The year was 1937. Skirts were long, hair was short, the movie “Wells Fargo” was released by Paramount, and the Golden Gate Bridge was opened to traffic, creating a vital link between San Francisco, Northern California, and the rest of the United States. Seventy-five years later, the bridge is as crucial to the social and economic well-being of the Bay Area as it was back then — truly an accomplishment to celebrate.

Wells Fargo is honored to be a part of the Golden Gate Bridge 75th anniversary celebrations.
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ON THE FRONT COVER
The pristine and rugged beauty of California’s open spaces inspired the work of impressionist and Plein-Air painter John Marshall Gamble (1863–1957). His depictions of lush hillsides decorated with wildflowers—including this example, California Landscape, most likely of the Central Coast region—paint a bucolic portrait of the California landscape at the turn of the century. The nature of the land and its use intrigued many of Gamble’s contemporaries, including the social reformer Henry George and the historian Frederick Jackson Turner, whose theses regarding the importance of land and its bounty to the future of America are contrasted in Alex Wagner Lough’s “Henry George, Frederick Jackson Turner, and the ‘Closing’ of the American Frontier” (see page 4).

CHS Collections at the Autry National Center;
Bridgeman Art Library CAH360138
People can read or study the same material or witness the same event but emerge with radically distinct interpretations. Reading between the lines denotes perceiving or detecting an unexpressed meaning. In this issue, Alex Wagner Lough's essay, “Henry George, Frederick Jackson Turner, and the ‘Closing of the American Frontier,’” observes that “both George and Turner drew . . . from the same historians, economists, and philosophers to tackle the issues before them.” Each grappled with the value of land and the future of its ownership, a subject of enormous interest in California and the rest of the nation by the late nineteenth century. “For Turner,” Lough notes, “the disappearance of the frontier signaled the end of the era of American Exceptionalism, largely defined by its independence from the class-based agitations facing Europe,” while for George, landlordism—the ownership of land—was the basic determinant of a people’s and a nation’s morality and well-being.

Haunting views of “Manzanar in 1973,” photographs made by James S. Brust, depict the derelict and forsaken War Relocation Center in Owens Valley where more than 10,000 Japanese American citizens and resident aliens had been confined thirty years earlier. Brust had sped past the unmarked and disremembered site many times before a book identifying the place as a “ghost town” triggered his curiosity. His photo essay of the space he encountered—eerie, evocative, and consequential ground—documents the remnants of the abandoned site, a restoration of memory accomplished by a growing number of individuals and organizations in the following years. That lonely, forgotten place now welcomes the public as the Manzanar National Historic Site, and Brust’s images now are part of the Manzanar archives.

The title of Albert L. Hurtado’s essay, “False Accusations: Herbert Bolton, Jews, and the Loyalty Oath at Berkeley, 1920–1950,” conveys expectations of revelations about the longtime chairman of the history department and director of the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley. Famous for founding the school of Spanish Borderlands history, publishing prolifically, and training record numbers of graduate students, Bolton is accused of “holding anti-Semitic attitudes and keeping Jews out of” his department. Hurtado expunges this charge through painstaking research and careful analysis over twenty-five years. Inserting his reactions to and ruminations over discoveries among Bolton’s profuse papers, and piecing together the clues he found among the professor’s multiple corresponents, Hurtado exposes the historian’s methodology while constructing a convincing argument to clear Bolton’s name once and for all.

Connecting the unexpected, recovering the disremembered, and correcting falsehoods: The essays in this issue display meticulous reading between the lines.

Janet Fireman
Even in dense fog, the soaring beauty of the Golden Gate Bridge awes and inspires. Designed and constructed during the 1930s in the midst of an unprecedented economic depression, this graceful and elegant Art Deco structure soon captured the imagination of local residents, and when the bridge was formally opened on May 27, 1937, up to 200,000 of them clamored to cross the span. The CHS collections provide insight into the full scope of the bridge’s story, from the earliest European experiences of “the Gate”—well before bridging it was thought possible—to its celebratory opening in 1937. It is a story told through an archive of paintings, prints, poems, and shipboard diaries of the nineteenth century; twentieth-century Southern Pacific Railroad tickets, maps, and timetables; personal scrapbooks; an extensive array of ephemera, including promotional material, invitations, brochures, and the official program of the opening-day Fiesta; and a wide range of photographs, among them this copyprint by one of the many photographers who captured breathtaking views of San Francisco’s most iconic symbol.

Celebrating a landscape that has long held a prominent place in the iconography of California and the West, this year CHS joins 74 community partners in commemorating the bridge’s 75th anniversary with A Wild Flight of the Imagination: The Story of the Golden Gate Bridge (Feb. 26–Oct. 14, 2012). The exhibition showcases CHS’s collections as well as treasures from the Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District, the Labor Archives & Research Center at San Francisco State University, UC Berkeley’s Environmental Design Archives, and the Bethlehem Shipyard Historical Museum.
Henry George and Frederick Jackson Turner launched their public careers amid economic panic and widespread fear about America’s future. The world had barely emerged from the Long Depression of the 1870s when, in 1879, George declared that private property in land lay at the core of the nation’s social and economic problems. “Everywhere that you find distress and destitution in the midst of wealth,” the California journalist wrote, “you will find that the land is monopolized.”

Industrial panic, unemployment, and unprecedented wealth inequality, George believed, resulted from the ability of landowners—a class that appeared to shrink with each passing generation—to exact huge sums from the wages of labor in the form of rent. “The ownership of land,” according to George, represented “the great fundamental fact which ultimately determines the social, the political, and consequently the intellectual and moral condition of a people.”

Turner, and much of the world, agreed. When Turner first introduced his famous frontier thesis at a meeting of the American Historical Association at the World’s Columbian Exposition in 1893, the nation faced widespread economic instability and uncertainty. The stock market had just collapsed, saddling America with bankruptcies, layoffs, and a pervasive sense of doom among its citizens. Similar to George, Turner turned his focus to land—the nation’s relationship with and dependence upon it—to explain the current economic meltdown. “The frontier has gone,” the young Wisconsin-bred historian declared, “and with its going has closed the first period of American history.” The existence of the frontier, Turner believed—that line “at the hither edge of free land”—not only defined the nation’s historical development, but also safeguarded American democracy by compelling its “institutions [to] adapt themselves to the changes of an expanding people.”

Although different in their intellectual orientation as well as their fundamental view about the importance of land to the future of America and its bounty, both George and Turner drew from the work of the same historians, economists, and philosophers to tackle the issues before them. Like his mentor Herbert Baxter Adams and “most post-Darwinian thinkers of the nineteenth century,” as Richard Hofstadter has pointed out, “Turner was fascinated by the idea of laying out the development of civilization in a series of distinct evolutionary stages.” But unlike Adams and other historians, Turner viewed that evolution of American development from West to East.
The allure and beauty of bountiful harvest in this Santa Clara Valley orchard suggests the national promise that enough free land existed in nineteenth-century America to provide every family its own homestead. By the turn of the century, however, many Americans believed that all of the land in the West had been settled and feared the consequences of the disappearance of the public domain. Addressing this “land question,” Henry George and Frederick Jackson Turner advanced critical theses that illuminated the economic, political, and social concerns of the era.
“The United States lies like a huge page in the history of society. Line by line as we read this continental page from West to East, we find the record of social evolution,” he claimed. “It begins with the Indian and the hunter; it goes on to tell of the disintegration of savagery by the entrance of the trader, the pathfinder of civilization; we read the annals of the pastoral stage in ranch life; the exploitation of the soil by the raising of unrotated crops of corn and when in sparsely settled farming communities; the intensive culture of the denser farm settlement; and finally the manufacturing organization with city and factory system.”

These stages repeated themselves on the western frontier where nature blessed America with a seemingly inexhaustible source of land. On Turner’s frontier, American society was reborn; “[t]his perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society,” Turner wrote, “furnish the forces dominating American character.” American social evolution depended on the advance of the frontier and, more importantly, the existence of free land on which to advance.

As Lee Benson and other historians have noted, the notion that society developed in direct relation to its land supply did not originate with Turner. A few years prior to the appearance of Turner’s essay, the Italian economist Achille Loria wrote that he believed that the history of the United States provided a near-perfect illustration of his “landed property system of political economy,” in which, Loria postulated, “the relationship of man to the amount of ‘free land’ available for cultivation holds the key to human history.” In addition to Loria, Ray Allen Billington also acknowledged Turner’s debt to John Stuart Mill, Francis A. Walker, and Simon H. Patten, from whom the essayist “distilled several concepts essential to his frontier thesis,” including the theory of land rent. As did George, Turner believed that rent—the price of land—involved social as well as physical factors and that rent increased relative to a diminishing supply of cheaper, fertile land elsewhere.

George also drew heavily from Mill. In justifying his scheme to tax and redistribute land values, George built on Mill’s concept of the “unearned increment,” which recognized the role of society—not the individual landowner—in increasing the value of land. James’s son John Stuart popularized the concept by proposing in 1870 that the state take all future increases in land values, given that they were unearned by individual landowners. George went further. The state, George believed, should intercept the full rental value of land to support the activity of government as well as to fund public services and projects. Thus, George grounded his “single tax”—so called because he believed that a tax on land values would render unnecessary all other taxes collected by government—in the firm belief of the fundamental injustice of private property in land.

While Turner enjoys the title of arguably the most famous American historian, some believe his thesis may have failed to survive the test of history. According to Patricia Nelson Limerick, Turner’s thesis suffered from “presentism.” “History was bound to go on,” Limerick wrote. “Any definitive statement on the meaning of the West offered in 1893 would soon show its age.” Not only did western settlement continue to thrive after Turner’s frontier “closed” in 1890, Turner’s central argument—that throughout history, the frontier protected democracy by offering a “gate of escape” where laborers struggling in the crowded East could start over—also proved fleeting. As William F. Deverell has explained, “Laborers trapped by wage work could not escape westward regardless of the availability of free land. For one, it was hardly simple, or cheap, to travel west, especially during downturns of the economy (when a “safety valve” would be most needed).”
Henry George (1839–1897), one of America’s leading social thinkers, economists, and reformers and a towering national and international figure of his day, was a gold prospector, compositor, and eventually a journalist in California, where he witnessed and wrote about the consequences of land monopolization in the United States. His best-selling book Progress and Poverty (1879) excoriated private property in land, which he proposed accounted for the persistence of poverty amid economic and industrial progress.

California Historical Society, CHS2011.751.tif

The Wisconsin-bred historian Frederick Jackson Turner (1861–1932), who argued that America owed its exceptional democratic character to the existence of a western frontier of free land, was influential in shaping popular and scholarly interpretations of the nation’s past. In 1924, he moved to southern California, where he helped establish the newly founded Huntington Library in San Marino as a renowned historical research institution.

Frederick Jackson Turner Papers, Box 58 (27), Huntington Library
Historians also have refuted Turner’s belief that the frontier fostered America’s “most striking characteristics,” including: “That coarseness and strength combined with acuteness and inquisitiveness; that practical, inventive turn of mind, quick to find expedients; that masterful grasp of material things, lacking in the artistic but powerful to effect great ends; that restless, nervous energy; that dominant individualism, working for good and for evil, and withal that buoyancy and exuberance which comes with freedom.”14

On the contrary, “far from being the crucible of ‘Americanization,’” as William Cronon and others have advanced, “the frontier was a region where racial and ethnic minorities remained significantly isolated from other communities.”15 Finally, even Turner’s assertion that the frontier promoted America’s “rugged individualism” has been undermined as a result of Richard White’s 1991 study, which revealed the federal government’s extensive role in the development of the American West. “More than any other region,” White argued, “the West has been historically a dependency of the federal government.”16 The frontier had neither closed by 1893 nor operated as a “safety valve.” The resettling of the West by Americans did not solely account for the nation’s democratic character any more than the disappearance of the western line of white settlement could explain all of the problems plaguing turn-of-the-century America.

While historians rightfully point out the flaws in Turner’s frontier thesis, few emphasize how the lure and dominance of his ideas reflected turn-of-the-century Americans’ obsession with finding an answer to the all-encompassing “land question” of what should be done about the shrinking public domain and what effects its disappearance would have on the future of American democracy. Furthermore, few have noted that George provided an alternative take on the American frontier’s “closing” that held as much, if not more, sway among the public than Turner’s. George, who ascribed to universal principles of justice and progress, pointed out similarities between America’s land crisis and those that had beset Europe, while Turner emphasized the uniqueness of the American experience with land. It seems as though historians have equated the palpability of Turner’s ideas, which appealed to America’s sense of exceptionalism, with authority.

Like Turner, George occupies a paradoxical place in history. On one hand, historians credit the best-selling author and self-trained authority on the political economy for inspiring the work of well-known reformers and social movements on three different continents in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.17 Some even note that George’s masterpiece, *Progress and Poverty* (1879), outsold every other book except the Bible by the close of the nineteenth century.18 On the other hand, historians also acknowledge the decisive failure of George and his followers to successfully socialize rent in the United States or,
for that matter, in any of the countries where the land reformer enjoyed the widest reception. As with Turner, George’s ideas survived long after the author’s sudden death in 1897, suggesting that the relationship of individuals and society to land constitutes a foundational field of study for understanding historical development, one in which both men laid cornerstones.

George and Turner did more than merely lament the diminishing supply of land in the United States; they elevated public concern through the deliberate connections their theses forged between land and the future of American democracy. In the process, each helped redefine Americans’ conception of this natural resource and their relationship to it. In placing land at the center of national development, Turner gave it historical agency. He transformed the concept of the frontier from a region of free land at the western edge of eastern civilization to a process responsible for the production of responsible citizens and democratic institutions. George highlighted the “land crisis” resulting from private monopolies and rising land values to excoriate America’s system of private land ownership. Turner’s work informed Americans’ understanding of their history and the necessity of an American frontier—whether within the continental United States or overseas—to maintain democratic institutions. George used his study of land to explain the causes of industrial depression and the persistent poverty amid wealth. The work and ideas of both George and Turner must be explored to appreciate the centrality of the “question” to social and economic discussions occurring at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century.

THE LAND QUESTION

By the time Turner declared the American frontier closed, the land question represented one of the most prominent issues covered by the press. To some, it addressed the growing concern that landlordism had taken hold in America. To others, it involved the assumption that all of the best land in America had been settled and the public domain no longer existed. Most, however, could agree that America’s land crisis was not unique. “The fact is,” Thomas P. Gill, commissioned by The North American Review to study and report on the conditions of tenancy and landlordism in America, wrote in January 1886, “America has refused to avail herself of one of the most vital advantages that she became heir to by virtue of her late entry into the family of nations. She has refused to benefit by the bitter experience of Europe in regard to the land question.” Warning America of the recklessness of its land policy, Gill observed: “The soil of a country is like the blood: once it is badly vitiated it seems impossible ever to cleanse it, and the poison keeps constantly breaking out.” To some, that poison came in the form of landlordism.

Landlordism, “the system according to which land is owned by landlords to whom tenants pay a fixed rent,” had, by the late nineteenth century, received blame for the downfall of Rome and the French Revolution, as well as the lasting tension in Ireland where absentee British landlords owned and controlled the land at the expense of Irish farmers. In essence, landlordism organized society around a rigid class system based on land ownership. As such, it could neither take root nor grow in America, many believed, because of the nation’s historically large population of landowners, fostered in part by the founders’ rejection of the Old World land policies, including primogeniture.

By the mid-1880s, however, Gill and others pointed to alarming statistics that revealed a shrinking landowning class and a growing tenant population in America. According to the 1880 Census, with more than a million farms operated
by renters, America possessed the largest tenant-farming population in the world—“a strange singularity for a nation,” Gill wrote, “one of whose proudest boasts is that the old feudal institution of landlordism has obtained no foothold on her free soil!” Gill blamed the premature disappearance of the public domain, coupled with a growing population, for the nation’s trend toward landlordism. Like many others, he lamented the overgenerous land policies of the federal and state governments, which not only gave away “untold millions of fertile acres of the public domain” to railroads but also invited fraud and corruption.

During the 1860s, Republicans in the federal government implemented a new land policy intended to promote their “utopian capitalist vision of the world.” According to Richard White, they imagined a new nation “wherein labor was rewarded, individual opportunity prevented class distinctions from arising, and progress and growth were the national destiny.” To that end, Congress passed the Homestead Act of 1862, promising 160 acres of free public land to any settler who paid a small filing fee and agreed to live on and improve the land for five years, at which point homesteaders could purchase the land for $1.25 an acre. Additionally, Republicans approved the Pacific Railway Act and a series of land grants and loans to aid in the construction of a telegraph and rail line extending west from Missouri to the Pacific Ocean. Under these bills, the Union Pacific and Central Pacific—which later became the Southern Pacific—railroads received more than 25 million acres of land from the federal government.

Although intended to provide cheap and fertile land directly to settlers and their families, only a small fraction of the expanding population obtained farms under the Homestead Act. The reason, according to White, lay largely in the fact that by 1862, Congress lacked complete control over lands in the West. Previous bills, such as the Morrill Act, granted western states 30,000 acres for each senator and congressional representative in exchange for their admission to the Union and provided land scrip to eastern states, where no unoccupied public land existed. These states could sell their land or scrip to whomever they wanted, including speculators who held it off the market until they could fetch higher prices. According to John Opie, William S. Chapman, one of California’s largest land speculators, paid cash for the 631,000 acres of mostly public land he owned. Even land set aside for homesteaders often fell to ranchers, miners, and loggers who skirted the act’s provisions by pressuring their employees to file claims with the federal land office. Thus, by 1890, when the superintendent of the US Census reported that the frontier line—“treated as the margin of settlement which has a density of two or more to the square mile”—was gone, fewer than 400,000 farms had been claimed through the Homestead Act.

Despite the stark truth that the public domain neared exhaustion at the end of the nineteenth century, not everyone believed that its disappearance necessarily translated into an increase of land tenancy. In response to Gill’s January 1886 article, Henry Strong and David Bennett King wrote in March of the same year that landlordism could never take hold in America, in part because “there is no country in the world where the ownership and transfer of real property is so easy and simple as in America.” The long-term tendency of landownership in America, Strong and King asserted, rather than toward landlordism or land monopolies, gravitated toward smaller farms occupied by a larger number of free-holders. Because every man could have his own stake in this earth, they believed, America would continue to be spared the social upheavals of Europe. “Every man who owns the land he cultivates,” they wrote, “has given a pledge to sustain law and order; to resist and put down the despotism
of anarchy, whether it appear in the unmasked conspiracy of Catiline, or the less threatening but more dangerous guise of modern socialism.” Similar to Turner and George, Strong and King recognized the power of Americans' direct experience with land to maintain order and foster self-sufficiency. But Turner and especially George also recognized the threat facing American democracy as a result of the public domain's consumption. Their definitions of land and its relationship to social progress helped illustrate this threat to the American people.

AMERICA'S STOREHOUSE

George based his proposal to abolish private property in land through the taxation of land values on a broad definition of the natural resource. Whereas Turner defined land in terms of its instrumentality to social development, George adopted a more essentialist view, arguing that it represented one of the fundamental building blocks of man. “The term land necessarily includes, not merely the surface of the earth as distinguished from the water and air,” he wrote,
but the whole material universe outside of man himself, for it is only by having access to land, from which his very body is drawn, that man can come in contact with or use nature. For George, land included everything “freely supplied by nature,” including water and minerals, in addition to the soil. Gifts of nature belonged to everyone; it was unjust, George believed, to treat land as the private property of individuals.

Though he considered private property in land a violation of humans’ natural rights, George did not support its confiscation or redistribution. Instead, he proposed to eliminate the privilege of private property in land by taxing its value. As he explained: “I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call their land. Let them continue to call it their land. Let them buy and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.”

Building on David Ricardo’s definition of rent as “that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord for the use of the original and indestructible powers of the soil,” George posited that rent was unearned and accounted for the reduction of wages despite increased productive power. By unearned, George meant that labor on or to land alone did not produce the increase in land’s price or exchange value. Instead, the natural richness of the soil, the growth of the surrounding community, and the proximity of land to railroads, canals, and other industrial developments determined the return individuals received for owning land. Like the earth, rent was not the product of one man’s exertion but the result of a combination of natural forces and the development of the surrounding community; as such, it rightfully belonged equally to all members of the community. George believed that socializing rent through the taxation of land values would reduce speculation, monopolization, and, ultimately, the private ownership of land.

George’s discussion of land, property, and taxes in Progress and Poverty built on long-standing political traditions and Americans’ growing interest in curbing monopoly power at the end of the nineteenth century. Since the colonial era, tax revolts and crusades for land reform had served as two of the most prominent expressions of popular political and economic discontent. The importance of land throughout American history derives, in part, from its connection to individual economic and political opportunities. As William Cronon aptly revealed in his 1983 study Changes in the Land, the perception of land as a commodity to be bought, sold, and traded has significantly influenced economic, ecological, and human relationships throughout North America since the colonial era. European colonists viewed uncultivated land as useless and wasteful and implemented a system of enclosure and improvement in response to both God’s command to “subdue the earth” and the Lockean supposition that “As much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of, so much is his property.”

More than the perception of land as a commodity, however, the resolute belief in man’s natural right to use and cultivate land shaped American land policy and the various approaches that social and economic reforms took from the nation’s founding through the end of the nineteenth century. George’s proposal to discourage private property in land through the taxation of land values, as Mark Hulliung has pointed out, “was in reality a recapitulation of a century of American pronouncements on the inviolability of the social contract, the need to secure the rights of the next generation, and the natural right to the land.”
Prior to the creation of governments, Americans believed, man had nothing but the uncultivated earth from which to provide for his sustenance. “Thus, in the beginning all the World was America,” Locke wrote, implying that nowhere was this fact more true than in the New World. In entering into a social contract and forming a national government, the founders claimed, individuals did not relinquish their natural right to the land but instead empowered government to protect and preserve that right for current and future generations.

Within a decade of the Constitution’s ratification, Thomas Paine reminded Americans of this commitment in a pamphlet titled Agrarian Justice (1796). As part of their contract with government, Paine observed, Americans submitted to the concept that “every person born into the world, after a state of civilization commences, ought not to be worse than if he had been born before that period,” and if a person was to be found in a worse state, provision should be made to aid in his comfort. To Paine, land monopoly, the purchase and hoarding of large tracts of the public domain by private individuals, violated this principle of civilization. Similar to George’s single tax, Paine advocated that “landowners should pay both a lump sum and an annuity to all deprived of their birthright.”

In justifying his scheme, Paine differentiated man’s natural rights to land from those “artificially” created by society, such as the right to personal property. “Land, as said before, is the free gift of the Creator in common to the human race,” he wrote. “Personal property is the effect of society; and it is impossible for an individual to acquire personal property without the aid of society, as it is for him to make land originally.” Personal property beyond what one man can produce, Paine concluded, was impossible without the aid of society and often occurred as a result of “paying too little for the labour that produced it.” Paine’s proposal to support the poor and landless from a tax on monopoly holdings of land did not amount to charity, the revolutionary believed. It represented the fulfillment of the social contract by recognizing every man’s natural right to the soil.

More than any other American issue, Richard White has argued, land policy—how to manage and distribute the public domain—occupied the central activity of the federal government throughout the nineteenth century and much of the twentieth century. Unlike George, who might have interpreted this fact in light of man’s inherent dependence on access to land for sustenance, Turner argued in his famous essay that the national government’s handling of the public domain had developed its powers and helped safeguard America’s independence from the social problems plaguing Europe. As Turner wrote, “When we consider the public domain from the point of view of the sale and disposal of the public lands we are again brought face to face with the frontier. The policy of the United States in dealing with its lands is in sharp contrast with the European system of scientific administration. Efforts to make this domain a source of revenue,
Unlike George, Turner argued in his famous essay that the national government’s handling of the public domain had developed its powers and helped safeguard America’s independence from the social problems plaguing Europe.

and to withhold it from emigrants in order that settlement might be compact, were in vain.” 48

Unlike Europe, which more successfully kept squatters from settling on common land, the federal government lacked the resources, and often the resolve, to prevent individuals from taking up tracts of the public domain. For years prior to the passage of the Preemption Act of 1841, common practice protected the claims of squatters who made improvements, such as constructing a fence or planting crops, to “unoccupied” public land.49 The act essentially legalized the practice by giving squatters first preference to purchase land they improved once it had been surveyed. According to Turner, the combination of a commitment to democracy and “the squatter ideal”—which he described as “the ideal of individual freedom to compete unrestrictedly for the resources of a continent”—accounted for the nation’s “growth and fundamental traits.”50

The squatter ideal, however, also accounts for some of the messiest land battles in the West and the growing agitation between farmers, settlers, ranchers, and railroads in the second half of the nineteenth century. For Turner, these battles and the federal government’s response to them represent critical stages in the nation’s democratic evolution. George, on the other hand, saw land disputes and the antagonism they engendered among various classes as reflecting the nation’s backward land policy. To both, California epitomized the inherent tensions associated with the nation’s dual commitment to promote democracy and protect squatter rights.

THE CALIFORNIA STORY

Despite its wide readership and appeal, Progress and Poverty evolved from George’s observations and experiences living in California.51 By the time of its publication, the Philadelphia native had lived in the Golden State for twenty years and had observed significant transformations, including the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, the rise of the Workingmen’s Party in the early 1870s, and the ratification of a new state constitution in 1879. George’s acquaintance with James McClatchy of the Sacramento Bee helped open his eyes to the especially intense land battles between squatters and land monopolists around Sacramento throughout the 1860s.52 Besides squatterism, California courts also had to sort out conflicting claims between railroads and settlers as well as those arising from the partial breakup of Mexican land grants.

All of this, according to Paul W. Gates, made the California land situation among the most tense and complicated in the nation: “What makes the California story unique is that it involved Spanish and Mexican land law, interpreted in United States courts by American lawyers and judges who were not altogether familiar with it and who remolded it by the application of federal and state laws. In the process of Americanizing Spanish and Mexican land law, the rigidities of Anglo-Saxon common law with its deep respect for property rights untempered by equity clashed with frontier conceptions of settlers’ rights based on natural law.”53 Finding few fences or other
indications that the land had been claimed, Gates explains, California settlers “felt safe in searching out vacant and undeveloped land, moving upon it and devoting months, even years, to its improvement.”

California, the state of gold and opportunity, also became the state of violent clashes, court appeals, settlers’ leagues, and angry squatters who never hesitated to defend what they viewed as their natural and private right to the land.

Among the most violent and highly publicized land disputes occurred between the small farmers of California’s Mussel Slough country and the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1880. The clash stands out not only for the involvement of the federal government and deaths of seven participants, but also because it contained a lethal combination of the particular elements found in many California land battles. The land in dispute, which included portions of Tulare and Fresno counties, had experienced a nearly fourfold increase in value since 1870 as a result of a planned railway and the construction of two irrigation canals—the Lower Kings River and the People’s Ditch.

Many of the evicted squatters had lived and farmed on the land for nearly a decade, evoking sympathy among supporters of preemption. Furthermore, the clash involved the Southern Pacific Railroad, which by 1880 had become one of the most notorious symbols of monopoly power.
and corruption in California. According to Richard Orsi, many of the Mussel Slough squatters “from the beginning, took up their claims with the intention of defeating the railroad’s title and acquiring the land free of charge.”57 To Orsi, the Mussel Slough affair, which is believed to have inspired Frank Norris’s novel *The Octopus* (1901), characterized the railroads’ ongoing struggle to remove and prevent squatters from claiming the land granted to the railroads by the state and federal governments. The level of violence and publicity, however, also corresponded to the intensity of public outrage to the extravagant gifts of public land to railroads. In total, the federal government granted railroads more than 11.5 million acres of land in California, representing roughly 11.4 percent of the state’s entire area.58

In the lead essay of the October 1868 issue of *The Overland Monthly*, George reflected on the meaning of these immense land grants and the nearly completed overland rail route in an essay entitled “What the Railroad Will Bring Us.” Along with the many benefits of the transcontinental line, including increased trade and wealth, George predicted that Californians would see wages fall, land prices rise, and diminished opportunities for those who did not own land. “The truth is, that the completion of the railroad and the consequent great increase of business and population, will not be a benefit to all of us, but only a portion,” he wrote. “Those who have lands, mines, established businesses, special abilities of certain kinds, will become richer for it and find increased opportunity; those who have only their own labor will become poorer, and find it harder to get ahead—first because it will take more capital to buy land or to get into business; and second, because as competition reduces the wages of labor, this capital will be harder for them to obtain.”59

Unlike the congressional supporters of the Pacific Railway Act, who hoped rail construction would promote rapid settlement, George
understood, as William Deverell has noted, “that
the overland railway could not exist in a social,
cultural, political, or economic vacuum.”\textsuperscript{60} The
transcontinental railroad would affect critical
relationships between labor and capital, technol-
ogy and the environment, the state and federal
government, and, most significantly to George,
individuals and the land.

George’s anxiety toward the completion of the
transcontinental line formed largely around his
belief that intense land speculation preceded
every major economic panic of the nineteenth
century. He was right. According to William
Cronon, “the most intense land speculation in
American history” occurred in the mid-1830s,
right before the Panic of 1837. “Believing Chicago
was to become the terminus of a major canal,” he
explained, “land agents and speculators flooded
into town, buying and selling not only empty
lots along its ill-marked streets, but also the
surrounding grasslands which the Indians had
recently abandoned.”\textsuperscript{61} Eventually, prices came
down, banks recalled loans, and “people who had
counted themselves millionaires teetered on the
edge of bankruptcy.”\textsuperscript{62} Within months, the nation
found itself in the midst of a full-fledged eco-
nomic panic. A similar event occurred in 1873.

Throughout the 1850s and 1860s, speculators
borrowed large sums of money to purchase land
just beyond the line of western settlement in the
expectation that its value would continue growing. According to Paul W. Gates, between 1854
and 1858, “the peak years of speculative purchas-
ing,” 65 million acres of public domain fell into
the hands of land agents and town planners.\textsuperscript{63} And, as expected, western land prices soared,
especially in areas around a planned railroad
route. Like speculators, railroads relied on the
promise of increased land values to attract inves-
tors who could supplement the loans received
from the federal government for rail construction.

One investment house in particular, Jay Cooke
and Company, took the risky nature of railroad
financing to a new level in 1870 when it agreed
to sell $100 million in bonds to fund the con-
struction of a Northern Pacific railway route.\textsuperscript{64} So
long as land prices continued to rise, Cooke had
no trouble finding investors. By 1873, however,
Cooke’s bonds stopped selling. In September of
that year, his banking house collapsed, triggering
a nationwide panic that temporarily shut down
the stock market and caused a string of bankrupt-
cies and bank closings throughout the country,
including the Bank of California in 1875.\textsuperscript{65}

The federal government’s decision in 1873 to
stop minting silver coins exacerbated the panic
by making it harder for farmers and small busi-
nesses, especially in the West, to secure credit.
Bishop Gilbert Haven nicely summed up the
situation in California when, in October 1879, he
wrote: “The storm did burst on California. The
elements were ready for the cyclone. They were
nowhere so ready as here in all America. This is
the land of monopolies. Three of these include
and control all the rest—the railroad, the mining,
and the land monopoly. People East have no idea
of the extent and force of these powers.”\textsuperscript{66} The
rest of the nation soon learned of the dire situa-
tion in California.

In the wake of economic turmoil, workers and
farmers joined Denis Kearney and the Working-
men’s Party of California in protesting the power
and privilege of the railroads. They attacked rail-
roads for monopolizing land, hiring cheap Chi-
inese labor over that of Americans, and charging
high rates to travel and transport goods on their
lines. Railroad workers also lashed out against
their bosses for lowering wages and instituting
massive layoffs after the Panic of 1873. In the
summer of 1877, workers on the Baltimore &
Ohio Railroad in West Virginia initiated a forty-
five-day strike supported by workers across the
country. The strike ended only after President
Rutherford B. Hayes sent federal troops to the striking cities to restore order. In San Francisco, where unemployment reached nearly 25 percent by the mid-1870s, the Workingmen's Party successfully lobbied for a convention to revise the California Constitution in an effort to regulate railroads and improve conditions for ordinary workers.67

NATIONAL PROGRESS?

As a representation of the nation’s commitment to motion, energy, and expansion, Turner would have viewed the completion of the overland railway as an expression of progress and the essential role of the frontier in promoting American development. Like most nineteenth-century Americans, Turner defined progress in terms of material growth and the incorporation of the nation’s vast wilderness into industrial society. In reflecting on the “final rush of American energy upon the remaining wilderness,” he marveled at the remarkable output achieved by America’s manufacturing sector in the first decade of the twentieth century, writing in 1911 that “the extension of American settlement, production and wealth have increased beyond all precedent.”68

Although Turner acknowledged the nation’s increased growth after the frontier’s supposed closing, he also recognized the increased class tension and regional antagonism as a result of the diminishing supply of land in the West. As George believed that the “potent charm of California” lay in the “general hopefulness and self-reliance” of its people, Turner saw the value of the West not only in the opportunities it offered to cash-strapped laborers but also in the way it “reacted as a check on the aristocratic influences of the East.”69 The frontier’s closing cut off this release valve. As he explained in the September 1896 issue of the Atlantic Monthly: “The free lands are gone, the continent is crossed, and all this push and energy is turning into channels of agitation. Failures in one area can no longer be made good by taking up land on a new frontier; the conditions of a settled society are being reached with suddenness and confusion. The West has been built up with borrowed capital, and the question of the stability of gold, as a standard of deferred payments, is eagerly agitated by the debtor West, profoundly dissatisfied with the industrial conditions that confront it, and actuated by frontier directness and rigor in its remedies.”70 The Populist movement, in full swing by the publication of Turner’s frontier essay, provided one of the most accessible channels of expression to disgruntled farmers and laborers in the West.
Until recently, historians have viewed Populism as largely a rural-based movement of small farmers who decried the passing of the old, agrarian ideal and resented the new, industrial economic order. Charles Postel’s 2007 award-winning *The Populist Vision*, however, reveals that in contrast to the traditional view, Populists lived modern lives committed to commercial and intellectual growth. Rather than the backward-looking simpletons of previous studies, Postel argues, Populists “embraced the notion of progress [and] wielded the concept as a weapon of reform.” In addition to free silver, many Populists supported land-reform schemes, including George’s single tax on land values, as a promising way to level the playing field between small and large farmers.

The Farmers’ Alliance, which began first in Texas before spreading into several other western and southern states, provided the organizational structure of the Populist movement. Its members included not only lifelong farmers but also part-time agricultural workers, full-time businessmen, and many women committed to using “education as a weapon to break the corporate stranglehold on business ‘intelligence’ that left the farmer at a commercial disadvantage.” In California, the alliance successfully organized large-scale cooperative agricultural enterprises to better compete with corporate-owned farms and orchards. Among the more successful cooperative ventures in the state was the Santa Clara Fruit Exchange, where hundreds of local farmers met to discuss prices, standardize grades, and experiment with “collective marketing.”

Both Turner and George viewed Populism as a symptom of social imbalance caused by the disappearance of free land rather than as a legitimate conduit of reform to the nation’s problems. To George, any proposal—including greater education, market regulation, or the organization of labor—short of the abolition of private property in land could serve only to mitigate, not solve, society’s underlying dilemma. “For every social wrong there must be a remedy,” he claimed.

“The remedy can be nothing less than the abolition of the wrong. Half-way measures, mere ameliorations and secondary reforms, can at any time accomplish little, and can in the long run avail nothing.” While many Populists, including Jerry “Sockless” Simpson and Hamlin Garland, championed the single tax, most of the movement’s leadership “refused to accept the single tax as the ‘universal solvent’ for the problems facing the nation.”
As George believed that the “potent charm of California” lay in the “general hopefulness and self-reliance” of its people, Turner saw the value of the West not only in the opportunities it offered to cash-strapped laborers but also in the way it “reacted as a check on the aristocratic influences of the East.”

George’s unwavering faith in the single tax emanated from his confidence that justice and progress followed natural laws discoverable by any individual and applicable to any society at any time. Unlike Turner, who viewed history and defined progress from a particular, national point of view—the sea-to-shining-sea story—George embraced universalism, believing that individual, social, and national development more or less followed the same path and could be measured by universal truths and common standards of justice. At a time when policymakers had begun to lean more heavily on social science to guide reform, George relied on Christian ideals to find truth and inform action. “Political economy and social science cannot teach any lessons,” George wrote, “that are not embraced in the simple truths taught to poor fishermen and Jewish peasants by One who eighteen hundred years ago was crucified.”

While George’s religiosity appealed to members of the Social Gospel and Christian Socialism movements, it allowed his critics to label him as a hackneyed idealist and dismiss his ideas as impractical.

Although many of George’s disciples did not share his steadfast commitment to the eradication of private property in land, most recognized the centrality of the land question to all other social, economic, and political questions. Some of his followers, including the Populist author Hamlin Garland, believed that land reform promised to improve the health of art and literature in America. “It is the increase in the value of theatre sites which makes the production of a new play each year more difficult,” Garland wrote in 1894. “The single-tax idea, applied to theatres, would release the theater from tax, but would tax the land value. More theaters would be built.” Similarly, J. Bellangee argued in the February 1894 issue of *The Arena* that by “seek[ing] to secure equal distribution of benefits,” the single tax supported the aim of a wide variety of progressive reforms, including voting rights for women, the initiative and referendum, as well as the direct election of senators. The reason for these connections, social reformer and editor Louis F. Post explained, lay in the fact that “[t]he land question is essentially a question of the rights of living men as against the exactions of one another.” In other words, Post continued, “It is really the ‘man question’ rather than the ‘land question.’”

**A TAX TO SAFEGUARD DEMOCRACY**

While Turner failed to comment directly on George or the single tax in his writings, the historian would have viewed the proposal as a “substitute for that former safeguard of democracy” America had enjoyed in the frontier. Unlike George, who emphasized the universal nature of the individual life and its connection to land,
In a retelling of the Little Red Riding Hood story, this 1884 political cartoon—published in the satirical Puck magazine—personifies Socialism as the wolf carrying George’s Progress and Poverty in his coat pocket while Red Riding Hood safeguards the “wages” in her basket. A poem published below the drawing warned the laborer of Socialism’s dangers, a result, perhaps, of the increased interest in Socialist doctrines as formulated by George in his 1879 seminal work.

Library of Congress; illustration by Sir John Tenniel
While Turner provided turn-of-the-century Americans with a national history they could be proud of, George offered a vision of the future free of poverty, depression, and industrial panic. Their experiences and observations of the American West informed both men’s narratives.

Turner viewed American history and development as inherently unique due to its “gift” of free lands, which enabled frontier expansion. The existence of free lands, he wrote, “promoted individualism, economic equality, freedom to rise, democracy” and “differentiated the American democracy from the democracies which have preceded it.”85 However, instead of finding a way to make land “free” in America, as George proposed by socializing its value, Turner believed that America’s natural “energies of expansion” would, instead, be directed toward the achievement of a more “vigorous foreign policy, for an interoceanic canal, for a revival of our power upon the seas, and for the extension of American influence to outlying islands.”86 Without a frontier of expansion, Turner believed, America risked losing its exceptionalism.

Although Turner did not address George or his proposal in his own work, Turner’s biographers have noted the similarities of their ideas and have speculated that Progress and Poverty informed Turner’s frontier thesis. While a student at Johns Hopkins, Turner had read and carefully studied George’s ideas; one of the final exam questions for a course he took from Professor Richard Ely asked him to “Compare Turgot, John Stuart Mill, and Henry George on Taxation.”87 Furthermore, Ray Allen Billington has pointed out that a note among Turner’s papers from the period before he had formulated his frontier thesis included a reminder to record a passage from page 349 of Progress and Poverty, which “contained several helpful ideas.”88 In this passage, George had written: “The general intelligence, the general comfort, the active invention, the power of adaptation, and assimilation, the free, independent spirit, the energy and hopefulness that have marked our people, are not causes, but results—they have sprung from unfenced land. The public domain has been the transmuting force which has turned the thriftless, unambitious European peasant into the self-reliant Western farmer; it has given a consciousness of freedom even to the dweller in crowded cities, and has been a well-spring of hope even to those who have never thought of taking refuge upon it.”89

Despite the striking resemblance of these ideas to Turner’s frontier thesis, Billington has suggested only that George’s ideas “bolstered Turner’s realization that a connection existed between free land and the frontier characteristics [Turner] was isolating.”90 That George not only shared but also informed Turner’s understanding that democratic development depended on individual access to land presents a more accurate conclusion regarding the significance of this passage noted by Turner.

While indicative of the importance Americans attached to land, that Turner and George both studied and wrote about this invaluable resource to explain the crises facing the country at the end of the nineteenth century is not coincidental. The success of both authors hinged on their ability to explicate America’s relationship to and depen-
dence on cheap land. Both men showed that the land question did not merely represent a “western problem” or rural concern; both Turner and George reminded the public of land’s historic and universal importance to individual and social development.

A critical difference, however, existed in their visions of American progress, in which land represented the crucial and contingent factor. Whereas Turner believed America’s best days lay in the past, George envisioned a future in which private property ceased to exist and was filled with peace and prosperity. Each year since the closing of the frontier, Turner wrote in one of his final essays, America had lost some of its exceptional democratic character. “We are more like Europe,” he declared in 1925, “and our sections are becoming more and more the American version of the European nation.” Without a buffer of free land, he continued, “We, like the European nations, are approaching a saturation of population” that threatened America’s social equilibrium. To avoid disunion, he concluded, “We must shape our national action to the vast and varied Union of unlike sections.”

George described his ideal vision of the future in which private property in land no longer existed as resembling all of the glory of a Socialist society without the loss of individual freedom that such a system, as then proposed, entailed. With the revenue from the taxation of land values, George wrote, “we could establish public baths, museums, libraries, gardens, lecture rooms, music and dancing halls, theaters, universities, technical schools, shooting galleries, play grounds, gymnasiums, etc. . . . We should reach the ideal of the socialist, but not through government repression. Government would change its character, and would become the administration of a great co-operative society. It would become merely the agency by which the common property was administered for the common benefit.”

Turner and George believed America’s response to the land problem promised to alter its social, economic, and political structures. To both, the disappearance of the public domain provided the opportunity to redefine the nation’s treatment of and relationship to land. Without a large public domain, America could no longer afford to treat land and its value as private commodities. Nor could the federal government ignore the fact that its handling of the nation’s bounty had enabled the monopolization of land and was responsible for bringing landlordism to America.

While Turner provided turn-of-the-century Americans with a national history they could be proud of, George offered a vision of the future free of poverty, depression, and industrial panic. Their experiences and observations of the American West informed both men’s narratives. For Turner, Americans’ direct relationship to unoccupied land accounted for the development of their best features, including a steadfast commitment to expansion and self-sufficiency. The frontier’s closing forced Americans to realize their dependency on land and to redirect the nation’s “nervous energy” toward finding alternative outlets capable of safeguarding democracy. George offered Americans such an outlet through his proposal to tax and redistribute land values. All of the problems plaguing modern industrial societies, he wrote, sprung from the unnatural and unjust system of private property in land. Neither America nor any other advanced nation could continue to develop unimpeded by the evil effects of land monopoly. Harnessing land’s value for the public, as George prescribed, might have gone a long way toward assuring and advancing the continuing prosperity of the nation, as well as finally achieving—or at least coming closer to reaching—for all Americans the nation’s founding ideals of equality and justice.

Alex Wagner Lough is a PhD candidate in American History at Brandeis University.
I discovered Manzanar in 1972.

Reading this today, one might assume I mean “discover” only in the sense of my own initial trip to a well-known spot, like a first visit to Gettysburg or the Grand Canyon. But in the early 1970s, and for a quarter of a century before, the Manzanar internment camp seemingly had disappeared from public consciousness. Established in California’s remote Owens Valley as the first of ten relocation centers for Japanese Americans in the West following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the camp had long since been dismantled and the desolate location left unmarked.

Obviously, I did not “discover” Manzanar—over 10,000 people were imprisoned within its guarded fences from 1942 to 1945 and many others were aware of it during and after that era. But this important historical site was so unnoticed that a few years earlier I had driven past it more than a dozen times with no idea of its significance. No wonder I felt as if I had uncovered a dark and brooding secret when I visited Manzanar for the first time, finally aware of where I was and what had happened there.

I was born in New York City on August 14, 1945—the day Japan’s surrender ended World War II and any vestige of justification for uprooting the Japanese American communities of California, Oregon, and Washington. When I moved to Los Angeles for a year in mid-1968, I knew little about the wartime relocation of nearly 120,000 Japanese American citizens and resident aliens to internment camps away from the Pacific coast. It was the prospect of skiing at Mammoth Mountain and not the study of history that lured me up Highway 395 in Inyo County, past the two small Asian-style gatehouses that, had I been more observant, might have distinguished this locale from other stretches of high desert along the way.

By the time I returned to Los Angeles three years later, in mid-1972, I had taken up photography as a hobby. I enjoyed photographing ghost towns in black and white and had purchased a guidebook to California locations. To my astonishment, the book listed a place I had mindlessly driven past so many times: the Manzanar War Relocation Center. In late 1972, on my way to Mammoth, I briefly visited the site for the first time and
made plans to return when I had sufficient time to photograph it.

Though I was unaware of it at the time, a trickle of organized interest in Manzanar already had begun to develop. A few individuals quietly had made personal visits to the camp since it had closed, but in December 1969, a group of 150 people made the first annual Manzanar Pilgrimage, led by an organization that became the Manzanar Committee. In January 1972, the site became a California Registered Historical Landmark. During this same period, two books were published that would prove very important to the remembrance of Manzanar: Executive Order 9066: The Internment of 110,000 Japanese Americans by Maisie and Richard Conrat (1972) and Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston’s Farewell to Manzanar (1973).1

In April 1973, through the efforts of the Manzanar Committee and other organizations, a state historical marker finally was placed at the camp’s former sentry post. I recall reading about the marker placement in the Los Angeles Times and thinking, It’s about time. Shortly afterward, I made a special trip to Manzanar and took the pictures featured in this article. I stayed in nearby Lone Pine overnight and went to the camp twice, exposing about 120 frames of 35mm black-and-white film in both morning and evening light. Typical of Manzanar in those days, I did not encounter another soul the entire time I was there. I made these photographs solely for my own interest and as a way of helping me to appreciate the moving, haunting qualities of this very special place.

The historical marking was a crucial step forward, but little would change for a long time to come. In home video of my family’s visit a full ten years later, in summer 1983, Manzanar looked and felt no different than during my earlier trips. Since there were no interpretive displays at that time, I had brought along a copy of Executive Order 9066 to show my wife and seven-year-old sons what once had stood there.

Though my interest in Manzanar never waned, eventually I put my photographs away and viewed them only on rare occasions. Fortunately, due to the efforts of the Manzanar Committee and the Japanese American Citizens League to remember and interpret the site, Manzanar was added to the National Register of Historic Places in July 1976 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 1985 and a National Historic Site in 1992. Subsequent acquisition of the land by the National Park Service from the City of Los Angeles in April 1997 led, step by step, to the establishment of a truly meaningful interpretive program.

Driving on Highway 395 in January 2011, I saw that two restored barracks had been erected near a former mess hall, which had been moved to the site a few years earlier. Curious, I entered the park and encountered Ranger Richard Potashin, who with great enthusiasm directed me to the newly opened barracks and mess hall displays. Heading out to see them through the inclement weather that is so often part of the Manzanar experience, I could not help but think about how meaningful visits to the site had become since my solitary trips in 1972 and 1973, when aside from the gatehouses and the cemetery, one had to search for any remnant of what had been. And I recalled the photographs that I was moved to make almost forty years earlier. With some trepidation, I told Ranger Potashin I had a group of images dating to the dawn of interpretation. “If you have any interest, I’d be happy to donate them to you,” I offered. When I returned home, I scanned and emailed a few. I was thrilled and deeply gratified when Potashin and archivist Mark Hachtman replied that they wanted to add my photographs to the Manzanar National Historic Site archives.
Today, at least 25,000 photographs document the World War II evacuation of Japanese Americans from their homes and their relocation to camps throughout the western United States. There exists a rich photographic record of Manzanar during the internment years, including images by two of the greatest names in twentieth-century American photography, Ansel Adams and Dorothea Lange, who visited the camp in 1943–44 and 1942, respectively. Clem Albers, an experienced San Francisco newspaper photographer, also worked at Manzanar (1942). And in some ways most interesting of all are the images made by an extremely skillful Japanese American photographer, Toyo Miyatake, himself a Manzanar internee from 1942 to 1945. Initially forbidden to photograph, then allowed to do so only with restrictions, he eventually was given free rein to record camp life. These luminaries and others chronicled the happenings in the camp and the moods of the men, women, and children imprisoned there. But significantly fewer images have documented the neglect and abandonment of the site after the camp closed in 1945. If anything, the photographs on these pages record the failure, for more than twenty-five years, to remember and commemorate this place and what it represented. Surely, the eerie feelings that pervaded my visits in the 1970s were enhanced by the almost complete neglect of this historic place by the vast majority of our society. The relocations and internments were tragic, but, in a sense, their subsequent absence from our cultural consciousness was even more so. The internees should have been honored for their courage and resilience; instead, what they endured was ignored.

Even some who were imprisoned at Manzanar struggled for years to give voice to their experiences. In Farewell to Manzanar, the autobiographical narrative of her childhood years as an internee, Jeanne Wakatsuki Houston writes that until she went back to visit the camp as an adult in 1972, “I half-suspected that the place did not exist. So few people I met in those years had even heard of it, and those who had knew so little about it, sometimes I imagined I had made the whole thing up, dreamed it.”

The photographs taken during my 1973 visit depict how Manzanar looked and felt for the quarter century it remained unmarked and all but disremembered. An abandoned car rusts in the high-desert grasses. Remnants of plumbing, steps, fountains, and planting pots hint at internees’ efforts to create new lives in a hostile environment. The large Japanese characters that identify the Cemetery Memorial obelisk constructed in 1943 by internee and master stonemason Ryozo Kado as “Soul Consoling Tower” comfort no one. The inscriptions of individuals etched in stone and the grave markers of some of the 10,000 camp residents, including infants, seem to await recognition and remembrance.

Thankfully, the era of Manzanar’s neglect has ended, especially since the opening of the Manzanar National Historic Site Interpretive Center in April 2004. With its knowledgeable staff, moving introductory film, and excellent exhibits, never again will visitors find themselves all alone at Manzanar.

James S. Brust is an independent historian specializing in nineteenth-century popular prints and photographs. A psychiatrist in private practice in San Pedro, California, Dr. Brust is coauthor of Where Custer Fell: Photographs of the Little Bighorn Battlefield Then and Now (University of Oklahoma, 2005) and author of the essay “A Psychiatrist Looks at Mary Lincoln” in The Mary Lincoln Enigma: Historians on America’s Most Controversial First Lady (Southern Illinois University Press, forthcoming [May 2012]).

Opposite: Historical marker at the military police sentry post.
MANZANAR

IN THE EARLY PART OF WORLD WAR II, 10,000 PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY WERE INTERRED IN RELOCATION CENTERS BY EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 9066, ISSUED ON FEBRUARY 19, 1942.

MANZANAR, THE FIRST OF TEN SUCH CONCENTRATION CAMPS, WAS BOUNDED BY BARBED WIRE AND GUARD TOWERS, confining 10,000 persons, the majority being American citizens.

May the injustices and humiliation suffered here as a result of hysteria, racism and economic exploitation never emerge again.

CALIFORNIA REGISTERED HISTORICAL LANDMARK NO. 850

Plaque placed by the State Department of Parks and Recreation in cooperation with the Manzanar Committee and the Japanese American Citizens League, April 14, 1973.
Gatehouse entrance to the Manzanar War Relocation Center
Cemetery monument built by internees in 1943
Above: Remnants of a decorative rock garden
Opposite: Stone fence and pathway to a vanished building
Overleaf left: Steps to nowhere
Overleaf right: Rusted spigot emerging from the arid ground
Above: Planting pots, home to weeds and tumbleweed brush

Opposite: A clothesline pole sculpts the deserted landscape
Above: Inscriptions etched by internees in concrete

Opposite: Cemetery stone marker for “Baby Jerry Ogata”
Three themes are woven through this essay: anti-Semitism, false accusations, and the corruption of the historical record that is often ambiguous and subject to multiple interpretations. Herbert E. Bolton is a key figure in this story because he has been accused of holding anti-Semitic attitudes and keeping Jews out of the history department of the University of California at Berkeley, a charge I have heard from several historians whose names will go unmentioned. That Bolton’s supposed anti-Semitism continues to be part of the lore about him is especially disappointing because nearly twenty years ago I published an essay that called this accusation into question. Alas, scholarly publications do not always influence popular perceptions, even among scholars.

It is not surprising that the stories about Bolton hang on. Given the times in which he lived and worked, the charge seems plausible. Born in 1870 on a Wisconsin farm, Bolton shared the usual prejudices of rural America. After studying with Frederick Jackson Turner at the University of Wisconsin (1896–1897), he completed his doctorate at the University of Pennsylvania in 1899. He taught at the University of Texas (1901–1909) and Stanford University (1909–1911) before taking a professorship at the University of California in 1911. Bolton retired in 1940 but was brought back to the university during World War II. He retired permanently in 1944 but maintained an office in the Bancroft Library, which he had directed for more than two decades, until his disabling stroke in 1952. He died in 1953.

During his four decades on the Berkeley campus, Bolton chaired the history department, ran the Bancroft Library, and trained hundreds of graduate students, some of whom became prominent historians in their own right. He was an immensely productive historian who founded the Spanish Borderlands school of historical study and was one of the most influential historians of the first half of the twentieth century. Historians of the American West, Mexico, and Latin America regard him as a founding member of their fields. Remembered today primarily by field specialists, in his own time he was famous to the general public. News clippings about him fill several cartons in his collected papers. Few academics generate that sort of publicity in any generation.
For nearly half a century, from 1911 to 1946, Herbert Eugene Bolton (1870–1953) taught history, directed the Bancroft Library, and chaired the history department at the University of California, Berkeley. His achievements include the publication of more than twenty volumes and scores of articles, positions on numerous boards, copious honors, and training 104 PhDs. A figure of towering influence, he developed what may be considered an enlightened position on the instruction of Jewish graduate students and the hiring of Jewish faculty in an unwelcoming academic world and during a time of changing racial and ethnic attitudes.

Courtesy of The Bancroft Library, University of California
When I decided to write a book about Bolton in 1987, one of the first claims that I heard about him was that he was anti-Semitic. In Bolton’s era, anti-Semitism was endemic to the academy. WASP faculty and university presidents maintained their sense of ethnic, religious, and gender exclusivity wherever they could by raising barriers against Catholics, women, and Jews. Unfortunately, the common experience of religious discrimination did not produce a sense of common cause when Nazi Germany began to persecute Jews; many Catholic American academics and universities seemed to be sympathetic with some of the aims of fascist dictators and failed to condemn these new Jewish pogroms.

The Berkeley history department was not immune to the contagion of anti-Semitism. Perhaps Bolton, who wrote favorably about Catholic history in America, shared these pernicious views. The weight of circumstantial evidence pointed in that direction. Consequently, when I first heard about Bolton’s presumed anti-Semitism I uncritically accepted the accusation against him. Several times I heard a story that supported the charge: Historian Woodrow Borah,
Bolton’s student in the 1930s, was kept out of the history department by Bolton because he was a Jew. For years, Borah, a prominent historian of Latin America, was forced to teach Spanish literature in Berkeley’s speech department until the history department finally hired him in the 1960s.

When I began my research into Bolton’s life, I expected to uncover plenty of evidence of Bolton’s prejudice. What I found surprised me. Bolton had his prejudices, all right. In his youth he was a nativist, anti-Catholic, and opposed to the Democratic Party because of its associations with Catholics and immigrants. From this I inferred that he was probably anti-Semitic, too. Yet time softened some of Bolton’s prejudices. He built his career as a historian by valorizing Spanish Catholic missionaries in colonial America. Eventually he numbered scores of priests and Catholic students among his friends. They, in turn, recognized Bolton’s contribution to the growing acceptance of Catholics among the general public. There was actually a Catholic mass held for Bolton after he died, although he was raised as a Methodist. Bolton’s transformation from anti-Catholic to a defender of Catholic heroes speaks of someone with a certain amount of flexibility in his religious views. Yet, more than a half century after Bolton’s death, a questionable charge of anti-Semitism remains a part of his legacy.

PRIVATE PREJUDICES?

But in his youth Bolton was not a crusader against prejudice. As a student at the University of Wisconsin he joined a fraternity, Theta Delta Chi, which barred Jews and Catholics. He seemed to believe that Jews could be identified by their physical characteristics. In later years, when college-hiring authorities inquired about the race of Bolton’s graduate student applicants, he routinely provided the information. One prospective employer asked about the ancestry of Charles Coan, whose last name raised a doubt. Bolton assured the inquirer that Coan was “not a Jew, and his personal appearance would remove any suspicions.”

Though Bolton evidently believed that Jews possessed distinctive physical characteristics, he did not believe that they should be barred from graduate school or academic employment. He trained Jewish students and placed them in academic positions, although this was not easy, as the case of Abraham Nasatir demonstrates. A gifted student, Nasatir received his bachelor’s degree from the University of California at the age of seventeen. He was interested in the Rocky Mountain fur trade, so Bolton asked his former student and coauthor, Thomas Maitland Marshall of Washington University, to direct Nasatir’s master’s thesis. Marshall refused. Nasatir remained with Bolton in Berkeley, where he finished his master’s (1922) and his PhD (1926). In 1925, he went to Saint Louis to complete his research on the fur trade. There he met Marshall, who characterized him in a letter to Bolton as “a smart but very obnoxious Jew. When he leaves we hope the Jefferson Memorial will be left to us. We hope that we will not see his like again.” Bolton coolly replied that if he had refused to work with “a man of ability . . . because he is obnoxious . . . half of my men would have been sent elsewhere.”

Marshall’s vicious comments foreshadowed the difficulty that Bolton would have in placing Nasatir. Bolton wrote strong letters recommending Nasatir as his “most brilliant student,” “a real scholar,” with “a very fine spirit,” though “youthful” and “good naturally egotistical.” Because of his youth and enthusiasm, Nasatir needed the “kind guidance of some one who really likes him.” If he got the right kind of treatment, Bolton believed, he would “almost certainly prove to be a great man.”

Bolton’s glowing recommendations failed to secure immediate permanent employment for Nasatir. Professor Arthur P. Whitaker explained
Though Bolton evidently believed that Jews possessed distinctive physical characteristics, he did not believe that they should be barred from graduate school or academic employment. He trained Jewish students and placed them in academic positions, although this was not easy.

that Nasatir’s “race was against him” in the competition for a job at the Florida State College for Women. Bolton bristled at Whitaker’s mention of race. “I am . . . sorry to learn that . . . his race will have anything to do with his appointment. Such a thing would be inconceivable in another community.” Finally, Nasatir landed a job at San Diego State Teachers’ College, where two of Bolton’s students, Charles B. Leonard and Lewis B. Lesley, already were teaching history. At first Leonard objected to Nasatir, and another Bolton student, Clarence DuFour, took the job. Nasatir at last got the San Diego position when DuFour resigned in November 1927. He remained on the San Diego State faculty until he retired in the early 1970s. It is fair to speculate that he would not have been hired there had Bolton not put pressure on his former students.

So by the 1920s it would appear that Bolton supported the recruitment, training, and placement of Jews in the academy. There is no reason to believe that he was not sincere in his statements about Nasatir, but perhaps he had ulterior motives as well. At the very moment Bolton was promoting Nasatir’s career, he was establishing an important relationship with a Jewish benefactor, Sidney M. Ehrman, an influential lawyer associated with the Wells Fargo Bank. Ehrman was a very wealthy man. He had graduated with the Berkeley class of 1896 and was a member of the Native Sons of the Golden West, a fraternal organization that provided funding for historical studies at the university. Every year, Bolton appeared before the organization’s annual meeting to explain the work of the history department, the accomplishments of fellows whom the Native Sons had funded, and the history department’s continuing needs. At the Sons’ 1922 meeting, he declared that Californians ought to be ashamed that they had not published the first history of California, written by the Franciscan missionary Francisco Palou, Noticias de la California. After the meeting, Ehrman, who was still a stranger to Bolton, touched his arm and asked how much it would cost to publish Palou. Bolton thought he “would impress him sufficiently” and said, “Well, $5,000.” Ehrman replied, “All right, the money is yours.”

From that moment, Ehrman underwrote the publication costs of most of Bolton’s books. Evidently he also gave to Bolton a substantial cash gift—an honorarium, he called it—when Bolton published Fray Juan Crespi, Missionary Explorer of the Pacific Coast, 1769–1774 (1927). In all, Ehrman may have given as much as $50,000 to subsidize Bolton’s work. Bolton and Ehrman became personal friends. The Boltons crossed the bay to attend dinner and opera dates with the Ehrmans in San Francisco; in summer they were guests at the Ehrmans’ Lake Tahoe lodge; and Bolton invited Ehrman along on one of his southwestern expeditions to retrace the routes of a Spanish
Ehrman came through with financial support for Bolton’s work again and again, as the acknowledgments in his books show. Bolton must have been pleased when Ehrman joined the University of California’s Board of Regents in 1930. A few years later, Ehrman endowed a chair in European history at Berkeley as a memorial to his son, who had tragically died. So Bolton would have had a personal motive for supporting Jewish students while avoiding statements that were anti-Semitic. Consequently, the question must be asked: Did Bolton harbor private prejudices while publicly supporting the employment of Jews in the academy? A definitive answer to this question cannot be deduced from Bolton’s published writings and private correspondence.

ERNST KANTOROWICZ

Despite his relationship with Ehrman and support for Jewish students, Bolton chaired a history department that had never hired a Jewish professor. This brings us to the case of Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz. In 1939, Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, called Bolton’s attention to Professor Kantorowicz, a German Jew who wanted to teach in the United States. Kantorowicz was forbidden to teach in Nazi Germany because he was Jewish, Sproul explained. “If you or your colleagues are at all interested in Dr. Kantorowicz,” Sproul wrote, “will you let me hear from you?”

Kantorowicz was a very well-known but controversial historian who had been a full professor at the University of Frankfurt until, like other Jewish faculty, he was forced out of his professorship by the Nazis as unfit to teach German youth. He was an assimilated Jew and a strong German nationalist with decidedly right-wing views. After World War I, he had taken up arms against communists in Germany. His biography of Frederick the Great (1927) was meant to serve a nationalist agenda. Kantorowicz’s early work was in some respects idiosyncratic, but he is now recognized as a major
Bolton made inquiries about Kantorowicz. Professor Ferdinand Schevill of the University of Chicago damned the German professor with faint praise for his biography of Frederick. According to Schevill, the book was “an elaborately reconstructed biography of a kind I thoroughly distrust.” Schevill continued that he would not call Kantorowicz either a “great scholar or a superior intellect.” “A less than major position in your university is quite compatible with his attainments,” he told Bolton. Bolton forwarded Schevill’s remarks to Sproul without comment.

Schevill’s criticism of Kantorowicz’s book was harsh but not unique. The Frederick biography had been published without footnotes and included a lot of mythology and folklore about the medieval emperor. Critics attacked his work accordingly. Kantorowicz subsequently published a volume of documentation that was intended to disarm his detractors, but it did not silence them. Despite Schevill’s unsupportive assessment, Bolton wrote to Kantorowicz inviting him to join the Berkeley history department as visiting professor of medieval history for the 1939–1940 academic year: “I am writing to welcome you and to make arrangements for the courses which you will give.” He assigned Kantorowicz the standard course load of two undergraduate classes and one graduate seminar per semester and allowed him to suggest the particular topics for each course. Bolton concluded his letter by promising the Jewish refugee “a friendly welcome by all the members of the History Department.”

Whether Kantorowicz was hired because Sproul insisted over Bolton’s objection or because Bolton privately recommended Kantorowicz remains an open question. Bolton’s long association with Ehrman and Jewish students like Nasatir and Woodrow Borah (who was then working on his...
Ernst Kantorowicz (1895–1963) (left) at the 1954 Byzantine Symposia at Dumbarton Oaks, Harvard University’s medieval center near Washington, DC. Kantorowicz, who escaped Nazi Germany in 1939, was a leading voice among nonsigning faculty at UC Berkeley during the university’s controversial Cold War–era requirement that employees sign an oath of loyalty (1949–51). “Where a human principle, where Humanitas herself is involved I cannot keep silent,” he explained. After leaving Berkeley, he taught for a year at Dumbarton Oaks and in 1951 accepted an appointment at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, where he completed his iconographic study begun at Berkeley, The King’s Two Bodies (1957).
dissertation in Mexico) argues against a deeply held anti-Semitism.30 Yet, Kantorowicz may have been hired despite Bolton’s possible reservation. “Provost Deutsch informs me that you have been invited to join our staff,”31 Bolton wrote Kantorowicz, which infers that the hiring decision had been made by the administration. However, this may have been merely a recognition that the hiring authority was not Bolton but the president through his provost.

If Bolton objected to Kantorowicz joining the history faculty, anti-Semitism might not have been his motive. Like many American academics, Bolton had become a critic of the German system of higher education. World War I propaganda had probably hardened his views. In 1920, he had observed that before the war “among older university men” there was “strong predilection toward” German university training. However, “it had become generally recognized that . . . American university degrees stood for much more than German degrees.”32 In the same year, he answered no to four questions asking his opinion about the proposed establishment of a federal Department of Education. At the foot of the questionnaire he scrawled, “Keep Federal hands off! Don’t Prussianize education.”33 Bolton may well have objected to Kantorowicz because of his German training, if indeed he objected to him at all.

There is one other motive that Bolton may have had. At the time Kantorowicz became a visiting professor, Bolton was attempting to place his own students on the Berkeley faculty in preparation for his retirement in 1940. Bolton believed that his own students should carry on his tradition at Berkeley. Adding a new senior man might stymie his plans.34

Exposure to Kantorowicz seemed to eliminate whatever objections Bolton may have held against him. In the spring of 1940, he told Sproul that he had attended the visiting professor’s illustrated public lecture on Charles the Bold. Kantorowicz made a very good impression on Bolton and the rest of the history faculty who were present, despite his “very foreign accent.” Bolton thought that if Kantorowicz could be permanently retained he would “be a real scholarly asset to the University, and a highly useful teacher, especially with advanced students.” Therefore, he unequivocally added, “I recommend that he be made Professor of History on permanent appointment.”35 The permanent appointment did not occur for several years, but that was not Bolton’s doing. If anti-Semitism was the reason for keeping Kantorowicz as a visiting professor in the history department, the fault must be found elsewhere.

WOODROW WILSON BORAH

The year after Bolton recommended Kantorowicz for a permanent faculty position, he wrote a letter of recommendation for Woodrow Borah, who wanted an assistant professorship at Tulane University. “He is one of the most brilliant graduates we have ever had,” Bolton offered. Bolton expected “a notable output of scholarly work by him in years to come.” The glowing recommendation included details about Borah’s work on colonial Mexico. Bolton added that Borah “was born in Mississippi of Jewish parents,” a statement that was evidently intended to aid Borah’s candidacy by highlighting his southern roots while alerting Tulane authorities to his ethnic and religious background.36

Borah did not go to Tulane. Instead he took a position at Princeton University.37 He was impressed with the magnificent architecture and the student body, who were “a healthy, happy group,” he told Bolton. They were “so well trained in good diet that their instinctive tendency” was “to reach for milk,” which he was surprised to find was served even at Princeton dances. “Scotch can also be had, however.”38 Borah liked Princeton and he hoped to stay.39
When the United States entered World War II, however, everything changed. Borah left Princeton for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), the intelligence corps that was the forerunner of the CIA. In 1946, he wrote Bolton a long letter summarizing his experiences. Borah had been in Europe with another of Bolton’s doctors-cum-OSS agents, Alfred B. Thomas. “My job was to set up OSS staffs in Italy and Germany” and to scour the archives for documents illuminating Latin American relations with the Axis. Now that the work was completed and published Borah could talk about it. Italians had been cooperative, but in Germany “the crushed, frightened population . . . hated us and cooperated as little as it dared. However, one could always find enough foreign slave laborers to tell where archives had been moved to.”40 With the war over and the OSS disbanded, Borah wanted to reenter academic life. He preferred to return to Princeton, but the situation did not look promising because they already had one permanent Latin Americanist. Would Bolton help him, Borah asked?

Bolton was willing to help Borah. By the late 1940s, there was probably no chance that Bolton could muscle another of his students into the history department. But he still had friends in other parts of the university and he recommended Borah for a spot in the department of speech. Bolton described Borah as “one of the most brilliant and scholarly men we have had here in History” who had “great clarity of thought and a gift for forceful and cultured expression.” “Frankly, other things being equal, I would prefer to see him in History,” Bolton wrote.41 Bolton mentioned nothing about Borah’s Jewish background as he had done in his prewar letters. Borah got the job in speech and was grateful to Bolton. “Four people have written about the fine letter you sent the committee, and its great value in getting the appointment approved,” Borah acknowledged.42 He taught in the speech department until 1962, when he at last transferred to the history department.43 Bolton’s letter made it clear that Borah belonged in the history department and he no doubt would have criticized the 1962 move as too long delayed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LOYALTY OATH

By the time Borah was asking for Bolton’s aid, Ernst Kantorowicz was a regular member of the history department, but his tenure there ended under unhappy circumstances. In 1949, the California Board of Regents required all faculty to sign a new loyalty oath declaring that they were not communists. All state employees including faculty signed an oath when they were hired, but now only university employees would have to sign an oath each year when their contracts were renewed. Most faculty, many of whom were war veterans like Borah, found the new requirement odious but were willing to sign as an expediency.

At first, only a minority of the faculty opposed the new oath on broad principles. One of them was Kantorowicz. The Jewish refugee who had fought communists in the street in Germany read a statement to the Academic Senate that condemned the new “enforced oath.” He had made a study of oaths, he said, and declared that while the oath may appear to be harmless, “All oaths in history that I know of, have undergone changes. A new word is added. A short phrase, seemingly insignificant, will be smuggled in.” Recent history was a guide, he continued. “Mussolini Italy of 1931, Hitler Germany of 1933 are terrifying warning examples for the harmless bit-by-bit procedure in connection with politically enforced oaths.” History demonstrated that it was unwise to yield “to momentary hysteria, or to jeopardize, for the sake of temporary temporal advantages the permanent external values.” “Professional and human dignity” were at stake. The regents were bullying the innocent professor “to give up either his tenure or, together with his freedom and his judgment, his human dignity and his
In the fall of 1949, half the UC faculty refused to sign the university’s controversial loyalty oath, but during the summer of 1950, after a few compromises, the number dwindled to thirty-nine. (Right) Nonsigners explain their position to students at a protest meeting on April 10, 1950. (Below) On August 25, 1950, UC president Robert Gordon Sproul (foreground) addressed the Regents, who voted to dismiss all thirty-nine faculty. Some signed the oath after the meeting. Ultimately, thirty-one nonsigning professors and many other UC employees were fired for their anti-oath position.
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responsible sovereignty as a scholar.”44 These were soaring words, but few professors thought that the oath was more than a meaningless and disagreeable technicality, something to be signed and forgotten. They were wrong.

For two years there ensued a complicated set of negotiations among Sproul, the Academic Senate, and the Regents. Eventually all parties felt that the others had acted in bad faith. The positions of the faculty and the Regents hardened. In February 1950, the Regents required that all university employees sign the oath as written in 1949, or in lieu of the oath, an explicit affirmation that he or she was not a communist. The Regents fired thirty-one nonsigning faculty, including Kantorowicz, then the state legislature required all state employees (including university professors) to sign an oath very similar to the Regents’ oath. Subsequent court decisions upheld the new oath while providing a means for the reinstatement of the cashiered professors, but not Kantorowicz. He had already accepted a position at Princeton University’s Institute for Advanced Study.

Not all the fired faculty fared as well as Kantorowicz. John Walton Caughey, a professor of history at UCLA who had been Bolton’s doctoral student, also refused to sign the new oath and was fired. After a long court battle, Caughey was permitted to return to his old position, but only after he signed the hated oath.45

It is inconceivable that Bolton, who spent nearly every day in the Bancroft Library and then lunched at the faculty club, did not harbor an opinion about the oath. As George Stewart put it, “We woke up, and there was the oath with us in the delusive bright cheeriness of the morning. ‘Oath’ read the headline in the newspaper, and it put a bitter taste into the breakfast coffee. We discussed the oath during lunch at the Faculty Club. And what else was there for subject matter at the dinner table?”46

Bolton’s colleagues and former students on the Berkeley faculty (who by then included George Hammond, Lawrence Kinnaid, James King, Engel Sluiter, and Borah) were all affected by this tumultuous episode. Kantorowicz and history department chair John D. Hicks took leading roles in the developing drama. During this unsettling period, Caughey and Bolton coedited the Chronicles of California series for the University of California Press. Yet Bolton never remarked on the oath in his correspondence with Caughey or anyone else. Why not? He likely thought that the storm would blow over and that in the meantime it was best to say little about it. The vast majority of the faculty signed the oath even though they believed that it was an obnoxious obligation. Bolton was personally acquainted with Sproul and influential Regents (like Ehrman) who were prominently involved in the controversy. Public comment by Bolton would have offended someone, and he had spent his professional lifetime avoiding political contretemps. He probably felt much like his former student Phillip Wayne Powell, professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara. “The whole thing stinks,” Powell wrote to historian Ray Billington, “so I just keep away from it. There has been exaggeration and hysteria on both sides,” he added, “so as friend [Dean] Acheson would put it, I’ll just wait and let the dust settle.”47

We might wish that Bolton had made a ringing defense of academic freedom, or a stirring public denunciation of anti-Semitism, but this would have been out of character. Bolton conciliated power; he did not confront it. In most cases he conformed to societal norms; he did not challenge them.

**FALSE ALLEGATIONS**

So what are we to make of the charges of anti-Semitism against Bolton and in particular the story about Borah? It is impossible to know for
We might wish that Bolton had made a ringing defense of academic freedom, or a stirring public denunciation of anti-Semitism, but this would have been out of character. Bolton conciliated power; he did not confront it. In most cases he conformed to societal norms; he did not challenge them.

certain Bolton’s beliefs about Jews from his public or private writings, but after twenty years of studying Bolton’s voluminous correspondence, I have a basis to make some inferences. First, Bolton’s views about race, religion, and ethnicity changed over time. As a boy, he learned all of the usual prejudices of nineteenth-century America. Education and foreign travel broadened his outlook. Although he was raised as a Methodist, his research into Spanish Catholic missionaries engendered an ecumenical view. It is not too much to suppose that as he developed more inclusive views about Christians, he abandoned (or at least softened) his prejudice against Jews. If this is true, and it seems to me that the preponderance of the evidence shows that it is, we are provided with one example that people can change over time, and sometimes for the better.

There is the less generous interpretation that Bolton supported Jews out of self-interest because of his relationship with Ehrman, who was his benefactor as well as a member of the Board of Regents. Such an interpretation makes Bolton a complicated and scheming personality who was able to suppress his innate prejudices for a prolonged period. If Bolton had been a closet anti-Semite, what are we to make of his critical remarks about racial prejudice to Professor Whitaker? Why would Bolton have actively supported Borah for a position in the University of California in 1948? Still, it must be admitted that we cannot know for certain all of Bolton’s ideas about race in general or Jews in particular.

Bolton is not above reproach in the matter of anti-Semitism. He was acutely aware that most of his academic peers were opposed to hiring Jews. Thus, he identified Jewish applicants in his letters of recommendation for them. There is no defense for this action, but Bolton no doubt felt that it was pointless to plump someone for a job who would be disqualified as soon as his religion was discovered. Judaism was not the only religion that Bolton mentioned in his letters. He sometimes indicated religion when recommending Catholics and Mormons for positions in Catholic and Mormon institutions. Of course, in these cases the revelations amounted to a positive recommendation to the hiring institutions. It is also worth pointing out that in his recommendations, Bolton revealed physical characteristics of applicants that might be deemed objectionable—blindness, a maimed hand, small stature—while praising other attributes, such as good looks, fine physique, and manly qualities. Delightful wives also merited a mention from time to time. Of course, by revealing objectionable qualities, whether they were religious, ethnic, or physical, Bolton was reflecting the established prejudices of his society and academe. To his credit, however, he took Jewish graduate students, worked to get them good jobs, and recommended hiring the
first Jew on the Berkeley history faculty. There is a long list of historians who never did as much. Still, rumors about Bolton’s anti-Semitism live on. Twenty years ago, I wrote an article about his racial views that included some of the material about Nasatir. One of the anonymous referees for the *Pacific Historical Review* wrote that he had been Bolton’s student and that my assessment of Bolton’s attitudes matched his own. I asked the editors if the referee would reveal his name. It was Borah. In 1992, I interviewed Borah and asked him explicitly if Bolton was anti-Semitic. Not to his knowledge, he said. Of course, Bolton had taken him aside and explained that he would have trouble finding work because anti-Semitism was prevalent in academic life, but he never discouraged Borah from pursuing the doctorate. Perhaps this story about Bolton’s frank assessment of lamentable academic conditions was retold and embellished by others so that Bolton became the villain of the piece. Or maybe someone made up the story to smear Bolton for some reason unknown to us. Whatever the case, the charge stuck to Bolton even after I published my essay.48

Not long ago I was telling one of my colleagues about my progress on the Bolton biography. “Oh yes,” he said. “He was anti-Semitic, you know. He kept Borah from getting into the Berkeley history department.” My response, as one might imagine, was lengthy. My friend’s belief about Bolton (now happily disabused) is proof that once someone is touched by the brush of opprobrium it is almost impossible to untar him. The persistence of the story also shows the power of rumor and innuendo to influence opinions even among historians who are trained to critically sift the evidence. The false allegation may be remembered long after careful investigation has revealed it to be groundless.

Rumormongering and scholarship do not meet on the same ground, but they are carried on by the same people. Historians (including the author) are as gossipy as any other group of humans. The story of Bolton’s supposed anti-Semitism reminds us that scandalous stories are remembered and retold but seldom verified.

And what a fine irony that their detractors called Bolton an anti-Semite and Kantorowicz—the Jew he recommended—a Nazi. The truth about these men is much more complicated and instructive than their accusers would have it. We are all caught up in a world that is not of our making; only a few of us make an effort to change it. In Bolton’s case, he quietly did what he could to assist Jews in academe but did not directly challenge the status quo. He could have done more, but at least he did something. Kantorowicz, who had already risked all and lost all in Germany, was prepared to do it again when he challenged the Board of Regents’ loyalty oath. Perhaps because of his experience in Germany, Kantorowicz thought that everything was always at stake, and perhaps he was right.

Rumors about Bolton and Kantorowicz will no doubt persist, but the truth about them deserves wider dissemination. If nothing else, their cases show that the historical record, oral and written, contains ambiguities and outright falsehoods. Sifting that evidence for the truth is the historian’s everlasting challenge.49

**Albert L. Hurtado** is the Paul H. and Doris Eaton Travis Chair in American History and a scholar of Western and Native American History at the University of Oklahoma. He has published several books, scholarly articles, and book chapters, including *Herbert Eugene Bolton: Historian of the American Borderlands* (2012) and *John Sutter: A Life on the North American Frontier* (2006), which won the 2007 John Walton Caughey Book Prize from the Western History Association for the most distinguished book on the history of the American West.
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35 Bolton to Sproul, Apr. 15, 1940, BP Out.

36 Bolton to Marten Ten Hoor, Apr. 2, 1941, BP Out.

37 I have not located a letter of recommendation for Princeton, although it is likely that Bolton wrote one.

38 Borah to Bolton, Oct. 15, 1941, BP In.
39 Borah to Bolton, Feb. 9, 1942, BP In.
40 Borah to Bolton, Mar. 29, 1946, BP In.
41 Bolton to Davis, Aug. 3, 1948, BP Out. See also Bolton to W. O. Aydelotte, July 26, 1948, BP Out.
42 Borah to Bolton, Aug. 24, 1948, BP In.
43 Brucker, May, and Hollinger, History at Berkeley, 53.

45 Ibid., 265. Gardner’s book is the most complete account of the loyalty oath.
R E V I E W S

Edited by James J. Rawls

IMAGES OF THE PACIFIC RIM: AUSTRALIA & CALIFORNIA 1850–1935

By Erika Esau (Sydney, Australia: Power Publications, 2010, 368 pp., $59.95 paper)

REVIEWED BY GARY F. KURUTZ, COAUTHOR OF CALIFORNIA CALLS YOU: THE ART OF PROMOTING THE GOLDEN STATE, 1850–1949 AND PRINCIPAL LIBRARIAN EMERITUS, CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY

Erika Esau, with her magisterial Images of the Pacific Rim: Australia & California 1850–1935, has created an extraordinary comparative cultural history of the Golden State and the “land Down Under.” The story of how this wonderful book came to be is a delight. Born and raised in California, Dr. Esau lived for a short period in the frigid upper Midwest and happily accepted a position at the Australian National University in Canberra teaching the history of Australian art. While developing her curriculum, she noticed a strong affinity with her California roots and the image-making of both Pacific Rim regions. The genesis of her book occurred when she saw an exhibition of Australian tourist posters that included James Northfield’s striking Canberra, Federal Capital & Garden City, Australia. The arches, red-roofed buildings, and enchanting sylvan landscape in the background reminded her not only of home but also of an earlier California citrus box label that incorporated many of the same visual themes. Both Australian poster and California label projected a semitropical paradise.

Ten years in the making, this well-researched and engagingly written large-format volume traces the cultural similarities of these Pacific Rim neighbors from the helter-skelter days of the two gold rushes of the 1850s to the Great Depression and the globalization of cultures and economies in the 1930s. As a native Californian, it was truly illuminating to learn of the profound influence our state had on Australia’s art, architecture, and publishing history.

California has long been recognized for her worldwide influence, but her unique impact on her Pacific neighbor has never been so well articulated. As Esau explains, “My own iconography of place—my sense of what is familiar and comfortable in the landscape as rendered through images—has been determined by my experience in these two cultures of the Pacific Rim. The images and the examples presented in this book suggest that this shared visual template is not simply serendipitous, but is the result of prolonged interaction between two peoples whose societies came of age at the same time, and in an environment that had much in common.”

This binational scholar neatly divides her book into seven robust chapters arranged in chronological order. Topically, she covers such important visual subjects as the daguerreotype in both gold regions; Francis Brett Harte’s famous illustrated poem, The Heathen Chinee, and its inspiration of Joseph C. Johnson’s ethnically diverse Australian painting, The Game of Euchre; the influence of sheet music cover art; the making of the monumental large folio publications of the late 1880s, Picturesque Atlas of Australasia and Picturesque California; and magazines such as Sunset, the Pacific Monthly, and the Automobile Club of Southern California’s Touring Topics. Through all of this, she traces the rapid technological changes in publishing in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that made possible the easy exchange of imagery and ideas and the “Californianising” of Australia. In addition to her cogent analysis of this aesthetic relationship, Esau has made a singular contribution to the publication history of the Pacific Rim by documenting the migration of California artists, engravers, photographers, and craftsmen to this antipodean land.

California’s influence extended dramatically to another art form: architecture. The California bungalow, for instance, became the “bush bungalow” in Australia. In 1915, San Francisco and
San Diego celebrated the completion of the Panama Canal, one with a world’s fair and the other with a regional fair. Both, however, produced architectural models studied and emulated by Australian designers. Hollywood, with its creation of fantasy Ramona-inspired settings, likewise found its way to this Pacific commonwealth. Though lacking an Iberian or Latin American past, red-roofed and whitewashed Spanish and Mission revival buildings became fashionable, as exemplified by the governmental buildings erected in the new capital city of Canberra and the UCLA-like campus of the University of Western Australia.

Australia, as any Californian knows, sent the eucalyptus. The stately tree remains the most enduring reminder of Australia’s affect on the California landscape. The climatic similarities of both regions made the tree a perfect fit. Side-by-side orange and eucalyptus groves became universal symbols of the Golden State. This botanical immigrant, however, has its detractors precisely because it is not native to the region. Esau traces how the ubiquitous eucalyptus was enthusiastically imported by California nurserymen in the 1870s, only to be denigrated by the modernist movement of the late 1920s. Each chapter is supported by scores of endnotes, many of them loaded with additional commentary. The book’s acknowledgments and bibliography attest to Esau’s prodigious research in libraries, archives, and museums on both sides of the Pacific. As a librarian, it is rewarding to see how Esau incorporated ephemera into her book in the form of pictorial letter sheets, playing cards, sheet music, citrus labels, posters, promotional brochures, and trade catalogs. This thick volume is embellished with fabulous illustrations that in themselves are an important primary source and not merely page decorations. As a final fitting touch, the book has dual forewords by Sam Watters of California and Ian Tyrell of Australia. There is one gentle point of criticism: this handsome yet fragile book deserved to be published as a hardbound volume with a dust jacket.

The three singular women with whom we are presented in these publications successfully navigated the social and political turbulence of nineteenth-century America. They shared only a few commonalities, namely that each married, had children, divorced, set about establishing a career with few if any role models, lived in California (at least for a time), and carefully crafted a public persona. Of the three, the most intriguing also happens to be the least known. If the central criminal court building in Los Angeles had not been renamed the Clara Shortridge Foltz Justice Center in 2002, she would have remained mostly unknown in and out of the law profession.

Barbara Babcock skillfully recounts the life of Foltz in Woman Lawyer, the first woman lawyer on the Pacific Coast who successfully brought suit against Hastings Law School for admission of women, the first to serve as legislative counsel, the first to hold statewide office, the first female notary public in California, the first female deputy district attorney, and her greatest legacy, founder of the public defender move-
ment. Even though Babcock clearly likes her subject, she does not shy away from pointing out Foltz’s shortcomings. Foltz demonstrated incredible energy as a lobbyist, lecturer, and jury lawyer, yet she exhibited an inability to focus on a specific aspect of the law to augment her practice. She spread herself thin as an itinerant political lecturer with ventures as a lobbyist and forays into the newspaper business. The author contends that some of Foltz’s more extreme decisions were precipitated by an inordinate need for remunerative employment because she was the sole support for five children. But dramatic and expensive relocations from city to city, including San Jose, San Francisco, New York, Denver, San Diego, and Los Angeles did not help her income. Furthermore, Foltz could not have succeeded if her mother had not provided child care.

*Woman Lawyer* demonstrates the skills of historical research and an insider’s view of the legal profession. Unfortunately, the index is not printed in the book but published online along with other bibliographic information.

Despite this regrettable publishing decision, it is a colorful portrayal of a heretofore unknown in California’s history the history of the field of law. *Frontier Feminist: Clarina Howard Nichols and the Politics of Motherhood* is the biography of a nineteenth-century women’s rights writer and lecturer who is less well known than some of her more radical counterparts. Nichols procured a divorce and custody of her children from a “wanton” husband and, needing to support herself and her children, developed what the authors effectively describe as Nichols’ “politics of motherhood.” It was a brand of women’s rights advocacy, guided by her role as a mother, which exuded the moral authority to extol temperance, abolition, and suffrage. She clung to personal values while lobbying for broader social rights.

The authors convinced this reviewer of Nichols’ rightful place in the history of the American women’s movement by her remarkably early—prior to the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention—editorship of a partisan newspaper in Brattleboro, Vermont. That Nichols main-

...
Can a hash house be gendered? The Emporium’s atrium? A ferry? A sidewalk? In *Women and the Everyday City*, Jessica Ellen Sewell equates the success of the spatial strategies suffragists used to demand ownership over California’s political landscape in 1911 with the tactics upper- and middle-class white women used to claim ownership over ordinary public landscapes in downtown San Francisco a generation earlier. Through their routine activities of riding a streetcar to run household errands, dining in a gender-neutral and modern cafeteria, sipping tea in a ladies dining room at the Fairmont Hotel, and blowing horns on Market Street to celebrate the commencement of a new year, women transformed the imagined landscape of San Francisco’s urban public space. Risqué locations where the presence of “polite women” would have invited rumors of disrepute became integral spaces of women’s everyday lives where their audible, visible presence ceased to be questioned, and even began to be welcomed.

Sewell claims that San Francisco’s suffragists in 1890 had yet to act as full participants of civic life. On the streets, upper- and middle-class women remained bound by rules of etiquette in accordance to their class status. However, the contradictions between San Francisco’s built landscape—with streetcars that invited the eye contact of male passengers, shop windows that required loitering on sidewalks, grocery stores that served a cross-class clientele—and the way those landscapes were imagined and experienced propelled women to resist San Francisco’s gendered worlds of transportation, errands, dining, and spectacle in order to reimagine the city’s everyday, non-political public spaces as their own.

Sewell’s methodology is grounded in theory that is most suitable for an academic audience familiar with cultural landscape and vernacular architecture studies, but her historical evidence to engage the quotidian activities of San Francisco’s women will satisfy any lover of history—academic, public, or otherwise. Guidebooks and etiquette manuals provide insight into San Francisco’s imagined landscape; diaries written by three middle-class white women of divergent social capital shed light on the ways women experienced the city; and photographs, maps, and architectural plans capture the built environment of San Francisco as historical evidence to be analyzed in its own right.

Sewell’s attention to built structures as historical evidence and not simply as spaces where historical events occurred is one of the book’s greatest strengths. With each unfolding page, readers can envision the scaffolding, pavement, shop windows, and columns of Market Street being built before their eyes.

Lovers of San Francisco, supporters of feminism, and admirers of architecture will rejoice at *Women and the Everyday City*’s publication. This impeccably researched book invites readers into the physical world of the women who modified San Francisco to suit the practicalities of their everyday needs. In summoning readers into the city’s “web of interlocking landscapes” (26)—with its streetcars, ferries, lunchrooms, and department stores—*Women and the Everyday City* satisfies any reader’s delight for San Francisco as much as it satisfies any historian’s eye for analysis.
Grave Matters: Excavating California’s Buried Past  

An Archaeology of Desperation: Exploring the Donner Party’s Alder Creek Camp  

Reviewed by Joseph L. Chartoff, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology, Michigan State University, and Coauthor of The Archaeology of California  

These books, though different in core subjects, objectives, and data, both represent well-written, insightful analyses about aspects of California’s historic past and approaches to its exploration. Both studies include important elements involving archaeological excavation and analysis. At the surface, the parallels between the two examinations are not very obvious, but what each one illuminates about ethical research can be enlightening.  

Grave Matters, by Tony Platt, who taught race relations at the University of California at Berkeley, had no prior experience with archaeology. His son died unexpectedly several years ago and the family held his funeral at their coastal Humboldt County cottage. That experience brought Platt into contact with local Native Americans and the hostile attitudes they held toward archaeologists. Platt studied the historical development of archaeology in California. Though some perspectives are statewide, mostly he focuses on coastal Humboldt County. He learned that some of California’s most important early cultural anthropologists, such as Alfred Kroeber, and archaeologists, such as Robert Heizer, showed little respect for Native American religious beliefs, values, and wishes for protection of the remains of ancestors and sacred sites. Instead, such sites were deemed sources of important scientific research data, and Native American wishes for their protection often were ignored.  

Within the past several decades, such archaeological practices have been gradually changing, partly because new state and federal laws and regulations created more protection of such remains, and partly because ethical values among more recently trained archaeologists have been changing. Platt’s discussion sheds light on the evolution of values and relationships between Native Americans and archaeologists, raising readers’ understanding of their foundations.  

An Archaeology of Desperation concerns the Donner Party’s disaster while trying to cross the Sierra in 1846–47. Trapped by blizzards, the party created two tiny villages for shelter, Lake Camp and Alder Creek Camp. Some were rescued, but many others died. Among those who survived, cannibalism was reportedly practiced to avoid starvation, which tainted the group’s reputation. Much has been published about the Donner disaster. This book summarizes the Donner Party’s fate, based on new compilations and interpretations of those records. More than half the book discusses recent archaeological excavations at Alder Creek Camp, where the Donner family took refuge. Much less was known about that site than about the larger Lake Camp. The book’s summaries add significantly to the literature. Some findings add support to document-based interpretations,
while others show contradictions to what has previously been interpreted.

The archaeological findings include many small bone fragments, none of which was human. This was the first archaeological excavation at Alder Creek. It involved application of new scientific technologies of searching and analysis. The lack of direct evidence for cannibalism at Alder Creek marks a major change in our understanding of what may have occurred at the Donner shelter.

In part because this bone analysis did not involve disturbing graves but rather relied on scattered fragments, the archaeological study of the dead from the Donner Party has not generated the same negative reactions as have excavations of Native American graves. However, the camps were stripped of visible surface materials soon after they were abandoned, not only by looters, but also by local Washoe Native Americans who moved all they could find away from the camp in order to help make the camp itself a sacred place. Although their motivation was very different than that of the archaeologists who dug up Native American burials, there are some parallels: Like Platt’s subjects, Washoe members did not request permission from the deceased’s descendants.

Each of these two books is an important contribution to our understanding of California’s past and the means by which it has been researched. Reading both serves as a provocative and insight-stimulating experience.

**CALIFORNIA WOMEN AND POLITICS: FROM THE GOLD RUSH TO THE GREAT DEPRESSION**

*Edited by Robert W. Cherny, Mary Ann Irwin, and Ann Marie Wilson (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2011, 424 pp., $40.00 paper)*

In answering these questions, contributing authors detail the breadth of California women’s activism, ranging from suffrage to protective legislation, from conservation to dance hall regulation. An astute political sense guided women’s actions in both oppositional and more traditional legislative politics. As Linda Heienreich shows, women of Spanish-Mexican descent attempted to use the testimonio to challenge the heroic myth of the Osos, the Anglo men involved in the 1846 Bear Flag revolt. At times, California women’s political sense failed them. In his study of dance hall regulation, Mark Hopkins notes that clubwomen’s efforts to regulate dance halls brought them into direct conflict with working-class women who depended on these lucrative wages.

**EARNING POWER: WOMEN AND WORK IN LOS ANGELES, 1880–1930**

*By Eileen V. Wallis (Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 2010, 272 pp., $39.95 cloth)*

Together, these two volumes examine women’s participation as social, political, and economic actors in California from the 1850s to the 1930s. They contribute to an increasing body of scholarship that explores women’s activism in the West. Middle-class clubwomen, working-class women, immigrant women, Latina women, and Native American women attempted to shape California society to meet their political, social, and workplace agendas. Theirs was not a single, unified purpose, as these works show. Rather, a diverse array of women voiced their ideas and concerns on a great variety of issues in what was a “truly multiracial environment.” (California Women and Politics, p. 341)

California Women and Politics is an anthology of fourteen articles addressing the nature of California women’s activism in politics, broadly defined.
In *Earning Power*, historian Eileen Wallis examines Los Angeles women’s efforts to shape their work and lives from 1880 to 1930. As Wallis shows, clubwomen, union women, and immigrant women all sought to improve conditions for female workers, with sometimes limited success. Clubwomen’s focus on morality, for example, resulted in recreational opportunities and respectable housing for working women but did little to increase their wages. Union organizing foundered on racial and ethnic divides as well as the city’s growing open shop movement, making “long-term change difficult to maintain” (84). A state minimum wage for women met with some success but was rolled back as politics took a more conservative turn in the 1920s. In the end, Wallis concludes, the interaction of gender, race, and ethnicity fundamentally shaped women’s access to work and limited their ability to improve working conditions. Although white women enjoyed clear advantages due to race and ethnicity, these divisions ensured that working women would not be able to organize effectively within or across occupations.

These two volumes provide a more complicated understanding of women’s contributions to politics and the economy in California. California women engaged in a wide range of activism, before and after gaining the vote, in and outside the workplace, but their gains were limited by real divisions along racial, ethnic, and class lines.

**THE LEFT COAST:**
**CALIFORNIA ON THE EDGE**

*By Philip L. Fradkin and Alex L. Fradkin (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011, 126 pp., $29.95 paper)*

**REVIEWED BY JAMES C. WILLIAMS, EMERITUS PROFESSOR, DE ANZA COLLEGE, AND AUTHOR OF ENERGY AND THE MAKING OF MODERN CALIFORNIA**

Philip L. Fradkin has been writing about California for over four decades and has earned enormous respect as one of the state’s leading environmental historians. In *The Left Coast*, he and his son, photographer Alex L. Fradkin, revisit the topic of his first book, *California: The Golden Coast* (1974), to weave a rich tapestry of history, geography, and memoir of the state’s varied and contested 1,264-mile shoreline.

Using a structural device he first adopted in another of his books, *The Seven States of California*, Fradkin identifies the particular uses of eight coasts of California: “The Wild Coast” (Humboldt County’s Sinkyone Wilderness), “The Agricultural Coast” (western Marin County’s Point Reyes area), “The Residential Coast” (Daly City to Half Moon Bay), “The Tourist Coast” (the Monterey Peninsula), “The Recreational Coast” (Santa Monica to Marina del Rey), “The Industrial Coast” (the Port of Los Angeles), “The Military Coast” (San Diego to the Mexican border), and “The Political Coast” (Huntington Beach’s Bolsa Chica Ecological Reserve). Accompanying the text are Alex Fradkin’s splendid color photographs that complement his father’s words in “capturing the shadings and extremes of coastal complexities.” (ix)

Readers should not expect to find the definitive story of California’s coast here, for much is left out. Like Fradkin, this reviewer spent the bulk of his life...
on the Left Coast, sailed boats on the San Francisco and Monterey bays, and combed beaches from San Diego to Arcata. I must admit initial disappointment in finding bypassed the Mendocino and Sonoma coasts, the Russian River, Santa Cruz, Santa Barbara, and other haunts of my life. Moreover, while I am drawn to the title, The Left Coast, I think some readers (particularly non-Californians) will be puzzled that “The Political Coast” omits discussion of San Francisco politics, seemingly the heart and soul of California’s liberalism.

Yet, on reflection, my personal disappointment evaporates and I have little annoyance with what The Left Coast omits. Rather, I find myself again enlightened about my home state, fascinated by the retelling of stories I had forgotten and regaled by newfound stories and ones marginalized in other histories. Through text and image, father and son have sketched a compelling perspective of California’s coast, its environment, its history, and its occupants. If you enjoy California, you will enjoy this book and will, I suspect, give it a prominent spot on your bookshelf.

**Ten Years that Shook the City:** San Francisco 1968–1978

*Reviewed by Mike Miller, Author of a COMMUNITY ORGANIZER’S TALE: PEOPLE AND POWER IN SAN FRANCISCO and Director of Organize Training Center, San Francisco*

Ten Years that Shook the City is a collection of mythical articles on a mythical period in San Francisco history. It reflects the perspectives of the countercultural and radical left of those years—with rare self-criticism, though that might be appropriate forty or fifty years later. Like any good cultural myth, there are truths embedded in this one. Their importance is severely compromised by the incomplete story the book tells and by a different community- and labor-organizing history it omits. (I was the principal organizer for the Mission Coalition Organization, the subject of one of the book’s chapters, and I deeply differed with these revolutionaries then, as I do now.)

There are richly detailed chapters on poetry, murals, the GI antiwar movement, San Francisco State’s student strike, the Los Siete campaign, life on a Bernal Heights street, a young Vietnamese refugee’s high school experience, the fight to save the International Hotel, Native Americans, gays, women, communes, labor reform and Chinatown garment industry organizing, food politics, ecology, posters and comix/comics, music, and counterculture. Excellent reproductions accompany a number of the essays. The book properly pays attention to the central struggle over urban redevelopment, whose bulldozers reshaped San Francisco and demolished minority, elderly, and working-class neighborhoods. Several essays deal with urban renewal and corporate development plans for the San Francisco Bay Area.

The problem with the book begins with its introduction and runs through most essays in the collection: The system is, in Chairman Mao’s term, a “paper tiger” on the edge of collapse. That is the myth repeated in variations on the theme: Amerika (often in those turbulent times spelled with a “k”) is the belly of the beast. Our revolutionary task is to (a) massively disrupt it so it cannot continue its imperial violence abroad and colonial presence in poor and minority communities at home; (b) educate the masses about the nature of their oppression and organize them to overthrow the system; or (c) create enclaves where alternatives can develop. These include utopian rural communities and urban “community controlled” neighborhoods—based on the faulty assumption that “communities” or “community-based nonprofits” could be self-determining using legislation they didn’t pass, appropriations and grants they didn’t control, and guidelines they didn’t write. Even bus routes are changed to fit the story line. The #22 Fillmore doesn’t go to China-
town, though in the book that is its destination.

There are several problems in the myth: the beast was more resilient than its disrupters anticipated; “the people” had other ideas about how to pursue their goals and who their leaders would be in that pursuit; and the enemy can also be us—as the multiple failures of communes and other sectarian divisions suggest.

Only the Mission District defeated urban renewal, and did it several times. Neither third-world revolutionaries nor new communitarians were the leaders of that effort. The irony escapes these writers as they continue to inaccurately dismiss the “liberal reformist” Mission Coalition Organization (MCO) and Saul Alinsky’s (he gets positive mention in the ecology essay) radicalism, which influenced MCO, and the also-discussed Western Addition Community Organization (WACO). Only Tomas Sandoval’s “‘All Those Who Care About the Mission, Stand Up with Me!’: Latino Community Formation and the Mission Coalition Organization” seeks to fairly portray MCO and the Mission Council on Redevelopment (MCOR) that preceded it.

Perhaps those ten years were “revolutionary times.” But revolutionary times elicit counterrevolution, and revolutionaries need to be careful that they do not provoke a reaction bigger than their own action. The revolutionaries of that period ignored this rule of revolution. We still live with the consequences. Let us hope that the Occupy Wall Street movement doesn’t repeat those mistakes.
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From 1945 to 1972, the Manzanar War Relocation Center, an internment camp in Inyo County for Japanese American citizens and resident aliens during World War II, lay deserted and disremembered—a forgotten and hidden part of the state’s history. By the mid-1970s, individuals and state organizations had begun to reverse this trend. While the camp’s war-era familiarity is part of the photographic record, few images document the camp’s neglect after it closed in 1945. This abandoned car was photographed in 1973, one of a number of images made by James S. Brust during his visit to Manzanar (see “Manzanar in 1973,” pages 24–37) that are now part of the Manzanar National Historic Site archives.
Proclaimed as a contemporary “Cathedral of Commerce,” the department store at 3050 Wilshire Blvd. in Los Angeles opened on September 26, 1929. Designed by John and Donald Parkinson, it is recognized by architectural historians as one of the finest art deco buildings in the United States.

Hailed as the first suburban department store, Bullocks Wilshire was one of the very first to cater to southern California’s growing automobile-centered population. Its 241-foot central tower could be seen from afar by motorists. The exterior façade was clad in architectural terra cotta by Gladding, McBean. Unfortunately, Bullock’s did not survive the great recession of the 1990s and closed in April 1993. Today, the building is occupied by the Southwestern Law School.

Before it opened to the public, the Mott Studios of Los Angeles made over 400 exterior and interior views of this striking art deco emporium. Founded by J. Howard Mott, the Mott Studios in the early 1920s was one of California’s foremost architectural photography firms. Its clients included such prestigious architectural firms as S. Charles Lee; Morgan, Walls, & Clements; Parkinson and Parkinson; John C. Austin; and Walker and Eisen. Mr. Mott died in a fishing accident in 1937, and Bernard Merge continued the business until his retirement in the 1960s. The California State Library houses over 40,000 of the studio’s positive prints and negatives, making it an essential resource for the study of twentieth-century California architecture.

GARY F. KURUTZ
In this absorbing exhibition of nearly 300 items, rarely seen works of art, personal letters, architectural drawings, photographs, and artifacts bring to life the history of the Golden Gate and the ambitious vision and determination to span it. Objects on loan from more than a dozen cultural and public institutions and private lenders join highlights from the California Historical Society’s collections in this celebration of the 75th anniversary of the bridge’s completion.