

Oswego Historical Review

Issue Two, May 2009



Oswego Historical Review Credits

Editors in Chief

Aaron Robinson
Senior History Major,
Museum Studies Minor
Medieval and Renaissance Studies Minor
arobinso@oswego.edu

Caitlin Orbanek
Junior English Major
orbanek@oswego.edu

Faculty Adviser

Dr Ming te-Pan
Chair of the History Department at SUNY Oswego
pan@oswego.edu

Editors for this Issue

Melanie Schaffer-Cutillo
Senior History Major
shafferc@oswego.edu

Scott Ball
Senior English Major
History Major
sball@oswego.edu

Logo Artist

Ashley Giordano
a_giordano87@hotmail.com

Table of Contents

Journal Credits Page.....	1
Table of Contents	2-3
Authors' Notes	4
Gina Beach- <i>Clovis' Franks</i>	5-12
Patrick R. F. Blakley- <i>Narodna Odbrana (The Black Hand) : Terrorist Faction that Divided the World</i>	13-34
Christine Godfrey- <i>Spartan Women: An Exception Among the Greeks</i> .	35-41
Jessica Godfrey- <i>The Unwanted Ones: The Reasons and Events that Led to the Expulsion of the Jews from England under Edward I in 1290</i>	42-56
Lauren Sordellini- <i>The Lord's Resistance Army's Real Soldiers: Child Soldiers in Uganda</i>	57-66

Authors' Notes

In this issue:

Gina Beach

Gina is a senior at Oswego and my major is European History. She chose to write about Clovis while taking a class in the Early Middle Ages. When learning about Clovis she realized that without his uniting of the Franks and conversion to Catholicism the history of Europe might have been completely different. If the barbarians who were doing all the fighting were of another religious persuasion that religion or denomination might have become the dominant religion in Europe.

Christine Godfrey

Christine is a graduating senior with a double major in Women's Studies and History with a concentration in Women's History. She chose to write her research paper on the women of Sparta because these women were the exceptions of their sex in both physical state, demeanor, and male opinion. Often times people use history and "tradition" to justify the current or past treatment/status of women, but Spartan women, while not completely equal to their male counterparts, were strong, vital, and visible citizens in their city-state.

Jessica Godfrey

Jessica is a graduate student majoring in history at SUNY Oswego. Her area of interest is medieval and early modern England. The paper was written for a graduate seminar on medieval outsiders.

Lauren Sordellini

During her freshman year in college, Lauren decided to take an African history class with professor Usuanlele to satisfy one of her history requirements. In this class, students were given a series of structured essays to write but, for their final assignment, they were allowed to write about any issue related to Africa since 1800. In the beginning of her freshman year, she attended a documentary screening held by the Invisible Children Roadies. The documentary allowed for viewers to understand life as an Invisible Child and discussed how the issue in Uganda has become Africa's longest running war and one of the most severely neglected humanitarian crisis in the world. This is where she found the inspiration for her final. After viewing the documentary she began to form a great interest in the Invisible Children, she wanted to know everything about what was happening in Uganda and why. When given the freedom in my African History class to

write about any issue in Africa she immediately thought to write about the Invisible Children so she might learn more about them and also help spread the knowledge about this war. As an Adolescent education major with a concentration in social studies, and only a sophomore, she still plans to do everything possible to help spread the word about the Invisible Children and she anticipates going over to Uganda to possibly teach history in one of the schools built for the Invisible Children.

Patrick R. F. Blakley

Patrick is a 2008 graduate with a degree in European History. This paper was written for a capstone seminar on terrorism. "The paper is written about, what I feel, is the most interesting period in Europe's recent past. This group of young men's stories are very compelling because they were fighting for what they believed in while completely blind to what would be the consequence of their actions. Princip had no idea that two of the bullets in his gun would be the catalyst for the entire world going to war." Patrick is an amateur author with some minor publications mostly regarding atheism and irreligion.

Clovis's Franks: Europe after Rome

By: Gina Beach

The approximate date agreed by historians as marking the fall of the Roman Empire is 410AD, but the dynasty that came out of this obscure period was the hand that shaped subsequent European history. With no centralized leadership and the banding together of the barbarian hordes, a period darker than the “Dark Ages” itself might have materialized. One man came out of the shadows of the crumbling Roman Empire, and used brawn and brain to control all of Gaul and become leader of the Franks. Clovis I united them through a series of plots and battles. His decision to convert to Christianity in 496 should not be overlooked, as the Catholic tradition has had a strong hold on Europe ever since.

Clovis did not inherit a vast empire with many able bodied warriors upon his succession to power after his father Childeric the Frank died. Leadership in the Frankish line was passed down paternally, but Clovis was only 15 years old when his turn to rule came. The ailing Roman Empire was essentially no more when Clovis made his first strike for more territory and power in 486. Rome was where the head of the Christian church on earth, the Pope, had his seat, and men Roman in name and culture were still governing large areas across continental Europe. The story of Clovis's first excursion into Roman land comes down to us from Gregory of Tours in his “History of the Franks,” which is one of the main sources for Frankish history written in the period. In the area of Soissons a Roman ruler named Syagrius was in power.¹ Clovis was a young leader of a

¹Randers-Pehrson, Justine D. *Barbarians and Romans*. OK: University of Oklahoma P, 1983. 260.

fighting barbarian horde that relied heavily on land to cultivate and hunt on. As the band grew so did Clovis's responsibility, as the leader, to provide more land. The battle for Soissons was fought, and Clovis came away with more land, as well as with Roman trained military units at his disposal, which no doubt added to the success of his later military excursions.

As a leader of a large group of Franks, and now Romans as well, it was appropriate for Clovis to marry. His choice of bride would affect the destiny of all of his people much more, even, than anyone could have foreseen. Around the year 493 Clovis chose Clothilde, a Burgundian as well as a Catholic, for his bride. Just as the barbarian hoards had threatened Rome, so too did they threaten each other. The Alamanni, a Germanic tribe, were a constant threat to Frankish territory. That threat would soon, in 506, boil over into all out war. In an area called Tolbiac the fate of the Franks would be decided.² Gregory of Tours, a Christian monk, and later made a saint, wrote of what occurred next with great enthusiasm. The battle at Tolbiac was looking unfavorable for Clovis and his Franks when he decided in a moment of desperation to call out to his wife's Christian God. A sudden turn for the best occurred, and Clovis walked away with new land, an enemy defeated and a new religion. On the following Christmas Day, Clovis and a large group of Franks, purportedly 2,000, converted to Christianity.³

Clovis was more powerful than ever, but one man stood between him and sole power over the Franks. Sigibert was the leader of the Franks to the East of Gaul, and had until this point been a junior partner in conquest and power. The scheme to become the only leader of a unified Frankish people was one of great intrigue and masterful

²Randers-Pehrson, 275.

³Robinson, J.H. Readings in European History. Ginn: Boston, 1905. 55.

manipulation. Clovis secretly called for the son of Sigibert to come to his dwelling in Paris, and told him in confidence that if his father were to die, "...his kingdom would be yours together with our friendship."⁴ At the subtle urging of Clovis, Sigibert's son Chloderic took it into his own hands to be sure that his father's kingdom would be his, and had him slain by hired assassins. Excited to forge an alliance and become ruler of the vast Frankish area his father had once held, he immediately told Clovis what had transpired. Clovis's plot was in motion, and all was going as planned. He told the Franks that Chloderic had had their leader slain. He then had Chloderic killed as revenge for slaying his own father.⁵ Clovis arrived at the Eastern Frankish kingdom as a hero who upheld what was right and who accepted these leaderless Franks into his Frankish kingdom. This intrigue, however, was far from being the direst step Clovis would take for more territory. "He received Sigibert's kingdom with his treasures, and placed the people, too, under his rule. For God was laying his enemies low every day under his hand, and was increasing his kingdom, because he walked with an upright heart before him, and did what was pleasing to his eyes."⁶

The conversion of the Franks to Catholicism gave Clovis a very strong ally in Rome: the Pope. Blood feuds had been at the heart of the barbarian warrior's fervor. The bonds between kinsmen and between men and their leader were the strongest in the Frankish world. With the introduction of Catholicism Clovis now had another cause to fight for, a new battle to fight. The Pope had long wanted all of Gaul to be under the leadership of Catholic rulers. With Clovis as leader, a large portion of Gaul was now

⁴Gregory of Tours. *History of the Franks*. Trans. E. Brehaut. New York, NY: Columbia UP, 1916. 37.

⁵Gregory of Tours, 37.

⁶Gregory of Tours, 39.

Catholic, but the southwestern areas were strongly influenced by the missionaries from Celtic Christian places such as England and Ireland. These southwestern areas were thus Arian, and a cause of distress to the Pope.⁷ These areas of Arian influence were under the leadership of a barbarian tribe who also had contributed to the fall of Rome, the Visigoths. Clovis once again called on his new God to bring him victory: “Let us go with God’s help and conquer them and bring the land under our control.”⁸ The Franks and Visigoths had for long uneasily shared their borders and were thus enemies already. The King of the Visigoths was Alaric II, a strong opponent who was slain in battle by Clovis himself.

Clovis was the man who united the Franks, and the first barbarian to expand his land and power by aligning himself with the Pope. A representative of the Eastern Emperor Anastasias in the Basilica of Tours bestowed the title of consul upon him. It did not grant Clovis any more territory or power, but it recognized him as someone familiar, welcomed and powerful in the eyes of those of Roman stock who had once looked down on all barbarians. How much respect they really felt for Clovis cannot be known, but in Roman tradition titles made strong allies. Clovis’s rule ended in 511, and a tumultuous period began, as Frankish tradition would divide his hard-won kingdom into four parts, one for each of his sons. Splitting up land among heirs with no specific will had been a part of Germanic tradition at least since Tacitus had written his *Germania* in the year 98. On the subject of succession, he wrote: “But every man’s own children are his heirs and successors, and there are no wills.”⁹ Followers of a Frankish king were expected to

⁷Tierney, Brian. *Western Europe in the Middle Ages: 300-1475*. McGraw-Hill College: Boston, 1999. 73.

⁸Gregory of Tours, 36.

⁹Tacitus. *Germania*. Trans. W.J. Brodribb. London: Macmillan, 1977. 87.

follow his heirs as they had followed him. The king's was then still a position more like that of a war leader than was the case with his later counterpart, who would never be expected to actually fight.

The assimilation of barbarians into Roman lands filled with people who had long shared customs, religion and language was difficult. The Romans had long considered themselves civilized, and the barbarians unintelligent brutes who sacked their cities and had strange customs. Their newly acquired religion made them socially acceptable, but there is no doubt that the Frankish laws seemed odd to the Romans when first introduced to them. The Romans were allowed to continue to live by their own laws, but under such close Frankish influence, Roman law slowly fizzled out; Roman jurists belonged to the old Roman order of highly trained specialists in law, but there was soon no one left to train them, and the Frankish tradition became common. The Franks decided guilt not in a court of law, but in a court decided by a higher power, the power of God himself. Franks determined guilt by something called ordeal. Ordeal consisted of the charged man picking up a scalding hot piece of iron, causing him to be burnt. "Three days later the wound was examined. If it was healing cleanly, the man was held innocent; if it was festering, he was held guilty."¹⁰ Other things considered with high regard and as demonstrating civility would take a back seat to the Frankish way. The Romans had men specifically trained in tax collection who were expected to do it in a fair manner. The Frankish tax system was less about collecting the actual amount owed, and more about getting whatever they could extort from those weaker than they.¹¹ The Roman system

¹⁰Tierney, 102.

¹¹Tierney, 105.

would not see a revival for generations after Clovis, when Christian morals began creeping into the ways of the rulers.

Clovis's Frankish kingdom, although split up into four parts, continued to grow and mold the face of continental Europe. By the year 536 Clovis's heirs had cooperated long enough to add the Thuringians, the Burgundians and the area in Southern Gaul now known as Provence to the Frankish kingdom. Clothar I was the last survivor from among Clovis's sons, and when he died in 562 another four-way division of the Frankish Kingdom took place.¹² This time it would not be as disorderly as before, as there was now more territory to divide. Division and fighting continued to be strong defining factors throughout the entire history of the Merovingian line, but as the first barbarians to control an entire kingdom, they needed some time to work out imperfections in finding a way to rule effectively. The Merovingian period was necessary in that they were able-bodied warriors who gained control of much land so that the next line, the Carolingian line, would inherit a much larger kingdom.

Clovis represented a shift in the tone of barbarian Europe from ravaging bands that raided Roman cities to a respected and feared kingdom. There is little evidence that Clovis's newfound monotheistic religion changed how he went about ruling the Franks, but it did give him new and strong allies. His receipt of a Roman title showed how far he had come. It may have been granted out of fear, but it told the Roman world that the Franks were to be respected. Had Clovis not converted to Catholicism, the Pope in Rome might have found his borders surrounded by Arian Visigoths. Who knows what would have happened when the Muslims began encroaching on Europe had the Pope not had all

¹²Gibbons, Edward. *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd: London, 1787. 349.

of the Frankish lands as Catholic allies. Would Arians have come to the aid of the Pope who so strongly disagreed with them? We cannot be sure, but we can be sure that the outcome would have been different had it not been for that Christmas Day when Clovis and a band of his Franks were baptized. Clovis, through intrigue, schemes and intellectual alignments, created a kingdom out of a war band, and thus started to mold a new order out of the fallen Roman Empire. With each succession after Clovis the territories that were passed down looked more and more like today's Europe. Clovis was of the Merovingian line, which later gave way to the Carolingians and one of the most famous rulers, Charlemagne. Nothing Charlemagne or any other rulers did in the 200 years preceding or after him, would have been possible without the uniting force, Clovis.

Works Cited

Gibbons, Edward. Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd: London: 1787.

Gregory of Tours. History of the Franks. Trans. E. Brehaut. New York, NY: Columbia UP: 1916.

Randers-Pehrson, Justine D. Barbarians and Romans. OK: University of Oklahoma P: 1983.

Robinson, J.H. Readings in European History. Ginn: Boston: 1905.

Tacitus. Germania. Trans. W.J. Brodribb. London: Macmillan: 1977.

Tierney, Brian. Western Europe in the Middle Ages: 300-1475. McGraw-Hill College: Boston: 1999.

Narodna Odbrana (The Black Hand): Terrorist Faction that Divided the World

By: Patrick R. F. Blakley

The Balkans at the turn of the twentieth century, a time awaiting the complete chaos of a world war hidden in the barrel of the gun gripped tightly by the hands of a terrorist. A confused royal driver for an esteemed heir and his wife makes a mistake en route to their destination. The clutch groans as the car is dropped into reverse at the same time as our young terrorist finds himself revealing his weapon. Three pairs of eyes close in these next few disquieting seconds. The young terrorist's close while his head turns away; he can't watch when his bullets fire into the car. The royal heir's wife's eyes close, never to open again as a bullet is injected into her abdomen alongside an unborn child. Finally, the heir to the throne closes his eyes after one last look at his departed wife and after one last bullet pierces his jugular. The Black Hand is successful at another murder, but this time worlds will collide, and many more will die as a consequence of the assassination.

Background

The twentieth century was a hundred years of turmoil escalating out of control. Leaders, by their treaties with one another, got their nations involved in disorder merely by signing their names on paper. At the turn of the century, a group formed that was competent and capable of beginning a massive war. Though it was not their goal, it was what they achieved. The Black Hand terrorist faction set their sights on an aspiration

cherished by the people of their country and background. While attempting to achieve their ambition of uniting the Serbs they, unknown to them, put the gears of World War I into motion. This relatively small terrorist faction had a goal of uniting the Serbian people; but, because of many national treaties, one assassination led to a world war. Dragutin Dimitrijević was born in Serbia on August 17, 1877. As an intelligent young man he did well in school and, at the age of 16, he joined the Belgrade Military Academy. His brilliance stayed with him there, and he graduated with such high honors that the general staff of the Serbian army immediately enlisted him.¹³ Once there he made the decision to become a specialist in terrorism; this was a decision that would lead him through the remaining years of his life. In 1903, at the rank of captain, young Dimitrijević and a handful of his junior officers planned and carried out the assassination of a despotic Serbian king. This was Dimitrijević's second plan to kill King Aleksandar Obrenović (his first attempt failed in 1901); but this time the King and his wife Draga were planning on making the Queen's brother heir to the throne of Serbia. In order to both prevent that, and to instate instead a man of whom Dimitrijević was fond, Petar Karađorđević, the King and Queen had to be assassinated.¹⁴

The royal palace was infiltrated by the terrorists (who, unknown to them at the time, would later be called the Black Hand.) The royal family hid in a closet in the Queen's bedroom. The terrorists searched long and hard for the royal couple, and were filled with even more with anger when they finally found them. The couple were savagely beaten and murdered without mercy or regard for pain. On June 11, 1903, the

¹³ McKenzie, David. 1989. The life of Colonel Dragutin T. Dimitrijević. New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 48

¹⁴ Ibid. pp. 97

King and Queen were shot and left lifeless.¹⁵ After their deaths the terrorists mutilated the bodies, ripping off limbs and throwing them out of a palace window. A few of the military men received injuries themselves, as was the case for Captain Dimitrijević: he took three bullets. After escaping quickly and quietly out of the palace, Dimitrijević's men tended to their wounded comrades, but could not remove the three bullets from Dimitrijević's body; though he survived, he spent the remainder of his life with those three bullets inside his body.¹⁶

King Aleksandar was not well-liked, and the Serbian people celebrated the success of the assassination. The group's leader, Dragutin Dimitrijević, received a promotion to Professor of Tactics at the Military Academy even as he secretly remained in control in Obrenović's place; he was using Karađorđević as a puppet. A prominent military tactician, Dimitrijević visited Germany and the Soviet Union to acquire more knowledge of his field.¹⁷ In the Soviet Union Dimitrijević became familiar with the People's Will and their tactics, such as killing leaders and officials. Dimitrijević also observed the anarchists' views, and the Soviet Union's approaches and methods aided him in his struggle during the Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913. Dimitrijević achieved many imperative victories with the Serbian army, such as the ones near Skopje, and then Bitola, in the first Balkan War. The second war gave Dimitrijević further experience, but victories were almost non-existent. At the close of the wars, Dragutin Dimitrijević was a colonel, and he gave himself the code name "Apis," from the Latin for "Bee."¹⁸

¹⁵ Shackelford, Micheal. [The Secret Serbian Terrorist Society.](http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/comment/blk-hand.html)
<http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/comment/blk-hand.html>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

¹⁶ McKenzie, David. p. 188

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 202

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 338

Organization

The Narodna Odbrana was a Serbian nationalist group created in 1908 in retaliation for the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria-Hungary. The semi-secret society focused on Pan-Slavism, and aimed to train a militia for a possible war between Serbia and Austria.¹⁹ By organizing forces and spreading propaganda, the Narodna Odbrana's goal was to protect and unify the ethnic Serbs of Austria-Hungary. The Serbs had never been completely united under one nation, and Austria-Hungary was now interfering with Serbian ideology. Serbian nationalism and anti-imperialism, mainly against the Austria-Hungarian Empire, were extremely common at the turn of the twentieth century. Religion did not play a large role in the ideology of the Serbs and, with the addition of some Muslims into groups like the Narodna Odbrana, the nationalistic ideals were proven to be totally pan-Slavic. Bosnians and Serbs also acted together for the same purpose. No women were involved, because it was a military assembly that trained men to defend Serbia against Austria-Hungary.

On May 9, 1911, 10 men met in secrecy to form a terrorist faction within the Narodna Odbrana. This faction began to call itself The Black Hand, and was also known as Union or Death. Most members were officers in the Serbian army.²⁰ They had created a five-section constitution in which the ideals and goals are clearly stated:

Section I, Article 1: "...The Unification of Serbdom..."²¹ It also states clearly that members are responsible with their own lives for the members they recruit:

Section III, Article 24: "It shall be the duty of every member to recruit new members, but

¹⁹ Gunther E. Rotherberg, "The Austro-Hungarian Campaign Against Serbia in 1914," *Journal of Military History* 53 (April 1989): p. 145.

²⁰ Shackelford, Micheal.

²¹ Black Hand. <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWblackhand.htm>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

it shall be understood that every introducing member shall vouch with his own life for all those whom he introduces into the organization."²²

The official Seal of the group as described by the constitution:
Section IV, Article 34: In the center of the seal there is a powerful arm holding in its hand an unfurled flag on which -- as a coat of arms -- there is a skull with crossed bones; by the side of the flag, a knife, a bomb and a phial of poison. Around, in a circle, there is the following inscription, reading from left to right: "Unification or Death," and in the base: "The Supreme Central Directorate."²³

Nine members of the executive committee, including Dimitrijević, signed the Constitution.

The Narodna Odbrana supported the Black Hand financially with money from the government, which was used to buy firearms and other destructive devices. Some of the men involved with the Black Hand were unemployed, and thus received some aid financially from the group.

As the Narodna Odbrana grew to about 2,500 individuals dedicated to protecting Serbia in the event of a war, the Black Hand grew underneath it. There existed hierarchies within the group: at the bottom were three- to five-member "cells"; above them were District Committees. Above the District Committees were the Central Committee in Belgrade, and above that was the 10-member executive committee led by Dragutin Dimitrijević, known to the group as Colonel Apis.²⁴ The members of the group rarely knew people other than the ones in their cell and one member superior to them; this would ensure that the identities of the leaders were kept secret. All new members were brought to a dark room and, seated behind a dagger and a revolver, they were required to swear...

²² Shackelford, Micheal.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Black Hand. <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWblackhand.htm>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

"...before God, on my honor and my life, that I will execute all missions and commands without question. I swear before God, on my honor and on my life, that I will take all the secrets of this organization into my grave with me." -Section IV, Article 35.²⁵

The leaders, irritated by the inaction that the government had displayed in the Pan-Serb cause, rashly began a power struggle. The Black Hand knew no solution other than assassination to the problems they saw. Their targets were the governments behind the leaders, and sometimes the threat of assassination would be enough to induce caution; although, once the idea of assassination had passed through the group, there was usually no negotiation. In addition, they tried to cover up any involvement they had with assassinations.

In 1908 the Austria-Hungarian Empire expanded by annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. It was an extremely complicated matter but, in the end, it prevented Turkey taking the territories for itself.²⁶ Europe was aggravated by the annexation; it was not legal by the books. To calm them the Austria-Hungarian Empire paid a cash settlement to Turkey. This succeeded in soothing the continent. The Serbs, however, were not calmed; in fact, just the opposite. They desired the provinces for their Serb empire.²⁷ Franz Joseph, the Emperor of Austria, had been the target of a Black Hand assassination in 1910.²⁸ When this attempt failed the terrorists turned their sights to his nephew, the heir to the Austria-Hungarian throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Ferdinand was an easier target because he did not take as many precautions as Franz Joseph, and

²⁵ Shackelford, Micheal.

²⁶ Dedijer, Vladimir. 1966. The Road to Sarajevo. New York: Simon and Schuster. p. 128

²⁷ Shackelford, Micheal.

²⁸ Black Hand. <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWblackhand.htm>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

assassinating Ferdinand would have quite the same impact on Franz Joseph and his nation.

The Archduke Franz Ferdinand was born on December 18, 1863 in Graz, Austria. When his cousin Duke Francis V of Modena died, Ferdinand became the heir to the throne with the stipulation that he add Este to his name. He was 12 when this happened.²⁹ He met his future wife, Sophie Chotek, at a ball in Prague. Sophie was born on March 1, 1868 in Stuttgart. In 1900 on July 1 the two were married at Reichstadt, Bohemia. They had three children: Princess Sophie, Maximilian, and Prince Ernst. One more child was on the way.³⁰

Background

In a café in Belgrade, a man by the name Nedeljko Čabrinović sat and read the contents of an envelope he had received from a friend. Čabrinović had been born in 1895 in Sarajevo. He began as a student and a handyman prior to moving to Belgrade, where he worked in a print shop; there he became familiar with anarchist literature.³¹ The envelope had been sent from Zenica in order to avoid Austrian censorship. All that was inside was a newspaper clipping announcing the upcoming visit to Sarajevo, the capital of the Austria-Hungarian province of Bosnia and Herzegovina, by the Archduke. The only message accompanying this clipping was one word: "Greetings." Soon, in another café, Čabrinović showed the clipping to a friend named Gavrilo Princip, who had

²⁹ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. 1984. *Archduke of Sarajevo*. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Company. p. 5, 13

³⁰ Ibid. p. 98

³¹ Remak, Joachim. 1959. *Sarajevo: the story of a political murder*. New York: Criterion Books. p. 62

recently made a connection with the Narodna Odbrana.³² Princip, born on July 25, 1894 in Obljaj, Bosnia, was the son of a postman. His parents, Peter and Marija, had nine children, of whom six -- five sons and four daughters -- died in infancy. He lived with his older brother in Sarajevo; these circumstances made him a prime candidate for the Narodna Odbrana. After taking part in a protest in 1912, he was expelled from school, and he moved to Belgrade.³³ Also in 1912, Princip joined the Black Hand; however, his poor health precluded active duty. Major Tankosvić was the man who connected the young Bosnian men to the Black Hand after Princip came to join the coup. With the approval of the Major, a third man entered this plot when Princip told his Belgrade roommate, Trifun "Trifko" Grabež.³⁴ Grabež was born sometime in 1895 in Pale. When he was 17, he punched one of his teachers in the face, and for that he was also expelled, as well as receiving a police record, something none of the others had. He then moved to Belgrade to continue his education. Danilo Ilić was the next man eager to join the trio after the news had spread throughout the Black Hand. Ilić was born in 1891 and, after his schooling, became a teacher himself in Bosnia. In 1913 he moved to Belgrade, where he grew to be a journalist and joined the Black Hand.³⁵ Ilić, allowed to recruit more people for the group, found three young men also from Sarajevo: Muhamed Mehmedbašić, Vaso Čubrilović, and Cvjetko Popović. The Sarajevo men were the key to the coup. The addition of these three gave the group a less Serbian-inspired look, mostly because of the Muslim Mehmedbašić.³⁶

Čubrilović and Popović were high school students when they joined the group.

³² Ibid. p. 62-63

³³ Shackelford, Micheal.

³⁴ Remak, Joachim p. 60

³⁵ Ibid. p. 54-55

³⁶ Shackelford, Micheal.

Čubrilović had been born in 1897, and was a student in Sarajevo when he joined. Vaso's brother, Veljko, also allowed to take part in the plot, received a very minimal job. Popović, a friend of Čubrilović's, was born in 1896, and also went to school in Sarajevo. As the youngest members of the group, they needed some training by Danilo Ilić for their role in the assassination.³⁷ Mehmedbašić had been involved with Black Hand ploys before; earlier in 1914, he was sent by Apis to kill General Potoirek – the governor of Bosnia, and the man who invited the Archduke to visit Sarajevo. Mehmedbašić failed to act when given his chance to complete the assassination. His experience with the Black Hand distinguished him as the lead man in the attempt. These men referred to themselves as Young Bosnia. Their ideals were more anarchistic than those of the Black Hand, but they set their sights on killing the Archduke.³⁸ Young Bosnia was adamant about destroying Austria-Hungary and uniting the Slavic people of the entire area. The members of Young Bosnia who actively participated in the assassination included Nedeljko Čabrinović, Gavrilo Princip, Trifko Grabež, Danilo Ilić, Muhamed Mehmedbašić, Vaso Čubrilović, and Cvjetko Popović. These seven men would find themselves assisting the Black Hand terrorist faction with the murder of a royal family member. At least three of them (Čabrinović, Princip, and Grabež) were appealing candidates to Apis because they suffered from tuberculosis; it gave them already-short lives. Apis wanted them to kill themselves after the assassination, so that he and the Black Hand would remain unattached in the eyes of the government.

Three men, Čabrinović, Princip, and Grabež, had about two months of training with bombs and firearms. Princip not only showed the most skill in firing a Browning

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Dedijer, Vladimir. p. 217-218

revolver at an oak tree from about 200 yards (six hits out of 10 shots); he had also shown the greatest mental stability of the three trained men.³⁹

Travel

Intense planning and strategizing were the next steps if it were to be a successful assassination. There were a few major problems to overcome before the subsequent steps could be taken. The biggest problem was that the men chosen to commit the assassination needed to get themselves into Sarajevo; this would prove no easy task, especially since they would all have weapons on their bodies.⁴⁰

The plan was to pass the weapons from one Narodna Odbrana official to another until they were in Sarajevo. Before they departed, Čabrinović, Princip and Grabež were each given a small card authorizing their use of a special channel on the way to Sarajevo by Apis's right-hand man, Major Vojislav Tankosić.⁴¹ Weapons were given to the young men in another Belgrade café. The trio's trip began on May 28 at a place called Šabac. Prime Minister Nikola Pasic learned of the three men leaving, and gave an order for their arrest; it was not carried out, and the three were well on their way to Sarajevo.⁴² At Šabac they were to give the small card to Captain Popović, a border guard. Popović then informed them that they were now to go to Loznica, and gave them a letter for a man named Captain Prvanović. Once they arrived, Captain Prvanović accepted the letter, and sat down with them and three of his own men to discuss the best way to cross the border

³⁹ Shackelford, Micheal.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid.

undetected. One of the Captain's men addressed the situation, and took Princip and Grabež, along with all of their weapons, to a small island in the center of the Drina River; this place divided Serbia from Austria-Hungarian land. From here, the Captain's agent sent the two into Austria-Hungarian territory with a member of the Serbian Narodna Odbrana.⁴³ The two men and the courier then traveled from safe house to safe house all the way into Tuzla. Čabrinović could cross at a more discernible point because he took no weapons with him.

The weapons were brought to Tuzla by another agent of the Narodna Odbrana named Miško Jovanović. Čabrinović and Grabež stayed at their parent's homes to lie low until necessary. It is unclear whether the parents knew about the plot. Assuming they would not want their sons to commit suicide, the young terrorists probably never told them the real reason for the visit. Princip stayed with Danilo Ilić's mother, and soon, after the other men's arrival, Princip and Ilić met up at the home.⁴⁴ Ilić, after meeting up with Princip, went to receive the weapons from Miško Jovanović. Jovanović kept the weapons hidden in a large sugar box. After taking them onto a train to Doboj, Jovanović handed the box off to Ilić. Ilić brought the weapons back to his mother's house, and hid them in a suitcase under the couch. He handed out the weapons on June 27.⁴⁵

The morning of June 28, 1914

At 10 o'clock in the morning the Archduke and his motorcade left an army base at which Franz Ferdinand had reviewed the troops. The motorcade consisted of six vehicles, all headed for the Sarajevo City Hall, where a reception was to be hosted by the Mayor.

The main road, which was the obvious choice for the motorcade, was called the Appel

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

Quay.⁴⁶ This road was wide, and a direct route to City Hall. It traveled along the northern bank of the River Miljacka. The first car belonged to Mayor Fehim Effendi Curcic. With him rode the Commissioner of Police, Dr. Gerde.⁴⁷ The second car in the motorcade was the target vehicle; four people occupied it: Archduke Franz Ferdinand, his wife Sophie, General Potoirek, and the driver, Count Harrach. The vehicle traveling behind the target was that of Franz Ferdinand's military chancellery, Sophie's lady-in-waiting, Potoirek's chief adjutant, the car's owner, Lieutenant Colonel Merizzi, and the driver. The fourth vehicle carried more of Franz Ferdinand's officials and some Bosnian administrators and executives. The last car was empty, a spare in case one of the others were to fail.

Crowds lined the road and windows of the buildings. The reflection of the sun off the river made it hot on the south side of the Appel Quay; most onlookers were in the shade on the sides of the buildings.⁴⁸ Decorations and flags hung everywhere, and the cheers could be heard far away. Among the cheering onlookers were seven deadly men with guns and bombs. The first three terrorists stood on alternating sides of the Appel Quay just prior to the Cumburja Bridge, beginning with Mehmedbašić. Ilić was next in line across the street, but unarmed; he had agreed only to plan the assassination in all its detail.⁴⁹ Čubrilović was across the street from Ilić just before the bridge. The next two men stood close together beyond the bridge. Čabrinović and Popović awaited the motorcade there. Much further down the street, just before the next bridge (the Lateiner Bridge), Princip stood and waited. The last man in line waiting before the Kaiser Bridge

⁴⁶ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. p. 243

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 244-245

⁴⁸ Ibid. p. 444

⁴⁹ Albertini, Luigi. 1953. Origins of the War of 1914. London: Oxford University Press. p. 380

was Trifun Grabež.⁵⁰

Six men were given Browning revolvers, and six were also given grenade-like bombs. Everyone also received a cyanide pill with which to commit suicide after the attack.⁵¹ If the plan succeeded flawlessly, all of the six revolvers would be emptied, and all of the six bombs would be hurled at the motorcade. Then all seven men would ingest the cyanide.⁵² With the armaments hidden in jacket pockets, the terrorists awaited their shot at the Archduke.

First in line was Mehmedbašić, but he failed to throw his bomb at the vehicle, stating later that he had been approached by a police officer and was unable to remove his bomb from the hiding place in his coat.⁵³ The next man in line to take action was Čabrinović; he was put in this position because he was older and more mature than the preceding men. He took out his bomb, activated its percussion cap by hitting it against a lamppost, and threw it, with a rather large arc, at the second vehicle.⁵⁴ General Potoirek heard the bomb struck against the lamppost, and thought one of the car's tires had gone flat: "Bravo. Now we'll have to stop." The driver, Count Harrach, saw the object flying toward his vehicle, and sped away from it. The bomb grazed Ferdinand's arm, then bounced off the folded-down roof of Ferdinand's car, and landed in the street.⁵⁵ It exploded under the wheel of the third car, wounding a few of its occupants, including Merizzi. About 20 people in all received injuries due to the bomb's shrapnel and splinters. Čabrinović ingested his cyanide pill, and jumped into the river. The crowd

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 382

⁵¹ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. p. 220

⁵² Ibid. p. 244

⁵³ Albertini, Luigi. p. 409

⁵⁴ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. p. 245-246

⁵⁵ Ibid. p. 246

grabbed his body from the shallow river, and flung it onto the shore for his arrest. The cyanide only caused him to vomit. The motorcade stopped only momentarily to assess the damage and the injured, and then rapidly drove to the City Hall.⁵⁶ All of the other members of the terrorist group failed to act, either because they thought Čabrinović had been successful or they could not get a clear shot at the speeding motorcade.⁵⁷

Franz Ferdinand, outraged by what had occurred, confronted the Mayor by shouting, "Mr. Mayor, one comes here for a visit and is received by bombs! It is outrageous!"⁵⁸ The Mayor had nothing prepared to say in reply, so he simply gave his planned speech; this gave Ferdinand some time to regain his composure. Activities at the City Hall went on as arranged.⁵⁹

The unsuccessful terrorists were at a loss to know what to do. Princip decided to have a sandwich at Moritz Schiller's food store on Franz Joseph Street, across the road from his attack position. Mehmedbašić fled right away, and ran south to Montenegro. The others made the decision to lie low in Sarajevo until they received instructions.⁶⁰

At the City Hall the Archduke's plans were debated, and it was decided not to change a trip to the museum or lunch with the Governor; they would make time first to visit Merizzi in the hospital. The new arrangement was for the Archduke to travel directly to the hospital from the City Hall building. He would not take any side roads, which would slow the car down and make it vulnerable.⁶¹

Gavrilo Princip stepped out of the food store, and saw an old friend with whom he began

⁵⁶ Ibid. p. 247

⁵⁷ Ibid. p. 247

⁵⁸ Shackelford, Micheal.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. p. 246

⁶¹ Ibid. p. 249-250

to talk. The Archduke's car turned off the Appel Quay onto the side road on which Schiller's store was located. The driver of the car, ill informed, turned here because it was the original plan and route to get to the museum. General Potoirek told the driver that he was mistaken, and to turn the car around. The driver stopped and, as he put the car into reverse, the gears locked and the car stalled. This put the now immobilized Archduke Franz Ferdinand five feet away from Gavrilo Princip.⁶² Princip knew exactly what had happened to the vehicle, and was quick to exploit the mistake. As he drew his pistol from his coat pocket, the crowd around him panicked. He aimed the gun quickly, closed his eyes, and turned his head away from the car. He fired into the car twice, both bullets finding flesh. The first bullet hit Sophie in the stomach, and the second cut into the Archduke's neck, piercing his jugular. With Princip's other hand he took out his cyanide pill, and swallowed it as he turned the gun onto himself. With the third bullet primed, he was tackled to the ground by the crowd, and severely beaten. The police officers had to rescue Princip from the crowd before they could arrest him. His cyanide made him violently sick, but did not end his life.⁶³

General Potoirek seems to have thought the shots had missed, and he ordered the driver to drive directly to the Governor's home instead of the hospital. The vehicle sped south across the Lateiner Bridge, the Archduke throwing up blood along the way, while Sophie muttered her last words to Ferdinand, as overheard by General Potoirek: "For Heaven's sake! What happened to you?" After saying this, she sank in her seat.⁶⁴ The General thought she had passed out at the sight of the Archduke vomiting blood, so he tried to help her up, but it was useless due to the bleeding in her abdomen. The

⁶² Ibid. p. 250

⁶³ Ibid. p. 250-251

⁶⁴ Ibid. p. 251

Archduke is rumored to have spoken his last words to her at this point, but with a bullet in the throat and a severed jugular, it would have been practically impossible to utter a sound. “Sophie dear, Sophie dear! Don’t die! Stay alive for our children.” By the time they had reached the Governor’s residence, Sophie had passed, and the Archduke departed soon after.⁶⁵ Sophie had been pregnant, and her child died with her.

Aftermath

Royalty in Vienna are normally buried in the Capuchin Crypt, but Franz Ferdinand was buried in a sepulcher under the chapel of his castle. The reason for this is that Sophie was not of the royal family; Emperor Franz Joseph had to personally intervene to have her coffin placed in the same chapel as the Archduke’s.⁶⁶

The Austria-Hungarian Government issued what came to be called the July Ultimatum to the Serbian Government. It granted Serbia only 48 hours to accept all of the points. Secret alliances had been in existence for some time between Austria-Hungary, the Soviet Union and France, and when Serbia completely accepted only two of the points, Austria-Hungary began mobilizing its army.⁶⁷ Austria-Hungary withdrew its ambassador, and broke political contact with Serbia. During the mobilization, some Serbs accidentally crossed the border into Austria-Hungary on the river at Temes-Kubin, and Austria-Hungarian soldiers fired into the air to caution them. A huge debate about retaliation ensued, and Austria-Hungary declared war on July 28, exactly one month after

⁶⁵ Ibid. p. 251

⁶⁶ Brook Shepherd, Gordon. p. 262

⁶⁷ Fay, Sidney Bradshaw. 1928. Origins of the Great War. New York. P. 327

Princip's fatal shots.⁶⁸ The web of alliances drew many nations into declaring war on each other, until almost all of Europe had chosen sides; some nations found themselves torn between two treaties. This was the beginning of World War I. The news and propaganda that spread rapidly throughout Serbia and Austria-Hungary were accepted more easily by the population of the former. The people of Austria-Hungary were livid over the deeds of the Serbs, fuelling more propaganda, both before and during the war, condemning the Serbs and promoting nationalism for the Austria-Hungarians.

In October 1914, all the young assassins except Mehmedbašić were tried. He did not lie low when he escaped south to Montenegro. He boasted about his role in the assassination, and for this the Montenegrin government arrested him, even though it was not unsympathetic to the cause of the assassination of the Archduke.⁶⁹ The arrest created a couple of complications: first, the Austrian government wanted him extradited. If he were returned to the Austrians, the people of Montenegro would not have been happy, and could have created problems. The two governments were, however, united by extradition contracts. Mehmedbašić "escaped" police custody, expediently solving both problems.⁷⁰ (In fact, the government probably staged an accident.)

The six members who were tried kept quiet about the Black Hand and their sponsorship of the young men. The interrogators were not exceedingly qualified for their job. Danilo Ilić almost spilled the beans when he testified, but Princip was able, in silence, to exercise his leadership skills.⁷¹

When Princip did testify, he stated that he had never regretted killing the

⁶⁸ Shackelford, Micheal.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Owings, W.A. Dolph. 1984. *The Sarajevo Trial*. North Carolina: Documentary Publications, Chapel Hill. Vol. II, p. 113-114

Archduke; he did, however, lament the death of Sophie. He stated that he was sorry that he had killed the Archduke's wife, and that he had taken aim only at him. He also said that he would rather have had the bullet that missed the Archduke find a place inside General Potoirek.⁷²

The trials of the six men involved a maze of birthdates, mainly Princip's. The law stated that no one under the age of 20 could be given the death penalty. A few of these young men did not even know their birthday, so it was up to the courts to decide. Princip was to turn 20 sometime in 1914, that much is certain, but his exact birthday was unknown to anyone; it was found to be either a few days before or a few days after the crime. In the end he was given the benefit of the doubt, and spared execution. The only man of the six arrested who was over the age of 20 was Danilo Ilić; he was 23, and sentenced to death. Nedeljko Čabrinović, Gavrilo Princip, and Trifun Grabež each received the maximum sentence of 20 years. Vaso Čubrilović received 16 years, and Cvjetko Popović was given 13.

Danilo Ilić was hanged on February 3, 1915 in Sarajevo. Nedeljko Čabrinović was the second of the seven men to die, which he did in prison in January of 1916. Trifun Grabež came a close third when he died in February that same year. Both of these men died of tuberculosis, which the bad prison conditions (made even worse by war) did not help.⁷³

In 1917, the government arrested the leader of the Black Hand, Apis, when Prime Minister Nikola Pasic began negotiations with Austria. He feared a Black Hand intervention, and wanted to prevent it. Other theories exist about Apis's apprehension,

⁷² Ibid. p. 85

⁷³ Shackelford, Micheal.

such as that he was aggressively undermining the government; alternatively, Apis could have exposed the government's involvement with the assassination in Sarajevo.

Whatever the case, Apis was tried, with many other militants, including Muhamed Mehmedbašić, for the assassination of King Aleksandar. The trial was rigged, and Mehmedbašić received a sentence of 15 years. Its main victim would be Colonel Dragutin "Apis" Dimitrijević. He was sentenced to death; and at sunrise on June 24, 1917, he was shot.⁷⁴ Throughout Dimitrijević's life, he had rarely made large demands; the assassinations of the people he did not like were intended to simply solve the problems he saw with governments. Negotiations were unnecessary with Dimitrijević because even if he did not kill someone, the thought of being murdered by him was constantly going through the heads of the rulers of the time.

Gavrilo Princip died of his tuberculosis a year after Dimitrijević, in October 1918 in a prison hospital in Theresienstadt in April. He weighed only 88 pounds.⁷⁵ The next year Muhamed Mehmedbašić was pardoned, and released from prison; from then on he would make an honest living as a carpenter and gardener. His death occurred some time during World War II.⁷⁶ The last two young men, the high school students Vaso Čubrilović and Cvjetko Popović, left prison when the Austrian government collapsed after World War I. Čubrilović became a teacher and professor and, eventually, a minister with the Tito government. Popović became Curator of Ethnography in the Sarajevo Museum.⁷⁷ Vaso Čubrilović died in 1990, and Popović's death date is unclear.

After the death of Apis, the Black Hand dwindled to nothing. A new group, the White

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

Hand (Bela Ruka), eclipsed the Black Hand, and was in incredible contrast to its relative namesake.⁷⁸ The White Hand consisted of trusted members of the Narodna Odbrana. It continued the task the Black Hand had left off, and soon became an important part of the newly formed country of Yugoslavia.⁷⁹

Definition

The word “terrorist” is a slippery term that should be used carefully. Every nation has a different definition and some believe it to be overused and even unnecessary. Terrorism is not an ideology or a political doctrine, but rather a premeditated method. It involves the state's or sub-state's application of violence or threat of violence to sow panic and bring about social, political, and/or religious change. It is also intended to influence an audience. Within this definition of terrorism, the Black Hand fits quite snugly. Their predetermined technique of getting what they wanted by political murder was, by definition, terroristic. The murders were intended to induce change, or political reform was intended to occur due to the threat of it. The audience before which they performed were the Serbs, and they received support for their actions.

The Black Hand was partially successful, mostly in the short run. The first assassinations and attempts to kill either directly allowed them to change the governing powers or directly influenced the current governing powers to change, or at least to consider the consequences of their actions with regard to the terrorist group. They completed the two main assassination efforts that they attempted. Yet, in the end, the

⁷⁸ Fay, Sidney Bradshaw. p. 365

⁷⁹ Ibid. p. 369

group failed in their one goal of uniting the Serbs under one nation's rule. Instead, by mistake, they brought war to Serbia and to the whole world.

The Black Hand was successful at another murder, but this time worlds would collide, and many more would die as a consequence. They had no idea of how big the effects of the assassination in Sarajevo would be. The idea of unification for all Serbs would ultimately divide much of the world. The attempt to realize an aspiration cherished by all Serbs set off chain reactions that would continue throughout the twentieth century. The hundred years following the creation of the Black Hand would be years of unease and terror.

Works Cited

Albertini, Luigi. 1953. *Origins of the War of 1914*. London: Oxford University Press.

Black Hand. <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/FWWblackhand.htm>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

Brook Shepherd, Gordon. 1984. *Archduke of Sarajevo*. Boston, Toronto: Little, Brown and Company.

Dedijer, Vladimir. 1966. *The Road to Sarajevo*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Dragutin T. Dimitrijevic. May 9, 1911. *The Constitution of the Ujedinjenje ili Smrt*.
<http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/1914m/blk-cons.html>
[Accessed May 16, 2007.]

Fay, Sidney Bradshaw. 1928. *Origins of the Great War*. New York.

Lyon, James M.B. July, 1997. *A Peasant Mob: The Serbian Army on the Eve of the Great War*. *The Journal of Military History*, Vol. 61, No. 3. pp. 481-502.

McKenzie, David. 1989. *The life of Colonel Dragutin T. Dimitrijevic*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Owings, W.A. Dolph. 1984. *The Sarajevo Trial*. North Carolina: Documentary Publications, Chapel Hill.

Pozzi, Henri (translated by Francis J. Mott). Reprint 1994. *Black Hand Over Europe*. Zagreb: Croatian Information Center.

Remak, Joachim. 1959. *Sarajevo: the story of a political murder*. New York: Criterion Books.

Shackelford, Micheal. *The Secret Serbian Terrorist Society*.
<http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/comment/blk-hand.html>
[Accessed May 14, 2007]

Spartan Women: An Exception Among the Greeks

By: Christine Godfrey

When we study history, we are often times filled with knowledge regarding heroes, governments and warfare. These elements of history are most often associated with the accomplishments of men, and therefore one is taught history through the eyes and deeds of man. This “history of man” is often seen in the ancient Greek world, which is highlighted by our fascination with events, such as the Battle of Thermopylae, and legends, such as that of the Trojan War. While these historical elements are in no way unimportant, they fail to represent the social and everyday history of Greece. Similarly, when we are asked to reflect on the women of Greece, we often bring to mind the legend of Helen of Troy or the Goddesses that prevailed in Greek religion. These figures do not give an accurate depiction of the lives of Greek women, nor do these mythological women generalize the treatment and obligations of the average woman of Greece. The city-state, however, that preached the most liberally in regard to women was the militaristic state of Sparta. Spartan women were given physical, educational and legal freedoms under their oligarchy, and as a result garnered respect and scorn from their fellow Greeks.

To begin to see how the Spartan women differed greatly from other Greek women we must look at the overall picture of how women were seen in ancient Greece by considering a popular Greek pastime, the reciting of satirical poems and telling of satirical stories. In the sixth century B.C, Semonides wrote a poem in which he describes

“the female mind.”⁸⁰ He wrote that Zeus created the female mind separately, and used different animals and inanimate objects to influence the nine different minds of woman.⁸¹ There are three “animals” in this poem, which poignantly illustrates which women should always be avoided. The mind “made from a bitch” is that of a woman who wants to know everything, and never ceases speaking, even if she is alone; it is impossible for a man to control her.⁸² Another female mind was created by the sea, according to Semonides, and has two different characters; one day she will be calm and pleasant and the next she will be a raging beast that is unapproachable.⁸³ A woman fashioned after a monkey is, in Semonides’ opinion, the worst choice. She is horrible to look at, everyone laughs at her stout and unfeminine body, and she always looks to trick and harm people.⁸⁴ Finally, the best woman that a man can hope to receive has the mind of a bee. This woman is sensible and reaches her full potential in marriage by producing handsome children, and she is devoted to her husband and him to her.⁸⁵ It is satirical poems such as this that give us a look into how the Greek women were interpreted in literature. Overall, though, women are seen as a nuisance and a punishment for man, and it was believed to be rare indeed that a Greek man would actually find pleasure in his wife or any woman.

Not surprisingly, the attitudes of Semonides towards women did surface in the real life world of the Greeks. The philosopher Aristotle described what he thought was the female role from the Athenian point of view. He sets the tone of his writing by stating

⁸⁰ Mary Lefkowitz and Maureen Fant, *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A source book in translation* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 25.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ Lefkowitz, 26.

⁸⁵ Lefkowitz, 27.

first that, “the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior.”⁸⁶ That sentence alone gives the reader an idea of where Greek women are placed in the hierarchy of society. He defends his statement by further insinuating that, “the male is by nature fitter for command than the female.”⁸⁷ This is somewhat understandable considering the time period. A common answer to the question, “Why were women always inferior?” is that physically, men are equipped to hunt and fight, and women are made for having children, which in effect renders women physically limited when pregnant. Also, while courage was a much admired trait among the Greeks, it was displayed differently by men and women. Aristotle credits Socrates with saying, “The courage of a man is shown in commanding, of a woman in obeying,” and, “Silence is a woman’s glory.”⁸⁸ Aristotle then brings to attention how the legislator Lycurgus at Sparta neglected to impose laws upon the Spartan women who, in Aristotle’s opinion, “live in every sort of intemperance and luxury.”⁸⁹ According to Aristotle, Lycurgus gave up on controlling the women, and demanding their chastity and obedience, because their dominance in society was needed while the men were away.⁹⁰ He then goes on to comment that the Spartan women’s influence on others has been “most mischievous.”⁹¹ In addition, Aristotle claims that tyrannies use these mischievous women and the slaves to help further the “evil practices of the last and worst form of democracy.”⁹² A tyrant hopes that the woman will “inform against her husband,” and that the slaves will “betray their masters,” because women and

⁸⁶ Lefkowitz, 38.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Lefkowitz, 39.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Lefkowitz, 85.

⁹¹ Lefkowitz, 40.

⁹² Lefkowitz, 41.

slaves flourish under tyrannies, unlike monarchies.⁹³ Aristotle is clearly untrusting of women and it comes as no surprise that he is even more untrusting of, and upset by, Spartan women and their influence over men.

Spartan women were raised to give birth to Spartan soldiers and to be good wives. This claim can be supported by two anecdotes: “When an Ionian woman prided herself on something she had woven, a Spartan woman boasted of her four beautiful sons, saying, ‘Such should be the works of a fine woman and this is what she should be proud of and boast about,’⁹⁴ and, “When a Spartan woman was sold as a slave and asked what she knew how to do, she said, ‘To be faithful.’⁹⁵

The expectations of Spartan women can be compared to those of the Spartan men, and while there were differences, the ideas behind them were similar. Under Lycurgus, Spartan women were expected to exercise by wrestling, running, and throwing the discus and javelin.⁹⁶ The intention was to ensure that the women were healthy enough to produce healthy and strong offspring and to prepare them for painful childbirth and labor.⁹⁷ Spartan women were also encouraged to roam naked and dance in the nude at ceremonies and festivals; this not only allowed them to show pride their bodies, but it also induced ideas of matrimony.⁹⁸ At these festivals, the young women would praise or mock the young Spartan males, who were showing off their militaristic knowledge and

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Lefkowitz, 88.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Lefkowitz, 85.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Lefkowitz, 85-86.

skill.⁹⁹ The praise would inspire the young men to strive for glory, and the mockery would serve as a cruel push for the men who needed to work harder.¹⁰⁰

Also, for a time, adultery wasn't an issue for Spartans because the raising of children was a communal obligation. If a respected man wanted to lie with the wife of another Spartan, and gained his permission, he could lie with her in hopes of producing children of the best family.¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, because perfection and strength were integral to Spartan life, any children born that were judged to be imperfect or weak were discarded in Apothetae, a pit near Mount Taygetus.¹⁰² A male child was praised and intended for glory on the battlefield, and a female child was expected to attain her glory by giving birth to a Spartan soldier.

The scholar Xenophon compared and contrasted the Spartan women with other Greek women in his writing about the constitution of the Lacedaemonians. The leader of Sparta, Lycurgus, saw that the men of other cultures had unlimited access to their wives for sexual intercourse and often times, the husbands were decades older than their wives, who were often only fourteen years old.¹⁰³ Lycurgus believed that husbands should be in their prime because intercourse with their young wives would bring about healthier children.¹⁰⁴ Also, he believed that if married couples were not allowed to cohabit, and they had to plan secret nighttime meetings, they would be more passionate and fertile because they wouldn't have tired of each other.¹⁰⁵ When a city-state is dependent on its

⁹⁹ Lefkowitz, 85.

¹⁰⁰ Lefkowitz, 85-86.

¹⁰¹ Lefkowitz, 87.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Lefkowitz, 84.

¹⁰⁴ Lefkowitz, 85.

¹⁰⁵ Lefkowitz, 84.

military ability and glory, it stands to reason that they would realize that every member of their empire matters when it comes to preserving their reputation.

The women of Sparta stood out among their Greek counterparts in both their physical and social expectations. While other Greek women were confined to their homes and were expected to remain silent and obedient, Spartan women were busy perfecting their bodies and minds, while helping run Sparta when the men were off at war. While Sparta was nowhere nearly as intellectually and physically beautiful as Athens, Spartans offered more to their women, who greatly outnumbered the men. The Spartans had a warrior culture respected among the Greeks, while at the same time being considered barbaric and primitive. Spartan women may have been lucky to have access to education and physical freedom, but they were really only valued for their childbearing skills. When it is was these women giving birth to the men who made Sparta what it was, however, it stood to reason that the women in return would be honored and appreciated as important and vital to the continuation of their city-state's power and reputation.

Works Cited

Lefkowitz, Mary R., and Maureen B. Fant. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A source book in translation*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

***The Unwanted Ones:
The Reasons for and the Events that Led to the Expulsion of the
Jews from England under Edward I in 1290***

by Jessica Godfrey

*If rulers think they harm their souls by taking money from usurers,
let them remember that they are themselves to blame.*
---Thomas Aquinas¹⁰⁶

Throughout the Middle Ages, the Jews were subject to much animosity. They were exploited for financial gain, served as scapegoats whenever a crisis arose, and were discarded when their services were no longer needed. Even though the Jews were expelled from several regions and countries during the Middle Ages, this paper solely focuses on the Jewish exodus from England under Edward I in 1290. Thus, this paper examines various reasons for, and actions that led to, their expulsion from England.

The history of the Jews in England prior to their expulsion in 1290 is brief. They first arrived in England from France during the Norman Conquest in 1066. The Jews constituted a small minority in England. In 1066, the English population was around two million and, by 1300, it had risen to about six million. From their arrival in 1066 to their expulsion in 1290, the Jewish population in England never exceeded five thousand. By 1290, the Jews in England comprised two thousand inhabitants.¹⁰⁷

The Jews acted as cash cows whose main purpose in England was to profit the Crown. Since canon law barred Christians from practicing usury, the Jews assumed the

¹⁰⁶ B. L. Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1895), 38.

¹⁰⁷ Robert C. Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State," in *The Medieval English State: Essays Presented to James Campbell*, ed. J. R. Maddicott and D. M. Palliser (London: Hambledon Press, 2000), 166. There is no evidence of Jews living in Anglo-Saxon England.

role of moneylender. In return for royal protection and special jurisdiction, the Jews financed the Crown in the form of taxes, loans, gifts, and fines. Furthermore, the Jews were the property of the king, so he could tax them at will.¹⁰⁸ For instance, Henry II (1154-1189) and subsequent English kings granted them royal protection and exclusive privileges in return for heavy taxation. They were allowed to settle conflicts in their own ecclesiastical courts, and were protected by royal officers in each district. Consequently, the Crown's ties with the Jews caused resentment and tension between the Christian and Jewish populations in England.¹⁰⁹

In terms of taxation, the Crown taxed the Jews arbitrarily in order to serve its own financial interests. Whenever the king needed extra money, he would tax them through the tallage system. Tallages were land taxes that were frequently levied from the Jewish community. Although they were a minority, they were taxed almost as much as the Christian majority. In 1187, Henry II received 60,000 pounds in taxes from the Jews and 70,000 pounds in taxes from the Christians. From 1230 to 1260, the Jews were taxed so heavily that the Crown could independently operate the English realm without the financial assistance of the barons, thus limiting baronial influence over the Crown.¹¹⁰ As the Crown grew more independent of baronial power, the Jews became increasingly impoverished from constantly paying exorbitant taxes.

The extreme demand for tallages to satisfy the avarice of the king had a distressing effect on the Jews. For example, in 1234, the richest Jew in Norwich, Isaac fil Jurnet, was worth 3,668 pounds; however, in 1290, the wealthiest Jew in Norwich, Isaac

¹⁰⁸ Barnett D. Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 67, no. 4 (April 1977): 224; Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997), 344.

¹⁰⁹ Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 11.

¹¹⁰ Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 13; Sholom A. Singer, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, (1965): 130.

fil Deulecresse, was valued at only 294 pounds.¹¹¹ Within the short span of 56 years in Norwich, the richest Jew's worth decreased by 3,374 pounds. In 1255, Aaron of York, once the wealthiest Jew in England, became so poor that he had to rely on the community to pay his tallage. Moreover, the following tallage figures suggest the rising impoverishment of the Jews: from 1221 to 1231, the Jews paid 3,000 pounds in tallages; from 1233 to 1257, 7,000 pounds; from 1259 to 1267, 600 pounds; and from 1271 to 1290, 2,500 pounds. Although the Jews paid over twice as much in tallages between 1233 and 1257 (7,000 pounds) than between 1221 and 1231 (3,000 pounds), tallage revenues decreased in the following decades. The decline in tallage revenues was due not only to the Jews' growing poverty, but also to the fact that many Jews left England during the period of 1250-55, after a difficult tallage period. Furthermore, the Crown received money from other sources, such as Italian and Gascon financiers. In contrast to Jewish tallages, Italian loans became increasingly valuable to the Crown: between 1221 and 1231, the Italians loaned 785 pounds; between 1233 and 1257, 3,550 pounds; and between 1269 and 1290, 9,000 pounds. While the Jews provided 2,500 pounds in tallages to the Crown between 1271 and 1290, the Italians loaned 9,000 pounds to the Crown during the same period.¹¹² Hence, the preceding figures indicate the growing significance of Italian loans and the decrease in the monetary usefulness of the Jews to the Crown.

Jews who were unable to pay their tallages were imprisoned, their property was confiscated and sold, and their wives and children were deported. Edward I (1272-1307) ordered the constable of the Tower of London to arrest any Jew who did not pay the

¹¹¹ Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews," 227.

¹¹² Singer, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290," 122-127.

tallage of 1274. He further stated: "They [the Jews] may be dealt with as men who have been outlawed and who have carried off chattels which are ours."¹¹³ Edward regarded the Jews as criminals who kept the king's property for themselves. Several Jews who failed to pay the tallage left England; especially during the heavy tallage period of 1250 to 1255.¹¹⁴

Apart from taxation, the Jews were active moneylenders who played a large role in the land market. Small landowners would often pledge their lands to Jewish moneylenders as security for debts. Some Jewish moneylenders sold their debtors' lands before they had enough time to pay back their debts. In turn, these lands were sold to those with available cash, such as barons and monasteries. Through the purchase of land, the barons and the Church amassed great wealth and political influence. Therefore, the practice of Jewish moneylenders receiving land as collateral from small landowners and then selling them to barons and monasteries created much resentment and discord among small landowners, and antagonized the king. The small landowners were angry with them for selling their lands before they had a chance to repay their debts, while the king viewed them as a threat to his authority. In order to halt the rise of the political and economic power of the barons and the Church, the king sought to restrict Jewish moneylenders from participating in the land market. Thus, to weaken the power of the barons and the Church, the king tried to reduce their means of attaining land through Jewish moneylenders.¹¹⁵

¹¹³ Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964), 73; Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews," 226.

¹¹⁴ Singer, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290," 123.

¹¹⁵ Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews," 229-232, 234; George Hare Leonard, "The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I: An Essay in Explanation of the Exodus, A. D. 1290," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5, (1891):112.

To inhibit the growing power of the barons and the Church, the Crown employed several measures to restrict Jewish moneylenders from participating in the land market. In 1269, Henry III (1216-1272) passed the Provisions of Jewry, which asserted: "No Jew hereafter may sell his debts unless he have first obtained license of the king."¹¹⁶ Edward I decreed in the 1275 Statute of Judaism: "That from henceforth no Jew shall lend anything at usury, either upon land, or upon rent, or upon other thing."¹¹⁷ The Statute of Judaism banned the Jews from lending money at interest -- their main source of livelihood. Any person of any religion who continued to practice usury was fined. Instead of moneylending, Edward wanted the Jews to do honest work as merchants, artisans, and farmers:

And the king granteth unto them that they may gain their living by lawful merchandise and their labour; and that they may have intercourse with Christians in order to carry on lawful trade by selling and buying. But that no Christian, for this cause or any other shall dwell among them.¹¹⁸

With their main source of livelihood cut off, many Jews became impoverished. Consequently, some continued to act as moneylenders in secret, especially in the countryside where they were less likely to be caught by royal agents. Other Jews purchased large quantities of grain and wool at wholesale and then resold them for a profit, while some utilized contracts in order to conceal loans. Only a few found success as merchants, artisans, and farmers.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews," 232.

¹¹⁷ Robin R. Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 291.

¹¹⁸ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 70; Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 293; Singer, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290," 134.

¹¹⁹ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 74; Robert C. Stacey, "Parliamentary Negotiation and the Expulsion of the Jews from England," in *Thirteenth Century England VI*, ed. R. H. Britnell, R. Frame, and M. Prestwick (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997), 98. Since the Statute passed by Edward I did not stop the Jews from moneylending, he sought to regulate its practice instead. Edward's Articles Touching the Jewry (1284) fixed the maximum rate of interest that Jews could receive for loans made to Christians.

Why was it so difficult for the Jews to make the transition from being moneylenders to being merchants, artisans, and farmers? Since they were prohibited from becoming town burgesses, it was almost impossible for them to gain admission into the guilds. They found it hard to buy and sell merchandise in towns, since the guilds held a monopoly over those activities. As non-guild members, they were forbidden to sell items of common use and, in some towns, they were prohibited from running their own shops or selling goods at wholesale. The Jews could become peddlers, but this trade was often dangerous and expensive. Peddlers risked being robbed and/or murdered while traveling alone around England with a cartload of wares. As a stranger in a strange town, it was usually difficult for a trader to gain a town's trust. In London, unfamiliar merchants were forbidden to stay in the city for more than 40 days. They were required to sell everything they carried with them within that time. Moreover, they were not allowed to take anything back with them. It was also hard for the Jews to become farmers since the Statute of Judaism only allowed them to farm on leased land for 10 years. Farming generally takes more than 10 years to gain momentum and become successful, and even then there is no guarantee. In addition, the Jews could not work as villeins because their religion forbade their taking the oath of fealty.¹²⁰ There always seemed to be an obstacle to Jewish advancement. Banned from moneylending and lacking success in their new professions, the Jews grew ever more impoverished.

After the Statute of Judaism was passed in 1275, the Crown accused the Jews of resorting to coin-clipping, since they were barred from moneylending and were desperate

Under these articles, loans could only gather interest for up to three years, and debts could not be collected after four years (Stacey, "Parliamentary Negotiation," 99; Ovrut, "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jew," 233).

¹²⁰ Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 39-41, 43.

to make money. Coin-clipping was the process of filing off the edges of coins and melting the clippings into bullion. The Crown took coin-clipping very seriously, since it devalued money. Edward I appointed a judicial commission to investigate the practice. On November 17, 1278, they conducted house searches, and arrested any Jew whose house contained any evidence of coin-clipping, such as particular tools, clippings, or coins with filed edges. Many Jews had their property confiscated, and were imprisoned and hanged. In November 1278, over 600 Jews were imprisoned in the Tower of London. By May 1, 1279, 269 Jews and 29 Christians had been hanged in London for coin-clipping. It is clear that the Jews were mostly blamed for coin-clipping, because 10 of them were hanged for every Christian.¹²¹

Furthermore, religious prejudice played a large role in the expulsion of the Jews from England. As a religious minority, they faced growing oppression in England, as well as in the rest of Christendom. Their plight worsened from year to year, until they were eventually banished in 1290. To distinguish them from the Christians, the Third Lateran Council (1178-79) required the Jews to wear a badge. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) called for all Jews to wear a badge or distinctive clothing. The badge was first instituted in England in 1218. The Crown and the Church ordered every Jew to wear one on their clothing at all times. Again, the Statute of Jewry (1253) under Henry II forced the Jews to wear a badge. Under the Statute of Judaism (1275), every Jew was

¹²¹ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 74-75; Robin R. Mundill, "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry," in *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, ed. Patricia Skinner (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003), 62; Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State," 175-176; Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 47-49, 76. Coin-clipping was common in England before the Statute of Judaism was enacted in 1275. In fact, in 1248, the chronicler Matthew Paris wrote: "No foreigner, let alone an Englishman, could look on an English coin with dry eyes and unbroken heart." Paris further noted: "They [the Jews] are notorious forgers and clippers of the coin." He also wrote: "The Jews had nearly all their money taken from them, and yet they are not pitied, because it is proved, and is manifest, that they are continually convicted of forging charters, seals, and coins."

required to wear a distinctive yellow badge in the shape of the tables of the law.¹²² The Statute ordered:

And that each Jew after he shall be seven years old, shall wear a badge in the form of two tables joined, of yellow felt, of the length of six inches, and the breadth of three inches.¹²³

Apart from his 1275 Statute, Edward I employed additional means to suppress Judaism in England. Both Edward and his mother, Eleanor of Provence, were bigots who viewed the Jews with aversion. In 1279, Edward ordered his government to look into allegations of Jewish blasphemy. Consequent to these inquiries, one Norwich Jew was drawn and burned for blasphemy against Christ. In 1280, Edward tried to convert the Jews to Christianity, since he thought they lived in ignorance and sin. He ordered all the sheriffs and baliffs in England to force Jews to attend sermons conducted by Dominican friars. Furthermore, the Jews who converted to Christianity under Edward I were allowed to keep one-half of the value of all their possessions. Edward's incentive, however, was unsuccessful. Many Jews rebelled against conversion, and attacked converted Jews.¹²⁴

The Church shared many of the anti-Semitic attitudes of Edward I. At the Council of the Province of Canterbury held at Oxford in 1222, the Jews were forbidden to build synagogues, employ Christian servants, or enter churches. In 1251, they were prohibited from eating meat on Fridays and during Lent. In 1286, Pope Honorius IV addressed a bull to the Archbishop of Canterbury and York concerning the Jews in England. He believed that the Jews dishonored God and the Christian faith. Honorius IV

¹²² Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 40; Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State," 174; Leonard, "The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I," 125, 128.

¹²³ Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 292.

¹²⁴ Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 274-276; Leonard, "The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I," 128; Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State," 176.

described the Talmud as “wicked and deceitful” and as including “abominations, falsehoods, heresies, and abuses.” The Church’s main concern was to limit social contact between the Christians and the Jews. The Fourth Lateran Council insisted that the Jews of England should live apart from the Christians and wear a distinguishing badge.¹²⁵ The measures taken by the Church exemplify the rising oppression the Jews encountered in their everyday lives.

The most outlandish allegations against the Jews during this period, however, was of their involvement in the ritual killing of Christian children. Throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Jews were frequently accused of crucifying Christian children and drinking their blood for their religious ceremonies. They were further accused of poisoning wells, desecrating the holy sacraments, and detesting anything that pertained to Christianity. The Jews were a constant source of blame for every mysterious death that occurred, especially when it involved children. They served as scapegoats whenever there was not evidence or answers to explain these deaths. As a result, countless Jews were imprisoned, tortured, and killed for purportedly committing crimes against Christianity.¹²⁶

The first known crucifixion charge against the Jews occurred in Norwich in 1144. The Jews were blamed for crucifying a 12-year-old skinner’s apprentice named William and consuming his blood for their Passover feast. Even though there was no evidence whatsoever to back up this claim, many Jews left Norwich, and those who remained were killed. From this event onwards, the Jews in England were persistently accused of

¹²⁵ Ovrut, “Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews,” 228; Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 66-68; Singer, “The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290,” 133; Leonard, “The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I,” 126.

¹²⁶ Stacey, “Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State,” 164.

ritually killing Christian children. In 1168, they were accused of murdering a child in Gloucester. In 1181, the Jews were charged with crucifying a six-month-old infant in the town of Bury St. Edmunds. The infant became a martyr, and was hence named St. Robert of Bury St. Edmunds. The supposed child victims of ritual murder were frequently considered martyrs, and were often buried in shrines in churches and religious houses.¹²⁷

Although the first known crucifixion charge against the Jews occurred in Norwich in 1144, there was an even older account of a child crucifixion in Bristol during the reign of Henry I (1100-1135). The case was called *The Passion of Adam of Bristol*, and it was written by an unknown author. The manuscript told a story of a seven-year-old Christian boy named Adam, who was lured into a Jewish family's home to be crucified. It was said that the family had crucified three other Christian boys in the previous year. The Jewish family enticed Adam into their home by offering him food and telling him that they were Christians. Once Adam was inside their home, the Jewish father, mother, and son bound and gagged the boy, cut off his nose and lips, and proceeded to nail him onto the cross.¹²⁸ The Jewish family was depicted as Christ haters, who described Christ as an "evildoer" and a "magician" and His mother Mary as a "base whore."¹²⁹ As soon as Adam found out that the father was Jewish, he exclaimed: "Woe, woe, I am dead, for he is a Jew."¹³⁰ Adam automatically knew he was going to die, since he was in the hands of

¹²⁷ Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State," 164, 168-169; Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 10-11.

¹²⁸ *The Passion of Adam of Bristol*, trans. Robert C. Stacey, British Library, Harleian MS, 957, no. 7 (2002), 1-2, 4-7.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, 6, 14.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, 6.

the Jews. Adam was then stabbed to death in the heart with a knife, and thus became a child martyr.¹³¹

In another case, a riot broke out in London in 1239 when a Jew was charged with murder. Many Jews were imprisoned or put to death, and a tax was placed on one-third of their property. In 1244, the body of a child was found in the churchyard of St. Benet's in London. It was alleged that the body had a Hebrew inscription cut into the child's skin. It was thought that the child was murdered by the Jews and used for ritual purposes. In 1279, a Jew was accused of crucifying a Christian boy in Northampton.¹³²

The most famous case of an alleged ritual child murder in England during the medieval period, however, was the death of "little" St. Hugh of Lincoln in 1255. In August 1255, a large number of Jews traveled from all over England to attend a wedding in Lincoln. A day after the wedding, a Christian boy named Hugh was found dead in a well. Hugh had been missing from his home for over three weeks. He probably accidentally fell into the well and died, but hate and fear blew this situation way out of proportion. A Jew named Copin was near the place where Hugh's body was found, and he was detained and tortured until he "admitted" that the boy was murdered by himself and his fellow Jews for ritual purposes. Since Henry III believed that the Jews had ritually murdered Hugh, he ordered Copin to be first dragged down the street tied to a horse's tail, and then hanged.¹³³ In addition to Copin, 19 Jews were executed, and around 100 more were imprisoned for the supposed murder of Hugh. After his death, little St. Hugh of Lincoln became a martyr, and was buried in a shrine in Lincoln Cathedral. Little Hugh's death became an instant sensation in the medieval world. He was mentioned in

¹³¹ Ibid, 14-15.

¹³² Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 55, 78.

¹³³ Prestwich, *Edward I*, 345; Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 56.

medieval songs, chronicles, and literature, including Geoffrey Chaucer's *The Canterbury Tales*. Even after the expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290, stories of ritual crucifixions continued to be common in religious and popular literature.¹³⁴

Throughout the thirteenth century, before the Jews were expelled from England altogether in 1290, they were expelled from so many English towns that there were few places left for them to live. Envy and prejudice may have been the causes. Local tensions could have erupted over their supposed wealth, their ties with the Crown, their alleged involvement in ritual killings, or for simply being Jewish. The towns, with the support of barons and the Church, took action in banishing them. For instance, in 1190, the Abbot of Bury St. Edmunds convinced Richard I (1189-1199) to expel the Jews from that town. In 1231, the Earl of Leicester, Simon de Montfort, issued a similar edict. In 1235, the residents of Newcastle-on-Tyne paid Henry III a hundred pounds to banish the Jews from their town, which he did. The hundred pounds was supposedly a gift to him. In 1234, 1235, 1236, 1242, 1244, and 1263, the Jews were banished from, respectively, Newcastle, Wycomb, Southampton, Beckhamsted, Newbury, and Derby.¹³⁵ Furthermore, Edward's mother, Eleanor of Provence, expelled the Jews from her dower towns. On January 12, 1275, Edward decreed: "No Jew shall dwell or stay in any towns which the queen mother [Eleanor of Provence] holds in dower."¹³⁶ In 1275, the Jews were expelled from Eleanor's dower towns of Marlborough, Gloucester, Worcester, and Cambridge. In

¹³⁴ Stacey, "Anti-Semitism in the Medieval State," 170, 174.

¹³⁵ Singer, "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290," 129; Abrahams, *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*, 20; Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 58; Leonard, "The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I," 133.

¹³⁶ Mundill, "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry," 57.

May 1278, Edward banished the Jews from his duchy in Gascony, France, an act that foreshadowed what was to come in England in 1290.¹³⁷

Twelve years after Edward's banishment of the Jews from his duchy of Gascony, he repeated the deed, but for the entire realm of England. Many factors led to his decision, economic, political, and religious. As the thirteenth century had progressed, the Jews had become increasingly impoverished due to financial exploitation, and encountered growing religious prejudice, and were expelled from numerous English towns and cities. Other factors included: failing to obey the 1275 Statute of Judaism by continuing to lend money at interest; their growing impoverishment making them less useful financially to the Crown; and the fact that Parliament would only approve Edward's tax venture, the single largest one of the Middle Ages, if he agreed to expel the Jews from England.¹³⁸

As a result, on July 18, 1290, Edward ordered the Jews to leave England before the first of November or else face the penalty of death. The Jewish population at the time of their expulsion was around 2,000. The general English population reacted to the news with delight. Edward seized the Jews' property, including their houses, and sold it to benefit himself and his friends. He did not make a large financial profit off their expulsion, however: only 1,835 pounds from the sale of the property. After the expulsion, many Jews went to France, and others went to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Spain, and Germany. The only Jews who stayed in England were the few who converted to

¹³⁷ Mundill, "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry," 57; Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 284.

¹³⁸ Stacey, "Anti-Semitism and Medieval State," 177.

Christianity and those who remained illegally. The Jews would not reappear in England until 1656, under the rule of Oliver Cromwell.¹³⁹

England was the first, but not the last country during the medieval period to expel the Jews. France, Spain, and Sicily would later follow suit. The expulsion of the Jews from England was not based solely on financial considerations, but on several deciding factors. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Jews confronted rising religious prejudice and resentment in England. They were accused of ritually murdering Christian children, coin-clipping, and committing blasphemous acts against Christianity. They were further oppressed by living apart from the Christians, by having to wear a yellow badge, by the forced limiting or discontinuation of their moneylending practices, and by paying steep taxes. Their only role in England was to serve the Crown's interests. Once the Jews were of no use to the Crown, they were quickly discarded. Thus, as a minority group, the Jews were the unwanted ones who were greatly exploited, despised, and feared by those of the majority.

¹³⁹ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 85; Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 26, 255, 259; Prestwich, *Edward I*, 346.

Works Cited

- Abrahams, B. L. *The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290*. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., 1895.
- Leonard, George Hare. "The Expulsion of the Jews by Edward I: An Essay in Explanation of the Exodus, A. D. 1290." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 5, (1891): 103-146.
- Mundill, Robin R. *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- "Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry." In *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives*, edited by Patricia Skinner, 55-70. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2003.
- Ovruv, Barnett D. "Edward I and the Expulsion of the Jews." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 67, no. 4 (April, 1977): 224-235.
- "Parliamentary Negotiation and the Expulsion of the Jews from England." In *Thirteenth Century England VI*, edited by R. H. Britnell, R. Frame, and M. Prestwich, 77-101. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 1997.
- The Passion of Adam of Bristol*. Translated by Robert C. Stacey. British Library, Harleian MS. 957, no. 7, (2002): 1-36.
- Prestwich, Michael. *Edward I*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Roth, Cecil. *A History of the Jews in England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Singer, Sholom A. "The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, (1965): 117-136.
- Stacey, Robert C. "Anti-Semitism and the Medieval State." In *The Medieval English State : Essays Presented to James Campbell*, edited by J. R. Maddicott and D. M. Palliser, 163-177. London: Hambledon Press, 2000.

The Lord's Resistance Army's Real Soldiers: Child soldiers in Uganda

By Lauren Sordellini

“One boy tried to escape, but he was caught. They made him eat a mouthful of red pepper, and five people were beating him. His hands were tied, and they made us, the other new captives, kill him with a stick. I felt sick. I knew this boy from before. We were from the same village. I refused to kill him and they told me they would shoot me, they pointed a gun at me, so I had to do it. The boy was asking me ‘Why are you doing this?’ I said that I had no choice.”¹⁴⁰

Since the emergence of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), under Joseph Kony, the Acholi people have experienced a period of violence and destruction, and some have dared to declare a possible genocide. Members of the LRA ruthlessly invade the Acholi people's villages, raping their women and young girls, and forcing young children into their army. One issue in need of great attention is that of the “invisible children” or child soldiers of Uganda. But who are these children? The Cape Town Principles have classified a child as any person under the age of 18 years.¹⁴¹ The invisible children are children who are being abducted from their villages and forced to join the LRA, where they act as sex slaves and soldiers brainwashed to spread destruction in their own hometowns. In 2004, the average age of these children was approximately 12 years.¹⁴²

¹⁴⁰ Gray, James. “The End of Innocence: Child soldiers in Africa and International assistance (2002), <http://www.dev-zone.net/downloads/devnetabstract368.pdf>. (Accessed March 05, 2008)

¹⁴¹ Gray.

¹⁴² Talwar, Namrita. “Fostering Terror: Child soldier crisis in Uganda” (2004), 1-2, <http://www.proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did-76152031&sid=6&Fmt=4&clientId=32258&ROQ=309&VName=PQD>. (Accessed March 12, 2008)

They are forced to “serve as weapons of terror against their own parents.”¹⁴³ These children are desensitized and demoralized, forced to torture their friends, family, or fellow captives. Many of the invisible children, if able to escape, are rejected by their own village when they return because of the acts they were forced to perform while under the control of the LRA. Many children in Uganda are orphans, or homeless, or are running from the rebels, thus causing them to be invisible to society; nobody knows if they are alive or dead, nobody knows who they are or that they even exist. Child abduction in Uganda has resulted in a repeating theme of vulnerability; children are extremely vulnerable in several different ways living in Uganda, and the LRA exploits this to its advantage. But who are the LRA, what are they fighting for, and why do they abduct children?

The Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) received its name from Joseph Kony in the 1990’s, but it developed long before then. In order to fully understand the reasoning behind child abduction, we must examine where this resistance originated and the purpose of the creation of the LRA. Before the start of World War Two, Britain began to recruit soldiers in Uganda into their newly created military force, the Kings African Rifles.¹⁴⁴ Southern Uganda had a more educated population and a higher economic status, while Northern Uganda had a less educated population consisting of mainly Acholi people; therefore, Britain targeted more of the Northerners for the newly founded

¹⁴³ ICG (International crisis group), “Northern Uganda: Understanding and Solving the Conflict.” (2004): intro. Page, 2-6

¹⁴⁴ ICG (International Crisis Group), “Northern Uganda: Understanding and Solving the Conflict.” (2004): intro. Page, 2-6

army.¹⁴⁵ This recruitment created a socio-economic division between the North and South, which helped promote the ethnic violence that still occurs today.

On October 9, 1962¹⁴⁶, Uganda received its independence, and Milton Obote became the first president. During his presidency, his Acholi soldiers “were implicated in many of the governments’ questionable activities.”¹⁴⁷ Obote’s soldiers had belonged to Britain’s colonial army, and were now forced to serve under his rule. During the 1970’s his colleague, Idi Amin, overthrew Obote, and began to slaughter many of the Acholi soldiers still loyal to Obote.¹⁴⁸ In 1979, Obote returned to power, and many of his soldiers were killed during the civil war with Yoweri Museveni’s Resistance Army.¹⁴⁹ This Resistance Army challenged the government of Obote, slaughtered the Acholi people, and was mainly supported by the people of Southern and Western Uganda.¹⁵⁰ “Yoweri Museveni’s guerilla National Resistance Army (dominated by Southerners and Westerners) sought to topple Obote by force.”¹⁵¹ In June of 1985, Milton Obote was removed from power a second time by his fellow Acholi military officer, Tito Okello.¹⁵² Okello attempted peace talks with Museveni’s Resistance Army; and, though he was successful in having the Resistance Army sign the Nairobi peace treaties, the fighting resumed only two weeks later.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁵ ICG

¹⁴⁶ ICG

¹⁴⁷ Human Rights Watch/ African Human Rights Children’s Rights Project, “The Scars of Death: Children Abducted by the Lord’s Resistance Army in Uganda.” 1-56432-221-1 (1997)

¹⁴⁸ Human Rights Watch

¹⁴⁹ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁰ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵¹ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵² ICG

¹⁵³ Human Rights Watch

On January 26, 1986, Museveni and his National Resistance Army took Kampala, the capital of Uganda, and assumed the presidency, which he still holds today.¹⁵⁴ Because Museveni's Resistance Army challenged Obote's government and his Acholi army, many Acholi soldiers were forced to withdraw to the north once he became president. By August of 1978, "Acholi ex-soldiers in Sudan had joined up with other opponents of the Museveni administration, and formed a rebel alliance".¹⁵⁵ This rebel alliance was named the UPDA (Uganda People's Defense Alliance).¹⁵⁶ In the mean time, the Acholi people were being wiped out by Museveni's army, their land was being destroyed and the people were being ruthlessly massacred. The emergence of one influential person would, however, become one of the main turning points during the conflict in Uganda.

Alice Lakwena "claimed to be possessed by the Holy Spirit," and was able to gather large numbers of Acholi supporters with "promises to defeat Museveni's government and purge the Acholi people of witches and sinners".¹⁵⁷ Alice promised to cleanse the Acholi of evil spirits and witchcraft, which would afterwards lead to peace and prosperity among the people.¹⁵⁸ The soldiers were to undergo initiation rites where they burned their clothes and magic charms; they then swore on the Bible that they would not practice witchcraft.¹⁵⁹ Afterwards, they were covered in Shea oil, which made them holy and was believed to protect them against bullets. Alice's army also supported abductions, believing them to be for the benefit of the abductees.¹⁶⁰ It can be argued that it was here that the trend of abduction began; Alice made it seem ethical to abduct people

¹⁵⁴ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁵ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁶ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁷ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁸ Human Rights Watch

¹⁵⁹ Human Rights Watch

¹⁶⁰ Human Rights Watch

into the army for their own salvation. Even though Alice's Holy Spirit Movement started as a major threat to the military, her soldiers were no match for Museveni's modern army, and Alice, in 1987, fled to Kenya abandoning her resistance army.¹⁶¹

After Lakwena's army was defeated, Joseph Kony took control of the Holy Spirit mobile forces remaining in the bush. Kony claimed to be a relative of Lakwena, and to have obtained some of her spiritual powers; his tiny resistance army began to call itself the Lord's Resistance Army.¹⁶² In 1991, the LRA began a major shift in its tactics, and the soldiers began to target Acholi civilians, including schools and clinics, and abductions of children became very popular. Originally, the objective of the Resistance Army was to overthrow the government and protect the Acholi people; but under Joseph Kony, their objectives became fogged, making the real reason for their existence unclear. "Sudanese government aid has turned the Lord's Resistance Army into more of a threat than ever, since the rebels are now armed with land mines and machine guns in place of rifles and machetes".¹⁶³ The LRA remains a force today because they help aid the conflict in Sudan and in return receive aid.

According to "Northern Uganda: Understanding and solving the conflict" by, The International Crisis Group, the LRA does not have a real political objective. Its main focus is to destroy the government set up by President Museveni. Today the people in Uganda are fearful of the destruction the Resistance Army has ruthlessly inflicted on many Acholis, even though this it was originally created to protect the Acholi people. If the people of Uganda are fearful of the rebel army, who is it then that makes up its ranks? How is it that they are still able to recruit members, if everybody is frightened of them?

¹⁶¹ Human Rights Watch

¹⁶² Human Rights Watch

¹⁶³ Human Rights Watch

Since 1991, the LRA has been abducting children in Uganda, and forcibly recruiting them into their rebel armies, molding them to become ruthless, brainwashed killers. Children are ripped away from their homes, brutally beaten, and forced to become sex slaves for the benefit of the rebel army. What is hard to understand is why a rebel army would want to recruit children, and what value children have for an army when they can recruit adults instead.

“As African countries gradually gained their independence from colonial powers, conflicts began to arise, most often internally, within countries themselves. As warfare developed and evolved, the use of children rose, and there are few signs that this trend is slowing.”¹⁶⁴ Many researchers and other people who are analyzing the crisis in Uganda have trouble understanding the culture in Africa in relation to child soldiers. Has it been a cultural norm or custom in Africa for children to become soldiers? This question is a first thought for many researchers who are trying to explain why the LRA abducts thousands of children. Looking deeper into the history of Africa, abducting children does not appear to be a cultural custom; in fact, “military definitions in Africa never permitted or encouraged the recruitment of children into the armed forces.”¹⁶⁵ The practice of abducting children started during the post-colonial era, when there was a high level of African internal conflict.¹⁶⁶ So if it were not in Uganda’s cultural past to have child soldiers, why would the LRA turn to children? The answer is that the LRA abducts children in Uganda because; the children in this area are all extremely vulnerable. The

¹⁶⁴ Kosmack, Margaret. “Letting Children be children: The Problem of Child Soldiers in Africa.” (2007): 2,3,9-11

¹⁶⁵ Kosmack.

¹⁶⁶ Kosmack.

children, being young, orphaned, uneducated, and poor, with no one to advocate for them, are extremely vulnerable to control by the military.

Uganda is a very poverty stricken country; leaving many children to feel they have no other choice but to join the Resistance Army in order to survive. Children may join the rebel army so they can support or help their families.¹⁶⁷ They may also be influenced by the resources that the LRA offers to its soldiers. “Clothing, food, and shelter can serve to entice a child to join a rebel army.”¹⁶⁸ Poverty in Uganda has led children to become very vulnerable to the Lord’s Resistance Army; where else would they turn to find shelter, clothing, or proper food? “Demographics of African societies are changing radically, and children are becoming an enormous majority of the population.”¹⁶⁹ Since there is an overwhelming population of children in Africa, it becomes much easier for the LRA to obtain children than adults. There are few or no adults to help protect these children from the harm caused by the LRA. “Women and very young children tend to migrate out of areas affected by fighting, leaving behind their older children.”¹⁷⁰ This abandonment of older children leaves them fully exposed to the Resistance Army, allowing it to become that much easier to take children. To a military with little financial means, children represent a more cost effective army. Adults are more expensive to have in an army than children are; children do not eat as much or wear as much as an adult does, they also do not demand pay. Children also do not have the responsibilities of adults; for example, adult males have to worry about coming back home to their wife and family, while a young child would not have that worry or

¹⁶⁷ Kosmack.

¹⁶⁸ Gates.

¹⁶⁹ Kosmack.

¹⁷⁰ Gates.

responsibility. Children are physically and mentally weaker than an adult, making it easier for the LRA to abduct them, knowing that they will not fight back as strongly as an adult male would. Because children are mentally weaker than adults they will refrain from questioning their authority figures, allowing the Resistance Army to easily mold and twist their sense of morality.¹⁷¹ Children are “frequently less terrified of death than older people,” making them, again, a more appealing target for the Resistance Army.¹⁷² This largely physical vulnerability of children has been a huge attraction for the LRA, and is one of the main reasons child abduction is practiced by the rebel army in Uganda.

“The widespread availability of small arms, and the ease with which they are used, has contributed greatly to an increase in child soldiering.”¹⁷³ With new technology, guns are lighter and easier to use, enabling more children to properly hold and understand how to use them. Politically, the children living in Uganda are left helpless because of the lack of law enforcement and protection set up for the children and people. Without proper law enforcement, who will protect the children without families or homes? The LRA is able to freely abduct children without major or effective resistance. With the economic, physical, and mental advantages the LRA has, the children are left exposed to abduction. These children, in every sense, are vulnerable to the Lord’s Resistance Army; they are demographically, socially, economically, physically, mentally, and politically exposed, making them easy targets for the military. This is the leading reason behind child abduction.

In conclusion, the Lord’s Resistance Army, under the rule of Joseph Kony, was developed as a result of Britain’s attempt to create an army during the colonial period,

¹⁷¹ Gray.

¹⁷² Gray.

¹⁷³ Gray.

which widened the socio-economic gap between Northern and Southern Uganda. This Resistance Army, when it first emerged, had the clear and concise intention of getting rid of Museveni's government; but today the intentions of the LRA are blurred. What once seemed to be a force set up to protect the Acholi people is now an army that massacres its own people and exploits its own children without purpose. Ugandan children live in a society that ultimately makes them extremely vulnerable to the LRA, allowing them to be easily obtained targets. They are physically and mentally vulnerable targets for the Resistance Army as well. The children, overall, live in a country that is susceptible to conflict; because Uganda is such a poor and war torn country, it is easy for resistance armies to dominate and destroy the people. Peace negotiations have been occurring throughout the years with high hopes of ending this ethnic destruction in Uganda, but the end of the road for the LRA doesn't seem to be approaching soon enough for the Acholi people and their children.

Works Cited

Gates, Scott. "Recruiting Child Soldiers." *Center for the study of Civil War (CSCW), International Peace research institute, Oslo (PRIO) and Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU)* (2004): 1-5, 14.

Gray, James. "The End of Innocence: Child Soldiers in Africa and International Assistance (2002), <http://www.dev-zone.net/downloads/devnetabstract368.pdf>. (Accessed March 05, 2008).

Humans Rights Watch/ Africa Human Rights Watch Children's Rights Project, "The Scars of Death: Children Abducted by the Lord's Resistance Army in Uganda." 1-56432-221-1 (1997):

ICG (International Crisis Group), "Northern Uganda: Understanding and Solving the Conflict." (2004): intro. Page, 2-6,

Kosmack, Margaret. "Letting children be children: The Problem of Child Soldiers in Africa." (2007): 2, 3, 9-11,

Talwar, Namrita. "Fostering Terror: Child Soldier crisis in Uganda02517329 (2004), 1-2, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did-76152031&sid=6&Fmt=4&clientId=32258&RQT=309&VName=PQD>. (Accessed March 12, 2008).