



NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE  
**Humanities**

DIVISION OF RESEARCH PROGRAMS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 12, 2015

TO: Participants, NEH Workshop

FROM: John D. Cox  
Senior Program Officer, NEH Division of Research  
(202) 208-7099 ([jcox@neh.gov](mailto:jcox@neh.gov))

SUBJECT: Review of applications for mock panel

The attached applications are for the mock panel portion of the application-writing workshop on Tuesday, March 19. To get the most out of the session, please read the applications and assign each a rating using the attached rating scale and evaluation criteria. Please keep in mind that these applications have been selected for a particular purpose: that is, to give workshop participants a chance to consider three approaches to crafting applications. They are not intended to serve as models, nor are they intended, by virtue of their subjects, to suggest a particular area of Endowment interest. Applications for NEH awards are as diverse, in both subject matter and methodology, as the applicants who submit them.

These proposals were submitted to NEH. For reasons of confidentiality, we have omitted cover sheets, résumés, and letters of recommendation for this exercise.

I look forward to meeting with you on the 19th.

Attachments

### NEH Fellowships

Fellowships support individuals pursuing advanced research that is of value to humanities scholars, general audiences, or both. Recipients usually produce articles, monographs, books, digital materials, archaeological site reports, translations, editions, or other scholarly resources in the humanities. Projects may be at any stage of development.

Fellowships support continuous full-time work for a period of six to twelve months.

### Rating Scale:

E = Excellent

VG = Very Good

G = Good

SM = Some Merit

NC = Not Competitive

Sorry, NEH does not allow split ratings (e.g. VG/G or E/NC) or other types of shading (e.g. VG- or G++).

### Criteria for Evaluation:

Evaluators are asked to apply the following five criteria when judging the quality of applications.

1. The intellectual significance of the proposed project, including its value to humanities scholars, general audiences, or both.
2. The quality or promise of quality of the applicant's work as an interpreter of the humanities.
3. The quality of the conception, definition, organization, and description of the project and the applicant's clarity of expression.
4. The feasibility of the proposed plan of work, including, when appropriate, the soundness of the dissemination and access plans.
5. The likelihood that the applicant will complete the project.

Fellowships support projects at any stage of development.

## The Work of Attribution in the Age of Anonymous Publication

My current book project, *THE WORK OF ATTRIBUTION IN THE AGE OF ANONYMOUS PUBLICATION*, takes up one of the great unanswered questions in the history of authorship and reading: namely, how individual readers in the period and region we tend to credit with the invention of modern authorship—the eighteenth-century Anglophone Atlantic—dealt with that era’s unprecedented proliferation of anonymous and pseudonymous publications. That is, by our usual accounts, it was in the eighteenth century that most writers became authors in the conventionally understood sense of the term: individuals who owned and could sell what they had written, possessed a certain moral authority over their productions, and could be held legally liable for them. Collectively, these various aspects of what Michel Foucault has influentially termed “the author function” allowed “the author’s name” to serve as “a principle of unity in writing” capable of explaining the various features of a text, resolving any apparent contradictions, and otherwise individuating a given oeuvre. Problems with this narrative arise, however, as soon as one acknowledges the sheer prevalence of anonymous and pseudonymous publication in the period: in some genres, such as the novel, upwards of 80 percent of what appeared did so without any indication of authorship and so, the current scholarship would seem to imply, any real chance of participating in this epochal transformation of literary culture. Clearly, such a perfunctory rejection of so much of the extant evidence would be both historically unjust and theoretically unsatisfying. What we need is a nuanced and detailed account of the fate of authorial names in the Anglophone Atlantic world that connects their uses and effects (and the uses and effects of their absence) to the emergence of modern authorship. I propose that the best place to start is with individual readers.

The letters, diaries, marginalia, catalogs, and book bindings that I have uncovered in my research to date collectively suggest that readers in the eighteenth-century British Atlantic were guessing at the authorship of anonymous or pseudonymous publications on an almost daily basis and were doing so in far more complex and self-interested ways than our scholarship has hitherto allowed. That is, speculative attribution on the part of individual readers was a practice central to literary culture in ways that we have hardly begun to acknowledge. Indeed, as bibliographers have long reminded us, for some genres and modes of publication in this period, anonymity and pseudonymity were close to the norm. To cite only the most canonical of examples, it is worth remembering that authorial names appear nowhere in the earliest editions of *THE RAPE OF THE LOCK*, *THE SPECTATOR*, *ROBINSON CRUSOE*, the *ELEGY WRITTEN IN A COUNTRY CHURCHYARD*, *THE WAY TO WEALTH*, *COMMON SENSE*, *THE COQUETTE*, or *PRIDE AND PREJUDICE*. The absence of such names hardly indicates any lack of readerly interest in authorship, however; it simply shifts the burden of attribution to individual readers. Even the most cursory survey of the traces left by avid readers on both sides of the Atlantic will turn up constant speculation as to who wrote what. Sometimes these guesses come off as playful, other times quite frantic. More often than not, they are inaccurate by modern scholarly standards (although often in deeply revealing ways). Invariably, though, these surmises testify to a clear desire among readers to put names to texts and thereby assign them an origin, even (or perhaps especially) when simple veracity was not the most obvious or dominant motive.

On the basis of this research, I contend that we cannot understand the emergence and functions of authorship in the eighteenth century without comprehending the ways in which readers perceived and engaged with authorial names (or the absence thereof). That is, the modern author function is as much the collective creation “from below” of myriad individual

readers as it is the product of any of the various institutions or heroic writers to which its invention has been traditionally credited.

Accordingly, *THE WORK OF ATTRIBUTION IN THE AGE OF ANONYMOUS PUBLICATION* traces the sustained negotiations between readers and writers over the course of the long eighteenth century concerning who had the authority to define an author's oeuvre and so shape the reputation by which he or she would be known. In the later seventeenth century, many readers felt free to construct radically different versions of an oeuvre depending on their respective visions of that author's reputation. For example, for some readers who were wedded to the notion that John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, was the supreme incarnation of the libertine wit, anything remotely bawdy from the 1670s was self-evidently the work of Rochester. For other readers, devoted to a counter-conception of Rochester as the ultimate deathbed penitent, those same poems were obviously the work of another—any other—hand. For still others, the contours of the canon of Rochester's verse were determined by their desire to enlist him in a particular cause: since he was a known libertine and libertines were devoted to liberty, any work that promotes the liberty of the subject against the monarch must be by Rochester. In short, the work attributed to Rochester not only varied widely, but did so according to readers' preexisting conceptions of "Rochester." Nor was this a dynamic peculiar to the case of Rochester: my research suggests that in the later seventeenth century, an author's oeuvre and reputation were widely felt to be both malleable and ultimately subject to the often self-interested judgment of individual readers.

At the other end of the period that I am marking out for investigation stands the curious collusion of readers on both sides of the Atlantic with Sir Walter Scott and his publishers in order to keep the authorship of the Waverley novels an open secret until Scott deigned to reveal himself. Scott's name had been privately passed around as the probable "Author of Waverley" for upwards of a decade before he openly acknowledged his work. Yet, for the most part, readers kept their attributions to themselves and their close friends, apparently out of respect for the Author of Waverley's desire to conceal his identity. Acknowledging the Waverley novels was generally felt to be their Author's business and so not a proper topic for public speculation.

What most intrigues me about these two episodes is how we get from one to the other, how the defiantly independent readers of the late seventeenth century became the deferential readers of the early nineteenth century and how this transformation in turn shaped the emergence of modern authorship. How, in short, did the very notion of an author's reputation and oeuvre get redefined from being an object of readerly debate, in which the author was at best an equal participant, into a kind of authorial property, upon which readers infringed at their peril?

As befits a problem in literary and cultural history, my solution takes the form of a narrative, which I divide into four chronological parts, each covering a roughly forty-year stage within the overall transformation I am tracing between 1670 and 1830. In each part, I reconstruct the attribution practices of a host of individual readers from around the British Atlantic, consider how their practices vary by genre and medium (print, manuscript, oral performance), and show what light those practices can cast upon authorship and literary culture more generally. In my first part (covering the late seventeenth century), this reconstruction enables us to consider the ways in which attribution was often treated as a readerly prerogative, especially in the realms of manuscript circulation, political controversy, and the public stage. Part Two focuses on the somewhat lowered stakes of attribution in the first half of the eighteenth century, at least by comparison with the previous era, and how the prospect of attribution's becoming an urban pastime shaped authorial production, most notably among periodical writers and would-be satirists. My third part takes up the mid- to late eighteenth-century's fascination

with pseudonymity and ever-expanding collected editions as the sign of an increasingly urgent, yet still playful desire among many readers to locate authorship in a specific body. Part Four examines the ways in which some early nineteenth-century authors, most notably Scott and Washington Irving, were able to persuade their readers to respect and play along with their pseudonymity, while others, including Byron, failed quite spectacularly at the same gambit.

I am framing this project as a transatlantic inquiry because my research indicates that the pace and particular trajectory of the overall transformations I am describing varied considerably along geographical lines, no doubt because readers often relied upon what could be termed literary gossip in order to make an attribution and so were subject to the lags and customary routes of provincial and imperial communications more generally. Jonathan Swift may have been exaggerating when he insisted that “twenty miles from London no body understands hints, initial letters, or town-facts and passages,” but his intuition that geography helped to shape reading practices is borne out again and again in the archive, as is his insinuation that the felt relationship individual readers had with other parts of the nation and the empire necessarily colored their perception of texts stemming from those parts (not to mention writing thought to be local in origin). Only by considering the Anglophone Atlantic as a whole, then, can we properly gauge the range and variety of attribution practices in the period: what the stakes of pinning a given author on a particular text were thought to be, how those stakes varied across time and space and genre and medium, and, of course, how authorial names functioned in the broader literary culture.

Building upon the work I have already done for my prize-winning “‘Haywood,’ Secret History, and the Politics of Attribution,” and that which I will do this July as part of a Summer Institute on “Benjamin Franklin: Reader, Writer, Printer” at the National Humanities Center, I expect to have completed most of the remainder of my research for this project before my fellowship begins. Much of this work can be done with the rich collections at Ohio State (which I have helped to build up with this project in mind), but I do anticipate making a number of targeted research trips to particular collections, including the American Antiquarian Society, the Harry Ransom Center, and the Beinecke and Walpole libraries at Yale. By the start of my fellowship, I will also have drafted Parts One and Two, presented a portion of my argument to the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, and circulated a lengthy and theoretically pointed overview of the project for discussion at the McNeil Center for Early American Studies (at the University of Pennsylvania)’s September 2006 conference on “The Atlantic World of Print in the Age of Franklin.” During the time funded by the NEH, I will concentrate on drafting Parts Three and Four, pursuing the new leads that inevitably come up in the process of writing, and polishing the entire narrative with the goal of having a completed manuscript ready for submission to the University of Pennsylvania Press by early 2008. Penn is the publisher of my first book and has already expressed interest in this new project.

By reconstructing both the general transformation of Anglophone attribution practices over the long eighteenth century and the significant generic, geographical, and medial variations within that transformation, I hope to significantly change the ways in which we think about authorship, both in the eighteenth century and today. In particular, I want to restore attribution to its proper place as a complex and often contested practice in literary culture, rather than the straightforward forensic exercise it now too often seems. This, I hope, will in turn better help us see both how much local agency and collective power individual readers have exerted over time and how an author’s signing (and thereby acknowledging) a text has itself historically been a charged practice, not merely the unremarkable norm of today.

## Bibliography

Much of my research for this project involves the letters, diaries, and marginalia of individual eighteenth-century readers, along with a host of magazines, library and sales catalogs, newspapers, title pages, and miscellaneous pamphlets from all over the Anglophone Atlantic world. Given the length constraints of this bibliography, I will confine myself to listing some of the principal scholarship with which I will be engaged. N.B. beyond my own “‘Haywood,’ Secret History, and the Politics of Attribution” and John Mullan’s “Dryden’s Anonymity,” almost nothing has been done on eighteenth-century attribution practices per se. Rather, the scholarship on attribution, including Harold Love’s recent *ATTRIBUTING AUTHORSHIP*, has concerned itself almost exclusively with forensic, “did he or didn’t he”-type questions. Such inquiries are an important and valuable part of textual editing, but of rather limited use in the history of reading.

- THE BRITISH ATLANTIC WORLD, 1500-1800, ed. David Armitage and Michael J. Braddock. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Brown, Richard D. *KNOWLEDGE IS POWER: THE DIFFUSION OF INFORMATION IN EARLY AMERICA, 1700-1865*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE BOOK IN BRITAIN, VOL. 4: 1557-1695, ed. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF THE BOOK IN BRITAIN, VOL. 5: 1695-1830, ed. Michael Turner and Michael Suarez. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming.
- Colley, Linda. *CAPTIVES: BRITAIN, EMPIRE, AND THE WORLD, 1600-1850*. London: J. Cape, 2002.
- THE COLONIAL BOOK IN THE ATLANTIC WORLD, ed. Hugh Amory and David D. Hall. Worcester: American Antiquarian Society, 2000.
- Duncan, Ian. *SCOTT’S SHADOW: THE NOVEL IN ROMANTIC EDINBURGH*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, forthcoming.
- Gallagher, Catherine. *NOBODY’S STORY: THE VANISHING ACTS OF WOMEN WRITERS IN THE MARKETPLACE, 1670-1820*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Griffin, Robert J. “Anonymity and Authorship.” *NEW LITERARY HISTORY* 30 (1999): 877-95.
- Hammond, Brean S. *PROFESSIONAL IMAGINATIVE WRITING IN ENGLAND, 1670-1740: ‘HACKNEY FOR BREAD’*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- HISTORY OF THE BOOK IN CANADA, VOL. 1: BEGINNINGS TO 1840, ed. Patricia Lockhart Fleming, Gilles Gallichan, and Yvan Lamonde. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Holland, Peter. “David Garrick: ‘3dly, as an Author.’” *STUDIES IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY CULTURE* 25 (1996): 39-62.
- Johns, Adrian. *THE NATURE OF THE BOOK: PRINT AND KNOWLEDGE IN THE MAKING*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Kewes, Paulina. *AUTHORSHIP AND APPROPRIATION: WRITING FOR THE STAGE IN ENGLAND, 1660-1720*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Love, Harold. *SCRIBAL PUBLICATION IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Moretti, Franco. *ATLAS OF THE EUROPEAN NOVEL, 1800-1900*. London: Verso, 1998.
- Mullan, John. “Dryden’s Anonymity.” In *THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO JOHN DRYDEN*, ed. Steven N. Zwicker, 156-80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- North, Marcy L. *THE ANONYMOUS RENAISSANCE: CULTURES OF DISCRETION IN TUDOR-STUART ENGLAND*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Rogers, Pat. “Nameless Names: Pope, Curll, and the Uses of Anonymity.” *NEW LITERARY HISTORY* 33 (2002): 233-45.
- Shields, David S. *CIVIL TONGUES AND POLITE LETTERS IN BRITISH AMERICA*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
- St. Clair, William. *THE READING NATION IN THE ROMANTIC PERIOD*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Steele, Ian. *THE ENGLISH ATLANTIC, 1675-1740: AN EXPLORATION OF COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNITY*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Warner, Michael. *THE LETTERS OF THE REPUBLIC: PUBLICATION AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Zwicker, Steven N. *LINES OF AUTHORITY: POLITICS AND ENGLISH LITERARY CULTURE, 1649-1689*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993.

## The Edge of the Woods: A Spatial History of Iroquoia, 1666-1777

Historians and anthropologists have since the 1950s made the Iroquois among the most-studied of all Native American societies. The geographical location of the constituent nations of the Iroquois League in between competing French and English empires in northeastern North America conferred on them a critical role in the commercial and diplomatic rivalries of the colonial era. Additionally, Iroquois occupancy and influence over what became a disputed border region generated a rich trove of archival materials for subsequent analysis. Yet despite the volume of attention that has been paid to the Iroquois, their historical experience remains incompletely understood.

Despite significant methodological innovations during the second half of the twentieth century, much of colonial-era North American historiography continues to anticipate the conquest of the continent's indigenous population by settler society. Scholarly emphasis on introduced diseases, technologies, and economic pressures has led to a conception of European contact as initiating an inevitable process of Native American cultural demise. In the case of Iroquois studies this tendency is accompanied by longstanding influences from evolutionist anthropology and its interest in reconciling the pre-Columbian Iroquoian past with the post-colonial present. Historians and anthropologists, whether interested in Iroquois acculturation to Euro-American norms or in tracing Iroquois resistance to colonialism, have to date focused much of their attention on tracing the survival of “authentic” fragments of “traditional” Iroquoian culture through time. Ethnographic information obtained from informants or via participant observation in the nineteenth or twentieth century “ethnographic present” has been projected back in time and validated (or not) by comparison to earlier documented examples of similar practices and customs. This approach results in a portrayal of Iroquois culture as a static inventory of behavioral and mental patterns. It renders the Iroquois experience in extra- or even anti-historical terms by emphasizing only those elements deemed impervious to change over time.

This problem is clearly illustrated in the context of Iroquoian spatial history. Scholars have long identified fixed localities in clearly bounded spaces as the fundamental analytical units of authentic Iroquois culture. Replicating the rhetoric of early colonizers, this construction of indigenous Iroquoian authenticity keys on the sedentary, agricultural component of Iroquoian territorial practices as the most enduring, legitimate, and “civilized” form, which ostensibly explains its survival into the postcolonial ethnographic present. Spatial mobility by Iroquois people has in contrast been severely constrained under circumstances of colonialism, and therefore has been largely invisible in the ethnographic present. Iroquoian mobility has thus been rendered “inauthentic” and even “primitive” in character, given its longstanding association with hunting and gathering. This interpretive bias, which dates from the nineteenth-century studies of Lewis Henry Morgan, has precluded an understanding of the significant extent to which freedom of movement affected Iroquois relations with the settler colonies on the borders of their homelands during the late precolonial period of their history: the time between the conclusion of an era of initial, irregular contacts with Europeans (circa 1608-1666) and their descent to colonized status after the American Revolutionary War.

Interdisciplinary in scope, this study combines a comprehensive examination of manuscript sources (many unpublished and hitherto neglected) with analysis of archaeological reports and close reading of Iroquoian ethnographic literature. While remaining conscious of the limits of documentary materials generated by cultural outsiders to (non-literate) historic Iroquois society, this study nevertheless breaks important new ground by incorporating extensive research in

French-language archival sources into what has been to date essentially anglophone research into the Iroquois past. Comprehensive, integrative analysis of this expanded evidentiary base (consisting of bilingual documentary sources, archaeological data, and ethnology) permits the Iroquois to emerge more clearly as historical actors in their own right.

This study recasts late precolonial Iroquois history into a field whose subjects are no longer considered as naturally anchored in fixed, bounded localities. It argues that spatial mobility represented a successful Iroquoian engagement with the pressures and opportunities generated by settler colonialism on the borders of their homelands. The project privileges an understanding of Iroquoian homelands as extensive spaces encompassing wide-ranging, dynamic, and multifaceted networks of relationships that sustained shared cultural identity and adjusted fundamental social institutions to evolving circumstances. By combining examination of the history of internal Iroquoian social relations with a comprehensive analysis of Iroquois foreign relations, it enables a fuller understanding of the ways in which Iroquois spaces, places, and identities were historically imagined, enacted, contested, and enforced. The project also provides a new appreciation of the extent of Iroquois initiative in their multifaceted engagements with (rather than flight from) the circumstances of colonialism during a critical period of their history.

Between 1666 and 1777, the “Edge of the Woods” ritual assumed special importance in Iroquoian social history. Iroquois people employed the spatial mobility this ritual supported to undertake fundamental shifts in their use and conceptualization of their homelands. This study employs a close analysis of the “Edge of the Woods” ritual as a means of understanding how the Iroquois, who appeared increasingly divided and scattered to contemporary European observers, worked to maintain unity on fundamental cultural values essential to their survival after European intrusions on the borders of their territory. The “Edge of the Woods” ritual, which originated prior to European contact as a component of the Iroquois Condolence ceremony, organizes the grieving process for deceased leaders and facilitates their replacement with living candidates. During the late precolonial era, the “Edge of the Woods” accomplished significant social, political, and cultural work for the purpose of Iroquoian community maintenance. As a performative ceremony displaying a sophisticated analytical framework, the “Edge of the Woods” demonstrated the necessity of spatial mobility to the restoration and reinvention of the Iroquoian social order. The foundational structure of the “Edge of the Woods” requires travel by “clear-minded” persons to a mourning village in order to initiate the procedures of condolence and requickening. The “Edge of the Woods” served as a crucial cultural convention for ordering Iroquoian movement in space during the late precolonial era, a period of rapidly changing sociopolitical conditions. As a rite of passage (in both the spiritual and spatial senses), it remade Iroquois individuals, communities, and the Iroquoian polity as a whole through symbolic acts of physical, social, and spiritual purification, while simultaneously dramatizing the vital role played by spatial mobility in the aspirations, needs, and functional rhythms of personal and collective Iroquois life.

Spatial mobility changed the geographical reckoning of late precolonial Iroquoian homelands to encompass an increasingly larger territory while simultaneously accommodating relations between increasing numbers of Iroquoian peoples living at greater distances from one another. Overturning assumptions of steady demographic decline, data from previously untapped sources indicates that the Iroquois managed substantial population growth between 1700 and 1777 by shifting from nucleated to dispersed settlement patterns, and by the deliberate, voluntary relocation of individuals, families, clans, and even entire villages from early contact-era homelands in modern upstate New York to affiliated communities in pre-contact areas of use and occupancy in the St. Lawrence River valley and modern Ohio. These intentional, planned



population movements placed Iroquois peoples athwart the two principal axes of Anglo-French intercolonial conflict and expansion between 1667 and 1763. Located between competing European colonial empires, the Iroquois positioned themselves to take advantage of the communications links provided by these new, affiliated communities. They employed an enhanced base of empirical knowledge of their colonial neighbors to adjust their internal governance and to craft (after 1701) a policy of diplomatic neutrality that enabled them to sustain patterns of mobility that contributed to stability within their homelands. Additionally, the spatial dispersal and convergence of Iroquois people in accordance with seasonal, strategic, or sacred exigencies rendered impossible efforts by colonial authorities to fix the Iroquois in predictable administrative units. Mobility thus created a vital spatial context for the exercise of Iroquois political power.

Commitment to spatial mobility and its exercise circa 1666 to 1777 allowed Iroquois people to retain far greater degree of external political influence and internal social cohesion than historians have hitherto acknowledged or understood. Mobility supported a broad repertoire of cultural tools to confront the challenges and opportunities posed by settler colonialism in ways that would become substantially more difficult after the American Revolution, when spatial confinement on reservations constricted the creative role of mobility in Iroquois society and marked them as colonized peoples. By asserting the vitality and complexity of the relationship between spatial mobility and sense of place in understandings of Iroquois culture history, this study reveals the problems inherent in contemporary understandings of historical Iroquois spaces as localized bounded containers. During the late precolonial period, a distinctive Iroquoian identity evolved and endured not because Iroquois people remained rooted in place but rather because they forged new, effective routes for associating with one another.

This study, through its reassessment of the history of Iroquois spatial mobility, offers a substantial revision of existing understandings of Iroquoian identity construction and the structure and function of Iroquoian governance. By attending to meanings and metaphors associated with movement in Iroquois epistemology, specifically those present in the “Edge of the Woods” ritual, it questions the localism inherent in many commonly-held assumptions about Iroquois culture history and challenges existing narratives of inevitable decline in historical and anthropological scholarship on the Iroquois. By foregrounding the experience of Iroquois historical actors in the context of their own times rather than as harbingers of a known future, it emphasizes complexity and contingency in the historical analysis of colonial North America.

This project expands my dissertation extensively in its interpretive scope, its research base, and its chronology (covering an additional sixty years). Only two dissertation chapters will be incorporated into the eight-chapter book (albeit with extensive changes). The project's findings have been enriched by post-dissertation archival research in the New York State Archives, the New-York Historical Society, the Huntington Library, and a return to the National Archives of Canada for a more systematic survey and study of French-language materials. Incorporation of these French sources will permit this study of late precolonial Iroquois history to rest on the most comprehensive analysis of archival holdings ever undertaken. All research materials for the six new chapters have been collected. The project is under contract as a book manuscript and due at Michigan State University Press in August 2007. I have a paid study leave from Cornell University during the Fall 2006 semester during which time I expect to draft the first three chapters. I am seeking support from the NEH in the amount of \$24,000 for a six-month sabbatical leave (between January and July 2007), that will enable me to draft the final five chapters and meet my publisher's deadline.

## Bibliography

### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### PRINCIPAL ARCHIVAL MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

*British Library, London, England. Additional Manuscripts.*

*British National Archives, Kew, England. Colonial Office Papers (Classes 5, 34, 42)*

*Henry E. Huntington Library (San Marino, CA). William Blathwayt Papers; Loudoun Collection of Americana.*

*Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, PA). Penn Family Papers; Richard Peters Papers.*

*Kroch Library, Cornell University (Ithaca, NY). George Hyde Clarke Family Papers.*

*Massachusetts Archives, Colonial Series, Indian Affairs, vols.27-36 (microfilm).*

*National Archives of Canada, Ottawa, ON MG1, France, Archives Nationales, Archives des Colonies (microfilm) Série B, 189 vols., Lettres Envoyées, Canada, 1663-1774. Série C11A, 128 vols., Correspondence Générale, Canada, 1458-1784. Série C11G, 12 vols., Correspondence Raudot-Pontchartrain, Domaine d'Occident et Île Royale, 1677-1758. Série F3, 287 vols., Collection Moreau de St. Méry, 1750-1819. RG 10, vols.1819-1821, Minutes of the Albany Commissioners of Indian Affairs, 1723-1755*

*New-York Historical Society (New York, NY). Goldsbroow Banyar Papers; Daniel Horsmanden Papers; Livingston Family Papers.*

*New York State Archives (Albany, NY). Series A1894, New York (Colony) Council Papers. 103 vols., 1664-1781; Series A1895, New York (Colony) Council Minutes. 31 vols., 1668-1783 Records of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (microfilm)*

*William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan (Ann Arbor). George Clinton Papers, 1743-1753; Thomas Gage Papers; Native American History Collection.*

#### PRINTED DOCUMENTS

*Colden, Cadwallader. THE HISTORY OF THE FIVE INDIAN NATIONS DEPENDING ON THE PROVINCE OF NEW YORK IN AMERICA. 2 vols. London, 1727-1747.*

*Fortescue, J.W. et al., eds. CALENDAR OF STATE PAPERS, COLONIAL SERIES:AMERICA AND WEST INDIES. 39 vols., London, 1860-1994.*

*O'Callaghan, E.B., ed. THE DOCUMENTARY HISTORY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. 4 vols., Albany, 1849-1851.*

*O'Callaghan, E.B., and Berthold Fernow, eds., DOCUMENTS RELATIVE TO THE COLONIAL HISTORY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. 15 vols., Albany, 1853-1887.*

*RAPPORT DE L'ARCHIVISTE DU PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC. 47 vols., Québec, 1920-1969.*

*Sullivan, James L. et al, eds., THE PAPERS OF SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON. 14 vols., Albany, 1921-1965.*

*Thwaites, Reuben G., ed., THE JESUIT RELATIONS AND ALLIED DOCUMENTS: TRAVELS AND EXPLORATIONS OF THE JESUIT MISSIONARIES IN NEW FRANCE, 1610-1791. 73 vols., Cleveland, 1896-1901.*

#### SECONDARY SCHOLARSHIP

*Aquila, Richard. THE IROQUOIS RESTORATION: IROQUOIS DIPLOMACY ON THE COLONIAL FRONTIER. Detroit, 1983.*

*Basso, Keith. WISDOM SITS IN PLACES: LANDSCAPE AND LANGUAGE AMONG THE WESTERN APACHE. Albuquerque, 1996.*

*Carter, Paul. THE ROAD TO BOTANY BAY: AN ESSAY IN SPATIAL HISTORY. London, 1987.*

*Dennis, Matthew. CULTIVATING A LANDSCAPE OF PEACE: IROQUOIS- EUROPEAN ENCOUNTERS IN SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NORTH AMERICA. Ithaca, 1993.*

*Engelbrecht, William. IROQUOIA: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIVE WORLD. Syracuse, 2003.*

*Fenton, William. THE GREAT LAW AND THE LONGHOUSE: A POLITICAL HISTORY OF THE IROQUOIS CONFEDERACY. Norman, OK, 1998.*

*Jennings, Francis. THE AMBIGUOUS IROQUOIS EMPIRE: THE COVENANT CHAIN CONFEDERATION OF INDIAN TRIBES WITH ENGLISH COLONIES FROM ITS BEGINNINGS TO THE LANCASTER TREATY OF 1744. New York, 1984.*

*Richter, Daniel. THE ORDEAL OF THE LONGHOUSE: THE PEOPLES OF THE IROQUOIS LEAGUE IN THE ERA OF EUROPEAN COLONIZATION. Chapel Hill, 1992.*

*Richter, Daniel, and James H. Merrell, eds. BEYOND THE COVENANT CHAIN: THE IROQUOIS AND THEIR NEIGHBORS IN INDIAN NORTH AMERICA, 1600-1800. Syracuse, 1987.*

*Taylor, Alan. THE DIVIDED GROUND. NY, 2006.*

*Wallace, Anthony F.C. THE DEATH AND REBIRTH OF THE SENECA. New York, 1969.*

*White, Richard. THE MIDDLE GROUND: INDIANS, EMPIRES, AND REPUBLICS IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION, 1650-1815. Cambridge, 1991.*

*Wolf, Eric. EUROPE AND THE PEOPLE WITHOUT HISTORY. Berkeley, 1982.*

## PROJECT STATEMENT

### Animals and Empire:

### The Tokyo Imperial Zoological Gardens and the Making of Modern Japan

The strangest thing that ever happened at the Tokyo Imperial Zoological Gardens was the massacre of the zoo's most famous and valuable animals in the summer of 1943.\* In that summer, as the Japanese Empire teetered on the brink of collapse, Ôdachi Shigeo, who would go on to become Home Minister in 1945, was recalled from his post as the Imperial Mayor of Occupied Singapore to become Tokyo's first Governor General, a powerful new position created to prepare the capital for Allied invasion. Ôdachi knew that the mass death and hardship of the frontlines would soon come home to Tokyo, but when he arrived in the city he found newspaper headlines filled with stories of Japanese triumph and a population woefully "out of touch with the real war situation." Faced with the question of how to mobilize a populace numb from years of propaganda and exhausted by more than a decade of conflict, Ôdachi initiated one of the most surreal events of the war: the mass mediated sacrifice of the zoo's hugely popular animals. Choreographed to shock depleted Tokyoites into the recognition that they, too, might soon be called upon to sacrifice themselves for emperor and nation, the bizarre ritual was replicated in each of the empire's thirty three zoos, institutions with a combined annual attendance in excess of ten million people in 1942.

The Great Zoo Massacre, as I have chosen to call this event, may be strangest thing that ever happened at the Tokyo Zoo, but it was neither the first nor the last time the institution was made to address the concerns of the nation. This application seeks support for the completion of a book manuscript introducing readers to the cultural and environmental history of the Tokyo Imperial Zoological Gardens, Japan's first modern zoo, opened to the public as part of the Ueno National Museum complex in 1882.

It is widely known that such Western institutions as the museum, the university, and the penitentiary shaped Japan's emergence as a modern nation-state. Less commonly recognized is the role played by the distinctly hybrid institution—at once museum, laboratory, and penitentiary—of the zoological garden. First opened to the public in 1828 in London, the modern zoo was a product of European expansion. The zoological garden emerged as scientists and natural historians struggled to come to terms with the overwhelming biodiversity of colonial ecosystems. Imposing order on exotic nature and alien cultures alike, zoos expressed national commercial reach, scientific progress, political eminence, and imperial hegemony. The Tokyo Zoo was the first zoological garden in the world not built by a Western power, and it was quickly woven into the fabric of everyday life in nineteenth-century Japan. Speaking to the wider transnational history of imperialism and modern dealings with the natural world, this book will explore the ways in which the scientific and institutional power of the zoo were deployed in the service of diverse political, diplomatic, social, and environmental ends as Japan modernized.

The interaction of government officials, scientists, publishers, and patrons transformed the artificial world of the zoo into the "natural" foil of life in metropolitan Tokyo. Animals and Empire will trace this transformation in four roughly chronological parts, each centered on a particular historical problem or dynamic. Part One, "Civilization and Animals," examines the place of natural history and public exhibition in the creation of the early nation-state. The zoological garden was at the center of a state-led effort to alter Japanese relations with the natural world in the 19th century. As a

---

\* In 1943 the gardens were formally known as the *Tôkyô-to Ueno Onshi Dôbutsuen*. For ease of translation and because the institution's name changed no fewer than four times across its early history, I have chosen to call it the Tokyo Imperial Zoological Gardens here.

new kind of didactic medium, the zoo made play productive, recasting animals as useful objects and the Japanese—together with Westerners—as “civilized” masters of a new natural history based on Linnaean nomenclature and Enlightenment ideology. This chapter will focus on the Tokyo Zoo’s institutional and cultural emergence, arguing that the garden was a microcosm of modern relations with (and uses of) the animal world. The zoo’s first director, Ishikawa Chiyomatsu, was also the first Japanese professor of biology at Tokyo Imperial University and perhaps the country’s most important proponent of Darwinian natural selection.

Both of the chapters in Part Two, “Empire and Exhibition,” will explore the origins of modern Japanese environmental consciousness in the context of empire. Chapter Two, “The Nature of Imperialism,” shows how the zoo was remade into a trophy case for the nation’s imperialist activities. Beginning in 1897, when the Imperial Household Ministry ordered the construction of exhibits for “live-animal war trophies” (*senrihin dôbutsu*), the drama of Japan’s imperial expansion was made real in the bodies of zoo’s animals and their exotic human trainers. These popular displays sparked a cycle of growth. The Tokyo Zoo was soon the most popular zoo in the world. I examine this development in the context of an institution that was consciously symbolic of the imperial enterprise, tracing the interconnections between the colonial zoo, anti-vivisection and conservationist movements, the new discipline of field biology, and the highly publicized culture of the safari hunt. Chapter Three, “The Nature of Desire,” examines the relationship between the zoo’s architecture of exhibition and consumer capitalism during the interwar period. Just as the nation’s marketing gurus deployed color, glass, and light to create a new aesthetics of desire in shopping areas such as the Ginza, so too did the zoo come to reflect the dream life of the country’s increasingly urban workforce. Where barred cages signified a stark separation between man and beast in the 1880s, naturalistic barless enclosures and plate glass offered the illusion of unmediated encounters with the wild in the 1920s.

The fascist 1930s and 1940s, the subject of the third portion of the manuscript, “The Culture of Total War,” began as a golden age for the zoo. Vast ecosystems were suddenly within reach as the military conquered new territory, and highly sought after megafauna such as Indonesian Komodo dragons and Mongolian snow leopards—totems of empire—flooded into the gardens. Research stations, natural history museums, and zoological gardens were built throughout the colonies. Tokyo was the administrative and exhibitionary center of that expansion. Chapter Four, “Domesticating Fascism,” shows how domesticated animals—strong, silent, obedient, and carefully bred—were idealized as model soldiers while millions of people streamed into the zoo to participate in the pageantry of fascist expansionism. Mounted troops led parades and government scientists staged exhibitions on the natural wonders of the Greater East Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere. This festival of martial celebration reached a shocking crescendo in the summer of 1943. “The Great Zoo Massacre” is the subject of Chapter Five. This chapter details the lavish Buddhist ceremony that memorialized the killing of the twenty seven “animal martyrs” (*jun’nan dôbutsu*), including the zoo’s three famously docile performing elephants, casualties of an empire on the verge of collapse.

The story of Tokyo’s Wretched Elephants (*Kawaisô na zô*) played a surprisingly salient role in the articulation of Japan’s postwar culture of war memory, ushering successive generations of children into the national community of selective commemoration. Published in 1951, Tsuchiya Yukio’s touching story—in which the Japanese people are helpless victims akin to the poor elephants—was the single best-selling children’s book in the country for more than two decades. The story was subsequently re-told by the novelist Murakami Haruki in his unsettling 1995 novel, Wind-Up Bird Chronicle (*Najimaki-dori kuronikuru*). Beginning with a chapter on the “Afterlives of Elephants,” Part Four, “After Empire,” will consider the conflicted status of wild animals in postwar Japan, at once objects of intense cultural and scientific attention and subject to relentless ecological marginalization.

This dynamic reached its apex in the so-called “Panda Boom” of the late twentieth century, the theme of the seventh and final chapter. The arrival of two giant pandas at the Tokyo Zoo in October 1972 in celebration of diplomatic normalization between Japan and the People’s Republic of China sparked an explosion of post-imperial fascination with all things Chinese. Fueled by a culture industry eager to extract maximum profit from the alluring *Ailuropoda melanoleuca*, attendance hit world historical highs for over a decade. This hyper-consumerism coincided with a shift in environmental consciousness in the 1970s. In wider society the contradictions between consumerism and conservationism often remain hidden, but the histories of Tokyo’s pandas—the first in the world to bear an artificially-conceived cub and perhaps the most-viewed non-human animals on the planet—throw modernity’s troubled relationship with nature (particularly endangered megafauna) into sharp relief. At once post-imperial mascots and post-commodity treasures—from 1984 pandas were leased by the Chinese government in complex financial transactions rather than gifted or sold—this chapter will suggest that Tokyo’s pandas are ciphers for the contradictions that lie at the heart of the modern zoo, and indeed for modern Japanese dealings with the natural world writ large.

This is an archival project. I am the first professional historian, Japanese or otherwise, to put the zoo’s collection to sustained use. Indeed, the archive is one of the things that set this project apart: where the collections of more prominent institutions were culled at the close of World War Two, edited before the arrival of American troops, the zoo’s collection was left intact, overlooked as officials turned their attention to more politically sensitive institutions. The resulting archive offers a telling picture of everyday life in imperial Japan. I draw on a wide array of sources—including natural history tracts, ethological studies, architectural blueprints, international agreements, marketing records, letters to the zoo director, bureaucratic memoranda, and children’s literature—in order to write as multilayered a history as possible. By locating my history “on the ground,” or more properly “in the zoo” and its records, I try to expose the historical origins of such stubborn dichotomies as nature and culture, science and society, even human and animal. The Japanese term for “animal” (*dôbutsu*), like that for “zoological garden” (*dôbutsuen*), was a nineteenth-century neologism.

This project started as a much narrower study on the development of the zoological garden in Meiji Japan (1868-1912). Drawn on by the depth of the archive and the issues involved, it has expanded chronologically to encompass the first full century of modern Japanese history and thematically to address the history of the biological sciences and the emergence of environmental consciousness in the context of empire. A semester of support from the National Endowment for the Humanities (five months) will give me the time I need complete the full manuscript. I will complete three entirely new chapters (chs. 4, 6, 7 each draw on new archival work), rework the first chapter to account for the legacies of early-modern natural history (*bonzôgaku*), signpost each of the three extant chapters, and craft an introduction to the expanded project. The manuscript will be submitted to academic presses by the end of the fellowship period.

As we come to terms with the realities of climate change, diminishing natural resources, and the ecological costs of development, it is increasingly clear that environmental issues deserve a place alongside the central concerns driving humanistic inquiry. Japan is a particularly important player in this global environmental saga. Changes in Japanese science, policy and economics affect every corner of the globe and the nation’s ecological footprint is recognized worldwide. At home, nearly 20% of mammal, amphibian, fish, reptile and vascular plant species are threatened with extinction. This project seeks to understand the origins of this situation, tracing the history of current Japanese attitudes towards wilderness and the wild. Nowhere are those attitudes more clearly on display than the zoological garden.

## ANIMALS AND EMPIRE | SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Kevin Attell, trans. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002.
- Asma, Stephen T. *Stuffed Animals & Pickled Heads: The Culture and Evolution of Natural History Museums*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Baratay, Eric, and Elisabeth Hardouin-Fugier. *Zoo: A History of Zoological Gardens in the West*. London: Reaktion, 2002.
- Bartholomew, James R. *The Formation of Science in Japan: Building a Research Tradition*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Berger, John. "Why Look at Animals?" In *About Looking*, 198. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.
- Bulliet, Richard W. *Hunters, Herders, and Hamburgers: The Past and Future of Human-Animal Relationships*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. 1st Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage Books, 1985.
- Daston, Lorraine, and Fernando Vidal. *The Moral Authority of Nature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.
- Davis, Susan G. *Spectacular Nature: Corporate Culture and the Sea World Experience*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- Figal, Gerald. *Civilization and Monsters: Spirits of Modernity in Meiji Japan*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1999.
- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. *Seiyō Jijō*. Tokyo: Shokodo, 1870.
- Hancocks, David. *A Different Nature: The Paradoxical World of Zoos and Their Uncertain Future*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Hanson, Elizabeth. *Animal Attractions: Nature on Display in American Zoos*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Hubert, Henri, Marcel Mauss, and W. D. Halls. *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function*. London,: Cohen and West, 1964.
- Ishikawa, Chiyomatsu. *Ishikawa Chiyomatsu zenshū*. 12 vols. Vol. 6. Tokyo: Kōbunsha, 1946.
- Mitchell, Timothy. *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Murakami, Haruki. *The Wind-up Bird Chronicle*. Jay Rubin, trans. 1st American ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.
- Nakamura, Ikuo. *Saishi to kugi: Nihonjin no shizenkan-dōbutsukan*. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 2001.
- Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Rothfels, Nigel. *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo, Animals, History, Culture*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Thomas, Julia Adeney. *Reconfiguring Modernity: Concepts of Nature in Japanese Political Ideology, Twentieth-Century Japan*; 12. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2001.
- Tōkyō-to Onshi Ueno Dōbutsuen. *Ueno Dōbutsuen hyakunen shi*. Tokyo: Dai -ichi hōki, 1982.
- Watanabe, Morio. *Dōbutsuen to in media*. Tokyo: Seikyusha Raiburari, 2000.