Archive

A Journal of Undergraduate History

Volume 10, May 2007

Director's Notes

This year marks the tenth anniversary of *Archive*, and judging by the number of submissions we received this past February, the journal will continue to be successful in the years to come. In addition to showcasing the variety of undergraduate historical work at UW-Madison – Rengyee Lee's paper on the Secret War in Laos, Trevor Leverson's 'Soviet' Cinema, and Claire Allen's paper about early Christian attitudes toward war – this volume of *Archive* includes an excerpt from a senior thesis (Trevor Leverson's work on the Byzantine 'Holy Man') and two very local pieces: Aaron Groth's environmental history of Madison's Picnic Point, and Tommy Greenfield's analysis of UW's own Charles Van Hise.

The *Archive* editorial board members deserve recognition for doing an amazing job reading, talking about, and editing this year's submissions. Their insight was helpful and greatly appreciated. More thanks go to our advisor Professor Laird Boswell and History Department Chair David McDonald for securing additional funding, and to Liz Preston, the History Department's undergraduate advisor, for enthusiastically supporting *Archive*. I would also like to thank Eli Persky, president of the UW chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, for answering all the questions I had for him this semester. Of course, *Archive* would not be possible if not for the funding from the Associated Students of Madison and the great work of the staff at DoIt Digital Publishing & Printing. Finally, I would like to personally thank my family, friends, and especially my roommate Deanna for being there for me during this sometimes difficult semester and throughout my years in Madison.

Emily Young
Madison, Wisconsin
April 19, 2007

About *Archive*

In 1997, the UW-Madison chapter of Phi Alpha Theta, with the support of the UW-Madison History Department, created *Archive: A Journal of Undergraduate History*. Thus far, Phi Alpha Theta has sponsored the publication of ten volumes of the journal. Students wishing to work on *Archive*'s staff are not required to be a history major or a member of Phi Alpha Theta. Members of the staff work together to select papers, publicize the journal, and edit the chosen submissions. *Archive* will accept papers for next year's volume until February 14, 2008. Requirements and submission forms can be found at http://uwho.rso.wisc.edu/archive.shtml.

About Phi Alpha Theta and the Undergraduate History Association (UW-Madison)

The UW-Madison chapter of Phi Alpha Theta and the Undergraduate History Association function as one group. Together, they provide student representatives to the History Department's Undergraduate Council, hold regular meetings on historical topics, and publish *Archive*. Information about the group can be found at http://uwho.rso.wisc.edu.

About the Contributors

Claire Allen is a junior majoring in Anthropology and History and obtaining a certificate in Religious Studies. She wrote "Defining 'the Camp of Light and the Camp of Darkness:' Early Christian Attitudes Toward War" for Professor Paul Stephenson's seminar on Holy War. After graduation, Claire plans to pursue either South Asian Studies or Law, or perhaps both.

Tommy Greenfield wrote "Our Charles R.: Progressivist, Procorporatist, Conservationist" for Professor John Cooper's U.S. 1877-1914 course in the fall of 2006. He currently works for First Rockford Group, Inc., and plans to graduate in fall 2007.

Aaron Asa Pierce Groth wrote "Picnic Point: An Environmental History" while a history major at UW-Madison. Originally written for Professor Cronon in Fall 2004, Aaron continued his research while interning with the Lakeshore Nature Preserve for a seminar with Professor Cal DeWitt in Spring 2006. Aaron graduated in May 2006. Aaron is now an Environmental Peace Corps Volunteer in northern Peru. He hopes to continue graduate studies in environmental history and historical geography.

Rengyee Lee is a senior majoring in History, Political Science, and Neurobiology with a certificate in East Asian Studies. He wrote "Lessons from the Secret War: Guerrillas, Bombs, and the CIA" for Professor Alfred McCoy's "CIA Covert Warfare & US Foreign Policy" spring 2005 inaugural seminar. After graduation, he plans to pursue a Ph.D. in Political Science.

Trevor Leverson is a senior majoring in honors history and economics. He submitted "The Rise of 'Soviet' Cinema" to Professor Francine Hirsch as the term paper for an Advanced History Seminar on, surprisingly enough, Soviet Cinema (Spring 2004). His thesis, "The Economic Impact of the 'Holy Man' in Byzantium 300-600 CE" was submitted to Professor Paul Stephenson during the spring of 2006. After graduation he plans to teach high school for a year and then to go to law school.

The Rise of 'Soviet' Cinema

Trevor C. Leverson

In the early 1920's the feature film not only presented the Communist Party with a new weapon for propaganda, but also a challenge for its effective use. The Communist Party saw film as so important that it consolidated the industry after the 13th Party Congress into *Sovkino*, a government run film company that funded Soviet films. *Narkompros*[1] and its minister, Anatoli Lunacharsky, addressed the problem by laying down guidelines for film that might achieve 'socialist' propagandist ends. But in reality these prescriptions left a lot of room for interpretation.

This gave rise to an experimental period in Soviet film. From 1922 on, the writings and cinematic works of intellectual-filmmakers, and especially those of Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov, greatly influenced Soviet cinema's direction. Ultimately, however, these directors and their films did not accomplish the goals set forth by the party line: the main one being to make the public more accepting of Communist doctrine. By the 1930's, when the Party had observed the effects of these films on audiences, Eisenstein and Vertov received heavy criticism for their artistic cinematography and were derogatorily labeled as formalists. Communist Party officials were unfamiliar with film in the early 1920's, and they viewed popular Soviet films as a necessity for the propagation of Communism. More than anything else, the experimental films of Eisenstein and Vertov showed the Party by the 1930's that its filmic propaganda could accomplish the Party's propagandist objectives more fully if its construction did not hinge on intellectual theories and techniques.

In the 1920's the Russian people did not accept Communism with open arms. Rather, Lenin recognized that his Party needed to 'educate' the Russian population, transforming it into something more malleable to the Party cause. By this time, Lenin had an idea as to what the Party needed for its propaganda to succeed in this mission, as his 1902 book *What is to Be Done?* demonstrated. Lenin provided Soviet propagandists with very clear examples of how such materials could be created:

> In the making of propaganda one should look for a glaring and widely known fact to audience, say, the death of an unemployed worker's family from starvation, the growth of impoverishment, etc., and utilizing this fact, known to all, will direct his efforts to presenting a single idea to the 'masses;' he will strive to rouse discontent and indignation among the masses against this crying injustice, leaving a more complete explanation…[2]

---

[1] In English *Narkompros* translates to the Commissariat of Education, but in reality it was a governmental organ that controlled media and propaganda.
[2] Vladimir Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" Found in: *The Lenin Anthology,* (New York: 1975 W.W. Norton & Co.), 16-17.

As his conversations and writings in 1920 and 1922 illustrate, Lenin attempted to ascertain how the Party could effectively use the feature film for propaganda – as the feature film was a new medium at the time. It seems clear from these writings that even Lenin was not quite sure of what he could expect from the nascent technology. In his 1922 "Directive on Cinema Affairs" - written to *Narkompros* and Anatoli Lunacharsky, its minister - Lenin seemed uncharacteristically unsure of himself:

> To be safe films of a propagandist and educational character should be tried out on old Marxists and literary men, so that we do not repeat the sad mistakes that have occurred several times in the past, when propaganda achieves the opposite effect to that intended.[3]

Similarly, in a 1922 conversation he had with Lunacharsky, Lenin seemed optimistic, though not quite certain of film's possibilities. As Lunacharsky recalled, "he had an inner conviction of the great profitability of the whole thing if only it could be put on the right foot."[4] Lenin knew what film could accomplish, but at the same time his unfamiliarity with the medium prevented him from grasping exactly how to attain these goals successfully.

Lenin was not the only one. Other leading Party members had similar problems in that they understood that propaganda was meant to sell socialism to the people exposed to it, but they too did not necessarily know how to provide such results. Lev Trotsky, at this point he was still a leading member of the Communist Party as the Commissar of Military and Naval Affairs, expressed his feelings very clearly in a 1923 *Pravda* article, "Vodka, the Church and the Cinema":

> The fact that we have so far, i.e. in nearly six years, not taken possession of the cinema shows how slow and uneducated we are, not to say, frankly, stupid. This weapon, which cries out to be used, is the best instrument for propaganda… a propaganda which is accessible to everyone, cuts into the memory and may be a possible source of revenue.[5]

In 1923 Nikolai Bukharin voiced similar views in *Communism and Education*: "cinema must be a weapon for the organization of the masses around the task of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat and socialist construction, and a means of agitation for the current slogans of the Party."[6] By 1923 it was clear that leading Communist Party officials had a concrete objective for filmic propaganda: they wanted it to be a weapon. But, as their limited amount of elaboration on the matter demonstrated, they were uncertain about how to accomplish this.

These kinds of assertions by Trotsky, Bukharin, and others spurred enough discussion that cinema, and its use as a 'weapon,' became a hot topic at the 13th Party Congress in 1924. The

---

[3] Vladimir Lenin, "Directive on Cinema Affairs," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 57.

[4] Anatoli Lunacharsky, "Conversation with Lenin. I. Of All the Arts," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 57.

[5] Lev Trotsky, "Vodka, the Church and Cinema," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 96.

[6] Nikolai Bukharin, *Communism and Education*, Found at http://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/ works/1920/abc/10.htm, Accessed on 11 May 2005.

resolutions of the 13th Party Congress in May 1924 illustrated the Communist Party's objective for propaganda film:

> The cinema, 'the most important of all the arts', can and must play a large role in the cultural revolution as a medium for broad educational work and communist propaganda… The cinema, like every art, cannot be apolitical. The cinema must be a *weapon* of the proletariat in its struggle for hegemony… 'it should be in the hands of the Party, the most powerful medium of communist enlightenment and agitation.'[7]

The Congress declared a monopoly over film production and distribution, and liquidated private film firms on the pretense that "these measures will lead to the elimination of the clashes and conflicts which have seriously delayed and disrupted work and will make possible the rational use of resources."[8] Three months later in a "Decree on the Establishment of *Sovkino*," *Sovnarkom* established *Sovkino*[9], which represented the first real Soviet monopoly over film production and distribution. The capital that *Sovkino*, now representative of the whole film industry, gained from private companies provided Soviet film directors with the necessary equipment and people for their films.

Even with a vehicle to produce film, proper Soviet filmmaking, an integral issue to the Soviet film problem, was left virtually unaddressed by the Congress. This responsibility fell to Lunacharsky and *Narkompros*. As expounded by *Sovnarkom's* aforementioned decree:

> The ideological guidance of the cinema industry is entrusted to *Narkompros*, and it is suggested that the forthcoming conference of the *Narkompros* of the Autonomous Republics should define the forms of ideological guidance for each Republic separately, together with the ways of unifying ideological guidance throughout the whole territory of the Federation.[10]

For this purpose Lunacharsky prepared "Revolutionary Ideology and Cinema - Theses." The interesting aspect of his initial theses is that he based his ideas for a Soviet film aesthetic on Western cinematography, which really hints at the fact he did not know what would make for effective Soviet propaganda:

> [In some ways] …we must imitate the bourgeoisie: we must wherever possible avoid tendentious films --- that is, large-scale films in which a didactic theme is

---

[7] "Resolution of the Thirteenth Party Congress on Cinema," in *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 111.

[8] Ibid.

[9] *Sovkino* translates into English as "Soviet Film."

[10] *Sovnarkom*, "Decree on the Establishment of *Sovkino*," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 114.

unraveled rather obviously. Our films must be just as attractive… as bourgeois films.[11]

He followed this statement up by maintaining that films "should develop the knowledge of the masses."[12] These two statements are confusing because they of their inherent contradiction: if he wanted Soviet propaganda then he did not want films that were "tendentious." He also provided no guidelines for the creation of *attractive* cinema. In fact, at no point during the entire article does he really provide any concrete 'rules' for the formation of *sovkino*. At this moment, Lunacharsky had really only made an open-ended set of guidelines – bear in mind that this was meant to be the most important foundational documents in formation of a Soviet style of cinematography. Finally, it was clear that Lunacharsky did not want to be held accountable for Soviet propaganda's potential failure. He revealed his insecurities in the last line of his theses: "A GENERAL REMARK: It is obvious that these ideas are not put forth as basic directions that we should follow."[13]

The high demand for Soviet films, but very few constraints with regards to film aesthetic, essentially shifted the problem of 'how to create Soviet film' from governmental organs to the Soviet filmmakers of the 1920's. This, combined with the creation of *Sovkino*, afforded film directors of the Soviet Union a chance not only to theorize about proper Soviet film methods, but also test their styles in their own government-funded feature film productions. In this environment that *did not* criticize experimentation, Eisenstein and Vertov made their own set of rules for Soviet cinema and film theory.

Sergei Eisenstein very explicitly submitted his art form in the name of the Soviet Revolution. As he asserted in his autobiography: "The Revolution gave me the most precious thing in life - it made an artist out of me… The Revolution introduced me to art, and art, in its own turn, brought me to the Revolution."[14] Eisenstein's Soviet film technique focused on the use of the montage and natural human reflexes to intellectual stimulants. He clearly understood that the lack of a Soviet film form or technique stemmed from the fact that up until 1924 very few films had been made with the intention of being 'socialist.' He used a quotation from the memoirs of Carlos Goldoni, an innovative 17th century Italian playwright, to begin his discussion of Soviet cinema in his book *Film Form*: "In every art and every discovery *experience* has always preceded the precepts. In the course of time, a method has always been assigned to the practice of [its] invention."[15] Eisenstein believed in this adage: from 1924-1927 he was among the most active Soviet directors, making three full length feature films, *Strike*, *The Battleship Potemkin*, and *October*, all with *Sovkino* funding.[16]

---

[11] Anatoli Lunacharsky, "Revolutionary Ideology and Cinema – Theses," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 114.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Sergei Eisenstein, quoted from "Relative and Silent Genius," Found at http://www.redflag.org.uk/frontline/eleven/11eisenstein.html, Accessed on 4 May 2005.

[15] *Memoirs of Goldini*, tr. John Black, (New York: 1926 Knopf Publishing), Found in: Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form*, ed. tr. Jay Leyda, (New York: 1949 Harvest Book), 72.

[16] James Goodwin, "Eisenstein Filmology," Found on: http://www.carleton.edu/curricular/MEDA/ classes/media110/Severson/filmog.htm, Accessed on 4 May 2005.

In a lecture, later printed as a manifesto in *Kino*[17], on "The Method of Making Workers' Films," Eisenstein spelled out the components he deemed necessary for the making of Soviet films:

> There is one *method* for making *any* film: [the] montage of attractions. [There must be a] specific purpose for the work - a socially useful emotional and psychological affect on the audience; this to be composed of a chain of suitably directed stimulants… a focusing of reflexes on struggle.[18]

According to Eisenstein, Soviet filmmakers needed to take into account who their audience was in order to deliver meaningful messages about any subject – i.e. considerations about things like class status, occupation, or sex:

> [There must be] A choice of the stimulants. In making a correct appraisal of the class inevitability of their nature, certain stimulants are capable of evoking a certain reaction only among spectators of a certain class.[19]

For example, the slaughterhouse scene in his 1924 feature film *Strike* employed an intellectual montage sequence that cut between shots of factory workers being killed by bourgeois factory goons and graphic footage of a bull being slaughtered: a montage that intended to evoke anger towards bourgeois factory owners. According to Eisenstein, the effect of the *Strike* slaughterhouse scene would be lost on slaughter-house workers or peasants who kill their own cattle because they are "accustomed to the slaughter of cattle."[20] Eisenstein's Soviet cinema technique stressed the use of the montage as a medium for propaganda. As he taught at his GTK Teaching and Research Workshop:

> *ideological expressiveness*, [is] concerned with the problem of transition of film language and cinema figurativeness to the cinematic *materialization of ideas*, i.e. with the problems of the direct translation of an ideological thesis into a chain of visual stimulants.[21]

He expected that his films would elevate the intellectual level of those who watched them. As he asserted in "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form," this happens by means of "an unheard-of form of cinema which inculcates the Revolution into the general history of culture, creating a synthesis of science, art and militant class consciousness."[22] His technique centered on film's ability to engineer

---

[17] *Kino* literally translates as "film," but in this sense it was a regular publication about Soviet film filled with reviews and articles.
[18] Sergei Eisenstein, "The Method of Making Worker's Films," Found in: *Film Essays and a Lecture,* ed. Jay Leyda (Princeton, NJ: 1982 Princeton Univ. Press), 65.
[19] Ibid, 66.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Sergei Eisenstein, "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form," Found in: *Film Form*, (New York: 1948 A Harvest Book), 60.
[22] Sergei Eisenstein, "The Fourth Dimension in Cinema," Found in: *S.M. Eisenstein: Writings, 1922-34,* (Indianapolis: 1988 Indiana Univ. Press), 194.

intense intellectual reactions from audiences, which, in turn, would leave people with an ideological slant pre-determined by the director.

Eisenstein's film technique relied too heavily on an audience's ability to understand his "materialization of ideas." In *Strike*, Eisenstein cut shots of animals together with bourgeois spies in an attempt to suggest that these people were somehow less than human. Eisenstein mentioned this scene in his article, "The Dramaturgy of Form," "What is animal becomes human and what is human becomes animal."[23] This effect, not easily graspable by modern day audiences, probably was even less accessible to Russian workers in 1924, which significantly diminished the ideological message of the sequence and thus failed to accomplish its objectives of agitation. One of Eisenstein's particularly well-documented film failures was his 1927 artistic recreation of the October Revolution, *October*. This film was inaccessible to its audiences – to the point that it bored them. As T. Rokotov put forth a 1928 film review, "Why is *October* Difficult?":

> Some supporters of *October* maintain that, in terms of its formal methods, the film is made in a manner that is quite accessible and intelligible to the mass audience… let me add this piquant detail… The Cultural Section of the Leningrad Regional Trades Union Council has introduced at [some of its] screenings a system of carefully monitoring audience reactions while the film is being shown. The dry statistics record in the minutes: 'During the fourth and fifth reels [of October] there was a loud sound of snoring in the front rows on the left.'[24]

Eisenstein was too artistic for his own good. It his film techniques hid his ideological messages - sometimes to a very large extent. The Soviet film aesthetics of Eisenstein's experimental films in the 1920's were not accessible to the masses, and Soviet film critics readily observed this fact.

Dziga Vertov also propounded his own Soviet film techniques. The key for Vertov was in the way that film was shot. From 1924 onward, he developed a technique he called *kino*-eye which meant for the cinematographer to assimilate his eye with cinematograph, essentially becoming one with the camera. This would result in the creation of film-truth, *kinopravda*. For Vertov, this method caught life unaware so as to capture truth. As he put forth in a 1924 article "The Birth of *Kino*-Eye":

> Not [using] *kino*-eye for its own sake, but truth through the means and possibilities of film-eye, not filming life unawares for the sake of the unaware, but in order to show people without masks, without makeup, to catch them through the eye of the camera in a moment when they are not acting, to read their thoughts, laid bare by the camera. *Kino*-eye has the possibility of making the invisible visible, the unclear clear, the hidden manifest, the disguised uncovered, the acted nonacted; making falsehood into the truth.[25]

---

[23] Sergei Eisenstein, "The Dramaturgy of Film Form," Found in: *Eisenstein: Writings, 1922-34,* ed. Richard Taylor (Indianapolis: 1988 Indian Univ. Press), 164.

[24] T. Rokotov, "Why is *October* Difficult?" Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 219.

[25] Dziga Vertov, "The Birth of Kino-Eye," Found in: *Kino-Eye The Writings of Dziga Vertov*," ed. Annette Michelson, tr. Kevin O' Brien, (Los Angeles: 1984 University of California Press), 41.

These 'life as it is' shots, as he often called them, would then be connected by means of the Kuleshov effect, which simply entails the editing of shots in such a way that they appear related to each other in front of an audience, in order to achieve complex associations and ideological implications.[26] The rejection of plots represented a key aspect to Vertov's 'life as it is,' *kinopravda*, approach to cinematography. As he put forth in his 1926 *Pravda* (Truth) article "The Factory of Facts," he considered pre-arranged plots to be "contrivances," and a fabrication of film truth. [27] Vertov used his theory in his 1929 film, *The Man with the Movie Camera*. He laced clear ideological messages throughout this movie, using only 'film truth.' In one good example, Vertov recorded some well-dressed 'bourgeois' ladies arriving at their apartment in a carriage, which passed several barefooted bums. The women handed off their heavy shopping bags and suitcases to a shabbily dressed maid who obediently took the luggage upstairs. The 'worker' lady was so preoccupied with lifting and carrying her burden that she hardly even noticed the camera; this took place as the elegant ladies flirted with the cameraman, Vertov, and then disdainfully dismissed him. Through these bits of *kinopravda* Vertov is making a poignant statement about class relationships: that one class is clearly being dominated (or at least looked down upon) by another. Short clips like this makeup the entire film. Vertov's Soviet aesthetic clearly lay in illuminating the superior nature of socialism through 'film truth.'

Vertov's works during this period of experimentation encountered a storm of criticism. Viktor Shklovsky, a prominent writer of the time and a Soviet film critic, did not directly attack any of Vertov's films in his 1926 article, "Where is Dziga Vertov Striding?", but the director's film theory itself:

> Dziga Vertov cuts up newsreel. In this sense his work is not artistically progressive.
> In essence he is behaving like those of our directors whose graves will be decorated
> with monuments, who cut up newsreels in order to use bits in their own films.
> These directors are turning our film libraries into piles of broken film.[28]

Shklovsky directly attacked the style of filming that typified Vertov's movies like his 1929 production *The Man with the Movie Camera*. He went on to write, "A montage of everyday life? Life caught unawares. Not material of world importance. But I think that the newsreel material is, in Vertov's treatment, deprived of its soul – its documentary quality."[29] This critique brings to light an important failing of Vertov's film experiments: his style of shooting diminishes the informational value of his newsreel approach. His movies simply project 'film truth' in front of an audience under the assumption that the message would get across. Even other formalists noticed that this experimental style did not get the job done. As Osip Brik, a co-founder of LEF (a magazine that discussed Leftist Art in the 20's and 30's), stated in 1927:

---

[26] Dziga Vertov, "On the Significance of Nonacted Cinema," Found in: *Kino-Eye The Writings of Dziga Vertov*," ed. Annette Michelson, tr. Kevin O' Brien, (Los Angeles: 1984 University of California Press), 36.
[27] Dziga Vertov, "The Factory of Facts," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 151.
[28] Ibid, 152.
[29] Ibid, 151.

> There is of course even now a sizeable group of people who maintain their right to treat real facts in an artistic manner. The main argument put forward by these people consists in the point that the sum total of facts cannot in itself produce a synthetic whole, that the creative will of the artist is required to join these facts into a unified work… This is a mistake... Nowadays the situation has decisively altered. [The viewer] is not as interested in the artistry of the work as in its high quality… this high quality is determined by the degree of authenticity with which material is communicated.[30]

Brik's assessment of Vertov's *The Man With the Movie Camera* would be most disapproving. In kino-eye fashion, Vertov produced his 1926 film, *A Sixth Part of the World*, as a sum of facts. At almost no point does this film provide its viewer with informational titles, dates, or locations which would assist with the explanation of a point or an argument. Instead, it is more of an artistic compilation of newsreelesque shots of 'a place' and 'some people.' Shklovsky, in another 1926 article, "The *Kino*-Eyes and Intertitles," specifically criticized this film:

> A most interesting thing occurred in Vertov's latest work *A Sixth Part of the World*. First and foremost the factual frame has disappeared and the staged frame appeared. They seemed to be geographically insecure and enfeebled beside their juxtaposition… it is filmed as a curiosity, an anecdote, and not as fact. The objective has lost its substance and become transparent, like a work by symbolists.[31]

Vertov's experimental films of the 1920's were not as clear and informative as he thought they were, and as a result they were deemed ineffective by Soviet film critics.

Vertov's willingness to use special effects in his films hindered the messages of his movies as well. *The Man with the Movie Camera* contained what seemed like innumerable examples of shock-value special effects. For example, he edited a scene that showed him standing over all of Moscow (in Godzilla-like fashion) with his cinematograph. Another showed his equipment coming to life and walking around, using Vertov's tripod as a set of legs. In 1929, Comrade Kirshon, the head of RAPP,[32] specifically cited *The Man with the Movie Camera* in his "Resolution on Cinema":

> The concept of revolutionary cinema has sometimes been identified with the concept of 'left' cinema and this has given Formalists the chance to camouflage themselves as 'revolutionaries' and declare 'revolutionary nay formal

---

[30] Osip Brik, "The Fixation of Fact," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 184.

[31] Victor Shklovsky, "The Cine-Eyes and Intertitles," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 219.

[32] The Russian Association for Proletarian Writers: a group of writers that worked in conjunction with the new ideological guider of Soviet film the ARRK.

experiments, even those devoid of any social content (Dziga Vertov's *The Man With the Movie Camera*).[33]

Audiences may have enjoyed shocking special effects, like those in *The Man With the Movie Camera*, but at the same time, these effects hindered the propagandist messages of his films from having a larger effect.

The Party learned from the experimental films of Eisenstein and Vertov, and in the late 1920's and early 30's it began rejecting their work in order to construct a more simplistic Soviet film aesthetic: one based on entertainment and accessibility, and as opposed to film form. As the Party Cinema Conference Resolution: "The Results of Cinema Construction in the USSR and the Tasks of Soviet Cinema" maintained in 1928:

> The socio-political tasks are by no means adequately realized by Soviet cinema. Cinema is quite inadequately fulfilling its role in the political education and cultural improvement of the masses, in organizing them around the tasks set by the Party and, to a significant degree, it betrays the pressure on it from petty bourgeois philistine tastes and attitudes.[34]

The Party, after seeing audiences fall asleep at *October*, and after only being able to guess at the ideological messages of *A Man With the Movie Camera*, knew one thing for certain - as was included in the Resolution - "The main criterion for evaluating the formal and artistic qualities of films is the *requirement* that cinema furnish a form that is intelligible to millions."[35]

The government sponsored Soviet films of the 1930's were a direct response to the formalism that prevailed in earlier works by men like Eisenstein and Vertov. The year 1929 marked the end of *Narkompros*. Its replacement, the Association of Workers of Revolutionary Cinematography (ARRK), was much harsher on the use of experimental techniques in Soviet cinema. The 1929 RAPP article "Resolution on Cinema," as was the trend at this time, criticized the older school of Soviet film aesthetics, labeling directors like Vertov and Eisenstein "formalists":

> However, it was in an unsatisfactory condition before the Party Conference [on Cinema in 1928] and it has not changed for better even now. Operating superficially with Marxist phraseology, it is basically alien to Marxism and, being thoroughly eclectic, it bears the stamp of Formalism, vulgar simplification, [and] subjectivity…[36]

New directors emerged, who advocated a different Soviet film form that was based on the party line objective for more intelligible propaganda. Pavel Petrov-Bytov was one of the leading anti-formalism advocates. As he expressed in his 1929 article, "We have no Soviet Cinema":

---

[33] RAPP, "Resolution on Cinema," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 275.

[34] Ibid, 210.

[35] Ibid, 212.

[36] RAPP, "Resolution on Cinema," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 278.

> The public-spirited artist who works on the masses and leads them must… spend a couple of years in the worker's 'school of life' and two years in the peasant's, or he must come from this milleu. No books can take the practice of this… you have to talk to [the masses] in their native language and not in the language of the Formalists… *We have no workers' and peasants' cinema.*[37]

The Soviet film aesthetic that formed in the 1930's focused on eliminating the two main failings of Eisenstein's and Vertov's films: Soviet films needed a definite political line (i.e. not tendentious in nature), and also they needed to be intelligible – or accessible – to the Russian population.

The Vasiliev brothers', Sergei and Georgi, 1934 production, *Chapayev*, provided a good example of how filmmakers reacted to the formation of a concrete Soviet film style. Their movie, which depicted the Russian Civil War, employed very simple cinematography in order to follow a straightforward plot in which the hero, Chapayev, galvanized his troops against the White army through courage and discipline.   Boris Shumatsky, the head of *Soiuzkino* (the production company that replaced *Sovkino* as the overseer of all film production and distribution in 1930)[38], hailed *Chapayev* for its simplicity in his 1935 article entitled "A Cinema for the Millions":

> In 1934 the best film produced by Soviet cinema in the whole period of its existence was released: *Chapayev* as a film represented the real summit of Soviet film art. The film is distinguished by its *exceptional* simplicity. This simplicity, which is a characteristic only of high art, is so organic to *Chapayev*, it constitutes a striking contrast to every Formalist device that in the first period after the film's release a number of 'critics' were unable to explain the reasons for its success to their own satisfaction.[39]

Chapayev served the Communist Party; its propagandist ideas were simple. The audience could readily see the importance of, and be affected by, the courage, the strength, and the unity displayed by Chapayev and his soldiers. It was the most popular Soviet film ever made, domestically speaking, as it sold nearly 10 million tickets per year for five years after its release.[40] Its popularity validated the persecution of formalism, and helped to prove simpler movies did in fact connect better with the masses.

Similarly, Gregory Aleksandrov's 1936 production of *Circus* provided another example of the new Soviet film style and its effective use as propaganda. Like *Chapayev*, *Circus* utilized a simple methodology of filming, one not laced with intellectual film techniques like Eisenstein's montage or Vertov's *kino*-eye. This allowed its audience to follow the plot and trends of the movie much more easily. One of the main themes, for example, stressed the accepting nature of the Soviet

---

[37] Pavel Petrov-Bytov, "We Have No Soviet Cinema," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 259.

[38] Lewis Seigalbaum, "The Shaping of Soviet's Leisure: Workers' Clubs and Palaces of Culture in the 1930's," Found at: http://www.kinokultura.com/articles/enthusiasm-cacophony.pdf, Accessed on 9 May 2005.

[39] Boris Shumyatsky, "A Cinema for the Millions," Found in: *The Film Factory,* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie (New York: 1994 Routledge), 358.

[40] Peter Kenez, *Cinema and Soviet Society*, (New York: 2001 I.B. Tauris), 155.

citizens. This portrayal contrasted sharply with a German circus ringleader who continually manipulated an American woman, one of the main characters, by telling her that she would not be accepted by society because of her black son. The idea of acceptance and equality also allowed for a comparison between Russia and the United States (the opening scene shows the wife running away from an angry mob on account of her black son). The final scene, in which the toddler is passed around by the Russian crowd at the circus, emphasized the progressive nature of the Soviet Union, its people, and Stalin's 1936 Constitution in comparison to those of other countries like the U.S. or Germany, which evoked nationalistic pride.

The fact that this film was a comedy also served the Soviet Union. This film came out during the beginnings of the Purges, a time of misery and danger for anyone in the Soviet Union, a time in which the Soviet population watched comedies to escape the harsh realities of its contemporary situation. The simple, funny plot of this movie allowed mass audiences to enjoy it, while at the same time it exposed them to easily discernible ideological messages.

Soviet film in the 1920's had a well-defined political objective (to convert the Russian public to communism), but no plan for the construction of popular films. High-ranking Communist officials continually demanded more effective Soviet propaganda films, but their unfamiliarity with the technology prevented them from doing anything more than laying down open-ended guidelines. *Sovkino* gave Eisenstein and Vertov a chance to control the development of a Soviet film theory, an opportunity of which they took full advantage. But in the end the Soviet population could not understand the movies produced during this time, nor the ideological messages delivered via methods like the montage and *kino*-eye. The public's difficulty in understanding the complex films and theories of men like Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov showed the Communist Party that simpler films connected better with the people. By the 1930's the Party had become more familiar with film and its audience, and it abandoned theoretical techniques in favor of something that worked better.

Bibliography

Brik, Osip. "The Fixation of Fact." Found in: *The Film Factory*. ed. Richard Taylor and Ian
        Christie. New York: Routledge.

Bukharin, Nikolai. *Communism and Education*. Found at
        http://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/ works/1920/abc/10.htm, Accessed on 11 May
        2005.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form." Found in: *Film Form*. New York: 1948
        A Harvest Book.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "Relative and Silent Genius." Found at
        http://www.redflag.org.uk/frontline/eleven/11eisenstein.html. Accessed on 4 May 2005.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "The Method of Making Worker's Films." Found in: *Film Essays and a
        Lecture.* ed. Jay Leyda. Princeton: 1982 Princeton Univ. Press.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "The Fourth Dimension in Cinema." Found in: *S.M. Eisenstein: Writings, 1922-
        34.* Indianapolis: 1988 Indiana Univ. Press.

Eisenstein, Sergei. "The Dramaturgy of Film Form." Found in: *Eisenstein: Writings, 1922-34.* ed.
        Richard Taylor.   Indianapolis: 1988 Indian Univ. Press.

Goodwin, James. "Eisenstein Filmology." Found on:
        http://www.carleton.edu/curricular/MEDA/classes/media110/Severson/filmog.htm.
        Accessed on 4 May 2005.

Lenin, Vladimir. "What Is to Be Done?" Found in: *The Lenin Anthology*. New York: 1975 W.W.
        Norton & Co.

Lenin, Vladimir. "Directive on Cinema Affairs." Found in: *The Film Factory*. ed. Richard Taylor
        and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Lunacharsky, Anatoli. "Conversation with Lenin. I. Of All the Arts…" Found in: *The Film
        Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Lunacharsky, Anatoli. "Revolutionary Ideology and Cinema – Theses." Found in: *The Film
        Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: 1994 Routledge.

Lunacharsky, Anatoli. "The Tasks of the State Cinema in the RSFSR." Found in: *The Film
        Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Memoirs of Goldini. tr. John Black. 1926 Knopf Publishing: New York. Found in: Sergei
      Eisenstein, *Film Form*. ed. tr. Jay Leyda. 1949 Harvest Book: New York

Petrov-Bytov, Pavel. "We Have No Soviet Cinema." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard
      Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

RAPP. "Resolution on Cinema." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian Christie.
      New York: Routledge.

"Resolution of the Thirteenth Party Congress on Cinema." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed.
      Richard Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Rokotov, T. "Why is *October* Difficult?" Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian
      Christie. New York: Routledge.

Seigalbaum, Lewis. "The Shaping of Soviet's Leisure: Workers' Clubs and Palaces of Culture in
      the 1930's." Found at: http://www.kinokultura.com/articles/enthusiasm-cacophony.pdf.
      Accessed on 9 May 2005.

Shklovsky, Victor. "The Cine-Eyes and Intertitles." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard
      Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Shumyatsky, Boris. "A Cinema for the Millions." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor
      and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Sovnarkom. "Decree on the Establishment of *Sovkino*." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard
      Taylor and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Trotsky, Lev. "Vodka, the Church and Cinema." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor
      and Ian Christie. New York: Routledge.

Vertov, Dziga. "The Birth of Kino-Eye." Found in: *Kino-Eye The Writings of Dziga Vertov*. ed.
      Annette Michelson, tr. Kevin O' Brien. Los Angeles: 1984 University of California Press.

Vertov, Dziga. "On the Significance of Nonacted Cinema." Found in: *Kino-Eye The Writings of
      Dziga Vertov*." ed. Annette Michelson. tr. Kevin O' Brien. Los Angeles: 1984 University
      of California Press.

Vertov, Dziga. "The Factory of Facts." Found in: *The Film Factory.* ed. Richard Taylor and Ian
      Christie. New York: Routledge.

Defining 'the Camp of Light and the Camp of Darkness': Early Christian Attitudes Toward War

Claire Allen

The foundational centuries of the Christian religion were marked by persistent ambiguity in both the attitudes of early Christians and the interpretation of these attitudes by modern scholarship. Frequently discussed is the nature of early Christian attitudes toward war and military service. Following the death of Christ in the first century AD, Christians—then a minority in the Roman Empire—slowly developed a corpus of ecclesiastical writings that swayed heavily toward pacifism and the peaceful teachings of the New Testament. However, these nonviolent writings are representative only of the "dominant thrust"[1] of early Christian attitudes toward war. Marginal voices, particularly from Christians employed as soldiers, argued that military service was, in fact, in the realm of biblical doctrine.

These attitudes, as well as the prevalence of pacifism, were to change under the reign of Emperor Constantine I in the fourth century AD. Prior to Constantine's ascension to power, most of the Roman Empire had recognized a pantheon of pagan deities who were believed to intercede on the behalf of legitimate rulers—a concept known as the Roman "theology of victory,"[2] through which most emperors justified their absolute power. Soon after his own rise as emperor, Constantine identified the Christian religion as the power behind his military victories. This dramatically shifted the socio-political context of Roman Christians. Their sudden rise from minority status to public eminence, combined with Constantine's new rendering of Christianity as inextricable from the state apparatus, greatly influenced their attitudes to warfare. Although some degree of ambiguity remained, the "dominant thrust" of Christian thought shifted with Constantine such that the marginal voices of the preceding centuries came to the foreground and the prevailing sentiments of the pre-Constantinian era were relegated to the background.

This "dominant thrust" of pre-Constantinian Christian war attitudes can be loosely identified as nonviolent. Within this nonviolent "thrust" were advocates against Christian participation in war, battles, or the army for a host of reasons: soldiers were forced into idolatry and pagan sacrifice; army camps exposed Christians to prostitution and gambling; the military required an oath to Caesar that violated the Christian's oath to God; the nature of battle forced Christians to kill fellow human beings.[3]

---

[1] This phrase is attributed to the discussion of Christian attitudes toward warfare in Swift, Louis J. "War and the Christian Conscience I: the Early Years," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 23.1 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 1981) 837

[2] Fears, J. Rufus. "The theology of victory at Rome: approaches and problems," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 17.2 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1981) 752

[3] Daly, "Military Service and Early Christianity: A Methodological Approach," in: *Studia Patristica XVIII, i: Historica – Theologica – Gnostica – Biblica*, ed. E Livingstone (Kalamazoo, 1985) 3, 5; Swift, "War and the Christian Conscience" 843-7

In order to understand the root of these objections, one must turn to the Bible. War and military participation in the early Christian centuries[4] were often seen as totally incompatible with the peaceful Christian doctrine and ideology of the New Testament. Taken literally, Jesus' New Testament teaching was fundamentally nonviolent,[5] and maxims from the text frequently placed peace and love at the heart of Christian theology. The Sermon on the Mount served as a classic example for many of the early Christians:

> But I tell you not to withstand him who is evil: but whoever strikes thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also: and if anyone wishes to…take away thy tunic, let him have thy cloak also: and whoever 'impresses' thee to go one mile, go two with him. Give to him that asks of thee, and from him who wishes to borrow of thee, turn not away. …I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you…[6]

Many early Christians, especially church writers, genuinely endorsed the Sermon's doctrine of "loving thy enemy" as a viable alternative to other forms of confrontation, namely war.[7] The commandment "Thou shalt not kill" and the paradigm of Jesus' life—one lacking in coercion or aggression against His nonbelievers—also added to the idea that violence was somehow antithetical to the Christian ideal. War was never explicitly prohibited in the New Testament, but countless other passages negated its efficacy in light of Jesus' teaching.[8] In the early Christian centuries it appeared that the New Testament "left little doubt in the minds of most men about the fundamental thrust of the Christian ideal"[9]—peace and brotherly love.

There was, however, the issue of the Old Testament. Even a cursory glance at this text revealed its incongruity with the successive New Testament. Fraught with violent wars sanctioned from heaven and executed by the Israelites, the Christian Old Testament and its God appeared vengeful and unrelenting against nonbelievers. *The Book of Joshua*, for example, depicted Moses' successor, Joshua, leading an army to reclaim the land of the Israelites. Joshua committed several atrocities under the direct command of God, not least of which involved slaughtering entire cities and hanging the slain from trees:

> And Joshua smote [the five kings], and slew them, and hanged them on five trees: and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening … And that day Joshua took Makkedah, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof he utterly destroyed, them, and all the souls that *were* therein; he let none remain …

---

[4] I.e., the first, second and third centuries AD

[5] Daly, Robert J. "Military Service and Early Christianity" 2

[6] *King James Bible*, as quoted in: Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War. A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982) 22

[7] Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War. A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982) 23

[8] see Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude to War* 19-31; Daly, "Military Service" 2; Swift, "War and the Christian Conscience" 838-41

[9] Swift, "War and the Christian Conscience" 840-1

Archive

> And all these kings and their land Joshua did take at one time, because the LORD
> God of Israel fought for Israel. [10]

This disparity between Testaments and their portrayals of war presented an obvious problem for early Christians with pacifist and peace-keeping sentiments. Many scholars of the period struggled with reconciling the violent and peaceful discrepancies. The corpus of one group in particular contains some of the richest evidence of this struggle and thus early Christian attitudes on war—the writings of the Church Fathers.[11]

The Church Fathers provide some of the most prolific sources for early Christian attitudes to war and military service. Although scholar Alan Kreider may be right in stating that "the theologians of the pre-Constantinian church vigorously, and with considerable unanimity, forbade killing in its many guises,"[12] this does not mean that the opinions of authors such as Tertullian, Origen or Lanctantius are interchangeable. Their writings represent a range of early Christian attitudes against participation in warfare or military service, and although they maintain a tendency of nonviolence, this tendency is the product of ambiguity within their work.

Take, for example, Tertullian, whose work is accepted as the earliest known record of baptized Christians being enlisted into the army.[13] His *Apology*, *De Idololatria*, and *De Corona* have all been used as examples of early, pre-Constantinian arguments for Christian abstention from the military or Roman public office.[14] However, upon closer inspection, only the latter two documents appear to openly lay out arguments for why Christians cannot serve in the military. *De Idololatria* states, "There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament, the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot serve two masters—God and Caesar."[15] When this is viewed beside his earlier document, *Apology*, Tertullian's opinion is not, in fact, so explicit. *Apology* condemns killing, but it also discusses war as a necessary instrument in implementing God's plan on earth,[16] and even praises the number of Christians "filling" the army bases.[17] Thus, while Tertullian can be seen as contributing to the "dominant thrust" of early Christian nonviolent attitudes, he does not present the monolithic front of pacifism with which he has been attributed. And his vacillation between partial and full condemnation of the military underscores the difficulty of discerning early Christian attitudes toward war.

Similar ambivalence has arisen in the works of Origen, another early Church Father. His most famous discourse, written in response to the pagan critic Celsus, includes both denunciations of warfare and justifications for Christian participation in it. For example, when Celsus argued that Christians' abstinence from military participation was a detriment to the empire, Origen retorted

---

[10] *The Holy Bible, King James Version*. Joshua 10:26-42; see also 6:1-27, 10:1-43

[11] "Church Fathers" may be defined as the writers and theologians of the early Christian Church (i.e., the first through fifth centuries AD). Their work was significant to the development of Christian doctrine and biblical interpretation. Stephenson, Paul, UW-Madison Lecture 3/7/2006.

[12] Kreider, Alan. "Military Service in the Church Orders," in: *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31 (2003) 424

[13] Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude*, 113

[14] see Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude*, 106-114

[15] Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, as quoted in: Daly, "Military Service and Early Christianity" 3

[16] Daly, "Military Service and Early Christianity" 3

[17] Tomlin, Roger. "Christianity and the Late Roman Army," in S.N.C. Lieu and D. Montserrat, eds., *Constantine. History, Historicity and Legend* (London and New York, 1998) 23

that, if everyone were Christian, there would be no cause for war in the first place. He continued, "[Christians] fight for the Emperor more than others do: and we…serve as soldiers *on his behalf*, training a private army of piety [which results in] the intercession [of] the deity."[18] Here Origen emphasizes the usefulness of Christians to the state as pious individuals garnering the favor of God. It is interesting that he does not denounce war more generally; rather, he depicts Christians fighting alongside pagans, with the former praying and the latter physically engaging in battle. Pacifism, in the traditional sense, is rejection of all forms of violent engagement, and it could be argued that Origen is not a true pacifist based on his words. He goes on,

> …how much more reasonable is it, that, when others are serving in the army, these Christians should do their military service…[by using their] prayers to God on behalf of those who are righteously serving as soldiers and of [the righteous Emperor], in order that all things opposed and hostile to those that act righteously may be put down?[19]

Origen, as well as other early church writers, clearly struggled with these issues of abstention from war. It was hard to deny that war was a reality of the context in which they lived, and not one, despite the intimations of the New Testament,[20] that was going to go away quickly. Thus the attitudes toward war that can be constructed from these documents seemed overridingly peaceful, but somewhat ambiguous in what they truly restricted and allowed in the military domain.

Although scant, there was some evidence of Christians serving in the army in the era prior to Constantine, despite these prevailing attitudes of nonviolence. The New Testament was the only document to indicate the presence of soldiers before the reign of Marcus Aurelius. After Aurelius' time in power, the accounts of Tertullian began to appear, as well as stories of Christian soldiers who refused to serve and were therefore martyred.[21] There were only five "solid" accounts of martyrs in the pre-Constantinian period, whose fate was the result of their refusal to comply with army religion.[22] The accounts were silent, however, on the soldiers' opinion toward killing—an interesting point in light of the Church Fathers' concern with the unchristian bloodshed of the military. It appeared that the attitude toward war among those Christians *in* war comprised beliefs against idolatry but not against manslaughter.

The pre-Constantinian Christian soldier justified his attitude toward war and his occupation in the military with biblical precedents that ran counter to the New Testament pacifism highlighted by the church writers: "…the Christian soldiers of [Tertullianus'] time justified their position, not by any public-spirited appeals to the obvious needs of society, but by … Old Testament references."[23] As discussed earlier, the Old Testament was rife with explicit battle scenes and injunctions, directly from God, to take up arms. It is interesting to note that the soldiers did not justify their continued employment with a sense of public duty for Rome. If Tertullian's observation is correct, early

---

[18] Origen, *Celsus viii.73*, as quoted in Cadoux, *The Early Christian* 135. Brackets are my own clarification, where appropriate, of Cadoux's translation.
[19] Ibid. Again, the brackets are my own clarification of Cadoux's translation.
[20] I.e., the Apocalypse as described in the Book of Revelation
[21] Swift, "War and the Christian Conscience" 860
[22] Daly, "Military Service and Early Christianity" 4
[23] Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude* 249

Christian soldiers simply saw themselves in a religiously justifiable position, validated by the militaristic portions of the Bible. In the pre-Constantine era, it is clear that this was a minority view—the majority of extant sources and church writings condemn Christian participation in the army's idolatry, paganism and bloodshed—but it served as a harbinger of the predominant Christian attitudes to come. In the early fourth century, these very soldiers helped usher in a new era of Christian interpretations of warfare, commenced by the ascension of the Emperor Constantine.

It was against this backdrop of conflicting, albeit mainly peaceful, attitudes that Constantine came to power in the early fourth century. Like many rulers before him, he used victory in battle as the justification for his ascendancy to power. In particular, his triumph over Maxentius at Milvian Bridge in 312 and then Licinius in 324 secured him sole reign over the empire.[24] What separated these feats from those of his predecessors was, of course, Constantine's religious affiliation—at the time of his defeat of Maxentius, he publicly converted to Christianity.[25] His triumphs were thereafter portrayed as the victory of Christianity over Paganism; "Constantine won the Battle of the Milvian Bridge with 'an army of Gauls which attacked the gods after previously praying to them.'"[26] The exact date and details of Constantine's conversion experience are highly contested, as is the question of his personal piety. While a discussion of details is unnecessary here, it is important to note that, even with pietism in question, the Christian community rapidly aligned themselves with their new emperor. Constantine's endorsement of Christianity greatly complicated the attitudes of that community; "just as there was a spectrum of theological positions in the Christian movement, so also was there a spectrum of opinion with regard to the proper relationship of Christianity to Rome."[27] In the preceding decades the prevailing opinions in the Christian community called for a prohibition of bloodshed and Christian abstention from the military. Now the highest military commander was conquering with Christian soldiers in his ranks and the apparent blessing of Christ. How did such a dramatic change—and acceptance of that change—take place? What were the implications for Christian attitudes to war?

Constantine's conversion not only brought Christianity to the forefront of the Roman Empire. This process also integrated Christianity into a primary feature of Roman society—the "theology of victory." This concept may be defined: "Victory as the justification and legitimization of absolute power; defeat as the proof of tyranny and falsehood; the conqueror as…clement inaugurator of a new eternal era of prosperity,"[28] all marked by the intercession of a patron deity on behalf of the conqueror. It appears that Constantine's Christianity was similarly construed: Constantine claimed to be imbued with the blessing of the Christian God so that he may bring prosperity to Rome. The shift in Christian attitudes and doctrines as a result of Constantine's claim was not so great as to call it syncretism with Roman paganism. But the way in which Christianity was endorsed by the Roman Empire as a manifestation of the theology of victory, and the way this

---

[24] Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude* xvi

[25] This conversion experience is highly contested in both primary and secondary sources. Constantine's biographer Eusebius, for example, wrote that the emperor saw a vision of the cross in the afternoon sky around the year 312; Lactantius, a Church Father, alleges that Constantine had a dream on the eve of a battle in 312 in which he put the *Chi-Ro* symbol on the shield of his soldiers, thereby fighting under the auspices of Christianity (Tomlin, "Late Roman Army" 25). Scholarly debate also revolves around Constantine's personal piety, a discussion of which will not take place here.

[26] *Epistula Constantini ad episcopos catholicos* in Optatus, as quoted in Tomlin, "Late Roman Army" 24

[27] Drake, H.A. "Constantine and Consensus," in *American Society of Church History* (1995) 3

[28] Fears, J. Rufus. "The theology of victory at Rome" 752

was interpreted by the pagan population, was very much unchanged from the state religion of the preceding centuries.[29] "In embracing [the theology of victory], Constantine … partook of the most enduring aspect of political mythology at Rome."[30] Constantine legitimized his rule and his religion via a system that resonated with the Roman populace. In one generation, the Church had evolved from a persecuted institution to a State-sanctioned one.

This new endorsement by the emperor resulted in concomitant changes in Christian doctrines and attitudes. After Constantine's ascent to power, and the inclusion of Christianity in a theology of victory that secured it to the Roman political and military complex, Christians were suddenly faced with a tension between pacifism and pragmatism. The New Testament appeal to "Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you"[31] did not engage well with Constantine's army or the *Chi-Ro* symbol that donned its armor. This had powerful implications for Christian attitudes toward war and military service. If the prevalent Christian opinion had been toward nonviolence before Constantine, there was a definite and profound shift in attitude during and after his reign. In the second and third centuries, the Christian church had been a minority structure with little, if any, political sway or duty. The fourth and fifth centuries, however, made immediate to Christians all the socio-political problems and processes of the state. Numerous Christians realized roles that were responsible for "public order and peace in the empire"—e.g., positions in government or civil service—and as a result their understanding of the role of warfare was fundamentally altered.[32]

Some of the most striking evidence of this is the Church Fathers. Many of them significantly changed their tack. Once stalwart advocates for abstention from the state military apparatus, during the reign of Constantine they penned treatises on the religious justification for war and the righteousness of the new empire. Lactantius is one such example. His *Divinae Institutiones*, written prior to 312 AD, argues against war and military service in a clearly pacifist strain, condemning the inevitable harm that results from warfare. In a subsequent document, the *Epitome* of the *Divinae Institutiones*, written after Constantine's ascent to the throne, Lactantius writes in praise of Constantine's triumph over Maxentius and commends the emperor's use of Christian symbols on the shields of soldiers.[33] "No doubt on the eve of full participation in the political life of the empire it was difficult for a Christian like Lactantius to look upon victories over persecutors with a wholly disapproving eye even though those victories involved bloodshed."[34] If an unassuming social role had encouraged Christians and their prominent authors to support nonviolence in the pre-Constantinian period, their sudden prominence under Constantine inspired a definite reduction of their standards. Constantine himself encouraged a more liberal interpretation of Christian doctrine for the sake of state harmony. He wrote,

> For we are not all of us like-minded on every subject, nor is there such as one disposition and judgment common to all alike … As far, then, as regards Divine

---

[29] Ibid
[30] Ibid
[31] *King James Bible*, as quoted in: Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War. A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982) 22
[32] Daly, "Military Service and Early Christianity" 6
[33] Swift, "War and the Christian Conscience" 857-9
[34] Ibid 860

Providence, let there be one faith, and one understanding among you, one united judgment in reference to God. But as to your subtle disputations of questions of little or no significance, though you may be unable to harmonize in sentiment, such differences should be consigned to the secret custody of your own minds and thoughts.[35]

Constantine's brazen dismissal of theological debates as "subtle disputations" demonstrates his broad view of the church and its role as an overarching, unifying aspect of the state. This attitude clearly permeated many church writers and lay Christians, whose attitudes toward the military shifted from condemnation to endorsement.

Even more indicative of changes in the Christian attitudes to warfare is the work of the church writer Saint Augustine, appearing in the late fourth century. Augustine primarily argued for the existence of just and righteous war. He attempted to eradicate moral confusion from the Christian perception of combat by reconciling nonviolent leanings of the preceding centuries with Biblical notions of war and elements of Roman thought.[36] Interestingly, he adopted an inverse interpretation of Scripture than the likes of Tertullian and Origen. While the latter theologians argued for an allegorical interpretation of Old Testament violence,[37] Augustine contended that the Old Testament wars were a just, divine punishment of sinners by God, and that the New Testament was in fact the metaphorical text. He reinterpreted the Sermon on the Mount to justify war: he explained that "loving thy enemy" was a metaphor for the temperament of the heart during combat, and he argued for the good intention behind the administration of punishment.[38] "Every war had peace as its goal," Augustine maintained, "hence war was an instrument of peace and should be waged only to secure peace of some sort."[39]

Interestingly, most church writers, whether arguing for pacifism or warfare, maintained this allusion to peace in their work. However, as demonstrated earlier, in the pre-Constantinian era pacifism was the literal course of action advocated by church writers, and after Constantine peace became an abstraction—the "temperament of the heart" or the goal of war. Augustine in particular represents this new and distinct strain of Christian thought that can be traced directly to the conversion and takeover of the Roman Empire by Constantine. Without Constantine's military victories in the name of Christianity—his infusion of Roman military doctrine and victory theory with the spirit of Christ and the Christian God—members of the Church community would not have been exposed to the rush of political and martial predominance. Once there was a taste for victory associated with the power of God, it is not surprising that many, like Augustine, expounded on the idea of Christianity paired with war. Pacifism, while not wholly eradicated, appears to have become passé.

There is, finally, the question of the Christian soldiers themselves. It was shown earlier that while some pre-Constantinian Christian soldiers were martyred for their religion, many simply remained unobtrusive enlistees. They often rebutted pacifist doctrine with reference to the Old Testament wars and there is evidence that they tried to abstain from the pagan sacrifices and

---

[35] Constantine, *De Vita constantini* [*VC*] 2.61 qtd. in Drake "Constantine and Consensus" 4
[36] Russell, Frederick H. *Just War in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 16
[37] Cadoux, *The Early Christian Attitude* 175
[38] Russell, *Just War* 17
[39] Ibid 16

idolatrous rituals that defined early Roman military life. Overall, however, it appears that there were few Christians in the Roman legions in terms of percentages, and this appears to have still been the case when Constantine took over the army of his father.[40] Eusebius, Constantine's contemporary biographer, wrote that Constantine in essence "Christianized" the army. This, however, appears to be untrue on a number of levels. The lack of evidence regarding the shields inscribed with a *Chi-Rho*, the varied ethnicities of recruited soldiers with pagan backgrounds, and the lack of Christian proselytization within the army contribute to this assertion.[41] It can be assumed that the army was loyal to Constantine and his successors not out of religious fervor, but because Constantine was both successful and charismatic,[42] employing traits that had been fundamental to Roman military allegiance for generations.

The reign of Constantine was in many ways a momentous event for the early Christian church. The emperor's endorsement of Christianity realized the hopes of many Christians that their religion would eventually become widespread, and they enjoyed a new position of religious, political and military prominence that was unprecedented in their history. This preeminence in the state military structure under Constantine had a profound impact on the way early Christians understood and responded to warfare and military service. Prior to Constantine's reign, there were a plurality of Christian attitudes toward war, but extant sources suggest that the predominant thrust was in the direction of pacifism. Prominent writers expected the inherent peacefulness and fraternal love of the New Testament to manifest itself in society, and they often barred Christians from participating in the military due to the prevalence of idol worship, pagan sacrifice and general debauchery and corruption. They also condemned the practice of warfare itself, declaring bloodshed inherently incompatible with Christianity. Coexistent with these attitudes was an undercurrent of belief in the biblical justification of war, primarily adhered to by Christian soldiers. It was this type of attitude that swept into the forefront of Christian thought after the conversion of the Emperor Constantine in the early fourth century. His use of Christianity as both a military and political front ushered in new theories of religion and war. As these ideas of religious conflict developed, they laid the groundwork for subsequent wars in the name of God, subjugating pacifism to a minority view for nearly all of Christian history.

---

[40] Tomlin, "Late Roman Army" 25
[41] Ibid 25, 35
[42] Ibid 29

Archive

Works Cited

Cadoux, C. John. *The Early Christian Attitude to War. A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982).

Daly, R.J. "Military Service and Early Christianity: A Methodological Approach," in: *Studia Patristica XVIII, i: Historica – Theologica – Gnostica – Biblica*, ed. E Livingstone (Kalamazoo, 1985) 1-8.

Drake, H.A. "Constantine and Consensus," in *American Society of Church History* (1995) 1-15.

Fears, J. Rufus. "The theology of victory at Rome: approaches and problems," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 17.2 (Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1981), 736-826

The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments. King James Version. (New York and Ontario: The New American Library, Inc., 1974.

Kreider, Alan. "Military Service in the Church Orders," in: *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31 (2003): 415-42

Russell, Frederick H. *Just War in the Middle Ages.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975).

Stephenson, Paul. Lecture, University of Wisconsin-Madison. March 7, 2006.

Swift, Louis J. "War and the Christian Conscience I: the Early Years," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 23.1 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 1981) 835-868.

Tomlin, Roger. "Christianity and the Late Roman Army," in S.N.C. Lieu and D. Montserrat, eds., *Constantine. History, Historicity and Legend* (London and New York, 1998) 21-51.

Additional Bibliography

The following sources had an indirect bearing on this paper. I read them in their entirety and I drew information from them, although I did not find occasion to directly cite them in my text.

Augustus. *Res Gestae*, trans. Thomas Bushnell, BSG. http://classics.mit.edu/Augustus/deeds.html.

Chadwick, H. "The Formation of Augustine's Mind," in idem., *Augustine: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 1-31

Eusebius. *Life of Constantine (Vita Constantini)*, in: *Volume I*, Nicene and Post-Nicene
          Fathers, 2nd Series, ed. P. Schaff and H. Wace, (Edinburgh: repr. Grand Rapids MI: Wm.
          B. Eerdmans, 1955). http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/basis/vita-constantine.html.

Holum, K. "Pulcheria's Crusade A.D. 421-22 and the ideology of imperial victory,"
          Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 18 (1977): 153-72.

Holum, K. & G. Vikan. "The Trier ivory, *adventus* ceremonial, and the relics of St.
          Stephen," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers 33* (1979): 113-33; reprinted in: G. Vikan, *Sacred
          Images and Sacred Power in Byzantium* (Aldershot, 2003).

Hopfe, Lewis M. "Mithraism in Syria," in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*,
          Band II, 18.4 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 1981) 2214-2235.

Lease, Gary. "Mithraism and Christianity: Borrowings and Transformations," in: *Aufstieg
          und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 23.2 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter,
          1981) 1300-1332.

MacCormack, S. *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles & London,
          1981; reprinted 1990) 17-61.

Najdenova, Varbinka. "Mithraism in Lower Moesia and Thrace," in: *Aufstieg und
          Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Band II, 18.4 (Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 1981)
          1397-1422.

Origen, *Homilies on Joshua* 8 &12 (tr. Bruce, pp. 85-94, 120-4)

Shepherd, M. "Liturgical expressions of the Constantinian triumph," *Dumbarton Oaks
          Papers* 21 (1967): 57-78.

S. Spain, "The translation of relics icon, Trier," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977): 279-
          304.

Storch, R. "The absolutist theology of victory," *Classica et Medievalia* 29 (1968): 197-
          206.

Storch, R. "The trophy and the cross," *Byzantion* 40 (1970): 105-18.

Straub, J. "Constantine as *koinos episkopos*. Tradition and innovation in the
          representation of the first Christian emperor's majesty," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 21
          (1967): 37-55.

Wortley, J. "The Trier ivory reconsidered," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 21
          (1980): 381-94.

Picnic Point: An Environmental History

Aaron Groth

In the fall of 2004, a sign posted at the entrance to the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Picnic Point cited the peninsula's status as a wildlife and recreation area; moreover, the sign prohibited motorized vehicles, guns, dogs, destruction of vegetation, fires outside designated fire pits, and bicycles deviating from the main gravel path. The 130-acre peninsula slowly narrows over the course of about a mile. About two-thirds of the way out on Lake Mendota, it forms a protruding bulb of earth. It resembles a "beckoning finger."[1] Hundreds of small trees inhabit the peninsula amidst scattered ancient oaks and tall conifers. These new additions testify to the area's changing landscape: far fewer trees existed when the university acquired the property in 1941. If one deviates from the main gravel path, walking north along a dirt footpath to the peninsula's northern shore, an old marsh borders the trail to the east, and upon reaching Lake Mendota, the northern shore presents a sandy, scenic beach.

The abandoned Point changing house nestles between a hill and the sandy shore. The stone façade rests upon a raised stone porch. Some stone has disintegrated to rubble along the porch edges. Brown, dry oak leaves carpet the wide porch and decaying steps. Architecturally, the building blends in well with its natural surroundings. A little graffiti indicates mischievous visitors. This quaint building is an important local landmark. It is a silent testament to the debate between competing interests that sought to develop the peninsula for organized recreational use and to preserve it for its natural beauty and solitude. Point changing house, though built in the 1960´s for public and university use, ultimately failed to serve as a catalyst for north shore beach use. Building the Point changing house involved state and municipal governments, and enjoined debate both on campus and within the larger Madison Community between the competing interests of recreational expansion and preservation. Although the Point changing house never served its intended purpose for the community or the university, the building remains an important part of the cultural landscape. Point changing house symbolized the university's and community's changing conceptions of the appropriate "natural landscape" of Picnic Point.

What is Picnic Point's natural state? Photographs of the peninsula from 1888 to the present depict a "foresting" of the Point. Prolonged human use of Picnic Point has dramatically altered its landscape. Indigenous tribes burned the land to provide wildlife habitat and to pursue horticulture. The plant species composition of Picnic Point, from the time of Native American use and management, to the agro-pastoral landscape of the 1880´s to a "wooded natural area" today represents continuing human intervention and alteration of the "natural" environment of Picnic Point. Human use of the Point for agriculture and grazing impacted not only soil composition but

---

[1] "Like A Beckoning Finger," *Wisconsin Alumnus*, Vol. 49, May 1948.

encouraged altered vegetation patterns, allowing for the prodigious growth of invasive species such as buckthorn, honeysuckle, and garlic mustard.

The history of the people of the city of Madison and the students of the university is intimately interwoven with this peninsula. By 1877, regular steamboat service on Lake Mendota opened up popular spots such as Picnic Point.[2] A single steamship monopolized the steamship service for Lake Mendota. David Mollenhoff recounts, "One entrepreneur made money hand over fist by taking people to a saloon he had set up on picnic point on his large steam yacht, whose staterooms were fitted with gorgeous silver and gold trimmings."[3] Only the elite could afford to travel in staterooms bedecked with "silver and gold trimmings."[4] By the 1920s, the Point retained few remnants of the pre-settlement landscape – namely old oak trees amidst pasture, orchards, and crops – giving it an agro-pastoral landscape. In 1925 Mr. Breese Stevens sold Picnic Point to Mr. Edward Young. On his new property, Young erected the stone wall still seen today and constructed roads and trails – some still in use today. University students frequently fished, canoed, hiked, and swam on the peninsula – even when Young prominently posted "No Trespassing" signs.

In 1939, when the university had the opportunity to acquire Picnic Point for an initial payment of only $10,000, the university's Comptroller, A. W. Peterson, declared the area, "so definitely a part of the University in the thoughts of students and former students [that] it seems to me that every effort should be made" for its acquisition.[5] Peterson wanted to ensure the university's interest over private interest. The possibility of Mr. Young selling the land to an entertainment firm galvanized the university to acquire the property. Peterson pressed:

> It would certainly be unfortunate if the property in question was sold by Mr. Young to private interests for hotel, night club, or entertainment purposes. This is such a choice piece of land that there is a real danger of it being developed for some such purpose unless the University acquires it. I believe we would be condemned if we did not take advantage of the opportunity… [6]

University of Wisconsin President C. A. Dykstra later voiced this source of concern, explaining, "'We made the purchase at this time to keep the land from going to a commercial entertainment firm, whose activities we could not regulate, and with which we didn't want our students too much in contact.'"[7] The purchase of Picnic Point marked not only the university's territorial expansion, but also the desire of the university to control the land use of the Point. Alumni, who themselves enjoyed the Point over scores of years, supported the decision of the university's administration to acquire the land. *The Wisconsin Alumnus* proclaimed the acquisition a success, citing "[t]he University turned the place – like its arboretum – into a wild life refuge, began to use it for study,

---

[2] David Mollenhoff, *Madison: The formative Years*. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2003. pg. 156.
[3] Ibid. pg. 112.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Letter from Comptroller A. W. Peterson to Secretary of the Regents, Mr. M. E. McCaffrey, 11 March 1939. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File.
[6] Ibid.
[7] "Picnic Point Purchase Plan Gains Ground," *Wisconsin State Journal*, 23 January 1940.

and re-opened it to the public."[8] With ownership, the university acquired the responsibility of balancing the interests of recreation and preservation.

Inevitably, with such an attractive natural setting, university and community interest converged on the idea of developing a lake front beach with infrastructure to accommodate public visitors. At the State Building Commission meeting of 13 June 1966, the university submitted its request for the development of swimming facilities on Picnic Point, including a changing house equipped with showers and toilets. The building request cited the importance of recreational facilities to students, arguing for a large swathe of underused sandy beach to be opened at relatively low cost – with facilities.[9] The Intercollegiate Athletic Fund would contribute to the project because it stood to benefit by gaining the use of a changing house on Picnic Point.[10] This development plan stimulated public and government debate about the appropriate use of university land open to the public. Competing interests of recreation included university educational instruction, research, as well as its status as a wildlife refuge. Fear for human safety and lake health precipitated the construction of a changing house equipped to handle sewerage.

The preliminary estimate of the development project listed a septic system for the Point changing house. Among the questions requiring investigation, would the well provide an adequate supply of water? Could the building be sustained if built next to the marsh? Building a septic system required testing the existing well, drilling test bores to ascertain the appropriateness of the site (i.e. sub-surface soil characteristics), and finally conducting tests of the subsoil to see if a septic system could safely be built.[11] Specifically, the report recognized that if the sub-soil proved conducive to a septic system, prevention of contamination of the beach and the drinking water source would be required.[12] The university report recognized the importance of testing to ascertain the safety of constructing a septic system with regard to human, as well as water and beach health. While the changing house required infrastructure to handle sewerage, the use of a septic system to manage sewerage could result in environmental degradation – harming human, lake, and marsh health.

The university was not the sole party or government agency concerned with the construction of a septic system. President Charles P. Smith of the Madison Rivers and Lakes Commission wrote the Board of Regents to express the city government's concern about "the installation of septic tanks quite near the lake and swimming area."[13] This letter was carbon copied to the Department of Resource Development and the Wisconsin State Board of Health. Inter-agency coordination, cooperation, and transparency marked this project's oversight. President Smith cited "that nutrients, particularly nitrogen, can penetrate the soil for considerable distances and thus may

---

[8] "Like A Beckoning Finger," *Wisconsin Alumnus*, Vol. 49, May 1948. pg. 19.

[9] Agency Request for State Building Commission Action, State Building Commission Meeting 13 June 1966. Submitted and signed R.H. Lorenz, Assistant Vice President and Business Manager – 27 May 1966. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File: 24/9/3 box 7.

[10] Preliminary Estimate for Picnic Point Interim Development Plan, 26 February 1966. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File.

[11] Preliminary Estimate for Picnic Point Interim Development Plan, 26 February 1966. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File.

[12] Preliminary Estimate for Picnic Point Interim Development Plan, 26 February 1966. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File.

[13] Letter from President Charles P. Smith of the Madison Rivers and Lakes Commission to the Regents of University of Wisconsin, 4 May 1967. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File: 24/9/3 box 10.

harmfully affect the lake."[14] Rather than risk pollution detrimental to human, lake, and marsh, the university dropped the septic tank plan.

By November of 1967, University of Wisconsin Assistant Vice President and Business Manager Lorenz wrote to the Wisconsin State Building Commission to propose an extension of the Eagle Heights Sanitary Sewer Project to serve the Point changing house. Lorenz stated in his letter:

> With an [increase in public] awareness [of the need to eliminate] all possible sources of pollution for Lake Mendota, the Bureau of Engineering, with the concurrence of the University of Wisconsin, recommended that a sanitary sewer system serve this facility in place of the originally programmed septic field. The proposed budget for a sanitary sewer system to connect into the Eagle Heights Sanitary Sewer Project….would be… [$32,000].[15]

The original, Preliminary Estimate, called for an allocation of $10,000 for the septic system. The estimated cost for the Point change house sanitary sewer system to connect to the Eagle Heights Sanitary Sewer Project was $32,000.[16] It appeared concern over environmental pollution and health triumphed over cost.

Another aspect of the construction project ignited concern over the larger issue of land use. Both the university and the city of Madison used Picnic Point: both community residents and students enjoy walking, biking, swimming, boating, skiing, and fishing on the peninsula that juts out into Lake Mendota. Picnic Point provided an escape from the rigors of school or work. While under private ownership, the city and university enjoyed the recreation possible at Picnic Point, save briefly when owner Young prohibited public use by fencing off the land and posting "No Trespassing" signs. The university's purchase of the peninsula in 1941 was a catalyst for the peninsula's redefinition from simply a pleasant, pastoral escape to a "natural" area completely divorced from its agricultural and commercial past.

The Point changing house debate of the 1960's grew in complexity because of the area's status within the university as a wildlife refuge and recreation area. What accommodations were appropriate for recreation? How could the integrity of the "near-natural" state of the peninsula be maintained? How could the preservation of the area for wildlife and research reconcile its status as a public recreation facility?

An editorial on 15 June 1966 in the *Capital Times* by Astronomy Professor Donald E. Osterbrock requested information be made available to the public concerning the Point changing house development plan. His editorial expressed a desire for solely foot access to a peninsula devoid of buildings, asphalt, and concrete.[17] This prompted the university to write an editorial justifying the construction and assuaging public fear. J.V. Edsall, Director of Planning and Construction stressed that the building "will blend with the wooded setting;" moreover, he assured solely foot access would continue since a moratorium prohibited any parking lots, and stated, "no

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Letter from Assistant Vice President and Business Manager R. H. Lorenz to the Wisconsin State Building Commission, 1 November 1967. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File: 40/1/7-1 box 33. (*I believe this letter was a draft.)

[16] Ibid.

[17] Editorial: Voice of the People, "Concerned at Plan To Use Picnic Point For UW Bath House," *Capital Times*, 13 through 15 June 1966.

other buildings are planned".[18] Capping the letter off, Edsall stated the university's intention that Picnic Point remain "'as a wooded natural area,'" and referred to it as "a verdant gem," worthy of preservation.[19] The university administration sought to address the concerns of those in favor of preservation who adamantly opposed to the expansion of infrastructure to accommodate recreation.

In a letter to Professor Osterbrock, Chancellor R.W. Fleming reiterated the moratorium on the construction of further roads, parking lots, and the prohibition of autos.[20] Furthermore, Chancellor Fleming stressed that they sought not to change the basic nature of the Point, but merely to provide funds to improve the beach and build a changing house for recreation.[21] Would not improving the beach and adding facilities inundate the area with increased numbers of people? Professor Osterbrock expressed just such concern in response to the chancellor, explaining: "But if you start improving the beach, I think you will change the basic nature of Picnic Point by attracting crowds of people to the beach, and then it will be hard to resist the pressure for a road, a parking lot, coke machines, and a P.A. system".[22] Professor Osterbrock championed the cause of those opposed to the expansion of recreational facilities at the detriment of preservation and conservation.

Ironically, there would never be an inundation of swimmers to the Point changing house. The university and the public failed to utilize the changing house. The pretty building, in the throes of decay, blends in surprisingly well with its natural surroundings. The main trail remains at the southern strip of the peninsula's shore. Swimmers use the narrowest part of the peninsula further east, for the main gravel trail provides easy access. Near this narrow strip of beach, pit houses sit fairly close to a dilapidated white lifeguard stand. Motorized vehicles remain prohibited and no parking lot exists on the Point. Had the Point change house met with success, would there have indeed been pressure to extend roads and parking?

Discussions of university land use and the Picnic Point changing house arose again in the mid-1990's. A 1994 *Wisconsin State Journal* article questioned Dave Drummond of the University of Wisconsin Department of Safety about the Point changing house's unused status. Drummond contended: to reopen the changing house, "'We would have to renovate the beach and reroute the main path, so we found there was no basis to reopen the beach.'"[23] Drummond attributed the changing house's absence of users to its isolation.[24] So due to geographic isolation, as well as economic and social considerations the building languishes, unused to this day.

The participatory preservation and restoration of Picnic Point (and other areas of the university) included many community volunteers, students, as well as university staff and faculty. University acquisition of undeveloped lands – totaling some 300 acres – occurred over many decades. Until recently, the university's arboretum retained responsibility for some small, key areas designated important for research and instruction (i.e. Picnic Point Marsh), while the physical plant managed the remaining tracts. Until recently, the university's Muir Woods, Bill's Woods, Eagle

---

[18] James V. Edsall, Director of Planning and Construction, University of Wisconsin: Picnic Point letter to editor, *Capital Times,* Draft (N) 17 June 1966. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point: 24/9/3 box 7.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Letter from Chancellor R. W. Fleming to Professor Osterbrock, 28 June 1966, cc: Mr. James Edsall. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File: 24/9/3 box 7.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Letter from Professor Osterbrock to Chancellor R.W. Fleming, 11 July 1966, cc: Mr. James Edsall. UW Madison Archives, Picnic Point File: 24/9/3 box 10.

[23] George Hesselberg, "Political deal done, bathhouse sits empty," *Wisconsin State Journal*, 21 July 1994. 1C.

[24] Ibid.

Heights Woods, Frautschi Point, Class of 1918 Marsh, and other areas remained individually identified within the Campus Natural Areas. These areas´ recent consolidation as the Lakeshore Nature Preserve in 2005 conserves these beloved areas under a single Master Plan. As a University Wisconsin-Madison Campus Committee, the Lakeshore Nature Preserve now has the responsibility of balancing the interests of preservation and recreation. This plan seeks to give cohesion to past disparate conservation and restoration efforts.

For example, in 1972, the 1922 half-century class established a fund to "'improve the ecology and restore the beauty' of the University Bay and Picnic Point on Lake Mendota."[25] This effort represented continuing alumni concern on behalf of campus conservation and restoration. Community conservation efforts included volunteers from Madison area schools picking up trash on Picnic Point and cleaning its shoreline when the university faced budget problems in 1973.[26] Alumni, students, staff and faculty, and Madison area residents continue to contribute to campus conservation and restoration efforts through Friends of the Lakeshore Preserve, donating money as well as their time and labor. The Master Plan of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve promises an integrated approach to resolving land use issues as well as initiating a program of restoration ecology. Removal of invasive species, use of fire as a management tool, countering of erosion, restoration of native plant communities, restoration and protection of views, improvement of trails, and trail closures all form part of the Master Plan.

Although the university provides egalitarian access to Picnic Point (and the entire Lakeshore Nature Preserve) to the public, the area is used for research, educational instruction, and a wildlife preserve. Picnic Point has been the site of scores of research projects for faculty and graduate students in numerous different departments. The Point (and entire Lakeshore Nature Preserve) offers an accessible outdoor laboratory for the instruction of students. Professors continue their research upon the peninsula; moreover, these professors offer their expertise for the recreation and education of the community. University professors of Botany, Ornithology, Wetland Ecology and other disciplines offer tours of Picnic Point. While providing obvious outreach and educational benefits, mitigation of the impacts of educational use within the Preserve is apparent. Simultaneously, as a recreational area, community members and students occasionally disregard rules intended for the Point's conservation. Bicyclists will sometimes use the pedestrian-only paths, and unleashed dogs often accompany trail users. The Lakeshore Nature Preserve Master Plan seeks to balance recreation with preservation and conservation.

The Point changing house serves to symbolize not only human alteration of the landscape, but evolving university and community conceptions of use and conservation. Indeed, university and community concern surrounding the construction of the Point changing house provided an important first step towards the integrated management strategy for the university's undeveloped lands. Various properties attained over the years by the university purposefully remained undeveloped. University alumni, students, faculty, and staff as well as Madison area residents contributed funds and labor to the preservation of various "natural areas" on campus. Consolidation of the university's undeveloped lands as the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and the writing of its Master Plan crystallized a long process and tradition of conservation within the university. In the case of the Point changing house, Professor Osterbrock raised public consciousness, requesting the university to

[25] Richard Schwarz, "Class of '22 to Improve University Bay," *Wisconsin State Journal*,1972.
[26] Diane Sherman, "Young Volunteers Pretty Up 'Point'," *Capital Times*, 16 August 1973.

inform the public of the planned development. Furthermore, inter-agency cooperation as well as transparency marked the oversight of the changing house's construction, providing an impetus for eventual integrated management of the university's undeveloped lands under the Lakeshore Nature Preserve.

Recognition and celebration of the cultural landscape of the university within the Lakeshore Nature Preserve represents part of the Master Plan. Lands acquired by the university over the years contain not only what may be construed as a "natural" area, but the vestiges of a peopled landscape. Picnic Point retains the stone wall and gate constructed under the private ownership of Edward Young. University construction of the Point changing house to accommodate recreation aroused vigorous university and public debate because it threatened to radically alter the "natural landscape" of the beloved Point. Although the Point changing house failed, at least in part, because the main path was not diverted, it remains an intrinsic part of the cultural landscape of the Point. Under the Master Plan of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve, vestiges of the cultural landscape, from a brick path to the grave of a pet dog to Native American mounds, as well as the Point changing house itself, are to enjoy the same respect and understanding accorded to its ecology and "natural beauty." The environmental history of Picnic Point as well as its historical geography attests to an ever-changing natural and cultural landscape.

Lessons from the Secret War: Guerrillas, Bombs, and the CIA

Rengyee Lee

The Central Intelligence Agency's operations in Laos from 1955-1975 have been characterized as a "Secret War" in that the American Executive denied the existence of operations in Laos despite continually escalating American involvement during that period. The Secret War operated in the context of circumstances unique to the Hmong people and the Indochina region. The United States interpreted the anti-colonialist struggle by those in Indochina in the Cold War context of the United States versus the Soviet Union generally, and the Vietnam War locally, and intervened on this basis. The United States' goal in the Secret War was to support the U.S.'s operations in the Vietnam War by containing the People's Army of Vietnam and interdicting the Ho Chi Minh trail. Operations in Laos consisted of two often complementary prongs: guerilla ground attacks and mass aerial bombing. The Secret War resulted in the devastation of Laos, and the oppression of the Hmong people. However, for the CIA, the Secret War was an astounding success in that it achieved all of its objectives at comparatively minimal political cost, and the Laotian operations served as a template for future campaigns by the United States. Thus, the Secret War was the result of unique political and cultural circumstances that led to the CIA's unrestrained operations in Laos and resulted in disaster for Laos and success for the CIA.

To explain the context surrounding the Laotian conflict, it is necessary to explore the prior history of Laos. This history, such that it pertains to this paper, began in the 13th century, when Lan Xang, the Kingdom of a Million Elephants, covered much of current day Laos. Lan Xang eventually split into three weak kingdoms that were merged back together by the French colonialists in the late 1800's. This new construction was called Laos.[1]

Laos was made up of various ethnicities, one of which, the Hmong (also known as the Meo), would later come to play an important role in the Secret War. The Hmong inhabited the highlands of Laos around the strategically important Plaine des Jarres, which was considered key to control of the country. They had been driven to Laos by the Han in China and continued to be discriminated against by the lowland Laotians. However, under French occupation, the Hmong were allowed some amount of autonomy, and this later helped endear the Hmong to Westerners.[2]

During World War II, after France came under the control of the Vichy regime following the surrender of France to Germany, French Indochina, including Laos, was ceded to the Empire of Japan. Because Vichy France was an ally of Japan by this point, the Japanese allowed French officials to maintain nominal control of Indochina. However, as the Japanese came to realize that they were losing to the Allies, the Japanese removed the French officials and began to encourage

---

[1] Kenneth Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975* (Carrollton: Squadron/Signal Publications, Inc., 1994), 3.
[2] Kenneth Conboy, *Shadow War: the CIA's Secret War in Laos* (Boulder: Paladin Press, 1995), 59-60.

nationalist movements. Out of this movement, three royal half-brothers, Prince Souvanna Phouma, Prince Souphanouvong, and Prince Phetsarath Rattanavongsa, who was the primary leader, took charge of the movement and declared an independent Laos. Despite this, after the end of World War II, France proceeded to reoccupy Indochina with the acquiescence of King Sisavang Vong and forced the leaders of independent Laos out of the country into Thailand.[3]

However, the French were unable to restore complete control of their colonies in Indochina, and the First Indochina War began. The communist Viet Minh, a nationalist movement in Vietnam, continued to fight French forces in northern Vietnam and over time were increasingly able to control the countryside. In response, the French, in an effort to retain some control over Laos, allowed Laos some degree of autonomy in order to appease the nationalists. The French persuaded the three half-brothers to return to Laos, although Prince Souphanouvong, now known as the "Red Prince," opted instead to join the communist Pathet Lao, which was fighting for full independence, and Prince Phetsarath was placed in the position of mediating between the two brothers.[4]

The Viet Minh started to back the Pathet Lao, which they would do for the remainder of both the First and Second Indochina Wars, and the Pathet Lao was able to seize the Laotian province of Sam Neua with support from the People's Army of Vietnam (PAVN). Eventually, the PAVN was able to decisively defeat the French army in Vietnam at Dien Bien Phu, and this disaster for the French forced them to agree to relinquish full control over Indochina at the Geneva Conference of 1954. As per the agreements, Indochina was divided into North Vietnam, which was communist, South Vietnam, which was pro-Western, and Cambodia and Laos, which were neutral.[5] This would set the stage for the Second Indochina War and the CIA's operations in Laos.

The Pathet Lao agreed to be ostensibly integrated with the Royal Laotian Government, which had inherited the country from the French and was led by Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, an advocate of neutrality between the United States and the Soviet Union. However, by this time, the Cold War was in full force, and the United States was focused on the policy of containing communism around the world. After the fiasco of China's successful communist revolution, the U.S., under President Dwight D. Eisenhower, was adamant that Indochina would not also fall to communism. Eisenhower considered Laos to be the key "domino" in Indochina. With this in mind, when the Southeast Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) was created in 1954 to combat communism, Laos was explicitly listed as a country that would be protected from communism.[6] Accordingly, the United States was dismayed with the prospects of the communists joining a neutralist coalition government and feared that the communists would attempt to subvert the government.[7]

The CIA began to support pro-Westerners in the coalition government. In 1955, the United States established the ostensibly civilian Programs Evaluation Office (PEO) to assist the Royal Laotian Army. However, since overt military assistance was forbidden under the Geneva

---

[3] Ibid., 3-5.

[4] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 5-6.

[5] Ibid., 6.

[6] Alfred McCoy, "America's Secret War in Laos, 1955-75" in *A Companion to the Vietnam War*, ed. Marilyn B. Young and Robert Buzzanco, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002), 285.

[7] Russell Baker, "NEW LAOS REGIME IS WORRY FOR U.S.; Inclusion of Communists in 'Unity' Coalition Feared as Infiltration Device," *New York Times*, November 21, 1957, 16.

Conference of 1954, the PEO became the first of the CIA's many covert operations in Laos.[8] With CIA and Thai funding, conservatives, led by Colonel Phoumi Nosovan, a first cousin of Sarit Dhanarajata, the Premier of Thailand, were able to seize control of parliament from the neutralists in February 1958.[9] With tensions now rising and the death of Prince Phetsarath due to stroke, the coalition government collapsed in 1959, and Laos descended into civil war between the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao.[10]

In July of that year, The United States sent U.S. Army Special Forces Mobile Training Teams, codenamed HOTFOOT, to Laos to be attached to PEO and to train the Royal Laotian Army.[11] Then, in August of 1960, a then-unknown paratrooper, Captain Kong Le, launched a successful coup against the right-wing government in a bid to restore the neutralist coalition government. He expelled Phoumi from the capital city, Vientiane, and reinstalled Souvanna Phouma into power.[12] At this point, the State Department officially supported Souvanna Phouma's neutralist policies, while the CIA continued to support Phoumi Nosovan's anti-communist policies.[13] However, Souvanna attempted to relieve Kong Le from duty, and the next day, Kong Le launched another coup against Souvanna, who fled to Cambodia, and replaced him with Quinim Pholsena, whose government was left-leaning. Only a few days later in December of 1960, Phoumi's right-wing forces managed to retake Vientiane from Kong Le, who fled to the Pathet Lao, and installed the conservative Prince Boun Oum as Prime Minister, although Phoumi remained the true powerbroker. Boun Oum, Souvanna and Souphanouvong were now known as the "Three Princes" and represented pro-Western, neutralist, and pro-communist viewpoints respectively. Boun Oum was subsequently recognized as Prime Minister by the U.S., and Souvanna continued to be recognized as Prime Minister by the Soviet Union.

The Pathet Lao, aided by supply airlifts from the Soviet Union, proceeded to support Kong Le.[14] In response, the CIA initiated Project Momentum, which sought create a guerilla army called the Secret Army by fusing a paramilitary army set up by the U.S. in Thailand with the Western-sympathetic Hmong. The Thai paramilitary army had originally been set up to fight the Chinese should Thailand come under Communist Chinese occupation, but was perfectly adaptable to the situation in Laos.[15] This combined army would come to be expertly led by the CIA's chief client among the Hmong, Vang Pao, who had fought in the First Indochina War on the side of the French. In addition, the CIA's private airline, Air America, started airlifting supplies to the Hmong under the direction of Vang Pao.[16] Eisenhower was so concerned with the prospect of Laos becoming communist that he spent part of his last day in office briefing his successor, President John F. Kennedy, on the situation in Laos.[17]

---

[8] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 6-7.
[9] McCoy, 286.
[10] Tillman Durdin, "LAOS AGAIN A COMMUNIST TARGET; Infiltrators Renew An Old Battle," *New York Times*, August 9, 1959, E4.
[11] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 7.
[12] Tillman Durdin, "Leader Broadcasts Aims," *New York Times*, August 11, 1960, 3.
[13] "Memorandum of Discussion at the 473d Meeting of the National Security Council," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis,* (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 7-8.
[14] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 12-13.
[15] Conboy, *Shadow War: the CIA's Secret War in Laos*, 57-59.
[16] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 13.
[17] *New York Times*, "The Unusual and the Routine Fill Eisenhower's Final Day at the White House," January 20, 1961, 16.

When Kennedy took office in January 1961, he inherited the Laotian crisis. The Pathet Lao had managed to seize the strategic Plaine des Jarres, although the Secret Army had secured the highlands surrounding the Plaine des Jarres.[18] In a memorandum to President Kennedy, the lackluster performance of Phoumi was contrasted sharply with the successful performance by the Hmong. The memorandum, dated February 28, 1961, states: "Phoumi is stuck… He has been stopped by a better organized and better equipped opposition than anyone had calculated... In addition, the good General has been politicking rather than using his forces to increase our bargaining position in the negotiations ahead."[19] It later says: "The one bright spot in our operation is the performance of the [Hmong] whom we have specially trained and who are doing a good job in a limited area against Pathet Lao."[20] The success of the Hmong here would be a precursor to their later heavy use.

In order to boost the performance of Royal Lao Army, Kennedy transformed the PEO into an overt Military Assistance and Advisory Group (MAAG), and reorganized the HOTFOOT advisors into WHITE STAR Field Training Teams, whereby they were able to wear U.S. Army uniforms.[21] Despite this, Phoumi's forces still proved to be ineffective, and Phoumi was dealt a major defeat at Nam Tha in December of 1961. This catastrophe was aided by Kennedy's reconsideration of strong action against Kong Le and the Pathet Lao following the Bay of Pigs debacle in Cuba.[22]

Influenced by both the Bay of Pigs incident and the catastrophe at Nam Tha, the Kennedy administration began to favor Souvanna's neutralist policies. The United States put economic pressure on Phoumi and forced him to the negotiation table. Although initially resistant, by July of 1962, all the major factions had agreed to form another coalition neutralist government whereby Souvanna would become Prime Minister, Kong Le would become head of the army, Phoumi would control the Ministry of Finance, and Souphanouvong would become Minister of Economic Planning. As per the Geneva Agreements, all foreign and paramilitary forces had to leave Laos.[23] Accordingly, MAAG was disbanded and all WHITE STAR teams were removed. However, many PAVN soldiers stayed in Laos in clear violation of the accords.[24]

By 1963, tensions were starting to rise again, this time between Kong Le's neutralists and now-Foreign Minister Quinim Pholsena's left-leaning neutralists, who were sympathetic with the Pathet Lao. At the same time, the neutralists and the Pathet Lao (which were ostensibly in a coalition) were maneuvering for control of the Plaine des Jarres. By early April 1963, Kong Le's second-in-command and Quinim Pholsena had both been assassinated.[25] Kong Le's neutralist faction allied with Phoumi's right-neutralist faction initiated a purge of the left-neutralist faction,

---

[18] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 12-13.
[19] "Memorandum From the President's Deputy Special Assistant for National Security Affairs (Rostow) to President Kennedy," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis* (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 62.
[20] Ibid., 62-63.
[21] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 13.
[22] "Telegram from Secretary of State Rusk to the Department of State," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis*, (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 188.
[23] "Memorandum From Acting Secretary of State Ball to President Kennedy," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis* (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 856-860.
[24] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 13.
[25] *Time Magazine*, "After the Party," April 12, 1963, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,828095,00.html (accessed March 27, 2007).

whose members subsequently fled to Pathet Lao controlled areas.[26] As the situation became tenser, the U.S. began to explore the possibility of a bombing campaign, while still remaining cognizant of global politics. An undated internal memo states: "During the course of the discussion, Ambassador Thompson (then-ambassador to the Soviet Union) stated that military action by U.S. air forces, such as a bombing raid into northern Laos, would not have serious effect on Krushchev's internal situation in Moscow."[27] Finally, in April 1964, Phoumi's right-wing faction launched a coup against the coalition government. Although Souvanna and Kong Le were able to restore control, and Phoumi fled to permanent exile in Thailand, the Pathet Laos used the coup as an excuse to overrun Kong Le's forces on the Plaine des Jarres and gain complete control of the area.[28]

By this time, the neighboring Vietnam War was escalating, and Kennedy's successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, was committing more and more American troops to South Vietnam. The PAVN was violating Laotian neutrality by continuing to support the Pathet Lao and, more direly for the U.S. war effort in Vietnam, by supplying the Viet Cong, South Vietnamese communists, via the Ho Chi Minh trail which functioned as a key supply route from North Vietnam to South Vietnam and which passed through Laos. As long as the Ho Chi Minh trail was operational, the Viet Cong was still a viable fighting force. If the United States were forced to stop interdicting the Ho Chi Minh trail, it would have been disaster for the American war effort in Vietnam and would have ended any chances of an American victory.[29] However, Johnson recognized that because the U.S. had already agreed to the Geneva Accords, they could not reintroduce overt U.S. military units into Laos, because such a direct violation of international law would affect America's public image of moral superiority.[30] Therefore, the war needed to be kept secret from both Congress and the American public. Laotian operations were placed under the authority of the CIA. The CIA used the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), an organization whose ostensible purpose was to provide humanitarian relief, as a front for CIA actions.[31] The Secret War had begun in earnest.

The CIA had in previous operations been restricted in its activities. In such operations as PBSUCCESS in Guatemala and Operation Ajax in Iran, the CIA had operated in the context of very short-term goals intended only to topple an ostensible enemy of the United States from power.[32] In Laos, the CIA was, for the first time, able to operate without restrictions in a long-term operation. The CIA would proceed to take full advantage of this.

[26] "Memorandum Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis* (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 948-952.
[27] "Memorandum From the [text not declassified] Directorate of Plans (Colby) to Director of Central Intelligence McCone," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961-1963, Vol. XXIV: Laos Crisis* (Washington DC: GPO, 1994), 987.
[28] Conboy, *War in Laos: 1954-1975*, 14.
[29] McCoy, 291-292.
[30] Fred Branfman, "Presidential War in Laos," in *Laos: War and Revolution*, ed. Nina S. Adams and Alfred W. McCoy (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 214.
[31] "1. Memorandum From the Deputy Director for Coordination, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Scott) to the Special Group," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998), http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/01_24.html (accessed March 10, 2005).
[32] Steven Kinzer, "How to Overthrow A Government," *Democracy Now!*, http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=04/03/05/1542249&mode=thread&tid=25 (accessed April 22, 2005).

The outline for the operation was laid out early. A memorandum dated January 17th, 1964 states: "The main effort in this program has been development of the Meo (Hmong), the largest non-Lao ethnic group in Laos, as an effective guerrilla force and the provision of plausibly deniable U.S. air support for the program."[33] The main goal of the operation was to maintain the neutralist government in Vientiane against communist opposition and thereby be allowed to continue to interdict the Ho Chi Minh trail. The overriding goal of supporting American operations in South Vietnam by preventing the PAVN from supplying the Viet Cong was demonstrated in a memo dated May 24, 1964 which stated: "In addition, we propose, if a conference should ever meet, to press for full compliance with the Geneva Accords of 1962 as our objective. This would include total withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces from Laos and an end to the corridor through Laos from North Viet-Nam to South Viet-Nam. Both of these Communist actions have persisted since 1962; we have protested against them frequently, but in practice have taken no stronger action."[34] The minimization of North Vietnamese interference in Laos and the interdiction of the Ho Chi Minh trail would serve as the CIA's primary goals for the rest of the war.

The means by which this goal was to be accomplished was by keeping the Pathet Lao from controlling the strategically important Plaine des Jarres. The strategic significance of the Plaine des Jarres is that it lies near the middle of the northern Laotian highlands. If the Pathet Lao were allowed to control the Plaine des Jarres, they would be in a position to attack Vientiane, the capital of Laos. If Vientiane was taken, then the neutralist government would be forced to accept the Pathet Lao into the government, and that would invariably lead to the Laotian government requesting that all U.S. forces leave Laos in international disgrace. Both the Pathet Lao and the American government knew the significance of the Plaine des Jarres. A telegram dated May 24, 1964 states: "…seizure of the entire Plain of Jars area by the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese has been aimed at demoralizing and indeed eliminating the Neutralist forces in Laos."[35] The CIA was thus given free reign to prevent this from happening.

Pertaining to the paramilitary ground forces, at this stage, "…this program has expanded to a present force of approximately 19,000 armed Meo guerrillas (23,000 authorized) engaged in village defense and guerrilla activities against the Pathet Lao."[36] In accordance with its ground operations, CIA thus began bombing communist forces on the Plaine des Jarres. At this early stage, bombings were initially mainly conducted by the Royal Lao Air Force (RLAF) using T-28 aircraft, old propeller planes acquired through the Americans. American involvement initially started as tactical bombing aimed at supply routes, troop concentrations, and providing close air support for Laotian government troops.[37]

---

[33] "1. Memorandum From the Deputy Director for Coordination, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Scott) to the Special Group."

[34] "60. Memorandum From the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs (Bundy) to the Executive Committee of the National Security Council," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998), http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/56_75.html (accessed March 10, 2005).

[35] "63. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in the United Kingdom," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998), http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/56_75.html (accessed March 10, 2005).

[36] "1. Memorandum From the Deputy Director for Coordination, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (Scott) to the Special Group."

[37] Branfman, 231, 233-234.

However, the aerial bombing soon proved to be ineffectual. Tactical bombing proved impractical, because Communist forces moved in small groups at night under forest cover.[38] Also, the planes were restricted in what armaments they could carry and the Royal Lao Government took too long in approving missions. According to a telegram by the American embassy in Laos, "The margin of utility of bombs (including 500-pounders) over rockets derives from nature of warfare in Laos—absence of large troop concentrations, particular importance of artillery and armor to outcome of fighting, and exposure of slow aircraft to ground fire during high-angle attack required with rockets or machine guns."[39] Also, the same telegram states: "Timing presents multiple problems: 1) several days frequently elapse between request for strike and completion [of] necessary military planning and approval; 2) required U.S. consultation (sometimes including referral to Washington) adds delay at minimum and apparently has discouraged FAR/RLAF to point that fuzes are no longer requested, in expectation of refusal; 3) present need to clear individual actions with Souvanna requires additional time."[40] Accordingly, even at this early stage, a tendency toward escalation is clearly seen. The same memo states: "We therefore believe early step-up in deterrent effect or in FAR/ neutralist capability to contain Communist attacks by air activity requires relaxation in restraints currently imposed on use of aircraft and bombs and grant of greater discretionary authority to Lao."[41] The Laotian government would remain ineffective, and infighting between Souvanna's neutralist faction and Kong Le's right-leaning neutralist faction would lead to Kong Le's dismissal as head of the army and exile to France in 1966. From this point on, Souvanna was increasingly marginalized as American forces increasingly took control of military operations in Laos.

Escalation in Laos proceeded at a brisk pace. By May of 1964, U.S. pilots were already being used to bomb Laos. A telegram from that month states: "Souvanna called me on telephone this morning regarding threatening situation around Muong Kheung-Ban An-Muong Soui and asked for T-28 strikes in area. I told him [1 line of source text not declassified] to do anything quickly we would have to turn to U.S. pilots for combat missions. Souvanna hesitated at first but finally gave me green light proceed with U.S. pilots."[42] In addition, the will and desire for future escalation is clearly stated in a telegram dated May 24th, 1964: "The US could take further military actions within Laos at any time. We have already introduced jet reconnaissance flights and have now authorized US civilians to fly T-28 prop fighter bombers against Communist positions. Our next actions in Laos could include the use of US aircraft in Thailand, South Viet-Nam or from carriers to bomb Communist positions in Laos."[43] These next actions would occur before the end of the year.

By the end of 1964, Johnson would approve Operation Barrel Roll, which would support the Hmong militia in northern Laos, and this operation began on December 14th, 1964.[44] Although

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] "13. Telegram From the Embassy in Laos to the Department of State," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998),
http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/01_24.html (accessed March 10, 2005).

[40] Ibid.

[41] Ibid.

[42] "59. Telegram From the Embassy in Laos to the Department of State," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998),
http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/56_75.html (accessed March 10, 2005).

[43] "63. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in the United Kingdom."

[44] McCoy, 290.

this operation was directly intended to support Hmong forces in Laos, American policy in Laos was for the entirety of the war focused on supporting the war in Vietnam. Thus, Operation Barrel Roll's primary psychological purpose was to indicate to North Vietnam of the United States government's willingness to more deeply involve itself in Southeast Asia.[45] In 1965, Johnson would approve Operation Steel Tiger, which was directed at the Ho Chi Minh trail. A memo written in March 20th, 1965 explained that Steel Tiger would escalate the conflict further: "It is envisaged that Steel Tiger operations (which would begin April 3) would be carried on at considerably greater intensity than present operations in Panhandle. Separate JCS message will define program more precisely, but broadly speaking it would be theoretically possible to have in any 24-hour period a re-seeding mission, one or more route recce missions, plus a special strike mission."[46] The United States thus became further enmeshed in the Laotian conflict.

Over the course of the war under Johnson, the air war would continue to escalate as the United States began to take more of a direct role in the war. American bombers increasingly directly targeted civilians in order to demoralize the civilian population, deprive the Pathet Lao of supplies, manpower, and shelter, and destroy all commerce and trade in enemy occupied territories. Bombing halts in North Vietnam only served to divert aircraft to Laos. By 1973, American jets had almost entirely replaced propeller planes, bombings were occurring both day and night, and B-52s were dropping 500-pound bombs, delayed-action bombs, napalm, phosphorous bombs, and antipersonnel cluster bomb units on any and all signs of possible human habitation within the free fire zone, including buffaloes, cows, rice fields, schools, temples, and small shelters.[47]

Simultaneously, Vang Pao, from his headquarters at Long Tieng, was able to effectively lead the Secret Army against the Pathet Lao. By this point, much of the Hmong economy was dependent on opium production. Vang Pao was able to control the Hmong effectively by having the CIA's air power at his disposal, which he used to control the shipment of opium across and out of the county (although it is unclear to what extent the CIA knew of these shipments). From 1964 to 1968, the CIA used the Secret Army to hold the highlands above the Plaine des Jarres. These battles were characterized by bloody fighting which eventually led to the retreat of Hmong forces in the northeast. At this point, the CIA conducted the first of many mass evacuations of Hmong civilians. From 1969 to the end of the war, the Secret Army was used as conventional infantry to take and hold the Plaine des Jarres.[48] Although guerillas are not usually asked to hold territory in wars, the Hmong were able to do so due to crucial American air support.[49] From then on to their final defeat, the Hmong and the Pathet Lao would engage in a back and forth battle for control of the Plaine des Jarres, with the Pathet Lao capturing the Plaine des Jarres in the rainy seasons and the Hmong, always supported by aircraft, capturing it in the dry seasons.[50]

---

[45] "BEGINNING OF AIR OPERATIONS IN LAOS," Project CHECO, http://chancefac.net/Laos/begin__air_ops_Laos.htm (accessed April 22, 2005).
[46] "174. Telegram From the Department of State to the Embassy in Laos," in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1964-1968, Vol. XXVIII: Laos* (Washington DC: GPO, 1998), http://www.state.gov/www/about_state/history/vol_xxviii/161_180.html (accessed March 10, 2005).
[47] Branfman, 231, 233-234.
[48] McCoy, 300-303.
[49] Henry Kamm, "Clandestine Laotian Army Turned Tide in Vital Region," *New York Times*, October 28, 1969, 14.
[50] McCoy, 300-303.

Under Johnson's successor, President Richard M. Nixon, Congress and the American public started to become aware of the large extent of American operations in Laos. Prior to that time, Congress and the American people had been kept completely unaware that Americans were taking part in combat operations in Laos. However, reports from the press and Congressmen started to filter down. In response, Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri chaired closed-door hearings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.[51] On March 7th, 1970, Nixon finally officially revealed that the U.S. indeed was operating inside Laos. However, in that speech, he emphasized that there were no U.S. ground troops within Laos and said, "No American stationed in Laos had ever been killed in ground combat."[52] Although an exaggeration, this would later be used as evidence of the success of the Laotian operation. Even though Nixon admitted that the U.S. was operating illegally in Laos, he also stated that he would continue operations in Laos and so the war went on.

In May 1971, Vang Pao launched Operation About Face II and recaptured the Plaine des Jarres. However, just six months later, the Pathet Lao, using North Vietnamese artillery, managed to recapture the Plaine des Jarres despite massive aerial bombardment from B-52s.[53] The fighting drove many Hmong refugees south and drained Vang Pao's manpower further. This exacerbated the problem of Vang Pao's shrinking army, which had suffered such a large amount of attrition since starting the fight against the Pathet Lao that it was now getting reinforced from Hmong child soldiers and Thai troops.[54] To further aggravate this situation, the U.S. had started the process of pulling out of Indochina, and this meant a decrease of air support in Laos. Faced with these problems, Vang Pao was unable to hold his ground in the face of his primary ally's desertion. In January 1973, the U.S. and North Vietnam signed the Paris Peace Accords, and a month later, the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao agreed to a coalition government.[55] All U.S. bombing in Laos ended in April. Vang Pao continued fighting until May 14, 1975, when Air America flew Vang Pao and his family out of the country, just prior to the fall of Long Tieng, to their eventually exile in the U.S. Finally, in December 1975, the Pathet Lao gained full control of the government and changed the name of their organization to the Lao People's Revolutionary Party. Subsequently, Souvanna Phoum was removed from power, Boun Oum left for France, and the Party established the Lao People's Democratic Republic under President Souphanouvong.[56]

The final result of the entire operation was a sharp contrast between positive consequences for the CIA and negative consequences for the Laotian people. For the Laotian people, the war was and continues to be a humanitarian disaster. They are forced to live in a battle-scarred land still littered with unexploded American cluster bombs. These bombs are estimated to have caused 12,000 casualties since the war and continue to kill hundreds of civilians every year. During these operations, allied aircraft dropped more than three million tons of bombs, which was three times the amount dropped on North Vietnam and greater than the total of all bombs dropped by the Allies during World War II.[57] Bombing by U.S. and allied forces is calculated to have caused some

---

[51] Richard Halloran, "Smoke-Screen Over U.S. Involvement in Laos," *New York Times*, October 19, 1969, E2.

[52] *New York Times*, "Text of Statement Issued by President Nixon on U.S. Policy and Activity in Laos," March 7, 1970, 10.

[53] McCoy, 299.

[54] Henry Kamm, "Laotian Said to Ask Massive Evacuation," *New York Times*, March 12, 1970, 3.

[55] Special to The New York Times, "Text of Cease-Fire Agreement Signed by Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao," *New York Times*, February 22, 1973, 17.

[56] McCoy, 300.

[57] *Bombies*, videorecording, directed by Jack Silberman (Oley, PA: Bullfrog Films, 2001).

350,000 civilian casualties in Laos.[58] For the Hmong, their population was decimated. A U.S. Air Force study concluded: "By 1971, many families were down to their last surviving male (often a youth of 13 or 14), and survival of the tribe was becoming a major concern."[59] After the war, the communists took revenge on the Hmong and forced many of them to flee to the United States. Even today, there is still a concentrated effort by the government in Laos to eradicate the Hmong still in Laos.[60]

In contrast, for the Americans, the Laotian operation was an astounding success. The Americans learned that they could minimize American ground casualties, and the negative shifts in public opinion that purportedly accompany such casualties, by committing Americans from the safety of the air and by using natives as proxies. The minimal amount of American casualties is a sharp contrast to the mass American ground casualties suffered in South Vietnam. The bombing and guerilla campaigns successfully disrupted PAVN activity along the Ho Chi Minh trail, and as long the Americans were fully committed, the Pathet Lao were unable to take any major urban areas. The Pathet Lao only took Vientiane after the Paris Peace Accords. Without the CIA's operations in Laos, the Vietnam War was would have ended in defeat for the Americans much sooner.[61] Thus, the CIA's operations were successful, although, perhaps owing to the CIA's prior focus on short term operations, the same operations were devastating in the long term for the people of Laos.

Because it was such a success, the strategies of using both overwhelming air force projection and relying on native ground troops were applied to later conflicts. In the Afghan-Soviet War of the 1980's, the CIA successfully funded Afghan fundamentalists and forced the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Under President Clinton, the U.S., along with NATO, used purely air power in 1999 to successfully force Yugoslavia to withdraw from Kosovo.[62] However, as in Laos, the bombings are purported to have caused civilian casualties then and continue to cause them in the form of unexploded bombs.[63] In a clear parallel to the methods of the Laotian campaign, the U.S., in 2001 used both air support and a client Afghan army, the Northern Alliance, to drive the Taliban regime from power in Afghanistan.[64] Again, such unrestrained bombing has led to harsh civilian casualties which continue to the present day.[65]

In addition, the success of the Laotian campaign opened the floodgates for further unrestrained covert operations, such as the Afghan-Soviet War, and opened the door for the final and most indiscriminate part of the Cold War. In particular, the U.S. began to increasingly ignore Article 3 of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War,

---

[58] Peter Tatchell, "Why Milosevic, but not Kissinger?" *Guardian Unlimited*, April 25, 2002, http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,,690678,00.html (accessed March 12, 2005).
[59] McCoy, 299.
[60] Andrew Perrin, "Licensed to Kill," *Time Asia Magazine*, June 23, 2003, http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,501030630-460245,00.html (accessed March 12, 2005).
[61] McCoy, 297, 309.
[62] McCoy, 310-311.
[63] *Serbia Info News*, "NATO accused of hiding truth about cluster bombs," August 12, 2000, http://www.serbia-info.com/news/2000-08/12/20225.html (accessed April 22, 2005).
[64] Ahmed Ibrahim Mahmoud, "The Fall of Taliban: An End to the War?" *Islam Online*, November 21, 2001, http://www.islamonline.net/English/crisis/2001/11/article4.shtml (accessed April 22, 2005).
[65] Marc W. Herold, "Above the Law and Below Morality: Data on 11 Weeks of U.S. Cluster-Bombing of Afghanistan," *Cursor*, February 1, 2002, http://www.cursor.org/stories/abovethelaw.htm (accessed April 22, 2005).

which provides for the protection of noncombatants.[66] This trend has continued all the way up to the present, with the selective interpretation of international law to justify a preemptive strike on Iraq in 2003, and has made affected countries wary of American claims of moral superiority.[67]

The CIA's operations in Laos, known as the "Secret War," began as a response to the threat of strategically-important Laos falling to communism and then became necessitated by the U.S.'s official support of Laotian neutrality. The CIA proceeded to operate unrestrained with operations consisting of the use of native Hmong troops supported by American aerial bombing. The CIA successfully kept American pressure on the Ho Chi Minh trail and prevented the Pathet Lao from seizing the Laotian capital of Vientiane until the Americans resolved to depart Vietnam. In the aftermath, both the Hmong and the rest of the Laotian people suffered and continue to suffer greatly. However, the CIA used the success of the operation as a template for future operations all over the world, duplicating the damage that they caused in Indochina. In addition, the United States learned that it could violate or bend international law without significant detriments. Both have continued to apply these lessons to the present day, and the results can be seen in Afghanistan and Iraq.

---

[66] *Diplomatic Conference for the Establishment of International Conventions for the Protection of Victims of War*, "Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War," August 12, 1949, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/92.htm (accessed April 22, 2005).

[67] Satya Sivaraman, "War in Afghanistan Evokes War Memories in Indochina," *Common Dreams*, November 2, 2001, http://www.commondreams.org/headlines01/1102-05.htm (accessed April 22, 2005).

The Economic Function of the 'Holy Man' in Byzantium
300 - 600 CE

Trevor C. Leverson

Introduction

Since the late 1970's, researchers of early Byzantine history have worked to explain the rise, functions, and importance of a terrifically influential group of men and women from this time period. The term 'Holy Man' has been made for this purpose. This identifier does not carry titular associations, nor is it gender-related. Instead, it refers to the way in which these people interacted with society as spiritual and pragmatic leaders. In essence, 'Holy Man' refers to a list of 'functions' that a man or woman performed for his or her society. If a person did everything on the list then he or she qualified as a 'Holy Man.'

For the purposes of this publication, the reader need only know that the 'Holy Man's' actions made him incredibly popular with institutional church leaders, emperors, and peasants alike. This popularity, and the public trust that came along with it, won him many different sources of revenue. He then used this wealth for the sake of public welfare. A 'Holy Man's' economic function represents something that scholarship has largely ignored to date – i.e. it is something that should be on the 'list' of what it takes to by a 'Holy Man.' This project will use the examples made available by sources like letters, law codes, and hagiography[1] in order to establish a 'Holy Man's' economic function. The 'Holy Man' of early Byzantium had many different sources of revenue, and he used his wealth for the betterment of society.[2]

Sources of Revenue

Personal Wealth

Initial wealth represented an important source of revenue that was not linked to the reputation of the 'Holy Man.' The 'Holy Man' indiscriminately rose from all classes of society from the highest to the lowest. John the Almsgiver, for example, came from a very rich family. "John's father, Epiphanius by name, did so many conspicuous and remarkable things in his life in accordance, we may say, with his name that he was chosen by the rulers of that time to be entrusted

---

[1] Hagiography is primary source material (almost always in the form of biographies) about a saint's life.

[2] The individuals in this project were active in Byzantium 300 – 600. Their specific occupations and backgrounds will be discussed as it applies to their economic function. For the purposes of this very brief discussion these people have all been identified as 'Holy Men.' The following discussion aims solely to use anecdotal evidence so that a common economic function among these people can be established – with the intention of making 'Holy Man' definition more specific. I will not delve into each person's background, nor argue for their inclusion under the 'Holy Man' title.

with the reins of government in the island of the Cyprians."[3] John found himself disconnected from familial relationships as his father, mother, wife, and children all died early in his life. He turned to a religious life and donated his money, land, and possessions to the Church and monasteries.[4] Theodore of Sykeon's family also enjoyed a comfortable living. His mother and a cook named Stephen, as described in Theodore's *vita*, owned a fairly successful inn: "his mother by this time had become quite respectable… They now relied upon the goodness of the fare when they entertained many governors and officers who came to the inn, and they congratulated Stephen who had made food so tasty."[5] When Mary, Theodore's mother, died, he rebuked the messenger who was sent to make him claim the dowry and offered the money itself up to spiritual purposes.[6] Similarly, Elisabeth the Wonderworker was born into a prosperous family:

> And, three years after this, her father Eunomianos also journeyed [died] rejoicing to the lord, and the blessed Elisabeth, left alone, turned straightaway to God, the Father of orphans. Since she desired the life of solitude and poverty [i.e. monasticism], she distributed among the poor the gold and silver that her parents had set aside for her, as well as her other property (which was considerable)…[7]

Basil of Caesarea also liquidated his extensive property holdings, prior to becoming a bishop, in 369 to alleviate a famine.[8] The initial wealth of the 'Holy Man' either contributed to his philanthropy or was given to the Church; very little of it was kept for personal use.

Ecclesiastical Wealth

The wealth of the institutional Church provided another important source of revenue for the 'Holy Man.' Byzantine 'Holy Men' often rose to high status positions in the Church due to their reputation and spirituality. John the Almsgiver, Theodore of Sykeon, John Chrysostom, and Basil of Caesarea all became the bishops for some of Byzantium's major cities - Alexandria, Cappadocia, Constantinople, and (though smaller) Anastasioupolis. All of them were reluctant to give up the monastic lifestyle for one in the spotlight. It was the case, however, that these titles proved vitally important as a source of revenue.

The ecclesiastical aristocracy possessed an incredible amount of wealth, and paid its highest officers very well. A 'Holy Man' who attained status in the institutional Church often earned a hefty salary. John the Almsgiver received 8,000 pounds of gold when he became the patriarch of Alexandria in the early seventh century.[9] Similarly, Theodore of Sykeon received a salary for his service as the bishop of Anastasioupolis in Galatia, "…[out] of the 365 *nomismata*[10] allotted to him

---

[3] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 199.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid. 90.

[6] Ibid. 110.

[7] *Blessed Elisabeth the Wonderworker*, tr. Valerie Karras. In: *Holy Woman of Byzantium*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 127.

[8] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 735.

[9] Ibid. 905.

[10] 365 *nomismata* amounted to approximately 5 pounds of gold.

for his household expenses, he only used 40 in the whole year and gave all the rest to the Church." [11]
In both cases the 'Holy Man' spent his money on philanthropy.

Interestingly, even the wealth of other Church leaders was not safe from the 'Holy Man.'
In Alexandria a an Egyptian bishop, Troilus, came to eat with John the Almsgiver with thirty pounds
of gold with which it was his intention to buy an extravagant set of silverware. John shamed him out
of his intended acquisition:

> Accompanying the Patriarch was a certain bishop, a lover of money and of a most
> unsympathetic disposition. To him the blessed Patriarch said: 'Give Christ's
> brethren (the poor) a little present, brother Troilus,' for that was his name, for
> somebody had whispered to the Patriarch that the bishop's attendant was carrying
> thirty pounds of gold at that moment in order to buy a set of engraved silver for the
> bishop's table. The bishop, reverencing the Patriarch's word and more probably
> momentarily quickened in soul thereby, ordered the man carrying the thirty pounds
> of gold to give a *nomisma* to each of the brethren sitting there. In this way the
> large quantity of gold was quickly spent. [12]

Another source of the Church's wealth for the 'Holy Man' came in the form of
endowments. In 434 an enactment of the *Theodosian Code* maintained that the estate and worldly
possession of any cleric who died without heirs passed to his Church. [13] As a result, the private
wealth of the clergy often swelled ecclesiastical holdings. Many clerics had become well off in Late
Antiquity. "Gregory Nazianzen left his whole estate, apart from minor legacies to the Church of
Nazianzus, and Caesarius had to leave his to the see of Arles." [14] As 'Holy Men' became high-
ranking members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy they had access to these contributions and seizures
for redistribution.
This source of revenue was not directly available to monasteries and abbots. Simeon and Daniel, for
instance, received no salary. They did, however, indirectly benefit from ecclesiastical wealth.
Monasteries often received subsidies and provisions from Church sources. John the Almsgiver was
renowned for his donations to religious institutions in or near Alexandria: "And by his hands he sent
a large sum of money and an abundance of corn, drink, oil and pulse; also garments for monks; and
for the sick, various kinds of eatables, and finally, a great many beasts of burden for the distribution
of these necessities." [15]

The reputation of a monastic 'Holy Man' also earned him grants from the Church. The
archbishop of Antioch made such a concession to Daniel the Stylite:

> And the Bishop said… 'God has made your presence here a great blessing to
> me…' He also implored him to let him build a cell for him saying, 'Since I am
> unable to persuade you to live here with me, if you will let me I will build you a

---

[11] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 141.
[12] Ibid. 238.
[13] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 895.
[14] Ibid. 896.
[15] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 204.

monastery, for our most Holy Church has many a suitable spot in the suburbs of
the city. Go out and look at them and whatever pleases you, I will give you.'[16]

Although the monastic 'Holy Man' did not receive a salary, nor did he benefit from law that was designed for the Church, he still often gained wealth from institutional Christianity.

The Role of Homilies and Sermons in Accruing Wealth

The 'Holy Man' was persuasive and people listened to him because of his reputation. Through homilies and sermons the 'Holy Man' thus connected with his audiences. John Chrysostom, the monk-turned-bishop of Antioch, began his second sermon in Constantinople with the following address in an attempt to woo the common people by associating himself with them:

> I have already addressed you once, but from that day I have come to love you as if
> I had grown up among you from childhood. The chains of affection which bind
> me to you are as strong as if I had enjoyed your most pleasant company for time
> past counting. And this has come about, not because I am especially given to
> friendship and love, but because you are of all people the most desirable, the most
> loveable. For who would not admire and marvel at your zeal tested in the flames,
> your unfeigned love, your warm regard for your teachers, the unity you have
> among yourselves.[17]

This particular passage illustrates the beginnings of the close bonds that the 'Holy Man' forged with the people of his locality. As the relationship between the 'Holy Man' and his people became more intimate he effectively targeted specific groups in his sermons.

Materialism and the accumulation of wealth represented a very common topic of 'Holy Man' sermons. Basil of Caesarea's and John Chrysostom's homilies, for example, often singled out the rich of Caesarea and Antioch. It is evident that Basil of Caesarea put a lot of thought into how to encourage generosity from the wealthy when collection time came. For example, no one, Basil suggested, would be inclined towards social justice unless he or she felt stimulated by the thought of eternal reward or punishment.[18] "The possession of power demands that one should regard one's fellows as one's equals. Control over the lives of others should make one realize that one cannot afford to treat them any worse than oneself."[19] He assured the better off that there was nothing wrong with economic success, which was the result of God's providence; yet he addressed the wealthy, by saying that "success and property should be oriented towards a generous life: riches were accumulated in order to be shared with others."[20] This, according to Basil, would be a saving grace come judgment day. In his homilies Basil utilized vivid imagery to portray this point: "[if you have lived justly], then the whole people, standing about our common judge, will call you nourisher, benefactor, and all those other titles that attach to philanthropy."[21]

---

[16] Ibid. 204.
[17] J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom: Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*, (Ithaca: Cornell Press, 1995) 17.
[18] Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1994) 137.
[19] Ibid. 139.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid.

Like Basil of Caesarea, Chrysostom wished for people's thoughts to be directed towards accruing a more spiritual kind of honor, instead of a high social standing:

> Such embroidery, such costly clothes…You have come to pray, to entreat pardon for your sins, to plead for your offences, beseeching the Lord and hoping to make Him favour you. Why do you adorn yourself? This is not the dress of a supplicant. How can you weep? If you did weep, your tears would be ridiculed by the onlookers. [He or she] who weeps should not be wearing gold. It is merely acting, and hypocrisy. For is it not acting to shed tears from a soul overgrown with extravagance and ambition to such a degree… This is the attire for actors and dancers. Nothing of this is suitable for modest people who should be adorned with shamefacedness and sobriety.[22]

John Chrysostom's homilies were much more biting toward the wealthy. He broke the elite into very specific categories. Gender typified one such grouping: "The number of you women who adorn yourselves with trinkets of gold, should long instead for the bonds of Paul. The collar around your neck does not glisten as much as the grace of these iron bonds gleamed about his soul."[23] Wealthy men received similar reprimands: "[and] what is more shameless than those eyes [of an avaricious man]? What is more immodest, more like a greedy dog? For a dog never holds his ground with such shameless impudence as when he is grasping at all goods."[24] Chrysostom, much like Basil, made sure to note that donation and charity would absolve rich people:

> If we use our wealth properly, nothing will destroy us; but if we do not, all things will bring us down, whether a kingdom, or poverty or wealth. But nothing will have power to hurt the man who remains on his guard.[25]

In this way the 'Holy Man' urged the wealthy to exert stricter discipline over their attitudes toward the possession of capital – or lack of capital. In doing so he also encouraged them to give it up for good causes.

Chrysostom made the same encouragements to the have-nots in society. As Chrysostom maintained in one of his later homilies:

> We must not then make ourselves miserable because we are poor, since poverty makes almsgiving easier for us. For the man who has collected many possessions is haughty, [and also feels great] ties to what he has. But he who has only a little is safe from both of these domineering passions, and so he finds more opportunities for doing good.[26]

---

[22] Aideen Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*, (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co, 2004) 135.
[23] Ibid. 136.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid. 163.
[26] Ibid. 173.

At any given social position, at least to some extent, the 'Holy Man' encouraged a downward flow of wealth. The connection between the general population and the 'Holy Man' manifested itself economically. As Chrysostom pointed out, the Church of Antioch in his day enjoyed income comparable to that of one of the wealthier residents of the city.[27]

Numerous opportunities for oblations enhanced the effect of these persuasive preachers. The methods used for collecting oblations correspond to those used in modern times. One main difference is that in the fourth and fifth centuries the plate for donations circulated many times throughout the course of the mass. As the recorder of Basil's liturgies noticed, the parish's plates circulated more than five times during just one of the parts of the mass.[28]

The difficulty in finding similar examples from the monastic 'Holy Man's' sermons lies in the fact that the hagiography of saints like Simeon and Daniel focused on different aspects of their lives, such as their miracles, their visions, and their asceticism – and not homilies. For example, it is known that both men gave daily homilies. "[For] the night and the greater part of the day [Daniel prayed], but twice a day he addressed the folk who thronged about the column, giving them moral counsel…."[29] Examples in the *vita* of Daniel recalled some of the subjects that he preached, but did not recall the exact words of the 'Holy Man':

> …the holy man from his pillar said to the people: 'Peace be upon you!' and then opening his mouth taught them, saying nothing rhetorical or philosophical, but speaking about the love of God and the care of the poor and almsgiving and brotherly love and of the everlasting life which awaits the holy, and the everlasting condemnation which is the lot of sinners. And by the grace of God the hearts of the faithful people were so touched to the quick that they watered the ground with their tears. After this the Archbishop offered a prayer, and then the holy man dismissed them all, and each man returned to his house in peace.[30]

These lectures were not as well recorded as, for instance, sensational confrontations with the devil. Simeon often found himself in such quarrels:

> Again, Satan often came with his host carrying lighted torches and appearing like flashes of fire going skyward. Again they would come and stand over him [on his pillar], crying out and shrieking for a long time to make the saint stop his service. But he did not fear nor was he scared by their outburst but busied himself in the service of his Lord. Sometimes they appeared as if smashing rocky stones, sometimes they sounded like thunder or like weeping, sometimes like men fighting each other with swords and spears. There were some who pronounced their own doom, saying 'You have slain me.'[31]

---

[27] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 905.
[28] *Divine liturgies of Saints Chrysostom and Basil*, tr. J. N. W. Robertson, (London: David Nutt and Strand, WC, 1894) 209-215.
[29] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 3.
[30] Ibid. 41.
[31] *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*, tr. Robert Doran, 170.

Simeon and Daniel did preach to the people of Antioch, but these aspects of their lives were not what they were known for, and this can clearly be seen in hagiography.

Donations of the Faithful

Offerings were not limited to donations received at church services. The 'Holy Man' also received contributions and endowments outside of liturgy that greatly increased his economic heft. As A. H. M. Jones has noted, "The revenue from contributions were how religious institutions supported themselves, maintained their buildings, and what they distributed as charity to the poor, and was originally derived entirely from offerings of the faithful."[32] Without a steady flow of money the 'Holy Man' could not have sustained his various philanthropic enterprises. Almost universally these examples demonstrated a donor's recognition of the 'Holy Man's' reputation and ability.

Contributions followed several archetypes. First, the 'Holy Man' often received them for an intervention on behalf of a supplicant. Although he acted without the expectation of compensation or reward, he often received it. This was the case when Simeon the Stylite cured the son of a Byzantine man:

> He had a grievous and obstinate affliction. The disease had seized him suddenly in the head. His face was swollen up, his eyesight taken away and his whole body became weak and feeble. Mucus which had an extremely offensive smell was coming from his nose and eyes. When his father heard reports of the saint… he sent many gifts to Simeon through him. When they had arrived and entered, they laid him down before the saint and told him where he came from and how cruel his affliction was. [The saint] ordered them to loosen the bandages with which his face and head were wrapped and cried out… 'Go in the name of Christ, and take some of that water in your hands. Pour it on your face and over all your body.'[33]

Simeon cured the boy within a week. Another story described how a wealthy man, Beth Laha, brought his daughter to Simeon. After she was healed the man, and his money, stayed "with the saint [for] all the days of his life."[34]

The 'Holy Man' also gained wealth as a consequence of his piety alone and not necessarily from his selfless deeds. Theodore of Sykeon's piety, for example, earned him contributions. A story in the life of Theodore of Sykeon spoke of a man who maintained a terrific admiration for the 'Holy Man.' The man donated large amounts of money to Theodore's causes:

> He gave such bountiful alms to the oratories of the monastery that from them leaden tiles were made for the church of the holy martyr George and many precious things were acquired. He also used to distribute much money to the poor who happened to be there; and owing to his reverence for the Saint he always granted the requests of those who desired audience from him.[35]

---

[32] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 898.
[33] *The Lives of the Simeon Stylites*, tr. Doran, 163-64.
[34] Ibid. 120.
[35] Ibid. 169.

Similarly, John the Almsgiver's selfless love reached many residents in his episcopate, and they responded with generous contributions to help him in his work.

Some of the most interesting examples of this included disbelievers. The 'Holy Man' even helped his critics. Daniel the Stylite's *vita* demonstrated an example of this:

> One day a disbelieving heretic came up to the holy man, ostensibly for prayer, with his wife and children and some girls; but instead of prayers he began uttering calumnies against the holy man and poking witticisms at him… 'I, too, heard from many about this man and came up to be edified, and I found the opposite…' [people said to the man] 'You will find out what lies you are uttering against the servant of God.'[36]

The man and his family left the column and started having relationship and health problems. He returned and apologized to Daniel – who prayed for him – and then left the 'Holy Man' ten pounds of silver.

Gold and silver were a common form of donation; however many other types of private property also contributed to 'Holy Man' wealth. The *vita* of John Cassian, an Egyptian 'Holy Man,' tells of "a pious farmer who with his neighbors brought tithes and fresh fruits of his crops to the abbot for distribution to the poor."[37] Similarly, Theodore took advantage of his acquaintance with Emperor Maurice. He asked Maurice for a small gift to help his institution with its work of providing nourishment for the local poor:

> … [The Emperor Maurice requested that Theodore] make any request he liked. The blessed man sent the most blessed Philoumenus, the abbot, to the Emperor and also wrote a letter in order to secure some small gift of food for the monastery to meet the needs of the poor who looked to them for support. On receiving the letter the Emperor made a grant to the monastery of 200 *modii* of corn annually, and sent it to him together with a chalice and a paten.[38]

This annual amount was an especially useful gift because Theodore could have factored it into his yearly expenditures. The food received from such contributions allowed the 'Holy Man' to spend his money and time on other things. The interesting aspect of the examples in this section is that the donation was not motivated by the Church or monastery collective, but by the 'Holy Man.' This indicated that it was not necessarily piety alone that motivated people of Byzantium to donate, but a trust in the 'Holy Man.'

The examples above were not isolated occurrences. A constant stream of contributions for both monastic and clerical 'Holy Men' made up a large portion of their income. John the Almsgiver received so many donations just walking around the streets of his patriarchate that he admonished himself on days that he could not obtain donations:

---

[36] Ibid. 42.
[37] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 895.
[38] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 127.

One day the admirable man went out as usual and sat in his accustomed place until the fifth hour, and as nobody came to him he returned all tearful and cast down… Saint Sophronius, who chanced to be present, said to him in private, 'What is weighing down your holy soul and cast us all into sudden dismay?' John answered in a meek voice, 'Today for the first time humble John did not get any wages from anyone, and this was the first time that he could not offer anything to Christ on behalf of his countless sins.[39]

Theodoret noted the "many thousands" of people who thronged about Simeon the Stylite's pillar on a daily basis. As seen in his hagiography, many paid homage to his abilities with a donation. With the money that he gained from these people he built a number of religious institutions around Asia Minor.[40]

Endowments

Endowments were a much more formal type of contribution than the impromptu donation. Donors drew up contracts that proclaimed their intentions. This served two important functions: a donor could explicitly lay out his or her intentions in the contract and a recipient had hard evidence of his or her claim to the endowment. In the early sixth century, for example, a bishop used a contract to bequeath everything he owned to a certain monk:

May it be possible for me to live and be in good health and enjoy all my modest goods! But should I suffer the common lot of humankind and leave this life, I wish and order that, after my death, you, the aforementioned Victor (the name of the man), the most pious priest and my disciple, shall enter upon all of the moderate property bequeathed by me: movable and immovable and animate property. of every kind and sort and of whatever type and quantity, in gold and silver and cloth and copper… including what I inherited for from my forebears and what I acquired by my own sweat and by purchase and by charitable gift and by any manner or intent whatsoever, by written or unwritten means.[41]

In this case, the bishop's endowment gave Victor all his moveable and immovable property. Victor would then be able to use this contract to lay claim to the property. This served as the vehicle by which religious institutions maintained their property and wealth as they passed it on from one generation to the next. A considerable proportion of these endowments, like the example above, were *mortis causa*. This Latin phrase referred to a gift made by a person in contemplation of death, with the intention that the gift would not become fully effective until he or she died.[42] As John Thomas has stated, religious institutions "were often recipients of *proshora* donations *mortis*

---

[39] Ibid. 213.
[40] *The Lives of the Simeon Stylites*, tr. Doran, 159.
[41] *Apa Abraham: Testament*, tr. Leslie MacCoull. In: *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents*, eds. John Thomas and Angela Hero, (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000) 55.
[42] Stan Rule, "Some Latin: *Donatio Mortis Causa*," accessed at http://rulelaw.com/2006/03/some-latin-donatio-mortis-causa.html on 19 April 2006.

causa… The actual donations might consist of landed property, wine or other commodities, or cash raised from the liquidation of movable property and real estate."[43] The 'Holy Man' pushed for these transfers:

> Private religious foundations were important in the rural areas of the empire. John Chrysostom pointedly urged the great landowners to undertake the task of providing places of worship for the agricultural laborers on their estates.[44]

Upon the landowner's death the title would be transferred to the church. The 'Holy Man' benefited from the numerous endowments of people who wished, in death, to have their assets transferred to persons of high moral caliber.

High-ranking civil leaders also used other contractual endowments in their effort to contribute to a religious cause. It is well documented that emperors both promoted and sponsored the development of the institutional infrastructure of Christianity. They played an active role in the erection of new religious facilities as well as rebuilding existing structures. Contracts made this process more efficient and legitimate, especially with large amounts of money or land. For example, Eudocia, wife of Theodosius II, allegedly endowed various monasteries in her region with over 20,000 pounds of gold and 10,000 measures of oil. Although the reliability of such numbers must be questioned, there are references to Eudocia's contracts in the histories written by a fourth-century Church historian named Evagrius and Cassiodorus, a monk and statesman in the fifth century.[45]

Land was a common donation that elites permanently transferred to the 'Holy Man.' The land on which Basil of Caesarea built his great hospital, dubbed *Basileias*, was partly contributed by the emperor Valens. As Theodoret recalled, "The emperor was so delighted that he gave him some fine lands which he had there for the poor under his care, for they being in grievous bodily affliction were specially in need of care and cure."[46] Similarly, Elisabeth the Wonderworker received land from Leo when she forewarned him of a large fire in Constantinople:

> For this reason, from that time on the Christ-loving emperor acquired great faith in the blessed Elisabeth and honored her as was her due and, being kindly disposed, he assigned as a gift to her monastery one of the imperial properties in Hebdomon, bearing the name of St. Babylas, inasmuch as the convent was in straitened circumstances and [low on] resources.[47]

Also, in the *vita* of Daniel the Stylite an emperor ceded land and money for the construction of his facilities.[48] Once made, these donations became a permanent, inalienable part of the 'Holy Man's' estate.

---

[43] John Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*, (Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1987) 79.

[44] Thomas, *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*, 18.

[45] E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire: AD 312 – 460*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) 239.

[46] Andrew Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism and the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005) 104.

[47] *Blessed Elisabeth the Wonderworker*, tr. Valerie Karras. In: *Holy Woman of Byzantium*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 129.

[48] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 41.

Tax Exemptions and Subsidies

      The imperial government granted provisions to the 'Holy Man.' Constantine initiated many of these benefits. "The churches from the reign of Constantine received subsidies from the state. According to Theodoret, Constantine issued general instructions to all provincial governors to allocate annual grants in each city…"[49] These provisions extended to the Church all over the empire:

> Since it is our pleasure that something should be granted in all the provinces of Africa and Numidia and Mauritania to certain ministers of the legitimate and most holy religion, to defray their expenses, I have written to Ursus, the illustrious finance minister of Africa, and have directed him to make provision to pay to thy firmness three thousand *folles*. Do thou therefore, when thou hast received the above sum of money, command that it be distributed among all those mentioned above, according to the briefs sent to thee by Hosius.[50]

Emperor Julian canceled these benefits in the fourth century. The rise of the 'Holy Man' and his philanthropy provided the government with a new incentive to support religious institutions. This was reflected in the *Theodosian Code*. Jovian reintroduced regular installments of food and money in the fifth century. A law of 451 ordered "the continuance of salaries which have hitherto been paid from the treasury to the holy churches in various kinds."[51] Foodstuffs represented one such salary. Much of the food for the hospitals and poorhouses that will be detailed below was a subsidy from the Church and Byzantine government. Emperors vacillated between providing churches and monasteries with concessions and provisions, but ultimately these benefits played a substantial role in the 'Holy Man's' philanthropic efforts.

      Tax exemptions were another way in which the Byzantine state showed its support for public service. Early in Byzantine history, if monks or clerics organized public services, then they received exemptions from a variety of different taxes. An enactment by Constantine held that "…clerics and those persons whom recent sage has begun to call 'gravediggers' must be granted exemption from compulsory public services of a menial nature and from the payment of taxes."[52] His son, Constantius II, made the enactment more inclusive. For example, Constantius made many laws that conferred tax exemptions to businesses owned or initiated by religious individuals. The only condition was that the owner's profits would be used for charitable causes, "…profits must benefit the poor, and clerics are to regard profits as having been collected for the profit of religion…"[53] Constantius was clearly concerned with the possible abuse of tax exemptions. His policy was not one of enriching the clerics. The privilege was that of turning over the proceeds of

---

[49] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 899.

[50] *Laws for Christians*, translated in *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*. *Online Medieval Sourcebook*. accessed at http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/const1-laws2.html on 3 May 2006. In: Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

[51] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 899.

[52] *The Theodosian Code*, tr. Clyde Pharr, 403.

[53] Ibid.

the tax-free enterprise to the poor and needy.[54] Julian quashed some of these policies in the mid-fourth century.

Locally, the 'Holy Man' and the quality of his institutions played a pivotal role in the renewal of religious benefits. In the late fourth and early fifth century Basil of Caesarea campaigned for these provisions. In 373, for example, Basil of Caesarea asked the local Prefect "that his clerical institutions be exempt from taxation… [reminding] Modestus that such a concession would confer a benefit even greater than the loss in public revenue."[55] Modestus' response to Basil spoke volumes: "The very act of writing to so great a man is most conducive to honour in the eyes of the discerning; for intercourse with men who are overwhelmingly superior to the rest of mankind affords the greatest distinction to such as are deemed worthy of it."[56] Basil's reputation made allowances an easy choice for local governments.

Secular concern about the abuse of these allowances still persisted. It was the case that *curiales* sometimes seized the opportunity to exploit legislative loopholes in order to maintain family fortunes.[57] Basil's letters to financial officials confirm that he acknowledged the possibility that tax allowances could be abused: "Those officials were also invited to inspect the [homes] for the poor."[58] There was little need for inspection. *Basileias* served the people of Caesarea as a storehouse and poorhouse, and is generally regarded by scholars as the first hospital. As will be detailed later, the quality of this institution, and many others organized by other 'Holy Men,' made it easier for them to receive benefits.

In the sixth century the 'Holy Man,' and his efforts, garnered jubilant praise from the Emperor Justinian. The emperor enthusiastically discussed the benefits of monastic and clerical doings in his various legal codices. His fifth novel, released in 535, was devoted exclusively to monasticism: "Monastic life is so honorable and can render the person embracing it so acceptable to God, that it removes from him every human blemish, declares him to be pure and conformed to natural reason, greatly enriched in understanding, and superior to human beings by virtue of his thoughts."[59] He made a similar proclamation in the introduction of his one hundred and twentieth book of *Justinian's Code*, which he dedicated to bishops, their privileges, and responsibilities. The government acknowledged the reputation of the 'Holy Man' and gave him benefits.

Loans

Religious institutions in the East acted as both borrowers and lenders in Byzantine society. Lending money was not frowned upon in the East as it was in the West, even to the point that interest was not deemed corrupt. "Unlike in the Western Church, the Eastern Church made no sustained effort to outlaw as sinful all interest-bearing loans, and this was undoubtedly a boon to Byzantine trade."[60] The Church of Alexandria under John the Almsgiver kept in its archives all sorts

---

[54] Ibid.
[55] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 142-43.
[56] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 159.
[57] Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 282-83.
[58] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 142-43.
[59] Andrea Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church*, (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 2004) 174.
[60] "The Role of Trade in the Economic Readjustment of Byzantium in the Seventh Century," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers XIII*, (Washington D.C.: 1959) 81. In: *Byzantium and the World around it: Economic and Institutional Relations*, ed. Robert S. Lopez, (London: Variorum Reprints, 1978).

of memoranda of business transactions in which it engaged the economic market as either a borrower or lender.[61]   John was extremely active as far as loans were concerned.   "Another command which the admirable Patriarch consistently observed was that 'From him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away'; he never refused anyone who begged for that kind of help from him."[62] His *vita* recounts this kind of lending:

> A man was harried by the tax-collectors and was unable to pay, for the crops had failed [because] the Nile [had] not risen as usual-so he went to a military commander, one of the grandees, and besought him to lend him 50 pounds of gold and offered to give security for double the value if desired. The officer promised to give it him, but postponed doing so at the time. But as the collectors pressed the man hard, he… [went] to the gentle and admirable Patriarch. Almost before he had fully explained the circumstances, the Patriarch said: 'Why, if necessary, my son, I will give you even this robe I am wearing.' For amongst his other wonderful traits was this one: he could not bear to see anyone weeping for misery without mingling his own tears with his. And so now, without a moment's hesitation, he fulfilled the request of the man who asked for a loan.[63]

Although there were generally no interest rates attached to the resources that a 'Holy Man' loaned, he still benefited from such endeavors. One story involved a man who needed to sell some cargo as a means to support his family. John provided him with two loans and an icon and eventually the man was able to return with a great profit and both men benefited.[64] People counted on the 'Holy Man' for temporary financial aid and this relationship earned him revenue.

The idea of profiting by making loans was generally frowned upon by hagiographers. This is why outside the *vitae* of John the Almsgiver and St. Spyridon it is difficult to find examples of such interactions. It was, however, the case that the 'Holy Man' lived according to a certain standard that stressed the moral advantage of lending without asking either for a reward or for collateral. The various concessions of these men often conferred some sort of economic benefit from their supplicants. An Eastern commander named Dionysius, upon witnessing and receiving a number of favors of Simeon the Stylite, put his services at the 'Holy Man's' disposal. "He returned in honor and great pomp. And coming [back], he bowed down to the saint and was blessed by him. As long as he lived he gladly received anything that the saint commanded him on behalf of the poor or about any matter. He would bow down and do his command."[65]

This is not to say that the 'Holy Man' would not occasionally lose money or resources on account of his loans. One story from the life of John the Almsgiver explained how a "scoundrel" borrowed 20 pounds of gold from John and then refused to pay him back. Instead of throwing him in jail, however, John forgave him (but he still did not get his money back). This kind of loss does not appear often in hagiography. Especially observable in the life of John, people greatly appreciated the interest-free and hassle-free loans that they could get from the 'Holy Man.' More

---

[61] Ibid.
[62] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 244.
[63] Ibid. 231.
[64] Ibid. 218.
[65] *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*, tr. Doran, 165.

often than not, they repaid him generously. The 'Holy Man's' interactions with Byzantine society as lenders provided him with another source of revenue.

The 'Holy Man' also borrowed for the sake of his society. In hagiography, borrowing was seen as a last resort for finances. John the Almsgiver borrowed money in order to make ends meet: "and great scarcity of food prevailed because the river had not risen to its usual height; therefore after he had spent all the money he had, the holy Patriarch borrowed about ten hundred pounds from good Christians."[66] This money bought food from abroad for the people of Alexandria:

> …news was brought that two of the Church's fast-sailing ships, which he had sent
> to Sicily for corn, had cast anchor in the harbour. At these tidings the blessed man
> knelt on the ground and gave thanks…[67]

It does not appear that 'Holy Men' asked for loans often, but in times of need, they supplemented their wealth by borrowing.

The 'Holy Man's' Reallocation of Wealth

As the 'Holy Man' became an economic powerhouse, he reallocated his wealth into public welfare projects. As this occurred, the expectations of a 'Holy Man' slowly transformed into those of a rural patron. From the time of Constantine, Byzantine churches and monasteries performed ever more public services, and the actions taken by 'Holy Men' in this period can be viewed as the new leap forward as far as public philanthropy was concerned. Areas lucky enough to have a 'Holy Man' saw the development of sophisticated economic systems, the most important of which included health care, famine relief, and welfare projects. The 'Holy Man' organized large-scale charitable organizations that improved Byzantine life.

Health Care Systems

The 'Holy Man' was renowned for his ability to heal both mundane and supernatural ailments. Health and well-being were among his primary concerns. Hagiographers included abundant examples in their records of the 'Holy Man' both healing and making facilities available that provided healing.

Recent research has framed the development of hospitals as a largely monastic phenomenon:

> Early monastic leaders obsessed over sickness and health. A deep concern with
> illness runs through all early monastic literature, the hives, rules, instructions, and
> homilies… monastic leaders wrestled less with the interpretation of sickness
> within their own bodies than with the treatment of the sick within society, that is,
> the healthcare system... Monastic leaders developed systems for providing health

---

[66] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 221-222.
[67] Ibid.

care to all monastics and [viewed] all manner of sick and disabled individuals as part of the monastic society.[68]

It must, however, be recognized that these same monastic leaders, often 'Holy Men,' brought these concerns to the city in the fourth and fifth centuries. As 'Holy Men' became bishops and patriarchs for major cities they viewed care for the sick as a high priority. During a particularly harsh famine, for example, John the Almsgiver ordered the construction of inpatient hospitals to deal with the overflow of sick and starving people.[69] Similarly both Basil of Caesarea and Theodore of Sykeon built large complexes that treated the sick in their regions: Basil's just outside of Caesarea[70] and Theodore's in Anastasioupolis.

The 'Holy Woman' had a pronounced impact in the establishment of health care systems. Nunneries, along with monasteries and church-operated hospitals, provided asylum for the infirm. Elisabeth the Wonderworker labored in one such establishment in the large city of Herakleia.[71] She was the most notable woman healer of the fifth century:

> Among the people who came to her was a man who had been blinded. Hearing of the blessed Elisabeth's miracles, he came up to her led by the hands of others and said, "have mercy on me, faithful disciple of God, and open my eyes, so that, seeing the sweet light through you, I may glorify the Creator of all." The blessed one was moved with compassion… Within seven days she made him [sic] to see most clearly, and he glorified God with a loud voice. In such fashion, therefore, the saint shone with the rays of her wondrous miracles and illuminated those who came to her in faith.[72]

Like the 'Holy Man,' the 'Holy Woman' played an important role in the development of the health care systems in Byzantium.

The 'Holy Man's' infirmaries were innovative. Three main characteristics separated these facilities from earlier forms of health care: they had new options for the sick, they had professional staffs, and they were free. The hospitals associated with the 'Holy Man' offered the sick inpatient, outpatient, and ambulatory options. At Basil's large hospital in Caesarea, for instance, patients could stay and be treated for the duration of their illness. Theodore of Sykeon built a similar facility:

> Now since the oratory of the holy martyr George was small… he built on its right hand side a very fine house (dedicated to Michael, the archangel) which was comfortable both in winter and summer… In this house he ordained that the community of Brothers should officiate in order that both those who were waiting either to be healed of an illness, or for the expulsion of evil spirits, and those who had come up to pray, might rest awhile in the hallowed church of the Archangel

---

[68] Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital*, 39.
[69] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 202.
[70] Basil of Caesarea's hospital, *Basileias*, was an exceptionally large full-service hospital. Modern scholarship has generally accepted it as the first of its kind.
[71] *Blessed Elisabeth the Wonderworker*, tr. Valerie Karras. In: *Holy Woman of Byzantium*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 118.
[72] Ibid. 131.

which was open day and night, and listen to the service and join in the prayers and find healing.[73]

Earlier prototypes had only housed the sick. Those who were contagious would be isolated.[74] Treatment, as opposed to containment, was a dramatic improvement in health care.

The 'Holy Man' also traveled to people who could not journey to his facilities. For example, Basil of Caesarea maintained a ready workforce for such purposes: "beasts for traveling and attendants" that delivered off-site medical treatment.[75] John the Almsgiver contributed a large amount of money for this kind of effort, "and for the sick, [he bought] various kinds of eatables, and finally, a great many beasts of burden for the distribution of these necessities."[76] Theodore of Sykeon traveled in order to heal a family:

> Mannas then told him everything… and implored the Saint to come and bless all those of his household [as they were suffering from a Devil initiated disease]. The Saint fixed a day for the visit and dismissed him. Theodore paid his visit, and that night the silentiary, as usual, was sorely troubled and the Saint prayed that he might be delivered from his malady… The next day after the morning service they were sitting at breakfast when the Saint said to the silentiary: 'Courage! my son: give glory to God, for I believe that in His goodness He has driven away from you your malady: from today it will trouble you no more.' The guardsman was cured, and the Saint blessed him, his wife, who was a fervent Christian, and all his household and then returned to his cell.[77]

In another story, Theodore ventured out with some of the monks from his monastery and saved a young boy who had a stomach problem.[78] It is important to recognize that both the construction of the hospital and maintenance of its inpatient and ambulatory staff required a considerable amount of revenue from the 'Holy Man's' sources. The 'Holy Man' adopted many innovations that improved the hospital as an institution.

The quality of treatment at the 'Holy Man's' hospitals reflected a second improvement in the area of health care. The hospitals organized by the 'Holy Man' typically housed and maintained a professional medical staff.   Byzantine physicians specialized in many areas of medicine – from surgery to optometry.[79] In an example that will be examined in more detail later in the discussion, John the Almsgiver built seven hospitals in Alexandria that specifically cared for pregnant women. The constant supervision of patients was unlike virtually every other type of ancient medical system. Traditionally, medical professionals prescribed a plan of treatment for the sick, but there was no extended contact. The 'Holy Man's' infirmaries offered care under the supervision of trained health care providers, including a nursing staff and doctors. For example, Basil acknowledged this

---

[73] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 117.
[74] Miller, *Birth of the Hospital*, 27.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid. 204.
[77] Ibid. 148.
[78] Ibid. 136.
[79] Ibid. 152-159.

necessity as he constructed his large hospital, "…for strangers, for those who visit us while on a journey, or for those who require some care because of sickness. All those people required nurses [and] physicians..."[80] According to Daniel the Stylite's life, Emperor Leo built a similar facility near his pillar.[81] Daniel initially did not like the idea. The accommodations of his mentor, Simeon the Stylite were much more modest. Leo eventually convinced him. "For the blessed Simeon, as you said, did not live in such a storm-beaten place, nor did people go up to him for so many different needs [as opposed to] only to pray and to be blessed…"[82] One of Daniel's most famous healings occurred at that location when he cured a man with "cut sinews."[83] The 'Holy Man' sponsored a health care system that included a professional staff and a ward large enough to deal with inpatient services.

‘Holy Men' also seemed to be gifted at treating patients with psychological problems. Hagiographers acknowledged the 'Holy Man's' ability to heal both mundane and supernatural ailments. These traits were often separated. In Theodore's *vita* he was described as having "power against the demons to cast them out from men *and* to heal the sick [my emphasis]."[84] This differentiation illustrates that Byzantines were acutely aware of the differences between colds, flu, stomach problems, and more indefinable afflictions. In hagiography, illness of supernatural origin, mostly articulated as demonic possession of some sort, often corresponded with psychological instability. For example, in Theodore of Sykeon's *vita*, there was a woman named Artemis in a nearby village would randomly harm people "even unto death."[85] Unsurprisingly, Theodore's hagiographer labeled her possessed and went on to note that she dwelt with many demons. Daniel the Stylite encountered a man who was similarly unstable and also regarded as demonic: he injured random people and sank ships.[86]

People who society deemed demonic were shunned and isolated. This kind of negative treatment undoubtedly exacerbated their conditions. In viewing the 'Holy Man's' treatment of these outcasts, it is reasonable to acknowledge the psycho-therapeutic value of attention and acceptance. Interestingly, the cure for many of these people was solely the attention of the 'Holy Man' and his monks. It is no surprise that many 'possessed' individuals often stayed with the 'Holy Man' after their cure. Theodore's hagiographer observed this trend:

> …especially did he make supplications to God for aid against unclean spirits; hence, if he merely rebuked them… they would immediately come out of people… [those] who had obtained healing would not leave him but stayed with him, giving him such service as he needed.[87]

---

[80] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 142.
[81] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 40.
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid. 60.
[84] Ibid. 98.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Ibid. 14.
[87] Ibid. 117.

Similar examples are seen in the *vitae* of John the Almsgiver and Daniel Stylite.[88] The 'Holy Man's' facility treated the psychological problems of his people as well as physical injuries and less exotic medical problems.

Finally, the health care system provided by the 'Holy Man' was free. His foundations provided even the poorest people with medical treatment. The accounts found in hagiography are of particular interest because they focus on the low cost of their treatment. Elisabeth the Wonderworker's narrative, for example, stressed not only her miracles, but also that her services were free:

> Now there was a man from a well-born and wealthy family, who had an only daughter with a flow of blood. He had exhausted the greater part of his wealth on doctors, but this profited her not at all, for the illness was stronger than their art. Finally, despairing of her being healed by the doctors, he took his child and cast her at the saint's feet, crying out his tears, 'Save my unfortunate daughter, handmaid of God – I commit her to God and to your prayers and hands – and, if you wish, take all I own.' She answered him, 'That which is in your house, my child, keep as your own, for I need none of it. If you… promise to be totally humble and to be merciful to the poor, your daughter will be healed.' When the man immediately agreed to do these things, with a prayer of Elisabeth anointed the child with holy oil from the great martyr George and restored her health…[89]

Free health care, even to the wealthy, greatly benefited Byzantine society. Sometimes these procedures of medicine and prayer were quite complicated processes. After the Persians laid waste to the Syrian countryside during John the Almsgiver's life, the 'Holy Man' provided free treatment to the wounded:

> He accordingly gave immediate orders that the wounded and sick should be put to bed in hostels and hospitals which he himself had founded, and that they should receive care and medical treatment without payment and that then they should be free to leave as each of them should choose.[90]

This impressive example indicated that the 'Holy Man's' facilities were not only large, but also capable of dealing with injuries associated with battle. The medical treatment at his hospital was both free and effective.

The medical practices of the 'Holy Man' not only eased the economic pressures and raised the physiological wellbeing of those nearby, but they also produced a number of jobs not related to actual treatment. The construction of such facilities necessitated considerable economic development. All the 'Holy Men' discussed in this project built multiple structures that served as hospitals for each man's respective area, but it was Basil of Caesarea who embarked on the most ambitious hospital project. He built an immense complex that fed, housed, and healed the infirm of

---

[88] Ibid. 16, 47, 202.
[89] *Blessed Elisabeth the Wonderworker*, tr. Valerie Karras. In: *Holy Woman of Byzantium*, ed. Alice-Mary Talbot, 130-31.
[90] Ibid. 241.

Caesarea. These projects meant jobs for many laborers, as well as for those who staffed the buildings. Basil recognized the logistical effort needed to make such a place function properly. "They need equipment and places to work; [and] still other buildings…"[91] Under Basil's pontificate, Caesarea expanded – structurally – by some 25%.[92] The construction of these hospitals provided a source of jobs in these areas.

Insurance

The villages that grew up around the 'Holy Man' were also, in a way, insured against unforeseen shortages or tragedies. He accomplished this largely in three ways. He organized surpluses, built shelters for the needy or sick, and diverted resources from other expenditures for the purchase of food. Famines paralyzed social, economic, and political development in the regions they affected.[93] Examples in hagiography described numerous famines that occurred near 'Holy Men' and also the devastating impact of such events. The actions of a 'Holy Man' provided stability for his region.

Hagiographical examples and accounts from the time exulted the 'Holy Man's' ability to organize surpluses in a town and keep it relatively safe from shortages.[94] For example, a catastrophic food shortage that affected Cappadocia in 369 was partially alleviated by Basil: "By his word and exhortations he opened up the storehouses of the rich and maintained control over the resulting redistribution of the food supply."[95] Similarly Theodore of Sykeon distributed all the wheat in his storehouses during a famine in Anastasioupolis. When wheat eventually ran out, he prayed to God:

> It was about this period that a severe famine prevailed at one and the same time throughout the whole country. 'Go to the storeroom and sponge out the wheat-bins; put what you find on a clean dish and bring it here.' When it was brought, he bent his head and besought God the Provider, Who readily hears men's prayers, to grant him a supply of food for the monasteries; and after the prayer he said to the brother, 'Go in and place this wheat together with the dish under the altar of the all holy Mother of God, and the Lord will send us food.' This was done and on the morrow some true lovers of Christ from a great distance came and brought him thirty large measures of wheat.[96]

The actions of Basil and Theodore limited the impact that famine had in each man's area. The surpluses of the 'Holy Man' provided stability during dire times.

Money also helped the 'Holy Man' cope with difficult famines. I call again on the example in which of John the Almsgiver spent all his money in an attempt to alleviate a famine in Alexandria.

---

[91] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 142.

[92] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 901.

[93] Peter Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 16.

[94] Gregory the Great's *vita* of Benedict of Nursia included a very good example of monastic surplus redistribution. "While Campania was suffering from famine, the holy abbot distributed the food supplies of his monastery to the needy until there was nothing left in the storeroom but a little oil in a glass vessel." Even that last bit of oil was eventually distributed.

[95] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 136.

[96] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 157.

It was not enough, so he borrowed another 1000 pounds of gold. These bought him two shiploads of corn that stemmed the effects of the famine.[97] Similarly, during the famine that affected Caesarea in 369, Basil sold what was left of his own extensive property "for the benefit of the starving and sick, he also raised subscriptions, and arranged relief work."[98]

The organization of famine relief in major metropolitan areas was no small effort. The 'Holy Man' initiated and managed groups that distributed charities. These *diaconia* would be in charge of food delivery during famines.[99] Many monasteries and churches supported such organizations. An important part of relief efforts also necessitated the construction of facilities that dealt with the problems associated with famines. Outbreaks of diseases caused by starvation and malnutrition often accompanied food shortages. The life of John the Almsgiver recounted the intricacies of his effort to deal with this problem:

> Once when a severe famine was oppressing the city and the holy man's stewards were, as usual, ceaselessly distributing food and money to the needy, some destitute women overcome with hunger and but lately risen from child-bed were obliged to hasten to receive help from the distributors while they were still in the grip of abdominal pains, deadly pale, and suffering grievously; when the wondrous man was told of this he built seven lying-in hospitals in different parts of the city.[100]

Theodore of Sykeon and Basil of Caesarea also built numerous complexes that dealt with famine related problems throughout their lifetimes. At the end of Basil's reign, hospitals, poorhouses, and food distribution centers made up more than a quarter of Caesarea (structurally).[101] Theodore of Sykeon's hagiographer laced the 'Holy Man's' *vita* with examples of his building more and more structures for the accommodation of his supplicants:

> When the blessed man saw the vast crowds that assembled and realized that the chapel of St. George was too small, he gave the rest of the money he had inherited to build a church worthy of the holy martyr George with three apses and an oratory on the right dedicated to the holy martyr Plato.[102]

These buildings served simultaneously as storehouses and as food distribution areas during hard times.

Some 'Holy Men,' according to hagiography, could also alleviate famines through divine intervention. Theodore of Sykeon accomplished this in a village called Skoudris:

---

[97] Ibid. 158.
[98] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 735.
[99] Demetrios Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*, (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1968) 75.
[100] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 202-3.
[101] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 901.
[102] Ibid. 127.

> In the village of Skoudris near the monastery of the Archangel there is a heavy hailstorm, the neighbouring stream is in flood and destroys houses and crops, carrying men, women, children and little babies in their cradles down into the river Sagaris. The householders of the half of the village which had not been ruined appeal to the Saint who comes to the place, prays and sets up a cross, and thereafter even when there were storms of snow and rain the stream was not flooded and no one suffered damage.[103]

Immunity to famine in early Byzantium would have had a substantial economic impact on any given community. No surplus grain would have been necessary, and the people of Skoudris could have pursued other activities like rural development or education. Simeon the Stylite also assisted villages that suffered during famines:

> Again in a little village near Gindaris there was a large spring which watered many fields. Suddenly it failed and dried up, and the trees withered and whatever had been sown among their irrigation system died completely… He said, 'I give you advice for your salvation I do not want your gold or silver; what I want are your souls that I may present them before God with confidence… take three small pebbles, make on them crosses and throw them down in the middle of that spring where it gushes forth...' They went and did as he said. When they went out early in the morning they found all the fields inundated, the spring full and pouring forth three times as much as previously.[104]

Public Welfare

The betterment of poor people was always a priority of the 'Holy Man.' As witnessed in his hagiography, he empathized with their difficult position. In his homilies, Basil of Caesarea often tried to make others see these hardships as he did:

> How can I bring before your eyes the suffering of the poor man? He considers his finances: he has no gold and never will. He has some clothes and the sort of possessions the poor have, all worth only a few coins. What can he do? He turns his glance at length on his children: by selling them he might put off death. Imagine the struggle between the desperation of hunger and the bonds of parenthood. The former threatens him with horrible death; nature pulls him back, persuading him to die with his children… finally he is overcome, conquered by necessity and inexorable need.[105]

Thus, the 'Holy Man' taught lessons of charity. As seen in a previous example, one of Daniel the Stylite's lectures on charity and almsgiving reduced his audience to tears.[106] The 'Holy Man'

---

[103] Ibid. 179.
[104] *The Lives of Simeon Stylites*, tr. Doran, 145.
[105] Paul Fedwick, *The Church and the Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1979) 34.
[106] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 165.

viewed charitable organizations as a vehicle that could uplift the poor. For example, Basil's sentiments motivated his construction of Byzantium's "most celebrated hospice of the poor."[107] With his sources of revenue the 'Holy Man' set about creating programs and building facilities that dealt with the poor in his areas.

The welfare systems of the 'Holy Man' utilized surprisingly intricate techniques to identify his recipients and disperse his services. In major cities, the 'Holy Man' generated lists of people who would receive regular donatives of food and money. In the sixth century, *Justinian's Code* identified a man as 'poor' if his revenues and possessions were worth less than fifty *nomismata*.[108] Typically, only these people could receive imperial assistance.[109] The 'Holy Man' had a much broader definition. He simply designated the poor as any individual who was in need. John the Almsgiver used this standard to generate such a list in Alexandria:

> The whole assembly which had gathered together was deeply moved at his words, and agreed thereto, and then the holy man continued, 'Go therefore through the whole city, please, and make a list of all my masters down to the last'. But his hearers could not imagine who these could be, and besought him to tell them, as they were astonished that any could possibly be masters of the Patriarch; and he opened his angelic mouth again and said: 'Those whom you call poor and beggars, these I proclaim my masters and helpers. For they, and they only, are really able to help us and bestow upon us the kingdom of heaven.' The imitator of Christ saw that this command was carried out with all speed, and he then bade them apportion a daily sum to be paid by his private treasurer sufficient for the needs of these poor; and they were more than seven thousand and a half.[110]

John Chrysostom also maintained a list of over 3000 widows and virgins.[111] These efforts dealt with specific groups of the economically incapable of a 'Holy Man's' community.

The 'Holy Man' made more general welfare available for his people. In some of Basil of Caesarea's letters, he discussed the logistics of the numerous soup kitchens that he had constructed throughout his city. These were accessible to anyone who needed a meal. Gregory of Nazianzus, a friend of Basil's, saw these kitchens: "they served simple meals, cauldrons of pea soup with salted meats."[112] He also observed that Basil did so without profit to himself. The 'Holy Man's' churches and monasteries also served a similar function. Byzantines would visit these institutions, often on holy days, in order to receive gifts of wheat, wine, meat, honey, beans, and other foodstuffs. Theodore of Sykeon increased the food holdings of his monastery for holidays and festivals:

> The Saint once gave orders to some carpenters to make a wooden chest for storing corn, [pulses, and meat]… And he commanded them not to touch any meat until the work which he had ordered was finished, and that then they could go to the

---

[107] Ibid. 40.
[108] Constantelos, *Byzantine Philanthropy*, 257.
[109] Ibid.
[110] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 211.
[111] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 903.
[112] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 137.

village and eat. For meat was never eaten in the monastery all the year through, except on three saints' festivals when the crowd which came to the festivals was given food.[113]

Hagiographical writers included many examples of the 'Holy Man's' efforts to deal with starving people on a day to day basis.

The 'Holy Man' also built buildings that housed the poor called *ptocheia*. These were for people who were utterly debilitated, both economically and physically. For example, a large section of *Basileias* was a poorhouse.[114]   *Basilieas* housed many of Cappadocia's economically incapacitated – orphans, widows, the sick, and elderly:

> Gregory's account of how Basil assembled in one place those afflicted, call to mind the famous *Basileias*, the 'new city' – a whole range of buildings for the care of the sick and the destitute, and for the distribution of surplus food to those in need. Basil referred to the enterprise in three letters, which appear to provide us with a chronological framework… In the first Basil reported that he was 'already in action, being engaged meanwhile in getting our materials together…' [In the second two Basil] emphasized a life of poverty, generosity to those in need, and asceticism…[115]

The structure became the most famous refuge for the poor of this time period. As noted above, Theodore of Sykeon's *vita* included many examples of his commissioning the construction of structures that handled the poor of Anastasioupolis. Two notable examples were his large complex dedicated to St. George and the multiple additions to his own monastery. Daniel the Stylite also built such accommodations around his pillar.[116] These buildings served as the sites for public welfare efforts by the 'Holy Man.'

The 'Holy Man's' various sources of revenue funded these welfare systems. For example, the Church provided the food at *Basileias* through subsidies, while Basil supplied the money needed to keep his operation running smoothly.[117] He even paid for delivery services that made these charities all the more widely available. Theodore of Sykeon also used these sources as supplies for his welfare centers. For example, by itself, Emperor Maurice's annual donation of 200 *modii* of corn would have been enough to feed forty families for a month.[118] The poorhouses of the 'Holy Man' were capable of dealing with poor people's welfare in his regions.

The institutionalization of public welfare systems had a large impact on the quality of life in the 'Holy Man's' cities. These efforts simultaneously gave poor people refuge and also made it easier for them to become productive members of society. As previously mentioned, after a stay at the buildings described above, many people would work for the 'Holy Man.' For example, outside

---

[113] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 134.

[114] Basil, in fact, did not refer to *Basileias* as a hospital, but as a "place for the poor."

[115] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 140.

[116] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 41.

[117] Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea*, 140.

[118] John Murray, *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 1975. Accessed at http://penelope. uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Frumentariae_Leges.html on 4 May 2006.

of Antioch, a number of people with sizeable debts voluntarily started to work for Simeon the Stylite at his monasteries and convents. In exchange for their service, he sponsored their payments. When Simeon became aware of these problems he spoke with local leaders and as a consequence they reduced interest rates and even "blotted out" some debt in the area.[119] People noticed this kind of development and stability. Theodore of Sykeon, for example, acknowledged the growth of Anastasioupolis: "…he exalted the renown of the city which had welcomed him, inspiring in the citizens such a virtuous activity that their city became the envy and the admiration of other towns and [from] this it really [earned] its right to its name of 'Resurrection.'"[120] In actuality, all the cities and areas that have been discussed, according to hagiography, developed in similar ways.

Public welfare efforts went largely unnoticed for some of the 'Holy Men.' Again, the performance of miracles overshadowed more mundane details in the lives of the Stylite saints, like the construction of facilities that handled their supplicants. This can be accounted for by recognizing that people like Daniel the Stylite and Simeon the Stylite catered to smaller permanent populations, unlike those of Alexandria, Constantinople, and other large cities. Simeon and Daniel respectively lived in rural areas outside of Antioch and Constantinople. These men both implemented emergency and non-emergency public welfare schemes on a smaller scale. The plans simply did not need to be as grandiose as those of Basil, Theodore, or John. For example, it is known that the public welfare-related structures built by Daniel were just north of his monastery and pillar, but little is known about the size of these buildings – for they are only briefly mentioned in his *vita*. Similarly, Simeon the Stylite, with material aid from Byzantine officials, initiated the construction of hostels and shelters.[121] These structures became well known by pilgrims who traveled to his pillar at Telanissos. The writers of John Chrysostom's life focused much more on his fiery homilies, speeches, and memorable conflicts with the ecclesiastical and secular aristocracy of Antioch and Constantinople. Chrysostom, very much like Basil of Caesarea, built large hospitals (some of which remained in operation until the 19th century), organized surpluses of food and money, and provided the poor with lodging. The intricacies of these endeavors, however, were not well documented.

Legislative Recognition of the 'Holy Man's' Abilities

As time passed, public welfare functions became legal responsibilities for the 'Holy Men.' In 423, for example, churches and some monasteries in Byzantium became liable for the roads and bridges in their vicinity.[122] By the sixth century, Justinian rewarded bishops with substantial subsidies and privileges, but also gave them more responsibilities. Justinian's legal code called for bishops and other men of good repute to overlook such efforts:

> Concerning civic incomes or revenues coming to cities in each year from public or private funds, either bequeathed to these by certain persons or donated or otherwise devised or acquired, whether allocated for works or for purchase of grain or for a public aqueduct or for [sic] heatings of baths or for harbours or for

---

[119] Ibid.
[120] *Three Byzantine Saints*, tr. Dawes and Baynes, 130.
[121] Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire*, 64.
[122] Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, 898.

constructions of walls or of towers or for repair of bridges or for paving roads or, simply, for the citizens' uses, whether from public or private causes (as has been said): we ordain the most God-beloved bishop and three men of good repute and of the chief men in all respects in the several cities, assembling together, in each year should inspect the works performed and should provide that these should be surveyed and the persons who administer or who have administered these should render accounts; and that in the constructing of the records it should be evident that the works have been completed or the funds for purchase of grain and for baths or concerning paving of roads or concerning aqueduct or for any other such projects have been administered.[123]

A law from another part of *Justinian's Code* held bishops responsible for grain provisioning in the countryside.[124] Similar enactments for monks and abbots can be found in his fifth novel. By this time the 'Holy Man' had become so renowned in his abilities to handle the demand for public services that the imperial government of Byzantium made him responsible these actions. Through economic reallocation, the 'Holy Man' executed the functions that he was charged carrying out, and consequently improved the wellbeing of the people in his area.

Conclusion

Modern research has examined the social, political, and spiritual interactions of the 'Holy Man.' Thus far, it has inadequately recognized the economic function that a 'Holy Man' had in his or her area. The argument here is simple: the 'Holy Man's' aspirations of empowerment for his people necessitated his action in the economic markets of his area. The achievements seen in this project must simultaneously be acknowledged as essential identifiers in the 'Holy Man' definition.

---

[123] Rapp, *Holy Bishops*, 289
[124] Ibid. 233.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Basil the Great. *A Summary of the Rule of St. Basil the Great*. Trans. Brotherhood of the Imitation of Christ. Tiruvalia: The Bethany Printing House, 1930.

Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. Ed. John Thomas and Angela Hero. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000.

Byzantine Saints' Lives in Translation: Holy Women of Byzantium. Ed. Alice-Mary Talbot. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1996.

Divine Liturgies of Saints Chrysostom and Basil. Tr. J. N. W. Robertson. London: David Nutt and Strand, 1894.

Laws for Christians. Translated in *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers*. *Online Medieval Sourcebook*. Accessed at http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/const1-laws2.html on 3 May 2006.

The Divine Liturgies of Our Fathers Among the Saints: John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea with that of the Presanctified. Ed., Trans. J. Robertson. London: David Nutt W. C. Strand, 1894.

The Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom. Trans. The Monks of Saint Procopius Abbey. Illinois: Benedictine Mission Press, 1942.

The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions. Trans. Clyde Pharr. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.

The Lives of Simeon Stylites. Trans. Robert Doran. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1992.

Three Byzantine Saints: The Lives of St. Daniel the Stylite, St. John the Almsgiver, and Theodore of Sykeon. Trans. Elizabeth Dawes and Norman H. Baynes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948.

Secondary Sources

A Monk of the Eastern Church. *Orthodox Spirituality: An Outline of the Orthodox Ascetical and Mystical Tradition*. Tr. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.

Attwater, Donald. *Saints of the East*. London: Harvill Press, 1963.

Attwater, Donald. *St. John Chrysostom*. London: Harvill Press, 1959.

Banaji, Jairus. *Agrarian Change in Late Antiquity: Gold, Labor, and Aristocratic Dominance*.
        Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Baur, Dom. *John Chrysostom and His Time*. London: Sands and Company, 1960.

Baynes, Norman. *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*. London: Oxford University
        Press, 1931.

Bréhier, Louis. *The Life and Death of Byzantium*. Trans. Margaret Vaughan. New York: North-
        Holland, 1977.

Brewster, Pomeroy. *Saints and Festivals of the Christian Church*. New York: Frederick A.
        Stokes Company, 1904.

Brown, Peter. *The Making of Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Brown, Peter. "The Philosopher and Society in Late Antiquity." *Protocol of the thirty-fourth
        Colloquy*.   Berkeley: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern
        Culture, 1978.

Brown, Peter. "The Rise and Function of the Holy Man in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Roman
        Studies*, 61, 1971 .

Campenhausen, Hans. *The Fathers of the Greek Church*. Trans. Stanley Godman. Stuttgart:
        Pantheon, 1959.

Cave, William. *Lives of the Most Eminent Fathers of the Church that flourished in the First Four
        Centuries*. Oxford: Printed by J. Vincent, 1840.

Chadwick, Owen. *John Cassian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Constantelos, Demetrios. *Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare*. New Brunswick: Rutgers
        University Press, 1968.

Constantelos, Demetrios. *Poverty, Society and Philanthropy in the late mediaeval Greek World*.
        New York: Caratzas Publishing, 1992.

Crislip, Andrew. *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism and the Transformation of
        Health Care in Late Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

Elliott, T. G. "The Tax Exemptions Granted to Clerics by Constantine and Constantius II."
        Phoenix 32 (1978) 326-336.

Farmer, David Hugh. *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Farrar, Frederic. *Lives of the Fathers: Sketches of the Church History in Biography*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907.

Fedwick, Paul. *The Church and The Charisma of Leadership in Basil of Caesarea*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979.

Garnsey, Peter. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Hartney, Aideen. *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*. Liverpool: Duckworth, 2004.

Harvey, Susan. *Asceticism and Society in Crisis: John of Ephesus and The Lives of the Eastern Saints*. University California Press: California, 1990. Accessed at: http://texts.cdlib.org/xtf/view?docId =ft3d5nb1n1&chunk.id=d0e3009 on 11 February 2006.

Hefferman, Thomas. *Sacred Biographers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hendy, Michael. *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy: 300-1450*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Homer, Sydney. *A History of Interest Rates*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Hunt, E. D. *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire: AD 312 – 460*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Later Roman Empire: 284-602*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1964.

Kelly, Christopher. *Ruling the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2004.

Kelly, J. N. D. *Goldenmouth: The Story of John Chrysostom Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Mayer, Wendy and Pauline Allen. *John Chrysostom*. New York: Routledge Publishers, 2000.

Miller, Timothy. *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1985.

Miller, Timothy. *The Orphanages of Byzantium*. Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of
          America Press, 2003.

Murray, John. *A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 1975. Accessed at
          http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/
          Frumentariae_Leges.html on 4 May 2006.

Ostrogorsky, George. *History of the Byzantine State*. Trans. Joan Hussey. New Brunswick:
          Rutgers University Press, 1969.

Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of
          Transition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Rule, Stan. "Some Latin: *Donatio Mortis Causa*." Accessed at http://rulelaw.com/ 2006/03/some-
          latin-donatio-mortis-causa.html on 19 April 2006.

Rousseau, Philip. *Basil of Caesarea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Sterk, Andrea. *Renouncing the World Yet Leading the Church*. Cambridge: Harvard University
          Press, 2004.

Stewart, Columba. *Cassian the Monk*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

The Economic History of Byzantium. Ed. Angeliki Laiou. Washington D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks
          Research Library and Collection, 2002.

"The Role of Trade in the Economic Readjustment of Byzantium in the Seventh Century."
          Dumbarton Oaks Papers XIII. Washington D.C., 1959. Found in *Byzantium and the
          World around it: Economic and Institutional Relations*. Ed. Robert Lopez. London:
          Variorum Reprints, 1979.

Thomas, John. *Private Religious Foundations in the Byzantine Empire*.   Washington D.C.:
          Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1987.

Thompson, James. *Economic and Social History of the Middle Ages*. New York: Fredrick Ungar
          Publishing, 1966.

Vasiliev, Alexander. *History of the Byzantine Empire: 324-1453*. Madison: University of
          Wisconsin Press, 1958.

.

Our Charles R.: Progressivist, Procorporatist, Conservationist
Charles R. Van Hise and "Problem of the Trusts" in the 1912 Election

Tommy Greenfield

In 1798 Thomas Malthus argued in *An Essay on the Principle of Population* that at the present rate of population growth and its related rate of consumption, man will outlive his land's resources.[1] Or, in his own words: "the power of population is indefinitely greater than the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man."[2] Charles Darwin wrote in his autobiography that reading this essay "for amusement" some time later, he "at last got a theory by which to work."[3] Malthus asserted that just as plants and animals produce far more offspring than will possibly survive, so too do men; Darwin added the corollary that under those circumstances "favorable variations would tend to be preserved."[4] That essentially explains the "procorporatist" view to which President of the University of Wisconsin Charles Van Hise contributed. While for many procorporatism simply implied a belief that some cooperation and combination in business leads to greater economies, for Van Hise it also meant more environmentally-conscious, less wasteful business practice. As he told his "anticorporatist" counterpart and old schoolmate (as well as then-senator) Robert La Follette, "great aggregations of wealth…result not only in *conservative use of a material* but in economic efficiency."[5]

In the following document I plan to expand upon how Charles R. Van Hise's background in geology at the University of Wisconsin contributed to his conservation initiatives in the years leading to the 1912 presidential election, when Theodore Roosevelt adopted his philosophy and established procorporatism as tenet of his Progressive Party's progressivism. But for Van Hise, more important than politics—whether the politics of politicians or the politics of businessmen and big business—was that conservation have a voice; his background in geology pointed him in that direction. Just as important, his background at the University of Wisconsin and his relationship with John Bascom inspired him to embrace the "Wisconsin Idea," the responsibility to maximally utilize his education to improve the lives of the democratic majority. This Wisconsin Idea intrigued Van Hise, who accordingly used his geological scholarship to promote conservation in the social, political, and economic arena. Whether filed under the header "conservationist," "progressivist," or, if in the context of the 1912 election, "procorporatist," Van Hise's initiative speaks for itself and speaks to power of the Wisconsin Idea.

---

[1] Malthus, T.R. "An Essay on the Principle of Population." London: J.M. Dent; New York: E.P. Dutton, 1914. Ch. 1.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Darwin, Francis, ed. *The Life of Charles Darwin*. John Murray: London, 1902.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Flehinger, Brett. *The 1912 Election and the Power of Progressivism: A Brief History with Documents.* Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston; New York, 2003. 101. (Italics added.)

Government promoters hoping to attract settlers to Wisconsin Territory lauded the land for its lead and zinc deposits as early as the 1830's, but comprehensive geological studies did not begin until decades later at a time when Charles Richard Van Hise could take advantage of the tremendous opportunity for research. By 1853, five years after Wisconsin's admission to the Union, the state appointed its first geologist, but regional tensions mounted and the development of the office "lapsed in The Civil War."[6] According to his biographer Maurice Vance, when Van Hise began his advanced work the late 1870's "it was at a time when a survey of the resources of the state was under way."[7] Rather than meddle with "mere copybook exercises" Van Hise worked closely with professors on what Vance considers "fruitful investigations on the frontier of geological knowledge."[8] In this atmosphere Van Hise quickly distinguished himself in the geological field with his thesis, a remarkable, comprehensive study in local pre-Cambrian rock formations.

Just as important as his studies, the interstudy social network Van Hise nursed under the wing of President John Bascom, an intellectual benefactor of the Wisconsin Idea, fostered a community of socially concerned academics. According to Vance, Van Hise and La Follette both considered Bascom's mentoring "one of the most important influences in their lives."[9] Bascom, "an ardent champion of prohibition, woman suffrage, and the right of workers to organize labor unions," expounded the philosophy of the Progressive Era some time before it really developed. He "labored to convince his students that they owed a great debt to society and that it was their obligation to participate in civic action."[10] Van Hise and La Follette certainly did so.

After Charles R. Van Hise's inauguration as President of the University in 1903, he made it quite evident that he, like Bascom, believed in democracy and that the University "must lead all, serve all, and hamper none."[11] Maurice Vance elucidates his commitment to the Wisconsin Idea in his conviction that "a *state* university is a beacon of guidance for the commonwealth," and that it "is an adjunct of the government, exposed to the political storms by which the control of that government is determined."[12] And how true it was: progressives in Wisconsin *greatly* disturbed both parties in the years leading up to 1912 by cleaving both parties into progressive and conservative factions, greatly complicating the two-party system.

With that in mind it is not surprising that by the 1910 election of Francis McGovern, "a leader typical of the Progressive era"[13] (and another Van Hise classmate), the state of Wisconsin and its legislature had already earned a progressive reputation. In Theodore Roosevelt's speech titled "A Confession of Faith," delivered just two months after he bolted from the 1912 Republican convention to found the Progressive Party, Roosevelt called the University of Wisconsin (then led by Van Hise) a "laboratory for wise social and industrial experiment in the betterment of conditions."[14] By this time the Wisconsin legislature had passed a corrupt practices act and progressive labor laws, and had placed limitations on women's and children's labor. In addition, the state instituted an

---

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Vance, Maurice M. *Charles Richard Van Hise: Scientist Progressive.* State Historical Society of Wisconsin: Madison, 1960. 21-22.

[9] Ibid., p. 84-85.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid., p. 91, 121. (Italics added.)

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid., p. 121.

[14] Flehinger, p. 90.

income tax, a cooperative marketing law, and bills to establish an industrial commission and a state board of public affairs to deliberate on the constitutionality of business practices. Nevertheless the Wisconsin Idea was not yet shared by the entire nation. The Wisconsin Idea, described by Charles McCarthy in his 1912 book as an initiative to commingle the university's smarts with the state's political savvy,[15] was revolutionary. Rarely had an academic exploited his expertise for definite ends in a national political arena.

That same year the publication of *Concentration and Control* brought Van Hise to the forefront of Roosevelt's campaign and allowed him to reach a national audience in the coming days in a perfect application of the Wisconsin Idea. Addressing Chicagoans in "A Confession of Faith," Roosevelt cited a passage from *Concentration and Control* at length. He "endeavor[ed]…to turn the attention of his countrymen toward practically solving the trust problem" so as to "gain the economic advantages of concentration of industry and at the same time…guard the interests of the public."[16] Van Hise espoused the same endeavor in a speech delivered in early November just prior to the 1912 election. In it, he too described why "concentration in industry up to a certain point is necessary in order to give efficiency."[17] Dismissing the anticorporatist argument, he explained the impossibility of returning to "local crossroads gristmills" and insisted that the only question is "what degree of concentration is permissible and advantageous?"[18] Roosevelt agreed. Both knew that one way to regulate competition is with legislation, but Van Hise said "It is utterly hopeless to control the trusts merely by antitrust law."[19] Rather, he said that "The administrative branch of government must exercise such control."[20] He reminded attendees of the 21st meeting of the Economic Club of New York that the establishment of pure-food laws was a byproduct of such practice.[21] Roosevelt, a linchpin in the pure-foods movement, assuredly agreed.

As in any scenario, however, not everyone agreed, and Louis Brandeis, one of Woodrow Wilson's principal advisors, took the anticorporatist stance. In a letter to Wilson dated September 3rd, 1912, Brandeis, known as "the Peoples' Attorney," clarified the "fundamental and irreconcilable" difference between the economic policies of the Democratic Party and those of the "New Party," Roosevelt's Progressive Party.[22] Paramount to the anticorporatists' policy was "to make that Sherman Law a controlling force,—to preserve competition where it exists, and to restore competition where it has been suppressed."[23] To do so, he told Wilson, "additional and comprehensive legislation is necessary."[24] The Sherman Antitrust Act, passed in 1890, was to date the primary means of trust prosecution, and few believed it to be very effective. Brandeis believed "prohibitions upon combination contained in the act must be made more definite; the provisions for enforcing its provisions by the Courts must be improved; and they must be supplemented by other

---

[15] McCarthy, Charles. *The Wisconsin Idea.* The McMillan Company: New York, 1912.
[16] Flehinger, p. 91.
[17] Van Hise, Charles R. "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly." Knickerbocker: New York, 1912. (From the Memorial Library: HKLP 83 V31.)
[18] Ibid.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Flehinger, p. 91.
[21] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[22] Flehinger., p. 118.
[23] Flehinger., p. 118.
[24] Ibid.

adequate machinery."[25] The Progressive Party, he said, "does not fear commercial power, however great, if only methods for regulation are provided. We believe that no methods of regulation ever have been or can be devised to remove the menace inherent in private monopoly and overweening commercial power."[26]

On the contrary, Roosevelt and Van Hise thought that "great corporations cannot possibly be controlled merely by a succession of lawsuits"[27] and considered the Sherman Act trifling. Van Hise's speech "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly" addressed the frivolity of the Sherman Act and the difficulty of interpreting—and inevitably reinterpreting—law for the regulation of competition. Even the two *fundamental* provisions of the Act, he said, read ambiguously. The first, as described by Van Hise, "prohibits every contract and combination in the form of trust or otherwise in restraint of trade"; the second "make[s] monopoly or attempt to monopolize illegal."[28] However, he informed his audience that the law had since been reinterpreted to cover only restraint of trade deemed "undue" (although, as he mentions, the word "undue" is nowhere in the act). The Courts made this decision, he said, because the act would otherwise "create an impossible situation" as "the law is violated by practically every man engaged in trade from one end of the country to the other."[29]

Although it was generally assumed that only violators of the Sherman Act were the "great combinations," Van Hise thought otherwise. To illustrate, he asked the audience: "Does it make any difference whether you buy anthracite of one company or another?"[30] He waited a moment and then he told them "No." Qualifying his answer, he said "[t]he price is the same from all the dealers in the same locality." In essence, his argument was that the biggest of corporations in the biggest of cities and the smallest of proprietorships in the smallest of cities cooperated in some way or another. He described the government's treatment of the trusts as no more than "singling one out because one rode in the front seat…because it is *good politics*."[31] He insinuated that "The politicians who say 'Break up these trusts; destroy them,'" say with the same breath, "'We must have cooperation among the farmers.'"[32] Rather theatrically, he exposed the double standard and announced: "Why, gentleman, cranberry growers of Cape Cod, New Jersey, and Wisconsin sell about ninety percent of their product through an agency down here in Hudson Street. Have we heard of the attorney general prosecuting these farmers?"[33] The manuscript of the speech at this point reads "*Applause.*"[34]

In *Concentration and Control* Van Hise outlined economic advantages associated with large-scale manufacturing and in doing so illuminated what he considered the backwardness of the anticorporatist argument. He described how in industries such as the iron industry, large-scale manufacturing processes unambiguously increase efficiency; their capacity for larger capital

---

[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid., p. 119.
[27] Roosevelt, Theodore. "Confession of Faith." 6 August 1912. A Project of the Ashbrook Center for Public Affairs at Ashland University. TeachingAmericanHistory.org. 11 December 2006.
<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=613>
[28] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[29] Flehinger, p. 105.
[30] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[31] Ibid., Italics added.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.

investment allows for more effective, conscientious extraction.[35] Moreover, specialization of labor is only possible in large factories. Vertical integration, a process exemplified by Andrew Carnegie's steelworks, entails bringing multiple steps of production into a single firm's hands, allowing for more efficient oversight and management. Big businesses have an advantage in their ability to buy and sell in bulk to reap the greatest rates of purchase and sale. Tantamount to these benefits is an intrinsic tendency toward environmental conservation. Big business, whether cooperatives, combinations, or otherwise, have the capital to produce conscientiously. The cutthroat nature of the competitive system on the other hand, he thought, *intrinsically* does the reverse.

The Darwinian argument claims that competition had led to cooperation and combination to capture economies, and so, many considered a state of "perfect competition" artificial; but to Van Hise it seemed beyond artificial and even wasteful. "Under the competitive system," Van Hise said, "we are recklessly skimming the cream of a continent with no regard to the rights of our children or our children's children."[36] Like Malthus, he urged conference attendees to "consider not only [their] own generation, but future generations" (although he *did not,* like Malthus, urge his audience to reform their habits of procreation). The following is a passage from *Concentration and Control* in which Van Hise elucidates the problem as an ethical *and* economic one.

> It is our duty to our descendants to conserve our fundamental resources, to use them economically, to prevent their unnecessary waste and destruction; and if by so doing a ton of anthracite or iron costs us a few cents more, we should bear this additional expense. Under unrestricted competition there is no hope for economical use of our resources, no hope for conservation.[37]

For many, this "additional expense" seemed odious. However, Van Hise cited other varieties of waste caused by competition, including the cost of advertising, which ultimately passes to the consumer. Consider for instance that "[t]he enormous expense of the traveling salesman…is paid by the consumers of the articles sold."[38] If they are not, companies themselves incur such expenditures and suffer. By extension, these "wastes of competition," Van Hise wrote, "drive to cooperation."[39] To support this thesis, Van Hise included a variety of case studies, one of which describes the wasteful nature of the early competitive railways. Theodore Roosevelt, with his "trust-busting" reputation, and the railroads, with their "trust" reputation, spoke strongly to this generation.

Indeed it was very fortunate that Van Hise's early years as University president coincided with Theodore Roosevelt's presidency of the United States and Gifford Pinchot's presidency of the National Conservation Association (the precursor to the National Conservation Commission), founded by Roosevelt in 1908.[40] His special interest in conservation earned him membership in the commission, as well as an encouraging audience and publicity. In 1910, Van Hise published *The Conservation of Natural Resources in the United States* and for the first time communicated the

---

[35] Van Hise, Charles R. *Concentration and Control: A Solution of the Trust Problem in the United States.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1912.   8-14.
[36] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[37] Van Hise, *Concentration and Control* p. 96-97.
[38] Ibid., p. 97.
[39] Ibid., p. 97.
[40] Vance, 160.

conservationists' platform in a concise, easily understood, and altogether "more readable form."[41] In the next two years Van Hise wrote furiously, perhaps because he felt the immense urgency and pressure that Thomas Malthus had just over one century earlier.

In *The Future of Man in America* Van Hise described how "[i]ntimately connected with the conservation of natural resources is the conservation of humanity itself."[42] It is perhaps the first textbook written on conservation. It asserted that "the conservation of our natural resources is more important than any political or social question."[43] Van Hise posited that in one way or another, the waste of any single natural resource threatens any and every thing and person, largely because it broadly and ambiguously affects the future and because correcting wasteful habits entails correcting behaviors widely established and accepted. Van Hise called this dilemma an "interlocking" one, because as the following passage illustrates, the conservation of any one resource contributes to the potential for conservation of another:

> If the forests are conserved in the rough lands and mountains, the streams will have an even flow, their navigability will be easily maintained, they will give a uniform water-power; the erosion of the soil will be lessened; the bottom lands along the stream will not be flooded. If the water-powers are developed, the consumption of coal will be lessened. If the elements which are changed from ore to metals are carefully saved—not being allowed to rust or to be lost—and thus utilized again and again, it will not be necessary to take from the mines so large an amount of ore, and thus less coal and power will be required for their extraction. The conservation of one resource assists in the conservation of all others. We should work with the agents of the earth rather than reverse their work, as we have been doing since American settlement began. [44]

Theodore Roosevelt felt Van Hise's work especially important and played a major role in the dissemination of his ideas. After receiving an advance manuscript of his latest, *Concentration and Control,* he wrote the following to Van Hise (whom he addresses "My dear President Van Hise"): "I am really obliged to you for the advance sheets of your book. Though I am worked to death, I shall take it up and read it at once."[45] And surely he did, as lengthy citations of his work in Roosevelt's "A Confession of Faith" speech demonstrate. Based in part on Van Hise's research, Roosevelt outlined the public's three hypothetical demands of business to prevent truly monopolistic practice, and those include: "the right to complete knowledge of the facts of work," the right to form minimum occupation standards based upon this knowledge, and a government adequately empowered to enforce violations of those standards.[46] Ultimately, Roosevelt aimed to reduce waste. Echoing Van Hise's description of the intimate interconnectivity between natural resources and the conservation of humanity, Roosevelt charged the unethical "industrial statesman of the day" with

---

[41] Vance, 160.
[42] Van Hise, Charles. "The Future of Man in America." World's Work. Vol. XVIII. 117-118.
      (Online facsimile: http://www.library.wisc.edu/etext/WIReader/WER0746.html#.)
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Flehinger, p. 102.
[46] Roosevelt, Theodore. "Confession of Faith."

contributing to "human waste."[47] In the following passage from "A Confession of Faith," he captures Van Hise's concept of the "interlocking" quality of waste:

> The first charge on the industrial statesmanship of the day is to prevent human waste. The dead weight of orphanage and depleted craftsmanship, of crippled workers and workers suffering from trade diseases, of casual labor, of insecure old age, and of household depletion due to industrial conditions are, like our depleted soils, our gashed mountainsides and flooded river-bottoms, so many strains upon the national structure, draining the reserve strength of all industries and showing beyond all peradventure the public element and public concern in industrial health.[48]

While the Democratic Party agreed and championed, in many ways, the Bryanite social concern fairly expressed in the above passage, it didn't agree that an increase in governmental regulation was the best solution. Rooted in Andrew Jackson's "states' right" indoctrination of the Democratic Party, more recently (for Van Hise, at least) espoused by Grover Cleveland, the party's characteristic ambivalence about federal government powers naturally positioned it against further procorporate-proposed interstate regulatory agencies. Most Democrats preferred legislation, which seemed more concrete. Leaving trust regulation to a commission of appointed men worried them. The answer for anticorporatist Democrats laid in conscientious and succinct legislation, and in the courts' power to uphold it. The revision of the Sherman Act—which Van Hise likened to a fox trap that had "never caught a fox for twenty years, [but] smells in one or two places of a tail or a leg"[49]— was the anticorporatists' focus. As Van Hise said, they proposed to "sharpen its 'teeth.'"[50] In a letter to Governor Woodrow Wilson, Louis Brandeis clarified just how he proposed to do so. He recommended that Wilson "Remove the Uncertainties in the Sherman Law," "Facilitate the Enforcement of the Law by the Courts," and "Create a Board or Commission to Aid in Administering the Sherman Law."[51] The Sherman Act was central to the policy; its tie to the "Board or Commission" separates the Democrats' policy from that of the procorporatists.

Just as Van Hise literally wrote the book(s) on procorporatism, Brandeis, among the staunchest believers in "perfect competition," figuratively, by formulating the anticorporatist rhetoric, wrote the book on anticorporatism. He explained that a governmental regulatory commission is "charged with securing…compliance with the law," and accordingly needed the legislation to lawfully judge a business' compliance. A strong advocate of the competitive system, he desired to pin this commission directly to the lapels of those hampering competition. In a letter to Arthur Holcombe dated September, 1912, Brandeis posed the following question: "To what end shall we regulate?"[52] As a lawyer, Brandeis knew that not every instance of business practice could feasibly go to court to be placed under the lens of the Sherman Act. Therefore, a regulatory commission tied to the Sherman Act must necessarily work with business to ensure compliance with

---

[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[50] Ibid.
[51] Flehinger, p. 119-120.
[52] Ibid.

the law (as opposed to prosecuting after a violation). In other words, he says, "shall we regulate in order to preserve competition and make it beneficent or shall we regulate to mitigate the evils of private monopoly?"[53] This was the precise question that brought Charles R. Van Hise to the aforementioned 21st meeting of the Economic Club of New York the following month when he delivered his address on "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."

Van Hise was certainly not broadly "pro-business" or "pro-*big* business," but was rather for capturing the benefits of cooperation in business. His first words acknowledged an agreement with Brandeis that "there should not be monopoly in this country."[54] He professed his belief that the "solution to the trusts" laid neither in the regulation of competition nor the regulation of monopoly and that trade commissions should operate independent of the Sherman Act because the variations of businesses and business practices were far too many to allow for adequate legislation. Furthermore, encapsulating Heraclitus' classic adage that "the only constant is change," he described how business, in general, is dynamic. Accordingly, business legislation tends to obsolesce.

Van Hise's special knowledge of geology and the different environmental impacts of the competitive system lent further momentum to this argument. Many would not think to ask questions like *Will legislators write provisions into their legislation for bituminous coal mine operators?* Drawing on J. A. Holmes' knowledge and research into the mining industry, President Van Hise alerted readers to the fact that for each ton of bituminous coal extracted from the earth, very rarely was less than one half of a ton left underground never to be brought to the surface "at any reasonable cost."[55] The implication is that under the existing anti-trust laws, operators were unable to combine and fix prices, and thus ease the pressure to mine as cheaply and quickly as possible. The result, Van Hise quotes Holmes as saying, is "ruinous competition, which encourages or *enforces* wasteful and dangerous mining."[56]

Another waste, one quite *directly* related to the coal mining industry (as conservation is "interlocking") is the waste of natural gases. Quoting an anonymous oilman, Holmes illustrates the kind of behavior that resulted from extreme competition: "I want to get oil, and if I can get the oil cheaper by letting the gas escape, that is the operation I will pursue."[57] As a result of antitrust legislation, many shared this attitude. 1910 Geological Survey statistics reported that 480,000,000 cubic feet of gas were lost to the atmosphere forever.[58] Although ignorant of global warming, Van Hise still sought to minimize the wasteful side-effects of the competitive system. To achieve environmental efficiency, Van Hise and procorporatists wanted a commission as conscientious as the anticorporatists wanted the Sherman Act to be comprehensive: a commission of experts in judging the total effects of businesses in cooperation or combination.

Most localities had instituted administration commissions for the regulation of privately-run public utilities in prior years; the idea wasn't terribly unusual. Even more recently, Van Hise noted, Theodore Roosevelt's pure-food laws imposed substantial government oversight of private production. In another instance in 1905, then-Wisconsin Governor La Follette passed legislation that

---

[53] Flehinger, p. 119-120.
[54] Van Hise, "The Regulation of Competition versus The Regulation of Monopoly."
[55] Van Hise, *Concentration and Control,* p. 91.
[56] Ibid. (Italics added.)
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.

instituted a railroad commission to prevent immoral, monopolistic business practices in the state.[59] Of course, businessmen feared the legislation, for its potential to stifle their operations was high. However, they were pleasantly surprised when it proved itself "fair and reasonable," both to the railroads and to the public. Van Hise felt "doubtless" that the same would prove true of other commissions. "I should expect the same slow development,"[60] he said, and continued to speak of similar developments in the Interstate Commerce Commission.

About twenty years in the making the Interstate Commerce Commission had—by moving "stage by stage, conservatively"[61]—become a rather successful agency, enjoying general confidence in its "fair and reasonable" intentions on behalf of both the public and of business. Van Hise hoped that by the same "slow development," industries "where co-operation has so extended as to become affected with a public interest"[62] would eventually be controlled by trade commission. His further proposals seem very evenhanded. In addition to an interstate trade commission he proposed an additional "state trade commission" so that every state could jointly oversee and administer commerce in its appropriate jurisdiction. Again though, to assuage fears of the *insurgent* progressivism in both parties, he told his audience "we should be conservative in giving additional powers to these commissions…. I should not expect that these trade commissions, if created, would at once be granted all the powers which they would finally exercise."[63] As with any progression, the tripartite process of building trust in the public, business, and governmental spheres takes time. Procorporatists aimed to take "coherent action"[64] above all else.

Interstate business, procorporatists argued, requires the oversight of an extra-state agency. Or in Roosevelt' words, "[i]nter-state commerce can be effectively controlled only by the nation."[65] To ease some concerns regarding the ballooning of the federal government, he also said: "our aim should be the same in both State and Nation; that is, to use the Government as an efficient agency for the practical betterment of social and economic conditions throughout this land."[66] Roosevelt hoped that if Democrats believed that the federal government was working *with* the states, then the states' fears of diminished political powers would also diminish.

According to Roosevelt, the problem with leaving matters to individual states—whether one was a pro- or anticorporatist—was that the worst of the trusts, the "bad trusts," operated through state machines. Without the federal government's interstate oversight, the potential for corruption was unlimited. Although the lobbying process "underwent considerable changes around 1900"[67] it still was far easier for businesses to offer favors—or *incentivize*—self-interested state machines than to legitimately lobby at a national, intra- and inter-party level. As I have already established, procorporatists thought "coherent action" was the only solution. By acting coherently, Roosevelt simply meant that the "only effective way in which to regulate the trusts is through the exercise of the collective power of our people through the Governmental agencies established by the

---

[59] Van Hise, *"The Regulation of Competition Versus The Regulation of Monopoly."*
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Roosevelt, "A Confession of Faith."
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order.* Hill and Wang: New York, 1967. 183.

Constitution for this very purpose."[68] Roosevelt, ever-hoping to strengthen the Union—or to further *unite* it—said: "The states cannot control [interstate commerce] under the Constitution, and to amend the Constitution by giving them control of it would amount to a dissolution of the Government."[69] Here, the classical Hamilton-Jefferson dialogue comes to life, Roosevelt arguing from the Hamiltonian angle against the anticorporatists' "Jeffersonian" one, which I compare to presidents Jackson and Cleveland earlier on.

However, political ideology had very little to do with Van Hise's commitment to the procorporatists' cause. For Van Hise, the question of business regulation extended beyond the economic sphere, and just as well, he thought it extended beyond the range of socioeconomic concerns that comprised the anticorporatist exigencies (i.e. small-business failures and labor (mal)treatment). More than anything else, the overlooked and yet primordial issue of conservation in business figured into Van Hise's procorporatist identity. Needless and careless waste greatly *disturbed* him, and although conservation sentiment did not resonate through the procorporatist movement, Van Hise recognized that the means sought by other procorporatists just as well suited his own. The very same concepts of productivity and efficiency in combination that excited businessmen for their revenue-generating potentials excited Van Hise for their tendency toward conscientious usage of the environment. The "interlocking" quality of conservation encouraged even the most incremental changes, and giving even the most minute slack to antitrust legislation had the potential to ease the artificial demand for cutthroat business practices that led to the *reckless skimming of the cream of the continent*. In addition to the coal industry, wastes due to the competitive system prevailed in the lead, zinc, and copper trade; and waste in metallurgy and the timber industry occurred with equal ubiquity.[70] A change in the processes of one of these industries could potentially precipitate changes in every other; a change in interstate commerce policy *would* precipitate changes in every other.

In my hypothesis I proposed that Professor Van Hise's background in geology at the University of Wisconsin influenced his adoption of the procorporatist policy. Just as important as Van Hise's *background in geology*, however, was his background in geology *at the University of Wisconsin*, mainly because of the relationship he developed with then-President John Bascom. The natural reaction of Bascom's students was to share any knowledge and expertise they could to the greatest extent possible, and Van Hise, by becoming president of the University and working closely with state and national government figures, did just that. In his "textbook," *The Future of Man in America*, Van Hise declared that the conservation of resources—beyond an individual's responsibility—is just as well "a state and national responsibility."[71] Practicing precisely what he preached, Van Hise took his individual feeling of responsibility and pressed for the state and national government to feel that same responsibility; because ultimately, as prior quotes by both Van Hise and Theodore Roosevelt show, this problem concerned the preservation of people.

The "T.R." of the eighteenth century, *T*homas *R*. Malthus, wrote "It has been said that the great question is now at issue, whether man shall henceforth start forwards with accelerated velocity towards illimitable, and hitherto unconceived improvement, or be condemned to perpetual

---

[68] Roosevelt, "A Confession of Faith."
[69] Ibid.
[70] Van Hise, *Concentration and Control* p. 95.
[71] Van Hise, *The Future of Man in America.*

oscillation between happiness and misery, and after every effort remain still at an immeasurable distance from the wished-for goal."[72] This was Van Hise's question too, one that addressed the long-term solvency of all people. He wrote that "The heaviest of the wastes of competition *with reference to the future of the race* are those due to the unnecessary destruction of natural resources to put an article on the market at a competitive price."[73] Accordingly, Van Hise—with his background in geology at the University of Wisconsin under the guidance of John Bascom—used his total knowledge and expertise, coupled it with his influence, and addressed an extra-political concern in a political arena. That, after all, is the "Wisconsin Idea."

---

[72] Malthus, T.R. "An Essay on the Principle of Population." London: J.M. Dent; New York: E.P. Dutton, 1914. Ch. 1.
[73] Van Hise, Charles R. *Concentration and Control.*