

Brigham
Young
University

STUDIES

AUTUMN 1962

Brigham Young's Ideal Society: The
Kingdom of God

J. Keith Melville

Crabbe, "Clutterbuck and Co."

Marion B. Brady

The Real Thing in James's "The Real
Thing"

Kenneth Bernard

Proper Names in Plays, by Chance or
Design?

M. C. Golightly

Mormon Bibliography 1962

Allied Strategy in World War II: The
Churchill Era, 1942-1943

De Lamar Jensen

**Brigham
Young
University**

STUDIES

Volume V

Number 1

CONTENTS

Brigham Young's Ideal Society: The Kingdom of God	<i>J. Keith Melville</i>	3
Crabbe, "Clutterbuck and Co."	<i>Marion B. Brady</i>	19
The Real Thing in James's "The Real Thing"	<i>Kenneth Bernard</i>	31
Proper Names in Plays, by Chance or Design?	<i>M. C. Golightly</i>	33
Mormon Bibliography 1962		45
Allied Strategy in World War II: The Churchill Era, 1942-1943	<i>De Lamar Jensen</i>	49

University Editor

Ernest L. Olson

Managing Editor

Clinton F. Larson

Associate Managing Editor

Dean B. Farnsworth

Editorial Board for 1962-1963: J. Roman Andrus, Jay V. Beck, Lars G. Crandall, Dean B. Farnsworth, Crawford Gates, Bertrand F. Harrison, Charles J. Hart, Clinton F. Larson, Melvin B. Mabey, Keith R. Oakes, Ernest L. Olson, Blaine R. Porter, Robert K. Thomas, Arthur R. Watkins, Dale H. West.

The purpose of *Brigham Young University Studies* is to be a voice for the community of L.D.S. scholars.

Brigham Young University Studies is published by Brigham Young University. Send manuscripts to Editor, *Brigham Young University Studies*, Box 12, McKay Building, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Enclose self-addressed, stamped envelope. Subscriptions, \$2.00 for four numbers; single copies, \$.50 each. Please send subscriptions to Office of University Publications, C-341 ASB, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah..

Printed by Brigham Young University Press

Vol. 60	Provo, Utah	May 25, 1963	No. 15
---------	-------------	--------------	--------

Brigham Young University Bulletin. Re-entered January 25, 1962, at Provo, Utah, as second-class matter under act of Congress of July 16, 1904. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1703, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 30, 1918. Published five times during May and September; three times during February, March, April, and August; and twice during January, June, November, and December.

Brigham Young's Ideal Society: The Kingdom of God

J. KEITH MELVILLE

Sir Thomas More published his *Utopia* in 1516. It is one of a series of imaginative portrayals, beginning with Plato's *Republic*, suggesting the desirability of, and man's hope for, an ideal society. More did not intend his *Utopia* to exist in the real world as a republic;¹ he meant simply to present a satire on the perversities of government and society.² Now the term *utopia* describes a vast literature searching for a society in which "justice" might become a reality in the interactions of man.

Cicero and Rousseau idealized the state of nature; Medieval Christians, beginning with St. Augustine, anticipated a divine Utopia in the future variously called the City of God, the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven; Marx, though critical of the Utopian Socialists, concocted an atheistic Utopia in his "scientific" socialism. Regardless of the approach, the goal of these schemes had similar idealistic features.

Nineteenth-century America was receptive to the utopian ideas of Europe. The New England conscience, with its Calvinistic, egoistic character, was gradually transformed following the Napoleonic Wars into a tender social conscience with sweeping programs of reform.³ From abolitionist to transcendentalist, varied voices of social conscience contributed to the store of utopian concepts in America.

The New World became the laboratory in which the social dreams of the Old World were applied in numerous communi-

Dr. Melville is associate professor of political science at Brigham Young University.

¹It is questionable if Plato intended his *Republic* to be a Utopia, even though McIlwain contends that "his was but an ideal 'laid up in Heaven.' " *The Growth of Political Thought in the West* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932), p. 39.

²George Catlin, *The Story of the Political Philosophers* (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1939), p. 543.

³See Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1930), II, 339 ff.

tarian experiments.⁴ Religious, philanthropic, and Utopian Socialist promotions are evident in the Shaker villages, the Owenite communities, and the Fourierist phalanxes. New Harmony and Brook Farm, two of the more popular experiments, bracketed chronologically the birth of Mormonism. At home in this reformist milieu, Mormonism sketched its own schemes of an ideal society.

Mormon social reform programs, as progressive and daring as they appear at first glance, were tempered with moderation. The Latter-day Saints joined neither the radical abolitionist nor the pro-slavery groups. When Joseph Smith advocated the abolition of slavery in his presidential campaign of 1844, it was to be accomplished by compensating the owners equitably for their slaves. The controversial marriage relationship of polygamy, which was officially sanctioned by the Church before the Manifesto of 1890, provoked a barrage of invectives. Yet the principle and practice of this marital system was morally puritanical and did not embrace the radicalism of free love or "spiritual wifeism" which some other groups espoused during the same era. Most radical of the social programs was Smith's plan for prison reform which he outlined in the 1844 presidential platform. Predicated on the Christian concept of forgiveness, the essence of his proposal was rehabilitation, instead of punishment. Even though more generally accepted today, it was too idealistic for his age and was generally laughed at by those who took notice.

The economic facet of Mormonism was designed to utilize the collective economic potential for the benefit of the entire society. But the Law of Consecration and Stewardship, as the first Church-sponsored economic system was called, promoted the group well-being by emphasizing the individual responsibility of stewardship, which was considerably more moderate than some of the Christian communistic or secular communitarian programs.

The religious or theological face of Mormonism was not reformist; it was restorative. Principles of an eternal gospel could not be new, nor could corrupted concepts be returned to their pristine purity by reformation, but truth could be re-

⁴See Arthur Eugene Bestor, Jr., *Backwoods Utopias* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950).

established on earth by revelation. This was the religious claim of Mormonism!

Very provocative were the political propositions which at first glance appear revolutionary.⁵ The economic and social aspects of Mormonism were communitarian; the religious and political principles were to be universal. The Kingdom of God in its broadest connotation was expected eventually to embrace the world as a world kingdom, wearing the vestments of a sovereign state.⁶

Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar had Church-wide acceptance as prophecy concerning the Kingdom of God which would fill the whole earth and be a "kingdom, which shall never be destroyed. . . but it shall break to pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."⁷ The second and seventh chapters of Daniel were coupled by Parley P. Pratt with the Revelation of John as the text of a letter to Queen Victoria of England. "Know assuredly," he wrote, "that the world in which we live is on the eve of a REVOLUTION. . . both religiously and politically—temporally and spiritually; one on which the fate of all nations is suspended, and upon which the future destiny of all the affairs of earth is made to depend."⁸ He warned the "Sovereign and people" of England to repent and turn to the Lord. As the elements of clay and iron will not mix, neither will there be unity of the independent kingdoms of the world. He

⁵Klaus Hansen, "The Political Kingdom of God as a Cause for Mormon-Gentile Conflict," *B.Y.U. Studies*, II, 241-260, suggests this position. See also James R. Clark, "The Kingdom of God, the Council of Fifty and the State of Deseret," *Utah Historical Quarterly*, XXVI (1958), 130-148, which assesses generally the influence of the Council of Fifty and the concept of the Kingdom in social, educational, and political developments in the pre-statehood period of Utah.

⁶It should be noted that the concept, "Kingdom of God," carried several meanings. According to a statement of Joseph Smith, it was as restricted as a righteous man "who has power and authority from God to administer in the ordinances of the gospel and officiate in the priesthood of God, there is the kingdom of God. . . ." Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Period I, ed. B. H. Roberts (2nd ed.; 6 vols.; Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1946, ff.), V, 286. (This history and a seventh volume covering the Apostolic Interregnum are commonly known as the *Documentary History of the Church*, and hereafter will be cited as DHC.) Of course the most general usage of "Kingdom" was loosely applied to the Church in a variety of its operations. But prior to the death of Joseph Smith, the political implications of the Kingdom of God were clearly understood by the leadership of the Church, if not so clearly so by the rank and file.

⁷Daniel, 2:44.

⁸Parley P. Pratt, *To Her Gracious Majesty, Queen Victoria* (Manchester: P. P. Pratt, 1841), p. 1. See also *Times and Seasons*, III, 592.

concluded: "The kingdoms of *this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and his Christ.*"⁹

Verbs which bespeak violence were used freely to indicate the triumphant establishment of the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless the Mormon Church leaders wanted it clearly understood that the Kingdom would be established by the word and not the sword. "We would here remark," editorialized Erastus Snow and Benjamin Winchester in the *Gospel Reflector*, "that it is not our intention to be understood that this destruction is to be accomplished by physical force of the people of God, but by the preaching of the gospel, and the judgments and power of God."¹⁰ Joseph Smith drew a contrast between the kingdoms of the world and the Kingdom of God when he stated that each of the great states of the past "was raised to dignity amidst the clash of arms and the din of war. . . . The designs of God, on the other hand, have been to promote the universal good of the universal world; to establish peace and good will among men; to promote the principles of eternal truth; . . . to make the nations of the earth dwell in peace, and to bring about the millennial glory."¹¹

But this did not mean that the Saints had to sit idly by awaiting the second advent of the Messiah to establish the Kingdom. Joseph Smith organized a "special council" on March 11, 1844, which was usually called the General Council or the Council of Fifty.¹² Diary sources adequately support the political significance of this council as the potential legislature of the Kingdom of God. As the Kingdom rolls forth to fill the whole earth the necessary temporal organization should be in readiness for the King, Jesus Christ. When He comes with the Kingdom of Heaven and the two kingdoms are joined, plenary power would be exercised and the Kingdom of God would assume sovereignty over all the kingdoms of the world.¹³

The political significance of the organization of the Council of Fifty was interestingly suggested in a letter dated May 3, 1844, from Brigham Young to Reuben Hedlock, who was president of the European Mission at the time: "The Kingdom

⁹*Ibid.* Italics in original.

¹⁰Reprinted in the *Times and Seasons*, III, 612.

¹¹*Ibid.*, III, 855.

¹²DHC, VI, 260, 61.

¹³See *The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1947), Section 65.

is organized; and, although as yet no bigger than a grain of mustard seed, the little plant is in a flourishing condition, and our prospects brighter than ever."¹⁴ Brigham Young discoursed on these initial developments throughout his leadership of the church. In 1874, at Lehi, he told the congregation that a full and complete organization of the Kingdom of God had been given by Joseph the spring before he was killed. "I shall not tell you the names of the members of this kingdom," he said, "neither shall I read to you its constitution, but the constitution was given by revelation."¹⁵ Earlier he told the Saints that "Joseph Smith had laid the foundation of the Kingdom of God in the last days; others will rear the superstructure."¹⁶ It was to Brigham Young, first as president of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles and then as president of the Church, that the primary responsibilities of "rearing the superstructure" fell.

"TO ALL THE KINGS OF THE WORLD, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: TO THE GOVERNORS OF THE SEVERAL STATES, AND TO THE RULERS AND PEOPLE OF ALL NATIONS," began the momentous "Proclamation" of the Twelve Apostles of the Church on April 6, 1845—at a time when disintegration of this religious organization seemed highly probable. This pamphlet boldly claimed that "the kingdom of God has come, as has been predicted by ancient prophets, and prayed for in all ages; even that kingdom which shall fill the whole earth, and shall stand forever."¹⁷

The Proclamation earnestly announced that God had once again established the High Priesthood or Apostleship which "holds the keys of the kingdom of God, with power . . . to administer in all things pertaining to the ordinances, organization, government, and direction of the kingdom of God." It further claimed that Christ's "coming is near at hand; and not

¹⁴*Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star*, XXIII, 422. This letter was sent shortly after the Council of Fifty was organized. The reference "the Kingdom is organized" is pregnant with political, not religious, meaning.

¹⁵Brigham Young, *et al.*, *Journal of Discourses* (26 vols.; Liverpool: F. D. Richards, *et al.*, 1854-1884), XVII (August 9, 1874), 157. Hereafter cited JD. Date in parentheses indicates the date when the discourse was delivered.

¹⁶JD, IX (August 31, 1882), 364.

¹⁷*Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints* (Liverpool: Wilford Woodruff, 1845), p. 1.

many years hence, the nations and their kings shall see him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."¹⁸

Even though it was announced that the Kingdom of God had come, the apostles recognized that it was at that moment only an embryonic kingdom. The people were commanded to repent and become members and citizens of the Kingdom, devoting their spiritual and temporal resources to its development. Warning the people of the world that a position of neutrality could not be taken, for the people would be either for or against the Kingdom, the Proclamation invited them to aid in "the greatest of all revolutions."¹⁹

Two centers of empire would be developed during the period of preparation before the advent of Christ at the beginning of the millennial period: one at Jerusalem and one at Zion in the Americas. It was predicted that the nations would oppose the rise of Jerusalem, armies would go against her, and she would be defended by the Lord Himself; a Jewish victory would result. "Jerusalem then becomes the seat of empire, and the great centre and capital of the old world."²⁰

Zion at the same time would be undergoing the predicted transformation into the "seat of government for the whole continent of North and South America. . . ." ²¹ Utopian hopes of brotherhood, freedom, unity and peace were predicted by the proclamation when the Lord would be the King and Sovereign over both seats of government, and "wars shall cease and peace prevail for a thousand years."²²

This significant tract was printed with the intent of achieving world-wide circulation. The highest officials, commanding respected positions in all walks of life, were not to be avoided in the distribution of the announcement, even though the Church was harrassed by outside pressures of hatred and mob violence and serious internal dissension. In the minds of the non-Mormons this bold announcement must have appeared, to many, as a piece of political lunacy. To the Mormons, however, the Proclamation was an inspiring force. Persecutions by mobs, the hardships of the exodus to the west, privations in a desert wilderness, and even the prospect of

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 7.

²¹*Ibid.*, p. 9.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 10.

death lost their sting in the anticipation of the Kingdom of God.

The Kingdom of God as an ideal to be attained in the future was fully used by Brigham Young. He asserted that it required work to usher in the Kingdom in its fulness. Individual righteousness, social unity and brotherhood, and most importantly in the barren western country, economic industry constituted "building the Kingdom." After the initial problems of survival in the Great Basin had been surmounted, the development of a self-sufficient community was demanded, cooperative merchandising was subsequently added, and finally a communitarian life was held to be necessary before the Kingdom of God could be realized. More than spiritual unity was expected. The Saints were constantly exhorted to identify themselves totally with the "Church and Kingdom." All individual activities were to be socially valuable; self-aggrandizement was to be sacrificed.

What was the origin and nature of the Kingdom of God in the mind of Brigham Young which carried with it such impelling force for himself and his people? Actually many of his statements about the Kingdom were obscure and incomplete, as he did not intend to develop a systematic political philosophy. "Build up the Kingdom" was a frequent exhortation lacking further explication. In the most common usage the term applied to the Church. The Mormon leader admitted this, but criticized this characterization of the Kingdom of God and demanded of himself, at times, more explicit definitions. The Church, however, could not be left out of the Kingdom, as it was an integral part of the all-encompassing society.

But President Young was impatient with the common beliefs of Christendom concerning the Kingdom. He said: "You know the old theory is that the kingdom of God, and all pertaining to it, is spiritual and not temporal; that is the traditional notion of our brother Christians."²³ In a matter-of-fact manner he continued: "It is nonsense to talk about building up any kingdom except by labor; it requires the labor of every part of our organization, whether it be mental, physical, or spiritual, and that is the only way to build up the kingdom of

²³JD, III (October 8, 1955), 122.

God.”²⁴ Reinterpreting the saying of Christ, “My kingdom is not of this world,” Brigham Young explained that this did not necessarily mean a spiritual kingdom; but rather the kingdoms of the world are born in war and carnage, exist on fraud and corruption, are filled with wickedness—Christ’s kingdom is to be just the opposite. Had the Jews accepted Christ as their king, thought Brigham Young, Christianity would have been more than a code of morals; the belief that “the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of God and his Christ” would have become a reality.²⁵

With the conviction that Christ was unable to establish the Kingdom of God in its fulness, because of His rejection by the Jews, Brigham Young considered it his responsibility as the President of the Church to urge, exhort, and lead the Saints in those activities which would bring about the Kingdom in its omnipotence. In addition, the proselyting activities of the Mormon missionaries were to gather the honest and upright people from all parts of the world to gather at Zion, except for the Jews who were to return to Jerusalem, and at some future date the Church would undergo a metamorphosis and a world-state emerge. It is obvious that the Church was expected to be the nucleus of the Kingdom, as Young said: “The kingdom of God will grow out of this Church. . . .”²⁶ But he wanted it clearly understood that there was a significant distinction between the Church and the Kingdom as suggested in the following:

As was observed by Brother Pratt, that Kingdom is actually organized, and the inhabitants of the earth do not know it. All right; it is organized preparatory to taking effect in the due time of the Lord, and in the manner that shall please him. As observed by one of the speakers this morning, that Kingdom grows out of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, but it is not the Church, for a man may be a legislator in that body which will issue laws to sustain the inhabitants of the earth in their individual rights, and still not belong to the Church of Jesus Christ at all.²⁷

Young also distinguished between the Kingdom of God and all other kingdoms on the basis of their origin and nature.

²⁴*Ibid.*

²⁵JD, IX (July 13, 1962), 310.

²⁶JD., V (October 7, 1857), 330.

²⁷JD., II (July 8, 1855), 310. See also XVII (August 9, 1874), 156.

The Kingdom would be established with divine sanction and not emphasize coercion and violence as basic aspects of its nature. The political entities of man conversely come to power by war and force as developed in the following:

When [Christ] was arraigned before Pilate to be tried for his life, he said to Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my kingdom not from hence." Connect this saying with "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God," and we can understand how the kingdom of Christ is not of this world, because it is established in peace, unlike all worldly kingdoms which are established in war. The motto of his kingdom is "Peace on earth and good will towards men," and hence not after the order of worldly kingdoms.²⁸

It is true that expressions which suggest violence and conquest were used freely in Young's discourses about the establishment of the Kingdom of God, such as, "God will revolutionize the earth," "The wicked will be destroyed," "Nations will be broken to pieces," "All will be brought into subjection," "We shall gain the victory," and "Our warfare very soon will come to a close." He indeed believed there would be war and carnage during the growth and development of the Kingdom, but Christ and the Saints would not initiate it. "The sinner will slay the sinner, the wicked will fall upon the wicked, until there is an utter overthrow and consumption upon the face of the whole earth, until God reigns, whose right it is."²⁹ Christ and the Jews would defensively take up the sword at Jerusalem, but the world-wide revolution would be brought about by conversion, not conquest:

The kingdom of God in the latter days must triumph upon the earth, subdue every species of sin, and destroy every source of sorrow to which down-trodden humanity has been subject. The work of making the kingdoms of the world the kingdom of God and his Christ has commenced. . . .

The world will be revolutionized by the preach[ing] of the Gospel and the power of the Priesthood, and this work we are called to do. In its progress every foolish and unprofitable custom, every unjust and oppressive law, and whatever else that is oppressive to man, and that would impede his

²⁸JD., IX (July 13, 1862), 309, 310.

²⁹JD., II (February 18, 1855), 190.

onward progress to the perfection of the Holy Ones in eternity, will be removed until ever lasting righteousness prevails over the whole earth.³⁰

Brigham Young was conscious that the Kingdom of God must include a sovereign, subjects, territory, government and laws.³¹ Acknowledging the possibility of different types of government, he said: "Kingdoms are organized to suit the conditions of the people, whether the government is that of the people, in the hands of a few individuals, or centered in one."³² The Kingdom of God, however, would be the ideal government for all of the people who would be on earth at the time of Christ's millennial appearance: "It is a perfect system of government—a kingdom of Gods and angels and all beings who will submit themselves to that government in heaven or upon the earth."³³

The Kingdom, thought President Young, would be similar to the United States in organization and operation. He said that "few if any, understand what a theocratic government is. In every sense of the word, it is a republican government, and differs but little in form from our National, State, and Territorial governments; but its subjects will recognize the will and dictation of the Almighty."³⁴ The incompatibility of the Kingdom, if sovereignty is to be held by Christ, and a republican or democratic government did not seem to trouble Brigham Young. Christ would be the lawgiver, yet the Council of Fifty would have legislative power. The explanation to this obvious contradiction lies in understanding Young's concept of theocracy more fully.

Transferring Church government procedure to the Kingdom, Young envisaged a system of government which would require the consent of the governed. The "voice of the Church" as it functions in Church affairs for the acceptance of officers and doctrines would be carried over to play a similar role politically in the Kingdom, apparently. "The consent of the

³⁰JD, IX (July 13, 1862), 309.

³¹JD, XIII (January 2, 1870), 91; XV (October 9, 1872), 160.

³²JD, XV (October 9, 1872), 161.

³³JD, VII (May 22, 1859), 142.

³⁴JD, VI (July 31, 1859), 342. Young made this comparison: "The Constitution and Laws of the United States resemble a theocracy more closely than any government now on the earth, or that ever has been, so far as we know, except the government of the children of Israel to the time when they elected a king."

creature," the Mormon leader said, "must be obtained before the Creator can rule perfectly."³⁵ Young's concept of theocracy portrays the Kingdom more as a republic, Christ more as a president than a king. This unique concept was not clarified in President Young's many discourses on the Kingdom.

The legislature of the Kingdom was considered to be a policy-determining body. During the theocratic period of the Church following the death of Joseph Smith, the Council of Fifty served in a legislative capacity. Illustrative of the business of the Council is the following extract from Brigham Young's history:

Tuesday, September 9, 1845.—Forenoon, unwell. Two p.m. General Council met. Resolved that a company of 1500 men be selected to go to Great Salt Lake valley and that a committee of five be appointed to gather information relative to emigration, and report the same to the council.³⁶

Other entries indicate that the Council was involved in setting the policy for governing the City of Nauvoo, planning the exodus, and general policy formulation for the Saints until civil government was established in the Great Salt Lake area.

Territorial government replaced the *de facto* State of Deseret when Congress passed the acts known as the Compromise of 1850. It was not long, however, until the desire for statehood was rekindled when friction resulted with the first federally appointed territorial officials. The unsuccessful bid for statehood in 1856 was followed by another constitutional convention and petition for statehood in 1862. Elections were held on March 3 for officers of the new "State of Deseret"; Brigham Young was unanimously elected Governor. For a decade the "Governor" held great hopes for the star of "Deseret" to shine brightly in the Union's firmament, but the ideal of the Kingdom was even brighter:

This body of men will give laws to the nations of the earth. We meet here in our second Annual Legislature, and I do not care whether you pass any laws this Session or not, but I do not wish you to lose one inch of ground that you have gained in your organization, but hold fast to it, for this is the Kingdom of God, and we are the friends of God and you will find that much will grow out of this organization

³⁵JD, XV (August 18, 1872), 134.

³⁶DHC, VII, 439. See also *Ibid*, VII, 379.

We are called the State Legislature, but when the time comes, we shall be called the Kingdom of God. Our government is going to pieces, and it will be like water that is spilt upon the ground that cannot be gathered. . . . For the time will come when we will give laws to the nations of the earth. Joseph Smith organized this government before, in Nauvoo, and he said if we do our duty we should prevail over all our enemies. We should get all things ready, and when the time comes, we shall let the water on to the wheel and start the machine in motion.³⁷

It was expected that complete harmony would exist between the executive and legislative departments in the government. Considering the composition of the legislature as being primarily chosen from the leadership of the Church, this might be expected. In 1857 Brigham Young explained that the legislators of the Kingdom of God were among the Latter-day Saints. The legislators would see the wisdom of Christ in his ruling capacity, "and the laws of that kingdom will be made in accordance with the revelations from Jesus Christ."³⁸

A suggestion of group rather than geographical representation in the legislature of the Kingdom is evident in Young's political thought. Not only did he believe that there would be different religious groups on earth during the millennium, but these groups would also be represented in the Kingdom's legislature:

A man may be a legislator in that body which will issue laws to sustain the inhabitants of the earth in their individual rights, and still not belong to the Church of Jesus Christ at all.

And further, though a man may not even believe in any religion, it would be perfectly right, when necessary, to give him the privilege of holding a seat among that body which will make laws to govern all the nations of the earth and control those who make no profession of religion to all; for that body would be governed, controlled, and dictated to

³⁷"Journal History of the Church," *Ms*, January 19, 1862. It is interesting to note that the disunion forces of the Civil War did not prompt the Mormons to attempt the establishment of the Kingdom of God as a separate political entity. Even though Brigham Young spoke about the imminent destruction of the United States, the Saints looked to the Constitution of the United States as the proper source of their own political authority. Young's discourses on the Kingdom make it quite clear that he felt that it would be a transition of minor consequence from the governmental system under the Constitution to the Kingdom of God.

³⁸JD, V (October 7, 1852), 330.

acknowledge others in those rights which they wish to enjoy themselves.³⁹

The sermons of Brigham Young idealized the Kingdom of God as a society where special interests would disappear, political quarrels would cease, and a near-celestial harmony prevail. Even so, he said: "I most assuredly expect that the time will come when every tongue shall confess, and every knee shall bow, to the Savior, though the people may believe what they will with regard to religion."⁴⁰ All would acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, but many would nevertheless refuse to embrace the gospel. Indeed he conjectured that "their feelings may be couched in these words, 'I will be damned if I will serve you.'"⁴¹ Young said that seeing the Lord did not make you a Saint, and that it would be some time, apparently after the establishment of the Kingdom, before all humanity would be "one" with Christ. Regardless of this lack of complete unity, in his mind the ideal still remained valid.

The Kingdom would not be self-administering, however. There would be the necessity of having a perfected organization to administer the laws. "When the government of God is in force upon the earth," Young announced, "there will be many officers and branches to that government as there are now to that of the United States. There will be such helps, governments, etc., as the people require in their several capacities and circumstances; for the Lord will not administer everywhere in person."⁴² The organs of enforcement, both executive and judicial, would also be necessary. The Kingdom would not be born in conquest, but initially coercion would be necessary. Sheriffs, marshals, constables, magistrates, jurors, and judges would be needed during the initial period of the Kingdom as not all people would be "in the Lord and all walk in his way." When this full unity with the mind and will of the Lord arrives, then mankind would be governed by the word of the Lord, not the sword. "But the kingdom of heaven, when organized upon the earth, will have every officer, law and ordinance necessary for the managing of those who are unruly, or who transgress its laws, and to govern those who desire to do

³⁹JD, II (July 8, 1855), 310.

⁴⁰JD, II (February 18, 1855), 189.

⁴¹JD, II (July 8, 1855), 316.

⁴²JD, VI (July 31, 1859), 346.

right, but cannot quite walk to the line; and all these powers and authorities are in existence in the midst of this people," Young explained.⁴³

Brigham Young happily believed, however, that the officers of the Kingdom would perform their duties justly. He said: "Every man that officiates in a public capacity will be filled with the Spirit of God, with the light of God, with the power of God, and will understand right from wrong, truth from error, light from darkness. . . ." ⁴⁴ Just administration of righteous laws, which were to be based on the revelations of Jesus Christ, would result in the universal justice to be found only in the Kingdom of God. Young summarized his great hope as follows: "If you and I could live in the flesh until that Kingdom is fully established, and actually spread about to rule in a temporal point of view, we should find that it will sustain and uphold every individual in what they deem their individual rights, so far as they do not infringe upon the rights of their fellow creatures." ⁴⁵

The government of the United States served as Brigham Young's conceptual framework for the structure of the Kingdom in organization and division of power. It was conceived to be a federal world-state. All of the nations of the world would be incorporated. The "kings and potentates of the nations will come up to Zion to inquire after the ways of the Lord, and to seek out the great knowledge, wisdom, and understanding manifested through the Saints of the Most High." ⁴⁶ Christ will rule over all nations as "the kingdom of God will be extended over all the earth. . . ." ⁴⁷ Brigham Young continued: "Suppose the Kingdom of God is compared to the American Eagle; when it spreads over the nations, what will it do? Will it destroy every other bird that now flies, or that will fly? No, but they will exist the same as they do now." ⁴⁸

And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains . . . and all nations shall flow unto it. ⁴⁹

⁴³JD, XV (October 9, 1872), 161.

⁴⁴JD, VI (July 31, 1859), 345.

⁴⁵JD, II (July 8, 1855), 309.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 316.

⁴⁷JD, VI (July 31, 1859), 345.

⁴⁸JD, II (July 8, 1855), 315, 16.

⁴⁹Isaiah, 2:2.

And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people. . . . And he shall set up an Ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.⁵⁰

All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth, see ye when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth a trumpet, hear ye.⁵¹

These prophecies of Isaiah are representative of Brigham Young's own views, as he visualized the Kingdom of God with a mighty "ensign" or "standard" unfurled in the breeze and beckoning an invitation for the nations of the world to come up to Zion.⁵² On this standard would be a flag of all the nations of the world. Brigham Young's attachment to his native country, however, could not be suppressed even in the prospect of this glorious vision of a world-kingdom. He said:

When the day comes in which the Kingdom of God will bear rule, the flag of the United States will proudly flutter unsullied on the flag staff of liberty and equal rights, without a spot to sully its fair surface; the glorious flag our fathers have bequeathed to us will then be unfurled to the breeze by those who have power to hoist aloft and defend its sanctity.⁵³

Transcending the scope of a sovereign world-state even, the Kingdom of God which Young envisaged would be a perfect society. The instruments of coercion, which are identified with the state, are to be gradually reduced and ultimately eliminated. This utopian civilization would become a reality, thought Brigham Young:

When the Lord shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither learn war any more. When the world is in a state of true civilization, man will have ceased to contend against his fellow-man, either as individuals, parties, communities, sects, or nations.

⁵⁰Isaiah, 11:11, 12.

⁵¹Isaiah, 18:3.

⁵²See B. H. Roberts, *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; Century I* (6 vols.; Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1930), III, 276.

⁵³JD, II (July 8, 1855), 317.

This state of civilization will be brought by the holy Priesthood of the Son of God; and men, with full purpose of heart, will seek unto Him who is pure and holy, even our Great Creator—our Father and God; and he will give them a law that is pure—a government and plan of society possessed by holy beings in heaven. Then there will be no more war, no more bloodshed, no more evil speaking and evil doing; but all will be contented to follow in the path of truth, which alone is calculated to exalt and dignify the whole man, mentally and physically, in all his operations, labours, and purposes.⁵⁴

Impatient with systematic theory, the Mormon prelate did not develop a precise treatise on the Kingdom of God. A thorough search of his discourses and writings on the subject leaves many gaps unclosed. Governmental organization, operation, and powers are hinted at, not developed. Because of Young's incomplete or incompatible political concepts, some might suggest a political naiveté; or, conversely, a realistic comprehension of the potential of the notion of the Kingdom as a motivating force to achieve succeeding objectives of survival, expansion, and eventually a bountiful life for the Saints in the arid West. These conclusions, though partially valid, are inadequate. The Kingdom of God, as idealistic and utopian as it was in many of its aspects, was more than an unattainable ideal "laid up in Heaven" to the Mormon leader. Faith in the Kingdom prompted Brigham Young and many of his followers to labor industriously and sincerely in transforming Utopia into Reality.

⁵⁴JD, VIII (March 4, 1860), 7.

Crabbe, "Clutterbuck and Co."

MARION B. BRADY

The criticism of George Crabbe is informed, generally, by the assumption that his poems lack a history—that they show no growth or development in ideas or techniques. But strangely enough, the critics who take this position grant Crabbe importance in spite of his faults and limitations. They praise him as a great storyteller, they write with sensitivity and discernment about the significance of his themes, but unfortunately they say comparatively little about his techniques, about the way in which he communicates his values.

But many of Crabbe's poems reveal a conscious artist who deliberately used certain techniques to develop and sustain his effects. No doubt much of the negative criticism is valid. Crabbe wrote too much and with too little care. Many of his narratives are uneven and often poorly sustained, but he also wrote many fine and memorable poems that maintain a consistent level of achievement. Although Crabbe's awareness of the importance of technique can be illustrated by an examination of most of the mature tales beginning with *Tales in Verse*, it is my purpose in this paper to show how Crabbe uses tone to contribute meaning to the "Elder Brother's Tale" in *Tales of the Hall*. I shall attempt to come to grips with the following problem: Does Crabbe use tone in such a way as to produce the effects he intended—that is, does he consciously move from a deliberately heightened, romantic tone to a deliberately lowered, prosaic tone, or does he unknowingly fall from an extravagantly romantic tone to a ludicrously flat tone? In other words, does he consciously create varying tones that reveal his meaning in the "Elder Brother's Tale," or does he unconsciously create shifting tones that obscure his meaning?

The story of the "Elder Brother" is part of a group of stories framed by the following outline: Two half-brothers, who have remained strangers to each other since the days of their youth, meet shortly after both men have returned to their native village. George, the elder of the two, has recently retired after a long and successful career. Now wealthy, he returns

Mr. Brady is associate professor of English at New Mexico State University.

to the village of his boyhood and buys the "Hall," the most imposing structure in the village. He is pleased to possess the old place, for he has a great and sentimental fondness for the past. Therefore, he regrets that the "ancient walls" and the "stately avenue of elms" have been sacrificed to progress. In politics, he is a strong conservative who reproves the intolerance of

Those who believe they never can be free,
Except when fighting for their liberty;
Who by their very clamour and complaint
Invite coercion or enforce restraint.

George also understands the value of compromise. If man is to insure the stability of his public liberties, he must learn how to forego some of their advantages and all of their excesses. He must acknowledge an authority which limits his rights:

The public good must be a private care,
None all they would have, but all a share:
So we must freedom with restraint enjoy;
What crowds possess they will, uncheck'd, destroy.

George is moderate in opinions and seems contented—but from resignation rather than optimism. In fact, the subdued tone of the opening section seemingly helps to define George's chastened and subdued character. His half-brother, Richard, some fifteen years younger, is the son of an "Irish soldier," the second husband of George's mother. Richard has spent most of his adult life in the service of his country, a service that has left him poor and barely able to support his wife and children. He is too proud to solicit aid from his older brother; he hopes that his brother will take the initiative. Friends tell him that the owner of Binning Hall "loves him well and will be rejoiced to see him when he has no better thing in view." Finally they meet, and the intense emotion of their meeting changes gradually into a profound and lasting attachment. They find their mutual companionship very pleasant, and each day they relate some of their respective adventures and experiences to each other.

George begins by telling his experience as a lover—an experience with a tragic conclusion.

"What if I tell thee of a waste of time,
That on my spirit presses as a crime.

Wrote verses, it may be, and for one dear maid
The sober purposes of life delay'd.
From year to year the fruitless chase pursued. . . ."

At the age of twenty the elder brother managed to escape from the authority of his stepfather and went to live with a clergyman to whom his uncle (his official guardian) had entrusted his education. As George begins his story, the subdued and sincere tone of the introductory section of the tale is succeeded by a highly mocking and ironic tone—a tone that changes and varies throughout the poem. For Crabbe's method is to add meaning and concentration to George's story by constantly modifying the tone and by changing the perspective from which the story is told. George's topic, as he tells his brother, is the account of a madness, a "flight," a "disease." In his youth he dreamed as youth has rarely dreamed:

"I built me castles wondrous rich and rare,
Few castle-builders could with me compare;
The Hall, the palace, rose at my command,
And these I fill'd with objects great and grand.
Virtues sublime, that nowhere else would live,
Glory and pomp, that I alone could give;
Trophies and thrones by matchless valour gain'd,
Faith unprov'd and chastity unstain'd;
With all that soothes the sense and charms the soul,
Came at my call, and were in my control."

There is something more than a little self-consciousness in his voice as he remembers his early naivete, his absolute and unthinking romanticism. Nevertheless, the elder brother goes on deliberately to emphasize and underline the "moonshine" in this picture of his power to build castles, by comparing it with the picture of himself as a boy:

"And who was I? a slender youth and tall,
In manner awkward, and with fortune small;
With visage pale, my motions quick and slow,
That fall and rising in the spirits show;
For none could more by outward signs express
What wise men lock within the mind's recess;
Had I within the mirror truth beheld,
I should have such presuming thought repell'd:
But awkward as I was, without the grace
That gives new beauty to a form or face,
Still I expected friends most true to prove,
And grateful, tender, warm, assiduous love"

The two quotations represent a radical contrast—a juxtaposition of opposites. Here and throughout the poem, Crabbe uses such “contrasts” as one of his basic organizing principles. The contrast between the awkward boy and his heroic dreams is succeeded by a contrast between the romantic boy and his realistic uncle, and both contrasts are succeeded finally by a contrast between the beautiful and virtuous Rosabella of George’s fancy and the sluttish Rosabella of actuality. Thus, the contrasts develop the varying tones of the poem, and the varying tones help to reveal the poem’s meaning. As we have noted, this first contrast—this first juxtaposition of opposites—is light and fanciful, and the tone it develops is one of self-mockery. George continues his account of his early romanticism by describing an isolated corner of Binning Park, which served as the setting for all his passionate meditations:

“To dream these dreams I chose a woody scene,
My guardian shade, the world and me between;
A green inclosure, where beside its bound
A thorny fence beset its beauties round . . .
And thus with knights and nymphs, in hall and bowers,
In war and love, I pass’d unnumber’d hours. . . .”

In this romantic setting, he confidently expects to find a “kindred heart,” a heart as constant and as kind as his own. And he expects to find a love who is a “Beauty; one of earth/Of higher rank or nobler in her birth.” He sees, one evening in June, his “Lady of the Leaf”:

“One matchless face I saw . . .
Slender she was and tall: her fairy-feet
Bore her right onward to my shady seat . . .
Thus as I was musing:—Is this maid, divine
As she appears, to be this queen of mine?”

But with the arrival of his “fancy’s gracious queen,” the tone of the poem changes from the lightly mocking irony we have already seen, to a devastating, mock-heroic account of a hero saving his heroine from disaster:

“It soon appear’d, that while this nymph divine
Moved on, there met her rude uncivil kine,
Who knew her not—the damsel was not there
Who kept them—all obedient—in her care;
Strangers they thus defied and held in scorn,
And stood in threat’ning posture, hoof and horn;

While Susan—pail in hand—could stand the while
And prate with Daniel at a distant stile

Look to me loveliest of thy sex! and give
One cheering glance, and not a cow shall live;
For lo! this iron bar, this strenuous arm,
And those dear eyes to aid me as a charm. . . .

Say, goddess! say, on man or cow
Meanest thou now to perch—On neither now—
For, as I ponder'd, on their way appear'd
The Amazonian milker of the herd:
These at the wonted signals, made a stand,
And woo'd the nymph of the relieving hand;
Nor heeded now the man, who felt relief
Of other kind, and not unmix'd with grief;
For now he neither should his courage prove,
Nor in his dying moments boast his love."

There is something heartbreaking as well as ridiculous in this account of George's first meeting with Rosabella. His later ability to see the early experience as a sardonic joke does not disguise his continuing involvement in what must have been a tragedy for the young man, for he "lost" the young queen almost as soon as he found her. Life has not been easy for the elder brother, for life is not easy to live in Crabbe's world, even with the understanding that comes to a mature man. The lifelong attrition of little tragedies which the mature George realized and understood is not too different in its final effect from the high tragedy which the youthful George experienced.

But there can be little doubt about the tone of the "battle" and the perspective of the viewer, and there can be little doubt about Crabbe's deliberate intention to create that tone. The diction, the irony, the mock-heroic form of George's highly exaggerated and highly romantic account of the birth of love—and of a lady's rescue from the dragons of the meadow—deepen the narrator's self-mockery. Only an author—or a narrator—striving consciously for a sardonic and comic effect would discuss a trivial encounter with kine in a meadow as if it were an event of cosmic importance. In this scene Crabbe continues the coincidence of opposites which began with the comparison of the castle-builder of dreams and the awkward youth of actuality. For the kine are "cowed" not by "this iron bar, this strenuous arm," but by the relieving hand of the milkmaid. And Crabbe shows "Victory" deserting first the

youth and then the kine. The absolute ludicrousness of the scene and of George's romanticism is defined by the epic epithet which describes the milkmaid—"the nymph of the relieving hand"—the nymph who brought relief to both of the warring factions—the beau as well as the "belles." But the counterpoint of sincere feeling remains apparent behind the mockery. The elder brother feels, even when he is sixty years of age, the attraction that made him a "bounded slave" to Rosabella, willing to give her "time, duty, credit, honour, comfort."

George was rewarded for his courage by a "gracious smile," and he fancied himself loved by his lady. Then she disappeared from the scene—"no more the mansion held a form so fair." But George was determined to find her and, ultimately, to marry her, even if he had to search throughout the world in order to see her once again. "And I, at last, shall wed this fairest of the fair."

He went to work for his "thrifty" uncle and learned something of the principles and language of the business world. However, he continued his search for Rosabella; he rode endlessly over the hills of romance and the roads of Europe in search of his fair lady. Once again, Crabbe utilizes the pattern of contrasts which he began with the comparison of the boy and his dreams. In the usual coincidence of opposites the romantic young man is always accompanied by a grim realism in the form of his uncle.

"My thrifty uncle, now return'd, began
To stir within me what remained of man;
My powerful frenzy painted to the life,
And ask'd me if I took a dream to wife? "

But as the youth grows older, he changes—his romanticism is seemingly mellowed. Crabbe indicates his change by a change in the tone of the story. The mood changes from the romantically heightened, yet ironic, tone of the meeting in the meadow, into a mood—a tone—that reflects the marketplace. The diction that reflected the exaggerated posturings of an overly romantic boy is succeeded by the businesslike shorthand of the ledger book. I believe that Crabbe uses this change in tone to prepare the reader for George's next meeting with Rosabella. George must be prepared to evaluate his ideal. He needs the language of the marketplace for such an evaluation;

the language of matter-of-fact rationality must succeed the language of light-hearted romanticism. His uncle is his teacher:

"He his own books approved, and thought the pen
A useful instrument for trading men;
But judged a quill was never to be slit
Except to make it for a merchant fit:
He, when inform'd how men of taste could write,
Look'd on his ledger with supreme delight;
Then would he laugh, and, with insulting joy,
Tell me aloud, 'that's poetry, my boy;
These are your golden numbers,—them repeat,
The more you have, the more you'll find them sweet—
Their numbers move all hearts—no matter for their feet.
Sir, when a man composes in this style,
What is to him a critic's frown or smile?' "

The rhythm as well as the diction reflects Crabbe's purpose in this section of the poem. The rhythm is as neat and mechanical—as economical—as the entries in a ledger. The precise structure, the syntactical balance, the control, all mirror the "mercantile" qualities of exactness and order which the uncle tries to impose upon George. In a magnificent literary description, Crabbe reveals the uncle's love of "numbers," his preference for some books over others, some "realms of gold" over others. In fact, the "love" of the uncle for his ledgers seems to be a parody of George's love for Rosabella, for Crabbe shows how the same language can be used for both subjects—the golden language of "poetry" is easily adapted to either subject. Therefore, Crabbe implies much more than a mere similarity between the words in the two scenes. Perhaps the seeming versatility of the language is in reality only a reflection of the one identical character of the two subjects. Perhaps Rosabella's character should be defined in the terms so loved by George's uncle. In any event, George is completely identified with his new materialistic background before his second meeting with Rosabella. Significantly enough, the second meeting itself is part of a business transaction:

"Something one day occur'd about a bill
That was not drawn with true mercantile skill,
And I was ask'd and authorised to go
To seek the firm of Clutterbuck and Co."

But the office is closed, and George is sent to a country house

where the merchant spends his leisure time. George finds his lost lady in the merchant's hideaway.

The lines featuring "Clutterbuck and Co." are favorites of Crabbe's parodists and are frequently quoted as evidence of Crabbe's flat and monotonous style, but the quotation, and especially the prosaic tone of the quotation, is very appropriate to Crabbe's subject. For this scene is similar in many ways to George's first meeting with Rosabella, but this time a menial task is defined in menial terms. The reader gets a ledger book account of George's meeting with Rosabella, a proper account of the meeting between a romantic boy and the materialistic soul of his beloved. George is finally forced to see the unromantic truth about Rosabella; he sees her according to her "real" worth and not according to his romantic fancy—a worth made obvious by the very real background. Therefore, the diction and the tone it creates is one with the materialistic objects described. The language is made one with the articles themselves—with the room, the building, the furniture. The material objects are also made one with the materialistic, the now slatternly Rosabella:

"His room I saw, and must acknowledge, there
Were not the signs of cleanliness or care;

The shutters half unclosed, the curtains fell
Half down, and rested on the window-sill,
And thus, confusedly, made the room half visible . . .

There were strange sights and scents about the room,
Of food high season'd, and of strong perfumes.

Two unmatched sofas ample rents displayed,
Carpets and curtains are alike decay'd"

And then Rosabella, who is the merchant's paramour, enters the room. She is the mistress of this place—the personification of its "spirit":

"But is it she?—O! yes; the rose is dead,
All beauty, fragrance, freshness, glory fled;
But yet 'tis she—the same and not the same—
Who to my bower a heavenly being came;
Who waked my soul's first thought of real bliss,
Whom long I sought, and now I find her—this.
I cannot paint her—something I had seen
So pale and slim, and tawdry and unclean;

With haggard looks, of vice and woe the prey,
Laughing in languor, miserably gay;
Her face, where face appear'd was amply spread
By art's coarse pencil, with ill-chosen red,
The flower's fictitious bloom, the blushing of the dead."

In a series of very compact paradoxes, Crabbe emphasizes the basic paradox that underlies the whole poem; he uses oxymora to underline this new juxtaposition of the opposites featured in all of George's experiences with Rosabella—a coincidence of opposites focused with sudden and shocking effect. The new, older, saner George can see and be shocked by this image of the seeming harmony between beauty and ugliness. And the seeming contradictions of "laughing in languor" and "miserably gay" actually underscore the truth that George must learn to accept: he must see that the Rosabella of his dreams and the Rosabella of actuality are "the same and not the same." Crabbe's skill in using paradox to develop the tone of this section of the poem is a good illustration of his ability to make technique serve his purposes, for the tone reflects his meaning. Furthermore, the poem does not degenerate, in George's despair, into hollow-sounding exaggeration or embarrassing sentimentality. George's early romanticism is so conditioned and controlled by his experiences in the "mercantile" world that he is able to endure his disillusionment. Therefore, his tone, as he considers his loss and his disappointment, is not wild and hysterical but calm and reasoned. The "heroine of romance" asks coyly, ". . . has your heart been faithful?" The hero of commerce responds ironically,

"My faith must childish in your sight appear,
Who have been faithful—to how many, dear?"

But George and Rosabella soon confess their early attachment, and they begin to talk about a life together. For George's contempt changes to pity when Rosabella tells him of the difficulties and sorrows of her life; in fact, "all reproach and anger died away." And then, just for a moment, the tone of the story changes once again. In a scene that epitomizes all of the coincidences of opposites that have developed the tone, Crabbe combines that first romantic moment in the meadow—the moment when George first saw and idealized Rosabella—with the tawdry atmosphere of the banker's hideaway. In a

purely materialistic setting the purely materialistic Rosabella sings a sweet, romantic lyric:

" 'My Damon was the first to wake
 The gentle flame that cannot die;
 My Damon is the last to take
 The faithful bosom's softest sigh;
 The life between is nothing worth,
 O! cast it from thy thought away;
 Think of the day that gave it birth,
 And this its sweet returning day.

Buried be all that has been done,
 Or say that naught is done amiss;
 For who the dangerous path can shun
 In such bewildering world as this?
 But love can every fault forgive,
 Or with the tender look reprove;
 And now let naught in memory live,
 But that we met, and that we love.' "

Alfred Ainger asserts that the story is marred by this "tasteless interpolation of a song which the unhappy girl sings to her lover."¹ But I believe that Crabbe has simply shown us that an unrestrained romanticism is still strong in George and that George is still willing to surrender to the same kind of appeal that captured him during his first meeting with Rosabella. George's early romantic posturing seemed ridiculous enough, but the same weakness is emphasized a thousand times by his second surrender. How pathetically easy it is for Rosabella to rekindle George's old passion. She speaks to him of love—speaks the old romantic lines with a new voluptuous intonation—and he surrenders. He surrenders to the old romantic, literary ideal that he substitutes for the real Rosabella. Significantly enough, her romantic voice is aided by the Anacreontic verse Crabbe chooses for her song. Nothing else in the poem illustrates so well Crabbe's ironic grasp of man's romantic penchant for the ideal and the unseen. Crabbe's conscious use of technique is emphasized also by this sudden juxtaposition of a charming, romantic lyric with the prosaic descriptions of materialism (in all its "evil effects") which precede and follow it. Two extremes in human nature are defined by the tone. By the end of the poem, however, a new

¹Alfred Ainger, *Crabbe* (New York, 1903) p. 176.

and more thoroughly disciplined George will find some new position, some middle ground between the two extremes.

For the romantic dream fades. Ironically, and according to the inevitable pattern of contrasts, George's beautiful lady loves the ugliness in which she lives, and Rosabella soon confesses that she cannot leave her life of ease and indulgence for the tedium of a new life with George:

"Soften'd, I said—'Be mine the hand and heart,
If with your world you will consent to part.'
She would—she tried—Alas! she did not know
How deeply rooted evil habits grow:
She felt the truth upon her spirits press,
But wanted ease, indulgence, show, excess"

She dies soon after—seemingly a victim of the life she has chosen—a "vice-worn and sin-wrecked creature." George turns in his sorrow to a brief idolatry of the materialism that Rosabella had adored, partly because of his desire to overcome his grief and partly because of the fascination which materialism had for her. At length, however, he finds his "heart humbled and his mind cleared," and he returns to his native village, where he finds relief and repose.

The tale told by the elder brother, then, shows several changes in tone: changes which communicate the texture of his experience as well as the development of his character. The mocking irony which follows the introductory section defines George's early romantic inclinations, and the prosaic, matter-of-fact accounts of the later sections define his experiences with his uncle and his last meeting with Rosabella. Both are succeeded, in the final section, by a tone that shows some kind of a compromise between the two kinds of life and the two kinds of characters defined by the following tone:

"Yet much is lost, and not yet much is found,
But what remains, I would believe is sound;
That first wild passion, that last mean desire,
Are felt no more; but holier hopes require
A mind prepared and steady—my reform
Has fears like his, who, suffering in a storm,
Is on a rich, but unknown country cast,
The future fearing, while he feels the past;
But whose more cheerful mind, with hope imbued,
Sees through receding clouds the rising good."

Thus, the character of the elder brother is finally defined by a tone that reflects a compromise between romanticism and materialism—he is finally a chastened and understanding human being, and Crabbe simply uses the changes in tone to lead from one attitude and state of mind to another. Therefore, since the changes in tone correspond to a very definite psychological structure, it is very difficult to believe that Crabbe was not in control of his techniques throughout the poem and that the reference to "Clutterbuck and Co." was not as intentional as it is effective. The "Elder Brother's Tale" is not a weak poem, marred by lapses in tone; it is a strong poem, characterized and unified by a brilliant handling of tone. The "Clutterbuck and Co." excerpt is not an illustration of Crabbe's carelessness or of a tendency on his part to write prose. It is a very deliberate and successful attempt to fuse his language with his subject—to create the texture (and the tone) of materialism with his language. Furthermore, the shifts in tone do not represent any confusion or incoherence. The over-all or controlling tone of the poem is introduced with the George who tells the story, and it ends with his last words. The subdued emotion with which the poem opens hangs in the air and is seemingly suspended throughout the entire story: the "first wild passion" and the "last mean desire" are properly framed and evaluated by the sincere emotion that underlies the mocking voice, that underlies the matter-of-fact voice—the chastened emotion that George still feels whenever he talks about Rosabella. For as he ends his story, he admits that even with his mature understanding and with his final knowledge that "we must freedom with restraint enjoy," whenever he thinks of his youth, he realizes that "much is lost, and not yet much is found."

The Real Thing in James's "The Real Thing"

KENNETH BERNARD

Henry James's "The Real Thing" has long been a standard anthology piece, and several interpretations of it have been written. The interpretation with most currency among readers is that expressed by Clifton Fadiman, among others, namely that the story demonstrates that ". . . art is a *transformation* of reality, not a mere reflection of the thing itself."¹ Attempting to copy a real lady and gentleman, the Monarchs, for his illustrations of ladies and gentlemen, the artist fails; transforming two subjects from the lower classes, Miss Churm, a cockney, and Oronte, an Italian immigrant, he succeeds. Although this reading has been considered "superficial,"² I think it is basically sound. However, it requires an application that has not been made. It has been generally assumed that the artist is finally successful in his project because he dismisses the Monarchs. This is true. *But his success is only the measure of his failure*, for he has been made aware of the difference between first and second-rate art, and the degree to which he is bound, perhaps forever, to the latter. It is this difference that is the point of James's story.

The artist finally dismisses the Monarchs because he finds them unsuitable for his illustrations. However, he has been deeply moved by their plight. As his friend and critic Hawley says, they did him "permanent harm." The artist, however, is "content to have paid the price—for the memory." Quite correctly, one critic points out that the artist is content to have his art suffer because his moral insight has been sharpened.

Mr. Bernard is assistant professor of English at Long Island University.

¹"A Note on The Real Thing," *The Short Stories of Henry James* (New York, 1945), p. 217. See also, for example, Gorham Munson, "The Real Thing, A Parable for Fiction," *University of Kansas Review*, XVI, 4 (Summer, 1950), 261-4; Sean O'Faolain, *The Short Story* (New York, 1951), p. 182; and Seymour Lainoff, "A Note on Henry James' 'The Real Thing,'" *Modern Language Notes*, LXXI, 3 (March, 1956), 192-3.

²Earle Labor, "James' 'The Real Thing': Three Levels of Meaning," *College English*, XXIII, 5 (Feb., 1962), p. 376f. Mr. Labor's perceptive article includes a selected bibliography of differing interpretations.

"From his painful experience with the Monarchs James's narrator emerges with a finer understanding of the human situation and with a new awareness of what constitutes 'the real thing' in human relationships: compassion."³ The narrator has been unfeeling. The Monarchs have remedied this deficiency. But what of the narrator as artist? Is there not also a new awareness of what constitutes the real thing in art?

I think there is. One, in fact, leads to the other. The Monarchs are also the artist's means for discovering that he is a second-rate artist. In human terms the real thing in the story is the pathos of the Monarchs reduced to such expedients as hiring out, washing teacups, etc. Their clumsy dignity, their essential innocence, their odd misfortune—all affect the artist deeply. Their unsuitability for his illustrations has little point. What matters is the human situation. *They* are the raw material for art. *They* are real. The artist, however, does not, perhaps cannot, work with real life. He does not, for example, work with Miss Churm or Oronte in any real way. He makes them into something artificial, and then he paints them. There is no emotional commitment. There never has been. He succeeds well enough, but what he has done is not to transform reality into art but to transform artificiality, or unreality, into art. That is his flaw as an artist. The Monarchs have introduced him to a more profound feeling, they have made him see the possibility of true art. And it is this awareness that does him "permanent harm." He cannot go on happily creating false art once he is aware of what true art might be. But he is glad of knowing the truth, however painful. His awareness might even be the beginning of true art.

So one can agree with Fadiman that the point of the story is that the artist must *transform* reality into art—but with the understanding that the protagonist does not do this; he fails. In working with the artificial he is transforming unreality into art, and that can be only inferior art. But he has been made aware of the difference. The real thing artistically, the foundation of true art, must be compassion for humanity.

³*Ibid.*, p. 378.

Proper Names in Plays, by Chance or Design?

M. C. GOLIGHTLY

Readers of fictional material are generally subconsciously impressed with names given to characters in a play or story by an author without being aware of any underlying motivation on the part of the author for having given them. Such names are ostensibly given through the creative process in an attempt to produce such symbolic representation of that character which best expresses a personal estimate or understanding of it insofar as the author is concerned. This understanding takes place, in part, in the mind of the reader by his instinctive reaction to the name, a process of which he is seldom aware.

It is logical to assume that these names, like any other appellations given to any person, place, or thing, are created from a combination of factors, deriving whatever connotations they may have from the combined total experiences of the author and of the reader. Names are likely to be derived from any background or environmental pattern which may have stimulated the author at one time or another, such patterns sometimes being intentionally acquired through intellectual pursuit or accidentally acquired through social activity. The author may not be able to explain how he named a particular character or even to trace the source of inspiration for use of any singular type name, but we can assume that the inclination for so recognizing a character (even in a nebulous way at first) is an initial factor in establishment of personal identification for the author.

Names take on even greater significance when given oral expression, since the word itself is composed of syllables which have their beginnings in all of the traditional and derivational usages connected with particular phonations. Although the word meaning or intentional meaning carries the first impression, something new is added when vocal interpretation of a name gives it an audible and inflectional per-

Mr. Golightly is instructor in speech at Brigham Young University.

sonality. The author and the reader, and in the plays, the dramatist, each give a particular and differentiating connotation to the name, according to the individual differences which affect their interpretation.

Titles and names of people are a fascinating part of any written material; they intrigue us into exploration and as we discover facets within their personalities, we experience things with them, until finally we have vicarious associations with them. These associations are vitally connected with relationship to names, and since names have always shared the essence of the personalities of the people who bear them, we apply readings into character because of them. It is known that people often receive distorted impressions of a given name because of their own association with it; these distortions may have been repeated in the giving of nicknames or terms of relationship which have long been used in lieu of given names, other than surnames, to distinguish certain peoples from others who bear the same name. Although such distortion of names was a common practice during the time of the writing of Restoration plays, other technically contributive changes have developed which have had a profound influence in this respect.

Changes in intellectual understandings through broader educational privileges have brought about an equanimity of social standards among people, resulting in psychological freedom in bestowing of names. This has in turn, resulted in a variety of phonetic impressions being used. In this regard, Ernest Weekley has outlined the major phonetic changes occurring most frequently in the etymology of name giving:

Aphesis is the loss of the unaccented first syllable, as in *'baccy* and *'tater*. It occurs almost regularly in words of French origin, e.g. *squire* and *esquire*, *prentice* and *apprentice*. When such double forms exist, the surname invariably assumes the popular form, e.g. *Prentice*, *Squire*. . . . Many names beginning with *n* are due to aphasis, e.g. *Nash* for *atten ash*, *Nalder*, *Nelms*, *Nock*, *atten oak*, *Nokes*, *Nye*, *atten ey*, at the island, *Nangle*, *atten angle*, *Nind* or *Nend*, *atten ind* or *end* Epenthesis is the insertion of a sound which facilitates pronounciation, such as that of *b* in Fr. *chambre*, from Lat. *camera*. The intrusive sound may be a vowel or a consonant as in the names *Henery*, *Hendry*, perversions of *Henry*. To *Hendry* we owe the northern *Henderson*, which has often coalesced with *Anderson*, from *Andrew*. These are contracted into *Henson* and *Anson*, the latter also

from *Ann* and *Agnes* Epithesis, or the addition of a final consonant, is common in uneducated speech, e.g. *scholard*, *gownd*, *garding*, etc. I say "uneducated," but many such forms have been adapted by the language, e.g. *sound*, Fr. *son*, and we have the name *Kitching*, for *kitchen*. . . . Assimilation is the tendency of a sound to imitate its neighbor. Thus the *d* of *Hud* (p. 3) sometimes becomes *t* in contact with the sharp *s*, hence *Hutson*; *Tomkins* tends to become *Tonkins*, whence *Tonks*, if the *m* and *k* are not separated by the epenthetic *p*, *Tompkins*. . . . The same group of names is affected by dissimilation, i.e. the instinct to avoid the recurrence of the same sound. Thus *Ranson*, son of *Ranolf* or *Randolf*, becomes *Ransom* by dissimilation of one *n*, and *Hanson*, son of *Han* (see p. 3), becomes *Hansom*. In *Sansom* we have *Sampson* assimilated to *Sanson* and then dissimilated. . . . Metathesis, or the transposition of sound, chiefly affects *l* and *r*, especially the latter. Our word *cress* is from Mid. Eng. *kers*, which appears in *Karslake*, *Toulmin* is for *Tomlin*, a double dim., *-el-in*, or *Tom*, *Grundy* is for *Gundry*, from Anglo-Sax. *Gundred*, and *Joe Gargery* descended from a *Gregory*.¹

Since we might assume that cristening names given to their offspring by parents are generally given them because of impressions, real or imaginary, it might also follow that such impressions may be related to the euphonious associations which the name bears, or through environmental experiences of the donors with the phonetic factors of the name. Names also have been given through a favorable association with trifling or important incidents, or from states of affairs, or from festive occasions, or they may be patronymic or matronymic—suggesting identity with forbears.

Such knowledge should have some influence upon the author as he is a "parent" of a kind, through fostering a literary "child," and should be affected by these same factors as he chooses names for the characters in his play or story. The creative process which goes into the name giving of some children is only an attributable factor, adding lustre to the otherwise conformative method of bestowing proper names as a result of choosing the most desirable from among a number of names found to be nonobjectionable. The author, however, expresses in certain degrees some conscious or subconscious hopes or intimations for those characters in the names

¹Ernest Weekley, *The Romance of Names* (London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, W., 1914), p. 33.

he chooses for them, without relying upon the direct or personal reaction of relatives or contradictory factors derived through ancestral traditions. Though some exploratory work has been done occasionally in this area by a few interested writers, an exhaustive study substantiated by literary evidences could be significantly rewarding. One can be certain that a great number of variable influences would be found through further research in this direction. Languages, in their systemization and colloquialization through usage, have advanced their peculiar accents and phonemes through a repetition of communication, respective of individualism or formalism, as time and setting demanded.

In the following study of fourteen plays of the Restoration period, eight comedies, four tragedies, one heroic drama, and a musical comedy, a listing of the names of characters have been categorized and a few comparisons made which might indicate what may have influenced the minds of the men who wrote during that period. It should be readily apparent that there seemed to be a discrimination on the part of the respective authors to distinguish certain "types" by appending "Mr.," "Mrs.," "Lord," "Count," and other parts to ordinary names. Separate listings have been made to suggest that some prompting in the author's mind influenced him to attach this other part to the name, rather than to use the single name as in the other cases, mainly to achieve an effect.

Examples cited in this study should indicate that the bestowal of purposeful and stimulating names is either a purely subjective gesture or an artifactual and subconscious process in which all the techniques, learned and unlearned, are employed, one having a direct relationship to the creative powers of the author, the other having little or none at all. Names and authors have been listed on either side of titles so that comparisons and similarities might be noted among separate works.

MEN (Double names, including Mr., and titles)

<i>Names of Characters</i>	<i>Title of Play</i>	<i>Author</i>
(Don) Alonzo d'Aguilar	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Thomas Aimwell	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Mark Antony	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
(Duke of) Arcos	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Francis Archer	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
(King) Arthur	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding

(Robin of) Bagshott	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Count) Bellair	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
(Old) Harry Bellair	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
(Young) Harry Bellair	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
(Sir) John Bevil	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
John Bevil, Jr.	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Jerry Blackacre	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Mahomet Boabdelin	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Ben Budge	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Roger Bull	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
William Catesby	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
(Sir) Tumbelly Clumsey	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
(Sir) Charles Easy	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Old) Novelty Fashion	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
(Young) Thomas Fashion	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
(Sir) Fopling Flutter	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
(Lord) Foppington	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Sir) Charles Freeman	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
(Sir) John Friendly	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
(Duke of) Gloster	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
(Lord) Grizzle	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
(Lord) Hastings	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
(Crook Fingered) Jack	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Matt (of the Mint)	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Edward Mirabell	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
(Lord) Moerlove	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
Charles Myrtle	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Nimming Ned	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Major) Oldfox	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	John Gay
Harry Paddington	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Lord) Plausible	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
(Sergeant) Plodden	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
(Sir) Richard Ratcliffe	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
(Mr.) Sealand	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
(Mr.) Smirk	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
(Ghost of) Gaffer Thumb	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Tom Thumb	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Jimmy Twitcher	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Edward Worthy	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Anthony Witwoud	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
(Sir) Wilford Witwoud	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve

MEN (Single names)

Abdalla	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Abdelmelech	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Abenemar	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Alexas	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Almanzor	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Antonio	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Bagshot	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Bayes	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Bedaman	<i>Venice Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway

Beggar	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Bellamour	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
Blunder	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Bonniface	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Brabe	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Brainwell	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Buttongown	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Cimberton	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Cordelio	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Coupler	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Daniel	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Decius	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
Dollabella	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Doodle	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Dorimant	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Drawcansir	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Dumont	<i>Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
Durand	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Eliot	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Fainall	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Ferdinand	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Filch	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Foigard	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Foodle	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Freeman	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Gibbet	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Gomel	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Hamet	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Handy	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Harry	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Humphrey	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Hounslow	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Jaffeir	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Johnson	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Juba	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
LaVerole	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Lockett	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Lory	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Lucius	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
MacHeath	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Marcus	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
Medley	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Merlin	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Mezzana	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Myris	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Noodle	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Novil	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Ozmyn	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Peachum	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Petulant	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Petulant	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Pierre	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Portius	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison

Pretty-Man	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Priuli	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Quaint	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Retrose	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Revillidio	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Scrub	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Selin	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Sempronius	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
Serringe	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Serapion	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Smith	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Spinosa	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Splitcause	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Sullen	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Syphax	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
Ternon	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Theodore	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Tom	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Tugg	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Zulema	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden

WOMEN (Double names, including Mrs., and titles)

(Widow) Blackacre	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
(Lady) Bountiful	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Molly Brazen	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Mrs.) Callicoe	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Betty Doxy	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Lady) Easy	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Mrs.) Edging	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Mrs.) Arabella Fainall	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Diana Frapes	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Lady) Graveairs	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Miss) Hoyden	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Lucy Lockit	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Mrs.) Marwood	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
(Mrs.) Millamant	<i>Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
(Lady) Betty Modish	<i>The Careless Husband</i>	Colley Cibber
(Mrs.) Peachum	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Polly Peachum	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Mrs.) Sealand	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Jane Shore	<i>The Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
(Mrs.) Slammekin	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Mrs.) Sullen	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Suky Tawdry	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Lady) Townley	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Dolly Trull	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Mrs.) Vixen	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
(Lady) Woodvill	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege

WOMEN (Single names)

Abigail	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Alicia	<i>The Jane Shore Tragedy</i>	Nicholas Rowe
Almahide	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Amanda	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Amaryllis	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Aquilina	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Belvidera	<i>Venus Preserved</i>	Thomas Otway
Bellinda	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Benzayda	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Berlinthea	<i>The Relapse</i>	John Vanbrugh
Betty	<i>The Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Busy	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	William Congreve
Charmion	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Cherry	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Cleopatra	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Cleora	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Cloris	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Dollalolla	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Dorinda	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Eliza	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Emilia	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Esperanza	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Fidelia	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Foible	<i>The Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Gipsey	<i>The Beaux Stratagem</i>	George Farquhar
Harriet	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Holyma	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Indiana	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Isabella	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Isabella	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Iras	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Jenny	<i>The Beggar's Opera</i>	John Gay
Lettice	<i>The Plain Dealer</i>	William Wycherly
Lucia	<i>Cato</i>	Joseph Addison
Lucinda	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele
Lydaraka	<i>The Conquest of Granada</i>	John Dryden
Mincing	<i>The Way of the World</i>	William Congreve
Mustacha	<i>Tom Thumb</i>	Henry Fielding
Octavia	<i>All for Love</i>	John Dryden
Parlas	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Parthenope	<i>The Rehearsal</i>	George Villiers
Pert	<i>The Man of Mode</i>	George Etherege
Phyllis	<i>The Conscious Lovers</i>	Richard Steele

It should be noticed that there is a frequency of those names which begin with the letter "B." Twenty names in the men's division outnumber the next most frequent, those which begin with "A," "C," and "P," numbering six in each. Names be-

ginning with two plosive sounds, two open vowel sounds, and two fricatives might have significant meaning in a technical study.

It is interesting to note that in the "B" classification in the men's division approximately half of the characters are humorous in personality projection, and the other half are romance and background, or secondary personages. Among these of the women in the "B" area there is an equalization of humorous and expositional characterizations.

The drama or speech student could wish to know in an analysis of this kind what effect the sounds of these names will have upon the speaker and upon the audience. It has already been mentioned that to speak the names and to "feel" the sound of them as they are articulated, sometimes creates a different effect than when the names are read silently. For instance, the name "Alicia," in *The Tragedy of Jane Shore* by Nicholas Rowe, is a genuine and original sounding name contrived by the author for an important secondary character. In a footnote in the written copies of this play in the text by Nettleton and Case, it is pointed out that there is no historical warrant for her presence in the play.² She contributes little in the development of the major plot line nor in the exposition or denouement of the ensuing action. We may therefore venture that the name was chosen because of a whim on the part of the author which gave him reason to believe it suited the character in the play.

On the other hand she was important enough to the action not to be innominate or commonly named; "Alicia" is euphonically satisfying and distinctively adequate for its purpose, particularly because of that quality which makes it unique, and for the use of soft and enjoyable sound syllables employed in construction of the name. Such a name might bear nothing by way of association for people of this day but perhaps would have connotations of other names or words which conveyed an emotional distinction. For instance, "Alicia" might have for one reader the same connotative accents which are found in the word "delicious," or "militia," or even "vicious," according to the individual response. That response of course would depend upon the background experience of the reader or

²George H. Nettleton and Arthur E. Case, *British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan* (Toronto: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1939), p. 509.

dramatist and also upon his ability to react—imaginatively or without a great degree of emotion. The name itself is composed of three syllables, each of them easily articulated. The final syllable has a slightly false tone, almost one of indecision, but considered wholly, it lacks extreme complication and has no sudden turn in articulatory directions. We trust the name. (This is misleading, because she proves to be heartless in the final scene of the tragedy.)

"Amanda," "Bellinda," "Benzayda," "Cleora," "Dorinda," "Emilia," "Fidelia," "Holyma," "Lucia," "Lucinda," and "Octavia," all might have similar elements of like qualities in them, although any association with one of these names would determine the extent of the stimulus which it might have upon the hearer.

"Mustacha" is another captivating name, and here we find a definite association with its common denominator, "moustache"; upon the discovery of its use for a feminine character, the effect is startling. This word alliteration must have been intended by the author, for the imagery seems too vivid for us to dismiss. It is possible that the author has given us opportunity for a preconception of character before we become further acquainted with the personality; this is perhaps exactly what the author intended, since turnabout is an applicable technique in writing comedy.

Some sounds bear personality connotations; these are the obvious and capricious names used to label characters in a positive manner. Occasionally we discover some artful ones such as Mrs. Callicoe, Miss Hoyden (which has something of the hoi-polloi in it and is an obviously veiled "hoiden," which means inelegant, rude, bold!), Mrs. Peachum, Sir Fopling Flutter, John Friendly, Major Oldfox, and Lord Plausible.

Some of the more contrived names which indicate that they may have been sounded out rather than reconstructed from traditional sources are the delightful Dollalolla, Lord Foppington, Sergeant Plodden, Drawcansir, and Dollabella; the interesting Abdelmelech, Almanzor, Abenemar, Bellamour, Cordelio, Hounslow, and Syphax; Mrs. Slammekin, Mrs. Millamant, and Lady Graveairs. All are so intriguing that they command our respect and our attention because they sound intriguing. Who would not wonder whether a Mezzana or an Azmyn were not priests or priestesses in jewelled costumery,

silently waiting beside a temple while a rose sky blushes around an enormous moon?

There is a certain relationship between Dorimant and the voracious cormorant, a greedy, rapacious web-footed bird of the pelican family. This comparison is made apparent after reading the play and observing the similarities of the two. We see some of that same rapaciousness in Dorimant in the scene where he is attempting to break relationship with his mistress, Mrs. Loveit. He is cruel and outrageous in his use of her.

Attention should be drawn to the fact that there is a correlation between the nature of the name given and the theme which is to be developed. This is unavoidable since the author knows what he wishes to say and attempts to develop a theme through expository contrasts in dialogue and between characters, and the names of the characters come to him as the play is fashioned. Names having romantic imagery or curious, musical variations in the syllable construction are seldom used in the straight, sophisticated type of comedy such as *The Rehearsal*, by George Villiers. In the comedy of manners, such as *The Man of Mode*, by George Etherege, where the satire is more evident but the names less conspicuous this idea finds logical support. Certain names if not handled skillfully would transpose a play from one category to another—creating one effect where another was desired.

A footnote to *The Beggar's Opera*, by John Gay, appears on page 534 in *British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan*, stating the following:

Most of the names given to the characters are 'label' names, based largely upon the canting language of the underworld. Peachum (to 'peach' is to inform against one's accomplices) probably represents Jonathan Wild, a notorious 'thief-taker' of the period, who was the head of a band of criminals, some of whom he occasionally betrayed to the police for pay. He had been executed in 1725 for acting as a receiver of stolen goods. 'MacHeath' ('son of the heath') alludes to the fact that the open heaths surrounding London were the favorite haunts of the highwaymen who halted and robbed stage-coaches. A 'twitcher' is a pickpocket. Bagshot is the name of one of the heaths, lying to the west of London, on the road to Winchester and Salisbury. 'Nimming' means stealing. Paddington and the Mint were disreputable districts of London, the latter, south of the Thames, being especially famous because it preserved until the reign of George I the

characteristics of a medieval sanctuary, in which the officers of the law could not arrest persons for debt. A 'budge' is a sneak-thief. 'Trapes' and 'slammekin' are synonyms for a slovenly woman; 'trull' and 'doxy' for a prostitute. A 'diver' is a pickpocket. The other names are self-explanatory.³

Although assignment of proper names to characters in a story or play can be made merely as a response to necessity, having no logical or developmental or sequential motivation other than that the characters must be called something, it follows that there is still some psychological incentive for a "proper" or "appropriate" name. Authors have been known to change names of characters from otherwise previously acceptable ones to those more in keeping with theme and setting or style as the play matured. People sometimes do this with their own names when they find them no longer fitting, possibly for similar reasons. The author, being indulgent in his creative privileges, exercises that prerogative in this exciting and amazing process of giving names to fictional personalities.

³*Ibid.*, 534.

Mormon Bibliography

1962

The 1962 *Mormon Bibliography* follows the same pattern that has been established in previous issues of *Brigham Young University Studies*. It consists of items listed in the 1962 volume (v. 3) of *Mormon Americana* which deal specifically with Mormon subjects. *Mormon Americana*, begun in 1960, is a cooperative listing of materials concerning the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and Utah for the purpose of providing contributing libraries both within and out of the State of Utah with a better chance of maintaining bibliographic control of this area. It is not intended as a polished bibliography of Mormon Americana materials, but only as a media wherein material is listed which might be of interest for those libraries collecting extensively in Mormon Americana.

From this semi-monthly, the following bibliography is drawn. In it is a cross section of materials written about the Mormon Church which would be of interest to scholars of various academic fields. No material from Church publications or official publications of the State of Utah are listed due to the fact that they can be located with very little difficulty.

Though *Mormon Americana* lists material concerning the westward movement, overland journeys, and books which have small sections dealing with the Church, this bibliography attempts to list only those books and periodical articles which deal exclusively with Mormonism. Reprints of books which are already known to scholars have also been omitted.

One of the most popular subjects during the year 1962 was the successful bid of George Romney for Governor of the State of Michigan. This interest is reflected in a great many articles which have explored not only Mr. Romney's political and business qualifications, but also his Church affiliation. None of these articles have been included in the bibliography due to the fact that it should be treated separately by a scholar interested in this segment of Mr. Romney's life. However, they are listed in *Mormon Americana* and are available in the contributing libraries.

BOOKS

- Adams, Elise Delia. *John Edge Booth, 1847-1920*. Springfield: Art City Publishing Company, 1962.
- Andrus, Ruth. *A History of the Recreation Program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Iowa, 1962.
- Bennett, Archibald F. *Searching with Success*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Book of Mormon*. English, 1962. (First illustrated edition of the *Book of Mormon*.) Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Brown, Hugh B. *The Continuing Quest*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961.
- . *Mormonism*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1962.
- Carter, Kate B. *Denominations That Base Their Beliefs on the Teachings of Joseph Smith*. Salt Lake City: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1962.
- Christensen, Parley A. *Of a Number of Things*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.
- Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Stakes. Indianapolis. *Science and Religion*. Indianapolis, 1962.
- Clark, J. Reuben, Jr. *Behold the Lamb of God*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- . *Stand Fast by Our Constitution*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Collinwood, Sarah P. *The Descendants of George Palmer and Phebe Draper*. Provo, 1962.
- Corbett, Pearson H. *Hyrum Smith—Patriarch*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Crowley, Ariel L. *About the Book of Mormon*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1961.
- Crowther, Duane S. *Prophecy—Key to the Future*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.
- Dyer, Alvin R. *The Challenge*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Gardner, Nathan Hale. *Alma Helaman Hale, History and Genealogy*. Ogden, 1961.
- Gudde, Erwin G. *Bigler's Chronicle of the West*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.
- Gunn, Stanley. *Oliver Cowdery, Second Elder and Scribe*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.
- Hafen, LeRoy R. *The Hafen Families of Utah*. Provo, 1962.
- Higdon, Barbara Joan McFarlane. *The Role of Preaching in the Early Latter-day Saint Church, 1830-1846*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Missouri. Available from the University Microfilms.
- Hill, Ivy Hooper Blood. *John Ensign Hill; Diaries and Biographical Material*. Logan, 1962.
- . *William Blood, His Posterity and Biographies of Their Progenitors*. Logan, 1962.

- Hubbard, Lester A. *Ballads and Songs of Utah*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.
- Hurst, Frederick William. *Diary; Compiled by Samuel H. and Ida Hurst*. Salt Lake City, 1961.
- Jacob, Carl. *While of These Emblems*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- James Mercer Kirkham*. Salt Lake City, 1961.
- Jarvis, Zora Smith. *Ancestry, Biography, and Family of George A. Smith*. Provo, 1962.
- Johnson, Rufas D. *The J. E. J. Story*. Salt Lake City, 1961.
- Larson, Clinton F. *Coriantumr and Moroni*. Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1962.
- Laxness, Halldor. *Paradise Reclaimed*. New York: Crowell, 1962.
- Laycock, Harold R. *A History of Music in the Academies of the Latter-day Saints' Church, 1876-1926*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Southern California, 1961.
- Life of Thomas Parker, Jr.* Provo, 1962.
- Lyman, Albert R. *Indians and Outlaws*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.
- McGavin, E. Cecil. *The Nauvoo Temple*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- McKay, David O. *The Cause of Freedom*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1961.
- . *Treasures of Life*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Markham, Ira J. *Share a Miracle*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Maughan, Ila Fisher. *Pioneer Theatre in the Desert*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1961.
- Melville, Alton Crane. *The Melville Family of Utah*. Salt Lake City, 1962.
- Mercer, Mildred. *History of Tooele*. Tooele: Daughters of Utah Pioneers, 1962.
- Miner, Caroline Eyring. *Building a Home to Last Forever*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1962.
- Musser, Ellis Shipp. *Ellis R. Shipp; Her Diary*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1962.
- Park, Clara Horne. *Joseph Horne, Pioneer of 1847*. Salt Lake City, 1962.
- Pearson, Glenn L., and Reid Bankhead. *A Doctrinal Approach to the Book of Mormon*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.
- Petersen, Mark E. *One Lord—One Faith*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1962.
- . *Patterns for Living*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.
- Piercy, Frederick Hawkins. *Route from Liverpool to the Great Salt Lake Valley*. Edited by Fawn M. Brodie. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Poulsen, Ezra J. *Robert Price*. Salt Lake City: Granite Publishing Company, 1962.
- Sill, Sterling W. *The Upward Reach*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.

- Smith, Ruby K. *John D. Giles, Modern Trail Blazer*. Salt Lake City, 1962.
- . *One Hundred Years in the Heart of Zion*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1961.
- Stewart, John L. *Brigham Young and His Wives*. Salt Lake City: Mercury, 1961.
- Walker, Lucile H. *Glimpses of Pleasant Grove Schools, 1850-1950*. Provo, 1962.
- Wood, Wilford C. *Joseph Smith Begins His Work*. Vol. 2. Salt Lake City, 1962.
- Young, S. Dilworth. *Young Brigham Young*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1962.

PERIODICALS

- Bjork, K. O. "Scandinavian Mormons," *Norwegian American Studies*, Vol. 21, 1962.
- Carmer, Carl. "The Farm Boy and the Angel," Part 1 of a New Series of the Mormons, *American Heritage*, 13:4-9, October, 1962.
- Davies, J. Kenneth. "Mormonism and the Closed Shop," *Labor History*, 3:169-187. Spring, 1961.
- Davis, Ray Jay. "The Polygamous Prelude," *American Journal of Legal History*, January, 1962.
- Fife, Austin E. (ed.) "Folk Ways of the Mormons, From the Journals of John D. Lee," *Western Folklore*, 21:229, October, 1962.
- (trans.). "Twaine's Essay of the Mormons," *Pacific Historical Review*, 31:49-65, February, 1962.
- Fifield, Allen. "The Men of the Mormon Battalion; Their Adventures and Achievements," *Journal of the West*, Vol. 1, July, 1962.
- . "Wagon East Across the Sierras," *Historical Society of Southern California*, 43:276, September, 1961.
- Hansen, Klaus. "The Making of King Strang; a Re-examination," *Michigan History*, 46:201-19, September, 1962.
- Lyon, T. Edgar. "Politics and the Mormon," *The Utah Alumnus*, 39:7-9ff.
- Poll, Richard D., and Ralph W. Hansen. "Buchanan's Blunder—The Utah War, 1857-68," *Military Affairs*, 25:121, Fall, 1961.
- Sorensen, Parry D. "Nauvoo Times and Seasons," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 55:117-135, Summer, 1962.

Allied Strategy in World War II: The Churchill Era, 1942-1943

DE LAMAR JENSEN

One of the disillusioning, though awakening, shocks which comes to students of recent history is the discovery, after staggering through mountains of patriotic oratory and propaganda, that the British and American allies in World War II were not quite so united in "marching ahead together in a noble brotherhood of arms" as is generally supposed. The wartime alliance of the major powers of Great Britain, the United States, and Soviet Russia was undoubtedly the most spectacular and effective military team ever thrown together in modern times. But it was neither a simple nor a natural combination. The differences in traditions, motives, philosophy, organization, and resources were enormous, and at times appeared insurmountable. Yet the common threat of Nazism was so great and so immediate that a working coalition—or more correctly, several working coalitions—eventually brought an allied victory and an end to one form of totalitarian dictatorship.

This working alliance among the three principal allies was not achieved by a single major compromise but by a constantly shifting set of compromises and adjustments which in the overall view resulted in British military strategy predominating in 1942 and 1943,¹ followed by Russo-American strategy in 1944 and 1945. It is the purpose of this and a subsequent article to critically examine the nature, justification, and results of these policies, and particularly the factors responsible for the dramatic shift in strategy which took place late in 1943.

Dr Jensen is associate professor of history at Brigham Young University.

*This study is in two parts, the second of which will appear in the next issue of *B.Y.U. Studies* in an article entitled, "Tehran, the Turning-Point in Allied Strategy."

¹Or as General Wedemeyer more descriptively put it, "the virtuoso Churchill led the Anglo-American orchestra, although we furnished practically all of the instruments and most of the musicians." General Albert C. Wedemeyer, *Wedemeyer Reports!* (New York: Henry Holt, 1958), p. 170.

I.

When the military events of 1941 caused Britain, Russia, and the United States to become active military partners in the war against the Axis powers, the sharp divergence of their respective philosophies of warfare soon became apparent. The British and American views, in particular, reflected two very distinct traditions of offensive strategy, each with impressive precedents dating back not only to Clausewitz and Napoleon, but even to Julius Caesar and Alexander the Great.

The British belief, as might be expected from their world-wide interests and involvements, was that primary attention should be given to softening up the enemy through indirect attacks upon supply lines, communications, and weak spots, before a direct frontal assault should be risked. Strength should be distributed, according to this view, between several different targets, with emphasis being placed upon flexibility and expediency rather than upon the classical imperatives of mass and concentration. The most outspoken proponent of this "peripheral warfare" was the Prime Minister himself, Winston Churchill,² although the majority of the Chiefs of Staff were generally of the same opinion.³ The disastrous experience of World War I, where Britain suffered 200,000 casualties in a single day in the attempt to meet the Germans head-on at the Western Front, certainly gave support to this view.

The American military experience and psychology had been very different. Without the worldwide commitments and frequent involvement in military action which the British Empire required, the Americans' attitude toward war was that it should be fought wholeheartedly and ended quickly. This American conception of all-out war or all-out peace was foreign to the British, who for centuries had never known either. The U.S. approach meant massing as many men and as much equipment into the battle as fast as possible and striking directly at the heart of the enemy. It required a concentration of effort

²See his summary statement on strategy in Churchill, *The World Crisis* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1923), Vol. II, pp. 18-28; also Harvey A. de Weerd, "Churchill, Lloyd George Clemenceau: The Emergence of the Civilian," in Edward Mead Earle (ed.), *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), pp. 287-305.

³See Arthur Bryant's, *The Turn of the Tide* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1957) and *Victory in the West* (1959), based on the diaries of Field-Marshal Lord Alanbrooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff, *passim*.

and the adherence to a specific well-prepared plan. This philosophy affirms that the total manpower loss will be less than in a drawn-out peripheral war and that the conflict will be considerably shortened. The American strategy was closely akin to that of Germany, and the Russian too was related to it in many respects, as we shall subsequently see.

These were the opposing views which, after December 7, 1941, had to be reconciled into a working coalition.⁴ Prior to the American entry into the war, the military staffs of both countries had exchanged enough information and advice to be rather fully aware of the obstacles ahead, yet they had also reached substantial agreements as to the overall grand strategy and priority of theater operations.⁵ Both countries agreed that Hitler was the greatest immediate threat and that the safety of both Atlantic communities depended upon his defeat. When the Japanese struck at Pearl Harbor, Churchill was fearful that the American reaction might be to turn full attention to the Pacific and leave Britain to face the European fortress alone. It was this fear, coupled with the apparent doom of Russia and the practical need to formulate concrete immediate plans, that sent Mr. Churchill speeding to the United States seven days after Pearl Harbor.

II.

The Arcadia Conference (22 Dec. 1941-14 Jan. 1942), as the first full-scale wartime meeting of the two powers was called,⁶ made some general decisions involving the overall conduct of the war, such as the reaffirmation of the priority

⁴A very fair and moderate description of the conflicting Anglo-American strategy in World War II can be seen in Hastings Lionel Ismay, *The Memoirs of General Lord Ismay* (New York: The Viking Press, 1960), pp. 248-52 *et passim*.

⁵See in particular Mark Skinner Watson, *Chief of Staff: Prewar Plans and Preparations. United States Army in World War II: The War Department*, Vol. I (Washington, D.C.: Historical Division, Department of the Army, 1950), pp. 367-410; Maurice Matloff and Edwin M. Snell, *Strategic Planning for Coalition Warfare, 1941-42. United States Army in World War II: The War Department*, Vol. III (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1953), pp. 32-62; and Louis Morton, "Germany First: The Basic Concept of Allied Strategy in World War II," in Kent Roberts Greenfield (ed.), *Command Decisions* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1960), pp. 11-47.

⁶See Ray S. Cline, *Washington Command Post: The Operation Division*, in *United States Army in World War II: The War Department*, Vol. II (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1951), pp. 87-89; and Matloff and Snell, *Strategic Planning*, pp. 97-119.

of the European theater,⁷ the creation of a unified command,⁸ and the agreement that allied troops should launch some sort of major offensive against Germany in 1942. Beyond that, agreement was much more difficult to reach. When the two staffs moved from the realm of general pronouncements into the arena of specific plans of operation, their differences quickly came into focus. First the British presented their plan of operation, which included a naval blockade of Europe, strategic bombing of key cities and industries, and strengthening the ring around Germany, by "sustaining the Russian front, by arming and supporting Turkey, by increasing our strength in the Middle East, and by gaining possession of the whole North African coast." This was all to be followed by limited moves on the European continent itself in 1943, preferably from the Mediterranean into southern Europe or from Turkey into the Balkans; and finally, with its success guaranteed, an invasion of Germany.⁹

For their part, the American Chiefs of Staff could not accept the British plan and cautiously advanced their own belief that as soon as possible "we must come to grips with the enemy ground forces."

They agreed [reports Morison] that a tight blockade must be maintained, and that the sea lanes must be kept open But nobody could figure out how a succession of "hit and run" raids around the ring of Hitler's *Festung Europe*

⁷This was only reluctantly accepted by Admiral King, the newly appointed Commander-in-Chief, United States Fleet (who three months later also became Chief of Naval Operations), and most of the naval staff who, especially after the humiliation of Pearl Harbor, were less than enthusiastic about maintaining only a holding action against Japan until Germany had been defeated. See Ernest J. King, *Fleet Admiral King: A Naval Record* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1952), pp. 360-64, and Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins: An Intimate History*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 445-46, and cf. William Hardy McNeill, *America, Britain, and Russia: Their Co-operation and Conflict 1941-46*, Vol. III of *Survey of International Affairs, 1939-46*; ed. by Arnold Toynbee (London and New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs, by Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 93 ff.

⁸This was a move considered vital by General Marshall, but which received stiff opposition and considerable modification before it was accepted. Cf. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, pp. 455-57, George C. Marshall, *The Winning of the War in Europe and the Pacific: Biennial Report of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army July 1, 1943 to June 30, 1945, to the Secretary of War* [Hereafter cited, *Biennial Report*] (New York: War Department by Simon and Schuster, 1945), p. 8; and Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service in Peace and War* (New York: Harper, 1947), pp. 413-15.

⁹Memo, Br CsofS (Amer CsofS), 22 Dec 41, sub: ABC 337 ARCADIA (24 Dec 41), 2, as detailed in Matloff and Snell, *Strategic Planning*, p. 101.

could bring victory any nearer. To us this seemed a strategy of weakness: something to be done to keep your spirits up when you could do nothing better. The American idea was to begin immediate planning and preparing for a massive assault aimed at the heart of Germany. This, incidentally, had been the American strategy in World War I, at a time when many British leaders preferred to get at Germany by some "back door."¹⁰

From Churchill's point of view the first major joint Anglo-American operation should be the invasion and occupation of French North Africa. General Marshall and his aides were emphatically opposed to such an obvious diversion of their forces away from what they considered the primary goal—the assault on Hitler's Europe.¹¹ But since no American counter-plan had as yet been prepared, Marshall was happy to have the conference adjourn without making any more binding commitment than the agreement that a North African operation would be studied logistically.

For the next two years Anglo-American relations were dominated by the issue of a Mediterranean vs. a European concentration of allied power, during which time the Prime Minister succeeded—through diplomacy, cajolery, and ultimatum—in making his strategy prevail.¹² In February and

¹⁰Samuel Eliot Morison, *Strategy and Compromise* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1958), p. 24.

¹¹General Arnold was among the American opponents of Churchill's African strategy. "The way to win the war," he insisted, "is to hit Germany where it hurts most, where she is the strongest—right across the Channel," H. H. Arnold. *Global Mission* (New York: Harper, 1949), p. 303. Secretary of War Stimson and others were equally strong in their opposition to the British plan. See Stimson's confidential letter to the President, 27 March 1942, in *On Active Service*, pp. 417-18.

¹²Churchill's ability to put teeth into his convictions soon became well-known to the Americans who negotiated with him. When Marshall, King, and Hopkins flew to London in July they informally talked with some of the British General Staff before calling upon Churchill at Chequers, and reaped, as a result, the now notorious tongue-lashing, described by Captain Butcher in the following words: "The PM [Prime Minister] had raised holy hell with Harry because the precise protocol of calling upon the Prime Minister first had for some reason not been followed, . . . the PM had declared in most vigorous language, as he strode up and down the room at Chequers, that he was the man to see first, that he was the man America should deal with and that the British Army-Navy staffs were under his command. And to emphasize his authority, he read from a British book of war laws, and . . . as he read each page, tore it from the book and threw it on the floor!" Harry C. Butcher, *My Three Years with Eisenhower: The Personal Diary of Captain Harry C. Butcher, USNR, Naval Aid to General Eisenhower, 1942-1945*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1946), pp. 24-25. Hopkins described the event this way: "The Prime Minister threw the British Constitution at me with some vehemence . . . Winston is his old self and full of battle." Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, p. 607.

March General Marshall and the American Joint Chiefs of Staff completed, with the War Plans Division (after March changed to the Operations Division and headed by General Eisenhower), their plan of attack against Germany. Briefly, this *Marshall Memorandum*, as the operational plan was popularly called, proposed a rapid and concentrated build-up of men and materiel in England (Operation BOLERO) for the purpose of a full-scale cross-channel invasion in the spring of 1943 (Operation ROUNDUP). This was to be supplemented by a previous probing attack in western France in September 1942 (Operation SLEDGEHAMMER) involving American as well as British troops. By this plan the allies would be able to strike at the heart of Germany much sooner and more effectively than if they followed Churchill's North African approach to Europe via the rugged mountains of either Italy or the Balkans.¹³ President Roosevelt was generally in agreement with the philosophy of his military advisers, but for some months there were also vigorous claims made by various groups and individuals for alternative operations, the most persistent on the American side being for the Pacific theater. By May, however, the president was convinced that the Marshall strategy was the one to pursue. Yet above all, he insisted, American forces must engage the German enemy in Europe before the year ended. "I regard it as essential," he affirmed in a strongly worded statement to his advisers, "that active operations be conducted in 1942."¹⁴ By then the *Wehrmacht* had launched its spring offensive on the Russian front, and it was not at all certain that it could be stopped. Stalin was desperately calling for a second front in Europe.

In the meantime, hopes for coordinating the American strategy with the British were growing slimmer. Early in April

¹³Marshall, *Biennial Report* (Report on the Army), 1 July 1941-30 June 1943 (Washington, D.C.: Infantry Journal, 1943), pp. 114-20; Dwight D. Eisenhower, *Crusade in Europe* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1948), pp. 42-47; Marshall Memorandum, 2 April 1942: Operations in Western Europe, Exec. 1, OPD Files, Dept. of the Army. The operational designations were not given to the American plan until later: the memorandum Marshall presented to Churchill contained the essence of these three "operations" without their code names; See Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, Vol. IV of *The Second World War* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1950), pp. 314-16. Also *Wedemeyer Reports*, pp. 97-98, 132-38, Stimson, *On Active Service*, pp. 416-20, and from the opposite point of view, Field Marshall Sir Alan Brooke in Bryant, *Turn of the Tide*, pp. 277-80.

¹⁴Memo, F.D.R. for SW, CofS, Arnold, SN, King, and Hopkins, 6 May 42, WDCSA 31 (SS), as quoted in Matloff and Snell, *Strategic Planning*, pp. 221-22.

General Marshall, accompanied by Wedemeyer and Chaney, and the president's chief civilian aide, Harry Hopkins, travelled to London to present the American plan to the Prime Minister and his Chiefs of Staff. "I recall vividly," General Wedemeyer later reported, "this initial joust with the British concerning definitive plans for a cross-channel operation, for it was the forerunner of many discussions, with the Americans always keeping uppermost in mind the basic idea of concentrating and making a decisive effort against the heartland of the enemy. The British, on the other hand, kept returning to a concept of scatterization or periphery-pecking, with a view to wearing down the enemy, weakening him to a point which would permit almost unimpeded or undisputed invasion of Fortress Europe by our forces."¹⁵ The Mission eventually seemed to be a success, though, ending in a tentative British acceptance of the *Marshall Memorandum*, yet skeptical of the means to carry it out.¹⁶

But the appearance of solidarity behind the BOLERO/ROUNDUP plan was shortlived. When General Eisenhower, formerly chief of the U.S. Operations Division and now Commander of the European theater of Operations, arrived in Britain in June, he found that little if anything had been done there to expedite the cross-channel assault,¹⁷ and learned furthermore that numerous other operations such as a Pas-de-Calais crossing, or a Norway invasion, were being considered instead. Soon Lord Louis Mountbatten, Chief of Combined Operations, was on his way to Washington to soften up the American president and the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the forthcoming announcement by Churchill that Operation SLEDGEHAMMER, at least, would have to be abandoned.

The sudden activity of General Rommel in Northeast Africa made consideration of a joint Mediterranean offensive imperative. In mid-June Churchill himself arrived at Hyde Park to discuss with the President the advantages of a North African operation in 1942 (which came to be known as

¹⁵*Wedemeyer Reports*, p. 105. "As 'Marshall's planner,' " Wedemeyer relates, "and as a personal believer in the principle of going for the enemy's jugular vein, I was continually called upon to challenge British periphery-pecking concepts of strategy." *Ibid.*, 132. Cf. Marshall, *Winning of the War in Europe and the Pacific. Biennial Reports*, 1943-45, p. 8.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, 119. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, pp. 634-38.

¹⁷Eisenhower, *Crusade*, pp. 53-4. Trumbull Higgins, *Winston Churchill and the Second Front* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 136.

TORCH). Churchill, the master diplomat, was at his best as he expounded the merits and urgency of the operation.¹⁸ The inadequacy of landing-craft especially, he insisted, although there were many additional drawbacks, in effect eliminated any possibility of a cross-channel attack in 1942. Knowing how strongly Roosevelt felt about launching a major operation somewhere before the year had ended, and preferably before the general election in November, Churchill played persuasively upon the Mediterranean theme. The fall of Tobruk to Rommel on 21 June could scarcely have been better timed to give validity and urgency to the Prime Minister's words if it had been planned by the Combined Chiefs themselves.

The next few weeks were crucial as proposals and counter proposals filled the air on both sides of the Atlantic.¹⁹ In the end, a combination of Roosevelt's anxiety to place American forces in action against Germany in 1942 and Churchill's vigorous championing of Operation TORCH carried the day. Roosevelt's capitulation to Churchill is anticipated in his informal instructions of July 15 to General Marshall prior to the latter's departure for London:

Even though we must reluctantly agree to no SLEDGEHAMMER in 1942, I still think we should press forward vigorously for the 1943 enterprise. I see nothing in the message from England to indicate any luke-warmness on their part for the 1943 enterprise. I am somewhat disturbed about this readiness to give up 1942. Will they also give up 1943?

But my main point is that I do not believe we can wait until 1943 to strike at Germany. If we cannot strike at SLEDGEHAMMER, then we must take the second best—and that is not the Pacific. There we are conducting a suc-

¹⁸On the military conclusions of this meeting see Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, pp. 383-84; and King, *A Naval Record*, pp. 395-96. The best defense of the American plan was presented in a brief to the President by Secretary of War Stimson on 19 June. See Stimson, *On Active Service*, pp. 420-23.

¹⁹See some of Churchill's communications to the President, in Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, pp. 434-41. According to Stimson, General Marshall was so upset at the reopening of discussions that for a time at least, he almost favored shifting American priority to the Pacific. "I found Marshall very stirred up and emphatic over it. He is very naturally tired of these constant decisions which do not stay made. This is the third time this question will have been brought up by the persistent British and he proposed a showdown which I cordially endorsed. As the British won't go through with what they agreed to, we will turn our backs on them and take up the war with Japan." Diary entry of 10 July 1942, Stimson, *On Active Service*, p. 424. Stimson subsequently explains that neither of them really intended to do this; it was rather their feelings about what *ought* to be done to bluff the English into agreement with BOLERO. Cf. Marshall, *Biennial Reports*, 1943-1945, p. 9.

cessful holding war. Troops and air alone will not be decisive at once—it requires the increasing strength of our Navy—which takes time.

If SLEDGEHAMMER cannot be launched then I wish a determination made while you are in London as to a specific and definite theatre where our ground and sea forces can operate against the German ground forces in 1942. The theatres to be considered are North Africa and the Middle East.²⁰

By the end of July SLEDGEHAMMER had been scrapped in favor of a North African campaign and, although he consoled the Americans that ROUNDUP would not be affected, Churchill knew very well that any full-scale operation in North Africa would delay a cross-channel invasion at least six months, and perhaps much longer. The Prime Minister was right. As the commitment of men and equipment to the Mediterranean theater increased during the next year, BOLERO and ROUNDUP were both sacrificed on the North African altar.

Meanwhile, Russia was stepping up her appeals for the opening of a second front in Western Europe and by late spring had been given some reason to believe that it was forthcoming. In the course of conversations with Mr. V. M. Molotov in Washington at the end of May and beginning of June, "full understanding was reached with regard to the urgent tasks of creating a second front in Europe in 1942," according to the official U.S. announcement.²¹ Churchill partially countermanded this assurance a few days later, however, when Molotov stopped at London on his return to Russia.²² But still, breaking the news to Stalin now, particularly after the recent conclusion of an alliance treaty between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, would not be an easy task.

Early in August, Churchill flew to Moscow to present the

²⁰From verbatim notes of the conversation taken down by Harry Hopkins, Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, p. 602. On the Marshall-King-Hopkins talks in London see *Ibid.*, pp. 602-12; King, *A Naval Record*, pp. 399-409; Butcher, *My Three Years*, pp. 25-33; and from the opposite side, Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, pp. 441-48; and Bryant, *Turn of the Tide*, pp. 341-47.

²¹Department of State, *Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1942* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961), Vol. II, pp. 559-61, 569-70, 575-77, and 582-83, [hereafter cited *Dipl. Papers, 1942*] and particularly the White House Press Release of 11 June, pp. 593-94. Cf. also, Arthur Bryant, *The Turn of the Tide*, p. 314.

²²Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, pp. 341-42. cf. Sir Llewellyn Woodward, *British Foreign Policy in the Second World War* (London: H.M.S.O., 1962), p. 197.

new strategic plan to the Russian ruler and his military staff. Stalin's reception of the news was somewhat less than cordial. For two days the two were locked in heated debate as Stalin accused the Prime Minister of reneging on the Anglo-American promise to open a second front in Europe in 1942.²³ Churchill denied that he had made any such promise, and Stalin countered that the British army was afraid to engage the enemy.²⁴ In the end it seemed that the now notorious Churchillian salesmanship had won out. In spite of continued skepticism on the part of the Russian military heads, Stalin appeared satisfied with the possibilities of the new alternative in North Africa,²⁵ and, at a farewell banquet in Churchill's honor, the Premier himself was reported to have been enthusiastically summarizing the advantages of the plan to his subordinates. Wendell Wilkie cancelled out some of Churchill's success, however, by informing Stalin, during Wilkie's visit to Moscow in September 1942, that "the United States was in favor of a second front but Great Britain was not."²⁶ And in an *Izvestia* press interview, published 27 September, Wilkie further emphasized the basic American-Soviet agreement by saying, "I asked myself what can be the most effective method of winning our war by helping our heroic Russian ally. There was only one answer for me—to establish together with Great Britain a real second front in Europe and within the shortest time our military leaders will approve. Perhaps the American public will have to prod them a little."²⁷

III.

For the next fifteen months the British strategy continued to prevail in spite of renewed Russian demands for a "legitimate" second front and increasing American impatience and despair over the diversion of so large a quantity of men and equipment away from what they still held to be their primary objective. According to estimates following the North African landings in November, the German and Italian forces were to be elimi-

²³*Aide-Mémoire* from Stalin to Churchill and Harriman, *Dipl. Papers*, 1942, p. 621.

²⁴Harriman to Roosevelt, 14 August 1942, *Ibid.*; also Churchill, *Hinge of Fate*, pp. 478-80. Cf. Churchill's report of the meeting to General Clark in Mark Clark, *Calculated Risk* (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 48-49.

²⁵Churchill, *Hinge of Fate*, pp. 481-83.

²⁶*Dipl. Papers*, 1942, p. 639.

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 647.

nated from North Africa inside of two months.²⁸ These hopes soon proved to be too sanguine, but while they were still held the chiefs of the two allied powers met again to determine the next step in "closing the ring."

The Casablanca Conference (14-25 January 1943) was another Churchillian victory in its decision to keep the committed troops in the Mediterranean, now that they were there, until further favorable action could be carried out.²⁹ Churchill's greatest fear in December had been that with the cancellation of SLEDGEHAMMER and the indefinite postponement of BOLERO and ROUNDUP the United States might elect to alter its original strategy and decide instead to concentrate on Japan in the Pacific until Britain had finished with its "playing around" in the Mediterranean. He therefore assured Roosevelt, Marshall, and Eisenhower that the cross-channel invasion had not been cancelled and that the arms build-up in England would continue at top speed. But in the meantime, he reasoned, the Mediterranean forces ought not be allowed to sit idle; they should be used in an invasion of Sicily since the allied occupation of that island would be of inestimable value to their cause.³⁰ Roosevelt hoped for the negotiating help of the Russians at Casablanca, and particularly of Stalin himself, who the President knew would also oppose any further delay of the actual European second front.³¹ Churchill emphatically opposed the idea of a Big Three conference, but was saved the embarrassment of a riff with Roosevelt by Stalin's refusal to attend the meeting.³²

Churchill's victory at Casablanca was almost complete. It now seems obvious that he never intended to return any of the Mediterranean troops to England for a cross-channel assault,

²⁸William D. Leahy, *I Was There, The Personal Story of the Chief of Staff to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, Based on His Notes and Diaries Made at the Time* (New York & London: Whittlesey House, 1950), p. 166; Sherwood, *Roose. and Hop.*, p. 654.

²⁹See especially the diary entries of Sir Alan Brooke in Bryant *Turn of the Tide*, pp. 439-59, and Churchill, *Hinge of Fate*, pp. 674-95.

³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 692-93.

³¹Roosevelt to Stalin, 2 December 1942, transmitted by Ambassador Harderson, *Dipl. Papers*, 1942, pp. 665-66. Cf. U.S.S.R.: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Correspondence between the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the Presidents of the U.S.A. and the Prime Ministers of Great Britain during the Great Patriotic War of 1941-45* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957), Vol. II, p. 42. [hereafter cited U.S.S.R. *Correspondence*].

³²Stalin's negative reply to Roosevelt's invitation was delivered by Molotov the following day. *Ibid.*, p. 43, and *Dipl. Papers*, 1942. p.666.

but such a disclosure at the time would surely have caused the Americans to withdraw their forces as soon as the campaign then raging in Tunisia was finished. Instead, the Prime Minister proposed only the invasion and occupation of Sicily, saying nothing of Italy itself until May, when planning for the Sicilian operation was nearing completion, and even then he said nothing of a continued operation into northern Italy.³³ The only significant concession to American demands was his agreement to begin a series of offensives in the south Pacific and in Burma against the Japanese.³⁴

Stalin received the news of the decisions at Casablanca with grave misgivings and disappointment as he again appealed to both Churchill and Roosevelt for an immediate second front.³⁵ On March 15 Stalin wrote to Churchill:

It appears from your communication that Anglo-American operations in North Africa are not being hastened, but are, in fact, being postponed till the end of April. . . . Meanwhile, Germany has succeeded in moving from the West 36 divisions, including six armoured ones, to be used against Soviet troops. . . . I still regard the opening of a second front in France as the important thing. . . . I have studied the arguments you set out in paragraphs 8, 9, and 10 as indicative of the difficulties of Anglo-American operations in Europe. I grant the difficulties. Nevertheless, I think I must give a most emphatic warning, in the interest of our common cause, of the grave danger with which further delay in opening a second front in France is fraught. For this reason the vagueness of your statements about contemplated Anglo-American offensive across the Channel causes apprehension which I cannot conceal from you.³⁶

But now the Western Allies were becoming seriously concerned over the Tunisian campaign, which in the final phase had become unexpectedly difficult. Another five months were still to pass before it would be successfully concluded.

³³Eisenhower, *Crusade*, p. 167; Marshall, *Biennial Report*, 1943-1945. pp. 9-11.

³⁴Ismay, *Memoirs*, p. 287. The deployment of U.S. troops in the spring of 1943 vividly indicates the degree to which Churchill's strategy still prevailed at that date. Whereas TORCH originally called for 185,000 U.S. soldiers in North Africa, there were by then 295,000 engaged there, while at the same time instead of the 250,000 Americans called for in Britain there were only 70,000. *Wedemeyer Reports*, pp. 212-13.

³⁵U.S.S.R. *Correspondence*, Vol. I, pp. 94-96.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 105-106. Cf. Stalin's letters of 16 February and 16 March to Mr. Roosevelt, *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 55-56, 58-59.

In the middle of May 1943 Churchill again met with Roosevelt in Washington at the important Trident Conference, for the purpose of working out strategy for the summer and fall, particularly involving the North African forces. The essence of Churchill's proposals were (1) the formal cancellation of Operation ROUNDUP on the grounds of insufficient Anglo-American strength in England and lack of landing craft (as well as the late date), (2) the immediate invasion of southern Italy with the North African troops as soon as the Sicilian campaign was completed, (3) and finally the attempt to bring Turkey into the Mediterranean war on the side of the allies.³⁷ Churchill, however, reluctantly agreed to begin preparations for a new cross-channel offensive in the spring of 1944 or later (Operation OVERLORD),³⁸ but insisted—on the boldly declared assumption that Italy could be knocked out of the war by the end of summer—that for the immediate future the Mediterranean remained the principal objective.³⁹ Sir Alan Brooke probably expressed Churchill's sentiments when he told Eisenhower that he would prefer eliminating the cross-channel project entirely.⁴⁰

Before the Sicilian venture was completed Churchill had succeeded, by the astute use of pressures and appeals to the Mediterranean commanders, in winning tacit acceptance of his

³⁷Churchill, *The Hinge of Fate*, pp. 784-811 *et passim*, esp. pp. 808-11; Marshall, *Biennial Report, 1943-45*, pp. 10-11; and Ismay, *Memoirs*, pp. 296-98. Also cf. Brooke, in Bryant, *Turn of the Tide*, pp. 502-16, with Wedemeyer, *Wedemeyer Reports*, pp. 228-34, and Eisenhower, *Crusade*, pp. 166-67.

³⁸Lt.-General Sir Frederick Morgan was put in charge of planning the operation. See Morgan, *Overture to Overlord* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1950); also Leahy, *I Was There*, pp. 158-62; and Gordon A. Harrison, *Cross-Channel Attack*, in *United States Army in World War II: The European Theatre of Operations*, Vol. II (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1951), pp. 46-82. This had actually been decided upon at Casablanca, but progress was still slow. By July the outline plan was ready for presentation to the Combined Chiefs and in August it was approved. At the Quebec Conference detailed tactical planning was initiated. *Eisenhower's Own Story of the War* (New York: Arco Publishing Co., 1946), p. 1.

³⁹Churchill made enough trouble at this conference that his own Chief of the Imperial General Staff became rather exasperated: "And Winston," wrote Brooke in his diary, "Thinks one thing at one moment and another the next moment. At times the war may be won by bombing . . . At others our main effort must be in the Mediterranean directed against Italy or the Balkans alternately, with sporadic desires to invade Norway and 'roll up the map in the opposite direction Hitler did.' But more often than all he wants to carry out all operations simultaneously, irrespective of shortage of shipping. . . . There are times when he drives me to desperation." Bryant, *Turn of the Tide*, p. 513.

⁴⁰Eisenhower, *Crusade*, p. 167.

plan to invade southern Italy and move rapidly up the peninsula to Rome. The inference then was that after the fall of Italy the Mediterranean forces could be redeployed to assist in the invasion of France. This was in harmony with General Marshall's determination "to avoid the creation in Italy of a vacuum into which the resources of the cross-channel operation would be dissipated."⁴¹ It soon became apparent, however, that the Prime Minister had no intention of removing the men from the Mediterranean, but planned instead to use them in an invasion of the Balkans through Yugoslavia, the culmination of his cherished "soft underbelly" approach to Europe.⁴²

Thus through the summer and fall of 1943 Churchill's Mediterranean strategy was continued, though not without strong opposition from American planners and commanders who could see, by the time of the next major conference of the allies at Quebec (Quadrant Conference), in August, the very real possibility of a cancellation or postponement of the spring 1944 cross-channel offensive.⁴³ Operation OVERLORD was given first priority over future Mediterranean projects at the Quadrant Conference,⁴⁴ but with the slowing progress in Italy after the initial landings, Marshall feared that Churchill would use this situation to further delay OVERLORD. Therefore the American planners became more adamant in their insistence that more troops be released from Italy to take part in the invasion of France. It was also decided by Roosevelt and Churchill that the entire cross-channel operation should be commanded by an American general rather than a British.⁴⁵

⁴¹Marshall, *Biennial Report, 1943-45*, p. 11.

⁴²*Wedemeyer Reports*, pp. 228-34; Cordell Hull, *The Memoirs of Cordell Hull* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), Vol. II, p. 1231. Ralph Ingersoll asserts that the decision to continue northward up the Italian boot was made solely by Churchill without consultation or conference. Ingersoll, *Top Secret* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1946), p. 61.

⁴³Eisenhower, *Crusade*, p. 168. *Wedemeyer Reports*, pp. 235-43.

⁴⁴Ismay, *Memoirs*, p. 310; Harrison, *Cross-Channel Attack*, pp. 83-100; John Ehrman, *Grand Strategy*, Vol. V, August 1943-September 1944. *History of the Second World War: United Kingdom Military Series*, ed. by J. R. M. Butler (London: H.M.S.O., 1956), pp. 8-10.

⁴⁵Stimson, *On Active Service*. In reference to the British attitude toward the second front, Stimson reported to the President: "Though they have rendered lip service to the operation, their hearts are not in it and it will require more independence, more faith, and more vigor than it is reasonable to expect we can find in any British commander to overcome the natural difficulties of such an operation carried on in such an atmosphere of his government." p. 436.

During September, and at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers in October,⁴⁶ Churchill put up further arguments in favor of an extended operation in Italy north of Rome (which was still much further away from grasp than even the most pessimistic had anticipated) and the possible use of these same troops across the Adriatic.⁴⁷ The deadlock over this point of Mediterranean vs. European strategy was still unbroken when the three heads of state met together at Tehran on November 27, 1943, for their first, and most crucial, conference.

⁴⁶See *Department of State Bulletin*, Vol. IX, No. 226 (23 October 1943), p. 271, No. 228 (6 November), pp. 307-11, No. 229 (13 November), p. 319, and esp. No. 230 (20 November), pp. 341-45.

⁴⁷Churchill, *Closing the Ring*, pp. 284-99; Hull, *Memoirs*, Vol. II, pp. 1274-91; General John R. Deane, *The Strange Alliance* (New York: Viking Press, 1947), pp. 13-26; Herbert Feis, *Churchill Roosevelt Stalin: The War They Waged, the Peace they Sought* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 223-34 and especially Ehrman, *Grand Strategy*, pp. 53-121.