To learn more about the White River and its place in the environmental history of the region, see Quinta Scott, “So Much to Learn: Understanding Missouri’s Landscape—The Early Years of the Missouri Conservation Commission,” starting on page 24.
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The articles in this issue of The Confluence reflect some of the diverse issues and questions facing our region. More importantly, these articles focus on interactions between people and their environment.

Both Theodore Cohen and Sarah Hinds are exploring what it means to be “Other” and the social constructs that accompany those definitions. Cohen asserts that notions of race in Mexico and the United States are very different, particularly for those of African descent. It was not unusual for African Americans visiting Mexico to note the different treatment and social view. Cohen uses Katherine Dunham’s performances in Mexico as a way of delving into those differences.

Sarah Hinds is looking at ideas about “Other” as well, only looking at both Americans and immigrants. She describes something of a matrix of views and conflicts—American and immigrant, Protestant and Catholic, native and Other. St. Louis had one of the largest Catholic populations in the United States in the early twentieth century, but it became both ethnically and religiously more diverse with rapid population growth in the decades after Missouri statehood. Tensions rose when Catholics from other places (especially Ireland) came with different views about faith and Catholicism. St. Louis was not alone in this, of course; violence broke out in Boston and Philadelphia. Hinds uses St. Louis as a case study for understanding how Catholics responded to this rising nativism and accusations that they were not even Christian.

In the second of her two-part series for The Confluence, Quinta Scott continues her examination of the environment of the region and our responses to it. By the 1930s, a growing conservation movement emerged in Missouri about natural resources and the landscape—and how to preserve and manage them. With thinkers such as Aldo Leopold influencing regional policymakers, the State of Missouri created a Conservation Commission to address the long-term care and maintenance of the natural world.

Jeffrey Smith, PhD
Editor
In Defense of the Faith:
The Catholic Response to Anti-Catholicism in Early Nineteenth-Century St. Louis

BY SARAH HINDS

(Above) The Cathedral in St. Louis was the largest physical symbol of the church for Catholics in the region. The publishers of the Catholic newspaper, *Shepherd of the Valley*, used the Cathedral as one of the paper’s stock images in its masthead. (Image: Office of Archives and Records—Archdiocese of St. Louis)

(Right) The Basilica of St. Louis, King of France, informally known as the Old Cathedral, stands adjacent to the Gateway Arch grounds today. When completed in 1834, it was the first cathedral west of the Mississippi and the only Catholic church until 1845. (Image: Office of Archives and Records—Archdiocese of St. Louis)
Beginning in the early nineteenth century, Roman Catholic immigrants entered America through major port cities at astounding rates, settling either along the East Coast or continuing westward. Many who continued west established themselves in St. Louis, a rapidly growing metropolis ideally located for trade and travel on the Mississippi River. These Catholic immigrants met hostility from Protestants who found their Catholic faith theologically backwards at best, and at worst incompatible with republican government and therefore inherently un-American. Out of fear and distrust of Catholicism’s association with the pope, most anti-Catholics hoped to keep “Romanists” out of politics, or to at least minimize their influence. As a result, anti-Catholicism manifested itself as largely a project of the Protestant clergy—a project that sought to keep in check a growing Catholic population. A similar phenomenon characterized the Catholic immigrant experience elsewhere in the United States at the time, but St. Louis is notable for the relatively peaceful response of Catholic immigrants to native Protestant anti-Catholicism. Ironically, as Catholics responded to anti-Catholic vitriol in the community, the press, and politics, they practiced many of the distinctly American values that Protestant antagonists accused them of resisting.
Despite the evangelical hue of the concurrent Second Great Awakening, the largest denomination in the country by 1850 was Catholicism. Catholics numbered 318,000 in 1830; by 1870, there were 4.5 million. This was partly due to the annexation of Texas and the United States’ acquisition of other primarily Catholic territories in the southwest, but immigration also contributed immensely to this increase. Thousands of Irish and German Catholics immigrated to America in the first half of the nineteenth century and brought their faith with them to their adopted homeland, many of them landing in St. Louis. These were not the first Catholics to make their home in St. Louis, a city named after a Catholic king and saint. The city could trace its Catholic roots back to the French fur traders who founded the city in 1764. In the early nineteenth century, the city drew thousands with its lucrative port on the Mississippi River and the enticing lure of opportunity in the American West. Immigrants came in waves, the first sizable group arriving in the 1830s. Extreme poverty in Ireland pushed thousands of unskilled Irish workers across the Atlantic to cities like St. Louis. Another wave began arriving in the 1840s, fleeing the devastation of the Irish potato famine in 1846 and 1847 and the tumultuous revolutions and economic downturn in the German Confederation. Between 1840 and 1850, the population of St. Louis grew by 372.8 percent. By 1850, 77,860 people resided in St. Louis: 9,179
of these were Irish, and 22,340 were German. By 1860, those numbers increased several times over; St. Louis boasted a population of 160,733, with 29,926 Irish and 50,510 Germans.¹

America, and St. Louis in particular, drew immigrant populations searching for peace and opportunity. Much to the chagrin of many native-born Americans, these immigrants often did not assimilate but created ethnic and religious enclaves within the city of St. Louis, often in the form of Catholic parishes. Churches formed on the basis of ethnicity. One could have walked down Chouteau Avenue in the heart of the city in the early nineteenth century and passed one or more specifically Irish, French-Irish, or German parishes along the way. The trend was repeated throughout the city. “Religious and ethnic solidarity, cultural isolationism, institutional separatism, and an aggressive minority consciousness that was defensive as well as insular” characterized immigrant Catholic communities across the city. Instead of meshing with the distinct culture of St. Louis, Irish and German Catholic immigrants retained and continued to embrace their own respective cultures. They worshiped with their fellow immigrants, and in the case of the Germans, continued to speak and publish newspapers in their native language. They further “alienated themselves from the community” by establishing their own newspapers and cultural organizations, leading nativists to assume reluctance on the part of the immigrants to “accept American institutions and ways of living.”² The fact that immigrants retained their own cultures and way of life, and that many of them were Catholic, contributed to the inevitable and gradually intensifying nativist sentiments that swept antebellum America, and St. Louis in particular.

Non-Catholics perceived Catholicism’s relationship to the pope to be both incompatible with and a legitimate threat to American institutions. The pope, to Roman Catholics, is the spiritual head of the Catholic Church—the Vicar of Christ, who follows a line of apostolic succession beginning with St. Peter, to whom Jesus gave the “keys to the kingdom of Heaven.” Thus the pope is not, and certainly was not, worshiped, but he is considered a spiritual leader of the world’s Catholics. To Protestants, this relationship with a foreign sovereign (who at the time was also temporarily in charge of the Papal States) seemed to be a blatant and dangerous misplacement of loyalties on the part of immigrants. An 1851 pamphlet published in St. Louis by Neidner & Co. argued that the “Romish Church” should be considered a threat because “it owes allegiance to a foreign sovereign.” The thought of ceding authority, even spiritual authority, to any foreign entity disturbed many American Protestants. To do so was to take a step backwards in the progress the country had made in the last several decades toward independence and liberty; it was to invite the danger of subversion by a foreign leader. “There is cause for alarm to our free institutions,” reads the 1851 pamphlet; “If infant liberty was crushed in Italy by French bayonets at the solicitation of the pope, why may not a similar course be attempted at some future time in America?”³

The conflict between Catholicism and the rest of religious America drew, then, not solely from Catholic practices and worship—though theological differences ran deep and caused contention—but from the role of the papacy in the life of the church. Catholics during the first fifty years of the American republic’s existence proved their loyalty by being some of the staunchest supporters of the cause for independence. Mary Jane Farrelly noted a “strongly republican element” existed in early American Catholicism, when “lay-clerical relations were marked by a degree of harmony and cooperation.” The “spirit of 1776” manifested itself distinctly in those of the Catholic faith, and Catholics in the late eighteenth century were “largely accustomed to the republican idea that ordinary people such as themselves were the source of power in civil society.” But the waves
of immigration from the 1830s onward brought Catholics from countries politically and socially chaotic. These Catholics found respite in what came to be known as ultramontanism—literally “looking over the mountains” to Rome—for guidance. Naturally, a historically Protestant nation still reveling in its young independence took offense at the idea of looking to a power other than immediate, American civil institutions—more specifically, the American people themselves—for any kind of authority. The fact that Catholic immigrants often used rosary beads to pray and the fact that they typically prayed in Latin, though of course alien to the average Protestant of the Second Great Awakening, was not as disconcerting as was the question of whether or not Catholics “[could] bear unshackled allegiance to the Constitution and government of [the] Republic while [owing] allegiance to a foreign sovereign.” The question was whether these newcomers could be both faithful Catholics and loyal Americans.

Concern for the immigrants’ loyalty certainly contributed to nativist, anti-immigrant sentiments that arose and took aim at Catholics, but so did a pre-existing stigma against Irish laborers. By 1836, more than half of Irish immigrants were unskilled. Irish pouring into the United States to escape the potato blight in the following years were one of the “most impoverished, destitute, unskilled groups” ever to immigrate to America. In the south, the Irish laboring class was so looked down upon that the upper echelon of society relegated them to the same social level as slaves. The Irish Catholic immigrants were denigrated to the lower rungs of society for their ethnicity, and they were altogether feared for their religious beliefs. The Native American Democratic Association in St. Louis concluded in 1835 that the “Roman Catholic religion is a political engine incompatible with a free government.” Some Protestants further interpreted the massive influx of Catholic immigrants to mean that the pope himself was “attempting to get possession of the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys.” It appeared to the most vehement of critics that Catholics were attempting to invade in order to establish a papal foothold in the West. Despite these perceptions, nothing indicates either Catholics or Pope Pius IX wanted to take over any part of the American West; these Catholic immigrants, the Irish
especially, sought to escape poverty and suffering in their homeland to find a better quality of life and economic opportunity, as did their fellow American-born citizens.

The perception that Catholicism and republican government were mutually exclusive moved an ever-increasing number of Protestant ministers and laypeople to speak out against the spread of Catholicism and to take action to prevent its influence in American civil life. To “prevent Catholics from becoming a political majority and taking control of the country,” many Protestants launched frequent verbal and political attacks on Catholics. Beginning in the 1830s, Catholics in antebellum St. Louis experienced increasing anti-Catholic rhetoric in the press, in the community, and in politics. Their reaction, nonviolent and defensive, sought primarily to defend the Catholic faith by responding to animosity in a way that fostered theological dialogue, cohesion within immigrant communities, and a distinctly American Catholic identity.

St. Louis experienced a significantly less violent nativism and anti-Catholicism compared to other American cities during the antebellum period. In Philadelphia and Boston, convents and churches burned, anti-Catholic riots raged, and small but significant casualties and personal damages mounted. The tense but few conflicts that did occur in St. Louis lasted but a few days, and violence was relatively minimal. Instead, anti-Catholicism voiced its vehement disgust for Rome in the community vocally, and by peaceful yet zealous activism.

As time progressed in the antebellum period, more and more immigrants traveled west and settled in St. Louis. As more Catholics arrived in the Mississippi Valley, more Catholic missionaries were sent to accommodate them, fueling the fear of a papal plot to dominate the region. The Home Missionary Society formed partly in reaction to fear of “popish aggression.” Established in 1826 to initially provide religious support for westward-moving Protestants, the society worked to establish Protestantism while at the same time tacitly combat Catholicism. It “supplied funds and preachers, set up seminaries, and by their press activity, helped to create an anti-Catholic atmosphere in the once-Catholic city of St. Louis.” So long as the Home Missionary Society supported Protestant missionaries in the West, Catholicism would not remain unchallenged as “Popish aggression” was considered a very real and legitimate threat to Protestantism in the West. In 1839, a Missouri agent of the society in St. Louis wrote, “It is by no means certain that the Jesuits are not to prevail to a great extent in this Western country. Their priests are coming upon us and with a zeal that ought to make Protestant Christians blush.” Four years later, a Home Missionary Society manager in St. Louis lamented how “popery,” in “occupying” the city, had “erected her banner, bid defiance to Protestantism—to free intelligence, equal rights, and a pure evangelical piety.” He asked: “[S]hall this fair land be abandoned, without a struggle, to the undisputed and perpetual dominion of the Man of Sin [the pope]?”

Catholics responded to the affronts of the Home Missionary Society and other similar groups by cohesion within their own ethnic and religious communities. In the larger community, Catholics and immigrants in general were harassed for their identity, so they often turned to their own parish or other groups in the community for moral or financial support while living in an often-unwelcoming environment. However, not all Protestants held nativist views. At times, mission crossed denominational lines. Catholic and Protestant immigrants often worked together in immigrant aid societies, and peacefully so. These groups offered material support to the poor and suffering of ethnic communities. Catholics and Protestants attended meetings of the “Friends of Ireland,” a group established after the potato blight hit Ireland. Germans established the Giessner Auswanderugs Gesellschaft with the sole purpose of assisting
Germans settling in Missouri. This group was not strictly Catholic or Protestant, but rather one that offered assistance to those with a shared heritage. When the focus was the homeland and ethnicity, religion did not seem to inhibit Catholics and Protestants from working together.

Other immigrant aid groups within the Irish community especially centered on supporting immigrants of the Catholic faith. The first wave of Irish immigrants established the Erin Benevolent Society in 1819 with the aim of addressing “the interests of distressed Irish both in St. Louis and in the homeland.” On March 17, the members combined their faith and ethnic heritage by celebrating their patron, St. Patrick, with a procession through the city and a subsequent banquet. A second generation of Irish Americans established the “Society for the Diffusion of Alms” in 1840. This group focused on “helping the needy at home.” Members, mostly men, were assigned wards of the city, and “[looked] after the needs of the poor” in their respective wards, distributing alms as needed.

The Catholic faith served as a basis for these and similar groups, and knit the Irish community even closer together.

Expressions of anti-Catholic sentiment were not limited to the work of specific organizations; many Protestants sought to disperse their warning of the threat of Catholic influence to the general public as well. The active resistance that aimed to minimize the spread of “papal aggression” communicated the anti-Catholic message to the public by sponsoring public lectures to fuel the “fires of racial and religious antagonism.” Protestant ministers frequently gave such lectures, which intended to primarily “attack their [Protestants’] opponents rather than limit their scope to an exposition of their own beliefs,” explaining why these lectures effectively directed animosity and suspicion toward Catholics. In St. Louis, one of the most prominent lecturers was the Reverend Nathan Lewis Rice, minister of the Second Presbyterian Church. In one lecture published in 1853, Rice expressed concern with the possibility of a papal invasion and described Catholicism as a religion “admirably adapted to please the carnal mind,” one of “pomp and show.”

While opponents like Rice took aim at Catholicism, Catholics reacted by starting their own faith-based organizations. The Western Catholic Association, one of the earliest of such organizations, formed in 1833 for the “propagation, defense, and support of the Catholic religion in the Western country by all honorable and lawful means.” Similarly, the St. Louis Catholic Institute, organized in December 1853, pushed back against the slew of anti-Catholic presentations and events by hosting its own lecture series and meetings. In its constitution and by-laws, the institute set forth the goal of the “inculcation of Catholic principles,” which the group pursued by “establish[ing] a select library and reading room to provide for lectures, addresses, and debates, and to found a hall for Catholic purposes.” The institute held meetings the second and fourth Tuesday of each month, and a member could use the reading room for a $3 per year charge. The formation of these societies and the philanthropy within the Catholic community served to embolden members and provide an atmosphere where they could hold fast to their Catholic identity. In responding to the anti-Catholic message of groups and individuals by forming their own Catholic societies, Catholics gave themselves a voice with which to defend their faith.

Catholics often channeled their defense through the publication of pamphlets. These responded to lectures, spoken and published, that attacked Catholic principles. From the nature of religious controversy at the time, wrote historian George Joseph McHugh, “it seems that the propagation of one’s religion could be compared to a business venture in which competition was very spirited.” Sold and distributed to the general public, pamphlets fostered something of a dialogue between Catholics and the rest of the community.
In 1853, Rice published his lectures in a number of pamphlets. They are riddled with his intense disagreement with several specific Catholic principles, including church authority and infallibility. “Romanism is full of absurdities,” he wrote. “But it claims a venerable antiquity; its rites are . . . imposing and its doctrines, when skillfully set forth by a cunning priest, are not without plausibility. . . . We too believe in the holy catholic church [sic]; but we do not believe in the church of Rome; nor do we believe in any church as the rule of faith.”

In regard to religious authority, he asserted his own interpretation of a Catholic’s adherence to Church authority, and then made clear that Protestants saw the Bible as their only rule of faith: “She [the Catholic Church] claims to be divinely appointed expounder of God’s revelation to man, and forbids, under severe penalty, anyone to understand that revelation otherwise than she directs.”

Catholics used diatribes against their church such as this to engage in theological debate. In the early months of 1854, an unnamed Catholic layman published a pamphlet disputing Rice’s points. His response, both theological and apologetic, used a Catholic perspective of the faith to explain and defend specific principles. The Catholic layman who wrote the 1854 pamphlet explained the authority of the Church as the rule of faith:

Now the Catholic reads and thinks for himself as much as the Protestant, but he knows that in all governments, human and divine, there must be some final authority to decide matters of law and doctrine. The Catholic reads the Bible and works on theology as the lawyer reads the enactments of legislators and the principles laid down by jurists. He understands his Bible, but in points of difficult interpretation, which might give rise to disputes, he willingly refers to the Church for a final decision—just as the lawyer and every sensible man is willing to refer contested points in the laws to the Supreme Court.

Church authority and infallibility are two principles that contributed to the Catholic allegiance to the pope in spiritual matters—naturally then, these two doctrines caused the most contention among Protestants. Later in his lecture series, Rice also took offense at the doctrine of infallibility: “These pretentions of the Church of Rome are founded upon her claim to infallibility in her teaching. She professes to be guided in all her decisions concerning doctrines and morals, by the spirit of inspiration, and therefore demands that her dogmas shall be received as the word of the eternal God. . . . He who disbelieves this, must abandon her communion. We are protestants and against all her exclusive pretentions and anathemas, we enter our solemn protest.” The layman responded:

The argument is this, and it is plain: The Savior established a Church to teach all nations. The Holy Spirit commands men to hear the Church—but God could not require men to obey a teacher unconditionally, which teacher might lead them astray; therefore that teacher is infallible, otherwise God would not command us to hear a teacher which might lead us astray. But he has commanded us to hear the Church. Therefore the Church cannot lead us astray. In other words, she is infallible.

Comparing the Protestant claim and the Catholic layman’s reply, the nature of the Catholic response becomes clear. The Catholic pamphlet, as did many others printed at the time, some also including more extensive biblical references, takes each protestation put forth by Rice and
systematically attempts to explain the principle to present a clear Catholic defense.

Pamphlets contributed greatly to the Catholic voice in antebellum St. Louis, but the Catholic press that emerged in reaction to anti-Catholic publications played an even larger role in giving Catholics an outlet through which to defend their faith. The Catholic Cabinet, a self-proclaimed “chronicle of religious intelligence containing original and selected articles” approved by the bishop himself, published articles on the Catholic faith in the immediate St. Louis area. The periodical also included works written elsewhere in the country. In July of 1845, an article titled “The Press” painted a lucid picture of the relationship between Catholicism and the press. The press in general, it stated, “is too much under the influence of the great majority of readers . . . the innumerable productions which fall from it consist rather of what is novel and exaggerated rather than what is sound and instructive.” The press, it claimed, too often portrayed Catholicism inaccurately. The article asserted that the press typically misrepresented and distorted principles and motives of the Catholic faith—principles, the article said, that have “been held sacred by a great majority of the Christian world for the period of eighteen hundred years.”

An editorial in the Baptist Pioneer, edited by J. M. Peck of Rock Spring, Illinois, exemplified this sort of misrepresentation and distortion: “The Missourians, and especially the citizens of St. Louis seem to have made up their minds that their children shall be moulded by the plastic hands of Jesuit priests, sent expressly from a foreign soil to form the minds and manners of American youth, that they may become the loyal subjects of a foreign prince, blasphemously styled God’s vice-regents on earth and ‘Our Lord God, the Pope.’”

A significant number of St. Louis Catholics responded by writing letters to the most prominent Catholic paper in the city, the Shepherd of the Valley, to “deplore [the Baptist Pioneer’s] anti-Catholic policy.” Peck’s manner of playing to the fear of a “popish plot” to take over the West while theologically misrepresenting Catholic doctrine characterized
the general tone of the press toward Catholicism during the antebellum period.

The press, the Catholic Cabinet aptly noted in July of 1845, "has been sustained by immense pecuniary means, and by a zeal which never tired in promoting its professed object, the destruction of the Catholic religion." This certainly appeared to be the case with Elijah Lovejoy, the controversial editor of the Observer. Lovejoy used his newspaper to spew frequent attacks against Catholicism, and as an individual he wholly condemned the Catholic faith and all associated with it. Little was off limits for Lovejoy, who even found cause to attack Catholics for their use of vestments and candles. His intolerance for anyone but Presbyterians and his vehement anti-Catholicism likely stemmed in part from his upbringing in a home that "accepted malicious rumors and unfounded superstition about Roman Catholics."20

The Observer "followed the trend" in rebuking Catholicism for fear of a "popish plot." Initially, Lovejoy printed anti-Catholic articles signed by a correspondent who referred to himself simply as "Waldo." The influence of other Protestant newspapers and the anti-Catholic Presbyterian minister Edwin F. Hatfield led Lovejoy to become "personally anti-Catholic" in 1834. "We have broken our truce with this spirit of darkness [Catholicism]," he said. "Henceforth we stand in direct and unceasing and uncompromising hostility to it. . . . [W]e are now fully convinced . . . that it is a spirit of unmixed evil."21

In this regard, the Catholic Cabinet astutely described the duty of the Catholic press as one of "defensive warfare." To accusations and attacks from Lovejoy, Catholics responded by not only writing of their disgust directly to the Observer, but also by starting their own newspapers. "Under circumstances so discouraging, the Catholic press has sustained itself with a dignity and decorum," wrote the Catholic Cabinet. Such dignity and decorum manifested itself in 1832 with the Western Catholic Association's founding of the Shepherd of the Valley, which became the city's most prominent Catholic newspaper. It had a "strongly defensive cast" and frequently "engaged in controversy with the Observer and other periodicals of the Protestant persuasion." The Shepherd printed a few local contributions, but included a great deal of content that had been printed in other Catholic publications across the country—all of which the editors hoped would help "refute some of the calumnies directed against the Church."22

In the case of Elijah Lovejoy and the Observer, Catholics responded emphatically—yet in "terms that were generally milder than Lovejoy's attacks." In addition to printing theological and apologetic tracts, the Shepherd printed lay Catholics' reactions and responses to Lovejoy's paper. Some called him out for his theological misgivings. Others were more personal: "The people will not patronize a slanderer, a calumniator, a libeller [sic]," wrote one. "I venture to predict [his] speedy extinction as an Editor in St. Louis." Another issue of the Shepherd more tactfully stated that Lovejoy was "a weak, unprincipled man, whose endeavors are calculated to create anything but brotherly love between Catholics and Protestants, but it is not true that any Catholic in this community. . . . bears any hatred towards him, and we are certain that the clergy harbor nothing but pity for him."23

Ultimately, as the Catholic Cabinet described, the Shepherd and other modes of the Catholic press in St. Louis achieved "the great object it [the Catholic press] had in view: the explanation of our tenets, the defence of those tenets against misrepresentation and calumny, and the encouragement of the faithful to persevere in that holy religion."24

Catholics used the press as a defense in the face of antagonistic preachers and journalists, but it was also the primary mode of defense in the hostile political environment Catholics faced. The early 1830s saw "erratic outbursts of a radical fringe of the Protestant populace." By the late 1830s and beyond, as the number of immigrants filtering into St. Louis grew rapidly,
anti-Catholicism became more determined and vigorous. Anti-Catholic sentiment had gone from a largely fringe movement to a more concentrated effort—a “crusade”—to “save the West from the Pope.”

The widely held and growing belief in Catholicism’s inherent incompatibility with American institutions largely fueled the sense of urgency and necessity to keep Catholics out of government and away from the political sphere of influence altogether. These notions were primary tenets of the American Party—the so-called “Know-Nothings”—a tacitly anti-Catholic and unabashedly anti-immigrant political party that came to prominence in St. Louis and across the nation in the 1850s. Nativists like the Know-Nothings shared the popular belief that Catholicism was an “enemy of republican institutions and a friend of foreign despotism.” Catholicism, to this group, represented all that stood in opposition to “the spirit of the age and progress.” Thus it became apparent to many
impassioned Protestants that “native-born citizens must counteract the growing political influence exerted by Catholic immigrants” in order to defend their distinctly republican, American way of life.26

The Know-Nothings personified these ideals of defending American institutions from immigrants and their foreign influence. Members and their activism essentially “galvanized the forces that had bred hostility to foreigners and Catholics for fifty years.” The Know-Nothings entered the political arena around the time the Whig Party began to disintegrate, providing a “temporary refuge for distressed Whigs.” The party required its members to not only be male and Protestant, but also required that they “believe in resisting the ‘insidious policy of the Church of Rome,’ and all other foreign influences against the institutions of our country.” Their goal became “placing in all offices . . . none but native-born Protestants.”27

Know-Nothings responded to what they believed to be a “popish plot” to take power with their own “Protestant plot” to maintain an ironclad grip on all offices of government. They found this acceptable and necessary, though; ingrained in their ideology was the belief that “Protestantism defined American society” because it was rooted in individualism, in private prayer, and in interpretation of scripture. The average Know-Nothing member found motivation in the claim that “a Romanist is by necessity a foe to the very principles we embody in our laws, a foe to all we hold dear.”28

This incendiary view of such a large portion of antebellum St. Louis’ population escalated—perhaps inevitably—into what became known as the Know-Nothing Riot of 1854. The event highlights the uneasiness with which the Know-Nothings approached the concept of immigrant voters, and the way in which the Irish community stood up for itself and each other during and after the riot. On August 7, 1854, voters flocked to the polls in St. Louis. Twenty members of the Know-Nothing Party “accompanied an election judge to the Fifth Ward” to oversee voting procedures. The judge began turning away mainly Irish voters who could not prove their citizenship. A scuffle ensued and erupted into the “largest riot in St. Louis before the Civil War.” The mob grew to number five thousand and raged for three days; when the dust settled, ten people were dead, fifty Irish boardinghouses were destroyed, and the mob had caused over $200,000 in damages to homes and businesses in the Irish district near the intersection of Second and Morgan Streets. While “nothing was unusual about the occurrence of violence at the polls between Irish-Americans and native-born Americans,” this mob trumped all other similar conflicts in St. Louis by its magnitude.29

The response of the Irish Catholic community during and after the riot illustrates their “ability to match the nativist onslaught.” During the riot, the Irish Hibernians, a “paramilitary religious organization,” contributed to the exchange of gunfire between the Irish and the Know-Nothings. The Hibernians were one of several Irish militia companies at the time. After the initial confrontation, during which an Irish boy stabbed a Know-Nothing member, the Irishmen fled and were pursued by the Know-Nothings to a boardinghouse on Second and Green Streets. The Irish Hibernians were among those who stood fast to “prevent the vengeful Know-Nothings from entering the building.”30

Irish-Americans who incurred either personal injury or damage to homes and businesses in the riot appealed to the city for reparations during the following months. The Irish physically impacted by the riot “mobilized and successfully persuaded the Board of Aldermen to pay damages . . . totaling $163,000.” Such persistence by the Irish community and the corresponding reaction of the city is notable since the city was, in no way, “bound by law or precedent” to pay such damages. Also during the riot, Bishop Richard Peter Kenrick ordered several diocesan priests to “go at once among the
Peter Richard Kenrick (1806–1896) was the first Catholic archbishop west of the Mississippi River. Like his brother Francis Patrick Kenrick (1796–1863), who was archbishop of Philadelphia between 1842 and 1851, Kenrick had to address anti-Catholic sentiment and protest during the 1840s and 1850s. (Image: Missouri History Museum)
Irish portion of the population engaged in these riots to counsel them to desist from all further attempts to disturb the peace.”

His response exemplifies the clergy’s decidedly impartial and uninvolved stance in regard to politics.

Bishops throughout antebellum America “repeatedly encouraged lay Catholics to good citizenship,” but they, as the clergy, “refused to become involved in partisan politics.” Part of the Protestant, nativist argument was aimed at the church’s involvement in European politics, and the clergy was aware of and sensitive to that criticism. In a pastoral letter in 1837, the American bishops “made it clear that, unlike some of the Evangelicals who had been organizing for a Christian Party in politics, they refused to identify Catholicism with any political movement.” They articulated clearly that the duty of Catholicism in the political arena was to “develop sound moral consciences, not to devise strategies or particular means to achieve penultimate temporal ends.” Kenrick ascribed to this same school of thought, having attended Maynooth, a seminary in his home country of Ireland that had a strong “no politics” tradition. Like many clergymen, Kenrick refrained from political involvement at all levels. Moreover, he refrained from “indulging in nationalistic prejudice.” Rather, he favored parishes formed on the basis of nationality; such parishes would “help immigrants make a transition from the old world to the new without losing [their] identification with the Church.” Kenrick remained “silently impartial” in regard to ethnic identity: “He did not identify Irish and American, or Irish and Catholic. . . . [H]e saw the middle west as a melting pot.”

The Know-Nothings certainly caused a fair amount of trouble in St. Louis, especially for St. Louis immigrants and Catholics. The party’s popularity for the few elections in which it made a strong showing was due in great part to “dissensions [that] occurred in the ranks of the older parties which allowed the natives the opportunity to hold the balance of power in a few elections.” McHugh writes that the nativist movement “furnished a temporary refuge for distressed Whigs and acted as a stepping stone to the formation of the Republican Party.” As the Know-Nothing movement began to decline, it began to become more focused on appealing to anti-Catholicism—yet this focus did not seem to prolong its existence. When the nativists made anti-Catholicism rather than anti-immigrant sentiment a primary focus in St. Louis, their influence rapidly declined. Because the Know-Nothings waited until their party’s popularity began to decline before they focused succinctly on anti-Catholicism, it is clear that “the Catholic population of St. Louis was not ready to allow the religious question to be brought into politics.”

Regardless, Catholics responded with their newspapers, and also by challenging city courts for what they believed was owed them, and in the case of the clergy, by not responding at all.

The question that remains, then, is how pervasive was this anti-Catholicism in antebellum St. Louis? Further, what was the essence of the Catholic response? The incendiary messages of people like Nathan Rice and Elijah Lovejoy certainly fueled a sense of anti-Catholicism in the city. But for quite some time, though they may have harbored immense theological disagreements, Catholics and Protestants could and did work together peacefully as fellow citizens. Both groups united for the cause of the homeland in Irish aid societies like the Friends of Ireland. For several years it was not uncommon for members of both faiths to attend these meetings together. This sense of relative tolerance is further qualified by the fact that in 1847, a majority of St. Louisans—faith disregarded—trusted the Catholic Bryan Mullanphy to lead the city as mayor.

Furthermore, over a decade before Mullanphy became mayor, both Catholics and Protestants gathered together for the dedication of the new Cathedral of St. Louis, King of France, on October 26, 1834. The event truly knew no religious bounds as much of the city came
together to celebrate what was viewed, more or less, as a civic ceremony. Local militia companies that were “captained by members of other Christian denominations” volunteered to participate. The event even blurred the line between Church and state, as a military band from Jefferson Barracks offered its services for the ceremony. Elijah Lovejoy, unsurprisingly, did not approve. He lamented the fact that the dedication had “defamed the Sabbath” and he was also disturbed by the multi-denominational nature of the event. For a time, this seems to have been the nature of the relationship between Catholics and Protestants in St. Louis: a relative peace, and a “spirit of cooperation between religious faiths” marked by the low hum of opposition on the fringe of religious communities.

The situation reached its zenith only when the Know-Nothing Party injected a partisan hue to immigrant-native relations. The only major violent incident, the riot of 1854, erupted over fear of the Irish Catholic voting bloc. The Know-Nothings contributed, in this way, to the polarization of Catholics and Protestants in St. Louis; because the party feared and distrusted immigrants’ involvement in politics and government, they felt only Protestants could dutifully serve in political office. Thus, every voting immigrant Catholic became a threat to the established political order of the American republic, an issue that brought anti-Catholicism from the fringes of the community to the forefront of political discussion. The Know-Nothings took the previous tacit concern for Catholic involvement in government and placed it on the political stage, making it an issue that weighed more heavily on the minds of lay Protestants, in turn negatively affecting their relationships with Catholics.

Still, anti-Catholicism in St. Louis did not escalate to the level that it did elsewhere in America. Even during the moments of greatest intensity, St. Louis retained a semblance of decorum in the face of religious difference compared to the vitriol and violence experienced in other cities with large Catholic immigrant populations on the east coast. This becomes apparent when considering that the same year that Catholics and Protestants peacefully gathered for the dedication of the Cathedral, a vehemently anti-Catholic faction of nativists (mainly Congregationalists and Unitarians) utterly destroyed an Ursuline Convent in Charlestown, Massachusetts. In the days prior to July 28, 1834, a rumor spread that a nun was being held at the convent against her will. City officials toured the convent and “found no signs of foul play.” Later that evening, dozens of nativists (many reportedly intoxicated) torched the convent after looting it and ransacking everything, including consecrated Eucharist hosts. In the following days, many participants cited an especially inflammatory speech given by Lyman Beecher in Boston on July 27 as the primary reason for the event. In one of his sermons, Beecher portrayed Catholic subversion as imminent and marked his words with a sense of urgency in fighting back against the rapid influx of Catholic immigrants:

[T]he Roman catholics of Europe seem to be seeking an asylum from the contentions and revolutions of the old world and a site for the palace of the Pope and the Romish Church in the Great Valley of the Mississippi. . . . [T]he principles of this corrupt church are adverse to our free institutions, from the contempt and hostility which they feel towards all Protestants. . . . Roman Catholic Europe is pouring her population into the Valley in great abundance; and . . . if the subjects of the Pope are increased beyond the increase of our own people . . . they would in thirty years more, out number our native inhabitants. . . . Despotic princes in Europe would empty their coffers of treasure liberally, could they by means
of the Romish church, subvert our free institutions and bring into disgrace all ideas of an effective government.36

Beecher expounded upon many of the same concerns over Catholic subversion in government that Protestant ministers in St. Louis lectured about, but St. Louis never experience such direct and unmitigated violence, especially against religious orders. Sisters in St. Louis were, in fact, largely responsible for much charity in the city from which all denominations benefited. The Sisters of Charity, for example, ran a hospital, and the Sisters of Mercy began one of the few schools for blacks. The Massachusetts convent burning was rooted in the widely held belief that monastic life itself was “deviant” and drew from a general suspicion of convent life in general.37 Though anti-Catholic Protestants in St. Louis may very well have shared these same suspicions, they never acted upon these beliefs to the violent extent that like-minded Protestants did in Boston.

Similarly, Philadelphia saw riots and violence almost incessantly throughout the summer of 1844; these events arose from vehement theological opposition to the Catholic view of the Bible, as well as other economic and social factors. Protestants became incensed when the bishop of Philadelphia requested that the school board allow Catholic students in public schools to read a Catholic version of the Bible in school rather than the Protestant King James Version. The board approved this request in 1843; Protestants largely considered the request “an outrage, an insult, and a direct violation of fundamental American religious values.” This, combined with frustration over immigrants competing for jobs and the ever-present perception of a papist threat, culminated in a series of riots in Philadelphia that became known as the Bible Riots. Two separate incidents ravaged parts of the city. The end result was astounding and incomparable to the singular, though significant, riot in St. Louis. In Philadelphia that summer, “Every Catholic Church . . . was threatened with attack. . . . [T]wo were burned to the ground, and one was badly damaged. . . . [T]wo libraries, two rectories, a schoolhouse and multiple blocks of homes were also torched. About thirty people were killed and hundreds injured. . . . [T]he riots caused at least a quarter of a million dollars worth of damage, an astronomical amount for the time.”38
These events in Boston, Philadelphia, and numerous other cities were often spurred by some deep theological dispute or misconception, or over concerns that immigrants would take jobs away from native citizens. St. Louis, which even in the 1850s had a history of Catholic presence in the city, only experienced an event of relatively comparable magnitude when anti-Catholicism was brought to the forefront of local politics.

Catholics responded to the verbal and political animosity they faced in a way that was both nonviolent and defensive. Elijah Lovejoy antagonized not only Catholics, but he also greatly angered slaveholders in St. Louis with his combative abolitionist views, which he zealously printed alongside Catholic criticisms in the Observer. While the offended slaveholders responded by defacing Lovejoy’s property, throwing his printing press in the river, and ultimately murdering Lovejoy, Catholics responded to his theological attacks with letters to the Observer and articles in their own Catholic newspapers. They created a means for their voices to be heard and then refuted accusations against Catholicism, defending the faith. This is not to say that the Catholic response was passive, for they certainly employed strong, most often theological, rhetoric in their letters, lectures, pamphlets and newspaper columns. But their
The Observer was initially an anti-Jackson newspaper published in St. Louis by Elijah Lovejoy (1802–1837) starting in 1827. Lovejoy was moved by the evangelical movement of the Second Great Awakening to return to Princeton Theological Seminary in 1832, where he became an ordained Presbyterian minister before returning to St. Louis in 1833. While a voice of abolition (especially after the lynching of Francis MacIntosh), Lovejoy's paper, which later moved to Alton, Illinois, also carried a strong anti-Catholic sentiment. Lovejoy was murdered in 1837 while trying to keep protesters from throwing his printing press into the Mississippi River in Alton. (Image: Mary Ambler Archives, Lindenwood University)

response was not geared toward physically harming or silencing those who swore Catholics to be enemies.

An antebellum Protestant's religious views, influenced by Second Great Awakening individualism, would describe an American as necessarily Protestant; to be American, many thought, one must live American values, like individualism and republicanism, and understand the importance of constitutional liberties. It seemed outlandish that one, such as a Catholic, could be faithful to an inherently hierarchical and universal Church while still pledging allegiance to American political institutions. Protestant tolerance ended with those whom they believed did not live these American values: therefore, Catholics were excluded. But when considering how Catholics responded to anti-Catholicism in St. Louis in the antebellum era, it is evident that Catholics were, in fact, enjoying and partaking in some of the most deeply cherished American values engrained in the fabric of the republic. In fact, these American values and liberties enabled them to defend their faith in the midst of the harsh criticism they faced. Immigrant Catholics used their newfound freedom of speech (a freedom they may or may not have enjoyed with such fervor in their countries of origin) to publish their own newspapers, write letters to the editor, and distribute Catholic pamphlets. The right to assemble freely made the Western Catholic Association and St. Louis Catholic Institute meetings possible. The concept of Manifest Destiny pushed Catholics westward along with Protestants.

Alexis de Tocqueville observed in 1844 that Catholicism itself “predisposes the faithful to obedience,” whereas “Protestantism . . . generally tends to make men independent, more than to make them equal.” With striking irony, at the same time Catholics were accused of being un-American, they practiced and lived American values cherished by the most vehement critics of Catholicism. Catholics may have paid spiritual homage to the pope, but they clearly enjoyed and understood the benefit of the liberties America afforded them—and used these liberties to defend the Catholic faith.
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So Much to Learn:
Understanding Missouri’s Landscape
The Early Years of the Missouri Conservation Commission

BY QUINTA SCOTT
Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County, Missouri

Les Wright walked out his front door early one morning, leaned over to pick up his morning paper, straightened, and was startled to find a deer ambling down his neighbor’s driveway. Wright lives ten houses away from Kingshighway, a busy north-south thoroughfare through the center of the City of St. Louis, where ambulances tear down the street to a large medical center ten blocks away.

When you have altered a landscape, as we altered the Ozarks in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, you have to learn to understand the ecosystems you have destroyed in order to restore them. To learn how to restore Missouri’s landscape, its various agencies had to learn how climate, geology, soils, and waters determined what grew where and who lived where in Missouri’s diverse ecosystems before European settlement. This process began in Missouri in the 1930s and continues to this day.

Before European settlement an estimated 700,000 deer ranged across the entire state of Missouri, across the prairies north of the Missouri River, and across the forested Ozarks to the south. Missourians turned the prairies over to row crops and stripped the Ozarks of their oak and pine. Deer lost habitat and places to hide from predators, whether four-legged or two-legged. In 1934 the U.S. Forest Service estimated that there had been as many as 250,000 turkeys running wild through 32,000,000 acres of forested cover in Missouri before European settlement. Like the deer, turkeys lost food and cover as loggers denuded the forests or burned them in the fall, destroying the acorns and other forest fruit turkeys depend on for winter food.\(^1\)

It is hard to believe that in the first decades of the twenty-first century, when deer run rampant through suburban yards and graze on city lawns, that Aldo Leopold, in his Report on a Game Survey of the North Central States, counted 564 deer in Missouri in 1926, but noted that the figure was probably too low, because many could be found in state parks where 300 had been recently planted. Eight years later Dr. Rudolf Bennitt and his student, Werner O. Nagel, upped the total no more than 2,000 in their census of Missouri game.\(^2\) Bennitt and Nagel published their survey in 1937 just as Missouri’s Conservation Commission became an agency independent of changes in Missouri’s political whims.

With the help of Aldo Leopold, a pioneer in the theory of land management for wildlife, and Nash Buckingham, a popular wildlife writer, Missouri passed the constitutional amendment that established its Conservation Commission in November 1936. The new agency had several tools at its disposal when it opened its doors the following year. Aldo Leopold's 1930 Game Survey of Missouri provided the agency with a picture of the state of Missouri's game; his 1932 Game Management provided a managing philosophy. Leopold's work reflected that of Herbert Stoddard, who had examined the life and habits of quail and published the first field study for land management for wildlife in 1931. In 1934 Bennitt and Nagel fleshed out the state of Missouri's game with their own survey. All three—Leopold, Bennitt, and Nagel—laid out the goal for the new commission: Game restoration and management dependent on professional administration, scientific research, trained

---

\(^1\) It is hard to believe that in the first decades of the twenty-first century, when deer run rampant through suburban yards and graze on city lawns, that Aldo Leopold, in his Report on a Game Survey of the North Central States, counted 564 deer in Missouri in 1926, but noted that the figure was probably too low, because many could be found in state parks where 300 had been recently planted. Eight years later Dr. Rudolf Bennitt and his student, Werner O. Nagel, upped the total no more than 2,000 in their census of Missouri game. Bennitt and Nagel published their survey in 1937 just as Missouri’s Conservation Commission became an agency independent of changes in Missouri’s political whims.

With the help of Aldo Leopold, a pioneer in the theory of land management for wildlife, and Nash Buckingham, a popular wildlife writer, Missouri passed the constitutional amendment that established its Conservation Commission in November 1936. The new agency had several tools at its disposal when it opened its doors the following year. Aldo Leopold's 1930 Game Survey of Missouri provided the agency with a picture of the state of Missouri's game; his 1932 Game Management provided a managing philosophy. Leopold's work reflected that of Herbert Stoddard, who had examined the life and habits of quail and published the first field study for land management for wildlife in 1931. In 1934 Bennitt and Nagel fleshed out the state of Missouri's game with their own survey. All three—Leopold, Bennitt, and Nagel—laid out the goal for the new commission: Game restoration and management dependent on professional administration, scientific research, trained

---

(Left) Long Bald, Lander’s Bald, Tater Cave Mountain, Big Acorn Knob, Bear Cave Mountain, Long Mountain, Morrison Knobs, Stony Knob, Little Stony Knob, Caney Mountain: These and six others are the Gainesville Monadnocks. The Missouri Department of Conservation has incorporated the eleven in the Caney Mountain Conservation Area, the site of the first management plan created by the new Missouri Conservation Commission in 1941. The monadnocks are isolated rocky cones, capped by the remnants of dissolved Mississippian limestone that once formed the plateau from which the cones were derived. After the limestone decomposed, what was left were mounds of erosion resistant chert, breccia, cemented together with silica.
professional foresters and game managers, and an educated public that understood its role in conservation.

The first director, Irwin Bode, who came with the recommendation of Leopold, could provide professional management. His first employees came from the old Fish and Game Commission, which had managed the state's hatcheries. He had money from the federal 1937 Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Program, which raised its funding through taxes on the sale firearms, ammunition, and archery equipment, to hire professional foresters and game managers. In 1939 Bode used the funds to hire nine young scientists who initiated the effort to build Missouri’s wildlife restoration program.

What Missouri had done to protect wildlife before 1937 had not worked. In spite of the open and closed seasons on hunting, in spite of the new system of state parks that protected wildlife, and in spite of the new funds that had gone into managing wildlife, when Bennitt and Nagel did their census, they identified fewer than 100 ruffed grouse, not more than 2,000 deer, and about 3,500 wild turkeys. In addition, they noted that quail and rabbits were declining along with raccoons, muskrats, and mink. They took no census of fish, because severe drought and wild fires in denuded forests eroded soils, which slid down steep hillsides to muddy streams. The state's fisheries had declined.

In 1939 the commission entered into an agreement with the U.S. Biological Survey, the University of Missouri, and the Wildlife Management Institute—a private, nonprofit scientific organization established by hunters in 1911—to establish The Cooperative Wildlife Management Program, a research unit. Dr. Paul Dalke, from the Biological Survey, led the program. Bode's young biologists, most of them recent graduates, worked in the Federal Aid-Wildlife Research Program in Missouri (Mo.1-5R), which started on December 1, 1938, and ended on June 30, 1943.

The biologists divided their work into three phases. First, they surveyed the state's ecological regions to identify why wildlife was losing ground, opportunities that could give critters a chance to recover, and ways to persuade landowners and hunters to cooperate in applying their research to wildlife restoration. Second, they tested those methods by developing Cooperative Management Units on Private Lands, where several landowners pooled their lands to protect their properties from over shooting. Third, they prepared comprehensive management plans for individual species. The biologists approached their research with a sense of urgency; they had so much to learn. They surveyed trends in land use, economic conditions, and the numbers and distributions of individual species. At first Bode assigned the biologists to various regions, but as the size and complexity of the task before them became apparent and money became available, several took on studies of individual species: Charles Schwartz studied the prairie chicken; Carl Noren, raccoons; David L. Spencer, deer and turkeys; and A. Starker Leopold, turkeys. Even before individual biologists completed their studies, others snapped up their data and used it. When Noren completed his raccoon study in 1941, Werner O. Nagel expanded it into a study of all furbearers and ventured into a study of the relationships between soil fertility and the size and health of furbearers. He asked the question: Why does a forty-acre pasture in the glaciated prairie of northern Missouri support eight head of cattle and several dens of healthy spotted skunks, while you would be hard put to find any spotted skunk in a forty-acre pasture on a rock-strewn ridge, which supported the same number of cattle in the southern Missouri Ozarks? He concluded that the common factor was the quality of the soil that produced food and cover that the skunk depends on. Arthur H. Denney picked up Nagel’s study and expanded it to cover the impact of soil types and fertility on all game species.

The work of Noren, Nagel, and Denney
changed the criteria for gauging the productivity of game. Aldo Leopold had used the types of vegetation that provide food and cover to study the health and numbers of game in his *Game Survey* and *Game Management*. While they modeled their Missouri Game Survey on Leopold's work, Bennitt and Nagel took it a step further and broke down their study into Missouri's zoogeographic regions: the Northern Glacial Region, the Western Prairie, the Ozark Highlands, and the Mississippi Lowlands. In their preliminary studies, Bode's biologists looked at land use as a factor in determining the health of game. Nagel and Denney based their work on the research of William A. Albrecht and Merritt F. Miller and Herman Henry Krusekopf, all soil scientists at the University of Missouri. Albrecht had concluded that fertile soils produce healthier farm animals. Miller and Krusekopf had classified, described, and mapped the soil types across the state.

In his survey, Denney sampled 38 15-mile-square areas of different soil types across the state, chosen on the basis of land use, wildlife, and vegetative cover. When he took his results and applied them to other similar areas of the state, he could draw a picture of who lived where in what habitat. He concluded that soil determined vegetation, the density of game species, and their distribution, behavior, and health. In short, he concluded that the more fertile the soil, the healthier the rabbits, raccoons, and quail. Denney’s research gave others the tools to prepare detailed management plans for each species within the state's various watersheds, including his own survey of the Meramec River watershed.5

To study deer and turkey, Bode stationed A. Starker Leopold at the Caney Mountain Refuge in Ozark County and David Spencer at the Skaggs Ranch, formerly the five-thousand-acre St. Louis Game Park and Agricultural Company, in Taney County, which the Conservation Commission began managing in 1939. Both incorporated Denney’s work on soils into their studies.
Thurman’s Sink, St. Louis Game Park and Agricultural Company, aka Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, Taney County, Missouri

The game park did not fare well after Moses Wetmore—president of Liggett and Meyers Tobacco in St. Louis, who founded the park in 1891—died in 1910. While his partner, George McCann, president of Old Coon Tobacco in Springfield, continued managing the park, the fire line was not maintained, trees invaded the border, and the deer-proof fence surrounding a five-hundred-acre enclosure stocked with deer broke down. The animals escaped. In 1917 McCann sold the park to the Ozark Livestock and Game Company, which raised hogs, mules, and cattle, and did not maintain the deer fence.

Steep ridges, deep hollows, moderately sloping uplands, cedar glades, oak-hickory-pine forests, creeks, a sinkhole, and three miles of bank on the White River characterized the game park.
Frank Drury House, Drury-Mincy Conservation Area

In 1929 Marion Barton, called M.B., Skaggs of Safeway Grocery Stores purchased the park as well as the Frank Drury ranch north of the park and other properties. He repaired the fences and buildings, wrapped an additional 160 acres in a deer-proof fence, and ran 650 head of cattle year 'round, which grazed forage down to the nubs. Charles Baker lived with his family in the Drury House in the 1950s. While at Drury-Mincy he designed a trap that could safely capture and transport deer. Today Missouri State University's Bull Shoals Field Station, which restored the house, uses it for its headquarters and dormitory for students who come to the refuge to study the wildlife, forests, and glades."
Gasconade stony loam-black and silty soil characterized the glades. It supported grasses, herbs, and shrubs in very shallow soils, and a few stunted trees.

Cedar Glade, Skaggs Ranch, aka Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, Taney County, Missouri.

Skaggs removed the livestock in 1935; the grass came back. When the Conservation Commission took over management of the park, Skaggs gave David Spencer and Paul Dalke access to records that detailed how the park had been managed in the fifty years it had been in private hands.
Bear Mountain, Skaggs Ranch, aka Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, Taney County, Missouri

Spencer and Dalke opened their study with descriptions of the soils and plant covers that characterized the landscape, using Miller and Krusekopf’s classifications. They found Huntington silt loam on the river bottoms and Clarksville loam, underlain by limestone, in the uplands, which they subdivided. Clarksville stony loam—best suited for timber and wildlife production and found on the high, steep slopes—supported post oak and black jack oak on dry sites on the southern slopes and white and northern red oaks on moist sites on the northern slopes. Clarksville gravelly loam could support agriculture if one chose to clear out the rocks and cut the black jack oak. Hardpan clay underlay Lebanon silt loam, which supported hard-to-drain post-oak flatwoods, unsuitable for agriculture. Gasconade stony loam—black silty soil that characterized the balds—supported grasses, herbs, and shrubs in very shallow soils and a few stunted trees, which were suitable for grazing only.
Landscape Outside Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, Taney County, Missouri

When Spencer and Dalke arrived at Skaggs Ranch in 1939, they found penned-in deer outnumbered the acreage that could support them in the enclosure. They faced two ironic conditions: inside the enclosure where the deer had browsed, all the woody shrubs and vines, grasses, valued by livestock, flourished. Outside the enclosure where livestock had grazed, all the grasses, woody shrubs and vines—valued by deer and other wildlife—flourished. They found that tree cover was similar to its original composition and density. In droughty years, when oaks produce few acorns, the deer depended on the grasses, became malnourished, and lost vitality. To provide winter food for deer, Skaggs and the biologists set out bales of hay and corn for turkeys and squirrels, which the deer also used.10

In the years since Miller and Krusekopf published their Soils of Missouri, soil scientists have refined their classifications. In the region outside of the Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, scattered cedars and a few hardwoods grow on moderately sloped hillsides. The soil is either Clarksville gravely loam, which can host cool and warm season grasses, or Hailey gravely loam, which also supports forage for livestock. Both support timber. Where the two occur together, the Clarksville soil is generally found upslope of the Hailey. Because both drain fast and well and can become droughty, overgrazing can cause erosion.9
Drury-Mincy Conservation Area, Glade, Taney County Missouri

M.B. Skaggs was as generous with his deer as he was with his records. He gave the state 50 deer a year, for a total of 750 over time. They went to refuges like Indian Trail State Forest and Caney Mountain Wildlife Refuge. During the winter of 1940 it was Spencer’s responsibility to trap and box up the 53 adult bucks; 27 does, many pregnant; yearlings, some males; and fawns—load them onto a truck, and cart them to the new Caney Mountain Refuge in Ozark County—a brutal drive, even today—where Bode had stationed Starker Leopold.

When the Agricultural Experiment Station of the University of Missouri studied the restoration of Missouri’s forests in 1937, researchers concluded that the thin, rocky soils on steep slopes, runty trees, and sparse herbs that were unpalatable to livestock made glades unsuitable for grazing. However, research might prove that grass forage could be grown on glades that then could be turned over to livestock. Today, we understand that glades have their own special herbs, forbs, and grasses. Critters—roadrunners, Missouri collared lizards, and others—found nowhere else live here.11
In early summer the spade-like leaves of Prairie Dock (*Silphium terebinthinaceum*) poke up among the purple coneflowers and grasses of Deer Lick Glade. In early summer the leaves are tender and shiny, but by fall they are coarse, hairy, and inedible. Their yellow flowers bloom July to September and attract Ruby-throated hummingbirds, bees, and beetles. Wildlife eats the flowerheads and Goldfinches the seeds.12
Starker Leopold’s Cabin, c. 1940, Caney Mountain Conservation Area

The conservation commission purchased 5,530 acres for the Caney Mountain Conservation Area in February 1940 to protect the eastern wild turkey, in a region where the last known deer had been killed in 1910 but where the landscape was suitable for deer, turkey, and other wildlife. Spencer and Leopold released the deer. Only eight, no males, strayed from the refuge, but they remained close by. Dogs or wolves killed two of the does. By June 1941, Leopold concluded that the restoration of deer at Caney had been successful and the delivery of another fifty would reestablish deer to Ozark County.13

In the five years Starker Leopold worked for the commission, he took charge of the turkey program; designed the management plan for Caney Mountain near Gainesville; wrote a general management plan for the State’s turkeys in 1943; and, working with Dalke, completed a 1942 survey of turkeys across the state. His 1941 management plan for the Caney was an experiment that built on the work of Herbert Stoddard, Aldo Leopold, and Rudolf Bennitt and Werner Nagel.

Long Bald, Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County, Missouri

Starker Leopold opened his plan by noting that the Caney refuge had never been overgrazed or overburned and therefore was suitable for turkeys; that Clarksville stony loam, underlain by limestone, characterized a landscape of steep hills and deep hollows; that Caney Creek bottoms provided sites for food patches; that there was a remnant wild population of turkeys that could serve as breeding stock; and that turkeys prefer the herbaceous ground cover growing under “the savanna-like stands of timber,” like Long Bald, that could supply cover and food: mast—nuts from oaks and fruit from dogwood, cedar, and ironwood or hornbeam trees.
Glade, Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County, Missouri

These prescriptions echoed Aldo Leopold’s in *Game Management*: that the new refuge be closed to hunting; that controlled burns be instituted, which Stoddard had done in Georgia but which Aldo only mentioned tangentially; that timber be harvested under a balanced program; that 15 to 25 percent of the new refuge be open land, distributed throughout; that supplemental food plots and watering ponds be constructed; that tick-bearing livestock be fenced out, as both bloodsucking ticks and hogs have a taste for young turkey poults; and that wolves and coyotes be trapped, which also led to the penning of neighborhood dogs, preventing them from stalking turkeys in the refuge.

Black-eyed Susan (*Rudbeckia hirta*), a member of the Aster family (*Asteraceae*), mix in with Big Bluestem grass (*Andropogon gerandii Vitman*). Black-eyed Susan appeals to a wide range of insects: bees, flies, wasps, butterflies, and beetles. Bees collect their pollen and feed on their nectar. Conservationists use them in prairie restoration. They tolerate a variety of soil conditions, including the dry, rocky soils of glades. Big Bluestem appeals to deer, songbirds, and small mammals.16
Giant Cane Stand, Caney Creek Floodplain, Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County

Caney Mountain is named after the giant cane, which grows on the Caney Creek floodplain, below Starker’s cabin. Elsewhere at Caney, the MDC is working to restore giant cane to the refuge.

Leopold Starker cultivated thirty food-plots as carefully as a farmer might cultivate his wheat or corn. He fertilized and rotated three crops on one-acre plots—cane, winter wheat, and black-eyed peas—all good turkey food. With deer as well as turkeys in mind, he added corn to the winter menu at feeding stations adjacent to eleven food plots.
Lastly, Leopold proposed a full-time employee with a long list of duties: patrol the refuge; maintain the food plots, winter feeding stations, and ponds; clean mud from the springs; maintain the fence; detect and suppress fire; trap wolves in season; keep in touch with the neighbors and enlist their cooperation in the success of the project; and count accurately the number of turkeys and deer in the refuge. The job fell to W. J. Morrison, a local resident, who fostered relationships with his neighbors. When Morrison died in 1942, his son Bernice took over and worked closely with Starker.\(^\text{18}\)

The Conservation Commission supplied Morrison with the tools: a horse, a pick-up truck, a scraper for building ponds, farm implements, fire-fighting equipment, other tools, and a house to live in. The tools could be shared with neighbors, particularly the scraper for building ponds. In the event of a big fire, other employees could be hired temporarily.
Between January 1 and April 15, 1942, Starker and Dalke took a survey of turkeys in Missouri. They chose winter because after the “fall shuffle,” turkeys settle into stable flocks and keep to well-defined territories for the winter. They interviewed farmers, hunters, country storekeepers, and game wardens, those people most likely to know where turkeys flocked. They did not finalize their count in any given territory until they had three reports in agreement as to place and numbers of turkeys. Their survey determined where turkeys were found and where they could be found given the right conditions. They established that Missouri had 4,340 birds living in 596 flocks across 31 counties, mostly in the Ozark region of the state. They found that the heaviest populations inhabited the thin-soiled balds, covered in limestone soils. They noted that balds draped by granitic soils hosted the fewest turkeys. They declared that “overgrazing, overburning, slashing, and poaching” had led to the bird’s decline. Once poaching stopped, the bird began to recover.19
Wildlife Pond at Food Plot 59 in the high northern reaches of Caney Mountain Refuge.

During the survey, Starker discovered that turkeys nest within three hundred yards of water. While Caney Creek and seventeen springs supplied ample water throughout the refuge, Starker built 17 ponds in its dry regions to encourage the birds to nest everywhere. Because livestock had been fenced off, turkeys and deer did not have to compete with cattle for access to water.
In June 1943 Leopold completed his report, *Wild Turkey Management in Missouri*, under the Federal Aid-Wildlife Program. In his summary he noted that turkey restoration should happen on areas characterized by Clarksville stony loam, where 75 percent of the remaining turkeys lived in 1942, or on areas characterized by Clarksville gravely loam, where another 15 percent lived; that native birds responded well to management efforts while game farm birds did not; that poaching, fire, and grazing were the biggest impediments to restoration, and their control would accelerate the process; and that conservative land use, which would build up soil rather than deplete it, would serve the same purpose. Finally, he concluded that management efforts should be reviewed in two to three years. He and David Spencer did so in 1946.\(^{21}\)

Pussytoes (*Antennaria parlinii*) thrive in sandy or rocky soils, where there is less competition with tall grasses and forbs. Quail, deer, and rabbit feed on the leaves, which are semi-evergreen.\(^{20}\)

In June 1943 Starker took a leave of absence to write his Ph.D. thesis, *The Nature of Heritable Wildness in Turkeys*, based on his work in Missouri.\(^{22}\) Starker found the brains and pituitary glands of turkeys to be bigger in wild birds than in pen-raised birds, even those with wild parents, but raised in pens. When released into the wild, 75 percent died in the first year. Others retreated to the safety of local barnyards. Nor did they breed at the rate of wild birds. Based on Starker’s findings the Missouri Conservation Commission abandoned its experiment of raising turkeys in pens.\(^{23}\)

Long Bald, Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Clarksville Stony Loam, Ozark County, Missouri

In June 1943 Starker took a leave of absence to write his Ph.D. thesis, *The Nature of Heritable Wildness in Turkeys*, based on his work in Missouri.\(^{22}\) Starker found the brains and pituitary glands of turkeys to be bigger in wild birds than in pen-raised birds, even those with wild parents, but raised in pens. When released into the wild, 75 percent died in the first year. Others retreated to the safety of local barnyards. Nor did they breed at the rate of wild birds. Based on Starker’s findings the Missouri Conservation Commission abandoned its experiment of raising turkeys in pens.\(^{23}\)

The rest of his colleagues in the Federal Aid to Wildlife Program dispersed when the program ended on June 30, 1943. Most went into the military. Little or no research was done until after the end of World War II, when the research program started again.
Glade and Monadnock, Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County, Missouri

Leopold, Spencer, and Dalke returned to Caney Mountain and Skaggs Ranch in 1946 to evaluate what they had learned about managing turkeys and the success of their efforts. They published their conclusions in *The Ecology and Management of Wild Turkey*, in which they reiterated and enlarged on what they had learned in the early 1940s: Turkeys eat a wide variety of foods across the seasons: buttercups, sorrels, blue-grasses in early spring, and insects when they arrive in June, but also walking-sticks in October. Throughout the rest of the summer, the birds sampled various plants across various landscapes from the bottoms of hollows up the ravines to the stony ridge-tops. Acorns, particularly the small ones from post and blackjack oaks that grow on the balds, were their favorites. The trio went on to report on a familiar list of ecological relationships, including breeding habits and nesting failures, to which they added the disruptions that adversely affect turkey habitat: fire, flood, drought, disease, parasites, and predators.
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Landscape Outside Caney Mountain Conservation Area, Ozark County, Missouri

Leopold, Spencer, and Dalke described the tension between forests and livestock and proposed a series of management ideas—land use changes, actually—that echoed many of the recommendations Leopold had alluded to in his 1943 report. Indiscriminate logging, which had depleted the forests, would have to be stopped; overgrazing of livestock would have to be stopped; the burning of dead forage to produce green grass and kill ticks would have to be stopped. All the logging, grazing, and burning had led to soil erosion and the muddying of once-clear Ozark streams. They proposed that the Ozarks as a whole be developed for timber production and watershed protection to prevent soil erosion. Doing so would require a “wholesale revision of an economic and social system based on land industries” that included logging, grazing, and agriculture.
Leopold and Dalke foresaw a varied pattern of dense forests, open woodlands, and clearings. They outlined a plan to achieve such a pattern: Log mature trees to make room for new stands. Girdle undesirable species and defective trees, let them die, and remove them; not only would such a pattern of development work for turkeys, but it would work for deer and other wildlife. Restrict livestock to secondary sites—open stands of trees, where forage could be grown in the understory and where cattle would not overgraze the land; control of grazing would mean bringing more and more land into national forests and state refuges. And they raised the possibility of private landowners engaging in forestry. Farmers have been planting crops in the bottomlands along Ozark streams since the beginning of European settlement. As Starker suggested in his master plan for Caney Mountain, row crops on the bottoms could provide wildlife with winter food.25
When the U.S. Forest Service established the Eleven Point and Wilderness Refuges, ten miles apart in Oregon County in 1938, both had remnant populations of wild turkeys. However, of the 125 game-farm turkeys released into the Eleven Point Refuge by 1938, only 40 remained in 1942. On the other hand, where no game-farm turkeys were released at the Wilderness Refuge in 1938, Leopold and Dalke counted 134 in 1942.26

Eleven Point Refuge, Mark Twain National Forest Oregon County, Missouri

Dalke, Starker Leopold, and Spencer concluded their report with recommendations for refuges, both national forests and state refuges, that echoed the work of Stoddard, Aldo Leopold, Sr., and Bennitt and Werner: Close refuges to hunting, control grazing, control fire, maintain native turkey stock, devise a balance program for forests and wildlife, grow food patches, construct ponds, control predators, and tell your story to the public.27
Bare Rock Limestone Glade, Peck Ranch Conservation Area, Shannon County, Missouri

In spite of the efforts of Starker Leopold at Caney Mountain to restore turkeys to Missouri, their populations continued to decline. Based on Starker’s research, the commission stopped restocking game-farm turkeys. Attempts to restock turkeys with birds from Maryland and Pennsylvania also failed. Turkeys continued to decline. Only when the commission began capturing native birds and restocking appropriate habitats and as public support grew did Missouri’s turkey population start to increase. Not until 1960 did Missouri open turkeys to hunting.\(^{29}\)

In 1945 the Missouri Conservation Commission purchased Peck Ranch, 23,763 acres of granite and limestone balds and extensive oak-pine forests, as a site for turkey restoration. While turkeys do not thrive on soils derived from granite, they do on soils derived from limestone. The commission started with a local population of nine birds, which increased to thirty-two by 1954, when managers began to release wild-trapped birds into the refuge. The people who lived in the region around Peck Ranch agreed to protect the birds.\(^{28}\)
Peck Ranch Conservation Area, Shannon County, Missouri

As for the deer: In 1947 Aldo Leopold and David L. Spencer, writing in the *Journal of Wildlife Management*, noted that “the Missouri deer herd is expanding so rapidly that there is trouble ahead unless the herd is kept shot down to range capacity.” By the time he died a year later, Aldo Leopold was entertaining the idea that deer were a “weed species,” living in a wolfless landscape, browsing on every available tree, able to adapt to changing landscapes and environments. A hunter shot the last Missouri wolf in 1950, ironically in Taney County, site of the Drury-Mincy Conservation Area. The conservation agency’s work in restoring deer to Missouri’s landscape has been so successful and their natural predators have become so rare that deer can be found ambling quiet streets off busy urban boulevards.30

So what did Aldo Leopold and Nash Buckingham have to say about the work of the Missouri Conservation Commission? Both kept in touch with the goings on at the agency. In 1945 Nash Buckingham weighed in on the accomplishments of the commission and praised it as being “twenty years ahead of its times.” He noted the success of Starker Leopold’s turkey program and praised Arthur Denney’s breakthrough study that tied land use, soil type, and soil fertility to increases in Missouri’s wildlife populations.31

If Buckingham was effusive in his praise, Leopold had a warning: “The conservation movement in Missouri at this moment is like a fisherman, wading a swift and deep bass stream. To get across without wetting his feet, he had to stop on four slippery rocks. Missouri has reached the third rock and is still right side up. Where is the fourth?”
On April 26, 1938, Aldo Leopold answered his question when he spoke at the dedication of the Ashland Wildlife Area in Boone County, south of Columbia. He congratulated Missourians on making it across the first three rocks: wanting conservation, the quality of their leadership and their law, and the new government agency’s willingness to do the research to learn how to “make your fields, woods, and waters productive.” He pointed to Bennitt and Nagel’s Game Survey as proof of “how much remains to be found about cropping quail, turkey, deer, and furs.”

He ended his introduction by asking, “Who is going to practice conservation on the land?” This was the fourth rock. If only one-fifth of Missouri’s lands were in public hands in the form of state refuges and parks and national forests, then Missourians were going to have to learn to practice land conservation on the other four-fifths. Missouri’s farmers would have to be as willing to produce wild crops—quail in their hedge-rows or fish in their creeks or ponds. “Until the gameless farm is considered unbalanced,” he concluded, “we will not have conservation in Missouri.”
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In 1983, the Center for Afro-American Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, published Katherine Dunham’s *Dances of Haiti* for the first time in the United States. In the “Preface,” Dunham explained this research, which originated as her master’s thesis at the University of Chicago, previously circulated in English and Spanish in the Mexican journal *Acta Anthropologica*. Since its original publication in 1947, Dunham’s career had dramatically transformed. The young dancer had blossomed into a New Negro intellectual, political activist, teacher, and world-renowned performer. A pioneer in the ethnographic study of dance in the 1930s, she studied under Robert Redfield, a sociologist of Mexico at the University of Chicago, and his colleague, the leading anthropologist of African-descended peoples in the Americas, Northwestern University’s Melville Herskovits. In 1964, she began to work in the greater St. Louis area as an artist-in-residence at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (SIU). Upon moving to East St. Louis in 1969, she introduced an Afro-diasporic purview to the city’s impoverished black population. As Dunham’s friend and biographer
Joyce Aschenbrenner noted, she drew parallels between the city’s residents and the isolated black communities of the Caribbean. Rejecting the legacies of Jim Crow segregation, she developed cultural initiatives, first at the SIU campus in Alton and then across the St. Louis metropolitan area, including the Maurice Joyce House in East St. Louis that she converted into the Katherine Dunham Museum in 1977.²

Throughout her lifetime, local, national, and international institutions celebrated Dunham’s achievements. In 1967 she received the key to the city of Alton. Numerous universities, including Washington University in St. Louis, awarded her honorary degrees of fine arts and humane letters. And, in 1989, she was enshrined on St. Louis’s Walk of Fame. To this day, her beautiful choreography is displayed at the Missouri History Museum. In the Americas, the Haitian and Brazilian governments conferred on her awards as prestigious as, if not more prestigious than, those given to her in the United States, and in 1993 she received Haitian citizenship. With Caribbean possessions such as the island of Martinique, France named her an officer of the Order of Arts and Letters in 1988, the same year that Haiti bestowed on her the same distinction.³

Mexico has remained on the margins of Dunham’s biography, often merely recognized in a list of countries where she performed. Yet, it stood uniquely in her personal story. As a predominantly indigenous nation, it pointed to her unabashed quest to find, document, and choreograph the African-descended dances of the Americas. She first arrived in the summer of 1947, when her dance troupe was scheduled to perform throughout Mexico City. Little did she know that she would encounter a new musical inspiration, the music of the coastal state...
of Veracruz, which in 1948 would become a standard in her oeuvre.

Dunham was aware of the African presence in Latin America and the Caribbean before she arrived in Mexico. On March 9, 1932, she wrote to Melville Herskovits, having not yet undertaken any ethnographic research. Her interest in dance was well established, but her ethnographic project to resuscitate Afro-diasporic cultures in the Americas was still inchoate. She introduced herself, saying that University of Chicago anthropologist Fay Cooper-Cole encouraged her to write. Dunham was interested in “a comparative study of primitive dancing,” particularly of “the American Indians and such primitive groups of American Negroes.”

Three years later, and with letters of introduction written by Herskovits, she traveled to the Caribbean islands of Jamaica, Martinique, and Trinidad to begin her ethnographic research. Writing to Herskovits from Martinique in September 1935, she expressed the frustrations typical of novice anthropologists driven by the desire to engender social uplift. Struggling with the nuances of objective community observation, she lamented: “This is a very difficult country. It is small, and the people are much amalgamated. Perhaps I repeat myself, but there is much more to be done here psychologically than artistically or anthropologically. The country is slowly decaying, and the people with it.”

Dunham’s observations in Martinique inspired her first ballet, L’Ag’Ya, which famously depicts two men dueling over a woman. Then, in 1936, she visited Haiti, embarking on the research that she submitted as “Dances of Haiti” for her master’s degree in Anthropology in 1938.

Dunham’s ethnographic-cum-artistic project continued into the 1940s. In 1939, she choreographed and premiered Bahiana, which drew inspiration from the music and dance of the people of Bahia, Brazil, one of the most African regions in the Western Hemisphere. Five years later, she debuted Choros, which used the Brazilian quadrille, a paired nineteenth-century dance with origins in Western Europe. Her fascination with the African-descended dance kept leading her back to the Caribbean, her most frequent source of artistic inspiration. She wanted to understand the African-descended dances of the Caribbean as a single cultural entity. Beginning in the fall of 1943, Tropical Revue brought this ethnographic initiative to life. Although the works included in the revue changed over time, certain standards, like L’Ag’Ya, were almost always included.

By February 1945, Dunham was beginning to look for new cultural inspirations to include in a second revue. On February 6, Gerald Goode wrote to her saying, “I have said many times that ‘Tropical Revue’ has run its course.” By February 24, she had taken his advice. In a letter cheekily addressed to “Tropical Revue/F(r)iends, comrades, & countryman,” she penned:

The time has come for a brief farewell. Not a goodbye but only “hasta La Vista” as the Spanish say or “Do Veedonaya” as we say in Russian. May you all have joyful and profitable vacations and circumstances agreeable to all partys concerned we shall meet again on the fair western shores.

Thank you for your kind cooperation

Yours with affection,
Katherine Dunham

In 1946, Dunham began to assemble Bal Nègre to replace Tropical Revue. This revue would feature music from Cuba, Haiti, Brazil, and Martinique.

In this context, Latin America re-entered Dunham’s artistic vision. In January 1946, Mexican Fernando González asked her to come to Mexico. By May, Dunham was also entertaining requests to visit Brazil, to which she responded on June 26, “I am very eager
to include South America in our itinerary for the coming season.” As the summer came to a close, Mexico increasingly captivated her attention. “I am working,” one of her staff wrote to her in a letter dated August 7, 1946, “on a very hot idea to go to Mexico.” The following summer, she and her dance troupe arrived in Mexico. Her perception of Mexico was mixed. On May 6, she exclaimed to Mexican Uldarica Manas, “You were perfectly right about Mexico that has taken us completely to heart. We are now thinking seriously of going independently to Guatemala, Havana and Caracas and perhaps as far as Rio if possible.” Two days later, her attitude toward Mexico was markedly less positive in a letter to Smith Davis:

Mexico City seems like the end of the world. Of course I have never been a fan of this part of the country but even so I thought I would learn to like it a little better. . . . Today is a national holiday because the President has returned. There is always a national holiday for some reason or another and much as I hate to be prejudiced I am beginning to get annoyed with the Mexican manners.

In Mexico City, she and her troupe danced at various theaters, including the Great Theater Esperanza Isis and the Palace of Fine Arts, where she debuted Rhumba Trio and performed for President Miguel Alemán. At Esperanza Isis, she performed the third edition of Tropical Revue. Although the revue commenced with music and dance from the south Pacific Islands of Melanesia and Tongo, it highlighted the Americas. The first act continued with the “Son” and “Bolero” from Cuba and “Haitian Roadside” and ended with “Mexican Scene.” With music taken from Harl McDonald’s 1934 Symphony No. 2, this rumba paid homage to Mexico’s musical heritage. The second act included her famed albeit ethnographically unspecific Rites de Passage [Rites of Passage]. The third brought the United States, with its ragtime and blues, to Mexican audiences as Dunham returned to her Afro-diasporic roots.

Mexicans responded favorably to her performances. Many affectionately called her “La Katarina.” México al Dia [Mexico Today] featured her in its issue from June 1, 1947. The article titled “Primitive Rhythms: Katherine Dunham, Artist and Scholar” introduced her to Mexican audiences not versed in U.S. dance or African American culture. “Katherine Dunham, anthropologist and ballerina,” it began, “is one of the most intelligent and notable women to have visited our country.” It extolled her ethnographic knowledge: “She has written various books about dance and folklore, especially her anthropology thesis based on Antillean customs, as well as articles published in the magazine ‘Esquire’ and in other journalistic publicans. She is currently working on a book that will
be soon published about customs, religion, art, and folklore in Jamaica.” Regarding her artistic prowess, it stated, “Her technique, the famous Dunham technique, is that of incorporating primitive rhythms into modern dance.”

According to journalist Jaime Luna, Dunham’s *Bal Nègre* merited particular attention. It represented music and dance, particularly jazz, which had often been perverted in the United States. Her troupe “conquered us from the first moment,” he exclaimed. *Bal Nègre* “is effectively something of which we have no idea and that artistically vindicates the colored race through its most genuine expressions: Love, Sorrow, Hope, Faith, Humor all with a tragic background.” Accompanying the article was a drawing of a female black dancer, presumably Dunham. Drawn by caricaturist Ángel Zamarripa Landi under the pseudonym Fa-Cha, this image, Luna opined, “has accurately captured the thing . . . the postures and behaviors of ‘Bal-Negre’ in action.”

The *New York Times* noted her popularity on May 19, 1947. Its short three-paragraph article began: “Speaking of the Iris Theatre in Mexico City, Katherine Dunham yesterday concluded a highly successful four-week engagement there with her company.” Her performances, it noted, were attended by Mexico’s artistic glitterati: “Incidentally, during the Iris engagement such leading artists as [Diego] Rivera, [José Clemente] Orozco, [Miguel] Covarrubias and [Carlos] Merida made sketches in the theatre for a book to be published in Mexico. La Katerina
seems definitely to have rung the bell south of the border.”

Covarrubias already knew Dunham. Like her, he spent his formative years participating in the New Negro Movement. While she danced in Chicago, he drew on the sights and sounds of Harlem. His sketches of African American society graced the pages of *Vanity Fair* and countless books like Alain Locke’s *The New Negro* (1925), Langston Hughes’s *The Weary Blues* (1926), and W. C. Handy’s *Blues: An Anthology* (1926), which included Handy’s famous song, “St. Louis Blues.” Not surprisingly, their paths crossed when Dunham visited Mexico and Covarrubias traveled to the United States. Documented in Mexican newspapers and magazines, they attended the same socials at galas as well as more intimate meals at the homes of Mexico’s cultural elite. Perhaps best illustrating their mutual admiration, he drew a caricature of her, and she sent him a personalized signed photo of herself.

In May 1947, Dunham gave a talk at the Palace of Fine Art, and Covarrubias served as translator. An article in the Mexico City-based newspaper *El Universal*, “Black Art Seen by Loyal Interpreter,” covered the event. She discussed her studies in Chicago, research in the Caribbean, and interpretations of African-descended dance. Eventually, Mexico came up, as the article explained: “Interrogated about the reason why she had not yet incorporated some Mexican dances into her program—even though a number of her shows had the title ‘Mexican’—she responded that she would need to remain with us for several years in order to know the psychology of the people, since she was not interested only in the outward aspects of the dances she executed.”

Mexico was barely on her artistic agenda. No one, including Dunham, could have foreseen that within a matter of months, she would tether the music of the Mexican state of Veracruz to her rejuvenation of Afro-diasporic aesthetics.

The music of Veracruz, particularly the *huapango*, had recently entered into the nation’s musical canon. Beginning in 1934, composer Gerónimo Baqueiro Foster studied the genre’s historical, cultural, and musicological elements. In the April 1942 issue of *Revista Musical Mexicano* [*Mexican Musical Journal*], he tied the *huapango* to Mexico’s history of African slavery. He concluded: “‘La Bamba’ and ‘La Palomita,’ for example, were descendants of the songs of the black slaves of the Spanish conquerors. It would not be difficult to acknowledge this black ancestry in the harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic elements of ‘La Bamba.’” He also arranged various *huapangos*, including “La bamba,” for a concert series at Manhattan’s Museum of Modern Art in 1940. His three-minute composition *Huapangos* was the first time the state’s black music had been recognized and performed within the nationalist narrative.

Covarrubias also embraced the music’s African roots. His 1946 book, *Mexico South: The Isthmus of Tehuantepec*, explained that the music of Veracruz’s coastal inhabitants “is a direct descendant of the old Andalusian music transplanted to the jungle by its half-Indian, half-Negro interpreters.”

Sometime after that talk at the Palace of Fine Arts, Dunham decided to learn more about the state’s music. Presumably, Covarrubias helped her find her footing. On July 22, she wrote to her friend and artistic collaborator, Trinidadian William Archibald, about her current and future projects, including her interest in Veracruz:

Dear Bill:

Don’t think that I have stopped negotiations on Carib Song. Last night I had a discussion with another producer (the first one turned out to be unable to swing the deal), and his [sic] is very much interested. His name is Julio Bracho and at present he is working on a picture with Del Rio. We have been discussing
whether it should be done in Vera Cruz, which has a Mexican-Negro setting, or whether it should be done in Trinidad. He suggested to save money that we try Jamaica.

He sees no way to do it before the first of the year and he is now going to take things up with his associates. Perhaps I will have more news soon. I took the liberty to tell that you and Beau would want to be on hand if it were being made.

Regards to Beau and Mary Hunter and Mary Mollaghan if you see her.

Yours,
Katherine Dunham

This “Mexican-Negro setting” provided her with the pretext to add Mexico to her Afro-diasporic worldview.

Before leaving Mexico, Dunhum learned of Baqueiro Foster’s composition, which he had re-arranged and renamed Suite Veracruzana, No. 1 [Veracruz Suite, No. 1]. On September 25, 1947, she acquired the rights to use it. Written on stationary from Mexico City’s Hotel Reforma, the contract stated:

Agreement between KATHERINE DUNHAM PRODUCTIONS, INC., and SR. BAQUIERO FOSTER.
1. For the sum of Five Hundred Pesos ($500.00) KATHERINE DUNHAM PRODUCTIONS, INC., acknowledges receipt of two piano

Lenwood Morris dancing in Veracruzana. [Image: Missouri History Museum]
copies of BAMBA, MORENA, and BALAJU, compositions of BAQUEIRE [sic] FOSTER.
2. It is further agreed between the two parties that for the sum of Fifteen Hundred Pesos ($1500.00) that KATHERINE DUNHAM PRODUCTIONS, INC., receives exclusive rights to the compositions BAMBA, MORENA, BALAJU, without time limitation, or performance limitation, and receives arrangements of the three above mentions [sic] compositions for a 100-piece orchestra.
3. With the signature of this agreement, BAQUEIRO FOSTER, renounces further fess [sic] or royalties for the compositions BAMBA, MORENA and BALAJU, and KATHERINE DUNHAM PRODUCTIONS, INC., receives full and complete rights to same.

Signed Katherine Dunham and G. Baqueiro Foster25

Dunham utilized this music as the foundation for her ballet Veracruzana. Broadway composer Dorothea Freitag rearranged Baqueiro Foster’s composition. After a brief vocal opening, the music commences with “Danzón Overture 1,” continues with “Balaju” and two more danzones, and finishes with “La Bamba.”26 Of all of Baqueiro Foster’s songs, his version of “La bamba” resonated most with Dunham’s Caribbean aesthetic. She implicitly established the connection between Veracruz and the Caribbean in her master’s thesis, which was published in Acta Anthropologica in 1947. In etymological terms, “Dances of Haiti” mentioned the African origins of the term bamba. It was a “Social or marginal socio-religious dance of Haiti, known in other islands and southern states of America.” It also identified the danzón as a “Social dance popular in the Caribbean, similar to the bolero.”27

To critical acclaim, Dunham performed Veracruzana in the United States and around the world in the late 1940s and 1950s. The scenery was designed by Covarrubias. The plot focused on three men who sought her attention. Logistically, it was hard to perform—the choreography required a large hammock to be strung across the stage, thereby preventing many smaller theaters from housing the production. When Dunham returned to Mexico in 1955, she included Veracruzana in some of her programs. In its advertisements, Mexico’s Lirico Theater highlighted Veracruzana amid a flourish of exclamation points: “Katherine Dunham, her ballerinas, her musicians, and her singers interpreting the ballet Veracruzana!! Judged by some! Applauded by others! And cheered by all of Mexico! Last Days! We are saying bye to Mexico!”28 In an interview on June 15 in Mexico City, she discussed her interests in the Caribbean and then South America, especially paying homage to the African-descended tango in Argentina. Finally, the interviewer asked: “And what about Mexico?” Her response referenced the music in Veracruzana: “very strong influence to me in Mexico has been my visit to the state of Veracruz. There I fell in love with the tropical climate and the BAMBA. Perhaps Frances would sing some of the BAMBA for us.”29 “La bamba,” the pearl of Veracruz’s music, was still fascinating to her eight years after she discovered its African heritage.

Dunham began her career interested in what she called primitive cultures, unaware that her interest in dance and the revitalization of Afro-diasporic culture would bring her to Mexico or that she would eventually perform Mexican music on Broadway and around the world. Just as she came to love the music of Veracruz, Mexicans found her keen ethnographic eye and sharp choreography revelatory. Politically, Dunham and the Mexicans who reviewed her performances rejected U.S. segregationist
Katherine Dunham headlined at Mexico City’s Lirico Theater in 1955. (Image: Missouri History Museum)
policies that denounced black aesthetics. An interview with Peter Waddington published in article form in *Opera and Concert* in June 1948 best describes the impact Mexico had on Dunham’s condemnation of U.S. racism and her broader artistic perspective. Extensively quoting her, he wrote:

“There is no doubt but what we are doing is creating a better understanding of, and sympathy for, the American Negro. From the beginning, I aimed at sociological as well as artistic targets. Now, however, I admit that a strong sociological purpose motivates my work and that there is a real drive in my purpose to present good looking, talented, clean, healthy-minded and healthy-bodied you American Negroes in a repertoire of dance mimes and sketches. How well I am succeeding is well illustrated by incidents both in this country and in Mexico, where, during our last tour, I was invited, with members of my company, to call on President Miguel Alemán, who was most gracious in his praise of our performance. He was particularly pleased that we spoke to him in Spanish, such as it was, an effrontery in view of his good English, but one that broke the contretemps and established a friendly feeling at once.” People who underestimate this kind of propaganda are blind to its advantages. “In other words,” Miss Dunham explained, “our appearances in Mexico, for example, did much to counteract Hollywood’s clichés for the Negro. They discovered that the Negro can also be an artist and not always a shiftless, ignorant person.”

---
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