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The Education of Linnie Haguewood

LISA R. LINDELL

“TO SEE LINNIE is to be interested in her; to know her is to love her,” wrote teacher Dora Donald in 1895. “It is my earnest wish that she will become so well known in our state that the people of Iowa as a body will have this feeling toward Linnie. When they do who can say what may not be accomplished by this dear child.”¹ In the months and years ahead, Linnie Haguewood, blind and deaf since infancy, would indeed become a popular figure with the Iowa public, her story widely spread through newspapers and fundraising appeals. The publicity brought the teenager, dubbed by the press “the Helen Keller of the West,” singular educational opportunities and a solid network of friends and benefactors.² It also created a public persona built on media representations and societal expectations.

Recent scholarship on disability and gender in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America sheds helpful light on Haguewood’s reality. Like her contemporaries with disabilities, Haguewood contended with having her story construed and shaped by others. Her experiences were a product of the complex mixture of cultural factors and assumptions that typified her era and determined how disability and gender were treated. Within that context, Haguewood’s midwestern location and her particular educational and travel experiences and network of

¹. Vinton Eagle, 3/15/1895.
². For examples of the use of this phrase, see Omaha Daily Bee, 11/18/1897; Pella Chronicle, 4/9/1902; New-York Tribune, 8/14/1903; Los Angeles Times, 8/16/1908.

support make her story distinctive and offer an opportunity to broaden the historical scholarship.3

BORN IN IDA GROVE, Iowa, on October 12, 1879, Linnie Haguewood was the second of seven children of day laborer George Haguewood and Emma Hefner Haguewood. An extended illness contracted at the age of 18 months resulted in the total loss of sight and hearing and extreme physical weakness. Haguewood’s parents, as future press accounts regularly emphasized, were poor, overworked, and unaware or wary of formal educational options for her. Haguewood thus remained at home, moving east across the state with her family to Delaware County in the mid-1880s. Although she lacked structured training, she acquired a few domestic skills, learning from her mother to crochet, knit, and sew. When Haguewood was 11, William DeCoursey French, founder of a small, privately funded day school for the deaf in Dubuque, and deaf himself, became aware of her case and introduced the family to the manual alphabet, in which each letter is represented by a specific finger position. As words were spelled into her hand, Haguewood gradually learned the system and became familiar with the names of about 300 objects.4


In November 1893 life changed radically for the 14-year-old Haguewood when interested friends persuaded her parents to enroll their daughter in the Iowa College for the Blind in Vinton. The school, approximately 60 miles from her home, was state funded, with families covering clothing, travel, and incidental expenses, if able. An advanced student was assigned to Haguewood as an attendant at a cost of $1 per week, paid by William M. Sawyer, a trustee from her home county. She was placed in the kindergarten classes, with the hope that, as Principal Thomas F. McCune stated in his biennial report, she might pick up some fragmentary knowledge.  

Established in 1853 by the Iowa state legislature as the Asylum for the Blind in Iowa City (then the state capital), the school relocated to Vinton in 1862. During the 1893–94 school year 180 students attended the school, the majority between the ages of 10 and 21, with a nearly equal percentage of males and females. Most, McCune reported, were not entirely blind. As the only student who was both blind and deaf, Haguewood attracted the interest and help of many of the students and teachers. In particular, she captured the heart of primary department instructor Dora Donald. Donald’s relationship with Haguewood, spanning nearly a decade, would prove formative for both pupil and teacher.\footnote{Aurner, History of Education in Iowa, 5:3, 15; Biennial Report, 1893, 19; Biennial Report, 1895, 13. In 1892–93 the Iowa College for the Blind had the seventh-largest student enrollment of the 36 state institutions for the blind, and in 1895–96 it had the sixth-largest enrollment of 35 institutions reporting. Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1892–93 (Washington, DC, 1895), 2056–59; Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1895–96 (Washington, DC, 1897), 2117–21. See also Biennial Report, 1897, 11. According to 1895–1897 statistics, 38 percent of the students were completely blind. Biennial Report, 1897, 14.}

Dora Edith Donald had begun teaching at the Iowa College for the Blind in 1892. Born in 1869 and raised in Kansas and Florida, she taught school at the French Icarian Colony in Adams County, Iowa, before attending the Iowa State Normal School in Cedar Falls in 1891–92. Donald’s choice of career may have been influenced by her father’s eye condition acquired during his service in the Civil War, which caused partial blindness.  

---

7. Historical Collections of Deuel County [South Dakota], 2 vols. (n.p., 1983), 2:389; Adams County Union, 6/22/1893; Catalog of State Normal School, Cedar Falls, Iowa (1892); Biennial Report, 1893, 5; Civil War Pensions, Donald, Samuel A., Kansas, Regiment 11, Company L, accessed from National Archives and Records Administration. The fourth child and oldest daughter of Samuel and Ellen Norris Donald, Donald was born in Washington County, Kansas, on July 7, 1869. After spending a portion of her childhood in Florida, where her younger sister Ida was born in 1876, and where her mother died, presumably of consumption, she returned to Kansas with her sister in the 1880s to live with an aunt and uncle, and subsequently relocated to Iowa. Ida Donald, like her sister, became an educator of the blind and deaf. She worked, throughout her career, at the Iowa College for the Blind, the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes in Sioux Falls, and the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind in Colorado Springs. Manuscript Population Schedule, Lincoln, Washington Co., KS, in U.S., Department of the Interior, Office of the Census, Ninth Census of the United States, 1900.
Haguewood’s progress at the school surpassed McCune’s and Donald’s expectations. She showed a particular aptitude for sewing, handiwork, and other manual endeavors. In gymnastics class, she began to gain in strength and balance and acquired the ability to walk to her classrooms alone. With the aid of a fellow student, she studied raised print, one of two notational systems taught at the school. Raised print used ordinary alphabet characters, easy for the sighted to decipher but challenging to read tactilely, thus prompting calls for its abandonment in favor of raised dot, or point, systems. New York Point, the other method taught at the school, was developed in the 1860s as an alternative to the Braille dot system and enthusiastically supported by Principal McCune. Braille, though, would ultimately prevail.

In the summer months of 1894, Donald arranged for Haguewood to stay with her for an extended time to work on language and writing skills. During the school year, there were no provisions for specialized instruction, which impelled Donald to action. Haguewood’s educational needs had become so imperative, she declared, that they reached beyond the college walls.

---

8. Biennial Report, 1893, 20–21. William Bell Wait of the New York Institution for the Blind pitched his New York Point, in which each character occupied a space two dots high and one, two, three, or four dots wide, as a more efficient system than Braille (first developed in France by Louis Braille in the 1820s, with each character arranged in a cell using the same amount of space, three dots high and two dots wide). Endorsed by the American Association of Instructors of the Blind in 1871, New York Point was widely used in schools for the blind in the latter decades of the nineteenth century. Braille systems persisted and developed, however, including British Braille and American, or modified, Braille, in which the most frequently used letters were assigned the least number of dots, and eventually supplanted New York Point. See B. L. McGinnity, J. Seymour-Ford, and K. J. Andries, “Books for the Blind,” Perkins History Museum, Perkins School for the Blind, 2004, accessed Aug. 15, 2012, www.perkinsmuseum.org/section.php?id=200.

IN MARCH 1895 Donald made an appeal in an article published in the local newspaper, the *Vinton Eagle*. There and in other writings, Donald presented Haguewood as a captive in need of rescue. Imprisoned in body and mind, she awaited the liberating and enlightening power of education.¹⁰ Such a perspective reflected common views of the era toward disability, the product, in turn, of a long history and synthesis of interpretation. Interest in the education of the deaf and blind had roots in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and philosophical speculation on the relationship between the senses and intellectual development. Scientific labels of abnormality and defectiveness, Christian teachings of charity and compassion, reformers’ zeal for improvement, and Victorian sentiment all factored into popular attitudes toward disability. Historian Mary Klages, in her study of disability in Victorian America, defines the then prevailing perception as that of suffering beings trapped within afflicted bodies needing to be freed through the earnest efforts of educators.¹¹

In her portrait of Haguewood, Donald drew on themes of Victorian children’s fiction that exalted model virtues and the role of suffering in building character and instilling empathy. Her depiction of Haguewood’s struggles to overcome adversity, her patient suffering, “sweet sunny nature,” sense of right and wrong, and innocence fit squarely into the tradition.¹² Such images, as Donald was certainly aware, suffused the public discourse surrounding America’s two most famous deaf-blind students, Laura Bridgman and Helen Keller. Separated in age by half a century, both women were cast in the sentimental role of victim heroine in widely reprinted reports that originated from the prominent Perkins Institution for the Blind in Boston and were composed by Perkins founder Samuel Gridley Howe and his successor and son-in-law Michael Anagnos.

In 1837 Howe had discovered seven-year-old Bridgman while seeking a deaf and blind child upon whom he could test his philosophical theories regarding sensory deprivation, innate

capacities, and language accession. She entered the Perkins Institution that year and spent most of her time at the school until her death in 1889. Her success in learning language and Howe’s active promotion of her accomplishments earned both him and his pupil renown and, from his admiring son-in-law, the appellation “knight-errant of humanity.”

In his annual reports, Howe stressed Bridgman’s isolation and imprisoned state (“a human soul shut up in a dark and silent cell”) before her liberation through language. He hailed her educational progress, praising her “insatiable thirst for knowledge” and her moral development. “The different traits of character have unfolded themselves successively, as pure and spotless as the petals of a rose,” he wrote, “and in every action unbiased by extraneous influence, she ‘gravitates towards the right’ as naturally as a stone falls to the ground.” Embracing Victorian ideals and language, Howe highlighted Bridgman’s “continual gladness—her keen enjoyment of existence—her expansive love—her unhesitating confidence—her sympathy with suffering—her conscientiousness, truthfulness, and hopefulness.”

Charles Dickens, consummate creator of tales of pathos and redemption and of such heroines as Little Nell, painted Bridgman in like terms. In his *American Notes*, he recounted meeting Bridgman at the Perkins Institution in January 1842. “There she was, before me; built up, as it were, in a marble cell, impervious to any ray of light, or particle of sound; with her poor white hand peeping through a chink in the wall, beckoning to some good man for help, that an Immortal soul might be awakened.” The help had come, he wrote, and “from the mournful ruin of such


bereavement, there had slowly risen up this gentle, tender, guileless, grateful-hearted being.”

Bridgman existed to the public in many ways as an object upon which sentimental ideals and scientific theories were projected. As she grew older, her popularity, based as it was on romanticized images of the child victim heroine, inevitably declined, as did Howe’s enthusiastic promotional efforts. Also contributing to Bridgman’s fading celebrity was the advent of Helen Keller.

Born in 1880, Keller began her education and association with Perkins just as Bridgman was nearing the end of her life in that institution. Michael Anagnos, who had assumed the leadership of the school upon Howe’s death in 1876, eagerly stepped up to promote Keller. In 1887 Anagnos recruited recent Perkins graduate Anne Sullivan to teach Keller; and, from 1888 to 1892, the pair spent part of their time at the institution. In writing about Keller, Anagnos employed language surpassing that of his predecessor in effusiveness. In his annual reports, hundreds of pages of which were dedicated to Keller, he proclaimed her “deliverance from the dreadful abyss of blackness and solitude” and described her story as a fairy tale or romance. “Noble aspirations, gentle manners, intense feelings, incessant thinking, native goodness, a passion for learning and self-improvement, a thirst for righteousness and a hunger for holiness,” he wrote, “all unite in her to place her far above ordinary mortals. She is a manifestation of loveliness, the personification of generosity, the essence of amiableness.”

As with Howe, Anagnos’s fervent promotional efforts would be transient. The cause of the fracturing of his relationship with Keller and Sullivan was an essay the 11-year-old Keller sent to

16. Factoring into Howe’s response to Bridgman was what he considered her religious indoctrination. In 1862 she chose to be baptized into the Baptist church. Howe had hoped that Bridgman would instinctively come to embrace religious views similar to his own liberal, Unitarian beliefs. Gitter, *The Imprisoned Guest*, 141–47, 160–66, 252.
Anagnos as a birthday gift. After reprinting Keller’s “The Frost King” in his 1891 annual report, Anagnos learned that her story was a close retelling of a published piece called “Frost Fairies.” Keller and Sullivan insisted that the plagiarism was unintentional and that Keller must have unconsciously retained the story in her memory after it was read to her, but Anagnos, concerned about his institution’s reputation, discontinued his encomiums and enthusiastic support. In her 1903 autobiography, Keller lamented that the incident resulted in the loss “of one of my dearest friends.”

Keller would graduate from Radcliffe College in 1904 and embark on a long career of active involvement in political and humanitarian efforts, though forever linked in the popular imagination with her disability. Her dramatic “rescue,” as symbolized by the story of her sudden grasp of language at the water pump, would continue to shape Keller’s public image to the detriment of a deeper appreciation of the fullness and complexity of her life.

Haguewood, with her similarity in disability and age to Keller, was inevitably compared with her counterpart (with Haguewood’s case being the “more pitiable” of the two, the Omaha Daily Bee declared). In her 1895 article in the Vinton Eagle, Dora Donald contrasted Haguewood’s circumstances with Keller’s, emphasizing that Keller had every possible educational advantage, while Haguewood was “left for fourteen years to struggle alone.” The publication of the article, with a headline proclaiming Haguewood “the Most Remarkable Child in Iowa,” inspired Bernard Murphy, the Vinton paper’s editor, to become Haguewood’s enthusiastic publicist. Through Murphy’s efforts and those of Donald and interested women of Vinton, a committee was formed to raise and administer funds for Hague-

18. Helen Keller, The Story of My Life (New York, 1903), 71. For analysis of the incident, see Kim E. Nielsen, Beyond the Miracle Worker: The Remarkable Life of Anne Sullivan Macy and Her Extraordinary Friendship with Helen Keller (Boston, 2009), 111–23. Another source of friction was Anagnos’s stance that Sullivan’s teaching methods were merely derivative of Howe’s methods rather than original and innovative pedagogy. Nielsen, Beyond the Miracle Worker, 116.
20. Omaha Daily Bee, 11/18/1897; Vinton Eagle, 3/15/1895.
wood’s education. Murphy, as the committee’s treasurer, and Donald, as secretary, worked diligently to promote the cause.\(^{21}\)

THE GOAL was to raise $1,500 (about $40,000 in 2012 dollars) to send Haguewood to the Perkins Institution for two years of study. Newspapers around the state quickly picked up Murphy’s appeals in the \textit{Vinton Eagle}. The publicity followed a familiar pattern: the pathetic story of a sorely afflicted girl awaiting release from the grip of mental darkness. An education at the illustrious Perkins Institution would enable “poor little stricken Linnie Haguewood” to overcome “the great desolation that has come upon her young life.” The public’s generosity would allow her “imprisoned soul to break every possible bar which shuts it from this world of life and sound and beauty.”\(^{22}\)

The appeals swiftly ignited widespread interest and a generous response. As donations began to accrue, newspapers enthusiastically reported the amounts raised from their communities: over $50 from a benefit concert in Marion; $42.45 from an ice cream supper in Manchester; $13.61 collected by a blind farmer in Monroe Township; $1.18 from a group of Waterloo girls donating their lemonade stand proceeds. Iowa schoolchildren contributed their pennies, nickels, and dimes “to send [Linnie] to school.” A long-term inmate of the Fort Madison penitentiary, who had been saving up his earnings, $12 per year, to seek a pardon, gave a dollar for Haguewood’s education and challenged others to contribute liberally as well. At a benefit held in Delhi, in Haguewood’s home county, the popular appeal of the sentimental victim heroine was much in evidence. The program included two poetry readings, one featuring a “poor little waif” who overcomes her miserable circumstances and the other a devout child with a grateful heart even upon her death bed.\(^{23}\)


Haguewood herself participated in a number of fundraising events, including an entertainment at the Presbyterian church in Vinton that drew 700 people and another at the music hall in Waterloo. At the latter event, held June 18, 1895, Bernard Murphy, Donald, and Haguewood’s mother were present. Murphy announced that Haguewood’s education fund now totaled $1,050; and Haguewood displayed samples of her crocheted handwork, her competence at club swinging (a popular activity in physical education classes of the period), and her developing facility in reading raised print. In reading, as described by the *Waterloo Daily Courier*, she followed the lines of raised letters with her left hand and with her right spelled out the words that Donald translated to the audience. Also of interest to the crowd was Haguewood’s sensitivity to vibrations from movements in the air and ground.24

The Iowans present may have experienced this public display by Haguewood as a novelty, but it was not unusual in a

national context. Exhibitions by students with disabilities were a common occurrence in the era. In the 1840s thousands had come to gaze upon Bridgman, and the practice of exhibiting students and their skills as a means of eliciting sympathy and raising funds continued well into the twentieth century. Haguewood’s feelings about the process are unrecorded.25

Fundraising efforts continued through the summer. In August the goal was met. Murphy deposited $1,537.71 with the Farmers’ Loan and Trust Co., with every penny donated going into the fund, he reported. The Perkins Institution, though, proved ultimately unattainable. A letter from Perkins director Anagnos informed the committee that the school was at capacity enrollment but assured them that a competent teacher could fully meet Haguewood’s educational requirements right where she was in Iowa. At that time, Perkins Institution’s student population included three deaf-blind students. All had come prior to Anagnos’s falling-out with Keller and Sullivan, however.26

Disappointed, but receptive to Anagnos’s advice, the committee arranged with the Iowa College for the Blind’s board of trustees to have Donald appointed as Haguewood’s personal tutor with continued residence at the institution. “This case is one for which the law makes no provision, but is so deserving that your trustees feel they would be censurable if they refused to accede to the request of the committee,” the trustees declared in the college’s biennial report to the governor. Murphy noted that the plan would have nearly equal advantages to what Perkins could offer, while saving $350 to $400 per year. In 1896 the Iowa legislature added to the fund, appropriating $500.27

25. Gitter, The Imprisoned Guest, 42, 106; Ernest Freeberg, “The Meanings of Blindness in Nineteenth-Century America,” Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society 110 (2000), 122–29. In his 1899 report, the Iowa College for the Blind’s Thomas McCune addressed the topic of public exhibitions: “The easiest way to secure [appropriations],” he wrote, “is to please a legislature with an exhibition of skill on the part of the blind.” Such methods were legitimate enough, he concluded, but should be relegated to a secondary place when the future of a school was assured. Biennial Report, 1900, 27.


HAGUEWOOD’S PRIVATE INSTRUCTION began in September 1895. In her role as teacher, Donald felt a responsibility to speak for Haguewood and act as her advocate. Her publicly available reports used the sentimental style of the day. They are, nonetheless, the prime source and most vital means of following Haguewood’s educational progress and provide a window into cultural perceptions relating to disability. Donald, aware of her influence on Haguewood, expressed her desire that her pupil retain her own individuality. “Linnie has a strong character,” she wrote, “and I want it to follow its own plan. . . . [I want her to] feel that she is living according to the impulse within her and not as I would have her live.”28

To the satisfaction of both teacher and student, Principal McCune allowed them much freedom at the Vinton school. “A mind so wholly undisciplined could not be confined to the narrow limits of a schoolroom,” Donald stated. She described Haguewood’s eagerness to satisfy her inquisitive spirit and her ability to do so through the help of her teacher and the use of the manual alphabet. “The halls, the rooms, the yard, boxes, packages, drawers, closets; nothing escaped her diligent fingers.”29

Donald emphasized the difficulty of holding Haguewood’s attention during her first few years of instruction. The task required the constant and united effort of both teacher and pupil, Donald wrote, and a “never-yielding determination.” In her initial attempts to use prepared educational materials, Donald lamented, the challenges only increased, “for Miss Linnie deliberately went to sleep when I tried some of the beautiful ‘book plans’ or looked so thoroughly disgusted that I often wondered if she were wiser than I.” Ingenuity was often required to keep Haguewood focused and engaged. Gradually, however, Haguewood’s growing sense of the wider world and of how words and ideas were formed and expressed through reading and writing incited a zeal to continue learning, her teacher observed. The classroom became more attractive.30

30. Ibid., 42; Omaha World Herald, 6/17/1899.
In teaching Haguewood, Donald followed the method Anne Sullivan had developed to instruct Keller. As Sullivan described her approach, “From the day when Helen first grasped the idea that all objects have names, and that these can be communicated by certain movements of the fingers, I have talked to her exactly as I should have done had she been able to hear, with only this exception, that I have addressed the words to her fingers instead of her ears.” The method differed substantively from Howe’s approach with Bridgman, which involved word-by-word memorization.

Donald’s aim, as she recorded in the spring of 1896, was to allow her student a free use of the English language by using it in every way possible. Haguewood’s language classes consisted of two purely conversational 40-minute sessions per day. “Name-words, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, anything needed, were given,” Donald wrote. “She has learned to use language through constant practice, and not through any knowledge of the grammatical rules for its construction.” In an address to the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf in 1898, Donald stated that she had read all that she could find on teaching deaf-blind pupils. Rather than focusing on Haguewood’s deafness and blindness, she considered her “a natural child” and endeavored to reach her by talking to her “about everything.”

As a result, Donald reported, Haguewood’s conversational range rapidly increased, leading Haguewood to introduce topics “quite startling in their scope.” In addition, books became con-

31. *Fifty-Seventh Annual Report* (Boston, 1889), 107. In April 1895 John Hitz, superintendent of the Volta Bureau for the Increase and Diffusion of Knowledge Relating to the Deaf (the institution founded in Washington, DC, by Alexander Graham Bell), wrote to Donald after reading her article in the *Vinton Eagle*. He advised her to follow Sullivan’s teaching methods as closely as she could. He also indicated that Sullivan perhaps might be able to take on another pupil if her health allowed, and provided Sullivan’s address at the Wright-Humason School for the Deaf in New York City, which Helen Keller attended. Reprinted in *Vinton Eagle*, 4/30/1895. Keller’s autobiography notes that Hitz gave Donald copies of documents relating to Sullivan’s work with Keller. Keller, *The Story of My Life*, 255.

stant and beloved companions. All that Haguewood read was a living reality to her and became part of her life, declared her teacher, evoking Sullivan’s descriptions of Keller’s experience. Besides raised print, Haguewood had learned to use the New York Point. She would soon study Braille as well, learning both American and British Braille, as there was no standardized version until well into the twentieth century.33

In learning to write, Haguewood began with New York Point, quickly gaining proficiency after grasping its correlation with the manual alphabet. She next successfully tackled writing with a pencil, learning as many as five letters in half an hour. To write, Haguewood placed a sheet of paper on a grooved board and formed the letters with her pencil in the depressed lines. She employed this method for letter writing. Donald provided samples of her pupil’s letters, charting her progress in grammatical composition and complexity of expression. During the summer of 1896, spent at home with her parents, five brothers, and baby sister, Haguewood exchanged letters with Donald, and soon began a wide correspondence with friends and acquaintances.34

Haguewood’s increasing communication skills aided her in all her studies. In mathematics, according to her teacher, her work showed that she “needed only language” to express the knowledge already within her. Haguewood used a number slate sent to her by William Wade, a philanthropist from Oakmont, Pennsylvania. Wade had first become interested in Helen Keller in the 1880s and subsequently expanded his attention to the welfare of all deaf-blind children in the United States.35

Haguewood’s happiest class hours, Donald avowed, were spent in the sewing room. “She has learned to sew on the ma-

33. Vinton Eagle, 3/27/1896; Fifty-Seventh Annual Report (Boston, 1889), 133. Progress toward a unified code was finally made in 1932 with the adoption of Standard English Braille, Grade 2. See McGinnity, Seymour-Ford, and Andries, “Books for the Blind.”

34. Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 3/19/1898; Adams County Union, 7/16/1896.

chine and no dignitary of this great state of ours has a greater sense of personal importance than has Linnie when seated at her machine.” During the school year, Haguewood constructed three articles of clothing, including a cotton dress for herself. The only help she received was placing the patterns on the fabric, and her teacher boasted that her work would compare favorably with that of any 16-year-old girl who could see and hear.36

In showing an attraction to the domestic arts and femininity, Haguewood followed typical patterns and expectations of the day. Accounts by herself and others highlighted her appreciation of fine clothes and adornment and the care she took with her wardrobe. Donald credited the power of “a fresh apron, clean collars and cuffs, and a few curls in her hair” to lift her pupil’s spirits. Donald also noted Haguewood’s interest in what others wore. She recognized friends’ attire by touch and, her teacher reported, formed an accurate impression of people through their habits of dress. Press accounts lauded Haguewood’s charming manners, her meticulously crafted handwork, and her domestic interests. “Housework is [a] delight,” the Saint Paul Globe claimed on her behalf.37

In addition to Haguewood’s femininity and domestic accomplishments, Donald emphasized her pupil’s sympathy and compassion, demonstrated through her friendships with other students and her concern for those who suffered in any way. Generosity and empathy were traits especially singled out by society as desirable in those with disabilities as a means of showing their moral development and the ability to transcend their “affliction” in the service of others. Reports on Bridgman and Keller showcased these qualities, including numerous examples of their generosity to others less fortunate.38

36. Vinton Eagle, 3/27/1896. See also Adams County Union, 7/16/1896.
37. Des Moines Daily News, 2/18/1898; Broad Ax (Salt Lake City, UT), 7/3/1897; Saint Paul Globe, 11/8/1897. See also Sioux City Journal, 12/24/1897; Des Moines Daily News, 2/18/1898; and Omaha Daily Bee, 11/18/1897. Letters by Haguewood reprinted in the Sioux Falls Press, 3/7/1897, and Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 3/19/1898, illustrate her enjoyment of jewelry and flowers.
38. See, for example, Ninth Annual Report (Boston, 1841), 38; Fifty-Seventh Annual Report (Boston, 1889), 100; and Klages, Woeful Afflictions, 7, 131.
At the Iowa College for the Blind, Donald reported, Haguewood was particularly close to a student named Alice, who had lost two fingers and with whom she loved to share her treats and spend parts of her holidays. Donald also related an incident in which a classmate of Haguewood’s sprained her ankle. Distressed by the mishap, Haguewood found comfort in a psalm in her prayer book, which entreated “that the bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice,” and eagerly shared the verse with her friend. Another acquaintance, whom Haguewood had met while visiting the orphanage in Council Bluffs, needed to have a leg amputated; Haguewood was so moved to empathize that she offered up all her savings, intended for a music box for herself, to buy “poor Maggie a cork leg.”

The perceived role of people with disabilities in inspiring others to live up to their own ideals of behavior formed a theme in media accounts about Haguewood. “No person who possesses the eyesight, hearing and the power of conversation and all of these blessings should forget this case, and no matter what their trouble may be, they should stop and make comparison before they complain too bitterly,” declared the Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette. “It requires courage to brave afflictions in life and surely this girl has demonstrated her bravery and it behooves each and all in distress and with burdens of various kinds upon them to struggle on, letting the light of hope burn brightly on with patience and humility and a belief in the rewarded justice, and do the best they can.”

In response to questions about Haguewood’s “mission in life,” Donald asserted that her pupil’s life was full of usefulness. “Where can you find such another example of patient perseverance; where can you find one who has worked more faithfully; who has taken up the burden laid upon them as cheerfully and performed the duties required of them with the painstaking care of this girl?” she asked. “Her development has been a rounding out of her character, a growth in every direction.”

40. Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 3/19/1898.
41. Adams County Union, 7/16/1896.
IN NOVEMBER 1896 Donald and Haguewood, now age 17, commenced a round of travel to regional schools for the deaf. The goal was to supplement Haguewood’s previous experience of associating primarily with blind students and to place her into direct contact and communication with others who were deaf. Donald, too, would benefit by familiarizing herself with methods of deaf education. The pair first made brief visits to the Iowa School for the Deaf in Council Bluffs and the Nebraska Institute for the Deaf and Dumb in Omaha. Both schools’ newspapers covered the visits, treating Haguewood as a star. “Her powers excited considerable wonder and admiration,” reported the Deaf Hawkeye. “All day she is flocked about by little children who converse with her by the manual alphabet. She takes their sayings by the touching of their fingers.” The Nebraska Mute Journal likewise fixed on the remarkable: “It is marvelous how much a person afflicted thus can do. . . . When she gets hold of a new idea, she will follow it up to master it, and will not abandon it till she does know it. We fell in love with the deaf girl, and want her to come back again. . . . To be deaf seems to us to be nothing, since we have seen poor, sweet-faced Linnie.”

Haguewood’s next and longest visit was at the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes in Sioux Falls, where about 50 students were enrolled. Teacher and pupil arrived at the beginning of December and remained in residence for several months. While there, Haguewood was able to interact closely with the school’s skilled deaf communicators. In January 1897 a Sioux Falls Press writer visited the school and spent a few hours in the company of Haguewood and Donald. “Miss Linnie can . . . talk with her fingers as rapidly as an ordinary child can with the tongue,” he marveled, detailing her facility with writing, doing sums, crocheting, telling time, and recognizing acquaintances by touch-

42. Vinton Eagle, 11/20/1896 (reprinted from Deaf Hawkeye); Daily Iowa Capital, 12/12/1896 (reprinted from Nebraska Mute Journal). See also Sioux City Journal, 11/15/1896.

ing their hands. “She enjoys company very much and is always pleased to show her accomplishments.”

At the end of February, the students and teachers of the public schools of Sioux Falls presented Haguewood with the gift of a typewriter. The machine was the newest model Smith Premier, a regular typewriter with no special features for the blind or deaf. In just a few days, the press reported, Haguewood had mastered typing and sent a letter of thanks to her donors, expressing, as she did in all her public correspondence, gratitude and delight.

Sioux Falls, S.D., March 5, 1897.

My dear friends: I want to thank you for your beautiful present. I want the children to know that it has made me very happy! I laugh all the time because it is such fun to write with a typewriter.

Everybody is so good—so very good—to me. Yesterday the ladies of Sioux Falls gave me a nice new ring. It has five sets: three are blue and two are white. They are kind to give it to me.

I shall always love the good people of Sioux Falls, and when I go back to Vinton I shall write to them with my typewriter.

Your grateful and happy friend.

Linnie Haguewood

At the request of Sioux Falls Argus-Leader editor Charles Day, Haguewood typed a letter, unaided, in his presence without, he observed, a single misspelled word. In it, she again conveyed her thanks to the people of Sioux Falls, wrote of her friendship with deaf school superintendent James Simpson (“He teases me when I go to see him in his office”), and described how much she liked South Dakota. “The blizzards blow at me and make me laugh. They are gone now. Spring made them go away. Spring means March, April and May. I shall go to my home in Delaware, Iowa, when happy June comes. They will be glad to see me.”

While at the South Dakota school, Haguewood practiced learning to speak, a process she had begun at Vinton. Voice

44. Sioux Falls Press, 1/10/1897.
45. Reprinted in Sioux Falls Press, 3/7/1897. See also Waterloo Daily Courier, 3/13/1897.
46. Reprinted in Broad Ax (Salt Lake City, UT), 7/3/1897. James Simpson (1855–1903) was superintendent of the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes from 1881 to 1903 and was himself deaf. The Transcendent Territory: The Minds, Hearts and Hands Behind the Unique Deaf and Hard of Hearing Culture of South Dakota (Sioux Falls, SD, 2000), 7–11.
articulation, or oralism, had become an increasingly popular though controversial and much debated method in deaf education. The debate pitted the oralists against the manualists, who favored the use of sign language and the manual alphabet. In advocating the teaching of spoken language to deaf people, oralists touted the advantages of integration with the broader, hearing society. Manualists emphasized the continuous struggle and uncertain results of learning speech at the expense of the abundant social, cultural, and educational benefits derived from use of manual communication.  

In 1890 Helen Keller had begun voice articulation lessons after finding out about a Norwegian deaf-blind girl, Ragnhild Kaata, who had learned to speak. Keller’s efforts to speak orally would be a lifelong, labor-intensive process. Alexander Graham Bell, a friend and mentor of Keller, was a staunch proponent of oralism and, consequently, a problematic figure among the deaf community. Bell wanted to integrate deaf people into hearing society as much as possible, fearing the creation of a “deaf variety of the human race.” Signs, he claimed, were a primitive form of language that should be discouraged. In 1890 Bell founded the American Association to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf and served as its first president. Samuel Gridley Howe, too, regarded sign language as primitive, believing in the superiority of alphabetic-based language. For deaf-blind instruction, he used raised letters and, subsequently, the manual alphabet. 

Donald believed in oral instruction for Haguewood, but only as a supplement to manual communication. She did not support exclusive oralism or the use of the method for all deaf

47. For historical perspective on oralism and manualism, see Douglas C. Baynton, Forbidden Signs: American Culture and the Campaign Against Sign Language (Chicago, 1996); John Vickrey Van Cleve and Barry A. Crouch, A Place of Their Own: Creating the Deaf Community in America (Washington, DC, 2002); and Susan Burch, Signs of Resistance: American Deaf Cultural History, 1900 to World War II (New York, 2002).

48. Nielsen, Beyond the Miracle Worker, 104; Nielsen, Radical Lives of Helen Keller, 2; Gitter, The Imprisoned Guest, 40–41, 81; Klages, Woeful Afflictions, 81. For more on Bell’s (ungrounded) fear that deaf couples’ marrying in large numbers would result in a deaf race, see Alexander Graham Bell, Memoir Upon the Formation of a Deaf Variety of the Human Race (Washington, DC, 1884); Baynton, Forbidden Signs, 30–31.
students. The speech learning process for Haguewood involved placing her fingers on the throat and mouth of her teacher while Donald simultaneously pronounced a letter or combinations of letters and formed them upon Haguewood’s hand, which Haguewood in turn attempted to pronounce. At first, Donald reported, Haguewood resisted the project, but the idea that she would be able to communicate with many more people by using her voice eventually led her to willingly enlist in the effort. Teacher and student painstakingly proceeded sound by sound, learning the facial movements of each. Learning to speak clearly would be an ongoing challenge. A reporter who interviewed Haguewood and Donald in August 1897 near Corning, Iowa, where the two were staying with friends of Donald’s, noted that some of Haguewood’s words were intelligible, including his own name and Donald’s, while others were only understood as yet by her teacher.

Haguewood returned to school in Vinton in the fall of 1897. Several of her letters from those months were reprinted in the press. She expressed interest in the lives of her friends and described her daily activities, including her studies, picnics attended, and visits received. She conveyed gratitude to her friends in Sioux Falls for the gift of a desk and to Bernard Murphy, who had provided train passes for a trip home at Christmas. Her brother Zed, she related, had taken her, her sister Charlotte Mae, and Donald sleigh riding, after which they made popcorn balls. She had received numerous Christmas presents, all of them “beautiful.”

49. “I feel that signs have been no disadvantage to [oral pupils] in the acquirement of speech and have added much to their general development,” Donald wrote in 1906 as superintendent of the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes. “South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes,” Ninth Biennial Report of the State Board of Charities and Corrections for the State of South Dakota (Huron, SD, 1906), 93.
50. Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 6/15/1899; Los Angeles Times, 8/16/1908.
51. Adams County Free Press, 8/12/1897.
52. Recipients of Haguewood’s letters included home economist Mary Moody Pugh of Omaha (9/30/1897, reprinted in Waterloo Daily Courier, 4/1/1899); Cedar Rapids resident Francis Wynn (10/6/1897, reprinted in Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 3/19/1898); and Bernard Murphy (1/13/1898, reprinted in Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette, 1/28/1898).
In February Haguewood, Donald, and Murphy visited the state legislature in Des Moines to personally appeal for continued funding of Haguewood’s education. Money from the fund Murphy and his committee had raised from Iowans had paid for the 1895 and 1897 school years; the $500 allocated by the Iowa legislature had been expended in 1896. Legislators were now asked to appropriate $1,000 for two more years. While at the capitol, Haguewood met with newly elected governor Leslie Shaw and a number of legislators. Donald noted the ease with which the young woman adapted to new situations, picking up “little airs and added graces.” Haguewood was the center of attention, noted the press, and “it will be a surprise if there is a vote against the appropriation.” Indeed, the otherwise generally stingy legislature readily granted the requested funds.53

HAGUEWOOD’S TRAVEL EXPERIENCES and her studies kindled a desire to “go every place and see everything,” her teacher wrote. Over the next few years, that wish was, to a degree, realized. “She almost seems to see the very landscapes from the car windows, so complete an impression does she get of the things around her while traveling,” stated one media report.54

In June 1898 Haguewood and Donald attended the Trans-Mississippi Educational Convention in Omaha. There, they took part in a session on the education of deaf and blind children. While in Omaha Haguewood also participated in the Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition, a giant fair that boasted some 4,000 exhibits and attracted more than 2.5 million visitors. The Smith Premier Typewriter Company employed Haguewood to demonstrate her typing skills for a few hours each day at the company’s booth in the Liberal Arts Building, where all types of modern appliances were exhibited.55 Helen Gillespie,

53. Des Moines Daily News, 2/18/1898; Milford Mail, 2/24/1898. See also Waterloo Daily Courier, 2/18/1898; Aurner, History of Education in Iowa, 5:48; 1898 Laws of Iowa, chap. 126, sec. 1.
55. “Miscellaneous,” American Annals of the Deaf 43 (1898), 331; Omaha World Herald, 6/3/1898; “A Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Expert Typist,” Illustrated Phonographic World 14 (Sept. 1898); “Publisher’s Notes,” The Menorah: A Monthly Magazine for the Jewish Home 25 (Nov. 1898), 335–36. The Exposition was held from June 1 to November 1, 1898.
Linnie Haguewood at a Smith Premier typewriter, on which she gave daily exhibitions during the 1898 Trans-Mississippi and International Exposition in Omaha. From Illustrated Phonographic World, courtesy of Harvard College Library.

who, with her husband, John (former principal of the Nebraska Institute for the Deaf), hosted Haguewood and Donald, wrote of the admiring attention Haguewood attracted at the booth with her “knowledge, ready answers, and pleasing manners.” Haguewood used her earnings to personally select and purchase white slippers and a wicker rocker.\textsuperscript{56} The nuances of being an object of public display went unexplored.

Later in the summer of 1898 Haguewood and Donald traveled to Columbus, Ohio, to attend the Convention of American

Instructors of the Deaf. The trip was arranged and financed by William Wade, the prominent supporter of deaf-blind education, whom they were meeting for the first time. At the convention, Donald spoke of her work with Haguewood, and again Haguewood displayed her skills to an engaged audience. Wade wrote to Murphy upon his return from the convention:

You may say to Iowa that Linnie Haguewood and Miss Donald simply captured the entire body. Even those who longest and most thoroughly knew and appreciated Helen Keller devoted themselves constantly to Linnie. . . . And so complete was the general interest in her that Miss Donald came to surrendering her with the utmost confidence. I may add that Miss Donald’s simplicity and absence of all notions that she had done anything wonderful or exceptional, only added to the universal opinion that there could not possibly be a better teacher of the deaf-blind. Iowa has rendered a great service to the interests of the deaf-blind by sending Miss Donald and Linnie to this convention.

For the 1898–99 school year, Haguewood and Donald returned to the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes at the invitation of Superintendent Simpson. In January 1899 Haguewood wrote to Francis Wynn, a Cedar Rapids resident, whom she and her teacher had befriended two years earlier, describing her Christmas and thanking Wynn for a picture he had sent her, which she kept on her dresser. She prized her new music box, received from William Wade, had delighted in dancing at two school parties, and was anticipating sledding. Haguewood was also enjoying reading her new Christmas stories, raised-print books of the Bible, and other “point books” provided by Wade. In school, she was studying history, geography, language, and arithmetic.

In June 1899 Haguewood and Donald began an extended trip, traveling by train to Duluth, Minnesota, and by steamer to Buffalo, New York, with a final destination of Northampton, Massachusetts, to attend the Convention of the American Asso-

ciation to Promote the Teaching of Speech to the Deaf. They were interviewed en route, while waiting to change trains in Cedar Rapids. Haguewood’s spoken words of greeting and her response to a question about her travel plans came slowly, but quite plainly, the reporter observed.  

At the conference, Haguewood met Alexander Graham Bell, in attendance as president of the association. She had also been looking forward to meeting Helen Keller, who was preparing to take final examinations for enrollment at Radcliffe College. Corresponding with William Wade shortly before the planned meeting, Keller referred to a letter of Haguewood’s that Wade had recently sent her. It “interested me very much,” Keller wrote. “It seemed to show spontaneity and great sweetness of character. I was a good deal amused by what she said about history. I am sorry she does not enjoy it; but I too feel sometimes how dark, and mysterious and even fearful the history of old peoples, old religions and old forms of government really is.”  

In her letter, Haguewood had mentioned disliking history because “it is about such old people.” Whether the meeting between Keller and Haguewood actually took place is unknown.

HAGUEWOOD turned 20 in October 1899. That fall she entered the teacher training department of the Iowa State Normal School in Cedar Falls, the school Donald had attended, and embarked on a regular course of study. This was Haguewood’s first experience in a school for seeing and hearing students. Bernard Murphy informed the Board of Control of the State Institutions of Iowa that Haguewood had (as worded by the *Waterloo Daily Courier*) “reached the age and the point in her education where it is desirable to have her mingle with an older class of associates than she meets at the College for the Blind at Vinton.” The $35 allotted quarterly to each resident of the College for the Blind

would continue, and the $5 fee regularly charged to students at the Iowa State Normal School was waived for Haguewood (as it was for returning Spanish-American War veterans).  

For the first part of the school year, Donald accompanied Haguewood to her classes and acted as her interpreter. Education professor George W. Walters, in full sentimental mode, lauded the partnership between student and teacher: “I used to sit in church behind Linnie Haguewood and see her teacher’s finger tips touching the palm of her hand; and Linnie’s face would light up with joy and radiant hope. And I said ‘Thank God for a State that makes a special appropriation to educate such a child.’”  

In April 1900 the Iowa legislature again approved $1,000 for two more years of education for Haguewood. “It was largely through Mr. Murphy’s efforts that the appropriation was secured,” the Cedar Rapids Evening Gazette reported, “and this is one of the items of expenditure that the legislature never wrangles about.”  

Meanwhile, at the beginning of 1900, Donald was appointed superintendent of the newly created South Dakota School for the Blind in Gary. She accepted the position with the agreement that Haguewood could continue as her student. Thus, after completing the year at the normal school and spending the summer with her family, Haguewood entered the South Dakota School for the Blind in October 1900. The 1900–1902 biennial report listed 29 students enrolled at the school. Haguewood’s mother and younger siblings accompanied her to Gary and remained there until Haguewood completed her education in 1903.

68. *Adams County Free Press*, 2/22/1900; *Waterloo Semi-Weekly Courier*, 9/14/1900; Wade, *The Deaf-Blind*, 11; *Gary Inter State*, 10/12/1900; *Des Moines Daily Leader*, 10/31/1901; “South Dakota School for the Blind,” *Seventh Biennial Report of the State Board of Commissioners of Charities and Corrections for the State of*
In the summer of 1901, after her first year at the Gary school, Haguewood traveled with Donald to Buffalo, New York, to attend a first-ever formal gathering of deaf-blind students, arranged by William Wade and held in conjunction with the convention of the American Instructors of the Deaf. Eight students were in attendance with their teachers. By all accounts, the convention proved valuable, allowing the students to interact and their educators to compare teaching methods and experiences. While in Buffalo, the conference goers visited the attractions of the Pan-American Exposition, which had opened in May 1901, and also nearby Niagara Falls.69

On September 6, 1901, Buffalo became the site of national tragedy. While at the Pan-American Exposition, President Wil-
liam McKinley was shot. He died eight days later. Back at the School for the Blind in Gary for the recently commenced fall term, Haguewood attended a church service commemorating the dead president. Also present were Donald and Haguewood’s deaf tutor, Jessie Beardsley. Donald’s role as interpreter drew comment from the local paper. “One of the most pathetic sights we ever witnessed occurred in the Methodist church in Gary last Sunday morning,” the report began, and then described how Donald, seated between the two women, provided one hand to each as she spelled out the proceedings. “The recipients were intent in their attention,” the article continued, “and evidently received full benefit of the very interesting service and sermon.”

In conjunction with her academic studies at the South Dakota School for the Blind, which included reading, spelling, English composition, language, geography, U.S. history (steadily gaining in appeal), and mathematics, Haguewood learned to operate the stereotype maker. The machine, provided by Wade, was used to copy materials in Braille. Haguewood quickly gained proficiency, Donald reported.

The stereotype maker had keys like a typewriter and printed characters in Braille onto brass plates. After making a plate, Haguewood proofread it with her fingers, hammering down any misplaced dots. She placed moistened sheets of heavy white paper over the brass sheets and then between rubber sheets and ran all through a roller press. When the pages dried, she bound them together. Among Haguewood’s major stereotyping achievements were novelist Laurence Sterne’s *The Story of Le Fevre*, extracted from *Tristram Shandy*, and *A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy*. Forty copies were made and sent to schools for the blind.

IN 1903, after finishing her education at the South Dakota School for the Blind, Haguewood moved with her family to Los Angeles, California, where her father had found work as a carpenter. The remaining funds set aside for Haguewood’s education were

70. *Gary Inter State*, 9/20/1901.
72. Tazewell (VA) Republican, 10/1/1903; *Los Angeles Times*, 8/16/1908.
returned to Iowa’s state treasury. In 1908 a Los Angeles Times reporter who visited the Haguewood home described a close-knit and supportive family. Haguewood’s parents and six siblings, he reported, “all think the world of her, understand her, and take keen joy in being able to talk with her through the sign-language.” Although the reporter found Haguewood’s spoken words difficult to understand, he observed that her brother readily comprehended them. Haguewood’s mother employed an additional means of communication: “No matter in what part of the house the young woman is, her mother calls her by tapping lightly ‘1---5,’ on the floor. No matter how much noise there may be, she catches the vibrations and answers the message.” Haguewood performed household chores and continued to crochet and do needlework. She made some of her own clothes and went shopping to select dress goods, ever fastidious about the weave and fabric. The reported described in detail Haguewood’s stereotype maker and her skill at copying books for blind readers, and he noted her fascination with machinery and how it worked. She had studied the automobile, telephone, and phonograph and was interested in keeping up with inventions and scientific topics. Notably, the reporter directed his questions about Haguewood to others rather than to Haguewood herself. “And is Linnie Haguewood happy?” he asked. “The ready and immediate answer of her closest friends is ‘Yes.’ She has a lovable disposition and usually wears a sunny smile.”

Haguewood spent the remainder of her life in Los Angeles, out of the public eye. In her later years, she resided with her younger brother Rollin, a retired pharmacist in the U.S. Navy, and then moved next door to live with her sister. Her great-niece Jeanie Hickerson remembered visiting Haguewood as a child. “She always identified me by gently feeling my face and arms, and then spelling out my name on her fingers.”

74. Los Angeles Times, 8/16/1908.
son recalled coming to visit once with her grandfather, who was Haguewood’s older brother Clem. “He shuffled his feet in a special way that he had always done when he came near her, and she could feel the vibration and identified him. I remember her face brightening up and her joyous voice calling out ‘Clem!’” Linnie Haguewood died April 18, 1967, in Los Angeles. She was 87 years old.75

For Dora Donald, the experience of being Haguewood’s teacher and the reputation gained thereby continued to open professional doors. In 1903 she was appointed James Simpson’s successor as superintendent of the South Dakota School for Deaf Mutes, and in 1907 she returned to Gary as superintendent of the South Dakota School for the Blind, serving until 1909. In July 1907, at age 38, she married LeRoy August Humbert, who had taught violin and small instruments at the School for the Blind. She remained active in public service until her death on September 3, 1934, in Gary.76

Donald’s influence and that of the media were instrumental in shaping Haguewood’s public persona. Prevailing Victorian attitudes toward disabilities and gender and the media’s pursuit of their own agendas all played their part in the construction of her identity. Societal expectations and conventions guided the content and tone of Donald’s reports and the letters written by Haguewood herself, many of which were reprinted in the press. As with Bridgman and Keller, press coverage commonly depicted Haguewood in one-dimensional ways, focusing on the remarkable, the pathetic, and the sentimental, leaving the complex and rich realities of her life unexplored. An examination of the available material is nonetheless valuable. Haguewood’s story discloses the options possible for students with disabilities beyond the sphere of the prestigious eastern institutions and illuminates the context in which she lived her life.

76. Eighth through eleventh biennial reports of the State Board of Commissioners of Charities and Corrections for the State of South Dakota (1904–1910); Gary Inter State, 8/2/1907; Historical Collections of Deuel County, 389.
ON OCTOBER 23, 1951, the members of the Drake University Athletic Council somberly convened in the office of their chairman, Professor Frank Gardner. Nearly 72 hours had passed since their football team arrived home after a defeat at Oklahoma A&M, only to be thrust into the national spotlight—not for the play of their All-America halfback, Johnny Bright, but for the injuries he sustained. On three successive plays in Drake’s first drive, A&M lineman Wilbanks Smith leveled him with high, hard blows to the face long after the ball had moved down field. By the time Drake tallied its first touchdown, Bright’s jaw was broken, sidelining him for the rest of the day and, as it happened, the entire season. Once Bright was out, Smith ceased his reckless tactics. If not for Des Moines Register photographers Don Ultang and John Robinson, who vividly captured the attack in photographs that indicated premeditation, the incident would likely have been waved off as another illustration that football is a violent sport.

I am grateful to the State Historical Society of Iowa for a 2011–12 SHSI Research Grant, which supported my work on this article. This article also draws on primary source research conducted under the auspices of the Elmer L. Andersen Research Program Scholars Grant (Archives and Special Collections, University of Minnesota–Twin Cities) and Special Collections Travel Grant (Special Collections, Washington University in St. Louis).

This is one of a series of Pulitzer Prize-winning photos by Don Ultang and John Robinson showing Wilbanks Smith attacking Johnny Bright (wearing #43, in white) in the upper right corner of the photo while the ball carrier is in the lower center of the photo. From Don Ultang Collection, State Historical Society of Iowa, Iowa City.

The irreducible fact that Bright was an African American rendered Smith’s hits far more than rough play. With the photographs plucked off wire services by newspapers in every corner of the country, those faculty members who composed Drake’s Athletic Council were faced with a full-blown crisis that grew by the hour as Smith and his head coach, J. B. Whitworth, issued repeated denials that Bright was targeted. As the councilmen gathered to watch the assault unfold on the game films, they knew that they had to counter such lies by giving voice to the truth the pictures already spoke. Because of his race, they asserted, “there was obvious intent to injure Bright with unnecessary roughness.”

1. Minutes of the Athletic Council, 10/23/1951, Folder “Bright, Johnny—Alum,” Drake Biography Files, Drake Heritage Collections, Cowles Library, Drake University, Des Moines (hereafter cited as DBF); Don Ultang, interview by Brian Thomas, 6/5/1999, Iowa Digital Library, University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City. On the Bright incident, see, generally, Jessica Lynn Schultz, “Moments of
Before this game, it was an article of faith throughout Iowa that Bright—who had led the nation in rushing the previous two seasons as well as when he took the field on that sweltering Oklahoma Saturday—was a virtual lock for the Heisman Trophy. The professors who winced as grainy footage showed him being slammed onto that same field had placed their faith in the belief that sport offered an arena for racial progress, where the competitive rights of African Americans were guaranteed. Both dreams now seemed as shattered as Bright’s jaw. If anything, Smith hammered home a warning from southern universities that they would not abandon Jim Crow in the postwar age without a fight.

The councilmen’s sullen silence as the projector rattled to a noisy stop registered the message as received. When they began to speak, the emotional tenor of their conversation betrayed a deep cynicism about whether the Missouri Valley Conference—of which Drake and A&M were members, joined by an equal split of integrated and segregated institutions—could preserve the openness of spirit that allowed Bright to participate in the first place.\(^2\) For the council, “A&M’s toleration of such conduct” indicated a retrenchment of old patterns that would hold black participation at bay, making sport yet another fortress in which Jim Crow found sanctuary. Ultang and Robinson’s photos peeked past the parapets, revealing a brutal defense of the competitive color line.\(^3\)

---

2. During most of the period this article examines—roughly 1946 to 1951—the Missouri Valley Conference included, in addition to Drake and Oklahoma A&M, Bradley University and the Universities of Detroit and Wichita, which, like Drake, featured black players on their athletic teams; and Saint Louis University, University of Tulsa, and Washington University in St. Louis, which, like A&M, segregated their teams. By the end of 1951, another segregated institution, the University of Houston, was invited to join the league, which tilted the balance in favor of whites-only teams for the rest of the decade. In 1957 Oklahoma A&M—by then, renamed Oklahoma State—would withdraw from the conference to join the Big Eight Conference.

3. Minutes of the Athletic Council, 10/23/1951. Drake did not officially resign from the Missouri Valley Conference for another six weeks, but the decision
That defense introduced a new dimension into intersectional play that called for much more than what the council termed “a mere reversal of the score.” Rather, when one professor suggested that Drake cut its ties with A&M, Gardner roared that such a move was “the least Drake could do”: it could leave the league. If the southern members of the conference let Smith go unpunished, he posited, the violence destined to follow “endangered” all of Drake’s black athletes—and their right to play. Better to resign the conference altogether than see this right assailed by “that sort of sport.”

It was a radical step, taken by a group of unlikely radicals. All men, all white, all conservative midwesterners, the councilmen who packed Gardner’s office had just placed the honor of Drake’s black students—ones with extraordinary athletic abilities, mind you—above all else, even football itself. “We acted in the only way we could,” argued one participant in the meeting, “and maintained the honor and tradition of Drake.” More than that, the hundreds of letters sent “from persons in all walks of life and from all parts of the country” signaled how “the move has had almost universal support.”

Nowhere was that support more universal—or visceral—than at home in Iowa. From Denison to Des Moines to Davenport, the incident represented, in the judgment of one group from Clear Lake, “a flagrant violation not only of football rules, but of human decency.” Every shutter-click of Ultang and Robinson’s cameras exposed the competitive realities of southern football to Iowans caught unaware, opening their eyes, Ultang later observed, “to a social problem that hadn’t been recognized in the sports world” before Bright’s assault. “Suddenly,” he noted, “they found out a black man could be knocked around . . . deliberately.”

to do so was made in this meeting. Concern for Drake’s other black athletes was well placed; there were five others besides Bright in its football program: Alfred Brown, Leslie Eddins, Noel Harris, Norm Johnson, and William Roberson.

5. Henry G. Harmon, Report of the President to the Drake University Board of Trustees, 12/14/1951, Folder “Bright, Johnny — Alum,” DBF.
6. Brad Hughes et al. to Henry G. Bennett, 10/21/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSU Presidents Papers, 1908–1968, Special Collections and University Archives,
This epiphany pushed football fans statewide toward the same conclusion as the councilmen: southern football was a world apart, governed by a resurgent degree of racial violence that in the postwar era proved, to the minds of one Des Moines husband and wife, “a travesty on our way of life.” Jim Crow never seemed so real for Iowans as he did in this moment. And his face was that of Smith, whose “gangster tactics and deliberate ruthlessness” brought home the intolerance underlying segregation for one Des Moines woman who lived near the Drake campus. Writing to Smith at his dormitory, she asked him, “Was your action stimulated by the fact that John Bright is a Negro?” But Iowans already knew the answer to that question. In the days following the game, stories circulated of white spectators laying bets in the stands on how long it would take to injure Bright. Compared to “Good Honest Football as played in Iowa,” alleged one group, this event revealed how the encompassing culture of southern football—players and fans alike—“didn’t have the courage to face the Drake squad with Johnny Bright playing, so they resorted to hoodlum tactics to get him out.” For a school superintendent in Spencer, the attack demonstrated something far more fundamental about southern values. An individual who “ignores, condones, and alibis the disgraceful act” seen in this game was, in his view, “afraid to take any constructive stand on the side of justice.”

When it came to football, at least, Iowans believed they were on the side of justice. Since the end of World War II, racial

---

Oklahoma State University Libraries, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK (hereafter cited as OSUPP); Ken Fuson, “Drake Great Johnny Bright Dead at 53,” Des Moines Register, 12/15/1983.

7. Mr. and Mrs. L. W. Matthews to Henry G. Bennett, 10/21/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSUPP; Mrs. A. J. Pesetski to Wilbanks Smith, 10/21/1951, ibid.; Anonymous (signed “Several Fans of Good Honest Football as played in Iowa”) to Henry G. Bennett, undated [10/22/1951], ibid.; W. F. Johnson to Henry G. Bennett, 10/23/1951, folder 10, ibid. Drake fans who attended the game in Stillwater, or heard from those who had, recounted the betting that took place in the stands and the rumors swirling through the A&M campus before kickoff about how the home team intended to harm Bright early in the first half. See, generally, J. M. Flynn to J. B. Whitworth, 10/25/1951, folder 10, box 18, OSUPP; and “Material Presented by Jack McClelland, Director of Athletics, before the Missouri Valley Conference Investigating Committee,” undated typescript [November 1951], folder “Bright, Johnny—Alum,” DBF.
reconciliation through gridiron competition was a facet of the college game that Iowa’s pigskin enthusiasts considered an inviolable proposition. So was the guaranteed right to play. “As long as they are members of an Iowa team,” insisted the Cedar Rapids Gazette in March 1950, black athletes should “have the right to play with it wherever it appears and that right should never be signed away” in a game contract “with an opponent which refuses to compete against Negroes.”

This unswerving determination that every athlete should be free to compete, regardless of race, was the animating principle of a wider activism that swept the landscape of college football in the state of Iowa in the five years between the first postwar season of 1946 and Bright’s assault in 1951. Iowans of all stripes advocated the elimination of the competitive color line, and, for a time, it looked as if they might do it. Progress expanded on the demands of average fans that their state’s brand of football stand for more than mere wins and losses. “It is my sincere belief,” a booster in Spencer told Paul Brechler, athletics director at the University of Iowa, “that colleges and universities, above all other places, should be free of bigotry.” Such idealism reckoned with harsher truths that afternoon at Oklahoma A&M. “It is not easy,” Frank Gardner keened, “to watch dreams die as a result of foul play.”

An avatar of these dreams, Bright embodied for Iowans the promise of racial progress before his attack as surely as he did the loss of it thereafter. His injury brought down the curtain on a half-decade of reform, a bitter end to the widespread notion that Jim Crow could be licked by sport alone, while presaging a darker resistance to the sort of racial equality that Iowans championed. From that point forward, argued a Guthrie Center man, Iowans would harbor “a marked distaste” for all teams southern,


which they reflexively regarded as defenders of Jim Crow and the values that precipitated this violence.10

Their anger and action in the aftermath of the Bright incident, however, cannot be fully comprehended without first coming to terms with their optimism and organization for lasting racial change in the years before this game. The striking synchronicity of campus activism, public opinion, and institutional policy during this period already concluded segregation to be a moral, cultural, and competitive evil sharply at odds with the democratic values they believed their racially diverse teams represented in every contest. Where administrators presumed that the black athlete’s ability to compete in every game qualified as a defense of democratic values, other Iowans would hold that such values should be advocated on and off the field. “We differ only in our approach to the same problem,” noted Virgil M. Hancher, president of the University of Iowa. In this way, the galvanic response to the Bright incident brought together the elements of this activism, bonding them so as to render the equality of each competitor—as athlete and man—a touchstone of justice on the gridiron in Iowa.11

This article explores how those “guarantees of justice,” in Gardner’s phrase, evolved in the world of Iowa football. Iowans embraced racial equality on the gridiron in this postwar period as the embodiment of democratic values, and they saw sports, generally, as a vehicle for combating the broader problems of racism in American life. However, the Bright incident demonstrated the white South’s continued determination to resist such efforts, thereby raising questions about the extent to which sports could engender cultural transformation. Plotting Bright’s assault along a longer arc of Iowa’s own racial history shows how interracial play articulated homegrown competitive sensibilities that would distinguish Iowa’s college teams for the intentionality of black participation. Interracial play was an act made revolutionary by Iowans’ insistence on these guarantees, signaling how this overwhelmingly white state came to see, as the *Drake Times-Delphic* observed in 1947, that “race . . . has no

10. R. Y. Taylor to Henry G. Bennett, 10/22/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSUPP.
bearing on capabilities.” The refusal of their southern opposition to adopt a similar definition on the gridiron convinced Drake, Iowa, and Iowa State to retreat from competition compromised by racism. If that transformation could not be effected in the South, then these institutions would initiate it at home, putting their nondiscrimination principles into practice. It was a legacy, Gardner concluded, that demonstrated how “this affair is about something bigger than John Bright.”

ON THE SAME DAY that Drake’s Athletic Council met to consider its response to Bright’s attack, James H. Foster, an undergraduate at the University of Iowa, sat down behind a desk in the Pi Kappa Alpha fraternity house and, in longhand, “contemptfully” [sic] composed a letter to Oklahoma A&M president Henry G. Bennett. Foster had grown up in Des Moines, mere blocks from the Drake campus; friends from his Roosevelt High days were now Bright’s classmates. Bright’s assault proved more than a news event for him: it was personal. He was not alone. “As it is,” he told Bennett, “Oklahoma A&M has gained 225,000 enemies in Des Moines, 2,750,000 in Iowa, and countless others across the country.” For every last one of them, “there is no doubt but that the incident was planned,” a searing lesson in Jim Crow values. “I realize that you and your fellow Southerners hold Negroes in contempt,” he observed. “While we don’t associate with them socially in Iowa, we show respect and admiration where they are due.” The “amazing” outpouring of support among “students here at the University of Iowa [who] have rallied behind Drake” showed Bright to be a man worthy of just such esteem. All that Bennett’s team earned was “disgrace.” For Foster, “the great spirit and exceptional sportsmanship of Southern and Southwestern football teams” was forever shown to be a fraud. After this event, he informed Bennett, “I now feel only hate for your brand of football.”


13. James H. Foster to Henry G. Bennett, 10/23/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSUPP. Foster was not inflating the outrage on his campus over the Bright incident. On the same day as his letter was written, the Daily Iowan ran an editorial, directly beneath Ultang and Robinson’s photographs, that declared how “the
The stark truths that came into focus in Ultang and Robinson’s photographs offered an even starker contrast for Iowans between the values of their home state and those of the South. “I can’t understand why your coach wanted to win your game enough,” Foster wrote Bennett, “that he would stoop to arrange the permanent injury of an All-American . . . by such foul means.”

A writer for the *Alton Democrat*, on the other hand, thought such violence easily understood. “Bright was a colored boy and was playing football against a southern team” that knew that it “had to break [his] jaw” to win. Football in the South was, by his account anyway, “positively vicious.” One former Missouri Valley Conference football player from Cherokee was well acquainted with the tactics that southern teams deployed at will: “the dirtiest, yellowest, meanest thing a white man can do—and this is especially true in the South on the home field before partisan fans—is to strike or deliberately foul a Negro on an opposing team.” A Des Moines salesman was not so sure that it was the players alone who derived pleasure from watching a black man beaten in public. He urged Bennett to take a second look at the photographs. “If, after looking at the pictures of the game, incident . . . concerns SUI in several ways,” not least of which was that “it happened in our backyard.” Because “Drake is an Iowa team,” there was “a personal meaning to the Bright incident”; “we cannot be indifferent to a neighbor’s house on fire.” The editorial called on the university’s student government to lodge a formal protest, but Student Council president John L. Bunce begged off in a letter to the *Daily Iowan* the next day. “For the University of Iowa to enter into this matter by way of a protest from the student body,” he maintained, “would be banal under these circumstances for the issue is not one in which we as a student body are engaged actively.” An incredulous sophomore responded, in his own letter to the *Daily Iowan*, “It is not only our responsibility, but our duty as students of SUI, to take an active interest in last Saturday’s football happenings in Oklahoma,” if only because “every man is his brother’s keeper.”

you still insist on defending [Smith],” he argued, “you must be judged lacking in a sense of fair play just as Mr. Smith will be judged by all sports loving people throughout the country.” Studying the images for herself, one native Oklahoman living in Des Moines told Iowans to take heart. “As far as racial prejudice is concerned,” she crowed, Iowans “are at least 50 years ahead of Oklahomans.”

That was a shifting mark. Iowa was not the South—that much was true. But acceptance of free and unfettered black participation in Iowa football was a decidedly postwar concept. Throughout the interwar seasons of the twenties and thirties, Iowa’s universities simply accepted racial violence as one of the unfortunate but unavoidable aspects of competition for black football players. “There’s no use kidding anyone,” remarked Ossie Solem, Iowa’s head coach in 1934, “a Negro player, even if his opponents play cleanly, always gets plenty of bumps and particularly when he is a star ball carrier.” His comments addressed the beatings his highly touted running back, Oze Simmons, endured that season, especially at home against the University of Minnesota, whose whites-only team knocked Simmons cold twice. Minnesota president Lotus D. Coffman dismissed the widespread “inference” afterward “that the players on the Minnesota team were in someway or other antagonistic to Mr. Simmons because he is a Negro.” Such an inference, he scoffed, was “silly and ought not to be given credence by thoughtful men.”

The recent past, however, showed other black players from Iowa having a rough go of it against the Golden Gophers. In a letter to himself on stationary from Minneapolis’s Curtis Hotel the night “before the first real college game of my life”—on October 6, 1923—Iowa State’s sophomore tackle, Jack Trice, held that no less than “the honor of my race, family, and self are at stake” in his performance against Minnesota. “Everyone is ex-

14. Foster to Bennett, 10/23/1951; Chester R. Lindhoff to Henry G. Bennett, 10/23/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSUPP; “It Seems to Us,” Alton Democrat, 10/25/1951; Bob Reeser to Editor, Des Moines Register, 10/25/1951; Audrey Loehr to Editor, Des Moines Register, 10/25/1951.

pecting me to do big things,” he noted. “I will!” It was a pledge fulfilled with his life: a broken collarbone suffered in the first quarter augured sustained injuries in the second half, hastening his death two days later. One of his teammates, Harry Schmidt, denied rumors that Gopher players targeted him because of his race. “Absolutely not,” he told an interviewer in 1973. Yet the mere suggestion was enough to worry Big Ten commissioner John L. Griffith, who had been Drake’s head football coach from 1908 to 1915. “Inasmuch as Mr. Trice was a colored man,” he wrote four days after Trice’s death, “it is easy for people to assume that his opponents must have deliberately attempted to injure him.” Griffith’s own experience with “colored boys” imparted “very little to indicate that their white opponents had any disposition to foul them.” After all, he declared, “one of the great glories of athletics [was] that every man, no matter who he is, is assured fair play in an athletic contest.”

A lofty principle, no doubt, but hardly one to which universities in Iowa subscribed. Not only were black athletes like Trice and Simmons subjected to rough play from their opponents, but they also had to endure repeated blows to their dignity by their own universities concerning their right to play. They competed in an era dominated by so-called “Gentleman’s Agreements” — informal accords negotiated between northern and southern universities that sidelined athletes of color, all in the name of Jim Crow. To keep southern teams on their schedules, Iowa’s universities abided the color line, making an athlete’s race the qualifying factor for participation.

Indeed, had Trice lived another week, Iowa State leaders “had no intention of using” him in their game at the University of Missouri. On the day that he died, Mizzou athletics director C. L. Brewer contacted S. W. Beyer, Iowa State’s faculty athletic chair, about him. Unaware of the events in Minneapolis, Brewer

reminded Beyer of “conditions here” in Columbia. “It is impossible,” he explained, “for a colored man to play or even appear on the field with any team” from Mizzou. Mindful of southern “tradition,” he insisted, “we cannot permit a colored man on any team we play.” The color line was drawn. For his part, Beyer replied that Iowa State, as a fellow member of the Big Six Conference, “understood for several years . . . that colored men could not be used on teams playing with schools from the states of Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma,” where Jim Crow ruled. Iowa State thus planned to leave Trice in Ames. “However,” Beyer noted, “that is all settled because Jack’s injury resulted in his death.”

17. S. W. Beyer to C. L. Brewer, 10/10/1923, folder 7, box 1, Trice Papers; C. L. Brewer to S. W. Beyer, 10/8/1923, ibid. Harry Schmidt claimed that Washington University had similarly drawn the color line for Iowa State’s game in St. Louis during the 1923 season. “Jack went with us,” he recounted, “but he got off the train at Kirksville [MO].” Schmidt alleged that teams in Missouri “would not play against a Negro”—a charge that Brewer’s letter here corroborates. However, Schmidt’s memory failed him: Iowa State did not meet Washington University until October 27, three weeks after Trice’s death. See Schmidt
Although “no written rule” existed, “only a gentleman’s agreement,” Beyer nonetheless toed the color line. Succeeding generations of Iowa State leaders would do the same over the next quarter-century, abetting the divisions in the Big Six between integrated and segregated institutions. For the conference’s two southern members—Missouri and the University of Oklahoma—the end of World War II intensified the need to codify these agreements in their bylaws. A wave of recently discharged black veterans stood to flood onto campuses, and this pair had a vested interest in seeing that none of them crashed onto the gridiron. Accordingly, in May 1946, the president of Oklahoma’s Athletic Council, Walter Kraft, aided by his Missouri counterpart, Sam Shirky, browbeat the other four faculty representatives—including H. D. Bergman of Iowa State—into approving, unanimously, a provision that they buried deep inside the Big Six rule book, written in such a manner as to obscure its true intentions. “The personnel of athletic squads,” it read, “shall be determined in accordance with the laws of the sovereign state” in which the game was played, with “the personnel of visiting squads . . . selected as to conform with any restrictions imposed upon a host institution by the sovereign authority.” That is, black athletes were unwelcome in both Norman and Columbia. Afterward, Kraft advised his president, George Lynn Cross, who personally opposed the state’s Jim Crow laws, that the “intense interest . . . in the negro question” compelled the action, to which, he boasted, “we all agreed.” This rule yielded the desired outcome. Kansas, Kansas State, Nebraska, and Iowa State simply avoided black recruits since they could not participate in every game. It was hardly a blow to the jaw, but this bylaw knocked black players out of Big Six games all the same.  


18. Beyer to Brewer, 10/10/1923; Baker, “Fields of Contest,” 42–44; Rules and Regulations Governing Athletics and All Participation of the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, 1948, folder “Athletics (#2),” box 38, George Lynn Cross Presidential Papers, Western History Collections, University of Oklahoma, Norman; Walter W. Kraft to George Lynn Cross, 5/20/1946, folder “Athletics,” box 13, ibid. This rule was found in Article III, Section 5, of the Big Six bylaws.
Kraft exerted such influence because the Big Six was a conference run by faculty members. Regardless of the opposition of institution heads to this bylaw—whether Cross or Iowa State president Charles E. Friley, who were both against this rule change—they were powerless to stop it. Only those faculty leaders charged with managing Big Six business could affect its policy. Here, they encoded prejudice as their official competitive stance.

The stoutest opposition to this provision was found among student leaders at the league’s institutions, including those at the University of Colorado, which joined as the league’s seventh member on New Year’s Day, 1948. The students took direct aim at the bylaw in hopes that the newly constituted Big Seven membership might turn the tide in favor of black participation. The groundswell had actually started with Iowa State’s student government, the Cardinal Guild, in November 1947. Its officers “reopened the question of discrimination,” the Daily Nebraskan reported, “by passing a resolution at their last meeting favoring equal opportunity for individuals, regardless of race, color, or creed to participate in the [league’s] athletic contests.” Led by a full spate of veterans, who believed that the bylaw violated the democratic values for which they had fought in Europe and the Pacific, the Cardinal Guild leaders presented their resolution to Bergman, who, they hoped, would lay their concerns before the faculty junta at the Big Seven’s winter meetings in Kansas City. “I told them I would do this,” he reported to Friley, “but doubted that the Conference would take any further action.” He was right. The matter was tabled at once.19

The Cardinal Guild resolution did, however, succeed in rallying students at other conference member institutions to action.

19. “Iowa State for Big Six Rule Change,” Daily Nebraskan, 11/14/1947; H. D. Bergman to Charles E. Friley, 11/13/1947, folder 31, box 9, Charles Edwin Friley Papers, ISU; Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Representatives of the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, 12/12/1947, folder “Big 6—Admission of Colorado Univ.,” box 1, William H. Baughn Papers, Archives, UCB Libraries, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder (hereafter cited as UCB). Bergman was presented this Cardinal Guild resolution by its president, Don Delahunt, and a representative of the campus chapter of the American Veterans Committee—a clear sign that Iowa State’s veteran community had a hand in crafting this resolution, inside the Cardinal Guild ranks and out.
Harold Mozer, student body president at the University of Nebraska, asserted that “this year, with Iowa State behind us, we should be able to do something about the situation.” In late November 1947 Mozer welcomed Cardinal Guild president Don Delahunt to Lincoln along with the student government presidents from four of the other five member institutions (Missouri’s president attended; Oklahoma’s did not) for a summit on this discriminatory rule. Their meeting produced a resolution similar to that of the Cardinal Guild: “any eligible student of a member institution shall be allowed to participate in all competitive athletic events at any member institution.” A skeptical Daily Nebraskan editor sniped that Iowa State’s students had accomplished just one thing: “the proverbial sleeping dog was aroused.”

Although the Big Seven’s faculty leaders rejected the joint student resolution at the same time as they tabled the one sent by the Cardinal Guild, the combined effect thawed the competitive landscape. By March 1948, Iowa State’s athletics director, Louis Menze, was the first of his cohort to publicly entertain the notion of suiting up black players. “If we have any Negro boys come out, and they’re good enough,” he informed the Chicago Defender, “we’ll play them.” There was, however, one catch: “but not at Missouri and Oklahoma.” A month later, a student body referendum put Iowa State undergraduates on record as overwhelmingly in favor of lifting all bans on black participation in the Big Seven. Of 5,483 ballots cast, 5,062 (92 percent) favored repealing the bylaw, making them the first student body in the league to collectively voice support for opening athletic opportunities to African Americans.

Iowa State’s faculty and administrators did not share their courage. When, in early March, the institution heads of Colorado, Kansas, Kansas State, Nebraska, and even Missouri held their own meeting about the bylaw, Friley deliberately ducked it. Nor did he sign the resolution those presidents and chancel-

lors produced that called on “each institution [to] determine for itself what players are qualified” to play football.\textsuperscript{22}

By May, Oklahoma’s faculty senate recommended to President Cross that “any restrictions due to race in the participation of athletics at the University . . . be removed.” Yet Bergman joined with Kraft in holding the line on segregated competition, voting later that same month in the Big Seven’s spring meetings to keep that bylaw in the rule book. No one in a position of leadership at Iowa State was willing, as Colorado president Robert Stearns put it, to “permit a change in official attitude.”\textsuperscript{23}

If Stearns had had his way, such a change would have been patterned on what Drake and its Missouri Valley Conference brethren had achieved by erasing the color line from league play in late 1947. The members of that league, in the words of the \textit{Drake Times-Delphic}, negotiated “far-reaching changes in rules governing athletic competition,” deciding that black athletes could compete on all conference teams and in all conference venues, starting in September 1950, regardless of local laws. Stearns approved of this approach: segregated and integrated universities arriving at “such a modification in its rules” through mutual accord. To “disturb the present alignment” in the Big Seven required a similar understanding. With the likes of Saint Louis and Oklahoma A&M permitting black athletes from, say, Drake to play on their home fields, he figured, “it might be much easier for us to convince the University of Missouri and the University of Oklahoma of the desirability of change.”\textsuperscript{24}

Not every Missouri Valley member was convinced of this desirability, though. It was a deeply conflicted league, a mis-

\textsuperscript{22} Robert L. Stearns to Milton S. Eisenhower et al., 3/8/1948, folder 2, box 72, Central Administration Records: President’s Office, UCB.
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\textsuperscript{24} “Valley League Picks Barrett,” \textit{Drake Times-Delphic}, 12/17/1947; Stearns to Gustavson, 1/12/1948. Colorado’s faculty athletic representative, Walter B. Franklin, was not as enthusiastic about the applicability of the Missouri Valley’s rule change to the situation in the Big Seven, advising Stearns that it “does not give us anything to be used as leverage upon Oklahoma University.” Walter B. Franklin to Robert L. Stearns, 2/18/1948, folder 2, box 72, Central Administration Records: President’s Office, UCB.
match of members who pursued radically divergent competitive ambitions—to say nothing of their varying cultural norms. Earle Davis, faculty athletics chair at the University of Wichita, was unsure whether the league could even “survive as a working and effective organization.” “We are far apart in many matters of principle,” he advised conference leaders in early 1947. “Some of us do not participate in various sports; some of us do not play other schools; some of us have wildly differing attitudes toward the conduct of sports.” Their concord on black participation, then, was an illusory kind of progress, suggesting that they were effecting real change, when, in fact, it was a last-ditch bid to save the conference from a seemingly inevitable dissolution.25

For their part, Drake officials would eventually blame this state of affairs on the “expansion of the conference to include schools from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.” Straddling the Mason-Dixon Line in that way “has created numerous conference problems,” not least of which was whether black participation was a guaranteed right. After World War II, Drake and the other integrated members functioned competitively at odds with themselves: their black athletes could play segregated teams at home, but facing the Missouri Valley’s “Southern Bloc” on the road was impossible. “Southern inhospitality” was how the Drake Times-Delphic euphemistically characterized it. To wit, Perry Harris, Drake’s “fleet Negro back,” who returned to campus after 38 months in the Army Tank Corps in time for the 1945 season, was left at home when his team departed for Oklahoma and a showdown with the University of Tulsa. But when the series was renewed in Des Moines the following season, Harris’s coaches ruled him “available for the Tulsa tussle.” For Iowans, this situation was a perversion of morality, good sense, and fair play. For white Oklahomans, though, it was a natural condition of culture. “Colored boys,” stated one coach there, “are not allowed to play south of the Mason-Dixon line.”26


All of which helps explain why Johnny Bright’s appearance at Oklahoma A&M on October 15, 1949, was so groundbreaking. Never before had an African American played a team from Oklahoma inside its own state borders. Bright’s participation, as a sophomore, was a trial run for the new Missouri Valley rule. It was also a sop to the Big Seven, which A&M officials were desperate to join, as a show of racial tolerance for a conference that finally broke the color line that season when Kansas State used Harold Robinson on Thanksgiving Day against Mizzou in a game played in Columbia. It was “not practicable or feasible,” asserted Bergman, for the Big Seven to admit another segregated member. Accordingly, Bright’s spot in Drake’s starting line-up demonstrated to skeptical Big Seven members that, although A&M was a segregated team, Jim Crow did not deter participation in the state of Oklahoma became a guaranteed right.27

Gardner would later recall the trepidation with which Drake officials approached the contest, worrying “how would this boy be treated” as “the first of his race to ever play on the Aggie field.” Bright was not quite the sensation he was when he returned to Stillwater in 1951, but, Gardner noted, “he was already attracting attention as the nation’s leading back”—which made him a ready target, no matter his race. The game was no contest, with a superior A&M team whipping Drake, 28–0. A reporter for the Drake Times-Delphic jibed that Bright and his teammates “were so well scouted that one got the idea that the


27. Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty Representatives of the Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, 5/19–21/1949, folder 14, box 8, Director of Athletics Administrative Papers, University Archives, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia; “Tiger Muzzles Wildcat, 34–27, Atkins Is Star,” Daily Oklahoman, 11/25/1949; Bob King, “Manhattan Youth First Negro To Play in Big 7,” Kansas Industrialist, 9/22/1949, file “Football, History of—Robinson, Harold,” KSU History Vertical Files, Special Collections and University Archives, Hale Library, Kansas State University, Manhattan; D. Scott Fritchen, “I Was There To Play Ball,” Powercat Illustrated, 10/29/1999, 8–11. Unsurprisingly, the only votes among the Big Seven’s faculty leaders that Oklahoma A&M’s application for conference membership could muster were cast by Walter Kraft of Oklahoma and Sam Shirky of Missouri. The five representatives from the integrated universities voted it down.
scouts had been working out with Drake since last August.” On the whole, Gardner confessed, “we were soundly trounced,” with Bright tallying his fewest rushing yards of the season, “but he was happy and we were made joyful by the fact that while the game was rough and tough, this boy was played clean.” Indeed, Bright told his coaches that the A&M squad was “one of the cleanest he had played.” Afterward, Gardner drafted a letter to A&M leaders “to express our deep appreciation for the fine way in which this young back had been treated [by] the coach and members of the team.” Their “exemplary conduct” toward Bright proved to Drake officials that black athletes could compete in the South without threatening their guaranteed right to play—and without violence. “Two years later,” Gardner observed, ruefully, “the story was much different.”

AT THE DAWN of the 1950s, that story remained one of increasing black participation in Iowa football—a refutation of Jim Crow values at home and in the South. “It is easier,” argued the Cedar Rapids Gazette in late February 1950, “to break down the fences of prejudice in sports than in other fields.” Bright accomplished that feat in Stillwater; Iowa State students demanded it in the Big Seven; now it was the University of Iowa’s turn.

On a sultry Friday night in November, nearly 45,000 spectators filed into Miami’s Orange Bowl Stadium to watch the undefeated Miami Hurricanes play host to a hapless Hawkeye team. The game would end much as this hometown crowd expected—in another Hurricane victory—but, early on, Iowa showed more fight than anyone had anticipated. Racing to a 7–0 lead on its first drive, Miami’s defense then faltered as Iowa quarterback Glenn Drahn hit a fluky 39-yard pass to Fred Ruck, hauled in

28. Gardner Statement; “Aggies Lasso Bulldogs, 28–0,” Drake Times-Delphic, 10/19/1948; “Sports! By George,” Drake Times-Delphic, 10/19/1948. Although the original did not survive, a copy of Gardner’s letter to A&M faculty athletics chair C. H. McElroy is included in A&M’s official response to the Missouri Valley Conference’s investigation of the Bright incident. Its language aligns with much of what Gardner says in the quoted statement, which was made in conjunction with the same investigation. See C. H. McElroy to Investigating Committee, 11/10/1951, folder 5, box 19, OSUPP.

six yards shy of the Hurricanes’ goal line. On the next play, Drahn swept to his right, pitching off to sophomore fullback Bernie Bennett, one of five black players to suit up for Iowa, who skirted Hurricane right end Tom Jelley to slip in the front corner of the end zone for Iowa’s only touchdown. Bennett’s sprint marked another first—a black athlete scoring on Miami—exactly what the 4,000 black spectators packed into the east stands paid to see. His touchdown, noted the Miami Herald, “inspired the Negro fans . . . to a wild cheer”—an unrestrainedly joyous expression of their racial pride. In his arms, Bennett cradled all their ideals, hopes and aspirations as surely as the ball itself. His achievement was theirs.30

30. “Morale May Be Factor in Miami Game Friday,” Daily Iowan, 11/22/1950; “Undefeated Miami Topples Iowa, 14–6,” New York Times, 11/25/1950; Jimmy Burns, “Iowa Best Team We Played This Year, Says Gus,” Miami Herald, 11/25/1950. Besides Bennett, the Hawkeye roster included four other African Americans: Harold Bradley, Donald Commack, Donald Corbin, and Donald Riley. On the experience of black athletes at the University of Iowa generally, see David R.
As with Bright’s experience in Stillwater the previous season, Bennett and his black teammates were surprised by the lack of violence. Judging it “a nice clean game,” Hawkeye head coach Leonard Raffensperger expressed appreciation for “how our colored boys were treated.” Given that most of the Hurricane players were northerners, the reception the black athletes received was, to his mind, “no different than we expected.” After all, his team had just faced the least southern line-up it could meet this far below the Mason-Dixon Line. “We didn’t think those Miami boys from New York, Pennsylvania, or New Jersey,” he remarked, with a wink, “would mind playing against our boys.” This alone felt like progress—“a realization of the democratic ideal,” declared one black writer.31

Yet the guaranteed right to play was not the guarantee of democratic ideals. Jim Crow made sure of that. From the start, every aspect of the contest reflected the vicissitudes of the segregated South. In March, as he was finalizing the game contract, Iowa athletics director Paul Brechler explained to his president, Virgil M. Hancher, that their team’s black players were “a touchy problem” in Miami. Just weeks earlier, the University of Minnesota had conceded to local laws and left a black boxer at home for its bout there—a fact that made Brechler’s efforts to avoid “any embarrassment” an imperative. However he managed it, he arrived at “an understanding” with Miami athletics director Paul Harding about black participation: “if Iowa has Negroes on its squad”—as he knew it would—“there will be no question raised as their being permitted to represent our athletic department.” With pride, Brechler told Hancher, “this will be the first time that Negroes have been granted permission to play against Miami” on its own field. To mark the occasion, Harding opened the east stands to black spectators, a one-time affair that not only cashed in on their interest, but at the same time effectively increased segregation inside the Orange Bowl. One out of every ten tickets purchased went to a black patron, meaning a full


tenth of the crowd was seated in a section that existed for one purpose alone: to separate the races.32

Back home, it was not who played or where spectators sat that concerned black Iowans, but the accommodations to which Bennett and his black teammates had been subjected. Before the Iowa team departed for Miami, Des Moines’s black newspaper, the *Iowa Bystander*, published an editorial blasting the university for a plan to house the team’s black players in private homes while its white players would stay in a swank downtown hotel. For the *Bystander*’s publisher, James B. Morris, it amounted to “a disgraceful arrangement, an insult to the Negro players.” To his thinking, the university had bowed to Jim Crow values—and unnecessarily so. “Segregation is undemocratic and unfair,” he attested, “and places a stigma upon those who are objects of the unholy practice.” While social progress was achieved on the field, the black athletes were branded by segregation all the same with separate lodging. The university was at fault for failing to acknowledge how “it would be necessary to take a stand in this very matter” when it scheduled a game in a segregated city. Instead, he alleged, the university did nothing but open “the Hawkeye state to the justifiable criticism that it has entered into a mutual agreement to segregate and embarrass a portion of those who have been sent out as representatives of the institution.” In a personal letter, Morris appealed to Hancher to avoid any future games “requiring an arrangement of this kind.” “Out of decency, respect for the players, and in keeping with our boast of democracy,” he insisted, no Hawkeye team should travel south again “unless arrangements can be made which will not subject the players to this type of thing.”33

---

32. Statement by President J. L. Morrill, 2/22/1950, folder “Discrimination, 1949–52,” box 95, Office of the President Records, UMN; Paul W. Brechler to Virgil M. Hancher, 3/14/1950, folder “No. 93, 1949–1950,” box 250, Hancher Papers. When the University of Iowa’s Board in Control of Athletics gave Brechler “authority to negotiate in completing the football schedule for 1950 . . . with such teams as Miami University,” no mention was made in the official record of the racial complexities of scheduling the game in segregated Miami. Minutes of the Board in Control of Athletics, 2/10/1949, folder “Minutes, 1949–1952,” box 3, Records of the Board in Control of Athletics, UIA.

Hancher and Brechler were flabbergasted. It simply never occurred to them that their team was participating in anything but what Hancher labeled “an event of great social significance.” For them, the game was the thing—and, in this vein, they regarded their conduct before and during the trip to Miami as a defense, even an expansion, of the black athlete’s right to play. “We think we have played a large part,” Brechler told Morris, “in helping do away with segregation.” Iowa stood up to Jim Crow on the field and, even if its team lost the game, they still defeated him.34

Yet the victory extended only as far as the chalky in-lines of the gridiron itself. Beyond them, the black athletes were treated to the humiliating varieties of southern segregation. No matter how feverishly Brechler promised that the black players were “exceedingly well treated, and happy to have made the trip and played in the game,” the guaranteed right to play assumed dimensions that no Iowa university ever envisioned: overcoming segregation on the field was a hollow victory if black athletes were resegregated away from it. Ignoring the individual rights and dignity of black athletes, Morris argued in his Bystander column, “takes an unfair advantage of these players.” For black Iowans like him, this game marked no progress at all if the treatment of black players did not adhere to precepts of a democratic society. The university’s commitment to the guaranteed right to play for its black athletes, protested the Des Moines Interracial Commission, could not be compromised simply “to play an intersectional football game.” “Equality of accommodations,” they contended, “is a privilege to which each citizen is entitled if the principles of democracy are to be upheld.”35

Like other universities throughout the state and the Midwest, Iowa was only then beginning to accord its black students the equality of accommodations that these activists demanded for black athletes. Those African Americans who applied to the University of Iowa in the thirties and forties discovered that their letters of acceptance were quickly followed by notices


from Housing Services, insisting that “the University of Iowa does not permit Negroes to live in any of our dormitories.” “Our Negroes,” they were informed, relied on Iowa City’s small black community for assistance. “They try to take care of their own,” one incoming freshman from Minneapolis was told in February 1935. On their own, black men either rented beds in rooming houses or, as the Hawkeyes’ gridiron star Oze Simmons did, lived in one of the two black fraternity houses downtown on South Dubuque Street. Black women typically found lodging in the private residences of local black families or a privately owned dormitory operated by the Iowa Federation of Colored Women’s Clubs. The university would relent in this practice of segregation in 1946, when Housing Services assigned five black women to rooms in Currier Hall. For black men—especially athletes—the policy change did not come until later that decade. Meanwhile, segregated housing remained a crisis on other campuses around the state. In 1947 a pair of white undergraduates objected to a similar ban on black housing at Drake, pointedly asking in the *Times-Delphic*, “Is Drake a Jim Crow school?” But it was another two years before African Americans, like Johnny Bright, then a sophomore, could finally reside on campus.36

Intersectional series only amplified the inherent contradictions between principle and practice at Iowa’s major universities. None of these institutions perceived the dilemma in demanding equality for black athletes on the field but treating them like second-class citizens away from it. “Men in high places,” Morris wrote of the Hawkeyes’ trip, “should not agree to deny a citizen all the rights and privileges to which he is entitled under the law of the land.” But Iowa universities continued the practice anyway when their football teams took to the road. In 1951, when Bright and his teammates arrived in Stillwater for that fateful game with Oklahoma A&M, the hotel at which they

had stayed in 1949 now denied Bright a room. Without any lodging, Bright and Drake officials scrambled to find an alternative for him, which ended up being the private home of a local black minister—just the sort of segregated accommodations to which Morris had objected. Two years later, Iowa State’s first black players, Harold Potts and Hank Philmon, bunked in a black-owned funeral home the night before their junior varsity team took on Mizzou in Columbia. The precedent had been set, and ingrained, which caused Morris to lament that black players “should be a party to a deal of this kind.”

Yet off-field discrimination was irrelevant for most Iowa football fans. “It appears,” one booster apprised Brechler, “that the department is making every effort to combat prejudice and segregation where it is met”—especially if that meeting was on the gridiron. From the vantage of history, it is clear that, by the start of the 1950s, when Iowa’s universities entered into a series against a southern opponent, “stipulated from the beginning,” Hancher maintained, “was the condition that any Negro players . . . would play in the game.” Institution-to-institution relationships in this matter required full agreement, he noted, or else the prospect of competition was “refused.” What happened off the field—as in lodging—did not bear upon whether the contest was scheduled. In this case, since hoteliers, not the University of Miami, had discriminated against the athletes, the University of Iowa, in Hancher’s telling, “did not cancel its contract with a University that did not discriminate because of the discrimination practiced by the hotel owners.” Socially segregating its black athletes from its white ones in a city governed by Jim Crow was merely the price to be paid, in his judgment, for helping interracial play “become commonplace.” After all, this game, he averred, “moved another step toward the solutions we seek”—namely, no forced disruptions in the services of its best players.


38. Cooksey to Brechler, 11/22/1950; Hancher to Morgan, 12/26/1950. There is evidence that the Iowa-Miami game did change the culture of southern football, at least with regard to the University of Miami. By 1957, Miami president Jay F. W. Pearson could attest that his fans had become accustomed to watching integrated teams play the Hurricanes in the Orange Bowl. “Our public,” he
“LICKING THE PROBLEM of discrimination could be accomplished only by Negroes continuing to go into the South.” So answered a faculty member when Drake’s athletics director, Jack McClelland, asked the Athletic Council, in a meeting just ten days after Bright’s assault, “if we should subject” athletes of color to “the discrimination they invariably received in the South,” competitively and culturally. For McClelland, “the question of continuing to play our men against schools in the South was one for serious consideration,” particularly when weighed against “the possibility of another ‘incident.’” “Sending teams to compete in the South” was, to his way of thinking, a chancy proposition, offering a definitive challenge to the university’s policy of “treating colored athletes the same as white ones.”

McClelland’s concerns touched the heart of the problem: Was intersectional competition fair to black athletes? Despite the attack that their best player had just endured, these councilmen believed that traveling south was worth the risk, asserting —against overwhelming photographic evidence—that “the race problem in sports is considerably better than it was some years ago.” McClelland tempered his doubts by mouthing similar platitudes. “Perhaps the best thing about this entire incident,” he sighed, “was the help it might give in the lessening of racial discrimination the country over.” Progress was happening in Iowa, no doubt. The question was whether the South would follow suit. From where McClelland was sitting, the violence in Oklahoma made those odds long, indeed. He reminded the councilmen of “the sort of men Drake has to deal with in the Missouri Valley Conference—men who do not think as we do.” What’s more, he warned, “Drake has alienated most of the Conference schools.” Its offense? Seeking justice for an African American.

told a presidential colleague, “does like to see teams from other major conferences and other independents like Notre Dame and Pittsburgh.” The Hurricanes would not integrate their own football program until the mid-sixties, but in the meantime their fans did not object to racial diversity in their opponents’ rosters. See Jay F. W. Pearson to J. Wayne Reitz, 2/13/1957, folder “Correspondence, SEC, 1955–57,” box 54, J. Wayne Reitz Presidential Papers, Department of Special and Area Collections, University of Florida, Gainesville.

40. Ibid.
For the sort of men Drake had to deal with in its conference—the so-called Southern Bloc—no cause was more offending. They made it abundantly clear after Bright’s assault that they would shield Oklahoma A&M, in general, and Wilbanks Smith, in particular, from ever facing justice. Jim Crow would be defended. For the Drake Athletic Council, the bloc “seemed to be pursuing a deliberate policy of procrastination” as a way to frustrate Drake’s determined drive to see Smith penalized. The bloc would stall hearings, cast aspersions on Drake’s motives, even accuse McClelland of selling doctored photographs to Des Moines newspapers. Worse yet, the chairman of the league’s investigating committee—a professor at Tulsa—told Frank Gardner that, although “A&M had a pitifully weak case,” no punishment for Smith was imminent, ensuring that he would get away with assaulting Bright. So much for justice.41

The Missouri Valley’s ultimate refusal to punish Smith not only incensed football fans across Iowa, but caused them to appreciate, for the first time, how black participation in an age of Jim Crow was not about competition alone; it was also a matter of justice. The guaranteed right to play, the rights of black athletes away from the field, the intersection of interracial play with principles of democracy—these aspects of the growth in diversity in Iowa football were implicated in the search for justice. The Missouri Valley membership, in the eyes of most Iowans, chose to forgive Smith but condemn Bright for being an outstanding athlete—and African American. “Such reprehensible and unsportsmanlike conduct and discrimination against a player because of color or outstanding ability as with Johnny Bright,” argued a Waterloo man, “cannot be shrugged off.” Yet that was precisely what the Southern Bloc would do, leaving Drake with what Gardner judged the “not very desirable alternative” of making good on its pledge to resign from the conference.42

In one final appeal for Smith to be held to account, Drake president Henry Harmon attended a gathering of Missouri Val-

---

41. Minutes of the Athletic Council, 11/16/1951, 10/30/1951. Oklahoma A&M athletics director Henry Iba claimed that McClelland was guilty of “showing pictures to the press.”

42. D. B. Smith to Henry G. Bennett, 10/22/1951, folder 9, box 18, OSUPP; Minutes of the Athletic Council, 10/30/1951.
ley presidents in mid-November, where it was apparent that bloc members would withhold justice for Bright. When Harmon asked his presidential colleagues “if the Conference refused to condemn the incident,” they all answered that they planned to make no statements one way or another. Baffled, he then inquired “if they denied the legitimacy of Drake’s protest.” Again, they would stay silent. To a man, they confessed that Smith was guilty. “But,” Harmon reported to the Athletic Council, “they were still unwilling to act.” Privately, he confided in McClelland that Drake could never expect to receive any measure of justice from them. Far from leading league leaders to a moment of moral clarity, Bright’s attack offered “a fine opportunity for the Southern schools to reintroduce the ban on Negro athletes or for the Conference to create a situation that would force out some of the Northern schools.” Showing Drake the door would allow them to “swing the Conference to the South and the Southwest” and reestablish “a Conference that practices segregation”—an association sure to deny justice to athletes of color.43

By that 1951 season, such a conspiracy no longer seemed far-fetched. The sports pages were filled with stories of midwestern institutions dealing with the racism of their southern counterparts. The week of Bright’s assault featured two such items involving Drake’s Missouri Valley brethren. Three days before Bright and his teammates traveled to Stillwater, wire reports carried news of the cancellation of a November 24 game between Bradley and Florida State, to have been played in Tallahassee. Despite the on-field progress made when black athletes from the University of Iowa played in Miami, Florida State officials declined Bradley’s request that its black players be guar-

43. Minutes of the Athletic Council, 11/27/1951; Memorandum, Henry G. Harmon to Jack McClelland, 11/15/1951, folder “Bright, Johnny — Alum,” DBF. There was some credence to Harmon’s allegations about the desire of the Southern Bloc to transform the Missouri Valley into a segregated, southern conference. In May of that year, the Southern Bloc had attempted to expand the league membership to include another of their ilk, Texas Tech. “In case of a dissenting vote on the part of the northern schools” about Texas Tech’s application, the Daily Oklahoman reported, “a bloc of southern schools in the Valley might pull away and form a loop of their own with Texas Tech as a member.” No doubt, Harmon would have been aware of Texas Tech’s application and the divisions it laid bare in the conference. See “Valley Gathers, Deny League Split Rumor,” Daily Oklahoman, 5/11/1951.
anteed a right to play, hastily pulling the plug on this date as well as on their return engagement in Peoria, Illinois, in 1952. Bradley athletics director A. J. Bergstrom was unapologetic. “If these four men can’t participate,” he insisted, “neither can the rest of the Bradley team”—a natural position, given the Missouri Valley’s own rules.44

Yet the Daily Oklahoman considered southern teams willing to use “deliberate mayhem” to win. A renewed campaign to marginalize and brutalize black athletes was essential to their project of unscrupulous success, witnessed that Saturday in Stillwater—and in Tulsa. There, rough treatment of Marquette University’s black players by Tulsa’s entire team prompted both institutions to terminate contracts for their future meetings. The Daily Oklahoman believed that the world of southern football, “tainted with thuggery,” was drifting further from the national mainstream, with Ultang and Robinson’s photographs illustrating the distance. “Some of our Southwestern institutions,” one Des Moines salesman mourned, “must ‘win at all costs.’”45

Rough play was one thing. But the spirit of the play in Stillwater—a concerted effort not just to limit Bright’s effect, but to take him out—went well beyond hard-nosed competition, a fact impressed upon the Drake team throughout their trip. One player, George Smith, visited a local barber shop, where the patrons “bet a certain amount of money that John Bright would not finish the game.” Another of Bright’s teammates, Jim Peterson, was told by a scared A&M student that head coach J. B. Whitworth had prodded his players in practice all week “to take care of John Bright, whatever it takes, even if you have to kill him.” Multiple players and coaches heard rumors that Whitworth’s assistants made the slogan for that week’s practice simple: “Get Bright.” Other stories told of these assistants screaming at players in defensive drills to “get that nigger” or “get that coon.”46

Whatever was said or done in practice, Gardner believed it “extremely important to find the source of this intent.” He urged


45. “This Hurts All Oklahoma,” Daily Oklahoman, 10/26/1951; Lindhoff to Bennett, 10/23/1951.

46. Warren Gaer Statement, 10/23/1951, folder “Bright, Johnny – Alum,” DBF.
the Missouri Valley’s investigating committee to focus its inquiry on what factors influenced Smith to act as he had. “If he is a mild person,” as A&M officials said he was, “the provocation to intent must have been all the more intense and strong.” Whitworth and his staff either “directly or indirectly instilled in him pre-game ideas,” but “were their slogans and ‘battle cries’ of such a nature that a ‘mild young man’ goes suddenly berserk on the very first scrimmage play of the game?” Smith’s intent had a source, but the southern members hardly wanted to find it.47

To pinpoint what prompted Smith to attack Bright would have meant traversing the gulf that was opening, not just between Drake and its southern opponents, but between the values of equality and access, which Iowa football fans believed to be hallmarks of this postwar age, and a closed and provincial southern society, encumbered by its fealty to Jim Crow. The Bright incident suggested that southern values were so inherently racist that its universities and their teams could not be trusted to know the right thing, let alone do it. It was a failure of institutions, cultural and educational. This assault, then, was, for one Drake fan, not only an “unsportsmanlike act”—it was also “un-American.” That feeling suffused the outrage. “There are many here in Iowa and the Middlewest,” KRNT sports director Al Coupee reported, “who are convinced that Smith attacked Bright in violation of every principle of American sportsmanship.” There was no need to play an opposing team that could not be trusted to play fairly, or whose “type of play,” Gardner asserted, “destroys the very canons of normal human decency.”48

Decency was never Jim Crow’s calling card: violence, misery, heartbreak—that was more his style. Drake and its supporters—and, of course, Bright himself—had more than their fill of his manner, his values, his influence over an athlete who was in thrall to the cruelty of prejudice, whose actions, Harmon told Drake’s board of trustees, were “below the whole intent and purpose of the game.” The university, he said, should have no affiliation with a conference that “hesitated to take any action

47. Gardner Statement.
against the Oklahoma school because it believed that the college would ignore any action that was taken.” Nor should Drake associate with institutions that deliberately refused to accept that Bright’s injuries were, in Gardner’s phrasing, “intentional beyond reasonable doubt.” With no punishments forthcoming, with Smith continuing to play as if nothing had happened, with Bright’s brilliant college career cut tragically short, Drake’s Athletic Council was left with no other recourse than to fulfill its pledge. On November 27, 1951, Drake resigned its membership in the Missouri Valley Conference. In solidarity, Bradley tendered its notice as well. With the Universities of Wichita and Detroit the only remaining northern schools, the Missouri Valley was now a southern conference, by right. “Alas,” Bradley’s faculty athletic chair, Philip Becker Jr., wrote to Gardner, “the villain has stolen the scene.”

WHEN WORD of Drake’s resignation circulated through campus, reported the Times-Delphic, students “overwhelmingly” supported the move. Seeing few alternatives, most of them echoed the proud insistence of one upperclassman that pulling up stakes and moving on was “the only thing we could do.” A brother in the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity guaranteed a repeat of the violence inflicted on Bright if Drake stayed put, given the Missouri Valley’s indifference to the motivations behind his assault. “If nothing was done,” he postulated, “this type of situation could just keep happening.” And then there was the matter of Bright’s honor. “We should withdraw,” asserted one of the star player’s senior classmates, “in respect to John Bright alone—who did so much and expected so little.” Still, no matter how strongly they felt that this stand was made on principle, students fretted about the prospects for Drake’s “Bright-less” future as an independent. “I think the action was justified,” confessed one Kappa Kappa Gamma sorority member, “but I don’t think we’ll be having any good games any more.”

49. Harmon, Report to Drake Board of Trustees, 12/14/1951; Gardner Statement; Philip Becker Jr. to Frank N. Gardner, 12/4/1951, folder “Bright, Johnny—Alum,” DBF.

Drake University’s withdrawal from the Missouri Valley Conference was the subject of four of the top five stories on the front page of the November 30, 1951, issue of the Drake Times-Delphic. Image courtesy of Cowles Library Archives, Drake University.
She was more right than she could ever know. Trading profit for principle meant that Drake’s independence from 1952 to 1956 lacked the drama of a conference championship race or the national spotlight of a star player. Fans lost interest as Drake endured one losing season after another, leaving Drake Stadium embarrassingly empty during home games. By 1954, the football program’s operating deficit was upwards of $20,000, a crushing sum for a university that depended on gameday revenue. “Very anxious to get in a conference,” President Harmon pressed Gardner and McClelland to secure a new league affiliation, which, by September 1955, they found, improbably, in the Missouri Valley. A unanimous vote of the league members—including Oklahoma A&M—ushered Drake back into the fold, an acknowledgment of what both sides had lost in the Bright incident. Drake needed its rivalries with Wichita, Tulsa, and Bradley (which resumed its membership in 1955 as well) to increase gate receipts. The Missouri Valley needed its traditional northern anchor. Bygones could be bygones, in Gardner’s view, if it might “stimulate attendance.”

Yet by the time that Drake made its prodigal return, the Missouri Valley was hardly the same conference. Southern members still dominated, yes, but the guaranteed right to play for black athletes was standing policy, in large part because their own football programs were now integrated. The composition of those southern teams on Drake’s regular season schedules before and after the Bright incident indicates just such a transformation (see table). Where Drake had routinely faced segregated foes in the six seasons prior to its withdrawal—in some years, playing as many as four whites-only squads on a slate of nine games—in the post-Bright era it never competed against opponents who toed the color line, even as the resumption of its Missouri Valley membership in 1957 returned the university to sustained contact with the world of southern football. Its teams

---

from the Missouri Valley Conference; 3 believed that Drake could simply stop playing Oklahoma A&M, while maintaining its conference membership; only 12 opposed the university’s resignation outright.

Iowans Confront the Jim Crow South

**TABLE**

Iowa Universities Against Southern and Segregated Opposition, 1946–1966 (regular season contests only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drake University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Games Against</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>8/0</td>
<td>9/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Teams/Segregated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Games Against</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>10/9</td>
<td>12/0</td>
<td>16/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Teams/Segregated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Games Against</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Teams/Segregated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were not facing the racially hostile likes of Oklahoma A&M, but, rather, North Texas State, which, in signing two African Americans, Abner Haynes and Leon King, to football scholarships in 1956, kept pace with the kinds of competitive change that enabled Drake to reenter conference play without violating its stand against Jim Crow. Indeed, Drake’s first trip below the Mason-Dixon line since that day in Stillwater was made to Denton, Texas, on October 5, 1957, to meet Haynes, King, and their North Texas teammates. (Drake would win, 19–6.) The regularity of black participation on the Drake squad, as well as on nearly all of the other league teams, revealed to the North Texas coaches, explained historian Ronald E. Marcello, that “recruiting other blacks in future years” was critical if their own program “were to remain competitive” in the Missouri Valley. It was an epiphany that guaranteed that Drake would be facing more Abner Hayneses and fewer Wilbanks Smiths.52

52. Ronald E. Marcello, “The Integration of Intercollegiate Athletics in Texas: North Texas State College as a Test Case, 1956,” *Journal of Sport History* 14 (1987), 286–316, esp. 309. The use of black athletes throughout the Missouri Valley Conference expanded in the late fifties and early sixties, except at the University of Tulsa. Although Tulsa allowed visiting African Americans to compete on its home field, there is evidence of fan abuse, even into the early sixties. Indeed, when Drake’s basketball team played there in early 1964, Tulsa fans hurled ice and racial epithets at Drake’s black players. “It is a shame,” railed the editor of
Drake’s guarded reengagement with southern football mirrors generally the experiences of the University of Iowa and Iowa State, whose schedules indicated a similar reluctance after 1956 to square off against opponents who insisted upon segregation. Although Iowa State continued to face Missouri and Oklahoma’s whites-only squads in Big Seven play until 1956, both institutions had long abandoned their opposition to black participation, clearing the way, by the early 1950s, for African Americans to join Cyclone football for the first time since World War II. The same was true at Iowa. The Hawkeyes, for instance, began their 1958 national championship season with Texas Christian, whose tolerance for African Americans on its opponents’ rosters was recognized across the Midwest. “Laest yeah,” one Texan explained to the Daily Iowan, which lampooned his accent, “weal whupped Ohiah Staet an lost ah owun confurance titul, so this yeah weal lost to Ahiowah and weal going to win thay Souuthwes titul.” Black players or not, “ouah boys wun’t wurried abah this game.” Perhaps they should have been more concerned about Iowa’s black stars, such as Bob Jeter, who reeled off a 42-yard touchdown run, or John Burroughs, whose strong tackling helped to keep them out of the end zone all day.\(^5\)

Texas Christian was the first southern university that Iowa had played since the Bright incident, which Iowa athletics director Paul Brechler had denounced at the time in a letter to Drake’s Athletic Council. Because of his “indignation” at Bright’s treatment, he refused to slate southern opposition. Similarly, Iowa State faculty athletics chair H. D. Bergman would contest Oklahoma A&M’s admission to the Big Seven for another five years. After Bergman persuaded Colorado and Nebraska to join with Iowa State in defeating A&M’s expansion bid in December 1954, the Times-Delphi, “that such a great basketball conference as the Missouri Valley has to be ruined by a team that bases a game on bigotry and intolerance.” “Is It All in the Game?” Drake Times-Delphi, 3/3/1964.

53. Lou Younkin, “Iowa Hawkeyes Favored Over TCU Horned Frogs Today,” Daily Iowan, 9/27/1958; “Post-Game Comments,” Daily Iowan, 9/30/1958. Iowa’s three southern opponents in the post-Bright era—Texas Christian in 1958, North Carolina State in 1965, and the University of Miami in 1966—each fielded all-white teams when they played the Hawkeyes. However, these institutions were well known for agreeing to interracial play and did not make the participation of Iowa’s black athletes an issue in scheduling their games.
Kansas chancellor Franklin Murphy consoled A&M president Oliver Willham with the promise that “it is only a matter of time” before their institutions would be conference colleagues. However, one Oklahoma City sportswriter counseled disappointed A&M fans that a Big Seven invitation was inconceivable so long as Iowa State could play up “sympathy” for Bright.54

When A&M was finally granted membership in 1957, its athletics director and head basketball coach, Henry Iba, pledged “to bring our athletic program in stride with the Conference.” That meant bringing African Americans into its segregated program, for Missouri and Oklahoma had integrated their teams by that time. It would be another three years, in September 1960, before the newly styled Oklahoma State program made its Big Eight Conference debut—a delay demanded by Iowa State to guarantee that this newest member did indeed recruit athletes of color into its football program. An integrated league would abide segregation no more.55

SUCH PROGRESS made on the field did not ensure progress away from it. Just because the color line was being erased from the gridiron did not mean that Iowa universities were scrubbing it clean from their own campuses. “Since we know that our fine University Community of Ames is blighted by prejudice,” a local minister remarked in 1963, the first step to eradicating this scourge was to stop “pretending it does not exist.” After all, he asserted, “in the Midwest, we are tempted to believe that we are isolated from the problems of racial discrimination.”56


56. Russell L. Fate to Editors of the Daily Tribune and Iowa State Daily, 1/29/1963, folder 16, box 9, James H. Hilton Papers, ISU.
That illusion of a color-blind society was enough to persuade at least one black student to attend Iowa State. When a young freshman from Charleston, South Carolina, named Harvey Gantt, enrolled there in the fall semester of 1960, he learned immediately that it was “really a considerably different place than I had thought it would be.” There were few black students. “In fact,” he recalled in 1986, “there weren’t many blacks anywhere.” Prevented by segregation from attending Clemson Agricultural College, Gantt, using his National Merit Scholarship and funds from a state-sponsored program to pay for African Americans to study outside South Carolina, enrolled at Iowa State to major in architecture. It was not the prospect of studying architecture, however, that had lured him to Ames. Rather, he confessed, “I was mesmerized by the big-time college football” that the Cyclones played “and seeing so many black athletes and assuming that the schools [in the Midwest] were a lot more integrated than they were.” The “complicated” reality for African Americans at Iowa State was that “very few blacks matriculated . . . and those that did were primarily athletes.” So pervasive was this reality, Gantt recalled, that most of the white students he met in his first days on campus “assumed that I was playing on the football team, which insulted me and was degrading.”

When Gantt finally won admission to Clemson in federal court in late January 1963, he was reminded “how different that was immediately from Iowa State”: the janitors at Clemson were black. Although he was the first African American to enroll in a traditionally white university in the state of South Carolina since the age of Reconstruction, Gantt was not the only person of color on campus, for Clemson was populated by a network of black service workers who told him that “we’re going to take care of you.” “As a matter of fact,” he noted, “Clemson turned out to be blacker” than Ames, which he had expected to be more open and fair than the South because it allowed minorities to play football. The presence of black athletes on Iowa’s football teams masked those deeper problems of discrimination in student life at Iowa’s universities, which blinded administrators

57. Harvey B. Gantt, interview by Lynn Haessly, 1/6/1986, Interview C-0008, Southern Oral History Program Collection, Southern Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill.
to the challenges still facing black students, and called into question the nature of an integrated university.58

The confluence of those dilemmas was seen in October 1961 on the Daily Iowan’s editorial page. When its editors reprinted a column from the Daily Texan, the student newspaper at the University of Texas, calling for the recruitment of African American athletes to its own football team, one Iowa student reminded his fellow Hawkeyes that “unfortunately, we . . . are in no position to be smug.” “Yes,” he conceded, “we have permitted Negro athletes to perform in sports events.” In fact, “we are willing to spare no expense to encourage their participation.” Nevertheless, there was still work to be done at Iowa. African Americans were not permitted to join the university’s all-white Greek system. Nor did the university defend the rights of black students to live in off-campus housing without facing discrimination from local landlords. For that matter, its officials were slow to acknowledge any complaint of discrimination on campus—a tell-tale sign, for this student, that issues of racial progress possessed a relevance beyond the brick walls of Iowa Stadium. “The antebellum attitude at Texas U. has, at least, the virtue of consistency,” he jibed. “Ours, on the other hand, is a curiously unprincipled code”—a code, that is, that conveyed to Iowa’s black students that “you can participate FOR us—but not WITH us.”59

58. Ibid.
59. “On Athletic Integration at a Texas University,” Daily Iowan, 10/4/1961; Larry Barrett to Editor, Daily Iowan, 10/7/1961. At the University of Iowa, for instance, the same administrators who insisted on equal access to the gridiron for black athletes shied away from fighting for similar measures of equality for black undergraduates. President Hancher was reluctant to intervene in civil rights disputes that arose in off-campus housing or fraternity membership. Many students saw his tentative approach as emblematic of an institutional disinclination to “seriously consider” discrimination on campus and in Iowa City. A few professors even were of the mind that “as an educational institution . . . the university should not take a stand on a political problem,” an anxious stance that refused to combat Jim Crow’s influence in their own midst. Even when Hancher finally approved a general policy on discrimination in late April 1960, he offered but pale support for the “general aims or goals” of the new regulations. “We all strive,” he allowed, “for a ‘climate’ of no discrimination.” See Robert Fulton to Donald E. Boles, 4/6/1960, folder 6, box 2, Records of the Committee on Student Life, UIA; Corrected Minutes of Committee on Student Life, 4/4/1960, ibid.; Policy re Organizational Discrimination, April 1960, ibid.; Press Release, 4/29/1960, ibid.
That this editorial dustup arose ten years to the month since the Bright incident indicated the endurance of these matters long “after the heat of the battle,” as Harmon described it to Gardner. The gridiron supplied a frame for white Iowans in which the essential values of a democratic society—fair and open access to opportunity, rewarded ability, social progress through education—could be defended, if not expanded, by the competitive ambitions of their universities’ football programs. When asked to break this frame and consider the applicability of these values to their everyday lives, white Iowans proved generally incapable of translating such advocacy to a world beyond the gridiron. By contesting Jim Crow’s influence over football in the segregated South, they were given license to overlook his cruel handiwork at home. “Racial prejudice exists in Des Moines,” observed Patti Miller, a Drake student who would participate in the Mississippi Freedom Summer of 1964. “People are killing and beating others with their thoughts.” Except, by the mid-sixties, Iowans did not need to look for this violence—physical or psychic—in Oklahoma, but in “the white backlash” that Miller saw materializing in her hometown and on her own campus toward the approaching reckoning with Jim Crow. To defeat the values of segregation once and for all, Iowans of all stripes would have to take a stand in the interests of progress as surely as they had for pigskin. “Now,” Miller concluded, “we have something to fight.”

Leaving Home—Three Farm Memoirs from the Midwest: A Review Essay

PAMELA RINEY-KEHRRBERG


*TIME’S SHADOW*, *The Farm at Holstein Dip*, and *A Family Farm* bear a strong resemblance to each other. Each is written by a farm-son-turned-professor who chronicles the end, or the beginning of the end, of each family’s farm. Each author is acutely aware that with the passing of his family farm, an era in his family’s life, as well as an era in the life of the nation, is also passing. None of them apologizes for making the life choice that he made, but each memorializes the family’s agricultural enterprise, making sure that it will not be forgotten, even if his parents had sold the land in the absence of a child who was willing to remain in the family business.
Arnold Bauer, who taught Latin American studies at the University of California–Davis, is the author of *Time’s Shadow*, the story of a small, eastern Kansas farm. It passed out of the Bauer family in the 1970s, when the author’s mother died and his father could no longer work the land or live on it alone. *Time’s Shadow* is the least “academic” of the books, with few footnotes and short, topical chapters. Bauer discusses a number of ways American customs and ways have changed in the past 50 years and in the transition from rural to urban. Especially interesting are “Food and Drink,” “Diversions,” and “Dying at Home.”

Bauer’s work is distinguished by his discussion of the rural-urban divide in his community. His family’s farm was 15 miles from Clay Center, and he attended a small, rural school as a child. Until he attended a consolidated high school, his visits to town were few and far between. The family certainly did not go to town on a weekly basis. When Bauer began high school, he felt entirely out of place, a piece of “rustic fauna” (121). He wore the wrong clothes and knew nothing of the latest slang or the sports that the other boys played. It took three years for him to begin to feel less like an outsider. When he left home in the early 1950s, it was to join the air force. Following his stint in the armed services, he decided to use his GI Bill benefits to go to college in Mexico City, a decision that took him away permanently from his family’s farm.

*The Farm at Holstein Dip* is a somewhat different story, although this is more a matter of style than substance. Carroll Engelhardt, a retired history professor who spent his academic career at Concordia College in Moorhead, Minnesota, tells the story of his family’s farm in eastern Iowa. The book is a combination of memoir and social history. Engelhardt interweaves his memories with recent historical scholarship on childhood, adolescence, and rural outmigration, among other topics. Unlike Bauer, he divides his work into larger, thematic chapters, titled “Home,” “Town,” “Farm,” “Church,” and “School.” Interestingly enough, because of the proximity of the Engelhardt farm to the town of Elkader and the presence of a large, consolidated school, the author never felt the kind of alienation from town that Bauer describes. Because of regular Saturday night visits to town and the homogenizing effects of radio first and television
later, Engelhardt’s memoir of farm life in that era in the 1940s and 1950s could almost as easily be read as the story of small-town life during that same era. The pipeline out of Elkader, and off to the larger world, seemed somewhat better established than in Bauer’s world; even in the 1950s, more than a quarter of Elkader’s graduating high school class was heading off to college. No one was surprised when Engelhardt left home to attend Iowa State Teachers College.

Robert L. Switzer’s *A Family Farm* also falls into the more academic vein of Engelhardt’s work. Switzer, professor emeritus of biochemistry at the University of Illinois, made his first foray into nonscientific writing in telling the story of his family’s farm in northern Illinois. He places his story in context relative to the ups and downs of American agriculture and small farms in the past hundred years. Relative to the other two, he spends more time on the story of his parents and grandparents, only getting to his own memories (which begin in 1946) on page 83. The long back story is essential to understanding the underlying sadness in the story. Switzer’s father, Stephen, came to farming enthusiastically, when many other avenues failed to take him where he wanted to go. Switzer’s mother, Elva, was unable to pursue her dream of becoming a scientist, even when Cornell University offered her a partial scholarship to study biology at the graduate level. She lived a lifetime on a farm where she did not want to be and in her old age suffered deepening depression and even attempted suicide. She encouraged her son’s interest in science and his eventual departure from the family farm to go to college to study chemistry. Switzer organizes his story around the different parental stories and the different stages of the farm’s life, including his parents’ ongoing work on the farm following their sons’ departure. He interweaves some of his father’s and children’s writings about their lives and the farm into the book and also includes his wife’s and son’s art featuring the family farm.

An interesting point of comparison between the three books is their treatment of the issue of child labor on farms. That issue can be a point of bitterness in some memoirs and is sometimes cited as the reason why individuals left the farm and chose to raise their own families elsewhere. In these three books, though,
it is only part of the story. Bauer, in particular, muses on the subject of work. He worked a great deal but seemingly without resentment. Work was simply what farm children did. When his sisters left the farm, he writes, “I became a full-time farmhand at age ten or eleven, working long summer hours in the fields and doing chores year-round” (49). As an adult, he remembers that arrangement as one that was, in fact, empowering, because children felt a sense of ownership within the family enterprise. “We took pride in our farm, compared favorably our stand of wheat, our cattle with the neighbor’s fields and herds. In fact, we willingly contributed to the family’s income rather than subtract from it” (46). Engelhardt, too, is remarkably benign in his discussions of work. He cites regular afternoon chores, consisting of shelling corn for the chickens, gathering eggs, caring for livestock, and, eventually, milking. He saw this as little different from the way the owners of small businesses in town put their own children to work to avoid the cost of hired labor. Although he claims that he was raised with a “belief in toil,” he counters his own claim with the comment: “in the natural order of things parents toiled and children played” (56). He devotes far more of his discussion to play of various sorts than to labor. Apparently, work did not hang too heavily over children in the Engelhardt household. Neither Engelhardt nor Bauer seems to have taken anything negative away from his working experiences as a child. Or, if either did, he chose not to include it in his memoir.

Switzer, too, spends time on the issue of labor but with a rather different tone than Engelhardt or Bauer. In his memoir, we see a more critical discussion of early labor and the development of an adversarial relationship between children and parents, particularly their fathers. Switzer learned to drive tractors and trucks early and was doing both by the age of 12 or 13, something he remembers with a degree of pride and pleasure. He gathered eggs and fed chickens while quite young; by the time he was 12, he was also out of bed by 6 a.m. to help his father in the barn. More work awaited after school. In the summers in particular, he helped with the field work. He remarked that neither he nor his brother was “a very willing chore boy” (98). If he resented his work, it was because his father was a difficult man to work for. His father “failed to make either Steve
[his brother] or me feel as though we were partners in a shared, mutually beneficial enterprise. Little wonder that both of us left home as soon as we finished high school” (100). Farm work was a push factor and education a pull, leading to Switzer’s departure from agriculture.

Read together, these three books provide an interesting commentary on children’s lives on family farms in the middle of the twentieth century and on the passing of the era of the small farm by the end of the century. Together, the three books illuminate the interplay among the many forces leading individuals away from farms and toward cities. Both Bauer and Switzer grew up with parents who wished they had different choices; had the parents been born a generation later, they probably would have pursued other lives. All three grew up as working children, although with very different interpretations of that experience. Bauer, Engelhardt, and Switzer tell of the growing relationship between farm youth and small-town high schools, institutions that might have seemed alien at first (as in Bauer’s case) but eventually convinced each young man of the wide range of possibilities existing off the farm, sometimes in faraway places. What they have told is the story of the majority of farm youth in the last half of the twentieth century. It is a story in which farm sons and daughters gain education and perspective and then choose to leave the family farm behind, sometimes fulfilling the dream of an older generation that lacked the opportunities provided by prosperity in the post–World War II era.

Reviewer Bonnie Martin is visiting assistant professor of history at Pacific Lutheran University. She is a coeditor of the forthcoming Uniting the Histories of Slavery in North America.

General readers and professional historians alike will enjoy and learn from Brett Rushforth’s fresh look at slavery in colonial North America and the Caribbean. Although the title suggests a regional study, the scope of the book is much broader. Rushforth pulls New France into the larger continental and Atlantic stories of economics and cultural exchanges in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Readers interested in colonial, borderlands, or Atlantic world history, as well as the history of slavery, will find this a worthwhile investment.

Rushforth’s writing style is engaging. He uses little of the jargon that can discourage students or the reading public. At the same time, he addresses the professional conversation on slavery in North America and supports his arguments with the kind of documentation demanded by professional historians. He successfully blends history and historiography with narratives and analysis.

The book opens with a powerful vignette that draws in the reader. An Indian woman of a slaveholding tribe is crafting what is simultaneously a work of native art and also an instrument of degradation and torture—a slave halter. She weaves into the utilitarian hemp base beads and animal hair in vibrant colors. As in Euro-American slavery, indigenous peoples used art to reinforce their slave systems by highlighting the power of slaveholders and underlining the helplessness of the enslaved. The halter was a ritual statement of control and pride. It reinforced unity among her own group, while stressing the alien inferiority of the captive’s group.

As the monograph develops, we get a closer look at the captives. They are not seized from local enemies as we might expect. Using the catchall label “Panis” (Pawnees), Indian slave traders offered buyers in New France plains Indian and Apache captives from as far away as New Mexico. As was typical in the indigenous slave trade, most of the slaves were women and children. Rushforth traces the intimate, serial
connections between the Great Lakes and the trans-Mississippi West. The connections were not limited by the continent, however. Through the trade links with France and its Caribbean colonies, French owners shipped North American captives from towns like Montreal to places like Cap-Français in the Caribbean.

*Bonds of Alliance* forces us to reconsider stereotypes. For example, indigenous bondage is often characterized as “soft slavery”—in which captives are incorporated into captor societies. Rushforth resharpens the edges of life for slaves of Indian masters and mistresses while reassessing the opportunities for the slaves of Euro-Americans in frontier places like New France. He demonstrates, probably to the surprise of some, that there was a range of constructed kinship relationships available across these cultures.

Taking the story to another level, Rushforth reminds us that more than laborers and commodities were exchanged across the Atlantic. The early colonial period was a time of rousing debates over which people might be ethically enslaved and under what conditions. With Rushforth as our guide, we are swept into the current of arguments over the “natural freedom” due Indians versus Africans, medieval allegories of a France free from unjust slavery, and the economic realities faced by settlers in New France and St. Domingue.

Historians will appreciate how Rushforth’s data and conclusions inform and are informed by the work of borderlands experts such as Pekka Hämäläinen, Juliana Barr, and James Brooks. Similar, strong parallels can be drawn to the insights provided by researchers of Indian slave traffickers east of the Mississippi such as Eric Bowne and Alan Gallay. The philosophical and legal debates invoke directly or indirectly studies of the Atlantic world by Sue Peabody and Malik Ghachem. On the other hand, students and general readers will enjoy the way Rushforth balances big economic and cultural stories with personal case studies of slavery from the vantage of French colonial North America.


Reviewer Thomas D. Thiessen is retired from his position as archeologist with the National Park Service’s Midwest Archeological Center, Lincoln, Nebraska.

In this massive book, historian William Swagerty explores and reviews much more subject matter than the title implies. “Indianization,” the
operative term that appears in the title, means simply the impact that contact with North American Indians had on non-Indian culture, in this case specifically the members of the epic Lewis and Clark exploration party. It is a term borrowed from anthropologist A. Irving Holloowell, who defined it in 1963 as a unique form of acculturation. Author Swagerty explains how the Indianization concept developed from related acculturation concepts offered at earlier times by various anthropologists and historians.

Swagerty solidly sets the expedition’s history in the context of Jeffersonian America: its pre-expedition perception of Native Americans; its regional food traditions shared by the expedition’s members, who came from different parts of the nation; its view of diplomacy with Native Americans; contemporary knowledge of common health issues and treatment; and Jeffersonian exploration in general. After all, the Lewis and Clark expedition was one of several exploration parties dispatched into newly acquired or desired lands, albeit the largest-scale geographically and the most successful in advancing geographic and ethnographic knowledge. The underlying theme, of course, is how contact with tribes along the Missouri and Columbia rivers changed the apparel, diet, medical treatment, technology, and transportation of the expedition, and how these changes and adaptations contributed to its success.

In exploring these topics in an introduction, 12 chapters of discussion, a conclusion, and an epilogue, Swagerty ventures into many diverse topical areas, including reviews of Lewis and Clark’s personal histories and Lewis’s relationship with President Jefferson, the publication history of the expedition’s journals, the state of knowledge of uniforms and other clothing worn by expedition members, the ironies of Clark’s diplomacy and treaty-making with Native Americans during his long post-expedition service as Superintendent of Indian Affairs, what happened to many of the Native American material culture and natural history specimens brought back by the expedition, and even the fate of the expedition’s members themselves. The last is accomplished in an epilogue that contains a lengthy table summarizing what is known of their lives and deaths.

Throughout the text, readers gain insight into how difficult the journey was for the exploring party in terms of physical hardship, food supply, maintenance of individual health, and, at times, diplomatic relations with the tribes. It truly is a wonder that the expedition lost only one man to death (Sergeant Floyd, presumed to have died from a ruptured appendix) and encountered as little outright violence as it did (resulting in the deaths of only two Native Americans). The
concluding chapter, titled “The Impact of the Expedition on Science, Culture, and Indian Diplomacy, 1806–1820,” is especially important for succinctly summarizing the legacy of the Lewis and Clark expedition immediately after its return.

The text is supported by a huge number of footnotes (1,989) and a bibliography that together reference virtually every published study relating in some way to the Lewis and Clark expedition. For the careful reader, the book serves as a guide to the immense literature on Lewis and Clark, a body of scholarship that increased greatly preceding and during the recent Lewis and Clark bicentennial celebration.

Illustrations—seven maps, 54 black-and-white figures (many of them of contemporary documents), and 11 color illustrations—are relatively sparse. The color illustrations are mostly late nineteenth-century and twentieth-century artwork depicting scenes of the expedition at various points in its travel, although one is Saint-Mémin’s remarkable 1807 painting of Lewis wearing Indian clothing and headgear presented to him by Shoshone Chief Cameahwait, Sacagawea’s brother.

Because of its length, the book is an arduous, but absorbing, read. Devoted buffs of the Lewis and Clark expedition will enjoy and learn from it immensely, and scholars of many persuasions will have much to mine from these volumes. The book will long stand as an important source for serious Lewis and Clark enthusiasts and researchers.


Reviewer Vernon L. Volpe is professor of history and department chair at the University of Nebraska at Kearney. He is writing a biography of John Frémont.

Zebulon Pike neither climbed the grand peak bearing his name nor successfully completed the objectives of his western missions to the Mississippi’s headwaters and the gates of Spain’s internal domain in Mexico. As the editors of this collection of essays note, the bicentennial anniversary of Pike’s 1806 expedition passed with little notice, the memory of Pike’s travels certainly still dim in the shadow of Lewis and Clark’s epic journey. Still, the editors and contributors to this worthy volume successfully cast light on Pike’s life work and the actual achievements of his explorations. Perhaps not resolving forever the questions of Pike’s “spying” and flawed navigation, these studies do clarify and cement Pike’s accomplishments more than ever before.
Neither a “lost pathfinder” nor an unwitting “spy” duped by his benefactor—the known rogue General James Wilkinson (Spain’s “Agent 13”)—Pike emerges from these pages a more substantial military explorer. Editor Jay Buckley contributes an essay detailing Pike’s personal and military life. Understandably, Buckley believes that Pike has been dismissed as an explorer rather than appreciated for his real scientific accomplishments and for helping to solidify America’s northern and southwestern borders, as well as leading the way to Santa Fe. (Another Buckley essay assesses Pike’s explorations alongside those of Hunter and Dunbar, Freeman and Custis, as well as Lewis and Clark.) In the end, Pike died a hero’s death, falling victim to exploding debris while leading an 1813 attack on a British fort at York (Toronto), Canada.

Somewhat more critical are essays by noted scholars John Logan Allen and James P. Ronda. Allen reconstructs Pike’s scientific understanding of the southwestern region, due perhaps to Alexander von Humboldt’s famous map of the Spanish lands. Speculating that Pike was more confused and frustrated than “lost,” Allen suggests that this led to Pike’s erroneous perpetuation of the mythical common source region of the western rivers and his depiction of the plains as “sandy deserts.” While showing the importance of Pike’s efforts at mapmaking, Allen still concludes that among Pike’s problems was a “disastrous grasp of geography,” thus contributing to his “failure.” Ronda also critically assesses Pike’s rather heavy-handed efforts to extend American sovereignty to the far north (in his Minnesota expedition) and across the Southwest to Santa Fe. In so confronting British traders, native peoples, and Spanish authorities, Pike served less as a naïve promoter of Jefferson’s “empire of liberty” than as a willing accomplice in General Wilkinson’s dubious machinations. Ronda proposes that Pike gladly embraced this sort of “spying” mission to the Southwest.

Jared Orsi’s essay proposes a different form of imperial reach: the ecological domain of the market. Both insightful and somewhat far-fetched (for example, connecting Shays’s Rebellion with Mississippi River access), the essay also shows Pike to be a willing participant in extending America’s commercial power over the energy stored in the lands and rivers of the West. Debatable is whether the American flag flying over a Pawnee village in Nebraska should be taken to represent the power of the growing market, but Orsi certainly presents the “achievements” of Pike’s mission in quite different terms.

Perhaps more intriguing is Leo Oliva’s essay on the unusual friendship that developed between Pike and the Spanish officer who would detain the American interloper, Lieutenant Facundo Melgares. Pike had followed the Spaniard’s route from the Pawnee villages to
the mountains and then garnered valuable information from Melgares during his captivity in Mexico. Ironically, this relationship provided the American explorer much useful information, leading to the Santa Fe Trail, though it might be too much to link it to provoking the Mexican War and the loss of much territory to the United States. Still, it was Melgares who welcomed American traders to Santa Fe when it opened to trade from Missouri.

Readers of this volume may find most interesting William Foley’s careful essay detailing the many and varied intrigues of General James Wilkinson. Fortunately for Pike, the explorer and his exploits play only a very small supporting role in this drama, but Foley’s essay provides essential insight into the motives and operations of the man who sent Pike up the Mississippi and to the southwestern frontier. The essay (and Wilkinson’s eventual demise) provides a fitting final chapter to the volume. While mostly debunking the myth of Pike’s alleged spying mission, these original essays provide much material for contemplating the meaning of his extensive exploits.


Reviewer William Whittaker is a project archaeologist at the Office of the State Archaeologist at the University of Iowa. He is the editor of Frontier Forts of Iowa: Indians, Traders, and Soldiers, 1682–1862 (2009).

When Black Hawk’s band of Sauk left Iowa in 1832 to reclaim their traditional homeland east of the Mississippi, settlers panicked and built dozens of small stockaded forts in Illinois and Wisconsin. The apprehension of the occupants of a small fort at Blue Mounds, Wisconsin, was well founded. Attacks by Sauk and other Indians allied with Black Hawk killed three occupants. Fort Blue Mounds briefly became the main bivouac and supply point of the volunteer militia attempting to stop the uprising. The fort’s historical importance in a campaign that essentially ended Indian claims to land east of the Mississippi is underappreciated. The uprising ended in disgrace for the United States after hundreds of Indian women, children, and men were massacred along the Mississippi River attempting to return to Iowa, a dishonorable act that taints all historical events and places associated with the Black Hawk uprising.

After the uprising ended, settlers and miners used the fort buildings through the 1850s. In 1921 the state of Wisconsin acquired the quarter-
acre of land that the fort occupied. A historical tablet and property markers identified the spot, which soon fell into neglect. In 1991 Robert Birmingham began efforts to identify the fort’s location. Although the site was state property, the property markers had been removed and the edges of the fort had been eaten away by plowing. The size of the parcel seemed far too small for the fort; historical accounts described a fort 150 feet long.

Excavation by volunteers during summer weekends over several years traced out the fort wall and trench, probable blockhouse locations, and internal features such as pits and a hearth. The entire fort area had been plowed after it was abandoned, so only deep features were well preserved; the floors of fort buildings were obliterated. The biggest surprise was how small the fort was; it was closer to 40 feet on a side, a claustrophobic enclosure of a cabin and two blockhouses for 50 people for four months.

Birmingham does an admirable job of summarizing the historical context of the Black Hawk uprising, the archaeology program, the features encountered, and the artifacts recovered, describing their significance in layperson’s terms. As with virtually every fort excavation, difficulties arise in trying to differentiate fort-era remains from post-fort occupations. The later sections of the book provide an overview and summary of other forts used during the Black Hawk uprising, an overdue listing that I do not think has been attempted previously.

If I were to find fault with this report, it would be with the occasionally lazy editing; there are more typos and other errors than one would expect in a glossy publication, and the prose can drift into clichés. When I read “alarms spread like prairie fire” in the very first sentence, I groaned, afraid of what I was about to venture into. Fortunately, Birmingham’s writing is usually superior to this, and I read the entire book in one satisfying evening.

Birmingham has pulled off the nearly impossible: leading a multi-year archaeological project with a crew almost entirely of volunteers, analyzing all the artifacts, maps, and data, and producing a creditable, well-written summary of results accompanied by research that places the site in historical perspective. Many well-intentioned archaeologists have started down this path; most seem to fail. It is encouraging to know that it can be done.

Reviewer Silvana R. Siddali is associate professor of history at Saint Louis University. She is working on a book on antebellum state and territorial constitutions.

Historians no longer have to defend the notion of studying state constitutions. Leading constitutional and legal scholars like Donald Lutz, Kermit Hall, and G. Alan Tarr (who wrote the foreword for the series in which this volume appears) have overturned assumptions that state constitutions are nothing more than cumbersome, formulaic documents overburdened by legal code and only interesting in comparison to the U.S. Constitution. Tarr’s foreword introduces the overall focus of the series: the role of state charters in buttressing the “new judicial federalism” (xiv). Following his lead, Jack Stark—like most of the other authors in this series—emphasizes how the state charters have provided greater protections for individual rights than those afforded by the federal constitution.

Greenwood Press originally published Stark’s guide to the Iowa state constitution in 1998 as part of its earlier State Constitution Reference Guides. Oxford University Press has now reissued and standardized that series (46 volumes to date) to create a useful basis for a uniform study of state constitutions. Like all volumes in the series, *The Iowa State Constitution* consists of a historical overview of the constitution, a list of amendments, a clause-by-clause case-law analysis of the current constitution, a table of relevant legal cases, and a brief bibliography.

In his overview essay Stark explains that the Iowa constitution adopted in 1857 has never been revised, despite a mandated call for a popular vote on constitutional revision every ten years. He attributes its longevity to an orderly and flexible amending procedure, which has allowed it to be regularly amended. Among the essay’s great strengths is the readable and well-contextualized discussion of the historical background. Although such reference books are rarely intended to be read from cover to cover, Stark’s excellent discussion rewards a careful perusal. The strong central core in the book illuminates the relationship among the state judicial, legislative, and executive branches. Stark argues throughout his essay (and later in the analysis of specific provisions) that Iowa courts have consistently deferred to the state legislature and to the governor rather than “engaging in judicial activism” (81–82).

Part two consists of a case-law analysis of each section of the constitution—that is, the most recent version available to Stark in 1998.
He is careful to explain judicial decisions and statute law to non-legal specialists. Perhaps one of the most impressive strengths is Stark’s thoughtful investigation of unintended constitutional restrictions that have forced the Iowa legislature to create imaginative solutions. For example, in 1887, a creative financing scheme made it possible for Des Moines to build improvements and pay for them with a special fund, which in turn allowed the city to circumvent a constitutional prohibition against the incursion of constitutionally mandated debt limits (175–76). Such subtle analyses, set in a rich, erudite context that makes use of the English constitutional heritage and Dickensian literary allusions, make this a particularly successful addition to the series.

Social, political, and cultural historians, however, would have benefited from more comparisons across state constitutions, particularly in the Midwest. Stark also wrote the Wisconsin volume for the series, and although he does briefly refer to that state constitution, the streamlined format of the series did not permit him to extend that discussion or to include references to other states in the region. That is a missed opportunity and renders the book less useful for historians and students than it might have been.

Of greater concern is the fact that although the publisher standardized the volumes in the series, it did not revise the original work published in 1998. Even so, there are dozens of new typographical errors not present in the original volume—some of which seriously alter the meaning of the text. More problematic is the failure to include two important amendments to the Iowa State Constitution passed since Stark’s original volume was published. In 1998 an amendment to Section 1 of Article 1 included women in the general statement on the rights of persons (“all men and women are by nature free and equal”); another removed the $100 limit to the maximum penalty allowable for cases to be tried summarily before a judge. When the Polk County District Court ruled Iowa’s Defense of Marriage Law unconstitutional in 2007, the decision—based in part on the 1998 amendment to the equal protection clause—certainly reached into the legislature’s domain, contradicting Stark’s argument that the Iowa judiciary rarely interferes with the legislative branch. The fact that the book was reissued three years after the Iowa Supreme Court marriage case, *Varnum v. Brien*, renders this omission nearly inexplicable.

Still, Stark’s work is deeply researched and subtly reveals an astonishing breadth of knowledge. This volume will be a useful resource for legal and political historians as well as for constitutional scholars.

Reviewer Kristen Anderson is assistant professor of history at Webster University in St. Louis. Her dissertation (University of Iowa, 2009) was “German Americans, African Americans, and the Construction of Racial Identity in St. Louis, 1850–1870.”

In Mrs. Dred Scott: A Life on Slavery’s Frontier, Lea VanderVelde examines the life of Harriet Scott, the lesser-known wife and co-litigant of Dred Scott. Many Americans are familiar with the outcome of Dred Scott’s lawsuit, but few are aware that his wife also sued for her freedom. Rather than focusing solely on the Scotts’ courtroom battles, however, VanderVelde attempts to reconstruct the entirety of Harriet Scott’s life, with the goal of advancing our understanding not only of freedom suits but of the experience of slavery on the frontier more broadly.

This is a challenging task, given the paucity of records from enslaved people generally and the small numbers of enslaved people on the frontier. VanderVelde meets this challenge by meticulously examining the available records of those who owned or hired Harriet or Dred, as well as those who lived in the same places as they did, to reconstruct the world in which they lived. By taking this anthropological approach to writing biography, she can make well-supported assumptions about the kinds of work Harriet would have done, where she would have lived, and the kinds of relationships she would have had with others. VanderVelde is drawing on some new source material, in the form of the letters and diaries of Lawrence Taliaferro, Harriet’s owner when she first came to the frontier. The significance of these documents for understanding the Scotts’ lives had been overlooked by previous historians, much as Harriet herself had been.

VanderVelde begins her account with Harriet’s arrival on the frontier as a 14-year-old girl in 1835. She accompanied her master when he traveled west from Pennsylvania to take up the position of Indian agent to the Dakota. Harriet thus came of age in a multiracial frontier environment, in which Native Americans, white soldiers, and black slaves or servants lived in close proximity to one another. It was while she was living in the West that she met and married Dred Scott. Their time living north of the Missouri Compromise line would become the basis for both of their claims to freedom, since Harriet’s master unfortunately did not directly state an intention to free her when he “gave” her to Dred as a wife before leaving the region himself.
VanderVelde continues her use of thick description to reconstruct the Scotts’ lives after they moved to St. Louis, building a detailed picture of white-black relationships in that community, including the role slavery played in the city’s social and economic life and the impact living in a slave state had on the free black population. Her coverage of the Scotts’ multiyear legal battle for their freedom is similarly detailed. She examines the ways both Harriet’s and Dred’s cases were constructed and the consequences of the court’s decision to ultimately lump the two cases together. The typical nineteenth-century subsuming of a wife’s identity under her husband’s not only hid Harriet’s story from the eyes of historians, but also changed the terms of the case itself. In some ways, Harriet had the stronger claim to freedom, and a victory for her would have had the added benefit of freeing their two daughters. VanderVelde also places Harriet’s and Dred’s suits in the context of the other freedom suits filed in Missouri during that era. Harriet and Dred’s case appears to be fairly typical and only achieved such notoriety because of the political situation surrounding slavery on the national level at the time the case went to trial.

The density of information in this volume would likely not suit it to an undergraduate audience. However, the work should have broad appeal beyond its most obvious audience of scholars interested in freedom suits or frontier slavery. As a result of VanderVelde’s extensive research into life in frontier forts, the book is also a rich source of information for those interested in relationships between whites, African Americans, and Native Americans on the frontier and in the settlement of the upper Midwest more generally. The level of detail regarding day-to-day life in frontier forts and white-Indian relationships in the area is particularly impressive. VanderVelde’s work is an important contribution to our understanding of slavery in an understudied region of the country.


Reviewer Kenneth L. Lyftogt is a lecturer in the department of history at the University of Northern Iowa. He is the author of several books on Iowa and the Civil War, including From Blue Mills to Columbia: Cedar Falls and the Civil War (1993).

Lee Miller wrote this book to honor the soldiers from Muscatine, Iowa, who served in the 35th Iowa Volunteer Infantry during the Civil War. During the war, 242 of them died, either from battlefield wounds or
disease, and 76 were seriously wounded. The book is a chronological narrative of the regiment’s service, from its first days at Camp Strong in Muscatine in early 1861 to its return home in the summer of 1865. The years of service put the regiment in the thick of the fighting at Vicksburg, the Red River Campaign, the Battle of Tupelo, Mississippi, and the Battle of Nashville and in the pursuit of Confederate Sterling Price from Arkansas to Missouri. The book has maps, some photos and illustrations, and a roster of the soldiers of the regiment.

The book is one more fine contribution to the scholarship of Iowa and the Civil War published by the Camp Pope Bookshop. Miller gives publisher/editor Clark Kenyon due credit for the quality of the book. As in most local histories, the book is a labor of love and respect. Miller has done his homework, his research is solid, and he gives his readers some of the personal stories and drama that bring the Civil War home to Iowa. It is a short book, which is not a bad thing. If every Iowa regiment had such a book, Iowa would be well served.


Reviewer Michael Knock is assistant professor of history at Clarke University in Dubuque. His dissertation (University of Notre Dame, 1996) was “‘Alone with Sitting Bull’s People’: The Dakota Indian Mission of the Congregational Church, 1870-1937.”

To the casual observer, the life of Mary Butler Renville sounds like a bad dime novel. A Christian missionary and teacher, Mary Adeline Butler married John Renville, a man of French and Dakota ancestry. The couple was held captive during the 1862 Dakota uprising, an event that would become a book with the sensationalized title, A Thrilling Narrative of Indian Captivity.

The similarities between Renville’s story and melodrama end there, however. Her story paints a nuanced portrait of the conflict at a time when the wounds from the war were still fresh. Where other writers demonized the Dakota, Renville emphasized the efforts of the Dakota Peace Party to protect captives while also negotiating an end to the bloodshed. The book even ends with a plea for the Dakota: “May God guide the people of Minnesota, who have suffered deeply, to act wisely in the present instance, and not drive even the friendly Indians to homeless desperation” (188).
A Thrilling Narrative of Indian Captivity, originally published in 1863, has been revived in a fascinating new edition edited by Carrie Reber Zeman and Kathryn Zabelle Derounian-Stodola. The book contains not only Renville’s original narrative, but also an appendix of letters that passed between the Dakota camps and Minnesota authorities during the war. A second appendix contains correspondence between Mary and John through 1888. These primary documents paint a far more complicated picture of the war, and of the Renvilles’ marriage.

The two stories are not unrelated. Zeman and Derounian-Stodola put the Renvilles’ story into historical and literary contexts by examining how this interracial relationship affected Mary and John and their role in the war. Zeman, for example, explains how Mary’s marriage to John would have been seen at the time: “Clearly the dominant society believed a woman who chose to marry an Indian fell quite short of ideal white womanhood: she must be of mixed blood, a prostitute, or ‘masterful!’” (29). Yet Zeman is clear that Mary and John’s relationship was genuine, proven by her willingness to stay by his side during the war: “The Renvilles chose to face their fate together as a family” (41).

Derounian-Stodola puts the Renville story in the context of the American captivity narrative. She, too, focuses on the unique racial component of their story: “As a biracial couple, especially during and immediately after the racially charged war, they were constantly dealing with identity issues depending on where and among whom they lived. Who were they? Where did they belong? How did they situate themselves in the world?” (124). These were perpetual issues on the Dakota frontier from the efforts of the Hazelwood Republic through the forced relocation of the Dakota following the war. And it is these questions that make this edition so interesting.

Of course, there are drawbacks to framing a story of the Dakota uprising from the perspective of the Renvilles. This is not a comprehensive history of that war. As Zeman explains, this is largely because the author, “like most captives, . . . was generally ignorant of the military side of the war, hearing little more than the exploits recounted by soldiers around campfires at night” (68). Still, this fascinating edition should help scholars to better understand the complexities of race, gender, and compassion through the voices of those who struggled with them in their own lives.

Reviewer Douglas Firth Anderson is professor of history at Northwestern College (Iowa). He is a coauthor of Pilgrim Progression: The Protestant Experience in California (1993).

Peter Pagnamenta’s new book begins with Iowa-born Buffalo Bill Cody and his Wild West show in Britain in 1887. Later in the book, the author devotes almost an entire chapter to recounting the English-born Close brothers’ (William, Frederick, and James) land operations in northwest Iowa. In his epilogue, Pagnamenta returns to both subjects.

Buffalo Bill Cody and the Close brothers are no strangers to those familiar with Iowa’s history. William Franklin Cody has been studied by many over the years, perhaps most comprehensively by Louis S. Warren in Buffalo Bill’s America: William Cody and the Wild West Show (2005). The Closes, though far less known than Buffalo Bill, have received book-length attention from Curtis Harnack in Gentlemen on the Prairie (1985). Pagnamenta adds nothing new about Cody or the Closes. He does, however, provide a lively narrative of the British elite’s fascination with the American West—a West that encompassed Iowa. Cody’s Wild West show and Close Brothers, Ltd., capitalized on that fascination.

The author, a British journalist and writer, limits his focus to the British upper classes—the aristocracy, the landed gentry, and the moneyed middle class. While he admits that the numbers of such who visited or emigrated to the United States were small, he rightly points out that “their financial resources, energy, and self-confident behavior gave them significance far beyond their number” (xii–xiii). During the mid- to late nineteenth century, Buffalo Bill was but the latest of a number of Americans to capture the imagination of the British public in general and the elite in particular. Against the backdrop of Anglo-American Romantic sensibilities, authors such as James Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, and Francis Parkman and artists such as John James Audubon, George Catlin, Alfred Jacob Miller, and Albert Bierstadt helped infect many British aristocrats with what more than one termed “prairie fever.”

In the 1830s–1850s, the “fever” manifested itself primarily through hunting. In part one of his book, Pagnamenta chronicles the travels—and trophies—of upper-class Britons such as William Drummond Stewart, Charles Murray, George Ruxton, John Palliser, Henry Coke, St. George Gore, and Grantley Berkeley. After the American Civil War, prairie fever’s symptoms changed: instead of the upper class largely
hunting for game, they turned to hunting for land. Part two of the book thus features the Earl of Dunraven in Estes Park, Colorado; the colonies of Victoria and Runnymede, Kansas, and Rugby, Tennessee; various ranching endeavors primarily in Texas and Wyoming; and the Close brothers’ land interests centered in Plymouth County, Iowa. Pagnamenta in effect argues for the “breaking” of the fever by 1890. The break came in part because of the financial losses in cattle ranching after the notorious summer and winter of 1886–1887. It also came because of the limits set to individual and corporate ownership of U.S. land by the Alien Land Act of 1887. Twin symbols of the fever’s passing, the author suggests, were Buffalo Bill’s bringing the Wild West show to Britain in 1887 and the death of Frederick Close in a polo accident in Sioux City in 1890.

The strength of Pagnamenta’s book is its narrative. The book is delightful to read. More, it convincingly connects varied individuals and developments that have tended to be treated in isolation. While Iowa is most often thought of as part of the Midwest rather than the West, this account makes it clear how for some Britons the northwest Iowa prairies, sparsely settled by 1870, could seem familiarly Anglo-agrarian and exotically American frontier at the same time.

Yet the narrative strength of the book is also its weakness. Narration from primary sources more often than not trumps substantive analysis. Indeed, there is little acknowledgment of other scholarship on anything—the West, Buffalo Bill, American Indians, hunting, farming, ranching, ethnic colonies. Given his narrative emphasis, it is strange that Pagnamenta does not examine John Henry Tunstall, the young British-born New Mexico rancher from a moneyed family whose assassination in 1878 launched the Lincoln County War (the most famous of the war’s participants was Billy the Kid, one of Tunstall’s cowboys). Since there is no bibliography (perhaps the publisher’s decision) and little reference to relevant scholarship in the book’s endnotes, one only learns about Harnack’s book on the Close brothers in the acknowledgments.

Nonetheless, Pagnamenta’s narration of the multifaceted role of upper-class Britons in the development of the American West is of some value. The book offers nothing new as a history, but it can serve to engagingly introduce readers to important players in the shaping of both the mythic and real West of the nineteenth century.

Reviewer John D. Buenker, a native of Dubuque, is professor emeritus of history and ethnic studies at the University of Wisconsin–Parkside. The author or editor of 15 books and numerous book chapters, articles, and reviews, his research and writing have focused on the Progressive Era, especially in Wisconsin.

In his introduction to *Poles in Wisconsin*, John Gurda, the foremost authority on Milwaukee history and the great-grandson of Polish immigrants, opines that this slim volume is “the most comprehensive and even-handed treatment ever published of an ethnic group that has long been one of the state’s most important.” Anyone reading it will be hard-pressed to disagree. Wisconsin has the nation’s highest percentage of people (9.3) claiming Polish ancestry and ranks sixth in total numbers. Milwaukee ranks fourth among U.S. cities in the number of residents claiming Polish roots, while Portage County is home to the nation’s largest rural Polish community. A map of the distribution of Poles in the state in 1920 illustrates those statistics (4).

The text itself is dense; every sentence is packed with valuable information and insights that elaborate on the process by which European Poles became “Poles in Wisconsin.” The author painstakingly delineates the successive streams of emigration, settlement, and assimilation of Poles from Prussia, Russia, and Austria over several decades. She also cogently differentiates their rich intramural diversity from those universal characteristics that define them all as Polish Americans. Adding significantly to the story are two collages of photographs (48–57, 89–100). The first group focuses almost entirely on rural settlements and includes images of Catholic churches, roadside shrines, and family farmsteads. The second consists primarily of Milwaukee neighborhoods and ethnic institutions; it also features the wedding portrait and naturalization papers of Gurda’s great-grandparents.

Capping off this pictorial cornucopia is the portrait of the 1898 wedding of Franciska Wojda to Stanislaw Ślizewski. To maximize the book’s human interest, the author and her husband have appended a 28-page translation of the memoir written by Franciska Wojda’s father, Maciej, in 1928. Arriving in Milwaukee as a 15-year-old immigrant in 1868, Maciej Wodja lived there until his death in 1933. Although he had little formal education, Maciej was “a shrewd and articulate observer with a keen sense of humor,” and “his spontaneous writing style gives the reader a sense of listening to the reminiscences of a kindly grandfather” (102).
About the only problem with Mikós’s highly informative and entertaining volume is that it has no footnotes or endnotes. The major source of documentation is a single-page “selected bibliography” of ten books and five articles in scholarly journals. This, unfortunately, makes it difficult for researchers to link up specific material in the text with its source. That aside, this is an excellent study of one of the most important ethnic groups in the upper Midwest.


Reviewer Catherine McNicol Stock is Barbara Zaccheo Kohn ’72 Professor of History at Connecticut College. She is the author of Rural Radicals: Righteous Rage in the American Grain (1996) and Main Street in Crisis: The Great Depression and the Old Middle Class on the Northern Plains (1992).

Wednesday morning, November 9, 1932, brought news of a landslide victory for Franklin Delano Roosevelt, whose promise of immediate action to help the devastated economy convinced many Americans to vote for a Democrat for the first time in their lives. It also brought a record snowfall to rural Iowa. This forgotten detail, one of hundreds collected and preserved in Lisa Ossian’s The Depression Dilemmas of Rural Iowa, 1929–1933, reminds us that even the most transformative moments in national or global history are inevitably experienced by individual men and women in one place and one time. Thus, no matter how important it is to see the “big picture,” to focus on comparative and transnational accounts, and to understand the past more completely, the foundation of our knowledge must still lie in the small view, the local experience—the snowstorm as well as the landslide. Ossian delivers on her promise to explain how rural people in Iowa managed to “make do” in the early years of the 1930s. Even for readers who believe they already know how hard these times were in the countryside, she presents a sense of place and time rarely crafted with such care elsewhere.

Historians of the Great Depression tend to write about its broad, signature events—the stock market crash, the end of Prohibition, the election of 1932, and the First Hundred Days of the New Deal—from a national perspective, since they affected all Americans. But Ossian turns the tables on the familiar. Rather than simply recount the failures of the Hoover administration, for example, she reveals how the people of his home state, Iowa, who had enthusiastically celebrated his election in 1928, came to terms with his lackluster response to
the crash. As Election Day drew near, one Hoover speech was only attended by local postmasters—federal employees—and even a few of them booed. Likewise, she recalls how Iowans who had proudly supported Prohibition responded to the movement for repeal. The stalwarts, she said, never gave up the fight because, as one leader wrote, “no question is ever settled until it is settled right” (149).

Even more importantly, by detailing the local “dilemmas” Iowans faced in these years and the solutions they concocted, she unearths data, images, and narratives never assembled in one place before. It is well known that women added productive labor and real income to their families in the 1930s by increasing home production of canned goods, garden products, and dairy, and also by learning to scrimp and save—to “make do.” But Ossian enriches this familiar concept by adding pages of rich detail. She draws one of the most memorable from a local woman’s story, “The Apron.” “Mom’s apron served many purposes. . . . They kept her dresses clean, covered up missing buttons, or a dirty dress. . . . At times she had several on. They brought garden stuff into the house, held eggs gathered from the chicken coop and more. . . . If it was a bad day she threw it over her face to cry, and no one would know it” (175).

Ossian does not stop with inspiring stories of overcoming hardship, however, nor should she, given the real tragedies that befell many rural families in the state. The chapter “Violence” examines the rise in robberies, murders, and suicides during the depression years. A neighbor killed two elderly women in the hope of finding money in their home; a son killed his father as he slept, so certain was he that the drunken father’s threat to kill his wife would come to pass; a young farmer who could not pay his debts killed himself in the barn with his own rifle. In the chapter “Welfare,” Ossian also reminds us of the unending work children performed on the farm and of their alarming rates of poor health. In one study in the late 1920s, officials reported that the vast majority of children in rural Iowa entered school without ever having seen a doctor or dentist. Economic hard times in rural America began long before the stock market crash, and its impact only increased during the 1930s.

Ossian has done a remarkable job making the years just before the New Deal in one small corner of the nation come to life. That alone makes the book worth reading. But in an important epilogue she ventures into the broader questions of twentieth-century agricultural policy that with each decade beyond the Great Depression has decreased the number of family farms and increased the power of monoculture and agribusiness. This highly analytical and policy-oriented chapter comes as a bit of a surprise—perhaps some of these critiques might
have appeared earlier in the work as well. As a whole, however, the book recaptures the details of a by-gone era in Iowa history, along with the resourcefulness of its people and communities, and makes us wonder exactly what we have left behind.

Lisa L. Ossian won the State Historical Society of Iowa’s Benjamin F. Shambaugh Award, recognizing The Depression Dilemmas of Rural Iowa, 1929–1933 as the most significant book on Iowa history published in 2011.—Ed.


Reviewer Jan Olive Full is principal at Tallgrass Historians L.C. Her dissertation (Loyola University Chicago, 2006) was “Hinterland or Heartland: The Survival of Small-Town Lake Mills, Iowa, 1850–1950.”

Far from being any sort of history of small towns or of small-town Main Streets, The Death and Life of Main Street is a broad study of the idea of Main Street—acknowledged symbol of small towns—using a classic myth-and-symbol approach. The short title is purposefully crafted to suggest that while “real small towns” (235) may be dead or moribund, the idea of the small town survives on a vastly greater scale through popular culture, planning theories, architects’ drawing boards, and developers’ business plans. Miles Orvell’s small towns are not limited to any particular size or place, however, and are not confined by historic definitions or geographic borders. And Orvell argues that Main Street is no longer strictly a town center or marketplace but a set of paradoxes and contradictions to be navigated in order to understand today’s cultural landscape. The “real small towns” of our past and the values they held have given way to the power of idealized Main Streets starting in the 1930s and culminating in Disneyland’s mythical Main Street of the 1950s. Disneyland’s Main Street USA has become the physical model encapsulating the values and aspirations of today’s American public, often employed by those who plan our newest communities, especially the New Urbanist movement.

Early on, Orvell explores the persistent cultural dichotomy of attitudes about small towns as paradoxical places that both sustain ideal American values and stifle individual vitality. He then develops his thesis—that the reality-turned-myth of Main Street has become the vehicle representing our desire for safe and happy communal life—over eight chapters. Orvell draws on a wide range of evidentiary
sources, including literature, plays and movies, television shows, recreations such as Henry Ford’s Greenfield Village, and an extravagant model railroad exhibit as well as Disney’s perfect Main Street. Orvell establishes the historical basis for the myth of Main Street in chapter one and describes actual small-town decline in chapter two using a 1950s Philadelphia suburban town (Chestnut Hill, where he lives) as his main example. In chapter three, Orvell places small towns at a cultural low point with the 1920s publication of Sinclair Lewis’s *Main Street*, a condemning satire of “Gopher Prairie,” Lewis’s thinly camouflaged hometown of Sauk Center, Minnesota.

Drawing on just one side of the cultural dichotomy, Orvell argues in chapter four that the myth of small towns began to grow in the 1930s and, “in a dramatic reversal of symbolic meaning, began to acquire a new magical glow, replacing the jaundice of the village virus” (99). He sees this transformation in how the work of Depression-era documentary photographers like Dorothea Lange, which preserved the bleakness of small-town life, evolved into nostalgic dramas like Thornton Wilder’s *Our Town*, the “definitive representation of small-town life during the 1930s” (114). By the end of the ‘30s, Orvell argues, Americans wanted to believe that the perceived community harmony of simpler times was still possible. He sees evidence for this in wistful movies such as Frank Capra’s *It’s a Wonderful Life* (1946).

This restoration of the “mythic image of Main Street as a place of communal harmony” (130) would persist through the 1970s and the advent of the New Urbanist movement’s efforts to plan communities that could actually generate such harmony. Orvell’s last three chapters explore decades of experiments with planned communities, from the gated East Coast nineteenth-century developments designed by architect Alexander Davis (a sometime colleague of landscape architect Alexander Downing) through the vast post–World War II Levittown developments of slab bungalows to the spectacularly unsuccessful housing projects of the 1960s and ‘70s.

In the end, Orvell returns to his main argument, that current efforts by urban planners, commercial developers, and New Urbanist designers alike are geared to creating communities they perceive Americans want to live in—places of harmony and symbols of democracy and community, but likewise places of “social homogeneity” (240) where residents of similar backgrounds and economic situations are safe and happy.

For those new to the subject, *Death and Life of Main Street* may be an eye-opening exploration of the mythology and culturally laden concepts behind small towns and Main Street. Despite its suggestive
title, however, the book is not grounded in the history of small towns, their change over time, or their economic and social struggle to survive. Nor is it intended to be. Geographically focused on the region around the author’s home near Philadelphia and in other coastal regions both east and west, the book is useful to understanding midwestern Main Streets only in a general and somewhat esoteric way. Readers may pick up this book because of its title and tinted picture postcard dust-jacket, but those wanting more grounding in real Main Streets and real small towns will set it down again.


Reviewer Gwen Kay is associate professor of history at the State University of New York at Oswego. She is the author of Dying to be Beautiful: The Fight for Safe Cosmetics (2005) and “‘If it did not exist, it would have to be invented’: Home Economics in Transition at Iowa’s Regents Institutions” (Annals of Iowa, 2011).

In Creating Consumers, Carolyn M. Goldstein argues that home economics, and the professionals who practiced it, had a profound impact on American culture. By creating a professional niche for women, particularly in government and business, home economists fostered a culture of smart consumption, economical and healthful meal planning, and sanitary home environments. Arranged chronologically, and parallel within time periods, the book details the careers of women in this burgeoning field. By focusing on two key arenas in which home economics was visible in the twentieth century, she illustrates women’s agency within the agencies of their employment.

This history of a discipline and its practitioners examines organizations and the individuals in them. The focus on the federal government minimizes state variation or extension work. The businesses, with varied locations and headquarters, are not particularly focused in the Midwest, although a food purveyor in Minneapolis and a utility in Chicago are among the many surveyed. The scope of research is impressive, and there are enough connections to Iowa State University to warrant future research into its faculty and graduates, particularly because education is not the focus of this book.

Home economics, organized into a discipline in 1908, fostered Progressive Era ideals of efficiency and sanitation. Arriving on the scene as the nexus of production was shifting from home to factory, home economists gave much attention to consumption. Just as these
early home economists were embedding themselves in academia, World War I broke out, and they were pressed into government service. What began within the Food Administration morphed into the Bureau of Home Economics (BHE) within the Department of Agriculture (USDA) in 1923. BHE employees, mostly female, were charged with providing information to the public, especially targeting rural populations. The work encompassed textiles, nutrition, home equipment (appliances), and behavior (social surveys). During the agricultural depression of the 1920s, for example, textile specialists worked with the cotton industry to find ways to improve sales and products.

Simultaneously, businesses began to hire home economists. Companies employing home economists included food producers, appliance and houseware manufacturers, magazines, and utility companies. In all instances, the role of these women was not sales but rather creating a relationship with the consumer, explaining how to use the new cheese products, helping manufacturers determine the best size and shape for bakeware, or arguing for the health benefits of clean light. These home economists positioned themselves as trained, professional women who could mediate between the needs of women consumers and the product of their employer; this connection, fostering a desire for consumption, was a key part of their job. The role of these women was precarious: was it to educate consumers or pitch a product? As such, some in the profession questioned whether this was a legitimate activity for home economists.

After describing this early period of establishing legitimacy and utility in the interwar years, Goldstein shifts to the war and postwar period. In contrast to their roles during World War I, home economists were important but less visibly so, more seamlessly integrated (as both paid staff and volunteers) in the government’s efforts of home conservation, recycling, and re-using as part of the larger war effort. Home economists in business were charged primarily with keeping the company’s name visible as product was often unavailable; cooking demonstrations, radio, and other means of communication with customers were still valued, not least in anticipation of pent-up demand.

Postwar prosperity produced many changes within government and business for home economists. In the former, the BHE underwent several name changes and reorganizations, ultimately focusing on nutrition at the precise moment that a consumer movement was calling for all the things home economists championed. New governmental agencies and watchdog groups were populated by people other than home economists. In industry, the new field of market research marginalized the special insight and connection with consumers the home
economists offered, increasingly relegating them to creating recipes and dress patterns rather than mediating on behalf of the consumer.

Other, larger cultural changes altered the public face of home economics in the 1960s and 1970s, including the feminist movement and debates about name and image within the home economics community. Home economists may be less visible today, but we have absorbed many of their lessons about consumption, efficiency, and sanitation. Ultimately, Goldstein believes, we have fully embraced their ideals, even as their public roles have almost wholly disappeared.


Reviewer Jill Nussel is a lecturer in history at Indiana University–Purdue University Fort Wayne. Her research and writing have focused on using ethnic cookbooks to gain a fuller understanding of ethnic communities.

There are days when I envy presidential historians who research the lives of men who are well documented and well archived. The rest of us who research the everyday lives of everyday people are usually compelled to extract usable histories from unconventional sources and an uneven core of evidence. Lee Somerville discovered that truth while working on her master’s thesis in landscape architecture at the University of Wisconsin. The result is her delightful and informative book, *Vintage Wisconsin Gardens: A History of Home Gardening*.

At the beginning of her research, she found that many of the nation’s prestigious open spaces and the landscapes of fabulous mansions were, in fact, well documented, but what Somerville wanted to know was how “regular folks” in Wisconsin conceived of and interacted with their outdoor space. As a result, she set about collecting and extracting everything she could on Wisconsin vernacular gardens of the nineteenth century. She defines vernacular as that which emphasizes the intimate relationships between everyday objects and culture—the area that reflects the real occupants of a home (xv).

With armloads of documents from the Wisconsin State Horticultural Society, what Somerville discovered is that Wisconsinites’ relationship to their outdoor space evolved over time and location. As white settlers began to move into Wisconsin Territory, they viewed the land as something to tame and exploit; women settlers tended to think about the areas around their homes as an extension of their idea of domestic tranquility. Early outdoor space was usually more utili-
tarian, featuring native trees and shrubs near the house and a chicken coop, large shed, and vegetable garden at the rear. As families either moved to the cities or their homes were absorbed by the cities, they added driveways and did away with the chicken coop in favor of a garage. In the nineteenth century, families built fences around their homes to keep grazing stock from invading the house. A century later, those fences have become the backdrop for climbing plants. Nineteenth-century outdoor space did not include much grassy area because mowing was an arduous chore that men would not want to do after a long day in the fields, but by the 1960s, families preferred more green lawn as technology made it easier to mow it.

Somerville demonstrates that people’s relationship to their outdoor space is a reflection of the history of Wisconsin and of the nation as a whole. For instance, urban Wisconsinites largely gave up vegetable gardening at the beginning of the twentieth century, but, like most Americans, they returned to growing vegetables during World War II. Also, as old homesteads were subdivided and homes became closer to one another, gardeners who had previously preferred lower plants so they could talk over the fence now favored vines to be used as screens for privacy.

Probably because the summer months are so short, the people of Wisconsin cherish their outdoor space and their relationship to natural things. Somerville lets us hear the voices of hardy Wisconsin women as they envision their space, challenge their environment, and conceptualize their lives. The result is that the people of the past help us to enjoy our outdoor space today so much more. *Vintage Wisconsin Gardens* is filled with all sorts of imagery—drawings, paintings, photography, and even needlepoint—to give contemporary observers clear insight into Wisconsinites’ outdoor domestic space. The book is valuable for any gardener of the heartland who wants to know what nineteenth-century women planted, how they laid out their gardens, or just what they considered to be beautiful. This book is a must for every vintage gardener.


Reviewer Abby Stephens is a Ph.D. candidate in American studies at Purdue University. She is working on a dissertation on twentieth-century rural women.

Much has been written about changes in twentieth-century agriculture, but scholars and writers have only recently turned their attention
to the significance of agricultural transformations for women. Evelyn Birkby’s new book provides heartwarming commentary on the changing meanings of rural womanhood in the post–World War II rural Midwest. In earning the moniker of Iowa’s best-known homemaker, Birkby has authored a weekly newspaper column since 1949 and worked as one of Shenandoah’s celebrated radio homemakers since 1955. Birkby’s latest book includes selections of favorite columns and recipes and fresh commentary on more recent experiences such as growing older, preserving and sharing the history of Iowa’s radio homemakers, and acting as an inspiration for one of Fannie Flagg’s fictional characters.

Although all of Birkby’s columns are available digitally through the Iowa Women’s Archives at the University of Iowa, scholars in women’s history, food studies, midwestern and Iowa history, and rural and agricultural history will appreciate this selection of columns for its accounts of the daily trials and achievements of mid–twentieth-century farm women. The columns provide an autobiographical folk history of a sort, allowing readers to step into the southwestern Iowa world of Birkby and her family. A particular strength is the book’s “Farm Life” section, with columns about Birkby’s life on farms near Sidney, Iowa: caring for livestock, preserving and preparing food, keeping house, and sharing with and supporting neighbors and friends. Through her firsthand commentary, Birkby offers one lens through which to view the recent history of Iowa’s rural women.


Reviewer Rebecca Conard is professor of history and director of the public history program at Middle Tennessee State University. She is the author of *Places of Quiet Beauty: Parks, Preserves, and Environmentalism* (1997).

According to the author, biologist Michael Lannoo, this slim volume was conceived as a commemorative publication during Iowa Lakeside Laboratory’s centennial year, 2009. As such, the book is best described as a nicely illustrated chronicle in which Lannoo demonstrates the staying power of a good idea. Iowa Lakeside Laboratory had its genesis in 1908, when Thomas Macbride approached the State University of Iowa Alumni Association about purchasing a five-acre tract on the shore of West Lake Okoboji as the site for a natural sciences field station. As Macbride explained at the time, the morainic topography of the Iowa lakes region held an unusually rich variety of flora, fauna, and
geologic formations. He and fellow naturalists Samuel Calvin and Bohumil Shimek had been studying the region since the early 1890s. The association agreed, funds were quickly raised, and Lakeside offered its first courses in the summer of 1909 with students from 14 Iowa colleges and universities attending classes that combined instruction with field research.

Lannoo charts the vicissitudes of Lakeside from its launch to the present. For the first decade, funding came from stockholders and private donors (mainly Macbride), but by the late 1910s this was insufficient to cover operating costs. Thus, in 1918, the State University of Iowa (SUI) agreed to assume responsibility, and for the next decade Lakeside operated as a pure research institution under the auspices of the SUI Graduate College. The offering of summer courses resumed in 1929, and significant changes followed: Lakeside was expanded from 5 to 95 acres; and the Lakeside Laboratory Association gifted the entire property to the State of Iowa under the joint control of SUI and the State Conservation Commission, which, with federal assistance through the Civilian Conservation Corps, constructed a new campus of rustic-design stone buildings (now on the National Register of Historic Places). After World War II, Lakeside entered a long period of stability. From the 1950s through the 1980s, the curriculum grew, a cadre of faculty provided remarkable continuity, the campus expanded to its present size of 147 acres, and another reorganization placed Lakeside under the auspices of the Board of Regents. When, in the early 1990s, funding cuts to the three regents universities threatened Lakeside’s future, Okoboji community leaders stepped in to create the financial security that has ensured its continuation into a second century.

Lannoo’s narrative is based in large part on Debby Zieglowsky’s well-researched article, “Thomas Macbride’s Dream: Iowa Lakeside Laboratory,” published in the Palimpsest in 1985, and two key reports on the status of Lakeside produced during Richard Bovbjerg’s long tenure as director (1964–1989). However, Lannoo brings the story up to date, and Jane Shuttleworth contributes a brief chapter on the “Friends of Lakeside Lab,” which now plays a large role in Lakeside’s operation and maintenance. A series of useful appendixes chart the growth and change in Lakeside’s curriculum from 1946 through 2010. Altogether, The Iowa Lakeside Laboratory presents the essential story of a truly distinctive place and a significant state asset.

Reviewer David Blanke is professor of history and chair of the Department of Humanities at Texas A & M University–Corpus Christi. He is the author of Hell on Wheels: The Promise and Peril of America’s Car Culture (2007).

There is good reason that road metaphors—including those that lead to Rome, to ruin, or to redemption—serve humanists so ably. Grounded, literally, in the empirical realities of their times and laden with the contingent choices of their creators—including the many “roads not taken”—public highways serve as visible, unavoidable reminders of values that long ago determined the shape of our nation’s economy, society, and natural environment. Earl Swift’s entertaining and informative survey, which details the provisional formation and ongoing evolution of the greatest public works project in American history, never loses sight of this fact.

Ostensibly focused on the $130 billion “Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways,” better known as the national interstate highway system, Swift’s work is best understood as a study of national public transportation policy within the context of rapid technological and economic change. The book’s charm lies in the author’s skill as narrator. His story follows a familiar narrative arc, including the rising demands made by engineers, industrialists, and politicians for a national interstate highway system, the passage and construction (or, more accurately, redesign) of those thoroughfares, and the subsequent problems and opportunities made manifest by 47,000 miles of macadam.

Summarizing such a complex story is impossible, yet Swift chose his subjects carefully. The first third of the book fixes on the work of Iowa’s own Thomas H. MacDonald who, along with Carl G. Fisher, Logan Waller Page, and an army of professional civil engineers founded the American Association of State Highway Officials in 1914. Together, they drafted and helped to pass the nation’s first comprehensive highway bill two years later. Swift acknowledges that the bulk of their work was in “refining,” not building, new roadways, yet the Federal Highway acts ushered in an era of national planning, funding, and oversight not seen since the days of the great internal improvement debates of the early nineteenth century. The residual effect at the state level—including the need for state highway maintenance, professional highway departments, and effective policing—are still felt today by every auto commuter and taxpayer.
The middle third of the text explores the vexing social and political problems exposed by such ambition. By the start of the Great Depression—when, significantly, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads began budgeting for transit planning and research, not simply road design and construction—the focus of interstates had settled not on the great stretches of rural roadway but rather on the gridlocked urban “corridors” that surrounded and often bound the nation’s major cities. Swift returns often to Baltimore and the work of Herbert Sinclair Fairbank as a useful case study. When coupled with the Federal Housing Act of 1949, these interstates effectively defined the geographic resources of 85 of the country’s largest cities. As Swift notes, their plans “were self-fulfilling” and used yardsticks that measured “the driving experience” (such as fuel economy and speed) rather than the expressed wants of the voting public. “The effects on those not using the roads,” he concludes, “were neither as easily tallied nor as eagerly sought” and “rested in a fundamental assumption that would soon prove flawed,” namely, that the urban cores would retain their magnetic attraction as the preferred places of work, residence, and play (147–48).

Critics and qualifying reforms dominate the final sections of the book. Leading a “Freeway Revolt” against a policy that he had done so much to justify, Lewis Mumford headlines a well-known cast who saw conformity and environmental degradation as the chief legacies of the interstate system. Sounding quite contemporary, Mumford and others lamented the “blithe and cocky” attitude of national planners, the “blunders of [their] one-dimensional thinking” that privileged Detroit’s “insolent chariots,” which served as the “second mistress” in every American household (242). Tellingly, their critique was not leveled solely against a system that chased pedestrians off the public thoroughfares but also, as Mumford wrote, bemoaned how “the building of a highway has about the same result upon vegetation and [local diversity] as the passage of a tornado or the blast of an atom bomb” (243).

Although *The Big Roads* is not the “untold” story promised in the subtitle—indeed, the one troubling aspect of Swift’s work is his willful evasion of a rich historiographical context, particularly Tom Lewis’s masterful *Divided Highways* (1997)—the book ultimately poses big questions about the relationship between modern public values and the tools we use to maintain them. Swift resolves this dilemma by bookending the text with his own personal driving experiences. He notes that he, like a large majority of Americans, accepts the numbing conformity of interstate travel and too often ignores the environmental costs of personal passenger automobile via the interstate system largely because of its speed, relative safety, and the fact that “it’s easy; and
some days, many days, that counts" (316). In the end we’re left with our adages intact, and, as Swift shows, new roads made new ruts.


Reviewer Patrick Nunnally is coordinator of the River Life Program at the University of Minnesota.

Historians have long used personal narratives as historical evidence; think of the contributions of letters, memoirs, autobiographies, and oral histories. Why not include essays, such as this lovely collection, also? Lisa Knopp’s reflections on the rivers that have run through her life are richly evocative. While they may someday inform a historian concerned with attitudes about a sense of place in the Midwest, they serve now to illuminate some new stories of the region, as well as revisit some well-known tales.

Knopp grew up in Burlington, Iowa, and the Mississippi is her “home” river. She also addresses the Missouri and the Platte, part of later stages of her life, and in several respects her essays on those rivers, which she came to know as an adult, are more informative than those on the Mississippi. Her essay on Missouri’s “Little Dixie” and the story of Jesse James are really strong—personal and evocative stories told well.

It is perhaps in telling the lesser-known stories that Knopp’s contribution to our understanding of the region is strongest. With personal essays, of course, the reader gets only what the writer wishes to convey. Her essay “The Taking,” on the Pick-Sloan Act of the 1940s that established the system of dams that flooded many Indian communities in the Dakotas and Montana, does not replace the voluminous literature on that sad tale. That said, she does illustrate well a personal, more intimate, dimension to the broad narrative, thereby providing a point of entry for the nonspecialist to begin to try to understand a complex subject.

Of course we don’t read essays for the same reasons that we read scholarly history. Knopp does not take up the issues and concerns that motivate scholars, thereby placing her book in conversation with public history, such as the interpretations given at historic sites and museums.

Knopp’s subjects are place, self, and history—broad subjects, to be sure, but her choice of rivers as the organizing principle serves her well. Rivers cut through themes of the past; they inherently cross invisible boundaries and serve as connectors of things previously separated.
“Missouri River Music” almost makes readers forget that there is a river at the heart of the story, or that the story of music and the river along the Missouri is in many ways the story of humans anywhere, pursuing any enterprise.

I suppose it is the reviewer’s job to reach a conclusion, a summing up that explains “what it all means.” Knopp’s book resists that effort; there are gems large and small—stories we know pretty well and stories that are new—throughout these reflections. Students of the land and people of the Midwest will find much that is rewarding here. Students of rivers will find even more.


Reviewer David Faldet is professor of English at Luther College in Decorah. He is the author of Oneota Flow: The Upper Iowa River and Its People (2009).

The sixty-some miles of the Bark River meander through a landscape sculpted by the same Wisconsin ice advance that shaped the heavily tiled pothole region of rural north central Iowa. The Bark, however, flows through exurban Milwaukee, linking at least six lakes and as many cattail marshes in its course. Bates’s miscellany of story and history attaches to the chronicle of a single float season’s trip on the river—the imagined composite of 30 years of paddling.

Although Bates hopes that “the story of the Bark River is the story of Wisconsin” (196), his book is really a river story of dams, mills, ice harvests, canal schemes, floods, lakeside development, fish, fishing, and wetland conservation. As the author elsewhere happily admits, “In the midst of suburban sprawl and commuter traffic, the Bark remains a place apart” (125). The book lacks the more singular focus of Lynne Heasley’s A Thousand Pieces of Paradise: Landscape and Property in the Kickapoo Valley (2005), which analyzes land use and ideas of property on another Wisconsin watershed, but in its best moments it captures the rhythms, windings, and repetitions of a river trip by canoe. It chronicles the culverts and beaver dams on a stream small enough to be left off the average atlas map of Wisconsin while showing that this “unsung river” (157) powered the foundation of several towns, that its lakes and millponds continue to be a focus for development and recreation, and that its flood threats and pollution are reminders that we neglect the environment at our peril.
New on the Shelves

“New on the Shelves” is a list of recent additions to the collections of the State Historical Society of Iowa. It includes manuscripts, audio-visual materials, and published materials recently acquired or newly processed that we think might be of interest to the readers of the Annals of Iowa. The “DM” or “IC” at the end of each entry denotes whether the item is held in Des Moines or Iowa City.

Manuscripts

Grgurich, Rudy. Papers, ca. 1942–ca. 1946. 2 files of documents, ephemera, and photographs. Materials of Rudy Grgurich (Des Moines) related to his service as an armed guard in the U.S. Navy during World War II, and career with the coast guard and merchant marine. DM.

Iowa Chapter, U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II. Records, 1960–2012. 1 ft. Records of this state chapter of the U.S. Submarine Veterans of World War II, including minutes, newsletters, membership rosters, and miscellaneous documents related to activities of the chapter and its members. DM.

Monona County (Iowa) courts. Docket, 1867–1887. 1 vol. Monona County justice docket. DM.

Vorland, Gehard. Papers, 1972–2012. 1 ft. Materials related to the “Bridge of Fellowship” program conceived by Iowa missionary Gehard Vorland as an international exchange program through which members of the Japanese Evangelical Lutheran Church could share theological insights and fellowship with Iowa host families of the same faith. The initial round of exchanges that occurred in 1974 and 1977 prompted expanded global exchanges in the 1980s and 1990s. Collection includes correspondence, planning materials, publications, photographs, and two oral interviews with Rev. Vorland. DM.

Published Materials

Along the Ohio Trail: A Short History of Ohio Lands, by Tanya West Dean and W. David Speas; edited by George W. Knepper. 3rd paperback ed. Columbus, OH: Auditor of State, 2002. 89 pp. IC.


Centerdale Woman’s Club, Organized 1890, Federated 1920. N.p., [1920?] 60 pp. IC.


“The Life and Career of Himie Voxman,” by Michele Ann Bowen Hustedt. D.M.A. thesis, University of Iowa, 2010. vii, 152 pp. Biography of longtime University of Iowa professor known for his contributions to the field of academic music as an educator and administrator, and for his publication of method books and arrangements of chamber music for wind instruments. IC.


Preliminary Outline of Mineral Resources: State of Iowa, prepared by Engineering Experiment Station, Iowa State College, Ames, in collaboration with Research Department, Chicago and North Western Railway System. Chicago: Chicago and North Western Railway System, 1953. 29 pp. + 6 plates. DM.


Announcements

THE 19TH BIENNIAL MEETING of the Association for the Advancement of Dutch-American Studies will explore historical themes dealing with the contribution of the Dutch to America during times of war and military operations, both in military services and on the home front, beginning with the Civil War and continuing through the Vietnam War.

The conference, titled “The Dutch-American Involvement in War: U.S. and Abroad,” cohosted by Central College and the Pella Historical Society, will take place Thursday, June 6–Saturday, June 8, 2013, at Central College, with a pre-conference tour of Pella, including the Pella Historical Village, the Vermeer Mill (built in 2002), a guided town tour, and a visit to the Scholte House Museum, on Wednesday, June 5.

For more information or to register visit www.aadas.nl or e-mail Lisa at zylstrabrianlisa@hotmail.com.

THE IOWA HISTORY CENTER at Simpson College seeks nominations for the outstanding master’s thesis in Iowa history for 2013. Selection will be based on contribution to the knowledge of Iowa history; originality of the subject matter or methodology; use of sources; and written expression. Nominees must have completed their master’s degree between July 1, 2012, and June 30, 2013.

The winner will be announced in the fall of 2013 and will receive a $1,000 cash prize and an award plaque. Three copies of the thesis and a brief letter of nomination from the thesis advisor, which includes contact information for the nominee, should be submitted to Bill Friedricks, Director, Iowa History Center, Simpson College, 701 North C Street, Indianola, IA 50125. Application deadline is June 30, 2013.

For further information, contact Linda Sinclair, (515) 961-1528 or linda.sinclair@simpson.edu.
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LISA R. LINDELL is a catalog librarian at Hilton M. Briggs Library at South Dakota State University in Brookings. Her recent historical research and journal contributions focus on women in the Midwest. Other research interests include family history, library history, and print culture.

PAMELA RINEY-KEHRBERG is department chair and professor of history at Iowa State University. Her books include *Childhood on the Farm: Work, Play, and Coming of Age in the Midwest* (2005); *Waiting on the Bounty: The Dust Bowl Diary of Mary Knackstedt Dyck* (1999); and *Rooted in Dust: Surviving Drought and Depression in Southwestern Kansas* (1994).
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