

# Ibid.

A Student History Journal

Published by the Eta Nu Chapter  
of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society

Texas Woman's University  
Denton, Texas

Volume Two  
Spring 2009

The contents of these essays are the sole responsibility of their respective authors and contributors and do not necessarily represent the official statements, opinions, or policies of Texas Woman's University, the Department of History and Government, the Eta Nu chapter of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society, or the editorial board. Neither Texas Woman's University, the Department of History and Government, the Eta Nu Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society, nor the editorial board accepts any responsibility or liability for any information contained on these pages.

© 2009, *Ibid.*: A Student History Journal

*Published by the Eta Nu Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society, Denton, Texas*

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....	iii
Editorial Board .....	v
Foreword .....	vii
<i>Christian Culture in Seventeenth-Century New Spain</i> by Bridgette Baima .....	1
<i>Soldados y Susannas del SP: The Mexican American</i> <i>Experience in World War II</i> by Stephanie Parham .....	13
<i>Feeding the Wartime Family: How Women Made Do</i> <i>With Less in the Name of Patriotism</i> by Jody Clayton .....	21
<i>Those Quaking Female Prophetesses</i> by Teresa Pierce .....	31
<i>A Thousand Words Unsaid: The Role of Censorship in</i> <i>the United States During World War II</i> by Tiffany Smith .....	49
Contributors .....	63
2008-2009 Chapter Officers .....	65



# *Introduction*

Welcome to the second volume of *Ibid.: A Student History Journal*, published by the Eta Nu chapter of Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society at Texas Woman's University. After our inaugural issue last spring, we received a generous amount of positive feedback; I hope that this year's journal has repeated the right things while improving upon others and will continue to grow into the enormous task of publishing academic work!

This year's journal would not have been possible without the extraordinary efforts of our editorial boards. Kate Landdeck and Jacob Blosser from Texas Woman's University, Eric Cheezum from Chesapeake College, and Aaron Haberman from University of Northern Colorado have returned from last year, and I am also pleased to welcome Alexis Antracoli from St. Francis University on board as well. Of course, as a student-run publication, I am deeply grateful to our student editorial board for all of their hard work: Michele Lockhart, Stephanie Parham, and Amy Hulbert from Texas Woman's University, and Derek Boetcher and Kevin Eades from University of North Texas. Thank you also to our new department chair, Mark Kessler, for his continuous encouragement.

And, of course, I am most appreciative of the students who researched, wrote, submitted, and revised their papers for this year's volume, and I am delighted that this journal can continue its support of student scholarship.

Leslie Lindsey, Editor  
May 2009  
Denton, Texas



# *Editorial Board*

**Editor:**

Leslie Lindsey

**Faculty Editorial Board:**

Dr. Jacob Blosser, Faculty Advisor, Texas Woman's University

Dr. Katherine Landdeck, Texas Woman's University

Dr. Alexis Antracoli, St. Francis University (PA)

Dr. Eric Cheezum, Chesapeake College

Dr. Aaron Haberman, University of Northern Colorado

**Student Editorial Board:**

Amy Hulbert, Texas Woman's University

Michelle Lockhart, Texas Woman's University

Stephanie Parham, Texas Woman's University

Derek Boetcher, University of North Texas

Kevin Eades, University of North Texas

**Contact:**

Editor, *Ibid.: A Student History Journal*

Department of History and Government

Texas Woman's University

P.O. Box 425889

Denton, Texas 76204

(940) 898-2133

[www.ibidjournal.wordpress.com](http://www.ibidjournal.wordpress.com)



# Foreword

I am honored to introduce another volume of *Ibid.: A Student History Journal*. Both Phi Alpha Theta History Honor Society and the Department of History and Government at Texas Woman's University are dedicated to fostering a lively and diverse environment for student inquiry, and this year's selection of essays are representative of the assorted conversations within historical discourse today.

The first two essays, authored by Bridgette Baima and Stephanie Parham, tackle themes of race and identity. Ms. Baima arranges an interesting argument on behalf of the ancient Pueblo culture from the present-day American Southwest in *Christian Culture in Seventeenth-Century New Spain*. Upon the arrival of Franciscan missionaries and the Spanish military in North America, Ms. Baima describes how Pueblos were forced to adapt their civilization to Christian and Spanish mores, with the percolating tension eventually coming to a raging boil in the Pueblo Revolt of 1680. In the next essay, *Soldados y Susannas del SP: The Mexican American Experience in World War II*, Ms. Parham illustrates the struggle of Mexican Americans during World War II. She shares how previous societal and political norms were challenged and that questions of civic duty and patriotism among men on the battlefield and women in the home front were brought forward in an ethnic community that had yet to benefit from all of the promises afforded by United States citizenship.

The next two essays address, appropriately enough for this university, the varied subject of women's history. First, Jodi Clayton investigates the lives of American women on the home front during

World War II in *Feeding the Wartime Family: How Women Made Do With Less in the Name of Patriotism*. Using generous amounts of primary material culled from newspapers, magazines, and cookbooks, Ms. Clayton creates an accurate portrayal of adaptations made by both working and stay-at-home mothers to create nutritional meals for their families, as well as the political implications and messages these changes had in the war effort. Next, Teresa Pierce constructs an interesting claim in *Those Quaking Female Prophetesses* that bucks traditional scholarship asserting that female Quakers in the seventeenth century were motivated by contemporary feminist ideology. Rather, Ms. Pierce uses these women's own writings to argue that they were driven by religious doctrine, and female agency was merely a byproduct in this pursuit of piety.

The journal concludes with an essay by Tiffany Smith entitled *A Thousand Words Unsaid: The Role of Censorship in the United States During World War II*, which undertakes the contentious issue of information control by the government during periods of military conflict. Ms. Smith explains how the federal bureaucracy was established during World War II to manage not only the public's perception of the campaigns but also the flow of military intelligence so that soldiers would be protected. Most interestingly, Ms. Smith writes, was the media's ready compliance with these new policies and their willingness to transmit only what the government deemed appropriate.

Although these essays cover a wide time span, they are all linked by their respective writer's dedication to uncovering new and interesting interpretations of sources, as well as by the author's devotion to depict the past as accurately and perceptively as possible. We are pleased to include them in this year's volume.

Leslie Lindsey, Editor  
May 2009  
Denton, Texas

# *Christian Culture in Seventeenth-Century New Spain*

by Bridgette Baima

The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 poses a distinct problem for scholars, as there are very few documents left from the period because, during the Revolt, the Pueblos gained control of Spanish buildings and destroyed almost all books and papers holding records of the early seventeenth century. This devastation has crippled the search for reasons behind the Revolt until recently, when archeological finds have been able to piece together these cultures and helped scholars to better understand seventeenth-century New Mexico. Although there were many catalysts that pushed the Pueblos into action, the all-encompassing motive for the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was the presence of a Christian society.

Franciscan priests sent by Spain to the region in the seventeenth century expected Pueblos to change their lives and to live like “civilized” European Christians, yet Franciscans and the Spanish military both abused the Pueblos in a very uncivilized manner. In this Christian society established in the new world, Pueblos held no power, and although love and equality were preached by Franciscans, it was never demonstrated, particularly by the Spanish military. Under the guise of Christianity, the Spanish military enslaved and abused the Pueblos from first contact. The Franciscans, on the other hand, wanted to come and “help” the Pueblos by converting them to Christianity, but for this to be successful, the Pueblos were required to give up everything they knew. Natives were expected to change every aspect of their culture; this led to increasing resentment and bitterness both toward the Franciscans and towards Christianity. The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was caused primarily by the Christian culture that was forced

upon the Pueblos, a culture that was perceived as hypocritical and was ultimately damaging for the Pueblo way of life.

Pre-Spanish Pueblo society was based on a gift giving culture. One cultural practice was that of indebtedness, which kept children respectful towards their elders. Historian Ramón A. Gutiérrez explained that parents and grandparents gave gifts to others in exchange for them to bless or train their child or “junior” in some way. As the junior grew up, they were to respect their parents and work hard to repay gifts given to others on the junior’s behalf.<sup>1</sup> This gift system was not only used to keep the balance between juniors and seniors; it was also used to keep the balance between men and women. Sex was something that women could give to any man, but it was not given freely. In return for this act, women could expect to get blankets or some other kind of gift from the man. Physicality was also given as a sign of peace, and when outsiders came to the villages, women would offer their bodies to the foreign men to keep peace between the two villages.<sup>2</sup> These practices greatly disturbed the Franciscan priests, who saw sex as something that should only be practiced within marriage and should never be given in exchange for material goods. For the Pueblo people, religion and sexuality were intimately connected; being ashamed of their bodies, or even covering them, was not their societal norm.<sup>3</sup>

Sexual intercourse and religion were completely intertwined in Pueblo society, so much so that “it was common for men and women to give their bodies to persons they deemed holy, in order to partake of their supernatural power.”<sup>4</sup> These sacred Pueblo rituals were not understood by the Franciscans or the Spanish military and were looked upon with disgust. Since this type of sexuality was not permitted by the Franciscans, and intercourse was only accepted within a legal marriage by the Spanish government, it was impossible for the Spanish to appreciate this aspect of Pueblo culture.

Native sexual practices were one of the single biggest sources of contention between Franciscan priests and the Pueblos. When the Franciscans arrived in New Spain, they were aghast to see men and women living in this way because they did not understand the gift giving society or the open sexuality. The Franciscans could not

---

<sup>1</sup> Ramón A. Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came, The Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500-1846* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press), 8-11.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

understand that “sexual intercourse was the symbol of cosmic harmony for the Pueblo Indians because it united in balance all the masculine forces of the sky with all the feminine forces of the earth.”<sup>5</sup> Since the Franciscans were determined to convert Pueblos to Christianity, they demanded that the Pueblos become monogamous. However, this was not understood or accepted by the Pueblo Indians; it went not only against their social norms but also against their religious practices. Although Pueblos went through a marriage ritual, it was never monogamous; even after the ceremony, it did not mean that the man and woman were tied solely to each other. Nor was it a lifelong commitment. Once the woman was ready to move on, she did so and the man found a new wife.<sup>6</sup> This type of open sexual relationship was not something that the Pueblos grew angry about; it was simply a way of life.

Open sexuality was one of the most striking differences between the Pueblo native religion and Franciscan Christianity. Therefore, when the Spanish military came to New Mexico, the Pueblo women gave themselves to the Spaniards as a sign of peace. But the soldiers simply saw the women as being lascivious and having no morals. As Gutiérrez notes, “the generosity of Pueblo women and the seeming indifference of their husbands to their behavior would have made sense to the Spaniards if placed within the political context of gifts as diplomatic gestures that guaranteed blessings and peace.”<sup>7</sup> The Spanish military essentially took advantage of the women and these practices in the Pueblo villages. Pueblos were very open with their sexuality, but they did not believe in forcing sex upon their women; sexuality was something to be given, not taken. As Fray Francisco Zamora wrote, “I know for certain that the soldiers have violated them [the women] often along the roads.”<sup>8</sup>

Although there were some similarities between the Christian and Pueblo faiths, the Franciscan missionaries only saw differences and demanded that the Pueblos wholly convert to Christianity. According to historian Henry W. Bowden, the Franciscans were, “convinced either that the Indians possessed no religion at all or that they had been lured by the Devil into a repugnant congeries of idol worship and

---

<sup>5</sup> Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 51-52.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 51-52.

superstition.”<sup>9</sup> Once the Franciscans had established their authority in a town, they ordered Pueblos to obey the Christian way of life, while “traditional leaders who persisted in continuing the old rituals were arrested, and the gentle sons of St. Francis directed that they be whipped or executed.”<sup>10</sup> Franciscans were eventually successful in spreading Christian doctrine and culture, but this transition was not always peaceful; Franciscans often used whatever means necessary to force Pueblos into Christianity. Often Franciscans would appoint *Fiscales*, or churchwardens, who would distribute punishment of those who may have been conflicted morally or were not paying attention in church. This resulted in additional resistance toward Christianity in the minds of the Pueblos, “prompting many Indians to regard the whip as the Christian symbol of authority.”<sup>11</sup> The harsh manner that many Franciscans dealt with Pueblos created very negative impressions of Christianity and why one should follow it.

Once Franciscans established a mission building in the town where they were assigned, they started a school for the Pueblo children. Although adults in Pueblo society saw Franciscans as harsh and sometimes even cruel in their interactions with natives, their treatment of children was much different. Children were taught well and given rewards for good behavior, sometimes with gifts of food or often tools to make farming easier.<sup>12</sup> By enticing children to attend school at the mission, Franciscans were able to raise and indoctrinate them in a Christian environment; in doing this, they attracted a young generation of Pueblos further from native traditions. This change upset the social order of the Pueblos, which normally brought up Pueblo children taught by their mothers. This system indebted children to their mothers in order to cultivate respect and their better treatment as they grew older. With the new Christian system, it was Franciscans who the children became indebted to, not their mothers or fathers. When children who were raised in missions became adults, they had not developed this indebtedness to their birth parents and, therefore, had no reason to continue serving them. By raising children in the Catholic Church, the Franciscans broke the cycle of gift giving, the cornerstone of the Pueblo culture.

---

<sup>9</sup> Henry W. Bowden, “Spanish Missions, Cultural Conflict and the Pueblo Revolt of 1680,” *Church History* 44, no. 2 (1975): 217-228.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 223.

<sup>11</sup> Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 81.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

When Franciscans instituted a Christian European cultural system, it was female Pueblos who lost the most. As Pueblos saw an end to their practices of open sexuality, so Pueblo women saw an end to their power. In traditional Pueblo culture, both men and women shared power in interpersonal relationships; it was simply assumed in different ways. Men were perceived as the stronger of the two and it was their job to hunt and go to war, while women gained power from their sexuality.<sup>13</sup> Since the Pueblos believed the world to be conceived through a woman, sexuality and the ability to contrive their bodies or not gave women a huge amount of authority. Sexual intercourse was also seen as a way for women to usurp a man's power; before men would leave for a hunt or to go to war, they would abstain from having sex, for they believed that women would take their strength.<sup>14</sup> When Franciscans arrived at the Pueblo tribes, they insisted on complete sexual abstinence outside of marriage; this forever changed the women's once powerful influence. And an end to open sexuality by the Franciscans ended the women's ability to trade with men, leaving women completely dependent upon the men for their subsistence, rather than it being a transaction agreed to by both parties.

As more Pueblos became Christianized, they also began to lose their native religious rituals. The Franciscans "stressed attendance at Mass, morning and evening prayer, monogamy with no divorce and obedience to Spanish magistrates as fundamental elements of moral life."<sup>15</sup> This changed everyday life for the Pueblos; a new European society was now destroying the gift-giving society and the traditional, ceremonial way of life. The elders and medicine men were the most vehemently opposed to this change as it now gave power to the younger men and destroyed the life they had worked to create. By upsetting these cultural norms, the Franciscans were able to gain more power.

The Franciscans did not simply bring a new religion to the Pueblos; instead, they brought a completely new way of life. Christianity did not leave any room for the Pueblo native culture and they were expected to abandon it. According to historian David J. Weber, Franciscans "altered native societies in ways that had nothing to do with Christianity but everything to do with living in civilized or European fashion – living *politicamente*."<sup>16</sup> Gone were the ceremonial

---

<sup>13</sup> Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 20.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>15</sup> Bowden, "Spanish Missions, Cultural Conflict and the Pueblo Revolt of 1680," 224.

<sup>16</sup> David J. Weber, *What Caused the Pueblo Revolt of 1680*, (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's,

dances, native gods, and medicine men; no longer did the women have the same equal standing in the community. The changes Franciscans enforced effectively took away native culture; the Pueblos were now expected to be not only “Christian” but also European. When Franciscans moved into Pueblo villages, they had a single purpose in mind: to convert all of Pueblos, irregardless of the cost.

Although Franciscans had a huge impact on Pueblos, they were not the only group of people who oppressed the Pueblos. The Spanish military came to conquer the Pueblos and find the gold that they were sure was to be found in New Spain. Along with the Franciscans, it was “a determined action by both arms of Spanish culture to eradicate every vestige of Indian life, world view as well as ethos.”<sup>17</sup> Believing that Pueblos were not any smarter than animals, the Spanish military had no problem treating them as such. Historian Robert Silverberg states that, the Spanish military did not, “see the Indians as anything much more than beast of burden, placed upon the earth to carry out the bidding of Europeans; clearly they were some kind of inferior species.”<sup>18</sup> When the Spanish came to conquer North America, Pueblos did not have the advanced technology the Spanish possessed and were therefore easy targets. The Spanish government forced the Pueblos to pay high amounts of tribute to leaders, to the point that the Pueblos themselves did not have the resources to provide for their own families.

With the belief that natives were put on earth to serve them, the Spanish military enslaved many Indians. The ruling government in Spain prohibited the capture and enslavement of the Pueblos, unless the master had a license or order to enslave them.<sup>19</sup> However, this law was rarely enforced; Pueblos were routinely taken and forced into slavery. Some Franciscans did protest this enslavement, but too often they had a personal investment in not protecting the natives from being exploited. As Silverberg notes, “if the governor compelled the Indians to work to the point of exhaustion and starvation on the lands of the *encomenderos*, who would tend the orchards of the missions ... who would provide the priests and their growing staffs with food?”<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, women were forced to become household slaves while men

---

1999), 64.

<sup>17</sup> Bowden, “Spanish Missions, Cultural Conflict and the Pueblo Revolt of 1680,” 220.

<sup>18</sup> Robert Silverberg, *The Pueblo Revolt* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1994), 77.

<sup>19</sup> Charles W. Hackett, “Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermin’s Attempted Reconquest 1680-1682” in *Coronado Cuarto Centennial Publications, 1540-1940, Volume 8*, ed. George P. Hammond (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1942), 219.

<sup>20</sup> Silverberg, *The Pueblo Revolt*, 77.

often worked the fields. Since the Spanish military did not bring women to the New World, Pueblo women who worked in the Spanish houses were frequently taken advantage of and often sexually abused. Spanish were very worried about miscegenation and the decline of “pure blood” Spanish settlers. According to Andrew L. Knaut, “surviving documentary evidence indicates that Pueblo and Spanish ancestries blended at a rate sufficient to alarm those conservative members of the need to maintain clear lines of European heritage in the midst of a Pueblo majority.”<sup>21</sup> The Spanish were greatly afraid that their Spanish culture would be absorbed by the Pueblos and they would no longer be the dominant race. This fear drove many of the Spanish to treat those who were mulattos or mestizos very poorly; those of mixed heritage were shunned from both cultures.

The Spanish military would also often push Pueblos to fight in a “just war” to punish those Indians who were not following Spanish law, although these expeditions were usually just to find slaves.<sup>22</sup> Since New Mexico did not yield the kind of precious metals that Spain was expecting, “the only way to amass wealth in mineral-poor New Mexico was to exploit Indian Labor.”<sup>23</sup> The Spaniards used the Indians’ disobedience as an excuse to enslave and exploit them, and since there were no precious metals to be found, the need for slaves to work the fields was great. Typically, Franciscans did not openly accept slaves, but it was not unusual to give a Pueblo town in tribute to Spanish soldiers who had helped the priests in some way. Indians who were held in these situations were called *encomiendas*; twice every year the Pueblo town would be required to pay their soldiers in maize, cotton clothing, or skins.<sup>24</sup> Franciscans decided to become indebted to these Spanish soldiers, not the Pueblos, even though it was always Pueblos who were required to pay the Spanish in “‘just’ amounts of Indian tribute and labor in return for protection, escort, and deference.”<sup>25</sup> Forcing Pueblos to work and pay for protection that was for the benefit of the Franciscan priests can be interpreted as another form of enslavement and abuse that Pueblos suffered at the hands of both Franciscans and Spanish soldiers. Although Franciscans occasionally tried to stop the enslavement of the Pueblos, often it was contingent on

---

<sup>21</sup> Andrew L. Knaut, *The Pueblo Revolt of 1680* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995), 139.

<sup>22</sup> Gutiérrez, *When Jesus Came*, 104.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 111.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 111.

whether or not it would benefit them. If the Franciscans could gain protection or needed the labor themselves, they were much more ready to defend the Pueblos. Although the Franciscans often had problems with the local Spanish government, the two would ally together to threaten and coerce the natives into doing as the Spanish military and the Franciscans wanted.

The enslavement of the Pueblos was often debated between Spanish authorities but rarely was anything done to protect the Pueblos. In a letter written by Don Bartolomé de Estrada of La Nueva Vizcaya in September 1680, he stated that, "one remedy I see is to declare as slaves, for a period of ten years, all the hostile Indians who may be captured, this to apply beginning with the age of sixteen. I regard this as much lighter punishment than their iniquity and wrongdoing deserve, and while his Majesty's orders oppose it, circumstances alter cases."<sup>26</sup> Don Bartolomé goes on to say that he is suggesting this because of his "experience" and knowledge on proper punishment for Pueblos, not because he wants more slaves.<sup>27</sup> Enslavement, along with regular beatings, was often applied to Indians who opposed the Spanish troops and who protected their homes, even if these Pueblos were no more than children.

These cultural, religious, economic, and physical abuses suffered by Pueblos at the hands of the Spanish military were ultimately the primary catalysts behind the Revolt of 1680. Over decades, resentment and bitterness built up within Pueblo societies, but it was only under the direction of one man that they were able to unite together. Popé was a Pueblo medicine man who was arrested by the Spanish government in 1675 for "sorcery"; he, along with forty-two other men, was arrested and whipped for disobedience.<sup>28</sup> This punishment reinforced Popé's hatred for the Spanish and their Christian culture. Over the next several years, Popé lived in secrecy at Tiwas of Taos, sending messages to many different chieftains to find other tribes who wanted freedom from the Spanish troops as well. As described by historian Andrew Kanut, "from his distant mountain kiva he dispatched runners, charged to secrecy under pain of death, to bring his message of liberation to every Pueblo in the land."<sup>29</sup> Popé provided the inspiration and direction the Pueblos needed to join as one force and stop the abuse.

---

<sup>26</sup> Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico*, 134.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>28</sup> Silverberg, *The Pueblo Revolt*, 97.

<sup>29</sup> Knaut, *The Pueblo Revolt of 1680*, 168.

Since the Pueblos greatly outnumbered the Spanish military, the biggest problem the Pueblos faced was being able to communicate to form a united front against the Spanish. Popé devised a way to communicate without the Spanish finding out; “he sent out a cord with some knots tied in it to represent the number of days that should intervene before the revolt.”<sup>30</sup> Originally the attack was set for the eleventh of August, 1680, but this changed when two of the secret runners were intercepted and tortured until they revealed the date. When his men were captured, Popé moved the day up in order to keep some elements a secret. Although it was not as secretive as first planned, the Franciscans and Spaniards were still taken by surprise, killing many and driving out the rest.

Once the rebellion was put into motion, no mercy was given. The Pueblos killed every Franciscan and persons of Spanish decent that they could capture. It was the intention of the Pueblos to completely rid their land of Spanish people; in doing so, they would be able to return to their ancestral way of worship and lifestyle. The Spanish recorded that the Pueblos killed “more than three hundred and eighty Spaniards – men, women and children – with some servants.”<sup>31</sup> This attack on the Spanish empire was unrivaled by any other rebellions of the time. The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was the first completely successful revolt against the Spanish forces in North America.

From the few remaining documents, it is clear that the Revolt was centered on religious resentments. One of the captured Indians was reported as saying the reason for the Revolt was “because the religious and the Spaniards took away their idols and forbade their sorceries and idolatries; that they have inherited successively from their old men the things pertaining to their ancient customs.”<sup>32</sup> This incredible amount of resentment had built up due not only to the abuses that the Pueblos suffered, but more importantly, because they were being forced to abandon their indigenous culture and religion. As the natives attacked churches and towns, they were recorded as saying, “now God and Santa María were dead, that they were the ones whom the Spaniards worshiped, and that their own God whom they obeyed never died.”<sup>33</sup> This declaration of religious power and superiority displayed Pueblo disgust with the Christian God. Throughout the Revolt, the Pueblos first targeted religious men and all that they had

---

<sup>30</sup> Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico*, XXV.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 178.

<sup>32</sup> Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico*, 60.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

created and, secondly, the Spanish who had abused them. Twenty-one of the thirty-four Franciscan priests in New Spain were killed, while many of the missions were burned and religious vessels were desecrated.<sup>34</sup>

When Antonio de Otermín, the Spanish governor of New Spain, marched out of the territory, records were kept about the towns they found along the way. On 26 August 1680, Otermín's group reached the Pueblo of Sandia; the town had been deserted and many buildings destroyed.<sup>35</sup> When Otermín entered the church he found that, "everything was broken to pieces and destroyed; the sacristy was found empty of chests and of all sacred vessels and vestments, and of the carved figures that were there, for everything had been stolen and profaned by the rebellious traitors."<sup>36</sup> Anything that was left had been mutilated, such as the "full-length figure of Saint Francis with the arms hacked off by an axe."<sup>37</sup> The mayhem and destruction left by the Pueblos was often focused on the church and religious areas of the town.

The fury and anger that had built up in the Pueblos for decades came to reality on 10 August 1680; through their actions, it becomes apparent what their end goal was: to destroy the Christian culture that so threatened their own culture. The Revolt of 1680 was a blatant attack on the Christianity that the Franciscans forced the Pueblos to accept. The Pueblos were ordered "that rosaries be taken away from every [Franciscan] and burned."<sup>38</sup> The Franciscans and their Christian way of life was not the only reason for the Revolt, surely, but it was assuredly a driving force. The *Autos* drawn up directly after the Revolt report said "the Christian Indians of this kingdom are convoked, allied, and confederated for the purpose of rebelling...they desire to kill the ecclesiastical ministers and all the Spaniards, women and children, destroying the whole population of this kingdom."<sup>39</sup>

The Pueblos were a peaceful people who were not known for their battle skills, but when their culture was in danger of being destroyed, the Pueblos created a united front against the Spanish. There were several issues that sparked the beginning of the revolt,

---

<sup>34</sup> Ysidro Sarñana y Cuenca, *The Franciscan Martyrs of 1680: Funeral Oration over the Twenty-one Franciscan Missionaries Killed by the Pueblo Indians, August 10, 1680*. (Santa Fe: Historical Society of New Mexico/New Mexico Printing Company), 10-12.

<sup>35</sup> Hackett, *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico*, 26.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 24.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

including physical, sexual, and cultural abuse. By forcing Christianity and European culture onto Pueblos, Franciscans and Spanish military tried to take away the rich ancestral culture and religion of the natives. For the Pueblos, religion and culture were completely intertwined; there was no separation between their religious convictions and how they lived their lives. The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was the response of an oppressed people who fought to keep their native culture alive.



# *Soldados y Susanas del SP: The Mexican American Experience in World War II*<sup>1</sup>

by Stephanie Parham

During their time in the United States, Mexican Americans have lived an incongruous existence. They have simultaneously been rejected by the country they or their parents have adopted, as well as their native Mexico. In the 1930s, the United States government forced the repatriation of thousands of Mexican American citizens. Despite this indignity that they suffered in the 1930s, Mexican Americans still answered the call to action in the aftermath of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Many consider Mexican American participation in World War II the first step in a shift towards change and equality. During this period of duress, Mexican Americans, who felt as though they had been wronged during repatriation, put aside their anger about the mistreatment they had suffered and allied with their Anglo counterparts. As historian Naomi Quiñónez acknowledged in her article about wartime roles, Mexican Americans could not deny the possibility of “belonging to a nation that had rebuffed and exploited them caused many to take on their new roles with hopes of change for a better future.”<sup>2</sup> During World War II, the Mexican American community seized its chance to become an integral part of society, taking part in every aspect of the war effort from joining the armed forces to going to work in the factories. Once the war was over, society attempted to force them back into their old roles; however, Mexican Americans had already experienced a critical movement towards

---

<sup>1</sup> *Soldados* is Spanish for “soldiers,” while *Susanas del SP* is the Spanish equivalent of “Rosie the Riveter.”

<sup>2</sup> Naomi Quiñónez, “Rosita the Riveter: Welding Tradition with Wartime Transformation” in *Mexican Americans and World War II*, ed. Maggie Rivas Rodriguez (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005), 249.

equality that would later serve as a foundation for the Chicano Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

Historically, it has been the norm for diverse groups to unite in the face of adversity. During World War II, women and ethnic minorities were able to take advantage of opportunities wartime presented. Though there was a “simmering desire to fulfill a patriotic duty,” there was also a knowledge that the war provided Mexican Americans with opportunities they would not have normally encountered.<sup>3</sup> Historian Naomi Quiñónez describes the advantages offered to Mexican Americans during the war which resulted in “Mexican American men enter[ing] the service with no hesitation and women enter[ing] the labor market to discover that, for the first time, they could obtain higher-skilled jobs for much higher wages than they had ever previously earned.”<sup>4</sup> The Mexican American population, like others whose prospects expanded during the war, recognized that they may be allowed rights they never had before and hoped that if they proved themselves in wartime, perhaps they could keep these rights and create a higher status for their group.

Perhaps one of the most significant ways that Mexican Americans gained the respect of dominant society was through their actions on the battlefield. Though some did join the armed forces without thought, others were more tentative. World War II veteran Lázaro Lupian recalled the idea held by some Mexican Americans that the war was not theirs to fight: “You can imagine our surprise when we were the first ones to go. We weren’t even true citizens.”<sup>5</sup> Though many Mexican Americans that were drafted into the war were not American citizens but in fact Mexican citizens, those who enlisted and fought in the United States Armed Forces were legalized and given citizenship. Legal citizenship was one of the steps toward equality made because of the war. Most of the Mexican American soldiers knew about this new chance at citizenship, as can be seen with the number of Mexican American men who joined the armed forces. Salomon Abrego, another Mexican American veteran, said, “I enlisted into the Army for

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>5</sup> Alison Kelley, “Lázaro Lupian Interview by Rene Zambrano,” *U.S. Latino and Latina WWII Oral History Project* (Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, 12 August 2009), [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work\\_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awwlatin.064&work\\_title=Lupian%2C+Lazaro](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awwlatin.064&work_title=Lupian%2C+Lazaro) (accessed 22 August 2009).

three reasons. It fascinated me, there was food and because they were going to get me anyway.”<sup>6</sup>

Once they joined, Mexican American troops participated in all theatres of conflict. Unlike African Americans and, later in the war, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans were neither segregated nor restricted to one front. The issue of integrated units came from the fact that they were considered ‘white’ on their intake papers as “all federal and Texas state laws either accepted people of Mexican descent as white or refrained from explicitly defining them as “Negro” or “colored.”<sup>7</sup> Mexican American troops could not help but notice that, though they were integrated, the treatment they received on the battlefield was as different as the treatment they received on the home front. Mexican American troops experienced inclusion in some units and ostracism in others, depending on who their comrades were and in what theatre they were participating.

For instance, in Italy, Company E, 141st Regiment of the 36th (Texas) Division, an all-Latino unit included not just those of Mexican descent but those of Central and South America as well; it was considered by some to be one of “the most colorful infantry companies that fought in the Mediterranean during WWII.”<sup>8</sup> Company E was not intentionally all-Latino and it was only because of how the different divisions were divided that they were all Latin American. Because the division was from Texas, many of the men knew each other from basic training and through family members, which created a tighter bond between them. This tight-knit bond is further explored in veteran Raul Morín’s *Among the Valiant*, where the author describes the dangerous mission the men of Company E undertook during the Italian campaign and the aftermath of the mission through the eyes of the Company’s Lieutenant Gabriel Navarrete. The story of the men of Company E showed that where the troops in the unit were from and how much they had in common affected how closely bound they were.

---

<sup>6</sup> Justin Lefkowski, “Salomon Abrego Interview by Juan De La Cruz,” *U.S. Latino and Latina WWII Oral History Project* (Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, 12 August 2009), [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work\\_urn=urn%3Autlol%3Awwlatin.229&work\\_title=Abrego%2C+Salomon](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work_urn=urn%3Autlol%3Awwlatin.229&work_title=Abrego%2C+Salomon) (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>7</sup> Thomas A. Guglielmo, “Fighting for Caucasian Rights: Mexicans, Mexican Americans, and the Transnational Struggle for Civil Rights in World War II Texas,” *Journal of American History* 92, no. 4 (2006): 1215

<sup>8</sup> Raul Morín, *Among the Valiant: Mexican Americans in WWII and Korea* (Alhambra, CA: Borden Publishing Company, 1966), 59.

Whereas the men of E Company, for the most part, experienced a sense of camaraderie and belonging in their unit, Enrique "Hank" Cervantes, one of the few Mexican American pilots, did not. Cervantes remembers that he was at first embarrassed of his dream of becoming a pilot. "I wanted to go up there so badly because I felt so ashamed of being Mexican, brown and poor." From a young age, Cervantes was "stripped of his Hispanic identity and [it was] inferred that his Spanish name was inferior." Upon graduating from high school in 1941, Cervantes attempted to join the pre-flight Navy school but was rejected because "as a recruiter put it, they didn't accept 'Filipinos, spics or niggers'." He was then drafted in January 1943. It was not until later that Cervantes took a test and was accepted into the Air Corps. During his eventual twenty-two year tenure in the Air Corps, Cervantes never encountered another Mexican pilot. When asked about the racial tension, Cervantes explains, "I just counted it as part of the price for being there, and let it slide off my back. I never challenged anybody; I wanted that gold so badly." He does remember however, "there were sufficient numbers of people who were willing to extend their hand out and help me succeed."<sup>9</sup> In contrast with the men of Company E, Cervantes' time in the armed forces was different because of the path he chose. But by challenging the status quo, Cervantes made an important stride for future Mexican American troops and what would be possible for them.

Though the men of Company E and Enrique Cervantes experienced extremes with regard to race relations during their time in the war, others such as Ross Dimas and Ernest Gallego did not. Dimas recalled his time in Iwo Jima, during which he "had captured one of the thirty three P.O.W.'s," and later was "recommended by letter to Japanese language school in Honolulu."<sup>10</sup> Dimas would also be part of the occupation force in Japan. While Dimas was participating in the Pacific Theatre, Ernest Gallego found action in Italy. His diary entry from 16 February 1945 recounts the horrors of war asking "Mama mia! How much can the human body stand? Assorted hell broke loose in the

---

<sup>9</sup> Carry-Ann Olsen, "Enrique 'Hank' Cervantes Interview by Bruce Ashcroft," *U.S. Latino and Latina WWII Oral History Project* (Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, 12 August 2009), [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work\\_urn=urn%3Autlol%3Awwlatin.456&work\\_title=Cervantes%2C+Enrique%22Hank%22](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work_urn=urn%3Autlol%3Awwlatin.456&work_title=Cervantes%2C+Enrique%22Hank%22) (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>10</sup> Ross Dimas Collection (AFC/2001/002/34280), *Veterans History Project at the American Folklife Center* (Library of Congress, Washington DC, 26 May 2004), <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/diglib/vhp/story/loc.natlib.afc2001001.34280/> (accessed 22 August 2009).

wild blue yonder today.”<sup>11</sup> Dimas and Gallego, though they were in different parts of the world during the war, experienced the horrors of war without the added pressures of racial tension.

The contribution of the Mexican American soldiers of World War II cannot be ignored. Their actions in both Europe and the Pacific created, for the most part, an immense respect for the efforts of Mexican Americans both at home and abroad. According to Morín, “twenty-five percent of the U.S. military personnel on the infamous Bataan Death March were Mexican American.”<sup>12</sup> Mexican Americans also had one of the highest ratios of buck privates serving in combat and received a significant number of accolades.<sup>13</sup> Among these were the Distinguished Service Cross, which is as prestigious as the Congressional Medal of Honor bestowed for bravery under fire, the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, and seventeen Infantrymen Medals of Honor.<sup>14</sup> Because of all they had done and lost for their country, Mexican American troops felt as though they deserved a better social status upon returning home. However, all of the accolades and praise that Mexican American troops had received at the end of the war disappeared upon their return home and American society’s return to normalcy, and these former troops were unwilling to go back to the way it had been. Instead, they and like-minded people would form the foundation of the equal rights movements for Mexican American citizens, a movement that would not come to full fruition until the 1960s and 1970s.

Mexican American men were not the only ones experiencing a different status in society. While the men were fighting overseas, Mexican American women felt obligated to do their part on the home front and, in some cases, abroad. During the war, Mexican American women took on a variety of roles and responsibilities that would drastically affect the future, not only for themselves but for generations of Mexican American women. Before the war, depending on their economic status, Mexican American women may have had jobs from a young age or they may have never lifted a finger outside the house. Most of the Mexican American women who did have jobs worked in the traditional positions offered to them: cannery workers and

---

<sup>11</sup> Ernest Gallego Collection (AFC/2001/001/30208), *Veterans History, Project at the American Folklife Center* (Library of Congress, Washington DC, 29 May 2007), <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/diglib/vhp-stories/loc.natlib.afc2001001.30208/> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>12</sup> Rodolfo F. Acuña, *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* (New York: Pearson Longman, 2007), 198.

<sup>13</sup> Acuña, *Occupied America*, 198.

<sup>14</sup> Morín, *Among the Valiant*, 11.

domestics. Once the war began, however, the types of jobs offered to these women expanded to include a number of fields including defense plants, secretarial work, and the armed forces. During the war, Mexican American women joined the work force in large numbers. For example, Betty Muñoz Medina started out working for the National Youth Administration during the 1930s and received training in clerical work, and then gained employment at the War Department. Not only was she an outsider from the Southwest who had been brought to Washington, she was also the only Mexican American in the office. Together, these circumstances would leave her open to ostracism and discrimination. Ironically, her first experience with discrimination came in the form of a reprimand from her supervisor for unwittingly putting a black officer in a white unit and was not necessarily an act of discrimination directed at her.<sup>15</sup>

Regardless of all of the positions opening up to them on the home front, a number of Mexican American women signed up for the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps (WAAC), the Navy Women's Service (WAVES) and Women Air Force Service Pilots (WASP).<sup>16</sup> Concepción Alvarado Escopedo was one of the women who joined the WAAC. The only Mexican American woman in the group, she looks back on her time fondly, "the army opened my mind to other things. In our families, the mothers would be very protective. They didn't tell you about things. In the service, they teach you and show you."<sup>17</sup> Alvarado Escopedo would later be awarded the World War II Victory Medal, the Good Conduct Medal, and the American Theatre Campaign Medal for her contributions to the war effort. The contributions of many Mexican American women were of a magnitude rivaling their male counterparts.

Like most American women, Mexican American women were asked to leave their jobs and return to normalcy after the war. Regardless of this, Mexican American women were already on a path to change. Historian Vicki Ruiz describes how "with World War II,

---

<sup>15</sup> Brian Goodman, "Betty Muñoz Medina Interview by Olga Briseno," *U.S. Latino and Latina WWII Oral History Project* (Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, 12 August 2009), [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work\\_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awlatin.386&work\\_title=Medina%2C+Betty+Munoz](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awlatin.386&work_title=Medina%2C+Betty+Munoz) (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>16</sup> Acuña, *Occupied America*, 200.

<sup>17</sup> Sandra Freyburg, "Concepción Alvarado Escobedo Interview by Sandra Freyburg," *U.S. Latino and Latina WWII Oral History Project* (Nettie Lee Benson Latin American Collection, University of Texas at Austin, 12 August 2009), [http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work\\_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awlatin.356&work\\_title=Escobedo%2C+Concepcion+Alvarado](http://www.lib.utexas.edu/ww2latinos/template-stories-indiv.html?work_urn=urn%3Autl%3Awlatin.356&work_title=Escobedo%2C+Concepcion+Alvarado) (accessed 22 August 2009).

Mexican American women perceived themselves in a new light, so much so that by the war's end they began to question discrimination in all of its forms."<sup>18</sup> They had, many for the first time, been allowed to leave home and strike out on their own. The independence experienced by these women allowed them for the first time to consider a life outside of the normal confines of Mexican American society. Their work "as farm hands, cannery workers, miners' wives, mutualista members, club women, civil rights advocates, and politicians, Mexican women have taken direct action for themselves and others."<sup>19</sup>

Despite the fact that the majority of the Mexican American population was contributing to the war effort, bouts of discrimination and violence towards the community continued to appear on the home front. In Richmond, California, "Sergeant Macario Garcia from Sugarland, Texas-a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor-could not buy a cup of coffee in a restaurant ... an Anglo American chased him out with a baseball bat."<sup>20</sup> More disturbing than Garcia's treatment is that of Private Ben Aguirre, a Mexican American soldier from World War II who returned to his West Texas home only to be beaten and left for dead while still in uniform. Historian Maggie Rivas Rodriguez gives detailed account of a funeral home in South Texas that refused to allow its facilities to be used in the funeral of a Mexican American soldier, Felix Longoria, who had been killed in action in the Philippines and whose family wanted to inter his body on American soil.<sup>21</sup> The media coverage of these events convey the discrepancy in the sentiments about Mexican Americans at the time, as some newspapers covered the incident with outrage while others ignored it.

After fighting in a war alongside the Anglo Americans and working alongside them on the home front, Mexican Americans were no longer willing to accept status as second-class citizens. World War II marked a turning point for Mexican American citizenship. Though there was no complete change in attitudes about Mexican Americans, there were steps in a new direction. Immediately after World War II, Mexican Americans began to make strides in civil rights. Social roles held by Mexican Americans before the war were no longer good enough. Mexican American men had risked or lost their lives fighting

---

<sup>18</sup> Vicki L. Ruíz, *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 250.

<sup>19</sup> Ruíz, *From Out of the Shadows*, 73.

<sup>20</sup> Acuña, *Occupied America*, 200.

<sup>21</sup> Maggie Rivas Rodriguez, "Framing Racism: Newspaper Coverage of the Three Rivers Incident" in *Mexican Americans and World War II*, ed. Maggie Rivas Rodriguez (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2005), 201-220.

for the United States, and Mexican American women were offered a glimpse of what the world was like outside of their traditional roles. These realizations about the position of the Mexican American in society opened the way for questioning the status quo and demanding more from the country they had supported and helped during the war. The ideas and activism that came in the years preceding World War II laid the groundwork for the Chicano movement of the 1960s and 1970s, which made even greater demands for equality for Mexican American citizens.

# *Feeding the Wartime Family: How Women Made Do With Less in the Name of Patriotism*

by Jodi Clayton

Since World War II, the common perception is that all women flocked to factories, leaving their traditional roles behind them.<sup>1</sup> While this was the case for some groups of women, the reality was that roughly seventy-five percent of married women stayed home and cared for their families.<sup>2</sup> These women faced many challenges as they dealt with scarcity in everything from toasters to housing, repairmen to doctors, hours working in a factory or office increased these difficulties for working wives and mothers. Coupled with these hardships were the psychological traumas many women faced of sending loved ones to serve in the Armed Forces. In coping with a world of scarce items, which included many staple foods, women were expected to continue to provide nourishing homecooked meals for their families. Untangling the mystery of rationing, standing in long lines, cooking unfamiliar foods, dealing with shoddy overpriced products, and other frustrations were common for the wartime homemaker.<sup>3</sup> The World War II housewife rose to the challenge of feeding her family by improving the nutritional quality of her meals, substituting scarce foods with those that were more abundant, as well as finding less traditional methods to supplement the family diet.

One of the first dilemmas faced by the housewife was that of malnutrition. In 1940, America was emerging from a ten-year economic

---

*Many of the primary sources used in this essay were provided in the extensive Cookbook Collection at the Woman's Collection at Texas Woman's University (Denton, TX).*

<sup>1</sup> D'Ann M. Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood: America During World War II* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979), 259-260.

<sup>2</sup> Harvey Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 85.

<sup>3</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 183-190.

depression, and many families could ill-afford the types of foods nutritionists believed to be essential to good health at the time. As young men began registering for Selective Service, many were rejected because of medical reasons. One hundred and fifty thousand, or roughly one third, of these men were thought at the time to be suffering from maladies caused by malnutrition.<sup>4</sup> It is questionable now whether this was actually the case, since according to historian Harvey Levenstein, the “main methods for diagnosing ... malnutrition ... were vaguely defined and led to extremely subjective judgements.”<sup>5</sup> However, the numbers were enough to frighten the leaders of the nation. Without healthy soldiers to fight or healthy factory workers to churn out munitions, America’s ability to win the war would be in jeopardy.<sup>6</sup> The government quickly began educating the public on nutrition, introducing the Recommended Daily Allowance in 1941.<sup>7</sup> In 1942, the eight basic food groups (changed later to seven) were introduced as a way to facilitate healthy choices.<sup>8</sup> The government aimed much of their nutritional propaganda at women, as they were considered most likely to change the eating habits of the family.<sup>9</sup> The Red Cross also joined in educating women about nutrition. In one hundred and thirty classes conducted by the Red Cross in 1942, more than five thousand women learned the importance of vitamins and minerals, as well as how to cook food for the optimal retention of nutrients.<sup>10</sup> One 1943 cookbook stated, “It’s up to the homemaker...to furnish, in appetizing form, all of the foods for growth and energy that children and workers require.”<sup>11</sup>

Another wartime cookbook told housewives, “It is our job, the women on the homefront, to keep workers healthy, enthusiastic and happy with proper food and restful home environment.”<sup>12</sup> By 1945,

---

<sup>4</sup> R.S. Halpern, “U.S. Defeat of Malnutrition by Proper Dietary Practices Will Mean Victory Over Axis,” *The Dallas Morning News*, 17 June 1942.

<sup>5</sup> Levenstein, 57.

<sup>6</sup> Amy Bentley, *Eating For Victory: Food Rationing and the Politics of Domesticity* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1998), 69.

<sup>7</sup> Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 66.

<sup>8</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 68.

<sup>9</sup> Emily Yellin, *Our Mothers’ War: American Women at Home and at the Front During World War II* (New York: Free Press, 2004), 20.

<sup>10</sup> “What’s This, Rabbit Food? Nope, Just Healthful Cooking,” *The Dallas Morning News*, 18 January 1943.

<sup>11</sup> *300 Helpful Suggestions For Your Victory Lunch Box: How to Plan, Prepare, and Pack a Compact and Nutritious Meal For Factory, Office, or School* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1943).

<sup>12</sup> *Pack-A-Lunch For Victory* (United States: Home Economics Department of Public Service, 1942), 2.

Americans enjoyed more nutritious diets than they ever had. According to Levenstein, "consumption of fresh vegetables hit an all-time high ... so did consumption of vitamin C in the food supply."<sup>13</sup> It is unclear, however, whether this increased nutrition was result of the education given by the government and others or was the result of increased wages for the average American family brought about by wartime prosperity. The prevalence of "Victory gardens" also played a part as families exchanged commercially canned vegetables for ones grown in their gardens.<sup>14</sup>

The wartime homemaker not only had the challenge of cooking foods that would keep her family healthy, but she also had to find the food to cook. Rationing and food shortages were commonplace during the war. Many items were scarce during the war as the United States had to feed not only its people on the homefront, but also the many men and women in the Armed Services and its Allies.<sup>15</sup> The United States had committed large quantities of supplies, including food, to Great Britain, and later to other Allied nations because the United States was the only country that was spared from destruction on its mainland. American factories and fields were untouched and able to produce immense quantities of goods, including life-giving nourishment. Though there was adequate food for the homefront, Allied friends, and the Armed Services, rationing was necessary to distribute it fairly. The government began rationing certain items very early in the war, knowing it was necessary, as explained by historian Amy Bentley, "to offset spiraling inflation, ferocious black markets, and inequitable distribution of goods."<sup>16</sup> Some of the foods that were rationed at different times during the war were sugar, coffee, meat, some types of fats, and processed foods such as canned and frozen fruit and vegetables.

The first rationing system introduced was coupon rationing. Each coupon could be exchanged for one rationed commodity of some of the earliest rationed food such as sugar or coffee. Another system was the purchase certificate. In this case, if the consumer needed an item that was listed as rationed under this system, she must fill out a form and apply to the Rationing Board.<sup>17</sup> The point system began in

---

<sup>13</sup> Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 88.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>15</sup> Katharine Fisher, "What You Should Know About the New Point System of Rationing," *Good Housekeeping*, February 1943, 156.

<sup>16</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 15.

<sup>17</sup> Holt, Jane. "The ABC of Point Rationing," *The New York Times Magazine*, 21 February 1943, 22.

1943 in an effort to ration meat and processed foods. This system encouraged the use of less popular cuts of meat and surplus items by assigning them a lower point value. Housewives were encouraged in one 1943 *Good Housekeeping* article to plan ahead and to “budget their points just as they ... budget their dollars.”<sup>18</sup>

As with nutrition information, the government directed the bulk of its rationing propaganda towards women, seeing them as critical to the rationing effort.<sup>19</sup> Prentiss Brown, head of the Office of Price Administration, recognized the power of women when he wrote to a female audience in an article published in the *Woman's Home Companion*, explaining . “The future of price control rests with American women,” he explained. “You are the enforcement agents who are going to make it work.”<sup>20</sup> The 1943 *Good Housekeeping* article explained. “Rationing is the best answer to the wartime problem of civilians sharing fairly the commodities that are scarce or must be conserved because of strategic reasons ... by conserving [food] at home we are helping to shorten the war and save the lives ... of the men who are fighting [for] victory.”<sup>21</sup> Millions of American women raised their right hands and took the Home Front Pledge: “I will pay no more than top legal prices—I will accept no rationed goods without giving up ration points.” Each woman who took the pledge signed a pledge card and then was given a poster to remind her of the oath she had just taken.<sup>22</sup>

Rationing and avoiding black market activities were two ways that women could do their part for the war effort and show their patriotism. War terms became associated with these activities, as housewives were advised to “reorganize your ‘family front’ so it will run smoothly” and “black market buyers are undermining one of the basic democratic principles for which we are fighting—fair distribution of the world’s good things.”<sup>23</sup> Articles directed toward a female audience carried titles such as, “Communiqués From the Kitchen Front.”<sup>24</sup> Housewives were called on along with everyone else to bring about victory for America.

---

<sup>18</sup> Fisher, “What You Should Know About the New Point System of Rationing,” 156.

<sup>19</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 24.

<sup>20</sup> Prentiss M. Brown, “What I Tell My Wife About Rationing,” *Woman's Home Companion*, June 1943, 24.

<sup>21</sup> Fisher, “What You Should Know About the New Point System of Rationing,” 156.

<sup>22</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 37.

<sup>23</sup> Dorothy Marsh, “Join Up, But Don’t Let Your Family Down,” June, 1942, 107; Patricia Lochridge, “I Shopped the Black Market.” *Woman's Home Companion*, February 1944, 82.

<sup>24</sup> Florence Paine, “Communiqués From the Kitchen Front,” *House Beautiful*, June 1943, 70.

Though rationing was seen as necessary for success, the ideology was at times cold comfort when the scramble for food was a daily battle. The dearth of food was not caused simply by rationing, but also from shortages in the food supply. At times, perceived shortages became self-fulfilling prophecies as consumers rushed to buy items when rumors of future rationing swirled. Evaporated milk was one example that suffered from the action of hoarders. Though not rationed, it became scarce nonetheless.<sup>25</sup> In rapidly growing urban areas, finding anything on the grocers' empty shelves was at times difficult. One wartime homemaker, as quoted by historian Emily Yellin, explained, "with the influx of war workers to the shipyards, the population of the Mobile area had quadrupled in a few months time. Food allotments were made on the basis of the last census. There was simply not enough food to go around and little in the stores to buy, whether one had ration stamps or not."<sup>26</sup>

Because of the scarcity and rationing, women learned to substitute unfamiliar foods for familiar ones. For example, certain cuts or types of meat had lower point values and women were encouraged to incorporate them in their cooking. In a 1943 *Better Homes and Gardens* article, women were encouraged "to be...more broadminded about what parts of which meat-animals we'll buy and eat—and that goes for Dad and the kids, too."<sup>27</sup> Housewives were taught how to cook tough "utility beef" since it was inexpensive and in good supply.<sup>28</sup> Animals that were not commonly consumed, such as the rabbit or the muskrat, were point-free.<sup>29</sup> But not everybody was eager to try new food for the sake of patriotism. Housewife Ruth Farrar tells of her experience feeding her husband rabbit:

Of course meat was rationed and my husband was a sweets and a meat eater. He ate his vegetables, too, but he loved the meat. Well, I went to the store that morning and they had the prettiest rabbit. It was just as white as it could be. It had been raised in the cage ... I decided I would buy one ... it was not rationed. So I smothered it, I browned it and smothered it in gravy. And I didn't think he would question it and after he had eaten some of it, he said, 'Well, what kind of meat is this?' And I

---

<sup>25</sup> Gladys D Shultz, "Baby's Ration Card: How to Get the Most From It." *Better Homes and Gardens*, May 1943, 104.

<sup>26</sup> Yellin, *Our Mother's War*, 30.

<sup>27</sup> Helen Train Hilles, "Can't Get That? Use This." *Better Homes and Gardens*, September 1943, 49.

<sup>28</sup> "Utility Beef: It is Cheap, Plentiful, Point-free, and Tough." *Life*, 16 October 1944, 61.

<sup>29</sup> Frank G. Ashbrook, "Why Not Rabbit For Dinner?" *Good Housekeeping*, February 1944, 88.; "Muskrabbit and Gravy," *The Dallas Morning News*, 12 February 1943.

had to tell him that it was rabbit and that was not rationed and it ... was good for you. Well, really it was good for you and it didn't taste, I just imagined it was chicken and ate it like I enjoyed it. And he would not eat another bite of it. So, I said well I am going to have to use this rabbit some way and I fixed spaghetti. I cleaned it up, you know, took the gravy off of it, cut it up in little pieces and fixed spaghetti with it and after he had eaten a few bites, he said, 'Is this that rabbit?' and he wouldn't eat it. So I had to find something else to cook.<sup>30</sup>

Prentiss Brown explained how his own family used substitution as a way of coping with scarcity, writing that "we Browns have learned to get along without a lot of things. Instead of canned fruit for an occasional dessert we have fresh fruit or homemade applesauce ... And often we have baked beans for dinner instead of meat."<sup>31</sup> Eggs and cheese were substitutes for meat as well and were consumed in record numbers. According to Levenstein, "macaroni and cheese, cooked in milk, which had been a popular Depression economy dish, now became a kind of patriotic dish—a healthy, meatless source of protein whose appeal crossed class and regional lines."<sup>32</sup> Oleomargarine was used instead of butter; honey, molasses, maple syrup, and corn syrup were used instead of sugar.<sup>33</sup> Chocolate bars were used to make frosting or fudge.<sup>34</sup> Cakes were made with fillings of jam or prepackaged pudding.<sup>35</sup> Some flavorings, like vanilla, were no longer available because they were normally imported from countries that were affected by the war. Other flavors that were more abundant were suggested, such as almond or mint flavoring.<sup>36</sup> Some fats were also in scarce supply, including olive oil and shortening. Recommended substitutions included corn oil, peanut oil, and, for shortening, Swan's wartime recipe book suggested using chicken fat or home-rendered lard instead.<sup>37</sup> Fresh produce replaced canned goods in many Americans' diets and large cans replaced small on the grocer's shelf,

---

<sup>30</sup> Ruth Farrar, interview by author (Flower Mound, TX), 21 November 2008.

<sup>31</sup> Brown, "What I Tell My Wife About Rationing," 99.

<sup>32</sup> Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 87.

<sup>33</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 195.; Louella G. Shouer, "Sugar Off Your Sweet Taste," *Ladies' Home Journal*, May 1942, 56.

<sup>34</sup> Clementine Paddleford, "What War Has Done to Life in the Kitchen," *House Beautiful*, August 1942, 79.

<sup>35</sup> *Ten Victory Cake Recipes: They're Sugar-Savers; They're Egg-Savers; They're Family-Pleasers* (New York: Standard Brands, Inc., 1942).

<sup>36</sup> Paddleford, "What War Has Done to Life in the Kitchen," 79.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*, 79.; *How to Bake By the Ration Book: Swan's Down Wartime Recipe*, 1943.

while other items came out of cans altogether and were sold instead in bulk.<sup>38</sup>

Scarce desirable food could also be stretched to make it go further. Soups and meatloaves acted as meat extenders.<sup>39</sup> The virtues of soup were extolled in a 1943 *Better Homes and Garden* article:

“What’s-it dishes”—soups and casseroles—are the experimenting cook’s best pals. No matter what you put into them, within reason they’re likely to hit the spot...what’s more, if you’re balancing your meal in that one dish, it’s a safe bet your family will be well-fed—and like it. It’s so easy to turn down bunch of carrots passed raw or in a vegetable dish, but it’s an awful nuisance to pick them out of the stew.<sup>40</sup>

Soup was also a way to avoid waste by using up the leftovers.<sup>41</sup> Cookbooks had several recipes on butter extenders, mixing butter with other ingredients so that butter, which was scarce at times, would last longer.<sup>42</sup> Many times, however, the housewife and her family just did without. Pies were made with only a top crust to conserve shortening, coffee was consumed unsweetened, cakes eaten unfrosted to conserve sugar, and meatless meals were commonplace.<sup>43</sup> Some foods were unheard of during the war, since the import of many foods had all but ceased. Few ships were available to bring food to the United States, and many countries that were normally sources of certain items were occupied by enemy nations. For example, the Japanese-occupied islands of the Philippines were usually a prominent source of sugar for the United States.<sup>44</sup> Yellin writes about a pregnant bride who dreamed of eating banana splits, and later wrote, “Boy, what I wouldn’t give for a nice banana. But that is just wishful thinking. I don’t think anyone in America has seen a banana for over six months.”<sup>45</sup>

Housewives were not only expected to cook nutritious meals with few resources but also to grow a garden and preserve their harvest. Through home canning, these gardens supplied needed fresh produce, which not only boosted the health of the civilians on the

---

<sup>38</sup>Paddleford, “What War Has Done to Life in the Kitchen,” 63; Katharine Fisher, “Rationing Has Brought a New Cookery,” *Good Housekeeping*, June 1943, 91.

<sup>39</sup> *300 Helpful Suggestions For Your Victory Lunch Box*, 23.

<sup>40</sup> Hilles, “Can’t Get That? Use This,” 49.

<sup>41</sup> Yellin, *Our Mother’s War*, 26.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>43</sup> *How to Bake By the Ration Book: Swan’s Down Wartime Recipes*, 1943; Shouer, “Sugar Off Your Sweet Taste,” 56.

<sup>44</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 102.

<sup>45</sup> Yellin, *Our Mother’s War*, 20.

homefront but also freed up more produce for shipping overseas.<sup>46</sup> The government again put pressure on women to garden, but especially to can. Many on the homefront responded enthusiastically to the challenge, and by the end of 1943, “there were twenty million Victory Gardens producing 40 percent of the nation’s vegetables in backyards, in vacant lots, or alongside factories.”<sup>47</sup> These gardens not only provided ration-free food, but at times built community ties. In many urban areas, neighbors worked together to cultivate community gardens and, after the harvest, would join together in community picnics to partake of the rewards of their labors.<sup>48</sup> Canning, too, was very popular during the war years, though it was mostly a middle class activity since the poor, particularly in urban areas, could not afford the needed equipment. Working wives were less likely to can as well, due to time constraints.<sup>49</sup> Housewives who wanted to can were frustrated at times with the lack of available sugar. These women who intended to can were allowed a greater allotment of sugar, but this sugar was not always to be found at their grocer’s market. Without the needed sugar, canning was next to impossible. One housewife complained, “they urge us to save and preserve everything and then let this occur.”<sup>50</sup> Despite these challenges, the wartime homemaker rose to the occasion, and canning found its way into the kitchens of a large number of housewives. The peak year for canning was in 1943, with 75 percent of women canning produce for their pantries.<sup>51</sup>

Most women agreed that rationing was necessary, at least in principle. A Gallup poll released in 1943 showed 83 percent believed rationing to be necessary.<sup>52</sup> But it became more difficult in practice for some. Patricia Lochridge, a journalist for *Woman’s Home Companion*, traveled around the United States in 1943, investigating just how easy it would be for her to purchase black market items. To her sorrow, she found that it was very easy indeed. She wrote, “I was genuinely shocked by what I saw. I found that the black market has no social or economic boundaries. From poor neighborhoods to rich, I discovered Americans purchasing meat, canned goods, sugar, shoes, nylon stockings, and manufactured goods without regard to either ration

---

<sup>46</sup> Hersey, Jean. “Grow Your Own Vegetables.” *House and Garden*, April 1943, 94.

<sup>47</sup> Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 85.

<sup>48</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 123.

<sup>49</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 136-137.

<sup>50</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 194.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>52</sup> George Gallup, “America Speaks,” *Dallas Morning News*, 5 March 1943.

stamps or ceiling prices.”<sup>53</sup> The problem was complicated. In Brooklyn, for example, housewives were not able to shop at their local stores unless they paid more than the ceiling price for certain items.<sup>54</sup> When surveyed, over a third of Americans stated “that they would pay a little extra for a scarce item” and yet “while few consumers actually purchased items on the black market, many a housewife, pleased to find a special food, often forgot to check the ceiling price.”<sup>55</sup> The homemaker was torn between her loyalty to her country and her anxiety to feed her family healthy, nourishing meals.<sup>56</sup>

Hoarding was also a temptation for many. After facing a decade of financial woes, the country was wracked with uncertainty and fear, not knowing if the brightening economy would last. People were also suspicious of a government who, in the early days of the Depression, had pigs slaughtered and buried, insisted on fields standing fallow, and in other ways allowed food to go to waste in the midst of unprecedented want.<sup>57</sup> Most Americans sincerely desired to sacrifice on behalf of the soldiers, but at times they were susceptible to rumors of food being wasted or strange stories such as “reports that Japanese interned in camps in Wyoming had hidden away huge caches of food, particularly mayonnaise.”<sup>58</sup> For those who had loved ones serving in the military, however, complying with rationing and price ceilings was a small price to pay compared to those who were dying on the battlefield.<sup>59</sup>

In the end, rationing and price controls did work. Families gardened and canned, ate unusual foods, and did without.<sup>60</sup> The United States Armed Services were the best fed in history.<sup>61</sup> Nutrition and good health increased for everyone.<sup>62</sup> Historian D’Ann Campbell wrote in her book, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood: America During World War II*, that “what is striking about these women was their flexibility, creativity and general competence [as] they met adversity head on.”<sup>63</sup> The wartime homemaker quietly made her contribution to the war effort by feeding her family healthy meals, following the

---

<sup>53</sup> Lochridge, “I Shopped the Black Market,” 20.

<sup>54</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 38.

<sup>55</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 196.

<sup>56</sup> Bentley, *Eating For Victory*, 39.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>58</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 196; Levenstein, 82.

<sup>59</sup> Brown, “What I tell my Wife About Rationing,” 99.

<sup>60</sup> Levenstein, *Paradox of Plenty*, 85.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 86-87.

<sup>63</sup> Campbell, *Wives, Workers, and Womanhood*, 202.

wartime pledge, gardening, canning, and for the most part avoiding hoarding and the black market. It was not a glamorous job, but one that needed to be done. A 1943 article in *The Dallas Morning News* praised the housewife, stating that “when the final victory is achieved, credit should go to these soldiers on the homefront as well as to those who serve on distant firing lines.”<sup>64</sup> The wartime homemaker had done her work well.

---

<sup>64</sup> “Housewives in the War,” *The Dallas Morning News*, 23 February 1943.

# Those Quaking Female Prophetesses

by Teresa Pierce

*Our New Quaking female prophetesses ... out of a pretended zeal of propagating the Gospel ... presumed to wander abroad, and preach publicly in England and elsewhere to women and others ... beyond The modesty of their sex for sundry years ... [now] presume to speak publicly to the people in some of their congregations ... Let your women keep silence in your Churches ... FOR IT IS NOT PERMITTED UNTO THEM TO SPEAK.”<sup>1</sup>*

-- William Prynne, 1655

As the quote by Puritan William Prynne illustrates, the patriarchal society of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries thought that public preaching and prophesying by female members of the Religious Society of Friends, or Quakers, was scandalous.<sup>2</sup> Conservative religious authorities of the period scoffed at the motivation for such outlandish behavior, and modern historians debate the reasons behind their unorthodox practices. Some authors and historians such as Margaret Hope Bacon believe that these female preachers had the intention of changing their society. Her book *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America*, credits these early female Quakers with the intention to promote female rights. In the foreword of *Hidden in Plain Sight: Quaker Women's Writings 1650-1700*, feminist historian Rosemary Radford Ruether describes the Quakers as being “one of two distinct kinds of feminist movements” in

---

<sup>1</sup> Phyllis Mack, *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 249. This is a quote by William Prynne from his book *The Quakers Unmasked, and Clearly Detected to Be But the Spawn of Romish Frogs* (London, 1655), 18.

<sup>2</sup> Margaret Hunt Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America* (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1986), 17. According to Bacon, the sobriquet of Quakers was given by a judge when George Fox told him that he should tremble in the sight of the Lord. “You are the Quaker, not I,” the judge said.

seventeenth-century England, rather than a religious sect.<sup>3</sup> Quaker women were unique among women of the period because of their standing within their religious community, and this standing has encouraged modern scholars to describe them as seventeenth-century feminists. However, it was their religious conviction that caused them to take on these non-traditional roles and to hold onto them in spite of persecution, imprisonment, and torture. Feminism is understood to be the theory of political, economic, and social equality of the sexes, or organized activity on behalf of women's rights. The Quaker women's writings illustrate their belief that they were providentially led by God in inspired preaching for the purpose of saving souls, rather than in a quest to gain social equality.<sup>4</sup>

All reformed Protestants believed that women and men were equal in the sight of God, but the Quakers were the only group at that time who gave women full equality in religious matters. The Quakers were among the many Protestant groups that were founded during the extended political, social, religious and gender upheaval that began with the English Revolution of 1640 and ended with the Stuart Restoration in 1660.<sup>5</sup> George Fox, founder of the Religious Society of Friends, proclaimed

So be ashamed for ever and let all your mouths be stopped for ever, that despise the spirit of prophesy in the daughters, and do cast them into prison, and do hinder the women labourers in the gospel. . . . For the light is the same in the male, and in the female, which cometh from Christ, . . . and who is it that dare stop Christ's mouth?<sup>6</sup>

Female Quakers had an unprecedented amount of religious independence as stipulated by Fox, although Separatists within the Quaker sect later raised some controversy as to how much authority women should actually be allowed to have, and over what areas they

---

<sup>3</sup> Mary Garman, Judith Applegate, Margaret Benefiel, Dortha Meredith, eds., *Hidden in Plain Sight: Quaker Women's Writings 1650-1700*, (Wallingford: Pendle Hill Publications, 1996), xiii.

<sup>4</sup> Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Incorporated, 1999), 4.

<sup>5</sup> Margaret Hunt, "Rising Above Gender," review of *Visionary Women: Ecstatic Prophecy in Seventeenth-Century England* by Phyllis Mack, *The Women's Review of Books* 10, no. 7 (1993), 20.

<sup>6</sup> William L. Andrews, *Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Women's Narratives* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 123.

would be allowed to wield it.<sup>7</sup> Both married and unmarried women were an integral component of early leadership and activism in the Religious Society of Friends. Public Friends prophesied and attempted to convert the larger society, and many women felt called by God to be public Friends. Fox commissioned a group called the Valiant Sixty to go out and teach God's will; nearly half of the Valiant Sixty were women.<sup>8</sup> The Quakers were unique among Protestant groups for their views on the equality of all people, and these views instigated an often violent reaction by seventeenth and eighteenth century society.

Friends did not seek to change the fundamental order of society, but their belief in the equality of all people before God, their lack of deference to social superiors, and their refusal to pay tithes or to swear oaths were overtly political acts, and women who engaged in these behaviors engendered violent responses from society.<sup>9</sup> Quakers did not curtsy or bow before their social superiors, and they used the familiar "thee" or "thou" to address members of every class, so their religious identity was obvious to everyone they came into contact with. All Quaker ministers were discriminated against by the British government and other Protestant churches worldwide, and many were beaten, tortured, imprisoned, and even murdered for the expression of their beliefs. Female Friends were often persecuted to a greater degree simply because of their gender. Historian Phyllis Mack says a seventeenth-century woman who prophesied was described variously as "a woman clothed with the sun," "a base slut," "a Jezebel," "a Jesuit," "a silly old woman," "a goat rough and hairy," "a woman to make your heart tremble," or "an old trot."<sup>10</sup> These epithets illustrate the contempt that was shown to any woman who dared to preach or speak in public. Historian Rebecca Larson stated that the catastrophic events associated with the English Civil War beginning in 1642 convinced the Quakers that the final judgment and the Millennium were imminent; this belief and their own identification with the divine gave them the courage to face any opponent and to withstand any

---

<sup>7</sup> David Booy, *Autobiographical Writings by Early Quaker Women* (London: Ashgate Publishers, Limited, 2004), 119. The Separatists were against the post-Reformation reforms initiated by George Fox. There is also evidence that the Separatists resented the power that women held within the church.

<sup>8</sup> Booy, *Autobiographical Writings*, 3. The Valiant Sixty were a group of early leaders and activists in the Religious Society of Friends. They were pairs of itinerant public Friends who set out from the northern counties of England to enlighten their countrymen in the south as well as people in other countries. There were actually over sixty of these ministers.

<sup>9</sup> Booy, *Autobiographical Writings*, 14.

<sup>10</sup> Mack, *Visionary Women*, 17.

abuse.<sup>11</sup> Women who were persecuted and ridiculed in this way necessarily had to have strong personal beliefs in order to go against the popular culture.

The theology of the Quakers regarding prophets must be deciphered in order to understand the women's motivation. Quakers believed that each believer had an indwelling Light of God which made the experiences of each individual important.<sup>12</sup> Women were co-religionists with the male members, and they had a responsibility and a duty to share God's leading. Also, Quakers did not believe that education and ordination were required for ministers; rather, they thought that preoccupation with books and logic interfered with spiritual truth. Anyone who possessed God's Light within was qualified to preach; this further opened the door for women to speak in public.<sup>13</sup> American Quaker William Penn wrote, "Sexes make no Difference; since in Souls there is none: and they are the subject of Friendship."<sup>14</sup> Prophets, whether male or female, were to ignore their own will and to place complete faith in God's leading. Quaker Priscilla Cotton said, "See your thoughts, and deny them, deny thy own will, thy own thoughts, and thy own self."<sup>15</sup> Many of the female prophets wrote that they considered themselves unsuitable to speak for God, yet they followed his leading and direction. The modern goals of happiness, self-respect, and self-expression would have seemed trivial and selfish to seventeenth-century Quakers. They expected to be transformed through God's presence, transcending their own identities.<sup>16</sup> Historian Phyllis Mack said the prophetess "felt her body to be flooded by a divine essence that she experienced variously as a loss of control (as in the Quakers' shaking or quaking) or as the mystic's rush of energy streaming from inside the self."<sup>17</sup> She also described the Quakers' understanding of this phenomenon as "the woman or man who had erased the self, or flesh, and exposed the soul—that piece of God, as Quakers thought—was believed to speak a new, authentic

---

<sup>11</sup> Larson, *Daughters of Light*, 16. The Millennium, when Christ is believed to return for a thousand-year reign, is one of a number of prophecies included in the Biblical book of Revelations.

<sup>12</sup> Catie Gill, *Women in the Seventeenth-Century Quaker Community: A Literary Study of Political Identities, 1650-1700* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2005), 2.

<sup>13</sup> David Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, xv. His glossary indicates that Light is to be capitalized; it is the Light of God or Christ that exists within everyone. Redemption lies in opening oneself to the workings of the Light within.

<sup>14</sup> Andrews, *Journeys in New Worlds*, 123.

<sup>15</sup> Mack, *Visionary Women*, 142.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

language.”<sup>18</sup> Historian David Booy said they were bolstered by the conviction that they had obtained a new self that was generated by God’s light within.<sup>19</sup>

Were the female prophets also seeking equality for women through their preaching and prophesying? Booy states “early Quakers were not concerned with advocating liberation and equality for women in a worldly sense, even if, in certain ways, female Friends did attain these.”<sup>20</sup> He believes there is sufficient evidence that Quakers considered women to be equal in the faith, but not within marriage or larger society.<sup>21</sup> Other scholars have ascribed more agency to the individual. Reviewer Sandra VanBurkleo questions, “There is the tantalizing problem of agency: did religious women see themselves as divine vessels or were they actors in their own right?”<sup>22</sup> Cristine Levenduski describes Quaker Elizabeth Ashbridge as being “a model of female empowerment that resonates through later American culture.”<sup>23</sup> The reviewer for Levenduski’s book *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America* believes the author identifies in Ashbridge’s autobiography “both the private voice of an alienated woman obsessively seeking love and reassurance in a hostile world and a public voice of an internationally renowned Quaker female minister.”<sup>24</sup> Author Margaret Hope Bacon argues that early Quaker women and their male allies wanted to broaden the concept of spiritual equality into social, economic, and political roles, and she believes the Quakers and their theology ultimately contributed to the nineteenth-century American women’s movement.<sup>25</sup> It is impossible to completely reconstruct the true thoughts and feelings of these women, but their extensive written autobiographies, letters, and documents of conversion lead to the conclusion that their primary motivation was to spread the word of God and to willingly display God’s light that was within them. Their testimonies express their complete willingness to follow God’s spiritual leading and to travel or to testify in his behalf.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>19</sup> Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 7.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>22</sup> Sandra VanBurkleo, “Movers and Quakers,” review of *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775* by Rebecca Larson, *The Women’s Review of Books* 17, no. 4 (2009), 9.

<sup>23</sup> Cristine Levenduski, *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1996), 8.

<sup>24</sup> Susan Juster, review of *Peculiar Power: A Quaker Woman Preacher in Eighteenth-Century America* by Cristine Levenduski, *American Historical Review* 102, no. 5 (1997), 1561.

<sup>25</sup> Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, 3.

As additional proof of this theory, as we will see, some of the women wrote that it was very difficult for them to follow the leading that they received from God. This suggests that although they were willing to follow his will, it was not a path that they would have voluntarily chosen.

There are numerous extant collections of documents written by seventeenth-century Quaker women; as many as 3,853 published Quaker texts exist for the period 1650-1699, and this corpus includes at least 220 texts where women were the sole or main author.<sup>26</sup> The Religious Society of Friends has always diligently archived their published writing, making these texts available for modern scholars. Female Quaker authors mention God numerous times throughout their writings, and they give God the credit for their actions. There are too many women to individually address, so this research focuses on a selected number of ministers and missionaries from a variety of backgrounds, spanning from the earliest days of the movement to those who were converted decades later.

This group of women ministers includes Elizabeth Hooton, who was one of the earliest converts to Quakerism; she met the founder of the Religious Society of Friends George Fox in 1647 while she was in her mid-forties.<sup>27</sup> Margaret Fell Fox was converted by George Fox in 1652; she was a member of the gentry and was able to intervene with authorities on the behalf of imprisoned or persecuted Friends.<sup>28</sup> Elizabeth Stirredge was converted in approximately 1655; she and her husband were merchants who often had goods seized because of their refusal to attend church services or to pay the tithe. Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers were a pair of itinerant Friends who traveled extensively in the ministry; unlike the previous women, they had husbands and small children who stayed home while they traveled and proselytized.<sup>29</sup> Elizabeth Sampson Sullivan Ashbridge was a reluctant convert; she had declared that she would never become a Quaker.<sup>30</sup> These women came from a wide range of social backgrounds, and they were very different except in their devotion to their faith. This disparity

---

<sup>26</sup> Gill, *Women in the Seventeenth-Century Quaker Community*, 1.

<sup>27</sup> Elizabeth Hooton, "An account of her experiences during her visits to New England, 1661 and 1663-65/6," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 62.

<sup>28</sup> Margaret Fell, "A Relation of Margaret Fell (excerpt); "The testimony . . . concerning . . . George Fox' (excerpt); The examination and trial of Margaret Fell (excerpt)," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 147.

<sup>29</sup> Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, "A true account of the great trials and cruel sufferings," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 26.

<sup>30</sup> Levenduski, *Peculiar Power*, 1-4.

will help illustrate the fact that piety was the common motivation for all of these women, and that it was not their previous training or education that enabled them to speak publicly.

Elizabeth Hooton was the first woman to become a Quaker minister, and was one of the earliest Friends to suffer imprisonment. In 1647, Hooton abandoned her Baptist beliefs for Fox's theology and eventually converted her husband, Oliver, as well. She was imprisoned in Derby from 1650-1651; in York Castle for over a year beginning in 1652; and again in Lincoln Castle in 1654 and 1655. She worked tirelessly for the movement, preaching, writing, and traveling. Hooton traveled outside England as well; while in her sixties she traveled from Old to New England and the West Indies several times. She documented her motivation for visiting New England:

In the year 1661 it was upon me from the Lord and my friend Joan Brocksopp ... for God and his truth [to visit?] those people in the heat of persecution, and if God required us to lay down our lives for the testimony of Jesus and in love to their souls, not knowing that they might hear and so be saved that they might be left without excuse, and God might have his glory, and we clear of their blood if they would not hear: an old woman above three score years old when I went thither.<sup>31</sup>

Hooton and Brocksopp evaded New England's law against Quaker immigration by sailing to Virginia, then traveling to Rhode Island. After attending a meeting of Friends in Rhode Island, they went to Boston and attempted to visit Friends who were imprisoned there. Boston authorities brought them before Governor Endecott, who jailed them until the General Court was convened. Hooton wrote, "they put 29 of us into prison at Boston ... some were condemned to be hanged, some to be whipped, at the cart's tail, and some to be kept into prison ... [but] they called another jury which condemned us all to be driven out of their jurisdiction."<sup>32</sup> They were marched two days journey into the wilderness and abandoned. The group returned to Rhode Island, and from there Hooton and Brocksopp traveled to Barbados and then sailed to England.<sup>33</sup> Hooton wrote,

So did the Lord help and deliver us and one carried another through the waters and we escaped their hands, and their laws were broken, and that which they intended against us it may fall

---

<sup>31</sup> Elizabeth Hooton, "An account of her experiences," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 62.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>33</sup> Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, 26.

upon themselves, and was a deliverance never to be forgotten, praises be to the Lord for ever and ever.<sup>34</sup>

After this trip, Hooton had an audience with King Charles II, to complain about her lands that had been appropriated for non-payment of tithes. The King gave her permission to buy a house anywhere in the colonies; she decided to buy a house in Boston to entertain travelers in. Hooton traveled to New England again in 1662 or 1663, this time with her daughter. She wrote, "So afterwards was I moved of the Lord and called by his Spirit to go to New England again, and took with me my daughter to bear there my second testimony."<sup>35</sup> The authorities in Boston denied her request to buy a house, and so they went to Cambridge where they were jailed in a dungeon without food or water for two days. Immediately after this imprisonment she asked again to buy a house, and showed the certificate from the King; instead mother and daughter were whipped for being wandering vagabond Quakers, and were sentenced to being beaten out of the jurisdiction, receiving ten stripes each at Cambridge, Watertown, and Dedham with a three-corded whip with knots at the ends.<sup>36</sup> Afterwards Hooton said,

So they put me on a horse and carried me into the wilderness many miles, where was many wild beasts, both bears and wolves, and many deep waters where I waded through very deep but the Lord delivered me, though I were in the night to go 20 miles, but he strengthened me over all troubles and fears.<sup>37</sup>

After this treatment they returned to Boston to retrieve their belongings, and they suffered more humiliations before Hooton and her daughter made their way back to Rhode Island and sailed home.<sup>38</sup> She wrote "had not the Lord been on my side I had utterly failed, blessed be the Lord for ever and ever that hath brought me to England again to my native country and amongst God's people."<sup>39</sup> Lodowijk Muggleton, a sectarian who condemned the Quaker faith, said, "I do

---

<sup>34</sup> Hooton, "An account of her experiences," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 64.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.

<sup>36</sup> Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, 27. Mary Bacon wrote that they were whipped through Cambridge, Roxbury, Dedham, Salisbury, and Dover. When they were "beaten out of the jurisdiction" they were tied to the tail of a cart and were forced to walk from town to town; the sheriff received them and administered the beating before taking them on to the next town until they were out of the jurisdiction.

<sup>37</sup> Hooton, "An account of her experiences," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 67.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 71-72.

pronounce Elizabeth Hooton, Quaker ... cursed and damned, both in soul and body, from the presence of God, elect men and angels, to eternity."<sup>40</sup> Hooton was not afraid to express her faith or to prophesy to anyone, including the King or to New England authorities, and she was known for her bold speeches and outrageous actions. Even in her old age, she traveled extensively and accompanied Fox on a trip to the West Indies, where she died of natural causes in Jamaica. In spite of numerous punishments, Elizabeth Hooton preached her faith; her testimony gives all credit to God for her strength and her words. Hooton was a well-known prophet; her speeches and writings effectively spread the Quaker theology, but they were not as polished or persuasive as those of Margaret Fell Fox.

Margaret Fell and her daughters were converted by George Fox in 1652 while her husband, Judge Thomas Fell, was away. Her husband converted shortly thereafter and their home, Swarthmoor Hall, in Cumbria, England, became the unofficial headquarters for the Quaker movement.<sup>41</sup> Fell utilized her status as the wife and later the widow of a judge, and as one of the elite, to intercede for imprisoned Friends on numerous occasions. She wrote many letters to traveling Friends and served as a clearing house to pass on news to others. In one letter to Friends in 1655, she wrote, "and this I was moved of the Lord, to write to you, in love and tenderness to the measure of God in you, with which I have unity, which will witness for me forever; and this is in love to your souls."<sup>42</sup> During Judge Fell's life he was able to provide protection for the Quakers, but after his death in 1658, they were persecuted almost continuously. In 1659, George Fox was arrested and charged with treason; Margaret Fell visited the king to secure his freedom after Fox had been imprisoned for twenty weeks. She was incarcerated several times herself, and was threatened with praemunire, the loss of her estate. It was during one four-year prison term that she wrote the book, *Women's Speaking Justified, Proved and Allowed by the Scriptures, all such as speak by the Spirit and Power of the*

---

<sup>40</sup> Mack, *Visionary Women*, 248.

<sup>41</sup> Swarthmoor is spelled variously as Swarthmoor or Swarthmore in different sources; this paper will use the British spelling throughout.

<sup>42</sup> Margaret Fell, "General Epistles to Friends (1655)" from *The Life of Margaret Fox, Wife of George Fox. Compiled from her own Narrative, and other Sources; With a Selection From Her Epistles, etc.* (Philadelphia: Published by the Association of Friends for the Diffusion of Religious and Useful Knowledge, 1859), The Quaker Writings Homepage (Glenside Friends Meeting, Glenside, PA), <http://www.qhpress.org/texts/oldqwhp/mf-e-2.htm> (accessed 5 May 2008).

*Lord Jesus*.<sup>43</sup> In this document she wrote, "let this Word of the Lord, which was from the beginning, stop the Mouths of all that oppose Women's Speaking in the Power of the Lord; for he hath put Enmity between the Woman and the Serpent; and if the Seed of the Woman speak not, the Seed of the Serpent speaks."<sup>44</sup> *Women's Speaking Justified* was considered to be one of her greatest works; it expanded on the writings of George Fox and noted all the occasions in the Bible when, "God made no difference, but gave his good spirit, as it pleased Him, both to Men and Women."<sup>45</sup> Fell explained why God's intent for women was unknown before the Quakers' revelation:

Yet this hath been hid from ages and generations past, but now is revealed unto us by the spirits which spirit people have erred from in the time of Apostacy ... because people have been erred from the spirit of God in them, through which the Revelation is manifested, and they have been erred in their hearts; therefore the way of God hath not been known.<sup>46</sup>

Fell is considered to be "the nursing mother" or perhaps the "mother superior" of the movement, providing monetary and emotional support for the public Friends who traveled around the country.<sup>47</sup> Eleven years after her husband's death she married George Fox. In the summer of 1669, he wrote, "I had seen from the Lord a considerable time before that I should take Margaret Fell to be my wife. And when I first mentioned it to her, she felt the answer of life from God thereunto."<sup>48</sup> Even in her most intimate decisions, she bowed to God's will. George Fox explained that theirs was primarily a spiritual union; he held no claim on his wife's estate and scrupulously paid his own way throughout their marriage.<sup>49</sup> From the time of their marriage until George Fox's death in January 1691, they spent most of their time apart,

---

<sup>43</sup> Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, 15-16.

<sup>44</sup> Margaret Fell, David J. Latt, ed., *Women's Speaking Justified*, (Los Angeles: The Augustan Reprint Society, William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, 1979), 4.

<sup>45</sup> Larson, *Daughters of Light*, 23.

<sup>46</sup> Margaret Fell Fox, A True Testimony, To All the professed Teachers in the whole world, who go under the Name of Christians (1660)," Women Writers Resource Project (Lewis H. Beck Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA), [http://womenwriters.library.emory.edu/earlymodern/content.php?level=div&id=fellfox\\_testimony\\_003&document=fellfox\\_testimony](http://womenwriters.library.emory.edu/earlymodern/content.php?level=div&id=fellfox_testimony_003&document=fellfox_testimony) (accessed 10 March 2008).

<sup>47</sup> Garman, *Hidden in Plain Sight*, 6.

<sup>48</sup> Gwynedd Friends Meeting Historical Notes, *An Abstract of the Life of Margaret Fell* (Gwynedd Friends Meeting, Gwynedd, PA), [http://www.gwyneddfriends.org/margaret\\_fell.html](http://www.gwyneddfriends.org/margaret_fell.html) (accessed 5 May 2008).

<sup>49</sup> Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism*, 16-17.

either through imprisonment or traveling to support the Quaker movement. Margaret Fell Fox was a member of the elite and was gifted and eloquent; although she possessed wealth and talent, she gave credit to God for her spiritual salvation.

Unlike Margaret Fell Fox, Elizabeth Stirredge came from a lower social class that did not prepare her for speaking to elites such as King Charles II, or the justices and aristocrats that she came into contact with. Elizabeth Stirredge's account of her activities as a Quaker clearly gives all credit for her testimonies and prophecies to God's spirit within her. She was converted to Quakerism by William Dewsbury in about 1655 when he visited her hometown of Bristol, England. It is not known when her husband, James, was converted, but he was also a Quaker. Her autobiography recounts the persecutions she and her husband suffered because of their faith, and it also describes the reluctance that she felt when she was called upon by God's spirit to preach and to prophesy. Stirredge discusses her trip to deliver a testimony to King Charles in 1670 when she was just twenty-six years old. She says that before she confronted the king she suffered from an

exercise and travail of spirit, which seemed so strange and so wonderful, that I could not believe that ever the Lord would require such a service of me that was so weak and contemptible, so unfit and unlikely, my understanding but shallow, and my capacity but mean, and very low and dejected in my own eyes.<sup>50</sup>

In this passage, she describes herself as unworthy of performing such a great service for God. In her description of her meeting with the King she says, "And I can truly say, that the dread of the most high God was upon me, and made me to tremble, and great agony was over my spirit."<sup>51</sup> Elizabeth and her husband were merchants who had goods confiscated for their refusal to attend services of the Church of England, and for holding unlawful meetings of Quakers. After one confrontation with authorities in their shop, she followed a leading from God to go and sit in a meeting of the local justices. She said,

Then the power of the Lord fell upon me, and filled my heart with a dreadful warning amongst them; telling them, that it was in vain for them to be found striving against the Lord, and his people; their work would not prosper; for the great God of heaven and earth would be too strong for them. Therefore I

---

<sup>50</sup> Elizabeth Stirredge, "Elizabeth Stirredge: strength in weakness manifest (excerpt)," in Booy, *Autobiographical Writing*, 123.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

warned them to repent, and amend their lives before it be too late.<sup>52</sup>

Although speaking against government authorities endangered her livelihood and her life, she followed God's direction. Finally, she tells how she was led to testify against John Story, a Quaker who became a Separatist. A Separatist was a Quaker who subscribed to holding secret meetings and not speaking publicly in order to avoid persecution by the English authorities.<sup>53</sup> Stirredge considered herself among "a small remnant that could not conform to the will of man, but feared the Lord, and dreaded to deny him before men."<sup>54</sup> John Story had vilified two female Friends for speaking against the Separatists; Stirredge says, "he grieved them, bidding them go home about their business, and wash their dishes, and not go about to preach. And said, that Paul did absolutely forbid women to preach; and sent them crying home."<sup>55</sup> George Fox authorized prophesying and preaching by members of both sexes, yet Story used I Corinthians 14:34-35 to discourage them from preaching against his own viewpoint. Stirredge felt that God was calling her to testify against Story and his associates, and she dreaded being required to speak:

So when first day morning came ... I sat down to wait upon the Lord, the power of the Lord seized on me, which made me to tremble; insomuch that my bones were shaken, and my teeth chattered, and I was in a great agony; and standing up, with a dreadful testimony, and proclaiming God's controversy with the exalted and high amongst the professors of truth, [Story and his companions] . . . with such God's anger was waxen hot, and his indignation burned, and I warned them to repent while they had a day.<sup>56</sup>

In all of these instances, Elizabeth Stirredge describes the dread and trembling that accompanied her public testimony, always emphasizing her own lack of confidence in her skills and intelligence. She gives God the glory for sustaining her in the accomplishment of her tasks. She

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 124.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 119. The Separatists were against the post-Reformation reforms initiated by George Fox. The King's Second Conventicle Act (1670) outlawed dissident religious meetings. As a matter of principle, Fox encouraged the Quakers to meet openly, while the Separatists thought it was less dangerous to meet secretly. There is also some evidence that the Separatists resented the power that women held within the church.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 127.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 128.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 131.

leaves no doubt that her words and actions were motivated by the desire to honor God and to do his will.

Two of the most well-known female missionaries were Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, a pair of public Friends who traveled abroad to proselytize, leaving their families alone for long periods of time. They were some of the earliest missionaries to Scotland in 1653, traveled to the Isle of Wight in 1655, and were imprisoned in Cornwall in the same year under such poor conditions that another female Quaker died. In 1656, Evans was banished from the Isle of Man; in the same year she was also imprisoned in Exeter, and in 1657, both Evans and Cheevers were stripped and whipped in Salisbury. Perhaps most noteworthy, they became prisoners of the Italian Inquisition in Malta in April 1659 and were kept in deplorable conditions until July 1662, when they were released to return to England. Their original plan was to sail to Alexandria, but when their ship came close to Malta, Evans wrote,

the Captain told us that *Malta* was in the way, and he must put in there a small time. But before we came there, our burthen [burden] was so heavy, that I was made to cry out [saying] Oh we have a dreadfull cup to drink at that place! Oh how am I straitned [sic] till it be Accomplished!<sup>57</sup>

The women sensed that they had great trials ahead of them, yet they did not falter or turn back. Cheevers and Evans were hostilely interrogated over and over during their incarceration on Malta. One friar said they never heard Mass, and they replied, "We did hear the voice of Christ, he onely had the words of eternal life, and that was sufficient for us. He [the friar] said, *We were Hereticks and Heathens*. We said, they were Hereticks that lived in sin and wickedness, and such were Heathens that knew not God."<sup>58</sup> During one interrogation, Cheevers was asked why she came to Malta, and she answered, "To do the Will of God, as she was moved of the Lord ... the Lord told her, she must go over the Seas to do his Will."<sup>59</sup> These missionaries were responsive to God's leading and after numerous instances of mistreatment they continued to witness to hostile audiences. When

---

<sup>57</sup> Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, "Travel Narrative," in Garman, *Hidden in Plain Sight*, 172.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 177.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.

they were threatened with death, they wrote, "but the Lord preserved us."<sup>60</sup> After being imprisoned in Malta, Evans exalts that God,

hath chosen us among his faithfull ones, to bear his name and to witness forth his truth, before the high and mighty men of the earth, and to fight the Lords battle with his spirituall weapons, to the breaking down of strong holds, high lofty looks and vain imaginations, and spirituall wickedness in high places.<sup>61</sup>

In spite of their suffering, torture, ill-treatment, and starvation in Malta, they praised God for the chance to witness for Him.

Elizabeth Sampson Sullivan Ashbridge was an English subject who was born in 1713. After a short marriage at the age of fourteen, the widowed girl lived with Quaker relatives before deciding to immigrate to the American colonies; she was then forced to sign papers binding her to a four year indenture. Her life in the colonies was very difficult, but a dream convinced her that she would find salvation: "there stood a Grave woman ... who ... said, 'I am sent to tell thee that If thou'l return to the Lord thy God, who hath created thee, he will have mercy on thee, & thy Lamp shall not be put out in obscure darkness.'"<sup>62</sup> She married a man named Sullivan who hated Quakers, yet she felt led by God to convert during a visit to Quaker relatives in Pennsylvania. Ashbridge wrote, "Now I began to be lifted up with Spiritual Pride & thought my Self better than they, but thro' Mercy this did not Last Long, for in a Little time I was brought Low & saw that these were the People to whom I must join."<sup>63</sup> She wrote that she continued to have doubts about her leading but, "He let me see ... that the time was near that he would require me to go forth & declare to others what he the God of Mercy had done for my Soul; at which I was Surprized & begged to be Excused for fear I should bring dishonour to the truth, and cause his Holy name to be Evil spoken of."<sup>64</sup> This fear of bearing witness is common among the testimonies of Quaker women, yet like others she did not refuse God's calling. When she greeted her husband she said, "My dear, I am glad to see thee," immediately revealing her secret by the Quaker familiar language; he responded, "The Divil *thee* thee; don't *thee* me."<sup>65</sup> After her conversion she walked eight miles to first day meeting every week in spite of his threats. She wrote, "he

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 178.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 172.

<sup>62</sup> Andrews, *Journeys in New Worlds*, 153.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 160.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 133.

several times Struck me with sore Blows, which I Endeavoured to bear with Patience, believing the time would Come when he would see I was in the right (which he Accordingly Did)."<sup>66</sup> She continued to defy Sullivan for several months. During one meeting she had a leading to speak, and she begged God to be excused. Ashbridge chronicled God's response:

I am a Covenant keeping God, and the word that I spoke to thee when I found thee in Distress ... I will Assuredly make good: But if thou refuse, my Spirit shall not always strive; fear not, I will make way for thee through all thy difficulties, which shall be many for my name's Sake, but be thou faithfull & I will give thee a Crown of Life. I being then Sure it was God that Spoke said, 'thy will O God, be done, I am in they hand; do with me according to thy word,' and gave up.<sup>67</sup>

That same day her husband told her, "Well, I'll E'en give you up, for I see it don't avail to Strive. If it be of God I can't over throw it, & if it be of your self it will soon fall." Sullivan enlisted in the army one night while he was inebriated; he was beaten for claiming Quaker pacifism, dying of his injuries a few months later. Elizabeth Sullivan later married Aaron Ashbridge, a staunch Quaker who was appointed an overseer of the Goshen Meeting in 1748 and became a justice of the peace in 1749. In 1753, an entry in the meeting records indicates that she had "drawings" to visit Friends abroad; she met with a committee of three to approve her plans. She traveled to England and Ireland in 1753 and died there of an unknown illness.<sup>68</sup> Author Cristine Levenduski believes Elizabeth Ashbridge would say that her conversion was due to God's leading her by the Inner Light of the Spirit.<sup>69</sup> Ashbridge's name is mentioned in conjunction with the most prominent Pennsylvania Quakers of the time. Her autobiography ends with the death of Sullivan, but extant Quaker documents indicate that she was revered for her public speaking. Aaron Ashbridge wrote a postscript to her autobiography after her death,

Her[e] Ends what was perfected by her Pen before she left home which was the 11th 5th mo 1753, tho' she had made some beginning & Several times expressed to me a desire to

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 166.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 138-139.

<sup>69</sup> Levenduski, *Peculiar Power*, 43. Levenduski states, "This Inner Light, rather than Scripture, became the final arbiter for Quakers, who denied that the age of revelation had ended."

commemorate the further gracious Dealings of Divine Providence with her & Leave some hints of her Experience for the Service of Such as should think worth while to Read what She Wrote; but a Concern for Visiting the Churches abroad Prevailing so weightily on her mind took the place of all Other Concerns.<sup>70</sup>

Elizabeth Ashbridge is significant because of her conversion in the colonies, and because of her strong reluctance to become a Quaker minister.

These women often took on roles that extended beyond the demands of their own families, and their actions led them into dangerous circumstances, yet it was their faith that sustained them. Elizabeth Hooton repeatedly testified for God and her faith, and welcomed the chance to suffer if it meant that some who heard her might receive salvation. She was tough and feisty, and she used every means at her disposal to promote her message, even at the risk of her life or of her daughter's. Margaret Fell Fox was a much more sophisticated, educated advocate for God, and she also used all her skill and her political clout to advance the Quaker theology. Elizabeth Stirredge confessed her fears and her nervousness at speaking, yet she testified against corrupt officials and even against an elite Friend when she received the Lord's calling. Katharine Evans and Sarah Cheevers traveled far and wide to spread the Quaker message, facing death multiple times while leaving their families at home. Elizabeth Ashbridge was a reluctant convert; she came into contact with Quaker relatives as a teenager, and again as an adult, and both times determined that she would never be a Quaker. She was ultimately convinced of God's love and his plan for her life. She also faced many obstacles and after finally accepting God's leading, she became a well-known and respected public Friend. All evidence in these women's lives indicates that they spoke, acted, and lived as they did because of a deep and abiding faith. They did not seek public recognition for themselves, although many times their actions garnered such attention. Phyllis Mack wrote, "no Quaker woman ever described her activities in terms of a desire for self-expression."<sup>71</sup> They did not attempt to change patriarchal society, but they did exert themselves to prophesy to the greater society in order to save souls. As feminist historian Mary

---

<sup>70</sup> Andrews, *Journeys in New Worlds*, 170-171.

<sup>71</sup> Mack, *Visionary Women*, 232.

Garman conceded, “early Friends lived their faith, despite the consequences.”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> Garman, *Hidden in Plain Sight*, 2.



# *A Thousand Words Unsaid: The Role of Censorship in the United States During World War II*

by Tiffany Smith

*"It should be understood that no one who does not like censorship should ever be permitted to exercise censorship."*

*-Byron Price, 1945<sup>1</sup>*

The United States government recognized during World War II that in order to safeguard military interests, censorship had to be developed and maintained in an organized, yet nationally acceptable system. Even during war, the manifestation and management of the Office of Censorship was not unanimous; the restrictions on freedom of speech were harshly criticized. If America could not win the wars of tyranny without creating one of its own, the loss of blood was worthless. Franklin D. Roosevelt endorsed and enacted vital military censorship; however, during World War II the barrier between compulsory and convenient government censorship frequently blurred.<sup>2</sup> Choosing to err on the side of caution, government restrictions appeared almost everywhere information could be relayed. The news press and radio asked for censorship guidelines and primarily adhered to them because they preferred to maintain a free system with the compromise of content monitoring.<sup>3</sup> The content and context people were subjected to were ultimately chosen as much for protection of the military as

---

<sup>1</sup> Byron Price, "A Report on The Office of Censorship" (Washington : United States Government Printing Office, 1945), 1.

<sup>2</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 8381, "Defining Certain Vital Military and Naval Installations and Equipment," (22 March 1940).

<sup>3</sup> Stephen T Early to Kent Cooper, Dec. 31, 1941, box 14, "Price, Byron" folder. STEP; Sweeny, Michael S., *Secrets of Victory: The Office of Censorship and the American Press and Radio in World War II* (Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 3.

advancement of politically influenced ideals. During World War II, censorship became for America a dual composition of what was strategically released, and what was withheld by a content conscious bureaucratic administration.

Americans had a cautious eye on the role of government censorship even before the United States entered World War II in 1941. The very idea of such controls in a democratic nation left citizens, weary of foreign control methods, uneasy. The control the fascists exerted upon media would be a desecration of the first amendment and “a form of tyranny [which] should have no place here” in America.<sup>4</sup> Assurance was issued quickly from White House Press Secretary Stephen T. Early, who said “the press of America will be kept free”; to destroy a society “you must destroy the press.”<sup>5</sup> In response to the widespread American belief that censorship was dangerously un-American, President Franklin D. Roosevelt assured citizens that “free speech was an undisputed possession” of the press and that censorship implementation, if need be, would only pertain to “vital military information.”<sup>6</sup> However, in private, FDR asserted he was “perfectly willing to mislead and tell untruths” in an effort to secure victory in war.<sup>7</sup> As the paranoia of war transitioned into dramatic certainty through Pearl Harbor, it was clear that America would have to develop some control of information or risk military ruin. The 1941 Joint Army and Navy Public Relations Committee proposal of absolute censorship was forcefully rejected by Roosevelt.<sup>8</sup> Roosevelt did however concede

---

<sup>4</sup> “Cloud over Hollywood,” *Dallas Morning News*, 06 October 1941, p. 4.

<sup>5</sup> “Dictators Aim at all World, Early Asserts,” *Dallas Morning News*, 25 January 1941, p. 4. Early alleged that his assurances were a direct message from Franklin D. Roosevelt himself.

<sup>6</sup> “F. D. R. Promises No Censorship, Invites Any Critics to Speak Up,” *Dallas Morning News*, 18 April 1941, p. 2.; President Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Letter to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, 16 April 1941,” *The American Presidency Project* (Gerhard Peters, University of California at Santa Barbara), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=16102&st=&st1=> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>7</sup> John F. Bratzel and Leslie B. Rout, Jr., “FDR and the ‘Secret Map’,” *The Wilson Quarterly* (Washington D.C.), 1 January 1985, pp. 167-173; George H. Roeder, *The Censored War: American Visual Experience During World War II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 97. Quoted from a conversation on 14 May 1942 with his advisor and Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau Jr.: “I may have one policy for Europe and one diametrically opposite for North and South America. I may be entirely inconsistent, and furthermore, I am perfectly willing to mislead and tell untruths if it will help us win the war.”

<sup>8</sup> Roeder, Jr., *The Censored War*, 8. FDR said in response to the proposal that the Joint Army and Navy Public Relations Committee knew “nothing about what the American public-let alone the American Press, would say to a thing like this.”

publicly that while “all Americans abhor censorship. . .some degree of censorship is essential in wartime,” and America was in war.<sup>9</sup>

Roosevelt, who himself disliked the institution of censorship, felt that “suppression of opinion and censorship of news are amongst the mortal weapons dictatorships direct against their own peoples.”<sup>10</sup> However, the wholesale of war-related research and information would ensure heavy losses for the United States in the war effort. America’s enemies would search for pertinent information; it was “necessary that information of aid to the enemy be scrupulously withheld at that source.”<sup>11</sup> Still, despite the necessity of such policies, those involved saw that “no operation connected with war merits more careful planning or more thoughtful administration” than censorship.<sup>12</sup> The implementation of a censorship system mimicking in any context those of fascist countries opposed Roosevelt’s belief that there could not exist “a completely stable world without freedom of knowledge.”<sup>13</sup> A complex bureaucracy grew out of these theories, which began in an effort to maintain security but endured an evolution into maintaining morale and national support and creating an appropriate cultural perception of the war.

No bureaucracy would exist during the war would equal the Office of Censorship.<sup>14</sup> It was officially established within twelve days of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and concluded its business directly after the surrender of Japan.<sup>15</sup> The Office of Censorship, which directed voluntary homeland censorship and mandatory international censorship, would in its brief existence face many challenges, yet meet with very few jeopardizing failures. Byron Price, former Executive News Editor of the Associated Press and the director of the Office of Censorship, believed that when it came to censorship guidelines for the press, it was more productive to ask for their cooperation than to

---

<sup>9</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 8985 “Establishing the Office of Censorship,” (19 December 1941).

<sup>10</sup> Roosevelt, “Letter to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.”

<sup>11</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 8985 “Establishing the Office of Censorship,” (19 December 1941).

<sup>12</sup> Price, Report on the Office of Censorship, 1.

<sup>13</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Excerpt from the Press Conference, Hyde Park, New York, 5 July 1940,” *The American Presidency Project* (Gerhard Peters, University of California at Santa Barbara), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=15976&st=&st1=> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>14</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 6.

<sup>15</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 8985 “Establishing the Office of Censorship,” (19 December 1941); Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 18.

demand it.<sup>16</sup> Codebooks for voluntary censorship, guided by codes from World War I, were based on Roosevelt's executive order which established censorship as "an instrument of war" which must be "administered effectively" and work in benefit of "our free institutions."<sup>17</sup>

Price saw censorship as a precarious necessity which could only work properly if those being censored saw the measures as "essential to national survival."<sup>18</sup> While some, especially within the military, desired complete blackouts or heavier mandatory censorship, Price dedicated himself to preserving the freedom of institutions.<sup>19</sup> Faced with the explosive and complex task of censoring press and radio, he chose voluntary censorship because, despite its weaknesses, he believed it could be both effective and widely supported within the media agencies. Regardless of the authority granted to Price by Roosevelt, the task of creating such a system was daunting and had to be created only from principle and necessity. Those directives materialized on 15 January 1942 in the form of the "Codes of Wartime Practices," which were released to the press and radio and contained information on what would be henceforth considered dangerous to national security.<sup>20</sup>

Another bureaucracy which would emerge during WWII was the Office of War Information (OWI) led by Elmer Davis. The office primarily worked on informing the American people about the war effort.<sup>21</sup> When Davis and Price were once asked to distinguish their administrative roles, Davis responded, "We give [journalists] stuff we hope they will print;" Price countered of his Office of Censorship, "We tell them what they cannot print."<sup>22</sup> The OWI, which would be the government's chief wartime propaganda department, promised to only

---

<sup>16</sup> Nathaniel R. Howard, "Editor's Column," *Cleveland News*, 21 August 1945; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 4-6.

<sup>17</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 47. World War I codes were originated by George Creel while he was head of the United States Committee on Public Information; Franklin D Roosevelt, Executive Order 8985 (19 December 1941); Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 32. WWI saw voluntary censorship very differently from WWII. It was characterized by bitterness and was, in result, a failure.

<sup>18</sup> Price, Report Office of Censorship, 1.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, 32. Price notes that critics of voluntary censorship tended to support strict press regulation in peace times also.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, 5-6.

<sup>21</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 9182 "Establishing the Office of War Information," (13 July 1942).

<sup>22</sup> Arthur Krock, "In Wartime What News Shall the Nation Have?" *New York Times Magazine*, 16 August 1942.

maintain secrecy of intelligence that might endanger military operations or political procedures, but admitted the job did not require “neutral reporting.”<sup>23</sup> However, the OWI did not infringe upon the duties of the Office of Censorship; it served only in a position of affirmation and processed no requests of newsprint or broadcast withholding.<sup>24</sup> The OWI would exert most of its energy not in stringent facts but to information perception and context, creating censorship of another variety, that which was strategically submitted to the public.

While voluntary censorship had widespread cooperation, its practice yielded thousands of violations by journalists whom did not receive a codebook, neglected to read it, or misunderstood it. Notably, there was almost no intentional military sabotage during the course of the war, and only one radio journalist ever knowingly violated the code.<sup>25</sup> Journalists attempted to appease Army and Navy personnel who “cringed at violations they considered dangerous” by staying true to the censors.<sup>26</sup> To practice otherwise could mean compromising national security and individual military lives, instigating mandatory censorship and damaging the audience base, thus finances, of that news medium. As the *Chicago Tribune* would discover in 1942 when they violated the censorship code reporting the battle of Midway, the government, when pressed, would prosecute media with the Espionage Act.<sup>27</sup>

Although writers followed the set rules, not all reporters enjoyed working within those bounds. While journalists practiced self censorship (for example, many did not expose appalling military training conditions), they often felt the censor’s veil stretched too far.<sup>28</sup> Some journalists felt that censorship was a violation of their right to work without acting as “a propaganda arm of [the] government.”<sup>29</sup> Willard A. Edwards, a correspondent for the *Chicago Tribune*, was once questioned as to whether he felt he had to follow the censorship policy and replied, “Oh God, yes, yes ... I was conscious what our line was, and I didn’t violate that line ... I submitted to censorship.”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Roeder, Jr., *The Censored War*, 2. Matthew Bernstein, *Controlling Hollywood: Censorship and Regulation in the Studio Era* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 130-131.

<sup>24</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 12.

<sup>25</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 3.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, *Secrets of Victory*, 22. A *New York Times* reporter withheld the story fearing it would damage American morale.

<sup>29</sup> James Tobin, *Ernie Pyle: America’s Eyewitness to WWII* (New York: Free Press, 1997), 140.

<sup>30</sup> Willard A. Edwards, Interview by Niel M. Johnson, 17 September 1988, transcript, Harry S. Truman Library and Museum, Independence, Missouri.

Journalists' sore sentiments were incited particularly when stories were rebuffed, not for military purposes, but national and political ego, as when a piece was deemed to nationally humiliating to publish in the United States.<sup>31</sup> The antebellum press had taken it upon themselves to be the envoy of official inadequacy but now found their inability to perform as such to be a literary and financial liability.<sup>32</sup> Many press sectors felt that if the truth was suppressed for illegitimate reasons, they and the government would be deemed untrustworthy by the public.

Journalists felt they should make "un-purchased opinions" without the interference of intentional propaganda induced by omission or submission of strategic facts.<sup>33</sup> Despite their officially noted "desire to cooperate," laboring beneath the voluntary censorship codes became a shared sacrifice for American journalists willing to do their part.<sup>34</sup> The Office of Censorship found that while monitoring compliant journalists was reasonably simple, they would occasionally stretch the codes' intentions to the point of security breach if they did not believe the censorship to be legitimate.<sup>35</sup> Most journalists, however, did maintain voluntary censorship primarily because they viewed themselves as American citizens before news journalists and did support the overall war effort. There was no desire within the press sector to see voluntary censorship slip to mandatory binds on freedom of speech.

Newspapers were directed specifically through codebooks and memos from the Office of Censorship's many censorship clauses, which they were expected to follow in the interest of protecting American lives and ensuring Allied victory. There were seven main sections to the code, which prevented the exposure of troop, ship and airplane movements; fortification locations, war contracts, certain kinds of

---

<sup>31</sup> Tobin, *Ernie Pyle*, 70. This was in reference to writing about Allied relations with the French Vichy government.

<sup>32</sup> The term antebellum, while most commonly referencing the American Civil War, simply means before-war. In this context, it seems appropriate to create an intense division between the way in which the press functioned on 6 December 1941 and how it would alter intensely within the twelve days leading up to the distribution of censorship codebooks. Antebellum in this context is meant to emphasize that time immediately before Pearl Harbor and the American declaration of war.

<sup>33</sup> "Freely Print Bad War News Editor Asserts," *The Dallas Morning News*, 07 May 1942, p. 3.

<sup>34</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Executive Order 8985, (19 December 1941); Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 35. Price notes that voluntary censorship required some journalistic sacrifice not expected in ordinary times.

<sup>35</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 136, 151, 214. Drew Pearson was one such journalist who troubled the Office of Censorship with constant self interpretations of code.

metrological forecasting, and specific photos and maps.<sup>36</sup> The *New York Times* condoned the codebook calling its many clauses “sensible.”<sup>37</sup> The codes were meant to protect against such errors as when, for advertising purposes, the specifics and movements of an oil train were exposed. Shortly after the breach, a similar train with the same destination was wrecked, yielding from Price, “maybe it was a coincidence, maybe not.”<sup>38</sup> The Office of Censorship knew that in such cases repercussions could be assigned; however, it was easier to let the publications be confronted with public scorn for military endangerment.<sup>39</sup> What would not be subject to censorship were news stories released in the foreign press earlier than in the United States. What was available to the enemy overseas in print was not considered worthy of American repression and was subject to news coverage even when the topic made military officials nervous, such as when it pertained to atomic research.<sup>40</sup>

The attack on Pearl Harbor shifted military censorship from theory to pressing practice. The extent of the destruction to the Pacific Fleet was silenced to preserve morale and prevent Japanese intelligence gathering; cable censorship began within one hour of the Pearl Harbor attack.<sup>41</sup> Later the actions of censorship, taken in response to the attack on Pearl Harbor, would create one platform for the Republican Party in 1944 which stated, “Vital facts must not be withheld. . . We want no more Pearl Harbor reports.”<sup>42</sup> The same reasoning directed the cover up of Japanese balloon bombs in America. Damage and resulting casualties, including the “only deaths from enemy attack on the mainland,” were reportable as long as the cause was cited as

---

<sup>36</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 6. The Office of Censorship asked that in using the codebook, newspapers employ common sense about what information would be useful to the enemy and might endanger lives.

<sup>37</sup> “Sensible Censorship,” *New York Times*, 19 January 1942.

<sup>38</sup> “Teach People Objectives of Censorship” *Dallas Morning News*, 09 September 1942, p. 7. Price asserted that while the destruction may have been a coincidence, incidents of leakage should be guarded against.

<sup>39</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 180. These remained the main policing measure for voluntary censorship throughout the war.

<sup>40</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 33; Patrick S. Washburn, “The office of censorship’s attempt to control press coverage of the atomic bomb during World War II,” *Journalism Monographs*, April 1990, p. 20.

<sup>41</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 3, 27. A labor leader in Hawaii complained of abuse of civil rights by military rule in Hawaii; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 31.

<sup>42</sup> “Republican Party Platform of 1944, 26 June 1944,” *The American Presidency Project* (Gerhard Peters, University of California at Santa Barbara), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=25835> (accessed 22 August 2009).

“unknown.”<sup>43</sup> Military censorship demanded a version of truthfulness which did not approach complete disclosure in an effort to ensure security, especially in relation to home front population and production on the mainland.

The standard censorship codebooks were invalid in military combat zones. No journalist could travel on military ships or tour occupied territory without accreditation. To become accredited, journalists would sign a contract agreeing to submit all stories to Army or Navy censors before its release to America, where they would then be censored a second time. Government and military officials could agree to release previously restricted information about the war and were often pressed to do so by journalists and the Office of Censorship. Military censors kept tighter control on photos than words, but did release previously unpublished images of Japanese atrocities before the bombings of Japan in order to reinforce national unity against the enemy who would be faced with a weapon of previously unseen power.<sup>44</sup>

The policy on photographic censorship is interesting when compared to the Office of War Information’s manual for the motion picture industry. While the OWI and Office of Censorship worked in separate segments, their policy on images differs in that the motion picture industry is encouraged to use “the weapon of truth.”<sup>45</sup> While the Office of Censorship would control images that could create race confrontations within the nation, the OWI encouraged portrayal of the United States as “a melting pot, a nation of many races and creeds” in which we would all ultimately “fight side-by-side.”<sup>46</sup> The organization and distribution of media, especially war photography, became part of a strategy to convey a patriotic ideology which would not challenge the propaganda released from the Office of War Information.<sup>47</sup> Photographs, like any media release, had the power to convey information but also had to be controlled in a separate way since it can have the power to convey an undesirable context and content.

---

<sup>43</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 40; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 188-194.

<sup>44</sup> Roeder Jr., *The Censored War*, 15. Davis stated the release of the photos would “nullify voices that might be raised if we should undertake bombing of Japanese cities” in January 1944.

<sup>45</sup> Office of War Information, *Government Manual for the Motion Picture Industry* (Washington D.C.: General Printing Office, 1943), 2.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 12.

<sup>47</sup> Bonnie Brennen and Hanno Hardt, *Picturing the Past: Media, history and photography*. (Springfield: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 6-7.

The journalists who worked through these images, then called pictorial reporters or newspaper illustrators, worked within photographic censorship restrictions; this often proved the desire to expose images which were less candid and realistic than were readily available.<sup>48</sup> Censorship immediately banned images of war equipment, especially aviation innovations. The military officers who performed censorship duties in regard to photography had to study images intensely and be acutely aware of all aspects to be certain nothing classified would be released.<sup>49</sup> Due to the power of war images, military defeats early in the war encouraged a system of visual voids where positive impressions could not be developed. Convinced that scenes of combat caused civilian distress, censors withheld photos showing soldiers maimed, mutilated, or killed in friendly fire, accident, or suicide. As part of the context strategy, photos showing more gruesomeness than glory in war were stored in the “chamber of horrors” in the newly built Pentagon, a secret file itself.<sup>50</sup>

Concerns over civilian cynicism of press photos brought forth lifting of the ban on death photos in September 1943 to prepare the public for greater casualties in the future and to quiet home front complaints.<sup>51</sup> Images of death were used to appeal to home front guilt in an effort to strengthen home front productivity, ignite commitment, and bring the reality of war on foreign soil to the mainland consciousness. With the new release of images containing mortality, propaganda produced by the Office of War Information developed a campaign to unify workers through mourning and guilt. Especially horrifying photos were released, but never actually printed, perhaps in an effort to validate the censor’s belief that both press and public overestimated their own desire for the stark truth of war.<sup>52</sup> The Office of Censorship and affiliated agencies who suppressed photos marked by gruesomeness kept images from a public who may not have been emotionally or psychologically prepared to see the exact results of modern warfare where death did not always resemble slumber.

---

<sup>48</sup> Brennen and Hardt, *Picturing the Past*, 123.

<sup>49</sup> Mame Warren, “Focal Point of the Fleet: U.S. Photographic Activities in World War II,” *The Journal of Military History* 69, no. 4 (October 2005), 1058.

<sup>50</sup> Roeder, Jr., *The Censored War*, 5, 8, 10, 12.

<sup>51</sup> Lisa Waananen, *Both Sides of the lens: A journalist’s loyalties in crisis photography* (Pullman: Washington State University, Spring 2008), <http://lisawaananen.files.wordpress.com/2008/04/thesis-final.pdf> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>52</sup> Roeder Jr., *The Censored War*, 13.

The United States stringently concealed photos that portrayed atrocities committed by America or its allies, showing enemy corpses handled with irreverence or decorated after death. Photos of American dead were distributed with more parsimony than scarce supplies, but some which did not reveal identity would be strategically released.<sup>53</sup> Those images which depicted American dead as forgotten, handled irreverently, or helpless were withheld to maintain the strong image of military honor in death and public morale. The bodies of the dead, which were often dismembered and contorted by the technology of prevailing warfare, were retained as too gruesome for publication.<sup>54</sup> While images of American death were cautiously released, any image which left the impression of allied immorality or weakness and the base brutality of war would be withheld.

Psychoneurotic cases were met with absolute silence from the government as were images of crying.<sup>55</sup> In a survey of generals questioned about photographic censorship policies surrounding hospitalized military personnel, General Dwight D. Eisenhower responded in support of only those which portrayed the “walking wounded” and “cheerful.”<sup>56</sup> Those whose trauma created psychological wounds were kept away of view despite a study by the Office of the Surgeon General, which found that incidents of psychoneurosis were unavoidable and probability of development of such conditions increased with longer war exposure. The study concluded that an infantry soldier could endure an average of two hundred days before the onset of debilitating mental trauma. These internal side effects of war were unexposed due to the lack of military or media desire to display that despite the safe return on military personnel, injuries may be more enduring than expected.<sup>57</sup>

Race also remained of the most volatile issues during World War II.<sup>58</sup> President Roosevelt attempted to blend all groups into the war effort, asserting that the war must be won by “the people as one

---

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 1, 7, 10, 134.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 16. Surveys conducted by the Bureau of Public Relations found that generals such as Eisenhower practiced in agreement with Britain.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 17. The military made efforts to avoid or reduce psychoneurotic cases by prescreening for preexisting disorders and problems, leading to the rejection of 970,000 men. Despite these efforts by the military, roughly three times those who died in combat would suffer war induced psychological disorders.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

great whole.”<sup>59</sup> While the war became a unifying national cause, it also served to highlight issues of segregation and racism, which also dominated propaganda and censorship. Images of unity saturated the culture and were designed to influence harmony within the ranks while the truths of race conflicts on military bases were omitted from public view. It became a challenge for the OWI to develop African American sentiments of unity while the group was still denied equality.<sup>60</sup> Racial barriers were especially difficult for leaders attempting to fulfill war needs without backlash from the white population. Sumner Welles, a close advisor of Roosevelt, declared that discrimination because of “color must be abolished.”<sup>61</sup> In reality, few images challenged existing social standards, and images of injured black soldiers became scarce due to the alleged African American propensity to undeservedly underscore their achievements in war.<sup>62</sup>

One surprising discovery of wartime censorship was that printed news media was afforded more protection under the first amendment than broadcasting.<sup>63</sup> What kept radio free from some censorship were the potentially massive bureaucracy and its estimated negative effects on voluntary censorship. Price wanted to give radio the opportunity to prove itself, knowing that if they failed, they could transition to more strident censorship policies to maintain security.<sup>64</sup> While radio broadcasts were considered a more immediate security threat, Price relied primarily upon a mutual trust, hoping to avoid having to keep the broadcasting industry under the government thumb of suppression.<sup>65</sup>

The main difference between print and broadcasting was the restriction on audience interaction. Censors requested that civilian airtime be limited to in-studio interaction to avoid possible spy

---

<sup>59</sup> President Franklin D. Roosevelt, “Radio Address, excerpts transcribed, 28 April 1942,” *The American Presidency Project* (Gerhard Peters, University of California at Santa Barbara), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=16252&st=&st1=> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>60</sup> Office of War Information, *Government Manual for the Motion Picture Industry*, 11.

<sup>61</sup> Sumner Welles, “Sumner Welles, Undersecretary of State, Memorial Day Address at the Arlington National Amphitheater, 30 May 1942,” *Words of War, Words of Peace* (Ibiblio Project, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1942/420530a.html> (accessed 22 August 2009).

<sup>62</sup> Roeder, Jr., *The Censored War*, 43-57. The Army refused to release photos of the 92nd Division or its burials.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 43-57; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 180.

<sup>64</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 9. Price’s argument was mainly against Lowell Mellett, a previous candidate for the censorship job, who argued the benefits of complete radio control by government during wartime.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 13, 119, 133.

transmission of coded messages through man on the street pieces and impromptu game shows. Special song requests at specific times were to be denied and weather was not to be discussed unless in emergency situations authorized by the Weather Bureau.<sup>66</sup> This proved to be a particularly difficult task for sports announcers broadcasting live sports game cancellations. At a time when U-boats in the Atlantic were a heavy threat, the main reason for the nondisclosure of weather conditions rested upon the ability of German submarine commanders to tell by triangulation the weather in their area for several days based off of weather reports on the radio.<sup>67</sup> The Army also restricted radio broadcasts on presently operating raids, while print press could publish such information while raids were still in action.<sup>68</sup>

Foreign language radio broadcasts were frequently affected by censorship because of their refusal to follow the Office of Censorship's requests and because nationalistic prejudice was slanted against them. The Office of Censorship had difficulty implementing their policy of having foreign language programs translated and scripted for approval because of a budget increase small stations could not sustain. To comply with prejudiced codes, the foreign language stations protested these would be a gratuitous intrusion upon freedom of speech and a hazard to the democratic system of American.<sup>69</sup> The stations finally complied only when reminded sternly by Price that not abiding by censor rules jeopardized the radio stations existence. Ultimately, the stations were allowed to continue only because they provided a way to keep "foreign born Americans in touch with the country's war needs and aims."<sup>70</sup>

Radio also faced some confusion when approved scripts were later reprimanded for releasing information that the military deemed too sensitive. Especially problematic was information or conversation concerning atomic research. Much like radar, atomic possibilities were more widely publicized in the pre-war press. The Army expressed concerns about the war's greatest secret being exposed and requested a complete press blackout in regards to it. It was feared by Price, however, that such a move would awaken journalistic interest. Instead,

---

<sup>66</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 34.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>68</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 104, 87.

<sup>69</sup> Thwaites to Byron Price, 19 August 1943, box 359, "KFUN" folder, Office of Censorship, Record Group 216, National Archives Annex, College Park, Maryland; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 115. The script compliance issue was particularly with KFUN, a Spanish radio station.

<sup>70</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 34.

Price sent out a memo reminding editors of the clause on new or secret weapons contracts.<sup>71</sup> Leaks, however, did continue to occur. Even after the Office of Censorship reminder, there were seventy-seven references recorded.<sup>72</sup> In 1945, the Manhattan Project would contact the Office of Censorship directly to prepare a series of statements for release after the bomb was tested in New Mexico. After creating a light visible for 200 miles, one of four official statements credited the flash to the explosion of an ammunition dump near Alamogordo.<sup>73</sup>

But despite the challenges which arose from voluntary censorship, it would prove exceptionally valuable in the weeks preceding the invasion of France. In the months before the invasion, extra vigil was kept in regards to information which the enemy, suspecting invasion abroad, might find useful. A censorship reminder in January 1944 stated that American press should observe immediately a “complete moratorium on gossip regarding [Normandy]” and called for there to be absolutely “no black market in information so dangerous to American life.”<sup>74</sup> These measures were imperative to ensure an Allied advantage upon an invasion of Europe which relied heavily on the element of surprise. On V-E Day, the press and radio was rewarded for their efforts by receiving a new, more lenient censorship code and the gratitude of those who had an interest in an Allied victory.<sup>75</sup> In January 1946, Byron Price received the Medal of Merit for his outstanding commitment to voluntary censorship and his aid in maintaining one of the many freedoms which the United States had fought for.<sup>76</sup> That the press and broadcasting associations had knowledge of imperative information but the patriotic restraint, guided by Price and the Office of Censorship, to withhold it is a testament to the unity felt in every sector of the country.

During World War II, censorship silently revealed itself in almost every sector of communication. The enactment of censorship policies in a democratic nation brings forth serious dilemmas for those

---

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 42; Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 198-200.

<sup>72</sup> Sweeney, *Secrets of Victory*, 204. There were 104 total published and recorded references, 77 made after the memo was sent.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 205. Price warned Manhattan Project officials, who were unsure of the power and force of the atomic bomb, “If you blow off one corner of the United States, don’t expect to keep it out of the papers.”

<sup>74</sup> Price, Report of the Office of Censorship, 40.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-17.

<sup>77</sup> President Harry S. Truman, “Citation to accompany the award of the medal of merit, 15 January 1946,” *The American Presidency Project* (Gerhard Peters, University of California at Santa Barbara), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=12412&st=&st1=> (accessed 22 August 2009).

who evaluate items related to censorship for security and national purpose. In examining World War II, the practice of omission and strategic submission of materials becomes an interesting portrait of a government at work as much on the home front psychology as the foreign fought war. Images and information were carefully selected to help make remote battles and deaths as real as possible but often censored to prevent a decline in morale and increase social clashes. Most striking of all may be the majority of public support censorship received in an era when the public trusted national government to make the right decisions for them, including controlling their level of intellectual involvement. Ultimately, for good or ill, censorship became a substantial aspect of the American experience at war and helped to determine what type of society would endure through and emerge from the postwar years and its enduring legacy.

# Contributors

**Bridgette Baima** (*Christian Culture in Seventeenth-Century New Spain*) is a graduate student in the Masters of Arts in Teaching program.

**Jodi Clayton** (*Feeding the Wartime Family: How Women Made Do With Less in the Name of Patriotism*) is a senior History major and will graduate in Spring 2009. For this essay, she received the *Ibid.* Editorial Award for Best Essay.

**Stephanie Parham** (*Soldados y Susanas SP: The Mexican American Experience in World War II*) is a senior majoring in History and will graduate in Spring 2009.

**Teresa Pierce** (*Those Quaking Female Prophetesses*) is a graduate student in History and will complete her master's degree in 2009.

**Tiffany Smith** (*A Thousand Words Unsaid: The Role of Censorship in the United States During World War II*) is a junior majoring in History.



# 2008-2009 Chapter Officers

**President:**

Bridgette Baima

**Vice President:**

Brittany Hinkle

**Secretary:**

Teresa Pierce

**Treasurer:**

Amy Hulbert

**Historian:**

Leslie Lindsey

**Faculty Advisor:**

Dr. Jacob Blosser

**Chairperson, Department of History and Government:**

Dr. Mark Kessler