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Introduction

The Gettysburg College Historical Journal embodies the History Department’s dedication to diverse learning and excellence in academics. Each year, the Journal publishes the top student work which range in topics and approach. For example, David Weimer’s article “Europe’s Little Tiger?: Reassessing Economic Transition in Slovakia under the Mečiar Government,” published in the 2013 edition of the Journal, won the American Historical Association’s Raymond J. Cunningham Prize. In addition, The Historical Journal is primarily a student-run organization. As such, it provides History students opportunities to get involved in the department outside of the classroom. The journal allows students to learn valuable editing, organizational, and leadership skills.

This, the thirteenth edition of the Historical Journal, continues the legacy of past volumes. The following works exemplify the varied interests of the History students here at Gettysburg. These articles explore topics from the Medieval era to Weimar Germany. In his article "This Fire of Contention": Factional Conflict in Salem Village after 1692,” Shaw Bridges examines the aftermath of the Salem Witch Trials focusing on the accused and their families. Sarah Dell compares and contrasts the Spanish Inquisition with Mary Tudor’s Inquisition in “The Unsuccessful Inquisition in Tudor England.” In “A New Officer for a New Army: The Leadership of Major Hugh J.C. Peirs in the Great War,” Marco Dracopoli examines the changes in the British Expeditionary Force during World War I through the letters of Major John Hugh Chevalier Peirs. Sarah Hayes’ “A Contrary Situation: The Rise of the Military Religious Orders in the Twelfth Century” investigates the contradictions in the militarism of Christian monks during the medieval Crusades. Lastly, in her article “Working Women and Motherhood: Failures of the Weimar Republic’s Family Policies,” Katie Quirin discusses how the welfare policies of the Weimar Republic failed to increase the birth rate among working-class women.

--- Co-Editors-in-Chief
Katie Quirin and Allie Ward
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“This Fire of Contention”: Factional Conflict in Salem Village after 1692

By Shaw Bridges

“Why is it that twentieth-century historians of Salem witchcraft have not bothered to explore the history of Salem Village, or the lives of the men, women, and children who peopled it, apart from that fleeting moment when the community achieved lasting notoriety?”¹

“Men who have the democracy of diversity must also accept the vocal and sometimes violent conflicts that give rise to that kind of democracy. It is pointless for them to wish for the ease of perpetual consensus, unless they envision withdrawing from the whole in a doomed effort to restore the homogeneity of the past.”²

In 1711, the Province of Massachusetts Bay General Court granted the reversal of the attainders, which exonerated the witch trial victims of social stigma and restored their right to entail their property to their families. Nearly two decades earlier, the Court of Oyer and Terminer doled out judgments against well over a hundred individuals in their effort to extirpate witchcraft from the Massachusetts Bay Colony. In the process, the witch trials claimed the lives of twenty innocent individuals, mostly women, and led to the torture and imprisonment of well over a hundred more.³ Family members related to accused witches were forced to post bail for their imprisoned relatives. Others sustained losses from the confiscation of their property and many more struggled to return to the normalcy of day-to-day life.⁴ Some historians debate whether it was a spark of internal factionalism, which ignited the witch-hunt in Salem Village (or as Mary Beth Norton aptly argues, the “Essex County witchcraft phenomenon”), while others contend the epidemic spread of accusations was fueled by manifold historical conditions such as the early European colonists’ deep-seated fear of Wabanaki attack, the position of women in puritan society, or the antiquated religious conservatism of the New England village leadership.⁵ Consequently, scholars have overlooked fundamental historical parallels which link the Salem

⁴ One of the younger victims, four-year-old Dorothy Good, required constant supervision for the rest of her life after her experience in prison, which left her “very chargeable having little or no reason to govern herself.” Bernard Rosenthal ed., Records of the Salem Witch-Hunt (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 2009), abbrev. RSWH, 871. Doc. 907, “Petition of William Good for Restitution for Sarah Good, Dorothy Good, & Infant.”
story to the narrative of community development in late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century New England. In his classic work, *Salem Witchcraft*, Charles Upham portrayed the Salem witch trials as the catharsis of the village factional struggles. Subsequent scholarship reveals the devolution of the Salem ministry’s capacity to settle the villagers’ conflicts; however, historians have not examined how these factional struggles were ultimately resolved.

I will reassess how factional politics rent a schism between the allies of Reverend Parris, and the Cloyse, Bridges, and Nurse families who sought justice for the witch trial victims. In spite of their efforts, it was only after these families’ out-migration when reconciliation occurred under Reverend Thomas Green. The new Salem minister recognized that the church’s long-term institutional security and financial support were dependent on a robust parish membership. He implemented the Halfway Covenant, which extended the privileges of full membership in the Covenant with God and His Saints to second and third generation Puritans in the vicinity of Salem Village via the suspension of the required “conversion experience” to maintain the “continuity contained in Puritan Covenant theology.” This liberalization of membership qualifications in the Puritan churches across New England began decades before the Salem witch trials at the Church Synod of 1657, but the theological controversy over this doctrine persisted well into the 1670s and persisted in Salem Village in the 1690s. Whether or not this conservatism galvanized the accusers, the minister Samuel Parris’ relentless persecution of suspected witches and village dissidents culminated in the out-migration of churchgoers to Framingham, and made the adoption of the Halfway Covenant necessary for the continuity of the parish. Moreover, I maintain that the indecisiveness of reconciliation between the disparate factions, which preceded the destruction, and reconfiguration of Salem Village parallels the developmental course of New England towns in the eighteenth century.

---

8 Upham, *Salem Witchcraft*. v. 2.
9 The post-1692 Salem narrative has mostly remained unchanged since Charles Upham penned his seminal two-volume work on the Salem witch trials. In his nuanced description of the villagers’ persistent conflict with the Reverend Samuel Parris he overlooks aspects pertinent to its resolution. *Ibid.*, 509. Even though Upham briefly refers to several families that left the Village after the trials, he neither discusses the reasons for their migration nor the role they played in Salem politics. *Ibid.*, 465.
10 Salem historian Benjamin Ray discusses the religious contention between the pro-Parris members of the Village Covenant and those attendees who were members of other parishes. He argues that the Salem Village church’s unyielding conservatism produced theological disagreements that explain why most accused individuals did not join the Salem Village Covenant Benjamin C. Ray, “Satan’s War Against the Covenant in Salem Village, 1692,” 74. Likewise, Richard Latner contends that Reverend Green’s conciliatory social and religious policy underscores the magnitude of this theological divergence Richard Latner, "Here Are No
I. The narrative of the victims’ families, whose livelihoods were tainted by the stain of witchcraft accusations, can elucidate the struggle for social and religious consensus in Salem Village at the turn of the eighteenth century. The families of the accused sisters Sarah Towne Cloyse, Rebecca Towne Nurse, and Mary Towne Easty were at the center of this struggle.\(^{11}\) The trial records suggest that even a well-respected figure in Salem like Rebecca Nurse was susceptible to accusation. Several historians have tried to analyze these sisters’ accusations in reference to their geographical locations, however, as Benjamin Ray’s map reveals, the victims occupied a large expanse of the town and its environs [Fig. 1]. Rebecca’s friends and neighbors vouched for her good character in several petitions to the Court of Oyer and Terminer, but to no avail. The young female accusers and the allies of Samuel Parris crusaded against the Towne sisters despite the fervent support of their defenders and even some of the accusers.\(^{12}\) In the end, while Sarah endured life in prison shackles, both Rebecca and Mary were excommunicated, cut off from the Covenant with God, and condemned to the gallows.

---


The trial records show that Nathaniel Putnam who accused several individuals himself, stood by Rebecca Nurse during her trial and “submitted his own petition on her behalf.” Similarly the constable Joseph Herrick Sr. came to her defense. Benjamin C. Ray, “The Geography of Witchcraft Accusations in 1692 Salem Village,” 465-66.
Family members of the deceased Towne sisters Rebecca and Mary were exasperated by the lethal sentences delivered in court despite the indeterminate evidence brought to bear against the accused women.\textsuperscript{13} Sarah Towne Cloyse’s second husband, Peter Cloyse, and his in-laws refused to attend parish services and meetings to express their vexation with the trials, specifically towards the Reverend Samuel Parris’ role in provoking accusations through his sermons.\textsuperscript{14} The memory of Rebecca’s body hanging unceremoniously from the gallows was still fresh, when on August 14\textsuperscript{th}, 1692 Samuel Parris spoke to his congregation about the absence of her family members from church, likely feigning ignorance of their collective frustration with the ongoing witch-hunt:

Brethren, you may all have taken notice, that, several sacrament days past, our brother Peter Cloyse, and Samuel Nurse and his wife, and John Tarbell and his wife, have absented from communion with us at the Lord’s Table, yea, have very rarely, except our brother Samuel Nurse, been with us in common public worship: now, it is needful that the church send some persons to them to know the reason of their absence.\textsuperscript{15}

The individuals mentioned above were unwilling to consult with Parris, let alone attend his inflammatory sermons that led to their loved one’s execution and expulsion from everlasting salvation. Peter Cloyse was preoccupied visiting his accused wife Sarah in the prison in Ipswich. Likewise, John Tarbell, Rebecca Nurse’s son-in-law claimed he was ‘ill,’ and Samuel Nurse opted to avoid the sermons, but still attended the public meetings.\textsuperscript{16} In his sermon book, Parris often spoke to the parish about his mistrust for those who “doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully,” and of the “rotten-hearted” who he felt betrayed him.\textsuperscript{17} Even before the trials, attendance in the parish had tapered off due to the unpopularity of Parris’s ministry. Samuel Parris had originally organized the parish under an older version of the Puritan Covenant in order to

\textsuperscript{13} The two family members being the sisters Mary Towne Easty died Sept. 22, 1692 and Rebecca Towne Nurse (var. spelled Nourse) died July 19, 1692, \textit{Ibid.}, 658 & 469. The third sister, Sarah Towne Cloyse was also an accused witch, but survived the trials (var. spelled Cloyes, Cloyse, Clayes).

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, 844-5. Sarah Towne’s second husband, Peter Cloyse, who would play a significant role in the post-trial story, was originally from Wells, Maine, having fled to Salem after the Wabanaki raided several settlements in and around Falmouth. Norton, \textit{In the Devil’s Snare}, 74, 130.


\textsuperscript{17} Quoted from Samuel Parris’ \textit{Sermon Notebook}. Ray, “Satan’s War Against the Covenant in Salem Village, 1692,” 79-80.
maintain what he believed to be a “pure church.”18 The Halfway Covenant, which had been in place in the nearby Salem Town parish, and in the surrounding parishes of Beverly, Lynn, and Rowley was a commonly adopted doctrine by the time Parris became minister in Salem Village.19 For the first few decades in the New England Puritan settlements, members were asked to recount a “conversion experience,” usually in the form of a written or verbal statement of religious awakening to the church leaders. This prerequisite account signified the new member’s righteousness and distinguished him or her as one of God’s chosen saints who would one day join him in heaven. As members of the early generations began to die and the parishes needed to ensure the loyalty and continued support of the second and third generations who were excluded from full membership, since many of them were raised Puritans and so did not convert. Through the Halfway Covenant, the Puritan theologians at the Church Synod of 1657 sought to remedy the systematic exclusion of second and third generation churchgoers from the privileges of full church membership such as the right to receive communion. In Salem Village, Samuel Parris gathered enough initial support to discontinue this liberal church policy in the new parish, but not without resistance. The parish’s conservative membership qualifications subsequently excluded nearly four hundred churchgoers from the benefits of communion and baptism, both privileges reserved for full members in the Covenant.20 On the eve of the witch trials, Parris invited churchgoers who did not recount their religious awakening through a “conversion experience” into limited membership alongside the Covenanters.21 After an initial increase of twenty-seven members in 1690, however, the numbers of new initiates, including baptisms, fell dramatically.22 This trend continued even after the trials ended in 1693, while Parris “continued to equate his enemies with the forces of Satan,” bent on the dissolution of the Salem Covenant.23

On February 7th John Tarbell and Samuel Nurse accompanied by Thomas Wilkins, scion of a predominantly pro-Parris family, met with Samuel Parris to voice their desire to see him resign and leave Salem Village. According to Parris’ records, Tarbell promptly castigated Parris for his role in the trials, even going so far as to accuse him of idolatry. Likewise, Tarbell blamed Parris for his mother Rebecca Nurse’s execution and said that he “had been the great prosecutor.” The pastor’s account reveals these men’s vehemence in their objections regarding Parris’s influence during the trials:

19 Ibid., 74.
20 Ibid., 75.
22 Benjamin C. Ray, “Satan’s War Against the Covenant in Salem Village, 1692,” 76.
23 Ibid., 93.
[Tarbell claimed] that others wise and learned who had been as forward as myself were sorry for what they had done, and saw their error, and ‘till I did so too, he could not join (in communion). His brother Sam: Nurse, for about an hour’s time has the same objections.24

The day after Parris received this barrage of complaints, Peter Cloyse returned from Boston, presumably where his wife was then held prisoner, to deliver a similar speech to the pastor. Their accusations of idolatry not only reflected fervent belief in Parris’s culpability for the deaths of their loved ones, but also their frustration over the marginalization of their entire family in Salem society. The descendants of accused witches who were excommunicated were also barred from obtaining the full privileges of Covenanted membership, thus negating the inclusive membership policy adopted just before the trials. The prohibitive consequence of this policy on church membership was not rectified in most parishes for several years. Thus, the witch trial victims and their families considered Parris, not only the great prosecutor, but also the artificer of their collective damnation.25 At a meeting with Samuel Parris in early February of 1693, his opponents Thomas Wilkins, John Tarbell, and Samuel Nurse formally accused the minister of wrongdoing and in order to make amends they required “satisfaction from him.”26 The conflict came to a head in March 1693, when the Salem Village Church entered a complaint at a “General Session of the Peace” in Ipswich against the Salem-Village Committee then headed by Rebecca Nurse’s son-in-law Thomas Preston, John Tarbell, and three others. The complaint was entered on behalf of the Reverend Parris who had yet to receive the funds required for his maintenance from his opponents. Parris and his supporters attempted to force taxation on those who refused to pay his salary in December, by threat of recourse to legal suasion by the constables. In response to this threat, Peter Cloyse and several of his compatriots drafted a letter to the Parish Elders from the surrounding communities summoning them to hear their grievances and adjudicate between themselves and Parris.27

In the succeeding months the tension between the Reverend Samuel Parris and the allies of the Nurse family deteriorated into a protracted quarrel through petitions and lists of grievances presented to the parish and surrounding communities. By early October 1693, Reverend John Higginson sent word to Salem Village that a Council of the Elders in Boston would be summoned to settle any disputes within the parish.28 When the time came to deliberate, however, Samuel Parris would not grant the “dissenting brethren” an opportunity

27 Ibid., 257-8, 283-4.
28 Ibid., 287.
to undermine his authority. In his letter to the ministers, John Hale of Beverly, John Higginson, and Nicholas Noyes of Salem Town, Parris said he would not permit the testimony of non-parish members from Salem Town or elsewhere to be heard in the Council. Parris believed Salem Village was an isolated parish community, and his atomistic methods for conflict resolution typified his conservative mentality. He refused to allow any Council to form unless an official list of complaints was presented to him and the parish, even though the “dissenting brethren” refused to supply the list unless a Council was called to read them. The preacher who in 1692 wrongly indicted men and women for witchcraft was under the scrutiny of his parishioners and struggled to retain the upper hand.

Throughout this civil disorder in Salem Village, Peter Cloyse removed to Boston to care for his imprisoned wife Sarah. He was therefore unable to help his obstinate comrades in the parish meetings; however, he continued as best he could to deliver petitions to the Reverend Parris and the parish. These visits were of course short as he was “haste to be gone,” presumably so he could return to Boston. In one of the petitions he signed and delivered along with John Tarbell and Samuel Nurse to Parris, an attempt was made to give the latter the opportunity to reconsider summoning a council by offering a concession:

That we agree together for a Council chosen by the General Court; who may have full power to hear and determine all differences, real and imaginable, which hath arisen amongst us; which if obtained, then we do promise to give unto you our Pastor the particulars of our grievances, in writing, thirty days before the said Council shall meet, to consider thereof.29

The villagers were willing to look to outside authorities to settle their differences. This offer was promptly turned down in a response approved by Parris’ allies in the Village parish November 26th, 1693.30 Historians of the Salem witchcraft in recent historiography have debated whether blame for the spiraling effect of the trial accusations should be attributed primarily to the Massachusetts Church authorities or to local political struggles.31 The petitions issued by the Cloyses and Nurses indicate they recognized the judicial and spiritual authority of the Church leaders, despite their involvement in the witch trials. At Deacon Ingersoll’s Inn, Parris and about twenty of the “dissenting brethren” (the number grew as months passed by) consulted letters of advice from the ministers of nearby towns in the hopes of finally reaching a settlement. The dissenting brethren said their offense was not with the church as an institution in Salem Village, but with

29 Ibid., 289-90.
30 Ibid., 291.
Samuel Parris’ ministry. The Salem villagers refused to forsake their church despite the prominent role that its leadership played in the witch trials.

Massachusetts at the turn of the eighteenth century was a theocratic society and therefore, as Mary Beth Norton articulates in her monograph, “It must always be remembered that the judges of the Court of Oyer and Terminer were the very men who led the colony both politically and militarily.” The strategic blunders of King William’s War have been attributed to several of the men who also presided over the Court of Oyer and Terminer in 1692-3 including the Reverend John Hathorne, Jonathan Corwin, Samuel Sewall, and William Stoughton. Due perhaps to the ongoing conflict of King William’s War (1689-97) against the Native Americans and the French or their desire to further disassociate themselves with the witchcraft scandal, these men stayed detached from the residual conflicts in Salem. This left the church leaders to oversee the dispute between Parris and his opponents. The ministers who intervened were concerned about the social unrest in Salem Village and “the sad effects likely to follow on the continuance of this fire of contention.” On June 14\(^{\text{th}}\), 1694, the neighboring ministers, John Hale, John Higginson, and Samuel Willard who among others participated in the sentencing of witches two years prior, wrote to the Salem Village church with their advice: “We beseech you to study those things which make for peace and edification, Eph. 4: 1-3.” Samuel Parris and his supporters finally offered conciliatory overtures to the dissenters in the town meetings by 1694, in an effort to salvage Parris’ ministry and his ownership of the parsonage. Those who opposed him at every turn, did so with the consent of the Puritan community at large, and made sure of this by inviting other church leaders to adjudicate their conflict with Parris.

---

33 Original emphasis. Norton, *In the Devil’s Snare*, 299.
34 Ibid., 299.
35 Many colonists felt the Salem Witch Trials were a miscarriage of justice and too much credence had been given to the delusions of young girls. Governor Phips was recalled to England by the British Crown, and several of those involved in the witch trial proceedings lamented their role, such as Samuel Sewall who later made an official apology, and John Hale wrote his famous account of the trials, *A Modest Enquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft* in which he argued that the Court of Oyer and Terminer followed dubious methods of prosecution. Ibid., 309-12.
37 Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem-Village Witchcraft*, 292.
The Nurses and their allies were also involved in an ongoing dispute with several Parris supporters in
the Village over land bordering Topsfield along the Ipswich Road. Benjamin Ray’s map depicts the locations
of many of the actors in this dispute in Salem Village along with other leaders and involved parties in the
Salem Village conflicts before and after 1692 [Fig. 2]. Members of the Putnam family and their allies
including Thomas Flint and Nathaniel Ingersoll were given authority by the town committee to pursue legal
action against these members of the Nurse and Towne families. At the same meeting, Francis and Samuel
Nurse, John Tarbell, and Thomas Preston entered their names into the Village Record Book in opposition to
the vote against them. In the aftermath of the trials this persistent land conflict added insult to injury to the

40 SVRB, [63] 30, November 1694. Also, see Boyer and Nissenbaum, “The Ipswich Road: An Anti-Parris Paradigm,” in Salem Possessed, 96-7.
families of the trial victims. Likewise, Samuel Parris continued, at least tacitly, to support his allies’ land claims.

The opposing factions reached an impasse until Parris finally relinquished his hold on the parish property in 1696. In the meantime, his opponents continued to demand redress for “his persisting in these principles and justifying his practices, not rendering any satisfaction to us when regularly desired, but rather farther offending and dissatisfying ourselves.” The Reverend may have used the fervor of the witch trials to unite members of the parish against a common foe, i.e. the devil and his servants, but after the excitement abated, his nexus with community solidarity dissipated. The members of the Salem Village parish could no longer identify with the apocalyptic message of war against the devil that Parris advocated in his sermons. Parris’s refusal to hear the advice of his church colleagues may have further diminished his credibility as a minister. The Reverend’s authority soon crumbled under a swelling number of Salem Villagers who wanted both retribution and the stability, which would result from legitimate leadership.

II. By the year 1695, the progress toward resolution between the Parris and Nurse factions stalled. In 1695, after Peter Cloyse procured a deed to property on Thomas Danforth’s Farms (named for the owner and famous witchcraft judge Thomas Danforth), he paid one last visit to the Salem pastor and requested a letter of recommendation so he and his family could join a new parish. The Reverend Parris wrote a letter of dismissal for Peter and his wife Sarah Cloyse to the Church of Marlborough. Peter returned it promptly after expressing his disappointment it was not the letter of recommendation he anticipated. According to Parris’ letter, both Peter and his family left Salem and had “now become near neighbors [to Marlborough].” After years of beleaguered exertion against the political stagnation in Salem Village, Peter Cloyse and his family failed in their efforts to resolve the conflicts in their Puritan community, and so from the “fire of contention” emerged a new community and parish in Framingham. Although the establishment of new settlements in the eastern half of Massachusetts counties including Essex and Middlesex plateaued during the first half of the eighteenth century, the subdivision of many of these communities increased from 22% from the years 1661-

41 Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem-Village Witchcraft*, 297.
42 Ibid., 292-309.
43 Thomas Danforth, who was the judge that presided over Sarah Cloyse’s trial in 1692, had been a critic, albeit a silent one, of the trials towards the end, according to the empirical writings of the Boston Minister Thomas Brattle. Norton, *In the Devil’s Snare*, 283; Josiah Howard Temple, *History of Framingham, Massachusetts, Early Known as Danforth’s Farms, 1640-1880; With a Genealogical Register* (Framingham: The Town of Framingham, 1887), 124-5.
44 Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., *Salem-Village Witchcraft*, 311.
1700 to approximately 48% over the succeeding 40 years.\textsuperscript{47} This statistical increase includes the early division of Andover and Salem, both towns that were caught up in the witch trials. As the historian Kenneth Lockridge argued, the process of community division before and after 1692 was due to the failure of these communities to reach a consensus with regards to their internal disagreements and conflicts.\textsuperscript{48} The Salem narrative is consistent with this process of creative destruction in the formation of new communities in colonial New England.

In 1692, the Framingham Township had not yet been established. The area instead consisted of swaths of wilderness territory sparsely occupied by a few settlers.\textsuperscript{49} The inhabitants of “those Remote lands scittuate and lyeing betweene Sudbury, Concord, Marlbury, Natick and Sherborne” petitioned the General Court to allow them to form a township.\textsuperscript{50} After the first failed, they petitioned again in 1692-3 to incorporate Framingham Township. The petition reveals the anxiety they experienced transitioning to their new life in frontier territory:

…By reason of the present distressed condition of those that dwell in these frontier Towns, divers are meditating to remove themselves into such place, where they have not hitherto beene concerned in the present war and desolations…\textsuperscript{51}

The early settlers in Framingham sent their petition to the General Court with hopes of not only easing the transition from their settled albeit turbulent existence in Salem but also of obtaining “some easement in our taxes that wee may be the better bee enabled to carry on our publick Town charges.”\textsuperscript{52} The Framingham settlers were at loggerheads with members of Sherborne Township who laid claim to the lands of seventeen families and the right to tax them as residents.\textsuperscript{53} Peter Cloyse and the Salem End settlers entered into the foray of the community’s conflict with Sherborne Township by drafting a petition to the General Court on behalf of the Framingham families whose lands were in dispute. In their petition they asked to definitively establish their separate township, both to accommodate the increased population from “200 souls to 350” due to the

\textsuperscript{47} Douglas Lamar Jones, "The Strolling Poor: Transiency in Eighteenth-Century Massachusetts," (\textit{Journal Of Social History}: no. 3, 1975, 28), 31. See Table 2.

\textsuperscript{48} There is an extensive historiographical debate on the nature of community development in seventeenth and eighteenth century New England. See Michael Zuckerman, \textit{Peaceable Kingdoms: New England Towns in the Eighteenth Century} (ACLS History E-Book Project, 1899); Kenneth A. Lockridge, \textit{A New England Town: the First Hundred Years}.

\textsuperscript{49} Temple, \textit{History of Framingham, Massachusetts}, 126.

\textsuperscript{50} Their initial attempt failed possibly due to opposition from the areas wealthiest landowner, the infamous witch trials judge Thomas Danforth. \textit{Ibid.}, 126.

\textsuperscript{51} \textit{Ibid.}, 127.

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{Ibid.} Faced with both the Essex County witchcraft outbreak and the threat of renewed hostilities with the Wabanaki in Maine, the General Court may have tabled the Framingham request. The conflict with Wabanaki in the northern territory (today’s Maine) had left the political leaders of Massachusetts to contemplate “an awfull frowne of Providence, under which we have cause to be humbled.” Norton, \textit{In the Devil’s Snare.}, 110.

\textsuperscript{53} Temple, \textit{History of Framingham, Massachusetts}, 142.
recent migrations from Essex County towns, and so all members of the community could travel less distance
to attend church on Sabbath.\textsuperscript{54} Finally, Peter Cloyse and the other signers pled, “We petition neither for silver
nor gold, nor any such worldly interest; but that we may have the worship of God upheld among us and our
children.”\textsuperscript{55} Thus, Framingham became one of many new communities to evolve from the dissolution of
communities like Salem Village after 1692.\textsuperscript{56}

The surviving records from Framingham’s foundation indicate several members of the Salem families
participated in the governance of their newly adopted township.\textsuperscript{57} At the first official town meeting after the
town’s incorporation, John Towne and Peter Cloyse were made selectmen and given responsibilities for the
governance of the town, while Benjamin Bridges, Sarah Cloyse’ son, was appointed assessor.\textsuperscript{58} These first
settlers in Framingham were presented with the unfavorable challenge of living in the wilderness. Peter
Cloyse, a one-time refugee from frontier territory in Maine, undoubtedly calculated the risks of moving so
close to Indian lands before choosing to leave Salem Village. In order to mitigate the potential risk of Indian
attack, the town constructed a fort with a watchtower near the Salem End settlement and provisioned it to
defend the inhabitants from enemies.\textsuperscript{59} Some family members, including Samuel Nurse, remained in the
Village on their father Francis Nurse’s estate. The two brothers John and Benjamin Nurse migrated to
Framingham with their families despite their equal share in the inheritance of their fathers’ estate, however,
complications may have arisen over the attainder fixed to their deceased mother’s name and the names of her
descendants. Samuel Nurse continued to petition for the removal of Samuel Parris from office and eventually
participated in the selection of his successor.\textsuperscript{60}

Although the installation of the Reverend Thomas Green as minister signaled the return of the status
quo after years of civil strife, he came too late to prevent the migration of these Salem families. Green

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 134-5.
\textsuperscript{55} William Barry, \textit{A history of Framingham, Massachusetts, including the Plantation, from 1640 to the present time, with an
\textsuperscript{56} Peter Cloyce, Benjamin and Caleb Bridges and Benjamin Nurse laid the foundation for the Meeting House and designated a
minister, the Reverend Smith who joined the first Framingham Parish Covenant in 1701. \textit{Records of the First Church of
Framingham} typescript (Framingham October 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1701). Henceforth abbr., FCR, unpublished.
\textsuperscript{57} Benjamin Bridges, a blacksmith by training was perhaps the earliest settler of what became the Salem End Colony in the spring of
1693, followed by his brother Caleb a bricklayer in 1697. According to Temple, Peter Cloyse and his son by the same name arrived
in Framingham in 1693 with their wives Mary Preston (daughter of Rebecca Nurse) and Sarah Cloyse (the accused witch) and their
families. The two younger sons of Francis and Rebecca Nurse, Benjamin and John both moved to Framingham in 1693 and 1696-7
respectively. Temple, \textit{Genealogical Register in History of Framingham, Massachusetts}, 483, 507, 653.
\textsuperscript{58} The August 5\textsuperscript{th} 1700 Town Meeting. \textit{Ibid.}, 43.
\textsuperscript{59} Temple, \textit{History of Framingham, Massachusetts}, 153-4. The resettlement of these Salem families in the Framingham wilderness,
far from the bustling center of trade near the Salem Town wharfs, seems to discredit Boyer and Nissenbaum’s thesis, that
agricultural families of the Village Proper were caught in a dialectical economic struggle with the allies of a merchant capitalist elite
in Salem Town.
\textsuperscript{60} Boyer and Nissenbaum, eds., \textit{Salem-Village Witchcraft}, 153-54.
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delivered sermons to the Village parish against the use of divination perhaps concerned this type of magic was
detrimental to the community’s recovery from witchcraft.61 After one of his many attempts to minimize
disagreements at a village meeting, Green wrote in his diary that the villagers, “dealt so unkindly [with him,
that he] purposed never to be present again at a Town meeting if [he could] avoid it.”62 He also suggested in a
sermon that the judgment be reversed on Martha Corey, one of the victims of the witch trials.63 Neither he nor
the other Essex County ministers could prevent the eventual split of the Salem Village parish at the start of the
eighteenth century. The establishment of new parishes became such a county-wide concern that on May 31st,
1711, the ministers of several towns held a meeting in which it was determined that, “about ye multiplication
of Parishes, that care should be taken that such needless multiplications might be prevented.”64 The conflicts
experienced in Salem Village were reflected in the other communities caught up in the witch trials fervor. As
Richard Latner indicates, the town of Andover, which had the largest number of accused witches of any town
in Essex County, also split following the death of the Reverend Francis Dane in 1697. Dane’s successor, the
Reverend Barnard, led the campaign in 1705 to build a new meetinghouse in the South End of Town in
anticipation of the 1709 General Court decision to split the community into two precincts.65 The Salem
Village parish eventually recovered its population numbers after extending membership through the Halfway
Covenant in 1700.66 The inclusiveness of membership in Salem and other communities, as Benjamin Ray
maintains, may have produced a “more liberal church” subject to the support of all its members.67 Historians
failed to construe this “liberalization” of membership in the Salem Village Covenant in the context of the out-
migration of families from and splintering of the parish after the witch trials.

Conclusion

In 1703, Peter Cloyse along with the Nurses, Proctors, and others signed a petition to clear the
records of the trial victims, so that “the Names and memory of those who have Suffered as aforesaid, that
none of their Surviving Relations, nor their Posterity may Suffer reproach upon that account.”68 The authors
of the dozens of petitions for restitution continued to struggle to clear the names of their relatives well into the

Collections of the Essex Institute, vol. 8 (Salem, MA: Essex Institute Press, 1866), 221.
62 Ibid., 222.
63 Ibid.
64 Ibid. In Historical Collections of the Essex Institute, vol. 10 (Salem, MA: Essex Institute Press, 1866), 90.
65 Richard Latner, “‘Here Are No Newters’: Witchcraft and Religious Discord in Salem Village and Andover,” 117.
66 Ibid., 120.
68 Doc. 876, “Petition of Francis Faulkner et al. to Clear the Records of Rebecca Nurse, Mary Easty, Abigail Faulkner Sr., Mary
Parker, John Proctor, Elizabeth Proctor, Elizabeth How, Samuel Wardwell, & Sarah Wardwell,” RSWH, 848-9.
eighteenth century. The Reverend Green initiated reforms to pacify the civil strife in Salem Village but could no longer rely on a static membership as the expanding local population either migrated or joined derivative parishes. The Cloyse, Bridges, and Nurse families migrated, not due to a change in their religious sentiments, but because of the futility of their efforts to preserve their “City upon a Hill.” The petitions that Peter Cloyse helped draft reveal an abiding sense of regret vis-à-vis the failure of reconciliation with the Salem Villagers. For all their efforts including their requests for mediation from neighboring parishes, the process of reconciliation was never completed. The historian Kenneth Lockridge aptly referred to this phenomenon of New England town development: “It is a peculiar, frustrating story, for the continuities of the period nearly balanced the changes, while the changes themselves were often elusively evolutionary.” Although, the sorrows and afflictions caused by the religious upheaval of 1692 became one of the catalyzing events for community transformation, the religious revivals in the 1730s attest to the elusiveness of this shift toward a democratically oriented colonial society. Nevertheless, the narrative of post-1692 Salem should not merely be discounted as an extreme case of religious radicalism, but instead, should be considered representative of this gradual process toward significant social and political change in Colonial Massachusetts. The inability of the leaders of the Puritan churches in the 1690s to prevent the movement of their members to new settlements caused them to become less autocratic and more accountable to each individual and family in their respective communities. The Salem families therefore contributed to these geo-political transformations in anticipation of the shift in political power away from the ministry as an institution. The collective impact these families had on the historical development of Massachusetts was not, nor should be misconstrued as intentional, for theirs’ was a “doomed effort to restore the homogeneity of the [Puritan] past,” which ushered in the expansion of New England towns in the eighteenth century.

---

69 This phrase is taken from John Winthrop’s sermon written aboard the Arabella in 1630, “A Model of Christian Charity,” Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, #7 (OGB: eBook, 2012).
70 Kenneth A. Lockridge, A New England Town, 91.
71 Ibid., 138.
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The Unsuccessful Inquisition in Tudor England
By Sarah Dell

The Spanish Inquisition has been irrevocably entwined with its reputation for overzealousness and plentiful methods of torture. Yet, the secrecy of the Spanish Inquisition was its most potent of weapons. Those who were arrested for heresy were often ignorant of what they would encounter during their imprisonment, and if they were lucky enough to be released, they were sworn to secrecy so that future victims would be just as unprepared as they were. Those who vanished and then reappeared as confirmed heretics were assumed to be rightfully guilty because the public had no way of knowing the process by which the court came to their decision. The fear that came from ignorance, combined with societal obedience to the Crown, helped to keep many Spanish commoners cowed. That conditioned behavior of obedience, coupled with the common belief that, as citizens, they were doing their Christian duty by reporting their neighbors for heresy, minimized disputes and left even fewer martyrs to rally behind.

In England, a similar hunt for heretics was taking place without the benefit of secrecy. Prisoners were able to contact the outside world, and those who survived were able to publish accounts about the time they spent incarcerated. This lack of secrecy allowed for the creation and accumulation of martyrs and sympathetic figures who were able to sway public opinion and frustrate the Counter-Reformation in England in the sixteenth century. The Inquisitional Courts of Spain in the sixteenth century and the tribunals deciding cases of heresy in England were fundamentally similar; the greatest difference and a key aspect of the Spanish Inquisition’s success, was its policy of secrecy.

Both the Spanish Inquisition and the English Reformation have proven over the centuries to be popular topics both for scholars and popular fiction writers. Immediately after Napoleon invaded Spain and abolished the Inquisition, former Inquisition secretary Juan Llorente started compiling his book, A Critical History of the Inquisition of Spain. For the first time, records and testimonies from the inner workings of the Inquisition Courts were made available to government officials and other non-clergy members. Subsequent research has delved into the records left behind to study individual cases like Lucrecia’s Dreams by Richard Kagan, which

---

studies a female prophetess damned by the inquisition for heretical prophecies. The documents have also been used to study trends and create general histories such as Henry Kamen’s *The Spanish Inquisition*. Statistics, and myths, and any number of other aspects of the Inquisition have also been studied and analyzed.

King Henry VIII of England and his children Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I have also commanded significant attention in the historiography of the Reformation. Scholarly literature is abundant regarding any aspect of the lives and public policies of these famous and infamous monarchs of England. Some of the more controversial events during the Tudor period were the religious disputes springing from the consequences of the English Reformation. Elizabethan era historian and writer John Foxe recorded the trials and tribulations of Protestants burned throughout history, but focused on cases in England and Scotland during the turbulent years of the English Reformation. He published his recordings under the title *Acts and Monuments of these latter and perilous days touching matters of the Church*, a work more commonly known as *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*. Mr. Foxe is not the author of all or even most of the work, but rather he spearheaded a project to collect evidence and manuscripts and incorporated them into a single volume archive four times the size of the Bible. His work has been challenged over the centuries for its historical veracity. Yet, even in his lifetime, Foxe published more than one edition to correct errors and incorporate new evidence, and he verbally attested to the purity of intent in recording the events. Jasper Ridley, believing that Foxe’s martyrs have been forgotten by modern society, published *Bloody Mary’s Martyrs* in 2001, relying heavily upon Foxe’s information integrated with other sources to reinforce Foxe’s narrative.

---

3 Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* (New Haven: Yale University, 1997).
5 Foxe has been criticized as a reliable historical source in large part to the very biased language in favor the Protestant plight in England during Mary I’s reign. Despite the language however, the inherent facts and events appear to be accurate. Many in the field of Tudor history like David Loades, Jasper Ridley, John Edwards, and others do utilize and quote Foxe to enhance their own arguments in their various works. These include but are not restricted to: Mary I England’s Catholic Queen and A Spanish Inquisition? *The Repression of Protestantism Under Mary Tudor* by John Edwards, *Bloody Mary’s Martyrs* by Jasper Ridley, and *Mary Tudor: A Life* and *The Reign of Mary Tudor* by David Loades. Foxe’s defense can be found in, Robinson, "Neither Acts nor Monuments," 8. John Foxe, *The Book of Martyrs* (New York: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, 1870).
Yet, scholarship comparing the Spanish Inquisition and the Counter Reformation in England is far less common. Short snippets of information in various works on the phenomenon in England may connect an aspect like the spectacle of a Spanish *auto-de-fé* to an English burning, but these comparisons generally seem like afterthoughts. John Edwards wrote an article, “A Spanish Inquisition? The Repression of Protestantism Under Mary Tudor,” that compares heresy legislation of the time of Queen Mary I to the tribunals of the Inquisition. He found points of law and goals that are significantly different as to discredit the theory that Mary’s husband, Philip II of Spain, brought Spanish Inquisitional techniques to England during Mary’s reign.\(^7\) I will attempt to demonstrate that though there are some significant differences, the process for the identification, arrest, interrogation, and disposal of heretics was not dissimilar except for the aura of secrecy that surrounded the Spanish Inquisition. That secrecy was the primary strength of the Spanish Inquisition, and the lack thereof in the English Reformation and Counter-Reformation was crippling to the objectives of each movement.

**Origins and Procedure of the Spanish Inquisition**

In 1478, Monarchs Isabella and Ferdinand of Spain asked Pope Sixtus IV for the dispensation to form an inquisition to investigate the rumored problem of new Christian converts from Judaism not being true to their new faith.\(^8\) Spain had once been a land of three religions—Christianity, Judaism, and Islam—but, with the rise of Christian rule over the nation, Judaism and Islam became less acceptable. Jews and Muslims found their opportunities for employment and societal freedom limited. Societal opposition to these religions escalated in the thirteenth century, resulting in increased conversion to Christianity.\(^9\) As those who converted prospered with their new freedoms and opportunities, many people questioned the veracity and legitimacy of their conversions. Rumors and accusations continued, and drove Isabella to petition the Pope to establish an inquisition in her Kingdom of Castile.

---

\(^8\) Henry Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition* 44.
In 1492, all Jews were ordered to leave the boundaries of the Kingdoms of Castile and Aragon.\textsuperscript{10} This only left two legitimate options for Spanish Jews: convert to Christianity, or move to a more tolerant nation. This ultimatum created a new \textit{converso} class of forced converts who were often suspected of insincere conversion and secret continuations of Jewish practices.\textsuperscript{11} These suspected \textit{judaizers}, or Christians who practiced Judaism in secret, were the primary targets in the early years of what has become known as the Spanish Inquisition. The inaccurate definition of Jewish religious practices versus cultural practices led to the denunciation, arrest, and execution of thousands of \textit{conversos}. \textit{Moriscos}, or Muslim converts, and other heretics raised as Christians would also become targets of the Inquisition over its three hundred year duration.

The large number of suspected heretics and the long life of the Inquisition led to a methodization of Inquisition protocol and the formation of the \textit{Suprema}. The \textit{Suprema} was, “a separate council for the increasingly important affairs of the Inquisition.”\textsuperscript{12} The \textit{Suprema} had authority and ultimate decision-making over all other Inquisition tribunals. Other individual tribunals were set up across the country and were relatively autonomous, following the guidance of the inquisitors in each area. Individual inquisitors utilized differing degrees of severity regarding sentencing and varying methodologies, but general trends and basic laws governed them all, enabling rather similar procedures. The people working for the Inquisition were technically working for the Catholic Church; yet, in this particular instance, they were under royal control. According to the Papal Bull that authorized the Inquisition, “Powers of appointment and dismissal were granted to the Spanish crown.”\textsuperscript{13} Payment and regulation fell to the Spanish Crown to control, and the Inquisition effectively became another branch of the Spanish government.

Once the tribunals were established in towns across the nation, a suspect would either come to the Inquisition voluntarily, most likely in an attempt to show true repentance, or be accused by someone in their community. Any goods and belongings would be seized in

\textsuperscript{10} Llorente, \textit{A Critical History of the Inquisition of Spain}, 54.
\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Converso}- New Christian converted from Judaism or descendent of a former Jew.
\textsuperscript{12} Kamen, \textit{The Spanish Inquisition}, 48.
\textsuperscript{13} Kamen, \textit{The Spanish Inquisition}, 44.
accordance with canon law. The goods and income of the suspected heretic would be sequestrated and catalogued to pay for their imprisonment and any sentenced penance. The arrested would then be told to confess their sins without knowing of what they were accused. The confessions would be compared to any evidence brought forth by witnesses and informants, and if “there existed significant discrepancies between the defendant’s claims and those of the prosecution’s witnesses, the accused may be tortured in an attempt to learn the truth about his or her activities.” The accused would also generally be asked about accomplices who had also participated in heretical acts. After torture, anything that was confessed would be ratified to ensure the torture did not merely bring out nonsense, and the heretic would be charged and sentenced. Oftentimes, the formal sentencing would be in the form of the public auto-de-fé, a spectacle for the public to hear the sentencing of heretics condemned to be burnt later in the day outside the main city by secular authorities.

The atrocities of the Spanish Inquisition have been documented extensively as a result of the records left behind by a highly organized bureaucratic system. The three hundred and fifty year duration of the Spanish Inquisition, combined with how recently it was officially destroyed—July 15, 1834—undoubtedly enabled rumor and speculation to effectively paint the Spanish Inquisition as the height of human capacity for cruelty. However, England also saw religious tumult in its history. The English Reformation swept through the nation, starting with King Henry VIII. During his and his children’s reigns, a battle for the religious identity of England ensued. One generation was raised to be strictly Catholic and the next was required to believe in Protestantism. This resulted in heretical casualties as Englishmen’s religious identities were subjected to the whims of the reigning Tudor monarchs.

**Beginnings of the Reformation in England**

Prior to and during a large portion of the reign of King Henry VIII, England was a dutiful Catholic nation that recognized the overarching power of the Pope in Rome. Henry was married to the Spanish Princess Catherine, the daughter of the Catholic Kings Ferdinand and Isabella of
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14 Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition*, 149.
Castile and Aragon and the founders of the modern Spanish Inquisition. Henry had not shown any inclination toward converting to the Protestant movements in Germany. However, several years into his marriage, Henry’s only legitimate child was a daughter, Princess Mary, and he became concerned that he would never have a legitimate male heir.\(^{18}\) He began investigating options to set aside Catherine for a younger wife. The practice of setting aside a barren or older wife was not unusual, and dated back through the Middle Ages; all that was necessary was a papal dispensation.\(^{19}\) Unfortunately for Henry, the pope was reluctant to act against Catherine because her wealthy Spanish family was terribly influential in Europe and important to Rome, (her nephew was the Holy Roman Emperor as well as the King of Spain). As H. Maynard Smith and countless others have observed, “it was not so easy to get rid of a princess of Aragon.”\(^{20}\)

Henry began the process of discarding Catherine honorably in 1527. By 1533, he banished Catherine, declared their daughter a bastard, and married a woman named Anne Boleyn and crowned her Queen of England.\(^{21}\) In order for Henry to facilitate his divorce, he found it necessary to separate England from Papal law and subjugated canon law to English common law. He accomplished this by 1534 with the Act of Royal Supremacy, which extended royal authority completely over the Church of England with Henry at its head.\(^{22}\) Therefore criticism of Henry’s actions was seen as both blasphemy and treason. As this duality progressed, it proved impossible to keep heresy cases secret in a system not designed for secrecy. Yet even early successful cases under Henry, that managed to keep a modicum of secrecy, were incapable of suppressing all details of heresy trials as with the trials of Elizabeth Barton.

**Heresy Under King Henry VIII**

Elizabeth Barton, also known as the Nun of Kent, took a hardline stance against the divorce proceedings and spoke out through her prophecies to help guide the Church righteously. She had several influential followers including John Fisher, one of Queen Catherine of Aragon’s leading supporters. “Such was her reputation that she even obtained audiences with [Cardinal

---


\(^{19}\) Rex, *Henry VIII and the English*, 7.


\(^{21}\) Smith, *Henry VIII and the Reformation*, xv.

and Lord Chancellor] Wolsey and the king,” English Christianity scholar Richard Rex notes. Her prophecies warned Henry that “if he put away Catherine he would cease to be King within six months.” She did not elaborate regarding his supposed downfall, nor is it evident she planned to act upon what could be interpreted as a threat. She appears to have merely taken Catherine’s side in the great matter of the King’s divorce and used her influence to attempt to chide Henry into acting honorably. However, Henry did not take the unfavorable news well, and Elizabeth was arrested, interrogated, and forced to publically recant all of her prophecies in November 1533.

Elizabeth made the mistake of believing that the King felt obeisance to Christianity to be above his duties as the leader of the nation. It appears she felt that he could be returned to the faith and his wife if he was but told to do so by a religious authority such as her visions from God. Elizabeth underestimated his devotion to his path of change. The Pope excommunicated Henry in September 1533, yet he continued on his path where he determined ecclesiastical right and wrong. He never forgot Elizabeth Barton, and she and her associates were prosecuted for heresy against the Church of England, which was also high treason against the Crown. She was executed on April 20, 1534 by hanging and beheading. Elizabeth suffered the loss of her reputation as a holy woman touched by God with prophetic visions and was thus silenced forever. Her story could not become a rallying cry because she was seen as a traitor and a disgraced holy woman who admitted to her falsehoods albeit, likely under duress. Any sympathy that could have been gained by the general public knowing the circumstances of her imprisonment and interrogation was effectively stunted as the methodology to ensure that Elizabeth recanted was not public knowledge. Henry was successful in silencing Elizabeth and retaining his and the Crown’s reputation while at the same time destroying hers. His daughter Mary would not prove as fortunate in suppressing the records of her courts.

This type of prophetic prodding demonstrated by Elizabeth is not dissimilar to events that occurred in Spain at that time. It also has roots going back to Saint Catherine of Siena and Saint Bridget of Sweden, for whom, “The dominant theme was the reform of the church, which was

---

23 Rex, Henry VIII and the English, 19.
accused of corruption and immorality.”²⁵ In England, as well as in Spain, when the prophetess strayed too far from saintly business and became too political and too pointed, she became a danger to the crown.²⁶ Elizabeth was arrested, not because she had the gift of prophecy, but because she became too enmeshed in the political world instead of remaining in the ecclesiastical one. Her same fall from grace and the ruination of reputation she experienced befell several women in Spain’s history, including one girl who fell several decades after the Nun of Kent named Lucrecia.

Lucrecia lived in Madrid in the late 1500s. She was from an average family and worked in the nearby palace of Philip II. She started having strange and dangerous prophetic dreams about the state of Spain. With the help of some interested members of the clergy, Doctor Alonso de Mendoza and Fray Lucas de Allende, her dreams were recorded and analyzed. In true prophetic fashion, many aspects of her dreams were symbolic or allegorical but she managed to convince many of their veracity.

Her dreams, benign enough at the outset, turned increasingly political. They became critical of King Philip’s fiscal policies and guidance of the nation, including a prediction of the end of the monarchy at God’s hands during Philip’s reign. She even predicted the destruction of the Spanish Armada during a conflict with the English in 1588.²⁷ These doomsday prophecies convinced authorities that Lucrecia “was using her dreams to foment opposition to the king.”²⁸ Lucrecia was now a political opponent actively predicting the fall of the empire. She and her believers were then denounced to the Inquisition. Lucrecia was threatening secular authority yet ecclesiastic authority was charged with silencing her. The subsequent investigations and imprisonment lasted for years effectively dissuading many of Lucrecia’s supporters. She was discredited and branded a seditious heretic, but allowed to live. Her sentence was “one hundred lashes, banishment from Madrid, and two years’ seclusion in a religious house.”²⁹ She served her sentence in a hospital for beggars and those infected with contagious skin diseases. She disappears from the historical record after her placement, never to rise from historical obscurity again. She did not die as an example as Elizabeth Barton did, but she was ruined, discredited,

²⁵ Kagan, Lucrecia’s Dreams, 86.
²⁷ Kagan, Lucrecia’s Dreams, 74.
²⁹ Kagan, Lucrecia’s Dreams, 155.
and cast away where she could do no more harm. Mendoza and Allende were discouraged from aiding her again, and both were sentenced with terms of seclusion.\textsuperscript{30}

Lucrecia may not have been killed, but as in the case of Elizabeth, the charge of heresy was a successful method of ridding the nation of political threats, and discredited the women to the extent that their followers would never again take up their cause. The results of Elizabeth Barton’s case are very similar to many results of the Spanish Inquisitorial courts in that her character was denounced and her reputation was destroyed. For whatever reason, the information regarding her trial and any evidence against her was not made public, and thus, the results were assumed to be valid. It would not remain so circumspect, as the large paper trail of the trial of Anne Askew, another woman charged with heresy during the reign of Henry VIII exhibits.

Anne Askew was a noblewoman from Lincolnshire who moved to London to preach and spread Protestant ideas. Among those ideas was her disbelief in transubstantiation, or the turning of wine and wafer into the physical blood and body of Christ. She was not a silent or secret Protestant, but a proselytizing one believed to have influential friends in the highest circles at King Henry VIII’s court, supposedly including ladies from Queen Katherine Parr’s household. She was arrested and examined in 1545 and in 1546 before being burned as a heretic.\textsuperscript{31}

Anne was arrested for the first time in 1545, and interrogations began with the Bishop of London’s Chancellor and the Lord Mayor of London. Anne’s charges of heresy were not a strictly ecclesiastical matter, as exhibited by the fact that both lay lawmen and religious leaders participated in her \textit{quest}, an official commission that would hold a heresy hearing and decide Anne’s fate.\textsuperscript{32} Anne was questioned about her many sayings and assertions disparaging the idea that access to God can only be through an intermediary priest, and that priests have the power to change wine and bread into the blood and body of Christ. Henry may have broken from Rome, but Anne’s very divergent ideas were still not tolerated. She was asked to explain the charges brought against her, whether they were true recounts or false accusations, and her reasoning for such utterances.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[31] Foxe, \textit{The Book of Martyrs}, 267-71.
\end{footnotes}
The men of the quest were concerned with several egregious accusations and were focused on determining their veracity. First, she was asked if she believed “that the sacrament hangynge over the aultre was the verye bodye of Christ reallye.”33 In other words: did she believe that the sacrament was truly the body of Christ? To this she did not answer, but in turn questioned the inquisitor to explain how the church could venerate Saint Stephen, who preached against God living in a temple, against God being a part of an inanimate object yet believe that the sacrament was truly a part of God. She argues with clear evidence that she had read the Bible and interpreted it beyond what a priest would teach.

Additionally, Anne was told to answer a charge brought by a woman who had heard her speak: “Secondly he sayd that there was a woman, which ded testyfye, that I shuld reade, how God was not in temples made with handes.” Anne later recalled that she “shewed hym the vii. And the xvii chapter of the Apostles actes, what Steven and Paule had sayd therin.”34 She answered the charge brought against her and continued to justify her beliefs and sayings with evidence from the Bible. At times, she would be accused of saying things she claims no connection to, including a rather famous quote attributed to Anne Askew yet Anne denies ever saying:

Besydes thys my lorde mayre layed one thynge unto my charge, which was never spoken of me, but of them. And that was whether a mouse eatyng the hoste, received God or no? Thys question ded I never aske, but in dede they asked it of me, whereunto I made them no answer, but smyled.35

Anne wisely did not provide opportunity to endanger herself by agreeing with something the quest obviously had issues with; trivializing transubstantiation by posing the question, “If a mouse ate the consecrated host would receive God?” The disbelief in transubstantiation is a common Protestant belief, yet not one of Henry’s new church. If Anne admitted to disbelief in transubstantiation, she would have declared her more radical beliefs. She denied all culpability, but refused to speak against herself. Her confession was still highly sought after as is evidenced

33 Askew and Bale, *The Examinations of Anne Askew*, 20
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by the numerous entreaties to hear her confession even after her cousin had come to bail her out
and take her home:

…my lorde of London sent for me, at one of the clocke, hys houre beynge
appointed at thre. And as I came before hym, he sayd, he was verye sorye of my
trouble, and desyred to knowe my opynyon in soche matters as were layed against
me. He requyred me also in anye wyse , boldelye to utter the secretes of my harte,
byddynge me not to feare in anye point. For what so ever I ded saye within hys
house no man shuld hurt me for it. I answered. For so moche as your Lodeshypp
appointed iii. Of the clocke, and my fryndes shall not come tyll that houre, I
desyre yow to pardon me of gevynge answere tyll they come.36

At this point the mayor of London, knowing she had family and counsel coming to talk about
bail, desired to appeal to Anne’s sense of Christian obedience to force a confession. Anne wisely
refused to endanger herself. After more interviews, Anne was convinced to sign a recantation of
sorts by the Bishop of London, Bishop Edmund Bonner. She swore an oath proclaiming her
devotion to the Church ending with, “I Anne Askewe do believe all maner thynges contained in
the faythe of the Catholyck churche.”37 She added “Catholyck” to the oath presented to her
which caused delays, yet she was released on bail a few days later.38

She was then rearrested in 1546 for her continued divergent beliefs about the sacrament
and due to the fear that her beliefs found sympathetic ears. It was believed that many of those
listeners came from the higher circles of the Court and reaching into the Queen Katherine’s
household. Anne was again questioned as to her beliefs, but, more importantly, who her friends
were, who believed as she did, and who helped pay for the betterment of her imprisonment:

Then they sayd, that there were diverse gentylwomen, that gave me moneye. But I
knewe not their names…I ans wered that there was a man in a blewe coate, which
delivered me, x, shyllynges, and sayd that my ladye of Hertforde sent it me. And
an other in a violet coate ded geve me viii. Shyllynges, and sayd that my ladye
Dennye sent it me. Whether it were true or no, I can not tell. For I am not suer
who sent it me, but as the men ded saye.39

38 Adding Catholyck to her oath bound King Henry’s Anglican Church to the Catholic one. In a sense Anne was
asserting that there was no difference between the two. It could be seen as asserting that her actions were those of a
true Protestant, not the renamed Catholic religion Henry was propagating while at the same time saving herself from
a heretic’s fate. The passage can be found in Askew and Bale, *The Examinations of Anne*, 62-3.
Anne did not lie, but she did not indicate that she knew the ladies before they helped her. For all she knew they could have merely been demonstrating Christian charity. This answer was unacceptable to her investigators, because Lady Hertford was Prince Edward’s aunt on his mother’s side, and a prominent noblewoman at court. If Anne Askew had friends as high as the Prince’s household, her influence may have spread further to Queen Katherine Parr. Anne was questioned about her accomplices, yet she refused to accuse or involve others. Anne’s interrogators could not break her faith or her resolve to protect her fellow believers, “Anne…is represented as having done nothing to conceal her own religious beliefs; she is said to have been tortured to inculpate others.”40 If ties from Anne to the Queen were found, Queen Katherine could have been accused of heresy as well. Given Henry’s reputation of discarding his wives, Katherine would have been in grave danger. On the other hand, searching for accomplices or familiars is sensible when trying to stamp out heresy, and a common direction of Inquisitorial questioning. In Spain, interrogation with the intent of discovering accomplices could keep a person in jail even after they have confessed all they know or have done, like in the case of Maria Gonzalez.

During Maria’s trial in Ciudad Real in 1511-1513, she confessed to the crime of being a Judaizing converso and was sentenced to “perpetual prison.” Her case was reopened in order to find her accomplices or Judaizing sect. She continued to profess that she, “had no more to say or confess, whether about herself or other people, besides what she had already stated and confessed before the lord inquisitors.”41 For her “recalcitrance,” the inquisitors felt the need to admonish her further: “we find that we must order Maria Gonzalez put to the question of torture, which may be given and continued at our will until she speaks the truth and perseveres in it according to the law.42 During torture, Maria confessed knowledge of a ring of women in her acquaintance who were still secretly practicing Jewish traditions. She confessed in order to stop the torture session, and under further investigation, her confession proved false. She gave specific information and details that were easily revealed to be untrue when corroborated with

testimonies gathered from other suspects. Maria was then charged “for having falsely confessed and being impenitent.” She was relaxed, or given, to the secular courts to be burned.

Thus, the threat of free accomplices of someone viewed as dangerous could understandably be a terrifying concept. In the case of Anne Askew, her accomplices and friends were believed to have great influence in court, especially over the upbringing of the Prince of Wales. Under these circumstances, it was deemed necessary by Lord Chancellor Wriothesley and his eventual successor Richard Rich to torture Anne on the rack for more information:

Then they ded put me on the racke, bycause I confessed no ladyes nor gentyllwomen to be of my opynyon, and theron they kepte me a longe tyme. And bycause I laye styll and ded not crye, my lorde Chauncellour and master Ryche, toke peynes to racke me their owne handes, tyll I was nygh dead.

Her recalcitrance and silence during the torture session seems to have cemented her fate as a heretic, and her refusal to recant finalized her sentence of burning at the stake. However, “The day of her execution being appointed, she was brought to Smithfield in a chair, because she could not go on her feet from the cruel effects of the torments.”

The brave woman who had held out through her limbs being pulled from their sockets was carried so ignobly to the stake. The spectators saw her mangled body and they heard that despite the obvious pain she was in she outlasted her torturers by not confessing. The crowd was then free to form their own opinion of the young lady being burnt, and many would admire her for her courage and fortitude.

Anne was investigated by a court composed of both ecclesiastical and secular authorities. She was interrogated for an ecclesiastical crime, yet the eyes of the Crown were very interested. As the Church and State now shared a common leader, the jurisdiction lines between the two blurred. Anne was tried in an ecclesiastic court, yet her heresy would be an offense to the head of the Church, the monarch, and thus could also technically be declared as treason. This trend started with Henry VIII and continued through England’s history. Though Anne was but a commoner preacher, she supposedly had ties to royalty. This made her very decidedly a political target, and could arguably explain why she was rearrested and tortured for refusing to stop preaching the Protestant faith. Anne was expected to repent and confess when questioned, and

44 Askew and Bale, *The Examinations of Anne*, 127.
was tortured when she refused to confess about any followers or supporters she might have. She was declared a heretic to the public and sentenced to a public burning. The particulars of her investigation bear many similarities to Inquisition investigations, except for one notable difference: Anne was able to write down her experiences and get them to John Bale, a fellow Protestant, who then published her writings with his commentary. John Foxe also added her story to his *Book of Martyrs*. During the Spanish Inquisition, no one involved could talk about any aspect of their time after they were arrested and imprisoned.47 This secrecy policy inhibited future suspects from being better prepared for the investigations, and effectively hid any of the internal aspects of declaring heresy. Once a person was arrested, they would not reemerge for months and only then to silently participate in an *auto-de-fé*, or a public sentencing spectacle, proclaiming their guilt for heretical views and actions. There was no method to ascertain the actual actions that occurred during the months or years of investigation. The public was left to assume that there was strong evidence of heresy and thus just cause for damning someone’s soul for all eternity by burning them as a heretic. Anne’s very public account of her interrogations and treatment clearly illustrates a divergence from Spanish convention.

Anne wrote of her interactions with her jailors, investigators, and torturers, and sent her manuscript to fellow Protestant John Bale, who then used her work to proclaim her martyr status to the English public. The public would hear the sentence, but now, could also read of the process and decide for themselves whether the young lady deserved to be burnt, based on her testimony. There was, of course, opportunity for Anne to exaggerate or lie in her testimony, but most of the flowery and passionate prose seems to come from Bale’s separated commentary and not Askew’s more prosaic retelling. Her matter-of-fact recounting most likely influenced readers to believe she truly was merely a devout woman loyal to her faith even when faced by treacherous and mean-spirited Papists determined to break her spirit. The very fact that she underwent such horrific torture that it left her permanently damaged could speak to the strength of her spirit and soul, thus making her a symbol others of her faith could aspire to. Anne wrote poems of her time in prison, and others commemorated her in song. If they truly believed, they could endure what this young lady had endured for her faith. Anne would remain a symbol until

47 Kamen, *The Spanish Inquisition*, 182.
the Counter-Reformation would provide the Protestant community with hundreds more who would be killed by the ruler whom history would remember as Bloody Mary Tudor.

In 1547, King Henry died, and Prince Edward became King Edward VI of England. He was educated in the atmosphere of the new religion his father had fostered, what would become known as Anglicanism. His reign was one of tolerance toward the new religion, and a continuance of the path his father had set. Edward’s reign only lasted six years, but those years had great impact on the growth and strength of Protestantism in England. This development greatly vexed Mary when she became queen.

Mary’s Attempted Counter Reformation in England

Queen Mary I of England was raised a devout Catholic during a time period when both of her parents were also devoutly Catholic. Though her father broke with Rome, Mary stuck to her pious roots, and when she became queen in 1553, she was determined to save the souls of her people from the New Faith plague sweeping through her country. Mary “shared the general view that the most desirable outcome was to persuade ‘heretics’ to recant, repent and then return to the true church. If they refused to do so, their deaths should be exemplary for the edification of the wider public.” She believed that the uneducated public had been influenced by high-ranking heretic Protestants during Henry VIII’s and Edward VI’s reigns and that her people would gladly return to the true faith if the rabble-rousers were dispatched or returned to the fold.

Mary I began her reign in 1553 by arresting the major Protestant religious leaders who gained power during Henry’s and Edward’s reigns. Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer, who was instrumental in completing the divorce between Mary’s parents, and bishops Ridley, Hooper, and others were arrested and replaced by devout Catholics. Prominent Protestant leaders like John Rodgers and Hugh Latimer also were arrested to halt their corrupting influence. These people who had been vocal in their beliefs, and who were actively working for the Protestant cause during Henry’s and Edward’s reigns, were the first to fall. Though many were arrested in 1553, Mary’s marriage to Prince Philip of Spain in 1554 delayed the executions until January

1555. The Lord Chancellor, Bishop Gardiner, presided over hearings to sentence Rogers, Hooper, Rowland Taylor, and other influential and prominent Protestants. They were accused of denying Papal Supremacy over the Church and the issue of transubstantiation, among other offences.

The investigations shared many qualities with the Spanish Inquisition, so much so that it has been claimed by historians that Philip transplanted Inquisition methodology to England. The goals were similar, in that both wanted to cleanse Christianity of Protestant influence and restore the dominance of Catholicism. Both relied upon community members and neighbors informing on suspected heretics. The interrogation styles also proved similar, as both were designed to prove innocence, rather than guilt. Also, both ended in public denunciation of the heretic and a public execution by burning. This common Catholic practice of dealing with heretics may have its roots in the bible verse John 15:6, which says “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.”

When Rogers, a preacher at St. Paul’s Cathedral, was questioned about the legitimacy of the Pope as the head of the Church, he replied, “I know no other head but Christ of his catholic Church, neither will I acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to have any more authority than any other bishop hath by the Word of God.” Rogers argued that Christ was the head of the Church, and the Pope was not able to supersede the Word of God. Rogers and the others defended their religious positions, while maintaining that they had not broken any English laws by marrying and preaching the Protestant faith. Rogers was accused of inciting a riot at Paul’s Cross Church, his former pulpit, during a Catholic mass. Rogers vehemently denied the accusations and claimed instead he had attempted to calm the crowd, but the people could not be calmed.

Yet, theological debate and protestations of innocence were not enough to escape the condemnations of heresy. However, there was an opportunity to escape the stake. Typically “the Protestants were found guilty of heresy on all charges, but were told that the Queen would grant
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them a pardon if they would recant and repent.”\textsuperscript{55} Some who were a part of the tribunal did recant and, after they completed a penance, were pardoned. Rogers, Hooper, Rowland Taylor, and many other prominent Protestants did not recant and thus were sentenced to burn. Rogers burned at Smithfield February 4, 1555.\textsuperscript{56} He was known as the protomartyr, or first martyr of Mary’s reign.\textsuperscript{57} Rogers’ case was unique because a dove flew over the flames as he was dying. Many appeared to take the presence of the dove to be the Holy Spirit, which had come to take Rogers’ soul to heaven.\textsuperscript{58} The protomartyr, not Mary or the investigators themselves, appeared to have divine approbation. Many later suspects who were convicted in London in the following years would be burned at Smithfield.

Burnings were popular events in England. Some of the crowd might have been supporters of the convicted person, but many others were just there for an interesting day. They can be compared to the autos-de-fé in Spain in terms of turnout and spectator appeal. But while the auto-de-fé merely sentenced and humiliated those convicted before relaxing the heretic to the secular courts to carry out the sentence, English burnings proclaimed the guilt of those convicted, and burned the person as part of the public spectacle.\textsuperscript{59} Great crowds watched as the heretic was set aflame, and the circumstances of that horrific death had the power to influence the spectators’ opinions of those condemned, as in the case of George Marsh.

George Marsh was a priest ordained under Edward VI sent to preach in Leicestershire under Lawrence Saunders. Saunders was arrested in 1553, and Marsh fled to his family in Lancashire where the Earl of Derby arrested him. He sent Marsh to Chester to be interrogated. He was offered the chance to recant, but refused and was burned in April 1555. Chester is located in northern England, close to Catholic Scotland, and so “he could not expect much sympathy in the Catholic north, though even here there were secret Protestants who admired and pitied him.”\textsuperscript{60} While imprisoned, he was met with hostility; and when he asked Bishop Cotes to pray for him, the Bishop scornfully replied, “I will no more pray for thee than I would for a
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Marsh met with very little sympathy and even fewer who understood or agreed with his religious ideology.

Marsh was fastened to the stake with a jar of tar hung above his head, the purpose to which is unknown, except to cause further pain and suffering. The faggots of wood, were too far away from Marsh and it was a very windy day, ensuring that Marsh was not going to see a quick death,

The fire being unskillfully made, and the wind driving it to and fro, he suffered great agony in his death, which nevertheless, he bore with Christian patience. When he had been a long time tormented in the fire without moving, having his flesh so broiled and puffed up, that they who stood before him supposed he had been dead, he suddenly spread abroad his arms, saying, ‘Father of heaven, have mercy upon me!’

Marsh died with dignity and courage. Those Protestants who watched proclaimed him “a martyr, and [he had] died marvelously patient.” No matter what the spectators felt about his religious identity, they could respect and admire his courage and fortitude. After Marsh was proclaimed dead, Bishop Cotes felt it imperative to counter the positive impression of Marsh the Martyr with a special sermon reminding the community that Marsh died a heretic. Cotes died a year later of syphilis and some said that it was God’s punishment for burning George Marsh.

Many other martyrs became symbols of hope and fortitude for their followers. Thomas Haukes was a gentleman in the household of Lord Oxford, who later denounced Haukes as a heretic. The courts condemned him to burn, but before his execution, he talked to his followers and friends regarding the burning itself, “[promising] his friends to show a disregard of pain, he agreed that, God helping him, he would, during his agonies, lift up his hands above his head towards heaven.” During his execution in 1555, Haukes remembered his promise, and though his fingers were burnt away and his skin thoroughly blackened, he held his hands up high as a signal that it was bearable. He gave his followers hope by overcoming the fear the grisly executions were meant to instill.

---
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Other martyrs managed to give hope in the form of literature after they were arrested. Robert Smith wrote poems to his Protestant friends and followers to encourage them to remain true to their faith. After he was arrested, he continued to produce poetry, which his friends received and distributed. The arrested suspected heretics were prisoners, and as a general policy for prisoners, communications were supposed to be limited. However, this policy was not terribly well enforced, as David Loades observed;

…such strictness was never sustained because very few of the gaolers and others who were immediately responsibly for their safe-keeping bore them any ill-will. As a result letters, tracts of instruction, and pious exhortation flowed out from the prisons to encourage the steadfast and support the wavering, while the leaders corresponded amongst themselves…

Prisoners were not supposed to have unlimited access to the outside world, yet literature and letters found their way across England from prison to prison, plotting, sharing hope, and offering symbols of courage.

The burnings, such as those of George Marsh and Robert Smith, not only had the power to influence spectators favorably toward specific brave heretics, but also to convert people to Protestantism. Instead of scaring the populace into obedience, the atrocities of the burnings could have inspiree otherwise devout Catholics to take up the Protestant faith. George Tankerville converted from Catholicism to Protestantism after witnessing the atrocities of Mary’s counter-reformation. Tankerville remained a steadfast Catholic even through the Protestant reign of Edward VI. But, under a Catholic queen, Tankerville began reading the common English Bible and was arrested for heresy by Bishop Bonner in London. As a formerly devout Catholic, he was entreated to recant, but he refused. He burned in 1555.

Eventually, public backlash against the burnings of admired men and women necessitated investigators to become craftier when arresting suspects, as in the case of Vicar Robert Samuel. Robert Samuel was one of the priests who married while it was legal during the reign of Edward VI. He was popular with many of his parishioners, and many were Protestant. Mary ended the practice of clerical marriage in England, and told those who had married they were required to set aside their wives if they desired to retain their positions; “The priests were told that if they

---

separated from their wives and agreed never to speak to them or to their children again, they could do penance in a public ceremony and continue in their benefices." Samuel refused to set aside his wife, and many of his congregation supported him. He was discovered hiding his wife and was marked for arrest. Foxe recounts, “They captured him in the night, because they durst not do it in the day-time, for fear of trouble and tumult.” Many in Samuel’s town supported him and his wife, and Master Forster, the local authority, was afraid he might be rebuffed if they attempted to take Samuel in broad daylight. That would be an unacceptable blow to his authority, so Master Forster circumvented that issue by attacking at night.

As the burnings continued, it became clear that not everyone in the realm supported Mary’s crusade. Faith, reassuring literature, and the bravery of those sent to burn managed to reach the public and sway their opinion away from obedience to the Crown to their own sympathies. The realm was not blindly returning to Catholicism as Mary expected, so sermons, speeches, and literature were all utilized to argue against the heretical Protestants. Beyond the church pulpit, pamphlets directed at the public were meant to reinforce Mary’s position. One of the most famous was A Godlye Treatise concerning the Masse, for the Instructyon of the simple and Unlearned People, published in 1555. It insisted that the martyrs were instead criminals, “by iuste [just] laws cast and condemned to burne for their obstinate heresie.” It continued to defame all Protestants as drunkards, lacking charity, and traitors to the Crown as well as the Church. A man by the name of Miles Hogarde also wrote The Displaying of the Protestants, which was in the same vein as A Godlye Treaties. He also defamed famous Protestant martyrs like Anne Askew, and ridiculed any followers who believed in them by arguing that they were duped by the second-hand stories of bravery and courage. It is difficult to say how influential Hogarde’s writings were or how much direct impact they had on the Protestant cause. However, as Christianity scholar Eamon Duffy observes, “something more was needed in the battle for hearts and minds than Hogarde’s rough humor or the more structured polemic of the Treatise on the Masse.” In his opinion, the propaganda techniques Mary’s regime employed were inadequate to completely sway the minds of the people. Two years into Mary’s Protestant

---
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Inquisition, many people of the realm were not fully behind the prosecution of Protestants, nor were they afraid or intimidated. Understanding what was going on, hearing the stories of those who fell, and offering support allowed the Protestants and their supporters to fight back and persevere through a very dangerous time in their history that ended with Mary’s death.

Mary died after only five years on the throne. The persecution of Protestants ended with her death, but prior to her demise there was no indication of the investigations slowing. Yet, there was growing opposition to the investigation and executions. In Spain, the Inquisition managed to run for over three hundred and fifty years. This institution endured for so long in large part because it was run intelligently. It generally did not allow for the creation of martyrs because it isolated those accused and sealed all records of their trials. Evidence was presented at their auto-de-fé declaring their obvious heresy. If the matter was more complicated, the auto could be private and the person never heard from again. Famous or influential figures, like Lucrecia, and others like her, were more difficult to deal with as they would be missed if they simply disappeared. They often were discredited and their followers also paid a price that would discourage them from continued association. A few notable exceptions were royal secretary to King Philip II Antonio Perez and Don Carlos Chichimecatecuhtli, an Amerindian in New Spain.

Antonio Perez was the royal secretary and friend to King Philip II. Due to factional hostilities, his machinations at court were denounced as “corruption and malfeasance.” He was exiled from Madrid and fired from all offices he held in the court. In 1590 he was arrested by the Inquisition in his native Aragon, but crowds rioted in the streets to protest his arrest. It was obvious that Perez was not arrested by the Inquisition because he was a heretic, but because he was a political problem that needed to be silenced. Perez escaped abroad where he could not cause great harm, and wrote about his mistreatments. Perez had been greatly influential and immensely popular. He was simply too renowned a person for even the Inquisition to make disappear.
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Don Carlos Chichimecatecuhtli was caught by the Inquisition tribunal established in New Spain in the New World. He was executed November 30, 1539.\(^\text{76}\) Don Carlos was a converted native nobleman in current day Mexico. The backlash to the execution of not only a nobleman, but someone so new to the faith resulted in the removal of the Inquisitor General responsible for his condemnation. Subsequently, this principle emerged: recently converted natives were exempt from Inquisitorial scrutiny as they must have time to learn their new religion before they could truly rebel against it. It is estimated that “75 to 80 percent of New Spain’s population was thus exempt from inquisitorial jurisdiction.”\(^\text{77}\) This is one of very few cases in which public opinion and public backlash managed to sway Inquisitorial influence. If more cases had greater exposure to the public, Don Carlos’s case may not have been an exception.

The Spanish Inquisition and Mary Tudor’s Protestant inquisitions had similar goals: make the subjects of their realm loyal to the Catholic faith and eliminate those who were not. They had similar methods of discovering such undesirables, through obedient denunciation by their peers, neighbors, family, and familiars. They also had similar styles of interrogation to prompt confession, and a symbolic public execution style. Yet, there were fundamental differences between these inquisitions that explain in part how the Spanish Inquisition could last over three hundred and fifty years with little irreparable backlash, while Mary’s investigations failed to capture the obedience of many of her subjects.

Many aspects of the Spanish Inquisition were a secret affair. Mary’s process was comparatively open with letters crisscrossing England even after the accused were arrested. Knowledge of the proceedings and investigative path were available and utilized to counter-propagandize for the Protestant benefit. Ill-defined or unfair legal procedure combined with spectacle of the burnings bred bad press for the Catholic cause, and courageous martyrs became symbols of hope and resistance. Thus, the secrecy policies of the Spanish Inquisition stunted many avenues of resistance before they could form, creating a more efficient and smoother system of disposing of heretics.

---
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A New Officer for a New Army:  
The Leadership of Major Hugh J.C. Peirs in the Great War  
By Marco Dracopoli

Gary Sheffield opens his book, *Leadership in the Trenches*, “an army, like any other human society, is an organism, whose well-being depends on the interplay of human relationships.”¹ In war, the relationship between officers and enlisted men is integral to the morale of an army. This is certainly true in the British Expeditionary Force (BEF) in World War I (WWI), as officers not only maintained their traditional roles as combat leaders, but also took on supplementary roles as guardians of their men’s physical and psychological well-being. This duel nature of a combat commander and father figure is aptly displayed in the letters and correspondence of Major John Hugh Chevalier Peirs who served on the Western Front from 1915-1918 as executive officer and later commander of the 8th Queen’s Royal West Surrey Regiment. As a combat officer who fought in the trenches, Major Peirs’ letters not only share many enlisted men’s concerns, but also document some of his efforts to improve the lives of those under his command. Major Peirs’ letters both provide a unique insight into the experiences of a WWI battalion commander as well as highlight the emergence and importance of a new breed of leadership within Kitchener’s New Army.

Leadership was crucial to the successful operation of any military force throughout history, yet it was especially so in WWI. Massive armies coupled with modern weaponry and the beginning of combined arms operations meant that officers exerted an unusually large influence on the outcome of battles.² According to Sheffield, “The leader has two main functions. First he helps to create and sustain unit cohesion. . . . Second, the leader has to mould the cohesive group so that their goals are congruent with those of the greater organization, the army; in short, he has to lead the group in battle.”³ Essentially, officers were expected to create units that not only worked well together and possessed *esprit de corps*, but also could be utilized and led in combat to achieve the strategic aims of the overall campaign. In order to fulfill both of these tasks the pre-WWI British army relied primarily on instilling discipline within the ranks.

---

² Throughout much of the war, combined arms operations consisted primarily of infantry supported by artillery, though tanks would eventually be incorporated as well.
While discipline often has the stigma of referring to punishment, it also includes such tasks as close-order drills, marching, and promotion of attention to detail through routine inspections. Sheffield writes, “Discipline cannot, of course, be measured purely by punishments. . . . Discipline was intended to promote unit cohesion and military efficiency by producing obedient men who took a pride in developing soldierly skills, and who did not give way to fear in battle.”

That discipline was of such importance in the pre-WWI Regular army makes sense given the fact that the enlisted ranks were comprised largely of uneducated and unskilled workers who were unfamiliar with army discipline. Discipline therefore provided a foundation of basic soldiering skills to enlisted men and conditioned them to take and follow orders. However, whereas strict discipline was utilized within the pre-WWI Regular army, the citizen-soldier make-up of Kitchener’s Army meant that the application of discipline would need to be reexamined as utilizing it in the same manner could have counterproductive effects.

In a letter to his father on November, 5, 1915, Major Peirs wrote of his commanding officer that “he is a very strict disciplinarian & I am afraid will be rather too much so, as the old sort of discipline is to my mind not required by the new Army, or anyhow not by our men. They have got enough to put up with without bothering them with small details.” Historian J.G. Fuller corroborates Major Peirs’ view of discipline within the New Army writing, “the effect of the British army’s faith in spit and polish was greatly to antagonize the ordinary infantryman: ‘it never failed to annoy the rank and file who believed it made no contribution to winning the war and was designed only to rile them.’” It is in Fuller’s statement that one can find a better understanding for the resentment of enlisted men against unnecessary discipline within Kitchener’s Army. Whereas the Regulars accepted discipline both as a punishment and means to further soldiering skill and bearing, New Army soldiers enlisted to fight in and win the war. Tasks that failed to explicitly pursue this aim were viewed poorly and seriously undermined enlisted personnel’s confidence in the leadership ability of the officer who ordered said task. Major Peirs notes just such an event in a letter to his father writing, “They sent me back yesterday to our base to be reviewed by [King] George & [Prince] Edward. . . . It was an infernal nuisance as I had to leave here at 5.30 & walk 3 miles to a horse, ride 7 miles… and back.
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again.”

Major Peirs’ was further upset after learning that prior to the King’s arrival for the inspection, “They had a battalion out in the morning & cleaned up the roads & sanded the streets much to our disgust, as the battalion in question happened to be building our huts & he had much better have been going on with them & incidentally [King George V] would have had a better insight into things if he had seen the road before the mud was removed.”

Yet, while Major Peirs clearly dealt with officers too focused on discipline and “spit and shine” perfection, other officers “attempted to balance the need to instill discipline with the necessity to recognize that recruits of 1914 were often of a very different stamp to those of prewar days” and “recognized the need to create a more enlightened, ‘auxiliary’ style of disciple than that of the Regular army.”

While the utilization of discipline was one aspect of leadership, which could either harm or hurt an officer’s reputation among his men, another was an officer’s role in maintaining and or improving unit morale. Within the BEF notes Fuller, “great efforts were devoted to seeing that the men’s comforts were looked after and recreations provided behind the lines.”

Major Peirs in a letter to his sister, Cecily, on November 3, 1915 recalls the opening of a “brigade institute” (a recreation center in modern parlance) writing, “I hear our new Institute opens tonight with a concert.” In a letter to his father written on November 11, Major Peirs provides further description of the “Institute” writing, “I had a look round our Brigade Institute today, & it is beginning to go very well. They have started a coffee bar there, & they’ve got a piano, so really there is very little more the men can want.” Major Peirs continues rather sardonically, “They are also thinking of starting a Divisional Band, but I can hardly imagine that it will be much of a success. . . . Possibly however they meant to torture the Huns with it.”

The importance of establishing areas in the rear in which soldiers could relax and recuperate was twofold. First, boredom was a chronic problem for soldiers along the Western Front. Even Major Peirs as an officer was unable to truly escape from it writing, “I have heard it said that life out here consists of long periods of absolute boredom with short intervals of
paralyzing terror, & I am beginning with the first condition now.”\(^\text{13}\) Activities in the rear—including but not limited to recreational “institutes,” organized sports, or leave to visit home or cities in the rear—went a long way to reducing boredom and stress for soldiers of all ranks. Secondly, the British learned far more quickly than either the Germans or French that “few men could undergo the strain of front-line service indefinitely.”\(^\text{14}\) Lord Moran who served as a Royal Medical Officer in the 1/R. Fusiliers postulated that, “a man has only a limited ‘bank’ of courage or ‘willpower’ and when in war it is used up, he is finished.”\(^\text{15}\) As such by providing facilities for soldiers to psychologically recover in-between deployments in the trenches, men could refill this “bank” of courage and better stand up to the stresses of combat.

Providing facilities for soldiers to rest and recover was just one of many ways that officers could attempt to improve the morale of the men under their command. Another such method was used from 1914-1916 when it became “extremely common for officers to use their own money to buy gifts for their men.”\(^\text{16}\) Major Peirs clearly partook in this tradition having written to Cecily, “I also had time to go round to the Field Force Canteen which has just opened a branch . . . it may be useful for getting things for the men.”\(^\text{17}\) In another letter Major Peirs asks his father if he wouldn’t mind ordering and shipping several footballs for the men to enjoy after they get off the line.\(^\text{18}\) What is most amazing about this is not so much the generosity of the officers towards their men—which contradicts most WWI British officer stereotypes—but the change that had come over the British officer corps. In Death’s Men, historian Denis Winter notes that in the Regular army prior to WWI, “NCOs trained and managed the men. Only when they were fit to respond to the word of command were they put in front of the officer, whose duty it was to regard them with total lack of friendliness or apparent interest.” Winter recounts how another Regular officer declared, “I have seen officers talking to men as equals. I won’t have that. In future, such men will be reduced to the ranks.”\(^\text{19}\) While most officers, Regulars or those within Kitchener’s Army likely viewed themselves as superior to enlisted men, the very fact that such vitriol subsided suggests a fundamental shift in the officer-enlisted man
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relationship, one that come about as a consequence of the massively expanded officer corps and eventual attrition of many of the pre-war Regular officers.

The ability to improve unit morale was a crucial skill of good leaders as it not only improved the lives of enlisted soldiers, but also improved combat effectiveness of the unit as well. Troops with high morale were willing to fight longer and harder against greater odds than troops that were exhausted physically and mentally. However, soldiers’ morale was not the only factor in determining a unit’s combat capability. An officer’s ability to not only lead but also exude an aura of calm in an otherwise chaotic environment was crucial to maximizing a unit’s potential. Alexander Watson, in his book *Enduring the Great War*, demonstrates the importance and perhaps even necessity of strong leadership on combat effectiveness by citing a German intelligence report from a raid on the I/Royal Irish Rifles: “3 Platoon, lacking leadership was quickly overwhelmed and surrendered, the soldiers in 1 Platoon, inspired by [Lieutenant] Hill, fought almost to the last man: ‘the majority had to be shot down or bayoneted.”

Like Lieutenant Hill, Major Peirs also inspired his troops during battle. After the Battle of Loos in late September, 1915, Private Lintott of the 8th Queens described his experience in the Battle of Loos to the *Surrey Advertiser* in which he told of how Major Peirs supposedly led the attack: “Our Major (Major Peirs) was magnificent. He led us in with a cigarette in his mouth, his walking [stick] in one hand and his revolver in the other. He is a jolly good fellow and brave too.” However, whereas Private Lintott recalled a rather positive and perhaps romanticized image from the battle, Major Peirs was far more somber in his recollection writing in a letter to his father: “We have had a most awful doing, & are reduced by half . . . . We went into action on Sunday with 20 officers & 10 came out . . . . The Brigade is reduced to about 1500.” In another letter written to his Mother on October 30, 1915, Major Peirs describes the advance.

Just after leaving the trenches we came under machine gun fire though the shells were coming over pretty thickly, & about 800 yards down the shells ceased to worry but then we caught it from a Battery of machine guns in a village on our flank which was intended to have been cleared. We got through this & eventually reached the wire in front of the German trenches, but they couldn’t get through this so we had to get back. The Brigade suffered very heavily.
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While the Battle of Loos was a defeat for the BEF, the difference in what Private Lintott recollected about the battle and what Major Peirs remembered illustrates the impact a single officer displaying calmness and bravery in the face of enemy opposition can have on those under his command, or at least it would if not for one detail. While Private Lintott told the *Surrey Advertiser* that it was Major Peirs he saw with a cigarette in his mouth calmly leading the assault, Major Peirs insisted that it wasn’t him. In a letter written to his mother on October 13, 1915, Major Peirs wrote, “As I told you the whole thing was flummery. If I get hold of Private Lintott I’ll wring his miserable neck.”24 In another letter written on October 17 to his father, Major Peirs again shares a similar sentiment writing, “I am still worried about that letter of the idiot Lintott, & the worst is that I have got to live up to it!!”25 While this discrepancy certainly highlights the perils relying on first person accounts of chaotic events such as battles, it does not necessarily disprove psychologist S. J. Rachman’s statement that “effective, calm leaders [make] important contributions to the control of fear.”26 Whether or not it was Major Peirs that Private Lintott observed is irrelevant. What is important is that Lintott observed an officer who was calm, in command, and leading the assault. That officer had such an impact on Lintott that he did not mention being scared, or even that the battle ultimately resulted in defeat. Instead he recalled the steely-eyed officer under whose leadership he and others went to battle.

While courage, the ability to inspire and improve morale, competence, and composure in battle were all crucial aspects of good leadership in the BEF, one final quality was looked for in the best officers: compassion. The ability for officers to understand what their men go through was crucial to understanding how best to serve their needs thus reducing stress and keeping the unit combat-effective for longer periods of time. A lecture given to future officers of the Artists’ Rifles stated, “Your first job is to get to know your men, look after them, study their interests and show you are one of them, taking a share in their pleasures and interests as well as their work. If you do this you will find that when the time comes they will follow you to hell.”27 As such, many officers took a paternalistic attitude towards their men, standing up for them against unfair treatment, and seeking to ease in some small ways the burdens of war. Sheffield describes when
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“on one occasion, the all-important rum ration failed to arrive at a TF unit. The battalion commander promptly handed over six bottles of whisky, which were ‘as precious as molten gold.’”

Major Peirs also displayed a moment of compassion or at least understanding when following the breakdown and uncontrollable weeping of an 18-year old soldier whom Peirs suspected of being no more than 16 while on patrol in no man’s land, rather than report him for cowardice, sought an alternative writing in a letter to his father, “I may be able to evolve some other method of getting round the authorities. I find that Regular officers have no qualms in such cases.”

In what was arguably a significantly bolder act of compassion, during the German offensive in March 1918, now Lieutenant Colonel Peirs disobeyed direct orders to defend to the last an untenable position and withdrew stating after the war, “As I had still over 300 men left they would be of much better use in the line than in a German prison or dead, so I decided to disobey orders and retire.”

Despite falling back without orders, Lieutenant Colonel Peirs would be awarded the second bar to his D.S.O for the holding action at Le Verguier, which held up the German advance for several hours allowing British forces to begin to reconstitute the line farther in the rear. But perhaps Peirs compassion is best summed up by his love of the 8th Queens and the men that served in it. After the battle of Loos, one of the few bright moments Peirs recalls is the performance of the soldiers under him. “The men were wonderful, & though caught in the flank by machine guns & later on by wire they went on as if on a field day.”

On March 21, 1918, when the 8th Queens came under heavy attack, Peirs was in the rear due to a septic foot “but, as soon as the unprecedentedly-ferocious barrage opened, no medical advice could keep him away from the Battalion he commanded.”

And finally in a letter written to his father from a hospital after being gassed, Peirs wondered what his battalion was up to writing, “I am rather wondering what the Battalion is doing. They can’t be far from the push mentioned in to-day’s papers, but whether they are in it I don’t know.”

Piers’ pride in, love of, and concern
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for the 8th Queens was one of the recurring themes in his letters home throughout the entirety of the war. This compassion undoubtedly served him well as a leadership attribute as it both enhanced his command presence as well as convinced those under his command that he genuinely had their best interests at heart.

Leadership is in many ways an intangible trait as it encompasses a wide body of other significant traits: courage, empathy, intelligence, competence, and command presence to name just a few. In WWI, officers had to balance their role as disciplinarian, combat leader, and paternalistic father to those under their command. Therefore, while competence and calmness when in combat were important aspects of good leadership, they were by no means the only desired traits. Officers were now encouraged to get to know the men under their command, to come to understand their interests and needs so as to improve morale, ward off combat fatigue, and increase combat efficiency. What emerged out of this desire for a dual-role leader was a new officer for a new citizen-soldier army. Peirs was by no means the only officer to leave behind letters, a diary, a memoir, or biography, but through his letters and correspondence one is not only exposed to the experiences of a battalion commander, but of an exceptionally talented officer, and a role model who I am proud to call my great grandfather.
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A Contrary Situation: The Rise of the Military Religious Orders in the Twelfth Century
By Sarah Hayes

Peace is one of the core beliefs of Christianity. In principle, Christians do not support war or violence of any kind. To become involved with a military expedition of any sort would be counterintuitive especially to those who have pledged their lives to religious orders. However in some instances, Christians have strayed from this basic belief in order to fight for their religion. The most famous example of this are the Crusades of the Middle Ages, during which full scale war was encouraged by the Catholic Church in order to protect the Holy Land. Out of these conflicts developed a new breed of religious organization, the military orders, which were made up of soldier monks who were willing die defending Christianity against the infidel. Despite their counterintuitive identity as religious warriors, they came to wield immense power in the twelfth century, particularly the Order of St. John, or the Hospitallers, and the Order of the Temple, or the Templars. The rise to power of the military orders was due to shifts in religious military thought, acquisition of immense wealth through donations from prestigious patrons, ecclesiastical privileges, and a military need in the Crusader states.

The members of the military orders were monkish knights who combined the life of a religious order with soldiering. Their primary function was the military defense of the Church and protection of the Crusader states. According to Desmond Seward, the military orders were “the first properly disciplined and officered troops in the West since the Roman times.”1 The fact that they were religious orders as well as professional soldiers in an era when armies were only mustered in times of crisis and gave them a discipline that other military forces of the time did not have. However, they did remain religious orders. The Primitive Rule of the Templars states “You who renounce your own wills… and scorn the temptations of your body, sustained by the food of God.”2 These are monkish vows of obedience, chastity, and poverty. Like monks, they followed an identical dress code when within their religious house, for example, the Hospitallers all wore a black habit emblazoned with a white cross and Templars were required to have a

---

Men who joined the military orders entered a solemn and sober world, not the worldly life of secular knight. However despite their monkish lifestyle, they remained members of the laity and, unless they chose to be, were not bound to their order for life. The most famous of these military orders were the Templars and Hospitallers, but other smaller orders throughout Europe and the Holy Land also played important roles in fighting those considered enemies of Christ, who were usually other religious groups. They were established primarily in the twelfth century and quickly grew to enjoy immense wealth and power.

The infamous Knights Templar were established in the early twelfth century as a small group of knights dedicated to the protection of pilgrims in the Holy Land; however, they became one of the most important institutions in Christendom. Their founder Hugh of Payns sought to protect pilgrims on the route from the port of Jaffa to the holy sites in and around Jerusalem. Although there is debate over the exact date of the Order’s foundation, it was probably between 1118 and 1120 that Hugh and others vowed before Warmund of Picquigny, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, to protect the pilgrims and lead lives of poverty, chastity, and obedience. They also received the support of King Baldwin II of Jerusalem, who allowed them to live in his palace, the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem. In 1129 at the Council of Troyes in France, they were recognized by the papacy and received a rule, or code of behavior. Only a decade old, they were already receiving support from important sources. As they aided the Crusader states in their conflicts with Islam, the Templars grew in both numbers and political power. Malcolm Barber estimates that by the thirteenth century there were at least 7,000 knights, sergeants, serving brothers and priests in the Order and that they were in possession of at least 870 properties of varying size and
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importance throughout Christendom. Clearly, the Templars were a force to be reckoned with, but the Knights Hospitaller were equally important.

Though they would eventually wield as much military strength as the Templars, the Order of the Hospital of St John was founded in the late eleventh century as a refuge for poor and sick pilgrims. Again there is debate about the exact date of foundation, but the Hospital of St John was definitely founded before the First Crusade, probably between 1070 and 1080. Originally it was a hospital and guest house for poor pilgrims dedicated to St John the Almoner under the authority of the monastery of St Mary of the Latins in Jerusalem. Despite its previous existence, the ruler of the Hospital during the First Crusade, Gerard, was eventually regarded as the founder of the Hospital. He is credited with development of the Hospital as an independent institution from the St. Mary of the Latins and the increase in significant donations. Gerard also asked for and received official approval from the papacy in a papal bull by Pope Pascal II in 1113. The Jerusalem hospital soon grew to 750 beds and accommodated a thousand pilgrims a year. Unlike the Templars, it is unclear how the Hospitallers evolved into a military order. Although there are scholars who believe that the Hospital militarized due to a rivalry with the Templars, Helen Nicholson argues that “the Hospitallers took up military activities as a natural extension of their vocation of caring for pilgrims.” With the instability of the kingdom, it was logical that they should also protect pilgrims in their care. However, the largest push towards their development as a military order was probably the gift of strategic defensive castles, such the castle at Beth Gibelin given to the Order by King Fulk of Jerusalem in 1136. If they were going to be given these important defenses, they had to be able to maintain them not as monks, but as knights. Together with the Templars, the Hospitallers’ wealth and defense of the Holy Land made the two the largest and most powerful of the military orders, but smaller important ones existed as well.
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The late twelfth century saw the foundation of other important military orders, which played important roles in the military and medical life of the Holy Land as well as in Iberia and eastern Europe. The oldest military order after the Templars and Hospitallers was the Order of Lazarus, which functioned primarily in the Holy Land as an order that took in knights who had contracted leprosy. The Iberian Peninsula saw the development of the Orders of Santiago and Calatrava in the late twelfth century. Like the Templars, the Order of Santiago was founded for the protection of pilgrims, in this case, those en route to the Shrine of St. James at Santiago de Compostella. They were officially recognized by the papacy as a religious order in 1175. The Order of Calatrava was recognized slightly earlier in 1164, after defending the Castilian capital of Toledo from Muslim attack since 1158.\footnote{Seward, 41-42, 148-153.} Although they remained small in the twelfth century, the Spanish orders are notable for their eventual role in the Reconquista. According to Seward, “They were the perfected instrument of five centuries of warfare with Islam.”\footnote{Seward, 143.} Their participation in the defense of Christianity made them the Spanish versions of the Templars and Hospitallers. The Germans also had an equivalent in the Teutonic Knights. Founded in the Holy Land in 1190, their rule states that “when Acre was being besieged…there was in the army a band of good people from Bremen and from Lübeck, who…started the aforementioned hospital.”\footnote{“The Rule and Statutes of the Teutonic Knights,” in “The Statutes of the Teutonic Knights: a study of religious chivalry,” trans. Indrikis Sterns (diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1969), http://www.theorb.net/encycloped/religion/monastic/tk_rule.html (accessed December 7, 2012).} Like the Hospitallers, they eventually outgrew their hospital roots and defended Christendom against the pagans in eastern Europe. Though these orders never achieved the same importance as the Templars and Hospitallers, they owed their growth to similar factors, beginning with a need for military protection.

A direct catalyst for the militarization of religious orders was the need to protect pilgrims created by the instability of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. Fulcher of Chartres explains in his chronicle that in his lifetime, there was no period where roads to pilgrimage sites were safe for travel.\footnote{Barber, The New Knighthood, 3, 6-7.} Pilgrims were supposed to travel unarmed as part of their pilgrim vows, making them easy targets in this unstable environment. It was the Templars who first attempted to find a solution to this problem which the First Crusade was supposed to have solved. Their initial purpose was not to protect the kingdom, but “the roads and routes against the attacks of robbers and
brigands. This they did especially in order to safeguard pilgrims.” In addition, the Hospitallers also began to provide protection to the pilgrims who came into their care. Without the need for the protection of pilgrims, the religious orders would never have developed into military organizations or evolved into defenders of the Church against the infidels. On the Iberian Peninsula, the Order of Santiago was also established to protect pilgrims to the Shrine of St. James. The protection of pilgrims was the primary reason behind the orders’ increasing militarism and provided a foundation for their later growth and power. This would also not have been possible without important theological changes within the Catholic Church.

In an ideological sense, the growth of the military orders was fostered by a theological shift in attitude of the Church towards just warfare. Prior to the First Crusade, the Peace of God movement had developed a policy within the Church that knights should be restricted from fighting among themselves and instead put their energies into fighting for the Church. Prior to this, the knightly class had been in almost a constant state of civil war amongst themselves and with the Church. At the Council of Clermont in 1095, Pope Urban II advocated for the service of secular knights for the church by declaring that “you have promised more firmly than ever to keep the peace among yourselves and to preserve the rights of the church, there remains still an important work for you to do.” By deliberately trying to encourage secular knights to fight for God in the Crusades, the Church created an acceptable form of warfare within Christian ideology. While Urban was not encouraging monks to go on Crusade, the military orders could not have existed without the ideology behind his speech because of Christianity’s traditional pacifism. The key element to this new ideology was the idea of *miles Christi*.

The term *miles Christi* was essential to the ideology of the military orders and is critical in understanding their rise to power. Coming into use through the writings of St Augustine and literally meaning “soldier of Christ,” it reflects the duty of a Christian knight to protect Christendom from outside evils. As the monk fought the spiritual enemies of the Church from
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within his monastery, the soldier of Christ fought Christianity’s physical enemies. Instead of committing the sin of murder, the traditional Christian view of warfare, a *miles Christi* was actually doing penance for his sins. 24 The Hospitallers and the Templars fought Islam in the Holy Land and the Teutonic was hugely instrumental in fighting paganism in eastern Europe. 25 The knights of the military orders were by definition *miles Christi* and their development and rise to power would not have been possible without the widespread acceptance of this idea. To the Church, the military orders provided the perfect outlet for the knightly class even when there was no official crusade being promoted. 26 Therefore, the Church was more than willing to support them and allow their power to grow both in the Holy Land and in Europe. As the dominant European ideology, the Church’s changing theology played a large role in the growth of the military orders, and was aided most directly by the theological support of St. Bernard.

The largest single ideological supporter of the military orders was arguably St. Bernard of Clairvaux, whose familial connections to the Templars led him to write the pivotal *In Praise of the New Knighthood*, which created an ideological basis for militant monks. Bernard had connections to the Templars and Hugh of Payns through the Counts of Champagne. Around 1130, he was asked by Hugh for help recruiting and wrote *In Praise of the New Knighthood*. Although the document refers specifically to the Templars, it provides a rationalization for the military activities of all of the Orders. 27 “A new sort of knighthood” Bernard writes “…unknown to the world is fighting indefatigably a double fight against flesh and blood as well as against the immaterial forces of evil in the skies.” 28 Here, Bernard gives the clearest explanation possible of how a brother of a military order fought both the spiritual battle of a monk and the physical battle of a secular knight. At the same time he also completely separates them from secular knights writing that “the knights of Christ fight the battles of their lord in all peace of mind, in no way fearing to sin in killing the enemy or to die at his hands, since indeed death, whether inflicted or suffered, is not tainted by crime but is marked by a large degree of glory.” 29 By fighting for Christ, the military orders were fighting a just cause in order to bring about peace; therefore, killing their enemies in battle was not a sin, as had been traditionally taught. It should be noted
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however, that although Bernard provided a powerful case for the existence of warrior monks, opposition remained to this admittedly contradictory ideal. Barber explains that, in the case of the Templars, Bernard’s patronage was crucial because through his endorsement, they “received donations and recruits on a large scale, as well as a number of exclusive privileges from the papacy.” Bernard was the one of the leading religious writers of the time and by giving his support to the military orders he invited subsequent support from religious and secular sources that was critical to their rise to power and influence. He provided justification for all of the orders, bringing them to the attention of powerful people who were critical to the growth of the Order’s material power.

If the protection of pilgrims and theological shifts were important factors in the rise of the military orders, the accumulation of wealth through generous benefactors was absolutely essential to the growth of their economic power. The primary sources of wealth for the military orders rested in the gifts western benefactors gave them for primarily spiritual reasons. Older wealthy nobles would commonly turn their lands over to the Orders so that they might be taken care of in their old age. Those of a lower economic status could become a servant for an Order if they had no material goods to give. In the cases of both the high and low born, the Orders would provide protection and sustenance. Greater than these two benefits of giving was the motivation to donate in order to achieve salvation. By giving to the military orders whose function was to fight the enemies of Christ, benefactors sought to redeem their own sins, much like the brothers who joined the Orders. Promoting spiritual forgiveness through donation to the military orders contributed to their rise in power by allowing them to accumulate great economic and political power. They were able to accumulate astonishing amounts of that wealth from the patronage of key figures in Europe of the time.

The military orders greatly benefited from the patronage of high ranking clergy and secular rulers in both the East and the West. In the East, the Hospitallers received castles from Count Raymond II of Tripoli and King Fulk of Jerusalem. The key political figures in the Holy Land knew that increasing the power of the military orders in this way would help them hold onto their own power. Raymond II’s son, Count Raymond III of Tripoli, was a benefactor of the

leper Order of Lazarus. The promise of salvation attracted powerful benefactors to even the smaller orders. In the West, all of the military orders enjoyed the support of the clergy and high ranking aristocracy. The abbots of Citeaux and Clairvaux as well as the archbishops of Sense and Reims were all early patrons of the Templars. The Templars also enjoyed the support and donations of the Counts of Flanders, Anjou, Champagne, and Blois. Hugh, the Count of Champagne went beyond mere patronage and actually joined the Templars around 1125. As in the East, Western monarchs provided support as well. The kings of the Iberian Peninsula, such as King Alfonso I of Aragon and King Alfonso IX of León, were particularly generous. The people that the military orders received patronage from were the most powerful in Europe and the Latin East. By becoming attached to and benefiting from their prestige, the military orders gained a legitimacy and power that they could not have gotten anywhere else. Without their support the Orders would never have achieved the power or the wide range of wealth that they did.

The great wealth of the military orders came in both the form of liquid capital and landed properties all across Europe. In the West, the Templars and Hospitallers came to hold property all over Europe, the Templars as early as 1127. Even the smaller Orders came to control vast stretches of land. Naturally, the Teutonic Knights controlled large properties in eastern Europe and the Orders of Santiago and Lazarus, acquired lands as far away from León as Hungary and Jerusalem as England. Gifts of property in multiple kingdoms and empires meant that the military orders were not under the control of any one secular power, giving them more freedom from outside control. Naturally, as they accumulated more wealth they attracted criticism and made enemies that would eventually become dangerous. Sometimes they received liquid capital, such as when Fulk, count of Anjou and future king of Jerusalem, gave the Templars thirty livres angevines a year beginning in 1120 or when King Alfonso IX of León decreed that the Order of Santiago be given ten percent of all the money coined in his kingdom. One of the most
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interesting donations was in 1131, when King Alfonso I of Aragon willed to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the Templars, and Hospitallers “my whole kingdom, as well as the lordship I have in all the extent of my kingdom, the sovereignty and rights I have over all the population of my land.”⁴¹ Although the will was never implemented, it signified that the Orders were powerful enough to justify being left an entire kingdom. The Kingdom of Aragon did not come under Templar and Hospitaller control, however, their vast holdings were able to successfully maintain the Orders as defenders of the Holy Land. They provided both everyday supplies and revenue was used to train brothers and fortify castles.⁴² The great wealth of the military orders gave them complete economic independence and their control of significant land, resources, and manpower allowed them to become a significant political and economic force in Europe. This acquired wealth was essential for maintaining the Orders and building up defenses. The economic power of the military orders contributed to their uninterrupted growth that was also the result of freedoms they were granted by the Church.

If the military orders gained much through the donations of secular rulers and the clergy, they also owed much of their growth in power to the privileges and exemptions given to them by their largest ecclesiastical benefactor, the papacy. The Hospitallers were brought under the protection of the papacy by Pope Pascal II in 1113 and the Templars received papal approval from the papal legate at the Council of Troyes in 1129 when they received their rule.⁴³ A host of freedoms were to follow. Both had their own priests and churches and were not subject to the authority of bishops. This meant that unlike other monastic orders, they answered only to the Pope. Thus, they were not controlled by a large church hierarchy above them and could grow unchecked by local authority. Seward writes that “...they were both a Church within a Church and a State within a State.”⁴⁴ This is perhaps best demonstrated by their control over taxes called tithes, which were traditionally reserved for the Church. In the Middle Ages, ten percent of every Christian’s annual income was paid to the church, but thanks to papal authority, the Templars and the Hospitallers were exempted from paying them.⁴⁵ By doing so, the Church singled out these Orders and took part of its own wealth away. This special privilege was carried even further. In the Primitive Rule of the Templars it states “you who live the communal life may

⁴¹ Alfonso I of Aragon, 161.
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receive tithes.”46 When Pope Pascal II officially recognized the Hospitaller in 1113, the papal bull declared “Moreover, as to the tithes of your revenues… we do hereby fix and decree, that they shall be retained by your own Hospital, all opposition on the part of the bishops and their clergy notwithstanding.”47 Allowing the orders to receive tithes not only gave them another important source of income and economic power, but also political power by acknowledging them as an authority worthy of collecting taxes. The income that they received from tithes would have otherwise gone to the church, which gained the Orders important enemies and critics in the upper echelons of the clergy. The collection of tithes was a form of economic power whereas the acquisition of strategically important castles was critical to the Orders military power.

After the First Crusade, there was a chronic shortage of able bodied men for the armies of the Crusader states, which played a direct role in the rise to power of the military orders. Despite the immense effort that had gone into the capture of the Holy Land during the First Crusade, very few Crusaders remained behind in the East to protect it.48 The small number that did stay behind was further depleted due to the near constant warfare and disease.49 Yet the Kingdom of Jerusalem was constantly under threat of attack and although the defense system was strong in theory, there were not enough men to make it effective. Castles and cities at strategic locations were to be manned by garrisons which could retreat behind thick walls and hold off sieges indefinitely. A host of the kingdom could be formed from these garrisons and the knights provided by nobles who owed loyalty to the crown. However, there were not enough men to properly fill either and when the host of the kingdom was assembled, the garrisons were greatly reduced, leaving them highly vulnerable.50 There were not enough men to properly defend the kingdom, but the military orders provided a perfect solution. Spiritually bound to helping the religious cause of the Crusader states, they development to fill the military weaknesses of the Franks played a large role in the growth of their defensive power.

The military orders gained impressive economic power through their donated wealth, but their political and military power in the Holy Land came from the castles they controlled that were placed strategically for defense. These castle came under the control of the military orders most commonly through the gifts of patrons in the Crusader states. Count Raymond II of Tripoli

46 “The Primitive Rule of the Templars.”
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gave the Hopsitallers a number of strongholds, such as Crac des Chevaliers, in the hopes that they might help repel attacks by the Muslims in his lands. The Hospitallers were also given Beth Gibelin in the Kingdom of Jerusalem to defend against the Muslim presence in Ascalon.\textsuperscript{51} The Templars played a critical role in the kingdom’s defense with their castles at Gaza, Safad, Ahamant, and La Fève. Sometimes lands were given that were still in Muslim hands in the hopes that it would encourage the receiving Order to retake it.\textsuperscript{52} With so much of the Crusader states defensive power entrusted to them, the Hospitallers and Templars became a powerful force in Crusader politics. The safety of the kingdom was under their control. Similarly, on the Iberian Peninsula, the Order of Calatrava was established to garrison a castle that was strategic in the defense of the Castilian capital of Toledo and the Order of Santiago was given defensive castles on the Castilian frontier.\textsuperscript{53} It was not only the Holy Land where military orders were critical to the survival of secular power. However, it was in the Crusader states that they became the key force in military matters.

By supplying essential manpower and maintaining defensive castles the military orders eventually outgrew their initial function of protecting pilgrims to become one of the largest powers in the military world of the Latin Franks in the East. “Because of their sacrifices, Outremer, land of the Crusades…endured for nearly two centuries,” writes Seward.\textsuperscript{54} Even when there was no open campaigning, there was constant attack on the edges of Crusader territory, which, led to the establishment of fortresses under the control of and manned by the military orders. The Orders also played key role in any military attacks in the Crusader states, such as in 1168 when the Hospitallers sent 500 knights with a Frankish host into Egypt.\textsuperscript{55} By the reign of King Baldwin IV of Jerusalem, the kingdom could not launch a military venture without the support of the military orders. There were not enough knights in the kingdom to muster a host without them and such was their power that the kings of Jerusalem could not force them to participate.\textsuperscript{56} The orders had control over how the military forces functioned in the Crusader states. Thanks to their wealth, privileges, and essential military strength, the Hospitaller and
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Templars had grown from a charitable organization and a small group of poor knights to forces that wielded immense power in both Europe and the Holy Land.

The rise of the military orders in the twelfth century was due to a number of theological, economic, and military factors as well as the support of powerful benefactors. It was the perfect combination of ecclesiastical promotion, donations of a variety of capital and practical need. Without these circumstances, such contradictory groups would not have been able to form. The idea of a fighting monk was against previous Christian ideology and yet it was met with great success. The different forms of support made a militant ideal acceptable in Christian society, despite its counterintuitive nature. The military orders developed into some of the most important political, religious, and military organizations of the twelfth century, despite the fact that the combination of religion and warfare make for a truly contrary situation.
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Working Women and Motherhood: Failures of the Weimar Republic’s Family Policies

By Katie Quirin

During the interwar period, the high number of casualties from the First World War combined with decreased birth rates created population crises for European nations such as France and Germany. The Weimar Republic, started in 1919, was particularly concerned with the depleted population. Fritz Burgdorfer of the Bavarian and Reich Statistical Office estimated that Germany lost 12-13 million people because of the war, or one fifth of the nation’s total population.¹ The loss of these Germans was not bolstered by the birth rate, which declined post-war and continued to decline throughout the interwar period. It fell from 27.5 in 1913, to 25.9 in 1920, and to 14.7 in 1933, then the lowest figure throughout Europe.² To combat these issues and to boost the birth rate, the Weimar Republic turned to family policy. In order to separate themselves from the pronatalism of the fallen monarchy, the Weimar government attempted to encourage motherhood through a host of social welfare programs. The programs included tax benefits, maternity leave benefits, and increased healthcare to combat the high infant-mortality rate. These programs did not, however, realistically encourage the majority of working women to have more children; the incentives given often excluded certain groups of women and working women could not feasibly partake in all aspects of the programs because of working-class lifestyles and financial concerns. These issues thus represent a failure in the Weimar Republic’s policies towards motherhood and the population crisis.

While scholars have written a large number of works pertaining to women and motherhood during the Weimar Republic, a smaller number have focused on the cultural and


governmental views on motherhood in relation to the population crisis. In “Mother’s Day in the Weimar Republic,” Karin Hausen looked at the cultural emphasis on motherhood through a specific lens: Mother’s Day. Hausen examined how “the Mother’s Day ideology glorified the idea of motherhood in order to promote population increases,” focusing primarily on the interest groups who were concerned with the morality of the society. Hausen argued that the programming of Mother’s Day offered a “magic formula” that connected the self-sacrifice and devotion of mother “in an attempt to implant the seeds of self-sacrifice in future generations of young women.” Through this self-sacrificing ideal, Hausen contended that the efforts surrounding Mother’s Day tried to change German perceptions about motherhood. While Hausen’s culture-based argument provided a detailed look at how one part of German society reacted to the population crisis, it was too narrow to offer a complete understanding of the public’s response to the low population levels.

In Modernizing Tradition: Gender and Consumerism in Interwar France and Germany, Adam C. Stanley also portrayed the interwar emphasis on motherhood primarily through a specific cultural lens, advertisement, but focused on its relation to the Weimar Republic’s policies regarding the population crisis. Largely citing the work of Cornelie Usborne, discussed below, Stanley described the efforts of the Weimar Republic to increase women’s healthcare in order to encourage higher birthrates. By claiming the Germans unilaterally accepted the governmental propaganda, Stanley asserted that the advertisements were evidence of a cultural reaction to the population crisis that resulted from these policies. However, since advertisement is a narrow field, Stanley’s work did not encapsulate the specific responses of German women to

---


5 Ibid., 149.


7 Stanley argued that the German people accepted the policies towards procreation “virtually unanimously.” Ibid., 57.
these policies, and therefore overlooked an important factor in the examination of the cultural response to the Weimar Republic’s efforts to combat the population crisis.

In *The Politics of the Body in Weimar Germany: Women’s Reproductive Rights and Duties*, Cornelie Usborne’s argument provided more balance between societal and governmental involvement than Hausen or Stanley; Usborne presented a detailed look at the government’s efforts to increase the population with evidence on how these policies affected women. In her analysis of the reaction to the population crisis, Usborne demonstrated how the Weimar Republic focused on women’s healthcare. The government meant for these advancements in women’s healthcare to convince more women to become mothers and to decrease the high infant mortality rate.8 Usborne also examined how women received these policies and their effectiveness.9 By examining not only what the government did but also how the policies were received by women, Usborne offered the most fully-developed assessment of the Weimar Republic’s response to the population crisis. Her argument lacks only a closer view of women’s responses to Weimar Republic’s efforts to combat the population crisis, and a comprehensive discussion of the failure of the policies.

Unlike the work of Mouton, Usborne, Stanley, and Hausen, Tim Mason in “Women in Germany, 1925-1940: Family, Welfare and Work. Part I” examined the population crisis during the Weimar Republic through statistical analysis of family size and motives behind the decreasing size of families, but he only provides a discussion of the government involvement in increasing the population in post-1933 Germany. Mason analyzed census records and other statistical reports to demonstrate the decreased family size, his primary focus in his description of the population crisis.10 He interpreted these statistics by discussing what could have culturally affected a woman’s ability to have larger families. While Mason did describe the far right’s morally driven response to the population crisis, it seemed to function primarily as a lead in to his section on “Women and Family 1933-1940,” not as a full examination of the response to the population crisis in Weimar Germany.11 He examined the governmental response to mothers in this section, but by ignoring the policies of the Weimar Republic, Mason portrayed the interwar
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8 Usborne, *The Politics of Body*, 34. For a description of these policies, see page 36.
9 Ibid., 210. For analysis of effectiveness, see examples on pages 43, 50 of Usborne’s text.
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years as a prelude into the Nazi regime. Mason’s work, along with Usborne’s, Stanley’s, and Hausen’s, can be added to by examining the ways in which the Weimar policies failed to produce a higher birth rate for working-class women as a result of the limited nature of some of the policies and issues with the implementation of them.\textsuperscript{12}

A brief explanation of the policies enacted is needed for an understanding of how successful the policies of the Reich were at increasing motherhood. The Weimar Republic’s policies towards women began in the Constitution itself, which included conflicting clauses. As Usborne described, “Article 121, for example, accorded children born out of wedlock equal rights and effectively undermined article 119, which protected the sanctity of marriage. Article 163, which promised every German the right to work, ran counter to article 119, with its pledge to promote population growth and protection of motherhood.”\textsuperscript{13} These inconsistencies reflected the Weimar government’s struggle to “create state policy that would at once respect traditional values and recognize and adapt to social change.”\textsuperscript{14} Beyond the Constitution, the Weimar Republic made several policies throughout the interwar period to help increase the birth rate. The Law for Maternity Benefits and Maternity Welfare, passed on September 16, 1919, granted maternity benefits for women with a yearly income of less than 2,500 marks.\textsuperscript{15} The law continued the maternity benefits from WWI, that had consisted of “a lump sum of 50 marks to cover the cost of delivery…a maternity benefit equivalent to sick pay…for ten weeks, a breastfeeding allowance of at least 0.75 marks per day for twelve weeks; an extra 25 marks should complications during pregnancy require help from a physician or midwife,” as well as extending the period of payment and providing support for all dependents in a man’s family.\textsuperscript{16} These “breakthrough” policies of the early Weimar period served as the beginning of the governmental emphasis on motherhood within the new republic, but the issues would not be addressed with policy again until the mid-1920s.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{12} Michelle Mouton’s book largely follows these ideas, presenting the policies of the Weimar and Nazi governments in conjunction with personal accounts to measure their effectiveness; See Michelle Mouton, \textit{From Nurturing the Nation to Purifying the Volk: Weimar and Nazi Family Policy, 1918-1945} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
\textsuperscript{13} Usborne, \textit{Politics of the Body}, 35.
\textsuperscript{14} Mouton, \textit{From Nurturing}, 272-3.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 155.
\textsuperscript{16} Usborne, \textit{Politics of the Body}, 47.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
The Weimar Republic passed additional laws concerning motherhood that began with family allowances to state employees and civil servants. In May 1924, salaried Reich workers received statutory child benefits, which were extended to manual workers in June 1926, and to civil servants in 1927. Public-sector employees were “granted a spouse’s allowance, a reduction in school fees (if their families were large) and preferential treatment in employment decisions” between 1923 and 1927. They also received “tax benefits after the first child with an increase for each subsequent child.”18 In addition to these benefits for civil servants, there was an increase in maternity benefits in 1926 that covered the cost of midwifery, and provided medical help and the medications and equipment needed for a home birth. The Weimar Republic followed this law by being the first European country to ratify the Washington Convention on July 16, 1927, which focused on working women by extending maternity leave from eight to twelve weeks, granting two half-hour periods for breast feeding during the work day, and protecting pregnant women or recent mothers from dismissal.19 Finally, the government extended incentives beyond these policies by awarding mothers for having large numbers of children.20

Despite the apparent breakthroughs in women’s welfare created by these laws, the Reich policies towards mothers often were ineffective because they did not include all women in the Republic. The mid- to late-1920s laws towards civil servants exemplified this failure. The laws for state employees and civil servants were clearly exclusive: the benefits did not extend to women or families in other areas of the economy, such as agriculture or industrial labor. Furthermore, this exclusivity reflected social elitism, as Usborne described, “[T]his highly selective system of benefit, aimed at what was largely regarded as an elite group, mirrored the increasing tendency towards eugenics.”21 These laws were focused on an occupational group that “was well known for having few children,” with hope “that extra money would encourage larger families.”22 Beyond the exclusivity of the policies, the monetary stipends of the laws did not always encourage an occupational group known for small families to have larger families.23 The benefits were often more symbolic than financially valuable. For higher-ranking employees with

18 Usborne, Politics of the Body, 43.
19 Ibid., 47-9.
20 In Prussia, for example, these benefits were awarded to women with twelve or more children, and they received an honorary cup or hundred marks; Mouton, From Nurturing, 113.
21 Usborne, Politics of the Body, 43.
22 Usborne, Politics of the Body, 41.
23 Ibid.
“a monthly salary of about 900 RM,” a 20 RM child benefit a month was “obviously no incentive to have more children,” though those with lower salaries may have benefited from the extra money.\textsuperscript{24} Furthermore, the benefit for the first child was halved in 1931 by a Bruning emergency decree, destabilizing the entire system.\textsuperscript{25} While these programs were intended to be beneficial, they did not serve to make a significant impact on increasing motherhood. The programs not only excluded a majority of working women by serving only civil and state employees, but they also proved to not be enough of a benefit for the government workers to have significantly larger families. The child benefits for government workers, therefore, would not have produced dramatic increases in the birth rate.

In addition to the problems with the functionality of the benefits for government workers, the Weimar policies towards working-class women proved to be ineffective for multiple reasons. First, the laws themselves were not always realistic for working women.\textsuperscript{26} Usborne described the problem with the policies being followed:

Twelve weeks’ maternity leave also often turned out to be wishful thinking. Because maternity benefits lagged behind wages, most women could not afford to take time off with less pay. The result was that many women violated the regulations….nearly 40 per cent of the women had worked until the last week of pregnancy and that one third had returned to work within four weeks of birth, ignoring the statutory period of six weeks’ maternity leave. Only very few women who returned to work continued to nurse their babies.\textsuperscript{27}

For working women, the maternity benefits provided by the Weimar government often were not financially realistic. Additionally, women “forfeited their maternity rights out of ignorance or fear of dismissal or discrimination.”\textsuperscript{28} Finally, the benefits also were ineffectual because some employers required medical examinations of their workers, and would not employ pregnant women; this restriction served to further limit the ability of working women to utilize the family benefits.\textsuperscript{29} These multiple issues demonstrated how the Reich family policies during the interwar period were not significantly effective in combating the population crisis. Even though the
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policies ideally helped working-class women, taking advantage of them was often unrealistic based on the women’s need for frequent paychecks and secure employment.

In addition to the impracticality of the policies towards working women, the maternity benefits of the Reich were restricted to only certain groups of women. The 1927 law did not provide coverage for “domestic servants, home workers or women working in agriculture.”30 This omission, which Usborne describes as “less an oversight than a practical compromise,” neglected a large percentage of working women, especially in agriculture.31 Women agricultural workers made up “[n]early half of all the working women in the Weimar Republic,” and “nearly 70 per cent of all married women workers.”32 Since agricultural work comprised the largest percentage of women workers, the exclusion of them from the 1927 law is striking. No matter the gains these policies made for some, particularly industrial, working women and their children, the majority of working women did not receive these benefits. As such, the Reich policies could not have possibly been very effective in changing women’s procreation, as a vast number were not given the benefits.33 Additionally, the 1927 law did not even reach all industrial workers, since the benefits only applied to full-time workers.34 Even when the Weimar Republic attempted to extend the maternity benefits beyond the Washington Convention for women workers, it fell short of providing for a large portion of German working women.

Beyond the problems the Reich policies had with providing benefits for the majority of German women, the policies also proved to be insufficient at vastly changing maternal health. After WWI, the government established ante-natal clinics in an attempt to combat the “persistently high levels of maternal morbidity and mortality or, more importantly, the perceived connection between maternal health and the survival chances of babies.”35 While there were well-functioning clinics in Berlin, such clinics did not arise in the rest of Germany, largely because ante- and post-natal care did not receive as much governmental support as infant care.

30 Ibid., 49.
31 Usborne explained that the compromise was formed because “middle-class Germany housewives who sought to protect their own economic interests against domestic servants’ unions, had foiled several attempts to extend labour protection to domestic workers. Home workers [including agricultural workers] were notoriously difficult to protect by law because of the unofficial nature of their work.” Ibid.
33 Usborne, to some extent, excused these failures by explained that “most other European countries lagged behind Germany’s maternal welfare programme.” Usborne, Politics of the Body, 50.
35 Usborne, Politics of the Body, 51.
leaving maternal medical care reasonably neglected. Functionally, this meant that “the majority of working-class expectant mothers either received no medical attention or, if they were insured, faced long journeys to an overcrowded surgery.”36 Furthermore, ante-natal clinics did not always provide working-class women with practical advice. Clinics encouraged pregnant women “to adopt a healthy life-style for the sake of the future generation, to practice meticulous physical and moral hygiene, to follow a strict diet, to consult an ante-natal clinic as soon as they suspected pregnancy, to arrange for delivery and to prepare a layette.”37 For working-class women, the personal attention to health suggested by the clinics was not feasible for their lifestyles, in which women potentially worked twelve hour days only to return home to care for their households and families.38 As a result, the medical aid provided to women did not dramatically change the lives of working women; even when women were treated by ante-natal clinics, they were largely unable to make the recommended healthy changes to their lives for the duration of their pregnancies. The benefits introduced in the Weimar Republic, therefore, did not make a significant difference in the health of pregnant, working women, which would not lead to more live births, as the policies intended.

The trouble working women had with receiving medical treatment and maternity benefits, and thus the effectiveness of the Weimar policies, can be examined through studying the accounts of women of that time. One such example is the personal account of a textile worker’s workday and weekend, part of a 1928 study by the Textile Workers’ Union on female employee’s attitudes.39 An unnamed woman described a workday that, with travel, lasted twelve hours in addition to taking care of her family and household. During breaks from standing for her nine and a half hour shift, she mended laundry. When she returned home at 9 pm, she had to tend to the household wash and prepare a meal. She stated outright the difficulty of working and maintaining a home: “My view is that if a housewife and mother could be at home, then the household and children would be better server….As far as I’m concerned, the work at home would be enough.”40 In another essay, a woman detailed the difficulty of caring for her young
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37 Usborne, Politics of the Body, 59.
38 An example of this is shown in “My Workday, My Weekend,” The Weimar Republic Sourcebook, eds. Anton Kaes, Martin Jay, and Edward Dimendberg (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994), 208-10.
40 Mein Arbeitstag, Mein Wochenende. 150 Berichte von Texilarbeiterinnen, ed. Deutscher Textilarbeiterverband (Berlin: Textilpraxis Verlag, 1930), 187-189, quoted in The Weimar Republic Sourcebook, 208. It has been
children before and after the work day, and how exhausted the workday made her, particularly because she was pregnant. Furthermore, she described the emotional toll of working and caring for a household: “Often I sit there and howl like a child, for no reason; I’m so tired, my nerves just go.”41 Lastly, she wrote of how she could not afford extra help, stating, “A cleaning lady is too expensive for me, for the 25 marks average earnings a week 1.50 marks already goes for transportation, 6 marks for childcare, and what it otherwise costs for you to be out of the house all day.”42 Both these sources depicted the day-to-day difficulties of working mothers, which largely correlates to the failures of the Weimar Republic’s maternal policies. Industrial female workers, physically and emotionally exhausted from their workday and household duties, could not easily change their lifestyles for healthier pregnancies, and with a budget that just covered the cost of sustenance, missing extended periods of time for work was not possible. Working-class women, therefore, were largely untouched by the Weimar family policies.

Another example of how working women were unable to fulfill the goals of the Weimar maternal policies comes from an essay about an abortion case.43 In it, Else Kienle described how, “Eighty percent of all patients who go to a doctor to have their pregnancy terminated are women who have already had several children.”44 She explained the type of family situation that would cause a mother to have an abortion: “Where four people sleep in the same bed and experience it as a rare event when together they can afford thirty cents for a bit of ham—in such conditions a fifth being simply has no right to exist. Hunger and love have been and remain the primal drives of human beings, and love is quite likely the only diversion a family of workers can afford.”45 Her example can be considered from the view of a working family, as she alluded to the family

41 “My Workday, My Weekend,” 209.
42 Ibid.
of four having working parents. As she described, poor families who barely supported themselves could not afford to bring another child into the world. The maternity benefits of the Reich did not adequately address this obstacle in boosting procreation. Though the Weimar government granted tax benefits for having children to state employed individuals, the programs for working-class mothers were based largely on welfare and financial relief specifically for pregnancy, not necessarily motherhood. While the tax benefits were needed by some of the poorer state workers, the lack of them for working-class people demonstrated another exclusion within the Weimar maternal policy. Families such as the one Kienle described, therefore, would not have been sufficiently supported through the Reich’s programs, and as a result, would not have had the addition of children the government hoped for.

In reaction to the population crisis after the First World War, the Weimar Republic passed family policies to increase the birth rate largely through welfare programs. These policies included some tax benefits and additional maternity welfare benefits to combat the high infant mortality rate. While these programs were groundbreaking in advancing women’s welfare, they did not significantly affect working-class women. Some policies did not include all types of working women, while others were not feasible for the daily lives of working-class women. Overall, the holes in these policies created welfare programs that did little for working-class women of the Weimar Republic. As a result, these women were not able to significantly increase the population, or even decrease infant mortality, thus demonstrating a failure in the Weimar policies.
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