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Theology for Freedom and Responsibility: Rudolf Bultmann’s Views on Church and State

BY ANTJE BULTMANN LEMKE

Rudolf Bultmann, one of the most distinguished and controversial Protestant theologians of the twentieth century whose ideas defined the field for many decades, was Professor of Theology at the University of Marburg from 1921 to 1951. He came to Syracuse University in the year 1958–59 as Visiting Professor of Religion. Through his and his daughter’s generosity, the George Arents Research Library has acquired a valuable collection of his papers, of which an inventory was published in 1972 in the Ernest S. Bird Library Dedication issue of the Courier. Since that time, additional materials have been presented.

At the symposium organized in 1986 by the Library Associates in conjunction with the Syracuse University Department of Religion to honor the centenary of Professor Bultmann’s birth date, his daughter, Antje Bultmann Lemke, gave the following address.

“Why don’t the churches just shut up?” Peter Berger exclaimed recently in response to the political and social activities of some church leaders and religious groups. “If the churches advocate specific positions on legislation or administrative policies, they risk squandering their moral authority on questions on which their technical competence will usually be slight.”¹ Can churches as institutions speak for, and act for, all of their members? These are crucial questions today, and they have existed with varying intensity throughout the centuries.

In the life of Rudolf Bultmann the issue of Church and State fig-

ured prominently. Born in 1884, he lived through two world wars, the Weimar Republic, the years of National Socialism, and the post-World War II era. The quiet pursuit of academic research and teaching, with which we associate the life of a New Testament scholar, was constantly jeopardized. The social and political events of that time forced any responsible theologian not only to analyze the Church-State relationship, but also to take a clear stand.

Rudolf Bultmann's father, a minister at the court of the Great Duke of Oldenburg, a markedly anti-Prussian state in northwestern Germany, in 1919 published a pamphlet entitled State, Church, Religion, School.\(^2\) In it, he argued that the task of the State is to improve public life, and especially education. Also, the State must protect the Church. The Church, on the other hand, as long as the State does not interfere in its affairs, must concern itself with its pastoral tasks. In politically uneventful times, this coexistence seems to work quite well in Germany. There may be local or regional matters like elections, or there may be such issues as censorship, in which the State wants to use the Church. These must certainly be taken seriously; but they can be resolved if both Church and State adhere to their fundamental responsibilities.

All of this changes when religious organizations try to impose their views on a government, or when the government of a nation interferes with the affairs of the Church as well as with the religious principles of its members. This is what happened in Germany in the 1930s. Hitler had been wooing both Catholics and Protestants prior to his election as chancellor in 1933. In the first program of the National Socialist Party of 1920, he coined the term "Positive Christianity", and he assured the public that his party would cooperate with the Church to strengthen Christian values. Only alert people noticed, as they read these statements carefully, that these 'Christian values' were a cover term for Aryan values, and as such were directed against the Jewish people and other ethnic groups.

In 1930 the National Socialist Party made a systematic effort to win over the Church: prominent leaders and uniformed Sturm Ab-

teilung (SA troops) with their flags appeared at Sunday morning services. In 1931 Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's ruthless collaborator and later Minister of Propaganda, had a church wedding, which Hitler attended. It was photographed for the press and used to testify to Hitler's support of the Church. Thus, many people felt reassured about the Führer's attitude toward religion. Only a minority realized that this was nothing but shrewd manipulation. They saw the potential danger of statements which guaranteed freedom for religious denominations provided they would not endanger the State nor conflict with the customs and morality of the Germanic race. Increasingly, the term 'race' appeared in public proclamations. While, in retrospect, this stands out like an obvious warning, the superficial reader either did not notice it, or chose not to take it seriously.

In 1932, a year before Hitler came into power, Paul Tillich³ published ten theses on the subject of the incompatibility of Christianity with Fascism. He concluded with the prophetic warning that agreements between Church and State, whether open or secret, could only lead to the increased power of National Socialism and the destruction of the Church. A few Catholic and Protestant theologians expressed similar warnings, but they were generally ignored.

When Hitler became chancellor of the German Reich on 30 January 1933, it did not take long to see that Tillich and those who were apprehensive about the Nazis's display of sympathy with the Church were absolutely correct, for efforts to establish an official Aryan Protestant Church were initiated immediately. On 25 April Hitler appointed Ludwig Müller, an unknown army chaplain, "Reichsbischof", Bishop of the German Empire. Thus, the complete fusion of Church and State was created: The Deutsche Christen (the German Christians) as they were called, accepted the Führer as their head and vowed to act in "accordance with the new political values" of the Reich. With this move, then, the State forced the Church into a union that abolished the principle of separation of Church

³. Paul Tillich (1886–1965), German theologian and friend of Rudolf Bultmann. After being dismissed by the National Socialists, he came to the United States and taught at Union Theological Seminary, Harvard, and the University of Chicago. In addition to his major work Systematic Theology, he published books for a wider audience, e.g., The Courage to Be.
and State. The minister and the individual church member had now to decide whether to conform or to look for other options.

On 2 May Rudolf Bultmann held his first class of the new semester. He opened his lecture as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen: I have made a point never to speak about current politics in my lectures, and I think I also shall not do so in the future. However, it would seem to me unnatural were I to ignore today the political situation in which we begin this new semester. The significance of political happenings for our entire existence has been brought home to us in such a way that we cannot evade the duty of reflecting on the meaning of our theological work in this situation. . . .

We must look at these events simply from the standpoint of their immense possibilities for the future and ask ourselves what our responsibility is as theologians in face of these possibilities. God is the Creator; that is, the world is his; it is his gift that encounters us in the world in which we stand with its beneficent and frightening phenomena, with its events that make us both rich and poor. 'God is the Creator' means that he encounters us as Lord in our concrete world, in the world that is determined historically, in our actual life in the present. Faith in the Creator is not a philosophical theory or world-view that one has in one's background, but rather something that we are to realize precisely in our experience and action. That God is the Creator means that our action is not determined by timeless principles, but rather by the concrete situation of the moment.

He went on to explain that, if we accept our place and responsibility in God's Creation, then our family, friends, and nation are our destiny. In normal times, the community of which we are a part determines our civic actions and these are in harmony with our personal faith. In other words, how we act in our family, in our profession, in public life, is in harmony with the ten commandments and with the concept that we are our brother's keeper. When, however, a head of state demands allegiance to a new ideology or when the government ignores or changes the law and ceases to protect individ-
ual citizens, a deep rift develops between the aims of the State and the principles of the Church. Thus, Rudolf Bultmann continued his lecture:

Only he who knows the transcendent God who speaks his word of love to the world is able to extricate himself from this sinful world. He alone has a critical perspective toward the loud demands of the day. . . . Such a critical perspective will never permit the struggle for State and Nation to become a preoccupation with concepts. For we must never overlook that State and Nation are made up of real people who are our neighbors. Like humanity, nationality is always in danger of losing its concreteness and of becoming a mere abstraction. . . . The criterion for each one of us in our action is whether we are sustained by love, that is, by the love that not only looks into the future in which it hopes to realize its ideal, but a love that brings us to the present—to those around us in our everyday life.

Bultmann then gave examples of what was already occurring, what he called the “demonism of sin”, especially the denunciation of those who did not conform to the National Socialist ideology and of the defamation of Jews. He concluded:

It is quite clear that, in face of the voices of the present, Christian faith itself is being called in question. In other words, we have to decide whether Christian faith is to be valid for us or not. . . . So we must be on guard ourselves against falsification of the faith by national religiosity, against a falsification of national piety with Christian trimmings. The issue is either/or!

The brief words of this hour can only remind us of this decision. But the work of the semester will again and again bring the question to our attention and clarify it in such a way that the requisite decision can be made clearly and conscientiously.

You will remember that he began his lecture by stating that he never intended to speak about current political issues. He felt strongly that, as a member of an academic community and especially as a theologian, he should not use his position to express political views or to organize political action. But these were exceptional times, and what he said was consistent with his principle that theologian and preacher have the responsibility not to prescribe a specific action, but to clarify the issues. The members of the audience must be made aware of the seriousness of events from the basis of Christian faith and must be urged to take a stand and to act, but they must not be told what to do, or how to do it. A leader of a party can tell his members how to vote or how to act, but the Church and its representatives should, in Bultmann's view, not yield to this temptation. There are fundamental differences between the secular and the religious missions, and these are often obscured in the emotional reaction to current events.

The lecture was delivered in May 1933, and not a week passed when it was not apparent that the State would interfere with the affairs of the Church or the University. Under Reichsbrishof Müller the German Church was to be shaped into one of the pillars that would support Hitler. We all have heard about the dismissal and persecution of Protestant ministers and Roman Catholic priests who did not conform to the demands of this official national Church. Soon pastors, theologians, and lay people who could not accept the “Reichskirche” founded an opposition church, the “Bekennende Kirche”, or Confessing Church. Rather than adjusting to the laws of the State, they adhered to the original confession of the Church, the Augsburg Confession. ⁵

The fact that the Confessing Church was able to organize itself shows that, when enough people with strong convictions band together, some expression of opposition is possible. This, we must remember, took courage, and it was sad to see how many people who considered themselves to be God-fearing Christians lacked this backbone. They feared the State to the degree that they did not take any

⁵. The Augsburg Confession is the statement of Lutheran creed, presented at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. Drafted by Philip Melanchton, it attempted to reconcile Luther's reforms with Roman Catholicism. Being rejected, the twenty-eight articles became the basic document for the Protestant Church in Germany.
risks. They seemed to be paralysed, as though they were staring at a snake. Instead of analyzing each issue and considering what could be done to uphold Christian principles, they attempted to adjust their action to the State's demands. Many did more than pay tribute to the new regime, they wanted to be accepted, to be part of it. What was more depressing than the majority's naive acceptance of Hitler's terms or the opportunistic adjustment to what seemed inevitable was the role of some reputable theologians at distinguished universities.

At Göttingen in 1933, for example, Emanuel Hirsch, the well-known Kierkegaard scholar and highly respected Church historian, immediately praised the establishment of a German Christian people's Church. "For all of us who stand in the present moment of our Volk experience, it is a sunrise of divine goodness after endless dark years of wrath and misery"; "Faith in God and the preservation of our Volk are one"; "The German people's Church will bring about the rebirth of true Christianity"; "The new will is a holy storm that has come over us and grasped us"; and "God stands with Hitler at this moment of German history"—these were a few of the statements that flowed from his pen.

Such theologians had either lost their reason in a fanatic nationalism, or their studies had been so abstract that they no longer saw any relationship between Judeo-Christian principles and the events of the day. They lacked neither information nor knowledge. They simply lacked character, by which I mean a commitment to the principle that demands a thoughtful analysis of an issue before taking action. This was true, in my view, for many academic teachers who chose to be deaf and blind to the words of Hitler from the time of his first illegal acts. Some saw gradually, but too late, that they had committed a grave error; a few admitted this and changed their attitude; others condoned and even supported the regime to the end in 1945.

A good example for showing up the difference in responses to the National Socialist State's intrusion into matters of the Church can be found in the application of the 'Aryan Paragraph', the legislation that excluded Jewish and half-Jewish people from civil service.

On 11 September 1933 clergy and lay people assembled at a Kir-
chentag in Hesse and asked the theology departments of Marburg and Erlangen Universities to express their views on the employment of people of Jewish descent in the Church.

On 20 September the members of the Marburg faculty stated positively that the Aryan Paragraph was irreconcilable with the Church and the Gospels for the reason that it reduced non-Aryan Church members to a second-class status, whereas the message of Christ was obviously addressed to all races.

In contrast to Marburg, the theology department of Erlangen stated on 25 September 1933:

The order of the Church according to Reformation teaching has to correspond not only to the universality of the Gospels but also to the historic-national organizations of Christian mankind. It has to be asked whether Jews domiciled in Germany belong in a full sense to the German people or to their own nationality and thus are an alien people. On this question the Church as such cannot decide. Here the answer can be given only by our people in view of their special biological-historical situation. Since today our people regard the Jews in their midst more than ever as a foreign nationality, and the Church in the present situation is called to reflect anew upon its task of being a national Church for Germans, the holding of offices in the Church by those of Jewish descent would be a heavy charge and restriction. Consequently, the Church has to demand that its Jewish Christians be restrained from holding offices.

The theologians of Erlangen even added: "In the struggle for the renewal of our people the new State excludes men of Jewish or half-Jewish origin from leading offices. The Church has to acknowledge the basic right of the State to take such legislative measures." This statement was formulated by the theology professors Paul Althaus and Werner Elert at the behest of the faculty, after it had had a "thorough discussion which resulted in complete agreement in the essential demands"!7

Another declaration expressing the conviction that Church and State must be clearly separated was issued by twenty-one New Testament professors from various universities. They concluded their statement, “New Testament and the Issue of Race”, as follows:

Jews and Gentiles are equally qualified to be church office-bearers. They are called to a church office by the Church and only by it solely in accordance with their faith and their ability. This position is based upon the fact that according to the New Testament the Church owes its existence in the world to the Holy Spirit alone. . . . It is therefore our opinion that a Christian Church may not surrender this standpoint in its teaching and action.  

Sadly, the theology department at Berlin opposed this opinion and published a declaration stating that positive Christianity now must formulate the basic Christian truths and that these must be based on the premises of the National Socialist Movement. It was then that theologians like Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Rudolf Bultmann, who had already defined the different tasks of Church and State, stood up against the State. They realized, of course, that in extreme situations such action might lead to controversial and dangerous political involvement of the Church. Many of those who did not differentiate the two positions clearly were willing to work in unison with the government and accepted the right of the State to issue legislation affecting the Church.

Rather than pursuing other examples of church-state relations during the years of National Socialism, I would like to turn to the 1950s and 1960s, when Rudolf Bultmann was involved in debates concerning political and liberation theology. After World War II, in both East and West Germany, the question of the Church’s role in politics was discussed widely. Could the Church have done more to resist Hitler? To save lives? Should and could all denominations have joined and assisted each other? Could Catholics, Jews, and Protestants have formed a united force against the State? How can the Church, on the basis of past experience, become more effective today?

8. Cochrane, ibid., 128.
9. Dietrich Bonhoeffer (1906–1945), German Lutheran theologian who was executed by the National Socialists as a member of the Resistance Movement.
One attempt to anchor politics on religious principles was the founding of a political party. The Christian Democratic Union (CDU) was founded in 1945. In East Germany (the German Democratic Republic) the CDU was immediately taken over by Communist forces, and the name became a mockery. In West Germany (the Federal Republic of Germany) the party still functions largely according to the intentions of its Catholic and Protestant founders; but the policies and style of this party, not only during election campaigns, remind us how precarious it is to claim a religious creed for political purposes.

The consequences of this affiliation are, as Rudolf Bultmann pointed out, that people who practice a ‘Christian’ politics can label those whose political views differ as un-Christian. Party membership will become a criterion for faithfulness or unfaithfulness. What about Jews, Bahais, or other religious denominations? Can they not be demo-
crats? Should they have their own party? Emotionally and as a reaction against the Hitler experience, it was understandable that some people wanted to base public life on the confession of the Church. But rather than ennobling the political party, this move has compromised religion.

During the last two decades of Bultmann’s life new issues evolved for those sensitive to the role of the Church in politics. Nuclear armament, environmental policies, population increase, and Third World poverty assumed such dangerous proportions that all those who took their religious convictions seriously had to ask themselves what stand to take. Should the Church or religious groups organize as political activists? Or should their members join Amnesty International, Union of Concerned Scientists, Common Cause, and secular organizations of this kind?

In 1971 Dorothee Söllle wrote a book, *Politische Theologie: Auseinandersetzung mit Rudolf Bultmann*, which was followed by a lively correspondence. Söllle had written, “Theology as a reflection of faith, has to comprehend the social situation . . . theology has to become political theology”. Rudolf Bultmann answered that in theology, theory and practice must indeed be considered together, and word and action must go hand in hand. Yet to achieve this, we do not need a political theology, we must rather sort out what are legal issues and what are economic issues, and acquire the knowledge necessary for informed action. “Your concept of a renewed world looks to me like a Utopia”, he stated in one of his letters.

His views on this subject are best expressed in an essay he wrote for *The Christian Century* in August 1958. The editor of the journal had asked theologians from many countries what they considered crucial issues of the times. He received an interesting variety of responses ranging from the struggle between Orthodoxy and Neo-Humanism to Ecumenicalism. Rudolf Bultmann responded with an essay, “Theology for Freedom and Responsibility”, the title I chose for this lecture. “The task of theology today”, he opened his essay,
“is determined by two temptations: the temptation to reaction and the temptation to politicize”. He closed with the summary of his experiences and insights:

[Today] demands are made on the Church to give guidance in questions such as elections, the use of atomic energy, and (in Germany) rearmament. Theological reflection surely makes it plain that the Church must absolutely refuse to yield to such a demand. . . . Theological reflection also and above all makes it plain that the Church simply dare not yield to such a demand. The Church’s task is to proclaim the word of God, not to pronounce political judgments. A political judgment in a concrete political situation is not the word of God. Theology must be sharply on guard against any identification of the Christian faith with a political program. . . .

Of course the Christian ought to act as such in practical life, and therefore in the political sphere also; which is to say that he recognizes that he is responsible in political life also and acts in that awareness. He can exercise such responsibility only if he tries to inform himself as fully as possible, and seeks as wide an orientation as possible in the political options at hand—in open discussion with others and in a spirit of both criticism and readiness to learn. He has been endowed with reason in order to arrive at independent judgments and make decisions. It is the duty of theology and the Church to make this responsibility clear to him and to inculcate it through the sermon. But it is not the function of theology and the Church to set up binding political rules and thus relieve the individual of responsibility for his decisions.

To some Christians the Church’s competence to make political judgments appears to arise from the fact that the Church must after all condemn war under all circumstances. True as this is, the competence of the Church to make political judgments does not follow from it. For the Church indeed can and must inculcate in all men their responsibility for seeing to it that matters do not come to war. But how a war can be prevented in this or that specific case—this is a political
question, one which the Church cannot judge and decide. Simply to cry “Never more war!” accomplishes nothing.

What then is the task of theology in the present situation? Briefly, it is to make clear that Christian faith gives no security in the world, but that, as faith in God’s manifest grace, it gives us the freedom to walk courageously through darkness and enigma and to risk and carry responsibility for action in the loneliness of our own decision.¹²

Yes, we all must act in the political arena, individually as Catholics or Protestants, Jews or Muslims. In the view of Rudolf Bultmann it is the task of the Church and its ordained leaders to make this responsibility clear, rather than to act for us.

Albert Schweitzer and His Nuclear Concerns Seen Today

BY RHENA SCHWEITZER MILLER

Mrs. Miller, a trained pharmacologist, became her father’s assistant during the late years of his life in Africa. After earlier visits to Lambaréné, she moved there in 1960 and worked at his side as head of the laboratory until his death in 1965. For the following five years, she took on the duties of director of the hospital, in accordance with her father’s wishes as expressed in his will. In 1971 she came to the United States and now resides with her husband, Dr. David Miller, in Georgia.

When it became apparent that the time had come to ensure the continued safekeeping of her father’s papers, Mrs. Miller turned for advice to Antje Bultmann Lemke, her friend and colleague at the Albert Schweitzer Center in Great Barrington, Massachusetts. Professor Lemke, who divides her affections between friends and libraries (particularly the Syracuse University Libraries), began arrangements for the purchase of this collection for the George Arents Research Library. As a result of her acuity and vision, not to mention immense effort, Syracuse University now holds the largest group of Albert Schweitzer papers in North America.

Mrs. Miller addressed the Library Associates at their 1986 Spring Luncheon, choosing a subject which, as she knew and as his notebooks and correspondence emphatically affirm, was very much in her father’s thoughts during the last years of his life. Her talk is given in its entirety herewith.

My father, Albert Schweitzer, is known as having been a theologian, a philosopher, a musician, and a medical doctor in the equatorial forests of Gabon, where he founded and directed the Albert Schweitzer Hospital in Lambaréné for more than fifty years. His hospital still exists and today, extensively modernized, continues to give medical care to its African patients in the same spirit of understanding of African customs that existed during my father’s lifetime.
When he was asked what he considered to be his most important contribution, he used to reply that it was his work as a philosopher. The basis of his ethical philosophy was the principle of Reverence for Life, which guided him in all that he did. This principle also compelled him to make his voice heard for the cause of peace, and specifically in warnings of the dangers of the testing and use of nuclear weapons. When the outbreak of World War I in 1914 overtook my parents in their hospital in Lambaréné, it came as a terrible shock to them. Not only was their work interrupted at the hospital, but, as German citizens in a French colony, they became prisoners of war. For my father this catastrophe was a further sign of the decline of Western civilization—a decline which he had already perceived and was fearing by the turn of the century. He had never been able to share the general optimism accompanying the dramatic technical progress of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, nor the assumption that because of that progress mankind had also progressed in the intellectual and ethical spheres. His impression, on the contrary, was that in many ways "we were not only below the level of past generations, but were in many respects only living on their achievements".

On the second day of his internment my father started work on his most important book, *The Philosophy of Civilization*, trying to find a basis in rational thought upon which a viable and ethical civilization could be built.

For months he lived in continuous mental struggle, until, while making a long trip on the Ogowé River to visit a patient during a brief period of freedom in 1915, there flashed upon his mind at sunset the words: 'Reverence for Life'. This was the revelation for which he had been looking and of which he later recorded: "Now I had found a way to the idea in which world and life affirmation and ethics are contained side by side. Now I know that the world-view of ethics and life affirmation together with their ideals of civilization is founded in thought." Although my father thought he had found the principle which could be the basis for a viable and ethical civilization, he knew that reality was very different; indeed, it became more and more threatening.

In 1932 in his Goethe address in Frankfurt my father warned of the dark clouds of an impending dictatorship.

All of World War II my father spent in his hospital in Lambaréné,
which also became a refuge for the wives and children of Frenchmen who were fighting each other, as Gaullists and as followers of Maréchal Pétain, in the vicinity of the hospital.

To be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for 1952 came for him as a big surprise. When one of his nurses, having heard the announcement on the radio, burst into his room, saying that she had important news for him, he asked: "Which cat has had kittens?" Though realizing what a great honor he was being awarded, he felt he could not leave his work at the hospital to attend the ceremony. It was not until 1954 that he went to Oslo and said in his acceptance speech: "Man has become a superman. His super-humanity arises from the fact that through his acquisition of knowledge and power he not only
disposes of his own body, but also can command and utilize the powers that reside in nature itself. This superman suffers, however, from a fatal, spiritual imperfection. He does not possess the superhuman reason, which should accompany his superhuman might. Knowledge and power have produced results that have become more fatal than helpful to him."

This brief statement was his only mention on that occasion of the dangers of nuclear war. He ended his speech with an eloquent appeal to all responsible men and to all nations for peace: "May those who have in their hands the fate of the nations take care to avoid whatever may worsen our situation and make it more dangerous. And may they take to heart the words of the Apostle Paul: 'If it be possible as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men'. Paul's words are valid not only for individuals but for whole nations as well. May the nations, in their efforts to keep peace, go to the farthest limits of possibility so that the spirit of man shall be given time to develop and grow strong—and time to act."

Even at that time, my father—though now universally known and respected for pleading the cause of peace in Oslo—shied away from getting involved in matters of a possible political nature. Efforts to persuade him to lend his voice and moral stature to the campaign against nuclear weapons during the first decade after Hiroshima and Nagasaki were unsuccessful. Nevertheless, he had already begun to inform himself as best as he could on the technical details and health consequences of nuclear radiation.

For my father the Nobel Peace Prize carried with it an obligation. He felt very strongly that it was his duty to do something to become worthy of the honor. Communicating with Albert Einstein, meeting Bertrand Russell in London, attending a conference of concerned Nobel laureates in Lindau—all these activities put a kind of moral pressure on him.

In 1957 Norman Cousins, who had already been corresponding with my father, came to visit him in Lambarené. One of the purposes of Cousins’s trip was to urge my father to make some statement on world peace. He considered him to be one of the very few individuals in the world whose voice would be widely heard and carry authority. Still my father resisted: "All my life I have carefully stayed away from making pronouncements on public matters. . . . It was
not because I had no interest in world affairs or politics. . . . It was just that I felt that my connection with the outside world should grow out of my work or thought in the field of theology or philosophy or music. I have tried to relate myself to the problems of all humankind rather than to become involved in political disputes. I wanted to be one man speaking to another man.”

Cousins’s persistence began to wear down my father’s resolve, though he still had qualms about speaking publicly of matters that he considered to be problems for scientists, about which it would be too easy to discredit him as a non-scientist. But with the information on nuclear weapons and their biological effects that began to pour in upon him from all over the world and with the interest of people like Jawaharlal Nehru, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Martin Buber, Père Dominique Pire, Pablo Casals, and others, he finally decided to speak out with the objective of addressing himself mainly to the dangers of
nuclear testing. He felt that "the scientific aspects of testing may be complicated, but the issues involved in testing are not". Next came the choice of the manner in which he would be willing to make a statement. He had no great faith in the press and considered a proposed meeting of world leaders as much too complicated. Finally, he settled on the idea of writing a message to be broadcast by radio from Oslo, the city of the Nobel Peace Prize. This statement, titled "A Declaration of Conscience", was released on 23 April 1957, three months after Cousins's departure from Lambaréné. It was the beginning of an intense period of activity—of alerting individual citizens and world leaders to the frightful dangers inherent in the nuclear arms race.

By then my father was eighty-two years old, still adding buildings to his hospital and supervising its medical activities. Nevertheless, despite the complex array of daily burdens, he acquired an impressive knowledge of scientific matters and stayed abreast of the developments in the nuclear field.

At the end of 1957 my father received a request from Linus Pauling to add his signature to an appeal by scientists of many countries, urging an international agreement to stop nuclear weapon tests. He signed the petition, along with thirty-six other Nobel laureates and over nine thousand other scientists. More importantly, he worked on three successive appeals for which he had had an invitation from Radio Oslo. I was with him on his eighty-third birthday on 14 January 1958 in Lambaréné and was frightened by his state of near-exhaustion. Work on these appeals, which were broadcast on 28, 29, and 30 April and later published under the title "Peace or Atomic War", had taken a heavy toll on his eyesight and on his health in general. He confided to me: "This work nearly killed me".

From then on, a world-wide correspondence and cooperation with the leaders of the movement against atomic weapons and testings took a great deal of his time. About the manner in which this fight should be conducted, my father differed from many of the other leaders. Rather than relying upon the press or other communication media, or upon large international organizations or conferences, he considered as most effective the stirring up of public opinion. He wanted to address his fellow men and make them aware that their human rights and international law were being violated. He said: "Public
opinion must realize that atomic weapons contradict international law”.

By the end of 1958 a trilateral moratorium was concluded between the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain on nuclear weapon tests. It lasted until 1960, when, on 13 February, France detonated its first nuclear explosion in the Sahara. Test ban negotiations continued, but with no agreement. And testing was resumed by all great powers.

Norman Cousins urged my father to send his objections to the resumption of testing to President Kennedy. But my father felt that to criticize the President would jeopardize the influence he might have in the United States. Nevertheless, he felt that the present situation was deplorable. “We are sinking ever more deeply into inhumanity by the resumption of tests.” All this was happening because “public opinion the world over has treated lightly the dangers of nuclear radiation”. As a tormented man, he wrote to Cousins:

I have been working for months on the wording of a new appeal. But it is impossible to finish it and publish it. The situation of nuclear politics never ceases to change. It is never stabilized. Therefore one cannot judge or advise. The text that I made a month ago no longer corresponds to reality. It is outdated by events. I am watching and when I think I am able to criticize and to propose, I shall speak.

This concern about a new appeal never left him during the final four years of his life. Shortly before his death in 1965, he said to me: “I am desperate about the world situation and know that I should launch a new appeal, if only I could have the time and would not be so tired”.

Despite his former refusal and after much hesitation, in April 1962 my father nevertheless sent a letter to President Kennedy, in which he pleaded for disarmament and a test ban treaty, saying that “only when the states agree not to carry out nuclear tests any more can promising negotiations about disarmament and peace take place”. In his answer President Kennedy wrote: “No decision I have taken in my administration has given me more concern and sorrow than the decision to resume nuclear testing”.
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A positive development did emerge, however, when a test ban treaty was concluded between the United States and the Soviet Union and signed in Moscow in August 1963. My father then wrote to President Kennedy calling the treaty “one of the greatest events in the history of the world” and thanked him for his foresight and courage.

Speaking out for sanity in nuclear arms policy in the 1950s and 1960s required great courage. These were the years of McCarthyism and backyard bomb shelters in the United States, when many moderate and responsible voices were automatically labelled as communist if they dared question the buildup and testing of nuclear arms. There was a somewhat similar hysteria within the borders of the other great powers. My father suffered from this pervasive atmosphere, and much of the mounting criticism of his hospital during his last year seemed designed to discredit him as a critic of nuclear arms testing. But he persisted undeterred, even after his ninetieth birthday. Until his last days he spared no time or effort in this fight, feeling that despite all his endeavors he had not done enough.

However, when he died on 4 September 1965, the world was united in mourning the man who, as Erich Fromm had written:

spoke the word, the keyword for man's survival, the word 'life'. He could have spoken of love, of truth, of justice, values which formed the basis of his existence. By speaking of Reverence for Life as the principle which ought to govern all human action, as the cornerstone of ethics, he challenged, criticized, denounced a society which has ceased to respect life and for which things rank higher than life. When he first made his call for Reverence for Life, Schweitzer did not even know that this disrespect for life would later manifest itself in the creation of nuclear weapons, a threat to all life on earth. But he did know the danger inherent in a life-hostile dominance of unbridled technique.

Knowing this danger, the man who had made his life his argument spared no efforts to arouse world opinion and to make it aware of the

* Unpublished letter from Erich Fromm to Rondo Cameron at the occasion of the Albert Schweitzer Centennial Symposium in Atlanta, Georgia, April 1975.
world-threatening danger of nuclear arms. His realization that his endeavors had met limits and that he had been inadequate to meet the demands made of him was probably the greatest tragedy in his life.
The Albert Schweitzer Papers at Syracuse University

BY URSULA BERKLING

The Syracuse University Libraries hold an outstanding body of Albert Schweitzer papers, which complement the Schweitzer archives at Günsbach in Alsace, France, his European home. The Syracuse materials came to us from his daughter, Mrs. Rhena Schweitzer Miller, through the generosity of the Library Associates. They include a variety of items, all of great interest to the Schweitzer scholar, and divide basically into the following categories: notebooks, letters, manuscripts, miscellanea, and books from Schweitzer’s library.

NOTEBOOKS

This segment of the collection comprises 123 “blue books”, which consist of single leaves gathered together between hand-cut pieces of soft, blue cover-paper and tied with string. Their homemade appearance attests both to Schweitzer's frugality and his ingenuity.

Fifty-one blue books from the years 1918–19, 1921, and 1928–65 make up the core of what might generally be considered Albert Schweitzer’s personal journal. These notebooks range extensively in subject matter: for example, the daily life in Lambaréné, his home (in Günsbach, or Königsfeld in the Black Forest), his patients (their diseases and family stories), hospital personnel, and visitors. Included also are: poems; quotations; excerpts from books on philosophy, religion, and history; aphorisms; flashes of wit; and all manner of ideas taken down in rare free minutes during work. Much of this material found its way into his published works.

* The author wishes to acknowledge the previous work of Honor Conklin, who prepared the preliminary survey of the Albert Schweitzer Papers at Syracuse University.
29. Dezember 1942, Lambarene


die Arbeit in der Philosophie nicht nur so viel Arbeit zu schaffen als man möglich, man einmal Muskelzünder. täglich

denn auch man braucht für die Philosophie zu finden. Die Theorien der Philosophie liegen stets auf meinem Tisch. Es war nicht leicht

gut, das ich den Stoff immer im Kopf

benutzte und man wenig mißschrieb.

Die, hatte ich mir 3 Monate ganz für

mir, wie viel wäre dann festig.

Dass der Kürzeleit ist mein Kopfplan.
Pasted onto these notebook pages are many clippings from French, German, English, and African newspapers: current reports on world politics, as well as commentaries on himself and his work. Personal remarks, linguistic curiosities, and jokes reveal an extremely humorous Schweitzer. From the many sarcastic, ironic, sometimes agreeing, sometimes disagreeing notes written in the margins of the articles, one can follow Schweitzer's reactions to the newspaper subject matter. The clippings from the fifties and sixties concern mainly information about militarism and nuclear rearmament in both East and West. Indeed, this topic pervades the notebooks of this period.

In addition to the information about the hospital, this group of blue books describes the African atmosphere and tells of adventures with the animals of the jungle. They recount a Second World War episode in which a twenty-day fight took place around Lambaréné between de Gaulle's troops and soldiers of the Vichy government, as well as a multitude of smaller everyday dramas. Schweitzer's criticism of the French colonial policies are better understood when one reads his account of his observations. The notebooks illustrate again and again that behind Schweitzer's actions stood his basic principle of 'Reverence for Life'. Recounting the origin of this idea, which so determined his later life, Schweitzer wrote: "There were three islands near the village of Igendja, eighty kilometres downstream from Lambaréné on the Ogowe river. It was here on a September day in 1915 that the idea that reverence for life is the basic principle of ethics and humanity came to me." In keeping with this principle, Schweitzer rendered his service not only to the hundreds of patients who came to the hospital but also to the injured animals which were so often brought to him.

In these notebook pages Schweitzer not only expressed his concern for the health of all living beings, but also his dismay over the unending problems with his building projects. On this subject one can find a series of descriptions, starting with the construction of a simple barrack, then of guest houses, and eventually a whole leper village. Trusting nothing to luck, he oversaw the putting in of water pipes and power supply. How exactly Schweitzer informed himself about all the necessary details is made evident by his consultation with qualified people in Europe, his reading notes, his drawings, and the books he ordered. A desire to have everything perfect made it difficult for him to delegate important work to others. But it also seems
that only Schweitzer with his authority could in fact keep the natives working. He showed understanding for their attitude towards work, recognizing that they were not lazy in our sense of the word, but merely accustomed (since nature in Lambaréné is usually provident) to put out effort only when required by circumstances, as, for instance: when the land no longer yielded the necessary subsistence and the whole village had to be moved; when money was needed to pay hospital bills, to buy medicine or perhaps a wife. Also, Schweitzer expressed a worry about the alcohol problem.

Schweitzer often copied out by hand verses of gratitude and respect written and addressed to him by staff members and patients. Most of these were dated near his birthday and bear testimony to the love he inspired in so many who were connected with the hospital.
Poetry, in general, was a major interest. The countless poems inserted in his notebooks reveal a sensitive response to lyric poetry and a nostalgic remembrance of his beloved home country. On these grounds one might be tempted to think of Schweitzer as only a romanticist. However, his realistic and practical handling of problems frequently provided proof to the contrary.

Schweitzer's pedagogical instincts, inherited from his forefathers, are apparent in his remarks about historical events, natural phenomena, word origins, and in the allegorical anecdotes that he records.

And finally, one finds some biographical details which are of interest. In one notebook he wrote about his own family origins. He believed his roots were Swiss and that he derived his name from the canton “Swytz” (or “Switz”—therefore the “tz” in his name). His ancestors moved from Switzerland to the area around Toggenburg, where Schweitzer still found relatives after the Second World War. After the Thirty Years War his family had moved to Alsace, where immigrants were being sought to repopulate the devastated villages. There, the name “Schwytzer” became “Schweitzer”. For over two centuries the Schweitzers produced organists, teachers, and weavers—wavers in the summer, when the children did not go to school but worked in the fields, and schoolmasters in winter. The first theologian among the Schweitzers was Albert Schweitzer's father. His father's brother, Charles, also studied theology but gave it up to become a high-school teacher in France. This same uncle helped Schweitzer later on to feel at home in Paris.

While studying philosophy in Paris, Schweitzer continued his organ studies with his former teacher, the composer and organist Charles Marie Widor. Schweitzer's book, J. S. Bach, dates from this time. It did not remain his only statement on Bach. Scattered throughout these notebooks are many ideas and notes for future publications and lectures on Bach, on special violin bows necessary for Bach pieces, and on works by Bach for keyboard instruments. Schweitzer inherited his love for organs and organ-building from his grandfather. He became passionately interested in the preservation and renovation of old organs. When Schweitzer and his wife embarked for Lambaréné in 1913, he was given a piano with a pedal attachment by the Paris Bach Society, enabling him to continue his work on Bach and to keep in practice. On extended tours in Europe between the two world
wars and after the Second World War, he played Bach concerts in order to earn money for Lambaréné. From his comments and receipts from record companies can be seen that Schweitzer recorded the organ music not only of Bach, but also of César Franck, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, and Charles Marie Widor.

The following story, copied out by hand, is found in one of the notebooks from the year 1943 with a postscript by Albert Schweitzer that he remembered the situation very well. The story is recounted by the organist Marcel Dupré, with whom, on a given day every week in Paris, Widor and Schweitzer used to meet for luncheon.

On one such occasion Schweitzer made the strange announcement of his plans to leave Europe for distant parts. His two companions were overcome with amazement. Schweitzer going to Africa! What could it mean? Schweitzer—a doctor of Medicine, a doctor of Theology, a doctor of Philosophy, a world-famous interpreter of Bach—going to Africa! What a waste of talent! "But the cause of art will suffer irreparable loss if you go", remonstrated Widor. "We can't afford to lose you!" "As long as you remain in Paris", Schweitzer answered, "the cause of art is safe. With you here I am free to go. You are the master." There was something in that episode which reminded me of words echoing through the ages: He must increase, but I must decrease! It is when we lose our little lives unto an all-important cause that we really find life, the abundant life's sacrifice remains the path to true selfhood. And so Schweitzer went to Africa. Indeed, the cause of art in Europe suffered a great loss. But what immeasurable gain was brought to the dark continent with the advent of this herald of light! Whatsoever things are good, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely—he had new audiences to think of them.

Overall, these fifty-one blue books constitute the most interesting portion of the entire notebook collection to the general reader. The remaining notebooks, however, contain abundant detail that will be indispensable to the Schweitzer scholar.

Another group of Schweitzer's blue books might be termed his 'travel notebooks'. There are forty-two of them. They contain dates,
information about people, meetings, and accommodations, explanations of organs in general and comments and technical data on specific organs which he visited and played.

Throughout the entire collection of notebooks a surprising amount of space is taken up by addresses of donors, acquaintances, and people in whom Schweitzer was particularly interested. But fifteen books contain only addresses, accompanied frequently by brief mnemonic notations on the correspondents themselves, as well as what might best be termed a 'correspondence log', namely, a record of letters sent and owed. Having no time to answer the many letters, which arrived with every mailboat and, later, by airplane, was one of Schweitzer's most burdensome frustrations. Pasted onto one page of
this group is a small press cutting about George Bernard Shaw on his eighty-fifth birthday. In it, Shaw is described as having thrown away, immediately upon receipt, all his incoming mail. Schweitzer's marginal note reads: "He is missing the simplest humanity!"

Three notebooks relate only to financial details: receipts and expenditures; royalties from publishers and recording companies; and notes and correspondence concerning income tax from the years 1946 through 1958.

Two notebooks list or refer to ordered books, medical equipment, medicine, and other materials needed at Lambaréné.

Two notebooks contain in alphabetical order the names of medications from Switzerland and the United States.

Five notebooks (among them three voluminous ones) relate to diseases, with source references and notes for the exact medical treatment common in the years between 1930 and 1950. Very orderly and conscientious notes demonstrate the aspects of diseases in that time and describe the natives' primitive condition of life. In reading through them one can see the progress that the science of medicine made in three decades.

The last three of the entire collection of 123 blue books are devoted to problems concerning the consequences of the atom bomb tests and of a possible nuclear war. In addition to handwritten remarks, there are, predominantly, clippings from international newspapers in French, German, and English.

Pervading all the notebooks is a sense of the pressure of time, frustrating most particularly to the philosophical element in Schweitzer's character. He had already expressed in his early letters his fears that, intellectually, mankind lives on the past without realizing it, and he wanted very much to bring about a change with his The Philosophy of Civilization. He had begun this work before first embarking for Lambaréné, and he tried to continue it in his rare free time and even as a prisoner during the First World War. The notebooks are full of notes about philosophy, interspersed as well with regrets whenever a year went by again without his finishing the Philosophy.

On the last page of his notebook for the year 1942, he wrote:

The sad part is, that I could continue with my work with the Philosophy only temporarily sometimes. I was too much
overwhelmed with work, too tired in the evening and normally not at all in a condition to concentrate enough. But I always carried the work in my mind, and tried hard to finish as much work as possible in order to find daily some spare time, even if short, for the Philosophy. The draft is always on my table. Perhaps it was good that I had the subject always in my mind and did not write down a lot. Oh, could I have only three months for myself, how much would then be completed.

LETTERS

The Schweitzer papers at Syracuse include an important group of letters touching on all of Schweitzer's major concerns. The principal correspondents are Rhena Schweitzer, Rudolf Karl Bultmann, and Erica Anderson.

Ninety-five letters from the years 1930 to 1937 to his daughter, Rhena, who was at that time between eleven and eighteen years old, show a strong, uncompromising, but always loving, understanding and forgiving father, full of caring, especially for the health of his little daughter.

Eighty-five more letters from the years 1945 to 1965 to his then-married daughter Rhena and her family reflect his longing for a home, his worry about the well-being of the family, the daily life in Lambaréné with its joys and its difficulties. The unconditional devotion to his calling remained intact, though he did not hide an often severe exhaustion which resulted from his work and the heavy responsibility that continued to grow, in spite of his advanced age.

There are three letters from Albert Schweitzer to the German existentialist theologian Professor Rudolf K. Bultmann, a group of whose papers are also located at Syracuse University. These letters deal mostly with theological problems concerning the interpretation of Apostle Paul's writing. However, in his letter of July 1912 to Bultmann, Schweitzer added the following comment: "This second volume will be my good-bye to theological scholarship. I want to spend the second part of my life in the Congo as a physician to the poor natives." Nevertheless, he continued with his research on Paul, as one sees not only from the many remarks in his notebooks but also from his
letter to Professor Bultmann written on 11 October 1931. Here he wrote: “First I would like to thank you for your kind letter of 28 August and the review of my book on Paul in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*. I am so glad that you wrote about the book in such detail, and that you agree with most of my views.”

Among other interesting letters in the collection there are: a handwritten letter of thanks to the Reverend Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, First Baptist Church, Syracuse, in French; a letter from the year 1946 from Mrs. Lilian Russell, Schweitzer’s temporary assistant, to Dr. Charles M. Courboin, organist at St. Patrick’s Cathedral, New York, in English, with an accompanying letter by Albert Schweitzer, in French; and a copy of a typewritten message on the occasion of the Brazza Centennial, in French.

However, the biggest corpus of Schweitzer correspondence at Syr-
acuse University is the group of 396 letters from Albert Schweitzer to the New York photographer Erica Anderson from the years 1950 through 1965.

Erica Anderson was born in Vienna, but she left Austria in 1938 together with her parents as refugees from National Socialism. After two years in England she followed her parents to the United States and became an American citizen. She had already produced successful film biographies of the English sculptor Henry Moore and of Grandma Moses before she first met Albert Schweitzer in 1951. During her first stay in Lambaréné a deep and lasting friendship developed, and, over the years, Erica Anderson became, in Schweitzer's words, the "Court Photographer of Lambaréné".

The letters, in which Albert Schweitzer wrote very openly and trustfully about his life, his problems, his joys and sorrows, and his thoughts about philosophy and theology, show how close to him Erica Anderson came to be. Often, he expressed his concern about the possibility of another war, with its inescapable consequence of human extermination by nuclear weapons, and on those occasions his thoughts turned to the principle of Reverence for Life, to ethics, and to the continuance of civilization. Schweitzer always showed strong feelings for the religions of the world. In particular, he was attracted by the Indian philosophers and their view of the world. In one of his last letters to Erica Anderson, Schweitzer, full of hope, wrote:

More and more the ethic for life makes its way into the world. In India they see its significance in bringing the European and Indian ethics into a relationship through the ideal of Humanism. This I had realized already, but I am deeply pleased that the people in India have the same certainty.

After Albert Schweitzer's death, Mrs. Anderson founded the Albert Schweitzer Center in Great Barrington, Massachusetts.

MANUSCRIPTS

For the most part these handwritten documents, first drafts of radio appeals, and reports concern the dangerous consequences of atomic
rearmament. Albert Schweitzer hesitated a long time before he went public with his three appeals against atomic danger, “Peace or Atomic War?”, broadcast by Radio Oslo in April 1958. Only after intensive research and considerable correspondence with physicians and physicists, did he feel obligated as a person representing the principle of Reverence for Life to speak about his fears. Whoever reads these appeals for peace today cannot help but be moved by their urgency. Typewritten versions in English, French, and German are part of the file.

Other papers speak of the danger of progress in science, which, in addition to possible benefits, might eventually lead to the destruction of mankind. Schweitzer was predominantly concerned with the medical consequences of radioactivity for people today and future generations.

He mused over the psychological background of the arms race between East and West. There is the handwritten draft of a letter to President Kennedy from the year 1962 with the urgent request to do everything in his power to bring about a stop to atomic weapons tests.

Other manuscripts deal with problems of ethics and culture and a potential, complete loss of culture through powerseeking and destruction of mankind by nuclear weapons.

In his “Reports about the Relationship between White and Coloured Races” are questions about the morality of colonizing and the obligations and responsibilities of colonial rulers as well as about human rights.

There is also a handwritten draft dated 1961 for the last chapter of a projected book with the title: “Free from Inhumanity: Free from Nuclear Weapons”.

MISCELLANEA

From the time of Schweitzer’s early years as a student of philosophy, theology, and music (1893–1902) as well as from the time of his studies of medicine (1905–1913), the file contains various documents, concert programs, photographs, and press cuttings. Among the items is, for instance, the newspaper clipping of an annoyed letter from Kaiser Wilhelm II to Admiral Hollmann, Officer of the
Deutsche Orientgesellschaft. The letter referred to the Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor at the University of Berlin, who pioneered in researching the Assyrian language and gave lectures on the subject “Babel and Bible”. His presentations caused polemic discussions, since he had concluded from his reading of the Assyrian papers that Jesus Christ could not be God’s son.

Additionally, the following inventories are available:
1. Inventory of manuscripts by Albert Schweitzer, in the Zentral-Bibliothek, Zürich.
2. Inventory of materials of Albert Schweitzer, brought on 15 March 1977 from Günsbach to the Zentral-Bibliothek, Zürich.
3. Inventory of literature by and about Albert Schweitzer, including records, editions of music, handwritten papers, and various archival materials in the Library of Erwin R. Jacobi, Zürich.
4. Inventory of all manuscripts, notebooks, and letters at Syracuse University with short notes about their content.

BOOKS FROM SCHWEITZER’S LIBRARY

Syracuse University also has in its possession a number of books (predominantly on music, religion, and Africa) from Albert Schweitzer’s personal library. Presented by Rhena Schweitzer Miller in 1978, all are signed by Albert Schweitzer. Several carry his extensive annotations. Noteworthy is Schweitzer's own marked copy of Les Mots by his cousin Jean-Paul Sartre. In addition, Mrs. Miller's gift included from her own library other books both by and about her father.
Clothing of Wrought Gold, Raiment of Needlework: Embroidered Chasubles in the Syracuse University Art Collections

BY SUSAN KYSER

Syracuse University has the good fortune to possess a beautiful and unusual collection of embroidered liturgical textiles made in southern Europe during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Donated to the University in 1950 by George Arents, the collection contains more than one hundred items, including vestments such as chasubles, stoles, and maniples, as well as chalice covers, altar and lectern covers, and other embroidered panels once used to decorate vestments.

Outstanding among the liturgical textiles are the chasubles, which show a uniformly high quality of execution and preservation. A chasuble is the outermost garment worn by a priest celebrating Mass and, as the most visible of the liturgical vestments, traditionally carries elaborate and religiously symbolic ornamentation. There are ten chasubles in the Arents donation, eight of which are complete; the remaining two consist only of the back panel, which typically receives far less wear than the front. The extreme care and enormous amount of work lavished on every piece complement the often precious materials from which they were created: silks, and metallic threads of gold and silver. Indeed, the technical complexity and expert execution of this needlework suggest the art of professional embroiderers.

It may well have been the beauty of this workmanship that attracted the collector, Mrs. George (Annie Walters) Arents, Sr.¹ to

1. This idea was suggested to me by Mrs. Julienne Oldfield, to whom I am also indebted for much encouragement and support at the inception of this project. Syracuse University owes another of its treasures to Mrs. Arents's interest in collecting: the Annie Walters Arents collection of nineteenth-century European academic paintings, donated by her son, George Arents, in 1949.
Fig. 1. En route from Cordoba to Sevilla—“Enjoying our troubles”, from the George Arents album of photographs entitled “Wanderings in Spain and Portugal”.
these embroideries. We know little of their collection history beyond the observation that the textiles appear to have been acquired from churches in Spain, Portugal, and Italy during the early part of this century. No collection records have been located, and as of now the only evidence for their provenance is, unfortunately, rather circumstantial: a photograph album compiled by George Arents entitled "Wanderings in Spain and Portugal"² (figs. 1 and 2) which documents two such family trips in 1905 and 1909. Prominent among its roadside scenes and architectural views are religious monuments and monastic institutions. However, without further information the provenance of individual pieces remains somewhat speculative. Attributions must be based upon the shapes of the vestments, which show certain national variations, and upon pattern designs, which also reflect national preferences. Stitching techniques tend to be a less reliable indicator of provenance since the basic vocabulary of materials and techniques in this kind of embroidery was common throughout the western European countries.

². Located in the rare book division of the George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University.
Distinguished by design, materials, and technique, professional embroidery is quite different from the popular or peasant embroidery of these countries, much of which is famous in its own right. Professional embroidery makes use of rich and sumptuous materials, employs a variety of complex needlework techniques within each piece, and represents the work of several hands. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries ecclesiastical embroideries were occasionally made and donated to the church by aristocratic ladies, but more often were commissioned from workers who had been trained in the art of embroidery. Large cathedrals throughout southern Europe supported entire workshops of these highly skilled artisans, both men and women. Trained embroiderers were also to be found within convents and monasteries, where they produced great numbers of elaborately worked vestments. Designs for these embroideries may have been furnished by painters but were also taken from the increasingly popular pattern books published in most European countries in the eighteenth century. Liturgical arts were in no way immune to secular fashions: produced for patrons who were desirous of imitating styles favored at the French court, eighteenth-century liturgical embroideries, like all professionally produced needlework, reflected prevailing fashions of the time.

The majority of the Syracuse chasubles are typical examples of Baroque ecclesiastical arts from southern Europe. Symmetrical, crowded designs articulated by sweeping curves or volutes, fantastic floral patterns unified by swirling leaves and stems, and an exuberant, often unrestrained use of color characterize the entire group. Most of the patterns are based on floral forms, although some are built on a scrolling structure with flowers added as embellishment. Foliage and flowers are strongly naturalistic, yet are more often products of the imagination than copies of botanical specimens. A few familiar blossoms such as roses and carnations have liturgical associations, but for the most part the designs remain secular. Conceived as a complement to the Baroque interiors in which they were used, the chasubles possess a surface pattern that is visually overabundant. Ornate, heavily textured, and glittering with silk, gold, and polychromed sequins, these vestments represent an expression in textile media of the same impulses that produced the vigorous and movemented architecture of the Baroque era.

One of the few chasubles here to make explicit use of religious
Fig. 3. SU 50.111, front of chasuble (dimensions: 45 x 26 inches). Spain, mid-eighteenth century (Photo: David Broda).
symbolism is SU 50.110/111, a Spanish vestment probably dating from the mid-eighteenth century (fig. 3). On the front a brilliant blue aureole radiates from the monogram IHS, which is surmounted by a moline cross and placed above a representation of the Sacred Heart ringed with the Crown of Thorns. Outside of this emblem images of palm trees and large fantastic blossoms fill the remaining spaces and float on a glittering ground of gold, which is worked to resemble woven cloth. The plain linen foundation fabric is entirely covered with needlework. For the background, gilt metal thread was couched, or attached to the surface of the linen by nearly invisible stitches of silk, worked from the back and placed in a particular geometric pattern. To create the effect of a woven fabric, the embroiderers used a couching pattern that resembles brickwork, cords stitched to the linen ground to give a low relief to the brickwork pattern, and alternation of groups of flat metal threads with groups of round metal threads.3

In shape this vestment is characteristic of Spanish chasubles in the eighteenth century. It has been trimmed in front, perhaps as much as five inches on either side, most noticeably near the top where the ends of the rays are covered by the added trim that edges the vestment. In this regard, SU 50.110/111 is a typical example of the Spanish 'fiddle-back' style, so named because the front panel, which narrows at the shoulders and flares towards the hem, was said by its detractors to resemble the shape of a violin case.4

Distinct national styles for chasubles were known since the sixteenth century in western Europe, and had resulted from the gradual narrowing of the vestment. In moving away from its bell-shaped me-

3. The great variety of needlework techniques used in this chasuble, particularly the low-relief metallic embroidery, are explained in Charles Germain de Saint-Aubin, Art of the Embroiderer (1770), trans. Nikki Scheuer (Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, in association with David R. Godine, publisher, Boston, 1983), which discusses techniques practiced by professional embroiderers in France during the third quarter of the eighteenth century. The Syracuse chasuble also resembles a problematic group of vestments coming from Bavaria and Mexico signalled by Christa Mayer-Thurman in Raiment for the Lord's Service: A Thousand Years of Western Vestsments (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1975), Nos. 78, 101, 131, and 141.

dieval form, the chasuble had been trimmed at the sides to allow greater freedom of movement in the liturgical celebration, particularly important when the vestment was made of heavy brocades trimmed with gold needlework. The process was a gradual one, and by the Baroque era the character of the chasuble had been transformed from that of an enveloping garment to that of a pair of stiffened panels attached at the shoulders. Older chasubles were trimmed at the upper sides, especially in front, and most chasubles that remained in use through this period show signs of having been altered. Four national styles are usually distinguished—Italian, Spanish, French, and German—each with slightly different sizes and proportions. The chasubles of Spain were most drastically diminished in size, while those of Italy remained generally wider and longer than the others.

Also typical of eighteenth-century chasubles is the decorative scheme of SU 50.110/111. The visual division of the panel into three vertical segments by two thin bands of interlocking leaf shapes is all that remains of the traditional orphrey band. During the latter part of the seventeenth century, in conjunction with the flowering of the Baroque era, the orphrey lost its importance as the visual focus of the chasuble, and embroidered decoration spread over the entire surface of the vestment. Orphreys were almost always retained in outline form, however, sometimes giving a basic structure to the design, and at other times simply adding another decorative element to a crowded composition. Orphrey shapes also reflect national styles. The Spanish chasuble had pillar orphreys, or plain columns, in front and in back, while the Italian chasuble had a pillar orphrey in back and an orphrey cross in front. The various types of chasubles were not confined to or exclusively used in the country for which they were named, but the styles did predominate in their countries of origin.

Another chasuble, SU 50.115/116, is also of the Spanish style, although it may actually be Portuguese in origin since the type of orientalized design it carries had such lasting influence in that country (fig. 4). Here, Chinese motifs and color schemes are arranged in a composition distinctly reminiscent of the embroidered pintados, or

5. Orphreys, from the Latin aurifrisium, originally referred to Phrygian goldwork. These are the decorative bands, usually embroidered, applied in a prescribed or traditional manner to liturgical vestments.
bed-coverings, imported from India into Europe in great numbers beginning in the fifteenth century. From that time Portuguese art and architecture were strongly affected by goods and ideas brought by traders returning from India and the Far East.

Worked entirely in colored silks on a cream-colored silk ground, SU 50.115/116 shows cloud-like peonies, wide-beaked birds, and butterflies with long tails and curving antennae, all unified by delicately scrolling vines and tendrils. The scale is relatively small, and the stitching minute and precise. Pillar orphreys are marked by borders similar to those that outline the sides and neckline of the chasuble. The upper part has been trimmed in front but retains the original border, which was hemmed on the inner edge where the alteration took place. The neckline border has also been rearranged.

In spite of the evident fading of the colors on this chasuble, a
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Chinese influence can be found in its use of a graded spectrum of colors, placed in the design in discrete bands. Adjacent colors are separated by a tiny line of the white of the background silk, a detail that imitates the block-printed designs of Indian chintz. The design is very closely related to the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century English crewelwork embroideries modelled on Indian chintz patterns; yet it would never be mistaken for an English embroidery. The particular stylization of the birds is one that never seems to have appealed to the English imagination, for example; and the design has none of the folk charm or playfulness of contemporary English chinoiserie. Instead, it seems to be a more somber rendition of exotic motifs in which the elements are employed for their ability to impress rather than their ability to express.

Orientalized elements of a very different kind occur on SU 50.36/51, which portrays a pair of crested, long-necked birds that makes it one of the favorites in the collection (fig. 5). This chasuble has a dark red silk ground embroidered with polychrome silks in golden browns, yellows, and creams, and two types of metallic thread worked in a variety of patterns. Symmetrical volutes and C-scrolls form the basis of the design, while delicate stems with small blossoms and leaves of several shapes are scattered in the interstices. Raised metallic embroidery is used in 'commas' that edge the silk curves to enhance the illusion of solidity and emphasize the swirl and turn of the composition line. Almost lost among the heavy swirls of this late Baroque design, the exotic birds hold delicate stems of white-tipped lavender flowers in their upturned beaks. Superior materials and expert execution seem to place the origin of this chasuble in Italy or France in the mid-eighteenth century.

Needlework techniques rarely signal national origins, but may confirm an attribution made on other grounds. One distinctive type of embroidery popular in Portugal for bed-coverings and also used a great deal in Italy is a particular laid-and-couched silk technique that

7. The cut of SU 50.36/51 is somewhat non-standard, presenting a hybrid of the Spanish and Italian types; in shape it is Spanish, with front and back of approximately equal size, and joinings of the two parts at the shoulders. However, the orphreys are Italian, with a pillar orphrey in back having a V at the neckline that becomes the upper part of the orphrey cross in front. Italian chasubles usually are divided into two parts of unequal size, the back being larger, and joined along the upper horizontal line of the orphrey cross in front.
Fig. 5. SU 50.36, front of chasuble, detail (area shown: 15 x 10 inches). Southern Europe, mid-eighteenth century (Photo: David Broda).
derives from imported oriental embroideries. In this technique a foundation fabric is entirely covered with couched silkwork: silk floss (untwisted strands) is laid on the surface and held in place by a set of finer, twisted silk threads placed at right angles to the first, and fastened by tiny stitches taken from the back of the foundation fabric. This produces a showy but not terribly durable fabric, which by retaining most of the silk on the surface takes advantage of its high luster. Two of the Syracuse chasubles employ this technique. In SU 50.108/109 a standard Baroque pattern of large loops facing alternating directions is infused with an exuberant and overabundant quality that seems to belong to folk or rural arts rather than to court-oriented traditions (fig. 6). Here, large scrolling floral vines shelter perched birds and burst into great pink and yellow blossoms. The quality of work on this chasuble is somewhat coarse, the stitches large and not so carefully executed as one might expect. However, the exuberance of pattern and color give this chasuble an expressive vitality not found in the others. SU 50.108/109 could have come from Spain, Portugal, or Italy, and probably belongs to the late seventeenth century.

Two outstanding Italian chasubles are worked entirely in metals upon a red silk ground. One, SU 50.23, shows a late seventeenth-century design that comes close to being an overall pattern: a tangle of gold vines spotted with large, fantastic silver blossoms in a great variety of fanciful shapes (fig. 7). The other, SU 50.75, remarkable for the sheer richness of its deep red and gold color, is at once ornate and sober (fig. 8). Its design belongs to the classical revival of the latter part of the eighteenth century but still bears marks of the Rococo: lopsided C-curves hold pedestalled vases of tiny flowers, and borders and orphreys are trimmed with a geometric meander pattern. The quality of work on this piece is exquisite: the metallic threads are extremely fine and the couching patterns minute and precise.

With historic textiles in particular, a collection history necessarily

8. One is SU 50.25/38, probably Portuguese, which contains polychrome silkwork entirely stitched in the laid-and-couched technique, as well as some metallic embroidery. The other, SU 50.108/109, has only the background worked in laid-and-couched silk, while the floral design is executed in satin stitch embellished with raised work in metallic threads.

9. SU 50.108/109 is very close to Mayer-Thurman No. 77, from Italy, second half of the seventeenth century.
deals with why the objects have survived at all, since use and extreme fragility of the materials as well as changing fashions combine to make most textiles disappear over the centuries. The very survival of pieces such as these testifies to the great care with which they have been treated. Unlike more durable media such as metal, stone,
and even wood, European textiles survive most often because they were treasured and cared for, not because they were forgotten or overlooked. A continuing high regard for liturgical objects in the Catholic cultures which produced them and the care they have received for nearly a century in America have made it possible for us today to glimpse into the world of their creation. They are products of a craft tradition whose skills were gained over the course of generations and belong to a culture which held the liturgical celebration at the center of life. What may seem to us an excessive amount of painstaking work was, no doubt, for its creators a kind of devotion. The finest skills and materials available at the time went into the making of these vestments, which were intended to adorn the liturgical celebrant in the most splendid manner possible. Taken out of their liturgical context, these textiles still speak of a world in which the value of objects directly related to the skill, the time, and the precious materials invested in their creation.

The chasubles represent just a fraction of the Arents donation of liturgical textiles in the Syracuse University Art Collections. This is indeed an unusual resource, of interest to students of textile history and design, decorative arts in southern Europe, ecclesiastical dress,
and ecclesiastical embroidery. The true richness and vitality of design, and the manner in which choice of materials, technique, color, and pattern combine to produce a coherent statement in these vestments is something that can be appreciated only from the objects themselves. For this opportunity we at Syracuse University are greatly indebted to the Arents family.
The Gerrit Smith Papers in the manuscript collections of the George Arents Research Library at Syracuse University are an indispensable resource for scholars interested in American social reform. Given to the University in 1928 by Gerrit Smith Miller, a grandson, the collection reveals that the abolition of slavery dominated the Madison County philanthropist’s reform interests from the mid-1830s to the Civil War. Of Gerrit Smith’s numerous antislavery correspondents, including such prominent reformers as William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Theodore Dwight Weld, none maintained a more regular and extensive epistolary relationship than Beriah Green, upstate New York’s most radical and complex abolitionist. The Syracuse University collection contains 206 letters from Green to Smith, dated from 1834 through 1872. Smith’s outgoing correspondence, partially recorded in two letter copybooks, is less extensive and therefore less helpful in revealing the dynamics of the Smith-Green relationship. Fortunately, Green’s letters to Smith frequently make reference to Smith’s missing correspondence. An examination of these letters, supplemented by other primary sources, makes possible an interesting case study of the partnership formed by two of upstate New York’s most important antislavery crusaders.

They were an ill-matched pair. Contemporaries knew Gerrit Smith as majestic in personal appearance. “Tall, magnificently built and proportioned, his large head [was] superbly set upon his shoulders [so that] he might have served as a model for a Greek God in the days

* Professor Sernett is the author of the recently published Abolition’s Axe: Beriah Green, Oneida Institute and the Black Freedom Struggle (Syracuse: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1986).
when men deified beauty and worshipped it.”¹ By contrast, Beriah Green was a “man of not more than middling stature, earnestly stooping forward [with] a strongly marked, nervous, decided face”.² Smith was widely respected for his disarmingly gracious temperament and affectionate disposition, the epitome of the earnest Christian. Green, who had been born in Connecticut in 1795 and trained at Andover Seminary, struck some as severe and craggy, like the rocks of his native New England. A New England abolitionist visiting her aunt in Oneida County reported that she found the president of Oneida Institute “ugly and clerical”.³ Smith had inherited his father’s business empire, possessed enough land to be embarrassed by it, and had the wherewithal to be the benefactor to a host of charitable causes, including Green’s school and family. As to mental powers, Green was an academic, a scholar of sacred literature and moral philosophy. Smith admitted to being a reader of newspapers and tracts, more adept as a publicist of reform causes than as a reader of books or an original thinker.⁴

Though oddly matched in these and other ways, Gerrit Smith and Beriah Green were yoked in common cause for over four decades. Their relationship, intimate yet stormy, throws light upon the inner workings of the abolitionist enterprise in central and western New York. Historian Lawrence J. Friedman has called the circle of abolitionists led by Smith “voluntarists”, for these immediatists of the Burned-over District (a section in upstate New York of intensive religious revivals) predicated reform upon the notion that democratic change could only come through the binding together of free individuals who were on intimate terms and shared common values.⁵ This ideological approach brought Green and Smith into a friendship

². [Elizur Wright, Jr.], “Finding a Man”, Model Worker, 11 August 1848.
³. Ann W. Weston to M. Weston, 16 May 1839, Anti-Slavery Papers, Boston Public Library.
⁴. Octavius Brooks Frothingham, Gerrit Smith (New York: Putnam’s Sons, 1878), 362–65. This highly sympathetic biography by a contemporary admirer received the approval of the Smith family. Frothingham had access to Smith’s private journals, which unfortunately have been lost. Smith’s Peterboro mansion was destroyed by fire in 1930.
that surpassed mere conventionality but eventually put severe pressures on the ties of brotherhood each freely expressed. We can best see this by examining several circles of intimacy shared by Green and Smith.

"GIVE US YOUR HEART AND YOUR HAND"

In 1834 Green began corresponding with the "patron" of the village of Peterboro, Madison County, on the subject of black educa-
tion. Green was then president of Oneida Institute, a manual labor and literary school located just east of Whitesboro, about four miles from Utica. It had been founded by the Reverend George Gale in 1827 in order to prepare recruits from the Finney revivals for mission work in the West. When Green was selected as Gale’s successor in 1833, he already had a reputation as an uncompromising foe of the American Colonization Society and an ardent advocate of immediate emancipation. While on the faculty of Western Reserve College, Hudson, Ohio, he had created a firestorm with four sermons attacking the scheme to export blacks to Liberia.

Green accepted the presidency of Oneida Institute on the condition that he would be allowed to do more for the cause of black freedom in central New York than he had previously been allowed to do by Western Reserve’s conservative trustees. “I am assured”, Green wrote Elizur Wright, Jr., “that Africa shall lose nothing in the exchange of stations I am urged to venture on. I am even assured that the Trustees [of Oneida Institute] will help me in my efforts to strike the chains from colored limbs, etc.” Green aimed to transform the Institute from a Presbyterian-dominated manual labor school into an interracial abolitionist training ground. For the benefit of “poor suffering humanity”, his young enthusiasts were to unite manual labor on the school’s farm and in its workshops with a revolutionary practical education that stressed study of biblical Greek and Hebrew rather than the Greek and Roman classics.

Gerrit Smith also had an interest in educating “colored youth”. As early as 1827, he proposed to establish a school in Peterboro to prepare blacks to exercise the Gospel ministry under the auspices of the American Colonization Society. He seems to have abandoned the plan without public explanation, but tried again in early 1834. Green protested the concept of a separate manual labor school for blacks. Thus, addressing Smith as “My Dear Sir”, Oneida Institute’s president began four decades of correspondence on a note of discord. “For one I am from principle opposed to charity which excludes either

color; I am opposed to the cord of caste wherever it may appear. Away with caste! It has strangled its thousands. . . . Till we have white and black together in our schools, the cord of caste will remain."

Smith proceeded over Green's objections and brought a handful of Afro-American youth to Peterboro for the rudiments of a classical education in a manual labor setting. "I hope my first class . . . will have members who will go to Africa with a sound education of head and heart", Smith wrote colonizationist leader Leonard Bacon. The Peterboro Manual Labor School had but one instructor, was solely dependent upon Smith's charity, and lasted only until late summer 1836. Six students petitioned their benefactor to keep the school open, pleading "we have just begun to drink fully of the fountain of knowledge". Land rich but cash poor, as the country headed for the fiscal Panic of 1837, Smith had to abandon his school. Green unsuccessfully urged him to merge it with the preparatory department of Oneida Institute. Only one of Smith's students, Elymas P. Rogers, transferred to the Institute, which is now known to have enrolled more Afro-Americans than any other American college in the 1830s and 1840s.

Green and Smith differed over the necessity for integrated higher education in the early 1830s because Smith still maintained cordial relationships with the leaders of the American Colonization Society and gave generously to its support. As late as March 1834, he complained of the "violent, bitter and fanatical" denunciations of the colonizationists by the immediatists. He confided in his journal a few months later, "I think I cannot join the Antislavery Society as long as the War is kept up between it and the American Colonization Society—a war, however, for which the Colonization Society is as much to blame as the other Society". Did this portend a change of

8. Green to Smith, 25 March 1834. Unless otherwise noted, all future citations of the Green-Smith correspondence draw upon the Gerrit Smith Papers at Syracuse University.
heart? Elizur Wright, Jr., thought so, for he wrote Green that the Peterboro philanthropist was "about making his last effort to reform the poor old colonization hobby. It is the creation of his imagination he clings to—not the odious reality." \cite{wright1834}

Green needed coadjutors in order to transform Oneida Institute into a model biracial community where young men could work on the farm and in the shops while being schooled in the principles of practical reform. The school's debts were heavier than Gale had led Green to believe. Some of the trustees were balking at Green's plans to enroll pious youth without regard to color or family background. Because of his philanthropic reputation and proximity to the Institute, Gerrit Smith was an obvious potential supporter. Green knew, however, that Smith was a trustee of Hamilton College, the Institute's conservative rival, and was giving liberally to the American Colonization Society. He attempted to win Smith over to immediatei
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Smith sent the Institute small donations, but as of spring 1835 he had not yet broken with the colonizationists.

External events often bring individuals to make ideological commitments when personal persuasion fails. Such was the case with Smith in October 1835. Green had urged him to attend the organizational meeting in Utica of a proposed state antislavery society. Addressing Smith as "My Dear Brother", Green wrote in September, "I feel a confidence, which my heart refuses to let go, that you will, sometime or other, give us your heart and your hand". \cite{green1835} Smith made no commitment at the time. However, he happened to be in Utica in October. He and his wife were passing through en route to Schenectady for a visit with Peter Smith, Gerrit's father, who had started the family fortune in the fur trade with John Jacob Astor. More out of curiosity than conviction, Gerrit was present at the opening session of the New York Anti-Slavery Convention, held at the Bleecker Street Presbyterian Church. He had barely taken his seat when a mob of about eighty commercial and professional men disrupted the

\cite{wright1834}
\cite{green1835}
meeting with cries of “Open the way! Break down the doors! Damn the fanatics! Stop your damn stuff!” As the assembly scattered in confusion, so an observer recalled, Smith’s “resonant and persuasive voice” could be heard above the uproar. Smith appealed for fairness and free speech, though he declared himself “no abolitionist”. Some four hundred delegates accepted his offer to reconvene in the safety of his Peterboro mansion house, some fourteen miles southwest of Utica.\(^\text{15}\)

Smith assumed a prominent role in the deliberations of the reassembled state society on the day following the Utica riot. He declared himself in opposition to all those who would muzzle the moral reformer.

The enormous and insolent demands of the South, sustained, I am deeply ashamed to say, by craven and mercenary spirits at the North, manifest beyond all dispute, that the question now is not merely, nor mainly, whether the blacks of the South shall remain slaves—but whether the whites at the North shall become slaves also.\(^\text{16}\)

Smith later wrote in his journal that the mobbing in Utica had been an “instructive providence”.\(^\text{17}\) Nevertheless, he demurred from joining the American Anti-Slavery Society, the national organization over whose constituting assembly Green had presided in December 1833. Smith’s eventual conversion to this society was motivated by concern for free speech rather than heartfelt antagonism to the American Colonization Society. Green, elected as corresponding secretary of the New York Anti-Slavery Society, continued to pressure Smith to make a clean break. The philanthropist did so in a letter, dated 24 November 1835, in which he informed Ralph Gurley, secretary of the American Colonization Society:


It is proper for me to say that I am brought to this determination, earlier than I expected to be, by the recent increase of my interest in the American Anti-Slavery Society. Since the late alarming attacks in the persons of its [the Colonization Society] members on the right of discussion, I have looked to it [the Anti-Slavery Society], as being the rallying point of the friends of this right. 18

Shortly after Smith converted, Green wrote him, “I rejoice to know that your thoughts and heart are so much with the oppressed”.\(^{19}\)

Now that this unlikely pair was fully yoked in common cause, Green pressed the needs of Oneida Institute upon his friend. He argued that the Institute should be “a special object of solicitude and of patronage”, because the abolitionist cause would itself be embarrassed should the school fail. President Green wanted water power for the Institute's workshops, new equipment for chemistry and physics, and an endowment so that the manual labor experiment might receive a fair trial. Green told Smith that his school deserved more patronage than Hamilton because it alone was dedicated to “subserve the glory of our Savior and the interests of His Kingdom”.\(^{20}\) Smith gave generously until the Panic of 1837 caused him to plead an “extreme scarcity of money”. Even then he borrowed funds and proposed to give three thousand dollars to Green’s school and family. “Because of the simple, straight-forward honesty inculcated in it”, Smith declared, “it [Oneida Institute] is dearer to my heart than any School with which I am acquainted”.\(^{21}\)

“REMEMBER ME TO YOUR DEAR CIRCLE”

In addition to Green, the circle of voluntarists in the Burned-over District that gathered around Smith included such abolitionists as William Chapin, William Goodell, Alvan Stewart, and Myron Holley. But the Green-Smith relationship was the most intense. Had it not been for Smith’s magnanimity and personal affection for Oneida Institute’s president, Green would have broken with the others sooner than he did. As it was, the two maintained a strong but stormy friendship that survived the break-up of the Smith reform circle in the late 1840s in part because of another area of intimacy. From about 1838 onwards, Green customarily concluded his letters to Smith with “Remember Me to Your Dear Circle”—a sign that their friendship extended beyond their abolition interests to their respective households.

There were many domestic connections between the two men.

Green and his family frequently visited Peterboro, and the Green children, notably Samuel, often spent long vacations at the Smith estate. Smith's business obligations rarely afforded him opportunity to lodge at the "Old Hive", as Green affectionately called his Whitesboro home, noteworthy as the first frame house in Oneida County. Ann Green and Elizabeth Smith were kindred spirits, sharing the joys and trials of growing up. Smith honored his friend by naming a newborn son after him. "Green Smith was born 1/2 past 2 p. m. this day [14 April 1842]. Who is Green Smith?, you will ask. He is my only son, named after my beloved brother Beriah Green." Immensely pleased, Beriah took special interest over the years in the welfare, both physical and spiritual, of his namesake. Even while caught in the confusion of abolitionist schisms and ideological debates, Green and Smith counseled and consoled each other on personal and family matters. As with Timothy Dwight Weld and Angelina Grimké, concern for the plight of the slave had brought these two disparate personalities together and set the orbits of their lives into intersecting and dependent patterns.

In 1837 Smith consented to serve on Oneida Institute's board of trustees, thereby further drawing himself into Green's life. When Green reported that his own salary had gone unpaid due to the school's debts, Smith forwarded money for Green's family and offered to employ some of the children on his Peterboro estate. Green expressed irritation that Smith should miss so many board meetings and jealousy that the philanthropist opened his purse to other petitioners. Indeed, there is a didactic tone to much of Green's correspondence with Smith. He lectured his friend not only on Smith's responsibilities as a trustee but also about abolition politics, family matters, diet, the proper ritual for taking a bath, the dangers of utopianism and spiritualism, and the need for regular physical exercise.

Green's need for support from Smith increased after the Panic of 1837 brought cries of alarm from Oneida Institute's long-suffering treasurer, Reuben Hough. Smith donated 3,800 acres of new land in Vermont to the school, but even at two dollars an acre few buyers came forward. Short of cash himself, Smith moved out of his mansion and resorted to employing his wife and daughter in his land office. Oneida Institute struggled along until February 1844 when its

22. Smith to Green, 14 April 1842, Letter Book 1.
buildings and grounds were sold to a group of Free Will Baptists. In September 1843 a fire had destroyed many of Green's personal effects and much of his library. The Green family was forced to take up residence in one of the Institute's dormitories. Thus, Green was on campus when the end came.

His anger and despair at being unable to forestall the inevitable fill his letters to Smith during the last years of the Institute. Green felt "odious in the eyes of the religionists" and betrayed by the education societies that had withdrawn support from his students. He also complained to Smith that the Institute had never had the wholehearted support of some in Smith's reform circle, especially Alvan Stewart, the Utica lawyer, whose growing influence in the New York Anti-Slavery Society Green resented. Oneida Institute's financial collapse was partly due to the failure of the Society to pay the school for printing the Friend of Man and other abolitionist literature. Because Green eventually severed ties with Stewart and others in Smith's reform circle, his relationship with Smith himself had to bear an intensified emotional and ideological load.

ENGAGEMENT WITH THE POWERS

From the beginning of their alliance as co-workers for black freedom, Smith and Green had shared a remarkably similar vision of an America transformed into a Christian republic with liberty and justice for all. Smith had far greater means at his disposal for influencing fellow citizens toward this end. His wealth enabled him to publish and disseminate more than fifty circular letters on slavery alone. He was widely noted as an excellent public speaker, gifted with a melodious voice and an attractive presence. A "devil of uneasiness", to use his biographer's description, drew Smith into so many good causes, so many entangling business and personal relationships that he risked weakening the impress of his abolitionism.

24. Green to Smith, 15 September 1842; 24 February 1843.
25. Ralph V. Harlow, Gerrit Smith (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1939), 17. Harlow's biography of Smith is rich in detail and thoroughly grounded in the valuable Smith Papers at Syracuse University. Unfortunately, it is marred by an
Green also supported many reform efforts, such as temperance, land reform, the redemption of prostitutes, and Christian missions. But he viewed the fight against slavery as the archetype of the whole Christian enterprise to remake America. A man of small means, Green's weapons were his voice and pen. Smith boasted that his friend's "intellect is not surpassed in the whole range of my acquaintance".26 Green's natural disposition inclined more to the scholar's study than the public platform. He drew strength from manual labor in the solitude of the woodpile and field. In technical matters of theology and moral philosophy, Smith deferred to Green and took to calling him "the superior Metaphysician".27

Despite contrasting habits of the mind, this pair shared a common religious disposition. Their commitment to immediate emancipation was grounded on an awakening to the evils of colonization akin to the experience of conversion common to American evangelicals. Slavery was a sin to be immediately repented of. It was, as Smith wrote, "an audacious usurpation of the divine prerogative . . . a presumptuous transgression of all the holy commandments".28 Once converted to abolition at Western Reserve, Green made the cause of the slave his sacred vocation. He initially shared Smith's optimism that moral suasion would convert the American public. They both held steadfastly to a genuinely radical vision of a purified nation, albeit a Protestant one, in which white and black supped together at the table of peace and prosperity.

excessively negative bias toward Gerrit Smith's religious sentiments and reform enthusiasms. Historical scholarship badly needs a more sympathetic biography of Smith, whose stature among important figures in American reform is now being acknowledged.


27. Smith, circular letter addressed to "President Green, Whitesboro", 4 April 1849, Smith Papers.

As organized abolitionism spread throughout the Burned-over District, Smith and Green found themselves agreeing on the need to convert the white, northern religious establishment. Both accepted the principle that moral reform must begin in those circles of intimacy to which they belonged. Green attempted to radicalize the churches in Oneida County, especially Whitesboro’s prestigious First Presbyterian, which many of Oneida Institute’s faculty and students attended. Rebuffed by David Ogden, First Presbyterian’s conservative pastor, Green departed with approximately seventy members in 1838 to form an abolitionist-minded Congregational society. The Oneida Presbytery eventually refused to recognize Green’s ministerial credentials, denied the legitimacy of his abolitionist church, and regarded him as a “troubler of Israel”. Green then became active in the Union Church movement, a loose confederation of Christian abolitionists in central and western New York who insisted that Christians should separate from all those blind to the sin of slavery.29

Embittered by the ecclesiastical establishment’s lackluster antislavery stance and consequent refusal to support Oneida Institute, Green began to question orthodox theology itself. He warred with his New England theological mentors and the “sober and scholarly” northern churchmen who hid behind the skirts of traditional doctrine when confronted by abolitionist demands. Though much less disenchanted with the organized church than the New England abolitionist, William Lloyd Garrison, whose anti-clericalism rankled him, Green broke rank with the orthodox on such doctrines as the atonement of Christ. His radical abolitionist convictions eventually brought him perilously close to the notion that true Christianity was to be demonstrated not by adherence to orthodox doctrine but by participation with “poor, suffering humanity”, according to the model provided by Jesus. Indeed, one can find in Green’s sermons and essays, from about 1840 on, themes similar to those of the liberation theologians of the contemporary period.30


30. For an example of Green’s unorthodox views, see his Thoughts on the Atonement (Whitesboro: Oneida Institute Press, 1842).
Gerrit Smith’s break with orthodoxy also followed upon the heels of his abolitionism. Having joined the Presbyterian Church in 1826, Smith attended services and revivals regularly. He was by temperament more broad-minded than many of his co-religionists and had an abiding dislike for the sectarians who claimed to have a monopoly on divine truth. Yet Smith’s abolitionism eventually led him to separate from the church of his youth as well as from all those connections that were silent on the sin of slavery. In 1842 Smith wrote William Goodell, “I speak against Presbyterian General Assemblies and Methodist conferences, as I do against National Whig and Democratic Conventions—as I do against Masonic fraternities. They are all unfit for Christians to belong to—and no one of them is any more a church than the others.” Smith had been sympathetic and supportive in Green’s struggle with the Reverend David Ogden of Whitesboro and the other conservative clergy of Oneida County, for he was himself in ill-repute with the cautious clergy of Madison County after having called them “proslavery ministers”. In 1843 he withdrew from the Presbyterians in Peterboro and organized his own Church of Peterboro on abolitionist principles. Like Green, Smith became active in the “come-outer” movement, wherein Christian abolitionists in central and western New York organized their own congregations. Smith also found solace in the religion of reason, a blend of evangelical piety, humanism, and rationalism.

As in ecclesiastical affairs, Smith and Green followed a common path in abolition politics. They moved in tandem from the Garrison-dominated American Anti-Slavery Society to the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society after the split in 1840 over, in part, the question of political means. Following the division, they devoted most of their time and energies to reform circles in upstate New York, where they initially urged voters to support only candidates whose abolitionism could be authenticated. Except for local offices, this tactic failed. Whigs by convention more than conviction, Smith and Green, like Garrison, had never placed much confidence in the major polit-

32. Smith, circular letter “To the Proslavery Ministers of the County of Madison”, 1843, Smith Papers.
33. On Smith’s “Religion of Reason” see his Sermons and Speeches (New York: Ross and Tousey, 1861), 1–80 and 121–42.
ical parties. Smith feared that “political instrumentalities” would taint an essentially moral crusade. Green expressed like sentiments, writing Smith in early 1840: “How to maintain in the common a Human Rights party without involving ourselves in the same evils as now stare so frightfully upon us from the ranks of the existing parties—that is the problem which demands for its solution more wisdom than most men are gifted for”. 34

Several members of Smith’s circle of voluntary immediatists, notably Alvan Stewart and Myron Holley, a Rochester abolitionist, called for united political action in the late 1830s. Stewart argued that an independent party was “the only hope for the redemption of the slave”. 35 Holley urged fellow abolitionists to “purify political life” as it was the nation’s “most potent source of social control”. 36 Gerrit Smith’s reservations about the dangers of “political instrumentalities” withered away in the face of repeated failure to work within the established political parties. Green, too, set aside his almost congenital disgust and joined the Liberty Party, the upstate New York venture into Bible politics. Both reformers supported the candidacy of James G. Birney for president on the Liberty Party ticket in 1840 and were principals in the post-election debate on whether to expand the Liberty Party’s objectives beyond the immediate end of slavery. Green wrote a campaign biography of Birney for the 1844 presidential election. 37 A staunch admirer of the ex-slaveholder from Kentucky, Green much preferred Birney to William H. Seward, the Auburn resident and ex-New York governor, whose candidacy Smith sought for 1848 in the wake of the Liberty Party’s dismal showing at the polls in 1840 and 1844. 38

Smith and Green did see eye-to-eye on the need to rethink the tactics of political abolitionism and the wisdom of a single-issue party.

34. Green to Smith, 26 March 1840.
35. Emancipator, 6 February 1840.
37. Beriah Green, Sketch of the Life and Writings of James Gillespie Birney (Utica: Jackson and Chaplin, 1844).
Both helped to organize the Liberty League in 1847 as a pressure group to expand the platform of the Liberty Party, but the Liberty Leaguers failed to convince most members of the Liberty Party of the need for abandoning “One-Ideaism” in favor of universal reform. Green
was particularly adamant that abolitionists should prepare themselves to assume the obligations of government rather than serve merely as a goad to the Whigs and Democrats on the single issue of slavery. In 1848 Smith led a rump faction out of the Liberty Party under the banner of the National Liberty Party, while other Libertymen allied themselves with the Free Soilers. Green shared Smith's abhorrence of the defection of Libertymen to the Free Soil Party and initially supported Smith's endeavors to construct a political coalition of reformers pledged to all the obligations of civil government. But, by 1850, these two incompatible friends had parted company.

OLD FRIENDS AT ODDS

The Green-Smith reform partnership dissolved in the early 1850s principally because of fundamental disagreements over the nature of civil government and the goals of political abolitionism. Their friendship had been severely tested by Beriah's depression and bitterness over the closing of Oneida Institute in 1844. His letters to Smith contain accusations that the Peterboro philanthropist might have done more to save the school from financial ruin, that he should have opposed Alvan Stewart's efforts to gain control of the state society, and that he could do more to assist in relocating Green and his family to a more congenial environment than Whitesboro. Smith tolerated all of this with remarkable patience and understanding, for he knew how much Green had suffered on behalf of his abolitionist principles. With the possible exceptions of James Birney and Elizur Wright, Jr., a colleague during the Western Reserve controversy, Green had no more supportive friends than Smith during his last troubled years at Oneida Institute. But the venture into Bible politics beginning with the Liberty Party gradually drew Smith and Green into conflict. While Smith placed more and more confidence in the democratic process, Green had less and less respect for the ability of the American electorate to vote into office candidates committed to the principles of righteous government.

Since first discovering the anti-democratic writings of Thomas Carlyle in 1838, Green had tried to persuade his abolitionist col-

39. Green to Smith, 23 April 1844.
leagues that the Scottish essayist’s views on civil government and human nature squared with experience. He told Smith that Carlyle had exerted a “powerful influence” on him with the proposition that since character is everything, the wise should rule the masses.40 Some of Carlyle’s ideas must have struck a respondent chord in Smith—the falseness of materialism, the reality of spirit, the need for leaders to live by spiritual values, the importance of duty, and the sacredness of work. But Carlyle’s philosophy of government and authority ran counter to Smith’s democratic nature and Jeffersonian faith in the rights of the individual as opposed to governmental authority. Smith abhorred all aristocracies, whether they were composed of fools or the wise. He still believed in the potential of a voluntaristic democracy to conform to Christian principles. He even stood for elective office and served in Congress from 1852 to 1854 as the representative of Madison and Oswego counties.

By contrast, Green’s overriding concern with the evils of Jacksonian America, notably slavery, led him to conclude that democracy was itself at fault. To James Birney, he wrote, “Alas, to a frightful extent, our poor countrymen cannot—at any rate do not,—distinguish between a conspiracy and a government”.41 With obvious allusion to Carlyle’s views, Green grumbled:

A greater delusion was never hatched from any cockatrice’s egg, than what is commonly boasted of as the Democratic principle. The thing has neither Truth nor Decency. We must insist upon the control of Wisdom. The wisest and the strongest we must seek out and welcome to their proper places.42

Green’s preference for “heaven-anointed rulers”—that is, individuals distinguished not by popular election but by their character, integrity, wisdom, and magnanimity—entailed contempt for universal suffrage, indeed for the democratic political process itself. Green admitted to Smith that his “God-the-only Potentate” theory of civil government had made him appear “an amazing novelty” and “radi-
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cally unlike” those with whom he had worked in the abolitionist enterprise. He hoped, however, that Smith would understand that all genuine friendships had their basis in agreement on principles.43

Green seems to have been genuinely surprised and shocked when Smith went public in 1849 over their differences on civil government. In a printed circular addressed to “President Green, Whitesboro”, Smith summarized his own views along the following lines. Just as impiety did not cancel the right or obligation of a man to pray, so a man’s injustice could not deny him the right or obligation to vote. Green’s theory that God-appointed rulers were somehow to be innately recognized and then obeyed by the general populace was “impracticable” [sic] and “perilous”. Green, Smith contended, would have government present in all departments of conduct rather than merely protecting individual rights. “You have none”, Smith told his friend, “while I have the utmost confidence in the masses to care for themselves”.44 Smith had actually voiced his concerns earlier in letters printed in the Model Worker, a newspaper published by Samuel Green as a vehicle for his father’s views on the evils of democracy.45 But the circular letter of 1849 was the unbearable insult, in part because Smith had it disseminated among the membership of Green’s “come-outer” congregation in Whitesboro.

Green now concluded that cooperation with Smith was no longer possible. He retreated further into isolation, even describing himself as a “misanthrope”. His misanthropy was, Green claimed, born of an intense hatred of all who in the least way supported slavery or gave credence to a political system which tolerated it.46 Smith attempted to mollify Green and keep him from abandoning all ties to abolitionist circles. “You may cast me off, but I shall never cast you off”, he wrote in February 1850.47 Green did not reply. Smith reluctantly acknowledged the painful separation. But he continued to care about Beriah and even tried to mediate a dispute between Green and his missionary brother Jonathan. Writing from the Sandwich Islands, Jonathan, an abolitionist in his own right, had inquired concerning
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his elder brother's "strange state of mind". Jonathan wondered whether Beriah's drift toward becoming a faction of one was not due to some kind of nervous breakdown. Smith confessed to be equally concerned, but he could only report on his own difficulty in trying to comprehend Beriah's habit of cutting ties of intimacy over real or imagined differences in ideological views.48

By 1854 Green appeared ready to renew the bonds of intimacy with Smith. He applauded Smith's resignation from Congress and once again asked him for financial assistance in relocating, this time to a small farm on the outskirts of Whitesboro.49 Smith welcomed the renewal of contact, though he described Green's love for him as a kind of "meat-axe affection".50 Smith was now involved in the Radical Abolition Party and tried to persuade Green to stand for elective office under its banner. Though he had lost confidence in Carlyle because of Carlyle's refusal to condemn British oppression in India, Green still viewed human government as "a stupid, grim, malignant conspiracy".51 He shared Smith's outrage following the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act and looked with an approving eye upon John Brown's raid upon Harpers Ferry. Smith's involvement with Brown caused him such nervous prostration that he had to be placed in the Utica mental asylum for eight weeks following Brown's capture. Green does not seem to have had prior knowledge of Brown's intentions, but, after the tragic climax of the events of 1859, he praised Brown as a true hero and martyr for righteousness, despite his violent means.52

When the Civil War started, Smith quickly sided with the Federal government. He saw the war question as the slave question. He hoped that abolitionists and anti-abolitionists would join hands to put down the rebellion and petition President Lincoln to proclaim the liberty
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of the slaves.\textsuperscript{53} By contrast, Green's displeasure with the Republicans waxed ever more vehement as the war progressed. He called them a set of "sworn kidnappers" and wished the Lincoln government "bad luck" in its efforts to preserve the Union at the expense of black freedom. Green described Lincoln as "the presiding bloodhound of the nation".\textsuperscript{54} Smith hoped that black freedom could be won on the battlefield. Green's despair was such that he could only hope that a political phoenix would rise from the ashes of a bloody Armageddon to usher in the millennial age.

By the end of the Civil War, Green and Smith were both in poor health due to the effects of old age and were more absorbed in personal rather than public affairs. Green characteristically had less confidence in Reconstruction politics than Smith did, but he did not press his differences. After nearly four decades of stormy intimacy, the Green-Smith relationship mellowed. Both reformers realized that their course had been run. Another generation would have to struggle with the demands of righteousness. Green's last letters to Smith are filled with musings about youth, old age, various health regimes, and family matters. "I feel a special interest in hoary heads", Green told Smith. "We are nearing the goal."\textsuperscript{55} Beriah Green reached his on 5 May 1874, nine months prior to Smith. He collapsed while delivering a temperance lecture in Whitesboro's town hall and died almost immediately. Smith passed away in more peaceful circumstances during the Christmas holidays while visiting a nephew in New York City.

For nearly half a century, these oddly matched friends wrestled with the demands of their consciences within a world they deemed worth saving. One saw shadows everywhere, even in the countenances of compatriots. The other preferred to walk in the light, confident that those yoked in common cause could remain congenial even when disagreeing over questions of ends and means. Abolitionism brought Beriah Green and Gerrit Smith together. It also drove them apart as the abolitionist campaign moved from moral suasion
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to political means. In retrospect, Green had good cause to despair of democracy's ability to solve the problem of slavery. As Frederick Douglass once put it, "Liberty came to the freedmen . . . not in mercy, but in wrath, not by moral choice, but by military necessity, not by the generous action of the people among whom they were to live, . . . but by strangers, foreigners, invaders, trespassers, aliens and enemies". 56 Thus, Smith's pragmatic optimism balanced Green's absolutism and pessimism. Green's understanding of the need for institutionalizing abolitionism in Oneida Institute provided the crusaders against slavery with a model of what the country might look like were their principles put into practice. Despite differences in personality, social status, intellectual interests, and views about the validity of civil or human government, these two antebellum reformers complemented one another. Had they been identical in temperament and character, the history of American abolitionism would be far less interesting and less revealing of the interplay of the personal, domestic, and public lives of the individuals who joined the crusade for black freedom.

56. Frederick Douglass' Paper, 16 November 1855.
My First Book—*Treasure Island*

BY ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON

In an article which first appeared in the August 1894 issue of the *Idler*, Robert Louis Stevenson (1850–1894) told the story of how his best-known novel, *Treasure Island*, came to be written. It is not often that a drawing generates the inspiration for the story which it comes to illustrate, but in this case it was so. During a wet and windy sojourn in the Scottish highlands, Stevenson was obliged by illness and a weak chest to pass a good deal of the time imprisoned indoors, where he alleviated boredom by painting and sketching in the company of a holidaying schoolboy, Lloyd Osbourne. Their lighthearted efforts produced an intricately detailed map, which Stevenson then painted with watercolours. The satisfying result, as he contemplated it, stimulated his imagination. In those moments, which in retrospect seemed predestined, he “ticketed [his] performance *Treasure Island*”.

Stevenson’s story, published under the title “My First Book—*Treasure Island*”, was reprinted the following month in the United States in *McClure’s Magazine* and was used as a preface in a number of the editions of his novel published early in this century. It is no longer so readily available.

The holograph manuscript of this essay, comprising eight foolscap pages with many of the author’s corrections and interlinear additions, was given to the Syracuse University Libraries by the late Sol Feinstone in 1957 together with three letters and six other Stevenson manuscripts. The manuscript of “My First Book”, formerly in the collections of W. T. H. Howe and Edith Barbara Tranter, was purchased by Mr. Feinstone in 1952 at the Parke-Bernet sale of Mrs. Tranter’s library.

The Syracuse University Libraries also hold the manuscript of St.

*The text used here was published in *McClure’s Magazine* in September 1894.*
My First Novel.

 Treasure Island.

It was one of those weeks in my life when I was not a novelist at all. But I was still
aware of the twilight of my imagination, the first faint, the only one I can remember with
real pleasure, of the may of a short, simple, of its power, to make me see in an
imagination and not in a dream, and then I can only tell my first novel, no question in the world, just what
is natural in my first novel.

I was in love, acquaintance. Anyhow, I was about to write a novel. It seems simple,
but I was still aware of the twilight of my imagination. And so


First page of Stevenson's recollection of writing Treasure Island, Syracuse University Libraries.
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Ives, the gift of George Arents, and an extensive collection of first editions of works by Robert Louis Stevenson.

We hope readers of the Courier will find this autobiographical account of interest not only because the manuscript is in the collections of the George Arents Research Library but also because of the amusing manner in which Stevenson describes a moment of tremendous importance to him. Treasure Island, the classic tale of peril and quest, was his first major success. It created his audience and cleared the way for his literary future.

Mark F. Weimer
Rare Book Librarian
Syracuse University Libraries

It was far, indeed, from being my first book, for I am not a novelist alone. But I am well aware that my paymaster, the great public, regards what else I have written with indifference, if not aversion. If it call upon me at all, it calls on me in the familiar and indelible character; and when I am asked to talk of my first book, no question in the world but what is meant is my first novel.

Sooner or later, somehow, anyhow, I was bound I was to write a novel. It seems vain to ask why. Men are born with various manias: from my earliest childhood it was mine to make a plaything of imaginary series of events; and as soon as I was able to write, I became a good friend to the paper-makers. Reams upon reams must have gone to the making of “Rathillet,” the “Pentland Rising,”* the “King’s Pardon” (otherwise “Park Whitehead”), “Edward Darren,” “A Country Dance,” and a “Vendetta in the West;” and it is consolatory to remember that these reams are now all ashes, and have been received again into the soil. I have named but a few of my ill-fated efforts: only such, indeed, as came to a fair bulk ere they were desisted from;

*Ne pas confondre. Not the slim green pamphlet with the imprint of Andrew Elliott, for which (as I see with amazement from the booklists) the gentlemen of England are willing to pay fancy prices; but its predecessor, a bulky historical romance without a spark of merit, and now deleted from the world.
and even so they cover a long vista of years. "Rathillet" was attempted before fifteen, the "Vendetta" at twenty-nine, and the succession of defeats lasted unbroken till I was thirty-one. By that time I had written little books and little essays and short stories, and had got patted on the back and paid for them—though not enough to live upon. I had quite a reputation. I was the successful man. I passed my days in toil, the futility of which would sometimes make my cheek to burn,—that I should spend a man's energy upon this business, and yet could not earn a livelihood; and still there shone ahead of me an unattained ideal. Although I had attempted the thing with vigor not less than ten or twelve times, I had not yet written a novel. All—all my pretty ones—had gone for a little, and then stopped inexorably, like a schoolboy's watch. I might be compared to a cricketer of many years' standing who should never have made a run. Anybody can write a short story—a bad one, I mean—who has industry and paper and time enough; but not everyone may hope to write even a bad novel. It is the length that kills. The accepted novelist may take his novel up and put it down, spend days upon it in vain, and write not any more than he makes haste to blot. Not so the beginner. Human nature has certain rights; instinct—the instinct of self-preservation—forbids that any man (cheered and supported by the consciousness of no previous victory) should endure the miseries of unsuccessful literary toil beyond a period to be measured in weeks. There must be something for hope to feed upon. The beginner must have a slant of wind, a lucky vein must be running, he must be in one of those hours when the words come and the phrases balance of themselves—even to begin. And having begun, what a dread looking forward is that until the book shall be accomplished! For so long a time the slant is to continue unchanged, the vein to keep running; for so long a time you must hold at command the same quality of style; for so long a time your puppets are to be always vital, always consistent, always vigorous. I remember I used to look, in those days, upon every three-volume novel with a sort of veneration, as a feat—not possibly of literature—but at least of physical and moral endurance and the courage of Ajax.

In the fated year I came to live with my father and mother at Kinnaird, above Pitlochry. There I walked on the red moors and by the side of the golden burn. The rude, pure air of our mountains inspirted, if it did not inspire us; and my wife and I projected a joint
volume of bogie stories, for which she wrote “The Shadow on the Bed,” and I turned out “Thrawn Janet,” and a first draft of the “Merry Men.” I love my native air, but it does not love me; and the end of this delightful period was a cold, a fly blister, and a migration, by Strathairdle and Glenshee, to the Castleton of Braemar. There it blew a good deal and rained in a proportion. My native air was more unkind than man’s ingratitude; and I must consent to pass a good deal of my time between four walls in a house lugubriously known as “the late Miss McGregor’s cottage.” And now admire the finger of predestination. There was a schoolboy in the late Miss McGregor’s cottage, home for the holidays, and much in want of “something craggy to break his mind upon.” He had no thought of literature; it was the art of Raphael that received his fleeting suffrages, and with the aid of pen and ink and a shilling box of water colors, he had soon turned one of the rooms into a picture gallery. My more immediate duty towards the gallery was to be showman; but I would sometimes unbend a little, join the artist (so to speak) at the easel, and pass the afternoon with him in a generous emulation, making colored drawings. On one of these occasions I made the map of an island; it was elaborately and (I thought) beautifully colored; the shape of it took my fancy beyond expression; it contained harbors that pleased me like sonnets; and with the unconsciousness of the predestined, I ticketed my performance “Treasure Island.” I am told there are people who do not care for maps, and find it hard to believe. The names, the shapes of the woodlands, the courses of the roads and rivers, the prehistoric footsteps of man still distinctly traceable up hill and down dale, the mills and the ruins, the ponds and the ferries, perhaps the “Standing Stone” or the “Druidic Circle” on the heath; here is an inexhaustible fund of interest for any man with eyes to see, or twopence worth of imagination to understand with. No child but must remember laying his head in the grass, staring into the infinitesimal forest, and seeing it grow populous with fairy armies. Somewhat in this way, as I pored upon my map of “Treasure Island,” the future characters of the book began to appear there visibly among imaginary woods; and their brown faces and bright weapons peeped out upon me from unexpected quarters, as they passed to and fro, fighting, and hunting treasure, on these few square inches of a flat projection. The next thing I knew, I had some paper before me and was writing out a list of chapters. How often have I done so,
and the thing gone no farther! But there seemed elements of success about this enterprise. It was to be a story for boys; no need of psychology or fine writing; and I had a boy at hand to be a touchstone. Women were excluded. I was unable to handle a brig (which the “Hispaniola” should have been), but I thought I could make shift to sail her as a schooner without public shame. And then I had an idea
for John Silver from which I promised myself funds of entertainment: to take an admired friend of mine (whom the reader very likely knows and admires as much as I do), to deprive him of all his finer qualities and higher graces of temperament, to leave him with nothing but his strength, his courage, his quickness, and his magnificent geniality, and to try to express these in terms of the culture of a raw tarpaulin. Such psychical surgery is, I think, a common way of “making character;” perhaps it is, indeed, the only way. We can put in the quaint figure that spoke a hundred words with us yesterday by the wayside; but do we know him? Our friend, with his infinite variety and flexibility, we know—but can we put him in? Upon the first we
must engraft secondary and imaginary qualities, possibly all wrong; from the second, knife in hand, we must cut away and deduct the needless arborescence of his nature; but the trunk and the few branches that remain we may at least be fairly sure of.

On a chill September morning, by the cheek of a brisk fire, and the rain drumming on the window, I began the "Sea Cook," for that was the original title. I have begun (and finished) a number of other books, but I cannot remember to have sat down to one of them with more complacency. It is not to be wondered at, for stolen waters are proverbially sweet. I am now upon a painful chapter. No doubt the parrot once belonged to Robinson Crusoe. No doubt the skeleton is conveyed from Poe. I think little of these, they are trifles and details; and no man can hope to have a monopoly of skeletons or make a corner in talking birds. The stockade, I am told, is from "Masterman Ready." It may be, I care not a jot. These useful writers had fulfilled the poet's saying: departing, they had left behind them

"Footprints on the sands of time;
Footprints that perhaps another—"

and I was the other! It is my debt to Washington Irving that exercises my conscience, and justly so, for I believe plagiarism was rarely carried farther. I chanced to pick up the "Tales of a Traveller" some years ago, with a view to an anthology of prose narrative, and the book flew up and struck me: Billy Bones, his chest, the company in the parlor, the whole inner spirit and a good deal of the material detail of my first chapters—all were there, all were the property of Washington Irving. But I had no guess of it then as I sat writing by the fireside, in what seemed the springtides of a somewhat pedestrian inspiration; nor yet day by day, after lunch, as I read aloud my morning's work to the family. It seemed to me original as sin; it seemed to belong to me like my right eye. I had counted on one boy; I found I had two in my audience. My father caught fire at once with all the romance and childishness of his original nature. His own stories, that every night of his life he put himself to sleep with, dealt perpetually with ships, roadside inns, robbers, old sailors, and commercial travellers before the era of steam. He never finished one of these romances: the lucky man did not require to! But in "Treasure Island" he recognized something kindred to his own imagination; it was his
kind of picturesque, and he not only heard with delight the daily chapter, but set himself actively to collaborate. When the time came for Billy Bones’s chest to be ransacked, he must have passed the better part of a day preparing, on the back of a legal envelope, an inventory of its contents, which I exactly followed; and the name of “Flint’s old ship,” the “Walrus,” was given at his particular request. And now, who should come dropping in, ex machina, but Dr. Jaap, like the disguised prince who is to bring down the curtain upon peace and happiness in the last act, for he carried in his pocket not a horn or a talisman, but a publisher; had, in fact, been charged by my old friend Mr. Henderson to unearth new writers for “Young Folks.” Even the ruthlessness of a united family recoiled before the extreme measure of inflicting on our guest the mutilated members of the “Sea Cook;” at the same time we would by no means stop our readings, and accordingly the tale was begun again at the beginning, and solemnly redelivered for the benefit of Dr. Jaap. From that moment on I have thought highly of his critical faculty; for when he left us, he carried away the manuscript in his portmanteau.

Here, then, was everything to keep me up—sympathy, help, and now a positive engagement. I had chosen besides a very easy style. Compare it with the almost contemporary “Merry Men;” one may prefer the one style, one the other—’tis an affair of character, perhaps of mood; but no expert can fail to see that the one is much more difficult, and the other much easier, to maintain. It seems as though a full-grown, experienced man of letters might engage to turn out “Treasure Island” at so many pages a day, and keep his pipe alight. But alas! this was not my case. Fifteen days I stuck to it, and turned out fifteen chapters; and then, in the early paragraphs of the sixteenth, ignominiously lost hold. My mouth was empty; there was not one word more of “Treasure Island” in my bosom; and here were the proofs of the beginning already waiting me at the “Hand and Spear!” There I corrected them, living for the most part alone, walking on the heath at Weybridge in dewy autumn mornings, a good deal pleased with what I had done, and more appalled than I can depict to you in words at what remained for me to do. I was thirty-one; I was the head of a family; I had lost my health; I had never yet paid my way, had never yet made two hundred pounds a year; my father had quite recently bought back and cancelled a book that was judged a failure; was this to be another and last fiasco? I was
indeed very close on despair; but I shut my mouth hard, and during
the journey to Davos, where I was to pass the winter, had the reso-
lution to think of other things, and bury myself in the novels of M.
du Boisgobey. Arrived at my destination, down I sat one morning to
the unfinished tale, and behold! it flowed from me like small talk;
and in a second tide of delighted industry, and again at the rate of a
chapter a day, I finished “Treasure Island.” It had to be transacted
almost secretly. My wife was ill, the schoolboy remained alone of the
faithful, and John Addington Symonds (to whom I timidly men-
tioned what I was engaged on) looked on me askance. He was at
that time very eager I should write on the “Characters” of Theo-
phrastus, so far out may be the judgments of the wisest men. But
Symonds (to be sure) was scarce the confidant to go to for sympathy
in a boy’s story. He was large-minded; “a full man,” if there ever was
one; but the very name of my enterprise would suggest to him only
capitulations of sincerity and solecisms of style. Well, he was not far
wrong.

“Treasure Island”—it was Mr. Henderson who deleted the first
title, “The Sea Cook”—appeared duly in the story paper, where it
figured in the ignoble midst without woodcuts, and attracted not the
least attention. I did not care. I liked the tale myself, for much the
same reason as my father liked the beginning: it was my kind of
picturesque. I was not a little proud of John Silver also, and to this
day rather admire that smooth and formidable adventurer. What was
infinitely more exhilarating, I had passed a landmark; I had finished
a tale, and written “The End” upon my manuscript, as I had not
done since the “Pentland Rising,” when I was a boy of sixteen, not
yet at college. In truth it was so by a set of lucky accidents: had not
Dr. Jaap come on his visit, had not the tale flowed from me with
singular ease, it must have been laid aside like its predecessors, and
found a circuitous and unlamented way to the fire. Purists may sug-
gest it would have been better so. I am not of that mind. The tale
seems to have given much pleasure, and it brought (or was the means
of bringing) fire and food and wine to a deserving family in which I
took an interest. I need scarce say I mean my own.

But the adventures of “Treasure Island” are not yet quite at an
end. I had written it up to the map. The map was the chief part of
my plot. For instance, I had called an islet “Skeleton Island,” not
knowing what I meant, seeking only for the immediate picturesque;
and it was to justify this name that I broke into the gallery of Mr. Poe and stole Flint's pointer. And in the same way, it was because I had made two harbors that the "Hispaniola" was sent on her wanderings with Israel Hands. The time came when it was decided to republish, and I sent in my manuscript and the map along with it to Messrs. Cassell. The proofs came, they were corrected, but I heard nothing of the map. I wrote and asked; was told it had never been received, and sat aghast. It is one thing to draw a map at random, set a scale in one corner of it at a venture, and write up a story to the measurements. It is quite another to have to examine a whole book, make an inventory of all the allusions contained in it, and with a pair of compasses painfully design a map to suit the data. I did it, and the map was drawn again in my father's office, with embellishments of blowing whales and sailing ships; and my father himself brought into service a knack he had of various writing, and elaborately forged the signature of Captain Flint and the sailing directions of Billy Bones. But somehow it was never "Treasure Island" to me.

I have said it was the most of the plot. I might almost say it was the whole. A few reminiscences of Poe, Defoe, and Washington Irving, a copy of Johnson's "Buccaneers," the name of the Dead Man's Chest from Kingsley's "At Last," some recollections of canoeing on the high seas, a cruise in a fifteen-ton schooner yacht, and the map itself with its infinite, eloquent suggestion, made up the whole of my materials. It is perhaps not often that a map figures so largely in a tale; yet it is always important. The author must know his countryside, whether real or imaginary, like his hand; the distances, the points of the compass, the place of the sun's rising, the behavior of the moon, should all be beyond cavil. And how troublesome the moon is! I have come to grief over the moon in "Prince Otto;" and, as soon as that was pointed out to me, adopted a precaution which I recommend to other men—I never write now without an almanac. With an almanac, and the map of the country and the plan of every house, either actually plotted on paper or clearly and immediately apprehended in the mind, a man may hope to avoid some of the grossest possible blunders. With the map before him, he will scarce allow the sun to set in the east, as it does in the "Antiquary." With the almanac at hand, he will scarce allow two horsemen, journeying on the most urgent affair, to employ six days, from three of the Monday morning till late in the Saturday night, upon a journey of,
say, ninety or a hundred miles; and before the week is out, and still on the same nags, to cover fifty in one day, as he may read at length in the inimitable novel of “Rob Roy.” And it is certainly well, though far from necessary, to avoid such croppers. But it is my contention—my superstition, if you like—that he who is faithful to his map, and consults it, and draws from it his inspiration, daily and hourly, gains positive support, and not mere negative immunity from accident. The tale has a root there; it grows in that soil; it has a spine of its own behind the words. Better if the country be real, and he has walked every foot of it and knows every milestone. But, even with imaginary places, he will do well in the beginning to provide a map. As he studies it, relations will appear that he had not thought upon. He will discover obvious though unsuspected shortcuts and footpaths for his messengers; and even when a map is not all the plot, as it was in “Treasure Island,” it will be found to be a mine of suggestion.
THE RECENT ALBERT SCHWEITZER ACQUISITION

The Syracuse University Libraries would like to thank the following donors, whose interest and generosity have made possible the recent purchase of eighty-eight Albert Schweitzer blue notebooks.

Atlantic Richfield Foundation
Dr. and Mrs. J. Howland Auchincloss
Mr. Henry S. Bannister
Mr. Pietro Belluschi
Mr. and Mrs. W. Carroll Coyne
Dr. Henriette Walker Dauerty
Mrs. Maxine B. Davison
DeWitt Community Church
Mrs. Elizabeth P. Downey
Mr. Robert A. Emery
Mr. and Mrs. Richard J. Fay
Mrs. Carol Finkel
Dr. William Fleming
Mr. Sidney U. Glaser
Barbara Goldsmith
Dr. and Mrs. William M. Harmand
The Honorable W. Averell Harriman (deceased)
Mr. Julius Kahn
Miss Betsy Knapp
Mr. Terence W. LaPier
Mr. Dewitt C. LeFevre
Mr. Richard L. Menschel
Onondaga Medical Society
Mr. and Mrs. Albert Ornstein
A LISZT MANUSCRIPT AT SYRACUSE

A holograph of Franz Liszt's "Ihr Glocken von Marling" for solo voice and piano came to light during the hundredth anniversary year of the great Hungarian composer's death. Last spring Syracuse University library specialist Edward Lyon discovered the unsigned and undated music manuscript in the course of examining papers left to the University by the widow of the American poet Robert Silliman Hillyer (1895–1961). Eric Jensen and George Nugent of the University's Fine Arts faculty confirmed that the manuscript is in Liszt's own hand. How Hillyer acquired the piece is not known, and until this year's discovery, survival of the manuscript was much in doubt, leading even to the designation "lost" in the source column for "Ihr Glocken" in The New Grove Dictionary (11:65) catalogue of the composer's works. The recovered manuscript is, in fact, in excellent condition and is preserved in the Robert S. Hillyer Papers in the George Arents Research Library.

The text of Liszt's song is a poem by the Austrian writer and journalist Emil Kuh. Work on the musical setting occupied Liszt off and on between March and July of 1874. He dedicated the finished work
to Princess Marie von Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, daughter of his long-term mistress, the Princess Karolina von Sayn-Wittgenstein. Evidently Liszt felt a special fondness for the work, since he made favorable mention of it in no fewer than eight letters, referring in one to its poetic dreaminess and tender melancholy.

The Syracuse holograph occupies both sides of a single rectangular sheet of paper. Eleven music staves are ruled on each side; notes and text are in ink. Unsigned and undated, it is clearly a working draft, but at a stage very close to the published form (see Liszt, Werke, ser. 7, vol. 3, pp. 52-54). Numerous discrepancies, however, merit at-
tention for the insight they provide into Liszt's creative process. At various places he discards, corrects, or substitutes, affecting to some degree text placement, dynamics, articulation, phrasing, expression indications, and pedalling.

A more detailed report on the manuscript has been written by George Nugent and will appear in the 1987 *Liszt Society Journal*.

THE LEOPOLD VON RANKE EXHIBITION

To accompany the international symposium held in the fall of 1986 on the Syracuse University campus in commemoration of the centenary of Leopold von Ranke's death, the George Arents Research Library set up an exhibition of Ranke's books, manuscripts, and memorabilia. Displayed materials included books and manuscripts from his personal library, works written by the most eminent of his many students, family letters, photographs, and an oil portrait (by J. F. A. Schrader, 1815–1900), as well as the chair and desk he used in his study during his years as Professor of History at the University of Berlin.

Especially to be thanked for the comprehensiveness of the selections and the clarity and interest of the accompanying commentary are: Dr. James M. Powell, Professor of History at Syracuse University and organizer of the symposium; Mark F. Weimer, Rare Book Librarian; Diane Casey, doctoral candidate in history at Syracuse University; and Janet C. Shahan, rare book catalogue assistant.

BOOK SALE

A book sale, co-sponsored by Syracuse University Libraries and the Library Associates, was held for three days in late October in the 1916 Room of Bird Library. Over 8,000 books were donated for the sale. Proceeds will be used for Library Associates activities and the acquisition and preservation of library materials.

The Book Sale Committee wishes to thank everyone whose contributions made this sale such an outstanding success.
IN MEMORIAM

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, former governor of the State of New York, ambassador, and counselor of presidents, died at Yorktown Heights, N.Y., on July 26, 1986 at the age of 94. Heir to privilege, he sought the public good in the highest tradition. In his succession of service he was the United States ambassador to Moscow during the Second World War, a senior advisor in the Democratic Party, and a patient and persistent negotiator in war and peace. In 1982, having assessed the American ignorance of the Soviet Union to be dangerous, he contributed extensively to Columbia University's Russian Institute, which was renamed the W. Averell Harriman Institute for the Advanced Study of the Soviet Union.

Ambassador Harriman's connection with Syracuse University, which awarded him the honorary doctor of laws degree in 1955, and the Syracuse University Library Associates, of which he was an honorary life member, was given archival permanence by the donation to the University of his gubernatorial papers. This extensive record—an estimated six hundred thousand items—documents his four-year administration as New York governor in the years 1955 through 1958.

On Monday, July 28, 1986, the Reverend BENJAMIN J. LAKE passed away at his summer home at Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts.

Dr. Lake, who was pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Cazenovia for twenty-five years, was also active in many organizations in Central New York. He has been especially well known for his interest in the Everson Museum of Art, to which he gave his fine collection of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century ceramics, the Syracuse Symphony, and Cazenovia College. He joined the board of trustees of the Syracuse University Library Associates in 1966 and served as chairman from 1970 through 1978. Many of us will fondly remember his special capacity for leadership and the enthusiasm with which he administered the affairs of the Library Associates.

Syracuse University lost a devoted friend in the passing of ANNA-BELLE BURDICK TERHUNE on June 24, 1986. She was 82.

The widow of Alfred McKinley Terhune, Professor of English at Syracuse University and internationally recognized authority on Edward FitzGerald (1809–1883), she was herself a student and scholar.
of high rank. After her husband's death in 1975, Mrs. Terhune completed on her own the publication of their monumental *The Letters of Edward FitzGerald*, published by the Princeton University Press in 1980.

Annabelle Burdick did her undergraduate work at the University of Michigan and took her master's degree at Columbia University. She taught at the University of Pittsburgh before her marriage to Professor Terhune. A great favorite with students and faculty at Syracuse, she was also a beloved and active member of the League of Women Voters, the Corinthian Club, the Library Associates, and Zeta Tau Alpha sorority.
THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ASSOCIATES, founded in 1953, is a society whose efforts are devoted to the enrichment of the Syracuse University Libraries and especially the rare book and manuscript collections. The Associates' interests lie in strengthening these collections through the acquisition of unusual books, manuscripts, and other research materials which are rare and often of such value that the Libraries would not otherwise be able to acquire them.

The Associates welcome anyone to join whose interests incline in the direction of book collecting or the graphic arts. The perquisites of membership include borrowing privileges and general use of the Syracuse University Libraries' facilities and resources, as well as invitations to exhibitions, Associates-sponsored lectures, and special events of the University Libraries. In addition, members will receive our incidental publications, typographic keepsakes, and the Syracuse University Library Associates Courier, a semiannual publication which contains articles related to unusual and interesting aspects of the Libraries' holdings and, in particular, to the holdings of the George Arents Research Library for Special Collections.

SUGGESTED MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS are as follows: Benefactor, $500; Sustaining member, $200; Individual member, $50; Faculty and staff of Syracuse University, $30; Senior citizen and student, $20. Checks, made payable to Syracuse University Library Associates, should be sent to the Secretary, 100 E. S. Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-2010. For further information about the programs and activities of the Library Associates, telephone (315) 423-2585.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Antje B. Lemke, Chairman
Stanton L. Catlin
Arpena S. Mesrobian
Walter E. Sutton
Mark F. Weimer
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY ASSOCIATES

OFFICERS

Chester Soling, Chairman
Arpena S. Mesrobian, Vice-Chairman
Mark F. Weimer, Secretary
Erik Hemmingsen, Treasurer
Metod M. Milač, Executive Secretary

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Through 1987
William Fleming
Barbara Goldsmith
Clyde A. Jones
Clare Kivelson
Elisabeth K. Melczer

Through 1988
Sarah K. Auchincloss
Henry S. Bannister
Erik Hemmingsen
Leedom Kettell
Antje B. Lemke

Through 1989
Paul Archambault
Stanton L. Catlin
Jerome R. Gerber
Elizabeth M. Henes
Richard Horowitz

Ex Officio
Melvin A. Eggers, Chancellor
Harry W. Peter III, Vice-Chancellor
Michael O. Sawyer, Vice-Chancellor
Gershon Vincow, Vice-Chancellor
David H. Stam, University Librarian
Metod M. Milač, Associate University Librarian