism in One Country" during a time when Russia was tired of wars and ready to redirect her vision inward. Stalin said, "[o]f all the treasures a State can possess, the human lives of its citizens are for us the most precious."[116] He won the admiration of the people with his image of a "man of the people" coming from humble roots and mild aspirations as opposed to Trotsky's more radical plan of permanent revolution.

Stalin greatly influenced soviet society in every aspect from the secret service, to industrialization. Yet his reforms were coupled with failures; they mixed the good with the bad. During Stalin's time he vastly increased the power and amplitude of the Soviet Union's intelligence agencies.They established branches in most of the world's major countries: France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan and the United States. He saw no difference between espionage, state sanctioned violence, and political propaganda. He incorporated all of these into the duties of the NKVD (later and more widely known as the KGB). The full strength and abilities of the NKVD was epitomized in the assassination of Trotsky in 1940 in Mexico: "[t]he Boss's [Stalin's] agents stalked Trotsky throughout the thirties. This was yet another form of torture: torture by the constant threat of death. At last, in 1940, one of the Boss's emissaries…split Trotsky's skull, exposing the brain of which he had been so proud."[117] One of Stalin's great accomplishments was the industrialization of Russia, but it came at the cost of collectivization and mass starvation at the end of the 1920's. He replaced Lenin's New Economic Plan with his Five Year Plans, which were

highly ambitions programs of state run "crash industrialization" combined with the collectivization of agriculture. He financed these by restraining the Soviet people's consumption and ensuring that that excess was then put into re-investment and industry by exportation. Stalin also extracted resources from the kulaks, wealthier peasants. His plans resulted in extreme economic growth, estimated at about 5.8%, through maximizing efficiency and scale of production, but at a steep cost. "Collectivization meant the effective abolition of private property in land, and the concentration of the remaining peasantry in 'collective' farms under Party control."[118] The living standards of the peasants plummeted, especially in the Ukraine and Kuban regions which were gripped by devastating famines between 1932-33, partly due to natural disasters but also imposed upon them by the government's high demands. People died in massive numbers from hunger and disease. A former activist once commented:

> On a battlefield men die quickly, they fight back, they are sustained by fellowship and a sense of duty. Here I saw people dying in solitude by slow degrees, dying hideously, without the excuse of sacrifice for a cause. They had been trapped and left to starve, each in his home, by a political decision made in a far-off capital around conference and banquet tables. There was not even the consolation of inevitability to relieve the horror.[119]

To add to the horrors, Stalin and his regime did not blame the failures on themselves or natural crop failures, but on the kulaks, which resulted in a movement known as de-kulakization, "[d]ekulakization meant the killing, or deportation to the Arctic with their families, of millions of peasants, in principle the better-off, in practice the most influential and the most recalcitrant to the Party's plans."[120] Stalin in one stroke passed the blame from himself for the deaths of the collectivization and eliminated a possible threat to the security of his administration. Stalin also showed his aptitude for tactful political withdrawl followed by intensification of initial strategies, a technique he procured from readings about Ivan IV, when he put collectivization on a hiatus due to being "Dizzy with Success" (an article from Pravda on March 2, 1930). He also fooled the world into blindly believing that the epidemic of famine in Russia was but a minor setback that had been overcome.[121]

Stalin's other accomplishments were in the areas of science, social services and culture, but just like industrialization, Stalin's reforms did not

come without their price. Science in Soviet Russia made great strides paving the way for atomic energy and space exploration, but the path to success was littered with atrocities. Scientists were under strict ideological controls, but they made great progress in "ideologically safe" domains such as technologies, genetics and cybernetics, because of growing education and governmentally funded research. In the late 1940s, he did try to suppress research in relativity theories and quantum mechanics, but leading physicists convinced him that their research must continue to beat the west in their efforts to create an atomic bomb. Stalin's scientists laid the groundwork for advancements such as the development of the BESM-1 computer in 1953 and the launching of Sputnik in 1957. Stalin's reforms in social services resulted in a degree of social liberation. Stalin also improved the healthcare system, which in turn extended the expected life span of the average soviet citizen. Pregnant women during Stalin's era had access to prenatal care and gave birth in hospitals; children born under Stalin did not have to fear typhus, cholera, or malaria. Stalin ensured universally accessible healthcare and education systems. The government funded schools and placed high importance on education; the first generation under Stalin was almost completely literate. He sent Russian engineers abroad to learn industrial technology, and brought in hundreds of foreign engineers to further enrich the Russian system. However, all this had to function within the ideological impediments which Stalin stressed; education and technology flourished within the acceptable limitations.

Stalin also touched Russian culture, both as a patron of the arts and eradicator. "Social Realism" for drama, literature, music, painting and sculpture was encouraged and promulgated, but the more traditional expressionism, abstract art and avant-garde were denounced. Famous artists, poets and writers were praised and emulated as well as repressed and executed. Anna Akhmatova was a celebrated Russian poet who was both persecuted and tortured for her pieces being, "devoid of Communist principles and ideas."[122] In 1921, her husband Nikolai Gumilev, another distinguished poet, was shot and her son Lev Gumilev was arrested and sent to the work camps for twenty years. She expressed the sadness and longing in her poem, "Requiem,"

> This was going on when only the dead
> Were smiling, glad of their peaceful composure.
> And when Leningrad was dangling
> As an unnecessary appendage of its jailhouses.[123]

Akhmatova, like many other unfortunate victims found that Stalin's opinion was crucial and his word final. For Mikhail Bulgakov, Stalin's opinion was his saving grace. Bulgakov was driven to destitution and despair, he wrote to Stalin begging for relief and Stalin granted it. His work *The Days of the Turbines* about sympathetic treatment of an anti-Bolshevik family caught in the Civil War was finally staged and ran for ten years at the Moscow Arts Theater. Stalin went to see the work several times, "Stalin had a strange, barely comprehensible love for this play and went to see it…on innumerable occasions."[124] Stalin also wanted to pay tribute to Ivan IV his inspiration and, "his favorite historical character;"[125] he therefore commissioned Sergei Eisenstein to make a film about Ivan. Stalin was a man of many layers, thoroughly cruel, yet appreciative of life's simple pleasures.

Stalin's more infamous dealings and exploits were his Great Purges and deportations known collectively as the Great Fear. It was a crusade to expunge the country of anti-Soviets, opportunists and revolutionary infiltrators, and to rid Stalin of any threats to his autonomy. Stalin became the head of the Politburo, but he did not have absolute power until the Great Terror of the late 1930s. The purges of the party ranks began after the assassination of Sergei Kirov on December 1, 1934. He had been Stalin's closest friend and confidant, but many scholars believe that Stalin had ordered the murder. He had succumbed to his paranoia, hearing too often Kirov's name where his should be and decided to strike before his opposition could arise, "[t]he Boss took Kirov to the station, and kissed him on the platform: it was not an easy thing to renounce a brother. He would kiss Kirov once more-as he lay in his coffin."[126] Kirov's death served a dual purpose for Stalin, it gave his purges legitimacy as he searched the party for competition, and yet seemed completely innocent of any wrong doing as he appeared the distraught, sorrow ridden friend.

Stalin's purges and deportations tried people before NKVD troikas, expelled people from the party, and if not murdered then sentenced them to life and ultimately death in the Gulag camps. The Moscow Trials, where the most influential and famous party members were tried were reciprocated throughout the country to fully cleanse the party. The Trial of the Sixteen in August 1936, the Trial of the Seventeen in January 1937, the Trial of the Red Army Generals including Marshal Tukhachevsky in June 1937, and the Trial of the Twenty-One, which included Bukharin in March 1938, produced many false confessions resulting in convictions for treason and ultimate death. After the party was purified, Stalin turned his attention on the Soviet people. People were arrested, disappeared into camps or were executed for being "enemies

of the people" and purportedly engaging in "anti-soviet activities." People would inform on each other in the hopes of expunging their name form the executioner's lists. These times inspired the Russian saying, "[h]e lies like an eyewitness."[127] As World War II drew closer the trials and executions slowed down, but the massive deportations continued, between 1941-1949, an estimated 3.3 million people were exiled to Siberia; whole ethnic groups were expelled from Russia: Armenians, Balkars, Bulgarians, Chechens, Crimean Tatars, Estonians, Finns, Greeks, Ingush, Jews, Kalmyks, Karachays, Koreans, Latvians, Lithuanians, Meskhetian Turks, Poles, Ukrainians, and Volga Germans and not until 1991 were they all allowed to fully return.

During World War II, Russia took the brunt of the Nazis force and won because of sheer numbers and determination. Many of Russia's hardships during the war were spurred by the harsh paradox that Stalin's purge of the military and failure to believe that the German attack was imminent left Russia vulnerable but Stalin's ruthlessness sealed their fate and ultimate victory. He would not allow Russia to be defeated by the Germans. He accepted his son Yakov's life as a sacrifice to the war cause, and told his soldiers that if they allowed themselves to become captured then they were traitors to their country. And while Russia and the world knew of his brutality, Stalin was both feared and loved. He met with Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt and later President Truman on several occasions: in Moscow, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Roosevelt referred to Stalin affectionately as, "good old Uncle Joe"[128] and Churchill on more than one occasion showered Stalin with praise and admiration. In Tehran, "Churchill presented the Boss with the Stalingrad Sword. 'Marshal Stalin,' he said, 'can take his place beside the major figures in Russian history, and deserves to be known as 'Stalin the Great.''"[129] And at the Yalta Conference, "Stalin made a very great impression on us…When he entered the conference room at Yalta everybody stood up as if at a word of command. And, strange to tell, for some reason stood with their hands along the seams of their trousers."[130] Stalin demanded respect without asking and commanded attention without speaking. He was a man that knew what he wanted and would not permit repudiations. The British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden stated,

> Marshal Stalin as a negotiator was the toughest proposition of all. Indeed, after something like thirty years' experience of international conferences of one kind and another, if I had to pick a team for going into a conference room, Stalin would be my first choice. Of course the man was ruthless

> and of course he knew his purpose. He never wasted a word. He never stormed, he was seldom even irritated.[131]

Stalin kept decent relations with the West as long as he needed, but once the war was over and lines were laid and boundaries drawn, the Iron Curtain fell and would not crumble until 1989. Russia occupied Eastern Europe and a large portion of Central Europe from eastern Germany to Albania. Russia also made alliances with soviet China and armed the newly formed communist North Korea. In 1952, Stalin performed one of his last foreign policy initiatives, the Stalin Note, which suggested German reunification and the disengagement of the Super-powers from Central Europe, but Britain, France and the United States dismissed his attempts at reconciliation with the West with suspicion.

On March 1, 1953, after a long night of drinking and socializing with his interior minister, Laurenty Beria, and the future premiers Georgi Malinkov, Nikolai Bulganin, and Nikita Krushchev, Stalin collapsed in his room. He suffered a stroke which left him unconscious and paralyzed on the right side of his body. While his guards were alarmed that he did not wake at his usual time, they feared disturbing him and therefore they did not discover him until late the following evening. He died four days later on March 5, 1953, at seventy-four years of age. Stalin's daughter Svetlana described her father's death,

> My father died a difficult and terrible death…God grants an easy death only to the just. The hemorrhaging had gradually spread to the rest of the brain. Since his heart was healthy and strong, it affected the breathing centers bit by bit and caused suffocation. His breathing became shorter and shorter…His face altered and became dark. His lips turned black and the features grew unrecognizable. The last hours were nothing but a slow strangulation. The death agony was horrible…At what seemed like the very last moment he suddenly opened his eyes and cast a glance over everyone in the room. It was a terrible glance, insane or perhaps angry and full of the fear of death and the unfamiliar faces of the doctors bent over him. The glance swept over everyone in a second. Then something incomprehensible and awesome happened that to this day I can't forget and don't understand. He suddenly lifted his left hand as though he were pointing to something above and bringing down a

> curse on us all. The gesture was incomprehensible and full of menace, and no one could say to whom or at what it might be directed. The next moment, after a final effort, the spirit wrenched itself free of the flesh.[132]

Khrushchev recounted Stalin's final moments from a slightly different angle. His account seemed to be from a grieving friend, which was a far cry from when he later openly blamed Stalin for all of the Soviet Union's atrocities. "It was painful for me to watch him [a medic] working Stalin over. I said, 'Listen! Stop it, please! Can't you see the man is dead? What do you want? You won't bring him back to life. He's already dead.'"[133]

Stalin laid in state with Lenin in his mausoleum until October 31, 1961, when he was finally laid to rest along side the Kremlin wall in an attempt at de-Stalinization. Rumors that Stalin's death was unnatural abound, and the evidence for them is extremely compelling. Once Stalin was found incapacitated, the Politburo, made up primarily of the four men that had been with Stalin on his last night, did not immediately call for medical attention. And as Stalin lay dying and people stood around powerless to stop it, mournful of the impending loss, Beria acted, "very nearly obscene…He was extremely agitated. His face, repulsive enough at the best of times, now was twisted by his passions-by ambition, cruelty, cunning and a lust for power and more power still."[134] Khrushchev also took notice of Beria's unsightly behavior.

> No sooner had Stalin fallen ill than Beria started going around spewing hatred against him and mocking him. It was simply unbearable to listen to Beria. But, interestingly enough, as soon as Stalin showed these signs of consciousness on his face and made us think he might recover, Beria threw himself on his knees, seized Stalin's hand, and started kissing it. When Stalin lost consciousness again and closed his eyes, Beria stood up and spat.[135]

The belief was that the four men closest to Stalin, those that would benefit most from his death had poisoned him. These ideas, however, are pure conjecture and will forever remain so; there will always be uncertainty surrounding the death of Stalin. Just as he was a mystery in life so he will be one in death. The truth of who Stalin was, is as complicated and complex as the web of lies which he wove to protect himself from the world. Who was Stalin? Who was Koba? Who was Soso? A terror of mythological proportions

like the Georgian hero he read about as a child? No, they are all Joseph Vissarionovich Dzhugashvili, a man born of the most humble beginnings and who at a young age was shunned by the world. Stalin's mother told him, she beat him to make him great and she did; she made him strong enough to give Russia the future. Stalin's name is synonymous with subversion, but in his rebellion, his insurgency against the established balance in Russia, Stalin gave Russia the world and in that lies his greatness.

Ivan IV, Peter I, Catherine II, and Stalin all altered the course of Russia's history and greatly influenced her destiny. Whether they have been remembered favorably or dishonorably, it must be remembered that history is not an unbiased judge nor free from exaggeration. People from different walks of life see historical characters in varying lights, and as Shakespeare once wrote, "[t]he evil that men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones."[136] Neither Ivan nor Peter nor Catherine nor Stalin were all good or all bad; they were as Russia is, "a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma."[137] All four of these legendary Russian rulers shared more than they differed, so why do people judge them so differently? Because truth is fleeting, belief is arbitrary, and greatness is subjective.

1 Leo J. Muir. <http://www.famousquotes.com> 11/15/06

2 Isabel De Madariaga. *Ivan the Terrible First Tsar of Russia*. New Haven. Yale University Press. 2005. Pg. 41. All further citations from this source will henceforth referenced as De Madariaga, Ivan.

3 Professor Igor Kyzmin. Class notes from History of Kievan Russe. St. Petersburg Polytechnic University. St. Petersburg, Russia.02/28/06. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Notes, Kievan Russe and the date they were taken.

4 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 41.

5 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 42.

6 Andrei Pavlov and Maureen Perrie. *Ivan the Terrible Profiles in Power*. London. Pearson Education Limited. 2003. Pg 32. All further citations from this source will be henceforth referenced as Pavolv and Perrie.

7 Lindsey Hughes. *Peter the Great A Biography*. New Haven Yale University Press. 2002. Pg 19-20. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Hughes.

8 Hughes. Pg 14.

9 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.

10 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.

11 Henri Troyat. *Catherine the Great*. New York. Meridian. 1994. Pg 2. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Troyat.

12 Catherine II, *The Works of the Empress Catherine II* (Sochineniya Imperatristy Ekaterini II), ed. by A. N. Pypin. 12 vols. St. Petersburg, 1907. In Russian and French.

13 Troyat. Pg 15.

14 Carolly Erickson. *The Life of Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia*. New York. Crown Publishers, Inc. 1994. Pg 56. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Erickson.

15 Troyat. Pg 48.

16 *The Memoirs of Catherine the Great*. Translated by Mark Cruse and Hilde Hoogenboom. New York. Modern Library. 2005. Pg 31-2. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referernced as Memoirs.

17 Edvard Radzinsky. *Stalin The First In-Depth Biography Based on Explosive New Documents From Russia's Secret Archives*. New York. Anchor Books. 1997. Pg 24. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Radzinsky.

18 Radzinsky. Pg 24-5.

19 Radzinsky. Pg 255.

20 Notes, Kievan Russe. 02/28/06.

21 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 30.

22 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 113.

23 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 151.
24 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 150.
25 Hughes. Pg 19.
26 Hughes. Pg 20.
27 Hughes. Pg 122.
28 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06
29 Hughes. Pg 129.
30 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06
31 Isabel De Madariaga. *Catherine the Great A Short History*. New Haven. Yale University Press. 2002. Pg. 3. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as De Madariaga, Catherine.
32 Troyat. Pg 156.
33 Troyat. Pg 165.
34 De Madariaga, Catherine. Pg 63.
35 Troyat. Pg 214.
36 Troyat. Pg 79.
37 Troyat. Pg 190.
38 Robert Conquest. *The Harvest of Sorrow Soviet Collectivization and the Terror-Famine*. New York. Oxford University Press. 1986. Pg 225. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Harvest.
39 Radzinsky. Pg 64.
40 Radzinsky. Pg 64.
41 Robert Service. *Stalin A Biography*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2004. Pg 70. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Service.
42 Service. Pg 70.
43 Service. Pg 233.
44 Service. Pg 292.
45 Service. Pg 292.
46 Radzinsky. Pg 294.
47 Radzinsky. Pg 476.
48 Svetlana Alliluyeva. *Twenty Letters to a Friend*. New York. Harper & Row Publishers. 1967. Pg 9. All further citations from this source will be referenced as Alliluyeva.
49 Peter had felt insulted in 1697 during his visit to Riga, when no special arrangements had been made for him and he was asked to move along by armed guards, while he was inspecting the ships in the harbor and sketching a plan of the fortification. He was insulted that he had not been treated as a czar and the high price of accommodations and transportation.
50 Hughes. Pg 60.

51 James Cracraft. *The Revolution of Peter the Great*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Harvard University Press. 2003. Pg. 31. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Cracraft.
52 Cracraft. Pg 139.
53 Troyat. Pg 212.
54 Professor Igor Kyzmin. Class notes from Russian Political Science: Common Era Russia. St. Petersburg Polytechnic University. St. Petersburg, Russia. 04/14/06. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Notes, Political Science and the date they were taken.
55 Alan Bullock. *Hitler and Stalin*. Parallel Lives. New York. Vintage Books. 1993. Pg 905.
56 Notes, Political Science. 04/14/06.
57 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 1.
58 Notes, Kievan Russe. 02/28/06.
59 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 77.
60 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 77.
61 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 66-7.
62 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 65.
63 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 92.
64 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 101.
65 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 102.
66 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 102.
67 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 102-3.
68 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 103.
69 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 105.
70 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 352.
71 De Madariaga, Ivan. Pg 352.
72 Pavlov and Perrie. Pg 197.
73 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06. Quoted Russian historian P. Kovalevsky.
74 Hughes. Pg 1.
75 Hughes. Pg 34.
76 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.
77 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.
78 Hughes. Pg 38.
79 Hughes. Pg 57.
80 Hughes. Pg 56.
81 Hughes. Pg 61.
82 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.
83 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06.
84 Hughes. Pg 63.
85 Cracraft. Pg 62.

86 Robert K. Massie. *Peter the Great His Life and World*. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. 1980. Pg 390. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Massie.
87 Massie. Pg 390-1.
88 Cracraft. Pg 164-5.
89 Cracraft. Pg 35.
90 Hughes. Pg 146.
91 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/04/06
92 Hughes. Pg 201.
93 Troyat. Pg 208
94 Troyat. Pg 158.
95 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/11/06.
96 Troyat. Pg. 128.
97 Troyat. Pg 128.
98 Erickson. Pg 206.
99 John T. Alexander. *Catherine the Great Life and Legend*. New York. Oxford University Press. 1989. Pg 5.
100 Princess Tarakanova was a woman who claimed to be the legitimate heir to the Russian throne, the supposed daughter of Empress Elizabeth. Catherine had her captured and imprisoned in the Peter and Paul fortress where she later died of tuberculosis in December of 1774. However a famous painting in 1864 by Konstantin Flavitsky depicts the legend that the Princess died in a flood in 1777.
101 Troyat. Pg 129.
102 Troyat. Pg 190.
103 De Madariaga, Catherine. Pg 4.
104 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/11/06.
105 De Madariaga, Catherine. Pg 99.
106 Troyat. Pg 159-60.
107 Notes, Kievan Russe. 04/11/06.
108 Troyat. Pg 231.
109 Letter of April 21, 1766. Cf. Daria Olivier, Catherine la Grande.
110 Troyat. Pg 145.
111 Robert Conquest. *The Great Terror A Reassessment*. New York. Oxford University Press. 1990. Pg 53. All further citations from this source will be henceforth referenced as Great Terror.
112 Radzinsky. Pg 296.
113 Notes, Political Science. 04/21/06.
114 Notes, Political Science. 04/21/06.
115 Radzinsky. Pg 24.
116 Great Terror. Pg 250.
117 Radzinsky. Pg 438.
118 Harvest. Pg 4.

119 Harvest. Pg 245.
120 Harvest. Pg 4.
121 Notes, Political Science. 04/21/06.
122 Professor Alexandra Raskina. Class notes from Masterpieces of Russian Literature of the 20th Century. Tulane University. New Orleans, Louisiana. 11/12/06. All further citations from this source will henceforth referenced as Notes, Russian Literature and the date taken.
123 Notes, Russian Literature. 11/12/06. “
124 Radzinsky. Pg 9.
125 Radzinsky. Pg 296.
126 Radzinsky. Pg 321.
127 Great Terror. Pg 109.
128 Radzinsky. Pg 4.
129 Radzinsky. Pg 497.
130 Radzinsky. Pg 4.
131 Anthony Eden. Memoirs 3rd Volume The Reckoning. London. CASSEL. 1965. Pg. 123.
132 Alliluyeva. Pg 10.
133 Nikita Khrushchev. *Khrushchev Remembers*. Translated and Edited by Strobe Talbott. Boston. Little Brown and Company. 1970. Pg 320. All further citations from this source will henceforth be referenced as Khrushchev.
134 Alliluyeva. Pg 7.
135 Khrushchev. Pg 318.
136 Shakespeare. Julius Caesar. Act 3 Scene 2.
137 Winston Churchill. <http://www.brainyquote.com> 01/05/07

Jason Straight

'Excess of Democracy' or Rule of Aristocracy: The Role of Socio-Economic Class in Shaping Anti-Federalist Thought

In the United States in 1787, "We the people" meant fewer than two thirds. The proposed Constitution had a significant number of opponents. Many felt, as prominent Maryland Anti-federalist Samuel Chase did, that "The [proposed] government is not a government by the people."[1] The opponents of the ratification of the Constitution were called "Anti-federalists," however; this term is a gross over-simplification of a highly diverse group of men with many varying interests. After the "Federalist" victory in the ratification debate, the term "Anti-federalist" was adopted by politicians, authors, and historians. The use of this term to describe the entire opposition has lead to a false appearance of unity within the Anti-federalist movement. There was not a united Anti-federalist position on almost any single issue and much Anti-federalist thought was an extension of existing social and political ideas to the proposed Constitution. Men in favor of democracy became Anti-federalists because of their view that the Constitution departed from democratic principles, while men who feared strong government opposed the Constitution because it worked to centralize the government.[2] Regional, social, and economic differences that predated the Revolution shaped Anti-federalist criticisms. Group ties could be stronger than political ones. Anti-federalists often had more in common with those of their own social standing than with other Anti-federalists. What united these diverse interests was opposition to the unamended Constitution and a name.

The term "Anti-federalist" itself was an invention of the pro-constitution party, who, in a shrewd move of politics, styled themselves "Federalists" and their opponents as "Anti-federalists."[3] By using an "anti" designation, the Federalists portrayed their opponents as mere "nay-sayers" who were unable to present a rival plan and could only attack the one that had been proposed.[4] Anti-federalists themselves rejected this term believing, correctly, that they were the true proponents of "federal" government and that a plan was already in place that only needed to be amended: the Articles of Confederation. Federal government, by the eighteenth century definition,

meant that of confederated sovereignties, such as the states under the Articles of Confederation. By this definition the "Anti-federalists" were the more "federal" party, this misnomer was reflected by Anti-federalist authors who signed their writings with pseudonyms such as A Federalist and The Federal Farmer. The line between Anti-federalist and Federalist was not always clear. Some Anti-federalists were not wholly opposed to ratification and some men, such as Edmund Randolph, found themselves on both sides at different times during the debate. Some Federalist concerns were almost indistinguishable from Anti-federalist criticisms.

Patrick Henry identified three social groups in American society: the well born, the middling, and the lower "Ranks." [5] The major strains of Anti-federalist thought can be connected to these social classes. Anti-federalism was primarily a rural movement,[6] and social lines were formed in this society around wealth and land ownership. The upper class was made up of large landholders, land speculators, and merchants, many of whom owned slaves or relied on bound white laborers. The middling class consisted of farmers, small land owners, artisans, and urban workers. The lower class, located primarily in the far western backcountry, was comprised of subsistence farmers many of whom did not own land and worked as tenant farmers or indentured servants. Most Anti-federalists of all classes agreed that unfair representation, encroachment upon individual rights, the potential for standing armies in times of peace, uncontrollable taxation, and over-centralization of the government were the major defects of the proposed constitution,[7] but the various groups within Anti-federalism disagreed over how to correct these defects.

Beyond disagreement on how to correct the defects of the Constitution, social classes had active mistrust of one another. Elite Anti-federalists feared popular dissent but recognized the necessity of lower class support. The lower and middling class Anti-federalists often spoke negatively of the "well born,"[8] but were willing to adopt ideas and arguments from the elite. These three socio-economic groups had differing views of liberty and the structure of government best suited to protecting liberty. Americans had been divided along class lines since colonization, while those in opposition to the Constitution were only united for a few years.

The roots of Anti-federalism as a political force can be traced to the Revolutionary and Confederation periods.[9] As Alexander Hamilton noted there were two main groups in American politics, one attached to "state" and the other to "Continental politics."[10] The majority of those who would become Anti-federalists fell into Hamilton's "state" group and most future Federalists into the "Continental" group, more commonly known as "Nationalists." Since

before the Revolution, these two groups had promoted different visions of the future of America. In 1767 Benjamin Franklin, in a letter to a British noble, wrote that, "America, an immense Territory, favour'd by Nature... must become a great Country, populous and mighty; and will in a less time than is generally conceiv'd be able to shake off any Shackles that may be impos'd on her."[11] Franklin was not alone in this view. Prominent men, including Henry Laurens, John Dickinson, and George Washington shared this vision of America's inevitable greatness.[12] Similar views were voiced during the ratification debate, mostly in Federalist writings such as Publius' Federalist no. 11, generally assumed to have been written by Alexander Hamilton. Leading up to the Revolution the Nationalists were in control of the colonial governments and had the strongest voice in Continental Congress. Around 1776, power in the Continental Congress shifted to those with a state-centered view, who, while not opposed to the expansion of the Unite States, were not willing to sacrifice the structure of the states to a national vision. The Declaration of Independence was a product of this state centered view and of popular democratic principles, and The Articles of Confederation would be the constitutional expression of these ideas.[13]

In 1807, John Adams wrote that "the principles of the American Revolution may be said to have been as various as the thirteen states that went through it, and in some sense almost as diversified as the individuals who acted in it."[14] Many different interests and desires were pursued in the Revolution which was both a struggle against the British and a struggle for control within the government at home. Class divisions were active during the war and divided Americans on their approach to the Revolution. Revolutionary action was sparked by the colonial elite to gain redress from oppressive British policies, but the elite wanted to avoid substantial change to the social structure of America. The lower classes, while resentful of British policies, had different aims in the Revolution, many saw the chance to gain more influence in the government. These two revolutionary visions were often at odds. Through the Revolution the elite gained their redress but not without the social upheaval they feared.

Most of the ideology and leadership during the American Revolution came from the upper class, many of whom were not wholly opposed to strong central government with coercive authority.[15] Since the beginning of opposition to Britain, notably in response to the Stamp and Tea acts, the elite had courted the lower class by necessity not out of democratic ideology. They remained fearful of the social upheaval that revolution could bring.[16] The colonial elite were the primary proponents of revolution but not originally of

independence. Many feared that a declaration of independence would provoke the lower classes to fight for a stronger position in the government.[17] The upper class rightly feared the lower class, as the history of colonial America was largely a history of protests of the populous against those authority.[18] Many of the elite were familiar with lower class dissent. In North Carolina, before the Revolution, lower class citizens from the far western counties had united in opposition to the upper class rulers in an action know as the Regulator Movement. The Regulator Movement, which lasted for three years, opposed what the lower class saw as corruption in the colonial leaders in the managing of taxation and running of the courts. Actions aimed at the elite continued to occur throughout the states before and during the Revolution. Regardless of the intentions of the elite, the Revolution altered the social foundations of American government. A situation was created where the government was answerable to the people who had the power to oppose, alter, or abolish it. Democracy, or the potential for democracy, was a chief result of the American Revolution.[19]

At the start of the Revolution, the Nationalists feared the removal of strong central government that would likely accompany a move for independence. Joseph Galloway, clearly expressed the Nationalist's view of independence, that without central British government "they [the states] are... destitute of any supreme direction... even to the settlement of differences among themselves."[20] When independence became a declared reality there was debate over what type of central government to create. Some Nationalists went as far as Edward Biddle who proposed, "Let us, in the name of GOD, at once have an empire, and place WASHINGTON at the head of it."[21] This Nationalist vision faced strong opposition from the states' power group that commanded the bulk of the small farmers in the rural areas of the country. The elite of the states group, with the support of lower classes, had forced the Nationalists into a declaration of independence and now threatened to block the creation, more truly the preservation, of strong centralized government.[22]

The Second Continental Congress that produced the Articles of Confederation originally intended to create a strong central government. The first draft of the Articles of Confederation—called the Dickinson Draft after its creator John Dickinson—had more in common with the later Constitution in the form of government it created than with the final draft of the Articles. The Dickinson draft placed national laws firmly above state laws. Article III of the Dickinson Draft stated that "Each Colony shall retain and enjoy as much of its present Laws, Rights and Customs, as it may think fit... in all matters that shall not interfere with the Articles of this Confederation." with the parenthetical

note that each colony "reserves to itself the sole and exclusive Regulation and Government of its internal police."[23] This clause was a vastly different grant of authority from the final draft of the Articles which granted that "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled."[24] Before adoption by the states, the Articles of Confederation were modified from the nationalist Dickinson draft to a confederated government largely out of fear that such a nationalistic vision would not be accepted by a majority of the people, who wanted to keep the states as strictly separate entities.[25] The old colonial aristocracy could not create a strong national government but they could keep all central authority from dissolving. Though drafted by Nationalists, the Articles of Confederation were a victory for the state's sovereignty group.

Although the power of the national government under the Articles of Confederation was vested in representatives to a congress, and not exercised by the people directly, the government was viewed by many as democratic. This view came from a classical understanding of government as consisting of democratic, monarchic, and aristocratic elements. In the eighteenth century, the congress was identified with democracy and the will of the people. To maintain democracy, the government was kept close to the people by vesting the majority of the power in the states and the people were given the power to recall their representatives. The elite Nationalists resented the nature of elections to Congress under the Articles of Confederation because they allowed those of lower rank to enter into the congress.[26] Although the confederated government granted more constitutional power to the people, many still resorted to rebellious uprisings. Shays' Rebellion and other riotous actions reflected the discontent many of the lower classes still held with the nature of the government.[27]

It was in response to these democratic principles and the perceived weakness of the central government that the Nationalists called for a convention to revise the Articles of Confederation.[28] Nationalists and believed the Confederation was too weak to solve the economic conditions created by the war; the failure of the impost was seen by many as evidence of this. Nationalists feared that the move toward decentralization, precipitated by resistance to Britain and the perceived efficiency of the new state constitutions, could lead to a dissolution of all central government.[29] This prospect was unacceptable to men who had hopes for the future greatness of a united American republic. Those committed to the states and Confederation also felt that Articles were in need of some revisions, although not on the level proposed by the Nationalists.

Many in favor of state control were in favor of the convention but carried fears that the convention could radically alter the form of government. The author "Legion" commented that the convention should be pursued "with great caution and circumspection."[30] The wording of the directions given to delegates also reflected this desire for caution; the convention was called "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation."[31]

Although much of the political ideology of the Anti-federalists had existed during the Revolutionary and Confederation periods, Anti-federalism began in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The convention was not a representation of the main body of the people but of the minority of the wealthy and powerful; the established aristocracy.[32] Men such as Elbridge Gerry, George Mason, John Francis Mercer, Luther Martin, Robert Yates, and John Lansing made up the Anti-federalist contingent to the convention, all men of wealth and position. In the convention, Anti-federalists joined with Federalists in denouncing what Anti-federalist Elbridge Gerry called "an excess of democracy."[33] This argument was a part of the political ideology of the day. Anti-federalists held to traditional Whig republican ideas of the corruption inherent in any political system. All government was seen as a form of aristocracy, the many ruling the few, and unless the aristocracy could be controlled it would become oppressive.[46] Many propositions of the elite Anti-federalists, both in the convention and during the ratification debate, worked to place restraints on power and corruption. Rotation in office, a bill of rights, and keeping representatives close to the people were not the marks of democratic leaning in elite thought but attempts to curtail the aristocratic tendency of government.

With the Constitution in the "public sphere," dissent arose from all classes. The rural small farmers was perhaps the largest body of Anti-federalists and produced many influential ideas. Notable authors including Centinel and The Federal Farmer aimed their writings at this middling class and represented the main current of Anti-federalist thought. Centinel's first two essays were very influential and joined Gerry and Mason's objections to signing the Constitution, Yates and Lansing's Reasons of Dissent, and The Address and Reasons of Dissent of the Minority of the Convention of Pennsylvania as the most reprinted and well known Anti-federalist documents.[47] Although some of these men held high positions in society and government, the ability to publish under pseudonym allowed them to voice the opinion of the masses. The letters were not a new argument to the masses, but a presentation of the ideas they already held. The Centinel essays, generally attributed Samuel Bryan the son of a Pennsylvania Supreme Court judge, were widely recognized

and reprinted by the middling and lower classes, which remained ignorant of the high social standing of the author.

Upper class intellectual Anti-federalists held the view that a truly representative government could not exist in a nation as large as the United States. In New York, the Anti-federalist writing as Cato eloquently made this small republic argument. In his essays To the Citizens of New York, Cato wrote that "whoever seriously considers the immense extent of territory comprehended with the limits of the United States" and the "variety of its climates, productions, and commerce" along with "the difference of extent, and numbers of inhabitants" with "dissimilitude of interests, morals, and policies... will receive as a intuitive truth, that a consolidated republican form of government therein, can never form a more perfect union."[48] Cato drew on the ideas of revered thinkers such as Montesquieu and Locke who had promoted this idea. Cato quoted from Montesquieu's Spirit of the Laws in defense of the idea of the small republic, in his third essay Cato writes that "it is natural, says Montesquieu, to a republic to only have a small territory, otherwise it cannot long subsist: in a large one."[49] Federalists spent much time attempting to refute this view. Publius' The Federalist is largely concerned with answering this Anti-federalist argument, possibly in direct response to Cato, a fellow New Yorker. While Publius made frequent references to breaking up of the union into several confederacies, this idea is almost entirely absent from Anti-federalist writings. This separate confederacies argument worked as a means to praise the virtue and ability of a national government. In Cato's Anti-federalist view, some of the states were already too large for effective republican government.[50] Elite Anti-federalists saw most of the states as small enough to be truly representative bodies and those that were not could peacefully separate into smaller states. The national government would exist to control matters relating to the states themselves, not the people of the states.

While adopting some ideas and arguments from the elite, the middling Anti-federalists created a distinct ideology. Like the elite, the middling Anti-federalists feared aristocracy but the meaning of aristocracy was different for different classes. To the upper class, aristocracy was explained in terms of corruption and abuse of power inherent in any political system. To protect against corruption the elite proposed solutions such as limited terms of service and the ability of the states to recall and replace their representatives. The lower classes, however, did not fear the corrupting influence of power but the powerful influence of the corrupt. Middling Anti-federalists argued against what they called the "Natural Aristocracy,"[51] a vague group of men of wealth, training, ability, and position who would attempt to take control

of the government and manipulated it to suit their own interests. This term is obviously vague and membership in the Natural Aristocracy was different to different people, but it can not be escaped that many of the elite Anti-federalists would, by necessity, be counted among this group.

Middling Anti-federalists held radical views and often directly accused the "Natural Aristocracy" of creating a constitution with the aim of seizing power. Centinel in his Letter to the Freemen of Pennsylvania attacked the Constitution's provisions for standing armies in times of peace, internal taxation, the structure of the judiciary, the powers and mode of election of congress, the lack of a bill of rights, and the ability to suppress the freedom of the press. Centinel saw these defects as a means for the proposed national government to overpower the states and create "a permanent ARISTOCRACY"[52] of, "the wealthy and ambitious, who in every community think they have a right to lord it over their fellow creatures."[53] Centinel's view of the elite was similar to Federal Farmer's idea of "Natural Aristocracy" and shaped the way that the middling class viewed the ratification struggle. Defects in the Constitution were seen by the middling Anti-federalists as intentional attempts to violate personal liberties. To Centinel, the secrecy of the Constitutional Convention "was obviously dictated by the genius of Aristocracy."[54] Not only had the convention met in secret, it had also produced a plan that radically changed the structure of government to what Centinel and other middling Anti-federalists saw as aristocratic in nature.

The middling Anti-federalists believed that the greatest threat to liberty was from the proposed structure of the legislature. Many Anti-federalists believed that congress was where the aristocracy would take root and eventually "grasp at omnipotence... and... swallow up the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judicial powers of the several States."[55] This aristocratic composition was largely a result of the small size of the lower house of congress and the ability of the legislature to control the location and nature of elections. Federal Farmer believed the house of representatives was too small and stated that, even with the proposed number of one representative for every thirty thousand people, "I have no idea that the interests, feelings, and opinions of three or four millions of people... can be collected in such a house."[56] To the middling class the constitutional provision for choosing the "times, places, and manner of holding elections"[57] was an obvious attempt by the aristocracy, who had created the powers of the new government, to take permanent control of these power through the congress. Centinel remarked "Will not this section [Article 1, Section 4 of the Constitution] put it in the power of the future Congress to abolish the suffrage by ballot."[58] Federal Farmer contemplated that with

this power the congress could make sure that their select men were elected by making the state a single district, holding the election in the capital city, and declaring that those men with the highest raw number of votes were the victors.[59] The elite Anti-federalists recognized these defects, but did not see them as the work of the Natural Aristocracy, rather as failures to curb the aristocratic tendency of government. Cato remarked that "the representation consists of... too few to resist the influence of corruption and the temptation to treachery, against which all governments ought to take precautions."[60] The middling class, however, saw a direct threat from an aristocratic class that could entrench itself in the seat of government.

According to the middling Anti-federalist position, once in power, the natural aristocracy could begin to use the government to further their own personal interests. Individual rights would be in danger of an aristocratic body that could silence all opposition. Freedom of the press was highly important to the middling Anti-federalists; it was called the "palladium of liberty."[61] A free press was seen as the bulwark between the people and tyranny, Centinel remarked, "As long as the liberty of the press continues to be unviolated, and the people have the right of expressing and publishing their sentiments upon every public measure, it is next to impossible to enslave a free nation."[62] A free press was viewed not only as the means of voicing dissent, but as the educator of the people on political issues to instill in them the knowledge and discernment needed to justly appoint representatives.[63] Middling Anti-federalists feared, at times justly, that the elite Federalists meant to take the free press away from them. Centinel's writing shows fear that voices of dissent were in danger of being silenced; he exclaims, "if I use my pen with the boldness of a freeman, it is because I know that the liberty of the press yet remains unviolated." Centinel's fears were realistic, as many newspapers would not publish Anti-federalist writings or only a small number published along side a Federalist refutation.[64] Suppression of the press was not a phantom during the ratification struggle and the enforcement of the Sedition Act of 1798 lends some level of foresight to Anti-federalist concerns about suppression of the press.

While the middling Anti-federalists sought to the use the press to point out and correct defects in the Constitution and the elite relied mainly on conventions, speeches, and personal correspondence, the lowest class of citizens was absent from the public written debate. No influential authors came from the lower class, because of this, the ideology of lower class Anti-federalist must be understood by the views of outsiders and by the actions of the lower class. During the ratification the strongest opposition to the Constitution was in

the backcountry among the lower class. Prominent Anti-federalist Thomas Rodney explained that, "The better sort... seem much afraid of the foederal [sic] constitution in its present form without a bill of rights." but "The inferior class are totally against it."[65] The division of the people into a "better sort" and an "inferior class" by a fellow Anti-federalist indicates the recognition of a class devision within the Anti-federalist movement. Lower class Anti-federalists remained fairly peaceful during the debate, but after ratification voiced their dissatisfaction with the new government and directly resisted implementation of the Constitution. Lower class Anti-federalists had specific views about the Constitution and forms of government, but were largely absent from the public debate and remained underrepresented in the state ratification conventions.

The state conventions were primarily made up of the social elite. Even in poorer counties, the people often selected the wealthiest and most well known men as their delegates.[66] The Anti-federalists in the convention were often men of lower rank and wealth compared to the Federalists. That the wealthiest citizens of Anti-federalist districts were often of lower social standing than their counterparts in Federalist districts reflects the strength Anti-federalism had among the lower class in rural areas and the backcountry. Of the sixty-nine delegates in the Pennsylvania convention, roughly half had served in the Revolutionary war, however, only one Anti-federalist held a rank above captain while sixteen of the Federalists were field officers. The Anti-federalist delegates came primarily from the western counties and half were farmers while every man in the convention with a college education was on the Federalist side.[67] This lower class and western stronghold of Anti-federalism existed in almost all of the states. It was not class issues alone, however, that decided the issue of ratification, but, with few exceptions, Anti-federalists who switched to the Federalist side, often against the will of the counties that elected them, were from the upper class.

Owning to its lower class origins, Anti-federalism in most states was disorganized and lacked effective leadership, with the notable exception of New York where a strong Anti-federalist "party" existed. Federalists capitalized on the deficiency of Anti-federalist leadership. In Delaware and Pennsylvania, the Constitution was put to a vote quickly before a prolonged discussion could be carried out, this haste worked to the Federalists advantage and built momentum that would carry help the next three states: New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. In the first five states to ratify there was little opposition to the Constitution except among the lower class, and Anti-federalist writings were notably absent from the newspapers. In Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Connecticut, commercial and mercantile interests played a major role in

securing a Federalist majority. Anti-federalism, however, prevailed in areas isolated from commerce.[68] Georgia was moved to ratify in part due to its weak position and a need for the protection that a strong union would provide, Washington noted that "If a weak state with the Indians on its back and the Spaniards on its flank does not see the necessity of a General Government there must I think be wickedness or insanity in the way."[69] Georgians did not suffer from "insanity" and ratified unanimously. The first five state conventions were great victories for the Federalists.

The first victory for the Anti-federalists came in New Hampshire. The New Hampshire convention, though having an Anti-federalist majority, postponed a vote on the ratification. New Hampshire's final decision would be connected to that of the other states. This was a minor victory for the Anti-federalists, and broke the seeming invincibility of the Constitution. New Hampshire's postponement helped spur Anti-federalist opposition in other states, especially Massachusetts. It was in Massachusetts that the Constitution faced its first great obstacle. At first, Massachusetts had an Anti-federalist majority, although Federalists still had control of the press and a majority of the most prominent citizens. Massachusetts Federalists recognized their disadvantages and, as Federalist George Richard Monat later admitted in his journal, used unethical means to "pack a Convention whose sense would be different from that of the people."[70] Even with these methods, Federalists failed to obtain a majority of the delegates but their control of the upper class allowed for them to eventually gain a majority. As New York Anti-federalist Melancton Smith, who would himself change sides, explained "The better sort have means of convincing those who differ from them."[71] These "means of convincing" worked in Massachusetts, where as many as twenty delegates from Anti-federalist districts either voted for ratification or abstained. The delegates who shifted from Anti-federalist to Federalist views were almost exclusively men of wealth from the eastern seaboard. Placated by the compromise to ratify with recommended amendments, many elite Anti-federalists broke their political ties and united with their social equals on the opposite side of the debate.[72]

With the momentum built from the close victory in Massachusetts, Federalists swept Maryland and South Carolina. In Maryland, as in other states, Anti-federalism was largely restricted to the lower class and the backcountry. Maryland had a notable lack of Anti-federalist leadership, in many counties Federalist delegates ran entirely unopposed. Where Anti-federalists did run they won about as often as they lost.[73] Even among the elected Anti-federalist delegates there was a notable lack of urgency. Six of Maryland's Anti-federalist

delegates did not even arrive at the ratification convention until four days after it had started.[74] The Federalists easily carried Maryland with a vote of 62-12, although this number does not accurately reflect the total strength of Anti-federalism in Maryland. South Carolina's Anti-federalists suffered from a similar lack of leadership. The ratification struggle in South Carolina was very similar to that of Maryland. In both states, an overwhelming majority of the delegates were drawn from the eastern cities disproportionate to population distribution in the state.[75]

With Massachusetts and South Carolina in favor of the Constitution and the Virginia debate well under way, previously Anti-federalist New Hampshire recognized the growing strength of Federalism, reconvened, and ratified. New Hampshire signed as the ninth state, fulfilling the requirement set forth in the Constitution for ratification, however, without the entrance of Virginia and New York the Constitution could not practically be put into effect. The Virginia convention had one of the closest votes of the ratification debates but was also fundamentally different from the rest of the state conventions. In Virginia both sides had the power of prestige behind their cause. The Anti-federalists had Patrick Henry, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, and Benjamin Harrison heading up their delegation and the Federalists were lead by Edmund Randolph, who was now working for ratification, Henry Lee, John Marshall, James Madison, and, above all, George Washington.[76] Not only did the Anti-federalists have the power of great men behind their causes, they were also equal with the Federalists in rhetorical prowess. Patrick Henry's passionate speeches were a match for any of the prominent Federalist speakers. In the end, the vote in Virginia's convention fell along sectional lines. Virginia was a state that had long been divided into distinct regions that had differing social and political structures. In general, areas on the coast or with access to major waterways, areas with commercial interest, voted Federalist, while the interior was strongly Anti-federalist.[77]

New York was the only state to have an organized Anti-federalist "party." Since before the Constitutional Convention, New York politicians had been running as part of a formal political structure crafted by New York governor George Clinton. New Yorkers ran as either Clintonians or Non-Clintonians.[78] The Anti-federalist party was a growth out of the Clintonian party, George Clinton himself a strong Anti-federalist. Anti-federalists in New York had greater access to the press than Anti-federalists of any other state. Along with Clinton's Cato and Sidney essays, other notable Anti-federalist writings were published throughout New York. Essays by Brutus, A Republican, and Mercy Otis Warren, under the pseudonym A Columbian Patriot, were

available during the New York public debate. Copies of Centinel's writings and other out of state Anti-federalist writings were also reprinted in New York newspapers. The famous Federalist Papers were written in response to these strong Anti-federalist arguments. The ratification struggle in New York was largely a battle ground for elite debaters, however, in the end, it was not rhetoric that lead New York to ratify the Constitution. When news of the ratification by New Hampshire and Virginia reached New York, the state faced ten others states that had ratified and some southern counties threatened secession if the state failed to ratify.[79] George Mason wrote that "After the adoption by Virginia they [New York Anti-federalists] thought themselves under the necessity of adopting also, for Fear of being left out of the Union & of civil commotions."[80] The impracticality of remaining outside the Union and the promise of amendments lead New York to ratify.[81]

With eleven states having ratified the Constitution, the possibility of North Carolina or Rhode Island staying out of the union was minuscule. North Carolina had already rejected the Constitution in its first convention and Rhode Island had refused to call a convention choosing instead to submit the Constitution to the towns where it was strongly rejected. Neither state could hope to exist long on its own. The hopelessness of remaining outside the Union along with the growing influence of commercial interests and promise of amendments allowed Federalists to acquire a bare majority. Not all the delegates who voted for ratification were pleased with the Constitution. Some states that ratified were also dissatisfied; Rhode Island, North Carolina, and to some extent New York, lacked a practical alternative to ratification, and held Anti-federalist views well after ratification.

Apportionment of delegates in relation to population in the state ratification conventions generally worked in the Federalists favor. It is estimated that representatives of only sixty percent of the American population carried the Constitution to ratification. Statistics drawn from the 1790 census reveal that the representatives of districts containing a third of the the population could have commanded a majority, these districts were usually the large eastern cities.[82] In South Carolina districts containing approximately twenty percent of the population were represented by sixty percent of the representatives. These districts also paid seventy percent of the taxes.[83] If the North Carolina and New York delegations had been evenly weighted it is likely that they would have failed to ratify.[84] Research suggests that Virginia may also have had an Anti-federalist majority and that some delegates voted against the wishes of their constituents.[85] The Constitution did not pass solely on account of this misrepresentation and the data is not entirely reliable. What remains clear is

that many of the state ratification conventions were slightly weighted in the Federalists favor.

The lower class Anti-federalists were fairly peaceful during the ratification debate; however, after the Constitution was ratified, lower class Anti-federalists took to public displays of dissent and even rioting. The actions of the lower class in reaction to the Constitution were very similar to their reactions to oppressive British policies. What the lower class Anti-Federalists distrusted was distant and centralized government, whether it be British or American. Symbolic displays were one way that the lower class made their ideas clear: they burned elite Federalist figures in effigy, staged protests, and "in some places the people had a Coffin painted black which... was solemnly buried as an emblem of the dissolution and internment of publick Liberty."[86] Such behavior of the lower class has almost direct parallels with the burning in effigy of Lord North and other Revolutionary actions, many of which were encouraged by the very men who the lower class now viewed as an aristocratic body. These actions acted both as statements of belief and ways to unify popular dissent without the use of published writings or conventions.

On December 26, 1787 a riot of lower class Anti-federalists took place in Carlise Pennsylvania. This riot was important to the elite and middling classes and pushed moderate Anti-federalists to accept the proposed Constitution and work toward amendments that would make it acceptable to their idea of government. The riot started when a group of Carlise Federalists, a minority in the town, attempted to hold a meeting celebrating Pennsylvania's ratification of the Constitution. A group of lower class Anti-federalists marched on the meeting area and ordered the Federalists to disperse. When the Federalists refused this order, the Anti-federalists resorted to violence and drove the Federalists from their meeting. The Carlise incident was not restricted to just the initial riot. When some of the leading rioters were arrested and jailed, the Anti-federalist majority worked with Federalists to free the prisoners. Although an arrangement had been made for the prisoners' release, an Anti-federalist militia company of between two hundred-fifty and fifteen-hundred men marched to the jail to insure the release of the prisoners. This militia was a visible reminder of the strength that Anti-federalism had within the lower class and backcountry even after ratification.[87]

The events in Carlise sparked a series of similar lower class protests that drove the social divisions of Anti-federalism further apart. In Huntington county Pennsylvania, Anti-federalist petitions to resist the implementation of the Constitution were seized and destroyed by the Federalists. The lower class turned to public display. This time the Federalist leaders were paraded in effigy

through the streets on the backs of old ragged horses and insulted. When the procession passed the court house, some of the Anti-federalist leaders were arrested. As in Carlise, a body of the lower class convened and marched in arms to the prison to free the incarcerated "sons of liberty."[88] These events were not seen as isolated occurrences. One Carlise Federalist explained the situation in Pennsylvania by saying that, "Nothing is or can be done... The whole country is alive with wrath, and it is spreading from one county to another so rapid, that it is impossible to say where it will end."[89] The elite on both sides saw these events as evidence of the effects of the dreaded "excess of democracy."

These populist Anti-federalist revolts did not have their intended effects. Ironically, the legacies of Carlise and Huntington county are as stepping stones toward the final end of Anti-federalism. Moderate Anti-federalists feared excessive democracy and Shays' Rebellion was still fresh in their minds. The Carlise riot gave credence to elite fears of the danger of direct democracy and the later riots strengthened these fears. Some elite such as Anti-federalist Elbridge Gerry went so far as to speak of "Civil war."[90] Violent populist rioting brought moderate Anti-federalists closer to the Federalists and further from the lower class. After the Constitution was ratified, a convention was called by Pennsylvania Anti-federalists to discuss the future of Anti-federalism and the possibility of a second Constitutional Convention. This convention, held in Harrisburg Pennsylvania, was attended by Carlise Anti-federalist leader William Petrikin. Petrikin wanted the Anti-federalists to unite to continue direct opposition to the Constitution but the moderates, shocked by the displays of anarchy in Carlise and Huntington, resolved to not risk mob rule.[91] The short term strength of populist Anti-federalism was the downfall of the Anti-federalist movement. This irony was commented on in a letter by Carlise Federalist John Montgomery, who explained, that events "Seeming evil..." had "been productive of real good in our public affairs."[92] The "real good" was that the prospect of anarchy and promise of future amendments brought many Anti-federalists to accept the Constitution, though imperfect, as a reasonable alternative to continued resistance.

The Constitution has been widely been considered the legacy of the Federalists and the Bill of Rights that of the Anti-federalists.[93] It was on condition that the Constitution would be immediately amended that several states had ratified. One of the earliest sets of proposed amendments proposed was included in the 1787 Address and Reasons of Dissent of the Minority of the Convention of Pennsylvania. The Reasons of Dissent proposed fourteen amendments: protection of the rights of conscience, of trial by jury, of defendants to confront their accuser and avoid self incrimination, a prohibition against

excessive bail or fines, restrictions on granting warrants, freedom of speech and of the press, the right to bear arms and a prohibition against standing armies in times of peace, hunting and fowling rights, state power over internal taxes, an increase in the size of the lower house of congress, a return of control of the militia to the states and a statement limiting the national government's powers to those specifically granted, the creation of a council to advise the president and assurance that the legislative, executive, and judicial powers would remain separate, prohibitions on treaties that violate national or state laws, and regulations of the jurisdiction of federal courts.[94]

The amendments proposed in the Reasons of Dissent were largely similar to those proposed by the state conventions. Five states—Massachusetts, South Carolina, New Hampshire, Virginia, and New York—included lists of proposed amendments in their official statements of ratification; while no two states proposed the exact same set of amendments, several rights were consistently named: the free press, trial by jury, protection from standing armies, regulations of taxation, an increase in the number of representatives, and the reservation of rights not expressly granted.[95] Individual Anti-federalists also spoke about the need for amendments. The writings of Cincinnatus read like a check list of amendments proposed by the Anti-federalists. In his first essay, Cincinnatus comments that, "The confederation, in its very outset, declares – that what is not expressly given, is reserved. This constitution makes no such reservation."[96] In his second and third essays Cincinnatus continues to cite specific rights that need protection: freedom of the press, trial by jury, religious rights, and protection from standing armies.[97] The amendments put forward in the Reasons of Dissent, the state conventions, and by individuals would become the basis for the amendments know as the Bill of Rights.

It was a Federalist, James Madison, who drafted the Bill of Rights and the final result was not satisfactory to many Anti-federalists. Many Anti-federalists saw the Bill of Rights as a mere paper barrier that, while claiming to protect rights, did nothing to control the actual danger to those rights. The Anti-federalist author Centinel reemerged to comment on the proposed amendments, he dismissed them as an opiate meant to lull the people.[98] The states that had the strongest Anti-federalist contingencies during the ratification debate were those least pleased with the proposed Bill of Rights. In Virginia senators Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson wrote a letter to the Virginia governor calling the proposed Bill of Rights "propositions inadequate to the purpose of real and substantial amendments."[99] In Virginia and other states, the elite were not pleased with the Bill of Rights but the public reaction was positive. Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to the Marquis De Lafayette,

explained that "The opposition to our new constitution has almost totally disappeared" however, some Anti-federalist leaders "had gone such lengths in their declarations of hostility that they feel it awkward perhaps to come over" but that "the amendments proposed by Congress, have brought over almost all their followers."[100] The political ideas expressed in Anti-federalism did not end with ratification and the adoption of the Bill of Rights. The social groups within Anti-federalism continued to promote their ideas of government in the same ways they had done during the ratification debate. Violent lower class discontent continued in actions such as the Whiskey Rebellion of 1791. Many of the middling and elite Anti-federalists, along with moderate Federalists, were active in the new Democratic-Republican Party and promoted a theory of constitutional interpretation that supported the ideas they had defended in the ratification debate.

The Anti-federalists have been viewed in many ways, as "Men of little faith" who distrusted democracy and democratic representatives[101] and also as the proponents of truly democratic government.[102] Both these contradictory positions are true to some extent. The upper class Anti-federalists did speak of an "excess of democracy" and wanted provisions to control the power of the representatives but these views were not entirely a sign of distrust of the populace. Fears of corruption and abuse of power drawing on traditional Whig republican ideas can account for many positions held by elite Anti-federalists. The elite feared democracy not because they wanted to silence the people but because they believed that public liberty could best be protected by representatives from among themselves. The middling and lower classes produced a democratic vision of government from a view that all classes possessed the virtue required to represent the people. Both of these groups opposed the Constitution on different grounds and both would also come to oppose each other. Anti-federalism, however, cannot be fully explained by these class differences. Regional, religious, and ethnic differences also existed that shaped constitutional thought but it was class differences that precipitated the end of Anti-federalism as a political institution. Lower class distrust of the eastern elite and upper class fear of mob rule created deep divisions within the Anti-federalist movement. The Anti-federalist movement was short lived, but the social movements with in Anti-federalism predated and endured beyond ratification. Anti-federalism existed as a grouping of different social and political movements to pursue a unified goal. In this sense Anti-federalism was not one movement but many.

1 Samuel Chase to John Lamb, June 13, 1788 as quoted in Main, Jackson Turner, *The Anti-federalists: Critics of the Constitution* 1781-1787, (New York, W.W. Norton Company, 1974), 175.
2 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, xi
3 Storing, Hebert J., *What Anti-federalists Were For*, 9
4 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, ix
5 Patrick Henry in Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 4
6 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 2
7 Cornell, Saul, *The Other Founders: Anti-Federalism and the Dissenting Tradition in America, 1788-1828*, (Williamsburg, University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 30-31
8 Letters of Centinel, #1, To The Freemen of Pennsylvania, Storing, Hebert J, ed., *The Complete Anti-federalist* 7 vols. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1981) II, 142. From now on cited as "Storing, CA-F"
9 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 72
10 Hamilton to Washington in Jensen, Merrill, *The New Nation: A History of the United States during the Confederation, 1781-1789*, (New York, Knopf, 1950) 79-80
11 Benjamin Franklin to Lord Kames, Feb. 25th, 1767, Labaree, Leonard W. ed, *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin* in 37 vol., (New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1970), xiv, 69-70
12 Egnal, Marc, *A Mighty Empire: The Origins of the American Revolution*, (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1988), 13
13 Jensen, Merrill, *The Articles of Confederation: An Interpretation of the Social-Economic History of the American Revolution*
14 John Adams to Mercy Warren, July 20th, 1807, Ibid, 14
15 Jensen, *The New Nation*, 79-80
16 Ibid, 22-23; Engal, *A Mighty Empire*, 124
17 Jensen, *The New Nation*, 23
18 Ibid, 21-22
19 Ibid, 125-126
20 Joseph Galloway as cited in Jensen, *Articles of Confederation*, 69-70
21 Memoirs of Alexander Graydon, 285, in Ibid, 112
22 Jensen, *Articles of Confederation*, 27-28
23 Dickinson Draft of the Articles of Confederation, Article III
24 Articles of Confederation, Article II
25 Jensen, *Articles of Confederation*, 163
26 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 105
27 Egnal, *A Mighty Empire*, 280
28 Farrand, Max, "The Federal Constitution and the Defects in the Confederation", The American Political Science Review, Vol. 2, No. 4. (Nov., 1908) 538-39
29 Ibid, 534

30 Continental Journal (Boston), May 31, 1787 in Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 115
31 Farrand, Max ed., *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787* 4. vols, (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1996) III, 584
32 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 117
33 Elbridge Gerry in James Madison, Notes on the Federal Convention (May 31) in Ketchem, Ralph *The Anti-federalist Papers and the Constitutional Convention Debates*, (New York, New American Library, 2003) 39
34 Ibid, 40
35 Ibid, 40
36 See Federalist no. 11 and Elbridge Gerry in James Madison, Notes on the Federal Convention (May 31), in Ketchem, *Anti-federalist Papers*, 39
37 James Madison, Notes of the Constitutional Convention, in Ketchem *Anti-federalist Papers*, 37-38
38 See Robert Yates and John Lansing's Reasons of Dissent, in Storing, CA-F, II, 16-18 and Cato no. 2, Storing, CA-F, II, 108
39 Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 116-17
40 Farrand, Max, "Defects in the Confederation", 540
41 See the writings of the non-signers in, Storing, CA-F, II
42 Henry Jackson to Henry Knox, Nov. 5, 1787; Jackson to Knox, Nov. 11, 1787 in Main, *The Anti-federalists*, 201
43 Hon. Mr. Gerry's objections to signing the National Constitution, in Storing, CA-F, II, 7
44 George Mason, Objections to the Constitution formed by the Government, in Storing, CA-F II, 12
45 Ibid, 13
46 Storing, *What Anti-federalists Were For*, 48
47 Cornell, *The Other Founders*, Appendix 1, 309
48 Cato #3, To the Citizens of New York, Storing, CA-F, II, 110
49 Ibid
50 Ibid, 111
51 Letters of The Federal Farmer no. 7, Storing, CA-F, II, 267
52 Centinel #1, To The Freemen of Pennsylvania, Storing, CA-F, II, 142
53 Ibid, 137
54 Centinel #2, To the People of Pennsylvania, Storing, CA-F II, 144
55 Ibid, 147
56 Federal Farmer, #3, Storing, CA-F, II, 235
57 Constitution of the United States Article 1, Section 4
58 Centinel #2, To the People of Pennsylvania, Storing, CA-F II, 159
59 Federal Farmer, #3, Storing CA-F, II, 235
60 Cato, #5, Storing, CA-F, II, 119

61 Cincinnatus #2, To James Wilson, CA-F, VI, 12, Centinel no. 1 To the Freemen of Pennsylvania, CA-F II, 142.
62 Centinel #2, To The People of Philadelphia, Storing, CA-F, II, 143-144
63 Cornell, *The Other Founders*, 131
64 Ibid, 121-22
65 Thomas Rodney, Journal May 10th, 1788, in Jensen, Merrill, *The Documentary History of the Ratification of the Constitution* in 19 vols. microform supplement doc no. 676, (Madison, The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1976-1995) as cited in Cornell, Saul, "Aristocracy Assailed: The Ideology of Backcountry Anti-federalism", The Journal of American History, vol. 76, no. 4, (March 1990),1149
66 Main, *Anti-federalists*, 232
67 Ibid, 191
68 Ibid, 193
69 George Washington to Samuel Powel Jr., Jan. 18th, 1788, Fitzpatrick, ed. *Writings of Washington*, XXIX, 368 as quoted in Ibid, 197
70 Journal of George Richard Minot as quoted in, Ibid, 202
71 Melancton Smith to Abraham Yates Jr., Jan. 28th, 1788 as in Ibid, 202
72 Ibid, 209
73 Ibid, 214
74 Haw, James, "Samuel Chase and Maryland Anti-federalism: A Study in Disarray", Maryland Historical Magazine 81, vol . 1, (1988), 41
75 Main, *Anti-federalists*, 220
76 Ibid, 227
77 Ibid, 233
78 Ibid, 233
79 Ibid, 238
80 George Mason to John Mason, Sept. 2, 1788, Rutland, Robert A., ed., *The Papers of George Mason* in 3 vols., (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1970), III, 1130
81 Main, *Anti-federalists*, 237-38
82 Roll, Charles, "We, Some of the People: Apportionment in the Thirteen State Conventions ratifying the Constitution", The Journal of American History, vol. 56, no. 1, (Jun. 1969), p.24 table II.
83 Ibid, 31
84 Ibid, 34
85 Main, *Anti-federalists*, Appendix B, 285
86 Aedanus Burke as quote in Ibid, 133
87 See Cornell, "Aristocracy Assailed"
88 Jensen, *Documentary History*, II, 718
89 Extract of a letter from Carlise in Papenfuse, Eric Robert, "Unleashing the Wildness: The Mobilization of Grassroots Anti-federalism in

Maryland", Journal of the Early Republic, vol. 46, no. 1, (Spring 1996), 91

90 Elbridge Gerry to S.R. Gerry January 28th, 1788, in Cornell, "Aristocracy Assailed", 1169

91 Cornell, "Aristocracy Assailed", 1170

92 Montgomery to Wilson, March 2nd, 1788, in Jensen, *Documentary History*, II, 703-704.

93 Storing, *What Anti-federalists Were For*, 64

94 The Address and Reasons of Dissent of the Minority of the Pennsylvania Convention, CA-F, III, 150-52, synopsis adapted from Cornell, *The Other Founders*, 32-33

95 State Statements of Ratification, in United States Bureau of Rolls and Library, *Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States of America 1786-1870* in 5 vols., (Washington, D. C.: Department of State, 1894) 93-96, 138-140, 141-144, 145, 146, 160, 190-203, 377-385; The Avalon Project at Yale University Law School, <http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/.htm>

96 Cincinnatus #1 To James Wilson, Storing, Storing, CA-F, VI, 7

97 Cincinnatus #2 and #3 To James Wilson, Ibid, 10-17

98 "Centinel revived" in Bowling, Kenneth R., "'A Tub to the Whale': The Founding Fathers and the Adoption of the Federal Bill of Rights", Journal of the Early Republic, vol. 8, no. 3, (Autumn 1988), 247

99 Richard Henry Lee and William Grayson to Governor of Virginia, Sept. 28, 1789 as cited in Ibid, p. 250

100 Jefferson to Lafayette, April 2, 1790, Boyd, Julian P. ed., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* in 30 vol., (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961), xvi, 293

101 Cecilia Kenyon, "Men of Little Faith: The Anti-federalists on the Nature of Representative Government", The William and Mary Quarterly, 3rd series, vol. 12, no. 1, (Jan. 1955) 3-43

102 See Main, *The Anti-federalists*

Rachel Henderson

Oh Cold and Misery[1]: The Dichotomy and Evolution of the Windigo in Indian and White Cultures

According to Algonquin mythology, the Windigo has thundered through North American forests since the time of Earth's creation, leaving a trail of felled trees and ravaged corpses in its wake. Luckless hunters and other travelers in these woods who encounter the Windigo are obligated to forfeit either their flesh or sanity to the monster, whose heart of ice harbors no concern for human suffering. Victuals are the Windigo's sole concern, and although it will grudgingly settle on the odd deer for a meal, it favors human meat above all else. The Windigo is relatively indiscriminate about the physique of its victims, but it especially favors those of a corpulent build, be they adults or babies. Preparation of comestibles is similarly negligible to the Windigo, who is as satisfied with well-roasted meat as raw flesh. An opulent supply of humans is favorable for the Windigo's comfort; however, its appetite is inexhaustible. Even an infinite cache of victims could not placate the Windigo, who is driven by an insatiable urge to gorge itself on the skin, blood, and organs of whoever crosses its path.

Occasionally, an individual escapes the gruesome clutches of the Windigo with his body intact. Tragically, these unfortunate few are even more miserable than those who are digested in the creature's stomach. After hearing the Windigo's gale-like howl, seeing its enormous, grotesque figure, or coming into contact with its nefarious spirit, a person loses his mind. Intense melancholy and hostility immediately take hold of the individual, and he becomes a social outcast. He notices cravings that did not exist prior to his Windigo encounter, notably a yen for human flesh. These depraved yearnings may be resisted, but in most cases, they are too strong for the individual to overcome. In winter, when game is scarce, cannibalism's siren song is particularly fierce. Typically, a close family member, such as a parent or sibling, is the first to fall prey to the afflicted individual's hunger. The first succulent mouthful of flesh is the point of no return. Rather than sating the cannibal's hunger, this macabre meal only drives him to eat more, until the impetus wholly consumes him. At this juncture, the person abandons the last vestiges of humanity, and gives himself over to cannibalism. He has become a Windigo himself.

Part of the mystique of the Windigo is that it cannot be comprehensively explained in a single narrative. Only three components of the myth have anything akin to universality: the monster's heart of ice, its proclivity for human flesh, and the fact that it is the most horrific creature in Algonquin folklore. Specific characteristics of the monster, including its origins, physical prowess, mating rituals, corporeal or non-corporeal existence, and vicious behavior, exist in certain Indian folk tales and are notably absent in others. The Windigo has been in a constant state of flux since its first documentation after early contact in the seventeenth century, due to the geographical expanse of its mythology, the natural evolution of folklore, and the external influence of whites in Indian cultures. Although these elements may liken the monster to a number of other folkloric entities in North America, it remains anomalous in both Indian and Western culture.

The Windigo was a necessary myth for Indians living in the harsh, sub-arctic climate of the Northeast; during the winters, among small family units, famine was frequent. As a result, occasional cannibalism was a reality in Algonquin culture. Because cannibalism existed in this context of isolation and starvation, it was stigmatized, abhorred, and feared. Undoubtedly, this phobia of cannibal acts gave birth to the Windigo, the folkloric manifestation of "the lethal cold and gnawing hunger that lead to cannibalism."[2] Coincidentally, Western cultures ubiquitously held similar values regarding the consumption of human flesh, a practice seen as unholy and barbaric. When European colonists discovered their revulsion of cannibalism mirrored in Algonquin culture, they were eager to accept the Windigo myth. Recognition of the monster as a viable North American demon quickly led to colonists' co-opting of the Windigo, whereupon the folklore began to absorb qualities more characteristic of Western stories than those in Indian cultures. In a general sense, however, the Windigo myth retained most of its fundamental traits for several centuries after its adoption by white culture. The nineteenth century marked a turning point for the Windigo; it became an archaic, spectral intruder in an era increasingly enamored with science and rationalism.

Unlike many myths that quietly die after they reach cultural obsolescence or incompatibility, the Windigo persevered. For Indians in Algonquin societies, the Windigo continued to symbolize an underlying fear of starvation and cannibalism that was paramount to their culture. Whites had a different motivation for clinging to the Windigo after it became incongruent with their more secularized philosophies. Although the monster was viewed as a foolish superstition by the late nineteenth century, its gory deviance made it perversely seductive. Because the Windigo could not be logically reconciled

with Western culture, it was re-invented in a psychological framework, typified by the culture-bound disorder known as windigo psychosis. This specious disease allows for the Windigo's existence in a scientific sphere. According to its tenets, a person in the Algonquin culture can "go Windigo," believing himself to actually be the monster, and engage in cannibalism (or harbor cannibalistic urges). Windigo psychosis essentially allows whites to demonize Indians within a secular context, through the application of modern psychological theories and Freudianism. Moreover, it represents the fundamental shift in the Western perception of the monster that helps illustrate the Windigo's dichotomy.

Despite the fact that the Windigo was a mercurial entity prior to Western interference, its modification by white observers ultimately changed it from a folkloric archetype into a cultural dichotomy. By the end of the nineteenth century, the Windigo simultaneously incorporated Indian supernaturalism and secular Western beliefs, in such a way that it became unique in North American mythology. Other creatures in Indian folklore, after being discovered by white colonists, have blended distinctly Western characteristics with their traditional attributes. The Windigo, on the other hand, is distinct because it lucidly embodies the cultural extremes of two different worlds: Indian and Western. Modern Windigo is born of fear, religious superstition, popular psychology, and science, because of its fundamental palatability; most people since the sixteenth century, Algonquin Indians and European colonists included, were sickened by cannibalism and welcomed a monster that symbolically represented the evils of the practice. Whenever the Windigo became cacophonous with current trends, the myth was suitably adjusted. This evolution resulted in the contemporary Windigo's dichotomy, a product of Indian and white cultures' reluctance to liberate the monster. As such, because the Windigo dichotomy concurrently denigrates Algonquin culture and illuminates the evolution of a folkloric paradigm, it is both lamentable and revelatory.

Arguments have been made that cannibalism is "the most disgusting thing in the world to Indians," but from a basic ethnological portrait of Indian cultures, this was clearly not the case for all Indians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[3] Before European contact, and for a period afterward, a number of Indian groups willingly engaged in cannibalism. Some cultures, specifically the Aztecs in Mexico and the Iroquois in the Northeast, participated in "exocannibalism," which is the killing and consumption of "enemies, slaves, or victims captured in warfare."[4] The ritualistic nature of many of these acts of cannibalism illustrates no aversion to the practice. One particular incident in The Jesuit Relations, involving the ceremonial execution and cannibalization

of a Jesuit priest by Iroquois, refutes the assumption that all Indians abhorred cannibalism,

> The Iroquois stripped the flesh from the priest's legs, thighs, and arms and roasted and ate it. When the priest was about to die, an opening was made in the upper part of his chest, his heart taken out, roasted, and eaten. Other Indians drank his blood, saying that the priest had been very courageous to endure so much pain and that by drinking his blood they would become courageous like him.[5]

A folkloric equivalent to the Windigo is logically absent in the records of sixteenth and seventeenth century Iroquois, despite their geographic proximity, because cannibalism was acceptable, religious behavior. The Kwakiutl Indians, on the Northwest Coast, similarly engaged in ceremonial cannibalism, albeit with less fervor than the Iroquois. A cannibal monster does appear in the annals of Kwakiutl folklore, but "the monster's power is integrated into the personality" of Indians, making the beast spiritually advantageous in a way the Windigo was not to the Algonquin culture.[6] There is further evidence of cultures that may have condoned cannibalism, such as the recent archaeological excavations of Anasazi sites that turned up "disarticulated, broken, and cut-marked human bone assemblages."[7] Obviously, Indians did not universally condemn cannibalism; it had its place in religious ceremonies and warfare traditions even amongst some cultures that inhabited environments similar to the Algonquians'.

This environment that the Algonquin Indians occupied at the point of European contact, and the climate that distinguished it, was relatively temperate during the brief summers, but miserably cold in long winters.[8] Algonquin subsistence depended on vigorous hunting and gathering, which was difficult in winter months, as the staple game (notably deer and beaver) was in short supply.[9] The sparseness of food required Indians to survive in family groups, rather than large communities, which subsequently fostered "separateness, aloneness, and self-sufficiency."[10] Isolation, in short, was a cultural necessity for Algonquins. Most of the individual Indian societies within the larger Algonquin culture, namely the Ojibwa, Saulteux Manitoba, Micmac, Montagnais-Naskapi, and Cree, practiced familial isolation during the winter.[11] Furthermore, this seclusion of small family units exacerbated the fear of starvation, which was a constant threat in the Northeastern forests.[12] Famine conditions existed well into the nineteenth century for many

Indians in the Algonquin culture, when tribal groups were larger, cohesive and migratory.[13] After some Algonquin groups, particularly the Cree, were removed to areas as far west as Montana, the "specter" of famine persisted in more gracious climates.[14] Evidently, the northeastern environment was an inextricable influence in the Algonquin consciousness; famine and starvation were parameters along which the culture was permanently defined, even after the immediate danger had disappeared. The most extreme effect of this situation was cannibalism, which was a great fear in Algonquin society for centuries to come.

Although cannibalism resulting from necessity is tolerable in some cultures, the practice has never been permissible in Algonquin culture. The unconditional evil of cannibalism for Algonquins may be attributed to the traditional isolation of families; if a starving person was forced to turn to cannibalism for survival, his victims were typically immediate relatives. According to the accounts of Johann Georg Kohl, a late nineteenth century observer of the Ojibwa Indians, "these cases of unnatural attacks on one's own brethren" contributed to "a state of natural repugnance against cannibalism."[15] The acceptance of cannibalism in other Indian cultures, such as the Iroquois, was inconceivable to the Algonquins, for whom it was the last, horrific resort of starvation. Gluttony, the polar opposite to famine, was also associated with cannibalism in the Algonquin mentality, because it symbolized a person who hoarded resources while his neighbors were in need.[16] Hence, cannibalism was reprehensible on two counts to Algonquins, who viewed it either as a result of starvation or shameful greed. In some cultures, cannibalism has the potential for relativism, but it was entirely damnable in Algonquin society. This horror of eating humans, therefore, resulted in the creation of the Windigo, a symbolic monster, culpable for the crimes of an entire culture.

Protean is the only term that can adequately encompass the innumerable characteristics the Windigo has exhibited in various folk tales. The fact that it "reigns as monster monarch…from the high Canadian Rockies to the Arctic Circle in the north and the Great Lake states and Dakotas in the south…as far east as the Atlantic provinces of Canada" ensures that no single myth is identical to another.[17] Many stories portray the Windigo as a creature of giant physical proportions, "taller than the tallest trees," that shakes the ground with its enormous footsteps.[18] Often, the Windigo has average humanoid qualities, typified by larger than normal proportions.[19] In a number of myths, the monster is described with an otherworldly hideousness; sometimes it is bestowed with

> A cavernous mouth made more awful by the lack of lips…the monster is so hungry for flesh that he has eaten off his own lips…from this gruesome maw protrudes rows of jagged teeth…his huge eyes are…yellow and protuberant like those of an owl, but they are bigger and roll in blood… hands are massive and paw-like, ending in terrible claws twelve inches or more in length…his feet are a yard long and have only one toe, capped by a dagger-long nail.[20]

The voice of the Windigo is frequently equated to the roaring of the wind, and does not necessarily emerge from its mouth. In one Ojibwa myth, the Windigo speaks through "a large hole at the top of his throat."[21] Additionally, while some folk tales maintain that the Windigo is exclusively male, others allow for the existence of females in the imaginary species.[22] Clearly, some of the defining features of the Windigo could be broadly applied to a substantial number of monsters in the folkloric tradition.

Idiosyncratic physical traits of the Windigo, on the other hand, are not only atypical in the larger sphere of mythology, but they are also distinctively telling about the Algonquin fear of winter and cannibalism. The Windigo's heart of ice is alluded to in most accounts; on a symbolic level, the heart may be equated with the winter season itself, and the lurking danger it harbors.[23] One Windigo story deviates from this model, that nevertheless describes the peculiarities of the monster's heart,

> These cannibals have acquired somehow to take their heart out of their body, and somehow preserve them. And the heart pulses separately from their body. And it is said that they had a special scaffold where they camp; a special basket was made containing down feathers very warm and insulated, and this is where the hearts are kept.[24]

This focus on the Windigo's heart, whether it centers on the organ's frosty qualities or its separation from the body, emphasizes the cruelty of the monster, and connects it to the harshness of the Algonquin environment. Another occasional element that lends the Windigo a strong connection to the Algonquin aversion to cannibalism is its physical weakness, in spite of a large body. The monster is sometimes shown as "gaunt to the point of emaciation, its desiccated skin pulled tautly over its bones;" due to its insatiable appetite, the Windigo is perpetually starving.[25] Such a description is a clear reference to

the dangers of famine in Algonquin society. Cannibalism is inexcusable, even in cases of starvation, and as such the Windigo cannot find relief for its hunger in consuming human flesh.

In its behavior, as well as its physical illustration, the Windigo embodies various fears in Algonquin culture. While large bands of Windigos are sometimes mentioned (in particular, an account of a "tribe" of Windigos on an island in the Hudson Bay), the monster is usually given a solitary status.[26] The monster is described as "asocial…misanthropic" and a "hermit" in many stories, similar to the hunters in Algonquin society, who are required to migrate in small groups rather than communities.[27] Clearly, although Indians in Algonquin culture "prized independence," there was also a recognizable aversion to complete solitude, which could intensify famine situations and cannibal impulses in humans.[28] The Windigo's avoidance of other Windigos and humans (except as a food source) in mythology is indicative of this fear of isolation. Moreover, the fact that the Windigo is exclusively active during the winter in folk tales points to the Algonquin apprehension of the season and its promise of hardship. These allegorical traits are important. Regardless of any terrifying descriptors, if the Windigo were simply an unearthly monster, detached from humans apart from its affection for their flavor, its significance in understanding Algonquin culture would be nominal. Windigo and humans are palpably joined, however; the traditional attitude is that a Windigo was, at one point, human.

According to Algonquin folklore, there are a number of ways a Windigo may be created. The predominant cause of "going Windigo," in accordance with the Algonquian terror toward cannibalism, is the consumption of human flesh for any reason. If the mythology is to be believed, the first taste of human flesh prompts an instantaneous addiction; after the first act of cannibalism, a person is inevitably driven to commit the act again.[29] In the Algonquin view, from the moment of the first offense, a human is transformed into a Windigo. Kohl shows the fatalism of this perspective in his recounting of an Ojibwa man's story about how hunger breeds Windigos, that if any individual

> Were to be in great need — if winter and hunger were to fall on him with all their terrors — if he were to be driven almost to madness by his sufferings — then you can understand how he might step over all bounds and become a savage. Then he will shoot his best friend and bury him in the snow, to feed on him like a wolf.[30]

Despite the occasional need for cannibalism as a means of survival, the person who chooses this route is always doomed to become a Windigo in the Algonquin philosophy. The deterministic character of cannibalism, with regard to the transformation into a Windigo, is cogent evidence of this culture's association of the practice with starvation, misery and disaster. It has been suggested that even the unconscious thought or desire to engage in a cannibalistic act is powerful enough to initiate one's transformation into a Windigo.[31]

Wholly supernatural influences are also cited as causes of the Windigo transformation, although they are more related to the Algonquin culture's traditional religious beliefs than any underlying fear of starvation and cannibalism. These channels for metamorphosis do, however, show the Algonquin folklore's reliance upon ethereal explanations for appalling realities that, by the nineteenth century, would be rigorously lauded. In Ojibwa society, witches were blamed for famine at times and, consequently, they were held responsible for the creation of Windigos.[32] Dreaming of Windigos, additionally, could cause a person to become a Windigo, as could subjection to "the acts of a sorcerer."[33] Certain myths report that "evil shamans…return from the dead as" Windigos, indicating that even corpses are not safe from cannibalistic impulses.[34] In this vein, it appears that the fear of cannibalism was so pervasive in Algonquin culture that no individual was seen as safe from its dangers.

Indeed, the degree of the Windigo threat is further illustrated by the indestructibility of the monster in Algonquin folklore. By nearly all accounts, the Windigo is extremely difficult to kill due to its enormous strength and supernatural qualities. Frequently, several strong individuals must subdue Windigos in folk tales in order to be killed.[35] Some stories from the Chippewa culture that include the Windigo as a feared specter claim that "the only way one can fight a windigo is to become a windigo oneself," a theory that is counterintuitive to the permanency of the Windigo condition, but shows the belief in the enormous power of the Windigo.[36] The alternative method of reducing the threat of the Windigo in Algonquin society was to isolate the monster, or the person believed to be the monster. The Indian who was accused of "going Windigo" in this society was the ultimate pariah; if he was allowed to live, he was regarded with a severe brand of disgust and suspicion.[37] In his observations of Ojibwa culture, Kohl surmised that this attitude toward those believed to have engaged in cannibalism (or harbored cannibalistic penchants) created "a class of windigos" that lived on the fringes of Indian society.[38] Both the killing and isolation of accused Windigos in reality, and

imaginary Windigos in folklore, indicate the fatalistic view of cannibalism in Algonquin culture. As a product of either starvation or wanton hunger, cannibalism was inexcusable, and once a person had engaged in it, he was beyond redemption. The result of cannibalism is not negotiable in Algonquin mythology; the practitioner always turns into a Windigo.

This fatalism about cannibalism and hostility to those who would choose to consume human flesh was mirrored in the sixteenth century European ideology. Cannibalism was, in the Western view, a practice reserved for savages and violent lunatics. Upon contact with some Indian cultures, such as the Aztecs and the Iroquois, European colonists were utterly appalled by ritualistic cannibalism, seeing it as barbaric and un-Christian. As such, the Algonquin fear of the Windigo was easily comprehensible for whites. In the Windigo, they recognized some of their own folkloric archetypes, including the horrific Grendel of Beowulf.[39] The first accounts of the Windigo, given by Paul Le Jeune in The Jesuit Relations, liken the monster to "a sort of werewolf," and claim that individuals, believing they are Windigos, "pounce upon women, children…men…and devour them voraciously, without being able to appease or glut their appetite."[40] It is understandable, then, that European colonists quickly equated the Windigo with the Devil.[41] There was not the same unconditional belief in the Windigo's genuine existence within white culture, but there were discernable strains of it. Well after the period of early contact, evidence of acceptance of the Windigo myth remained in non-Indian stories, particularly those of the French-Canadian fur trappers, who were well acquainted with the general Algonquin culture.[42] Even if the Windigo was not believed to be an actual monster by white observers, they were at least appreciative of the Algonquins' faith in its existence; it prevented them from condoning cannibalism in the tradition of some of their neighboring cultures. One favorable description given in The Jesuit Relations states that during a famine

> Corpses have been dug out of the graves; and, now carried away by hunger, the people have repeatedly offered, as food, those who were lately the dear pledges of love, -- not only brothers to brothers, but even children to their mothers, and the parents to their own children. It is true, this is inhuman; but it is no less unusual among our savages than among the Europeans, who abhor eating flesh of their own kind.[43]

A peculiar kinship was forged with Algonquins, in the European mentality, due to their mutual disgust for cannibalism. Whites' adoption of the myth until the nineteenth century, then, was unconscious and relatively innocent, a natural result of one culture embracing familiar qualities they perceive in another.

Perhaps the lethal feature of the Windigo myth, which led to whites' refusal to abandon the monster in the 1800s after they criticized it as irrational, is its fundamental sensationalism. It is consistently "gigantic, ancient, mute, unstoppable, ancestral to man, ferocious, supra-human… godlike and demonic, a repository of all our worst fears, an incarnation of pure malevolence…as well as reflecting a certain degree of superstitious awe and veneration."[44] By this period, however, there was collective scorn in the white community for individuals who believed in the Windigo's reality. Such attitudes reflect the larger evolution of Western thought, which was hastily replacing the superstitious remnants of their historical culture with rationalism and scientific thought. Before Western culture managed to fully articulate the Windigo's reconciliation with its new, modern philosophies, it found ample room to disparage the myth. In the late nineteenth century, the literature regarding the Windigo made a clear shift from fear and apprehension to scorn. One anecdote of Egerton Ryerson Young, a minister among the Cree Indians, illustrates this break with past attitudes; Young recounts how he observed the Indians' fear of "windagoos" and lectured them on the childishness of such emotions.[45] Some stories in the latter part of the century cast the Windigo in a comical light, such as "Red-Headed Windego," which simultaneously mocks the beliefs of the Algonquin Indians and those of the French-Canadians (the hero of the tale is ultimately a plucky English-speaking Canadian, who exposes the foolishness of his gullible comrades.)[46] This obvious aversion to the myth, previously eagerly embraced, represents a transitional period in the evolution of the Windigo; it was the point when Western culture could not rationally accept the existence of a cannibal monster, and had not yet discovered the way to cerebrally incorporate it into the modern world.

Although the widespread application of the term "windigo psychosis" did not properly emerge until the twentieth century, foundations were laid for its acceptance in the 1860s. Kohl's early analyses of the Windigo's role in Ojibwa culture betray modern psychological notions, such as the concept of self-fulfilling prophecy,

> It is very natural that in a country which really produces
> isolated instances of such horrors, and with a nation so

> devoted to fancies and dreams, superstition should be mixed
> up in the matter, and that at last, through this superstition,
> wonderful stories of windigos should be produced,
> as among us, in the middle ages, the belief in witches
> produced witches.[47]

His noting of some physical symptoms of individuals believed to be Windigos, namely melancholia, explains how his writing was a prototype for windigo psychosis.[48] The application of such psychological terms in reference to the Windigo was nonexistent in previous centuries, dually because of a lack of interest in this science and a willingness to adopt the monster at relative face value. Kohl symbolizes the late nineteenth century watershed in the Windigo's transformation, separate from the mocking skepticism of clergymen and other Western spectators. When psychology was first applied to the myth in Kohl's journals, the dichotomy of the Windigo was set into motion; it would no longer be absolutely embraced as a supernatural phenomenon, or ridiculed as a superstitious native belief, in Western thought. Rather, its basic folkloric tenets were combined with popular science, culminating in the creation of an entirely new monster: windigo psychosis.

In his landmark work "Windigo psychosis," Morton Teicher examines seventy case studies, predominantly from the late nineteenth century, wherein individuals exhibit symptoms of the purported disease (he claims that forty-four persons actually committed cannibalism in this demographic).[49] The dominant symptoms, according to Teicher and others who subscribe to the disease's legitimacy, are "anorexia, vomiting, insomnia, and melancholic withdrawal into oneself."[50] An individual who demonstrates any number of these symptoms in an extreme way may be, in the eyes of some psychologists, stricken by windigo psychosis. Moreover, windigo psychosis is wholly a culture-bound disorder; that is, it is exclusively applicable to Indians within the Algonquin culture. Individuals whose symptoms conform to those described in windigo psychosis do not necessarily make the cogent association with a psychological condition. Rather, they have the tendency to believe that they are literally turning into a Windigo, and harbor cannibal urges.[51] As such, there are remnants of traditional religious beliefs regarding the Windigo in descriptions of the disease.

One element of the Algonquin culture that is too frequently absent in windigo psychosis, however, is an emphasis on the culture's attitude toward famine and starvation. There is always a mention of the influence of climate, isolation and the harshness of subsistence living in accounts of windigo

psychosis, but they are typically eclipsed by other rationales for the existence of the disease. Robert A. Brightman, a proponent of windigo psychosis' reality, elucidates that the disease was not always "the after-the-fact consequence of famine cannibalism…behavior categorized as windigo could occur in both famine and nonfamine circumstances."[52] This attitude breeds confidence in the anomalous nature of windigo psychosis; it is not a result of famine, or fear of famine, but rather of a collective consciousness within the Algonquin culture. An emphasis on the prevalence of cannibalism in times of plenty suggests a fundamental defect in the Algonquin mind, and hearkens back to the late nineteenth century observers' views of the Indians as "childish." Windigo psychosis only nominally allows Indians to defend themselves in terms of the values of their traditional culture, in that it characterizes them as a society of latent deviants, equipped to resort to cannibalism at any time.

Another explanation for this move away from the customary tenets behind the Windigo myth is that while nineteenth and twentieth century psychologists were beguiled by the romantic blood and gore of Algonquin folklore, they were equally seduced by the popular scientific and psychological ideas of the time. Nutrition science, which was beginning to gain a large following in the late nineteenth century, was one of the components incorporated into windigo psychosis that allowed it distance from archaic superstitions in the public eye. One study of windigo psychosis maintains that the cause of the disorder is "deprivation of animal fat and its associated nutritional value;" consequently, an individual afflicted by windigo psychosis may stave off its injurious effects by drinking bear fat, as was sometimes done in examples given by Teicher.[53] A more general view of how bad nutrition causes one to "go Windigo" is echoed in the claim that "physiological reactions, 'produced by drastic dietary change, chronic or periodic mineral or vitamin deficiency, or…consumption of toxic food substances,' may be responsible."[54] Apart from nutrition, other scientific rationales for the presence of windigo psychosis in Algonquin society include genetics; some observers of the disorder have alluded to the "possibility of genetic factors that could easily become manifest in this area where small breeding populations are the norm."[55] If these scientific analyses of windigo psychosis are to be believed, Indians in the Algonquin culture are historically predisposed to cannibalize one another for little reason other than poor eating habits and a small gene pool. Clearly, this injection of the scientific method into Windigo mythology had a secularizing effect in the nineteenth and twentieth century; once the monster could be understood with the tools of scientific rationalism, it held less credence in the supernatural folkloric sphere.

The greatest Western extreme of the Windigo dichotomy, employed

by advocates of windigo psychosis, was the utilization of Freudianism and psychoanalytic beliefs in comprehending why Algonquin Indians have a widespread fear of cannibalism. Incest, a staple of the Freudian doctrine, is often referenced as a motivational factor in windigo psychosis. Teicher describes one case of the disorder, wherein a mother ate her son, and alludes to latent incestuous desires in all "mother-son relationships."[56] More explicit connections to incest are often drawn in studies of windigo psychosis that "include descriptions of incestuous-like behavior in which a mother and son, for example, kill and eat the father."[57] The prevalence of connections between incest and cannibalism in windigo psychosis has led certain observers to facetiously classify it as a standard Oedipal disorder, rather than a culture-specific disease.[58] This information must have been dismal for Algonquins; for generations, they had incorrectly assumed that famine and starvation were the agents responsible for cannibalism and the Windigo, when they should have instead blamed their mothers.

Incestuous urges aside, Freudianism and spurious psychological theories found their way into other elements of windigo psychosis. Teicher describes the role of the displacement defense mechanism in one of his case studies, referring to an ill-tempered elderly woman, beset by hysteria, who desired to cannibalize children.[59] Because this case did not rise out of a famine situation, he argues that the windigo psychosis was simply a product of misplaced aggression rather than immanent starvation. Even more speculative are assertions that windigo psychosis is the natural result of "oral-aggressive fantasies of early childhood operating in conjunction with 'certain neurological associations detectable between eating and emotionality.'"[60] Such emphases on the innate urges of childhood, pioneered by Freud, are misdirected in their application to windigo psychosis. Through psychoanalysis, the Windigo is further separated from its Algonquin origins. Although some scholars, such as Thomas H. Hay, concede that there is a viable connection between this peculiar type of cannibalism and traditional Algonquin culture, the favored explanation for the reason why a person "goes Windigo" is most often extracted from unfounded psychiatric suppositions. Hay states,

> People who want to eat human flesh are generally pursuing one of three outcomes. These outcomes are (1) "preserving" a relationship with some loved one who has been "lost," (2) "solving" ambivalent feelings toward some one, or (3) acquiring some property, such as vitality or courage.[61]

Although the third principle may be applicable to traditional Iroquois culture, as seen in the example of the cannibalization of the Jesuit priest, this analysis lacks supporting evidence in the Algonquin model. Psychoanalysis, and other abstract psychological methods, are foreign in the Algonquin context; they embody the modernism of the nineteenth and twentieth century Western world, that was illogically relocated to a sphere dominated by traditional religiosity, supernatural beliefs, and a fundamental fear in the prowess and cruelty of nature.

The statement that "as time went by, more and more learned people declared that such monsters were a product of superstitious minds and imaginations…the Weendigoes were driven from their place in…traditions and cultures and ostracized by disbelief and skepticism," is largely accurate.[62] It cannot be asserted, however, that the Windigo was "ostracized;" rather, it was reborn in the late nineteenth century as a dichotomous being, a product of supernaturalism and Western science. Windigo psychosis, the lucid incarnation of this dichotomy, illustrates three elementary problems that rose out of this synthesis of Algonquin and Western cultures. On a basic level, it cheapens the traditional Indian mythology of the Windigo, by characterizing it as superstitious and archaic. Furthermore, although windigo psychosis is, by definition, a culture specific disorder, it generalizes the Windigo. This is mainly seen in the application of certain psychological theories, such as Freudianism, that do not make cultural distinctions regarding the latent desires of the human race. Despite the fact that only Algonquins can be afflicted with windigo psychosis, the reasons they "go Windigo" are generally similar to the motivations of cannibals around the world, according to some observers of the disorder. Ultimately, however, the most significant problem of the Windigo dichotomy (as seen through windigo psychosis) is the fact that it obscures the origins of the myth, and is subsequently misleading about traditional Algonquin culture. Historically, winter, isolation and starvation have been central themes in all aspects of Algonquin society and culture, especially folklore. The Windigo, as the grotesque manifestation of this pervasive fear, is inadequately explained in modern Western studies, especially windigo psychosis. By reducing the Windigo to a Freudian vehicle, or the product of a protein deficiency, a vital element of Algonquin culture is overlooked.

The Windigo was never irredeemably polluted by Western influences. Throughout its evolution, both as a piece of folklore and a cultural icon, the monster has succeeded in clinging to many of its original traits. Indeed, such qualities were both consciously and unwittingly preserved by white adopters of the myth, out of a wicked fascination for the macabre and recognition of their

own traditional Western ideology. The cataclysmic moment came in the late nineteenth century, when the Windigo no longer suited the new rationalist white culture. As such, the monster was dichotomized, and became a dualistic entity, beholden to two incredibly different cultures. By the twentieth century, the claim could be made that the remodeled, dichotomous Windigo was as much a product of Western culture as its original Algonquin heritage. This new situation de-emphasizes an important cultural locus of the Algonquin Indians, but it simultaneously typifies the absorbing complexity of the evolution of a terrifying North American archetype.

1 Charlie Maguire, *Harbour Lights: The Second Voyage*, compact disc.

2 David D. Gilmore, *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 83.

3 Ibid., 82.

4 Peggy Reeves Sanday, Divine Hunger: *Cannibalism as a Cultural System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 7.

5 Ibid., 126.

6 Ibid., 114.

7 Brian R. Billman, Patricia M. Lambert, and Banks L. Leonard, "Cannibalism, Warfare, and Drought in the Mesa Verde Region During the Twelfth Century A.D.," American Antiquity 65 (2000): 145.

8 Morton Teicher, "Windigo psychosis," Proceedings of the 1960 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society (1960): 8.

9 Sanday, 105.

10 Ibid., 105.

11 Gilmore, 76.

12 Sanday, 105.

13 H.C. Wolfart and Freda Ahenakew, *They Knew Both Sides of Medicine: Cree Tales of Curing and Cursing Told by Alice Ahenakew* (Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba Press, 2000), 111.

14 Verne Dusenberry, *The Montana Cree: A Study in Religious Persistence* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 233.

15 Johann Georg Kohl, *Kitchi-Gami: Life Among the Lake Superior Ojibway*, trans. Lascelles Wraxall (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1985), 356.

16 Theresa S. Smith, *The Island of the Anishnaabeg: Thunderers and Water Monsters in the Traditional Ojibwe Life-World* (Moscow: University of Idaho Press, 1995), 122.

17 Gilmore, 76.

18 A. Irving Hallowell, *The Ojibwa of Berens River, Manitoba: Ethnography into History* (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers,1992), 65.

19 *Windigo: An Anthology of Fact and Fantastic Fiction*, ed. John Robert Colombo (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1982), 14.

20 Gilmore, 79.

21 Edward S. Rogers, *The Round Lake Ojibwa* (Toronto: The Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, 1962), D44.

22 Christopher Vecsey, *Traditional Ojibwa Religion and Its Historical Changes* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1983), 77.

23 Sanday, 106.

24 *Algonquin Spirit: Contemporary Translations of the Algonquin Literatures of North America, ed. Brian Swann* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 281.
25 Basil Johnston, *The Manitous: The Spiritual World of the Ojibway* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1995), 221.
26 Colombo, 13.
27 Gilmore, 81.
28 Smith, 142.
29 Sanday, 104.
30 Kohl, 362.
31 Gilmore, 82.
32 Vecsey, 147.
33 Sanday, 107.
34 Rogers, D43.
35 Gilmore, 82.
36 Victor Barnouw, *Wisconsin Chippewa Myths: Tales and their relation to Chippewa life* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 120.
37 Colombo, 32.
38 Kohl, 357.
39 Gilmore, 90.
40 Colombo, 8.
41 Vecsey, 82.
42 Colombo, 44.
43 The Jesuit Relations (Cleveland: Burrows Bros., Co., 1901), 23.
44 Gilmore, 90.
45 Colombo, 35.
46 Ibid., 43.
47 Kohl, 357.
48 Ibid., 358.
49 Teicher, 109.
50 Gilmore, 85.
51 James B. Waldram, *Revenge of the Windigo: The Construction of the Mind and Mental Health of North American Aboriginal Peoples* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 192.
52 Robert A. Brightman, "The Windigo in the Material World," Ethnohistory 35 (1988): 365.
53 Vivian J. Rohrl, "A Nutritional Factor in Windigo Psychosis," American Anthropologist 74 (1972): 101.
54 Sanday, 109.
55 Ibid., 109.
56 Teicher, 80.
57 Sanday, 109.
58 Lou Marano, "Windigo Psychosis: The Anatomy of an Emic-Etic

Confusion [and Comments and Reply]," Current Anthropology 23 (1982): 396.

59 Teicher, 89.

60 Sanday, 110.

61 Thomas H. Hay, "The Windigo Psychosis: Psychodynamic, Cultural, and Social Factors in Aberrant Behavior," American Anthropologist 73 (1971): 3.

62 Smith, 235.

Danielle Smith

Laywomen Deriving Power from their Piety and Involvement with the Medieval English Church

When thinking of the medieval church and women's roles within it, most people think patriarchy; women with no rights or power. The only women who gained any respect had to become nuns and live as virgins. Women in the Middle Ages had to constantly struggle between the faults of Eve and the ideal of Mary. When it is mentioned that women actually could derive power from the church, most people are more than a little skeptical. Despite the many restrictions placed on women by the church, it had its good points, too. Laywomen who were pious, whether within the parish community or on their own, could often find their relationship with the church to be empowering. Whether this granted a public power or a private, personal power depended on the woman and her situation, but it certainly did happen. Compared to today, this "power" may seem insignificant, but it is proof that medieval women were not oppressed completely by the church.

The community of the parish was an important part of everyday life for women. Much of women's socializing took place at the church, and it was through involvement with the parish community that many women were able to express their piety. Katherine L. French offers some of the ways in which women could play roles in their parishes:

> Women's pious concerns reflected their domestic spheres of action. Within their families, women spun wool, washed and mended the clothes, and dressed the children. Buying altar clothes and banners for side altars dedicated to women saints is a similar gesture. … Activities conducted in all-women's groups, whether at Hocktide, with its clear-cut gender roles and its focus on male and female sexual contact, or in women's guilds, with their emphasis on marital status, provided ways of incorporating women's concerns about marriage and their interactions with men into local religious life and parish participation.[1]

Obviously, the practices of gift-giving, being involved with women's guilds, and participation in Hocktide (all to be discussed below) helped women to achieve greater visibility than they would have had otherwise.

These roles are not the only ones that could empower women of the parish. While it is true that some customs only allowed householders to have an influence on parish politics, thus eliminating most women, there were still opportunities for widows. In Nettlecomb, Somerset, the office of churchwarden was rotated through families. In the case of a deceased husband without a male relative to pass on the position, it became acceptable for a widow to take his place, thus keeping the family in the cycle. French writes, "Allowing widows to serve as churchwardens suggests that the parish viewed the office as a family honor and responsibility to be preserved, even when it required the unusual step of having widows take over for their deceased husbands."[2] The primary duty of a churchwarden was to watch over the liturgical items in the absence of a member of the clergy to do so.[3] They also kept detailed accounts of the stock of their church. This was quite a responsibility to allow to be bestowed upon a woman, and obviously, a woman who became churchwarden obtained a fair amount of public power. While women as churchwardens never did become the norm, it was acceptable. French attributes it to being "part of a broader regional pattern of including women in parish administrations," noting that this area was also home to the majority of all-women's guilds.[4] Another factor in women's becoming churchwardens was religious uncertainty in the time leading up to the Reformation: men were wary of accepting such a position, and so it was able to fall to women.

The only women who were churchwardens were widows from prosperous families. However, other women could still find ways to hold some degree of power in their local churches, as long as they had the proper connections. Women whose husbands or other family members were involved in the administration of the church could use this influence to take on leadership roles. French gives the example of two women who were in charge of the church ale held on the feast of St. Margaret. One woman was married to a man who had served as churchwarden on several occasions, and the other had a relative who had served not only as churchwarden but also as bailiff.[5] While these women did not become churchwardens themselves, their familial relationships allowed them to gain visibility within the community by doing something for their church.

Another way women could gain renown in their local communities was by giving gifts to the church. Gifts to the church were often a form of fund-raising, with smaller gifts being sold for profit and larger gifts such as land being kept

within the parish for its use. The types of gifts given by women, and whether or not they were credited in the church's records, depended on the woman's own economic status. Town women were more likely to give cash, which was considered more of a family gift. In this case, the husband would usually be listed as the only benefactor, although the community would recognize it as a gift from the whole family. Rural women, on the other hand, were more likely to give clothing and jewelry, "personal or individualized property rather than household or familial property controlled by their husbands," and these were the items more likely to have a woman's name attached to them in the records.[6] Lower-class women could also be recognized for their cash donations. When the parish of Yatton decided to have a painting done of the Virgin Mary in 1467, the churchwarden collected donations: on the list are two lower-class women who donated money to the project.[7]

French also suggests that the gifts given by women were determined by their roles at home: "[they] used their notions of home economy and domesticity to act out their piety."[8] This can be seen rather clearly in women's bequests to the church in their wills (it should be noted that married women could not make wills without the husband's permission, so most of these wills were made by widows). Women were likely to bequest household items (such as sheets and dishes), clothing (such as dresses and kerchiefs), and jewelry (usually wedding rings). Men, on the other hand, left items such as tools, liturgical items, and vestments.[9] Women were also more likely to leave instructions as to how their gifts should be used. "By offering suggestions, women became posthumously involved in parish administrative decision making–from which they had generally been excluded during their lives."[10] Although the giving of these gifts was considered pious, it could also be construed as the woman finding a way to be bossy and overbearing. Overbearing or not, gift-giving and leaving instructions for usage allowed women to exercise a bit of public power before their deaths, knowing that they would still wield some sort of control over the gift even in death.

Within a church, men and women's pews were separated according to gender (only the very well-off could afford pews for the whole family to sit together). While this segregation could sometimes have negative results (French notes that having a permanent seat could make women visible and thus susceptible to attack[11]), it also allowed for a strengthening of community bonds between the women who sat together. "Although men had plenty of public opportunities to gather in all-male groups, attendance at church became one of the few sanctioned places where women could gather in all-female groups," French writes.[12] These women could also come together

after the birthing of a child in a ritual called "churching," during which they had their own liturgical celebration.[13] This kind of solidarity could, in turn, lead to the forming of women's guilds. Guilds could address differences that existed within a parish, and different guilds could address specific interests. These guilds often supported a side altar, a chapel, and a light within the nave. In Stogursey, the St. Mary's guild seemed to be made up predominantly of women. The wardens were men, but the guild's property was only rented by women.[14]

Guilds could also serve social needs. Maidens' guilds could play a role in helping young women attract husbands. Through involvement with a guild, a woman could be out performing activities that she normally could not do without compromising her reputation, such as soliciting money for the parish. A young woman participating in guild activities was also displaying her piety and economic sense, desirable traits in a wife. The chances of a young woman finding a husband increased when a maidens' guild collaborated on a project with a young men's guild, putting the two sexes in closer proximity than they had been before.[15]

Even if these guilds had not been useful in making marriage matches, they allowed women of similar social standing to connect with one another. The usual age at marriage in England was older than the rest of Europe, and this created a prolonged period between childhood and marriage, in which many young women either worked as servants or helped their families, leaving little time for socializing. Being part of a young women's guild gave them a chance to socialize with other women in the same situation. This also held true for married women, who could use guilds to express and discuss common concerns.[16]

The holiday "Hocktide" was yet another outgrowth of a strong church community that afforded women some power that they normally would not have had. The unique celebration "was thought to commemorate a victory by Anglo-Saxon women over the Vikings,"[17] and women were the primary organizers and participants. Hocktide took place on two days: the second Monday and Tuesday after Easter. On Monday, the women of the church would chase men, tie them up, and demand payment of "forfeit," upon which they would release the men. On Tuesday, the roles would be reversed.[18] Because the money collected would then be given to the parish, these festivities allowed women to have an economic role not normally available to them. In parishes where both sexes had a turn, the women were frequently more successful than the men at raising money.[19]

One of the explanations put forth for the women's impressive monetary success comes down to one of the fundamental differences between men and women in medieval society: men simply had more money. When they were captured, women could expect a large return. On the other hand, when a woman was captured, she would not have as much money to forfeit. She could, however, rely on her charms to exact a donation from another man so that she could be released, although this still did not bring in the kind of money that the capturing of men did.[20] The ways in which a community put the money raised to use also reflected the holiday's emphasis on women. Various parishes record the money as having been used for a light to support the Virgin Mary, a new tabernacle for a St. Mary statue, a banner for St. Margaret, a satin altar cloth, curtains, and various other church furnishings that one would associate with woman's role within the church.[21] Women's strengthening roles in the church made their contemporaries nervous: women needed to keep within expected female behaviour.[22] It may be for this reason that so many of the items purchased with money raised from Hocktide and by women's guilds reflected what one may term "women's interests." By using women's profits to purchase items that were associated with women, it was insured that this solidarity among women was being "channeled into more acceptable directions that would reestablish women's interests within traditional limits of behavior."[23] Undoubtedly, these men would have been more comfortable had the women in their parishes kept their spirituality more private.

Another way women could become involved with the church without leaving their "lay" positions (and possibly also a way to keep from causing a lot of tension) was by becoming what Dyan Elliot refers to as "professional penitents."[24] These women would confess far more often than the once a year that was required, and in much further detail. "Women were not only regarded as especially prone to frequent confession, but their spiritual lives were seemingly organized around their confessional needs and desires," Elliot writes.[25] Jacques de Vitry remarked that Beguines (a group of religious laywomen who would usually fall under the "professional penitents" category) would cry more over a venial sin than the men from his country would cry over a thousand mortal sins.[26] Elliot attributes this to men and women's separate positions in the world: "Men, socially enabled, could search the world. Women, socially hobbled, could search their souls."[27] With options outside of the home so limited to women, it was only logical that they should turn to spirituality find power of a different sort.

Women could use their sex's tendency towards spirituality to achieve their own ends. Elliot tells the story of a woman (appropriately named Sybil) who

tricked her community into believing that she was a mystic. She pretended to have raptures, have conversations between angels and demons, and fight off demons. At night, she would put on a demon disguise and walk the streets "threatening" Sybil for her spirituality. She was eventually found out, and it was discovered that many of her tricks had been carried off with the help of her local priest. Nevertheless, for a short time Sybil had achieved a type of fame that many women could not; her fame even continues today, although perhaps not for the reasons she would have liked.[28]

Another private way in which women could use their piety to empower themselves was at home, through the usage of devotional manuals. Robert L. A. Clark argues that devotional manuals were far from the stifling objects they are often thought to be, and instead "encouraged their readers actively to engage in the exploration and creation of subject positions that otherwise would not have been available to them."[29] Devotional literature frequently prescribed a prayer regimen not far off from that of a cloistered woman, except that it had to be adapted for a laywoman's life. In the cases of the texts Clark examines, these are women who would probably be members of a female monastic community, except that they cannot withdraw from their social responsibilities. In the case of a married woman, it was not only the responsibilities of running a household and looking after her children that stopped her. Her body was not hers to dispose of as she pleased; it belonged to her husband. Young girls and widows could also have responsibilities at home that prevented them from entering the monastic life. These worldly responsibilities kept women from being able to achieve the devotional ideal.[30] This may seem to only reinforce the idea of these devotional books as stifling, but Clark takes the opposite view: "it fell to the women in question to juggle their various obligations … in so doing, they were actively engaged in constructing themselves as devotional subjects."[31] Instead of feeling suffocated by the expectations put upon them in their home life and spirituality, these women were given a choice about how to handle the situation, thus taking their spirituality and indeed religion into their own hands.

One solution could be to find a way to turn nondevotional activities into devotional ones. The simple act of dressing could be a reason to pray to God and give thanks.[32] The other (and probably simpler) solution was to set aside parts of the day for devotion, especially those that were seen as "especially propitious for prayer," such as early morning.[33] The devotional manuals also instructed that the girl or woman use her room for these purposes. It was her room where a woman could go to read, pray, meditate, and retire from the world, and it became sanctified through these activities. Some manuals instruct

that the women keep an altar in her room, decorated with holy images and an altar cloth of her own making.[34] This kind of life was easiest for women who were highborn, as they had the leisure of following a demanding devotional program. Clark explains how the highborn woman should see her position:

> She should realize that God has granted the labor of the socially humble to the church, nobles, and bourgeois, not so that they can be called monsieur or mademoiselle and wear fine clothes but so that they will have the instruction, intelligence, and strength to purge body and soul and turn themselves entirely to God.[35]

In this respect, then, there is no reason why a highborn woman should not follow the instructions of a devotional book. To do so granted women a type of autonomy they could not achieve otherwise. Women who followed devotional books had the leisure of personalizing their religion and having their own little sanctuaries in which to pray and meditate. Juggling devotional books with the responsibilities of daily life gave women a religious experience that was quite different from what one would receive if involved in a parish as mentioned earlier.

From rowdy parish activities like Hocktide to the intensely personal decisions that went into following a devotional manual, it is undoubtedly true that women had much more autonomy than many people would assume. While women may not have frequently become church leaders, it did happen. Overly zealous confessions were also a way of expressing piety that gave women spiritual power. And women who followed devotional manuals had the unique experience of personalizing their religion. Women were not equal to men by any stretch of the imagination, but taking their religious experiences into their own hands was a step in the right direction.

1 Katherine L. French, "Women in the Late Medieval English Parish" in Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages, ed. Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, 167 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.)
2 Katherine L. French, *The People of the Parish: Community Life in a Late Medieval English Diocese* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), 78.
3 French, *The People of the Parish*, 45.
4 French, *The People of the Parish*, 87.
5 French, *The People of the Parish*, 82.
6 French, *The People of the Parish*, 105.
7 French, *The People of the Parish*, 201.
8 French, "Women in the Late Medieval English Parish," 160.
9 French, "Women in the Late Medieval English Parish," 160.
10 French, "Women in the Late Medieval English Parish," 161.
11 French, *The People of the Parish*, 167.
12 French, *The People of the Parish*, 167.
13 Katherine L. French, "'To Free Them from Binding': Women in the Late Medieval English Parish" Journal of Interdisciplinary History 27, no. 3 (1997): 394
14 French, *The People of the Parish*, 172.
15 French, "Maidens' Lights and Wives' Stores: Women's Parish Guilds in Late Medieval England" Sixteenth Century Journal 29, no. 2 (1998): 411.
16 French, "Maidens' Lights," 411.
17 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 389.
18 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 389.
19 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 391, 401.
20 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 407.
21 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 409.
22 French, "Women in the Late Medieval English Parish," 157.
23 French, "To Free Them from Binding," 399.
24 Dyan Elliot, "Women and Confession: From Empowerment to Pathology" in Gendering the Master Narrative: Women and Power in the Middle Ages, ed. Mary C. Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski, 34 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003).
25 Elliot, 31.
26 Elliot, 32.
27 Elliot, 36.
28 Elliot, 38-40.
29 Robert L. A. Clark, "Constructing the Female Subject in Late Medieval Devotion" in Medieval Conduct, ed. Kathleen Ashley and Robert L. A. Clark, 160 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2001).
30 Clark, 169.

31 Clark, 170.
32 Clark, 171.
33 Clark, 171.
34 Clark, 172.
35 Clark, 177.

About the Authors

Julie Unger is a Senior History and Russian Double Major from Madison, Alabama, President of College Democrats, and the History Representitive on the Dean's Student Advisory Committee.

Jason Straight is a Freshman History Major, Medieval Studies Minor from Luling, Louisiana and Editor of the Student Historical Journal.

Rachel Henderson is a Senior History Major, Spanish Minor from Fort Collins, Colorado.

Danielle Smith is a Junior English Literature Major, Medieval Studies and Women's Studies Minor from Metairie, Louisiana, and a Member of Sigma Tau Delta.