

2019

## The Histories, Vol. 15, 2018

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/the\\_histories](https://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/the_histories)



Part of the [History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

(2019) "The Histories, Vol. 15, 2018," *The Histories*: Vol. 15 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.  
Available at: [https://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/the\\_histories/vol15/iss1/2](https://digitalcommons.lasalle.edu/the_histories/vol15/iss1/2)

This Complete Volume is brought to you for free and open access by the Scholarship at La Salle University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Histories by an authorized editor of La Salle University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [careyc@lasalle.edu](mailto:careyc@lasalle.edu).

**The Histories, 2018**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Two Takes on Immigration ..... Joshua Hackney-Power**

**Jan Gross's Neighbors Reflection .....Stephen Pierce**

**Slavery Through Distinct Perspectives .....Kevin Gomez**

**To Keep the Waters Troubled: The Life of Ida B. Wells, Book Review ....Mackenzie Bender**

**Locke vs Rousseau: Revolutions in Property..... Stephen Pierce**

**Medicine or Magic? Physicians in the Middle Ages .....William Gries**

**Richard Wellesley and the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War .....Ryan Campbell**

**The Salem Witch Trials: Dehumanizing the Different.....Finn Michael Brown**

## *Two Takes on Immigration*

*by Joshua Hackney-Power*

In the introduction of *The British Dream*, David Goodhart succinctly and somewhat abrasively defines multiculturalism as “allowing immigrants not to have to adapt beyond a bare minimum” (2013). This is worded differently, but is fundamentally similar to what we have discussed multiculturalism to mean in class. For the purpose of HON-341 and of this paper, multiculturalism is the belief that immigrant groups should hold on to their way of life as their primary identifier; the practical means of this are somewhat isolated communities that can maintain their ethnic and cultural traditions side by side with other members of their own group. This sort of multiculturalism was openly pursued for years in Britain for years before Prime Minister David Cameron publicly declared that it had failed. He says that the nation encouraged “different cultures to live separate lives” and thereby has “failed to provide a vision of society to which they (minorities) want to belong.”

In the 1<sup>st</sup> century BC, Roman Legionnaires arrived on the British Isles and mingled with the peoples who had been there since prehistory. Then over the course of the 5<sup>th</sup> century AD, many Germanic peoples migrated to the Isles and became integrated into the (all white) ethnic fabric of the land, forming what is now called the Anglo-Saxon people. For the next 1400 years, there was no significant migration and integration of people into Britain; during the Norman invasion, William the conqueror took control of governing the Isles, but genetic data shows that the Norman influence on the general population is rather small (Li et. Al. 2008). And then, in 1948, the SS Empire Windrush arrived in London carrying 500 Jamaican migrants, beginning a larger wave of migration from other British Commonwealth states. Many were retired members of the British armed forces, and they came to England for work under the British Nationality Act 1948 which granted full British citizenship to all "subjects of the Empire". This was the first time in nearly a millennium and a half that new ethnics arrived in large numbers to England, and the first time ever that they were of a different skin color.

The American story is remarkably different. In 1492, Columbus sailed the ocean blue, and then wave upon wave of European colonists forced the native people of North America onto tiny reservations. However, without millennia to do so, these European colonists, did not and have not mixed together and homogenized the same way that the people of England did. In contrast to the ideal of "Britishness" discussed in "British Dream," the USA has been fairly diverse from early on, as stated in our motto, "E Pluribus Unum," or "From Many, One." Initially this meant that thirteen separate colonies could form a unified country, and the “diversity” was mainly white descendants of Englishmen. Before long however, the ideal of "E Pluribus Unum," along with the need to fill an ever-expanding country led to the formation of a much different national identity from that which exists in Britain. As President Obama said to immigrants at a 2016 Naturalization Ceremony, "We are a nation united not by any one culture or ethnicity or ideology, but by the principles of opportunity, equality, and liberty that are enshrined in our founding documents" (Naturalization Ceremony 2016). The president was right about what does and does not unite us all, however that does not mean that an American culture does not exist; what it means is that the culture unites most, but not all Americans.

The American national identity may not be based on ethnicity, but that does not mean that it is completely compatible with real multiculturalism. The "Unum" in E Pluribus Unum *does* mean one. Whether a new group is accepted or initially rejected and discriminated against, they are expected to eventually become "American." Even if the idea of what it means to be

American has changed over time, the idea of the "melting pot" is that there is an American culture that holds us together. While the traditional idea of assimilation means that  $A+B+C=A$ , the American idea of the melting pot means, in theory, that  $A+B+C=D$ . A new culture is formed by the combination of other cultures, but the end result is still one culture. True multiculturalism on the other hand, would look like  $A+B+C=A+B+C$ . Each culture that makes up the whole must remain distinct, and so one culture that unites everyone cannot really form.

Goodhart states in *The British Dream*, that "a national identity has both a very particular aspect rooted in the customs, language, texture and reference points of everyday life, and a more universal citizenship aspect derived from the political rules and procedures of liberal democracy," however "it is the first that carries most of the emotional charge." (2013) If Goodhart's ideas on national identity are correct, then the American identity as President Obama described it would not be a very strong identity.

While America is indeed a nation of settlers and immigrants, that has not always translated to friendly policies toward and treatment of new immigrants. The first piece of legislature passed in the U.S dealing with the rights of immigrants was the 1790 Naturalization Act. The act stated that only a "free white person" of "good moral character" could apply for naturalization, and it contained a two-year residency requirement. The residency requirement was increased to five years in 1795, and then to fourteen years in 1798, and was finally brought back down to five in 1802. The act was finally amended to include people of African birth or descent in 1870 (Cohn 2015). The first piece of legislation actually regulating immigration (as opposed to naturalization) was the Page Law, which "undesirables" including convicts, forced Asian laborers, and most Asian women; it was passed in 1875 and Cohn states that it was a precursor to the 1882 Chinese exclusion act.

As we've discussed in class, immigration from Europe flowed rather freely until the quota acts of 1921 and 1924, which shut down the vast majority of immigration until the 1965 Hart-Celler Act. Prior to Hart-Celler, a 1943 act repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act, and a 1952 act removed race as a reason for exclusion altogether, which opened the doors for huge numbers of Asian and African immigrants once Hart-Celler was finally passed. Concurrent acts over the following decades removed refugees from the common visa pool, removed hemisphere-based visa caps, provided relief from deportation to young immigrants who arrived as children, and occasionally provided avenues to citizenship for illegal immigrants (Cohn 2015). Despite past racist immigration laws, recent laws up through 2016 have not discriminated in any observable way against immigrants of any particular ethnicity, nationality, or religion. If a foreigner has a citizen family member or job offer, then there is a potential (though still difficult) path to immigration. Whether that will be the case through 2017 remains to be seen.

The history of immigration in Britain is far shorter than in the U.S., but the path that British policy has taken in that short time has been essentially opposite to the American path. While early American policies were restrictive and racist, the British Nationality Act 1948 was very open and progressive. Allowing people from the worldwide British Empire into England itself caused the very homogenous British people to experience diversity for the first time. The catch with this act is that it was not expected to be a means of mass migration, but rather to fill a labor void in post-WWII Britain. The fact that mass migration, especially from colonies such as Jamaica and Trinidad, was unintentional is highlighted by Mr. Andrew Turner's statement that "in June 1950, a Cabinet committee was established with the terms of reference of finding 'ways which might be adopted to check the immigration into this country of coloured people from British colonial territories'" (House of Commons 2003). Whatever the intention of the act, its

effect *was* mass migration. Commonwealth immigration increased from 3,000 in 1953 to over 136,000 in 1961.

Through a series of laws in the late 60s and early seventies, Britain restricted immigration to those who had work permits AND a parent born in the U.K. This cut off the vast majority of commonwealth country natives, while most whites in those countries could return to Britain. Since then, rules were slightly relaxed to include a close relative in the U.K. as a possible sponsor, but then in 2012, legislation was passed that requires a spouse living in Britain to earn at least 18,600 pounds per year to sponsor their foreign spouse; what the person seeking a visa earns is irrelevant (Foreign Spouse Income 2017). This culling of immigration along monetary lines also, likely not coincidentally, falls along racial lines.

Even during that time of high immigration, discrimination and ethnic conflict was common, as evidenced by occurrences such as the Philadelphia nativist riots of 1844 (Feldberg, 1975). Conflict occurred when groups stood out as too different from the norm, like the strong Irish Catholic communities of Philadelphia, and natives felt threatened. According to the Poverty Site, U.K.'s site for statistics on poverty and social exclusion, the percentage of people living in low income households in 2009 was vastly skewed towards racial minorities. In the time before the immigration income law was passed, about 20% of white Britons lived in low income households. That number was about 30% for Indians and Caribbean islanders, 50% for Africans, 60% for Pakistanis, and 70% for Bangladeshis (2010). Due to this skewed income for those already in the nation, the 2012 law is very racist in its effect.

Clearly, many ethnic minorities have not done very well in Britain, but some have, and the same can be said for U.S. immigrants. However, the extent to which some groups in Britain, especially Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, live below their white counterparts is very extreme. It may be possible that this is partially a result of the state multiculturalism that has precluded assimilation. If minority communities remain tight knit groups that do not expand into the mainstream, it will be difficult to escape poverty. The U.S. does have certain areas that are similar, such as Chinatowns and Little Italys, but the public-school system has always served as a rapid assimilator and has precluded the type of multiculturalism that exists in the U.K. In public schools, children of all ethnicities salute the flag, and yet can still go home and speak their parent's language. In U.K. faith schools, as we discussed them in class, students learn little to nothing about the existing culture in England, and patriotism is discouraged. I believe that this issue causes tension between multiculturalism and national identity to be worse in Britain than America. However, if America tried to implement a hard multiculturalism, as Britain did, the results would likely not be much different than what has happened over the pond.

### Work Cited

- Cohn, D'Vera. "How U.S. Immigration laws and rules have changed through history" *Fact Tank: News in the Numbers*. Pew Research Center. September 2015.
- Feldberg, Michael. "The Philadelphia Riots of 1844: A Study of Ethnic Conflict". *Greenwood Press*. 1975.
- Foreign spouse income limit for immigration at court. *BBC News U.K.* BBC.com. February 2017.
- Gallagher, Chip. "HON 341-The Immigrant as the Other." Lecture and discussion series. La Salle University. Spring 2017.
- House of Commons Debate 19 March 2003 vol 401 cc270-94WH. *Westminster Hall Sitting*. Hansard Millbank Systems. March 2003.
- Li, Jun, Devin M. Absher, Hua Tang, Audrey M. Southwick, Amanda M. Casto, Sohini Ramachandran, Howard M. Cann, Gregory S. Barsh, Marcus Feldman, Luigi L. Cavalli-Sforza, Richard M. Myers. "Worldwide Human Relationships Inferred from Genome-Wide Patterns of Variation." *American Association for the Advancement of Science*. Sciencemag.com. February 2008.
- "Low Income and Ethnicity." United Kingdom Poverty Indicators. *The Poverty Site*. 2010.
- "The Naturalization Ceremony 2016." *KCLV-TV Las Vegas City of Las Vegas Television*. Youtube. June 2016.

## *Jan Gross's Neighbors Reflection*

*by Stephen Pierce*

*Neighbors* by historian Jan Gross gives the audience an in-depth analysis of the pogrom atrocity that took place in the Nazi-occupied Polish town of Jedwabne on July 10, 1941. After being published in 2001, this book turned controversial due to Gross's revelation in his research that found it was the local Polish population of the town that committed the grisly murders of the Jewish community, not the Nazi soldiers who were in control of the territory. This paper will give a summary of the book, then talk about Gross's research that supports his claims, why his work is controversial, what effects it has on the world today, and why it should be required reading.

Gross first goes through the history of the area of Jedwabne before World War Two. He describes it as a small little woodland Polish town where Jews made up around 60% of the population in 1931.<sup>1</sup> Before the war the Jews primarily lived in harmony with its native Polish inhabitants, saying that there was some tension between the two groups, but most of the time they got along. Gross then goes through the brutal Soviet occupation from 1939 to 1941 and how that occupation led many Poles to believe that it was the Jews in the town who were collaborating with the Soviets imposing these severe laws (Gross lays out that these allegations are false). He goes through the Nazi occupation after they took the region back in 1941 and how the Polish residents of the town were planning revenge action against the Jews for alleged collaboration with the Soviets. This revenge operation was mainly orchestrated by the Mayor of Jedwabne, Marian Karolak, who Gross believes was the "the evil spirit of this tragedy."<sup>2</sup> Gross says that we still don't know if the original pogrom plan came from the Germans or the Polish. But he does provide some evidence that the Gestapo came before the pogrom commenced possibly influencing the Poles, but also believes that it was a part of a trend of pogroms that were taking place in different towns in Poland. Then on the morning of July 10th, 1941 all the Polish men were called into the city for a town hall. They ordered the Jews of the town to be at the public square for "cleaning duty."<sup>3</sup> The men at the town hall acquired clubs, stones, whips and any weapons they could get their hands on to commence the slaughter the Jews at the square and plunder their homes. The mob forced the Jews to break up a statue of Lenin that was built when the Soviets occupied the area and made the local rabbi sing about how the "Jewish Bolsheviks" started the war.<sup>4</sup> The Polish, after killing many of the Jews, forced the remaining ones into a barn that was then poured with kerosene. As a result, Gross estimates that around fifteen hundred people died in this pogrom. Gross, throughout this book gets testimonies, written journals, and interviews to piece together what happened that day. He then ends the book talking about some of his research gathering along with how victims can become victimizers.

Gross used multiple ways of collecting the research for this book. First, he talks about using the 1949 Łomża Trials records, which were conducted under the Stalinist People's

---

1 Gross, Jan Tomasz. *Neighbors: The Destruction of the Jewish Community in Jedwabne, Poland*. London: Arrow Books, 2003. 35

2 Ibid. 73

3 Ibid. 91

4 Ibid. 98

Republic of Poland to investigate the tragedy. Gross as well used the writings of Szymul Wasersztajn who was a survivor of the attacks. He used interviews that Agnieszka Arnold did in her documentary, *Where Is My Older Brother Cain?* Finally, he interviews some former residents of the area. These were diverse ways of collecting research but were flawed in many ways. He first admits in his “Sources” chapter that Gross was unable to find German documentation of the Jedwabne pogrom which he states was the first kind of record he was trying to find because it was critical. He also talks about how during the Łomża Trials that many of the accused were tortured during interrogations. This messes the records up because the individuals under physical examination will say anything to get out of being punished. He refutes this by saying that it was not a political trial because Stalin’s regime was anti-Semitic as well during this period. During the trial additionally, none of the witnesses or the accused were asked about the plundering which is strange. Finally, he presents the evidence of many of the people he interviews that it was hard for them to see what was happening during the pogrom due to so many people rioting that it was tough to figure out all the details of the incident.

This book has become controversial due to Gross pointing out that regular Polish citizens were committing these acts of horror without the help of the Nazis. In fact, he points out that the Nazis actually liberated and restored order in these Polish towns. The one example that was truly astonishing was written by a Jew named Menachem Finkelsztajn who recorded a pogrom taking place in Radziłów, Poland three days before Jedwabne. Finkelsztajn writes, “What a terrible sight this presented can be gauged from the fact that the Germans stated that the Poles had gone overboard. The arrival of the Germans saved eighteen Jews who had managed to hide during the pogrom. There was an eight-year-old boy among them, who had already been buried, but who revived and dug himself out. . . . In this manner, the Jewish community in Radziłów was wiped off the face of the earth after five hundred years of existence. Together with the Jews everything Jewish was destroyed in the village as well: the study house, the synagogue, and the cemetery.”<sup>5</sup> Gross then talked about how during the Jedwabne pogrom the Nazis did not do anything but take pictures and watch. Later in the aftermath of the pogrom, Karol Bardoń one of the accused murderers stated at the trial that Mayor Karolak was in the public square and the local German commander named Adamy shouted at the mayor for not burying the bodies. The Germans took control of the area and stopped the pogroms by the Poles. Making it safe for some of the Jews to return, the ones that survived returned to town but were ultimately forced by the Nazis to the ghetto in Łomża. These stories dispel the myth that Poland was innocent in its endeavors during the Holocaust shocking many Polish citizens.

Jan Gross does a great job in showing why this pogrom is an essential aspect of the Holocaust that needs to be taught at educational institutions. *Neighbors* needs to be required reading for high schools around the world. The reason being is that many Holocaust books talk about what the Nazis did in the concentration camps across Europe which is a story that needs to be told. Books like *Night*, *Diary of Anne Frank*, and *The Bookkeeper* are examples of mainstream publications that many high schoolers have to read. But the problem is that these books give the public a typical good versus evil story of the Holocaust. It creates the notion that once you put on the Nazi uniform, you’ve become subhuman, a monster, and makes the 1930’s

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. 69

seems like an event in history that could never happen again. *Neighbors* gives the audience a very different narrative; Gross lays out that these atrocities were not committed by Nazi soldiers but by ordinary people, your neighbors. It indeed shows that this could happen anywhere, it does not have to be men in uniforms taking orders from an authority figure. Even if some of Gross's research is not a hundred percent correct when it comes to the exact number of Polish that committed these horrible acts of violence it does not matter; it just reinforces the idea that evil does not always show up with a swastika band around someone's arm. It is essential that the modern Polish government recognize their past atrocities and embrace their past mistakes just like Germany has. That is why Gross has the Abraham Lincoln quote at the beginning of the book that says, "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. 5







## *Slavery Through Distinct Perspectives*

*by Kevin Gomez*

Stephen F. Hale a Confederate soldier, and commissioner of Alabama was one of the leading pro slavery voices in the South during the time of the Civil War. Frederick Douglass was a famous abolitionist who had a burning passion to end the institution of slavery. Confederate General Patrick Cleburne proposed emancipating slaves, and using them as soldiers. President Andrew Johnson was a former slave owner who openly refused blacks the right to vote. Each of these men either participated in or had something to do with the Civil War. The impacts of these men are still felt in our society today and will continue to be felt for years to come.

In late 1860, Hale wrote a letter to Governor Beriah Magoffin of Kentucky stating various reasons why Southern states should secede from the Union. Among them were states rights, Northern inequality towards Southerners, and most important Lincoln's election without any Southern support. In most Southern states Lincoln was not even on the ballot. Lincoln's election proved to Southerners that they did not have a voice in government. Hale believed Lincoln wanted to see the down fall of the South. According to Hale "the election of Mr. Lincoln cannot be regarded otherwise than a solemn declaration, on the part of a great majority of the Northern people, of hostility to the South, her property, and her institutions" (Hale 97). The ending of slavery was seen as aggressive attack on the way of life for most Southerners. According to Hale the South was completely powerless in what seemed to be the destruction of its way of life. "There are many constitutional conservative men at the North who sympathize with and battle for us. That is true, but they are utterly powerless" (Hale 99). Hale urged the Southern states to secede in response to Lincoln's election so that they could protect their way of life, property, and safety.

Hale's letter states that "slaves were recognized both as property and as a basis of political power by the federal compact" (Hale 91). To Hale the fact that the Union was trying to take away the right for Southerners to own "property" called for an immediate secession. Considering the majority of Southern wealth was built on the backs of slaves, eliminating slavery would cripple the economy. Hale wrote "every law of congress passed for the protection of northern property, and submitted ever since the foundation of the government, with scarcely a murmur to the protection of their shipping, manufacturing, and commercial interest" (Hale 93). The North continuously passed laws that favored its economy, and according to Hale it purposely ignored laws that favored the Southern economy. For example, the North never enforced, or even passed laws against, the fugitive slave act causing Southerners to lose valuable property. Hale also stated that the US had navy ships off the coast of Africa to stop the slave trade, instead of using those resources to protect America. To Hale and most Southerners, the end of slavery seemed very unfair, and thus to them secession seemed like the only choice.

Hale writes in his letter that the North saw John Brown as a hero instead of the treasonous criminal Southerners saw Brown as. The North made him into a martyr, and a hero while the South condemned him a felon. After the election, the South essentially saw President Lincoln as another John Brown, meaning the North loved him while the South could not stand him. Lincoln's election was an insult to the South, and its way of life. After Lincoln's election

Hale wrote “for the triumph of this new theory of government destroys the property of the South, lay waste her fields[...] consigning her citizens to assassinations and her wives and daughters to pollution and violation to gratify the lust of half-civilized Africans” (Hale 98). Hale saw Lincoln’s election as the nail in the coffin for the Southern way of life. Southerners believed Lincoln despised them, so to draw up more support Hale proclaimed that it was “the imperative duty of the Southern states to resume the power they have delegated to the federal government and interpose their sovereignty for the protection of their citizens” (Hale 96). In other words, Hale believed the South had no choice but to secede from the union.

Fours years after Hale’s letter to the governor of Kentucky, Confederate General Patrick Cleburne proposed a plan which could lead to a Southern victory. In his proposal, General Cleburne stressed three of the biggest Southern weaknesses; supplies running low, soldiers deserting their post, and slaves becoming spies for the northern army. From Cleburne’s point of view, if the South did not do something drastic the war was basically lost. Cleburne’s proposal was to emancipate the slaves and have them join the Confederate army, promising them freedom if they stayed loyal to the South. Although the North had also suffered large numbers of casualties, their supplies, and soldier count was not as depleted as the Confederates. The north received aid from foreign nations, and after winning a battle, the North would often recruit the slaves they had just freed.

Even with the odds stacked against them, failure was not an option for the South. General Cleburne wrote, “Loss meant loss of all we now hold most sacred- slaves and all other personal property, lands, homesteads, liberty, justice, pride, and manhood” (Cleburne 55). General Cleburne believed that emancipating the strongest and ablest bodied slaves was the South’s only chance of victory. According to Cleburne slavery went from one of the South’s strongest sources of strength to one of the weakest resources. At the beginning of the war slavery powered the Southern economy, but by the end of the war it was costing thousands of Southern lives daily to protect their property. It was a struggle for the South to protect themselves because most battles occurred in the South. The battlefield stretched everywhere in the Confederacy there was a slave to set free. Cleburne wrote “to prevent raids we are forced to scatter our forces, and are not free to move and strike like the enemy” (Cleburne 56). The South clearly needed more troops, and the only way Cleburne saw of expanding the Southern army was to emancipate, and enlist slaves.

General Cleburne believed, as much of the South did, that the North was trying to enslave the South. Cleburne believed “slavery is not all our enemies are fighting for. It is merely the pretense to establish sectional superiority and to deprive us of our rights and liberties” (Cleburne 58). Although giving up their property was going to be a big economic hit for the South it was better than Northerners enslaving white Southerners. Emancipating the slaves would also destroy the North’s biggest war platform. According to Cleburne without the abolition platform the only thing the North would be fighting for was ambition, and greed for more land. Cleburne was also convinced that Emancipation would mean foreign aid; as Cleburne believed that there were many countries willing to help the South, but could not support slavery.

Cleburne was convinced that Southern emancipation would stun the North and make them reevaluate the war. Emancipation would also prevent the North from using slaves as spies, and would actually motivate slaves to fight harder than the bravest soldier because they fought

for their freedom. Cleburne stated, “the galley slaves of portions of the fleet were promised freedom... they fought well, and civilization owes much to those brave galley slaves” (Cleburne 61). In addition, Cleburne believed the emancipated soldiers would stay loyal to the South because the South had the power to give them their wives and homes back. In Cleburne’s opinion with a revitalized army of slaves, the South could now properly protect its borders and win the Civil War.

Stephen Hale’s letter may lead one to believe Hales would not have been in favor of Cleburne’s proposal. Although both are in favor of slavery Hale sees’ slavery as vital to the Southern way of life. Hale sees’ slavery as “both property and as a basis of political power by the federal compact” (Hale 91) so it is unlikely Hale would want to give up some of that power and “property”. Hale saw Lincoln’s election as an insult to the South because of Lincoln’s desire to emancipate the Southern slaves. It was very likely that Hale would feel the same way towards Cleburne’s proposal. If Hale would have responded to Cleburne, Hale would have been outraged. In Hales opinion whites and blacks could never be on the same social platform. Hale states “the white man stripped by the heaven-daring hand of fanaticism of that title to superiority over the black race which God himself has bestowed” (Hale 98). Hale would have probably preferred to die defending slavery than to emancipate some slaves in order to help the South win the war.

The great abolitionist Frederick Douglass would have been completely opposed to General Cleburne’s proposal. Douglass, a former slave, knew the hardships of slavery, therefore would have never supported the emancipation of only some slaves. To Douglas nothing was worse than returning to slavery, that is why he devoted the majority of his free life to the abolitionist movement. Douglass would not have trusted General Cleburne’s proposal. Cleburne is clearly not bothered by slavery; to Douglass this is the worst trait a person could have. In studying Douglass, it is very clear Douglass supported the abolition of slavery. Having said that one can draw the conclusion that Douglass would have advised slaves not to trust the racist General Cleburne.

Contrary to the racial views of Frederick Douglass, President Johnson believed that whites were superior to African Americans. Johnson believed “everyone must admit that the white race was superior to the black” (Johnson 6). Johnson was a slave owner who believed that blacks being elected to office was more dangerous than the Civil War itself. Johnson gave the impression that he was not a racist but seems to have believed whites were superior to blacks. In his interview with Fred Douglass, Johnson claimed to want to be “the Moses to lead the colored man from bondage to freedom,” (Johnson 2) but in reality, Johnson was the one holding the colored man back. Johnson claimed that he did not pass any legislation that allowed blacks to vote because it would upset the poor whites who were now forced to be on the same social platform as blacks. By refusing to pass any legislation that gave blacks the right to vote, Johnson was putting all political power in the hands of “the enemy.” Johnson was empowering whites while putting down blacks. Johnson sympathized with the poor whites because in his eyes they had nothing to do with causing the war, but yet they suffered the most. Johnson believed that slaves received freedom, and the poor whites received destroyed property and loss of life. Johnson believed this gave poor whites an excuse to be upset at blacks, but he did not realize those poor whites were the former slave breakers, slave catchers, and overseers of blacks.

President Johnson's racial views were very similar to the views of Stephen Hale. Both men seemed to believe in the superiority of the white race. Although Johnson did not seem as extreme as Hale in his racial views one can definitely see the similarities between their ideas. Johnson believed if we "give the colored race the unlimited right of suffrage, and a fire brand it cast among the people that cannot be extinguished" (Johnson 6). This sounds a lot like the ideas of Hale as he saw slaves as "property and a source of political power" (Hale 91). Although Johnson would have probably agreed with Hale, Johnson would have also agreed with some of General Cleburne's ideas. For example, Cleburne would have been in favor of blacks fighting for the North instead of whites, as Cleburne believed whites were superior to blacks. This would have probably saved many white lives, and caused the deaths of many African American soldiers.

Frederik Douglass, General Cleburne, President Johnson, and Stephen Hale all had a strong impact on America. Douglass spread the abolitionist message, and wanted black suffrage because he believed it would lead to racial equality. Cleburne preached Southern emancipation of slaves because nothing was more important than victory to him. Hale urged the South to secede because Hale believed slavery was essential to the Southern way of life. Johnson withheld voting from African Americans because Johnson was racist. Some of their ideas were good, some were not, but they each contributed in molding America into what it is today.

## *To Keep the Waters Troubled: The Life of Ida B. Wells Book Review*

*Mackenzie Bender*

In the book, *To Keep the Waters Troubled: The Life of Ida B. Wells*, author Linda O. McMurry gives an in-depth synopsis of Wells' life. McMurry uses pictures and quotes from Wells' personal diary to portray the kind of life that she led. Wells became an adult in the generation that followed Fredrick Douglass. This African American woman lived a migrant life, constantly moving from state to state because of her many professions and occupations. Ida B. Wells started out as a teacher, then became a full time journalist, and an activist for anti-lynching laws. McMurry emphasizes throughout this historical text the ups and downs in Wells' life. This book gives a thorough representation of the life that Ida B. Wells led and is a good choice for anyone seeking to learn more about how African American women contributed to American history.

McMurry opens *To Keep the Waters Troubled* by talking about the birth of Ida B. Wells, which took place on July 16, 1862, in Holly Springs, Mississippi, a few years prior to the reconstruction period in America. Wells' parents died while she was in her early teenage years, leaving her to care for her five siblings. In an attempt to support her siblings and herself, Wells dropped out of high school to become an elementary school teacher in Memphis, Tennessee, where she moved the family for a better paying position. As a teacher, Ida felt unheard and ignored, therefore hated being a teacher. The only reason she held the position for many years, was solely for the steady income to keep her and her siblings afloat.

During her tenure as an elementary school teacher, Wells entered the realm of journalism. In order to prevent others from tracing her unpopular beliefs back to her, Ida B. Wells undertook the pseudonym, Iola. Under this pseudonym, Wells wrote several hundred articles for many different newspapers that mainly discussed anti-segregation. One article that Ida "Iola" Wells wrote in *The Living Way* paper pertained to an incident that occurred upon a train in which she had purchased a first class ticket for in 1884. On this train, the conductor ordered Wells to leave her seat and go to the smoking-colored car of the train, which she refused, so was physically dragged to that section. It was because of this and similar pieces, that Wells was eventually 'found out' and fired by the Memphis Board of Education for criticizing the education system used in the colored schools, and how the conditions were far worse than those of the white schools. Ida B. Wells then began writing full time for various newspapers. Wells highlights in her diary that she "tried hard to fulfill many expectations that were unnatural for her, all the while wondering 'what kind of creature [she] will eventually become?' Journalism helped her find a way out of this confusion and gave her an outlet through which to express the 'real [her]'" (76).

Early in her journalism career, Wells partnered with Rev. Taylor Nightingale and J.L. Fleming, and bought one-third of the *Free Speech and Headlight* newspaper, becoming an editor, a position she had dreamed of for years. Upon writing a strong controversial article about the horrors of lynchings in Memphis, Ida B. Wells received horrible threats from many community members. Wells then left without plan to return Memphis, to escape these threats and still have the ability to have her voice heard. These horrific events though, did not stop Wells' demand for

the motives behind lynchings. Wells' interest in this topic began when three of her close friends were lynched and humiliated, simply because their white counterparts feared competition of the blacks. Wells went on to spread knowledge of the tragic lynchings of Southern America on abroad tours that she took to Europe. Ida's sole purpose for these trips was simply to let the Europeans know what was going on in the states with hopes that they would step up to aid the anti-lynching and anti-segregation efforts in some way.

Following her European tours, Ida B. Wells settled down to start a family of her own. Wells married Ferdinand Barnett, and gave birth to four children. Being an orphan without a mother and father, Ida wanted to personally be there to watch her children grow up and to be a part of their lives. Therefore, Wells' traveling abroad career was now over, but she did not end her anti-lynching efforts, and continued to travel to neighboring cities and states. Wells-Barnett sought to actually make change on top of investigate, "by writing anti-lynching pamphlets and articles for white periodicals" (259). Wells also founded the Negro Fellowship League (NFL) in 1910 to give African Americans a place where they would have a sense of community in the new places in which they were migrating. For the latter of Wells' life, she worked on creating organizations like the NFL to make Chicago, the last city she resided in, a better place to live for African Americans. Ida B. Wells died in March of 1931, preceding her four children and husband. After death, Wells' legacy continues as one of the most prominent African American women in history because of her involvement in anti-segregation and anti-lynching efforts.

In McMurry's book, there are many components that negatively attribute to the telling of the life of Ida B. Wells. A few of these components are the use of too many details, the misuse of photographs, and the overuse of Wells' personal diary.

Linda McMurry makes this biography of Ida B. Wells far more detail-oriented than necessary. The overuse of details makes focusing on the content of the book rather difficult. McMurry gets very caught up in specific dates for events of Wells' life, and jumps to new people, while almost losing the reader in the process. One example of this occurs between pages 210 and 211, where McMurry talks about an interview (of Frances Willard, a man Wells met) that was published in October of 1890, then jumps to Wells leaving for England in 1893, and lastly to leaving again in 1894. *To Keep the Waters Troubled* of itself is in chronological order. McMurry might have benefited from simply giving a general timeline, as tagging a year on to every single piece of information is excessive.

The pictures that McMurry used did not contribute much to the storyline. The majority of the pictures used ranged from single sketches/photographs of Wells to photographs of her with her family. These pictures were more unnecessary than anything, as they did not play any pertinent role in telling the story. For example, there is a picture of Wells on page 152 that is seemingly 'randomly' inserted, as it does not pertain to Well's journalism about lynching, which is the topic being discussed on this page. The lack of 21st century technology during the time period may have contributed to the limited selection of photos McMurry could choose from. To reverse this, McMurry may have inserted pictures of Wells on her tours or with her various activist groups.

Even for writing a biography, Linda McMurry references Ida B. Wells' diary far too often. In the text, McMurry frequently quotes and gives credit to Wells' diary as a source for information. Even when other sources were used, McMurry did not put them in plain-text, but rather only included the specific sources in the ending 'notes' section of the book. This leads the reader to think that McMurry is almost telling Wells' diary over again, and making the whole biography solely about the diary, as one would not normally pause at every endnote to check the rear of the book for the author's source. For example, of the fifty citations used in chapter three of the book alone, thirty-three of them are from Wells' personal diary, and the remaining minority consisting of a few newspapers and journals.

In conclusion, despite the many challenges that Ida B. Wells faced, she led a life and gave influences that would change America for centuries to come. Her efforts in the anti-lynching initiative really opened people's eyes not only in America, but in other countries as well, that would lead to better treatment of African Americans and minorities alike. Linda O. McMurry's *To Keep the Waters Troubled: The Life of Ida B. Wells* covered Well's life in plenty detail. One might even consider McMurry's piece as an information overload that would be intended for a postgraduate audience, or someone of a similar rank. McMurry did though, use plenty primary sourcing, directly from Well's personal diary for the biography. By the end of her life, Ida B. Wells-Barnett had showed that African American women had the power to make prominent changes that would make America a better country in the future.



## *Locke vs Rousseau: Revolutions in Property*

*By Stephen Pierce*

The writings of 18th-century political theorists John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau were critical to the Age of Enlightenment period of the 18th century. These writings influenced two of the significant Atlantic Revolutions in both America and France especially when it came to the topic of property. This paper will talk about the differences between both theorists when it comes to property, along with government structures. It will start with John Locke's theories on property and how property influenced the actions of the American Revolution. Then how Rousseau's ideas on property influenced the French Revolution. Finally, what both theorists agree/disagree on.

John Locke writes in the *Second Treatise of Government* that in the state of nature man is in perfect freedom to do whatever they want. It is anarchic, but it has some sense of morality, unlike Thomas Hobbes state of nature depicted in his work *Leviathan*. Individuals help each other in the state of nature out of reason. Humans in Locke's state of nature do give up some liberties to a legislative authority to live in a civilized society. This new civilization has its natural rights based upon a constitution, this is to ensure that the government does not subjugate its citizens from turning into mere subjects. Locke states explicitly that if the government tries to take away your ability to achieve, "Life, liberty, and estate"<sup>1</sup> you then have a right to rebel against that government. The acquisition of property to Locke is what he calls "first gathering"<sup>2</sup> or the action of taking something out of the state of nature for someone's own good. Locke believes that the human race would be seen as unclaimed, to use the gifts that God has given to the earth has given them. That is why Locke argues that the primary purpose of government is for it to protect that private property and to pass laws to make it so people can achieve it. This idea on property was adopted by the Radical Whigs in British Parliament who also warned about standing armies during peacetime, taking away trial by jury, and taxation without representation. The American Colonies were highly influenced by the Whigs in the 1760's and could see the British government was doing all of these illegal actions especially with property. *The Newport Mercury* a newspaper in Rhode Island wrote in 1767 that property was the "substance of liberty," that "fled to a distant country."<sup>3</sup>

One of the critical texts the American rebels cited in the early stages of the Revolution was section 138 of the *Second Treatise*. Locke states in this section that "the supreme power cannot take from any man any part of his property without his own consent." Locke adds on to say that, "no body hath a right to take their substance or any part of it from them, without their own consent; without this, they have no property at all. For I have truly no property in that which

---

1 Locke, John, and Crawford Brough Macpherson. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, In: Hackett, 1980. 46

2 Ibid. 19

3 Dworetz, Steven M. *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke, Liberalism, and the American Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. 75

another can by right take from me, when he pleases, against my consent."<sup>4</sup> The opening lines from section 138 appeared in papers across the colonies like *Pennsylvania Gazette* the biggest newspaper at the time. It was such an important section that an anonymous author who signed his work "From the County of Hampshire" praised the "immortal Mr. Locke" stating that section 138 should "be written in letters of gold and sunk to the center of every man's heart."<sup>5</sup>

The colonists also emphasized the idea of consent with property; they cited 139 of the *Second Treatise*. That a government "can never have a power to take to themselves the whole or any part of the subjects' property, without their own consent. For this would be in effect to leave them with no property at all."<sup>6</sup> Locke reconstituted his position in section 193, stating that property "without a man's own consent, it cannot be taken from him."<sup>7</sup> The idea of consent also helped create the connection between taxation and property. Parliament, however, cut off that connection when it enacted the new taxation methods. William Pitt the Elder, a Whig in Parliament, demanded that "the sacred, ness" of the colonists' property "remain inviolable." It should be "tax, able only by their own consent, given in their provincial assemblies; else it will cease to be property."<sup>8</sup>

Locke's idea of property is also stated when he talks about his state of war; this is when the state of nature breaks down into violence. Locke believes that slavery is the state of war continued, and when a person is without property that person is no more than a slave. Locke states in Section 85 Chapter 7 "A slave has forfeited his life and with it his liberty; he has lost all his goods, and as a slave he is not capable of having any property; so, he can't in his condition of slavery be considered as any part of civil society, the chief purpose of which is the preservation of property."<sup>9</sup> *The Essex Gazette* a colonial newspaper located in Salem, Massachusetts echoed Locke's words in 1771, "liberty, which distinguishes a free man from a slave, implies some sort of right and/or property of his own, which cannot be taken from him without his consent."<sup>10</sup> In the mind of the colonists consent creates or at least preserves, property and stands between liberty and slavery. Many of the leaders of the Revolution understood this well because many of them were slave owners. Like George Washington who stated in a letter to George Fairfax in 1775, "America are either to be drenched with Blood, or Inhabited by Slaves. Sad alternative! But can a virtuous Man hesitate in his choice?"<sup>11</sup> Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1775 "we will, in

---

4 Locke, John, and Crawford Brough Macpherson. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, In: Hackett, 1980. 73

5 Dworetz, Steven M. *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke, Liberalism, and the American Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. 76

6 Locke, John, and Crawford Brough Macpherson. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, In: Hackett, 1980. 74

7 Ibid. 99

8 Dworetz, Steven M. *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke, Liberalism, and the American Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. 78

9 Locke, John, and Crawford Brough Macpherson. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, In: Hackett, 1980. 17

10 Dworetz, Steven M. *The Unvarnished Doctrine: Locke, Liberalism, and the American Revolution*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1994. 79

11 George Washington to George William Fairfax, May 31, 1775 - American Memory Timeline- Classroom Presentation | Teacher Resources." Library of Congress. Accessed April 17, 2018.

defiance of every hazard, with unabating firmness and perseverance, employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die freemen rather than to live slaves.”<sup>12</sup>

Locke also goes into detail on class and property. Locke believes that if the economic and political elites don't create laws for average citizens to acquire property, there will be class conflict. In Chapter 5 Section 34 of the *Second Treatise*, Locke states that God gave “to the use of the industrious and rational, (and labor was to be his title to it;) not to the fancy or covetousness of the quarrelsome and contentious.”<sup>13</sup> That the super-rich in society cannot hog all the land or riches for their own. Thomas Jefferson saw the dry timber for class revolution in France as ambassador to France before it actually started. He stated that “The property of this country is absolutely concentrated in a very few hands, having revenues of from half a million of guineas a year downwards.”<sup>14</sup> Then followed to give a very Lockean answer, “Whenever there are in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. The earth is given as a common stock for man to labor and live.”<sup>15</sup> Jefferson was observing that the French nobles were monopolized the land and Royal French laws made it hard for the poor to gain property because that land was expensive. Jefferson wanted to solve it through the eyes of Locke, but most Frenchmen and women wanted to solve it through the eyes of Rousseau.

Rousseau in his *Discourse on Inequality*, looks at the growth of agriculture first establishment of private property, Rousseau discovers the emergence of inequality between the people who own land and those who do not. In his state of nature Rousseau says that in the state of nature people help each other out of piety, not reason like Locke says in his state of nature. Rousseau believes it is property that corrupts men. That is why he thinks indigenous people are happier because they have no concept of private property, this is known as the “noble savage.”<sup>16</sup> Property makes you miserable; he states in the *Social Contract* that, “man is born free, but he is everywhere in chains.”<sup>17</sup> Society creates that sense of perfection and makes us unhappy, putting us in constant competition. Rousseau goes back to the “fall” in which Adam and Eve ate the apple from the tree of knowledge. The apple is property which creates conflict or *Amour-propre*. The state of war for Rousseau is class warfare, not Locke who believes it is when someone is about to enslave you. To prevent the state of war citizens must come together to form a sovereign called the “general will.”<sup>18</sup> This sovereign expresses the general will that aims for the common good. This assembly only deals with public concern, but it is absolute. When voting in assemblies, people should not vote for what they want personally, but for what they believe is a general will. Very much like colonial New England town halls, a small direct democracy. For

---

12 "A Declaration by the Representatives of the United Colonies of North-America, Now Met in Congress at Philadelphia, Setting Forth the Causes and Necessity of Their Taking Up Arms." Avalon Project - Declaration of the Causes and Necessity of Taking Up Arms.

13 Locke, John, and Crawford Brough Macpherson. *Second Treatise of Government*. Indianapolis, In: Hackett, 1980. 21

14 West, Thomas G. *Vindicating the Founders: Race, Sex, Class, and Justice in the Origins of America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1997. 47

15 Ibid. 48

16 Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, and Donald A. Cress. *Rousseau: The Basic Political Writings*. Hackett Publishing Co, 2012. 8

17 Ibid. 141

18 Ibid. 158

Rousseau, you either had a direct democracy or none at all. He states in the *Social Contract* “the moment a people allows itself to be represented; it is no longer free: it no longer exists. The day you elect representatives is the day you lose your freedom.”<sup>19</sup> Rousseau also said that a man could be forced to be free, he suggested the cult of a civil religion being established. All of these things were of significant influence in what would be the French Revolution.

Rousseau had such a massive impact on the ideas of the French Revolution that the French people moved his remains from his original burial place to the Pantheon in 1794. James Swenson author of *On Jean-Jacques Rousseau* wrote that “every party of the Revolution made some claim on the heritage of Rousseau.”<sup>20</sup> In 1789 the Marquis de Lafayette, a veteran of the War of American Independence, drafted the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* with some help by Thomas Jefferson. The document had some of Locke’s language but more of Rousseau’s. The document set up a new National Assembly that would fulfill the “general will” of the country. This is expressed in *Article Six*, “The law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have the right to take part, in person or by their representatives, in its formation. It must be the same for everyone whether it protects or penalizes. All citizens being equal in its eyes are equally admissible to all public dignities, offices, and employments, according to their ability, and with no other distinction than that of their virtues and talents.”<sup>21</sup>

This ended up turning into a national identity crisis because Rousseau also says that it is not laws that make up a nation. It is about blood, culture, food, and morals it is not a citizenship compact like Locke with a constitution. It started to turn into a class revolution to who would betray the general will. This is taken into effect by Maximillian Robespierre, Saint-Just, and the Jacobins in the late 1790’s during the Regime of Terror. These men saw themselves as trying to get rid of the corrupting influences of private property through the general will of the people. They also decided to set up an official state religion as Rousseau talks about in his works as well. Robespierre himself put it, “Rousseau is the one man who, through the loftiness of his soul and the grandeur of his character, showed himself worthy of the role of teacher of mankind.”<sup>22</sup> Even though Rousseau would most likely not have agreed with Robespierre’s brutal tactics.

Locke and Rousseau differed on many ideas relating to property; these ideas showed the contrasting values America and France fought for in their Revolutions. Locke was more restrained when it came to the idea of setting up guidelines for governments to not infringe on the rights of its citizen's liberty. While Rousseau, through the assembly and the general will refuse to let individual freedom be taken away by any government unless it is done by the majority of the people. One thing that both of these theorists’ share is that they do not have considerable safeguards for the minority population. This would change in the 20th century as liberation movements started all around the world and economies changed. But both men were vital in starting the conversation of balancing freedom, equality, and security in a democracy.

---

19 Ibid. 180

20 Israel, Jonathan I. *Revolutionary Ideas: An Intellectual History of the French Revolution from the Rights of Man to Robespierre*. Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2014. 60

21 Hunt, Lynn Avery. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton &, 2007. 396

22 Johnson, Paul. *Intellectuals: From Marx and Tolstoy to Sartre and Chomsky*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007. 17



## *Medicine or Magic? Physicians in the Middle Ages*

by William Gries

According to Hannam's paraphrase of the subject in *The Genesis of Science: How the Christian Middle Ages Launched the Scientific Revolution*, Aristotle claimed that, "no object could continue moving without some object moving it."<sup>1</sup> Such an observation may seem quite obvious to the unformed observer, for, when one stops pushing a chair, the chair stops moving. This theory bumps into some problems, however, when it is extrapolated to all types of motion, such as a thrown ball that continues to move even after it has left the hand of the thrower. To make such an anomaly fit in with his theory of motion, Aristotle, "was convinced that something must be pushing it after it had left [one's] hand...the only thing he could think of was that the air behind the ball was propelling it forward."<sup>2</sup> Now, modern science, the product of the Renaissance and Scientific Revolution in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, tells any learned person today that these Aristotelian claims are quite wrong. Even natural philosophers in the middle ages were actually aware that, "this idea [of violent motion] is easily refuted"<sup>3</sup> by basic empirical experimentation or just simple observation. The issue was that, "such was Aristotle's prestige that even his hairbrained ideas had to be taken seriously [and so] although critics were unconvinced by the air-pushing concept, they still accepted Aristotle's fundamental law that a moving object must be moved by something else."<sup>4</sup> Clearly, even natural philosophy, through the study of physics, was plagued with grossly incorrect, at least in hindsight, theories and explanations for certain phenomena. Note, however, that these, rather hairbrained, theories do not detract from Hannam's claim that, "as scholars explore more and more manuscripts, they reveal achievements of the natural philosophers of the middle ages that are ever more remarkable"<sup>5</sup> demonstrating that simply being tied to antiquity era writers, and their ideas, does not remove the label of 'science' from medieval era studies; in fact, such methods of thinking, that bound new thought up in the study and interpretation of ancient philosophers, appeared to have been the very basis for what did, and did not, constitute 'science' at the time.

There is one area, however, of intellectual study that Hannam specifically disqualifies from his argument for advance during the middle ages: medicine. He claims that "scholarly medicine operated in competition with both magic and miracles, but its 'cures' were far more likely to be actively harmful. Physicians could make good money hastening their patients to the grave."<sup>6</sup> In effect, he is claiming that the term 'medical science,' in the middle ages, was more of an oxymoron than anything else, and that, "praying at a saint's shrine was the safest course of all and consequently, in all likelihood, the most effective."<sup>7</sup> Of course, one must wonder how a medieval knight and later Duke of Lower Lorraine, such as Godfrey of Bouillon, who was fighting in the Crusades in August of 1097 and managed, while drawing his sword, to "mutilate the calf and sinews of his own leg with a serious cut,"<sup>8</sup> would feel about such advice as he lay

---

<sup>1</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 167.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>8</sup> Mitchel, "Injuries and their Treatment," 149. The unfortunate Duke actually had the bad luck to inflict this wound on himself, not during a battle, but while fending off, "a wild bear that had attacked a peasant wandering in some wood." The injury, while not further explained in the actual chronicle than the above quoted text, probably was a

bleeding to death. Certainly than, in traumatic instances like these, physicians in the middle ages had to do more than simply refer their patients to a shrine for ‘spiritual healing’ or the hope of a miracle. In the Duke’s case, it is recorded that, “in January 1098, a full five months later, [he] continued as one of the prominent leaders of the First Crusade and became ruler of Jerusalem after it was conquered in 1099,”<sup>9</sup> an outcome that could not have occurred if medical science in the middle ages was as backwards and muddled as Hannam claims.<sup>10</sup> While medicine, in the middle ages, may have been riddled with errors of factuality, “to judge the theory and practice of medieval physicians solely by the standards of modern biomedicine is, in the last resort, as unproductive as it is predictable.”<sup>11</sup> Instead, to determine whether medicine, at this time, could rightfully be called a ‘science,’ on par with the various strains of natural philosophy in the medieval world, requires an analysis of its practice and study in the context of that world. Through this lens, just as John Buridan, a natural philosopher, came quite close to disproving Aristotle’s laws of motion<sup>12</sup>, yet was still led astray by the authority possessed by ancient works, so also were medical practitioners and scholars led to their errors by the authority vested in the ancient writers; particularly Gallen.<sup>13</sup> Just because, as Hannam points out, academic medicine in the middle ages was, “likely to be actively harmful,”<sup>14</sup> in some instances, to the patient, this does not eliminate its standing as a fully developed science.

In common terminology, today one says of a doctor that he or she, after going to medical school for many years, ‘practices medicine’. In the world of the middle ages, this phrasing would be seen as more than a bit of an oxymoron. Those who would be considered ‘doctors’ or ‘physicians’ in the middle ages, those that undertook the trouble to, “travel a considerable distance to get a medical education, often at great expense”<sup>15</sup> at one of the prominent medical universities such as Montpellier or Salerno,<sup>16</sup> would never deign themselves to the physical work of letting blood<sup>17</sup> or curarizing a wound. These duties went instead to the local ‘practitioners of medicine’ that actually administered care to those in the medieval world. Hannam points out this

---

“transection of an artery rather than a vein, where bleeding would be less.” In all respects than, this was a rather serious injury.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>10</sup> The excessive bleeding of the wound was probably halted via a process known as ‘cauterizing.’ In this process a hot ‘olive cauteries’ would be applied to the wound in an effort to seal up the artery. A ‘cauteries’ was a metal disk, that was available in many different shapes a sizes, that could be heated up in a fire. The excessive heat, when applied to the artery would, “burn the artery and stop the flow of blood through the middle” (150) as Mitchel in *Medicine in the Crusades* says. While this may sound like a rather beastly procedure it was not done without a significant amount of skill as, “all the blood pouring from the vessel would make both instruments and body tissues very slippery to hold” (150). Therefore, while cauterizing may have been an example of ‘practiced’ medicine in the Middle Ages, as opposed to the university’s ‘theorized medicine’, it was also an example of the advancement of the field above simple magic.

<sup>11</sup> Rawcliffe, “Applying Science,” 162.

<sup>12</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 181-2.

<sup>13</sup> This point will be developed later, but, to emphasis this statement, French, in *Medicine before Science*, goes so far as to claim that, “the scholastics took their sources literally, without realizing the personal motives of their authorities and some procedures they adopted in trying to re-establish ancient medicine, such as surgical operations or dissecting the human body, were reconstructions from words only” (112). Clearly than, the medical corpus of the medieval physician was of the upmost importance to his work.

<sup>14</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 101.

<sup>15</sup> French, “Scholastic Medicine,” 91.

<sup>16</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 14.

<sup>17</sup> The stereotype that Medieval Doctors held bloodletting as the most preferred treatment is flawed also. Instead, Nutton points out, in *The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC to AD 1800* that, “surviving account books show that therapy was almost entirely by diet (in some cases with an annual bloodletting in the spring)” (148).

division, briefly, by saying that, if one was ill in the middle ages they had, “two options; three if [they] had money. There is the church, the local healer, or a qualified doctor.”<sup>18</sup> Hannam is right to introduce this tripartite division of the medical system for the ‘qualified doctor’ of his words, the ‘scholastic physician’ in French’s terminology, was quite different from the “apprentice barber surgeons and apothecaries”<sup>19</sup> in London that needed their medical texts translated into ‘vulgar’ middle English as opposed to the scholastic Latin. This division of medicine between the, “busy practitioner” and the “wise physician”<sup>20</sup> certainly contributes to the false classification of medieval medicine as a bastard science filled with magic and thinly veiled guesses. Unlike mathematics or astronomy, which can be done exclusively in the brain or from a distance, the study of medicine is inextricably bound up with physical tasks and objects<sup>21</sup> and so it remained, “intimately bound to the world of crafts, ‘secrets’ (magical or otherwise), skills, and techniques”<sup>22</sup> making it a ‘lesser science’ even in the consideration of its contemporaries.

Those that could most definitively be said to have studied medicine as a science, at least in the medieval sense of the word science, were the ‘university’ physicians or ‘scholastic’ physicians. These were people that, just as scholars of the natural sciences would do, flocked to the great universities of Europe. However, due to, “the costs involved, the number of medical students were always small, both in themselves and in comparison with the total university population.”<sup>23</sup> It is notable though that, unlike the Alchemists who Hannam states were, “notorious for losing fortunes in their research,”<sup>24</sup> medical doctors stood to make huge sums of money if they could get through the course of studies. Indeed, French claims that, “what made this [getting a medical degree from a university] worthwhile for the prospective doctor was the financial reward of practice.”<sup>25</sup> Now in this sense, the word ‘practice’ means not to physically carry out procedures on the human body but instead to garner a position, which French describes as, “their idea form of practice...to be retained in a big household and to govern the regimen of people who were not ill.”<sup>26</sup> This sort of practice then, was not one of medical healing but of theory; medical theory that could be exercised not by delving into someone’s body but by managing the daily intake or ‘regimen’ of those he watched or by prescribing various sorts of baths. In fact, the classical university physicians, “poured scorn on the new empirics, a category they had helped to invent.”<sup>27</sup> In this condemnation the connection to other forms of medieval science, outside of medicine, can be found, for, the different schools of medical thought,

---

<sup>18</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 102.

<sup>19</sup> Rawcliffe, “Applying Science,” 165.

<sup>20</sup> Rawcliffe, “Applying Science,” 164.

<sup>21</sup> This fact is evident before one even considered the conception of empirical analysis. By virtue of being human, one studying medicine must have some physical interaction with the subject matter for he, himself, is that matter which he studies.

<sup>22</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 16.

<sup>23</sup> Nutton, “Medieval Western Europe,” 156.

<sup>24</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 123. It is interesting that Hannam lumps Alchemy, Astronomy, and Medicine together in his category of ‘erstwhile sciences’ and even more interesting that he does not include Astrology as a subsection of medicine for it was in this role that the pseudo-science was quite often pursued. Knowing the sign under which some event happened, physicians theorized, could help lead to its cure or management.

<sup>25</sup> French, “Scholastic Medicine,” 91.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

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

empirics, rationalists, and Methodists, correspond quite closely with the ongoing “philosophical dispute between realism and nominalism”<sup>28</sup> present throughout much of medieval academia.

Empiricists, drawing their name from their stress on the need for empirical data, that is data garnered from the sense, believed that, “theory is completely useless for therapeutic purposes; that the task of the medical practitioner is to treat his patients; and the only reliable guide in so doing is experience.”<sup>29</sup> This sounds rather similar to the nominalist argument that William Ockham would put forward claiming that, “experience is the only way to know things” and that, therefore, ‘universals’ were, “merely names that humans ha[d] invented for convenience.”<sup>30</sup> Conversely, the rationalists, who depended on rational theories drawn from the authorities of antiquity era works, believed that, “the primary task of medicine was to use reason to investigate causes of health, disease, and physiological phenomena generally and to construct physiological theories.”<sup>31</sup> This approach is notable in that it is based on the ancient medical writers, the literary medical tradition of Europe that will be addressed shortly, to an almost religious degree. French claims that, “the moral tone of the exhortations of some [medical] masters was consonant with the almost religious respect accorded to the ancient authorities.”<sup>32</sup> French goes on to further claim that, “the ultimate aim of medical education was, by the devices of commentary and disputed question, to make the ancients so clearly understood it was as if they were in the same room.”<sup>33</sup> It was from these ancient writers that university physicians of this strain of thought got their overarching theories of medicine that cast health as a set of universally constant variables, such as the ‘four humors’ theory drawn from Galen, that could be managed and built on. This thought-process lines up with the realists of natural philosophy who, “believed that universals have real existence... such as [the term] ‘dog’ for all dogs.”<sup>34</sup> Methodist, representing the application based side of medicine that existed exterior of the university environment, saw medicine as “a few simple rules that could be mastered in six months.”<sup>35</sup> Medicine then, was no stranger to the great philosophic debates, concerning

---

<sup>28</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 164. The division, highlighted here, between realism and nominalism and between the different schools of medical thought actually is quite close in appearance to the debates going on during the time of the Hippocratic writers. G. E. R. Lloyd, in his book *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle*, claims that there were numerous competing theories on what the cause of disease was. Theories ranged from, “those who argued that all diseases have a single origin, to those who held that there were as many different disease as there are patients” (58). Those that claimed that there was one universal cause of disease could be seen as a very early example of the realist school of thought that postulated universals whereas those that saw an infinite number of individual disease could be seen as a proto-nominalist school of thought that wished to examine each and every single instance of illness by its own criteria and with no reference to universals. It is rather telling that the ‘correct’ answer, settled on today, is some balance of these two approaches to medicine and thought. It is true that the, “same symptoms may have different explanations” (59) but it is also true that there are specific types, or universals, of disease that can present themselves with different sets of symptoms. It should also not be surprising that the debates of the medieval era medicine men mirror those of the Hippocratic writers for, as will be shown, it is from these writer that the doctors of the middle ages received their medical training.

<sup>29</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 4.

<sup>30</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 164-5.

<sup>31</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 4.

<sup>32</sup> French, “Scholastic Medicine,” 98.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 165.

<sup>35</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 4. While this view of medicine may today seem absurd, at the time it was quite reasonable for much of the medical knowledge of the scholastic physicians was tied up in ‘Aphorisms.’ French defines these aphorism as “rules... [that are] mostly general and relate to the nature of medicine and the doctor...and designed to guide the doctor in good practice” (110). It was these sayings, such as the colloquial ‘like attracts like’ that were, according to Rawcliffe in her book *Leprosy in Medieval England*, disseminated through non-Latin texts to

methodology, evident in the other natural sciences. It incorporated and included them just as the others did, demonstrating its inclusion in the ranks of medieval science.

According to Hannam, what is defined as scholasticism was a, “carefully organized system that medieval philosophers used to construct rational arguments.”<sup>36</sup> The philosopher in question, in this case, would be St. Thomas Aquinas and the specific arguments he was making were in an effort to incorporate Aristotle into the Christian tradition. As such, the “entire body of medieval thought is often described by the single word ‘scholasticism’<sup>37</sup> and as such represents the deep integration of Aristotle into nearly all strains of academic thought in the middle ages. It has already been shown how even the smartest and brightest minds of the middle ages were loath to challenge ‘The Commentator’<sup>38</sup> until the very eve of the Black Death. Just as the natural philosophers, then, had their great masters and, so called, ‘inflatable’ sources of wisdom, so also did the university physicians, yet “medicine retained its separateness from Aristotelian natural philosophy in several important respects... foremost, in the Hippocratic and Galenic writings medicine possessed an equally venerable scientific tradition of largely independent origin (even though Galen himself adopted some Aristotelian concepts).”<sup>39</sup> Therefore, medicine had its own independent literary tradition, just as natural philosophy or, the queen of science, theology. While, “like other university-educated men, the doctor was rational in a dialectical way, in using Aristotle’s logic and its medieval developments”<sup>40</sup> and for some of these young men, “medicine was simply a stage in an ultimately theological education,”<sup>41</sup> for many, the study of medicine was both grounded in the thought process of Aristotelian argument yet separate from it due to its factual basis in Galen and Hippocrates.

Galen himself was a Greek living in a Roman world during the second century C.E. <sup>42</sup> It is from Galen that much of the medieval world’s understanding of medicine comes for he is seen as the last man to truly understand nearly the whole scope of medical knowledge before the fall of the Roman Empire. More importantly though, Galen was the first person to truly advocate for “a split between theory and practice,” <sup>43</sup> that same split so evident in the middle ages. This division quickly lead to a, “movement towards a definition of medicine in terms of specific books.” <sup>44</sup> By establishing a set group of books that defined ‘medical knowledge’ Galen, and his followers, moved their writings from the realm of opinion to dogma. Of course, it was not Galen himself who did this but those studying his works, after his death, in the Roman world. Significantly, “Galen himself had commented on several Hippocratic texts and singled out the *Aphorisms* as essential.” <sup>45</sup> As such it is also through Galen that the medieval world gets the works of the Hippocratic writers such as the *Epidemics* and *On The Sacred Disease*.<sup>46</sup> However,

---

the general populations of Europe (165). She then goes on to state that these saying were, “set down in verse, so that it could be more easily memorized and passed on to others” (165). Clearly than, while a gulf existed between the university physician and the local medic / barber, they still shared some common knowledge, or, at the very least, the latter gained a simplified understanding of the former’s extensive knowledge.

<sup>36</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 88.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 63.

<sup>39</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 16.

<sup>40</sup> French, “Scholastic Medicine,” 102.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>42</sup> Nutton, “From Galen to Galensim,” 79.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Siraisi, “Western European Medicine,” 8.

in order for Galen and Hippocrates to be the revered masters of the middle ages, they first had to be reclaimed from the east for the Latin speaking world after the fall of Roman Empire. Of course, Galen and medicine as a whole did not completely fade away in the immediate collapse of the Roman Empire, but instead, “like other learned disciplines, survived in western Europe between the seventh or eighth and the eleventh century mainly in a clerical or monastic environment.”<sup>47</sup> At the start of the middle ages then, both the Islamic and Western European worlds possessed some works of Galen, what differed was, “the extent of the material and the way it was used...between the two societies.”<sup>48</sup>

It would not be until the tenth and eleventh centuries that the real meat of Galen’s (and his commentator’s) works would be translated into Latin and transported to Europe. This work was done by a select few people, as was true also of those that focused on translating Aristotle and Plato into Latin. These people tended to be situated in Spain or Italy, as these places had the best and most constant contact with the Islamic world in comparison to more landlocked places such as the University of Paris. In keeping with the theme that medicine survived through the truly dark years of the 700s and 800s in the monastic setting, the first real translator of Galenic works was “Constantine of African, a Tunisian monk”<sup>49</sup> from Monte Casino in about 1070. His work, “put the Latin-speaking world in touch with the tradition of Hippocratic learning promoted by Galen and extended by Arabs.”<sup>50</sup> It is important to note here that Constantine translated works ‘extended by Arabs’ for it was in the Islamic world that true growth in medical knowledge was being made at this early point of the middle ages. The next translator, Gerard of Cremona translated many Galenic texts but also, “concentrated on major Arabic practical texts, like the *Canon*”.<sup>51</sup> The *Canon* is interesting for it was not written by an ancient Greek but by an Arabic writer who was a near contemporary to Gerard. Gerard translated the work, “about 100 years after [the writer] Ibn Sina’s death.”<sup>52</sup> Gerard was followed by Burgundio, a “Pisan merchant”<sup>53</sup> and later by Niccolo da Reggio in the early 1300s who “translated over 50 writings by Galen.”<sup>54</sup> Each one of these translators brought more and more written medical works into western Europe in the centuries leading up to the Black Death, a test that would show the ultimate ineffectuality of many of the medical practices put forth in these works.

However, just because the medieval “authors composed their books on diet (or, better, lifestyle)”<sup>55</sup> based on inherently incorrect information provided to them by Galen does not mean that they were any less scientific than their natural philosopher counterparts. The difference, and

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 8. To further highlight on this point, there was often little to no conflict between the church and both scholars and practitioners of medicine. French, in his work *Medicine before Science*, points out, “the church’s attitude to doctor’s was traditionally ambivalent” (90). Additionally, as will be further expanded upon, it was in monasteries and other religious institutions that the translation of medical works was often conducted and often for the stated purpose of, as Nutton in *The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC to AD 1800* says, “to lead to a better understanding of God and His Creation” (139). Notably, it was the monastic orders that eventually came to run the hospitals for, “the chronic sick and those suffering simply from the ravages of old age” (152). By no means were these hospitals seen as ‘death-traps’ (152), but were instead noted as being quite effective at their specified role of providing care to those who were old or suffered from some ‘acute disorder’ (150) such as a broken hand.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 12.

<sup>49</sup> Nutton, “Medieval Western Europe,” 140.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 141.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 143.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 144. It is not surprising that he had access, as a merchant, to many Arabic medical texts to translate.

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., 141.

therefore the extra amount of scorn heaped on medieval doctors was that an incorrect understanding of the cosmology of the universe would not kill anyone (excepting possibly the bold philosopher that put such ideas forward if his statements edged on heretical), but a misunderstanding of the proper method by which to treat a certain illness (or the ineffectuality of those scholastically known methods) would almost certainly be fatal.

Even when a university physician had a full and complete understanding of the Galenic tradition, he was still sure to be faced with situations that were completely outside his understanding. While physical trauma, such as that suffered by those who went off to fight in the Holy Land, was, to some degree manageable by the medieval doctors, the invisible diseases caused by bacteria were quite another issue. For example, when confronted with the Black Death, even the most medically learned men of England had little recourse. When, in 1347, the disease encroached into France and worked its way towards Avignon, "Pope Clement consulted his personal physician, Gui de Chauliac... as a scholarly trained physician he was, of course, a firm believer in the Hippocratic epidemiological theory of miasma."<sup>56</sup> As such, his advice to one of the most powerful men in Europe, the Pope, was to "spen[d] day and night sheltering between to large fires."<sup>57</sup> While modern medicine would know that this is a foolhardy way to avoid bacterial infection, at the time it was supposed that the stench ridden, and therefore infected, air could be warded off by light and heat. Notably though, the Pope did not "believe that epidemic disease, in this case the Black Death, was an expression of the Lord's wrath at the abominable sins of his human subjects."<sup>58</sup> The fact that he turned to medicine at all then, is an endorsement of its respectability, regardless of medical factuality, in the middle ages.

Another bacterial, and so invisible, disease that medieval medicine attempted to deal with was leprosy. It was essentially impossible to cure a person of leprosy in the middle ages, the whole idea of a 'cure' is, itself, an 1800s idea that comes from modern medicine and a Victorian society obsessed with finding solutions to newly recognized problems. As such the real aspects of consideration that warranted medical study in the middle ages were diagnosis and comfort care to forestay the disease's ultimate end. One could point to some of the outlandish methods by which doctors, at this time, attempted to diagnose leprosy in an attempt to show the complete worthlessness of medicine in the middle ages. For example, one such test, "involves placing a freshly laid egg in the patient's urine and then cracking it open within an hour to see if it had been corrupted or 'cooked' by adust humors."<sup>59</sup> Of course, this does sound completely outlandish, but it was built off of an understanding of Galenic works and so, it represented a experimentation of sorts on these theories. Rawcliffe argues that, "this negative view of pre-modern diagnosis is largely unfounded"<sup>60</sup> pointing specifically to, "blood tests recommended by practitioners such as Gilbertus Anglicus and John of Gaddesden to determine abnormal levels of coagulation and adhesion."<sup>61</sup> It is interesting also that Rawcliffe points to the 'practitioner' of medicine indicating that, "responsibility for the diagnosis of leprosy (or, indeed, any other medieval malady) was thus far from clear-cut, and certainly extended beyond a narrow cadre of university-trained physicians and licensed surgeons."<sup>62</sup> This highlights that the tripartite division of medical science, while certainly evident, may not have been particularly rigid in some places.

---

<sup>56</sup> Benedictow, *The Black Death*, 97.

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

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

<sup>59</sup> Rawcliffe, "Applying Science," 166.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

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

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 167.

Especially those places where the understanding of the malady, in this case the ever-elusive leprosy, was so minimal.

Medieval medicine was certainly not the most successful of sciences, but it was yet nevertheless a science. Through Galen and Hippocrates, it featured an enormous, yet distinct, body of writings that put it in parallel to the Aristotelian and Platonic works of the natural philosophers. Just as natural philosophy and reason was sheltered by, and arose out of, religious institutions, so also was the medical corpus of the day preserved and enlarged by those ambitious ecclesiastical men that acquired and translated Arabic texts. In some cases, such as those of physical trauma suffered by the men who fought in the crusades, medieval medicine could be rather effective in preventing imminent death and fostering long term recovery. Specifically, in these cases, medical men did not simply pray that their patient would improve but instead conducted, or directed the conduction of, rather complex surgeries based on the anatomical knowledge of the day. When faced with the invisible killer of the Black Death the non-microbial science of the middle ages was largely frozen in its tracks and could do little more than fruitlessly speculate. However, this represents a deficiency in the knowledge acquired to that point, not a lack of effort on the part of medieval doctors and practitioners. Where 'invisible death' caused by bacteria was less vigorous and disastrous, such as in leprosy cases, medical men began to turn to experimentation and development of practical diagnosis procedures that could be effectively implemented. Importantly though, these men, largely, did not turn to a supernatural explanation for these chronic diseases but instead saw in them some natural cause that had to be found and addressed. Therefore, while medieval medicine may have been, at some points, a "Bloody Failure"<sup>63</sup> as Hannam claims, it was still very much a science with a deep and complex, though equivalently deeply flawed, system of thought that was studied and debated in much the same manner as that of the natural philosophers.

---

<sup>63</sup> Hannam, *Genesis of Science*, 101.

## Bibliography

- Benedictow, Ole J. "France." In *The Black Death 1346-1353*, 96-109, 2004.
- French, Roger. "Scholastic Medicine." In *Medicine before Science: The Business of Medicine from the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment*, 88-127. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Hannam, James. *The Genesis of Science*. Washington D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2011.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. "The Hippocratic Writers." In *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle*, 50-60. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1970.
- Mitchell, Piers D. "Injuries and their Treatment." In *Medicine in the Crusades*, 137-183. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Nutton, Vivian. "From Galen to Galenism." In *The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC to AD 1800*, 79-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995a.
- . "Medicine in Medieval Western Europe, 1000-1500." In *The Western Medical Tradition 800 BC to AD 1800*, 139-198. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995b.
- Rawcliffe, Carole. "Applying Science: The Spread of Information." In *Leprosy in Medieval England*, 158-168. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2006.
- Siraisi, Nancy G. "The Formation of Western European Medicine." In *Medieval & Early Renaissance Medicine*, 1-17. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

## *Richard Wellesley and the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War*

*By Ryan Campbell*

The British Empire in India was the final result of decades of expansion by the East India Company. The East India Company had been actively trading in the East Indies since the granting of its charter at the beginning of the seventeenth century.<sup>1</sup> Starting with the battle of Plassey in 1757, and followed by the defeat of the Marathas in 1818, the East India Company became the dominant power in the Indian subcontinent. The supremacy of the Company lasted until the Great Mutiny in 1857, and it was during its aftermath the Company lost control. During the initial phase of this period, famous individuals such as Robert Clive and Warren Hastings led the conquest of Bengal.<sup>2</sup> The person who is largely credited with expanding upon the initial gains of Clive and Hastings is Richard Wellesley. These gains included the Eastern Ghats, The Malabar Coast, and Rohilkhand.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to annexations by the East India Company, Wellesley also oversaw the initiation of many subsidiary alliances with local powers. The subsidiary alliance was “a satisfactory means of gaining control over the internal affairs of allied states, without being officially responsible for them.”<sup>4</sup> Regions that Wellesley brought under control through this system include, Travancore, Hyderabad, Oudh, and Mysore.<sup>5</sup> Wellesley was Governor-General of the Presidency of Fort William in Calcutta from May 18, 1798, to July 30, 1805. One scholar even described Wellesley as “the first of the governor generals to have an imperial vision.”<sup>6</sup> During this time Wellesley enjoyed “power (that) was equal to that of a Roman Proconsul.”<sup>7</sup> Throughout his tenure, Wellesley expanded Company territory in order to defend it from foreign and domestic enemies. It is the purpose of this study to prove that Richard Wellesley utilized the French threat in India to engage in an offensive war motivated by geopolitics against Tipu Sultan, which culminated in the Siege of Seringapatam.

The chief foreign adversary in India and globally for the British was France. This phase of the Anglo-French rivalry dated back to the late seventeenth century, and grew with intensity throughout the eighteenth century.<sup>8</sup> In the Seven’s Years War (1756-1763), Britain scored decisive victories over the French in North America and India.<sup>9</sup> The Anglo-

---

<sup>1</sup> East India Company, *The Register of Letters & C of the Governour and Company of Merchants of London Trading into the East Indies* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1893), 158-159.

<sup>2</sup> Philip Lawson, *The East India Company: A History* (Florence: Routledge, 1993), 91.

<sup>3</sup> John Severn, *Architects of Empire: The Duke of Wellington and His Brothers* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007), 68.

<sup>4</sup> Edward Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801* (Bath: Adams & Dart, 1970), 3.

<sup>5</sup> Severn, *Architects of Empire: The Duke of Wellington and His Brothers*, 192.

<sup>6</sup> Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 97.

<sup>7</sup> Jac Weller, *Wellington in India*, (London: Greenhill Books, 2013), 20.

<sup>8</sup> Jonathan I. Israel, “The Emerging Empire: The Continental Perspective, 1650-1713,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume I: The Origins of Empire*, ed, Nicholas Canny (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 441.

<sup>9</sup> Bruce P. Lenman, “Colonial Wars and Imperial Instability, 1688-1793,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, ed P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 163.

French rivalry flared up again and led to conflict with the outbreak of The French Revolutionary Wars 1782-1802, and the advent of Napoleon Bonaparte. As a result of this rivalry, France continued to seek out Indian allies to fight against the East India Company.

The Fourth Anglo-Mysore War combined both the foreign and domestic threats to British control in India. This was the final confrontation between the British East India Company and the Kingdom of Mysore, ruled by Tipu Sultan. Tipu ascended to the throne of Mysore in 1782 after the death of his father Hyder Ali.<sup>10</sup> In the 1750s Hyder had become the de facto ruler of Mysore through his military acumen, and pushed aside the Wodeyar family during the chaos of the Mysore-Maratha Wars.<sup>11</sup> During the course of Tipu's rule 1782-1799, the Kingdom of Mysore became the biggest obstacle to British control of South India. Only eight years into his rule Tipu invaded Travancore, which led to the Third Anglo-Mysore War. The Third Anglo-Mysore War lasted from 1790-1792; this resulted in a resounding defeat for Mysore, but the British failed to seize his capital Seringapatam. The Fourth Anglo-Mysore War 1798-1799, however, ended with a second and successful siege of Seringapatam on April 5 – May 4, 1799, and the death of Tipu.<sup>12</sup> The foreign threat was French aid promised to the Kingdom of Mysore<sup>13</sup> in the shape of the Malartic Proclamation issued by the French Commander of the Isle-de-France, Anne Joseph Hyppolyte de Maures Comte De Malartic, on January 1798.<sup>14</sup> This proclamation stated that Tipu desired to make an alliance with the French in order to drive the British out of India. Furthermore, it stated that Tipu would finance the war, and that he was only waiting for the French in order to declare war against the British. It also called for volunteer citizens, since the French army stationed there was stretched thin.<sup>15</sup> It was after thirty-two years of intermittent warfare between Mysore and the British East India Company, that this obstacle would be removed.

But scholars have not always agreed as to what were Richard Wellesley's motivations were for the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War. Some have argued that Wellesley was motivated by economic factors. P.J. Marshall has argued that the East India Company was a "military-fiscal state."<sup>16</sup> This meant that the expansion of Company territory was caught in a perpetual cycle, because every increase in territory required a larger military and administrative force. Which in turn required further conquests to fund the increase in personal.<sup>17</sup> While others have stressed that Wellesley was motivated by geopolitical factors. C.A. Bayly has argued that for the British in India, "internal tranquility could only

---

<sup>10</sup> Lewin B Bowring, *Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan and the Struggle with the Musalman Powers of the South* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1899), 117-118.

<sup>11</sup> P.N. Chopra, *History of South India: Ancient, Medieval, Modern, Part III* (New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons, 2003), 71-76. As a result of this Tipu was often seen as a usurper to the British, for this see Kate Brittlebank, *Tipu Sultan's Search for Legitimacy: Islam and Kingship in a Hindu Domain*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 2.

<sup>12</sup> M.S. Naravane, *Battles of the Honourable East India Company: Making of the Raj* (New Delhi: APH Publishing, 2006), 172-180.

<sup>13</sup> Jac Weller, *Wellington in India*, 26-27.

<sup>14</sup> J Whittle, "Original Criticism: A View of the Origin and Conduct of the War with Tippoo Sultaun Comprising a Narrative of the Operations of the Army under the Command of Lieutenant-General George Harris, and of the Siege of Seringapatam." *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine* 7(1801), 120.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, 120-121.

<sup>16</sup> P.J. Marshall, *The Making and Unmaking of Empires: Britain, India, America c. 1750-1783* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 2

<sup>17</sup> *ibid*, 224.

be guaranteed by absolute paramountcy in the sub-continent.”<sup>18</sup> This meant the neutralization of the French threat and Mughal successor states in India.

Scholars have also argued over the nature of the war, whether the war was fought in either an offensive or defensive manner. Lawrence James argued that Wellesley was looking for “an excuse to invade Mysore.”<sup>19</sup> On the other hand Jac Weller has portrayed Wellesley as defensive, and Tipu as the aggressor.<sup>20</sup> This work will first analyze the insufficient theories of economic and defensive motivations for the conflict in question. Secondly it will explore why the theories of geopolitical and offensive motivations are more accurate to explain why Wellesley’s war against Mysore. Third, it will explore how the reactions to the Siege of Seringapatam demonstrated the early nineteenth-century British attitudes towards empire. This period showed an embracement of the growing Empire, which was focused on peace and prosperity. However, the only way to ensure the safety of the Empire was through military conquest.

\*\*\*

Perhaps the most important of evidence to support the economic theory was Tipu’s agenda as ruler. Tipu sought to develop “state management of commercial factories and banking establishments.”<sup>21</sup> This policy of economic control was seen in many of the Mughal successor states, such as Awadh, Bengal, Hyderabad, and Mysore. These local regimes “sought to monopolise and protect trade, settle wandering groups and disperse armies, to re-establish the power to tax the countryside.”<sup>22</sup> Tipu had also injured Company trade by establishing an embargo, cutting the British out of Mysore.<sup>23</sup> These economic practices are why the East India Company labeled Tipu as a “frivolous and capricious innovator; the mean and minute economist; the peddling trader; and even the retail shopkeeper.”<sup>24</sup> The “frivolous and capricious innovator” labels are referencing his changes in Mysore, to make it a stronger state. While the “peddling trader” and “retail shopkeeper” are referencing the embargo enacted against the British. While it is true that conquering Mysore would result in the British being able to trade in the region, there is insufficient evidence to indicate that this was Wellesley’s main motivation.

Furthermore Wellesley’s wars were devastating for the finances of the East India Company.<sup>25</sup> Wellesley did increase the potential revenue of the East India Company by £15 million, but he also dramatically increased its debts.<sup>26</sup> “Notwithstanding the despatch (sic) of nearly six millions sterling to Wellesley, the Indian debt between 1799 and 1807

---

<sup>18</sup> C.A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830* (New York: Longman Inc, 1989), 106.

<sup>19</sup> Lawrence James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India* (New York: St. Martin’s Griffin, 1997), 68.

<sup>20</sup> Weller, *Wellington in India*, 27.

<sup>21</sup> Rajat Kanta Ray, “Indian Society and the Establishment of British Supremacy, 1765-1818,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, ed, P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 521

<sup>22</sup> C.A. Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*, 47.

<sup>23</sup> Ray, “Indian Society and the Establishment of British Supremacy, 1765-1818,” 551.

<sup>24</sup> William Kirkpatrick, *The Select Letters of Tippoo Sultan to Various Public Functionaries* (London, 1811), x.

<sup>25</sup> Philip Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 135.

<sup>26</sup> Ray, “Indian Society and The Establishment of British Supremacy, 1765-1818,” 552. Quoting Elliot and Dowson VIII, 439.

increased from about £10,000,000 to over £26,000,000.”<sup>27</sup> This accounting has led to Wellesley being characterized as a “man bent on militaristic adventures”, whose governorship was a series of “military excursions...made without any regard to cost”.<sup>28</sup> As a result the economic motivation is at its best, is seen as a secondary motivation when compared to the geopolitical motivations.

Third, the most significant factor in determining Wellesley’s motivations in India are the geopolitical factors. The primary geopolitical factor that influenced Wellesley was the French menace, which he was able to use against another geopolitical threat Tipu Sultan. Wellesley reached India in 1798 in the middle of the French Revolutionary Wars. That same year in 1798 when Wellesley arrived in India, Napoleon invaded Egypt with the goals of acquiring grain for France, and disrupting British trade in the East.<sup>29</sup> Some scholars have even argued that Napoleon dreamed of marching on either Constantinople or India and joining forces with Tipu Sultan.<sup>30</sup> The invasion of Egypt and the Malartic Proclamation gave Wellesley the perfect opportunity to go to war with Tipu. There was the precedent of opposing France regardless of the cost. A prime example can be found in Wellesley’s predecessor Lord Cornwallis actions in 1785.

Cornwallis had been instructed to follow the Act of 1784, which was a neutrality act in the case of conflict between any of the powers in India. This act was tested just a year later when war broke out between Tipu Sultan and the Maratha Empire. The Board of Control advised Cornwallis that, “if any European power, in particular France, took one side in the war, the Company was automatically to take the other.”<sup>31</sup>

Furthermore, the suspicion that the French were planning to invade India can be found in a series of letters between Wellesley and William Eden. In a reply to one such letter Wellesley explained:

On October 18, we learnt the destination of the Toulon fleet and army to be towards India. Although I certainly did not expect that the French would attempt the route by Egypt, I have been convinced for a long time that their views were turned this way, and accordingly (thank God) I took my precautions as early as the month of June. We can now defy them<sup>32</sup>

This excerpt is telling because it shows two things that Wellesley thought in regards to the French. First, Wellesley said that he “did not expect” the French to attack India via Egypt. This phrase leads one to believe that Wellesley would have dismissed any French attack from Egypt as improbable. Second, Wellesley said that he was “convinced that their views were turned this way”. This statement shows that Wellesley did not think that France would attack India directly from Egypt. Instead Wellesley was more concerned about France meddling in relations with Mysore and Hyderabad. This is a prime example of Wellesley at

---

<sup>27</sup> C.H. Philips, *The East India Company 1784-1834*, (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1940), 154.

<sup>28</sup> Philip Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 134-135.

<sup>29</sup> Juan Cole, *Napoleon’s Egypt: Invading the Middle East* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 130.

<sup>30</sup> William E. Watson, *Tricolor and Crescent: France and the Islamic World*, (Westport: Praeger, 2003), 13.

<sup>31</sup> C.H. Philips, *The East India Company 1784-1834*, 66.

<sup>32</sup> The author uses excerpts from various letters written by Wellesley to Baron Auckland to show his “susceptible, eager, inquisitive nature” but does not provide dates written. As quoted in William McCullagh Torrens, *The Marquess Wellesley: Architect of Empire*, (London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1880), 177.

the very least having down played the French threat. Further on in the letter Wellesley asked Eden:

I trust you will be of opinion that the blow which I have struck at Hyderabad was not unseasonable. It took place on October 22; and the intelligence reached me nearly at the same moment with the glorious news of the victory at Aboukir. Our accounts of the state of Bonaparte's army leave little doubt of its final destruction.<sup>33</sup>

This portion of the letter covers Wellesley's effort to have the French forces removed from Hyderabad. The "blow which I have struck at Hyderabad" was to force the nizam to dispel the French troops there.<sup>34</sup> This effectively removed French influence from the kingdom and also ensured that they would come to the Company's aid in the war against Mysore. Furthermore Wellesley referenced Horatio Nelson's victory at the Battle of the Nile (Aboukir). Nelson's victory effectively ended France's ambitions of using Egypt as a base from which they could launch a seaborne invasion of India.<sup>35</sup> These two events resulted in the hindrance of France's ability to interfere in India.

These two statements show that Wellesley acknowledged that the French threat in India was in a state of decline. Despite the lack of France's capability to support the Malartic Proclamation, Wellesley was still preparing the Company to go to war against Tipu. At first glance, Wellesley's actions appeared to have contradicted his correspondence with Eden. In fact they revealed Wellesley's true intentions, that regardless of France's capacity to aid Tipu, he was going to war against him. This proves that Wellesley over-emphasized the French threat in India in order to have a justification for war against Tipu.

Ultimately the geopolitical situation was the biggest factor that led to the capture of Seringapatam. The proposed alliance between the French Republic and the Kingdom of Mysore ended up having the opposite effect for both parties. It did very little for the French in their geopolitical aims; at the best, it kept British troops busy in India. For Tipu it proved a death sentence. On the contrary, it was a boon for Richard Wellesley and the East India Company their aims. Wellesley was able to use the half-hearted promises of support from the French as an excuse to go to war with Mysore. Or in other words the threat of a Franco-Mysore alliance was a "godsend, for it gave him [Wellesley] an excuse to invade Mysore and deal once for and all with a persistent and dangerous adversary [Mysore]."<sup>36</sup> Prior to the Malartic Proclamation and the French Invasion of Egypt, the East India Company was reluctant to expand more. Wellesley used these developments as "lever" for him to pressure the Company to allow him to launch a preemptive strike against a "revival of French influence."<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> The author uses excerpts from various letters written by Wellesley to Baron Auckland to show his "susceptible, eager, inquisitive nature" but does not provide dates written. As quoted in William McCullagh Torrens, *The Marquess Wellesley: Architect of Empire*, (London: Spottiswoode and Co., 1880), 177.

<sup>34</sup> Robert Montgomery Martin, *The Despatches, Minutes & Correspondence of the Marquess Wellesley During His Administration in India*, (London: 1836), 672-675.

<sup>35</sup> Roy Adkins, Lesley Adkins, *The War for all of the Oceans: From Nelson at the Nile to Napoleon at Waterloo* (New York: Viking, 2006), 7.

<sup>36</sup> James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 68.

<sup>37</sup> Michael Duffy, "World-Wide War and British Expansion 1793-1815," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, ed, P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 198.

Furthermore, by leading an expansion of British power, one might argue that Wellesley was motivated by a potential increase in revenue that new territories would bring. But claiming that Wellesley was driven strictly by economic factors has been described by C.A. Bayly as “simple-minded economism.” Bayly describes Wellesley’s reasoning for expansion as wanting to “create in India a great counter weight to France in Europe. They were concerned that what the British already held in revenue and trade was at risk from further ‘tribal breakout’ of Afghan under Zaman Shah Durrani or, worse, from the revival of Maratha power within India.”<sup>38</sup> All of the aforementioned evidence leads one to doubt the validity of the economic theory behind Wellesley’s motivation for the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War. If Wellesley were motivated by annexing new lands in order to collect revenue, then why would he more than double the debt of the Company? The economic need for the annexation of Mysore is “difficult to establish.”<sup>39</sup> “In the India of militaristic belief and crumbling Mogul polities,” Philip Lawson explains, “Wellesley was provided with the ripest opportunity to achieve his ends”<sup>40</sup>

While Wellesley’s actions make Tipu Sultan appear to be the victim in this game of geopolitics between two European empires, he was not completely innocent. In addition to being viewed as a usurper by the British, Tipu was seen as a major threat to British rule in India. Tipu was indicated as being “their (the British East India Company’s) most dangerous single enemy in India and the most likely to be active in future.”<sup>41</sup> This fear of Tipu was not unfounded; in fact he had attacked an East India Company ally before Wellesley’s tenure as governor. In 1790, after receiving encouragement from the French government Tipu Sultan attacked Travancore beginning the Third Anglo-Mysore War. At the outset of the war the Company enjoyed initial success, until supply problems and Tipu forced the British commander Charles Cornwallis to retreat from Seringapatam.<sup>42</sup> Tipu would not be able to replicate this success in his last war with the East India Company.

Second, the theory that Wellesley fought this war in a defensive manner is worth exploring. The best example of the Wellesley’s defensive posture is found in his answer to the Malartic Proclamation. Wellesley first learned about the infamous Malartic Proclamation on June 8 1798, after seeing that it was published in a Calcutta newspaper.<sup>43</sup> At first Wellesley doubted its authenticity but when he received two copies of the proclamation he took it seriously.<sup>44</sup> The first copy came from Lord Macartney at the Cape of Good Hope. Macartney obtained that copy from an American sailing vessel, which was ironically named the *Sultan*.<sup>45</sup>

Wellesley then wrote to Tipu, “being anxious to afford you every proof in my power of my sincere wish to maintain the good understanding which had so long subsisted between

---

<sup>38</sup> Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*, 106.

<sup>39</sup> P.J. Marshall, “Britain Without America – A Second Empire?” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, ed, P.J. Marshall (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 586.

<sup>40</sup> Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 135.

<sup>41</sup> Kate Brittlebank, *Tipu Sultan’s Search for Legitimacy: Islam and Kingship in a Hindu Domain*, 2. And M.S. Naravane, *Battles of the Honourable East India Company: Making of the Raj*, 15.

<sup>42</sup> Philips, *The East India Company 1784-1834*, 67.

<sup>43</sup> Denys Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1970), 257.

<sup>44</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 53.

<sup>45</sup> Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*, 257-258.

your Highness and the Company... ”<sup>46</sup> This correspondence may appear to show Wellesley attempting to placate Tipu, but in fact it was a façade. The reason that Wellesley wrote to Tipu in such a cordial manner was to “buy time” from him in order to gather material for the war. Wellesley had initially wanted to go to war to neutralize the threat posed from Mysore as soon as possible, but was unable due to numerous factors. On July 6 1798 Wellesley wrote to Lord Dundas the Secretary of State for War, that he was calling off the attack because he “lacked of the necessary funds, because monsoon in the south would make the roads impassable, and because neither the nizam [of Hyderabad] nor peswha [Maratha] would provide any assistance.”<sup>47</sup> Edward Ingram maintains that “throughout 1798 and 1799 Wellesley had to write as if Tipu Sultan was about to attack the British: in fact the British were about to attack him.” The source of this strategy was the board of directors in Madras. They believed that although Tipu was antagonistic towards the British, his policies would always be defensive. The board also believed that he would only attack if they made their preparations “too obviously offensive.”<sup>48</sup>

Wellesley also wanted support from the Kingdom of Hyderabad and the Maratha empire.<sup>49</sup> This support included getting the Kingdom of Hyderabad to disband the French units that were stationed there.<sup>50</sup> This move served the dual purpose of weakening the French influence in Southern India and denying Mysore a potential ally. The kingdom of Hyderabad and the Maratha Empire both aided the British East India Company and Wellesley in the Fourth Mysore War. This was due to the Treaty of Yadgir signed in 1784, which promised that Hyderabad and the Marathas would not go to war against one another. The two powers met again in 1790 and agreed to aid the British in future wars against Tipu.<sup>51</sup>

Therefore, what is perceived at first glance as a defensive posture taken by Wellesley was in fact an act of deception. Wellesley had to prepare the finances and gather troops and allies in order to wage a successful war. Dundas praised Wellesley in a private letter on March 18, 1799 that his decision to delay attacking Tipu until the proper resources were allocated allowed the Company forces to “enable you (Wellesley) to act with effect, if the humility of acknowledgements is not adequate to what our power, and the justice of our cause, entitle us to demand”<sup>52</sup> If he was going to destroy the last obstacle to British control of Southern India, he had to make sure that he had the army and resources for it.

Fourth, the aggressive manner in which Wellesley pursued and carried out the war is seen in the tenacity Wellesley demonstrated throughout his correspondences. For example, in a series of letters to Henry Dundas, Wellesley portrayed his aggressive motives. Dundas on the other hand expressed a general reluctance to go to war; he simply

---

<sup>46</sup> As quoted in *Ibid*, 258.

<sup>47</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 5.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid*, 5.

<sup>49</sup> Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan* 262.

<sup>50</sup> Robert Montgomery Martin, *The Despatches, Minutes & Correspondence of the Marquess Wellesley During His Administration in India*, (London: 1836), 672-675.

<sup>51</sup> Sailendra Nath Sen, *Anglo-Maratha Relations: 1785-1796 vol. 2* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1974), 198.

<sup>52</sup> Edward Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, (Bath: Adams & Dart, 1970), 128.

wanted to defend British interests.<sup>53</sup> One can trace Wellesley's determined effort to convince Dundas to allow him to go to war in a letter written on February 23, 1798, three months before he learned of the Malartic Proclamation.<sup>54</sup> Wellesley detailed the growing military strength of Hyderabad with an attachment of a survey taken by Lt. Col. William Kirkpatrick that showed

“The actual strength, but the original part of the nizam's military establishment, its rapid increase, the consequences to be expected from its continuance or further growth, as well as the means which either had been or might be suggested for averting any danger which those consequences might threaten to our interests in India.”<sup>55</sup>

Although Hyderabad was a Company ally, Wellesley still used it as an example to claim that the British position in India was under threat. This was a clever strategy on Wellesley's part, because what better way to cause Dundas to become unsettled over the British possessions in India, than to portray their own allies as being superior in strength? Dundas' reluctance to go to war was untenable after he became aware of the Malartic Proclamation; in fact, on June 16, 1798 Dundas wrote in a private letter to Wellesley “the intelligence we have received from the Cape *must* have reached you either from the Mauritius itself or from the Cape of Good Hope, long before you can receive this.” So, Dundas assumed that Wellesley already was aware of the Malartic Proclamation, but in case Wellesley were not, Dundas provided a copy to him. Dundas also assumed that “we (British East India Company) are probably by this time at war with Tipu Sultan.”<sup>56</sup> Although Dundas was reluctant to become engaged in open warfare with Tipu, he has acquiesced to it. This was due to the Malartic Proclamation. Dundas' tone and attitude toward the war would change again in another note to Wellesley.

Dundas wrote to Wellesley and gave him a different command just three days later, on June 19, 1798: “If Tipu has made preparations of a hostile nature, or if the proclamation of Tipu inviting the French was his own, do not wait for actual hostilities on his part...attack him!”<sup>57</sup> This evidence supports the notion that Wellesley was encouraged to act aggressively in India. In fact Lord Dundas directed the annexation of parts of Mysore territory in order to connect the British territories in India.<sup>58</sup> The land that was desired the most was the Malabar Coast, by annexing this Mysore would be landlocked, and Company possessions would be contiguous.<sup>59</sup> This aggressive strategy was not limited to the Indian subcontinent and included other territories in the East Indies including Dutch possessions of Java, Batavia, and Surinam.<sup>60</sup> This action is in line with Dundas' strategy prior to the

---

<sup>53</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 4.

<sup>54</sup> Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*, 257.

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

<sup>56</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 46.

<sup>57</sup> C.H. Philips, *The East India Company 1784-1834*, 102-103. Quoting from Board's Secret Drafts, 2, 18 Jun. 1798. Secret Board Minutes, 1, f. 87, 19 Jun. 1798.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid*, 103.

<sup>59</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 98.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid*, 103. Quoting from Board's Secret Drafts, 2, 31 Oct. 1799.

Malartic Proclamation, which was to take European colonies in order “to deprive them of their colonial possessions”.<sup>61</sup>

There is also another piece of evidence proving Wellesley’s aggressive strategy towards Tipu. The article in question is a letter that came from the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, Selim III. It is worth noting that this letter was written prior to the invasion of Mysore. Selim wrote the following to Tipu in order to offer advice that also happened to be influenced by Ottoman geopolitics:

We make it our special requested that your Majesty will please to refrain from entering into any measures against the English, or lending any compliant ear to the French...we wish the connection above alluded to be exchanged in favour of Great Britain.<sup>62</sup>

In this letter Selim advised Tipu to relinquish the hope that the French would come to his aid. Interestingly this letter represents an about-face of Franco-Ottoman diplomacy, where for centuries prior to the French invasion of Egypt the two countries enjoyed an alliance.<sup>63</sup> Napoleon’s invasion of Ottoman Egypt caused Selim to declare war on France in retaliation.<sup>64</sup> Selim has urged Tipu to “befriend” France’s oldest enemy, Great Britain. Napoleon’s invasion also resulted in the Ottomans signing alliances with the Russian Empire on January 9, 1799 and Great Britain on January 11, 1799.<sup>65</sup>

Wellesley received this letter from the British minister in Istanbul, Spencer Smith. This occasion was not the first time that a document from the Sultan reached Tipu. When the Ottoman Empire declared war on the French in retaliation for their invasion of Egypt, the declaration was also sent to Tipu.<sup>66</sup> Wellesley forwarded this letter to Tipu. Tipu responded to Selim’s advice in a letter to Wellesley dated on 13 February 1799. Tipu thanked Wellesley for forwarding the letter to him, but declined to meet Selim’s wishes.<sup>67</sup> It is worth noting the date that Tipu responded to Selim, which was February 9, 1799. Wellesley had already ordered General Harris to invade Mysore two days before on February 11, 1799.<sup>68</sup> This leads to the conclusion that regardless of Tipu’s response to Selim the invasion was going to occur one way or the other.

\*\*\*

The British reaction to the Siege of Seringapatam demonstrated changing attitudes towards the empire. This period showed an acceptance and celebration of the growing Empire. This Empire was centered on peace and prosperity, which was provided through military strength. This was evident in the positive reaction The Court of Directors issued on September 24, 1799:

---

<sup>61</sup> Ingram, *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*, 4.

<sup>62</sup> Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*, 274.

<sup>63</sup> The Franco-Ottoman alliance dates back to 1536. This was the result of Francis I and Suleiman I the Magnificent’s mutual geopolitical struggle against the Habsburgs. For this see Roger Bigelow Merriman, *Suleiman the Magnificent 1520-1566* (Charleston: Nabu Press, 2011), 129.

<sup>64</sup> Cole, *Napoleon’s Egypt: Invading the Middle East, 152-157*.

<sup>65</sup> Efraim Karsh, Inari Karsh, *Empires of the Sand: The Struggle for Mastery in the Middle East 1789-1923*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 10.

<sup>66</sup> Forrest, *Tiger of Mysore: The Life and Death of Tipu Sultan*, 273.

<sup>67</sup> Tipu’s response as quoted in *ibid*, 274.

<sup>68</sup> Naravane, *Battles of the Honourable East India Company: Making of the Raj*, 179.

Resolved unanimously that the thanks of this Court be given to the Earl of Mornington, Governor General, for the able and successful measures which he adopted, whereby the complete annihilation of French influence at the Court of Hyderabad was happily accomplished, for the ability, firmness and decision manifested by His Lordship in his conduct towards the late Tippoo Sultan, and for the previous measures which he pursued for enabling the army to take the field, whereby it was put in a situation to act with vigor against the enemy, and to effect the speedy conquest of the capital of the Mysore dominions, the happy presage of a lasting peace in India, and consequent increase of prosperity to the East India Company<sup>69</sup>

This appreciative reaction would be repeated two months later on December 24, 1799.<sup>70</sup> This overwhelming positive reaction by the East India Company supports the idea that the Company valued Wellesley's actions in Mysore. Though the Company was initially reticent about the escalation of conflict and costs in India, seen in the tenuous strategy of neutrality in 1784, this changed due to French influence in Mysore. As soon as French influence was rumored in Mysore, both Tipu Sultan and his kingdom's independence were on borrowed time.

The reaction that Parliament issued on October 4, 1799, to the capture of Seringapatam is similar in tone to the one issued by the East India Company. Though there are some differences in the Parliamentary response in regard to the content. The House of Lords can see these differences in the following proclamation:

Resolved, *nemine dissentiente* (no one dissenting, unanimously), by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled that the thanks of this House be given to the Right Honorable Richard Lord Wellesley, Earl of Mornington in the kingdom of Ireland, and Governor General of India, for the wisdom, decision and energy with which is discharged the arduous duties of his station, from the time of his taking upon him the said Government to the glorious termination of the late war by the capture of Seringapatam; during which period, by opposing to the perfidy of the late Sultaun(sic) of Mysore a uniform moderation, dignity and firmness, and by counteracting with equal promptitude and ability the dangerous intrigues and projects of the French, particularly by destroying their power and influence in the Decan(sic), he prepared the way for the rapid and brilliant operations carried on under his superintendance(sic) and direction, the result of which has finally disappointed all the designs of our enemies in that quarter, and has established, on a basis of permanent security, the tranquillity(sic) and prosperity of the British Empire in India.<sup>71</sup>

This proclamation was repeated in the House of Commons with only minor changes in word usage.<sup>72</sup> In addition to the lofty praise from the Company and Parliament, Wellesley was awarded a pension of “£5,000 a year, granted for twenty years-a return for

---

<sup>69</sup> P.C. Gupta, *Fort William-India House Correspondence and Other Contemporary Papers Relating Thereto, Volume XIII: 1796-1800* (Delhi: Civil Lines, 1959), 131.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid*, 28.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*, 132-133.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, 134-135

Mornington's having declined to take his share of the prize-money collected at Seringapatam."<sup>73</sup>

These declarations of appreciation are worth analyzing because they reveal much about British attitudes toward their growing Empire. This shows the view that Wellesley and the British had of Tipu Sultan, that he was a treacherous enemy. In regards to the French, they are not viewed very highly either. The French activity in India is described as being a state of "dangerous intrigues. Now these "dangerous intrigues" most likely refer to the half-hearted overtures from the French to Tipu Sultan, or the call in the Isle-de-France calling for volunteers to fight for Tipu Sultan. Both of these entities threatened the peace and prosperity of the Empire in India. So, in order to deny France an Indian ally that could challenge Company rule, the imperial conquest of Mysore was deemed the necessary response to both dangers.

The conquest of Mysore is indicative of the predicament that the East India Company found itself in at the end of the eighteenth century. The Company was stuck in a position in India that in order to defend its territory, it had to wage war against the Mughal successor states. The Company would then either annex the state, or make its rulers sign a subsidiary alliance. This was done in order to maintain the peace and prosperity of British India. In other words, "only formal rule could provide stability for the Indian Empire."<sup>74</sup> This problem plagued the Company until the mid-nineteenth century.

Furthermore, it is worth noting the irony in the last part of the statement that Wellesley's actions "established, on a basis of permanent security, the tranquility and prosperity of the British Empire in India. Following the Fourth Anglo-Mysore War, the East India Company would be in an almost constant state of warfare until the Great Mutiny in 1857. This era of conflict includes the following wars: The Second Anglo-Maratha War 1803-1805, The Third Anglo-Maratha War 1817-1818,<sup>75</sup> The First Burma War 1824-1826, The First Afghan War 1839-1842, The Conquest of Sind 1843, Defeat of Gwalior 1844, The First Sikh War 1845-1846, The Second Sikh War 1848-1849, The Second Burma War 1852, Nagpur Annexed 1853, Oudh Annexed 1856."<sup>76</sup>

The reaction to the capture of Seringapatam was not limited to 1799. During a debate in parliament in 1800, Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger delivered an address discussing the French threat. This commentary traced the growth of French power in Europe and the extension of that power outside of the Europe and how it spread to Egypt. An excerpt of Pitt's address is provided below:

The only plea which they have since held out to colour this atrocious invasion of a neutral and friendly territory, is, that it was the road to attack the English power in India. It is most unquestionably true, that this was one and a principal cause of this unparalleled outrage: but another, and an equally substantial cause (as appears by their own statements), was the division and partition of the territories of what they thought a falling power. It is impossible to dismiss this subject without observing that this attack against Egypt was accompanied by an

---

<sup>73</sup> Richard Wellesley, *The Wellesley Papers: The Life and Correspondence of Richard Colley Wellesley, Marquess Wellesley, 1760-1842, Volume 1* (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1914), 119.

<sup>74</sup> Bayly, *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*, 106.

<sup>75</sup> M.S. Naravane, *Battles of the Honourable East India Company: Making of the Raj*, 64-66.

<sup>76</sup> Dennis Judd, *The Lion and the Tiger: The Rise and Fall of the British Raj 1600-1947* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 47.

attack upon the British possessions in India, made on true revolutionary principles. In Europe, the propagation of the principles of France had uniformly prepared the way for the progress of its arms. To India, the lovers of peace had sent the messengers of Jacobinism, for the purpose of inculcating war in those distant regions, on Jacobin principles, and of forming Jacobin clubs, which they actually succeeded in establishing, and which in most respects resembled the European model, but which were distinguished by this peculiarity, that they were required to swear in one breath, *hatred to tyranny, the love of liberty, and the destruction of all kings and sovereigns – except the good and faithful ally of the French relic Citizen Tippoo.*<sup>77</sup>

Pitt's speech not only traced the growth of French power, it revealed the British view of Tipu. Tipu represented in Pitt's opinion, the monstrous combination of enemies for late eighteenth-early nineteenth century Britain. The first enemy was the "Jacobin principles" that France had brought to Mysore. Proof of the Jacobin presence in Mysore was found in reports that Tipu wore a liberty cap, and even referred to himself as "Citizen Tipu."<sup>78</sup> It is worth noting that the Jacobin threat was eliminated with the closing of the Jacobin Clubs in France in 1794.<sup>79</sup> Furthermore, Pitt referred to Tipu as a "relic". Use of the word relic showed that Pitt viewed him as one of the last vestiges of India prior to the British rise to power. Pitt combined the defeated Jacobin ideology with the tyrannical Tipu to show that the new power in India was the East India Company.

Furthermore, the change in the attitude toward empire is best observed when one looks at the treatment that previous Company administrators received upon their return to Great Britain. The previous Company leaders, Robert Clive and Warren Hastings, were both criticized for expanding Company territory. Clive was subject to hearings conducted against him by Parliament from 1772-1773, during which he was attacked for money he received in India. Clive was never fully charged for any offenses, and died shortly after his exoneration on November 22, 1774.<sup>80</sup> Hastings faced an impeachment trial throughout the 1780's and early 1790's, due having been accused of corruption.<sup>81</sup>

Edmund Burke was one parliamentarian who argued in favor of the impeachment of Hastings. Burke charged Hastings with "villany" which included the "wasting of the country and destruction of the land"<sup>82</sup> Burke indicated to his colleagues in parliament that the East India Company received a portion of its power through its charter from the British government. It also derived another portion from the Mughals via the diwani rights of Bengal.<sup>83</sup> Burke interpreted that as a consequence of accepting the diwani rights "Great Britain made a virtual act of union with that country, by which they bound themselves as

---

<sup>77</sup> William Pitt, *The Speeches of the Right Honourable William Pitt, in the House of Commons, Volume IV* (London: Longman, 1806), 26-27.

<sup>78</sup> James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 68.

<sup>79</sup> Paul R. Hanson, *Contesting the French Revolution* (Wiley-Blackwell: Hoboken, 2009), 130-134.

<sup>80</sup> Mark Bence-Jones, *Clive of India* (London: Constable, 1988), 252.

<sup>81</sup> Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 128. Quoting from P.J. Marshall, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings*. 1965.

<sup>82</sup> Mia Carter, "Edmund Burke on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings, 15-19 February 1788," in *Archives of Empire Volume I: From the East India Company to the Suez Canal*, ed. Barbara Harlow and Mia Carter (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003), 153.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid*, 144-145.

securities for their subjects, to preserve the people in all rights.”<sup>84</sup> Burke charged Hastings with abusing that power, but maintained that they were responsible to “the high justice of the kingdom.”<sup>85</sup> Burke continued to argue on that it was the duty of the British to “teach men that they are to confirm their practices to principles.”<sup>86</sup> In other words, it was the duty of the British Empire to spread the rule of law to its subjects. Burke carried on with the impeachment in the name of the Commons of Great Britain, “whose parliamentary trust he betrayed”, and in the name of the Indian people.<sup>87</sup>

Fortunately for Hastings he would be acquitted of all charges on April 24, 1795. Despite Hastings being found innocent, Burke’s testimony was indicative of the critical view that eighteenth century Britain had towards Empire building. Burke considered Hastings’s activities in India to have demonstrated “arbitrary power.”<sup>88</sup> Burke also considered empire building philosophically to be wrong. Towards the end of his indictment of Hastings, Burke stated that “it is not to be had by conquest; for by conquest, which is a more immediate designation of the hand of God, the conqueror only succeeds to all the painful duties and subordination to the power of God which belonged to the sovereign that held the country before.”<sup>89</sup>

Ten years after Hastings’ acquittal, in 1805, Wellesley was recalled back to Britain. This was caused by two factors, first Dundas left the Board of Directors in 1801. As a result Wellesley lost the support of board when it came to further wars. Second, the Second Anglo-Maratha War had taken a turn for the worse.<sup>90</sup> Wellesley’s order to return back to Britain caused John Malcolm make a stunning claim in defense of Wellesley record of expansion:

It was a true statement which the great Lord Clive applied to the progress of the British Empire in India - ‘To stop is dangerous; to recede ruin.’ And if we do recede, either from our right pretensions and claims- nay, if we look as if we thought of receding- we shall have a host of enemies, and thousands who dare not harbour (sic) a thought of opposing the irresistible tide of our success, will hasten to attack a nation which shows by diffidence in its own power that it anticipates its downfall.<sup>91</sup>

This statement shows the transformation of how Britain viewed its Empire. In only ten years after Hastings’s trial the attitude toward empire changed dramatically. The view had initially viewed further expansion negatively, but in the last years of the eighteenth-century expansion started to be viewed as positive because of its perceived necessity. Malcolm’s statement is an example of the need for more expansion. What Malcolm essentially said in his speech is that the maintenance of the empire required further conquests, and that if conquest were to stop then the British Empire would end as a result.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 145

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, 144.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 151.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, 154.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, 151.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 152.

<sup>90</sup> Weller, *Wellington in India*, 254.

<sup>91</sup> James, *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*, 63-64. Quoting from J.W. Kaye, *The Life and Correspondence of John Malcolm*, I, 320-1.

\*\*\*

The Fourth Anglo-Mysore War was the penultimate event in first phase of the British Empire in India. The first phase started with the granting of the charter for the Company in 1601.<sup>92</sup> The beginning phase concluded in 1818 with the defeat of the Maratha Empire, which resulted in the Company domination of the subcontinent. The second phase lasted from 1818 until the decolonization and partition of India in 1947. Throughout the first phase the Company was focused on trade and was hesitant to conquer regions in India. This mercantile focus was first subjugated to a geopolitical one in the mid-eighteenth century, when more ambitious Governor-Generals led the Company. With Robert Clive's victory at Plassey on 1757, the Company controlled the rich region of Bengal. After Clive, Warren Hastings consolidated Company rule in that region but did not expand beyond it. Cornwallis resisted expanding the Company and instead focused on the maintenance of the territory that it held.<sup>93</sup> These leaders ushered in an era of territorial expansion that lasted until the end of the Empire.

Richard Wellesley's career in India proved that territorial expansion was necessary for the maintenance of the British Empire. During the seven years Wellesley spent in India, he presided over the conquest of numerous regions, and brought others under control through subsidiary alliances.<sup>94</sup> This continuous expansion continued well beyond his career. Mysore was one of these regions that transitioned from being an enemy of the British, to being a subject.

Wellesley also represented the shift the Company went through, from a trading power to an imperial one. Wellesley's actions proved the importance of geopolitical factors, and that they would be given priority over economic ones. Wellesley's apparent disregard for the debts that the Company incurred in order to fuel his wars of expansion proved the primacy of geopolitical factors. Another example of the importance of geopolitical factors is how Richard Wellesley utilized the French threat in India to engage in an offensive war against Tipu Sultan.

Wellesley was able to use the fear of France because of the long running Anglo-France rivalry.<sup>95</sup> Wellesley exaggerated the severity of the danger that the French invasion and subsequent occupation of Egypt posed to Britain's empire in India. Wellesley also was given a great tool that further helped him when he overstated the French threat, the Malartic Proclamation. The proclamation showed France's intent to meddle in India via Mughal successor states. However, the document only showed France's weak willed desires to aid Tipu, it lacked concrete plans to. Ultimately the proclamation did not lead to a Franco-Mysore alliance; instead it made Tipu a casualty of Great Britain and France's geopolitical struggle.

Furthermore, Wellesley's time in India demonstrated a shift of how Britain viewed its empire. Starting in the middle of the eighteenth century the British viewed their empire with reluctance. Some parliamentarians argued that the Empire was supposed to be responsible for spreading rule of law and taking care of its subjects.<sup>96</sup> When Robert Clive

---

<sup>92</sup> East India Company, *The Register of Letters & C of the Governour and Company of Merchants of London Trading into the East Indies*, 158-159.

<sup>93</sup> Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 91.

<sup>94</sup> Severn, *Architects of Empire: The Duke of Wellington and His Brothers*, 68&192.

<sup>95</sup> Israel, "The Emerging Empire: The Continental Perspective, 1650-1713," 441.

<sup>96</sup> Carter, "Edmund Burke on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings, 15-19 February 1788," 153.

and Warren Hastings returned to Britain after their time in India they were criticized by Parliament. Both men had impeachment trials held against them but were acquitted.<sup>97</sup> The opposite occurred with Wellesley, immediately after the capture of Seringapatam, Parliament praised him and the East India Company.<sup>98</sup> Wellesley continued the expansionist policies of Clive and Hastings, but the view of empire had changed. Now empire and the expansion of it were seen as necessary.

Ultimately during the period in question, Wellesley's "imperial vision" transformed the Company from a trading company into an imperial power.<sup>99</sup> When the Company lost control of India in the aftermath of the Great Mutiny in 1857, the state maintained this vision. But this imperial vision also exposed a major problem that plagued the British Empire until its end. This problem was that in order to keep the empire functioning and intact, the British would have to continuously engage in military conflicts. These military conflicts included both wars of expansion and of protection.<sup>100</sup> Eighty years after the end of the Fourth Anglo-Mysore war, in 1879, Queen Victoria took notice of the state of perpetual warfare. Victoria warned that, "If we are to maintain our position as a first-rate power we must be prepared for attacks and wars, somewhere or other, continually."<sup>101</sup>

In conclusion, Richard Wellesley's career in India showcased two major changes in how empire was viewed by Britain. After Wellesley's career the expansion of British territory via warfare was seen as a positive, but only as long as the British won the wars. Furthermore, when the centuries old Anglo-French rivalry flared again up during the French Revolutionary Wars and the Napoleonic Wars, it too altered the view of empire. From now on empire was seen as the best way to ensure peace and prosperity.<sup>102</sup> These two factors reverberated throughout Pax Britannica, and shaped much of the modern world.

---

<sup>97</sup> Bence-Jones, *Clive of India*, 252 and Lawson, *The East India Company: A History*, 128. Quoting from P.J. Marshall, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings*. 1965.

<sup>98</sup> Gupta, *Fort William-India House Correspondence and Other Contemporary Papers Relating Thereto, Volume XIII: 1796-1800*, 132-133.

<sup>99</sup> Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*, 97.

<sup>100</sup> Judd, *The Lion and the Tiger: The Rise and Fall of the British Raj 1600-1947*, 47.

<sup>101</sup> Elizabeth Longford, *Victoria R.I* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), 426

<sup>102</sup> Gupta, *Fort William-India House Correspondence and Other Contemporary Papers Relating Thereto, Volume XIII: 1796-1800*, 131.

## Works Cited

### Primary Sources

Bowring, Lewin B. *Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan and the Struggle with the Musalman Powers of the South*. Oxford: Calrendon Press, 1899.

East India Company. *The Register of Letters & C of the Governour and Company of Merchants of London Trading into the East Indies*. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1893.

Gupta, P.C. *Fort William-India House Correspondence and Other Contemporary Papers Relating Thereto, Volume XIII: 1796-1800*. Delhi: Civil Lines, 1959.

Ingram, Edward. *Two Views of British India: The Private Correspondence of Mr. Dundas and Lord Wellesley: 1798-1801*. Bath: Adams & Dart, 1970.

Kirkpatrick, William. *Select Letters of Tippoo Sultan to Various Public Functionaries*. London, 1811.

Martin, Robert Montgomery. *The Despatches, Minutes & Correspondence of the Marquess Wellesley During His Administration in India*. London, 1836.

Pitt, William. *The Speeches of the Right Honourable William Pitt, in the House of Commons, Volume IV*. London: Longman, 1806.

Torrens, William McCullagh. *The Marquess Wellesley: Architect of Empire*. London: Spottiswoode, 1880.

Wellesley, Richard. *The Wellesley Papers: The Life and Correspondence of Richard Colley Wellesley, Marquess Wellesley, 1760-1842, Volume I*. London: Herbert Jenkins, 1914.

Whittle, J.” Original Criticism: A View of the Origin and Conduct of the War with Tippoo Sultaun Comprising a Narrative of the Operations of the Army under the Command of Lieutenant-General George Harris, and of the Siege of Seringapatam.” *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine* 7(1801): 119 -128.

### Secondary Sources

Adkins, Roy, Adkins, Lesley. *The War for all of the Oceans: From Nelson at the Nile to Napoleon at Waterloo*. New York: Viking. 2006.

Bayly, C.A. *Imperial Meridian: The British Empire and the World 1780-1830*. New York: Longman Inc. 1989.

Bence-Jones, Makr. *Clive of India*. London: Constable. 1988.

Brittlebank, Kate. *Tipu Sultan's Search for Legitimacy: Islam and Kingship in a Hindu Domain*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Carter, Mia. "Edmund Burke on the Impeachment of Warren Hastings, 15-19 February 1788." In *Archives of Empire Volume I: From the East India Company to the Suez Canal*, edited by Barbara Harlow and Mia Carter, 143-55. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Chopra, P.N. *History of South India: Ancient, Medieval, Modern, Part III*. New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons, 2003.

Cohn, Bernard S. *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Cole, Juan. *Napoleon's Egypt: Invading the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Duffy, Michael. "World-Wide War and British Expansion, 1793-1815." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 184-207. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Hanson, Paul R. *Contesting the French Revolution*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Israel, Jonathan I. "The Emerging Empire: The Continental Perspective, 1650-1713." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume I: The Origins of Empire*, edited by Nicholas Canny, 423-445. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

James, Lawrence. *Raj: The Making and Unmaking of British India*. London: Little, 1997.

Judd, Denis. *The Lion and the Tiger: The Rise and Fall of the British Raj 1600-1947*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Karsh, Efraim, Inari Karsh. *Empires of the Sand: The Struggle for Mastery in the Middle East 1789-1923*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Lawson, Philip. *The East India Company: A History*. New York: Longman Publishing, 1993.

Lenman, Bruce P. "Colonial Wars and Imperial Instability, 1688-1793." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 151-168. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Longford, Elizabeth. *Victoria R.I.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.

Marshall, P.J. "Britain Without America – A Second Empire?" In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 576-595. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Merriman, Roger Bigelow, *Suleiman the Magnificent 1520-1566*. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2011.

Naravane, M.S. *Battles of the Honourable East India Company: Making of the Raj*. New Delhi: APH Publishing, 2006

Philips, C.H. *The East India Company: 1784-1834*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1940.

Ray, Rajat Kanta. "Indian Society and the Establishment of British Supremacy, 1765-1818." In *The Oxford History of the British Empire Volume II: The Eighteenth Century*, edited by P.J. Marshall, 508-529. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Sen, Sailendra Nath. *Anglo-Maratha Relations: 1785-1896 vol. 2*. Popular Prakashan: Bombay, 1974.

Severn, John. *Architects of Empire: The Duke of Wellington and His Brothers*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2007.

Watson, William E., *Tricolor and Crescent: France and the Islamic World*. Wesport: Praeger, 2003.

*The Salem Witch Trials: Dehumanizing the Different*

*by Finn Michael Brown*

In the year 1692 in Salem Village, Massachusetts, one of the most infamous incidents in American history occurred. A group of young girls started acting very strangely – having convulsive fits, speaking in strange tongues, shrieking at odd intervals, and being disruptive at home and also in public, including during church services. After consultations with clergy and physicians, it was the opinion that the girls had somehow become bewitched. In that time and in that place, witches were a real and present danger to the people of Salem. The preceding three centuries had seen a widespread belief in the Devil-given powers of witchcraft cause the burning and hanging of thousands, if not tens of thousands of people for being suspected witches. The very accusation was a virtual death sentence – all it took was one or more odd occurrences and someone, usually a woman, to be the scapegoat. Defending oneself was near impossible, as ‘evidence’ such as odd birthmarks, hygiene issues, promiscuity, and simple proximity to the events were considered marks of guilt. Worst of all, and prominent in the Salem incident, was the use of ‘spectral evidence’ – supposedly an assault on the person by the witch’s disembodied form. As Wendell Craker put it, “Spectral evidence refers to the common belief that, when a person had made covenant with the devil, he was given permission to assume that person's appearance in spectral form in order to recruit others, and to otherwise carry out his nefarious deeds. Ubiquitous and sensational, testimony concerning the spectral appearance of the alleged witches dominated the preliminary hearings and was a factor in the trials themselves. A special coterie of accusers had developed, first at Salem, then another at Andover, claiming the power to see the alleged specters. Testimony concerning spectral appearance was limited to these self-selected groups who were enabled by a 'special sight' to see what to others was invisible. It is doubtful that anyone was accused who was not charged with having appeared in spectral form. (Craker 332)”

The evil in the Salem Witch Trials takes several forms. There is the depletion of personhood of the accused victims, in that they were after seen as corrupted or less than human by their former neighbors, friends and relatives. There is the obstruction of good through the village elders allowing false accusations and mob mentality to prevent the accused from being allowed to live, or live unhindered – to be. There is the deception by not only the original group of girls but multiple others who saw opportunity in using the accusations to remove a rival or settle an old grudge. There is the delusion of the entire concept of Satan-worshipping witches, who rather than use their supernatural powers to enrich themselves, would waste them in plaguing young children, causing cows to dry up, and giving disease to people and crops. Last is the pure destruction of the local society – a fairly peaceful area became overrun with strife, paranoia, and moral panic. As Reed put it, “The Trials also fit all the sociological elements, basic intuitions, and theoretical associations that have developed through and around the concept of a “moral panic” ... First, the Salem Witch Trials were definitely a disproportionate response, and not only from a naturalistic perspective according to which witchcraft-qua-spellcasting does not exist (even if the social category of witch was real and important). For, even if we accept the reigning local interpretation of witches in Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1692—that they were real and harmful—one can still argue that the witch trials were a disproportionate response to the initial finding that a few teenage girls in Salem Village were “under an evil hand.” Of all the witch trials in Massachusetts in the seventeenth century, Salem was by far the largest, the

deadliest, and the most emotionally charged. This disproportion, furthermore, was eventually so extensive that it became disruptive of the very fabric of beliefs and practices that surrounded witchcraft accusations in Puritan Massachusetts. (Reed 74-75)”

How does this relate to metaphysics? According to Clarke, metaphysics is the study of being *qua* being, or the study of ‘being’ – reality – itself. In Clarke’s *The One and the Many*, he postulates two types of beings: Real and Mental. In the case of Salem, the Mental Being is of particular interest. The entirety of the justification for the trials revolves around a concept which is patently false in the Real – malefic witches and their master, the Christian Satan. Yet Clarke’s Mental Being theory would argue that they do have a quasi-reality, in that they are concepts that can be thought about by Real Beings. As Clarke writes, “Mental Being = that which is present *not* by its own act of existence but only within an idea, i.e. as being-thought-about. ‘Its being’, St. Thomas says, ‘is to-be-thought-about’ by a real mind. (Clarke, S.J., "Meaning of Being" 30)” And in this vein, the witches and their infernal Master do indeed become real; the people of Salem Village and Town, and later Andover, are so convinced of the reality of these concepts that they create a special court for the trying of the accused, execute those convicted who do not confess, seize the property of those accused, and create an atmosphere of general panic and paranoia in a good-sized area of the Massachusetts Bay Colony – all real acts and real consequences created by the Mental Beings in the minds of Real Beings, i.e. the colonists. Where Clarke would have seen the people of Salem failing is in believing that their knowledge is so complete in these things that they cannot allow other opinions or theories, regardless of evidence, to sway them from the course they have set themselves upon. They are denying the underlying truth of metaphysics itself, which is that there is always more to learn about things. They know the truth of the matter, and they will prove it by any means necessary, to root out the evil within their society. The sad, all-too-real truth is that their methods and procedures of ‘evidence’ so often brought forced confessions to completely imagined crimes, but as long as they fit the narrative, the prosecutors were satisfied.

Clarke also spoke on the concept of personhood and being. In his book *Person and Being*, he postulated multiple qualities that made a ‘Being’ a ‘Person’ – not just an animal or object, but a thinking, reasoning human. These concepts are relevant because through multiple methods – privation, obstruction, or destruction – they were denied to the accused, rendering them less than human in the eyes of the community, and far worse, in their own. For one of the first precepts of Personhood is that the Person recognizes themselves as such. “I am” is a powerful statement – the declaration that one recognizes one’s own self, a unique, distinct being with self-knowledge. The torture and indignities suffered by the accused during the Trials had the effect of breaking the will of many of these poor souls, robbing them of that quality of self. In addition, those who were forced to confess to witchcraft violated what Clarke refers to as ‘self-possession through self-determination’. As he puts it, “The second mode of self-possession proper to personal being is in the order of action, achieved through self-determination, i.e. mastery over our own actions by freedom of the will. This enables the person to say, ‘I am *responsible* for this action.’ Moral responsibility flows immediately from this self-possession through freedom. The ‘I’ of the person is where the buck stops in assigning responsibility for an act as moral. ‘I did it,’ ‘I am sorry,’ ‘I deserve praise or blame,’ not some subconscious impulse, some environmental or social pressure, something external to me – higher or lower, good or evil – taking me over... A personal being is therefore one that is in charge of its own life, a *self-governing* being. (Clarke, S.J., 48)” This is stripped away from the accused ‘witches’. Firstly, in that they are imprisoned, tortured, and hounded into confessing responsibility for acts which

were not their doing. Secondly, in the view that as ‘witches’, their will is not their own – Satan or one of his minions is directing them, making them use their ‘powers’ to injure their fellow humans, and using their semblance to beguile or injure others in pursuit of His evil plans. They have become little more than puppets, animated by the will and desires of the Adversary, and not true Persons any longer.

Indeed, the violation of Personhood goes even deeper in this dark incident. As I mentioned, there is the belief that not only are the witches themselves mere extensions of their Master’s will, but they themselves force others to do things that they would not otherwise do, through the use of dark magic. The witches are accused of causing fits of paralysis, convulsions, weakness, screaming fits and hallucinations. Martha Corey, a pillar of the local religious community, was accused soon after the first round of trials; this concerned many, as it opened the door to anyone being vulnerable to accusation, not just the poor and disliked. It led to people dehumanizing their neighbors and friends – anyone was a potential witch, and with new people getting accused constantly, even the smallest anomaly was seized upon as a possible omen that someone else was in league with the Devil. Confessed witches, eager to avoid hanging, named ‘accomplices’ by the dozen, and spun wild tales of bloody rituals and orgies of violence and lust. The accused were no longer People, they were witches, servants of evil, forever tainted by association, whether they were convicted or not, executed or not. In fact, when the panic finally passed, many in authority felt guilty enough to attempt to restore their Personhood, although for many it was too late. “Following the trials and executions, many involved, like judge Samuel Sewall, publicly confessed error and guilt. On January 14, 1697, the General Court ordered a day of fasting and soul-searching for the tragedy of Salem. In 1702, the court declared the trials unlawful. And in 1711, the colony passed a bill restoring the rights and good names of those accused and granted £600 restitution to their heirs. However, it was not until 1957—more than 250 years later—that Massachusetts formally apologized for the events of 1692. (Blumberg, par. 10)”

One of the most difficult parts of unpacking this dark period is unraveling all the many threads that lead up to it, as well as the various incidents during it. There is the question of the general mood of Salem Town and Village – the two were not the best of neighbors, having feuded over boundaries and rights for years. There were many new immigrants to the area as a result of King William’s War in 1689, overburdening the local residents. Also, the Massachusetts Bay Colony itself was in turmoil, as multiple political upheavals in recent years had left everyone uncertain of the future and where they stood. As Rebecca Brooks wrote, “One major factor was that in 1684, King Charles II revoked the Massachusetts Bay Colony’s royal charter, a legal document granting the colonists permission to colonize the area. The charter was revoked because the colonists had violated several of the charter’s rules, which included basing laws on religious beliefs and discriminating against Anglicans. Charles II died shortly after and James II replaced him and merged the Massachusetts Bay Colony into the Dominion of New England which instituted a royally-appointed government with many strict new laws. In 1689, after the Glorious Revolution occurred in England, the Massachusetts Bay colonists overthrew the unpopular Dominion of New England. In 1691, the new King and Queen of England, Mary and William of Orange, issued a new, more anti-religious charter, instead of reissuing the old charter, and also combined the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Plymouth Colony and several other colonies into one. The new charter and regime basically continued the policies of the Dominion of New England. The Puritans, who had left England due to religious persecution, feared their religion was under attack again and worried they were losing control of their colony. (Brooks,)” In this

heightened state of anxiety, many people ended up doing things that perhaps they might have been more resistant to previous to this uncertainty. This is what metaphysicians would call the evil of depletion – the constant strain of not being able to plan for the future, of not being able to trust their neighbors or government, of fear of the local natives during King William’s War, drained their ability to weather new difficulties and think clearly when the unexpected happened. The second big question is that of the people who were the accusers – what motivated them? The original group of girls laid the blame for their unusual behavior on three essentially defenseless women – Sarah Good, a homeless beggar; Sarah Osbourne, a poor elderly woman; and Tituba, an African slave in the house of Reverend Samuel Parris. Tituba had told stories of African witchcraft to the girls as entertainment. Were the girls simply lying, trying to shift blame for bad behavior onto others in an attempt to escape punishment? Or were they deluded by Tituba’s fireside tales and perhaps coached along by Reverend Parris, in an elaborate plot to remove some undesirables? Good and Osbourne both professed their innocence, but Tituba confessed, implicating both other women and others as well. Others accused people who they had grudges against, or who they believed to be ‘not the right sort’ – was it simple revenge? Was there a profit motive for those who ended up with the lands and goods of the condemned? Did it start with what might have just been a simple incident and snowballed by those who saw an opportunity to remove their enemies? Why did those not directly involved simply stand by and watch as their friends and loved ones were taken, tried and executed? There is evil in all of these things, to a greater or lesser degree, direct or indirect. Perhaps the greatest evil in this black time is that we will most likely never know the complete truth of what happened and why.

## Works Cited

- Blumberg, Jess. "A Brief History of the Salem Witch Trials." *Smithsonian.com*, 23 Oct 2007, <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/a-brief-history-of-the-salem-witch-trials-175162489/>.
- Brooks, Rebecca Beatrice. "History of the Salem Witch Trials." *History of Massachusetts Blog*, 18 Aug 2011, <http://historyofmassachusetts.org/the-salem-witch-trials/>.
- Clarke, S.J., W. Norris. *Person and Being*. Marquette University Press, 1993.
- . "The Discovery and Meaning of Being." *The One and the Many*, University of Notre Dame Press, 2001, pp. 25-41.
- Craker, Wendell D. "SPECTRAL EVIDENCE, NON-SPECTRAL ACTS OF WITCHCRAFT, AND CONFESSION AT SALEM IN 1692." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 2, Jun 1997, pp. 331-358. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2640070>.
- Reed, Isaac Ariail. "Deep culture in action: resignification, synecdoche, and metanarrative in the moral panic of the Salem Witch Trials." *Theory and Society*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2015, pp. 65-94. *ProQuest*, doi:10.1007/s11186-014-9241-4.