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Piscator and Brecht
Closeness Through Distance

John Willett

Piscator and Brecht: for nearly fifty years their names have been linked, yet without anyone ever being quite sure what the nature of that linkage should be. Here we have the two outstanding left-wing theatre men of the Weimar Republic, where the “Political Theatre” (as Piscator called his only book) seemed to matter more than ever before or since, thanks to the brutal political realities of the background against which it played. Their contribution to it was, and still is, of worldwide importance; the formal and technical innovations which they worked out remain exemplary and suggestive. Personally they were not only associated through their membership in a common political-aesthetic movement and because of Brecht’s work for Piscator during 1927-28, but also in an odd kind of master-pupil relationship thanks to their (divergent) pursuit of the ideal of “epic theatre” first proclaimed by Piscator, the older man. All through their careers they turned to a common stock of ideas and interests—of course each had others outside it—and to a common body of actors and colleagues, even though these became widely scattered in the years of exile after 1933. Ernst Busch, Alexander Granach, Fritz Kortner, Leonhard Steckel the actors; Teo Otto and Wolfgang Roth the designers; Hanns Eisler the composer and Bernhard Reich the director: one finds such people, throughout their variously eventful lives, maintaining personal and professional touch with both men, wherever they happen to be.

In all kinds of ways they interrelate. For instance, Piscator stages Saint Joan with Luise Rainer in Washington in 1940—her first

Unless noted, Brecht quotations are translated from the German by the author. They are printed with the kind permission of Stefan S. Brecht and Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main. Copyright © 1974 by Stefan S. Brecht, New York.
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Piscator as he appeared in 1964 near the end of his career.

appearance on any U.S. stage—and The Chalk Circle by Brecht’s old friend Klabund (Alfred Henschke) as the second production of his Studio Theatre in March 1941. Brecht meantime, having already written his first Saint Joan play, is preoccupied with these same themes, which lead to The Good Person of Szechwan (1939-41), to the second Saint Joan play Simone Machard (1942-43), and finally in 1944 to the new version of The Chalk Circle which he writes for Luise Rainer. The relationship is positively incestuous, in a way that largely excludes other leading directors and dramatists of the German Left: Friedrich Wolf, for instance, or Gustav von Wangenheim or the Hungarian Julius Hay. Over a sector of the globe from the Volga to Los Angeles, Brecht’s and Piscator’s plans overlap; their movements intersect; their desire to join forces flickers up; from time to time a working alliance is apparently proclaimed. And yet in fact they scarcely ever worked together after 1928, and when they did it went wrong. Brecht was chary of entrusting his plays to Piscator even at the preliminary stage, while Piscator never showed any real enthusiasm for them or for the theoretical principles on which they were supposedly based. Was this simply due to Brecht’s none too tactful interventions, to his nagging wish to do everything himself? Or was there some more fundamental incompatibility between the two men? There are problems here which have never been explored, and the Erwin Piscator Papers in Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, which recently have been opened for research, allow us to examine these problems at various points.

In July 1936, some three years after the great German diaspora had begun, Piscator left Moscow to attend conferences and visit organizations in the West. This is where the Carbondale material begins, for it was during the trip in question that he decided not to return to the USSR. The Brechts were then in Denmark, seriously considering whether to move to Engels in the Volga German Republic, where Piscator, with Reich as his aide, was hoping to establish a brilliant new theatre using all the finest exiled talents. Brecht had seen him in Moscow the previous year, and the same autumn had made his first trip to New York, where he encountered the American progressive theatre and the Stanislavsky Method—not a particularly encouraging experience. There had been some question of Piscator’s staging his Die Rundköpfe und die Spitzköpfe for Michoels in Moscow, but it was now scheduled for the opening
season at Engels, which Reich was left behind to prepare. That month (the dating is tentative) Brecht wrote to suggest that Piscator should visit them in Denmark and talk these possibilities over:
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We could of course do a bit of work together. For it’s quite wrong that we should be making no propaganda for our view of theatre and film. We ought to write articles, possibly an illustrated booklet, all this mass of material must at last be got into shape and made usable. I read Stanislavsky’s My Life in Art with unease mixed with envy. The man got his system straight, with the result that in Paris and New York everyone’s becoming a Stanislavsky disciple. Is that unavoidable? We really are unworldly dreamers.

—a view that evidently inspired his subsequent plan for a Diderot Society (about which he wrote to Piscator the following spring). The details of this visit are discussed over the next two or three months while Piscator visits Prague (for an important but unnamed meeting it would be interesting to know more about), Brussels (the Arts Committee of the World Peace Movement) and Paris, where he apparently heads an Association Universelle du Spectacle and complains to Louis Aragon that the organizers of the Maison de la Culture are not treating him as comrades should. The Brechts suggest that he should have his tonsils taken out in Denmark (by a Dr. Lund, maybe Ruth Berlau’s husband), then that he should come to the Copenhagen premiere of *Die Rundköpfe und die Spitzköpfe*. Finally, he never comes, though Margarete Steffin (whose letters complement Brecht’s) tells him about the production, claiming that Eisler’s music was disliked by both audience and cast. Meanwhile Reich sends increasingly gloomy reports from Engels, pressing Piscator to come and take charge on the spot. His replies suggest that he is staying put on Party orders (letter of October 1—a fortnight after the first rehearsals at Engels were due to begin) and that Reich by grumbling is not doing his communist duty; he asks, no doubt with unstated implications, if the German Communist Party leader Wilhelm Pieck definitely wishes him to return. Pieck’s son Arthur had worked closely with him and Reich in the International Association of Revolutionary Theatres, which the Russians had now dissolved, and a friendly but crucial letter from Pieck senior, dated October 8, tells him “by agreement with the responsible authorities” not to come back either for Engels or for his Moscow organizational tasks, saying: “You should concentrate once more exclusively on your artistic activities.” On the 26th Piscator accordingly tells Brecht that “my intentions are to remain somewhat longer in the West,” so that he may still bring his tonsils to be fixed. In November Grete Steffin tells him of Carola Neher’s (Mrs. Klabund’s) arrest in the purges, the first of many reports that must have confirmed him in his change of mind. Unlike some others of their acquaintance, Brecht does not seem to have blamed Piscator for the decision to leave and the abandonment of the Engels project, though this must have left a number of actors awkwardly placed; no doubt he knew of Reich’s arrest not long after and realized that Piscator’s might easily have followed. One of the more tangible bonds holding them together at this time was their common enthusiasm for Hašek’s *The Good Soldier Schweik* on whose dramatization they had worked together in 1928. For among the many irons which Piscator now thrust in the fire—an invitation to war-wrecked Barcelona, the reorganization of the Mexican theatres, the calling of a conference of anti-Fascist playwrights at Christmas 1936, the hope of a U.S. production, the direction of a Jewish theatre in Paris and the renting of the Théâtre Pigalle—was the filming of this epic anti-militarist novel. Nothing, of course, in the Southern Illinois University papers indicates how far the 1928 dramatization had in fact been Brecht’s work, a disputed question on which the surviving scripts in the Brecht-Archive shed no light. But already in 1933 (so a letter there shows) Piscator was hoping that Brecht would join him in writing a scenario for filming in the USSR, so that now, when he again turned to film plans, a Schweik film and Brecht’s involvement in it were uppermost in his mind.

Schweik runs like something of a leitmotiv through the story of the two men’s relations, though nothing in their later treatments of the theme was as successful as the 1928 production with its accompanying cartoon film and cutouts by George Grosz. Looking back at the correspondence it is easy to see that Piscator’s film projects, like nearly all his plans around this time, were hopelessly unrealistic, involving as they did the commitment of sizable installments of his new wife’s fortune to a series of partners among whom the only film man of undoubted competence was the young Sam Spiegel, whom he quickly ditched. However, among the various schemes for filming *War and Peace, Lady Chatterley* and *Idl mitn Fidl* and distributing French films in Mexico, Piscator gave Schweik
priority, making every effort between November 1936 and around the end of 1937 to sort out the rights question (with Jan Löwenbach, the Hašek lawyer in Prague) and explore the ambiguous implications of making the film. In this he seems to have had many advisers, to judge from an undated paper headed “Welche Fragen sind prinzipiell über den Schweik-Film zu klären?”, where they range from the Austrian embassy to the French Communist Party and from Henri Jeanson (who wanted the story set in an unspecified country) to Arthur Koestler (who wanted Schweik to be fighting for Franco). Nobody was more downright than his old dadaist friend Wieland Herzfelde, to whom he wrote at the outset to get Lowenbach’s address. Herzfelde pained Piscator by saying that he found the whole scheme irritating and out of tune with the political realities, and asking instead why he didn’t go off to fight in Spain. On April 4th Brecht welcomed the scheme; on the 21st he begged Piscator not to tackle it without him; on May 8th he was told that he would definitely be needed. However, since there was nothing for him to do until the first treatment had been passed by the backers and exhibitors, his role was a frustrating one. He read the initial treatment by Piscator and Leo Lania and made some comments, notably that the opening “needs more risks, perhaps by showing thousands of Schweiks making a mess of things as the nations rearm on every side. But at least the possibility of working on his favorite epic novel helped Brecht to keep the lines of communication open. Thus he sent Piscator a First World War film story (presumably Die Judith von Saint Denis), and proposed a film on the Spanish War character Potato Jones. His wife, Helene Weigel, consulted Piscator about the possibility of her going to Spain; she was chafing at her “idiotic existence” in Denmark and claiming (in February 1937) to be “a person who can still be made use of; this hibernation has been going on too long.” In July Brecht himself came to Paris at Aragon’s invitation for the Anti-Fascist Writers’ Congress, then again in September for the production of The Threepenny Opera which the original Berlin producer E. J. Aufricht had put on at the Théâtre de l’Étoile; there is an interesting draft letter from Piscator with detailed criticisms of this. By that time virtually all Piscator’s plans (outside Mexico, where he still had hopes) had collapsed, including not only the Schweik film but a Schweik stage production which had been promised by the C.G.T.-run Théâtre de la Renaissance. The political climate had changed when the year-old Popular Front government ended in June; the vast International Exhibition had come and gone without his directing any of the hoped-for productions—Mexican, Spanish or émigré German. On September 9th he approached Jean Cassou at the Ministry of Education, and wrote that “so far everything I have attempted has failed.”

Eighteen months later Brecht had left Denmark, after putting himself and his family on the list for immigration into the United States. Franco was in Madrid, the Nazis in Prague; the Second World War was only four months off. Piscator by then was in New York, having come to feel that his only chances now lay in the New World: chances that included the old Mexican plan, a scheme for a German touring company in the U.S. with backing from Gilbert Miller (including some of the actors once earmarked for Engels, in Nathan der Weise, Faust and Schweik), finally the War and Peace stage adaptation which Miller had commissioned him and Alfred Neumann to make. Once again none of these materialized, nor was his first view of the American theatre any more encouraging than Brecht’s: “Stanislavsky tempered by the box-office” as he termed it in a letter of that March now in the Brecht-Archive. Nonetheless he was soon encouraging Brecht to join him: “Do you remember,” asks a letter of June 15th, “how you cabled me in Moscow to come here at all costs, on account of the vast opportunities; And I didn’t. Why are you imitating me?” In the March letter he had told Brecht that Dorothy Thompson had $1000 for him if he could come; then he got him a contract from the New School of Social Research, whose Dramatic Workshop the Piscators were now commissioned to set up. He also tried to raise a further $1500 for Brecht, appealing for contributions inter alios to Klaus Mann and Elmer Rice (both of whom refused). Brecht in return sent him a script of Galileo whose relevance to his American plans now becomes much more clear. From Helsinki he wrote on April 15th as he waited for the visas to come, “I was incredibly isolated here, and under such conditions it is infinitely difficult to do literary work—all the same I managed to complete one or two things which I hope to be able to bring you in person.” Thanking Piscator for all his efforts on May 27th, he repeated that he
would bring further new plays “but above all an intense desire to work. i believe the u.s.a. to be among the few remaining countries where one can freely do literary work and submit plays like *Fear and Misery of the Third Reich.*” In the year’s wait before leaving Finland he finished *Puntila, Arturo Ui* and *The Good Person of Szechwan.*

Soon after landing in California in July 1941 he wrote to Piscator to say that for the moment they had decided to stay in the West. He wondered if the New School would wish to renew his contract and if so what they would like him to teach:

purely theoretical lectures would be much harder for me than seminar work, what’s more i doubt if they would be of any immediate use to the students. i would far sooner work in the no-man’s-land between dramatic construction and performance style, and try to establish one or two points of difference between playwright and director, director and actor, actor and rational human being etc. for instance we have the author being helpless in the theatre, the actor being helpless where dramaturgy is concerned, and both being helpless in the sphere of social effects.

He also thought of using the twenty-seven scenes of *Fear and Misery of the Third Reich,* since they

show how widely-differing kinds of persons behave under the nazi dictatorship, how every relationship becomes distorted under terror, the whole was conceived as a play, it all needs to be played in quick succession, perhaps under a forest of floodlit swastika flags, with a ballad between the scenes. the advantage would be that the scenes could be separately rehearsed, that each would have its specific value etc.

Like this, Brecht’s immediately succeeding letters to Piscator are undated, but it looks as though he first sent him *The Good Person of Szechwan* to look at, then recommended *Ui* as being “easier to perform” than the former, which would be more demanding on the actors and require more time than he expected the Dramatic Workshop to be able to provide. (Oddly enough there is no record of his trying to get *Puntila* performed throughout his American years.) Piscator seems to have done as Brecht wished, for he wanted himself to stage *Ui,* which he had got H. R. Hays to translate by September 23rd (when Hays forwarded the last installment), and recommended *Szechwan* to the Theatre Guild. According to information from Hays there was to be trade union backing for the *Ui* production, but it nonetheless fell through for lack of money. Another possibility

---

*Piscator in 1941, director of the Dramatic Workshop, New School for Social Research.*
mentioned by Brecht was a Workshop adaptation of *Troilus and Cressida*, a play which “has interested me keenly for many years,” Thersites being “among the most likeable characters in world literature.” But whether for this or for *Ui*, his problem was how to finance a visit to New York. And having stated it, he ceased to correspond.

None of these joint plans are mentioned in Brecht’s journal and it now looks as if his anxiety to collaborate was never quite as great as he initially claimed. At any rate as Brecht got down to more or less rewarding work in California the relations between him and Piscator became more distant, to say the least. Whether there was any specific ground for this, or even awareness of it, on Brecht’s side is not clear; on Piscator’s the complaint was that Brecht had failed to answer Hays about his proposed translation agreement, had shown Elisabeth Bergner the *Szechwan* play without consulting him, and above all was failing to keep in touch. “Brecht hasn’t written for 1½ years,” he told their mutual friend Mordecai Gorelik in a letter written in English and dated January 21st 1943:

I have never in my life witnessed such unfriendly behaviour—nearly hostile—as Mr Brecht’s. I am a very bad subject for insults. He is quick to write even phone or send telegrams or friends to me when he needs me. At other times he’s behaved like the worse word I can find a “Hitlerite.” [Then about Hays and Bergner.] A man who can be so callous to personal relationships must not wonder when his artistic qualifications suffer too. Brecht behaves like a man without any sensitivity or imagination; a man who cannot think of another person’s point of view, and the necessity for all of us—in this time—is to hold together. A bad comrade, There can be no excuse for this. Indeed, if I showed the same behaviour, Mr Brecht would perhaps today be sitting in Helsingfors. If that’s friendship, to hell with it.

Years earlier Hanns Eisler had told Piscator that he had “a special gift for writing angry letters,” and if this was the mood in which he entered 1943 it is amazing that the events of that summer did not make him break with Brecht altogether. For while Piscator was discussing a new production of the old *Schweik* adaptation with the Theatre Guild, and even mentioned to Brecht the possibility of collaboration on it (presumably during Brecht’s New York visit that spring), Brecht was going ahead with Aufricht and Kurt Weill on a plan for a new *Schweik* adaptation as a full-scale Broadway musical. This was done, fairly clearly, behind Piscator’s back, no doubt so that Aufricht could clear the rights with the lawyer Löwenbach, who was also in New York. When Piscator learned of it in mid-August the script (known to posterity as *Schweik in the Second World War*) had been finished, money raised and the rights (which Piscator had assumed were his) secured. He was not aware, it seems, that Weill saw no chance of success for the play as it stood and was soon to withdraw entirely; he was quite simply furious, and all the more so because the news was broken to him “in the frankest and friendliest spirit” in a letter from Alfred Kreymborg whom he had been expecting to translate the play for the Theatre Guild. In this, Kreymborg said that having found Brecht’s script first-rate, he had decided that it would be foolish for him to compete, particularly as he was being offered “a real advance as against no offer from the Guild.” He told Piscator that the backers insisted on an American director, and signed himself “As ever your friend.”

A handwritten draft thereupon accuses Brecht of “Brecht’sche Schweinerei,” threatens physically to “knock the ‘poet’ off his amoral Olympus” and claims that his actions make the “positive aspect” of his work “into a lie.” Evidently it was never sent and what actually went off to Brecht on September 24, with copies to Aufricht, Kreymborg and Weill, was a letter in English addressed “Dear Mr Brecht” which asked them to discuss their plans with him, failing which “I shall reluctantly be compelled to turn this over to my attorneys with instruction to protect my rights fully.” No doubt this was a factor in persuading Weill (by now much the most experienced in local ways) that the rights position was, as he told Brecht, too unclear to appeal to possible backers. There is, however, also a much more considered list of criticisms of the Brecht play which bears no date but could indicate that Piscator had been shown a script before he realized that the production was being set up without him. He found that scene one was too long and verbose, that Baloun was too prominent, overshadowing Schweik, that Schweik’s mastery of the Nazis was too easily achieved, that there were too many indecencies for “American puritanism” to take, and, more basically, that “It is neither Brecht nor Häsek.” A few names at the end suggest that he was envisaging how it could be cast: Mostel or Sam Jaffe as Schweik (as against Peter Lorre, whom we know Brecht had in mind), Mostel again or Stafford Kane as Baloun. If these notes by Piscator were on the other hand made after Kreymborg’s letter,
then it is striking that they should have been written so judiciously and so much from the standpoint of a potential director.

For some eighteen months after this episode there seems (to judge from the evidence in Carbondale and the two Berlins) to have been no correspondence between the two men. Brecht was involved in *The Caucasian Chalk Circle* and the planned production of *Galileo*; Piscator was fighting to save his Studio Theatre. Then around the spring of 1945 they came together again, amicably enough so far as can be seen, for a production of *The Private Life of the Master Race* before a mainly trade union audience by an off-Broadway group called “The Theatre of All Nations.” Piscator had known this work for many years under its peacetime title of *Fear and Misery of the Third Reich*, and in the spring of 1943, not long before the *Schweik* explosion, had been planning to stage it in a translation by Hays with the Studio Theatre. Since then Brecht had got Eric Bentley to make a new translation using the wartime version whose “theatrical framework” (with Nazi soldiers in a half-track) he had worked out in consultation with Max Reinhardt in May 1942. Extensive notes and sketches show how Piscator now proposed to set about staging the play; it would begin informally with the actors and stagehands preparing the stage; the pianist would then play “The Star Spangled Banner,” after which a giant S.S. man with a revolver would force him to switch to the Horst-Wessel song; then there would be a discussion about dictatorship and democracy, moving on to the epic theatre of Brecht and himself, and finally the opening of the play proper. He did the casting, which included the extremely eminent but far from Anglophone Albert Basserman and his wife, and conducted the first rehearsals. Then Brecht arrived from California and at first (so Eric Bentley says) wanted to cancel the performance; when this proved impossible he tried to have the critics excluded, and thereafter was “very destructive.” On May 29th Piscator walked out, writing (to “Dear Mr. Brecht” in English) that he had been hesitant about the whole thing:

> You came late, not to say too late, and your presence didn’t help to achieve results and to simplify the complications. ... Unfortunately I can’t permit myself the luxury of an artistic failure. On the other hand, when I direct I need the time for myself without your co-directing—and when you direct you need the time without me. For my part, I have conceived a different physical performance from yours, and I have greater difficulties in following your version—enough so that I suggest that you take over the directing, and I withdraw.

According to Brecht’s journal, Piscator “had cast the play with students and emigrants and wanted a new framework. I brought in viertel, and we mounted the performance in a few days of rehearsal.” It took place on June 12th at City College. One or two critics liked the play, but so far as the production was concerned the press seems to have been uniformly bad.

> “Dear Pis,” wrote Brecht on June 2nd, “the ghastly thing is that time is too short to allow one to think out theoretical disagreements.” Nonetheless he thanked Piscator warmly for continuing to support the production in various ways, thus “preventing anybody from getting the... impression that we have become bitter enemies.” A friendly but highly critical letter from Piscator followed three days after the performance:

> Dear Bert: At different moments the other evening I wanted to jump over the footlights, come backstage, and beat you. Not because I personally felt insulted when I saw the results of this work, but as the more objective harm you have done to yourself.

Brecht, he said, had directed like “every amateur”; “the staging, stage design, scenery, and lighting were killing.” What indicates a deeper incompatibility is his complaint at Brecht’s intellectualism and his dislike of the structure of the play:

> ... you had not the idea of an epic play as you put the scenes together, but in your mind it was nothing but un-epic, disconnected, disunified—a series of coincidental scenes written one after another and laid side by side.

For of course Brecht’s concept of “epic” involved the principle of montage, of “one thing after another” and “each scene for itself,” as Piscator cannot but have known. “Our ideas on epic theatre are so different that I preferred to leave him alone,” he wrote to Leon Askin on July 3rd. To Egon Erwin Kisch he wrote (June 18th) “I left ... to avoid endangering our whole lifelong friendship.”

They never collaborated again, though the letters in the Brecht-Archive and the West Berlin Academy show them once more discussing the possibility before and immediately after Brecht’s return to Berlin. Like Friedrich Wolf, Brecht wanted Piscator to
return to take charge of the Volksbühne—this being before the
division of the city—while he himself took over Aufrecht's old
Theater am Schiffbauerdamm. His reason for not wanting actually to
join forces he expressed in March 1947 as being that

there is a part of my works for the theatre for which I need to evolve a
specific style of performance that differs from yours. That is the extent of
my reservations, and I think they are constructive. Nobody could be less
likely than you to believe in a hard-and-fast line between the writer of plays
and the putter-on.

Nonetheless he did wish to collaborate on an unrealized plan for a
satirical revue called Der Wagen des Ares, and two years later he
asked Piscator to stage The Days of the Commune in Zurich and
thereafter with the newly-organized Berliner Ensemble. Oddly
enough, both men remained involved with Schueik, though the
subject was not again raised between them. Brecht tried to organize a
first production of his version in 1947, then hoped to stage it himself
with Peter Lorre at the Berliner Ensemble. Piscator, too, at the end
of his life was hoping to put on some form of the play at the
Volksbühne and was renegotiating the rights with Max Brod in Tel
Aviv. But at least there was no further clash.

What is well established is that Brecht repeatedly acknowledged
Piscator's importance in the twentieth century theatre, and as
something more than a director. He did this not only publicly (for
instance in The Messingkauf Dialogues) but also privately to Piscator
himself, writing for instance in that same letter of March 1947:

Just to straighten things out, let me tell you that of all the people who have
been active in the theatre over the past twenty years no one has been as
close to me as you.

To this Piscator replied on March 29th:

I too believe that I've still to come across any author who comes nearer than
you to the sort of theatre I have in mind. And just because I don't believe in
the “writer-director” distinction I have always regretted the accident that
prevented our ever having a single full and authentic collaboration.

But just how much of an accident was it? For all their common
interests and achievements Piscator and Brecht remained utterly
different kinds of men: the one serious, dignified, elegant, dis-
Erwin Piscator & Bertolt Brecht

tinghished, the other sardonic, unpretentious, awkward, plebeian. Brecht never seems to have doubted the value of Piscator's work in the Berlin theatre of the 1920's, but throughout the period covered by the Carbondale papers there was good reason for him to grow sceptical first of Piscator's great plans and then of the quality of his productions. Moreover their concepts of "epic theatre" differed more and more as Piscator moved away from certain aspects of his past; nor did he ever accept Brecht's later doctrine of "alienation." Above all, Brecht wanted to direct, which meant that as a colleague Piscator could only get in his way instead of complementing him as a director should. Looking back at their exchanges now it seems that it was Brecht, for all his frequent lack of consideration, who saw this the more clearly. So perhaps it is as well that they never came together in Berlin after all. Their overlap was not enough to outweigh the actual and potential differences. What kept them close was the fact that they remained apart.

Erwin Piscator
A Checklist

Jürgen Stein

It is very likely that no other director in the modern theatre has had such a complicated life history as Erwin Piscator. His artistic work throughout his life aroused heated controversy among critics, who often reacted either with total approval or complete condemnation. His politically oriented theatre work, referred to as Epic or Documentary Theatre, resulted in frequent relocations in Germany, Russia, France, and other European countries, and the United States.

Born in 1893, Piscator gained his experience in conventional theatre as an apprentice at the Königliches Hoftheater in Munich and as an actor and director in army theatre groups during World War I. Already with his first independent venture, an avant-garde theatre in Königsberg, Das Tribunal, he aroused the press and public so much with his revolutionary ideas (stemming from the impact of his war experience and of reactionary extremism and revisionism during the rise of the Weimar Republic) that he was forced to close during the first season in 1920.

In the same year he founded the Proletarische Theater, performing in beer and factory halls in the Berlin suburbs. The plays he produced, designed to make an immediate propaganda impact in favor of revolutionary action, inspired the Agitprop movement in Germany. In 1922, when the Berlin chief of police, not sharing Piscator's political views, did not reissue the theatre's license, Piscator had to close again.

In 1924, after a season with the Central Theater, Piscator was called to direct for the influential Volksbühne, the traditional theatre of the workers in Berlin. There he was able to realize his new concepts of production, such as the use of projectors, films, and other devices, to involve his audiences actively in the plays. After three years of constant disagreement with the Volksbühne manage-

Erwin Piscator Checklist

ment, which had found his productions too disturbing, Piscator opened his own Theater am Nollendorfplatz. It was mainly there that he mounted most of the famous productions for which his name is best known, including Hoppla, We Live! (Ernst Toller), Rasputin (Alexei Tolstoy), and the historic staging of The Good Soldier Schweik (Jaroslav Hašek). As an independent theatre director he was free to produce any type of play and to explore technical stage devices as dramaturgical means to the fullest extent, using cranes, conveyor belts, lifts, multilevel and rotating stages. But with the economic crisis and change in the political situation in Germany, Piscator was forced to close this theatre and various other theatrical enterprises he was successively engaged in.

From 1931 to 1936, accepting an invitation from the Mezhrabpom Film Company, Piscator worked in the Soviet Union where he directed the film-adaptation of Anna Seghers’ novel, The Revolt of the Fishermen. He was elected president of the International Revolutionary Theatre Association in 1934 and also made efforts to establish a group of German speaking theatre practitioners in Engels, the capital of the then Volga German Republic. Possibly because of the upcoming Stalin purges, Piscator left Russia in 1936 for Paris, where he lived for two years, trying in vain to establish himself in the theatre and film métier.

After conceiving and abandoning the idea of forming a National Theatre Company in Mexico City, Piscator left Paris for the United States on an invitation from producer Gilbert Miller to direct War and Peace on Broadway. Here, with the same idea in mind, he tried to establish a National Repertory Theatre in Washington and to develop a new concept of play production, the Living Publishing House. Only after these undertakings failed did Piscator restrict himself to educational theatre with the organization of the Dramatic Workshop at the New School for Social Research. In late 1940 he managed to form a semiprofessional experimental theatre, The Studio, which enabled him to work actively in the theatre again. With this theatre and later with the President and Rooftop theatres, Piscator formulated and implemented a theatre education program which integrated professionals with students. His method of tying many interrelated fields closely together with artistic production influenced a whole generation of American actors and playwrights, including Tennessee Williams, Harry Belafonte, Rod Steiger, Marlon Brando, Walter Matthau, Judith Malina of the Living Theatre (all of whom had been his students at the New School), and encouraged the development of off-Broadway companies.

In 1951, at the peak of the McCarthy era, Piscator returned to Europe where he worked as a freelance director in Germany, Switzerland, The Netherlands, Sweden, and Italy. From 1962 until his death in 1966, he was general director of West Berlin’s Freie Volksbühne. Despite the difficulties he encountered with the administration of that theatre and the German press in his attempt to reestablish a significant ensemble and to produce topical plays, Piscator was able to stage the world premieres of Rolf Hochhuth’s The Deputy, a play which other theatres refused to produce, Peter Weiss’ Investigation, and Heinar Kipphardt’s In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer thus fostering a new generation of internationally acclaimed playwrights.

Piscator’s life history is far more complicated than the above biographical sketch can reveal. Not surprisingly, the location of his papers reflects the Odyssey of his life. There is no one institution which owns his papers but several, a fact which makes research with original source material difficult. The major collections are located in the Archives of the Akademie der Künste in West Berlin and at Southern Illinois University.1 The holdings at the Akademie der Künste, which represent for the most part the 1950’s and 1960’s, can be considered almost equal in quantity to the holdings here.2 The Erwin Piscator Papers at this university, the gift of his widow, Maria Ley-Piscator, document his work from 1936 to 1951 and fragmentarily from 1962 to 1966.

Various sections of the papers at Southern Illinois University differ greatly in completeness. Based on several facts, it must be assumed that large quantities of material from the Dramatic Workshop are lost. Not only do vast differences occur in the amount of correspondence on file from year to year, but relatively little documentation exists for several major Dramatic Workshop productions. The material stored at the Akademie der Künste shows that some papers were probably sent to Europe during the 1950’s and 1960’s, presumably when Piscator was working on his projected second book and also for an exhibit at the Freie Volksbühne.3 This could at least partially account for some variation in the quantity of material. Large portions of Piscator’s papers, especially those from
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the 1920's and the years in Russia, appear to be lost—or, more hopefully, not yet uncovered.\(^4\) The exact locations of many of Piscator's extensive diaries are not yet known.\(^5\) This and the fact that various manuscripts which are attributed to Piscator but are merely transcripts of occasional interviews taped in later years complicate research.\(^6\) The neglect and inaccessibility of original source material may explain, among other causes, the extreme diversity of opinion on Piscator and his work. The importance of Piscator's extensive diaries are not yet known.\(^5\) This and the fact merely transcripts of occasional interviews taped in later years well documented in these papers. The generally accepted opinion that only Piscator's work in the 1920's deserves study is easily refuted by these papers, which open up new aspects and raise questions about previous studies.

Basic research for a complete chronology of Piscator's production work in the theatre has been done by this author.\(^7\) The following attempt to list Piscator's largely unknown but extensive writings complements the chronology. Unlike an earlier, selected bibliography,\(^8\) listing mainly German sources, this compilation lists all known publications. In the checklist that follows, the compiler has indicated the place of publication for periodicals and newspapers the first time each is cited. Many items are reprinted in the collection of Piscator's writings edited by Ludwig Hoffmann (2 vol., Berlin: Henschel, 1968), and references to that collection have been abbreviated under the title Schriften. Since Hoffmann's "Selected Bibliography" in the 1971 Arts Council exhibit (see fn. 8 below) included interviews with Piscator, this compiler has also, clearly designating them as such. The compiler has also used the bracketed titles supplied by Hoffmann for untitled articles. Finally, the extreme scarcity of some of the publications in which Piscator's articles appeared made it impossible for the compiler to examine every title.\(^9\) Additions and corrections are welcomed.

THE CHECKLIST


Das Aktionsbuch, ed. Franz Pfemfert (Berlin-Wilmersdorf: Verlag der Wochenschrift Die Aktion, 1917),249.]


"Begeisterung." Simplicissimus (Munich) 23,xx(18 June 1918):140. [Anecdote.]


"So verlöschen Augen...," Menschen (Dresden) 2,xxii(1919):13. [Poem.]


[Brief an Die Deutsche Bühne.] Die Deutsche Bühne (Berlin) 12,xxi(1920):313.


"Bericht der deutschen 'Künstlerhilfe für die Hungernden in Russland' von ihrer Gründung bis zum 15. Juli 1922," Der Rote Aufbau (Berlin) 1,ii


“Piscator über die Regie.” *Die Volksbühne* (Berlin) 1,iii (1 Feb. 1926):1-2. [Interview. Rptd. in *Schriften*,II,14-16.]


“Gorkis ‘Nachtasyl’ in der Berliner Volksbühne.” *Die Volksbühne* 1,xxii (1926):1. [Interview by Zw., i.e. Hans von Zwehl.]


“Was wollten Sie in Ihrer Jugend werden?” *Beilage zur Magdeburgische Zeitung* (1926). [Rptd. in *Schriften*,II,5.]

“Das Theater unserer Zeit.” *Der Klassenkampf* (Berlin) 1,ii (1927):47. [Rptd. in *Schriften*,II,23-24.]


“Eine Erklärung Piscators.” *Die Rote Fahne* no.21 (27 March 1927). [Statement concerning the interference of the Volksbühne administration in his prod. of Ehm Welk’s *Gewitter über Gottland*, 23 March 1927.]
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"Dank an Sowjetrussland." Das Neue Russland (Berlin) 4,ix-x(1927):48. [Rptd. in Schriften,II,31.]

"Ein Geschenk an die Jugend.' Das Votum Erwin Piscators." Die Literarische Welt (Berlin) 3,xxvi(1927):2.

"Das proletarische Theater.' Aus einem Gespräch mit Erwin Piscator." Die Literarische Welt 3,xxxvi(1927):6. [Interview by L.L., i.e. Leo Lania, pseud. for Hermann Lazar, also Lasser.]


"Das Studio der Piscator-Bühne." Berliner Tageblatt no.11(7 Jan. 1928).


"Das proletarische Theater." Die Furche (Berlin) 1,ii(1928):12.

"Gespräch mit Erwin Piscator." Die Welt am Morgen (Berlin) no.26(25 June 1928). [Interview by Hans Wesemann.]

"Die Antwort Piscators." Berliner Börsen-Courier no.388(20 Aug. 1928). [Concerning the rent agreement between Meinhard-Bernauer and the Piscatorbühne GmbH.]


"Brief eines 'revolutionären' Theaterdirektors (vorläufig a.D.)," Das Forum (Berlin) 9,ii(1928):105-06. [Commentary regarding Wilhelm Herzog.]


"Wieder Piscatorbühne!" Die Junge Volksbühne (Berlin) 1,ii(1929):1. [Rptd. in Schriften,II,46-47.]


"Das Theater von morgen." Beilage 2 zum Berliner Börsen-Courier no.151(31 March 1929). [Rptd. in Schriften,II,48.]


Das politische Theater. Berlin: Adalbert Schultz, 1929. [Sections in Engl. in International Theatre (Moscow) iv(1933):8-12, titled "Attempt to Stage an Epic Work: Adaptation of The Good Soldier Schweik" in the Piscator Theatre. Also in Theater heute (Velber/Hannover) vii(1962):23-32, titled "Erwin Piscator. Das politische Theater." In addition to the other editions and translations listed infra, there was a Russian trans. (Moscow, 1934) with a special epilogue by Erwin Piscator (in German in Schriften,II,101-09); a Slovak trans. (Bratislava, 1962); and a Chinese trans., date not known.]


Teatro politico, trans. of the 1963 ed. by Aldo della Nina. Rio de Janeiro:
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Civilização Brasileira, 1968.


“Tonfilm Freund und Feind.” Die Literatur 32, vi(1929-30):381-82. [Rptd. in Schriften, II, 70-72.]

“Das politische Theater.” Das politische Theater (Berlin) 1,i(1930):9-11. [Answer to a questionnaire. Rptd. in Schriften, II, 73-74.]

Was soll die IFA-Schau sein?” Die Welt am Abend (Berlin), (20 Feb. 1930). [IFA, i.e. Internationale Funkausstellung.]

[Notiz.] Programmheft des Piscator-Kollektivs (Berlin), (1930):5. [Playbill: Carl Credé, Gequält Menschen.]

“‘Audienz’ bei Dr. Frick. Piscator in Thüringen,” Berliner Tageblatt no.250(29 May 1930). [Interview.]


“Wie ich es sehe,” Berlin am Morgen (9 Sept. 1930). [Commentary on the discussion on “Faschismus, Demokratie oder Sozialismus?”]


“Der Durchbruch des politischen Theaters.” Die Linkskurve (Berlin) 2, xii (1930):10-11. [Rptd. in Schriften, II, 77-78.]


“Piscator zum Solidaritätstag. Telegramm aus Moskau zum Internationalen Solidaritätstag der IAH.” Die Welt am Abend (9 June 1931). [IAH, i.e. Internationale Arbeiterhilfe.]

“Piscator si piska.” Rozpravy aventina (Prague) 6, ix(1930-31):97-98. [Interview by A.H., i.e. Adolf Hoffmeister.]


“Stanislavskis Dank an deutsche Schauspieler. Ein Briefwechsel Stanislavskis und Piscators.” Die Welt am Abend no.42(18 Feb. 1933.]

“Foreign Writers Greet Serafimovich on His 70th Birthday.” International Literature (Moscow) no.2(1939):139.

“Aus der Begrüssungsrede von Erwin Piscator auf dem Ersten Weltkongress der MORT im Namen des Internationalen Revolutionären Theater-Bundes.” Thea-Presse-Correspondenz (Moscow) 1, ii(1933):11-12. [MORT, i.e. Meshdunurodnnoe Objedinenije Revoluzionnovo Teatra,]


“Rozmluva s Piscatorem.” Rozpravy aventina 9, xiv(1933-34):121-22. [Interview by v.k.a., i.e. Miloš Hlavka. In German in Schriften, II, 110-12.]

“Rozhovor s Ervinem Piscatorem.” Haló noviny (Prague), (15 April 1934). [Interview by K.H., i.e. Kurt Hausner.]
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“Darf man schweigen?” Der Gegen-Angriff no.27(7 July 1934). [Rptd. in Schriften,II,113-15.]


“Zeigen wir die Sowjetdeutschen im Buch, im Film, auf der Bühne.” Deutsche Zentral-Zeitung no.214(16 Sept. 1934).


“Was jetzt Du in dieser Minute?” Der Gegen-Angriff no.25(22 June 1935).


“Piscator Describes Combination of Cinema and Stage Technique.” Sunday Worker (New York) 1,ix(8 March 1936):6.


“Piscator chez nous.” Russie d’aujourd’hui (Paris) no.51(1 Feb. 1937):6. [Interview by André Wurmser.]


“Piscator, le cinema, le théâtre et André Gide.” Figaro (Paris), (2 March 1937). [Short interview by Simone Dubreuilh.]
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“Das Theater in der Umerziehung.” Freies Deutschland (Mexico, D.F.) 3,xii(1944):23. [Telegram.]

“Stage Is His Pulpit.” New York Post (22 Jan. 1945). [Interview by Mary Braggotti.]


An unidentified cartoonist sees humor in Piscator's Androcles en de Leeuw, the Hague, 1953.


"Wir sprachen mit Erwin Piscator. Der Theater-Revolutionär verlor nichts von seinem Jugendelan." Badische neueste Nachrichten (Karlsruhe), (21 May 1952). [Interview.]

"De passage à Paris... Erwin Piscator nous dit: 'L'époque est si indigne ou'aujourd'hui plus que jamais le théâtre doit avoir pour mission de révéler a l'homme sa conscience." Combat (Paris) no.2483(27 June 1952). [Interview.]

"Erwin Piscator nous écrit." Combat no.2498(15 July 1952).


"'Technik:' Anklage und Freispruch." Das Theater-Tagebuch (Emsdetten/Westfalen) 1, iv(1953):1-6. [Rptd. in Schriften,II,169-72.]


"Theater ist Aufruhr! Gespräch mit Erwin Piscator." Der Tag (Berlin) no.279(1 Dec. 1954). [Interview by D.D.]


"Vorschlag zu einer Theaterakademie." *Beilage Lebendige Kunst zu Pädagogische Blätter* (Berlin-Grunewald) nos.5-6(1955):1-5. [Rptd. in *Schriften*,II,179-84.]


Erwin Piscator Checklist

Denis Bablet, Jean Jacquot (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1963), 179-91.


"Es geht uns alle an." Die Kultur (Munich) 8, cxlvi (1960): 11. [Commentary on anti-semitic trends in West Germany.]


"So tot ist McCarthy gar nicht. Der Fall Sinatra — Albert Maltz." Deutsche Volkszeitung (Düsseldorf), (17 June 1960). [Interview.]


"Die Ehre Gottes oder die Ehre Becketts?" Das Schönste (Munich) 7, iii (1961): 72.


"Cinq questions à Erwin Piscator." Théâtre (Paris) 6, xxxvii (1962): 8-9. [Interview.]


"Darum nahm ich das Stück." NRZ und Rhein und Ruhr no. 53 (2 March 1963).


"Von Stückeschreiben und Theaterspielen," Deutsche Volkszeitung (29 Nov. 1963). [Interview by Rolf Traube.]

"Wir fragten Prominente Berlins: Was tun Sie am liebsten, wenn Sie nicht arbeiten?" Weihnachtsbeilage zu Telegraf (Berlin), (25 Dec. 1963). [Commentary.]

[Théâtre populaire a dix ans.] Théâtre populaire no. 50 (1963): 18-19. [Commentary.]
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"Nicht der Autor, der andere ist schuld." Spandauer Volksblatt (9 Sept. 1964).

"Schreiben Sie doch bessere Stücke." Theater heute 5,6(1964):4-5.
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**Rundschau** (7 April 1966). [Similar versions in Allgemeine Zeitung (Mainz), (10 April 1966), Rheinische Post (Dusseldorf), (14 April 1966), and in Volksbühnen Spiegel 12,vi(1966):14-15.]


NOTES

1. Besides these two major collections, materials can be found in the following institutions: Deutsche Akademie der Künste in East Berlin, Deutsches Literaturarchiv in Marbach, Klara-Ziegler-Museum in Munich, Theatermuseum in Cologne, Lincoln Center Library and Museum of the Performing Arts in New York, The New School for Social Research in New York, Freie Volksbühne in Berlin, and at the Stadtbibliothek in Mannheim. For more information see the unpublished inventory to the Erwin Piscator Papers at Southern Illinois University, pp.1-2.

2. A preliminary inventory of the holdings at the Akademie der Künste in West Berlin is contained in the inventory to the Piscator Papers at Southern Illinois University, pp. 312-19.


4. Fiebach, when writing his dissertation on Piscator, tried in vain to see original material which is assumed to be stored in Moscow archives. Also a study in progress and planned for publication in 1974-75 by Diezel deals with the work of German theatre exiles in Russia and might give some clues as to the possible existence of material concerning this practically unknown period. (Hans Joachim Fiebach, “Die Darstellung kapitalistischer Widersprüche und revolutionärer Prozesse in Erwin Piscators Inszenierungen 1920-1931,” Diss. Berlin 1965. See also Fiebach’s letter in the correspondence files of the Erwin Piscator Papers at Southern Illinois University, 21 August 1963. Peter Diezel, dissertation in progress on German exiles in the Soviet Union; written in collaboration with the Deutsche Akademie der Künste in East Berlin.)

5. The major part of the diaries are in the possession of Special Collections at Southern Illinois University, ranging from 1912 until Piscator’s death.


9. Christopher D. Innes, Erwin Piscator’s Political Theatre: The Develop-
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Erwin Piscator Checklist (Cambridge: University Press, 1972), p. 228, also lists under “Newspaper articles by Piscator” the following primary sources without giving titles: Nachrichtenblatt der Volksbühne (March 1924), Die Rote Fahne (6 Sep. 1927), Welt am Abend (17 July 1925), Die Weltbühne nos. 5-6 (1928). The compiler has been unable to consult these references.

Town Life in Southern Illinois during the Great Depression

David E. Conrad & Glen M. Jones

When the Great Depression came to Southern Illinois in the 1930’s, it found an area which had always been more or less depressed. In fact, some aspects of the Great Depression had been apparent for several years before 1929 in Southern Illinois. One of the main causes of the depression was technological change—industries and markets being affected by the new technology of the twentieth century. A good example of this was the coal industry in Southern Illinois.

Coal is mined in Southern Illinois principally in the counties of Franklin, Williamson, Perry, Saline, Randolph, and Jackson. In 1920, coal mining was so important in Franklin and Williamson counties that nearly one of every four citizens was a coal miner. Since the beginning, mining labor in the area had been highly organized, and nearly all mines during the 1920’s operated under a contract negotiated by the United Mine Workers. It gave each miner a minimum pay of seven dollars per day, a relatively high wage for that period.

But in the mid-1920’s, when the Southern Illinois coal industry reached its peak of expansion and production, the markets for coal began to decline. Petroleum and natural gas had become serious competitors for both industrial and domestic fuel markets, and the greatest single user of bituminous coal, the railroads, had made technological advances which improved the efficiency of their coal burning by one-fourth.

When the national coal market began to decline, Southern Illinois was the first area to feel the effects. Coal companies with decreasing orders decided that rather than fight with the union over reducing labor costs in Southern Illinois, they would simply close some of their
mines in the area and produce coal in other, less unionized areas.\textsuperscript{1} Another reaction among the operators was to mechanize the mines in order to cut labor costs. The net effect was widespread lay-offs of miners and growing economic distress.\textsuperscript{2}

By 1927 the coal industry in Southern Illinois was clearly in a depression of its own. Between that year and 1929, a total of twenty-nine mines closed permanently in Franklin, Williamson, and Saline Counties; five thousand miners, nearly one-fourth of the miners in these counties, were out of work. The 1930 Census, taken only a few months after the stock market crash of 1929, showed clearly that the coal counties of Southern Illinois were among the first victims of the Great Depression. Franklin County had the highest unemployment rate of any county in the United States. Franklin, Williamson, and Saline Counties had four times the national average of unemployed.\textsuperscript{3}

As the grim outlines of the Great Depression became more and more apparent, other sectors of the Southern Illinois economy felt the effects. Agriculture, following the national trend, was especially hard hit. Production fluctuated, but prices declined drastically. Tenancy and farm debt grew rapidly while the size of the average farm decreased and the number of people on the land increased. Statistics are but a poor reflection of the misery on the farm caused by the depression. Many farmers, in the seasons of 1932 and 1933, found that the price they could obtain for their crops was less than the cost of harvesting. The result was that they let the crops rot in the fields and had almost no income those years.\textsuperscript{4}

Numerous other indicators show clearly how Southern Illinois was crippled by the depression—worse than nearly any other part of the country. The effect of this situation on the towns of the region is the subject at hand. Much has been written about the depression on the farm and much on the suffering of the big cities, but very little has been done to describe the quality of American life in small towns during those trying years. The towns of Southern Illinois were not typical of the nation, yet it seems a safe assumption that their problems were much the same as those of small towns everywhere, only perhaps worse.

Since all the towns of Southern Illinois cannot be studied, representative ones have been selected for analysis. The towns of the region are of four distinct types according to their economic bases:

- coal towns
- farm towns
- towns with a substantial state institution
- river towns

COAL TOWNS

The coal towns in Southern Illinois were relatively new. One representative town, West Frankfort, was only a tiny village until coal was discovered near it in 1902. Then it became a boom town, and in the years before World War I it sustained a great influx of foreigners, railroad workers, farmers and miners. Like most boom towns, West Frankfort was disorganized and completely unplanned.\textsuperscript{5} Even so, by 1930 it was the largest town in Southern Illinois, with a population of 14,683, double that of 1920. Such growth brought to the municipality the usual new responsibilities of supplying water, sewage disposal, garbage collection, and fire and police protection. This in turn meant new taxes and many other attendant problems.

Property taxation presented a particularly vexing problem. Since the coal boom, property values in the coal areas had increased as much as six-fold. Property tax assessments were made by the county and municipal governments and these had been raised accordingly. In 1919 the state legislature raised the rate of property tax from one-third to one-half of the full assessed value. The coal towns such as West Frankfort took this opportunity to reassess all property and raise most valuations.

Events in real estate were only a reflection of what had happened to the West Frankfort coal business. Already ailing when the depression struck, the local mining industry between 1930 and 1934 continued to decline in production; the number of miners employed
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went down; the average number of days worked in the mines was reduced; the price of coal plunged. Hundreds of coal miners in West Frankfort were out of work, and there was no other industry to provide jobs. The fortunate miners who had work saw their take-home pay cut by almost half, which left an income barely at the subsistence level.

Depression and unemployment left the municipal government of West Frankfort in turmoil. The town’s major industry, coal, had never borne much of the local tax burden anyhow. Most of the real estate on the tax rolls was farm land or town lots and not coal mine property. The bigger mines had absentee owners who cared little about the problems of the town in which their employees lived. With most of the taxable wealth in the form of personal homes and land, local government had to sustain itself largely by real estate taxes on individuals. The same private homes and land also made up the capital base of the local economy. Such capital was the foundation for local banking and building and home associations. But the depression had severely damaged the market values of private homes and land, and this had the effect of severely constricting the local tax base and capital structure.

Heavy municipal debts and tax delinquency presented other problems. West Frankfort, during the 1920’s, issued a total of $330,000 in bonds for local improvements. This included new water mains and additions to the sewer and street system. In 1926 West Frankfort collected $135,000 by special assessments to help pay for the improvements, but in 1933 the town was able to collect only $7,900 in this manner. In 1932 seven of every ten city lot owners could not pay the taxes due.

Eventually city officials realized that tax delinquency was not simply a phase through which they were passing and that property evaluations would have to be drastically reduced. Their hope was that after lower assessments more people would be able to pay their reduced taxes. However, state law complicated this matter because it required that all back taxes must be paid, something that for many people was impossible. Unemployment was high, and business came to a standstill. By the spring of 1932, it seemed that starvation threatened the people of Williamson and Franklin counties.

Marion, a town of 9,000 a few miles south of West Frankfort in the Southern Illinois coal fields, offers striking examples of some of
the other problems faced by coal towns during this period. As local taxes declined and operating budgets were cut, the schools of the mining communities were the first to feel the pinch. School functions had to be cut drastically in Marion during 1930 because school funds had been deposited in several local banks which had closed. Eventually the schools got part of their money from the defunct banks, but not all. The regular school year was reduced from nine to eight months, and courses in art and music were dropped for economy reasons. By 1932 twelve out of thirty teachers had been eliminated and expenditures were less than half of what they had been in 1930. At the same time, student enrollment increased. Those teachers lucky enough to retain their jobs had their pay reduced. Moreover, the school system paid its salaries in anticipation warrants which were very difficult to cash. Sometimes the teachers had to take less than half the face value of the warrants from speculators.8

Other problems at Marion show the effects of the depression. In 1931 four prisoners escaped from the jail because the city could not pay a jailer to guard them. The city council, in a further economy move, ordered that all city departments except the police become self-sustaining. The council also placed a ten to two-hundred dollar fine on anyone other than the city sexton caught digging a grave. The city needed the revenue even from this source.

Banking was an intractable problem at Marion throughout the depression. In 1930 both of the banks failed, and the town was utterly without organized banking until 1937 when the Bank of Marion opened.9 It is not difficult to imagine the hardships of a town of 9,000 people without banking. At first there were the problems of depositors who could not obtain their funds, not only individuals but also the local governments, the school system, and business concerns. Later there was paralysis of local business caused by the lack of loans and other services provided by banks. In effect, a capitalistic community which loses its banking facilities has to revert to a near primitive economic system in which many of the more sophisticated aspects of modern capitalism are not present.

By late 1937, however, evidence could be seen that Marion had passed through the worst of the depression. After seven years without a bank, a new one opened. The school system was able to pay its teachers in real money and, with the help of the Works Progress Administration, had built some new buildings. The city was solvent enough in 1937 to resume its street paving program. Two new policemen had been hired to work the night shift, and according to Marion journalists the police force was now strong enough to deal effectively with hoboes and vagrants.10

So the picture is clear in the coal towns. They were the hardest hit of all Southern Illinois towns. Their banks closed first and stayed closed longer, causing great distress to municipal and school governments and the local economy. Their tax collections declined sharply, their unemployment was disastrously high, and their attempts to diversify their economies and bring in new industry proved futile. The result was drastically reduced public services, severe financial distress, and human suffering, the latter poorly reflected by the standard historical sources but still excruciatingly real.

FARM TOWN

Anna, in Union County, was about as typical as any of farm towns in Southern Illinois, surrounded as it was by a region of intensive agriculture, especially fruit orchards. Agriculture, like the coal industry, had not prospered during the 1920's, and when the depression came, farmers were in a vulnerable position.

With farm incomes cut by two-thirds, the merchants, suppliers, servicers, and bankers of farm towns like Anna felt the brunt of the depression almost as much as the farmers. All of the signs of depression in the coal towns—unemployment, bank failures, tax defaulting—also were present in the farm towns, but in the case of Anna not so severely. Several factors contributed to the amelioration of the depression there. For one thing, unemployment was never as bad in Anna as it was in the coal towns. Farmers, although their incomes were drastically reduced, could not be rightly considered unemployed. They retained their farms, at least for a while, and they operated on a subsistence level, using the farm to provide food, shelter, and fuel needed by their families. However, as a result farmers produced less to sell and their incomes declined sharply. The effects of this agricultural withdrawal on the local economy were not immediate, however. Local business declined gradually, eventually to near-paralysis, but it was not suddenly and completely wrecked by mass unemployment as it was in the coal
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towns.

Anna, for instance, never lost its banking, although one of the three small banks closed in 1933 and dissolved five years later. The City of Anna experienced problems, too, with tax collections, but not as severely as the coal towns. Farm land in the area showed a greater loss in valuation than did town lots, but taken altogether these losses were not as disastrous as those of the coal towns where valuation losses amounted to millions of dollars.

The public schools of Anna also seem to have suffered from the depression, but here again it could have been worse. The Anna system paid its teachers for a time in warrants which had to be cashed at less than face value, but during the first three years of the depression the high school budget was cut only slightly. Throughout the depression in Anna, schools had difficulty in keeping well-qualified teachers because their pay was lower than elsewhere, and one year the school board was so short of funds that it was forced to put all athletic programs on a self-supporting basis. For years there was insufficient money to carry on the basic functions of the school system.

The good people of Anna were not so hard-hit by the depression that they could not give some aid to the unemployed and the hungry. The city government did not have the resources to handle the problem, so the Chamber of Commerce formed a Charities Committee to coordinate relief work. In 1930 they collected money from football games, a community drive, and merchandise donations. The sum was not great, but with it the town was able to feed from five to fifteen hungry persons breakfast each morning at the city hall. There was money enough to continue the program for two years.

The Charities Committee got school children to collect clothing for the needy, and ten large boxes of children's clothing were turned over to the school nurse for distribution. Men's and women's clothing was kept at the city hall to be distributed by the chairman of the Committee and city officials. Thirty families received such clothing and no one was refused.

Union County also received some federal aid in the early years of the depression. It came in the form of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a device used by the Hoover Administration to avoid what it considered the onus of direct public aid by the federal government. The Union County allowance was pitiful when compared to that of Cook County and Chicago, but such inequities of distribution did not bother the people of Union County greatly.

Local self reliance was an article of faith in rural America, and the people of Union County took pride in their ability to look after their own and to do without federal aid. Also, they seemed to think that it was a different depression in Chicago. In reporting the distribution of federal funds, the Anna Democrat explained the matter easily by saying that Chicago's needs were greater because "one-third of the population [there] is depending on the public for a living, being out of work."

Possibly the poverty and need of Union County and the other Southern Illinois counties was simply less visible than that of Chicago. Throughout the country during the depression, rural areas did not command as much relief attention as did the big cities. Farmers in the process of going broke and being foreclosed, town dwellers who had lost their jobs or businesses, or people on pitifully low wages were seldom included in unemployment statistics. Many rural areas had no relief at all, and one of the trends of the depression was for rural people to move to the cities in order to obtain government relief. In Southern Illinois counties like Williamson and Franklin, coal counties where unemployment was more observable and more likely to appear in statistics, the levels of state and federal aid were higher.

Relief grants or loans were not what Anna needed most, anyhow. What Anna needed was some form of direct stimulation to its moribund economy. The worst year of the depression in this area seems to have been 1930, when the peach crop froze on the trees in an early winter storm and when the garment factory, the main local industry, was forced to close. But after 1930, Anna was fortunate that there were stimulants to its economy, stimulants which were mostly the doing of its own people.

The chief boost to recovery was a new shoe factory. The City of Anna, which had been in the process of selling a factory building to the local garment manufacturer when the company folded, was left with the building on its hands. Through the vigorous efforts of the Chamber of Commerce in the summer of 1931, the city was able to negotiate a deal with the International Shoe Company of St. Louis to take over the building and convert it into a shoe factory. The shoe factory eventually employed 450 people and attracted hundreds of
new families to Anna, families who now purchased most of their goods and services there. Obviously this was the most effective way to fight local depression, but it was a way which was simply not possible for the worse-stricken coal towns, which talked of developing new industry but could never do it.

Another boon to the Anna economy was highway construction. During the early years of the depression, a state highway was built from Cape Girardeau, Missouri, to Vienna, Illinois, with Anna about in the middle. New roads also were constructed in nearby Giant City State Park. The Anna Stone Company supplied limestone for the roads from its quarry, and in 1930 the payroll of the company doubled. Once finished, the new roads facilitated shopping trips to Anna by rural people, and the town began having sale days. It installed a new downtown lighting system to popularize night shopping and also changed its ordinances to allow Sunday motion pictures in order to attract people to town. In July, 1931, the Anna Chamber of Commerce voted to give the nearby City of Jonesboro money in order to purchase rights of way through the town and allow the road from Cape Girardeau to be finished that year.

Federal building projects also were quite helpful to Anna. In 1933 the city received funds from the Public Works Administration for the construction of a badly needed new waterworks. About the same time, another PWA project was approved for the construction of a municipal market designed to make Anna a center for the shipping of fruit. About seventy-five men worked for two months in the construction of the market. There was much talk around Anna of building a cannery to process the large amounts of fruit and vegetables grown in the area, but this idea did not get past the talking stage.

Overall it would appear that although the municipal government, banks, school system, and local economy of Anna experienced real distress during the Great Depression, things were not nearly so bad as in the coal towns to the north. Unemployment was not as wide-spread in the Anna area, agriculture was not as hard-hit as coal mining, road construction helped the local economy, and the people of Anna were able to find ways to provide local relief and to establish new businesses.
TOWN WITH A STATE INSTITUTION

Carbondale, today the largest city in Southern Illinois, had a multiple economic base. Situated in the eastern part of Jackson County, it was near the edge of the coal fields. To the north lay open prairies, producing corn and other grains, and to the south was orchard country. Carbondale had been established in the mid-nineteenth century as a railroad town, and in the 1930’s it was an important junction of the Illinois Central Railroad. There was also a factory which produced railroad ties. Then there was Southern Illinois Normal University, located on the south side of Carbondale. Even so, the town had a population of less than five thousand and had never been exceedingly prosperous.

Apparently the Great Depression struck Carbondale suddenly. On December 6, 1929, less than two months after the stock market crash, the United Charities of Carbondale announced the results of a survey of poverty in the town: close to one hundred families were in dire need, and some children in the public schools, especially the segregated black schools, were without adequate clothing and shoes. On December 10 the Rotary Club was shocked to hear a poverty worker tell them of instances “in this very city” of children with no shoes who went about in mid-winter with their feet wrapped in rags. The same worker told of a one-room house where seven adults, four children, five dogs, and a dozen chickens lived in absolute squalor. When the worker had entered the house, the children had crawled under the beds in fear and the dogs had taken the opportunity to jump onto the tables and lick the unwashed plates. This distressing poverty was blamed by many on “winter weather,” but it seemed there was something especially difficult about this winter. No one realized at that early date that the nation was entering a terrible depression, but through all the years of the depression, there were other signs which indicated that the town did not suffer excessively. Old-timers take the view that because of the railroad, the university, the tie factory, and diversified agriculture, the Great Depression was not so bad in Carbondale.

Certainly banking, a good indicator of local business stability, was never in serious trouble in Carbondale. Avoiding a run, the First National Bank was very sound, and by publishing a special report it allayed its depositors’ fears that a run was likely. The bank assured the public that the Carbondale economy was healthy and that Carbondale banking could continue to provide for the credit needs of the community. It promised to give the kind of banking that the town needed—“careful and conservative.” Amazingly, in January of 1931 when the banks of the entire nation were in their gravest crisis, the First National held a position which was almost identical to that of 1930. The other bank in town, the Carbondale National, was smaller, but it remained just as sound as the First National throughout the depression. Obviously many citizens of bankless Williamson County had been forced to come to Carbondale to do their banking.

In fact, what was identified locally as “business uncertainty” had at least one beneficial effect on the Carbondale economy. The demand for farm land in the area was greater than ever—even more so than the fat years of 1928 and 1929. Every day the agents turned away people desiring to rent farms, apparently most of them refugees wealthy, produced not nearly enough to provide adequately for the town’s suddenly expanded class of new poor. As the depression wore on, other special efforts were made. In 1931 there was a bumper crop of peaches in the area, and growers trucked their culls (wholesome peaches but too ripe to market) to the Carbondale City Hall to be given to the hungry. The head of the city relief committee supervised the distribution of the peaches, certifying that each recipient was truly in need. The city council also set up an employment service in City Hall, but few persons got work through it. The problem was, as everywhere, that large numbers of the unemployed registered but virtually no employers offered jobs.

The full extent of the impact of the Great Depression on Carbondale is difficult to determine. There were the usual signs of distress—the unemployment, the business failures, the reports of unusual poverty and need—but through all the years of the depression, there were other signs which indicated that the town did not suffer excessively. Old-timers take the view that because of the railroad, the university, the tie factory, and diversified agriculture, the Great Depression was not so bad in Carbondale.
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from the big city depression trying to return to the land. The real estate men accounted for this phenomenon by saying that at least on a farm a living was assured.

Probably the greatest single factor in the financial health of Carbondale was Southern Illinois Normal University. In the 1930's it was, according to one of its chroniclers, "little more than a teacher's college granting occasional higher degrees, with restricted offerings, diminished enrollment, and a wretched campus." Nonetheless it remained a mainstay of the area's economy, and, symbolic of this, the mayor of Carbondale during most of the depression was John I. Wright, an associate professor of history at the University.

Not only was the University able to hold its own during the depression, it grew and prospered, and continued to pump money into the local economy. In fact, the amount grew steadily. The total of faculty and staff salaries, for instance, increased by 50 percent between 1933 and 1938, and by 1940 was approaching one-half million dollars per year. The University also contributed materially to the local economy in the form of purchases of goods and services from Carbondale merchants and tradesmen. During one month in 1934 such purchases amounted to $2,800. It is important to remember that all local disbursements of the University in the form of salaries, student wages, or local purchases represented money injected into the local economy from the outside, money that would for the most part stay in the area and continue to circulate.

By the end of the 1930's, SINU was a bustling place. A former student who had left in 1931 and returned as a librarian in 1938 found the campus and town had changed greatly and was a "paradise" compared to the floundering South Dakota college she had left. Every square foot of available housing space in Carbondale was in use and rents were high compared to other towns in the area. Students lived in boarding houses, basements, attics, and spare rooms, often on diets consisting of canned foods and hot dogs. Their standard of living was not good, but they were getting a college education and they were off the job market. They were also contributing materially to the Carbondale economy.

The Illinois Central Railroad was also a major factor in the stability of the Carbondale economy throughout the depression. Carbondale was headquarters for the St. Louis Division of the Illinois Central, which included all of Illinois south of St. Louis, Missouri. At the peak of the railroad years there were as many as twenty-eight passenger trains passing through the town each day, and even more freight trains. Altogether, there were between two and three hundred railroad employees at Carbondale.

So Carbondale, with stable banking, a diversified economy, and constant sources of income, weathered the depression better than any other town examined in this study. It entered the 1940's in an excellent position to outstrip all the other towns of Southern Illinois in growth and economic development.

RIVER TOWN

A typical American river town is Cairo in the southernmost tip of Illinois at the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Established in the 1840's, Cairo had always been an important port on the two rivers. During the Civil War it was a center for operations of Union river forces. In 1900, when many of the coal towns were not yet established, Cairo was already an old town for the midwest with a fine system of parks, a well-stocked library, and a municipal government which performed many community services. It was also the largest town in Southern Illinois and adjacent areas of Kentucky and Missouri.

Like Carbondale, Cairo had a diversified economy. The lumber industry in the area was considerable; the town was a leading agricultural trade center for the region, and large amounts of outside money came from transients, tourists, and shoppers from the sparsely settled areas in nearby Kentucky and Missouri. In addition to the river traffic, Cairo also had good rail connections and was the site of a new highway bridge across the Mississippi River. However, like the coal towns, Cairo began to feel the effects of the Great Depression several years before the crash of 1929. The local lumber industry went into a decline after 1925 and traffic on the rivers lessened. The town's population dwindled accordingly.

Then came the stock market crash of 1929, and the psychological and economic shock waves were felt in Cairo as they were everywhere. By January 1930 the Cairo Evening Citizen reported that hunger was driving many people into the alleys to search through garbage for food. With many people lacking proper shelter and in poor health, the paper claimed there was great danger to the
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health of the entire population, and it feared that “moral degeneracy as well as hunger would drive the people to stealing and killing for food.”

The depression refugees camped out in the woods south of town and along the river, creating a new type of real estate development called a “Hooverville” or “shantytown.” Early each morning the indigents came into Cairo to panhandle in the streets or beg for food from door to door. Near the Illinois Central freight yards was another depression product, the hobo jungle. It was filled every night with tramps who spent their days riding the rods of the American railway system trying to escape the depression and never succeeding.

The city government of Cairo weathered the storm of the early years of the depression, but not without showing some splits at the seams. There had always been insinuations and rumors that the municipal government was corrupt, and the shortages of funds and the abandonment of public services made necessary by the depression only heightened these charges. Shortly before Christmas in 1932 the city ran out of money completely and was forced to quit paying its employees for the rest of the year. Even though the city had always paid its debts in the past, the local banks refused to make a loan in the current emergency. Even the local gas stations stopped credit to the city with the result that no city vehicles operated for several months.

Cairo's municipal problems were much like those of the coal towns, but it fared much better in banking. Cairo had four banks when the depression came, and only one of these, the Cairo National Bank, failed. This was in 1930, and the bank was rather smoothly absorbed by the Alexander County Bank to become the Cairo-Alexander Bank. Similarly, the Cairo school systems seem to have come through the depression without serious retrenchment.

The indications are that 1936 was a turning point for Cairo. The economy of the town had always been basically sound, and although the depression severely hurt the economy, it did not destroy it. Cairo had always done good business with farmers of the region, and the completion of a new bridge across the Mississippi River in 1928 made Cairo the center for handling and processing the cotton, soy beans, corn and alfalfa grown on the rich delta farms of the Missouri Bootheel. A new bridge across the Ohio River, begun in 1936, promised to open up similar trade with adjacent areas in Western Kentucky and Northwestern Tennessee, although these areas were not so productive as the Missouri Bootheel.

In addition to agriculture, there were other signs of economic recovery after 1936. The merchants of Cairo for the first time decorated the downtown area for Christmas in 1936, and a new sugar warehouse was completed along with a new lumber mill. The Illinois Central built a new depot, and a new hotel went up across the street from the depot. Businesses such as a theater, the J. C. Penny store, and a drugstore made extensive renovations. The WPA had begun work on a new jail for the city, with the city furnishing one-fourth of the cost, and a river front project had been completed making the levees not only strong but pleasing to the eye.

In 1937, less than a month after the Evening Citizen published an optimistic report on Cairo’s economic advance and the general good health of its citizens (“no epidemics and no calamity to mar the year”), a great flood struck the town and changed things drastically. The most destructive flood since the turn of the century covered the entire Ohio Valley and threatened Cairo’s very existence. Women and children had to be evacuated, while able-bodied men stayed behind to labor on the powerful levees and try to keep the river in its channel. Cairo was saved and little real damage was done to homes and businesses, but the flood frightened many of the residents and many more lost confidence in the town. For years to come, Cairo went to great lengths to publicize that it was a safe place and that the rivers could always be crossed there, but the psychological damage had been done, not only to citizens of Cairo but to the tourists, salesmen, businessmen, shippers, truckers, regional farmers, and others who were so important to Cairo’s economy. 17

Cairo recovered from all the blows of the thirties, even the flood, but the bright future foreseen in 1936 was never fulfilled. Economic recovery came to Cairo because of the diversity of its economy, some timely large construction, several WPA projects in the vicinity, and the building of two new bridges, but real prosperity or dramatic growth never came. Even so, Cairo ended the thirties as the largest city in Southern Illinois and one of the healthiest.

Town economies in Southern Illinois offer some real surprises for the student of the Great Depression. First, there was the fact that in the four types of towns, the depression, although it was undeniably
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severe and painful, seems to have passed in five or six years in all but the coal towns. By 1936 or 1937 normalcy, if not prosperity, was returning. This picture is in contrast to the usual one of the depression in which it wears on throughout the 1930's and is relieved only by the coming of World War II.

Another surprise was the rapidity with which the depression struck the towns. Within a few months, sometimes weeks, after the stock market crash, real signs of depression were apparent throughout the area. Again this is in contrast to the usual interpretation that it took many months to develop fully. In several of the towns, the worst year was 1930 and not 1932 or 1933, the usual "worst years." This indicates that as far as these towns are concerned, economists have either made too much of the connection between the stock market crash and the depression or not enough of the psychological effects of it. Clearly there were signs of a coming depression in Southern Illinois as early as 1926, so perhaps it simply came early and "bottomed out" around 1930, in which case the importance of the stock market crash may have been overestimated. Or, perhaps, with signs of depression already apparent, the people of the area were shocked so traumatically by the crash that they allowed their economies to plunge into depression immediately. Certainly classic economics cannot account otherwise for the almost instantaneous reaction of small town economies in Southern Illinois to events which took place in far-off Wall Street. If this trauma theory is correct, the psychological effects of the crash have not been fully recognized, at least in this area.

Finally, banking offers another surprise. The over-all statistics on banking in Southern Illinois during the depression are dismal, indeed among the worst in the country. But the strange part is that banking distress was so uneven. In the coal towns banking was virtually wiped out, but elsewhere banks survived, albeit with difficulties. In isolated cases banks even prospered through the worst years, and there were other businesses that seemed to benefit from the ill wind—real estate for instance.

But despite the surprising differences, the depression in Southern Illinois corresponds in general outline to the national depression. An area which was already poor suffered terribly during the Great Depression and never really recovered to the point of prosperity.

NOTES

2. Gene Moroni (Executive of the Old Ben Coal Corporation), Interview, November 2, 1967.
10. Marion Daily Republican 1937 and 1938, passim. Much of the information for this article comes from the files of this and three other newspapers of the period: the Carbondale Free Press, the Anna Democrat, and the Cairo Evening Citizen.
Walt Whitman Answers a Collector

E. Earle Stibitz

In the fall of 1968, Morris Library acquired its millionth volume, a copy of the first edition (1855) of Walt Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*, which was added to the Rare Book collection. Folded into the book was the 100-year-old unpublished letter here reproduced.¹

The Washington, 1871, dating of the letter reveals that Whitman wrote it while he occupied a clerkship in the Attorney General's office, a position he had obtained after his dismissal as a clerk in the Department of Interior by Secretary James Harlan. The Secretary considered *Leaves of Grass* iminoral. At this time Whitman was engaged as usual in revising and adding to his volume of poems, and during this year he put out two issues of the fifth edition of the *Leaves*. While the letter presented here is not of special biographical or critical significance, it does offer a sense of personal connection and, suggestively, confirms something of what we already know of Whitman.

It is of interest that Whitman did not possess any extra copies of the subsequently famous 1855 edition, a fact that suggests that despite his frequent self-acclaim he did not feel assured of his reputation, at least to the degree of thinking that his first edition would some day be much sought after. His lack of knowledge of and even indifference to the accessibility of this edition underscores this conclusion. And it is a matter of record that he had reason not to be very sanguine about his ultimate acceptance as a poet in America, for although his reputation abroad had grown substantially, nothing comparable had taken place here. It is true that he was not being attacked as earlier, but he was still generally ignored at this time. Actually, when the letter was written he was experiencing a definite "low," both subjectively and objectively. In September, a month earlier, he had had an indifferent and even to some extent a hostile
Washington,
Oct. 17, 1871.

Dear Sir:

In answer to your letter of September 5, (I beg pardon for not replying to it before,) I have to inform you that some time ago Dion Thomas, bookseller, 2? Story, Fulton st., North side, about midway bet. Nassau and Broadway, had some copies of 1st edition Leaves of Grass— but whether he still has them to sell I don't know.

Walt Whitman

I can procure you of the artist a good photograph. The price is $1.

The last edition of my Poems Complete I publish & sell myself.

Walt Whitman writes a book collector about the first edition of Leaves of Grass.
reception at the public reading of a poem ("After All Not to Create Only") at the opening of the Fortieth National Industrial Exhibition in New York.²

The last sentence in the body of Whitman's note and the postscript bring to mind another aspect of his relationship to Leaves of Grass: his personal involvement, one might say ego involvement, in all aspects of the creation and publication of the work. His mention of the availability of a photograph of himself recalls his quite constant concern with his image, both literal and figurative; and, of course, it is a specific reminder that the 1855 edition did not bear the author's name on the title page but offered across from the title page a photographic portrait of him.

Whitman's direct involvement in the sale of his book, revealed in the postscript, is in harmony with his activity in the promotion of his work both before and after publication. Directly and indirectly Whitman often had a hand in obtaining favorable comments about himself in the press and in writing and placing rather flattering reviews. For example, he wrote favorable articles for the papers about the unhappy public reading mentioned earlier, even describing to his advantage his physical appearance on the stage.³ The handling of the sale of the recent edition, referred to in the letter, is quite logically and psychologically in keeping with his basic attitude toward himself and the Leaves, though it certainly needs to be said that economic necessity no doubt also directed this particular involvement.

NOTES


The Mexican Revolution of 1910 Perspectives from the Francisco Vázquez Gómez Papers

Anthony Bryan

Mexico was the first Latin American nation to experience a fundamental social revolution. There is much scholarly debate over a suitable definition of "social revolution" but few would deny that the Mexican experience since 1910—commonly referred to as the Mexican Revolution—has contributed to the creation of a stable polity, progressive economy, and some beneficial alteration in the social structure. Revolutionary nationalism, land reform and cultural pride have been basic psychological ingredients of the Mexican phenomenon.

The year 1910 in Mexico witnessed the termination of three decades of dictatorial rule by the national caudillo Porfirio Díaz. Even from that time some pro-revolutionary writers viewed the ensuing struggle as a cohesive effort to procure radical political, social, and economic change from the dictatorship. Despite the sophistication of mid-twentieth century historical investigation, many studies have considered the revolutionary process as the almost spontaneous uprising of common folk against a despotic regime. To contend that the Revolution was spontaneous would be reasonably accurate; but multiple reasons for the fall of Porfirio Díaz can be found in the interaction of social classes, political struggles, and disparate ideologies which prompted conflict.¹ There were also regional socioeconomic variations and contradictions which hastened political destabilization in various parts of the nation. Hence, the character of revolt differed in northern and southern Mexico.² While the early revolutionary movements contained diverse personalities, their leaders (with the exception of Emiliano Zapata in Morelos) were mainly members of the upper and middle classes who addressed their proposals and theories to their peers. Except for the overthrow of Díaz the major activist groups held few common goals and little
ideological conviction. Every shade of political opinion between the most radical and most moderate proponents of change was reflected.

The man who reaped the political and military victory in 1910 was Francisco Madero, a moderate liberal who profited from the groundwork laid by more radical precursors. Physically unimpressive (except when he sat astride a horse), extremely wealthy, a believer in spiritism, a vegetarian and a teetotaler, he was a most unlikely leader for a modern revolution. Elected president in November 1911, he promptly failed to hold the country together. His greatest character defect was a fierce optimism, epitomized in his belief that effective political democracy in Mexico would serve as a panacea for social and economic injustices. With incredible naivety he minimized the turmoil which surrounded him, so that by the end of 1912 he was no longer able to govern. Many of his problems stemmed from his delay in attending to urgent issues such as land reform, his inability to bring about a new and viable political order, and his failure to control both the revolutionary armies and the federal army of the ancien régime. While the revolutionary groups could not agree among themselves to oust him, a consensus did exist among the old generals of the former regime. On February 9, 1913, they began what became a successful coup d'etat. Twelve days later the president was assassinated. Madero in death was proclaimed a martyr and an apostle of liberty. Those who had moved to overthrow him were symbols of evil and the objects of prorevolutionary historical polemic.

The early period (1910-1917) of the Revolution is still a controversial one for historians because the personalismo and factionalism of the early years is overwhelming: maderistas, zapatistas, carrancistas, villistas. Scholars, for the most part, have treated the historical events by examining the careers of the more important personalities (Francisco Madero, Emiliano Zapata, Venustiano Carranza, Francisco "Pancho" Villa) glorified by the victors. Undeniably, the contributions of some revolutionists have been grossly exaggerated at the expense of other participants. However, in the historiography of the Mexican Revolution specialized studies concentrating on "secondary" figures within the milieu have begun to appear. The Vázquez Gómez brothers provide a case in point.

Francisco and Emilio Vázquez Gómez were intimate participants
Francisco Vázquez Gómez

in the early phase of the revolutionary process. Yet they have not earned justifiable consideration by historians. Usually, when discussed, their individual activities are blurred, as are their personalities. At best they have emerged as Mexican versions of Tweedledum and Tweedledee. Born of poor mestizo folk in Tamaulipas (Emilio in 1858 and Francisco in 1861), they distinguished themselves in their respective, hard-earned professions. Francisco became the personal physician to dictator Porfirio Díaz, while Emilio enjoyed a successful law practice in Mexico City. During the Díaz regime their political links with the administration were at best cursory and expedient. By the middle of 1909, when prerevolutionary political organizations rose to challenge the dictator, both brothers were catapulted into national prominence. Francisco became president of the governing board of the revista movement, seeking to nominate General Bernardo Reyes of Nuevo León as a presidential candidate. Emilio chose to join the more embryonic antireeleccionista party of Francisco Madero and became director of its Mexico City nerve center. When Reyes failed to declare his candidacy and accepted a military mission overseas, a disenchanted Francisco joined his brother Emilio in the antireeleccionista cause and was selected by the party’s convention as its candidate for the vice presidency.

When Madero, smarting of frustration with Díaz’ oppressive anti-electoral tactics, scheduled his armed rebellion against the dictator for November 1910, both Vázquez brothers proved to be reluctant rebels. They were cool toward Madero’s course of action; but eventually Francisco agreed to become Madero’s confidential agent in Washington, while Emilio assumed control of a maderista junta in San Antonio, Texas, which was sending arms to rebels in northern Mexico. Madero did not win a total military victory against the forces of the old regime. Instead he decided to negotiate a compromise with representatives of Díaz. Signed on May 21, 1911, it provided for Díaz’ resignation and an interim president (conservative Francisco León de la Barra) to rule until Madero could be legally elected. This compromise, which robbed the revolutionaries of full military and political control, was Madero’s initial blunder. Others would follow.

Both Vázquez brothers served in the de la Barra government, Francisco as Minister of Public Instruction, Emilio in the post of Minister of Government. But neither was inclined to work with functionaries of the old regime who were retained in the interim administration. They became embroiled in arguments with de la Barra and with Madero who seemed obliged to condone the less than revolutionary actions of the provisional president. Within six months the victorious maderista revolution was ruptured internally. As the schisms widened Emilio was forced out of the government. Francisco then lost the nomination for vice president at the antireeleccionista convention and several disputes later with Madero was also forced to resign from the cabinet. The alienation between the brothers and the Revolution’s nominal leader was complete. Francisco retired to his physician’s practice in Mexico City, but Emilio, unable to swallow the bitter pill of political defeat, decided to revolt against Madero.

During late 1911 and 1912, a series of abortive insurrections were directed against President Madero. Emiliano Zapata in the south was the first to rebel openly late in 1911. Before the end of that year Bernardo Reyes launched his ill-fated movement in the north. Unsuccessful rebellions instigated by Emilio Vázquez Gómez, Pascual Orozco, and Felix Díaz followed during 1912. Seen collectively they paved the way for the eventual overthrow of Madero by Victoriano Huerta. Significantly, those who revolted against the “Apostle” represented elements on both the right and left of the political scale. None of the rebellions (not even Huerta’s) was reactionary. Their leaders had no desire to reinstate new versions of the Porfiriato.

Huerta became a temporary symbol of agreement for rival factions. But he in turn, assailed verbally and militarily by those who conceived themselves as the revolutionary heirs of Madero—namely, Carranza, Alvaro Obregón, Villa, and Zapata—was president for only a brief, tumultuous period. He resigned and went into exile in 1914. Even with Huerta gone, the competing revolutionists failed to reach substantive agreement about the nation’s future. They then proceeded to destroy Mexico and each other. The physical and economic costs to the already shattered nation were staggering. Fortunately, during the phases of expedient violence, destruction of traditional class lines and alterations in the body politic resulted in the development of precepts for drastic socioeconomic reform. Once Carranza had triumphed, he summoned a congress which gave the rather nebulous Mexican Revolution its ideological base—the Constitution of 1917.
The spectrum of constant and competing revolts is difficult to comprehend unless one appreciates the exaggerated factionalism and internal dissent engendered by the personalism of that first decade of the Revolution. Personal opportunism, in both politics and battle, was rampant. Rapid changes in allegiance, to the accompaniment of rhetoric and vituperation, were commonplace. Once the Revolution had triumphed, certain leaders on the winning side were propelled abruptly into historical fame. For the losers there were defamation and scathing epithets which have survived in the historical literature on the era. The Vázquez Gómez brothers, for their role, have been scorned variably as late arrivals in the Revolution, eternal plotters, greedy men concerned with personal aggrandizement, and political reactionaries. Such evaluations may possess only slight merit when the protagonists are perceived in broader perspective and when historians have recourse to their personal archives.

The large collection of Francisco Vázquez Gómez papers, in the Special Collection of Morris Library, should provide scholars with additional perspectives on the personalities and conflicts which helped to shape the course of the early Mexican Revolution. The collection contains substantial information about the maderista movement, political factionalism, the relationships between certain individuals and various fragmentary movements, and the quality of Madero's administrative structure. Since Francisco Vázquez Gómez remained active in politics until shortly before his death in 1933, historians may glean from his papers additional information on the Zapata revolts and the Constitutionalist years.

The collection came to Southern Illinois University through the efforts of Professor Albert W. Bork, Director of the Latin-American Institute, as the gift of Dr. Ignacio Vázquez Gómez, son of Don Francisco, who spent forty years gathering and ordering his father's papers. They consist of approximately ten thousand chronologically arranged handwritten and typewritten letters, coded and decoded telegrams, scrapbooks, and newspaper clippings. A folder-by-folder inventory of the documents is available and a calendar is in preparation. Many of the documents were excerpted by Francisco for publication in his memoirs, but there is a great deal left to delight scholars. Serious research in the collection, which will serve to reevaluate the role of the brothers in various revolutionary activities, has already commenced.

Among some Mexicans and Mexicanists it is fashionable to say that the Revolution is dead. Official doctrine decrees that it is alive and well. Some skeptics say it really has not begun. The issues are far from being resolved; but buried within private archival collections in Mexico and elsewhere is a wealth of documentation which can be utilized to question many of the generalizations and much of the sterile rhetoric propounded in defense of or in opposition to the Mexican experience. The answers are there for those willing to dig.

NOTES


6. The nature of these revolts is best explored in the previously cited...
Francisco Vázquez Gómez


9. John Caleca has thoroughly researched the papers for an enlarged study *The Vázquez Gómez Brothers and the Mexican Revolutionary Movements: From Reyes to Zapata*, Diss. Univ. of Nebraska (in progress). I have consulted the collection for additional material on political and revolutionary links between the brothers and Bernardo Reyes, for a forthcoming book.

Manuscript Collections in Morris Library

Ralph E. McCoy

During the past fifteen years, Morris Library has assembled an impressive collection of manuscripts in support of faculty and doctoral research. These manuscript holdings are largely (with some notable exceptions) in the humanities—American, British, and Irish literature, philosophy, theater, and history—and represent the twentieth century. The bulk of the holdings, including the entire archives of modern philosophy and much of the theater collection, was acquired by gift. Other collections, especially in American, British, and Irish literature, were purchased. Several, including the distinguished James Joyce collection, were a combination of gift and purchase.

Concentration on the twentieth century came about in part because of faculty interests and strengths that began to be apparent as the University developed into a graduate and research institution. There was also a realization that manuscripts in any significant quantity for earlier periods were either unobtainable or out of range in price. Furthermore, the twentieth century had not been preempted by other midwestern institutions. Decisions to develop areas of concentration and to make particular acquisitions were arrived at jointly by the library and teaching faculties.

The manuscripts in Morris Library have been consulted in the preparation of numerous books and articles and have been the basis for doctoral dissertations at Southern Illinois and other universities. Last year scholars from twenty-two universities, here and abroad, used the collections.

The library staff has worked closely with Southern Illinois University Press, keeping in mind publishing possibilities inherent in collections of papers under consideration. Professor C. Harvey Gardiner's *A Study in Dissent* was based in large part on the Elbridge
Francisco Vázquez Gómez

Gerry papers in Morris Library. The Early Works of John Dewey and The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant are notable examples of Southern Illinois University faculty research based on resources in Morris Library and resulting in publication by the University Press.

The following brief descriptions of major manuscript holdings in Morris Library were prepared for inclusion in a survey of Illinois library resources, compiled by Robert B. Downs, to be published by the American Library Association. References are made throughout to bibliographies, inventories, or works emanating from the collection.

These collections are in varying condition of arrangement and description and anyone contemplating use of the materials should be in touch with the Curator of Special Collections, Kenneth W. Duckett.

PAPERS OF PUBLIC FIGURES

ULYSSES S. GRANT. In support of the University’s publication of The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant, the Library has assembled a collection of original Grant correspondence and, in facsimile, all known and available Grant letters, including family letters, letters in private hands, and correspondence in the Library of Congress and the National Archives.

Personal papers of General Ulysses S. Grant, 3d, and his father, General Frederick Grant, and papers of Frederick Dent, President Grant’s father-in-law, include letters from Mark Twain and from Generals Sherman and Sheridan. (John Simon, The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant, 1967-date; 5 volumes to date.)

ELBRIDGE GERRY. The Elbridge Gerry correspondence includes letters to and from John Adams, James Monroe, James Warren, John Jay, Timothy Pickering, and other public figures of the period of the American Revolution. (C. Harvey Gardiner, A Study in Dissent: The Warren-Gerry Correspondence, 1776-1792, 1968.)


DRS. WILLIAM JOSEPHUS ROBINSON AND VICTOR ROBINSON. A small collection of papers related to the careers of these two leaders in birth control and sex education.

ROBERT G. INGERSOLL. A small collection of personal papers of the nineteenth-century political figure, orator, and self-styled agnostic, accompanies an extensive collection of books, pamphlets, and photographs. (Gordon Stein, Robert G. Ingersoll: A Checklist, 1969.)

FRANCISCO VÁZQUEZ GÓMEZ. The personal papers of the man who was candidate for Vice President of Mexico in the 1910 elections which Porfirio Díaz nullified thereby bringing on the Revolution. Vázquez Gómez had been Minister of Public Instruction during the administration of President Porfirio Díaz. The papers cover the years 1907-19. (Anthony Bryan, “The Mexican Revolution of 1910: Perspectives from the Francisco Vázquez Gómez Papers,” ICarbS, Spring/Summer 1974.)

AMERICAN PRESIDENTIAL PAPERS. Two sets of autographed letters of all the American presidents, some of the letters of considerable substance, are the gifts of Philip D. Sang and Alfred Berol. In addition, Mr. Berol presented the Library with a rare fourteen-page handwritten speech given by Abraham Lincoln in 1859, entitled “Discoveries, Inventions, and Improvements.” The Library also has the corrected typescript (reading copy) and galley proof of President Theodore Roosevelt’s speech at Cairo, Illinois, 3 October 1907. (John Clifford and Ralph E. McCoy, “The President of the United States”: An Exhibition, 1960.)

MANUSCRIPTS AND LETTERS OF LITERARY FIGURES

JAMES JOYCE. The Croessmann Collection of James Joyce contains several hundred letters and other holograph material, including letters to Joyce’s biographer Herbert Gorman, his literary agent James Pinker, and his German translator Georg Goyert. The Library has added to the collection over the years as Joyce letters have become available. (Alan M. Cohn, James Joyce: An Exhibition, 1957; Alan M. Cohn, “Joyce’s Notes on the Oxen of the Sun,” James
Joyce Quarterly, Spring 1967.)

LENNOX ROBINSON. (See Archives of the Theater.)

KATHARINE TYNAN. The papers, manuscripts, and letters of Katharine Tynan, Irish poet, novelist, and critic, include more than fifty hundred letters from J. B. Yeats, George Russell, James Stephens, Lionel Johnson, Alice Meynell, Padraic Colum, and Lady Augusta Gregory.


MARY LAVIN. Manuscripts of this contemporary Irish short-story writer.


ROBERT GRAVES. A significant portion of the prose work of British writer Robert Graves were acquired by Morris Library from him. This includes manuscripts of sixty-two works of fiction, many in numerous drafts, and more than five hundred manuscript pages of poetry. Additionally, there are letters written to Graves by Siegfried Sassoon, George Russell, Edith Sitwell, E. M. Forster, T. S. Eliot, Arnold Bennett, Alec Waugh, and other literary figures. (Ted E. Boyle and Richard F. Peterson, “The Robert Graves Collection: The Artist and the Personality,” ICarbs, Fall/Winter 1973; James McKinley, Robert Graves: A Biography, in progress.)

LAWRENCE DURRELL. The personal papers and literary manuscripts of British novelist Lawrence Durrell form a comprehensive documentation of his life’s work. The collection includes some thirty working notebooks, published and unpublished poems and essays, manuscripts and galley proofs of Durrell’s novels, original art work, and some two thousand letters from such literary figures as Henry Miller, T. S. Eliot, Dylan Thomas, and Richard Aldington. (Ian MacNiven, “The Lawrence Durrell Collection: A Preliminary Examination,” ICarbs, Fall/Winter 1973; Ian MacNiven, “A Descriptive Catalog of the Lawrence Durrell Collection at Southern Illinois Univ. at Carbondale,” Diss. Southern Illinois Univ. 1974.)


RICHARD ALDINGTON. A large bloc of personal papers of British writer Richard Aldington was acquired from his daughter and other members of his family, from friends, and from his literary executor.

KAY BOYLE. The Library has the bulk of the personal and literary papers of this contemporary American writer, including diaries, notebooks, and extensive correspondence with other literary figures, including Henry Miller. (A bibliography of Kay Boyle’s writings is being compiled by David Koch.)

SAMUEL PUTNAM. Papers and manuscripts of this American expatriate were acquired from his widow. The Putnam archives consist largely of a record of his later years, which were devoted to Latin American literature and translating. (C. Harvey Gardiner, Samuel Putnam, Latin Americanist, 1970.)
Morris Library Manuscripts

H. ALLEN SMITH. This contemporary American humorist and native of southern Illinois presented his personal papers and manuscripts to Morris Library. (Elton Miles, H. Allen Smith: Observer of the Human Farce, in progress.)

TROVILLION PRIVATE PRESS. The archives of the oldest private press in America, operated by Hal Trovillion "At the Sign of the Silver Horse" in Herrin, Illinois, are on file in Morris Library. Included is correspondence with proprietors of other private presses in the United States and England, correspondence with the Powys family and with British poet Kenneth Hopkins. (Herman Schauenger, A Bibliography of the Trovillion Private Press, 1943; Alan M. Cohn, The Private Press: An Exhibition in Honor of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Trovillion Private Press, 1908-1959, 1959.)

OTHERS. A miscellany of manuscripts and letters of Lionel Britten, George Barker, James Stephens, Thornton Wilder, and André Gide.

ARCHIVES OF THE THEATER

IRISH RENAISSANCE. The papers of Lennox Robinson, Irish playwright and producer, include, in addition to his own manuscripts, letters from William Butler Yeats, Lady Augusta Gregory, George Bernard Shaw, Sean O'Casey, Sara Allgood, and others associated with the Abbey Theatre. Also included is extensive correspondence between philosopher-author Arland Ussher and Yeats's biographer Joseph Hone, covering some thirty years, and correspondence relating to the affairs of the Abbey from the files of Abbey Director Gabriel Fallon. Tape recordings of Eoin O'Mahony give background and identify figures in the Irish Renaissance. (The Irish Collection, Rare Book Room, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1970; Donald Peake, "Plays of Lennox Robinson: A Mirror of the Anglo-Irish Ascendancy," Diss. Southern Illinois Univ. 1972.)

ERWIN PISCATOR. The personal papers and business records of Erwin Piscator, internationally-known producer, director, and playwright, represent an important record of the epic theater. This extensive collection consists of scripts, playbills, photographs, business records of various productions abroad, correspondence with actors, directors, and playwrights (including Bertolt Brecht), both in America and Europe, and family papers. Included also are papers of his widow, Dr. Maria Ley-Piscator, ballerina, playwright, director, novelist, and donor of the collection. (Jurgen Stein, "Die Archivierung theatralischer Quellen am Beispiel der Erwin Piscator Papers an der Southern Illinois Univ.,” Diss. Univ. of Vienna/Austria 1973; Jurgen Stein, "Erwin Piscator: A Checklist,” ICarbS, Spring/Summer 1974; Akademie der Künste, Berlin, Erwin Piscator, 1893-1966, 1971.)

MORDECAI GORELIK. The personal papers of Mordecai Gorelik, stage designer, director, and playwright, contain a large volume of correspondence with persons of the theater, here and abroad, scripts of plays, and thousands of sketches, drawings, and photographs of stage settings.

JOHN HOWARD LAWSON. Personal papers, both literary and political, of playwright John Howard Lawson consist of fifteen file drawers of manuscripts, notes, and correspondence. There are letters from Dos Passos, a friend since World War I, Witter Bynner, Paul Robeson, Charles Chaplin, Pearl Buck, Harlow Shapley, Alvah Bessie, and Dalton Trumbo. There is also an extensive record of Lawson’s role in liberal and left-wing causes, including the affair of the "Hollywood Ten” and blacklisting by the film industry. (Robert Gardner, The Theatre of John Howard Lawson, Diss. Univ. of California, Los Angeles, in progress.)

KATHERINE DUNHAM. Personal papers, photographs, and memorabilia of the theater, assembled by dancer Katherine Dunham, and her gift to the University, contain records of her dance studio and her work with folk music and dances in the West Indies. (Terry Harnan, African Rhythm, American Dance: A Biography of Katherine Dunham, 1974.)

UNITY THEATRE. The archives of London’s Unity Theatre, the gift of Professor Herbert Marshall, comprise business records, correspondence with theater people, photographs of sets, and playbills. (Ronald Travis, “The Unity Theatre of Great Britain, 1936-1946: A Decade of Production,” Thesis Southern Illinois Univ. 1968.)

ARCHIVES OF PHILOSOPHY

JOHN DEWEY. The papers of John Dewey, acquired by the
Morris Library Manuscripts

John Dewey Foundation from the estate of his widow and presented to Southern Illinois University, consist of correspondence, manuscripts, class lecture notes, photographs, and memorabilia of a long and distinguished career. Included are letters from such scholars as William James, William Rainey Harper, James Mark Baldwin, James Cattell, and Adelbert Ames. There also are letters to his wife and children, a pictorial record of his stay in China (1919-21), and his personal library, many of the volumes heavily annotated.


OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO. The archives of Dr. Paul Carus and the Open Court Publishing Company of LaSalle, Illinois, major publishing center for philosophy for over eighty years, consist of about one hundred thousand letters and manuscript pages. Dr. Carus and his associates conducted a voluminous correspondence with philosophers, scientists, and men of letters throughout the world, so that the archives offer a major source of historical study of philosophy from 1886 to 1930. There is correspondence with John Dewey and C. S. Peirce (whose early writings were published by Open Court), J. M. Baldwin, Couturat, DeVries, Höffding, Husserl, Eucken, Harnack, Hasegawa, Lévy-Bruhl, Lovejoy, Lombroso, Lutosławski, Mach, Morgan, Poincaré, Royce, Sarton, Suzuki, Thorn-dike, and Wundt. In addition to letters from philosophers, there is correspondence with such leading figures in other areas as Elisabet Ney, Luther Burbank, David Belasco, and Jack London. The archives also contain manuscripts, galley proofs, art work, and business records. (Rolland Stevens, “The Open Court Publishing Company, 1877-1919,” Thesis Univ. of Illinois 1943; James Sheridan, “Paul Carus: A Study of the Thought and Work of the Editor of the Open Court Publishing Company,” Diss. Univ. of Illinois 1957.)

HENRY NELSON WIEMAN. The archives of this contemporary American theologian and philosopher consist of some thirty volumes which Wieman authored or coauthored, together with manuscripts (published and unpublished), autobiographical materials, letters, lecture notes, and other papers.


JAMES HAYDEN TUFTS. The Tufts papers include correspondence with John Dewey, with whom he collaborated in writing Ethics, James R. Angell, and Alfred North Whitehead.

CHARLES AND MARY BEARD. A file of correspondence contains approximately one hundred letters between historians Charles and Mary Beard and educator George S. Counts.

STEPHEN C. PEPPER. The personal papers of philosopher Stephen C. Pepper include published and unpublished manuscripts, lecture notes, correspondence, family papers, and photographs. (Joseph Monast, The Philosophical Methodology of Stephen Pepper, Diss. Tulane Univ., in progress.)

WAYNE A. R. LEYS. The personal papers of Wayne A. R. Leys represent a long career as philosopher, teacher, college dean, and author.

TOYOHIKO KAGAWA. Correspondence and papers relating to the life and work of Toyohiko Kagawa, Japanese social reformer, philosopher, and theologian, were acquired from his long-time secretary. The file represents the entire record of his English language correspondence.

HENRY DAVID THOREAU. The Library has a small but significant group of Thoreau manuscripts, letters, and books from Thoreau’s own library. Included is Thoreau’s annotated set of The Dial. (Ralph W. Bushee, Henry David Thoreau: An Exhibition, 1965.)
UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES. The Library is the official depository of Southern Illinois University archives. In addition, the Library has the personal papers and oral interviews of a number of presidents and faculty members, the earliest of which are the papers of Professor George Hazen French, member of the faculty from 1877 to 1917.

LOCAL HISTORY. Representative holdings include, for example, papers of John Allen, local historian; papers of John E. Jones, pioneer in coal mine safety; papers of the Joseph W. Rickett family of Waterloo; journals of Maude Rittenhouse, Cairo, 1880's; Civil War letters and diaries of a number of Southern Illinois residents, including Colonel Michael K. Lawler of Makanda and Lieutenant John P. Mann of Rockwood; small collections of records of local churches, a newspaper, a hospital, and several businesses; records of the Outdoor Education Association; marriage records of early residents of Shawneetown; and a small group of letters from ornithologist Robert Ridgeway of Olney.

COUNTY ARCHIVES. The Library has been designated by the Illinois State Archives as an official depository of early records of southern Illinois counties. At present these include records from Gallatin, St. Clair, and Randolph counties.

Contributors

ANTHONY T. BRYAN is an Assistant Professor in the History department at the University of Rhode Island in Kingston. His dissertation for the University of Nebraska is on General Bernardo Reyes and Mexican politics at the beginning of the twentieth century.

DAVID E. CONRAD recently has been a Fulbright lecturer at the University of Costa Rica. He is an Associate Professor in the History department at SIU-C.

GLEN M. JONES is a Master's degree candidate in the History department, SIU-C.

RALPH E. McCOY is Dean of Library Affairs, SIU-C. He currently is completing a supplement to his Freedom of the Press, an Annotated Bibliography, scheduled for publication by the Southern Illinois University press for the Bi-centennial year.

JÜRGEN STEIN, scholar-businessman, lives in West Germany. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Vienna. At SIU-C he organized and processed the Erwin Piscator papers.

E. EARLE STIBITZ is Professor of English at SIU-C, specializing in pre-twentieth century American literature. He edited Illinois Poets, published by the Southern Illinois University press, and has been a Fulbright professor several times.

JOHN WILLETT has been an editor for the Times Literary Supplement and is past president of the International Brecht Society. He co-edits the Methuen-Pantheon collected edition of Brecht's work and has authored The Theatre of Bertolt Brecht, Art in a City, and Expressionism. His edition of selected Brecht poetry will be published in the Spring. Mr. Willett currently is completing a book on Piscator and one on the arts in Central Europe during the 1920's.
A Biographical Dictionary
of Actors, Actresses, Musicians, Dancers, Managers, and Other Stage Personnel
in London, 1660–1800
by Philip H. Highfill, Jr.,
Kalman A. Burnim, and
Edward A. Langhans

To be completed in 12 volumes, this monumental work here begins publication with the
first 2 volumes — Abaco to Belfille and Belfort to Byzand. Published seriatim, the
Biographical Dictionary will include information on more than 8,500 actors, actresses,
musicians, managers, dancers, scene painters, acrobats, machinists, puppeteers, and
others who contributed grandly or humbly to patent theatres, opera houses, fair booths,
concert halls, and pleasure gardens. The accompanying illustrations, estimated to be
some 1,500 portraits, will include at least one portrait for each subject for whom a por-
trait exists. Many dozens of luminaries are given fresh treatment, employing much
new information. But here also are full entries for hundreds of important secondary
figures and of minor ones whose stories have never been told, as well as a census (and at
least a few recoverable facts) for even the most inconsiderable performers and servants
of the theatres.

Volume 1: Abaco to Belfille
with 103 Portraits and Views of London and Theatre Sites
480 pages, 6¼ x 9¾ $19.85
ISBN 0-8093-0517-8

Volume 2: Belfort to Byzand
with 90 Portraits and Views of Theatre Exteriors and Interiors
512 pages, 6¼ x 9¾ $19.85
ISBN 0-8093-0518-6

Southern Illinois University Press
CARBONDALE AND EDWARDSVILLE
FOR ORDERS: P.O. BOX 3697, CARBONDALE, ILLINOIS 62901 In Canada: Burns & MacEachern Ltd.
Publishers of The London Stage, 1660-1800, Edited by William van Lennep, Emmett L. Avery,
Arthur H. Scouten, George Winchester Stone, Jr., and Charles Beecher Hogan