



Historical Studies Journal

Spring 2018 • Volume 35



University of Colorado
Denver

Historical Studies Journal

Spring 2018 . Volume 35

EDITOR:

Brittany Huner, *Graduate Student*

ASSISTANT EDITORS:

Shelby Carr, *Graduate Student*

Lindsey Flewelling, *Graduate Student*

Emma Lane, *Graduate Student*

Thomas James Trump, *Graduate Student*

Thomas J. Noel, *Faculty Advisor*

DESIGNERS:

Shannon Fluckey and Kristen Morrison

Integrated Marketing & Communications

Auraria Higher Education Center



University of Colorado
Denver

Department of History

University of Colorado Denver

Kariann Yokota, Ph.D.,

Department Chair

Colonial and Early U.S., Pacific Rim

Christopher Agee, Ph.D.

20th Century U.S., Urban History,
Social Movements, Crime and Policing

Ryan Crewe, Ph.D.

Latin America, Colonial Mexico,
Transpacific History

James E. Fell, Jr., Ph.D.

American West, Civil War,
Environmental, Film History

Gabriel Finkelstein, Ph.D.

Modern Europe, Germany,
History of Science, Exploration

Rebecca Hunt, Ph.D.

American West, Gender,
Museum Studies, Public History

Michael Kozakowski, Ph.D.

Europe, Mediterranean, Migration History

Pamela Laird, Ph.D.

U.S. Social, Intellectual, Technology,
Public History, Business

Marjorie Levine-Clark, Ph.D.

Modern Britain, European Women
and Gender, Medicine and Health

Brandon Mills, Ph.D.

19th Century U.S. History, The United
States and the World, Imperialism,
Racial Identity

Thomas J. Noel, Ph.D.

American West, Art & Architecture,
Public History & Preservation, Colorado

Carl Pletsch, Ph.D., Emeritus

Intellectual History (European and
American), Modern Europe

Myra Rich, Ph.D., Emerita

U.S. Colonial, U.S. Early National,
Women and Gender, Immigration

Richard Smith, Ph.D.

Ancient, Medieval,
Early Modern Europe, Britain

Dale Stabl, Ph.D.

Environmental History,
Global History, Islam

Chris Sundberg, M.A.

Africa and History Education

William Wagner, Ph.D.

U.S. West

James B. Whiteside, Ph.D., Emeritus

Recent U.S., Vietnam War,
U.S. Diplomatic, Sports History

Greg Whitesides, Ph.D.

History of Science, Modern U.S., Asia

Table of Contents

Preface.....v

Neither English nor Glorious:

A Historiographical Account of the British Revolution of 1688-89 1

Matthew Fulford

Who's Your Daddy?

How the Judicial World of Alimony Payments
to Illegitimate Children Characterized Women's
Rights in Seventeenth Century Puritan New England 15

Sarah Turner

The Dazzling Doyenne of Gilded Age Denver:

Louise Sneed Hill, A Biography..... 25

Shelby Carr

Uncertain Wanderers:

Victorian Constructs of Morality and a
Family's Migration into Wisconsin, 1830s-1840s..... 39

Micaela Cruce

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln:

Its Impact on Democracy, Feminism and Professionalism 55

Thomas-James Trump

Plowing up the Middle Ground:

The Meeker Massacre, Indian Agents, and the
late 1800s Federal Assimilation Campaign..... 73

Sam Irving

Notes..... 83

Bibliographies..... 97

Preface

In 1983, the University of Colorado Denver launched the first *Historical Studies Journal*. That first journal was mimeographed with only three articles. Since then, numerous students have published papers on a wide variety of subjects—from French salons to Catherine the Great to Japanese internment camps to Arab and Jewish nationalism. In my term as the editor of this year’s journal, I have strived to continue the tradition of recognizing a wide range of students’ historical research.

The first paper, Mathew Fulford’s histographical essay, “Neither English Nor Glorious,” considers the inaccuracies of the term “The Glorious Revolution,” and argues that the revolution was not just an “English” revolution, nor was it as bloodless as many scholars claim. Instead, scholars should examine the Glorious Revolution in a wider scope that includes events in Scotland and Ireland, which allows for greater context and complexity in the revolution both in England and its’ affect on Europe as a whole. In “Who’s Your Daddy,” Sarah Turner looks at several paternity and child support cases in early Puritan America and how those court cases reveal the power women often held in those instances. “The Dazzling Doyenne of Gilded Age Denver,” by Shelby Carr, utilizes a different type of historical writing—a biography—to tell the story of Louise Sneed Hill, the Denver socialite who created the “Sacred Thirty-Six” and helped to establish early Denver’s high society culture. Micaela Cruce’s article, “Uncertain Wanderers,” explores American migration to the West through the micro-lens of a single family, the Strongs, and how their experiences reflect the varying perspectives on westward expansion, as well as Victorian ideas of morality and family. Thomas-James Trump examines the effects of a single battle during England’s First Barons’ War and its impact on modern English culture, professional militaries, and early ideas about gender roles in his paper, “The 1217 Battle of Lincoln.” The final article, “Plowing Up the Middle Ground,” by Sam Irving, analyzes the Meeker Massacre and the late 1800s federal assimilation campaign. His paper reveals how the fight stemmed from larger bureaucratic changes within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as well as strong cultural differences on both the sides of the Ute-United States conflict.

Working as the editor of this year’s journal has been an incredible honor for me. I would like to thank all of my assistant editors, who have been an invaluable asset in selecting and editing articles for publication. I would also like to thank Shannon Fluckey and Kristen Morrison for all their hard work in designing the journal and creating a beautiful publication. This journal would not be possible without the support of the history faculty of the University of Colorado Denver and I am grateful for their aid in bringing wonderful student papers to our attention. As always, a huge thank you goes out to our faculty advisor, Tom Noel, who has made this journal possible every year since that first journal in 1983—this project would not be possible without his time and advice. Please continue to submit papers and support the *Historical Studies Journal*! Let’s keep this journal going for another thirty-five years!

BRITTANY HUNER
Editor



*The landing of William Prince of Orange at Torbay, England, November 5th 1688*¹

“To call the Revolution “glorious” was to invoke the power of pulpit propaganda in favor of Whiggish notions.”²

Neither English nor Glorious:

A Historiographical Account of the British Revolution of 1688-89

By Matthew Fullford

Historians have labeled the revolution of 1688-89, when the English and Scottish parliaments invited William of Orange and Mary Stuart to take the thrones from James II, as “bloodless,” “sensible,” “respectable,” “aristocratic,” “moral,” “model,” “quiet,” “modern,” “English,” and ubiquitously, “glorious.”³ Most historians seem to agree that it was, in fact, a revolution, despite the fact that it contained many of the signature elements of a coup d’état or dynastic struggle.⁴ Yet the decision about which moniker to use for this revolution divided historians throughout the eighteenth century. The political influence of Whig historians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries allowed the previously contentious title of

Mathew is originally from northern England and is currently in his first year of the MA History program studying part time, where he concentrates on 19th century British history. He teaches AP European History at Denver East High School. Before coming to University of Colorado Denver, he studied Politics & Sociology at Newcastle University and Curriculum & Instruction at University of Denver.

“the Glorious Revolution” to ascend into orthodoxy. As historian James Hertzler explained in the lead up to the tercentenary of the revolution in 1987, “doubtless the number of politically-minded people who questioned the glory of the Revolution was greater than those who would have affirmed that it was indeed glorious.”⁵ Nevertheless, it became known as “the Glorious Revolution,” bringing with it the underpinnings of an English foundation-myth that separated the event from its wider geographical and political contexts.

The introduction of the label “Glorious Revolution” in the early eighteenth century initiated more than two-hundred years of Whiggish⁶ narratives, each asserting the notion that modern liberty began in 1689. As G.M. Trevelyan explained in 1938, English society viewed 1689 as “the last year of creation, when God looked upon England and saw that it was good.”⁷ Whig politician and historian Thomas B. Macaulay defined many of these conventional narratives of English constitutional progress and modern liberty in his seminal 1849 work, *The History of England from the Accession of James II*. John Locke’s principles of English liberty heavily inspired Macaulay’s writing, and he described the 1688 revolution mostly from Locke’s perspective despite the fact that in 1688 Lockean views were distinctly radical.⁸ Macaulay responded to the violent European revolutions of 1848 by explaining the distinctiveness of the 1688-89 revolution from those uprisings. Lord Macaulay argued that James II triggered the 1688 revolution by violating well-established English rights, forcing parliament to invite William and Mary who peacefully and permanently eradicated absolutism from England.⁹

Macaulay’s interpretation remained English gospel and was in large part retold by Trevelyan in 1938 when he published *The English Revolution, 1688-89*. Trevelyan set out to reaffirm the exceptionalism of English liberty at a time when fascism was spreading throughout Europe. Trevelyan characterized 1688-89 as a “Sensible Revolution,” which exemplified a civilized English instinct to avoid bloodshed and anarchy.¹⁰ From Macaulay to Trevelyan, the consistency of the Whig interpretations lay in the belief that 1688-89 was a rational English response to tyranny, one that highlighted England’s uniqueness compared to its European neighbors. To Whig historians, the revolution launched an era of liberty and prosperity that made Britain the envy of the world. The tercentenary in 1988-89 revived British interest in the Glorious Revolution and led to widespread criticism of this Whig orthodoxy. Self-described revisionists such as J.P. Kenyon, John Morrill, and Jonathan Israel responded by challenging the “glibness” and “heroic simplicity” of Whig interpretations of the revolution.¹¹ They attacked the notion that the events of 1688-89 were a rational, bipartisan attempt to restore liberty. More importantly, however, these revisionists sought to place the Glorious Revolution in its proper British and European contexts. Revisionists exposed a revolution that was anything but bloodless and unified; they brought the notion of “glory” once again into question by examining previously ignored Scottish and Irish histories. Through their expansion of the geographical focus, revisionists challenged the conventional idea that the Glorious Revolution was mainly an English event.



*William and Mary*¹²

More recently, a new generation of historians, such as Edward Vallance and Steve Pincus, have continued to research the wider British and European context to the so-called “English” revolution. However, these “post-revisionists” have revived several Whiggish notions that remain accurate in this broader context, while examining some of the obvious controversies that are visible when viewing the events of 1688-89 from an Irish or Scottish perspective. These authors indicated that we do not necessarily need to exclude Scottish and Irish viewpoints in order to maintain the belief that 1688-89 was indeed a fight for liberty. In doing so, they continued to highlight the significance of this revolution in European history while also casting doubt on whether the revolution actually was “bloodless” or “sensible.” However, it is the superficially innocuous title of “English Revolution” that seems most inappropriate in light of the recent examination of the broad European context of the events of 1688-89.

THE “ENGLISH” REVOLUTION

When Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher addressed parliament to commemorate the tercentenary of the Glorious Revolution on July 7, 1988, she recited a version of the events of 1688-89 that had dominated British history for nearly three hundred years:

First, the glorious revolution established qualities in our political life which have been a tremendous source of strength: tolerance, respect for the law and for the impartial administration of justice, and respect for private property. It also established the tradition that political change should be sought and achieved through Parliament. It was this which saved us from the violent revolutions which shook our continental neighbours and made the revolution of 1688 the first step on the road which, through the successive Reform Acts, led to the establishment of universal suffrage and full parliamentary democracy.¹³

This “Whiggish” interpretation of the 1688-89 revolution focused primarily on its contributions to English Constitutionalism, civil liberties, and the creation of lasting national stability. According to this progress-focused narrative, various political and religious factions came together in 1688 to avoid catastrophe and steer England away from a conflict similar to that of the 1640s. Thatcher’s account echoes that of historian G.M. Trevelyan, who saw the revolution settlement in England as a rational compromise that solidified national power until the reforms of 1832.¹⁴ From this perspective, the revolution settlement’s combination of religious toleration, individual liberty, and a stable constitution created a winning formula for the subsequent British domination of Europe. According to Trevelyan, the settlement established rule of law and resulted in an increase in national power to rival the absolutism of Britain’s neighbors.¹⁵ Parliament’s rational behavior led Trevelyan to propose his own moniker for 1688: “The Sensible Revolution.” In this 1938 continuation of traditional Whig views, Trevelyan saw the English parliament as united in national purpose, with an undeniable moral outcome: liberty overcoming tyranny.

However, the tercentenary of 1688-89 provided an occasion for several self-proclaimed revisionists, such as John Morrill, to challenge Trevelyan’s “Whiggish” idea of a “Sensible Revolution.” To Morrill, Trevelyan’s arguments are symptomatic of a “Whig myth” that emphasize political unity in 1688 when there was none.¹⁶ Morrill describes revisionism as the “search for a fuller horizontal history.” Revisionists, he says, “refuse to use the historical filter, to highlight or emphasize those events, values, structures which...persist, endure, win out.”¹⁷ When applying this approach to the revolution of 1688-89, Morrill determines that it was far from a politically unified effort to remove a tyrannical monarch. Instead, he describes an agreement that allowed different sides to believe contradictory things about the revolution’s causes and outcomes.¹⁸ According to Morrill, “The offer of the crown to William and Mary along with the Declaration of Rights, the later Bill of Rights, and the Toleration Act were all muddled compromises,

most things to most men, and were not, could not be, the foundation of a new order.”¹⁹ This interpretation responds to the fact that many Whig histories, unsurprisingly, overlooked the Tory hesitation to invite William and Mary to take the throne. According to Morrill, Trevelyan also neglected the significance of the fact that many Tories continued to reaffirm the principle of divine right in 1688 and beyond, and only justified William’s invitation by arguing that James II had effectively abdicated the throne. Morrill highlights one of Trevelyan’s own points to make this claim: that in order to gain Tory support, the 1689 English Bill of Rights was, in fact, a distinctly conservative document that merely reiterated those liberties that were already beyond dispute. It did not reflect the more extreme views of Whigs such as John Locke, and it was not a social contract.²⁰

Morrill points to the “thin research” of Trevelyan’s famous account of the 1688-89 revolution to demonstrate that Whig histories relied too heavily on conventional wisdom.²¹ One point Morrill scrutinizes is the nature of King William III himself and his credentials as a harbinger of liberty to confront James II’s tyranny. As a response to



James II ²⁴

the threat of Jacobitism, the Whig narrative of the revolution evolved to emphasize this dichotomy between William and James.²² However, Morrill challenges this view of the new king by describing “the ruthlessness with which William subordinated the scruples of his English subjects to his drive to mobilize resources against Louis XIV.”²³ Morrill highlights a significant revisionist conclusion about the revolution: that English liberty was not a pressing concern for William. To the new king, the revolution of 1688-89 was a strategic and fortuitous move in his ongoing struggle against France.

One of the principal misconceptions of the 1688-89 revolution, according to revisionists J.P. Kenyon, W.A. Speck, and John Morrill, was the idea that James II could have continued to successfully create a Catholic, absolutist state in England had

he been able to continue his policies. Trevelyan described the outcome of the revolution as the “chaining up of fanaticism” and expressed relief that “our ancestors [had] the opportunity to right themselves” from James’s descent into tyranny.²⁵ Historian J.R. Jones reaffirmed Trevelyan’s view in 1972, claiming that absolutism was, in fact, a “practicable proposition” under James, in a way it had not been for his predecessors.²⁶ Jones argues that James’s policies were a realistic threat to liberty, and they were the main justification and incentive for revolution.

Yet, with only one in twenty English people in 1688 being Catholic, Morrill contends that widespread conversion was very unlikely; rather, this argument is an assumption introduced after the event in order to provide justification and defend the revolution's basis.²⁷ Kenyon reaffirmed Morrill's view in 1989 by challenging Trevelyan's assumption that the revolution highlighted a failure in the English political system that necessitated radical change. Instead, Kenyon explains that 1688-89 was more a result of James's personal failures to enact his own policies.²⁸

Likewise, Speck argued in 1988 that Whig historians had hugely exaggerated the case for James's potential absolutism. According to Speck, most English people in 1688 believed James's policies were "doomed to failure."²⁹ Speck counters the Whig belief in a revolution of "angels" versus "demons" by explaining that "it was not [James's] absolutism so much as his Catholicism that alienated his subjects."³⁰ Speck supports this claim by explaining that it was the announcement of James's Catholic heir in November 1688 that prompted parliament's invitation to William and Mary, not his policies. By challenging the Whig foundations of the revolution in England, revisionist historians such as Speck emphasize that the political unity and moral justification for the revolution were mostly myths written by the Whig victors.

Recently, historians Edward Vallance and Steve Pincus have built upon several of the revisionists' ideas whilst reviving some of the traditional Whig interpretations of 1688-89. Both Vallance and Pincus, writing in 2007 and 2011 respectively, disagree with the revisionist argument that the constitutional changes of 1689 were unimportant.³¹ They reassert Trevelyan's perspective that the revolution did, in fact, usher in a significant era of liberty. Vallance specifically "challenges the revisionists' claim that the constitutional changes wrought by the revolution were insignificant." He goes on to say that "Whig historians were right to see the Revolution as a fight for liberty, but what that liberty meant was highly contested."³² As a "post-revisionist," Vallance reasserts the revolutionary credentials of 1688-89 and argues, essentially, that the revisionists misplaced their criticisms of Whig history by challenging its constitutional impact.

In 1688: The First Modern Revolution, Pincus also argues that revisionists were wrong to downplay the constitutional significance of the revolution. In justifying his title, *The First Modern Revolution*, he explains that "the Revolution of 1688-89 drastically transformed, and was intended to transform, English foreign and imperial policy, English political economy, and the Church of England."³³ Pincus claims that both revisionists and the Whigs before them focused too much on short term causes and effects to reach their conclusions, leading them both to underestimate the revolution's transformative impact. In explaining that it was, in fact, a modern revolution, Pincus also challenges the idea of a civilized event that only involved parliament: "The revolutionaries of 1688-89 numbered in the thousands. They were not a tiny political elite. England in 1688-89 was ripped apart by violent acts against property and people."³⁴ According to Pincus, it was certainly not a "bloodless" revolution, even in England.

Several recent historians have argued that titles such as "glorious" or "bloodless" revolution incorrectly ignore the event's impact on Ireland and Scotland. Indeed, this has been featured in Irish political dialogue for centuries. However, few disputed the idea that the revolution was relatively peaceful in England before Pincus's account.

Stuart Prall's 1972 work *The Bloodless Revolution: England 1688* seems mostly to reiterate Trevelyan's Whiggish ideas, but is even narrower in focus. The text has almost no consideration of the events after December 1688 when William of Orange arrived in London. Such a limited scope led Prall to describe "relief [in London] that England had passed through the night peacefully" when the new monarch arrived, with just a cursory mention of some "protestant looting."³⁵ Prall explains that, against all expectations, the revolution had resulted in a nonviolent transfer of power. Countering the assumption of authors such as Prall that the "bulk of the nation" supported the revolution, Pincus instead explains that "a substantial minority of the English retained their loyalty to James and his political projects."³⁶ Pincus asserts that there was widespread violence across England in response to the revolution. He writes that, like the French Revolution, we should view the 1688-89 revolution in the appropriate chronological context, with more attention to long-term causes and outcomes. Restricting the event to just a few weeks leads to considerable misunderstandings about how "bloodless" it truly was and who was involved.

The Whig history of the revolution of 1688-89 was also extremely narrow in its geographical scope. Building on the work of revisionists such as Jonathan Israel, the recent writings of Vallance and Pincus have sought to place the revolution in its British and European contexts. The revolution had become part of an English creation story—even the Tory, Viscount Bolingbroke, argued in 1733, "from thence we must date both king and people."³⁷ Yet since the tercentenary of 1988, several historians have agreed that we cannot understand the revolution as merely an English event. In this manner, Israel claims that "there can be no adequate grasp of the English Revolution of 1688-89 without seeing it as part of a wider revolutionary process closely linked to offshoot revolutions in Ireland, Scotland and the American colonies."³⁸ Adding context to the revolution is not just about providing an equitable account of events that acknowledges the experiences of Scottish or Irish participants. Rather, Israel references J.G.A. Pocock's belief that the English tradition of isolating its history from other British developments "can obscure and make nonsensical some of the deepest processes of English history itself."³⁹ Therefore, it is essential we recognize the English Revolution's interconnectedness with the Irish and Scottish Revolutions in order to comprehensively understand all the events of 1688-89. Likewise, recognizing that the revolution may have been just one development in the ongoing Dutch war with France may help to fully contextualize the event in European history.

THE "SCOTTISH" REVOLUTION

"The loyalty of Scotland to the Stuart dynasty was indeed a most important factor for the English to consider."⁴⁰

In order to reach their overwhelmingly positive conclusions about the 1688-89 revolution, Whig historians tended to exclude the events in Scotland from their overall argument. This was possible because they viewed the revolution in a very narrow chronological and geographical context. Trevelyan included some details of the division

and violence in Scotland leading up to the revolution, yet still reached the same anglocentric conclusion that “Britain flourished” under the revolution settlement of 1689-1832.⁴¹ It is hardly surprising in a book titled *The English Revolution* that he so easily conflates “English” progress with “British” progress after the Act of Union of 1707. When Trevelyan refers throughout his book to the “wisdom” of “our ancestors,” he is undeniably speaking to an English audience.⁴² What is remarkable is not his omission of Scottish events, but rather his unwillingness to include them in his thesis in order to temper his simplistic, celebratory narrative. However, historians writing more recently on Scotland’s role in the revolution have demonstrated that it was anything but politically unified, inevitable, sensible, or bloodless.

To call the revolution of 1688-89 “unified” is to ignore its connection to wider eighteenth century events and therefore downplay the reluctance of Scottish leaders to follow England’s lead in 1688. Although Trevelyan briefly explained Scottish events and admitted that the revolution in Scotland was “different,” it does not factor into his overall conclusions. Robert Barnes, in his 1971 article “Scotland and the Glorious Revolution,” challenges the idea that Scotland’s invitation to William and Mary was an inevitable response to James’s abuses. Barnes explains that James could have easily retained his widespread support in Scotland had he been willing to compromise.⁴³ James II had built stronger Scottish alliances than any Stuart monarch since James I due to his time in Edinburgh during the “exclusion crisis.”⁴⁴ Far from revolting in response to James’s policies, Barnes argues that most Scottish leaders stayed loyal to James until October 1688 and only followed suit with the English parliament after they realized James had abandoned his Scottish alliances. Barnes’s assessment of James’s relationships in Scotland explains the reluctance of Scottish revolutionaries to follow England and clarifies the later violence among loyal Scottish highlanders. His account helps to explain that, in Scotland, 1688-89 was neither a glorious nor unified revolution. It was James’s neglect of Scotland during the winter of 1688-89 that gave Scotland no choice but to follow England’s example; he thereby squandered his opportunity to retain the Scottish throne.

According to Trevelyan and other Whig-influenced historians, 1688-89 was a victory for parliamentary compromise that set a powerful constitutional precedent. Describing the revolution as a “victory of moderation,” Trevelyan believed this was fundamental to the national stability and British dominance in Europe that followed.⁴⁵ However, Trevelyan did not qualify his thesis with an explanation of the quarrels that occurred in Scotland from 1688-89, where a strictly partisan revolution settlement paved the way for future violence.⁴⁶ When overruled by this one-sided settlement, many Scottish Tories immediately became Jacobites. In the short-term, this caused violence in July 1689 with the Highland Scots at the Battle of Killiecrankie. Scotland, however, suffered the repercussions of the settlement until the violent Jacobite rebellion of the 1740s.⁴⁷ Trevelyan disproved his own thesis that the revolution led to unprecedented national unity by explaining that the revolution of 1688-89 made the dual monarchy untenable, caused a crisis over the Hanoverian Succession, and triggered several Jacobite rebellions. We can only understand his thesis by accepting that, for Whig historians, the 1707 Act of Union transferred English identity onto the entirety of Britain, therefore completely discounting the difference in Scottish experiences.

In recognition of the revolution's tercentenary, historian Ian Cowan explored Scottish division over the revolution settlement in his essay "The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688." As part of Eveline Cruickshanks' collection of revisionist essays, Cowan describes Scotland as a politically and religiously divided kingdom, where James had considerably more support than his brother Charles II had enjoyed.⁴⁸ According to Cowan, there were "few if any parallels" in the lead up to the revolution between England and Scotland.⁴⁹ Like fellow revisionists, Cowan uses this fact to challenge the Whig narrative of a unified and "sensible" revolution. From mob rule in Edinburgh to the 1689 Jacobite rising led by Viscount Dundee at Killiecrankie, Cowan describes a tumultuous period in Scottish history that propagated future divisions.⁵⁰ Pincus reiterated this view in 2011, highlighting the intense religious violence of street battles in Edinburgh during the convention of 1688-89. Pincus used this description to liken the revolution in Scotland to other modern, popular European revolutions, deviating further still from the Whig narrative of a civilized, "Sensible Revolution" initiated by parliament.⁵¹

As Kenyon wrote in 1989, James could have succeeded in Scotland had he not abandoned the loyal Scottish Jacobites. The accounts since then have increased their focus on the Scottish experience of the revolution of 1688-89 and found that it undermines many of the core tenets of the Whig narrative. By incorporating a wider geographical perspective, we can better understand the events of this period in England and Scotland. However, by also increasing the chronological scope of the revolution, historians such as Cowan clarified that it was far from bloodless or unified in Scotland. Instead, the revolution of 1688-89 laid the foundations for fifty years of political turmoil that culminated in the destruction of the Highland Scottish culture at the Battle of Culloden in 1746.

THE "IRISH" REVOLUTION



Belfast "Orangemen" in 2012 marching to commemorate William III's victory over James II at the Battle of the Boyne. Orange Walks remain controversial and continue to face Catholic opposition.⁵²

In the final chapter of his book *The English Revolution*, Trevelyan introduced the topic of Ireland's role in the revolution of 1688-89: "Ireland was the Achilles heel of the Revolution Settlement. Yet even in Ireland the arrangements made after the reconquest at the Boyne and Limerick lasted for ninety years unchanged. But they rested on a basis of force alone."⁵³ Only in Ireland does the absurdity of the title "The Bloodless Revolution" come fully into view. English historians ignored Ireland for centuries due to their perceived irrelevance to the history of English constitutionalism. When Whig historians did mention Ireland in reference to 1688-89, it was as a roadblock to this progress. Trevelyan went on to describe the Williamites' victory at the Battle of the Boyne in a divisive tone: "The English Revolution was saved, and England had set her foot on the first rung of the ladder that led her to heights of power and prosperity in the coming years. And by the same action Ireland was thrust back into the abyss."⁵⁴ Viewing the Irish experience of the revolution in such an indifferent way is part of the Whig tradition dating at least back to Lord Macaulay in 1849. According to Macaulay, the Irish did not warrant a great deal of consideration because they "did not belong to our branch of the great human family."⁵⁵ To Whig historians, the Irish had no place in the story of English progress.

Revisionist historians, such as Morrill, argue that there are two main reasons why it is essential to understand the Irish theatre of the revolution of 1688-89. Firstly, Ireland held the key to the wider European sphere of the revolution, where a proxy war took place between William of Orange and Louis XIV. Secondly, the lasting impact of 1688-89 is certainly more profound in Ireland. The revolution and the Battle of the Boyne are palpable components of Irish Republican and Unionist identities today. However, historians have only recently begun to give the Irish perspective of 1688-89 the attention it deserves.

The tercentenary in 1988-89 coincided with a particularly heated period of the Irish Troubles.⁵⁶ This meant that simply restating the Whig view about the "glory" of 1688-89 was extremely contentious, because in Ireland there were highly emotional politics surrounding the memory of the events. In July 1988, the British House of Commons began a debate on the significance of the revolution. Labour MP Tony Benn countered Margaret Thatcher's celebration of the tercentenary by arguing that the revolution was "all because William of Orange...landed an army in Torbay and took over, in order to repress Catholics and the Irish."⁵⁷ Writing amidst the Northern Ireland Conflict of the 1980s, many revisionist historians acknowledged that the anti-Irish assumptions of the traditional Whig narrative of the revolution were no longer acceptable. This fact led historians to give more authority to Ireland's perspective of the British and European events of 1688-89.



*Lest We Forget:
Northern Irish
Unionist Mural.⁵⁸*

D.W. Hayton wrote his essay, “The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91,” in the context of the tercentenary. Hayton claims that sources are scarce on the Irish perspective of the revolution, possibly as a result of the political repression it initiated. He is able, nonetheless, to show the Irish view of two celebrated aspects of the traditional English narrative.⁵⁹ Firstly, Irish Catholics can easily reverse the dichotomy of James’s tyranny in opposition to William’s liberalism.⁶⁰ To Jacobites, James was a “proto-Liberal” supporting religious toleration, whereas William was a foreign invader who came to remove the religious freedom that had been tolerated since the Restoration.⁶¹ Secondly, the constitutional developments in England, which reduced the power of the monarchy, conversely increased the power and efficiency of the English state and its ability to repress Irish Catholics. According to Hayton, both Williamites and Jacobites justified their cause with ancient constitutional principles.⁶² Therefore, the increase of English power initiated by the revolution resulted in a period of intense repression of Irish Catholics. While some Whig historians acknowledged the political repression of Ireland, it did not restrict their thesis that the revolution initiated constitutional progress. Irish perspectives such as Hayton’s, however, assert quite the opposite: they claim that the political efficiency and English unity afforded by the revolution of 1688-89 created a more tyrannical state than that of previous monarchs.

The revolution of 1688-89 was largely responsible for dividing Irish society along sectarian lines. In what he describes as a “flagrant breach of peace terms,” Vallance explained in 2007 that the revolution resulted in a violent protestant hegemony.⁶³ William showed a callous disregard for Irish Catholics and the rights they possessed by failing to uphold the terms of the Treaty of Limerick. Vallance argues that we can only understand William’s harsh penal laws and oppression of the Irish by considering Ireland’s role in his ongoing war with France.⁶⁴ As historian Maurice Ashley previously asserted, James II was considered a “puppet” of Louis XIV; this notion led William to believe that Irish Catholics were a back door into England for France.⁶⁵ Pincus agrees with Ashley that William’s priority was maintaining the balance of power with France, and Ireland was a vital battleground in that conflict. According to Pincus, William saw the English and Irish events of 1688-89 as just part of a “broader struggle over European liberty.”⁶⁶ Overall, the Irish theatre of the revolution adds essential context for its long-

term impact and sheds light on the wider European causes and effects. When considering events in Ireland, titles such as “Glorious Revolution,” “Bloodless Revolution,” or “English Revolution,” become increasingly difficult to justify.

Recent writings on the revolution of 1688-89 have expanded the geographical focus of the event considerably. Whereas the Whig thesis depended on excluding many of the wider European struggles, writers such as Vallance, Pincus, and Hayton have shown that understanding Irish events also helps to explain English ones more accurately. The recent writings on 1688-89 also include the role of Dutch and French foreign policy, as well as the impact of the revolution on English colonies. What remains debatable, however, is whether the subjugation of Irish Catholics or the Jacobite conflicts in Scotland detract from the revolution’s preeminent status in the history of Anglo-American constitutionalism. Vallance deviates from revisionists in his claim that, despite the undisputable violence of 1688-89, “an important move, however unintended, towards the freedoms enjoyed by modern liberal democracies had been made.”⁶⁷ Thus, Vallance argues that we need not rely on Whiggish oversimplifications to believe that the revolution of 1688-89 played a significant role in the evolution of modern liberty. In fact, both Vallance and Pincus agree that the reality of 1688-89 involved several messy compromises, bloody conflicts, and widespread oppression outside of England; however, it was still a fight for modern liberty.

CONCLUSION

The revolution of 1688-89 was no more an “English Revolution” than the Thirty Years’ War of the same century was strictly a German war. Both events took place on a broad European stage with innumerable potential histories reaching far beyond their country of origin. By expanding the geographical scope, historians have shed light on many of these accounts of the revolution of 1688-89 and shown that labeling the event the “Glorious Revolution,” the “Sensible Revolution,” or the “Bloodless Revolution” necessitates isolating the English experience from those of its British and European neighbors. Although several revisionist historians challenged the simplicity of the Whig histories during the tercentenary in 1988-89, recent historians have revived some central components of the Whig narratives. Specifically, they explain that it is possible to acknowledge the bloodiness of the revolution while also accepting its positive role in the history of English constitutionalism. Overall, historians have demonstrated that by widening the geographic lens, we are better able to understand the revolution in England as well as in Europe as a whole.

Pincus claimed in 2011 that the 1688-89 revolution was the first modern, popular revolution involving people of several social classes. According to Pincus, it was violent and radical, allowing historians to embark on further exploration of the experience on different social classes, religions, and genders. Viewing the history of 1688-89 “from below” may increase the scope further, and challenge the Whig interpretations by providing “a fuller horizontal history.”⁶⁸ Historian Lois Schwoerer responded to the tercentenary by examining the effects of the revolution on women and the experiences

of the many women who participated in it.⁶⁹ According to Schwoerer, aside from the biographies of Princesses Mary and Anne, no one had addressed this previously.⁷⁰ Given the significant research on women's participation in other revolutions in Europe, this lack of exploration is surprising and suggests one of many opportunities for future study.

The conflict between revisionist accounts of the revolution and previous narratives exemplifies a wider debate about the theme of progress in European history. When we acknowledge the role of the 1688-89 revolution in the subjugation of Ireland, it raises the question: do the sins of England negate the belief in constitutional progress? Can the Glorious Revolution be both the beginning of an era of constitutional liberty and the start of accelerated British imperial conquest in Ireland and beyond? Jeremy Corbyn, Labour MP and current party leader, alleged in 1989 that "the so-called glorious revolution of 1688 paved the way for the processes of imperialism and colonialism. Implicit in the wording of the Bill of Rights is the domination of colonies throughout the world and all the disgusting and degrading events that followed from that, such as slavery and the domination of subject peoples."⁷¹ In this way, historians could place the Glorious Revolution alongside the Enlightenment as they analyze the role such progress played in European imperialism and the confidence in cultural superiority. Like American colonists in 1776, many Scottish and Irish subjects realized that a Constitutional Monarchy founded on the English Bill of Rights did little to protect their freedoms; from an English perspective, they were too far removed from them to deserve such liberties. The recent writings on the revolution of 1688-89 prompt us to temper our faith in the virtues of progress with the sobering reminder that, while celebrating their own freedoms, the English outwardly dismissed the rights of those who they believed "did not belong to [their] branch of the great human family."⁷²



Avery, Elroy McKendree. (1918). *A History of Cleveland and Its Environs: the Heart of New Connecticut*. Chicago and New York: The Lewis Publishing Company. Retrieved from University of California Libraries. <<https://archive.org/details/historyofcleve02aver>>

When Rachel Halfield and Lawrence Clinton were married in the small region of Ipswich, Massachusetts on a cold December day in 1665, there were high hopes within their small community that the young couple would soon bear children to the world as a testament to their love for one another. Yet their relationship was anything but peaceful or loving. As early as June 1670, Lawrence was brought into court for attempting to “abase”

Who's Your Daddy?

How the Judicial World of Alimony Payments to Illegitimate Children Characterized Women's Rights in Seventeenth Century Puritan New England

by Sarah Turner

Mary Knoulton and received a whipping of twenty stripes as well as a mandated stay in prison until his payments to her father had been made. In the meantime, Lawrence was required to pay two shillings a week to his wife for “her maintenance” and to lodge with her at least once a week “as duty binds him.”¹ Nonetheless, in 1673 Lawrence made a reappearance before the court, this time on a highly more serious charge that he had fathered the child of Mary Greely, a poor maid for a wealthy family within the region.² In May of 1674, when Rachel was brought into court on the accusation of not living with her husband, she defended that it was he who was still not providing for her, in which the court ruled again that Lawrence needed to bring Rachel at least two shillings once a week.³

Sarah Turner is a sophomore attending the University of Colorado Denver. This is her first published paper, but she is also working on her first novel in her spare time. A student at heart, Sarah hopes to attend graduate school and obtain a doctorate in history as to fulfill her dream of becoming a college professor. Sarah is currently working towards a bachelor's degree in history with a minor in philosophy and interdisciplinary research.

After watching her husband be presented in court again in September of 1677 for fornication—this time with Mary Wooden—Rachel had reached her limit.⁴ On November 6th of the same year, Rachel asked that the court grant her a divorce from Lawrence. However, deeming that the court “could not grant it,” the state instead demanded that Lawrence pay Rachel fifty shillings upon demand, as to follow their “former engagement.”⁵ By November of 1678, Rachel appealed to the court again for assistance, but the court simply ordered that Lawrence pay his wife a peck of corn per week, most likely out of the hope that this was an order that Lawrence could easily afford to do.⁶

At first glance, the Clintons’ story almost reads like a soap opera, between the money and the affairs, especially after another man was discovered in Rachel’s bed on November 24th, 1677, and the two were accused of having “unlawful familiarity” with each other.⁷ However, Rachel Clinton’s story raises more questions than it entertains, the most important question being why the couple was not granted a divorce. Unlike in England, divorces in Puritan New England were approved more often as marriage and divorce were viewed as civil matters.⁸ While there were few reasons to which a divorce could be granted, adultery was one of them. Anne Clark was granted a divorce from her husband, Denis Clark, after he had fathered two bastard children with another woman. Katherine Ellenwood, along with many other women at the time, was granted a divorce from her husband on the grounds of something as light as impotence.⁹ Yet despite all the evidence that pointed to adultery and that the couple did not even live together anymore, the courts refused to grant Rachel’s request for divorce. The answer lies in Rachel’s background before she married Lawrence Clinton and ultimately in the poor economic structure of Puritan New England, in terms of both wealth and design, when handling the growing rates of illegitimate children.

Rachel lived in a time where her government actively avoided bearing the responsibility of having to maintain a woman and her illegitimate child. As a woman’s political and economic autonomy was completely restricted to that of a man’s, if a man could not provide for the family, then that same responsibility would have to fall on the state. It was a responsibility that the government could not financially afford to do, nor did it wish to. Current historiography comes to the consensus that since the Puritan society was so poor, there was an almost unanimous favoring of rulings toward cases that relieved the fiscal obligation of taking care of these children from the state. However, historians differ more broadly in terms of whether these economic motivations behind



Abbey, Edwin Austin. (1901). Anne Hutchinson on Trial. [Illustration]. Retrieved from Harvard College Library, Cambridge. <https://www.brooklynmuseum.org/eascfa/dinner_party/place_settings/anne_hutchinson>.

court rulings were beneficial to the women of their time. Historians have largely found these laws to create socially oppressive conditions for women. If a woman could not get a man to pay for the child, it became the entire community's burden, as it would have to pay for the child through increased taxes. Some communities were so desperate to convince the women to name any man who had the monetary backing, regardless if he was married. When this could not be achieved, women found themselves ostracized from society; they became the object of hate as society attributed more of the blame toward the women than the men for the same crime.¹⁰



Baker, Joseph E. (1892). *The witch no. 1*. [Drawing]. Retrieved from United States Library of Congress. <<https://www.loc.gov/item/2003677961/>>.

However, this essay will aim to demonstrate that despite the social repercussions of such court cases, the laws that dictated the alimony payments to illegitimate children and to the women themselves were ultimately progressive. In one way, they were laws that created long-term financial accountability for the men instead of traditional one-time physical punishments. In another way, they gave women the chance in court to act on an equal playing field—if not at an even higher standing—as the men since a woman's word was unequivocally accepted as nothing less than the truth. While women certainly endured much more of the blame for the crime and suffered a significantly deeper loss of social standing than the men, it was the first step toward recognizing the repercussions of gender inequality within the society.

PURITAN NEW ENGLAND AND ITS MOTHER ROLE MODEL

The Puritan New England colony was structured quite similarly to England in terms of economy, law, and religion.¹¹ The two societies both dealt with high rates of mortality, poverty, and bastard children. In the past, fornication and having a child born out of wedlock were judged primarily on the basis of their moral violations. Punishments could range anywhere from one-time fines to the church to physical discipline, such as whippings, as long as the accused promised to maintain good behavior. However, when such punishments seemed to do nothing but increase the population of illegitimate children, the state passed the 1624 statute requiring the man to make alimony payments toward the woman and child. The state hoped that such a law would not only discourage residents from such costly promiscuous behavior, but also save itself from financial persecution. Mark Jackson, author of *New-born Child Murder: Women, Illegitimacy, and the Courts in Eighteenth-Century England*, explained that “the statute’s principal aim was apparently to prevent the economic, rather than simply moral, burden of bastardy.”¹² Most of the time, if both parties involved were not married, the courts would encourage—even compel—the two to get married. If one of the two was already married, alimony payments would still usually have to be made to the mother and her child. If no father could be found, the government many times would, after the child reached a certain age, find a “new master” to provide the care needed. However, the task of finding apprenticeships for these children became exceedingly difficult with the growing rates of illegitimate children, especially in colonial New England, as it had a much smaller population of men who could have taken these apprentices on. This development and sense of desperation for the courts to assign blame were reflected in their rulings. In his book, *The Economy of Colonial America*, Edwin J. Perks agreed that “economic and legal rationale took clear precedence over moral considerations in the assessment of penalties.”¹³

This could explain why Rachel was never granted a divorce from her husband, seeing how the man had already fathered an illegitimate child with the maid, Mary Greely. Unlike Mary, Rachel came from an economically stable background. Before passing, Rachel’s widowed mother, Martha Halfield, willed to Rachel and her sister over thirty pounds along with land distribution to her brothers on April 8th, 1652. This was far more money than the average woman had, much less the average man, so when Lawrence married Rachel, he received all the wealth that had previously belonged to her. Although Lawrence surrendered “his right and interest” in the will of his late mother-in-law in 1668, he appointed his friend, Thomas Fiske, to be his “feoffe,” which gave Lawrence the full right to use the wealth as much as he wanted without having any actual full ownership and legal responsibility for it.¹⁴

Lawrence took full advantage of this. With fines to the court for fornication and minor theft crimes, he had a surplus of debts to pay. However, the most expensive debt Lawrence acquired was to his illegitimate child and Mary Greely. In April of 1677, Lawrence was ordered by the court to pay Mary twenty pence per week. It was only a little bit less than what Lawrence had been ordered to pay Rachel per week! Slowly, all the wealth that Rachel had inherited from her late mother, including a little bit of land, became further and further from her, due to a husband who was not even able to share it for her own survival. When Rachel appealed for assistance again in 1678, a year after the court had

denied her first request divorce, the basis of her appeal was that “she had suffered the loss of her estate by her husband and [was] now altogether neglected by him.”¹⁵

Rachel was certainly a victim in the society’s treatment of women for when she needed the law most, it failed her. It is initially hard to see Rachel’s story as evidence of laws being progressive toward women at the time. In so many ways, her husband took advantage of Rachel’s wealth and status, despite her pleadings for a divorce. The fact that the courts cared more about their own pecuniary liability over Rachel’s was nothing less than damaging. It is possible that Rachel committed her own act of adultery with the discovery of John Ford in her bed in an attempt to legally if not romantically separate herself from Lawrence, considering that the crime took place only weeks after the court denied her request for divorce. While both John and Rachel claimed that they thought she was divorced last court, the amount of confusion from the couple shows the dissension if not mixed motivation this court had behind Rachel’s desire for divorce. In the end, the court ruled to punish the both of them with fines, just barely resolving not to order physical punishment.

Nonetheless, it is crucial to recognize that Rachel’s wealth and monetary standing was an anomaly among women in Puritan New England. While Rachel suffered from her husband’s acts, another woman gained. At Rachel’s expense, the courts were able to keep Lawrence Clinton accountable for what he did. The court’s rulings ensured the economic survival of Mary Greely and her child, as there are no documented court cases of Lawrence not making the payments. Anne Clark’s divorce, as previously mentioned, allowed Denis to be accountable not just legally, but financially for his illegitimate children. Except his payments did not cripple Anne. Richard Woolery in another case was ordered to pay the mother of his bastard child three shillings a week.¹⁶ In many ways, Rachel’s story reflects the crushing duality which the Puritan society held against its women. While Puritan New England was progressive, as it allowed women the opportunity to make men accountable in court, all the power remained within the state, a state that did not recognize the political and capital rights of women.



Old Colony Trust Company. (1920). *New England, Old and New: A Brief Review of Some Historical and Industrial Incidents in the Puritan “New English Canaan,” Still the Land of Promise*. Boston: Old Colony Trust Company. Retrieved from Cornell University Library. <<https://archive.org/details/newenglandoldnew00oldcrich>>.

JOHN ATKINSON'S CONFUSING PREDICAMENT

On January 10th, 1660, a beautiful daughter named Mary was born to Sarah Stickney. The mother confided to Elizabeth Browne that the father was Samuel Lowell and that before he went away, he promised to return with clouts and whittles for her.¹⁷ In September of 1682, James Myriek testified that he stayed at Sarah's house one night because it was too dark to travel. She admitted to him there that Samuel Lowell often stayed the night too, but Samuel found this to be no more sinful than smoking tobacco



Hals, Frans. (1647-1650). *A Family Group in a Landscape*. [Painting]. Retrieved from the National Gallery. <<https://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/frans-hals-a-family-group-in-a-landscape>> .

in the street “for that was a breach of the law.”¹⁸ John March similarly testified that he, along with Samuel Lowell and John Atkinson, wheeled by Sarah's place some day after Mary was born, and reportedly said to Samuel, “A you roge, yonder is yor Child under the tree, goe take it up and see it,” to which Samuel replied that the child was not his.¹⁹

However, years after Mary's birth, it was not Samuel Lowell that Sarah brought to court on March 1682 to demand maintenance. The man was John Atkinson, a reputable resident who already had a wife and nine children. Sarah said that she concealed the fact “upon his promise to maintain the child which he now refuses to do.”²⁰ Many witnesses were called in to substantiate the legitimacy of this claim—and the evidence was compelling. John Stickney, Sarah's other child from her previous marriage, testified to many visits Atkinson made to their house. When Mary was first born, Atkinson reportedly came to see Sarah after the delivery was done and, taking the child into his arms, “kissed it.” Stickney also testified that before leaving for Boston, Atkinson gave his mother thirty shillings and told her “to be true to him,” after having asked little John to hide his horse out of sight. According to Nicholas Rawlings, Sarah even confessed to Jonathan Haynes that the child was not Samuel's, but another man's in the town. Haynes in turn testified that Sarah became so tired of Atkinson's game that she showed up to Hayne's house, where Atkinson and his wife were, to ask him if he was going to continue to deny his child. Atkinson's wife promptly responded by slapping

Sarah across the face.²¹ By the end of the case, the court ruled in Sarah's favor, to which Atkinson responded that he wanted to be judged by a jury. In March of 1682, a jury found Atkinson guilty and sentenced him to pay twelve shillings to the jury, eight pounds for the maintenance of the child, and two shillings and six pence per week to Sarah.²²

In September of that same year, Atkinson petitioned the verdict and the claims Sarah made against him. In court, Atkinson emphasized evidence that had been presented earlier that year in which Samuel Lowell was the father and that Sarah only went after Atkinson since she "never had any money of any man living to pay her fine nor for the child's maintenance."²³ One such testimony was that of Anne Cheney's in March when Sarah told her that Samuel was the father of her child and that she would have married him and let him carry her "to Providence," but he had no money.²⁴ Jonathan Haynes and his wife testified that Sarah told them that she went to Frances Thurley's estate to talk with James Atkinson and "several men's names were mentioned" in order to "lay claim of the child." James was the first to mention his brother.²⁵

Had Sarah really framed Atkinson to be the father of her child in order to receive money? Despite all of the conflicting evidence presented, Atkinson was told that he was still accountable for the child. Instead of making weekly payments, however, he would have to provide a "meet place for the child at his own cost" and in no case keep the child "at his own house." If Sarah refused to deliver the child to this meet place, she would have to maintain the child "at her own cost," which certainly wasn't an option.²⁶ Even though the judicial process finally reached this endpoint, the payments and fines Atkinson went through were not only expensive and stressful, but also shamed him as a "reputed father" to another family. In May of 1682, Atkinson went to court saying his payments to Sarah were much too heavy for him to handle, in which the court compromised to have him pay half of the payment in cash and the other half in provisions or clothing.²⁷ In the same month that the jury found him guilty, Atkinson was also fined twenty-six shillings for striking Sarah with his staff so hard that she almost knocked her child into the fire.²⁸ The violent action alone can offer a glimpse into the stress and shame Atkinson felt at the time, intense emotions that gave way to anger which only costed him more in the end.

Throughout the entire process, however, the government did not give Atkinson any relief. While the court sided with Atkinson not to have his name listed as Mary's father in the books when Sarah tried to apply for the entry in November, as the case was "highly irregular," the financial payments were to be continued.²⁹ Earlier, after Sarah had initially won the court case debating whether Atkinson was Mary's father, Sarah told Jonathan Haynes and his wife herself that the court did not care so much for the fine "so long as they could get the money."³⁰

It is impossible to determine with certainty who the father was. The ambiguous nature of the testimonies alone makes one wish that paternity tests were available then. The court was presented with two possible fathers for an illegitimate child. There was a fair amount of evidence on both sides—along with a fair amount of suspicion towards the evidence on both sides. While Sarah's claim that Atkinson was the father carried a lot of evidence, most of the testimonies came from her son, John, who could have easily been manipulated due to his mother's pressure and authority over him. Although, if



Crafts, William A. (1879). Pioneers in the settlement of America: from Florida in 1510 to California in 1849. Boston: Samuel Walker and Company. <<https://archive.org/details/pioneersinsettle01craftch>>.

John Atkinson was as reputed and rich as the testimonies made him out to be, it could also be argued that Atkinson bribed locals to testify against Sarah, even if that meant fabricating stories. For example, Jonathan Haynes was used as a witness on behalf of both cases, the verdict and the appeal. In the original verdict, testimony revealed that Haynes knew that the father of the child was not Samuel. It was also at Haynes' house that he testified Sarah arrived to ask Atkinson if he was going to continue to deny his child. However, during the appeal, Haynes' story changed as he testified that Sarah went to another estate as to figure out who she could blame the child on. Could Haynes have been influenced by money or by some other form of coercion? The guess is speculative as there is no documentation of such a bribe, but it certainly adds an air of suspicion to the appeal.

Who actually fathered Mary can never be certain; however, the fact of the matter is that when the court was forced to make a decision on who the father was, the court decided not to believe the man, who had more of a political and social standing, but the woman. Ruling to believe Sarah was the easier choice in terms of economics but was not so morally easy if Sarah had indeed lied about who the father was. Atkinson suffered from the court's decisions, but if Atkinson truly did father Mary, the man was rightly punished. Just because he was rich did not mean he was above the law. Even so, he might have been targeted by the law because he was rich.

In truth, women were given so much more authority and power over men when it came to court settlements like these. As Cornelia Hughes Dayton wrote in her book, *Women Before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789*, “The prohibition against lawyers, the simplification of procedural rules, and the magistrates’ confidence that God would help them discern the truth behind the dispute or criminal charge meant that women’s testimony was invited and encouraged in ways that clashed with English local traditions.”³¹ In other words, Puritan New England law was revolutionary in how it treated women; it gave women legal and judicial authority in ways that women had never experienced before. It provided women with a system to secure economic stability for themselves separate from having a husband. It assigned women a new way to influence the political and economic environment of the colony.

Puritan New England’s laws toward fathers of illegitimate children were discernibly “poor laws,” reflecting the mass amount of poverty and illegitimate children the colony struggled through. These children were without homes and income since their very mothers had no rights to pursue economic stability for themselves in a political world dominated by men.³² However, these “poor laws” were some of the first steps made by the society to fix or at least address this inequality. For once, the man was not able to walk away from a crime he had committed and leave the woman entirely with the legal blame. Instead, he was left with a legal and financial connection to the child, one that would keep him accountable for years. Certainly, if women had been given more autonomy and freedom from the start, Rachel and Atkinson’s stories would not have been a part of the historical narrative. While Rachel and Atkinson may have been victimized for their economic standing due to these laws, their stories add complexity to a time in which these progressive ideas were abhorning. Perhaps it was because of such laws that we have child support payments today.



Louise Hill in her gown crafted for presentation to King Edward VII at the Court of St. James, London, 1908. Louise Hill Collection, Carton 34, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.

First, you have to have money. Then you must have the knowledge to give people a good time.

– Louise Sneed Hill

Louise Bethel Sneed was born March 28, 1862 into the southern aristocracy. Her parents, William Morgan Sneed (1819-1891) and Louisa Maria Bethel (1823-1862), were lifetime residents of North Carolina. Her father's side of the family first appeared in North Carolina in 1761 when Louise's great-great-grandfather, Samuel Sneed, purchased a tract of land in what was then Granville County. Samuel built a grand plantation, the Sneed Plantation, on his property and became a prominent figure in the community. The plantation remained in possession of the Sneed family for generations. After many Sneeds chose

The Dazzling Doyenne of Gilded Age Denver:

Louise Sneed Hill, A Biography

by Shelby Carr

Shelby graduated from the University of Colorado with her Bachelor of Arts, Magna Cum Laude, in History. As an undergraduate she worked as an intern for History Colorado in their school programs division as well as National History Day in Colorado as a mentor and competition judge. Currently, she's in her final semester of classes to achieve her Master of Arts in American History with an emphasis in the Gilded Age and a minor in Public History. During her graduate studies, she has interned writing speeches for Governor Hickenlooper at the Colorado State Capitol, assisting in various museum operations at Byers-Evans House Museum, and in communications and marketing as well as the archival department at History Colorado Center. She also had the wonderful opportunity to present her research on the restoration and preservation of the Colorado State Capitol at Colorado Preservation Inc.'s 2018 Saving Places Conference. Shelby hopes to one day become an author and travel the world composing historical literature.

to relocate to Tennessee, Kentucky, and other neighboring states, the plantation in Granville County became the home of William Morgan Sneed and his family, the last generation of the Sneed family to own the property. William, like his patriarchal line before him, was a slavemaster. His father, Richard, owned twenty-five slaves when he was in charge of the plantation. When he decided to move to Kentucky around 1850, he left a portion of his slaves with William.¹ William married Louisa Maria Bethel in 1842 and they had six children together, Louise Bethel Sneed was their youngest.² While married to Louisa, William also had two children with one of his slaves, Nancy, whom he purchased from his father in 1848.³

Louise's young life appears to have been wrought with a bit of heartache. Her mother, Louisa, passed away in July of 1862 when Louise was only four months old.⁴ Though tragedy was present in her early life, her family name provided her with a comfortable childhood and she grew up as a southern belle in the mansion on her family's plantation. The Sneed family was prominent in the south and strengthened their power through marriages that connected them to former chief justices of the North Carolina Supreme Court, statesmen, investors in the Transylvania Company (including the founder of Kentucky), and other plantation owners.⁵ Louise grew up privileged and spent many summer seasons with close family friends Mrs. Jefferson Davis (the wife of the president of the Confederate States) and Mrs. Worthington Davis (cousin of Jefferson Davis and mother-in-law of Joseph Pulitzer, the creator of the Pulitzer Prize) at The St. Elmo in Green Cove Springs, Florida.⁶ During her most formative years, at the height of the Civil War, her father — a lawyer by trade — became the Clerk of the County Court and served as a lieutenant in the Confederate Army.⁷ William survived the war and in 1866, he married Sarah Ann Lewis, a widow.⁸ Sarah's first husband, James Madison Bullock, died under suspicious circumstances; citizens discovered his body slain on the side of a road in Granville. Legend has it rumors swirled through Granville that William was the murderer because he was infatuated with Sarah.⁹ It is highly unlikely that William committed the crime (the police never investigated him for it) but the rumor mill persisted with their suspicions of his guilt until Sarah's death in 1878.¹⁰ Nevertheless, William and the Sneed family remained prominent in the Granville community and he continued to own and run the Sneed plantation until his death in 1891.¹¹

At the time of her father's passing Louise was a single, unmarried woman. Due to societal customs of the time — which had many young women living with their parents until wedded — she most likely lived with her father until his death.¹² Two of her brothers (William Morgan Sneed Jr. and Walter Alves Sneed) and her sister, Mary Bethel Sneed, had moved to Memphis, Tennessee by the time their father passed away and it is highly likely that Louise moved there to live with one of them after her father's death.¹³

The Civil War ravaged the southern area where Louise grew up. The war killed numerous southern young men and caused many southern towns to become bankrupt. Due to that destruction, prospects for leading a charmed future were rather limited in the post-reconstruction south. Louise was highly ambitious and no one in the South had enough money to provide a vessel for her to achieve her ambitions. Louise had relatives who lived in territorial Colorado and after stories of great wealth and fortune made their

way eastward from the Rocky Mountain region, she decided to leave the South and travel westward to explore suitable marriage prospects.

Louise chose to visit Denver, Colorado in 1893 and stayed with relatives, Captain and Mrs. William D. Bethel. William was Louise's cousin on her mother's side; William's father and Louise's mother were siblings.¹⁴ Captain Bethel was a former officer in the Confederate army and after moving westward became a "well-known Colorado pioneer and capitalist."¹⁵ He also served as the mayor of Memphis (or President of the Taxing District as Memphis went bankrupt during the Civil War and the state repealed its charter) Tennessee from 1891-1893.¹⁶ Though William served in Memphis during that time period, due to a physical breakdown in 1891, he moved his family to Denver where he built a mansion at the intersection of East Colfax and

Marion Street.¹⁷ Perhaps word traveled back eastward of her cousin's successful business ventures in Colorado — William became the principal stockholder in the Southern Investment Company and in 1891 provided the financial backing for the Manhattan Beach amusement park on Sloan's Lake — as Louise blew into Denver like a whirlwind in 1893.

Upon arriving in Colorado, she found it to be a "social wasteland" seemingly destitute of all culture and customs with which she had been raised. Denver was a town powered by the saloon and tavern business. In 1890, there were 478 saloons in the city and many individuals felt the "absence of bars [was] a hallmark of a 'good neighborhood.'"¹⁸ The presence of so many saloons meant rowdy, perhaps uneducated patrons flocking into the

city. Louise would have been confronted with a bit of culture shock and felt appalled at the lack of propriety and proper decorum in Denver.

Due to Captain Bethel's prominence in Denver society and the early social scene, it was easy for Louise to make a proper entrance and attain introductions to Colorado's wealthiest families. Faced with finding a suitable husband upon her arrival, Louise went to work scouring Denver for the perfect match. She set her sights on the best match possible, the most eligible bachelor in town, Crawford Hill.

Crawford Hill was the son of the incredibly wealthy and prominent Nathaniel P. Hill



Boxed collection – Hill family, Crawford Hill, Carton 34, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center

(1832-1900). Nathaniel was “one of Colorado’s outstanding pioneers.”¹⁹ He was born into a distinguished New York family, studied at Brown University and became a chemistry professor there in 1858. He first journeyed westward to Colorado in 1864. Wealthy manufacturers in the northeast sent Nathaniel on a mission to examine gold mining in Gilpin County, Colorado Territory. Consequently, he quit his work in chemistry at Brown and studied mining in Colorado and Europe for three years. A major focus for his studies was the Welsh Swansea smelting process to extract gold, silver, or copper.²⁰ He established the Boston and Colorado Smelting Company in 1867 and employed the Swansea smelting process there.²¹ With the incorporation of the Boston and Colorado, Hill Effectively transformed the smelting industry in Colorado. In 1879, Hill desired a more central location for his business and decided to move the Boston and Colorado from Black Hawk to the city of Denver. In “a classic move befitting the Gilded Age” he renamed the place ‘Argo’ after the “mythical vessel...in search of the Golden Fleece” in Greek mythology.²² Hill became the mayor of Black Hawk from 1871-1873, served as a member of the Colorado Territorial Legislature from 1872-1873, and finally served as a United States Senator for Colorado from 1879-1885. He helped form the Denargo Land Company in 1887, served as president of a real estate development firm, an oil company, and a smelting company, and was principal owner of the newspaper *The Denver Republican*.²³

Nathaniel and his wife Alice were members of Denver’s “old guard,” the small group of Denver families who “had manners and charm” as well as “character and integrity,” connections, and money.²⁴ According to Marilyn Griggs Riley, Denver’s Old Guard society served to “provide marriageable sons and daughters, to form corporations, to solidify water rights, to secure real estate investments...and shaped and ruled the city from Capitol Hill mansions.”²⁵ With their immense wealth and status in the Denver community, Senator and Mrs. Nathaniel P. Hill became arbiters of the Old Guard society. They owned a now long gone twenty-room, three-story mansion at 14th and Welton streets, an area that early Denver citizens considered to be the city’s first ‘upper-crust’ neighborhood. Their wealthy neighbors included Governor and Mrs. John Evans, Mr. and Mrs. William Byers, and Mr. and Mrs. John Wesley Iliff. The Old Guard ran the city of Denver, its development, and its politics with the Hills at the helm of the social scene.



*Coleman & Remington Photographic Studio.
“Nathaniel P. Hill and Family,” 1876.
History Colorado Online Collection,
History Colorado Center*

When tiny but powerful Louise Bethel Sneed arrived in Denver in 1893 she made an immediate impact. Her cousins, Captain and Mrs. Bethel, threw an opulent ball to introduce her to Denver society at their mansion on East Colfax upon her arrival. Many of Denver's Old Guard society attended the black-tie affair including the Moffats, Cheesmans, and Hills.²⁶ Crawford Hill, the most eligible bachelor in Colorado although rather devoid of a sparkling personality, made the acquaintance of the energetic Louise Sneed at that ball in her honor. It was the perfect match, what Crawford lacked in social presence Louise more than made up for with her ambition, tenacity, and drive to rule. Two years later, they were married in a lavish ceremony in Memphis, Tennessee. In an article published in the *Aspen Daily Times* January 16, 1895 entitled "Crawford Hill Married" the author dubbed the bride, Miss Louise Sneed, "the reigning belle of this city."²⁷ An article in *The Denver Republican* praised Louise's beauty, her exquisite pearl white, satin and chiffon gown, and described the "superb diamonds" that sparkled "on her ensemble" that were a gift from Crawford.²⁸ In another untitled article from Louise's personal scrapbook, the Hill-Sneed wedding was described as a "beautiful, notable, and important event." The author described Louise as "recognized everywhere as belle and a beauty...her marriage into a family as prominent as her own makes it an occasion of unusual import and interest."²⁹



"Louise Hill," Louise Hill Collection, Carton 34, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center

After their wedding, Mr. and Mrs. Crawford Hill established their home in Denver and Louise went to work building her empire. Louise began a love affair with the society pages of Colorado's various newspapers on her wedding day that lasted to her dying day. She clipped her favorite articles and kept them in scrapbooks that now reside within the rest of her collection at the Stephen H. Hart Research Center in Denver's History Colorado Center. She began her rise to the top by seeking to "captivate all of Denver with her charm, wit, and beauty."³⁰ Unlike the Old Guard of Denver, Louise loved the press. Much like Ward McAllister and Mrs. Astor's 400 of New York City, Louise invited the press to write about her. She welcomed attention, craved it, and wanted to be seen by everyone, everywhere.

Crawford and Louise lived in La Veta Place, a row of Victorian brownstone apartments, at the southwest corner of West Colfax Avenue and Bannock Street. It was the most elegant apartment house

in Denver but Louise despised the “dark and uninspired” surroundings.³¹ Consequently, after the birth of her sons Nathaniel in 1896 and Crawford, Jr. in 1898, Crawford, Sr. built his family a twenty-two-room French Renaissance mansion. It was completed in 1906 at the southwest corner of 10th Avenue and Sherman Street. Although the front door faced 10th Avenue, the Hills preferred to use the address 969 Sherman Street. Sherman Street led directly to the state capitol building and having a home on that street implied a sense of political and social stature within the community.³²



“Crawford Hill Residence,” 1910-1930. Denver Public Library’s Western History Department

Louise attended all sorts of societal functions in Denver in the hopes of establishing herself as its reigning queen, and began holding social events at her new mansion as well. Her husband Crawford had two younger sisters who did not appreciate the brown-haired beauty’s resolve. The struggle for power in the Denver social scene between the Hill family was a hot topic for newspapers but in the end, Crawford’s sisters were no match for Louise. They both married and left Colorado.³³ Once she defeated her competition, one of her first acts as self-titled social arbiter of Denver was to declare forty names that she considered to be worthy of high society. In an untitled newspaper article Louise clipped and kept in one of her scrapbooks the “immaculate, immortal Forty are tagged and ribboned beyond the peradventure of a doubt.” These names were those individuals who were exclusively in attendance at a dance at the Adams Hotel. The article named all forty guests and concluded by stating “and there you are- or are not!”³⁴ Perhaps knowingly or not, she whittled down the forty names to thirty-six herself. She began hosting bridge parties in her stately home and instructed others in “the best way to arrange the tables” but to “be sure and do not say that I arranged the tables.”³⁵

Louise's bridge parties were exclusive and consisted of nine tables of four players each. Like Mrs. Astor's New York ballroom that could only fit 400 people, Mrs. Hill created a society group in Denver that the local press dubbed the "Sacred Thirty-Six" because of the amount of people her bridge tables could accommodate. The thirty-six names on the elite list were influential, wealthy people who lived in the city of Denver; it was a reinvention of the Old Guard.³⁶ The Sacred Thirty-Six was the first establishment of a highly publicized, aristocratic-style elite social scene in Denver and resulted in



*Sacred Thirty Six – Denver Country Club, 1910- 1930.
Denver Public Library's Western History Department*

the acknowledgment of the city as a legitimate cultural and educated place to the larger world. Historians have often attributed the "Sacred" title to the thirty-six names to an untitled newspaper interview a journalist conducted with Mrs. P. Randolph Morris. Mrs. Morris was one of Louise's closest friends whom she considered herself to be inseparable from and "for whom she ha[d] known for many years."³⁷ Supposedly, Morris responded to a journalist's question by stating: "Goodness, you'd think we were

sacred, the way you were asking." The journalist properly titled the story that followed "Party at Mrs. Hill's for the Sacred 36" and the general public referred to the group of social elites as such from that moment forward.³⁸

Louise was very selective in who she allowed to attend her events. She routinely denied Denver socialite Margaret Brown entrance to her exclusive parties due to Brown's unrefined behavior, new money status, and humble, poor Irish Catholic origins. Louise laid out her particular social constructs in a work of her own that she entitled *Who's Who in Denver Society*. The blue book, originally bound in red cloth with gold lettering, was published in 1908. It contained many names of those individuals in Denver who Louise considered to be of an upper class. A sketch of Louise graced the cover page along with the title of the book. Naturally, Louise put herself and her husband, Crawford, at the top of the list for the category entitled "The Smart Set." According to the text, some "Hints on Behavior" suggested that: "manners are indeed stronger than laws and are signs by which one's status is fixed." The text continued on to state that "people of breeding never "look up to" or "look down upon" their associates but rather they leave them with the effect of "unspoken caress without the familiarity of anything personal." It also states that to "be quietly qui vive is the first mark of breeding." These traits, among countless others including the avoidance of painful or disgusting topics and laughing or giggling, were the set requirements that all individuals, both men and women, hoping to enter the upper echelons of society must possess.³⁹



"Sketch of Louise Hill," Who's Who in Denver Society, 1908. Denver: W. H. Kistler Stationary Co., 1908.

Louise was a smashing success as the doyenne of Denver society. It was important for her to stay in the limelight, to represent herself to the outside world as the ideal woman. She attended various theater performances and at times when shows began she would stand and face the audience rather than the stage so that the audience might gaze upon her as well.⁴⁰ In pursuance of perpetuating exclusivity, she had to maintain a sense of unattainable wealth, prominence, and societal etiquette. In order to do so in such a reserved and rather undeveloped society, she imposed her ideas of what she believed to

be proper, culturally speaking, on the citizens of Denver. By modeling her ideals after Mrs. Astor's 400 in New York City, rather than the previous ideals of early Denver that had relied upon morals rather than wealth, she changed the social structure and created a legacy for herself unmatched by any other Denver citizen of her time.

Whether it was articles about her tiara that "dazzled society" and oozed with diamonds, her diet regimen of "two glasses of buttermilk, two crackers, and water" or that she had given up "letting her friends copy everything she wears or does" for Lent, Louise was certainly the center of attention in Denver.⁴¹ Her "aptitude for doing the charming and graceful thing, her ready sympathy for others, a naturalness of manner as refreshing as a spring, tact breeding and an uncanny sense of the fitness of things, and a proficient memory remembering people and avoiding situations that might result in friction" factored in her success.⁴²

While Louise found great success in Denver, she yearned for more. She wanted to establish her elite society on the international level. In 1908, she took the first step towards her goal. In an article entitled "Denver Society Woman to Enter Palace, Mrs. Crawford Hill Will Be 'Presented'" a journalist described Louise's presentation to a European aristocratic court. That event marked her place in history as she was the first Denverite to be presented in an English court. The article stated that:

The importance of being presented at court may be judged correctly only when you consider a society woman from any of the lesser cities of America is absolutely unknown outside of her own home. She has no acquaintance worth speaking of among New York's "400" and in the capitals of Europe there is for her no possibility of recognition. But let her be presented at court and her whole social status is changed.⁴³

The Denver Republican published an article that described Louise's exquisite presentation dress. The journalist wrote that Louise "attracted much attention in a particularly handsome gown of white satin, embroidered with diamonds, with a comb train of red velvet, heavily brocaded with gold."⁴⁴ The author continued his or her description by stating that her "ornaments were a pearl and diamond collar with lace, a string of pearls and a tiara of diamonds with pear-shaped pearls."⁴⁵ During her presentation, she was received by the Prince and Princess of Wales and the Duke of Connaught.

Her grand entrance into English high society put her, and her Thirty-Six, in the limelight. It allowed the important individuals in New York to acknowledge Denver as a relevant, elite society. As the article stated it gave "distinction and la[id] a foundation for the future recognition of Denver society."⁴⁶ After her presentation at court, the notoriety and popularity of the Thirty-Six only continued to grow as did her features in the society pages. From that point forward, Louise was acquainted with numerous members of nobility including lords, ladies, and Prince and Princess Henry XXXIII of Reuss, a former principality in what is now East Germany.⁴⁷

One minor indiscretion tarnished Louise's social record. On September 19, 1919, Crawford penned a letter to George W. Gano Esquire, the president of The Denver Country Club. In that letter, Crawford stated that his wife had received correspondence

from the Board of Directors of the club “advising her that the Board had suspended her for a period of sixty days on the grounds that she had violated the rules and bylaws of the club, with respect to an incident which occurred in the club on the evening of August 9th.”⁴⁸ It is unknown what incident Crawford was referring to, journalists never covered the story in the press nor was it discussed further in Crawford’s collection of letters. Based upon the rules and by-laws of the Denver Country Club at the time, there are two strong possibilities as to what the incident may have been. One rule of the Club was that the “privilege of occupying rooms at the club house” was “restricted to men.”⁴⁹ It is possible that another member of the club found Louise occupying a room upstairs to meet with her lover, Bulkeley Wells, as they were known to disappear together upstairs during club events. Another rule of the club was that “no alcoholic liquor shall be brought, distributed or consumed within the club house or on the club grounds.”⁵⁰ Louise was well known for her champagne luncheons, cocktail parties, and for providing liquor for other parties.⁵¹ It is highly likely that during prohibition she still would have wanted to drink alcohol at social events and perhaps someone caught her drinking on club grounds.

Crawford’s letter also went on to state that Mrs. Hill was only an “associate member” of the club through his membership and therefore the “provisions of Article X of the bylaws” were only applicable to the male members of the club.⁵² Furthermore, he penned that Louise had attempted to reply to the complaint in writing but her letter was perhaps too strongly worded as she had to change sentences and expressions before she could mail the letter. Finally, Crawford wrote that Louise did not “desire to involve anyone else in this matter, nor to evade responsibility for her action” though it is possible she did and did not want a scandal on her hands. She left town immediately and traveled to Memphis, perhaps until the incident blew over.⁵³

Throughout their years of marriage, the Hills maintained their wealth in the industry where Crawford’s father had first earned it, smelting. Due to mutual interests in the success of the mining industry, the Hills found themselves acquainted with Mr. and Mrs. Bulkeley Wells. Bulkeley Wells (1872-1931) was a graduate of the engineering school at Harvard University and by 1896 he “became nationally known in the field of hydroelectric engineering.”⁵⁴ He married Grace Livermore, the daughter of successful lawyer and mining investor Colonel Thomas Livermore, and they had four children together over their twenty-three years of marriage. His father-in-law was a major investor in Telluride’s “richest and most famous gold mine” and the Wells family settled in Colorado. Wells served as the president and general manager of the Smuggler-Union in Telluride and “president or director of at least sixty other mining companies in Colorado, Nevada, and California.”⁵⁵ He despised unions and helped crush the strongest one in Colorado, the Western Federation of Miners.⁵⁶ Wells was also a polo player and his dashing good looks, suave style, and wealth certainly attracted the attention of Louise Hill.



"Bulkeley Wells," 1899. History Colorado Online Collection, History Colorado Center

It is unknown at which event the Hills first made the acquaintance of Bulkeley Wells, perhaps it was at one of the various social polo events in Denver that Louise attended, but he quickly became a close friend of the Hills. Crawford Hill mentioned Bulkeley in quite a few of his personal letters to his sons, Nathaniel and Crawford, while they were away studying at Harvard University and Brown University.⁵⁷ Crawford also penned personal letters to Bulkeley and signed them "as ever devotedly your friend."⁵⁸ All the while, Louise and Bulkeley engaged in a love affair. The Wells family lived in Colorado Springs but by 1914, Bulkeley had his own office and apartment in the city of Denver. Bulkeley and the Hills were both members of the Country Club in Denver.

Partygoers at the various dances and events of the club remembered Bulkeley and Louise leaving the dance together to "disappear upstairs."⁵⁹ Crawford either did not notice or did not mind the affair — some individuals who knew him, such as Caroline Bancroft, said he was dull and not very bright — as they continued to be a tight trio of travel partners and even spent every winter in Palm Beach, Florida together.⁶⁰ When their sons had trouble abroad or in school, Crawford frequently enlisted Bulkeley's assistance in the matters.⁶¹ Their bond became so tight that Louise hung a life-sized portrait of their dear friend Bulkeley in his finest polo attire beside her husband Crawford's smaller, head only portrait in the main foyer of their Sherman Street mansion.

In 1918, Bulkeley's wife divorced him and cited desertion as her reasoning. He did not contest the suit and effectively lost his family, and the financial backing of his incredibly rich in-laws.⁶² Around the same time, Crawford grew very ill. Some described him as an invalid in his final years, he was very sick for a long time, and he either died of heart failure or stroke at the age of fifty-seven in 1922.⁶³ After Crawford passed, Louise and the rest of Denver society rather expected Bulkeley to marry her. Only mere weeks after her husband's passing, sixty-year-old Louise was shocked by her lover as he chose to marry a younger woman instead. In 1921, Bulkeley had moved to San Francisco in search of new business ventures and met a strawberry-blonde twenty-something-year old named Virginia Schmidt. They eloped in January 1923 and when Louise heard of the union she severed all ties with her former lover and set out to destroy him socially and economically. She convinced some of his financial backers, her close friends, to pull their support from Wells and though his marriage was quite successful (they were together for eight years and had two children together), Mrs. Hill ruined him both socially and financially. Bulkeley developed a gambling addiction and with living a life of poverty as his foreseeable future, he made a drastic decision. He went to his office on the morning of May 26, 1931, spoke briefly with his co-workers and asked for a loan of twenty-five dollars. He returned to his office, sat down at his desk, penned a note to a bookkeeper

of his at the Smuggler-Union, took a revolver from his desk, laid down on a couch, and shot himself in the head. He lessened the sound of the gunshot by holding a pillow over the pistol and no one heard the shot. Co-workers entered his office to discuss business and discovered him bleeding out on the couch. Bulkeley was rushed to the hospital but never regained consciousness and died shortly thereafter.⁶⁴

Sometime later, Louise held an event for the press at her home. Close friend and *Rocky Mountain News* photographer Harry Rhoades pressed Louise to speak about what had happened to Bulkeley and she finally replied cheerfully “well, I really don’t know.”⁶⁵ Louise’s reign of high society, national and international travel continued through the 1920s and 30s. Her favorite destinations were Memphis, Newport, New York, London, and Paris. She entertained presidents and fabulously wealthy and titled society people. She never told anyone her age and still hosted in her 60s with the exuberance she had in her 30s.

In her later years, the upkeep of her large mansion became too much for her and in the 1940s she and her staff moved into the Skyline Apartments at the Brown Palace, room 904. She became a bit of a recluse in her later years and was saddened by the lack of visits from her sons and their families. She wrote to her niece in 1938 that she felt her own letters were “so stupid, so that I am sure that they bother you.”⁶⁶ She penned to Nathaniel and Crawford in 1940 that she knew they had only “slight interest in how I’m doing but...you might feel sorry for me as I have been so terribly sick suffering from intense pain, confined to my bed



Boxed collection – Hill family, Crawford Hill Jr. & Nathaniel P. Hill II, Carton 34, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center

constantly.”⁶⁷ She wrote both of her sons again that year that she spent “so much time trying to convince you not to come out here as it would bore you to death...but I did think you could send me a postcard.”⁶⁸ In 1944, Louise had shut down the mansion for parties and social gatherings due to the ravage of World War II. In 1947, many of Louise’s spectacular clothes and furnishings were put up for auction and in 1948, the Hill mansion was sold to The Jewish Town Club. She spent fifteen years in her Brown Palace apartment and died there of pneumonia in 1955 at the age of ninety-one.

She was survived by her two sons, Nathaniel P. of New York and Crawford, Jr. of Newport, her four grand-children, and seven great-grandchildren. Both of her sons died shortly after her. Crawford, Jr. passed in 1960 in Palm Beach, FL and Nathaniel died in 1965 in Boston, MA.⁶⁹

Louise led a fabulous life. She was a tough mother to her sons (she once wrote a letter to Crawford stating that “The Boettchers...said that you were so fat they would never had known you had someone at the table not told them who you were...I told you about growing fat...get thin and stand up”⁷⁰) but also loved them fiercely and worried greatly for their safety during the World Wars. She yearned for them to find financial and personal success in life and they both achieved that. She had a sensational personality and an insatiable thirst for wealth and public recognition of her power and success. She was a beauty of short stature, high heels, and a sharp tongue. She did not like her stubby hands so she wore elbow length gloves for a better appearance. She bribed newspaper reporters to only write the best about her and to mar the face of herself in photos that she did not love. In a letter to Miss Helen Eastom of *The Denver Post*, Louise expressed that she wanted to present Eastom with a photograph “which is really lovely except the face, which does not look like a human being.” Louise went on to instruct Eastom to “tell the printer who executes the picture that you put in the paper, that if he will have the face blurred...he will do me an everlasting favor and I shall properly send him a check for \$5.00” and that “Mr. Bonfils will think it is only a mistake, and the picture will be divine.” Included in the letter, Louise also sent the caption to accompany the photograph. They described her as “too magnificent” and instructed Eastom that if she did not use them Louise understood; however, if she recalled correctly, Eastom told her to write the lines in such a way as to make herself sound like “the greatest person in the world.”⁷¹

Though tragedy wrought the beginning and end of her life, Louise Sneed Hill always displayed class and sophistication. She was bold, brazen, and unapologetic in her forceful actions. She was a force to be reckoned with and effectively put Denver on the high society map. She is in part the reason why Denver has such a strong cultural presence to this day. Louise created an aristocratic social scene in pioneer Colorado.



American Progress (1872), by John Gast

On August 7, 1842, aging New Englander Moses Strong, penned a letter to his eldest son—a thirty-two-year-old Wisconsin resident of the same name. In his letter, Strong explained that during a recent visit to Washington, he had met a Wisconsin lawyer who was acquainted with young Moses. According to this man, the younger Strong had recently renounced “all and every kind of dissipation” which he had “in some degree indulged.” The letter leaves little question as to what sins young Moses had apparently forsworn. “Gambling and drinking,” Strong assured his son, could lead only to “ruin of reputation and

Uncertain Wanderers:

Victorian Constructs of Morality and a Family's

Migration into Wisconsin, 1830s–1840s

by Micaela Cruce

property.” Seemingly unconvinced of Moses’s commitment to virtue, Strong advertised the domestic merits of sobriety: “It tends so much to the happiness of a man and his family.” Then, targeting his son’s professional ambition, Strong insisted that temperance was the test of a political man’s character. He must have known that young Moses was in the midst of a grueling campaign for re-election to the upper house of the Wisconsin Legislature. “I hope,” Strong wrote, “this [rumor] is true & that you will make a thorou [sic] business of it without any relapse.” Although he

Micaela Cruce is an undergraduate history major with a minor in anthropology. She wrote this paper for Dr. William Wagner's senior seminar class in the fall of 2017. She is especially interested in the borderlands history of the region that is now the southwestern United States and northern Mexico. Micaela is a 2017-2018 Koch Fellow and the vice president of University of Colorado Denver's branch of the national history honors society, Phi Alpha Theta. After completing her undergraduate coursework, she intends to study history at the graduate level.

may have been gingerly optimistic, Strong believed his son stood on precarious moral ground, quite literally. After all, the young man lived in a place that was, from the elder's perspective, intrinsically corrupting. "I have always had great fear," Strong confessed, "what [influence] the habits of your new country would have on you." To the patriarch, the West was a place of vice, and young Moses's soul was on the line.¹

The letter that Moses Strong wrote that summer day in 1842 casts light on an important dimension of Euro-American westward expansion: nineteenth-century notions of morality. In Victorian America, ideas about vice and virtue were ubiquitous. Moral values shaped Euro-American culture at all levels—from interpersonal dynamics to societal norms. Standards of morality dictated appropriate forms of behavior and contoured family relationships. Furthermore, nineteenth-century views on morality were interlaced with Victorian ideas about gender. As Moses Strong's letter illustrates, moral values also determined how Euro-Americans perceived and acted upon the West. In fact, ideas about morality underpinned two cultural paradigms—'manifest destiny' and 'the cult of domesticity'—which catalyzed American expansion.²

The nineteenth century witnessed the dramatic and violent growth of the United States. Between the 1830s and the 1850s, the country's territory doubled. By the middle of the century, the United States stretched between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, reaching as far south as the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande and extending north to the 49th parallel. Over the decades in which the United States swelled westward, the country's population exploded. As the nation's limits moved, so did its people.³ Although the mythos of westward expansion has long been imbued with a certain masculine ruggedness, migration was often a family enterprise. Migrant families consisted of women as well as men.⁴ As in other aspects of antebellum society, moral values were essential to the processes that pushed and pulled Euro-American families into the Upper Mississippi Valley during the first half of the nineteenth century.

When the elder Moses Strong pleaded that his son not waver in his commitment to virtue, the father argued his case in three points. First, he threatened that intemperance would lead to "ruin of reputation and property." Next, he appealed to young Moses's familial sensibilities when he wrote, "[sobriety] tends so much to the happiness of a man and his family." Finally, Strong targeted Moses's professional ambition, claiming that temperance was "a test by which political men" could prove their worth. It was no accident that the Strong family patriarch outlined his argument in the three-tiered framework of economy, reputation, and family. The values of wealth, status, and kinship were essential components of westward migration. To many nineteenth-century Euro-Americans, the West was a place of transformation and fulfillment. Migrants might reshape their public images, increase their means, and grow their families in a western land of rich soil and abundant resources. Yet, as Strong's letter illustrates, the West could also be a place of dangerous "habits" and corrupting influences. Transformation was as great a hazard as it was an opportunity. In spite of the patriarch's reservations, a number of his children and their spouses followed Moses west. The stories of these siblings are concrete examples of how the transformative power of migration—as it related to economy, identity, and family—both complemented and challenged Victorian constructs of morality.

A STRONG REPRESENTATION



Moses M. Strong

The relocation story of the younger Moses Strong and several of his siblings into Wisconsin during the 1830s and 1840s was in many ways representative of a particular current of westward migration: the economically driven movement of middle-class and somewhat-affluent New Englanders into the Upper Mississippi Valley during the middle decades of the nineteenth century. Like the Strongs, whose family roots were in Vermont, the majority of Euro-Americans who sought to remake themselves in the newly appropriated territory of Wisconsin emigrated from the Northeast. In fact, the prominence of migrants from this region earned a large swath of western land the title: “Greater

New England.” This unofficial province included parts of New York, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Wisconsin.⁵

In addition to geographic origin, the Strong family shared socioeconomic attributes with other antebellum immigrants in Wisconsin. Descended from a line of landholding lawyers, the Strongs were modestly wealthy.⁶ Many of the New Englanders who poured into the Wisconsin Territory sought to establish farms. Prior to the 1862 passing of the Homestead Act, the cost of purchasing land and farming equipment could range from \$500 to \$1,000, making this agriculturally based wave of migration unfeasible for the majority of New England’s poorer people. Conversely, the balance of opportunity and exertion discouraged the very wealthy from making Wisconsin their home. In the early years of Euro-American migration into the Upper Mississippi Valley, elites were better benefitted by speculating in western lands than by settling on them. Mid-nineteenth-century Wisconsin was, therefore, a region of opportunity to a cast of largely middle-class and semi-wealthy migrants.⁷

The western branch of the Strong family also represented the youthfulness of the migratory current which carried Moses and several of his siblings to Wisconsin. In general, westward migrants were a relatively young demographic.⁸ Within the Strong family, chain migration was primarily a conversation between the younger Moses Strong and other members of his generation, both male and female. During the late 1830s and early 1840s, a number of Moses’s siblings wrote to him, expressing interest in the West. Moses Strong, his wife, two of his sisters, one of his brothers, and two of his brothers-in-law eventually migrated to Wisconsin. All of these individuals were between the ages of twenty-four and thirty when Moses headed west in 1836, with one exception: Samuel Hinman, who was forty-one.⁹

Central to the significance of the Strong family's westward migration was the complex relationship between communal values and individualistic aspirations in the family's relocation story. During the first half of the nineteenth century, as the expansion of market capitalism reshaped Euro-Americans' identities, New Englanders integrated values of commerce and community. Rather than view the market economy as a threat to communal and familial bonds, they crafted a worldview wherein economic success, achieved through interpersonal cooperation, could strengthen community ties. Agriculture was important to this paradigm because farming, as a business and a lifestyle, strengthened collective relationships and enhanced family status. Northeastern farmers often shared ownership of land, livestock, and equipment. Agricultural families tended to work their land cooperatively, building relationships on economic collaboration.¹⁰

Because New Englanders believed that capitalism could enrich family relationships, the market economy acquired moral legitimacy. Yet, if an entrepreneur prioritized individual gain above collective advancement, capitalism could pose a threat to family and community. In the American West, the moral legitimacy of capitalism often hinged on the economic modes through which migrants engaged in commerce. While family groups poured into the West to establish community farms and shape the Upper Mississippi Valley in the image of domestic virtue, individual entrepreneurs eyed western resources with more self-interested objectives. In search of investment opportunities, businessmen engaged in a variety of nonagricultural ventures. Frequently, these opportunists jumped from one enterprise to the next, variously trying their luck in merchandising, banking, milling, hotel keeping, and land speculation.¹¹

Members of the Strong family interacted with themes of individualism and community in a variety of ways, and they assessed the economic possibilities of westward migration with differing motives. Some sought to solidify community through capitalist success. Others approached the economic prospects of migration with more individualistic designs. In seeking prosperity through western enterprise, the family's migrants contemplated a variety of commercial endeavors. Representative of the broad range of opportunities that antebellum Americans saw in the Wisconsin Territory, the family's migrants considered almost every financial scheme the West had to offer—from the virtuous vocation of farming to the far less honorable business of speculating in western lands.

MOSES STRONG: SINFUL SPECULATOR

In May of 1836, Moses M. Strong was lured west by the bait of potential fortune. He was twenty-six years old.¹² Prior to his migration, Moses was a struggling lawyer who could not afford to build a house for his wife, Caroline.¹³ While still in Vermont, the young man had gained experience as a land agent and a surveyor. He had also acquired a taste for speculation. Already deeply in debt from speculating in marble, silver, and eastern lands, Moses stubbornly sought to improve his circumstances by pursuing the same enterprise in Wisconsin. Investing heavily in the young territory's lead-mining region, he acquired massive quantities of real estate at the cost of great debt. By 1870, over three decades after Moses migrated to Wisconsin, he estimated that his land holdings were worth \$12,000, six times the value of his personal estate.¹⁴

When Moses Strong left his hometown of Rutland to survey and speculate in western lands, some members of his family saw danger in his ambitions. Caroline Strong believed her husband's bid for wealth was well-intentioned, even practical, but she worried it might come at the cost of his health. Still living in Rutland, Vermont, Caroline grasped the hardships of frontier life from Moses's letters home. Yet, she admired his grit. On December 14, 1836, she wrote to Moses, applauding his fortitude. According to Caroline, her father was pleased with Moses's efforts to provide for his family. Of the elder's approval Caroline said, "he wished you success & then went on to praise you for the strength and perseverance which he said you must have to enable you to go through & endure so much hardship [as] you must endure in such a new country."¹⁵

Given the reality of how Caroline's father, Dr. Green, viewed speculation, Moses would have been wise to read his wife's compliment critically. Dr. Green was less than thrilled with his son-in-law's western land interests, and he did not share his daughter's belief that Moses's enterprises would bring the family fortune. When Dr. Green first discovered that Moses intended to invest in western real estate, he gave the young man an ominous warning: "The sun often goes down in the West, but I hope it will not go down so as to rise no more on you . . . Speculations are like lotteries or like gaming." Equating land speculation with a game of cards, Dr. Green reminded Moses that the young man could not know what was in his opponent's hand.¹⁶

The opponent to which Dr. Green referred may well have been the American economy, and his advice was stunningly prophetic. Moses Strong decided to balance his financial circumstances on western land speculation at an inauspicious moment in American history. Because Moses was deeply in debt, his western land investments were dependent upon the wealth of eastern investors. The young man worked as an agent, securing land for affluent speculators who sought to capitalize on westward expansion from the comfort of their eastern homes. In 1836, the year that Moses began working



Mineral Point and Environs, 1836

in Wisconsin, investing in western real estate was a popular trend. Potential investors were plentiful. According to Strong's records, within his first two years as a land agent, he entered 1,150 acres of land for a single client—New Hampshire's U.S. Senator Henry Hubbard.¹⁷ Moses's initial experience of economic abundance did not, however, last long.

The epidemic of speculative fever that drew Moses to Wisconsin was a symptom of an economic bubble with a quickly thinning membrane. Four years before Moses began speculating in the West, President Jackson vetoed a bill that would have renewed the charter for the Second Bank of the United States. Because of the bill's failure, government deposits went to state banks. These institutions responded by dramatically expanding loans and circulation. The availability of capital led to a frenzy of land speculation. In 1836, Jackson attempted to contain the speculative bubble, inadvertently causing it to burst. The resulting banking collapse led to a massive economic crash in 1837 and a depression that lasted until 1843.¹⁸

The crash of 1837 had a profound impact on Moses's economic circumstances. Prior to the disaster, money was abundant. With the help of eastern investors, Moses was initially successful in obtaining western lands in his own name. In the years that followed the crash, however, his real estate holdings failed to appreciate. By 1844, he possessed lands that had accrued no value since the day he had purchased them eight years earlier.¹⁹

Not only did Moses Strong's personal investments suffer when western lands stopped appreciating in value, but his business as a land agent wilted as well. Dependent on the capital of eastern investors, western land agents found funds in short supply after the crash of 1837. By the early 1840s eastern speculators had so often lost money on western lands that they were hesitant to invest in Wisconsin real estate.²⁰ One of the eastern Strong siblings, George, captured this sentiment when he wrote to Moses on February 27, 1840. "The fact is," George said, "the western country is getting unpopular here."²¹

Central to the moral significance of Moses Strong's migration was the way in which he hoped to make his fortune in the West. Moses's western dream was not one of an agricultural, kinship-based community. True, family ties were important to Strong; he played an active role in effecting the migration of those siblings who followed him to Wisconsin. His economic aspirations were, however, rooted in capitalistic notions of personal gain. The particular nature of Moses's business only magnified the moral danger of his bid for economic success. Of the western enterprises that eastern moralists associated with individualistic depravity, one was especially sinful: speculation.

In the nineteenth century, as now, to speculate was to bet. When the elder Moses Strong cautioned his son about the dangerous habits of the West, he emphasized gambling above the rest. After warning young Moses of the perils of drink, Strong implored, "Above all leave off, square off, gambling, do not touch a card." While Strong was willing to admit that some games were innocent, he argued, "The world will not distinguish between those games which are innocent and those which are immoral."²² The patriarch did not reveal his stance on the moral implications of speculation. Perhaps, this was because he himself had massive landholdings.²³ What Moses's father did not say, his father-in-law did. When Dr. Green warned against Moses's western land interests, his statement that "speculations [were] like lotteries or gaming" was telling.²⁴ While speculation was legally sanctioned in antebellum America, it occupied a moral gray area. The enterprise was, after all, a form of gambling.²⁵ Considering the stakes, it was an especially risky one.

CAROLINE STRONG: LOVELORN WIFE

Moses Strong was not the only member of his family to experience disappointment when dreams of western fulfillment crumbled under the pressure of reality. Migration was no less a let down to Moses's wife. Caroline's dissatisfaction was not, however, primarily rooted in her economic circumstances. To Caroline Strong, migration was an experience of agonizing social dislocation and loneliness.

When Moses first traveled west, in 1836, he left his wife in Vermont. Caroline missed her husband deeply. Before she migrated to Wisconsin, she associated the West with her beloved Moses. If only she could be with him, she imagined, she might be less lonely. On June 7, 1836, twenty-three-year-old Caroline leaned against the western window of her bedroom in Rutland, Vermont, and penned a letter to Moses who was surveying land "west of everything."²⁶ As she wrote, Caroline expressed "some doubts as to the propriety" of sending her correspondence "to such an uncertain wanderer in the western wilds."²⁷ Her words reveal the mythic lens through which she perceived the West prior to her migration.

Caroline had mixed emotions about her husband's work in Wisconsin. She missed him dearly, but she also romanticized his travels. Caroline envisioned Moses "camping out on the prairie, or in some settler's cabin." She yearned to see her spouse, atop his saddlebag-laden pony, making his way "through the western wilderness."²⁸ She even pictured herself beside him. In a letter Caroline wrote on October 10 of the same year, she stated that she was determined not to let Moses "go off again so easily" without taking her along. Playfully, she threatened, "You may as well make up your mind to the burden of a companion the next time you go west."²⁹

In her letters to Moses, Caroline sketched the West as an exotic wilderness where she and he might someday share companionship and adventure. Caroline was, however, pragmatic about the prospect of migrating to the "wilds" of Wisconsin. As early as May, 1836, she began to negotiate the possibility of moving west. "With regard to my passing the winter in St. Louis," she asserted on May 5, "we will settle that matter when you come home." Caroline may have dreamed of the West as a place where she could be closer to Moses, but she knew migration would not necessarily end her loneliness. She articulated this awareness when she wrote, "I know I shall be lonely here, but should I see you any oftener there? That, you know is the principle deciding point." Caroline continued, "If you can say, yes often you will be there—then I will not hesitate to go."³⁰ Whether or not Moses gave his wife the assurance she requested, Caroline did not spend the winter of 1836-1837 in St. Louis. After Moses intimated that he planned to return to Rutland in the spring, Caroline opted to wait.³¹

As winter thawed, however, Moses realized that in order to protect his interests in Wisconsin mineral lands, he would likely have to stay in the territory throughout the remainder of 1837. When Caroline received this unwelcome news, she convinced Moses's father to escort her on a visit to Wisconsin. The West, as Caroline experienced it during this first trip, was not the romantic wilderness she had envisioned as she looked out of her bedroom window. She quickly developed a deep contempt for Wisconsin. It was a sentiment she would hold throughout the remainder of her life.³²

After Caroline's first visit to the West, she and Moses returned to Rutland, where the couple spent the winter of 1837. To Caroline's displeasure, Moses set his sights on attaining an appointment to public office in Wisconsin. He decided he would not return to the territory until he achieved this goal. On July 5, 1838, President Van Buren appointed Strong as the United States Attorney for Wisconsin. A little over one month later, Moses and Caroline departed from Troy, New York. They arrived at their new home in Mineral Point in late September.³³



Moses Strong Residence in Mineral Point

Caroline's life in Wisconsin was not characterized by romantic travels alongside her western "wanderer." Nor was her new home a place of domestic bliss. Migration did not exactly reunite Caroline with her husband. Even after the couple moved to Mineral Point, Moses's lifestyle remained peripatetic. His work caused him to travel frequently. On a Tuesday evening in December of 1840, Caroline chastised Moses for failing to write the previous Sunday. "I fully expected a *few lines* that evening," she scorned. "Do not neglect me again for it is my only comfort in my loneliness during your absence—I am indeed if possible more lonely [than] ever—with the exception of last winter." In the years that followed, Caroline's isolation continued to vex her. On March 6, 1843, she informed Moses of the depth of her dissatisfaction when she wrote, "It is very lonely when you are not here. . . I am sometimes tempted to wish we had never come west it is so lonely."

In addition to longing for Moses's company, Caroline missed her eastern friends and family.³⁴ Her feelings of separation were not anomalous. Sorrow and loneliness were common themes in the experiences of female migrants to the West. Moved by aspirations of economic and social betterment, men were often enthusiastic about migrating. Women, on the other hand, tended to be more reticent. Antebellum wives had loyalties to husbands and family networks alike. Migration could put such loyalties into conflict, forcing women to choose between their moral obligations to follow their husbands and their personal desires to remain near their natal kin.³⁵ The archetypal sorrow of isolated western wives, removed from their communities so their husbands

could pursue capital gain, lent credibility to the fears of those eastern moralists who believed that migration for the purpose of personal advancement posed a significant threat to family and community.

AGNES AND LUCY: WOMEN OF THE WEST

Western migration was not categorically disempowering to women. Some embraced and even catalyzed relocation. The West and its seeming ability to transform migrants' identities appealed to men and women alike. Reflecting this fact, some women's publications even depicted the West as a place where female migrants might achieve a degree of influence and power.³⁶ In contrast to Caroline's experience of loss, Moses Strong's sisters—Agnes and Lucy—embraced migration as a means of self actualization.

On May 31, 1838, Moses's youngest and dearest sister, Agnes, married his friend Samuel Ormsbee.³⁷ Immediately after the two were wed, Agnes began insisting on moving to Wisconsin.³⁸ She had already traveled to the West. Her father—the elder Moses Strong—had sent Agnes and Lucy to Chicago in the summer of 1836.³⁹ By the following spring, the two sisters were living in Milwaukee, where Caroline visited them during her first journey to the West.⁴⁰ Although Agnes subsequently returned to Vermont, she maintained an emotional attachment to Wisconsin. On June 22, 1839, she wrote a letter to Caroline in which she stated, "How I should like to see [Wisconsin] again."⁴¹ In stark contrast to Caroline's sentiment toward the West, Agnes wrote, "I am extremely anxious to go to that country to reside & hope Samuel will conclude to go."⁴² Unlike her sister-in-law, who had been reluctant to part with the East, Agnes could not wait to leave New England.

Agnes Ormsbee's eagerness to migrate was not lost on her husband. Between June of 1836 and the same month of 1843, Samuel Ormsbee wrote at least six letters in which he cited Agnes's "great anxiety to go west" as a primary reason for his own migratory intentions. On June 19, 1839, Ormsbee told Lucy and her husband, "[Agnes] is so very anxious to go west I feel it my duty to go as soon as I can." He explained, "I take but little comfort in being here as she will never be contented until she is settled in a log shanty in Wisconsin." Samuel went on to state, "I have fully made up my mind to go as soon as I can see my way clear."⁴³ It would take several years for Ormsbee to provide Agnes her western dream. Yet, she remained persistent, frequently reminding Samuel of her desire to relocate until, in June of 1843, Samuel Ormsbee finally booked the couple's passage to Wisconsin by way of "the Great Western [railroad]."⁴⁴

Long before Agnes finally settled in the West, Lucy and her husband, Samuel Hinman, made the Wisconsin community of Prairie Village, (alternatively Prairieville), their home. On December 11, 1839, Lucy and Samuel co-wrote a letter to Moses and Caroline. Whether or not Lucy had been as enthusiastic about migration as Agnes, it was clear that she regarded her western abode with a touch of romanticism. "I am very much pleased with our situation," she beamed, "I think it will make a handsome place in a few years, and the land is excellent—when will you come over and see us?" Lucy promised to entertain Moses and Caroline "with all due hospitality" in her "log-house." In Samuel's portion of the letter, he too deemed it worth mentioning the building material

of the couple's new home when he wrote, "We have got our land [&] have built a house (of logs)." Hinman stressed that the couple was living comfortably. "It is not much like what Lucy has been accustomed to," he admitted, "but she is apparently as happy as if it was Marble with furniture to correspond."⁴⁵ Samuel clearly admired the composure with which his wife embraced her unrefined surroundings.

As the stories of Agnes and Lucy demonstrate, the West was not only a place of isolation and sorrow for Euro-American women. It was also a land of opportunity. Just as male migrants sought to capitalize on western resources in order to elevate their socioeconomic positions, women could use migration as a tool to refashion their images and perhaps even gain some amount of power. Relocation often meant rougher living conditions for migrant women. Yet, the rustic character of prairie life held a degree of romantic appeal in antebellum society. Some women embraced the West's ruggedness for its perceived charm; note the almost fetishist fixation on log cabins in the aforementioned letters. Other antebellum women embraced the West as a place where they might reshape their public images.⁴⁶

By enduring the discomforts of western life with poise and fortitude, female migrants helped to reform antebellum ideas about gender. In early western Euro-American communities, it was virtually impossible for women to embody the cultural norms which Americans associated with domesticity. The idealized Victorian woman, delicate and refined, was poorly equipped to handle the strain of life in the West. Not only did western women live in cruder conditions than their eastern counterparts, but they also had to engage in more robust forms of labor. In adapting to their new circumstances, they exposed the elasticity of antebellum ideas about gender.⁴⁷

While western women did not generally reject Victorian values, they did sometimes tug at the conventional lines between masculinity and femininity.⁴⁸ During the middle of the nineteenth century, a trend in popular literature glorified western women's judicious adoption of traits that their society traditionally reserved for men. Literary journals and guidebooks praised the hardiness and fortitude of female migrants. In popular publications, a caricature emerged. The western woman was simultaneously heroic, brave, robust, resilient, resourceful, and perfectly ladylike. Sometimes, proponents of this hardy model of womanhood used overtly masculine language to describe the ideal woman. One western migrant, for example, told his mother that "a woman looks so much better when managing a house in a workman like manner."⁴⁹ Of this new type of American woman, the *Western Literary Journal and Monthly Review* conceded admiringly, "We admit they [are] masculine, if you term that masculine which [prompts] them to defend, aye die, for their husbands and their children."⁵⁰

The archetypal western woman could dabble in manly qualities without truly threatening the gendered fabric of American society. She was, after all, essentially wholesome. As the *Western Literary Journal* put it, female migrants were to act as "hand-maids in rearing a nation in the wilds of the West." To do so, they had to possess "those [attributes] which were the developments of their nature's purity, uninfluenced by the fashion and artifice of society." Thus, in the American West, women's sparing resistance to the gendered norms of Victorian society—norms that were themselves rooted in ideas about morality—could constitute moral authority, even power.

SAMUEL ORMSBEE: FAMILY MAN AND MORALIST

Agnes Ormsbee played an influential role as a catalyst of her family's migration, but her husband was not passive. Samuel Ormsbee likely wanted to relocate to Wisconsin for reasons other than—or an addition to—pleasing his wife. The economic fallout from the crash of 1837 had a disastrous effect on Samuel's financial circumstances. His story illustrates that although the economic climate of the late 1830s made eastern elites wary of sending their money west, the depression could incentivize men of middling status to consider relocating. Through westward migration, the young man hoped he might find a reprieve from the financial troubles of his recent past.

Samuel Ormsbee's perspective on relocation reflected the northeastern philosophy that the market economy and the American family could coexist in an idealized western community. During Ormsbee's early contemplation of westward migration, he envisioned an agricultural cooperative in which he could live with other members of the Strong clan. Through "industry and strict economy," Ormsbee fanaticized that he and his extended family might become "independent of the world."⁵¹

Among those with whom Samuel Ormsbee hoped to share his western paradise were Lucy and Samuel Hinman, the couple who migrated to Prairie Village in 1839. Like Ormsbee, Samuel Hinman was among the Strong clan's more morally inclined men.⁵² If the Ormsbees were to live near the Hinmans, the family group could function as a little colony, founded on virtue. In solidarity, Ormsbee reasoned, they would be better equipped to attend to their own religious needs. On June 19, 1839, Ormsbee pitched his idea of establishing a virtuous family community in a letter to Hinman. "We should be [a] society of ourselves & we could enjoy some religious privileges even at first," he exclaimed.⁵³



*Edward Dwight Eaton Chapel
(A late-nineteenth-century Wisconsin church.)*

Ormsbee's concern over finding religious camaraderie in the West was rational. During the first half of the nineteenth century, western communities had markedly different religious infrastructures than their eastern counterparts. Upon distancing themselves from the confines of eastern society, many Euro-American westerners shirked religious norms. To the dismay of their devout neighbors, some migrants opted not to observe the Sabbath. Even those who did hold the day sacred yearned for more codified means of celebrating their faith. Many western communities did not have formal places of worship. Mineral Point acquired

its first preacher as early as 1828 or 1829. Because the community did not yet have a church, this man had little choice but to deliver sermons in the confines of his small home.⁵⁴ Years passed before Mineral Point residents constructed a church. Erected in 1834, this twenty-four-by-thirty foot log structure was the first Protestant church in Wisconsin.⁵⁵ Thus, in the timespan between the initial movement of Euro-Americans into the Upper Mississippi Valley and their establishment of formal religious structures that resembled those in the East, pious migrants had to improvise means of satisfying their spiritual needs.

Although Samuel Ormsbee's moral values factored heavily into his vision of a western utopia, he knew that commercial success was the lifeblood on which his dream would thrive. Economic ambition was a powerful force in motivating Samuel's migratory aspirations. Economic reality was, however, a significant obstacle. On June 22, 1839, Ormsbee declared that he would migrate west as soon as he could "make any business" that would "support [him] & a little more."⁵⁶ Shortly after Samuel decided to relocate, an acquaintance offered to front him \$3,000 so he might purchase western land and farming equipment.⁵⁷ It is unclear why this opportunity fell through, but in September Samuel announced that because of the struggling economy he would have to postpone his family's migration. The economic consequences of the crash of 1837 likely incited Ormsbee's desire to move, while making migration all the more difficult. On September 5, Ormsbee promised Moses that "should the times change, so as to restore confidence," he and his family would arrive in Mineral Point the following spring.⁵⁸

The depression did not end in 1840.⁵⁹ Samuel continued to postpone his family's move, but he did not stop looking for a means to economically justify migration. In this quest, Ormsbee began to consider occupations with less moral legitimacy than farming. He even speculated in western lands. Given the persistence of the depression, these speculations became a burden to the aspiring migrant. In July of 1842, Samuel told Moses that he had decided to take advantage of bankruptcy law to free himself of this burden.⁶⁰ Between 1839 and 1843, Samuel ran through a sizable list of western enterprises in search of the perfect venture. Agnes participated in this process, suggesting the couple might operate a hotel as a means of making money. Ormsbee, was initially resistant to his wife's suggestion. To him, mercantile trade seemed a better option.⁶¹

In the winter of 1842 and the spring of 1843, economic instability continued to plague Samuel. An employee of the "Western Transp. Co.," he feared that "the general distress that had reached almost every business man" in the northeast would lead to his discharge. This time, instead of deterring Ormsbee from migrating to the West, his precarious economic circumstances served as a primary motivating factor. Again, Ormsbee considered becoming a merchant in Wisconsin. Writing to Moses on December 30, 1842, Samuel asserted that he and Agnes had "concluded to locate west very soon." Ormsbee told Moses that there was "no boy play in the matter" and that he was "determined to have a farm & to keep the best country *Hotel in Wisconsin*."⁶² By the time that Ormsbee booked his family's travel, six months later, he had discarded his plan to run a country hotel and farm. Instead, he determined to make his living as a merchant.⁶³

Samuel Ormsbee's story exemplifies the complex interplay between market capitalism and familial values in the narrative of Euro-American westward expansion. Unlike Moses, Ormsbee aspired to build his western life on the virtuous foundation of agricultural collectivism. Yet, in attempting to realize this ambition, he embraced economic schemes which had far less moral legitimacy than farming—going so far as to dabble in the morally questionable business of speculation. Even after his land investments bankrupted him, Ormsbee remained faithful to his dream. Economic reality, however, forced Ormsbee to be flexible when it came to the means of achieving his goal of migration. He and Agnes may have imagined their western lives against the sentimental backdrop of a quaint farm and country hotel, but the pragmatism of capitalist enterprise won the day when Samuel finally opted for mercantilism. Nonetheless, Ormsbee's attraction to the West was rooted in his perception that migration would benefit his family. To him, the West was not intrinsically immoral, and capitalism was not rooted in sin. Rather, Ormsbee saw the western landscape and the market economy as resources to aid him in achieving a domestic and moral ideal.

JOHN STRONG: PRODIGAL SON

Samuel Ormsbee was not the only member of the family whose western aspirations inspired much talk and little action over the course of years. John Strong, Moses's brother, also wished to make Wisconsin his home. Much like Samuel Ormsbee, John was motivated by economic push-and-pull factors. In December 1838, he told Moses that he was uncertain of the success of his Rutland business: "How much I have made I am unable to tell." John had decided that should his business be less prosperous than he hoped, he would "put off for the west."⁶⁴

Business in Vermont may have been more successful than John had thought, at least for a time. He did not immediately act upon his goal of migration and was still living in Rutland nearly five years after he first mentioned the possibility of migrating. Although John had not yet followed through on his intention to move to Mineral Point, the prospect was still on his mind. On May 18, 1843, he revealed his interest in the western mercantile trade when he wrote to Moses, asking his brother what goods might be in highest demand in Wisconsin. Like Samuel Ormsbee, John saw the West as a place where he could engage in a diverse array of enterprises. Not only did he consider mercantilism as a possible means of income, but he also contemplated going into the copper smelting business. John stated that he "should prefer an active out door business to selling goods." At one point during his perennial search for economic success, Strong even considered animal husbandry.⁶⁵

Unlike Ormsbee, however, John Strong did not aspire to channel western economic gain into the creation of a morally based agrarian community. Young John had a reputation for intemperance, and his western aspirations reflected his self-serving nature. To the rambunctious young man, the West represented a place where he might be freed from the constraints of Vermont's prudish lawmakers. On December 12, 1838, John wrote a letter to Moses in which he complained, "I do not like the ways of our people here &

they are growing worse.” Among his concerns was the fact that Vermont’s legislature had recently passed a law “prohibiting the sale of liquors.” Disgruntled by what he believed was a violation of his right to attend to his own business, John considered migrating to “some place where the people have a little more extensive views of matters & things”—some place like Wisconsin.⁶⁶

In addition to viewing the West as a place where he could avoid the restrictive influence of eastern policymakers, John believed that migration would enable him to assert his manliness. Dissatisfied with his social status in his hometown of Rutland, John told Moses, “I never shall be able to overcome the prejudice as that the people here have against me.” John resented that other members of his natal community looked upon him as “John Strong six years old & under.” The young man could not imagine gaining his birth community’s esteem, but in the West he could fashion a new image for himself. In Wisconsin, John could be “on par with others of equal talent.”⁶⁷ John’s attraction to the West was in a sense paradoxical. Although he hoped that through migration he might gain the social respectability that his birth community withheld, his desire to relocate was also a manifestation of his resistance to legislation against alcohol, a substance that may well have played some role in causing the prejudice that his eastern neighbors held against him.

THE FAMILY IN COMPOSITE

Central to the story of family migration into the Upper Mississippi Valley during the 1830s and 1840s were complex interactions between larger cultural themes and intimate personal experiences. The Strong siblings’ migration story illustrates that macroscopic social forces interwove with individual personalities and interpersonal dynamics to form the broad and complex story of Euro-American westward expansion. Family migration was, of course, only one facet of this story, but a significant one. The Strong family’s migratory narrative highlights universal themes while demonstrating the crucial significance of the idiosyncrasies of individual characters. Throughout this story, values of economy, identity, and family intertwine. Gluing the disparate tales of individual Strong-family migrants together is one overarching theme: the moral impetuses and implications of westward migration.

The Strong family’s migration was characteristic of the clash that occurred when traditional New English moral values concerning the preeminence of family and community collided with individualistic aims. Through the process of relocation, each of the family’s male migrants sought personal profit while maintaining kinship bonds with his brethren. The siblings looked to one another for emotional support. Their joint migration provided instant community in an unfamiliar setting. It also offered economic benefit. When members of the Strong clan wrote to one another, familial themes of birth, death, and the mundane experiences of daily life intermingled with business propositions and economic discourses. This amalgamation of economic and familial values was characteristic of the northeastern culture from which Moses and his siblings originated. Yet, the degree to which each individual prioritized family ties versus individual gain varied greatly.

The Strong family's migration story highlights the range of perspectives with which New Englanders conceptualized western opportunity and reconciled communal values with individualistic aspirations—moral standards with transformation. Some of the clan's migrants idealized the structures of community that they would form through migration, prioritizing familial and moral values. Others rejected domestic responsibilities and embraced migration as a means of attaining personal satisfaction and economic gain. Most members of the family hoped migration would elevate their status and provide them with opportunities to reshape their public images and self identities. Although the family's story highlights the moral tensions between commerce and community, it is not a narrative of virtuous agrarian communalists versus depraved capitalists. The migrants' interactions with themes of economy, identity, and family were reflective of their individual personalities as well as broader cultural values, illuminating the complexity of the collective westward migratory experience.

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln is one of the most important battles in history, yet it is relatively unknown. This battle, also known as the Battle of Lincoln 1217 or the Battle of Lincoln Fair, determined the fate of the English monarchy when it had almost collapsed. This battle was the military highlight for Sir William Marshal, a famous English knight. The battle was fought during a siege with Marshal's army breaking the siege and routing

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln:

Its Impact on Democracy, Feminism and Professionalism

by Thomas-James Trump

the numerically superior French army. The Battle of Lincoln further showcased the strength of Lady Nicola de la Haye, the noblewoman who led the defense of Lincoln Castle. This battle pitted a mixed force of knights, mounted men-at-arms, crossbowmen and infantry against a French army featuring a large army of knights. If the French had won this battle, the English monarchy would be lost, Magna Carta would have been destroyed, and the course of history would have been

Thomas-James Kaisch Trump is a current graduate student at the University of Colorado Denver in his third semester pursuing a Public History Major concentrating in Historic Preservation. Before moving to Denver, TJ obtained a Bachelor of Arts in World History, with Minors in Archaeology and Rhetoric of Inquiry at Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado. He is an autistic student and part Oglala Lakota Sioux. TJ is interested in Public History, Historic Preservation, Ancient Roman, Hellenistic History, Medieval History, and Military History. TJ plans to be a Public Historian, working on a variety of Historic Preservation and Research projects.

changed. Marshal's English forces won the battle, preserving the English monarchy, enacting the Magna Carta and leading toward the rise of democratic governments. The 1217 Battle of Lincoln is significant because it not only challenged medieval ideals and inspired modern concepts of democracy, feminism and professionalism, it also created governmental documents leading to the United States' development.

JOHN AND THE ENGLISH MONARCHY

The origins of the 1217 Battle of Lincoln can be traced to King John Lackland of England, his military incompetency and his tyranny and abuse of his subjects. King John inherited the throne of England after his brother Richard Couer de Lion (Lionheart) died fighting to regain certain sections of the Vexin and Maine, given to King Phillip Augustus of France by John, in exchange for help in seizing the English throne.¹ These sections of land helped defend Normandy, Maine, and Anjou – French lands controlled by the English. Even before John became king, he blundered and gave up land in order to gain power. Sir William Marshal and the Archbishop of Rouen had debated between John and his nephew by his immediate brother Geoffery, Duke Arthur of Brittany. Marshal succeeded in declaring John the heir, because England needed a grown man like John to rule and fight this war, and Arthur was only a boy.²

After John took power, Arthur staked his claim and civil war erupted between John and his nephew, who was supported by the French.³ The war was brutal and greatly weakened the English armies, resulting in the capture of Arthur. John locked Arthur in the castle in Normandy, where John either killed, or gave the order to kill, Arthur with William of Brionze as a witness.⁴ This act was cruel and denounced by many of his contemporaries for his cruelty. It was further cruel because John had eliminated a potential heir just out of the need to keep his power. This incident haunted him for the rest of his reign, but that was only the start of John's tyranny.

A main problem with John being king was that he was a terrible military commander. Normandy was later invaded by King Phillip, which King John tried to counter with flanking attacks with the Holy Roman Emperor and rebellious French barons. However, this resulted in the Battle of Bouvines, during which King Philip defeated the Holy Roman Emperor and the rebels.⁵ About to be outflanked, King John left Normandy and returned to England to gather more troops. This allowed King Phillip to pillage and capture all the castles of Maine, Anjou and Normandy. John tried several times to rally troops to relieve Normandy, especially to retrieve Chateau Gaillard, the castle Richard built specifically as a first line of defense, commanded by Roger de Lacy.⁶ The main relief force was defeated by the French fleet, and John left the castle to its fate. Chateau Gaillard was taken on March 6, 1204, and Normandy fell after that.⁷ This was a crushing blow to the monarchy since Normandy was part of England since 1066AD when William the Conqueror sailed from Normandy to conquer England.⁸ These defeats, and the cowardly retreat from Normandy, pushed the nobles to choose between serving John or Philip. It further made them lose faith in John as he was incompetent militarily.

Both during and after Normandy's conquest by France, King John humiliated, insulted and overtaxed his subjects, especially his nobles. Over the course of his reign, John became paranoid and mad, thinking that his enemies lurked around every corner.⁹ He further questioned the motives of England's barons, especially those who owned land both in England and in Normandy. Marshal was the most famous example, as he first received permission to negotiate a way to keep his lands in Normandy. Marshal was forced to pay homage to Philip for his Norman lands.¹⁰ This tactic was used to pit John against his nobles, because paying homage and acknowledging Philip as the overlord threatened the feudal relationship between king and vassal. King John was Marshal's natural overlord as King of England, but now Marshal's homage to Philip made him acknowledge two overlords. John was furious and accused him of treason. Marshal reminded John of his word and offered to fight in a trial by combat to prove his innocence.¹¹ Seeing that no one wanted to fight him, John forced Marshal from his court. He was not the only noble to be attacked or insulted by the king.

John's actions and policies, alienated and disturbed his barons and his subjects. He first utilized taxation as an important tactic to check the nobles, especially using the scutage. The scutage tax or shield tax was a tax that various nobles paid the crown to hire mercenaries. While the scutage was levied only four times by Richard, and eight times by his father, King Henry II, John levied five scutages by the end of 1204.¹² He further added heavy fines, just to pay the scutage, on all of his scutages and issued the scutages ahead of the campaigns. This was not common at the time. Richard imposed a similar fine once, but he only levied that with one of his scutages.¹³ In February 1207, John imposed a tax "set at one shilling in every mark" on all the goods and income of every Englishman.¹⁴ That tax became known as the Thirteenth, as thirteen shillings made up a mark and brought over £60,000 by September 1207.¹⁵ These taxes were unpopular because they hampered the poor masses by cutting into every mark they had, and depleted merchants of profits as their goods were all taxed. The nobles were enraged because their money, goods, possessions, and land were taxed, which deprived them of their wealth and, potentially, land. Though we have income and property taxes today, this standard and specific tax was overwhelming to medieval England and it exhausted his subjects financially.

King John further demanded the barons to send him some of their children as hostages. William of Brionze's wife immediately refused, stating "I will not deliver my sons to your lord, King John...because he basely murdered his nephew, Arthur, whom he ought to have taken care of honorably."¹⁶ This forced Brionze and his family to flee, with his wife and sons dying during the fall of AD1210. This angered many in England, as they did not expect one of their own to be pursued in such manner. On top of that, John was particularly harsh on the clergy. He seized their lands and brought them under the crown authority.¹⁷ He then captured all of their mistresses and ransomed them as well.¹⁸ This was unprecedented as John stole land given to the Church by his nobles.

MAGNA CARTA AND THE FIRST BARON'S REBELLION

The barons were furious with these abuses and many of them rebelled against John. They were supported by the clergy and townsfolk, especially the citizens of London. The clergy convinced the Pope to excommunicate John, allowing Philip to fight a holy war to “save” England.¹⁹ The nobles, clergy and townsfolk had to limit the power of the crown, before they shifted their allegiance to Phillip. The charter, originally the Articles of the Barons, listed the initial demands of the barons to John.²⁰ They were presented to John when he arrived at Runnymede on June 10, 1215.²¹ On June 15, John sealed the charter, which later became known as the Magna Carta.²² The Magna Carta protected the rights of all Englishmen, both noble and commoner. Two blows to the charter were dealt when the pope rejected it for threatening the divine right of kings, and John broke its clauses shortly afterwards because they limited his power.

This launched the First Baron’s Rebellion in 1215, where the rebel barons shifted allegiances to King Phillip. They planned to remove John from the throne and replace him with King Phillip’s son, Louis.²³ This is the worst scenario John could have faced because it could mean the end of the English monarchy. The French monarchy would then force French culture onto the English, destroying English culture, language and identity. John needed to win this war to ensure England’s future. However, John’s odds were stacked against him. The northern barons and most southern barons were up in arms against him, as well as the citizens of English cities, especially London. The Magna Carta granted “the barons of London” or its citizens the right to elect their own mayor.²⁴ This left John to control parts of the south, the west and the east. To top off his opponents, the Welsh decided to launch raids and potential signs of rebellion.²⁵ To counter this threat, John forgave Marshal of any potential wrongdoing and brought him back into royal favor. Marshal, one of the prominent barons in the Welsh marches, assigned himself to guard Wales.²⁶ John benefited from this because it allowed him to focus his troops on the rebels and crush them before the Capetian French arrived.

Though John had an initial advantage as king, the barons quickly gained the upper hand. London’s citizens quickly seized control of the town for the rebels and began to besiege the royal palace.²⁷ This was a harsh blow as London was starting to become the royal capital, though part of the government functioned at Westminster.²⁸ The rebels kept the royal army occupied, besieging Lincoln and other royalist castles. This strategy hinged on waiting for Louis to arrive with French troops. Shortly afterward, Louis launched his armada and successfully invaded southern England.²⁹ This boosted the rebel baron’s morale as both their candidate and reinforcements arrived to help launch major incursions. Upon Louis’ arrival, hundreds of nobles saw the tide of the war shift, and started abandoning John.³⁰ They abandoned their king to potentially gain new positions, favors and titles from Louis. As a result, more castles defected, forcing John to flee with the remnants of his army, sometimes off road to avoid detection. It was on this march that John caught an illness on the road. When John discovered he was dying, he created a will entrusting his sons, Henry and Richard, to Marshal, appointing him as their guardian. John later died in the royal fortress of Norfolk, Gloucester Castle, suffering from his illness.³¹ After King John’s death, the monarchy was on the verge of collapse. The stage was set for the Battle of Lincoln, as the fate of England hung in the balance.



Image 1: Scene from Matthew of Paris' manuscript describing the Battle of Lincoln, showing the English crossbowmen firing upon the French knights and the Count of Perche's death. "The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover." *De Re Militari*. <https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/> [Accessed June 29, 2017]. Also shown in a variety of sources on the topic including Thomas Asbridge's *The Greatest Knight: The Remarkable Life of William Marshal, The Power Behind Five English Thrones*.

PROFESSIONALISM: MILITARY AND POLITICAL EXPERIENCE

Word of the king's death was sent by messenger to Marshal ahead of Henry's party, along with the will stating the guardianship. Marshal was chosen as Henry's guardian for a variety of reasons. Marshal served the royal family for most of his life, first serving John's mother, Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine. He became the master-of arms and tutor to her son and the royal heir, King Henry "The Young King."³² Marshal served him faithfully, becoming his confident and closest advisor. After his death, Marshal went to the Holy Land briefly before he returned to England and served John's father, King Henry II "the Old King," and later his brother Richard. He even served as a justicar- an equivalent of a prime minister- in England during the Third Crusade and Richard's later imprisonment in the Holy Roman Empire.³³ Thus Marshal had been part of the royal family and had the experience to help administer England in Henry's stead. Marshal would also be chosen as Henry's guardian because of his military experience. By John's death, Marshal had fought multiple military engagements and campaigns in France, England, Wales and in the Holy Land.³⁴ He was also a renowned tourney champion and a cunning strategist, who could easily lead the war effort in the name of his king.

When Henry III met up with his new guardian, Marshal embraced him, pledged his undying loyalty and grieved with him. They headed to Worcester to bury John and decide the government and future plans for King Henry III. When John's will was revealed, it noted that Henry III was to succeed him and Marshal was his guardian, but John did not name a regent for his son. The Papal legate Guala suggested Marshal be named as the regent. There was no clear definition for a regent, as there had been no need for one prior to Henry III. Thus Guala, knowing the Marshal's experience and knowledge

of the government, chose him to help define the role without trying to seize too much power. The Marshal humbly refused to take up the position first, but then Guala met with him privately to discuss the matter more. Persuaded by Guala's reasoning, and by an absolution of all his sins, Marshal accepted the post and was accepted by everyone present as the regent.³⁵

After the regent was chosen, Henry III was knighted and coronated as king, with a more elaborate ceremony to occur when he came of age. This secured the king's legitimacy because Henry III could now outrank Louis. Louis was only a Prince who would rule England on behalf of France. Henry III became a king through his coronation, becoming England's leader and figure-head. Once Henry III was crowned king, Marshal immediately began to concentrate the loyalist forces and to dissuade rebel barons and troops from serving Prince Louis. Marshal sent messengers to proclaim John's death, Henry's coronation.³⁶ He further issued an edited version of the Magna Carta to all the barons.³⁷ These moves were a gamble by Marshal to gather more supporters, and demonstrate that Henry was different from his father John. The announcement of John's death and Henry's coronation explained how that John was dead, and a new government was in control. The 1217 Magna Carta secured the same rights as the 1215 Magna Carta, but it eliminated a variety of clauses limiting royal power, including the security clause.³⁸ This proved how different Henry's government was, as Henry showed his willingness to adhere to the Magna Carta's clauses. Many men and barons left Louis's cause and renewed their allegiance to Henry as King of England in Northampton.

While the army mustered in Northampton, Marshal and the royalists tried to plan their strategy in the war. The problem was that even with the new troops, the royalists were outnumbered. Furthermore, most of the keeps were still in French hands and the main castles such as Lincoln were still under siege, depriving Marshal of additional reinforcements. Marshal knew he had to meet the enemy head-on and win the fight to relieve the royalist castles. If he lost, England would fall and the royalists would have to surrender. If Marshal won a Pyrrhic victory, the royalist forces would be heavily depleted, unable to launch another counterattack. Marshal had to choose his battle wisely, or else the campaign would end in utter failure. Fortunately, an opportunity occurred when Louis decided he had to end the sieges of Dover and Lincoln quickly to crush royalist resolve.

Louis divided his massive army into two, commanding one half to march on Dover, while the other half he assigned to Thomas the Count of Perche, one of his commanders. Perche was to reinforce the rebel barons who had to break the siege of Lincoln temporarily.³⁹ By crushing those two sieges, they would eliminate two large footholds the English still had in the eastern half of England. If those were fall, hope for Henry to rule England would decrease rapidly. However, Count Thomas of Perche was barely known, and had minimal experience fighting in Phillip's conquest of Normandy and in the rebellion. The count may have known about the current tactics and techniques used, his lack of thorough experience, which paled compared to that of the royalist commanders, meant that he would either be cautious or be overconfident in his current situation.

After hearing the news of Perche's move, Marshal immediately decided that it was the most opportune time to strike. They would still be outnumbered, and the royalists would be forced to fight the enemy head-on. However, the battle would force the royalists to fight on multiple fronts, including a coordinated attack from the castle garrison. The battle could result in a clear victory for either side. Thus, the decision was made to relieve the siege of the castle and city of Lincoln.

PROFESSIONALISM: TROOP TYPES, CROSSBOWS, AND EQUIPMENT STANDARDIZATION

Marshal left Northampton for Lincoln with the royalist army, made up of a variety of different troops. One portion of the army was the knights and mounted men-at-arms, who formed the cavalry. Knights were elite warriors, trained to fight with the sword, lance, and other medieval weapons since they were young.⁴⁰ Armored in a full chain-mail hauberk, helm, and chausses, the knight is the most armored individual as well.⁴¹ Knights were considered to be a must-have in the medieval army as elite warriors. But they were targets for enemy troops to capture because knights were nobles worthy of being ransomed. This was because knighthood was achieved by the best warriors and granted them admission into the noble class.⁴² The knights received land from their lords in exchange for their service. The army featured larger numbers of men-at-arms, both mounted and infantry, levies, and crossbowmen.

The men-at-arms, both mounted and on foot, were professional soldiers that were part of a standard force. Men-at-arms were full-time guards and soldiers, paying for their armor and equipment.⁴³ Mounted men-at-arms were not knights, nor necessarily squires.⁴⁴ They were regular cavalry, with their ownership of a horse being a main factor. These cavalymen were not as well equipped as the knights they fought beside, but usually they could afford a mail coat.⁴⁵ These troops needed to supplement the knights, who were limited by their rank and privilege. The crown and baron's levies were usually peasants and townsfolk willing to fight at a minute's notice.⁴⁶ Their equipment was poor for peasant levies and their weaponry featured polearms, clubs and other tools they could find.⁴⁷

By contrast, the French army was predominantly made up of knights and men-at-arms. The Count of Perche's force also consisted of the rebel baron's knights and infantry. This contrasts with the Marshal's army as it featured mostly nobility compared to the range of troops the English fielded. France had been the birthplace of chivalry, developed through the first tournaments and The Young King, dubbed "the father of chivalry," spending time in France with other famous knights.⁴⁸ It would make sense that France would showcase armies of knights against its enemies. The English troops, by contrast, were more diversified. The men-at-arms were freemen, just like the crossbowmen and townsfolk that fought for Henry III. There were also fewer knights and nobility present, limiting their impact on the battle. Thus, infantry was pitted against a mostly knight army in the showdown in the streets of Lincoln.

IMPACT OF CROSSBOWS

A large contingent of 250-317 crossbowmen fought for the English, equipped with crossbows and a sidearm for close combat. Crossbowmen were highly valuable troops to have in a siege battle, as the crossbow's "slow rate of fires was particularly suited to use from fixed and protected positions."⁴⁹ This would be a hindrance on open battlefields, but when relieving a siege, crossbowmen were very useful when placed on Lincoln's walls. Positioned on the walls facing the city, they could rain fire upon the French and wreck devastation throughout the ranks. However the slow rate of fire was a major problem. The crossbow's string is permanently attached, thus the string could get wet during a rainstorm and weaken its draw. Furthermore a crossbow bolt can pierce solid plate armor from around 300 yards away.⁵⁰ This would be devastating as the knights in 1217 wore a chain mail hauberk with no or little plate armor. The crossbow's stock and trigger form two key components used in developing guns centuries later. The trigger can activate the igniting mechanisms quickly and the stock helped stabilize the weapon using the user's shoulder. In this way, crossbows played a big impact, both today and at Lincoln.

The crossbowmen were valuable troops. Many crossbowmen were listed individually on the Pipe Rolls, the lists recording the troops raised to fight in England's wars.⁵¹ This is significant because crossbowmen earned respect through their specialization at being able to fire a crossbow. John, in particular, loved having crossbowmen in his army. John awarded one master crossbowman nine ducats a day during the latter part of his reign and gave him, his companions and their wives brand new robes.⁵² Together, these crossbowmen and their comrades would help save England.

THE EQUIPMENT STANDARDIZATION

Whilst discussing the equipment of these troops, it is important to note that there was no specific uniform like in a modern military or in ancient Rome. However, medieval England did create a law regulating Englishmen's armor and weapons. The Assize of Arms of 1181, decreed by King Henry II, declared that all able-bodied freemen were to fight for the Crown when war broke out.⁵³ It also stated the minimum weapons and armor each freeman had to have. These amounts were:

Those who held a knight's fee or had over 16 marks (£10. 13s. 4d.) in chattels or income should possess a mail-coat, helmet, shield, and lance. Free men with over 10 marks (£6. 13s. 4d.) in chattels or income were required to own a mail-shirt (*albergellum*), iron cap and lance, which burgesses and the remaining freemen had to have a padded coat [or gambeson], iron cap and lance.⁵⁴

Additionally, the Assize asserted that knights “should have as many hauberks and helmets and shields and lances as they have knight fees within their lordship.⁵⁵ This law ensured that England would have every soldier to have similar equipment. Professionalism could be developed as the similar equipment meant the soldiers could be similarly trained. The knights had to have more equipment because of both their noble status and their job as the elite warriors. This English law ensured that Henry’s troops would all be properly equipped, a step towards professionalism.

THE LADY OF LINCOLN AND FEMINISM

Marshal’s troops mustered May 17-18, AD1217 and they marched for Lincoln the day after. Lincoln’s castellan, Lady Nicola de la Haye, had maintained custody of the castle through her father, Richard de la Haye and then her two husbands, William FitzErneis, and Gerard de Canville.⁵⁶ She was the eldest of three daughters, trained to lead troops and rule Lincoln castle in the name of the Crown, as her father had. Nicola was unique among medieval women as she was a landowner, royal official, and military commander. She and Gerard supported John’s claim and had lost custody temporarily of Lincoln castle by Richard the Lionheart.⁵⁷ The castle was restored to them when John became king, due to their previous support.⁵⁸ He even visited Lincoln in September 1216, and told her to keep holding the castle in his name. This showed the confidence John had for Nicola despite common ideas of gender roles at the time. Nicola often fought alongside her men, being described by her contemporaries as “a ‘noble woman’ who behaved ‘manfully.’”⁵⁹ Since warfare was considered a man’s activity, to depict a woman as behaving manfully by fighting her enemies is a huge accomplishment for women by proving they can fight well on the battlefield.



Image 2: Medieval manuscript image of a medieval noble women defending her castle from attackers. This image has been used in association with Lady Nicola de la Haye. British Library, shown on Murray, Joe. “Nicola de la Haye: The Woman who Saved England.” Visit Lincoln. Pub. March 8, 2017. <https://www.visitlincoln.com/blog/nichola-de-la-haye> [Accessed 3/5/18].

The first siege of Lincoln occurred in August 1216 by a force led by Gilbert de Gant, who had been recognized as earl of Lincoln by Louis. He took the city, but could not capture the castle. Nicola bought off a truce with Gilbert and he left the city to gather reinforcements.⁶⁰ This was a testament to Nicola's determination, as she held the castle against French and rebel forces. It was after this siege that John visited in September 1216. When he arrived, she offered him Lincoln's keys, to which John responded, "My dear Nicola, it is my desire that you continue to keep the castle until I order otherwise."⁶¹ John saw that she could defend Lincoln castle successfully and maintain control. His other castles either joined the rebels, or, most likely, were captured by the rebels. The second siege began in February 1217, when Gilbert captured the city again, but failed to breach the walls.⁶² This siege intensified after Louis's arrival and continued through John's death. Louis then sent the Count of Perche to Lincoln, to reinforce Gilbert and prevent Nicola from buying another truce. One chronicler remarked about how "a noble woman, by the name of Nicola, manfully defended herself," as she fought alongside her men.

Nicola can be seen as a feminist icon from medieval England based both for her leadership roles and fighting prowess. She ruled Lincoln Castle and administered the city and countryside. John not only allowed her to rule Lincoln, he appointed a new sheriff instructed to serve "under our beloved lady Nicola de la Haye."⁶³ Nicola helped open an important role as an administrator as she now enforced the royal and shire laws in both Lincoln and its countryside through the sheriff. Nicola fought alongside her men in both sieges, and in earlier sieges before John became king. In a conflict caused by John and Gilbert to seize more power from William Longchamp, Richard's chief justicar, Nicola was besieged in Lincoln by Longchamp and his troops. According to Richard of Devizes, Nicola had put "...aside her womanly instincts," and "she defended the castle like a man."⁶⁴ The fact that her defense of Lincoln was recorded on the same level as a man meant she can effectively lead troops against her enemies. Women were not supposed to fight, yet Nicola did so successfully. This made her an excellent castellan, who is in charge of the castle and defended it. Nicola's ability as a royal official, both as castellan and administrator, proved that women could lead armies and administer lands as well as men. However, she could only hold the castle in the 1217 siege of Lincoln for so long before she would be forced to surrender. Thus, Marshal was spurred to relieve the castle quickly.

THE BATTLE

Marshal's men marched against the enemy and prepared for the upcoming battle that would determine the fate of England. Prior to the march, Guala excommunicated the French and rebel soldiers, while lifting the indictment against John and England. This shifted the battle further because it turned the royalist cause into a crusade. The same advantage that Phillip utilized to launch his invasion was now used to unite the royalists to fight not only for England, but also for God. Roger of Wendover, an English chronicler at St. Alban's Monastery, wrote how "they flew to arms, mounted their horses at once and struck their camp rejoicing" once the men heard this news. The men marched to the city, stopping by Stowe for the night, which was eight miles away from Lincoln.



Image 3: Map of medieval Lincoln complete with battle maneuvers by Marshal and his commanders. Note the location of the castle and cathedral. Thomas Asbridge's *The Greatest Knight: The Remarkable Life of William Marshal, The Power Behind Five English Thrones*, pg 355.

The next day, they marched in “seven dense and well appointed battalions” towards the city. The marching order was described as:

...the crossbow men all the time kept in advance of the army almost a mile; the baggage wagons and sumpter-horses followed altogether in the rear with the provisions and necessaries, whilst the standards and bucklers [small, round shields] glittered in all directions, and struck terror into those who beheld them.⁶⁵

This must have been impressive to those who saw it. Upon hearing about the royalist host, the Count Thomas and the French laughed about it at first. However Robert fitzWalter and the earl of Winchester conducted reconnaissance on the royalists, and reported that “...we are much more numerous than they are...our advice is that we sally forth to the ascent of the hill to meet them.”⁶⁶ The count of Perche replied, “You have reckoned them according to your opinion we also will go out and count them in the French fashion.”⁶⁷ This highlighted the Count of Perche’s inexperience as he only trusted French military customs, instead of accepting those of his allies. The French conducted their reconnaissance, but were deceived by the baggage train and the troops behind it, along with multiple standards, to thinking that the English had more men. They blocked several of the gates, posted guards at others and continued the siege. This angered the rebels, who knew how to count their countrymen’s troops properly. Marshal planned this, as he knew that he could make his army appear larger by having troops on both sides of the baggage train and have multiple banners displayed throughout the ranks.

The royalist host camped out the walls of Lincoln and planned their assault. Marshal sent multiple parties to scout out Lincoln’s gates and walls. Lincoln was established on top of the Witham River’s northern banks, with “a circuit of ancient Roman walls running in an extended rectangle from the lower town, north up a steep slope – rising 175ft in less than three quarters of mile- to a long ridge.”⁶⁸ The walls connected to the twelfth-century Norman castle to the west and the cathedral to the east. ⁶⁹ This narrow city was perfect for a siege to surround the front of the castle, but could leave the rear unguarded. As the reconnaissance came back, Peter des Roches found “a sizable gate, in the northwestern quadrant, that had been blocked by masonry and rubble.”⁷⁰ Roches found no guards there and argued that the stone could be removed quickly if the work was not disturbed.

Marshal’s battle, based on this information, utilized the capabilities of his men and showcased decades of military experience. He first created a diversion by sending Ranulf of Chester, a baron of the Welsh Marches to attack the northern gate as the first attack of the day.⁷¹ Simultaneously, Marshal sent Faulkes of Breaute, a mercenary captain, to escort a large contingent of around 250 crossbowmen into the castle and position them on the walls facing the city to fire upon the enemy.⁷² This two pronged attack would divide the French efforts in half, diverting their attention from the northwestern gate. From there, the royalists would sweep into Lincoln and achieve victory. This plan utilized the effectiveness of the crossbows from castle walls to fire upon the enemy. It further used the military experience Ranulf and his fellow Marcher barons had to occupy the enemy. Without the two pronged diversion, the Battle of Lincoln would have been more costly.

On May 20, 1217, the Battle of Lincoln began, to determine the fate of England. Ranulf's charge came first hammering the northern gate with his troops, probably including some crossbowmen as supporting fire.⁷³ Meanwhile, Faulkes successfully led his men through a postern door into the castle where Lady Nicola greeted him.⁷⁴ The crossbowmen were led to the walls and told to wait until Ranulf launched his attack. The timing was crucial as if the crossbowmen attacked before Ranulf and vice versa, the diversion would fail. As Ranulf's charge was seen occurring from the castle walls, the crossbowmen unleashed a devastating attack on the French-rebel forces.⁷⁵ This two pronged attack, including the crossbow volleys, must have shocked the French because they were expecting an assault on the outside, instead of one from the interior. While these assaults occurred, the task of removing the rubble and debris from the northwestern gate occurred uninterrupted, until the gate was unblocked around midday.⁷⁶ The royalist forces could now enter the city at will.

Marshal planned for the royalists to conduct a massive charge through the city and crush the enemy. Once the gate was unblocked, Marshal, the knights, and the mounted men-at-arms assembled in front of the gate to launch the charge. There he enthusiastically ordered the charge, but a squire rode up next to him and reminded him to put his helmet on.⁷⁷ This scene appears humorous by this display of Marshal's old age forgetfulness, but the helmet could mean the difference between life and death. After donning his helmet, Marshal ordered the charge, and the royalists entered the city of Lincoln. Instead of turning left to assist Ranulf, Marshal led the charge, accompanied by his nephew, John Marshal and Peter des Roches, a warrior bishop, to the right and emerged in front of the castle.⁷⁸ At this point, the rebel cavalry, made of primarily French knights, was under fire, with their horses being "killed like pigs." Marshal's charge caught the enemy unawares. Marshal spurred his horse into the fray and, right before the English cavalry clashed with the French host, des Roches shouted "This way! God is with the Marshal!"⁷⁹ Demonstrating how unaware the French were about the attack, one French artilleryman manning a catapult, mistook Marshal's troops for additional French troops and prepared another missile to be launched at the castle. While he was about to load the catapult, the royalist knights "cut off his head without further ceremony."⁸⁰ If an artilleryman who saw the royalists did not suspect any new attack or breach, then the diversion went off brilliantly. Ranulf broke through the northern gate after the Marshal charged down the French and joined the melee in front of Lincoln Castle.

The battle of Lincoln turned into a frenzied melee, in front of both the castle and the cathedral. The castle garrison charged after the Marshal's charge breached the French lines, which further threw the French-rebel troops into confusion.⁸¹ They had not expected Marshal's charge nor, that Nicola and her men would move out to fight them. Here the enemy could not use overwhelmingly numbers to crush Marshal, but instead had to fight in a narrow courtyard flanked on both sides by buildings. In the midst of the fight, Robert of Roppesley pierced the royalist Sir William Longsword's body with a lance, only for Marshal to deal him "such a fierce blow between the shoulders that he almost knocked him to the ground."⁸² This highlighted how strong and skilled of a warrior Earl William Marshal was despite being seventy years old.

The Count of Perche rallied any immediate French troops and made a last stand in front of the cathedral. This was the high point of the battle because Perche knew he had lost and wanted to make a grand stand to be remembered or as an inspiration to his men to fight. Chroniclers note that many were “wounded and maimed, trampled on and beaten.”⁸³ This was due to the chaos around the last stand as well as the melee focusing on Perche’s position. Marshal’s own biographer noted how Marshal was the midst of the battle and the Count rained “three shuddering blows to the head...that left his helmet badly dented.”⁸⁴ Marshal’s helmet being dented by Count Thomas was not found in any other source, thus the biographer probably wrote it to increase the Marshal’s status and legend. One of Faulkes of Breauté’s knights, Reginald Croc, delivered a deadly lunge with his sword against Perche “through [the] visor of Thomas’s helmet,” through his eyeball and into his brain.⁸⁵ Thomas fell off his horse, while Reginald received grievous wounds, from which he died. Perche’s death was shocking as usually knights and nobility were often times captured and/or were well protected by their armor enough to survive a battle. After Perche’s death, the tide of the battle shifted.

The Battle of Lincoln turned from a frenzied melee into a riot after Thomas was killed. The French and rebel troops immediately fled down the hill to try and rally. However, Marshal and the royalists pursued them, breaking the partly-reformed French lines. As a result, many English rebel and French barons, knights, and noblemen were captured at the southern gate.⁸⁶ The rest fled from Lincoln, only to be harassed by English peasants who killed every French and rebel they could find.⁸⁷ This was a shocking defeat, as it resulted in the capture of valuable hostages and destroyed half of the French-rebel forces. If the Count decided to fight Marshal on the field, this might have ended differently. It is recorded that Count Thomas, Reginald, and the artillerymen were the three known documented casualties of the Battle of Lincoln on both sides.⁸⁸ I disagree though as that does not take into account the deaths of the horses, infantrymen and knights killed by the crossbows. The causality record furthermore does not mention the deaths of soldiers caused by the melee battle in front of the castle and the cathedral. Even in full armor, knights could be killed just like their infantry counterparts, even if they had better armor than the mounted men-at-arms. Despite the casualty records possibly being off, the 1217 Battle of Lincoln was the victory both Marshal and Henry desperately needed, saving both England and the English monarchy.

THE AFTERMATH AND IMPACT

The Battle of Lincoln changed the tide of the First Barons Rebellion, as well as England’s future. After the battle, the royalists sacked the city of Lincoln, slaughtering most of the residents and capturing the gold and silver in the cathedral.⁸⁹ The citizens, if they were royalists, could have waged guerrilla warfare in the city or fled to the castle. Instead, they allowed the French to besiege the castle. By doing so, the citizens rendered themselves as traitors to the royalist side. After the sack, the troops feasted and Marshal rode all the way to Northampton to personally deliver the news of the victory to Henry.⁹⁰ As Marshal led the royalist forces and was Henry’s regent, he felt he should

deliver the news personally instead of through a messenger. News reached Louis in London through a handful of French stragglers and he called for further reinforcements. Those were defeated at the Battle of Sandwich, a key naval battle.⁹¹ Had the French won at Lincoln, the Battle of Sandwich would not have been fought. After that, Louis returned to France and later signed the 1217 Treaty of Lambeth, ending the First Baron's Rebellion. This fulfilled Marshal's plan because the royalists brought Louis to the table and got him to leave for France. The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmund's Abbey noted that because of the treaty, "the great gift of peace was granted once more."⁹² This shows how the English, or at least the abbey's monks, were tired of the conflict and wanted Henry to win, because otherwise the chronicle would have not state great peace if it was neutral or if it leaned towards Henry. It would have instead said peace or a regretful peace or something similar. Furthermore, the English began to identify themselves as Englishmen and developed their own culture. This must have been inspired by Louis being unable to conquer England as well as the loss of Normandy. This shift was an indirect impact of the Battle of Lincoln rather than a direct one.

England experienced the immediate impact of the Battle of Lincoln in other ways as well. The rebel barons renewed their allegiance towards King Henry III of England, a political move by Marshal to further show Henry's new governance. King Henry III made them sign the 1217 Magna Carta, and then continued to send subsequent versions of the Magna Carta throughout the rest of his reign.⁹³ This was a major development because it showed that the monarch had to rely on his vassals as much as he relied on them. In addition, Parliament first operated as a council of lords and bishops who voted on laws and measures issued by the monarch, before becoming the legislative body of government for England and Great Britain.⁹⁴ This created a two-branch government that limited the monarch's powers, as the king had to gain Parliament's approval for taxation, war, laws and other actions that normally belonged to him. This can be seen as a step toward democracy in the medieval world, where monarchs, lords and knights reigned supreme. English nationalism was established as Englishmen of all backgrounds fought at the Battle of Lincoln and saved England, preserving their culture, laws and customs, and stopped a French conquest of England. If Louis had won at Lincoln, French law and culture would be firmly established, while English culture would be destroyed. As it was, Louis was driven out while England established its own unique government and identity.

The battle impacted the United States, even though it was fought in England. The Magna Carta, which was preserved thanks to the Battle of Lincoln was the inspiration for the Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution. The Declaration of Independence was a list of grievances against King George III, just like the barons wrote their concerns and demands against King John. The US Constitution establishes the balance of power between three branches of government.⁹⁵ This is similar to the two branch government created in medieval England after the Battle of Lincoln, because the power is not focused on one man. Parliament was the legislature while the king was the executive and judicial branch. The fight to preserve Magna Carta probably inspired our Founding Fathers to fight for the rights of all men. The Magna Carta's Clause 39, stating how freeman were not to be arrested, imprisoned or ruined unless he broke the law or

by a trial of his peers, finds its equivalent in the US Bill of Rights' Sixth Amendment, which calls for a "speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury."⁹⁶ Both emphasize a trial by jury and that they both insist the legal standing of innocent until proven guilty. Clause 39 further attacks John and absolute monarchy because John just accused and punished his subjects without a trial of their peers.

CONCLUSION

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln was significant both to England and the modern world in a variety of ways. It did not just change the powers of the English monarchy, but impacted the United States as well. The 1217 Battle of Lincoln preserved the Magna Carta, which later influenced both the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution. Professionalism was demonstrated throughout the events of the Battle of Lincoln. Sir William Marshal was the most qualified English earl with the political and military experience necessary to not only serve as King Henry III's regent, but to lead the royalist army. The English army was composed of multiple troop types, including crossbowmen. The English implemented The Assize of 1181 which guaranteed the royalist troops had the minimal equipment necessary to fight at Lincoln, thus providing a step toward standardizing the equipment of England's troops. The Battle of Lincoln showcased a battle that pitted the well-equipped English army, utilizing infantry, crossbowmen and cavalry, against a French host predominantly made up of knights. Lady Nicola through her administrative capabilities, her unique status as lady and castellan of Lincoln, and her martial ability to lead her men into combat and to successfully defend the castle, proved how women can fight and govern successfully, if not better than men, when she defended Lincoln alongside her men during the February 1217 siege, and the 1217 Battle for Lincoln, shocking medieval contemporaries in the process. The 1217 Battle of Lincoln was a major event that inspired an English identity, as well as English nationalism. This battle is one of the most significant battles in England and the medieval world because it inspired the development of modern concepts and the United States, while also challenging the medieval ideals.

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln saved the English monarchy when it was on the brink of destruction. This battle was the military highlight for Sir William Marshal. The battle resulted in Marshal's royalist army, a mixed force of knights, mounted men-at-arms, crossbowmen and infantry, breaking the siege of Lincoln castle and routing a French army at least twice its size and comprising mostly of knights. The Battle of Lincoln demonstrated the bravery, martial ability, and leadership of Lady Nicola de la Haye, the castellan of Lincoln Castle, who held the castle against multiple sieges and fought alongside her men. If the French had won this battle, history would have changed as the English monarchy would be dismantled and Magna Carta would have been destroyed, and the course of history would have been changed. Fortunately, Marshal's English forces won the battle, preserving the English monarchy, enacting the Magna Carta and leading toward the rise of democratic governments. The 1217 Battle of Lincoln is important for historians to study and learn about because it challenged medieval ideals, inspired the concepts of modern democracy, feminism, and professionalism.



Left: Nathan C. Meeker. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nathan_Meeker#/media/File:Meeker.jpg
Right: White River Ute Chief Jack. <https://truwestmagazine.com/bloody-siege-at-milk-creek/>

On September 10th, 1879 on a remote Indian reservation in Northwest Colorado, White River Agency federal Indian Agent Nathan C. Meeker frantically put pen to paper to inform his Washington based superior of imminent danger. In a pithy two-sentence telegram to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra A. Hayt, Meeker wrote “I have been assaulted by a leading chief, Johnson, forced out of my own house and injured badly.” Prior to the assault, Meeker, following orders from his superiors in Washington, had insisted that the Ute Indians

Plowing up the Middle Ground:

The Meeker Massacre, Indian Agents, and the late 1800s Federal Assimilation Campaign

by Sam Irving

under his charge abandon their equestrian hunting lifestyle for that of settled agriculturalism. He ordered his employees to plow up a favorite Ute horse racing track and convert it into cropland. In response, Ute chief Johnson took the aging agent by the shoulders, gave him a few brisk shakes, and let him know the depths of his opposition to such an attack on ancient tribal traditions. In a very prescient last line of his telegram Meeker wrote “the opposition to plowing is wide; plowing stops; life of self, family, and employés not safe; want protection immediately.”¹ Two weeks after he sent that

Sam Irving recently earned his Master's degree in History at the University of Colorado Denver. His focus was on the American West and U.S. foreign policy. Sam's earlier work was featured in the Spring 2014 edition of this journal. He also presented at CU Denver's Spring 2017 Research and Creative Activities Symposium. Sam is a social studies teacher at Golden High School.

correspondence, Meeker's body lay mutilated outside his agency home, his wife and daughter were being held captive by the Utes, and the bulk of the active U.S. army was on the march towards the White River Agency.

By 1879, the Ute Indians had already ceded most of their Rocky Mountain homeland to the U.S. Government and settled into two reservations in Colorado and one small reservation in Utah. Nathan Meeker served as an agent to the White River Utes in the northernmost Colorado reservation for approximately one year before sending off the frantic telegram above. Following Meeker's death, Ute warriors and the U.S. Army engaged in one of the longest U.S. v native battles in American history. The conflict came to an end in October after calls for peace from both Ute and U.S. leaders and the captives were returned. For the Utes—both those responsible for Meeker's death and several bands that had nothing to do with what became known as the Meeker Massacre—this incident led to their removal from the larger Colorado reservations to much smaller tracts of land in Utah and along the Colorado-New Mexico border.²

While violent encounters between the army and natives in the late nineteenth century American West were relatively common, the murder and mutilation of Nathan Meeker and the detainment of the white women at the agency gripped the nation. Newspapers wrote of Meeker as a philanthropist of the highest moral fiber. Conversely, reporters portrayed Utes as savages and created a national narrative that served to ultimately justify Ute removal.³ But what exactly did Meeker do to stir up such animosity amongst the Utes in his agency? What specific actions led to this massacre that struck Americans as so uniquely abhorrent? Most importantly, what larger forces were operating on both sides of the conflict leading to Meeker's death? Somehow in the brevity of his telegram Meeker encapsulated the expanse of the wider cultural assault that was to wash over reservations across the country under the late 1800s federal assimilation campaign. Leaders in Washington placed Indian agents like Meeker on the front lines of this cultural conflict.

Although not garnering a significant amount of scholarly attention, the Meeker Massacre has been the focus of several monographs over the past few decades. It has also received a few pages in several macro level Western histories.⁴ Throughout the historiography, a general consensus seems to have emerged amongst the various treatments of the causes and events leading up to the bloodshed. Authors have emphasized Nathan Meeker's character as the catalyst of the confrontation. In these descriptions of Meeker, the words idealist, fanatic, stubborn, and zealot permeate the literature. This characterization has proven quite stable. It appeared in the earliest texts of the 1950s and still remains in most recent monographs published in the last few decades.⁵ Various scholars have quite aptly analyzed how Meeker attempted to transplant the agricultural utopian vision of his Union Colony to the White River Ute Agency. Historians also highlight the intransigence with which he set about his work. Indeed, given this emphasis one might be led to believe that Meeker's idiosyncrasies are fully to blame for this brutal event that looms large even amongst a much greater history of tragic encounters between natives and the westward expanding American nation.

While there is no doubt that Meeker's abrasive personality and unbending will caused much friction between himself and the White River Utes, it is also valuable to consider the larger system of which he was but one actor. Meeker entered the Indian agency in 1878, just as policymakers in the capital began implementing their assimilation campaign. Although warfare between natives and the U.S. military was not uncommon, a shift in policy from military to assimilationist means of engaging with natives gained support in the last few decades of the 1800s. By the time Meeker entered the agency, agents could no longer subsist by simply keeping natives out of the way of railroad construction. The agency in Washington had placed a heightened emphasis on eliminating native culture to solve the "Indian problem" once and for all. President Grant's 1868 Peace Policy that replaced corrupt agents with missionaries who could convert natives to good Christian farmers perhaps best represents this shift. While Meeker's post began just after Grant's term, his beliefs and vision for the Utes were very representative of this assimilationist turn. Looking forward, Meeker's stubborn insistence upon agriculture at the agency was a precursor to the 1887 allotment policy that would split up reservations across the country into individual farming plots. The Secretary of the Interior that Meeker served under had begun formulating this larger policy when he purposefully selected Meeker for the post due to his agricultural expertise.⁶ Thus, Meeker's background and belief system made him a very apt agent to represent these larger federal policies.

While the rhetoric behind this shift in policy was much less bellicose, put into practice these policies were just as confrontational as previous military engagements. At this time, belief systems replaced bullets as the preferred means of waging war. Native culture was put into the crosshairs and Indian agents advanced to the front lines. Armed with a conviction in the civilizing powers of agriculture, Meeker was absolutely in line with these assimilationist policies. With these larger federal policies in mind, Meeker's intransigence in combating Ute equestrian culture seems much less idiosyncratic. Whereas previous monographs have emphasized the individual characters and particular actions leading up to the Meeker Massacre, this study will analyze these same events but as part of a whole, much larger cultural confrontation between Ute and U.S. society. This study will emphasize how the federal assimilation campaign increasingly hamstrung the frontier flexibility of Indian agents as the central bureaucracy pushed against Euro-Native relations on the reservations with increasing force.⁷ From this wider scope, individual eccentricities seem less impactful than the larger societal forces operating on natives and agents during the assimilationist years of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Euro-native borderlands. This study will show how assimilation changed the role of the Indian agent, how agents increasingly became combatants in the culture war, and how the Bureau of Indian Affairs became increasingly centralized and left no room for agents to engage in cultural negotiation. Throughout, this paper will situate Meeker's actions within these larger bureaucratic changes. Finally, this study will connect the particular confrontation between Meeker and Ute Chief Johnson discussed above to the larger cultural conflict from which it stemmed so as to detail the cultural conviction behind Ute actions as well as Meeker's.

I. HARDENING BORDERS, HARDENING BUREAUCRATS: THE U.S. AS APPROACHING CULTURAL HEGEMON

During the first half of the nineteenth century the Indian agent operated along a much more flexible frontier than in the latter half of the century. At that time, the American West was still a space contested between settlers and various native tribes. The Indian Wars did not fully come to a close until Geronimo finally put down his rifle in Arizona in 1886.⁸ Even after, with the consolidation of the reservation system, borders in the American West were still not hardened lines. Treaty language generally stipulated tribal hunting rights beyond the reservation borders. Further, lines on Euro-American maps often meant very little in the minds of the more bellicose younger men who rejected reservation life. For these warriors, agreements made by aging chiefs had no bearing on their relation to the land. Hence, both cultural conflict and accommodation still played out between various societies in this heterogeneous zone of contact.

Along this more contested, negotiated space early 1800s Indian agents operated with the autonomy and flexibility requisite to maintain a cultural middle ground between the burgeoning United States and the various Native American societies cohabitating the North American West.⁹ Whereas historian Richard White famously depicted how Europeans and Native Americans negotiated a cultural middle ground on equal footing around the Great Lakes prior to the War of 1812, Anne Hyde has more recently detailed how a similar phenomenon operated in the American West until at least 1860. In her critically-acclaimed 2011 *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the North American West, 1800-1860*, she wrote of “a mixing of worldviews and ideologies in an often uneasy ‘middle ground’ that lasted far longer and with different outcomes than we have imagined.”¹⁰ She discussed how the fur trade brought Native and European Americans together as biracial extended families making a living, if not a fortune, navigating the complex relationships forged along the fur trading frontier. Many of the pre-assimilation era Indian agents were themselves former fur traders intermarried into tribal kinships bonds.¹¹ This melding of governmental duties and personal business interests has received much attention as a precursor to the notoriously corrupt Indian ring in which agents amassed much wealth through graft and corruption. It is also important to note, as Hyde did, that these flexible middle ground relations between agents and natives worked towards cultural accommodations.

Noted frontiersman Kit Carson certainly fit into this intermingled, multicultural space when he was appointed Ute agent in 1853. He married two native women and forged kinship bonds that helped facilitate trade in his earlier business endeavors that later gave him clout as a respected voice amongst the tribe as Indian agent. Since Carson served the agency prior to the assimilation campaign, he had no school or mission to promote cultural assimilation. He was not heavily pressured by his superiors in Washington to make good Christian farmers out of the natives in his agency. His only charge was to stop Ute raiding by providing them annuity goods and payments.¹² With this less stringent task, the flexibility to set about his work, and the multicultural personal relationships needed to maneuver the mid-1800s American West, Carson proved quite successful as an Indian agent in the decades just prior to the assimilation era.

As the U.S. fully consolidated its hold on the American West after the Civil War, frontier relations between agents and tribes shifted. When relatively equal power and trade relations ceased to exist, the middle ground gave way. The dominant group assumed control of natural resources and asserted cultural hegemony upon the land and people. By viewing Meeker's strained relationship with the White River Utes leading up to the massacre as a result of the federal assimilation campaign, the cultural conflict that occurred on the individual level all across the late nineteenth century U.S.-Native borderlands is visible. Whereas Kit Carson's middle ground rested upon a foundation of mutual dependence and somewhat equal power relations, the ground upon which Meeker laid dead was loose soil, plowed up by a burgeoning continental power no longer in need of cultural accommodation to survive. By 1879, the United States had long since ousted any competing nation, European or native, to become the dominant power in North America. It had also more recently ended the Civil War, which allowed the new nation to march westward as a united front. While no Western native nation stood as a competing power, several smaller tribes and bands still resisted the reservation system though the Indian Wars were coming to a close. Given this domination, the U.S.-Native frontier was rapidly giving way to a bordered land in which native culture, if not natives themselves, had no place. Anne Hyde noted that "building relationships with Native people, so crucial to the world of trade, became anathema in the last part of the nineteenth century. The concentration of power in one nation, the United States, would hasten this process."¹³ Within this inequitable power structure, the Indian agent found his room for autonomous actions increasingly boxed in by a bureaucracy no longer in need of cultural accommodation. It was within this more rigid framework that Meeker entered the agency.

II. ASSIMILATION ERA INDIAN AGENTS: SOLDIERS IN THE CULTURE WAR

The late 1800s was a time of transition in federal Indian policy. As natives were rapidly becoming less of a military threat, the use of the army to solve the "Indian problem" became increasingly criticized. Reports of atrocities such as the Sand Creek Massacre gave support to those in favor of a cultural campaign to incorporate natives into white society. Whereas the Civil War had split the country north-south, the debate over federal Indian policy split the nation from east to west. Easterners were increasingly advocating assimilation while western states, still facing tribes hostile to white incursions on their reservation lands, were largely in favor of military means. Eastern assimilationists, however, began to hold sway over federal policy. Grant's Peace Policy reduced military measures and brought eastern religious reformers to the Indian agencies to set natives on the path to civilization.¹⁴ Meeker, while nondenominational, fit this bill, hence his agency appointment. Given the heated debate between assimilationist tactics and military means, these new agents set about their task with a zeal indicative of their religious conviction and a drive to prove the efficacy of their actions. As both idealist and agricultural expert, Meeker was clearly an apt front line soldier in this assimilation campaign.

Viewing Meeker's character as part of this new federal approach, one sees not an isolated example of stubbornness but an exemplar of a larger policy of supplanting native culture with that of the United States. Meeker's idealism was exactly what Washington leaders wanted in Indian agents on this new cultural crusade. Agents were no longer tasked with keeping natives out of sight and out of mind on reservations to the west. Their new charge was to tame the cultural frontier that kept native hostilities festering, natives on the federal dole, and reservation lands out of reach of white settlers. It stands to reason that individual hostilities would have developed between Meeker and Ute leaders given the cultural conflict inherent to all agents charged with acting out this peace policy.

III. INDIAN AGENTS AS THE TIP OF THE SPEAR: THE CENTRALIZATION OF THE INDIAN BUREAU

Earlier Indian agents operating on a middle ground benefitted from flexibility and spontaneity in decision making so as to make accommodations across cultures. The Bureau of Indian Affairs of Meeker's time, however, was a much more centralized bureaucracy. If the cultural confrontation was to be won, the BIA needed to be converted into an efficient fighting machine, as opposed to a collection of individual agents making ad hoc decisions. Further, the looseness with which agents engaged with natives seemed to be a breeding ground for the infamous corruption of the Indian ring.

Immediately after taking the position of Secretary of the Interior in 1877, Carl Schurz set about reforming the BIA. President Grant's Peace Policy sought to replace corrupt Indian agents who had so famously defrauded natives for personal gain with selfless Christian missionaries to uplift natives in a godly pursuit. Schurz also sought to remove the laxity with which agents answered to the central agency. He introduced civil service rules, conducted inspections of agents and agencies, and worked toward streamlined communication from lower employees to himself and Commissioner of Indian Affairs Ezra A. Hayt.¹⁵ With these reforms in place, Schurz hoped to eliminate corruption and unify the new assimilationist approach from Washington all the way to White River and other remote agencies.

These reforms, however, clearly worked in the disservice of agent autonomy in dealing with local dilemmas. Meeker, as a model employee, wholeheartedly adopted this centralization of authority and sought to leverage the weight of the entire Washington-based apparatus in his favor. Secretary Schurz was a major proponent of agriculture and hired Meeker due to his agricultural expertise. In implementing this central directive, Meeker moved the White River Agency buildings to a location with more direct sunlight at a lower elevation. The Utes were against this move because they used this area as a horse pasture. To justify his decision, Meeker made an appeal to central authority. In a letter to Colorado Senator Henry Teller, Meeker boasted how he "told Douglass and other leaders that the Commissioner would get a 'heap mad, by and by,' and they had better not object to moving."¹⁶ He threatened the same to induce the Utes to help dig irrigation ditches at the new location. Clearly Meeker sought to awe the Utes with the strength of the U.S. government. Meeker's numerous appeals to central authority were part of a larger bureaucracy pushing a rigid chain of command. His actions were

in line with the top-down systemic reforms initiated by the Secretary of the Interior as the entire agency approached natives on unequal ground.

While in line with the reforming Bureau of Indian Affairs, Meeker's constant appeals to central authority created tension between himself and the Utes. Along with highlighting Meeker's idealism, White River blacksmith Albert Woodbury noted that "whenever a difficulty arose, he would ask Washington for instructions, instead of settling it himself. The Indians did not like this."¹⁷ After the massacre, Ute chief Nicagaat fumed to his captive Josephine Meeker that her father was constantly threatening his tribe with soldiers if they did not conform to his orders.¹⁸ Due in part to the dispute between the war and military departments over control of Indian affairs, Meeker's military requests were not always met. His requests to Schurz for agricultural equipment, however, were fulfilled at a level well beyond that of a typical request from agent to secretary. It seems here Meeker was on the frontier of the bureaucratic centralization happening in Washington. On this new frontier, the momentum of a burgeoning global power pushed behind Meeker as he set into supplanting Ute culture. Once again Meeker's actions reflected the larger shift towards cultural conflict.

In this new conflict, agents were instructed to follow central directives to the letter. Indeed, Meeker's immediate predecessor at the White River Agency, Pastor Edward Danforth, was relieved of his duty due to laxity in following orders. Pastor Danforth received the White River Agency post under Grant's Peace Policy. In a letter to the Secretary of the Interior in 1878, Commissioner of Indian Affairs E. A. Hayt complained that Danforth allowed the Utes to "wander off the reservation." Given Danforth's laxity in enforcing mandates that came from his superiors in Washington to tie the natives to the land as agriculturalists, Hayt contended that he was "generally inefficient" and needed to be replaced.¹⁹ Danforth's removal further exemplifies how the bureau was streamlining and cutting out the slack that once allowed agents more flexibility in engaging with natives.

IV. FROM PASTURES TO PLOWSHARES: UTE EQUESTRIANISM V. AGRICULTURAL SEDENTARISM

The central way Meeker eliminated the middle ground was also the most literal. As Ute Chief So-wa-wick testified in the aftermath of the massacre, "the whole question was about land."²⁰ The personal conflict between Meeker and Chief Johnson—referenced in the telegram quoted on the first page of this study—was due to Meeker's insistence upon plowing up the Utes favorite horse pasture for cultivation. Within this minor confrontation lay the larger confrontation inherent to federal assimilationist policies. While the centrally-imposed intransigence of the Indian agent during assimilation is crucial, the story of the Meeker Massacre would be incomplete without a consideration of the ancient cultural forces that pushed back at these federal front-line soldiers.

If Meeker's stubbornness about implementing the will of his superiors in Washington made White River an especially heated battle in the culture war, the power and rootedness of Ute equestrian culture in their ancestral homelands of the Rocky Mountains was equally important. The Utes had centuries of ancestry rooted in the soil Meeker put to the

plow. Rock art found throughout Utah and Colorado provides evidence of a prehistoric Ute occupation.²¹ While the BIA's cultural combine sought to uproot Ute equestrianism, the Utes adoption of horses preceded even the most well-known mounted tribes of the plains and gave their Rocky Mountain lifestyle much deeper roots than American settler colonialism. The Utes had been traversing their homeland on horseback for three centuries prior to Meeker's appointment. As a result of their close proximity to New Spain, the Utes were one of the first native tribes to acquire horses and employ them in the full exploitation of their environment.²² Given the centuries-old relationship the Utes had with their homeland and their horses, their dogged resistance in the fight to keep their ponies is understandable.

The Ute's relationship with the horse consisted of more than simply the duration of time they have been acquainted. It seems they also developed an especially powerful spiritual relationship with horses and the Utes never considered horses a source of material nourishment.²³ They went well beyond abstaining from eating horse. They tended to the every need of their equine companions. When vacationer Samuel Bowles wrote of his 1869 trip to Colorado territory, he made note of witnessing Utes put their sick horses in the hot springs of Middle Park for the healing qualities of the bubbling baths.²⁴ Their spiritual attachment extended beyond the grave. When Ute chiefs died they were buried in caves with their favorite horses for transportation in the afterlife.²⁵ Ute horses were not beasts of burden used only to augment hunting and warfare capabilities, they were pampered pets beloved by their owners.

Given the value Utes placed on ponies, Meeker's orders to dismount Ute warriors and arm them instead with farming equipment was indeed a fundamental blow to Ute identity. The Utes themselves gained social status commensurate to their horse herds. Bowles further noted that "their wealth consists in their horses."²⁶ Thus when Meeker sought to reduce Ute horse herds in the interest of promoting agriculture, he was taking aim at a fundamental component of Ute culture. Meeker set about establishing individual plots on the Utes horse pastures as a precursor to the burgeoning allotment campaign that Schurz was formulating to sever the collective tribal ownership of hundreds of thousands of acres.

Just as westward expansion followed a path paved in broken treaties, Meeker disregarded Ute ownership of their ancestral lands in the interest of completing his assimilationist assignment. When land-use conflicts such as the one that precipitated the massacre occurred, Meeker constantly fell back on the false claim that as Indian agent the land was rightfully his to do as he pleased. Recalling one such dispute, Ute Chief Douglass noted that Meeker told him "that anyhow the land was not ours,...that the land was bought by the government with blankets and such things."²⁷ Meeker's move of the agency buildings to a lower elevation with more exposure brought him into conflict with Chief Nicagaat. Fully cognizant of his tribe's rights, Nicagaat told Meeker that "the site of the old agency had been settled by treaty, and that [he] knew no law or treaty that made mention of the new site."²⁸ Meeker ignored Nicagaat's legitimate appeal to treaty stipulations and followed his orders to assimilate. He imposed the office in Washington's preferred use of Ute land in the same way that general allotment would

soon force lands in severalty against the will of natives across the country. Thus the land dispute was yet another way that Meeker came into conflict with the Utes in his role as assimilationist Indian agent.

Converting Ute horse pastures to farmland clearly broke up the cultural middle ground as the United States imposed its vision of appropriate land use. Gone were the days described by Anne Hyde when natives and Europeans came together for mutual trade benefit in the American West. By 1879, the United States perceived itself as a continental nation. From coast to coast the land was to be cultivated and worked in accordance with its economic and cultural norms. Natives, if they were to survive at all, were to assimilate as agricultural laborers. Indian agents of the assimilationist era were to lead this conversion.

Meeker saw the Utes' horse herds as a "powerful obstacle to progress."²⁹ Thus, he sought to reduce the large herds and replace them with a manageable amount of cattle. In a letter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Meeker wrote "I think it is a good help to get them tied to cows, and the next thing is to get them tied to personal allotment of land, cabins, and a lot of 'trumpery'."³⁰ He knew that his efforts at instituting agriculture were a necessary first step in eliminating Ute culture. Thus, the intransigence with which Meeker sought to put the horse pasture to the plow was in essence the assertion of a dominant culture excluding any tolerance for dissenting ways of life. Whereas other aspects of Meeker's temperament and treatment of the Utes were less overtly representative of larger processes, he very much saw himself as an agent of cultural assimilation and set about his task with stubborn determination. Clearly the conditions ripe for cultural accommodation had long since withered in the shadow of the emerging American nation.

Along with considering the larger cultural conflict fueling the land-use dispute between Meeker and Chief Johnson, one can also see the centralization of the bureau playing out at the personal level in this dispute. While Meeker's conviction in the civilizing power of settled agricultural existence is well supported by the archival record, historians should also note that his rhetoric mirrored that of his superiors all the way up the chain of command. Meeker's immediate supervisor, Commissioner of Indian Affairs E.A. Hayt, wrote of the dangers of allowing natives to "gain subsistence by the chase which is a relic of barbarism and an obstruction to the progress of Indian civilization."³¹ The penultimate link in the chain was Secretary of the Interior Carl Schurz, appointed by President Hayes in 1877. In that same year Schurz wrote "the pursuit of hunting is as much as possible to be discouraged among the Indians...and their ponies should be exchanged as much as practicably for cattle."³² As the originator of what would become the General Allotment Act, Schurz heavily promoted the conversion of common reservation lands into individual plots.³³ Meeker was on the front lines of this policy formation, but the belief flowed throughout much of the Eastern U.S. population, all the way up to the Washington leaders quoted above. As the lowest link of this increasingly rigid chain of command, Meeker was the one to fall, as his boots were on the ground cementing these assimilationist lines onto Western landscapes.

In some ways it would be easier to write off the Meeker Massacre as an especially violent encounter between a few particular natives and an eccentric Indian agent. It is difficult to accept that the forces that led to this bloodshed were operating at a national level; but Meeker's belief system was guided by the larger federal assimilationist campaign. Although a lower-level bureaucrat, the Indian agent operated as a critical cog in the larger federal machine. Historian Peter Shrake wrote that "Indian policy was set by politicians and bureaucrats in Washington or worked out in numerous treaty negotiations. Agents represented that policy and functioned as a daily point of contact between two cultures."³⁴ Given this position on the cultural frontlines, agents were of the utmost importance in implementing federal policy. When the policy shifted to assimilation and the central office increased oversight and expectations of agents, this daily point of contact became increasingly contentious. Meeker put the cultural hegemony proposed by his superiors and supported by eastern reformers into practice. In doing so, he faced a cultural tradition equally willing to stand its ground. While this is the framework of the Meeker Massacre, it is also the more general story of the Euro-native borderlands. Whether in a native boarding school in Carlisle, Pennsylvania or at an agency in the remote Rocky Mountain West, the assimilation campaign was an attack on native culture. Strong personalities clashed on the highlands of the White River Agency. Perhaps the clash between the Utes and Meeker over ponies and plowshares was an especially acute encounter between native and U.S. traditions but the overarching phenomenon of the U.S. running roughshod over native cultures in the belief that it was in their best interest was the guiding principle of the assimilationist era. Meeker drew a line in the sand against a tribe equally willing to defend their soil and sense of self. Just as Meeker drew this line the federal government made cultural usurpation the larger law of the land. Just as each particular instance of this onslaught deserves individual attention, the historiography should also highlight the larger trends that weave these instances together. From this more macroscopic perspective, the confrontations leading to the Meeker Massacre seem unsettlingly all too similar.

Notes

Neither English nor Glorious: A Historiographical Account of the British Revolution of 1688-89

by Matthew Fulford

- 1 *The landing of William Prince of Orange at Torbay. November 5th 1688*, accessed February 27, 2018, <http://digitalcollections.nypl.org/items/ecda9990-2bb9-0132-1dd9-58d385a7b928>
- 2 James R. Hertzler, "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution'?" *Albion* 19, no. 4 (1987), 581.
- 3 See Hertzler, "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution'?" 581; Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (Yale University Press, 2011).
- 4 Pincus, *1688*, 32.
- 5 Hertzler, "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution'?" 581.
- 6 "Whiggish" refers to a progressive view of history based in the success of parliamentary democracy in Britain made popular by Whig historians such as Thomas B. Macaulay. See Jonathan Israel, ed., *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Hertzler, "Who Dubbed It 'The Glorious Revolution'?"
- 7 G.M. Trevelyan, *The English Revolution, 1688-1698* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938), 8.
- 8 H.T. Dickinson, "The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the 'Glorious Revolution'" *History* 61, no. 201 (1976), 28-45.
- 9 See Thomas B. Macaulay, *The History of England from the Accession of James II* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1849); Maurice Ashley, *The Glorious Revolution of 1688* (New York: Scribner, 1967), 197.
- 10 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 3.
- 11 Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution: 1688-Britain's Fight for Liberty* (New York: Pegasus Books, 2007), 15.
- 12 William Wissing, *Portrait of William III, Prince of Orange*, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, accessed February 27, 2018, http://library.artstor.org.aurialibrary.idm.oclc.org/asset/ARIJKMUSEUMIG_10313629708.
William Wissing, *Portrait of Mary II, Queen of England*. University of California, San Diego, accessed February 27, 2018, http://library.artstor.org.aurialibrary.idm.oclc.org/asset/ARTSTOR_103_41822001883956
- 13 See Margaret Thatcher address to House of Commons, "HC S: [Revolutions of 1688-89 (Tercentenary)]" (Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 2017), Accessed November 01, 2017, <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107286>; Vallance, *Glorious Revolution*, 4.
- 14 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 8-10.
- 15 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 8-10.
- 16 John Morrill, "The Sensible Revolution" in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 103.
- 17 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 95.
- 18 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 103.
- 19 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 96.
- 20 Maurice Ashley, *The Glorious Revolution of 1688* (New York: Scribner, 1967), 188.
- 21 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 75.
- 22 "Jacobitism" refers to the supporters of James II and his eighteenth century descendants and the political movement to restore this line to the throne. See Dickinson, "The Eighteenth Century Debate," 28-45.

- 23 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 82.
- 24 George Vertue, *King James II*, engraving, Ackland Art Museum, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Pickens Collection, accessed February 27, 2018, http://library.artstor.org.aurarialibrary.idm.oclc.org/#/asset/AACKLANDIG_10314032873.
- 25 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 129.
- 26 J.R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1972), 331.
- 27 Morrill, "Sensible Revolution," 80.
- 28 J.P. Kenyon, "Introduction," in *By Force or by Default?: the Revolution of 1688-1689*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1989), 2.
- 29 W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 218.
- 30 Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries*, 2, 233.
- 31 See Pincus, 1688, 8; Vallance, *Glorious Revolution*, 17.
- 32 Vallance, *Glorious Revolution*, 18.
- 33 Pincus, 1688, 474.
- 34 Pincus, 1688, 475.
- 35 Stuart Prall, *The Bloodless Revolution: England, 1688* (New York: Anchor Books, 1972), 242.
- 36 Pincus, 1688, 475.
- 37 Pincus, 1688, 12.
- 38 Jonathan Israel, "Introduction" in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment, Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 10.
- 39 Israel ed., *Anglo-Dutch Moment*, 11.
- 40 Prall, *Bloodless Revolution*, 270.
- 41 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 107.
- 42 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 120.
- 43 Robert Paul Barnes, "Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688," *Albion* 3, no. 3 (1971), 124.
- 44 The "Exclusion Crisis" of 1679-81 refers to the attempts by parliament to exclude James from succeeding the throne after Charles II due to his Catholic faith. See Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 195.
- 45 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 128.
- 46 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 114.
- 47 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 114.
- 48 Ian Cowan, "The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688" in *By Force or by Default?: The Revolution of 1688-1689*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1989), 65.
- 49 Cowan, "Reluctant Revolutionaries," 65.
- 50 Cowan, "Reluctant Revolutionaries," 77.
- 51 Pincus, 1688, 275.
- 52 *Orangemen, Ulster Covenant Commemoration Parade*, Belfast, Northern Ireland, September 2012, accessed March 1, 2018, [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ulster_Covenant_Commemoration_Parade,_Belfast,_September_2012_\(010\).JPG](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Ulster_Covenant_Commemoration_Parade,_Belfast,_September_2012_(010).JPG)
- 53 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 117.
- 54 Trevelyan, *English Revolution*, 121.
- 55 Quoted in Prall, *Bloodless Revolution*, 219.
- 56 The "Troubles" is the common Irish and British title for the Northern Ireland conflict that lasted from the 1960s to 1998.
- 57 Vallance, *Glorious Revolution*, 4.
- 58 *Lest We Forget: Battle of the Boyne*, mural, accessed February 27, 2018, http://library.artstor.org.aurarialibrary.idm.oclc.org/#/asset/ARTSTOR_103_41822003752035.
- 59 D.W. Hayton "The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91," in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, ed. Jonathan Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 193.
- 60 Hayton "Williamite Revolution in Ireland," 185.
- 61 Hayton "Williamite Revolution in Ireland," 185.
- 62 Hayton "The Williamite Revolution in Ireland," 185-187.
- 63 Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 195.

- 64 Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 224.
 65 Ashley, *The Glorious Revolution of 1688*, 191.
 66 Pincus, *1688*, 277.
 67 Vallance, *Glorious Revolution*, 17.
 68 Morrill, *Sensible Revolution*, 95.
 69 Lois G. Schwoerer, "Women and the Glorious Revolution," *Albion* 18, no. 2 (1986).
 70 Schwoerer, "Women and the Glorious Revolution," 195.
 71 Vallance *Glorious Revolution*, 5.
 72 Quoted in Prall, *Bloodless Revolution*, 219.

Who's Your Daddy?

How the Judicial World of Alimony Payments to Illegitimate Children Characterized Women's Rights in Seventeenth Century Puritan New England

by Sarah Turner

- 1 George Francis Dow, transcr., *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 4 (Salem: Essex Institute, 1914), 269.
- 2 *Ibid.*, 267.
- 3 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 5, 312.
- 4 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 6, 338.
- 5 *Ibid.*, 344.
- 6 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 7, 100.
- 7 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 6, 375.
- 8 Ava Chamberlain, *The Notorious Elizabeth Tuttle: Marriage, Murder, and Madness in the Family of Jonathan Edwards* (New York City: NYU Press, 2012), 110.
- 9 John Francis Cronin, transcr., *Records of the Court of assistants of the colony of the Massachusetts Bay*, vol. 2 (Boston: Suffolk County, 1901), 138; Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 8, 356.
- 10 Mark Jackson, *New-born Child Murder: Women, Illegitimacy, and the Courts in Eighteenth-Century England* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 30.
- 11 Elaine Forman Crane, *Ebb Tide in New England: Women, Seaports, and Social Change, 1630-1800* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 7.
- 12 Jackson, *New-born Child Murder*, 30; Mason Mary, *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 3.
- 13 Edwin J. Perkins, *The Economy of Colonial America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 154.
- 14 Dow, *The Probate records of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 1, 144; Dow, *The Probate records of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 2 (Salem: Essex Institute, 1917), 118.
- 15 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 6, 137; Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 7, 100.
- 16 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 6, 206.
- 17 Dow, *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*, vol. 8, 260.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 386.
- 19 *Ibid.*, 261.
- 20 *Ibid.*, 260.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 260.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 288.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 260.
- 24 *Ibid.*, 261.
- 25 *Ibid.*, 387.

- 26 Ibid., 385.
- 27 Ibid., 296.
- 28 Ibid., 289.
- 29 Ibid., 433
- 30 Ibid., 288.
- 31 Cornelia Hughes Dayton, *Women Before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789* (Chapell Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 10.
- 32 Jackson, *New-born Child Murder*, 31.

The Dazzling Doyenne of Gilded Age Denver: Louise Sneed Hill, A Biography

by Shelby Carr

- 1 “Sneed Plantation” *NCGenweb Project & North Carolina*
- 2 *North Carolina Marriage Records, 1741-2011* & Marriage Bond Louisa Bethel and William Morgan Sneed 28 Jun. 1842 <https://www.ancestry.com/mediaui-viewer/tree/72466258/person/46261814446/media/7fd3a8fa-0e1b-497f-9d92-46139745358e> (Accessed 25 Oct. 2017)
- 3 Death Certificate of Walter Sneed (1852-1941) former slave, who was also son of William M. Sneed and his slave, Nancy Sneed & enslaved ancestors bill of sale
- 4 Louisa Maria Sneed grave marker, 11 Jul. 1862, <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gt&GRid=49497819&ref=acom>
- 5 “Sneed Plantation” *NCGenweb Project & North Carolina*.
- 6 Correspondence (Letter) Crawford Hill, James A. Rose, Esq., 27 March 1900, Crawford Hill collection, Volume I, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library & “Brochure: Hotel St. Elmo, Green Cove Springs, Florida.” *University of North Florida*. Special Collections and University Archives. Tourism. Paper 4. <http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/tourism/4>
- 7 “William Morgan Sneed,” *Military History Online* <http://www.militaryhistoryonline.com/genealogy/ancestorcomments.aspx?id=37909> (Accessed 1 Nov. 2017)
- 8 *Marriages of Granville County, North Carolina 1753-1868* and marriage certificate <https://www.ancestry.com/mediaui-viewer/tree/72466258/person/46261814446/media/ab2affb7-b1b7-4574-bec4-e84c3c292d61>
- 9 Samuel Thomas Peace, “Zeb’s Black Baby,” *Vance County, North Carolina: A Short History* (Vance County: Seeman Printery, 1956)
- 10 “Sneed, Mrs. Sally A. Lewis – w/o Maj. Wm. Sneed Obituary” *Torch Light*. 22 Jan. 1878.
- 11 William M. Sneed of Granville Co, NC tombstone
- 12 “Why can’t I find 1890 census records?” *United States Census Bureau*. (Accessed 31 Oct. 2017) A devastating fire destroyed the 1890 census so it is not certain that she still lived with him then but due to her high stature in society and societal customs of the time, that was most likely the case.
- 13 She married Crawford Hill in Memphis four years later as stated in many newspaper articles. Other historians also assert this as fact including: Marilyn Griggs Riley, *High Altitude Attitudes: Six Savvy Colorado Women* (Boulder: Big Earth Publishing, 2006), Debra B. Faulkner, *Ladies of the Brown: A Women’s History of Denver’s Most Elegant Hotel* (Charleston: The History Press, 2010), and Dick Kreck, *Rich People Behaving Badly* (Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2016).
- 14 “Biography of William D. Bethell, 1840-1906,” The Papers of Pickney C. and William D. Bethell, 1848-1901, The Library of the State Historical Society of Colorado.
- 15 “Captain Bethel Dies in Denver,” *Pueblo Chieftain*, 20 Aug 1906.
- 16 “The Mayors of Memphis from 1827 to Present,” *Historic Memphis* (Accessed 31 Oct. 2017)
- 17 For more on Captain Bethell see: Beverly G. Bond and Janann Sherman, *Memphis: In Black and White* (Mount Pleasant: Arcadia Publishing, 2003)

- 18 Thomas J. Noel, *The City & The Saloon: Denver, 1858-1916* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982), 78.
- 19 "Nathaniel P. Hill Inspects Colorado: Letters Written in 1864," *The Colorado Magazine*, vol. 33, no. 4, October 1956, pg 241.
- 20 James E Fell, *Ores to Metals: The Rocky Mountain Smelting Industry* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 22.
- 21 "Nathaniel P. Hill," *Encyclopedia Brunoniana* (Providence: Brown University, 1993)
- 22 James E Fell, *Ores to Metals: The Rocky Mountain Smelting Industry* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979), 137.
- 23 "Nathaniel P. Hill Inspects Colorado: Letters Written in 1864," *The Colorado Magazine*, vol. 33, no. 4, October 1956.
- 24 "Louise Hill," manuscript, pg 2, Marilyn Griggs Riley papers, Box 2, FF32, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library.
- 25 Ibid., 2.
- 26 Ibid., 2.
- 27 "Crawford Hill Married," *The Aspen Daily Times*, 16 Jan. 1895.
- 28 Society page, *The Denver Republican* 1895.
- 29 "Hill-Sneed Wedding," Louise Hill scrapbook, 1895, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center
- 30 Kristen Iversen, *Molly Brown: Unraveling the Myth* (Boulder: Big Earth Publishing, 1999), 142.
- 31 "Louise Hill," manuscript, pg 3, Marilyn Griggs Riley papers, Box 2, FF32, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library.
- 32 Renee McReynolds, interviewed by Shelby Carr, Personal inquiry, Denver, October 19, 2017.
- 33 "Louise Hill," manuscript, pg 3, Marilyn Griggs Riley papers, Box 2, FF32, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library.
- 34 Untitled newspaper article, Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center
- 35 Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Mrs. H. H. Tammen, 4 March 1927. Carton 11, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 36 "Biographical Sketch," Guide to the Hill Collection.
- 37 Untitled newspaper article, Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 38 Marilyn Griggs, "Louise Sneed Hill: She Scandalized Denver's Old Guard," *Colorado Homes & Lifestyles*, vol 6. 1986.
- 39 *Who's Who in Denver Society, 1908* (Denver: W. H. Kistler Stationary Co., 1908), 204-207.
- 40 "As the leader of the 'Sacred 36' she could make or break someone," *Historic Denver News*, May 1977, pg 7.
- 41 "Society Dazzled by Tiara," "If You Just Must Be Good Take a Peep at These Suggestions," and "Crackers and Buttermilk Diet, Mrs. Hill Must Reduce Weight," Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 42 "Society's Queen Owes Success to Human Qualities," Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 43 "Denver Society Woman to Enter Palace, Mrs. Crawford Hill Will Be 'Presented,'" Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 44 "Mrs. Crawford Hill at British Court," *The Denver Republican* 6 Jul. 1907.
- 45 Ibid., 1.
- 46 Denver Society Woman to Enter Palace, Mrs. Crawford Hill Will Be 'Presented,' Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 47 "Denver Society Leader to Give Party March 13" and "Sacred Thirty-six of Denver Welcome Lord and Lady Decies," Louise Hill scrapbook, undated, Carton 35, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 48 Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, George W. Gano Esquire, 19 Sept. 1919, #435, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library

- 49 *Articles of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules, Officers, and Members of The Denver Country Club* (Denver, 1926), 52
- 50 *Ibid.*, 54.
- 51 Caroline Bancroft, interview by Sandra Dallas Atchison & James H. Davis, July 22 1971, 2 cassettes, Caroline Bancroft Collection, Series 4 Audio-Visual, AVBox 1, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 52 Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, George W. Gano Esquire, 19 Sept. 1919, #435, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 53 The incident at the country club was August 9 and by August 18 she was in Memphis, Tennessee as Letter #423 in the Crawford Hill collection Volume II is a letter to Louise in Memphis from Crawford. Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Louise Hill, 18 Aug. 1919, #423, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 54 Wilson Rockwell, "Gentleman of Fortune" in *The 1966 Brand Book*, vol 22. William D. Powell ed. (Denver: The Denver Westerners, Inc., 1967) 17-18.
- 55 *Ibid.*, 23-24.
- 56 William D. Haywood, *Big Bill Haywood: The Autobiography of William D. Haywood* (New York: International Publishers Co., 1929), 193.
- 57 Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Nathaniel Hill, 21 March 1919 & Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Nathaniel Hill, 16 March 1918, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 58 Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Bulkeley Wells, 23 Nov. 1920, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 59 Marilyn Griggs Riley. *High Altitude Attitudes: Six Savvy Colorado Women* (Boulder: Big Earth Publishing, 2006), 16.
- 60 Caroline Bancroft, interview by Sandra Dallas Atchison & James H. Davis, July 22 1971, 2 cassettes, Caroline Bancroft Collection, Series 4 Audio-Visual, AVBox 1, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 61 Rosemary Fetter, *Colorado's Legendary Lovers: Historical Heartthrobs and Haunting Romances* (Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004), 103-106. & Correspondence between Crawford Hill and Nathaniel and Crawford Jr., Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- 62 Rockwell, "Gentleman of Fortune," 26.
- 63 Rockwell claims Crawford died of a stroke in his work "Gentleman of Fortune," 25. Griggs claims it was heart failure in *High Altitude Attitudes*, 17.
- 64 Rockwell, "Gentleman of Fortune," 27.
- 65 Griggs Riley. *High Altitude Attitudes*, 17 & Faulkner, *Ladies of the Brown*, Part II "Doyenne of the 'Sacred Thirty-Six'"
- 66 Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Mary Robinson, 20 Sept. 1938, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 67 Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Nathaniel and Crawford Hill, 28 Aug. 1940, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 68 Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Nathaniel and Crawford Hill, 23 Aug. 1940, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- 69 Graves, Berkeley Memorial Cemetery in Middletown, Rhode Island. <https://www.findagrave.com/cemetery/1982730/Berkeley-Memorial-Cemetery> (Accessed 31 Oct. 2017)
- 70 Dick Kreck, *Rich People Behaving Badly* (Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2016), 169.
- 71 Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Miss Helen Easton, 6 Apr. 1929. Carton 6, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.

Uncertain Wanderers:
Victorian Constructs of Morality and a Family's
Migration into Wisconsin, 1830s–1840s

by Micaela Cruce

- 1 Moses Strong to Moses M. Strong, August 7, 1842, Box 26, Folder 3, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1842, Wisconsin Historical Society; Kenneth W. Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune: Moses M. Strong of Mineral Point* (Binghamton, New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1955), 49-57.
- 2 Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 5; Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27; Bret Carroll, ed. *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia*. SAGE publications, 2003; Annette Kolodny, *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers 1630–1860* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), 14, 15, 279; Glenda Riley, *The Female Frontier: A Comparative View of Women on the Prairie and the Plains* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1988), 42.
- 3 Mark S. Joy, *American Expansionism, 1783–1860: A Manifest Destiny?* (London: Pearson Education Limited, 2003), xxv; Amy Kaplan, “Manifest domesticity,” *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (1998): 584; Julie Roy Jeffrey, *Frontier Women: “Civilizing” the West? 1840-1880* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1979), 3, 4; Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood*, 34.
- 4 Brigitte Georgi-Findlay, *The Frontiers of Women’s Writing* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1996), ix; Julie Roy Jeffrey, *Frontier Women: “Civilizing” the West? 1840-1880* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1979), 5.
- 5 Susan E. Gray, *The Yankee West: Community Life on the Michigan Frontier* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 1-2.
- 6 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, vii; “John Strong (1738-1816) Family Papers, 1762-1870 Doc 10 & MS Size C,” *vermonthistory.org*, accessed November 7, 2017, <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>.
- 7 Gray, *The Yankee West*, 11-12.
- 8 Catherine A. Cavanaugh and Randi R. Warne, *Telling Tales: Essays in Western Women’s History* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000), 16; Rebecca Looney, “Migration and Separation: Divorce in Kane County, 1837-1869,” *Illinois Historical Journal* 89, no. 2 (1996): 80.
- 9 “Lucy Hinman Death Certificate,” *Ancestry.com*, accessed December 10, 2017, https://www.ancestry.com/interactive/4661/41268_312343-00059?pid=143975&treeid=&personid=&rc=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=nYO21&_phstart=successSource; “Samuel B. Ormsbee Grave,” *Find a Grave*, accessed December 10, 2017, <https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/32222537>; “Timeline of Strong Sibling Births,” *Ancestry.com*, accessed December 10, 2017, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/64716587/person/48590946339/facts>; Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 12; 1850 United States Federal Census for Samuel Hinman, Beloit, Rock County, Wisconsin, Bureau of the Census; “Samuel Hinman Census Record 1850,” *Ancestry.com*, accessed December 10, 2017, https://www.ancestry.com/interactive/8054/4206491_00392/12222767?backurl=https://www.ancestry.com/familytree/person/tree/64716587/person/81003470983/facts/citation/520290756809/edit/record.
- 10 Gray, *The Yankee West*, 12-13.
- 11 Gray, *The Yankee West*, 12-13.
- 12 1870 United States Federal Census for Moses Strong, Mineral Point, Iowa County, Wisconsin, Bureau of the Census; Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 22.
- 13 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 16, 18.
- 14 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 3-20; 1870 United States Federal Census for Moses Strong, Mineral Point, Iowa County, Wisconsin, Bureau of the Census.
- 15 Caroline Strong to Moses Strong, December 14, 1836; Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 30.
- 16 Isaac Green to Moses Strong, April 16, 1836, in the Strong Papers, General Correspondence, in the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, quoted in Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 19.
- 17 Joseph Schafer, “A Yankee Land Speculator in Wisconsin.” *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 8, no. 4 (1925): 379.

- 18 Ann Fabian, "Speculation on Distress: The Popular Discourse of the Panics of 1837 and 1857," *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 3, no. 1 (1989): 130.
- 19 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 67.
- 20 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 68.
- 21 George Strong to Moses Strong, February 27, 1840, Box 26, Folder 3, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840-1841, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 22 Moses Strong to Moses M. Strong, August 7, 1842.
- 23 "John Strong (1738-1816) Family Papers, 1762-1870 Doc 10 & MS Size C," *vermonthistory.org*, accessed November 7, 2017, <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>.
- 24 Isaac Green to Moses Strong, April 16, 1836.
- 25 Joshua C. Tate, "Gambling, Commodity Speculation, and the Victorian Compromise," *Yale Journal of Law & Humanities* 19 (2007): 97-113.
- 26 Caroline Strong to Moses M. Strong, June 7, 1836, Moses M. Strong Papers: General Correspondence Vol. 7, 1836-1837, Wisconsin Historical Society; Kenneth W. Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune: Moses M. Strong of Mineral Point* (Binghamton, New York: Vail-Ballou Press, 1955), 20-48.
- 27 Caroline Strong to Moses M. Strong, June 7, 1836; Duckett, 12.
- 28 Caroline Strong to Moses M. Strong, June 28, 1836.
- 29 Caroline Strong to Moses M. Strong, October 29, 1836; Caroline Strong to Moses Strong, June 28, 1836.
- 30 Caroline Strong to Moses M. Strong, May 25, 1836.
- 31 Duckett, 32.
- 32 Duckett, 32-35.
- 33 Duckett, 35.
- 34 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 40.
- 35 Rebecca Looney, "Migration and Separation: Divorce in Kane County, 1837-1869." *Illinois Historical Journal* 89, no. 2 (1996): 70-84.
- 36 Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 30, 31.
- 37 "John Strong (1738-1816) Family Papers;" Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 114. <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>; "Agnes and Samuel Ormsbee Marriage Certificate," *Ancestry.com*, accessed December 10, 2017, https://www.ancestry.com/interactive/4661/41599_312462-02784/395335?backurl=https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/64716587/person/48590946339/facts
- 38 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 22, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838-1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835-1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 39 Caroline Strong to Moses Strong, May 25, 1836.
- 40 Duckett, *Frontiersman of Fortune*, 33.
- 41 Agnes Ormsbee to Caroline Strong, June 22, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838-1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835-1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 42 Agnes Ormsbee to Caroline Strong, June 22, 1839.
- 43 Samuel Ormsbee to Samuel Hinman, June 19, 1839.
- 44 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 19, 1843, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838-1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835-1840, Wisconsin Historical Society; Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 22, 1839; Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, September 5, 1839; Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, July 8, 1842; Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, December 30, 1842; Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 22, 1843.
- 45 Samuel and Lucy Hinman to Moses and Caroline Strong, December 11, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838-1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835-1840, Wisconsin Historical Society
- 46 Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 5, 6.
- 47 Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 5, 6.
- 48 Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 5, 6, 19, 20, 27, 28.
- 49 Palmer Gardner to his mother, February 29, 1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 50 Riley, *The Female Frontier*, 8; Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 25, 30, 31; "The Pioneer Mothers," *Western Literary Journal and Monthly Review* (July 1836): 100-103, in Jeffrey, *Frontier Women*, 27, 28.
- 51 Samuel Ormsbee to Samuel Hinman, June 19, 1839.

- 52 Letter, Samuel Ormsbee to Samuel Hinman, June 19, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society; John Strong (1738-1816) Family Papers, <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>.
- 53 Letter, Samuel Ormsbee to Samuel Hinman, June 19, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society; John Strong (1738-1816) Family Papers, <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>.
- 54 History of Iowa County (Chicago: Western Historical Co, 1881), 714.
- 55 History of Iowa County, 714.
- 56 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 22, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 57 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 24, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 58 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, September 5, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 59 Fabian, “Speculation on Distress,” 130.
- 60 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, July 8, 1842, Box 26, Folder 9, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters Family Correspondence 1840–1847, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 60 John Strong to Moses Strong, December 12, 1838.
- 61 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, September 5, 1839, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 62 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, December 30, 1843, Box 26, Folder 9, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters Family Correspondence 1840–1847, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 63 Samuel Ormsbee to Moses Strong, June 19, 1843, Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 64 John Strong to Moses Strong, December 12, 1838.
- 65 John Strong to Moses and Caroline Strong, May 18, 1843, Box 26, Folder 9, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840–1847, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- 66 Letter, John and Lucy Jane Strong to Moses and Caroline Strong, December 12, 1838, Box 26, Folder 8, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840, Wisconsin Historical Society; Duckett, Frontiersman of Fortune, 146.
- 67 John Strong to Moses and Caroline Strong, January 21, 1846. Box 26, Folder 9, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840–1847, Wisconsin Historical Society.

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln: Its Impact on Democracy, Feminism and Professionalism

by Thomas-James Trump

- 1 Powicke, F.M. *The Loss of Normandy (1189-1204): Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire*. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1913. 143.
- 2 Asbridge, Thomas. *The Greatest Knight: The Remarkable Life of William Marshal, The Power Behind Five English Thrones*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2014. 256.
- 3 Huscroft, Richard. *Tales from the Long Twelfth Century: The Rise and Fall of the Angevin Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016. 188.
- 4 Morris, Marc. *King John: Treachery and Tyranny in Medieval England: The Road to Magna Carta*. New York: Pegasus Books LLC, 2015. 155.
- 5 Ibid. 235.
- 6 Ibid. 39.
- 7 Ibid. 43.
- 8 Rowley, Trevor. *The Norman Heritage: 1055-1200*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983. 21
- 9 Painter, Sidney. *William Marshal: Knight-errant, Baron, and Regent of England*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1933. 125.

- 10 Duby, Georges, *William Marshal: The Flower of Chivalry*. Trans. By Richard Howard. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 141.
- 11 Ibid. 142.
- 12 Morris. 2015. 53
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid. 130.
- 15 Mortimer, Richard. *Angevin England 1154-1258*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994. 51.
- 16 Morris. 2015. 143.
- 17 Ibid. 142.
- 18 Ibid. 143.
- 19 Painter. 1933. 171.; Asbridge. 2014. 318.
- 20 Morris. 2015. 253.
- 21 Ibid. 257.
- 22 Ibid. 259.
- 23 Asbridge. 2014. 335.
- 24 Norgate, Kate. *England Under the Angevin Kings*. Vol. II. First Pub. 1887. New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969. 472.; Jones, Dan. *Magna Carta: The Birth of Liberty*. New York: Penguin Random House, 2015. 125 and 206.
- 25 Painter. 1933. 171.
- 26 Asbridge. 2014. 337.
- 27 Morris. 2015. 251.
- 28 Mortimer. 1994. 63
- 29 Asbridge. 2014. 336.
- 30 Ibid. 337
- 31 Ibid. 339.
- 32 Ibid. 92
- 33 Ibid. 213.
- 34 Painter. 1933. 208.
- 35 Asbridge. 2014. 346.
- 36 Ibid. 348
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid. 349.
- 39 Ibid. 351-352.
- 40 Asbridge. 2014. 49.
- 41 Ibid. 50.
- 42 Ibid. 53.
- 43 Dougherty, Martin. *The Medieval Warrior: Weapons, Technology and Fighting Techniques AD1000-1500*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press, 2008. 34
- 44 Ibid. 34
- 45 Ibid. 35.
- 46 Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225*. (The new Oxford History of England). New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2000. 145.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Asbridge. 2014. 126-127.
- 49 Bartlett. 2000. 254.
- 50 Dougherty. 2008. 99.
- 51 Bartlett. 2000. 54.
- 52 Ibid. 254.
- 53 Henry's Assize of Arms. Penultimate HarnPage. May 2000.
<http://www.penultimateharn.com/history/armsassize.html> [Accessed January 24, 2018].
- 54 Bartlett. 2000. 253.
- 55 Henry's Assize of Arms. Penultimate HarnPage. May 2000.
<http://www.penultimateharn.com/history/armsassize.html> [Accessed January 24, 2018].
- 56 Huscroft. 2016. 250.
- 57 Ibid. 252.

- 58 Ibid. 252-253.
- 59 Ibid. 249, 253.
- 60 Ibid. 253.
- 61 Ibid. 244.
- 62 Ibid. 255.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Huscroft 2016. 252.
- 65 “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*.
<https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 66 “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*.
<https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 Asbridge. 2014. 354.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 Ibid. 357.
- 71 Ibid.
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 Huscroft. 2016. 256
- 74 Ibid.
- 75 “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*.
<https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 76 Asbridge. 2014. 357.
- 77 Ibid. 358.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Ibid.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*.
<https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 82 Asbridge. 2014. 358.
- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 Ibid. 359.
- 86 Ibid. 360.; “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*.
<https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 87 “The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover.” *De Re Militari*. <https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/>
 [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 88 *Battlefields of Britain*. “Second Battle of Lincoln (1217)” *Battlefields of Britain*. http://www.battlefieldsofbritain.co.uk/battle_lincoln_1217.html [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 89 Bartlett. 2000. 256.
- 90 Asbridge. 2014. 360.
- 91 *Battlefields of Britain*. “Second Battle of Lincoln (1217)” *Battlefields of Britain*.
http://www.battlefieldsofbritain.co.uk/battle_lincoln_1217.html [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- 92 *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*. Ed. Antonia Gransden. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1964. 4.
- 93 Jones. 2015. 184 and 185.
- 94 Tombs, Richard. *The English and Their History*. 1st Edition. New York: Vintage Books, 2014. 76.
- 95 United States Constitution; *United States House of Representatives*.
<https://www.house.gov/the-house-explained/branches-of-government>
 [Accessed January 29, 2018].
- 96 United States Constitution, amend. 6.

Plowing up the Middle Ground: The Meeker Massacre, Indian Agents, and the late 1800s Federal Assimilation Campaign

by Sam Irving

- 1 U.S. Civil Works Administration, Correspondence of Nathan C. Meeker, CWA Pioneer Interviews Collection, Volume 342, Interview 3, 1933, History Colorado, Denver, Colorado, 34.
- 2 R. David Edmunds, Frederick E. Hoxie, and Neal Salisbury, *The People: A History of Native America* (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2007), 314-315.
- 3 The 3/26/1863 issue of the Rocky Mountain News wrote that the Utes were “a dissolute vagabondish, brutal and ungrateful race and ought be wiped from the face of the earth.” Quoted in Peter R. Decker, “*The Utes Must Go!*”: *American Expansion and the Removal of a People* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004), 29.
- 4 See R. David Edmunds, Frederick E. Hoxie, and Neal Salisbury, *The People*, and Robert M. Utley, *The Indian Frontier, 1846-1890*, Revised Edition, (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, [1984] 2003).
- 5 See Robert Emmitt, *The Last War Trail: The Utes and the Settlement of Colorado* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954); Marshall Sprague, *Massacre: The Tragedy at White River* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957); Mark E. Miller, *Hollow Victory: The White River Expedition of 1879 and the Battle of Milk Creek* (Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1997); Peter R. Decker, “*The Utes Must Go!*”: *American Expansion and the Removal of a People* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004); and Robert Silbernagel, *Troubled Trails: The Meeker Affair and the Expulsion of the Utes from Colorado* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2011).
- 6 Robert Silbernagel, *Troubled Trails*, 8.
- 7 This is not to say that the historiography is completely devoid of macro-level analysis. While scholars have situated the Meeker Massacre within a larger framework of Indian removal, their treatments of the particular events is much more narrative. In his seminal text, Sprague writes “when I got going on the story, it was the human beings caught up by the forces who interested me even more than the forces themselves.” *Massacre*, viii.
- 8 Robert M. Utley, *The Indian Frontier, 1846-1890* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2003), 196.
- 9 In his seminal work *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, historian Richard White argued that natives and Europeans created a negotiated cultural space, the middle ground, within the historic, geographic location of the Great Lakes region of French Canada. He contended that the cultural middle ground depended in large part on the inability of both sides to fully gain their ends through force. White’s thesis has proven to be a powerful force in the burgeoning area of borderlands studies. Since its 1991 publication, *The Middle Ground* has led other scholars to analyze borderlands across the globe where similar conditions hold to see how various groups have come to cultural understandings for mutual benefit. Prior to full military subjugation of native tribes and the subsequent assimilation campaign, Indian agents were able to negotiate with natives so as to promote peaceful coexistence along this cultural borderland.
- 10 Anne F. Hyde, *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the North American West, 1800-1860* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011), 20.
- 11 *Ibid.*, 272.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 443.
- 13 *Ibid.*, 226.
- 14 For more on Grant’s Peace Policy see Francis Paul Prucha, *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976).
- 15 Hans L. Trefousse, “Carl Schurz and the Indians,” *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (1984): 112.
- 16 U.S. Civil Works Administration, Correspondence of Nathan C. Meeker, CWA Pioneer Interviews Collection, Volume 342, Interview 3, 1933, History Colorado, Denver, Colorado, 17.

- 17 Ibid., 1.
- 18 Silbernagel, *Troubled Trails*, 3.
- 19 Commissioner Hayt to the Secretary of Interior, 25 January 1878, NA, RG 75, M 234, quoted in Peter R. Decker, *"The Utes Must Go!": American Expansion and the Removal of a People* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004), 64-65.
- 20 *White River Ute Commission Investigation: Letter from the Secretary of the Interior*, 46th Congress, 2nd Session, 1880, Ex. Doc. 83, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), 3.
- 21 Jan Petit, *Utes: The Mountain People* (Revised Edition. Boulder: Johnson Books, 1990), 9. While claims to knowledge of prehistoric human habitation of North America are ever elusive and contested, Jan Petit argued that continuity of art style in petroglyphs is evidence of an early Ute presence.
- 22 Virginia McConnell Simmons, *The Ute Indians of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico* (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000), 29. Simmons dates the entrance of Spanish horses all the way back to 1640. Elliot West presents the magnitude of changes to human-environmental interactions that the European horse had on Native Americans in *The Contested Plains: Indians, Goldseekers, and the Rush to Colorado* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1998). Ned Blackhawk specifically explores how the Utes leverage Spanish horses to dominate trade in their enslaved non-equestrian neighbors in *Violence Over The Land: Indians and Empires in the Early American West* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- 23 Silbernagel, *Troubled Trails*, 51.
- 24 Samuel Bowles, *The Switzerland of America: A Summer Vacation in the Parks and Mountains of Colorado* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1869), 73.
- 25 Decker, *"The Utes Must Go!"*, 12.
- 26 Bowles, *The Switzerland of America*, 77.
- 27 *White River Ute Commission Investigation*, 3.
- 28 Ibid., 66.
- 29 U.S. Civil Works Administration, Correspondence of Nathan C. Meeker, CWA Pioneer Interviews Collection, Volume 342, 1933, (History Colorado, Denver, Colorado).
- 30 Ibid.
- 31 *Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877), 9.
- 32 *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the year ended June 30, 1877* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877), x.
- 33 Hans L. Trefousse, "Carl Schurz and the Indians," *Great Plains Quarterly* 4, no. 2 (1984): 110. For more on allotment see Frederick E. Hoxie, *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984).
- 34 Peter Shrake, *The Silver Man: The Life and Times of Indian Agent John Kinzie* (Madison, WI: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2016), 3.

Bibliographies

Neither English nor Glorious:
A Historiographical Account of the British Revolution of 1688-89
by Matthew Fulford

- Ashley, Maurice. *The Glorious Revolution of 1688*. New York: Scribner, 1967.
- Barnes, Robert Paul. "Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 3, no. 3 (1971): 116-27. Accessed August 9, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4048193>.
- Cowan, Ian "The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688" in *By Force or by Default?: the Revolution of 1688-1689*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1989.
- Dickinson, H.T. "The Eighteenth-Century Debate on the 'Glorious Revolution.'" *History* 61, no. 201 (1976): 28-45, accessed August 10, 2017, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24409553>.
- Hayton, D.W. "The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91," in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment : Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, edited by Jonathan Israel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Hertzler, James R. "Who Dubbed It "The Glorious Revolution?"" *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 19, no. 4 (1987): 579-85. Accessed October 10, 2017, doi:10.2307/4049475.
- Israel, Jonathan I. Introduction to *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*, edited by Jonathan Israel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Jones, J.R. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1972.
- Kenyon, J.P. Introduction to *By Force or by Default?: the Revolution of 1688-1689*, edited by Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: J. Donald, 1989.
- Macaulay, Thomas B. *The History of England from the Accession of James II*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1849.
- Morrill, John. "The Sensible Revolution" in *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* edited by Jonathan Israel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Prall, Stuart. *The Bloodless Revolution: England, 1688*. New York: Anchor Books, 1972.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. "Women and the Glorious Revolution." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 18, no. 2 (1986): 195-218. Accessed October 10, 2017, doi:10.2307/4050314.
- Speck, W.A. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Trevelyan, G.M. *The English Revolution, 1688-1698*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Vallance, Edward. *The Glorious Revolution: 1688-Britain's Fight for Liberty*. New York: Pegasus, 2007

Who's Your Daddy?

How the Judicial World of Alimony Payments to Illegitimate Children Characterized Women's Rights in Seventeenth Century Puritan New England

by Sarah Turner

- Chamberlain, Ava. *The Notorious Elizabeth Tuttle: Marriage, Murder, and Madness in the Family of Jonathan Edwards*. New York: New York University Press, 2012.
- Crane, Elaine Forman. *Ebb Tide in New England: Women, Seaports, and Social Change, 1630-1800*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998.
- Cronin, John Francis, transcr. *Records of the Court of assistants of the colony of the Massachusetts Bay*. Boston: Suffolk County, 1901.
- Dayton, Cornelia Hughes. *Women before the Bar: Gender, Law, and Society in Connecticut, 1639-1789*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Dow, George Francis, transcr. *Records and files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts*. Salem: Essex Institute, 1914.
- Jackson, Mark. *New-born Child Murder: Women, Illegitimacy and the Courts in Eighteenth-century England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Mason, Mary Ann. *From Father's Property to Children's Rights: The History of Child Custody in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- Perkins, Edwin J. *The Economy of Colonial America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

The Dazzling Doyenne of Gilded Age Denver: Louise Sneed Hill, A Biography

by Shelby Carr

ARTICLES/ LETTERS

- 1) Three untitled newspaper articles from the Louise Sneed Hill collection scrapbook, carton 35
 - 2) Titled newspaper articles from the Louise Sneed Hill collection scrapbook, carton 35:
 - "Crackers and Buttermilk Diet, Mrs. Hill Must Reduce Weight,"
 - "Denver's Most Exclusive Set Ruled by One"
 - "Denver Society Leader to Give Party March 13"
 - "Denver Society Woman to Enter Palace, Mrs. Crawford Hill Will Be 'Presented,'"
 - "Hill-Sneed Wedding,"
 - "If You Just Must Be Good Take a Peep at These Suggestions"
 - "Sacred Thirty-six of Denver Welcome Lord and Lady Decies"
 - "Society Dazzled by Tiara"
 - "Society's Queen Owes Success to Human Qualities,"
 - "Who are the Mighty Ninety?"
- Articles of Incorporation, By-Laws, Rules, Officers, and Members of The Denver Country Club*
Denver, 1926.
- "As the leader of the 'Sacred 36' she could make or break someone," *Historic Denver News*,
May 1977, pg 7.
- "Biography of William D. Bethell, 1840-1906," The Papers of Pickney C. and William D.
Bethell, 1848-1901, The Library of the State Historical Society of Colorado.

- “Captain Bethel Dies in Denver,” *Pueblo Chieftain*, 20 Aug 1906.
- Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Louise Hill, 18 Aug. 1919, #423, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (Letter) Crawford Hill, James A. Rose, Esq., 27 March 1900, Crawford Hill collection, Volume I, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Nathaniel Hill, 21 March 1919 Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Nathaniel Hill, 16 March 1918, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, Bulkeley Wells, 23 Nov. 1920, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (letter), Crawford Hill, George W. Gano Esquire, 19 Sept. 1919, #435, Crawford Hill collection, Volume II, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library
- Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Miss Helen Eastom, 6 Apr. 1929. Carton 6, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Mary Robinson, 20 Sept. 1938, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Mrs. H. H. Tammen, 4 March 1927. Carton 11, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Nathaniel and Crawford Hill, 28 Aug. 1940, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- Correspondence (letter), Louise Hill, Nathaniel and Crawford Hill, 23 Aug. 1940, Louise Hill collection, Box 10, FF367, Stephen H. Hart Library and Research Center, History Colorado Center.
- “Crawford Hill Married,” *The Aspen Daily Times*. 16 Jan. 1895.
- Death Certificate of Walter Sneed (1852-1941) former slave, who was also son of William M. Sneed and his slave, Nancy Sneed & enslaved ancestors bill of sale
- Griggs, Marilyn. “Louise Sneed Hill: She Scandalized Denver’s Old Guard,” *Colorado Homes & Lifestyles*, vol 6. 1986.
- “Louise Hill,” manuscript, Marilyn Griggs Riley papers, Box 2, FF32, Western History Genealogy Department, Denver Public Library.
- Marriages of Granville County, North Carolina 1753-1868*
- “Mrs. Crawford Hill at British Court,” *The Denver Republican* 6 Jul. 1907.
- “Nathaniel P. Hill Inspects Colorado: Letters Written in 1864,” *The Colorado Magazine*, vol. 33, no. 4, October 1956.
- North Carolina Marriage Records, 1741-2011*
- Renee McReynolds, interviewed by Shelby Carr, Personal inquiry, Denver, October 19, 2017
- Rockwell, Wilson. “Gentleman of Fortune” in *The 1966 Brand Book*, vol 22. William D. Powell ed. Denver: The Denver Westerners, Inc., 1967.
- “Sneed, Mrs. Sally A. Lewis – w/o Maj. Wm. Sneed Obituary” *Torch Light*. 22 Jan. 1878. Society page, *The Denver Republican* 1895.

BOOKS

- Bond, Beverly G. and Janann Sherman. *Memphis: In Black and White*. Mount Pleasant: Arcadia Publishing, 2003.
- Faulkner, Debra B. *Ladies of the Brown: A Women’s History of Denver’s Most Elegant Hotel*. Charleston: The History Press, 2010.
- Fell, James E. *Ores to Metals: The Rocky Mountain Smelting Industry*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

- Fetter, Rosemary. *Colorado's Legendary Lovers: Historical Heartthrobs and Haunting Romances*. Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004.
- Haywood, William D. *Big Bill Haywood: The Autobiography of William D. Haywood*. New York: International Publishers Co., 1929
- Iversen, Kristen. *Molly Brown: Unraveling the Myth*. Boulder: Big Earth Publishing, 1999.
- Kreck, Dick. *Rich People Behaving Badly*. Golden: Fulcrum Publishing, 2016.
- "Nathaniel P. Hill," *Encyclopedia Brunoniana*. Providence: Brown University, 1993.
- Noel, Thomas J. *The City & The Saloon: Denver, 1858-1916*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1982.
- Peace, Samuel Thomas. "Zeb's Black Baby," *Vance County, North Carolina: A Short History* Vance County: Seeman Printery, 1956.
- Riley, Marilyn Griggs. *High Altitude Attitudes: Six Savvy Colorado Women*. Boulder: Big Earth Publishing, 2006.
- Who's Who in Denver Society, 1908*. Denver: W. H. Kistler Stationary Co.

WEBSITES

- "Brochure: Hotel St. Elmo, Green Cove Springs, Florida." *University of North Florida*. Special Collections and University Archives. Tourism. Paper 4. <http://digitalcommons.unf.edu/tourism/4>
- Graves, Berkeley Memorial Cemetery in Middletown, Rhode Island. <https://www.findagrave.com/cemetery/1982730/Berkeley-Memorial-Cemetery>. Accessed 31 Oct. 2017.
- Louisa Maria Sneed grave marker, 11 Jul. 1862, <http://www.findagrave.com/cgi-bin/fg.cgi?page=gr&GRid=49497819&ref=acom>. Accessed 1 Nov 2017.
- Marriage Bond Louisa Bethel and William Morgan Sneed 28 Jun. 1842 <https://www.ancestry.com/mediaui-viewer/tree/72466258/person/46261814446/media/7fd3a8fa-0e1b-497f-9d92-46139745358e>. Accessed 25 Oct. 2017.
- "The Mayors of Memphis from 1827 to Present," *Historic Memphis*. <http://historic-memphis.com/biographies/mayors/mayors.html>. Accessed 31 Oct. 2017.
- Sneed Plantation" *NCGenweb Project & North Carolina* http://www.ncgenweb.us/ncstate/plantations/sneedfam_plantation.htm
- "Why can't I find 1890 census records?" *United States Census Bureau*. Accessed 31 Oct. 2017
- "William Morgan Sneed," *Military History Online* <http://www.militaryhistoryonline.com/genealogy/ancestorcomments.aspx?id=37909>. Accessed 1 Nov. 2017.

Uncertain Wanderers: Victorian Constructs of Morality and a Family's Migration into Wisconsin, 1830s–1840s

by Micaela Cruce

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Hinman, Samuel to Strong, Moses. December 14, 1840. Box 26. Folder 2. Moses Strong Typewritten Letters 1840–1841. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- History of Iowa County. Chicago: Western Historical Co., 1881.
- "Lucy Hinman Death Certificate," Ancestry.com, accessed December 10, 2017, https://www.ancestry.com/interactive/4661/41268_312343-00059?pid=143975&treeid=&personid=&rc=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=nYO21&_phstart=successSource.

- Nevius, John to Nevius, Aaron. December 22, 1829. Papers of Aaron C. Nevius. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. June 19, 1839. Box 26. Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1845–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. June 22, 1839. Box 26, Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. June 24, 1839. Box 26. Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. September 5, 1839. Box 26. Folder: Typewritten Letters 1838–1839. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. December 30, 1843. Box 26. Folder 9. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters Family Correspondence 1840–1847. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Ormsbee, Samuel to Strong, Moses. June 22, 1843, Box 26, Folder 9, Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters Family Correspondence 1840–1847, Wisconsin Historical Society.
- “Samuel B. Ormsbee Grave,” Find a Grave, accessed December 10, 2017, <https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/32222537>.
- Strong, John (1738-1816) Family Papers, 1762-1870 Doc 10 & MS Size C. vermonthistory.org. Accessed November 7, 2017. <http://vermonthistory.org/documents/findaid/strong.pdf>.
- Strong, George to Strong, Moses. February 27, 1840. Box 26. Folder 3. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840-1841. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Strong, John to Strong, Moses. May 18, 1843. Box 26. Folder 9. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840–1847. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Strong, John to Strong, Moses. January 21, 1846. Box 26. Folder 9. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1840–1847. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Strong, John and Strong, Lucy Jane to Strong, Moses and Strong, Caroline. December 12, 1838. Box 26. Folder 8. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1835–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- Strong, Moses to Strong, Moses M. August 7, 1842. Box 26. Folder 3. Moses M. Strong Typewritten Letters 1845–1840. Wisconsin Historical Society.
- “Timeline of Strong Sibling Births,” Ancestry.com, accessed December 10, 2017, <https://www.ancestry.com/family-tree/person/tree/64716587/person/48590946339/facts>.
- 1850 United States Federal Census for Samuel Hinman, Beloit, Rock County, Wisconsin, Bureau of the Census

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abbot, Carl; Leonard Stephen J; Noel, Thomas J. *Colorado: A History of the Centennial State*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2013.
- Carroll, Bret ed. *American Masculinities: A Historical Encyclopedia*. SAGE publications, 2003.
- Caughfield, Adrienne. *True Women & Westward Expansion*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2005.
- Cavanaugh, Catherine A. and Warne, Randi R. *Telling Tales: Essays in Western Women’s History*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2000.
- Conzen, Kathleen Neils. “A Saga of Families.” In *The Oxford History of the American West*. Edited by Clyde A. Milner, Carol A. O’Connor, and Martha A. Sandweiss. (New York: The Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Duckett, Kenneth W. *Frontiersman of Fortune: Moses M. Strong of Mineral Point*. Binghamton, NY: Vail-Ballou Press Inc., 1955.

- Fabian, Ann. "Speculation on Distress: The Popular Discourse of the Panics of 1837 and 1857." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 3, no. 1 (1989): 127-142.
- Gast, John. "American Progress [painting]." Autry Museum of the American West, Los Angeles, CA (1872).
- Georgi-Findlay, Brigitte. *The Frontiers of Women's Writing: Women's Narratives and the Rhetoric of Westward Expansion*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press
- Greenberg, Amy S. *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Gordon, Linda. *The Great Arizona Orphan Abduction*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Gray, Susan E. *The Yankee West*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Greenberg, Amy S. *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy. *Frontier Women "Civilizing" the West 1840-1880*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1979.
- Johnson, Susan Lee. *Roaring Camp: The Social World of the California Gold Rush*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2000.
- Joy, Mark S. *American Expansionism, 1783-1860: A Manifest Destiny?* London: Pearson Education Limited, 2003.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity," *American Literature* 70, no. 3 (1998): 581-606.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Romancing the empire: The embodiment of American masculinity in the popular historical novel of the 1890s." *American Literary History* 2, no. 4 (1990): 659-690.
- Kleinberg, S. J. *Women in the United States, 1830-1945*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1999.
- Kolodny, Annette. *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontiers 1630-1860*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Limerick, Patricia Nelson. *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1987.
- Looney, Rebecca. "Migration and Separation: Divorce in Kane County, 1837-1869." *Illinois Historical Journal* 89, no. 2 (1996): 70-84.
- Matt, Susan J. *Homesickness: An American History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Riley, Glenda. *The Female Frontier*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1988.
- Roberts, Brian. *American Alchemy: The California Gold Rush and Middle-Class Culture*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Schafer, Joseph. "A Yankee Land Speculator in Wisconsin." *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 8, no. 4 (1925): 377-392.
- Stuart, James Reeve. "Moses M. Strong," Wisconsin Historical Society. Accessed November 7, 2017, <https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Image/IM2952>.
- Tate, Joshua C. "Gambling, Commodity Speculation, and the Victorian Compromise." *Yale Journal of Law & Humanities* 19 (2007): 97-113.
- "The Pioneer Mothers." *Western Literary Journal and Monthly Review* (July 1836): 100-103.
- Wisconsin Historical Society, Fuller and Johnson, Moses M. Strong, 27749. Viewed online at <https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Image/IM27749>.
- Wisconsin Historical Society, Unknown, Edward Dwight Eaton Chapel, 29279. Viewed online at <https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Image/IM29279>.
- Wisconsin Historical Society, Unknown, Mineral Point and Environs, 96504. Viewed online at <https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Image/IM96504>.
- Wisconsin Historical Society, Unknown, Moses Strong Residence, 38036. Viewed online at <https://www.wisconsinhistory.org/Records/Image/IM38036>.

The 1217 Battle of Lincoln: Its Impact on Democracy, Feminism and Professionalism

by Thomas-James Trump

- Asbridge, Thomas. *The Greatest Knight: The Remarkable Life of William Marshal, The Power Behind Five English Thrones*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2014.
- Bartlett, Robert. *England Under the Norman and Angevin Kings 1075-1225*. (The new Oxford History of England). New York: Oxford University Press Inc., 2000.
- Battlefields of Britain*. "Second Battle of Lincoln (1217)" *Battlefields of Britain*. http://www.battlefieldsofbritain.co.uk/battle_lincoln_1217.html [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- Dougherty, Martin. *The Medieval Warrior: Weapons, Technology and Fighting Techniques AD1000-1500*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press, 2008.
- Duby, Georges, *William Marshal: The Flower of Chivalry*. Trans. By Richard Howard. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.
- Henry's Assize of Arms. Penultimate HarnPage. May 2000. <http://www.penultimateharn.com/history/armsassize.html> [Accessed January 24, 2018].
- Huscroft, Richard. *Tales from the Long Twelfth Century: The Rise and Fall of the Angevin Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.
- Jones, Dan. *Magna Carta: The Birth of Liberty*. New York: Penguin Random House, 2015.
- Morris, Marc. *King John: Treachery and Tyranny in Medieval England: The Road to Magna Carta*. New York: Pegasus Books LLC, 2015.
- Mortimer, Richard. *Angevin England 1154-1258*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.
- Norgate, Kate. *England Under the Angevin Kings*. Vol. II. Fist Pub. 1887. New York: Haskell House Publishers, 1969.
- Painter, Sidney. *William Marshal: Knight-errant, Baron, and Regent of England*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1933.
- Powicke, F.M. *The Loss of Normandy (1189-1204): Studies in the History of the Angevin Empire*. Manchester: University of Manchester, 1913.
- Rowley, Trevor. *The Norman Heritage: 1055-1200*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983
- The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*. Ed. Antonia Gransden. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1964.
- "The Battle of Lincoln (1217), according to Roger of Wendover." *De Re Militari*. <https://deremilitari.org/2014/03/the-battle-of-lincoln-1217-according-to-roger-of-wendover/> [Accessed June 29, 2017].
- Tombs, Richard. *The English and Their History*. 1st Edition. New York: Vintage Books, 2014.
- United States Constitution; *United States House of Representatives*. <https://www.house.gov/the-house-explained/branches-of-government> [Accessed January 29, 2018].
- United States Constitution, amend. 6.

Plowing up the Middle Ground:
The Meeker Massacre, Indian Agents, and the
late 1800s Federal Assimilation Campaign

by Sam Irving

PRIMARY SOURCES:

- Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877.
- Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the year ended June 30, 1877*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1877.
- Bowles, Samuel. *The Switzerland of America: A Summer Vacation in the Parks and Mountains of Colorado*. Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1869.
- U.S. Civil Works Administration. Correspondence of Nathan C. Meeker. CWA Pioneer Interviews Collection. Volume 342. Interview 3. 1933. History Colorado, Denver, Colorado.
- White River Ute Commission Investigation: Letter from the Secretary of the Interior*. 46th Congress. 2nd Session, House of Representatives, Ex. Doc. No. 83. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880.

SECONDARY SOURCES:

- Decker, Peter R. "*The Utes Must Go!*": *American Expansion and the Removal of a People*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2004.
- Edmunds, R. David, Frederick E. Hoxie, and Neal Salisbury. *The People: A History of Native America*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 2007.
- Emmitt, Robert. *The Last War Trail: The Utes and the Settlement of Colorado*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.
- Hoxie, Frederick E. *A Final Promise: The Campaign to Assimilate the Indians, 1880-1920*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1984.
- Hyde, Anne F. *Empires, Nations, and Families: A New History of the North American West, 1800-1860*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2011.
- Miller, Mark E. *Hollow Victory: The White River Expedition of 1879 and the Battle of Milk Creek*. Niwot, CO: University Press of Colorado, 1997.
- Pettit, Jan. *Utes: The Mountain People*. Revised Edition. Boulder: Johnson Books, 1990.
- Prucha, Francis Paul. *American Indian Policy in Crisis: Christian Reformers and the Indian, 1865-1900*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1976.
- Shrake, Peter. *The Silver Man: The Life and Times of Indian Agent John Kinzie*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Historical Society Press, 2016.
- Silbernagel, Robert. *Troubled Trails: The Meeker Affair and the Expulsion of the Utes from Colorado*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 2011.
- Simmons, Virginia McConnell. *The Ute Indians of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2000.
- Sprague, Marshall. *Massacre: The Tragedy at White River*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957.
- Trefousse, Hans L. "Carl Schurz and the Indians." *Great Plains Quarterly*. 4, (Spring 1984): 109-20.
- Utley, Robert M. *The Indian Frontier, 1846-1890*. Revised Edition. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, (1984)2003.
- White, Richard. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.



NEITHER ENGLISH NOR GLORIOUS

A Historiographical Account of the
British Revolution of 1688-89



WHO'S YOUR DADDY?

How the Judicial World of
Alimony Payments to Illegitimate
Children Characterized Women's
Rights in Seventeenth Century
Puritan New England



THE DAZZLING DOYENNE OF GILDED AGE DENVER

Louise Sneed Hill, A Biography

UNCERTAIN WANDERERS

Victorian Constructs of Morality
and a Family's Migration into
Wisconsin, 1830s-1840s



THE 1217 BATTLE OF LINCOLN

Its Impact on Democracy, Feminism
and Professionalism

PLOWING UP THE MIDDLE GROUND

The Meeker Massacre, Indian
Agents, and the late 1800s Federal
Assimilation Campaign