THE GETTYSBURG HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Volume 16 Article 1

2017

Gettysburg Historical Journal 2017

Gettysburg Historical Journal 2017

Keywords
Vietnam, Vietnam War, Military history, Civil Rights, Military integration, Missionary, Cherokee, Indian Removal, Ethnocentrism, Racism, Civilized, Savage, First World War, Great War, Black History, African-American History, Social History, Civil Rights History, World War II, Aid Man, American, POW, Nazis, Great Depression, Hyperinflation, Economic Development, Military Buildup, Nazi Germany

The GETTYSBURG HISTORICAL JOURNAL

Volume XVI
Spring 2017

Gettysburg Historical Journal
Volume XVI ~ ♦ ~ Spring 2017

Table of Contents

Letter from the Editors

The *Gettysburg Historical Journal* embodies the History Department's dedication to diverse learning and excellence in academics. Each year, the Journal publishes the top student work in a range of topics across the spectrum of academic disciplines with different methodological approaches to the study of history. In the words of Marc Bloch, author of *The Historian's Craft*, "history is neither watchmaking nor cabinet construction. It is an endeavor toward better understanding." In the spirit of this maxim, our authors strive to elucidate the many facets of human societies and cultures. Whether this research is focused on politics, religion, economics, environmental history, or women, gender, and sexuality studies, the editorial staff is consistently proud of the diverse subject matter we select for publication.

With the assistance of the *Cupola*, Gettysburg College's online research repository, and the distinguished college faculty, our authors' work has received both serious scholarly attention and national accolades. Past authors have gone on to publish follow-up work in refereed journals, and to present their work at undergraduate and professional conferences. The *Gettysburg Historical Journal* is primarily a student-run organization, and as such, it provides undergraduate students with a unique opportunity to gain valuable experience reviewing, editing, and organizing academic articles for publication. In all cases, authors and editors have also had the opportunity to apply these skills to their future careers, or to their work as graduate students.

This sixteenth edition of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* continues the tradition of scholarly rigor of past volumes, while broadening both the diversity of historical perspectives and the

methodologies employed by each author. Each of the following works selected for this edition exemplifies the varied interests of the History students at Gettysburg College.

In his article, "The Nazi Fiscal Cliff: Unsustainable Financial Practices before World War II," Parker Abt analyzes the powerful but ultimately unsustainable methods used by the Nazi government to transform the weak German economy they inherited from the Great Depression.

Abigail M. Currier's article, "A Different Way of Touring Europe: One Aid Man's Journey Across Europe During World War II," examines the memoirs of Robert Bell Bradley in order to highlight the experiences of one American veteran of World War II who participated in the D-Day Invasion of Normandy and was later taken captive by German troops.

Matthew D. LaRoche discusses divisions within the African American community that arose in response to the media's portrayal of black soldiers at home during and after World War I, and the country's inability to respect the liberties of the soldiers in his article "From Crusaders to Flunkies: American Newspaper Coverage of Black First World War Soldiers from 1915 and 1930."

In his article, "Helpers in a "Heathen" Land?: An Examination of Missionary Perceptions of the Cherokees," Andrew C. Nosti deconstructs traditional views on the relationship between missionaries and Cherokees in order to reveal a far more complex interracial and intercultural dynamic in the Early Republic of the United States.

Kaylyn L. Sawyer's article, "A Divided Front: Military Dissent During the Vietnam War," examines the ideological disunity among soldiers during the Vietnam War. She traces these divisions to a changing culture within the United States in the years and decades after World War II, as well as revelations about the government's dishonesty about the nature of the war.

This edition of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* also includes an article featuring responses given by four professors within the History Department at Gettysburg College given in answer to the following question: What figure, event, or idea inspires your interest in history?

Collectively, these articles demonstrate the hard work and careful research of our student authors, and exemplify the diverse interests of our students and faculty in the study of history.

The General Editors,

Caitlin T. Connelly

Julia K. Deros

Brianna O'Boyle

Acknowledgements

The staff of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* would like to thank all the professors of the History Department for encouraging our history majors to produce excellent work. In particular, we would like to thank Professor Timothy J. Shannon for providing guidance to the Journal staff as our faculty advisor; Janelle Wertzberger for her support and assistance in helping us manage an undergraduate journal; Ryan Nadeau for his vital help in publishing the journal; and Clare Crone and Samantha Isherwood, our administrative assistants, for their help in preparing the Journal for publication.

Featured Piece

This year the General Editors decided to create a feature piece to show our appreciation for the History Department. We selected four professors from the faculty to answer a question about history: what figure/event/idea inspires your interest in history? Reading their responses helped give us insight into the thoughts of these brilliant minds and further help us understand their passion for the subject we all share a common love and interest in. We hope that you enjoy reading their responses as much as we did.

Dr. Timothy Shannon

Dr. Timothy Shannon teaches Early American, Native American, and British history. He received his BA from Brown University and his PhD from Northwestern University. His book *Indians and Colonists at the Crossroads of Empire: The Albany Congress of 1754* (Cornell, 2000) won the Dixon Ryan Fox Prize from the New York State Historical Association and the Distinguished Book Award from the Society of Colonial Wars.

I first became interested in early American history as a child. I grew up in a suburban Connecticut town that had a green and a couple of Congregational churches at its center. One of those churches had a cemetery that dated back to the mid-eighteenth century, and in my comings and goings, I always enjoyed pausing to read the names and epitaphs that were still legible on those weathered gravestones. They told me about people who had walked in my steps two centuries before, long before paved roads, automobiles, and bicycles, and that sense of time gone by gave me an appreciation for where I was from, even if my town looked like all the other towns around it.

Later on, as a high school and college student, I was drawn to the study of history because it was a subject I seemed to do well in without much effort, as opposed to math and other quantitative disciplines. I did not read much historical fiction, but I liked biography and other genres of non-fiction, even the scholarly books I was assigned in my college history courses. As impending adulthood forced me to think about ways to make a living, I considered law school, a common path for many history majors, but was also drawn to teaching. When I thought about the kind of life I wanted to have, my college professors struck me as a useful model. They certainly weren't rich, but neither did they appear to be starving, and they all seemed to enjoy their work. Of course, I had very little idea of what they actually did when they were not in the classroom (committee work is something best hidden from the young and innocent), but I was impressed by the fact that they wrote books and articles in addition to teaching their classes. The idea of writing history appealed to my creative side, and it still does. I have never exhibited much interest in the visual arts and my enthusiasm for making music far outpaces my ability to do so, but historical research and writing perfectly balance my aspirations with my abilities, and so here I am.

Dr. Ian Isherwood

Dr. Ian Isherwood specializes in modern history with a focus on the history of war and memory studies. He has taught in both the English and History Departments at Gettysburg College and serves as the academic coordinator for the Civil War Era Studies minor. He is a Gettysburg College alumni having received his BA here, he received his MA from Dartmouth College and his PhD from University of Glasgow. He is the author of *Remembering the Great War* (IB Tauris, 2017) and his articles and book

reviews have appeared in *First World War Studies, War, Literature and the Arts, The Journal of Military History,* and *War in History*.

I am going to take something of a dodge on the question of what figure/event inspires me from history. With the limitations of space here, not to mention the attention spans of readers, any attempt for me to define and discuss either the many historical figures that I find inspirational or the many events that I find moving, might seem flippant. So, I am going to withdraw my forces in an orderly way, reestablish a line of defense, and attempt to outflank the question.

I am often intrigued by the fact that so many of my students wince when I say the word 'historiography'. The word itself is neutral – it has no inherent negative and certainly no positive connotations – but it is a word that is immediately associated with rigor, boredom, and an undue amount of stress. Yet, this word, or shall I say what it means – process – is what I find most inspirational in being an historian. Facts, figures, and events are the moving parts of history, but they require a researcher and a writer – a working and curious mind - to actually make sense of their meaning. It is that role in which the historian has the honor of playing.

The play itself has three acts: Act 1 (Setting: The Dorm Room/The Graduate Suite/The Faculty Office) the struggle with one's topic, to create an inference/idea, to gather and read one's secondary sources; Act 2 (Setting: The Archive) working with piles of documents and uncovering new ways of thinking about the subject based on a new reading of the documents; Act 3 (Setting: The Computer Screen) he struggle to write with sense, clarity, and purpose – crafting and layering one's work through revision. (Note

to self: dramaturgical analogy is not the best way to make this point).

So why do I find so much enjoyment in the process of interpretation and writing? I think it is because somewhere between my eighteenth and twentieth birthdays, I grew fatigued by the Gradgrind approach to history – rote memorization and all the 'well actually-ing' that can come in our discipline. It seemed like this – trying to own the past by hoarding minutia - was missing the forest for the trees. Thankfully, I was taking methods at the time and through that and my senior seminar later on Eisenhower (and really all my history classes at GC), I grew to appreciate the ways in which historians interpreted and argued and I was able to get my hands dirty with documents. I learned that history was malleable and imperfect, which I found liberating.

Later, in graduate school – surrounded by brilliant professors and peers – I learned over and over again the value of humility and the limitations of my own knowledge. As professor, I have learned just how difficult it is to convey complex ideas and differing approaches with clarity to students who oftentimes want answers (and not more questions). At every level of my historical training, what has driven my interest is not just the people and events of the past, but how to interpret these things to make them seem relevant. This – the making of history from imperfect sources – is what I find to be the most inspirational part of our art for it poses a daily challenge to the way we see the past in our present.

Dr. Jill Titus

Dr. Jill Titus's work focuses on 20th-century African American history, civil rights and public history. She is particularly interested in the intersection of African American history and public memory. She received her BA from Taylor University and both her MA and PhD from University of Massachusetts. Her first book, *Brown's Battleground: Students, Segregationists, and the Struggle for Justice in Prince Edward County, Virginia* (UNC Press, 2011), was a finalist for the Library of Virginia Literary Award.

As is probably true for most people, my answer to this question is continually in flux. As a child, my interest in history was kindled by visits to Colonial Williamsburg and Gettysburg, and countless hours lost in the orange-bound pages of the Childhood of Famous Americans series, both of which resonated with me deeply, albeit in different ways. Ultimately, though, I think the takeaway for me was that history was made up of stories, lived by people whose lives were very different from my own, but who sometimes felt some of the same emotions that I did. I wanted to understand these people, and "see" the world they saw.

As I got older, stories continued to resonate with me, but I became more and more interested in the relationship between historical "events" and lived experience, and in the way the same event could be experienced differently by different people. I became fascinated by the idea of perspective – and I clearly remember the way it began. Having loved *Johnny Tremain*, I was thrilled to find a book called *Redcoat in Boston* in my school library. The main character was the same age as Johnny Tremain, and both books dealt with the same events, but *Redcoat in Boston* encouraged readers to empathize not with the Sons of Liberty, but with the British soldiers. I was astounded at how differently the familiar story of pre-Revolutionary tension in

Boston came across when approached from a different perspective.

Books have always played a really important role in shaping my historical interests, so the figures and events that inspire me have shifted based on what I'm reading. In and after college, I read a lot of Civil War and colonial American history, which I combined with stints at Gettysburg NMP and Independence NHP. By the time I began my graduate work in history, I was fascinated by the relationship between religion and politics in the founding era. But not long after that, my interest in modern civil rights history, kickstarted by an unforgettable class in college, reignited, and for the past 15 years, has supplied the fuel for my interest in history. It all fascinates me – the tactics, the personalities, the multiple fronts, the shifting alliances, and most of all, the unyielding determination to challenge injustice. I care deeply about this field, in no small part, because it connects so profoundly with the present.

Dr. Scott Hancock

Dr. Scott Hancock's interest focuses on the African American experience from the mid-seventeenth century to just before the Civil War. His work considers African Americans' engagement with the law, and incorporates other disciplinary perspectives such as law & society and geography. He received his BA from Bryan College and both his MA and PhD from University of New Hampshire. Some of his work has appeared in the anthologies Paths to Freedom, We Shall Independent Be, and Slavery, Resistance, Freedom, and more recently in the journal Civil War History.

In 1975, when I was 13 years old and living in Heidelberg, West Germany, when comic books were 25¢—when kid math was

still easy, four for a buck—and when the Amazing Spiderman was still Amazing, I collected comic books avidly (that's right, we called them books, not magazines.) That spring my mother, my brother and I rode a train into West Berlin—my father, an Army intelligence officer, wasn't permitted into East Germany because, as he claimed, his brain was a weapon that knew too much. Soon after we arrived, we took a bus to East Berlin, through the Berlin wall at Checkpoint Charlie. East German guards inspected our stuff…and took what seemed to me a sinister interest in my Spiderman comics. What I remember is that they confiscated them. It is entirely possible this is a memory colored by what came after; maybe they simply examined and returned them. Regardless, the question it generated was why? Why are they like this?

What came after seemed a stark contrast to sections of West Berlin we had seen, which were vibrant, westernized, shiny and modern. East Berlin was drab, run down, almost stifling. The few people we saw with seemed (to a 13 year-old American army brat) at best indifferent and at worst depressed. That it was a grey overcast day didn't help. For me, the why question stuck: what had happened to produce what appeared to be two such starkly different worlds, side-by-side?

That day alone didn't spark my interest in history. I already had intense interest in World War II, especially aerial warfare. And though I was mixed race, I never identified as white, and started developing interest in stories of Black pride and power. But looking back, the experiences of moving from a working-class, racist white neighborhood in Baltimore to a military community in West Germany during the Cold War, of growing up with an outspoken Black woman (my mother), of seeing the effects of anti-American terrorist groups targeting American military

installations, of being the child of white man who served three tours in Vietnam…that one day of moving through the Berlin wall may have coalesced a variety of questions into two: why do people do the things they do? And what might get them to do things differently?

Answering those questions requires a sankofa experience: understanding what came before in order to effectively move forward.

The Nazi Fiscal Cliff: Unsustainable Financial Practices before World War II

By
Parker Abt

~ ♦ ~

The Great Depression hit Germany harder than it did any other European country.[1] With a fragile economy that was financed primarily by foreign short term loans, the country endured a banking crisis when the 1929 stock market crash caused these loans to be called back. The crisis reached its trough at the close of 1931 when Herbert Hoover had to allow Germany a one year reparations holiday to avoid a total economic collapse. Three successive governments failed to stimulate employment before the Nazis came to power in January 1933.[2] The ensuing miraculous growth of the German economy, the quickest in history, causes one to ask how the government financed the recovery. [3] This paper attempts to document the Nazis' financing methods, both on a domestic and global scale. It argues that these methods were unsustainable, leading to economic uncertainty by the time war broke out in 1939.

Upon taking power, the Nazis immediately implemented an expansionary fiscal policy that encouraged job growth through

[1] Albrecht Ritschl, "Deficit Spending in the Nazi Recovery, 1933–1938: A Critical Reassessment," *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 16, no. 4 (December 2002): 561.
[2] Hans-Erich Volkmann, "The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War," in *Germany and the Second World War*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 161–63.
[3] Adam Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy* (New York: Penguin, 2006), xxv.

civil building projects and the rearmament of the German military.[4] Over 140,126 jobs were created in July 1933 as opposed to 23,665 in January 1933. By November the average monthly growth in jobs had reached 400,000.[5] This extremely positive growth trend continued to 1936, at which time the economy reached full employment.[6] The Gross National Product (GNP) increased 9% annually while state demand as a share of GNP increased from 14% to 31% between 1933 and 1938.[7] The Nazis paradoxically managed to keep inflation and deficit spending low during this remarkable feat of government sponsored recovery.[8] Though these statistics suggest a command economy had taken hold, the Nazis actually undertook a campaign of privatizing businesses.[9] The resulting set of circumstances led one 21st century economist to remark

[4] Raymond L Cohn, "Fiscal Policy in Germany During the Great Depression," *Explorations in Economic History* 29, no. 3 (July 1, 1992): 338; Rainer Fremdling and Reiner Stäglin, "Work Creation and Rearmament in Germany 1933-1938: A Revisionist Assessment of NS-Economic Policy Based on Input-Output Analysis" (Discussion Papers, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, 2015), 1.

[5] R. J. Overy, *The Nazi Economic Recovery, 1932-1938* (London: Macmillan Press, 1982), 53.

[6] Cohn, "Fiscal Policy in Germany During the Great Depression," 319.

[7] Guido Giacomo Preparata, "Money for the Third Reich: The Nazis' Financial Legerdemain, 1933-1938" (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1998), 7; Christoph Buchheim and Jonas Scherner, "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy: The Case of Industry," *The Journal of Economic History* 66, no. 2 (June 2006): 390.

[8] Burton H. Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 32.

[9] Germà Bel, "Against the Mainstream: Nazi Privatization in 1930s Germany," *The Economic History Review* 63, no. 1 (February 1, 2010): 35–37. Command economies exist when the central government plans the nation's major economic ventures. A key characteristic of command economies is government ownership of the state's largest companies.

> We conclude that the Nazi recovery was not a textbook exercise in Keynesian demand stimulation… Economic recovery in Germany in the 1930s remains the paradox case of public demand expansion without Keynesian demand creation.[10]

The catalyst for such an atypical recovery was a sustained government campaign to grow the military. Full scale rearmament had begun by 1934, and 70% of government expenditures had gone toward it by 1939.[11] However, the Nazis felt it necessary to completely hide such spending from official figures until March 1935 since rearmament was illegal per the Treaty of Versailles.[12] There was the added concern of causing inflation. It was clear that early in the Nazis' reign Hitler did not want to induce inflation, which would scare Germans, who had vivid memories of the 1923 hyperinflation.[13] He was even willing to harm Germany's fragile foreign trade position to inhibit inflation.[14]

---

[10] Ritschl, "Deficit Spending in the Nazi Recovery, 1933–1938," 577.
[11] Ibid.; Fremdling and Stäglin, "Work Creation and Rearmament in Germany 1933-1938," 23; David Sanz Bas, "An Austrian Analysis of the Nazi Economic Recovery (1933-1939)," *Procesos de Mercado* 8, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 294.
[12] Hjalmar Schacht, "Unsigned Schacht Memorandum to Hitler Concerning the Financing of the Armament Program," May 3, 1935, 2, 1168-PS, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946. The Nazis no longer needed to hide military spending figures because, in March of 1935, Hitler announced Germany's rearmament plans to the world, officially breaking one of the world's worst kept secrets.
[13] Harold James, "Schacht's Attempted Defection from Hitler's Germany," *The Historical Journal* 30, no. 3 (1987): 729; Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 76; Martin Wolfe, "The Development of Nazi Monetary Policy," *The Journal of Economic History* 15, no. 4 (December 1, 1955): 392.
[14] "Affidavit I of Emil Puhl," November 7, 1945, 3, EC-437, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.; Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War*, 5.

Hitler essentially wanted all the positives of heavy government spending without the negatives. In response, the architect of the recovery, Reichsbank President Hjalmar Schacht, created MeFo bills. At their simplest, MeFo bills were bills of exchange.[15] They were issued by the industrial company Metallurgische ForschungsAnstalt (Metallurgical Research Institution). But this company was a dummy corporation, cobbled together by Schacht and German heads of industry with a capitalization of only 250,000 Reichsmarks (RM).[16] The MeFo corporation would fund rearmament projects by issuing these bills of exchange, which contractors could discount for RMs at private banks. These banks were willing to hold MeFo bills because the Reichsbank, Germany's central bank, guaranteed to re-discount them. To further entice investors, MeFo bills carried an interest rate of 4%, which was higher than that of other trade bills at the time. To make sure that the bills were never exchanged for RMs, which would lead to inflation, the ninety-day maturation period for the bills kept being extended until the actual maturation period became five years.[17] Summing up how unethical MeFo bills were, the Russian Nuremburg judge Iona Nikitchenko called them "a swindling venture on a national scale that has no precedent."[18]

From 1934 to 1938, the Nazis funded rearmament through 12 billion RMs worth of MeFo bills.[19] These MeFo bills allowed the government to exclude this figure from their official

[15] For an exhaustive account of the MeFo bills system, see Preparata, "The Nazis' Financial Legerdemain," 9–94.
[16] Guido Giacomo Preparata, "Hitler's Money: The Bills of Exchange of Schacht and Rearmament in the Third Reich," *American Review of Political Economy* 1, no. 1 (December 1, 2002): 21.
[17] Christopher Kopper, "Banking in National Socialist Germany, 1933–39," *Financial History Review* 5, no. 1 (April 1998): 59.
[18] International Military Tribunal, *Opinion and Judgement*, 169.
[19] Kopper, "Banking in National Socialist Germany, 1933–39," 59.

expenditure statements (so no inflation could occur) and to circumvent the Central Banking Law, which prohibited the Reichsbank from funding the government.[20] Perhaps most importantly, the MeFo bills also allowed the government to hide its rearmament financing from the world until Hitler was ready to reveal it in March 1935.[21] The Nazis knew that dealing in MeFo bills was a risky maneuver with the potential for immediate collapse and Reichsbank officials hoped that the budget would balance before banks decided to rediscount their MeFo bills.[22]

After issuing MeFo bills, the Nazis further financed the recovery by controlling capital markets, which enabled them to co-opt private businesses into funding the rearmament and other desirable, autarkical programs. Instead of nationalizing corporations as the Soviets did, the Nazis provided strong incentives for businesses to invest in Reich friendly programs.[23] For example, the Loan Fund Law of December 1934 capped dividend payments at 6% of reserves and taxed the surplus.[24] Whereas the retained earnings of private companies had been 170 million RM in 1933, earnings increased to 3,420 million RM by 1938. Of those reserves, over 62% were reinvested into the economy.[25]

---

[20] Ibid.
[21] Schacht, "Unsigned Memorandum from Schacht to Hitler," 2; Hjalmar Schacht, "Correspondence between Schacht and Hitler," January 11, 1939, EC-369, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
[22] "Affidavit II of Emil Puhl," November 8, 1945, 2, EC-438, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
[23] Buchheim and Scherner, "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy," 395.
[24] Wolfe, "The Development of Nazi Monetary Policy," 397.
[25] Robert Clement Engström, "Nazi War Finance and the German War Economy" (MBA, University of Pennsylvania, 1968), 45.

By 1936, the government also influenced where this capital was reinvested. One method was through the tight rationing and regulation of raw materials. Germany was a net importer of raw materials.[26] Therefore the Nazis found it important to reallocate their scarce supply of raw materials through supervisory boards to help rearmament. This reallocation made it hard for companies to get the amount of raw materials necessary to fund their own projects.[27] However, the Nazis would release more raw materials for projects deemed important for rearmament or reaching autarky. Thus it became profitable in many instances for companies to pursue the goals of the Reich. As a result, private investment in autarkical industries grew more than seven-fold by 1937.[28] Furthermore, even though 42% of that year's GDP growth came from military spending, the private sector's fiscal contribution to said GDP growth was 79%.[29] However the Nazis' reliance on the private sector had its limits. Companies still considered the potential for long term profit and it was clear that rearmament could not continue forever. This mentality dictated that they would not produce rearmament goods at as high a rate as the Nazis desired.[30]

An ancillary effect of increased private reinvestment was that large investment banks lost a considerable amount of business since companies no longer needed industrial loans to finance new

[26] Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War*; Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 50; Volkmann, "The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War," 349.
[27] Buchheim and Scherner, "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy," 398.
[28] Jonas Scherner, "Nazi Germany's Preparation for War: Evidence from Revised Industrial Investment Series," *European Review of Economic History* 14, no. 3 (December 1, 2010): 442.
[29] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 63.
[30] Buchheim and Scherner, "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy," 399.

projects.[31] Consequently, companies became more dependent on the Reich than investment banks because the Reich controlled the imports of raw material that production required. The Nazis' capital controls handcuffed the investment banks and they essentially became depositories for MeFo bills.[32] Once the investment banks became disabled, the meaningful supply of money shifted to private savings banks. Again, the Reich took advantage. Despite a 77% increase in deposits, the banks' loans to private debtors surprisingly decreased from 1933 to 1938.[33] For a variety of reasons, the Reich could control these banks' loans more than they could control those of investment banks

> There were three main reasons why the Reich reserved the refinancing power of savings banks for itself and why the savings banks could easily be moved by material incentives. First, their structure of long-term liabilities made such banks extraordinarily fit for taking on long-term loans in their portfolios. Although saving deposits were legally short-term liabilities, in aggregate they fluctuated only slightly so that they could be reinvested in long-term loans without risking illiquidity. Second, the Reichsbank recognised Reich loans as liquid assets which meant that savings banks could easily fulfil the liquidity standards of the Reichskommissar fur das Kreditwesen [Reich Commissioner for credit

[31] Kopper, "Banking in National Socialist Germany, 1933–39," 56; Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 110.
[32] Engström, "Nazi War Finance," 34; Wolfe, "The Development of Nazi Monetary Policy," 401.
[33] Kopper, "Banking in National Socialist Germany, 1933–39," 58.

> business]. Third, the interest paid on Reich loans was significantly higher than that on private bills, which fell from 4.1 per cent to 3.3 per cent. [34]

Because of these conditions, private savings banks played a large part in refinancing long-term government debt as well as investing in rearmament industries. Their holding of government debt in 1939 was 6.5 times higher than it was in 1933.[35] These banks became the third major financier of the recovery after MeFo bills and private corporations.

With such risky methods of financing, the confidence and trust of the parties involved was paramount. The Nazis needed to provide economic stability to keep confidence in their unorthodox methods high. To this end, they instituted strict wage and price controls. Two months after taking power in 1933, the Nazis eliminated collective bargaining rights and unions and replaced them with the Nazi affiliated German Labor Front. The role of this organization was to keep worker morale high through fascist indoctrination and middle class comforts such as vacations, company picnics, and Volkswagens. New laws were passed in early 1934 that gave government appointed labor trustees the power to regulate wages for whole industries.[36] The Nazis succeeded in keeping wage rates at depression levels throughout the recovery, which benefitted the recovery by decreasing consumption and freeing corporations to produce more rearmament focused goods through increased earnings that had to

[34] Ibid., 57–58.
[35] Engström, "Nazi War Finance," 40.
[36] Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War*, 66; Engström, "Nazi War Finance," 20.

be reinvested in production per the Loan Fund Law.[37] Another advantage was that companies' profits would directly increase as technological improvements and economies of scale decreased production costs. These profits also meant there was more money available for reinvestment.

Despite the wage controls, private consumption had to rise as unemployment decreased.[38] As this began to occur, representatives from the Labor Front voiced their concern that workers were unhappy that price increases in consumer goods were not met with wage increases. In 1936 the problem worried the Nazis enough that they created the Office for Price Formation, which audited consumer businesses and told them what to charge for their products.[39] Oversight was so strict that the Reich even regulated whether certain hotels could give jam with breakfast.[40] Naturally, the Nazis granted more profitable price structures to companies that produced more rearmament goods.[41] Harsh punishments for evading the Nazis regulations, including execution, prevented the formation of large black markets. The Office for Price Formation is yet another example of how the Nazis manipulated the free market to encourage businesses to reduce their production of luxury goods and instead focus on goods necessary for autarky. As seen with their control over wages, the Nazis' control over prices proved largely successful; the cost of

[37] Overy, *The Nazi Economic Recovery*, 57; Volkmann, "The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War," 290.
[38] As more people became employed, money flowed from the government and private businesses to the workers. The workers, naturally, spent some of this money, which meant that private consumption would rise.
[39] Engström, "Nazi War Finance," 28; Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 231.
[40] Wolfe, "The Development of Nazi Monetary Policy," 396.
[41] Ibid., 395.

living was only 6% higher in 1938 than it was in 1933 despite massive economic growth.[42]

While these internal policies kept the domestic economy stable during the mid-1930s, the stability came at the expense of Germany's foreign exchange reserves. Though the Nazis aimed for autarky, the reality was that Germany needed to import ever-growing amounts of food and raw materials to feed the rearmament economy.[43] Germany had always needed to import these resources. However, the loss of territory mandated by the Treaty of Versailles exacerbated the problem, reducing Germany's agricultural capacity 15% for many important crops and its iron ore capacity by 75%.[44] Shortages in steel, iron ore, copper, and oil could not be met by increased production, necessitating the importation of those crucial war machine materials.[45] The Nazis' rearmament financial practices and labor laws crowded out investment for exports and consumer goods, which strained German foreign exchange reserves even more to compensate.[46]

Whereas the Nazis' economic policy solutions and financing methods kept domestic confidence high, they sent international confidence in its economy into a tailspin. While Germany's antagonistic general foreign policy no doubt played a role, their financial decisions must be heavily considered in an analysis of their foreign trade weakness. To begin with, a moratorium on foreign debt payments in 1933 and a purposeful

---

[42] Ibid., 396; Volkmann, "The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War," 294.
[43] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 50.
[44] Volkmann, "The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War," 160.
[45] Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War*, 41–44, 50.
[46] Bas, "An Austrian Analysis of the Nazi Economic Recovery (1933-1939)," 308; Buchheim and Scherner, "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy," 390; Ritschl, "Deficit Spending in the Nazi Recovery, 1933–1938," 559.

default on these payments in 1934 surely did the Reich no favors.[47] It was also lost on no one that if the Reich had the funds to rearm, it could surely pay back its foreign debts first.[48] The effect of this mentality was seen in early 1935 when German bond prices began to steadily decline on the world market until they reached rock bottom once war commenced in September 1939.[49]

It fell to Hjalmar Schact to minimize Germany's foreign trade troubles. Introduced in 1934, his collection of initiatives was called the New Plan. One such initiative to remedy the Germans' lack of food and raw materials was to pressure weaker countries in Eastern Europe and South America into bilateral clearing agreements with Germany. Per these agreements, trade would be conducted either through barter or, if necessary, in RMs so that foreign exchange-reserves were never used.[50] By 1938, clearing agreements had been signed with over forty countries, who collectively bought about 80% of Germany's exports.[51] In order to avoid devaluing the RM, Schacht devised a clever bond discounting/subsidy scheme that subsidized German exporters on foreign financial markets.[52] With this plan, Schact was effectively able to give exporters the competitive advantage of currency

---

[47] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 72; Albrecht Ritschl, "Reparations, Deficits, and Debt Default: The Great Depression in Germany," in *The Great Depression of the 1930s: Lessons for Today*, ed. Nicholas Crafts and Peter Fearon (OUP Oxford, 2013), 118.
[48] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 80.
[49] Schacht, "Unsigned Memorandum from Schacht to Hitler," 2; William O. Brown and Richard C. K. Burdekin, "German Debt Traded in London During the Second World War: A British Perspective on Hitler," *Economica* 69, no. 276 (November 1, 2002): 655–69.
[50] "Affidavit I of Emil Puhl," 3.
[51] Ibid.
[52] For further explanation, see: David E. Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War: Germany, Britain, France, and Eastern Europe, 1930-1939* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 140–41.

devaluation while avoiding the inherent increases in import prices and the national debt.

However, with the 1935 fall in bond prices, this mechanism became untenable and Schacht told the army that he would not be able to fulfill their rising demand for imported raw materials.[53] To remedy the situation, he had to impose a new, large tax on the businesses profiting from the rearmament in order to keep exports competitive.[54] This tax proved effective; exports rose, allowing imports of raw materials to rise as well. The government used supervisory boards to control the allocation of these imports across the country.[55] Since these imports primarily went to rearmament (metals) or autarkic industries (primarily food), production of consumer goods decreased. In fact, there was no increase in consumer production from 1934 to 1936 despite the economic growth caused by the recovery.[56]

Schacht had to damage domestic happiness in order to shore up foreign exchange shortfalls. This would hurt the Reich over time as average Germans began to notice that their quality of life had decreased despite the country's theoretical prosperity.[57] The idea of working for the benefit of the state was not enough to stop workers from asking for promotions, especially once workers knew that unemployment was low, making each one of them more valuable to their companies. To keep wages stagnant, the Nazis passed laws to keep workers in their current jobs and even assert that workers could be reassigned at will to industries with labor

[53] Hjalmar Schacht, "Letter from Schacht to Reich and Prussian Economics Minister Concerning Army Demands for Raw Material," December 24, 1935, EC-293, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
[54] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 92.
[55] Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War*, 132.
[56] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 94–95.
[57] Ibid., 162–65.

shortages.[58] The effect was that workers put in less effort and domestic production became less efficient.[59]

As 1939 inched closer and Germany began to annex land to the east, Schacht had to keep rearmament growth high despite an ever worsening foreign trade situation and decreased efficiency at home. The 1938 annexation of Austria provided a much needed infusion of foreign exchange reserves, equivalent to 782 million RM, which doubled Germany's supply.[60] This allowed Schacht in 1938 to run the largest German trade deficit since 1929.[61] However, the acquisition of Austria actually hurt Germany in the long run because, like Germany, Austria was an importer of food and raw materials.[62] By the start of 1939, the Austrian foreign exchange reserves were exhausted.[63] Schacht had to get more desperate with his foreign trade practices.

Due to the Nazis' policy for years of keeping the RM sheltered from the free market both domestically and abroad, it became increasingly difficult to value as a currency. The countries who had clearing agreements with Germany wanted to trade less with it as a result, instead preferring hard currency countries such as Great Britain.[64] As Germany's importation needs became ever greater, Schacht began to rely less on clever financial tricks than on outright economic bullying of Eastern European countries. The most extreme case was a one-sided deal with Romania he signed in

[58] Engström, "Nazi War Finance," 21; Klein, *Germany's Economic Preparations for War*, 66.
[59] Timothy W. Mason, "The Workers' Opposition in Nazi Germany," *History Workshop*, no. 11 (April 1, 1981): 127.
[60] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 246.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War*, 245.
[63] Schacht, "Correspondence between Schacht and Hitler," 3.
[64] Kaiser, *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War*, 138–39.

late 1938.[65] Romania had to accept German arms exports in exchange for foodstuffs, oil, and other materials the German economy needed. This deal so strained Romania that they had to import raw materials themselves to keep up with the German demand.[66] It is interesting to note that Poland, the first victim of the German blitzkrieg, was one country that held its ground and refused to make a trade deal with Germany.[67]

Despite Schacht's efforts, Germany was unable to keep up with its import demands and Hitler dictated that the shortages hit normal Germans instead of hindering the rearmament effort. In an urgent letter written in January 1939, Schacht told Hitler, "Especially in the field of *daily requirements* for the home and clothing, the lack of supply and above all the decline of quality is most evident."[68] The analysis of labor historian Tim Mason puts it best

> The whole economic system was so strained that any one hold-up immediately caused another. These multiple shortages, which constituted a kind of negative multiplier effect, were the chief distinguishing mark of the situation just before the outbreak of war… it was a general economic crisis.[69]

The confidence of the people and the confidence of businesses and banks was what the Reich, by necessity, valued most. Even though

---

[65] Ibid., 265.
[66] Ibid., 269–70.
[67] R. J. Overy, "Germany, 'Domestic Crisis' and War in 1939: Reply," *Past & Present*, no. 122 (February 1, 1989): 228.
[68] Schacht, "Correspondence between Schacht and Hitler," 3.
[69] Timothy W. Mason, *Nazism, Fascism and the Working Class* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 116.

there were food and import shortages, they were never so severe as to put the country at risk of starvation. Having enough food to eat was not the point; confidence in the Nazis was. The Nazis were frightened by how shortages may affect the public morale; a shortage would alert the average German to the frailty of the economy, which would damage support for the Nazis.

While the supply shortage of early 1939 caused the working class to lose confidence in the Nazis' economic prowess, MeFo bills did the same for businesses and banks. The MeFo bills that jumpstarted Germany's miraculous recovery also threatened it the most. In March 1938, Schacht ended MeFo financing because he felt the system had gotten out of control.[70] Finally Schacht had found a predicament from which he could not slither out. Many MeFo bills were also reaching maturity and the Reichsbank had to pay back the bills' worth to their holders. But Hitler wanted to continue financing rearmament to the fullest. Schacht tried to sell long-term bonds to MeFo bills creditors instead of giving them hard cash, but they would not buy.[71] His only recourse was to print money and run a deficit. But the rearmament campaign still demanded money as well. To plug this hole, in October 1938, Schacht tried to sell four packages of long-term bonds to the public, each containing 1.5 billion RM. Surprisingly, private savers and insurances funds bought the first three packages but the fourth one suffered a massive failure in late November after Schacht introduced it.[72] The financiers of the Nazi economy had lost confidence a couple of months before the workers did at the start of 1939.

[70] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 253.
[71] Ritschl, "Reparations, Deficits, and Debt Default: The Great Depression in Germany," 120.
[72] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 295.

The result was that Schacht had to increase the money supply and run up a massive deficit to counterbalance the loss in capital and keep the rearmament going. From the start of Hitler's reign to the end of MeFo bill financing, the amount of RMs in circulation rose from 3,560 million to 5,278 million. But from March to December 1938, currency circulation rose to 8,223 million RMs, effectively rising more in ten months than it had in the previous five years.[73] The deficit likewise rose enormously in this time though it had been increasing at a healthy pace previously. Schacht told Hitler that spending on the military would have to be cut or incredible inflation would ensue.[74] Instead of listening to Schacht, Hitler fired him, electing to replace him with a loyal deputy named Walther Funk.[75] Hitler instructed Funk to get prices, wages, and the foreign trade debacle under control using whatever means necessary.[76] A short, obsequious letter written by Funk to Hitler regarding the status of the economy in mid-1939 highlights the stark difference between Funk and Schacht as protectors of the German economy; Funk would do whatever Hitler demanded, regardless of the havoc it would wreak.[77] In June 1939, Hitler also abolished the Reichsbank limit for adding to the money supply, officially taking Germany off the gold standard it had speciously claimed to be on since the end of World War I.[78] After that, Funk instituted a war rationing system that gave the government draconian control over consumer goods with the justification that Germany was, or soon would be, at war. Funk's

[73] Schacht, "Correspondence between Schacht and Hitler," 5.
[74] Ibid., 8.
[75] James, "Schacht's Attempted Defection from Hitler's Germany," 731.
[76] Overy, "Germany, 'Domestic Crisis' and War in 1939," 227.
[77] Walther Funk, "Letter from Funk to Hitler, Reporting on Economic Affairs," August 25, 1939, 699-PS, In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
[78] Tooze, *The Wages of Destruction*, 299.

actions signaled a shift to the wartime economy that would generally dominate the Nazi state until its collapse in 1945.

Taken as a whole, the Nazi economic recovery of the 1930s was like a balloon. The Nazis tried to fill the balloon with air but they could never tie the knot to keep it stable. Their choice was either to stop pumping air and let the balloon fizzle away or to keep pumping until it popped. The evidence indicates that they chose the latter. The Nazis' call for immediate economic growth led to financing practices that produced massive short term gain with equally as massive long term consequences. The success of their policies regarding MeFo bills, the co-opting of the private sector, and the regulation of wages and prices all rested on domestic trust and confidence. While Germans trusted their economy for some years, the rest of the world, operating mostly on a free market basis, was skeptical. For an economy that relied heavily on imports, this was fatal. To prevent a total collapse of Germany's foreign trade position, the Nazis had to make sacrifices that damaged domestic confidence. Eventually, these sacrifices became so great that confidence in the German economy faltered both domestically and globally, leading to an unstable economy by 1939.

Bibliography

"Affidavit I of Emil Puhl," November 7, 1945. EC-437. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.

"Affidavit II of Emil Puhl," November 8, 1945. EC-438. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.

Bas, David Sanz. "An Austrian Analysis of the Nazi Economic Recovery (1933-1939)." *Procesos de Mercado* 8, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 291–314.

Bel, Germà. "Against the Mainstream: Nazi Privatization in 1930s Germany." *The Economic History Review* 63, no. 1 (February 1, 2010): 34–55.

Brown, William O., and Richard C. K. Burdekin. "German Debt Traded in London During the Second World War: A British Perspective on Hitler." *Economica* 69, no. 276 (November 1, 2002): 655–69.

Buchheim, Christoph, and Jonas Scherner. "The Role of Private Property in the Nazi Economy: The Case of Industry." *The Journal of Economic History* 66, no. 2 (June 2006): 390–416.

Cohn, Raymond L. "Fiscal Policy in Germany During the Great Depression." *Explorations in Economic History* 29, no. 3 (July 1, 1992): 318–42.

Engström, Robert Clement. "Nazi War Finance and the German War Economy." MBA, University of Pennsylvania, 1968.

Fremdling, Rainer, and Reiner Stäglin. "Work Creation and Rearmament in Germany 1933-1938: A Revisionist Assessment of NS-Economic Policy Based on Input-Output Analysis." Discussion Papers, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, 2015.

Funk, Walther. “Letter from Funk to Hitler, Reporting on Economic Affairs,” August 25, 1939. 699-PS. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
International Military Tribunal. *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression: Opinion and Judgement*. Washington, D.C., United States: United States Government Printing Office, 1947.
James, Harold. “Schacht’s Attempted Defection from Hitler’s Germany.” *The Historical Journal* 30, no. 3 (1987): 729–33.
Kaiser, David E. *Economic Diplomacy and the Origins of the Second World War: Germany, Britain, France, and Eastern Europe, 1930-1939*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
Klein, Burton H. *Germany’s Economic Preparations for War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
Kopper, Christopher. “Banking in National Socialist Germany, 1933–39.” *Financial History Review* 5, no. 1 (April 1998): 49–62.
Mason, Timothy W. *Nazism, Fascism and the Working Class*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
———. “The Workers’ Opposition in Nazi Germany.” *History Workshop*, no. 11 (April 1, 1981): 120–37.
Overy, R. J. “Germany, ‘Domestic Crisis’ and War in 1939: Reply.” *Past & Present*, no. 122 (February 1, 1989): 221–40.
———. *The Nazi Economic Recovery, 1932-1938*. London: Macmillan Press, 1982.
Preparata, Guido Giacomo. “Hitler’s Money: The Bills of Exchange of Schacht and Rearmament in the Third Reich.” *American Review of Political Economy* 1, no. 1 (December 1, 2002): 15–27.
———. “Money for the Third Reich: The Nazis’ Financial Legerdemain, 1933-1938.” Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1998.

Ritschl, Albrecht. “Deficit Spending in the Nazi Recovery, 1933–1938: A Critical Reassessment.” *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 16, no. 4 (December 2002): 559–82.
———. “Reparations, Deficits, and Debt Default: The Great Depression in Germany.” In *The Great Depression of the 1930s: Lessons for Today*, edited by Nicholas Crafts and Peter Fearon, 110–39. OUP Oxford, 2013.
Schacht, Hjalmar. “Correspondence between Schacht and Hitler,” January 11, 1939. EC-369. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
———. “Letter from Schacht to Reich and Prussian Economics Minister Concerning Army Demands for Raw Material,” December 24, 1935. EC-293. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
———. “Unsigned Schacht Memorandum to Hitler Concerning the Financing of the Armament Program,” May 3, 1935. 1168-PS. In *Nazi Conspiracy and Aggression*. United States Government Printing Office, 1946.
Scherner, Jonas. “Nazi Germany’s Preparation for War: Evidence from Revised Industrial Investment Series.” *European Review of Economic History* 14, no. 3 (December 1, 2010): 433–68.
Tooze, Adam. *The Wages of Destruction: The Making and Breaking of the Nazi Economy*. New York: Penguin, 2006.
Volkmann, Hans-Erich. “The National Socialist Economy in Preparation for War.” In *Germany and the Second World War*, 1:157–372. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
Wolfe, Martin. “The Development of Nazi Monetary Policy.” *The Journal of Economic History* 15, no. 4 (December 1, 1955): 392–402.

A Different Way of Touring Europe: One Aid Man's Journey across Europe during World War II

By

Abigail Currier

~ ♦ ~

Two hours after lights out when everyone was supposed to be in bed, the sound of a sole trumpet rang through the air, with the sound of "Taps" blending into the breeze. For the men listening, this song was an inspirational break from the monotony of their current life. It was a symbol of independence and spirit; these men were unbroken and refused to fully submit. All over the camp, the men waited for that night's performance to start. Every evening, the mysterious performer had to switch locations. If the guards ever figured out where he was playing, the punishment would be severe. For the past week, this impromptu concert, usually followed by a couple of other, more popular tunes, was taking place in the least likely place in the world; approximately forty miles east of Berlin in the middle of Stalag III-C.

A few weeks before, a prisoner smuggled a large box to Arley Goodenkauf and told him to keep it. Confused, he brought the package into his barracks and, after checking around to make sure no one was watching him, he carefully opened the box. Inside lay a dented, old trumpet. After trying a few quiet notes on it, Arley quickly realized it was incapable of playing music. For the next couple of days, he spent every spare moment testing the instrument and attempting to patch it up. Eventually one of his trial breaths turned into a serviceable note. Although the trumpet was

not going to win any beauty competitions, it could at least produce music. But Goodenkauf now had a serious dilemma. What was he supposed to do with a trumpet in the middle of a German POW camp? A trumpet is not an easy thing to conceal and with guards doing periodic checks of the barracks, they were sure to notice a trumpet sitting on his bed. His foot locker was not safe either; they were sure to look in there. Even if he could disguise it, what worth did it truly have? There were only two things that could give this trumpet value; its value as a tradable commodity or its ability to produce music. The trumpet was more of a liability than an asset because it was so hard to disguise. Because of this, few people would actually wanted it and it would not have a high trade value. Therefore, its worth lay in its musical capabilities. Goodenkauf had learned how to play the trumpet before joining the army and still knew some of the basics. But such activities were strictly forbidden by the Germans and punished severely. Was it worth it?[1]

Morale was low in the camp; winter was quickly approaching and the men only had a few threadbare blankets to guard against the cold. Heat was nonexistent in the barracks and most of the men spent their days languishing on their beds. Many nights had been spent huddled together for warmth. Daily rations consisted of one bowl of thin soup, more akin to flavored water than the thick stew that these men were used to receiving back home, and a few slices of bread for the evening meal. This was barely enough food to survive summer with. The men were severely underweight and needed every ounce of body fat to help them keep in the warmth. The only thing that was certain was a cold future that could include frost bite on ears, hands, and toes.

[1] Arley L. Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoirs in Robert Bell Bradley Collection at U.S. Army War College Library and Archives. 8-9

German winters are bitterly cold and even more so when there is no adequate clothing or heating. The future looked bleak.[2]

Goodenkauf considered all of this and decided that the risk was worth it. While the men huddled together at night to stay warm, he thought that they deserved something positive in their miserable lives. So, he went out every night and performed for his fellow inmates. No one knew who he was and every performance took place in a different location to preserve his anonymity. The nightly music confounded the German guards, who desperately searched for the performer. After about two weeks, the Germans finally found the trumpet during one of their periodic raids of the barracks. The instrument was confiscated during a morning roll call and never seen again. However, the trumpet player managed to remain anonymous.[3]

These concerts were one of the very few positive events that happened to Private Robert Bell Bradley during his time as a Prisoner of War. Bradley began the war as an aid man with the 30th Infantry Division as a part of Operation OVERLORD and ended his war experiences trekking across Europe. While Bradley struggled to survive in Axis Germany, and later in contested eastern Europe, global events continued apace without him. However, these events would have serious and lasting impacts on his journey. Often on his journey to freedom, Bradley, and others, would get caught up in the fighting between The Soviet Union and the United States during the degradation of relations between these two super powers.

***

[2] Robert Bradley, "Interview with Robert Bradley." Interview by Ryan Adams. Musselman Library Special Collections. 19-21.; Robert Bell Bradley, "Thoughts Born in a Stalag," *A Collection of Poems* (n.p. 1988), Musselman Library Special Collections. 5; Goodenkauf , Unpublished Memoir, 8.
[3] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 9.

Within the medical corps, there were clear distinctions between the roles of the various medical personnel. The job of the aid men was to stabilize the wounded and get them to a battalion aid station or hospital. As such, their position during battle was on the front line, running into the line of fire, immediately assessing the situation, and responding appropriately as quickly as possible. Aid men had to be able to do everything the infantry units they were assigned to were able to do. To prepare for this crucial role, the aid men received hybridized training that combined the training of a regular soldier with intensive study of medical theory and its application. The training covered everything from how to properly wrap a wound to how to fire a wide variety of weapons, both domestic and foreign.[4]

However, there was a desperate need for medical personnel in the European Theater of Operations (ETO), so this all-important training period could often be as short as eleven weeks to increase the number of medical technicians available. When Bradley enlisted in October of 1942, there were 324,814 enlisted men in the Medical Department. By June of 1944 when Bradley landed in France, that number had jumped to 553,095 demonstrating that this shortened training had worked to produce a larger number of aid men. However, the ratio of enlisted men to soldiers had dropped from 73.5 for every 1,000 soldiers in 1942 to 69.2 in 1944. There was still plenty of room left for improvement.[5]

---

[4] Bradley, "interview" 11-14; Robert Bell Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I* (n.p.), Musselman Library Special Collections. 17-19; Vincoe M. Paxton and Stuart D. Rizika. "Soldiers of the Medical Detachment," *The American Journal of Nursing.* 45, no. 9 (Sept., 1945): 694.

[5] There have been few historical studies regarding the roles of aid men during World War II. While the United States government published several voluminous books on the topic of the Medical Department during the second world war, especially during the Vietnam War era, these books rarely address the role played by the aid men and are very difficult for the lay person to understand. They are written in military and medical jargon that is often hard to

When Bradley enlisted in the United States Army in October of 1942, his only request was to be placed with a medical unit. Prior to enlisting, he had been enrolled in a pre-med program at the University of Maryland. Many of Bradley's friends and classmates had either enlisted or been drafted. Bradley did not want to be left out of the war and felt it was his patriotic duty to enlist, especially considering his specialized training. So, after his induction on New York Avenue, Bradley was shipped to Camp Blanding, Florida, where he completed his basic medical training along with thousands of other trainees.[6] Basic training for aid men contained all of the usual parts of basic training for normal soldiers. However, it was expanded to include medical and surgical theory and their practical application.[7] After passing the requisite exams, the aid men were assigned to different units. He was eventually assigned to the 120th Infantry Medical Detachment of the 30th Infantry Division. Their job was to move with the unit on their maneuvers and provide basic aid and medical advice. In Ocala National Forest in Florida, that meant tending to a

---

understand, so for general interest questions, these books should be avoided. Albert Cowdry's *Fighting for Food* is a good book on the role played by these men in actual combat, but neglects their training and the building up to getting these men prepared to fight. Modern books on Aid men and medics in World War II have tended to focus more on biographical accounts rather than comprehensive histories. While these books are good for very specific focuses and may be more engaging for the general public, they are not very comprehensive in general history nor provide adequate background on what is an understudied subject. Charles M. Wiltse, *Medical Department United States Army in World War II* (Washington DC: Office of the Surgeon General Department of the Army, 1963), 10-13, 60-165.

[6] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 14.; Bradley "Interview," 28; Camp Blanding in Florida also became home to thousands of German POWs captured by allied soldiers. These men provided critical agricultural labor in nearby areas. Robert D. Billinger Jr., "With the Wehrmacht in Florida: The German Pow Facility at Camp Blanding, 1942-1946," *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 58, no. 2 (Oct., 1979): 161.

[7] Paxton, 694.

surprisingly large number of snake bites and other small injuries. As Bradley and the other aid men adjusted to their new role as unit care giver, they rarely, if ever, had to deal with any serious or catastrophic wounds. Instead, they had to fight against infection in the large number of cuts and scrapes the soldiers acquired daily on their pretend missions.[8]

Blisters were also a common problem, though not as prevalent during regular training as they were during maneuvers. All soldiers had been taught and practiced basic foot care routines that, if followed daily, prevented serious blisters. These routines included drying the feet out completely, applying powder to maintain dryness and then layering socks as a cushion. When going on short maneuvers in relatively dry areas, blisters were rarely an issue. However, on longer marches, or maneuvers that would occur later in training, this regimen would not be enough. Bradley and the other aid men spent nearly all of their time on these injuries. They eventually became so proficient at it that they even designed a special type of pad to apply to blisters to alleviate the pain and allow the soldiers to return to training as soon as possible.[9]

Preliminary training for Bradley's unit concluded with a multi-day hike through Ocala National Forest. They spent several days in the forest where the men were expected to spend all day marching, often wading through streams when they encountered them. No one had dry feet and Bradley and the other aid men spent the entire day repairing damaged feet. As soon as one blister was wrapped, another soon appeared. The aid men used hundreds of bandages as their world narrowed to the size of the next foot. Gauze, tape, next. Gauze, tape, next. Gauze, tape, next. It felt like

[8] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 14-19.
[9] Ibid., 17- 20.

it would never stop. Meanwhile, Bradley's own foot was throbbing from a blister he had gotten the day before. Occupied with tending to the blisters of his unit, he had had no time to address his own wound. Later that night, Bradley was finally able to tend to his blister. At this point, he was completely worn out from all of his work that day. Not only had he spent the whole day bandaging feet, but every time Bradley stopped to help someone, both he and the wounded man fell behind. After patching up the soldier, Bradley had to run to catch up with the unit and the next wounded. It had been one of the longest days of Bradley's professional life. As he drifted off to sleep, Bradley's dreams were filled with feet mutilated by blisters.[10]

Although Bradley's practical experience was with minor wounds and injuries like heat exhaustion and snake bites, as an aid man he was expected to master a wide range of ailments. After completing basic training, aid men were required to give basic medical information and advice to the members of the unit they were assigned to shadow. This information was often sought on the spur of the moment and covered a wide variety of ailments and injuries. The aid men also had to give lectures periodically to whole divisions on various health related topics.[11] These lectures varied from the proper construction of a splint using nearby materials to proper field sanitation, including latrine location and construction and sterilization of mess equipment. The principle goal of these lessons was to train the men in how to care for themselves while waiting for an aid man to come.[12]

***

[10] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 17-20; Robert Bell Bradley, *The Aid Man Infantry Team* (n.p. 1995), Musselman Library Special Collections, 8.
[11] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 16; Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I*, 6.
[12] Paxton, 694.

After completing training at Camp Blanding in Florida and several weeks on maneuver in Tennessee, it was finally time for Bradley to ship out.[13] He and the rest of the 120th boarded the *Argentina*, which was a part of a large convoy, including the larger troop carriers and the smaller destroyers and warship used as protection. Rumor had it that the entire 30th Division was on the convoy. Such large convoys were necessary to defend against attacks by German U-boats. German subs, which would attack single ships were reluctant to fire on large groups. The men docked at Firth of Clyde without too many issues. Luckily, the entire voyage had gone smoothly without any major incidents. The men passed the time in a variety of ways, including being sea sick for many of them. Boredom was seldom broken on the ship and Bradley was able to complete a fair number of poems during this time. Throughout Bradley's time in the US army, he wrote a large number of poems and used it as a way of expressing himself. He would continue to write after his discharge and self-published several books filled with his works.[14]

As preparations for Operation OVERLORD ramped up, the 30th Division was shifted from its original camp at Bognor Regis to just outside of Oxford to be closer to its embarkation point. [15] There was very little to do at this camp but train and that got boring very quickly and rarely distracted the men for long. Baseball games became a popular past-time on the various bases throughout Europe. Not only did they keep the men on the base and thus prevented them from over running local towns, but it also

[13] For Bradley and the 30th Division, training consisted of several weeks of basic at Camp Blanding, Florida and then being sent to the Smoky Mountains in Tennessee to go on maneuvers, which basically meant that the whole division spent days in the field, learning what it meant to be in a combat zone and what life on the front lines was like. Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 19-23.
[14] Ibid., 24-27.
[15] Ibid., 29-30.

occupied a large number of men. The games were often good forms of entertainment and helped to alleviate some of the boredom.

On June 6th, 1944, Bradley and the others on the base awoke to the sound of thousands of planes flying overhead. This was not entirely out of the ordinary, as the base was located next to an air base. However, this particular morning there were more planes taking off than usual. Rumors of a cross channel invasion had been circulating for months, but all of the men in Bradley's unit had assumed that they would be a part of the landing force. Why else had they trained so intensively back in the States? Surely they would not be left behind. But, at the same time, the large number of planes overhead seemed to indicate that they would not be a part of the first wave. And yet, no one had announced anything and there was still a possibility that this was not the major invasion. This could just as easily have been a probing raid before the main event.

Bradley and the others gathered for the daily baseball game as if it were any other day. The players took to the field as usual, but it was clear that their hearts and minds were not in the game. Each squad of planes that flew overhead drew the gaze of players and spectators alike. The outfielders were more interested in these planes than the balls that they were supposed to be catching. No one seemed to care how well the game was played that day. Suddenly, all of the radios in camp blared to life and the news poured out; the landing had been a success. The invasion of France had begun and the Allies were beginning their long march towards Germany and eventually the capital, Berlin.

After a moment of confusion, it sunk in; the 30th had been excluded from the initial landing party. After all their training and drilling, they would not be storming the beaches of France with the rest of the army. A few hours later, the order was passed around;

the 30th would be following in the wake of the 29th Division on the Omaha Beachhead. Two days later, the unit was loaded back onto ships and left England. [16] After two years filled with training and waiting, the 30th was finally going into combat.

***

Two days after the start of D-Day, Bradley and his unit loaded on to a British ship and were sent across the English Channel and dropped at Omaha Beach. Even though fighting on the beach head itself had ended, the men still had to climb off the ships and wade/swim ashore. Artillery from the earlier fighting made this difficult for a lot of the men. Invisible to them, large craters had been created by shelling from the intense conflict, creating an uneven sea floor. The men would be fine for one second and then the next the weight of their equipment would drag them down as the sea floor dropped out from underneath them.

Eventually, all of the men made it to shore. They quickly formed into a column and headed up the road lined with hedgerows that the Allies had struggled to establish just days before. As they marched towards the 29th Division, the true cost and destruction of war rapidly became apparent. German corpses littered the sides of the road. Most were missing limbs or had some other horrendous wound. There had been no time to bury these bodies and the 30th could not afford to stop to dispose of them either, so they had to continue marching past these potent reminders of the cost of war. The Allied dead were even harder to see. These bodies had been hastily removed and, as a result, a lot of their equipment had been left behind, the most conspicuous of which were their helmets. A soldier never relinquished his helmet

[16] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 46.

as it often meant the difference between life and death. For these men, it no longer mattered.[17]

At the second hedgerow, Bradley encountered his first real casualty of World War II. Taking a squad of six men with him, Bradley heard the call of a young soldier who had stepped on a mine that blew his foot off. Bradley snapped into action. Before he had even fully crouched down to examine the man, he had taken his belt with full medical kit off of his own waist and thrown it down beside the wounded soldier.[18] Next, Bradley reached for the man's belt and quickly took that off too. Bradley then reached for the scissors that he kept on a string on his wrist and cut the ragged pant leg away from the wound. He reached for the man's belt and used this as a tourniquet, quickly stopping the blood pouring out of the gaping wound.[19] Bradley then wrapped up the exposed flesh before getting the squad he had brought over to escort them back to the battalion aid station. Bradley had just successfully dealt with his first battlefield injury, but there was no time to stop and congratulate himself. Already, the call of 'aid man!' pierced the air and Bradley was off on his next case.

Fighting remained intense and continued from hedgerow to hedgerow for the next two and a half weeks. Bradley was constantly in motion, trying to save as many men as possible and this gave him invaluable experience to not only recall his training, but expand it beyond all bounds. Even though he had hated somersaulting during training, Bradley quickly mastered it during his time in northern France. The easiest way to get to the wounded

[17] Ibid., 46-48.
[18] This was a common practice of aid men during WWII because it allowed them to access all their equipment at once, instead of having to reach around their waists to get at what they needed. The kits were placed specially on their belts to be more accessible when the belt was laid out than when it was worn. Bradley "Interview," 8-9.
[19] Ibid., 4; Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I* 17.

was to go over the hedgerows and he could not afford to lose any time in taking a less direct route. Minutes often meant the difference between life and death for these men and, unlike the helmets Bradley had seen earlier, these men could not afford to wait.[20]

Bradley spent these weeks treating a large variety of wounds. The worst were the chest wounds. In order to put enough pressure on the wound to slow the bleeding, Bradley and other aid men literally threw themselves across the soldiers while attaching the bandage. When they stood up, the aid man's uniform was soaked with the wounded man's blood. But there was never any time to clean up. When he was able to make it back to camp, Bradley was barely recognizable. His uniform was soaked with the blood and various fluids of the men he had helped and caked with mud from all of his acrobats among the hedgerows. His shoes, as usual, were a complete mess. They were just as dirty as his uniform, but also shredded from all of the shrapnel and metal shards that he had stepped on throughout the day. The whole outfit would need to be replaced. Even when Bradley spent the night in the field tending to the wounded, a soldier would be sent to find him to bring replacement pieces for his uniform, saying, "Bradley, here's your shoes and a shirt."[21] During this time, Bradley rarely slept, and when he did it was often in a fox hole that he dug himself. This constant action occurred unabated for several weeks and then continued into the month of August with only periodic breaks when the GIs made a break through. These break throughs brought a brief respite to the soldiers, but medical personnel and aid men continued working trying to help as many men as possible before the division moved to their next assignment.

---

[20] Albert E. Cowdrey, *Fighting for Life; American Military Medicine in World War II* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), 253.
[21] Bradley, "Interview," 10

***

The 30th Division eventually headed towards St. Lo, France. The Germans had mounted an unexpectedly strong defense there and the Allies were determined to break their lines. An army, mainly composed of Americans, had been massed just outside of St. Lo to confront the German Army. The offensive would begin with a massive bombing raid by the Allied air force to weaken the enemy and then the US Army would punch through the German lines.

The attack had already been delayed for several days because it was too rainy for the fliers to see anything. Finally, on July 25th, six days after the attack had been scheduled, Bradley was lined up with the men of the 30th when General MacNair came over to visit the troops. He stood talking with Bradley and some of the other men before moving onto the next division.[22] In the middle of their conversation, he heard the drone of Allied planes overhead. Sooner than Bradley expected, he heard the whistle that meant the planes had dropped their load of bombs. The whistling was much closer than expected and Bradley quickly realized that there was a serious problem. The men ran for cover as bombs started to fall around them. Bradley sprinted to the right, his eyes set on a fox hole that would serve as a shelter. Out of the corner of

[22] General MacNair stopped to talk with Bradley after he had patched up two GIs who had suffered a rather ironic accident. The men were already nervous because the day before, the US Air Force had attempted a bombing attack and one of the squads of airplanes had accidently dropped their full load on the Allies instead of on the Germans. Communication got all tangled up and the men were pulled out of their entrenched positions and told to get into ditches and fox holes to await the attack. Fearing a repeat of the day before, these two GIs saw the same fox hole and both tried to dive in at the same time. Needless to say, this did not go well and they ended up stabbing one another with their bayonets. Bradley had just finished patching both up when General MacNair stopped by to chat. Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 65; Niall Barr, *Eisenhower's Armies*, (New York: Pegasus Books, 2015), 388-389.

his eye, Bradley saw General MacNair run to the left. A flash of doubt crossed his mind as Bradley wondered if he had made a mistake in not following the general. But, in situations like this, doubt could cost a man his life and Bradley could not afford to second guess himself. He managed to make it to the fox hole and ride out the bombing, which was mercifully short. As soon as they left, Bradley crawled out of his fox hole and set about healing the wounded. The wounds that he treated were the exact same as if they had been caused by German bombs but Bradley could not forget that these injuries were caused by friendly fire. The worst part of working on that field was watching all of the bodies being moved away. Many had suffered bodily injury from the explosions and that had caused their deaths. The most pitiful, however, were the men who had been buried alive when their fox holes or trenches were hit and the earth nearby covered up their openings, suffocating them. There were no marks on their bodies, but they were dead all the same. Bradley, at this point used to the most gruesome of wounds, could not stand to look at those corpses as they were brought back from the front lines.[23] While bandaging damaged wounds, word was eventually passed to Bradley that the attack was still on but his division had been pulled back because of their losses. He was to return to camp as soon as he could.

Back at camp that night, Bradley heard that General MacNair had perished in the bombing. Apparently, his body was so disconfigured from the blast that at first it was hard to identify him. If Bradley had followed the general, his corpse would have been among those destroyed by the accidental attack. He realized

[23] The Americans killed 24 and wounded 131 of their own men on July 24th and 61 were killed and approximately 600 were wounded the second day by dropping these bombs in the wrong spot. Barr, 388-389.

how close he had come to dying and marveled at the instinct that had pushed him towards life instead of death.[24]

***

Eventually Bradley and the remnants of the 30th Division made it to Mortain in France, the first town they encountered that was relatively untouched by the war. This would not last long.[25] Hitler had ordered Field Marshall von Kluge, the German commander of the Normandy Front, to prepare a counter attack against the Americans. Von Kluge decided to move his troops west towards the Allies and attack several areas, including Mortain, France and consequently Bradley.[26] When he reported for duty at the command center, a major and a captain from General Hobbes's staff, the commander of the 30th Infantry Division, stopped Bradley and told him to hold back. The officers looked at Bradley and said, "'General Hobbes has looked into the data on the men who waded in on the beach head and you are the last one. You are to be moved to the rear for survival... you've done enough.'"[27] Bradley had basically been in constant action since landing on Omaha Beach over a month ago and as far as they were concerned, he deserved a break. While he chafed at the idea that he was not out there helping people, Bradley did admit that a break sounded like an enticing idea. Bradley spent the night at the second battalion aid station. He would not be allowed to rest for long. The next morning a report came in of a battalion stranded on a hill just outside of the town and there were reports of serious casualties. Bradley was pointed

[24] MacNair's body had been so destroyed that his corpse was only identifiable by the stars on his shoulders. Ibid., 389.
[25] Bradley *Aid Man!,* 68.
[26] Barr, 383-391; Peter R. Mansoor, *The GI offensive in Europe; The Triumph of American Infantry Divisions, 1941-1945* (Kansas: University of Kansas, 1999), 167-170.
[27] Bradley, "Interview," 15.

towards a jeep with a man leaning on it and told to take the man and the jeep to the hill to see what he could do to help.[28]

Bradley hopped into the jeep and he and the other soldier started for the hill. The closer they got to the hill, the more shells and bullets started flying around. By the time they reached the base, both Bradley and the driver were crouched beneath the dashboard, desperate to avoid the swarm of ammunition flying above their heads. Enemy and friendly fire made the trip chaotic and threatened to kill one, or both, of them at every turn. Eventually, the driver had to stop and Bradley jumped out of the jeep. He grabbed two of the stretchers in the back and went searching for the nearest wounded. Almost immediately, a machine gun was fired right over his head, causing him to drop the litters and dive into a nearby ditch. Once the firing slowed, Bradley picked the litters back up and slowly made his way to two nearby rocks that had a small space between them. Four wounded were laying near the rocks, so Bradley worked on them from the limited protection offered by the rocks and prepared them to be moved to a less conflicted part of the battlefield. He managed to get the four men back to the jeep, despite the fact that two of them had to be carried in litters and the other two were seriously wounded. As soon as everyone was loaded into the jeep, the driver floored the accelerator and Bradley threw himself across the wounded to prevent them from falling out on the bumpy road. All six men made it back to the small church where Bradley had spent the previous night. It was now set up as the battalion aid station. However, command soon realized that their position was rapidly becoming imperiled and the order was given to pull out of the area. Bradley and the others left the church and the village altogether

[28] Ordinarily, aid men were not given jeeps because they might be mistaken for attacking forces and attacked by the enemy, so this was a strange occurrence for Bradley. Ibid., 15-16

and moved to a house a few miles away down a dirt road. The men quickly reestablished their aid station and then checked their fox holes and slit trenches. After assuring themselves that everything was as prepared as it could be, the men crawled into their respective holes and fell into a heavy sleep. The men were awakened to the sound of "Raus! Raus! Raus!"[29] In the pre-dawn light, the men saw a series of shapes moving around them in the semi darkness. As the sun rose, it shined light on their new situation and the muzzles of a variety of weapons. While they slept, they had been surrounded by Germans and were now Prisoners of War.[30]

***

Arley Goodenkauf was drafted into the United States army and assigned as a paratrooper. He was captured during the initial fighting on Utah Beach and spent several months being moved from one Stalag to another until he finally ended up at Stalag III C in September of 1944. He would stay there until the camp was liberated four months later by the advancing Red Army.[31]

Immediately after being captured, Goodenkauf was hustled into a small barn where he and the other prisoners spent the night. The next day they were force marched to a nearby town and loaded into trucks. From there they were moved across Germany, staying briefly in various camps for a few weeks before being sent onto their next destination. On August 24th, they crammed into boxcars and began another miserable trip, this time to Stalag IV B. Compared to the barns, tents, and trains that he had spent the past ten weeks in, this camp was a relatively comfortable place to stay.

[29] In German, 'raus' means out. When the Germans found the medical team in the fox holes, they demanded that the men climb out so they could be properly captured. Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 70-71.
[30] Bradley, "Interview," 17.
[31] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoirs, 2-8.

There were beds to sleep in at night, showers were available, and there was a delousing facility. After two and a half months of moving around the country, everyone had picked up a variety of tiny pests and finally they were able to get rid of them, if only temporarily. Best of all, at Stalag IV B the men were fed on a regular schedule. Although they never got enough food, it was a blessing to know when food was coming and how much to expect.

As Goodenkauf adjusted himself to this new place and the luxuries it provided, he compared his weight to that of the other prisoners in the camp. Among the American and British soldiers in his compound, his weight was roughly the norm. Everyone had suffered some weight loss due to being a prisoner for several months, but most were relatively healthy. The same could not be said for the Russians in the next compound over. The Germans barely fed their Soviet prisoners and, as a result, Goodekauf was living next to a compound of walking skeletons.[32] This was a common trend throughout Germany. According to Christina Streit, "of about 5,700,000 Red Army soldiers captured by the Germans, only about 2,000,000 survived the war"[33] Most of the members of the Red Army that were captured were allowed to starve to death, violating the regulations set forth by the Geneva Convention.[34] At first, he thought that this oppression had created solidarity among the Russians. However, as he was soon to learn, that was not always the case.

---

[32] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoirs, 7-8.

[33] "Prisoner of War (POW)," *Britannica Online Encyclopedia*, accessed November 8, 2016. https://www.britannica.com/topic/prisoner-of-war Streit, 80-81

[34] Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 27 July 1929, Article 11. Accessed November 8, 2016. https://wcjp.unicri.it/db_legislation/docs/Convention%20relative%20to%20the%20Treatment%20of%20Prisoners%200f%20War_1929.pdf

On one of his first days at Stalag IV B, Goodenkauf lined up as usual for roll call. Across the yard, he could see the Russian prisoners doing the same thing. As he watched, two POWs emerged from one of the barracks carrying a third man between them. The third man appeared very frail and lacked the strength to take the offered food from the Germans. Instead, one of his supporters took the food. Arley's heart warmed at the sight of this unity and camaraderie. Even in the worst of times, people were still able to come together and help one another out. After roll call was finished, Arley hung around to see if the two Russians would be able to get their comrade to eat anything. Instead, he watched as the prisoners were dismissed and the two Soviets dropped their fellow POW on the ground and divided up his ration. Goodenkauf was furious that these two men would treat a fellow prisoner so unfeelingly. However, when the fallen man made no sound nor movement to catch himself, it suddenly dawned on Goodenkauf. That was no man lying on the ground. That was a corpse. He had probably died during the night and rather than reporting it immediately, the two prisoners had seized the opportunity and used his death to their advantage.[35]

Arley felt sorry for the dead man. He deserved a better send off than being used as a prop in a scam to get a little extra food. But at the same time, he worried about his own future. The Russians must have been desperate to exploit their fallen comrade as they did. Goodenkauf was doing okay now, but his future was more uncertain than ever and he wondered if he could ever sink as low as those two Russians. For Goodenkauf and the other American prisoners, their future was anything but certain and there was no guarantee that in a couple of weeks they would not be in the same situation and the same choice would become an option.

[35] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 8.

Arley spent approximately three weeks at Stalag IV B. During that time, he saw similar scenes play out over and over where the Russians plotted and schemed to get more food. Everyone in the Russian compound was desperate for food and willing to do whatever it took to get a little extra. On September 18th, he and some of the other prisoners were loaded onto another boxcar and shipped to Stalag III C. As Arley changed camps, his future changed as well. Soon, both he and Bradley would come to know exactly what those Russians were thinking.[36]

***

Bradley's life as a POW was about to begin. After waiting several days outside of Mortain, the Germans began to hustle Bradley and the others away from the small town.[37] Often, the men were forced to jog even though they preferred a slow pace to delay their departure as much as possible. It was clear to Bradley that the Germans were in a rush to get somewhere and they were not sure if they were going to make it. Years later, he learned that their goal had been to make it through the Falaise Gap before it closed. However, in the moment all that Bradley knew was that the

[36] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 7-8.

[37] Bradley was told by the Germans that they had tried for several days to negotiate a trade with the Allies for some captured German medics. In *Aid Man!*, Bradley questioned the validity of this argument but did remember being held at Mortain for several days. However, in one of his later books, *Recollect and Ponder Part I*, which was written nearly a decade later, he stated that he had received a letter from Major Mark J. Reardon who had found a note in the National Archives that was carried by a German corporal. The note offered to exchange prisoners. It was dated the day that Bradley was captured, so it is possible that the aid station was taken for the deliberate purpose of trading medical prisoners. He also recalls that some of the medical personal were offered the opportunity to join the German Army as part of their medical team. Many of the men refused to join the Germans, but a few chose this option instead of going to a POW camp. This would indicate a serious lack of medical personnel within the German military and led credence to their story that a large number of them had been captured by the Allies. Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 72; Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I*, 37-65.

Germans demanded that he run and that was the last thing he wanted to do.[38]

The Germans were so desperate to reach their destination that they even commandeered a truck one morning to drive the prisoners across the French countryside and to German territory. There were a number of risks involved in being in a vehicle, including the frequent Allied bombing attacks that targeted modes of transportation. Bradley could not forget his bumpy ride in a jeep at the Battle of Mortain and how he and the infantry man barely escaped with their lives. He prayed that this ride would end better than that one had. As it happens, the road that Bradley was driven down was virtually deserted, making their vehicle easy to spot and target. Suddenly, the air filled with the drone of planes and the whistle of bomb being dropped. The driver was forced to take evasive action to escape the bombardment. He veered off onto a tiny dirt road and everyone dove off of the truck. The Germans organized the prisoners into lines and had them lay down in rows in the ditches along the sides of the road with a German soldier at each end of the line. All of the men braced themselves for impact. Luckily, the road the driver had selected had lots of tree cover and the men and vehicle were shielded from the eyes of the bombers. However, the fliers continued to target the main road that Bradley had been on trying to make it impassable for vehicles. The bombing lasted for the rest of the day, and into the beginning of the

[38] The Falaise Gap, also known as the Falaise Pocket, was a region in the ETO between the American and British armies. Initially, the two forces had been converging to form a wall that would trap a large number of Germans and prevent their escape into Germany. However, the American forces were moving too fast and some of their commanders feared overextending part of the line and thus weakening it. So, the Americans halted and left a large space through which many Germans escaped, including Bradley and his captors. Barr, 392-393; Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I*, 37.

night as the Allies poured bombs onto the road in their pursuit of total destruction.

As the sun was setting, the noise finally stopped and it seemed like the bombardment had finished. The men slowly stood up, wary of another attack. Americans and Germans together looked at the damage that resulted from a few hours' worth of bombing. Trees had been destroyed and the road was barely recognizable. Bradley could not recall if there had been a stone wall along the roadside before, it certainly was not there now. Both the Germans and the Americans soon came to the same conclusion; it was suddenly more than possible that the Germans could lose this war. If the Allies brought that kind of destruction to the fatherland, Germany would be forced to collapse. For many of the Germans, this was a new thought, and a rather frightening one.

The Germans also quickly came to the conclusion that daylight was no longer safe. A group as large as theirs was sure to attract attention from fliers and there was no way to be sure that if they got caught in another bombing that they would all survive. Instead, even thought it would be slower and more difficult, the Germans decided to move the prisoners only at night to avoid attracting another bombing mission.[39]

***

After several weeks of forced marching through the German countryside, Bradley and the other prisoners made it to the French city of Amiens. While there, the men were kept in the city prison until they could be moved to their next destination. For the first time since being captured, they were given beds to sleep in rather than a barn floor. The men had finally reached a place where they could stay for a while and there would be no more marches at night to avoid allied planes. Instead, the men would be able to keep

[39] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 73-75.

regular hours and sleep at night instead of stumbling in the dark along dirt roads.

Bradley's first morning at Amiens was very rough as he and the other prisoners were woken early by the sound of German guards ordering them to fall out for roll call. After being counted, Bradley and the other men in his barracks were organized into a work detail and marched out of camp. Before leaving, the group was surrounded by guards, presumably to prevent any ideas of escape, and brought to an area of the city that had been heavily damaged by Allied bombers. Through a combination of elementary German and pantomime the guards explained to the men what was expected of them. They were to clear the zone of all the rubble created by the destruction. The Germans wanted the roads and walkways cleared to facilitate the moving of supplies and all of the debris sorted by material. Bradley and the others balked at this idea; Allied fighters had risked their lives to cause this disruption and the Germans were expecting Allied prisoners to clean it up. The point of these attacks was to slow down and hinder the German war machine; to force them to waste their own labor on correcting the damage. It was certainly not planned to give work to POWs. Bradley detested the idea of helping the Germans, so he, and the others, did as little work as possible while in the town. All of the men moved as slowly as they could. This was partly an involuntary instinct born of weeks of hunger; the men had become accustomed to trying to conserve energy at all times.[40] But this lethargy was also intentional. There was no incentive, monetary or otherwise, to complete a certain amount of work within the city so the men strove to be as unproductive as possible.[41] The lethargy

[40] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 75-76.

[41] According to the Geneva Convention of 1929, all POWs were entitled to some level of pay. The amount was generally fixed at whatever the POW's rank equivalent made but the rules varied depending on if the person in question was

was a part of this but they also had several other strategies to slow down work. Rather than all of the men using one central pile for the debris, each created his own piles away from the others. In this way, rather than efficiently moving everything to one central location, all of the debris simply migrated to a new home. It was often hard to tell what was a pile and what had yet to be moved so the same piece of rubble could move between several piles in one day as the prisoners tried to 'clean' it up. So, although the street looked like it was filled with motion nothing was actually being accomplished. Bradley and the others continued to do this for several weeks.[42]

***

That morning started the same as every other morning at Amiens; with the call to fall out for roll call. The day before, Bradley and some of the other prisoners had been told they were being transferred and to be prepared to leave the next day. The selected prisoners followed the work detail as they left for the day. Instead of going to the street that was to be cleared that day, they were marched to the train station in town and loaded onto a box car. Once all of the prisoners had boarded, the train left for their mysterious destination. As the train started to move, gaps in the walls of the car let fresh air in. Bradley felt the coolness of the air as it passed by him and he knew that winter was not far off.

Once the doors to the car were locked, most of the men did not have the energy nor the balance to remain standing while the

---

an officer or not. Officers could not be forced to work while enlisted men could. However, the Axis powers tended to disregard the rules and did not often pay their POWs for their labor. When ex-prisoners, like Bradley, returned to the States, they were expecting to receive their back logged salary which the government had not made provisions for. Walter Rundell Jr. "Paying the Pow in World War II," *Military Affairs* 22 no. 3 (Autumn 1958), 121; Convention at Geneva, 27-34.

[42] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 75-76.

train was in motion. One by one, they began to lay down on the floor each trying to get their own space. The prisoners quickly realized that they could not lay down haphazardly where ever they pleased. There was simply not enough room in the box car unless everyone laid down on their sides in long rows all pressed together. Any movement created a ripple effect. They were all so close together that in order for anyone to move, everyone had to mimic it to create the necessary space.

Bradley quickly joined the rest of the men on the floor. He wanted to take advantage of the relative peace that existed within the box car and catch up on some sleep. However, peace was hard to come by considering Bradley was forced to roll over every thirty or so minutes to accommodate one of the other prisoners in the box car. He soon realized that it was going to be a long ride to where ever it was that they were going.[43]

Upon entering Limburg, the men were sent to Stalag XII A.[44] Inside, their first stop was at the delousing stations where they took hot showers to kill off the bugs. At the same time, their clothes went through a special dryer to give the lice in the clothes the same treatment. Next, the newly cleaned prisoners formed a line in front of a long table. When Bradley finally made it to the front, a German officer thrust a piece of metal on a chain to him. Before he could examine it and ask what it was, the guards forced him along and the next guy in line was getting the same treatment. While hustling him away, the guards indicated that Bradley should put the chain around his neck. When he did so and let go of the piece of metal, he realized that it was a similar shape to his dog tag. Stamped into it were the numbers 86042. It was his POW identification number. In this and other camps, every POW

[43] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 76-77.
[44] Bradley, "Interview," 19.

captured by the Germans was assigned an identification number. Each number was stamped into a piece of metal and the GIs were expected to wear it at all times. This new tag always hit Bradley's regular dog tags and created a soft ping whenever he moved. Bradley and the others hated their tags because it felt too much like they were in the German Army. That clinking would follow him across Europe and served as a constant reminder of his capture by the Germans. After being processed, Bradley and many others were put on a train bound for places unknown.[45]

***

After spending what felt like several days being moved from one train to another, Bradley and the other prisoners got off of the train expecting to be immediately herded onto the next one. Instead, they were surrounded by guards and marched down the road away from the train station. The guards led the men to the most desolate place that Bradley had ever seen. Dozens of short, long buildings were surrounded by fences topped with barbed wire. Placed periodically within the wall were guard towers, each manned by large spot lights and heavily armed Germans. The guards forced the men to pass under their gaze as they entered the gates of Stalag III C.

As Bradley took his first look at the camp, he noticed that there were no plants within the compound. No trees grew to provide shade nor any grass to carpet the ground. The Germans had even managed to defeat the tenacious weed that always managed to grow everywhere.[46] If a plant that had evolved to survive in some of the least hospitable environments in the world could not live here, how was a lonely boy from DC expected to make it?

[45] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 77.
[46] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 80.

***

Bradley and the other men were brought into the camp and processed. They were assigned to three room barracks with each room holding between twenty-seven and thirty-three prisoners. There was one lone bulb in each room to provide light at night. However, this only lasted until 9 o'clock when all the lights were turned off and the men were expected to be in bed. Just before lights out, the men would spend a few minutes catching all the lice and other bugs crawling on them and worked together to crush them using their finger nails. Along with the light bulb, the only other amenity in the barracks was a lone stove that rarely had enough coal. The men often spent the nights huddled together under thin blankets, hoping to survive the night. Morning brought little respite for the men, who were ordered out into the freezing yard to be counted. Those lucky enough to have some food were allowed to eat it and then they returned to their barracks to pass the day. When food was available, it was often of very poor quality. The prisoners got a small cup of watery soup made almost exclusively of sauerkraut for lunch. For supper, they would occasionally get a potato, turnip or rutabaga if they were lucky and a slice of bread, the equivalent of 1000 grams.[47] All of the food in the camps was very strictly rationed and controlled, as it was in the rest of Germany. [48] Due to this rationing, the bread that the

[47] Bradley, "Interview" 19-21; Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 8.

[48] Rationing all over Germany began in 1939 before the fateful invasion of Poland but increased dramatically after the failed invasion of Russia. Desperate for food, the Germans had originally planned on utilizing their conquered territories as an unlimited supply of food and other crucial supplies for the German War Machine. This plan ultimately failed, in no small part due to the intense fighting that these regions suffered. In order to acquire the necessary food, the Germans in 1942 decided to invade Russia, a comparative bread basket to the food that Germany was operating with. The initial invasion was projected to last approximately three months, after which all of the food of Russia would be made available to the Nazi Regime. As history tells us, this was not quite

prisoners received was often of extremely poor quality. Flour, and grain in general, were in high demand across Germany, so the smallest amount possible was used to create the prisoners' bread. To supplement the meager amount of flour used, the Germans mixed saw dust and wood chips into the batter to thicken it and prepare it for baking.[49] Although nearly unpalatable, when the men were starving, it was better than nothing. The occasional snap pea, if they had any, was reserved strictly for Sundays. The call of 'Meat!' was a cause for celebration as meat had become a precious commodity within the camp.[50]

During their forced march to get to Stalag III C, food had been a rare commodity and the men often went days in between meals.[51] When Bradley finally arrived at the camp, he expected that they would be fed on a more regular schedule. While this did occur, the amount of food that the men were receiving was minuscule compared to what their bodies required. The American POWS never reached the level of starvation experienced by the Russian prisoners, who were specifically targeted for starvation and deliberately received an insufficient amount of food. Red

---

accurate and the Germans never successfully exploit the food reserves they imagined were waiting for them in Russia. Instead, rationing ramps up and seriously affects POW. Combined with the sharp increase of POWs in the early 1940's and this overall lack of food supplies, POWs were fed the bare minimum. The Nazis believed that any food given to POWs was taken from the mouths of German citizens and this was unacceptable. Lizzie Collingham *The Taste of War; World War II and the Battle for Food* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2012), 164- 359.

[49] At the beginning of Bradley's internment, the wood used in the bread was often taken from fresh trees, meaning it was free of chemicals. Towards the end of the war, even this became limited and the Germans resorted to using processed woods. Bradley speculates that they may have needed to resort to telephone poles. Regardless, this change had a major impact on the men's health as their diet now contained a wide variety of poisonous chemicals. Bradley, "Interview," 19.

[50] Ibid.; Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 8.

[51] Bradley, *Aid Man!* 76; Goodenkauf Unpublished Memoirs, 7

Cross packages often contained gifts of food and the POWs used this to supplement their diets and fend off starvation.[52]

***

Unlike Amiens, there was no work required of the prisoners at Stalag III C. Other than falling out for roll call when called, nothing was expected of the men and consequently they had a lot of free time on their hands. The prisoners learned to adapt and found activities to occupy themselves. Some of the Red Cross packages had included packs of cards, so many them passed their days sitting on the floor of the barracks playing cards. Bradley occasionally played a hand or two, but when the stakes got too high he left. Often, the men cleared a space on the floor and put pieces of straw in the middle. For some, that was all that they had to bet with. For others, that was the highest they were willing to go. The games were supposed to just be a fun way to pass the time. It was when the men threw down cigarettes or food as their bet that some of the lower betters left, including Bradley.

During one card game, Bradley was sitting on the floor of the barracks with some other men playing a round of poker. The betting was very low stakes. So far, only straw had been thrown into the betting circle. After several rounds of this, another prisoner joined the group. The new comer was given the honor of placing the first bet. Instead of grabbing a nearby piece of straw, the new prisoner took a cigarette out of his pocket and placed it in the small clearing. His audience paused, unsure of what to do next. Bradley and one of the other men quickly got up and left the game. Bradley

[52] By October 1941, Soviet POWs in Germany were specifically allotted fewer calories than the minimum number needed to survive. Over 3,000,000 Soviet POWs perished in German POW camps, approximately 57% of the total number of Soviet Prisoners. Only 3.5% of American and British POWs died. Christian Streit, "Soviet Prisoners of War in the Hands of the Wehrmacht," in *War of Extermination; The German Military in World War II, 1941-1944.* Ed. Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann (New York: Bergahn Books, 2000), 81-82.

went to search for one of the few books that were available at the camp. Even though he had read most of the ones that the prisoners had access to, anything was better than wasting cigarettes on such a pointless activity. While he walked away, the rest reluctantly reached for their own packs. For many cigarettes were too valuable to risk in such a way. They were the only form of currency among the prisoners and worked with some of the guards. Bradley had even heard a rumor that a prisoner with a full carton of cigarettes could bribe his way not only out of the camp but also out of Europe. As such, many men, Bradley among them, requested large numbers of cigarettes when they wrote to their families. No packages ever arrived and the prisoners assumed that the guards had stolen them because of their valuable contents. Red Cross packages did occasionally contain cigarettes but there were never enough to make a whole carton. Regardless, Bradley held onto that dream and jealously guarded his supply.[53]

Cigarettes were also better than cash inside of a POW camp. A few slipped to one of the guards equaled a few extra pieces of food that night or some other small comfort. Extra coal for the furnace or another bottle of soap could make the difference to a Prisoner of War. Bradley lived among these men for several months and knew just how desperate they were.

Some of the men in the camp were desperate for things other than food or small comfort. These men were addicted to smoking. Tobacco had always been readily available in the army.[54] For many of the men, Stalag III C was the first time that they were

[53] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 84-87

[54] Smoking was a part of everyday life in the 1940's and it remained a part of life even when Americans left for combat. Even the rations given to men in combat often contained a few cigarettes. At night, however, the men were forbidden from smoking because the glow of the lit butts was known to draw enemy fire. So, the army provided tins of tobacco so the men could still get their fix without giving away their position. Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 86.

without a steady supply of the substance. Many did not know how to handle it and some went to drastic measures to get the fix that they craved. When Bradley first entered Stalag III C, he had noticed how barren and lifeless it was. Initially, he had blamed the lack of flora on the Germans, but he later found out that it had actually been caused by some of the heavy smokers in camp. In their desperate need, several had gathered up all of the plants and dried them out. They then tried smoking the leaves, often with poor results. However, that solution did not last very long. Once the plants were gone, the men started chipping away some of the posts and beams inside of the barracks. They took the resulting wood chips and tried to smoke them in crude pipes. This too did not end well but that never stopped the prisoners. In some areas, their carving was so extensive that posts became unstable and the other prisoners had to force the smoker to stop for everyone's safety.

The smoking of wood chips was the act of a man in need, but it was not the most desperate thing that Bradley witnessed. While in the camp, he saw several prisoners trading their rations to other prisoners for some cigarettes. In an environment where their next meal could literally make the difference between life and death that action alone told Bradley how desperate some of these men were.

As one of the aid men in camp, Bradley was expected to, and felt obligated to, help the sick and wounded as much as he could. Even though he rarely had any supplies, he tried to offer what assistance he could. Due to this compassion, Bradley spent many nights sitting with the smokers when their newest experiment went horribly wrong. Although he could not provide any actual medical aid, he offered what encouragement he could.[55]

[55] Ibid., 84-87.

***

After days filled with hearing rumors about the advance of the Soviet Army, on January 31st, Bradley and the other prisoners got the order they had been dreading. The next morning the entire camp would be evacuated. Prisoners were expected to gather their belongings and be prepared to move out immediately following roll call. Across the compound, in the rec hall, Goodenkauf and the other performing prisoners realized that their time had come. For several weeks, they had been digging a hole to store supplies and hide in.[56] That night, they moved their belongings into the hole and the following morning Goodenkauf and the others climbed in. Another of the prisoners put a metal plate over the hole and moved the stove onto it to cover and disguise the opening.

Meanwhile, the prisoners outside of the rec hall were doing all that they could to delay their departure. They were successful for over two hours. However, at approximately 10 o'clock, the guards set up machine gun nests within the camp. The prisoners were given two choices; either they could form into a column and move out, or the guards would open fire. A column was quickly formed and the prisoners were marched out. They followed the road out of the prison gates. For many of the men, this was the first time in months that they were not surrounded by fences and barbed wire. Even though the men wanted to stand and look around at land not enclosed by fences, the German soldiers kept forcing them along. The Germans needed to make it away from the Stalag before the Russians arrived. Unbeknownst to them, an advanced

[56] At first, the men had hidden the dirt in a hay stack outside of the rec hall. However, a few days into digging, one of them overheard a guard telling another guard that he thought the stack had grown a little. Digging stopped immediately. They were only able to start digging again when snow started to fly and they could use the snow to hide the dirt. The hole was finished only a few days before the order was given to evacuate. Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 9-10.

unit of the Russian army had come up to the camp and surrounded it with tanks. The column of POWs was marched straight into a line of Russian tanks. [57]

The Soviet army saw the first line of German guards and a large column of men marching towards them. Thinking that these men were all German soldiers, they opened fire. Guards and prisoners alike dove into the snow under the sudden barrage of tank fire. The Germans quickly gathered up their charges and herded them back towards camp. The prisoners followed without any issues as the thought of immediate death put any plans of escape out of their minds. Several of the prisoners were forced to help some of their comrades back as they had been wounded during the onslaught.[58] Once back behind the wire fences, the Germans hurried to organize a second evacuation. All of the prisoners were lined up again and the Germans prepared to march them out of camp using a different gate.

This time, the Germans barely made it past the fence before they saw Russian tanks on the horizon. Once again, the men ran back for the relative security of the camp and the Germans prepared to defend the camp against the invaders. Meanwhile, the prisoners were permitted to wander around the compound and many returned to their barracks. While in there, Bradley watched as the Russians overran the camp and defeated the few Germans who tried to defend the Stalag. The Russians executed nearly all of the guards as they swept through the camp. However, German reinforcements quickly arrived at the compound and opened fire on the Russians. The POWs were caught in the no man's zone of a battle with the Germans on one side and the Russians on the other. Bullets and artillery shells flew through the air from both

[57] Goodenkauf, Unpublished Memoir, 10; Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 91.
[58] Bradley, *Recollect and Ponder Part I*, 40; Bradley, "Interview," 18.

directions, making any area outside a serious hazard. Bradley and another man inside his barrack tried to sneak a look outside through their window and came face to face with a German fighter pilot. The flier was down so low that Bradley's head was about even with the barrels of the machine guns attached to the plane. Both men dropped to the floor moments before the gunner opened fire. It was at that moment that Bradley, and many others, decided that the camp was too dangerous to stay in and made preparations to leave.[59]

The next morning, nearly all of the soldiers retraced their steps from the day before and walked out of the gates of Stalag III C, but this time for the final time. The large mass soon divided up into smaller groups as everyone migrated towards their friends. This arrangement also worked out better for foraging needs. The Russians had few supplies and preferred to live off the land. They expected the former prisoners to do the same. It was easier to forage with a group of ten men than with a group of a hundred, so the men broke apart.[60]

Bradley eventually joined a group of seven to nine other GIs. The group contained a mixed cast of characters, including a man who spoke English, German and Polish, an Irishman who was very handy and a Mexican who was very adept at survival. Together they started what was bound to be a very long walk.[61]

***

As Bradley and the others made their way across Europe, they realized they were going to need to find a source of food, and quickly. They were completely on their own and had to adapt to survive. The Russians had not prepared to liberate any POW

[59] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 91-94.
[60] Bradley, "Interview," 22.
[61] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 91-94.

camps and consequently had no infrastructure in place to deal with them.[62] The men spent most nights in abandoned barns, sleeping in the hay. The Russians, who had moved through the area some weeks before, had eaten all of the available food. All that was left was the feed bin for the livestock. This was barely palatable food as the grain it contained was very course. However, the men stewed it with large amounts of water to make an oatmeal substitute that served their needs. The men ate this meal as often as they could because the Russian Army had left no other option and food was scarce. The Russians had moved through the Polish countryside like a plague of locust until nothing was left; no produce nor livestock had survived their onslaught.[63]

The only thing that seemed to have survived were a few chickens scattered in various areas. These were often unavailable as they were often already claimed by Russian soldiers staying nearby and being caught with one of their chickens was paramount to a death sentence. One night though, after they had finished their evening gruel but before they had bedded down for the night, the men decided that they wanted a little meat to round out their meal. On their way to the abandoned house they were spending the night in, the men had passed a chicken coop and had seen a few chickens milling around outside. Even just talking about having meat made some of the men salivate; they had not had any for several weeks and that which they had had was of a questionable nature, whose origins were unclear.

The men all gathered together to discuss their strategy. It would not be enough to simply walk into the coop and grab a chicken. Even if they managed to grab the animal by the neck and silence it, it would still flap its wings and wake the other birds who

[62] Michael Jones, *After Hitler; The Last Ten Days of World War II in Europe* (New York: Penguin Random House, 2015), 74-75.
[63] Bradley, "Interview," 24

would then set up a ruckus. Under normal circumstances, this would not be an issue, but the noise would inevitably wake a nearby Russian who would roll over in his sleep and let loose a burst of gunfire at the chicken coop to dissuade potential thieves. The unarmed men wanted to avoid this fate at all costs.

One of the men in the group, a Mexican, was particularly adept at catching chickens and explained the correct procedure to the rest of the group. Rather than killing the bird inside of the coop, the trick was to slip a finger right under the feet of the chicken along the pole it was roosting on. The chicken's feet would then instinctively curl around the finger and the thief would be able to walk out of the coop with the sleeping bird on his finger. Once far enough away, the animal's neck could be rung and preparations for the feast could begin.[64]

Bradley and a few others followed the Mexican's suggestion and managed to capture several chickens unobserved and prepared a thick stew with hearty amounts of meat. As they were sitting down to eat, a loud noise sounded outside of the building and the front door came crashing down. Before the men could run for cover, a Russian patrol, made up of both men and women, streamed into the room with all of their guns aimed at Bradley and his men. One of the women demanded to know if the men were Germans. Based on the way the rest of the soldiers were deferring to her, Bradley determined that she was probably their commanding officer. Giving her the wrong answer at this point meant death by firing squad. Germans were forbidden from gathering and if these soldiers thought for a moment that Bradley and his men were German, they would shoot without asking any further questions. Better a dead mistake than a live German. Bradley and the others in his group all started yelling

[64] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 95-96.

‘Amerikansky’ at the top of their lungs. They assumed that it meant American in Russian, but none of them were sure if it actually meant anything. It had worked with earlier patrols and they desperately hoped that it would work now. Bradley saw confusion enter some of the Russian’s eyes and many of their stern faces softened. However, the guns were still pointed at the group and Bradley had run out of ideas. Suddenly, the Irishman in the back called out, “‘Give her a chorus of ‘Pistol Packin’ Momma’!’”[65] All of the men started singing the popular tune. The Russians were stunned; they were unprepared for this new line of attack. Suddenly, the officer in charge broke into a huge grin and started laughing. She lowered her weapon and holstered it. Her soldiers followed her lead and put their own guns away. The atmosphere quickly changed from one charged with tension to one of revelry. The Russians started celebrating and a quiet dinner developed into a fully formed party.

As the party started to get into the swing of things, Bradley noticed one of the female soldiers slip out the front door. She returned moments later with one of the extra gas cans that were stored on the backs of all jeeps. For the British and the Americans, these tanks were for storing emergency gasoline. For the Russians, they were for emergency vodka. Bradley had seen Russians getting

---

[65] “Pistol Packin’ Momma’!” was a popular song in the 1940’s and consequently all of the men in Bradley’s group was familiar with the lyrics. The chorus of the song goes

Lay that pistol down Babe, Lay that pistol down,
Pistol Packin' Mama, Lay that pistol down.

The song itself describes a man drinking at a bar when his female companion finds him and accuses him of cheating on her. She confronts him armed with a gun and the man tries to talk his way out of the situation. She subsequently catches her man back at the cabaret, this time dancing with a blonde. The woman returns with a gun and kills the blonde and then turns on her husband. He tries to talk her out of shooting him too but it ultimately unsuccessful. “Pistol Packin’ Mama by Al Dexter, 1943,” *Luftex.com,* accessed Dec. 10, 2016, http://www.luftex.com/aldexter.htm; Bradley, *Aid Man!,* 96.

drinks from these tanks and knew that they had contained a toxic mix of gasoline and vodka that kept the Russians going but made every other soldier ill. The girl put the tank down on a table. Another girl saw the tank and poured herself two glasses. Seeing Bradley, she made a beeline straight for him.

Bradley started to worry again. Not only did he rarely drink, but when he did he certainly never ordered a cocktail of vodka and gasoline. The girl tried offering him the drink several times and each time he refused he got increasingly nervous. Bradley never forgot that the Russians were often trigger happy and that they were armed and he was not. After several tries, the girl became frustrated and started yelling at him that he had disrespected Mother Russia, Stalin, and all things Russian. At the same time, she grabbed one of the submachine guns that one of her comrades and brought in and began waving it at Bradley. She kept threatening to shoot and he knew that she was more than capable of it.

Suddenly, one of Bradley's men ran up to them. He had seen what was going on from across the room and thought he could help defuse the tension. The man started talking rapidly to the girl in Polish, trying to explain the situation. Bradley watched as her expression changed from one of anger to one of confusion and then she suddenly burst out laughing. Shaking her head, the soldier wandered off, still laughing, to a knot of other Russian soldiers. She started chatting with them and turned around to point at Bradley several times. When she finished her story, they too burst out laughing.

Confused and still a little worried, Bradley turned to the other guy to ask what he had told the girl. Chuckling, the man responded that he had told the soldier that Bradley was from a crazy Baptist sect whose church forbade him from drinking

anything other than water. Bradley started laughing at the absurdity of it and the rest of the night passed without incident.[66]

***

Several weeks later, their Polish guide led Bradley and the rest of the group into yet another small town in the Polish countryside. As they were trying to get their bearings, several Russian soldiers emerged and surrounded the group. Bradley was used to this and explaining that they were Americans, Americanskys, and just wanted to return to their countrymen.[67] As he prepared to deliver his speech, Bradley noticed that none of the Russians had their guns pointed at the group. This in itself was strange considering how all the way from Stalag III C to here any Russian soldiers they had met had assumed the group was German and only quick thinking and smooth talking had kept the group from an early grave. For some reason though, these soldiers were trying to get Bradley and his friends to follow them. This too was abnormal as the Russians usually preferred to shoot onsite instead of trying to relocate their victims. Although wary of some sort of trick, Bradley knew that when angered, a Russian's first instinct was to shoot and Bradley certainly did not want that. He and the others resignedly followed the soldiers. They were led to a large compound with a train station at the center. At first, the men feared that they had been brought to another POW camp. Sensing a trap, Bradley and the others started to worry even more. However, an interpreter was quickly brought over and explained to the

[66] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 95-97

[67] Bradley admitted that for some reason, the Russian soldiers seemed to believe that he was the leader of their particular group and he was always the one being interrogated when the group was stopped. When the men were walking through Europe, these constant interviews confused and bothered Bradley, but looking back years later, he finally realized that the Russians had assumed that he was the group's leader. Bradley, "Interview," 27.

bewildered group that this was a collection center. From here, the men would take a train to Odessa and from there a ship would return them to Allied lines.

Hardly believing that their ordeal was over, Bradley and the others allowed themselves to be herded onto a flat car. The men spent most of the trip believing that there had been a mistake and that there was no way they were really headed home. Others feared a German attack against the train and prepared to flatten themselves on the ground to avoid gun fire and bombs. At one point, the men even discussed the best way to jump from a train. Wandering in the wilderness was preferable to getting shot or recaptured for some of the men. Despite the various fears, the worst enemy the men faced was the cold. The cars they rode were meant for cargo and had not been designed for human passengers. Consequently there was no insulation and the men huddled together for warmth. However, soon even that was not enough and they resorted to using plywood, tarpaulin or anything else they could find as blankets. By the time they arrived at the next station, the men looked more like a pile of garbage than actual human beings.

Bradley and the others had been told they would need to switch trains part of the way through their trip to Odessa. They stopped in a small town and were moved to their next vehicle. The new car they were loaded onto was absolutely gorgeous. It was the first train that Bradley had been on since being captured that had been designed and furnished with humans in mind. There were large piles of fresh straw for the men to sleep on and a furnace in the center of each car to help the men warm up. And, best of all, none of the cars were overcrowded. Each only contained about twenty or so men and Bradley knew from bitter experience that a car such as this could hold far more than that. Everyone got their

own space and were all able to spread out for a nice nap within the car.

As the train neared Odessa, the temperature inside of the car steadily dropped. Despite the heat created by the furnace, many of the men started to feel the cold. Their car was not fully insulated after all. When the train stopped and the doors opened, Bradley saw the reason why. While they had been traveling, a snow storm had blown into Odessa and worked itself into a blizzard. The snow was falling fast and heavy, making it very difficult to see anything. The men quickly gathered together and followed their Russian guides away from the train station. Scared of getting separated after making it this far, the men stayed within hands reach of each other as they were led down the street to a large building. Heavily armed Russians stood outside of the building and watched as the former prisoners filed past. They were shown to a room where the men were expected to sleep on the floor together. At this point, Bradley and the others were used to this arrangement and quickly drifted off.

The next morning, Bradley expected to be woken early for roll call, but no such call came. Every day at Stalag III C had begun with roll call and it felt strange to be back under guard and not need to fall out. The men were left to their own devices until after lunch when the Russians took them outside, still under guard, to walk around several blocks for exercise before returning to the compound. Walking around Odessa, Bradley saw the destruction wrought by German fliers and saw the large piles of rubble that used to be buildings. For a moment, Bradley flashed back to Amiens and thought that he was expected to clear the area of rubble. When he paused to look, it was a Russian voice yelling for him to catch up, not a German one. Bradley had to remind himself that he was looking at Russian buildings, not German ones and no work was expected of him here. He quickly fell back in line. The

guards stayed with the men all day and all night both to act as protection and to ensure that the men could not leave. Negotiations were underway with the Americans and the British and the Russians did not want to lose their bargaining chips. Bradley and the others had survived Stalag III C and a trek across Europe in their pursuit for freedom. Now, they were stuck back under guard by a foreign power without any control over their own lives. Bradley and the others hoped that this really was the end of their ordeal and not the start of a new chapter.[68]

Eventually, the men were given the good news; a ship was waiting in the harbor to take them back to their own lines. Negotiations had broken down between the Russians and the Americans, but the British, who also had former prisoners waiting to be returned, had sent a man to negotiate their return. The British were more successful than their American counterparts and the Russians told their captives to expect to leave shortly after meeting with the British representative. Bradley and the others were more than excited to leave, as bombings on Odessa had picked up again and they desperately wanted to escape before they became a part of the rubble covering the city.

The next day, all of the men were marched from the building they had been staying in and were brought down to the docks. On their way there, they passed a large, gleaming ship. The Russians told them, filled with pride, that that vessel was going to take Premier Stalin to Yalta to meet with other officials. Next to the Russian ship was the British liner that was to take the men home.[69] Even though it was not as new nor as shiny, Bradley and the others believed that their ship was more magnificent than whatever vehicle Stalin chose to cross the Black Sea in.

---

[68] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 100-102.
[69] Bradley, *Aid Man!*, 103

The trip itself was relatively uneventful and after more than a day at sea, the ship finally docked at Naples, Italy. British officers soon took charge of the men and checked them over. The men were all interviewed and given medical exams and then fed. During the exam, those with the worst medical cases were immediately separated and flown to hospitals in the U.S. to give them the best shot of surviving. The rest of the men were forced to wait for a ship that would return them to America. The GIs took advantage of the brief holiday and went off to explore Pompeii. Bradley, however, could not join them because he had cut his foot and it had become infected, making it very difficult to walk. He instead spent several days in bed, resting up and taking medicine to kill the infection.[70]

Several days after their arrival in Naples, an American ship arrived to take the men home.[71] Once aboard, the captain of the ship spoke over the loud speaker and explained the situation to the men. The ship would be sailing alone across the Atlantic alone and would not be a part of a convoy. Many of the German U-boats that normally would have threatened them had already been destroyed by the Allies and those that still survived would not dare attack such a large ship. Regardless, the captain was going to make the run as fast as possible as this would also decrease the likelihood of attack and would not stop for any men who fell overboard. The ship would not be stopping for anything, so everyone that wanted to return to the US had best stay on the ship. For the entire trip, the men got nervous whenever the ship hit a wave, fearing that they would be thrown overboard and abandoned in the ocean.

Eventually, the ship made it back to the United States, with all of the men it had left Italy with, and everyone quickly

[70] Ibid., 105
[71] Bradley, “Interview,” 29.

disembarked. Bradley and the others were again loaded onto trains and taken to various camps to be processed. Bradley ended up at Fort Meade in Maryland where he was interviewed again, this time by Americans, and then given a furlough to visit home. He took the train into DC and got off at his usual stop. Walking down New York Avenue to his boyhood home, Bradley felt isolated from all of the people he passed. None of these people had watched people get blown apart by both Allied and Axis bombs in Europe. They would never know the joy of winning the meat lottery and finding that one scrap of meat at the bottom of their stew in the middle of Germany. And, Bradley was fairly certain, none of these people had ever been threatened with a machine gun for not drinking a vodka and gasoline cocktail. In short, none of these people had his war experiences, and although he could spend the rest of his life trying to explain it to them, they would never truly understand what he had gone through.[72] Nothing could accurately convey all of his experiences to these strangers and no matter how hard he tried, a gap would always exist between him and civilians. For the rest of his life, Bradley tried to bridge this gap by talking and writing about his experiences. He published multiple books filled with his writings and poems through which he tried to convey all that he had seen, heard, smelled, touched and tasted. Short of bringing people back in time with him, this was the closest that Bradley could get people to what he experienced and Bradley was determined to share all that he knew.[73]

[72] Bradley, *Aid Man!, 105-107*
[73] Bradley, "Interview," 30-31.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Bradley, Robert B. “The Lost Battalion,” “*The Lost Battalion and Vermont Poems* n.p. 1993, Musselman Library Special Collections.

Bradley, Robert, “Interview with Robert Bradley.” Interview by Ryan Adams. Musselman Library Special Collections.

Bradley, Robert Bell, “Thoughts Born in a Stalag,” *A Collection of Poems* n.p. 1988, Musselman Library Special Collections.

Bradley, Robert Bell, *Recollect and Ponder Part I* n.p., 1995, Musselman Library Special Collections.

Bradley, Robert Bell, *The Aid Man Infantry Team* n.p. 1995, Musselman Library Special Collections.

Bradley, Robert B., *Aid Man!* New York: Vantage Press, 1970, Musselman Library Special Collections.

Goodenkauf, Arley L., Unpublished Memoirs in Robert Bell Bradley Collection at U.S. Army War College Library and Archives.

Secondary Sources

Barr,Niall. *Eisenhower’s Armies,* New York: Pegasus Books, 2015.

Billinger Jr., Robert D. “With the Wehrmacht in Florida: The German Pow Facility at Camp Blanding, 1942-1946.” *The Florida Historical Quarterly* 58, no. 2 (Oct., 1979); 160-173.

Collingham, Lizzie, *The Taste of War; World War II and the Battle for Food* New York: The Penguin Press, 2012.

Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 27 July 1929, Article 11. Accessed November 8, 2016. https://wcjp.unicri.it/db_legislation/docs/Convention%20relative%20to%20the%20Treatment%20of%20Prisoners%200f%20War_1929.pdf (Geneva Convention of 1929).

Cowdrey, Albert E. *Fighting for Life; American Military Medicine in World War II* New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Jones, Michael. *After Hitler; The Last Ten Days of World War II in Europe*. New York: Penguin Random House, 2015.

Mansoor, Peter R. *The GI offensive in Europe; The Triumph of American Infantry Divisions, 1941-1945*. Kansas: University of Kansas, 1999.

Paxton, Vincoe M. and Stuart D. Rizika. “Soldiers of the Medical Detachment.” *The American Journal of Nursing* 45, no. 9 (Sept., 1945): 693-696.

"Pistol Packin' Mama by Al Dexter, 1943," *Luftex.com,* accessed Dec. 10, 2016, http://www.luftex.com/aldexter.htm

"Prisoner of War (POW)," *Britannica Online Encyclopedia,* accessed November 8, 2016. https://www.britannica.com/topic/prisoner-of-war

Rundell Jr., Walter. "Paying the Pow in World War II," *Military Affairs* 22 no. 3 (Autumn 1958): 121-134.

Streit, Christian, "Soviet Prisoners of War in the Hands of the Wehrmacht," in *War of Extermination; The German Military in World War II, 1941-1944.* Ed. Hannes Heer and Klaus Naumann New York: Bergahn Books, 2000.

Wiltse, Charles M. *Medical Department United States Army in World War II* Washington DC: Office of the Surgeon General Department of the Army, 1963.

From Crusaders to Flunkies: American Newspaper Coverage of Black First World War Veterans in American Newspapers between 1915 and 1930

By
Matthew LaRoche

~ ♦ ~

"War is teaching us that we are inseparably linked together here in America," said Dr. Robert Moton of the Tuskegee Institute, in 1918. "The test of our greatness as a nation is not in the accumulation of wealth, nor in the development of a culture merely. The great test is for the fortunate to reach down and help the less highly favored, the poor, the humble—yes, the black. My race… simply asks an equal chance on equal terms with other Americans."[1] Black Americans met that test admirably. They bled in opposition to aggressive nations on the Western Front. However, after American newspapers released a slew of encouraging pieces—patriotic war propaganda aimed at convincing black Americans to bleed for President Wilson's great democratic crusade—the nation and the news quickly forgot the inherent promise in letting black soldiers serve: service must equal citizenship in all its forms. However, with the war won, newspapers no longer championed the capability of and dues due to all black Americans. Less than a decade after the United States entered the First World War, the nation returned to a comfortable

[1] "Dr. Moton Writes of the Colored Man in the World War," *Washington Bee*, May 18, 1918.

racial status quo that saw blacks as fit to serve, but not to stand shoulder to shoulder with their white comrades in matters of respect, remembrance, and remuneration. The great, resurrected hope in a worldwide democracy, led by an America that proudly brandished equality on the home front as her sacred sword, was betrayed with silence.

As Nina Mjagkij chronicles in *Loyalty in Times of Trial: The African-American Experience During World War One*, throughout the mobilization of the United States leading up to 1917, the black community largely held three distinct views of their place in the World War. One faction, headed by W. E. B. Du Bois and others, including Robert Moton, imagined that the selfless sacrifice of black lives at the front would force a crisis of conscience across America, that at long last, whites would extend the blessings of liberty to their black countrymen.[2] The second group, disillusioned after decades of Jim Crowe despotism, saw little of benefit in Wilson's hypocritical proclamations of a war to defend and spread democracy worldwide.[3] Put simply, if Wilsonian democracy abroad looked the same as democracy at home, nothing substantial would be gained by their deaths. However, the third and perhaps largest group neither dared to hope, nor outright condemned the war—they could only eye developments warily from the sidelines.[4] Even with the advent of the universal draft for eligible males in May of 1917, supporters of black involvement in the war had to quickly undo centuries of bad blood between black Americans and the reality of America as they

[2] Nina Mjagkij, *Loyalty in Time of Trial: The African-American Experience During World War I*, (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2011), XIX.
[3] Ibid., xx.
[4] Ibid.

had suffered it.[5] In order to call them to the colors, encouragement of all kinds appeared in the public sphere. Perhaps the most widely distributed and noticed encouragements appeared in American newspapers and, largely speaking, in specifically black publications.

Between 1915 and mid-1919, newspaper representations of black soldiers, their accomplishments and those of their predecessors are fairly positive.[6] For example, in August of 1915 the *Cleveland Gazette*, a black newspaper from Ohio, ran the story of two colored sailors in the war of 1812. John Thompson lost his legs—and his life—aboard a privateer, allegedly shouting "Fire away, boys! Nebber haul de colors down!"[7] as he passed. Aboard the same warship, John Davis "begged that he might be thrown overboard immediately, lest his mangled remains encumber the working of the guns."[8] An Ohio newspaper choosing to resurrect the story of a few long dead black sailors does seem somewhat out

---

[5] Ibid.

[6] Searching the database *America's Historical Newspapers* for headlines pertaining to different permutations of "negro soldiers," and "colored soldiers," during "war," "great war," or "funerals," between 1915 and 1930 revealed interesting articles and unexpected patterns in media coverage. Overall, I found perhaps a hundred or so articles that were relevant to the black war effort, or black soldiers post-war. This is a huge dearth of coverage, considering the fifteen-year span of the search, and the fact that *America's Historical Newspapers* contains over one thousand U.S. newspapers. This is also surprising considering that, according to induction rates supplied in Table 4.1 of Nina Mjagkij's *Loyalty in Times of Trial*, the 367,656 black soldiers who served in the U.S. armed forces during the Great War constituted about 1/6th of the entire army.

[7] "Heroic Colored Sailors," *Cleveland Gazette*, August 7, 1915.

[8] Ibid.

of place, and perhaps even facetious. However, the article speaks with the utmost respect throughout, suggesting that it numbered among the first publications of an entirely new strain of black journalism, one set on resurrecting the will of black men to fight by extolling the successes of their ancestors.

However, the anti-war faction within the black press countered these encouragements by dramatically covering the ways in which the military actively used its black servicemen as fodder. For example, the *Topeka Plaindealer*, another black paper, bristled in reaction to the fighting on the Mexican border in June of 1916. The headline left little room for ambiguity: "In Mexico the Colored Boys are Chucked in Front of Enemy Bullets so that Some White Might Gain the Honor and Obtain Promotion!"[9] Others in the newspaper business condemned the military less vehemently. This third faction utilized language that acknowledged the injustices suffered by black troops, but still clearly aspired to full respect and citizenship. A day after the *Plaindealer* covered the fighting in Mexico, another black paper, the *Freeman*, asked that "colored Americans hold memorial meetings in honor of the colored cavalrymen who were sacrificed in Mexico and died bravely fighting for the flag, which does not protect them at home."[10] The *Freeman* did not present the abuses on the southern border as symptomatic of an unassailable racial divide—as injustices that would have no solution except for, presumably, separation from the United States, and a total rejection of its hypocritical claims to liberty and equality. Rather, the *Freeman* made an intentional effort to utilize the language of patriotism as a means of shaming the military for not upholding the very standards

[9] "War Outlook and the Colored Soldier," *Topeka Plaindealer*, June 30, 1916.
[10] "Honor Colored Soldiers," *Freeman*, July 1, 1916.

of liberty and equality it claimed to protect. They sought to correct the injustice by drawing wide attention to its inherent contradictions. Whether any of these efforts were particularly successful is unclear. But they do suggest that a lively skepticism posed a real challenge to the pro-war sections of the black press.

Still, pro-war media had other strategies for countering this skepticism. For one, they ran hopeful op-eds that promised black contributions to the allied war effort would be acknowledged and rewarded by war's end. Their first cause for optimism came with the widespread use of colonial troops in the French and British armies. The *Western Outlook*, a black press out of Oakland, California, ran a piece in 1915 assuring its readers that, "employment of colored soldiers upon the continent of Europe deals a shattering blow to race prejudice. After the war is over, the position of the dark people in the political economy in Greater Britain and Greater France will never be the same as it was before the conflict."[11] However, this inducement came with a massive drawback—it would only be proven right or wrong at war's end. More persuasive were the incentives that offered immediate payoffs, so pro-war publications naturally stressed these as much as possible.

For example, the *Savannah Tribune*, another black paper, published the letter of a "Satisfied Colored Soldier" in February of 1918, advertising service as a path to good food and travel.[12] Drawing upon a letter that Private Henry Perry's mother had just received, the *Tribune* described army life in beyond idyllic terms. It brought "news that her son is doing splendid… enjoying life and

[11] "The War and the Colored Races," *Western Outlook*, May 29, 1915.
[12] "Letter Received from a Satisfied Colored Soldier," *Savannah Tribune*, February 23, 1918.

getting good pay for his services," to the tune of sending home twenty-five dollars a month.[13] Indeed, Perry wrote that the army, "give[s] me everything I need. We get plenty to eat. Get up every morning at 5:30 and go to bet [sic] at 9. This is healthy and I like it."[14] And if the lifestyle and paying work failed to entice black men to enlist, the *Tribune* added comments that applied social pressure to their young black male readers. They seized upon Perry's passing comment that he felt fortunate to work alongside "lots of colored boys and men."[15] The *Tribune* turned this personal opinion into a subtle shaming device, writing that letters like Perry's had already "caused many others at home to enlist."[16] But perhaps this article's most surreptitious tactic was its attempt to convince readers that Perry's experiences were that of a standard, black Doughboy. By giving no details as to the work Perry found himself doing, the *Tribune* deemphasized the fact that Perry was a member of "Stevedore Regiment 303, at Newport News, VA," and as such was relegated to dock work.[17] A casual reader might be drawn in by the reports of travel, pay, and camaraderie, might skip past the word "stevedore," and forget the indignity of being consigned to manual labor until he had already signed enlistment papers.

By mid-1917, with the U.S. finally in the war, it was too late for many black men to debate the pros and cons of service. By May 18th, the Selective Service Act had been passed, and hundreds of thousands of African-Americans dutifully registered for the

[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.

draft.[18] They suffered overt discrimination from military authorities. Draft board officials tore off the lower left-hand corner of black registrant's forms to better mark them out for segregated units.[19] Naval policy relegated African-Americans to menial roles, and the Marine Corps barred them entirely.[20] Worse, after the Houston Riot in August of 1917 saw armed black soldiers scuffling with aggressive, local whites, the military doubled down on its estimation that black soldiers were more a liability than an advantage.[21] For the rest of the war, the majority of African-American servicemen would work logistics and construction jobs—only two units, the 92nd and 93rd infantry divisions, ever saw combat.[22]

Despite these ill omens, pro-war papers continued to publish and republish assurances that victory in Europe would lead to a proper appreciation of blacks at home. But none, perhaps, summed up the black community's lingering hope as they endured the First World War than a Mr. William T. Fergusson of Washington, D.C. As a man well past the age of eligibility for the draft, Mr. Fergusson nonetheless wanted to be seen doing his part to defeat "an enemy whose success means a slavery many times worse than the one from which Lincoln emancipated us."[23] He wrote to the *Washington Bee* with a different approach in mind than most—something which the pro-war papers may not have

---

[18] Chad L. Williams, *Torchbearers of Democracy: African-American Soldiers in the World War I Era*, (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), p. 53.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid., 54.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid., 2.
[23] "Our Country At War—Will the Colored Soldier Do His Duty?" *Washington Bee*, April 13, 1918.

fully anticipated, but surely welcomed. As he saw it, "We have given our men and our money to help the cause of democracy. Now, let us… enlist in that cause for which we can fight—producing bigger crops."[24] Viewing this as a natural way for civilians to keep faith with their sons, fathers, and brothers overseas, Fergusson threw his heart into his plea. However, his zeal and optimism took a surprising turn as he fully embraced the tenets of the pro-war faction. He chides his fellow black civilians who have yet to find ways to support the war effort from home, "the rewards for being a patriotic citizen is a thousandfold greater than a few dollars ready cash."[25] But he rounds out his plea with a resounding faith that "When the war is over, and various men are called to the White House to be congratulated… some colored man will be among the number."[26] And not only will he be invited and recognized, but President Wilson "will say: Well done, faithful American. Enter thou into the joys of democracy."[27]

Mr. Fergusson could hardly have been more wrong. While black soldiers served with *extreme* distinction, one of the first acts by the U.S. military in the post-war environment was to exclude blacks from officially partaking in the fruits of victory.[28] As the triumphal Allies in all their diversity, "the British and their colonial servicemen, the Italians, the Japanese, the Portuguese, and others,"[29] passed under the Arc de Triomphe, the American soldiers displayed were decidedly monochromatic

---

[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid,.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Chad L. Williams, *Torchbearers of Democracy*, 299.
[29] Ibid.

> "By the time of the victory parade, the Ninety-second and Ninety-third divisions had been hastily shipped home, leaving no black combat troops in France. Thousands of black stevedores, pioneer infantrymen, and other service troops still remained for Pershing to include in the representative assemblage of American's forces…. The marginalization of African American troops spoke volumes to how Woodrow Wilson, the War Department, and much of white America envisioned a similarly Jim Crowed historical memory of the war and black participation in it."[30]

From the first moment of the cease-fire, white Americans began the work of returning black soldiers to civilian life, to another strict racial hierarchy that would not afford them any kindness based on their sacrifices. They were to accept that, as a white speaker in New Orleans said, "you are going to be treated exactly like you were before the war; this is a white man's country and we expect to rule it."[31] American newspapers watched the enforcement of this home order throughout the demobilization period of 1919, when outbursts of violence throughout that "Red Summer," disproportionately targeted returning black veterans.[32] While papers typically denounced the violence, few made the black soldier their main concern.

This attitude is not surprising, considering that only for a brief period in 1918 did white newspapers take a positive interest

---

[30] Ibid, 300.
[31] Arthur E Barbeau and Florette Henri, *The Unknown Soldiers: African-American Troops in World War I*, (Philadelphia: Temple University Press), 175.
[32] *Torchbearers of Democracy*, 223-225.

in the accomplishments of black soldiers in France. For the majority of the war, black servicemen were functionally invisible. However, in May of 1918, the *Grand Forks Herald* cited "a notable instance of bravery and devotion by two soldiers of an American colored regiment operating in a French sector."[33] In a remarkable act of soldiering, Private Henry Johnson and Private Roberts "continued fighting after receiving wounds and despite the use of grenades by a superior force. They should be given credit for preventing, by their bravery, the capture of any of our men."[34] The *Fort Wayne News Sentinel* echoed this as the "best story, so far, of the valor of Americans on the battlefields of France."[35] The *Duluth News Tribune* concurred, and even took this event as proof positive of "a spirit of democracy which knows no race nor color."[36] However, this enthusiasm for rallying around universal democracy was short-lived, both in the headlines and in the national sentiment. As soon as there was no more news of heroic deeds coming from the front, fault lines quickly reemerged between the white public and the returning black veteran.

Most notably, perhaps, was the coverage given to promises of war risk insurance for black soldiers and their families, and to provide hospitals for black as well as white veterans in need of long-term care. In December of 1917, with the war far from decided, the *Savannah Tribune* published an article relaying Secretary of War Newton D. Baker's desire to overcome the "many difficulties" of mobilizing blacks for war while taking "the

---

[33] "Two Colored Soldiers Keep Off Hun Raid," *Grand Forks Herald*, May 21, 1918.
[34] Ibid.
[35] "Pershing Puts Thrills in Official Communique," *Fort Wayne News Sentinel*, May 20, 1918.
[36] "Lufbery's Death is Announced in Communique," *Duluth News Tribune*, May 21, 1918.

peculiar southern situation," namely the explosive bigotry unleashed whenever southern whites encountered blacks in uniform, into account."[37] Reporting, in full, an official statement by the Secretary of War, they distributed proof of his promise that at war's end, "all will be alike entitled to the gratitude of their country"—or, as the paper put it, that the "Negro Must Get [a] Square Deal."[38] In March of 1918, the *Tribune* announced that the Secretary of War had unveiled legislation "provided by the Government for the protection of the soldier and his family, in addition to the soldier's monthly allotment and in addition to the Government's compensation for the soldier's death or disability."[39] Such insurance was surely badly needed after the war had claimed or crippled many black soldiers, leaving many veterans and families short on income.

However, regardless of Baker's attempts to remunerate black war veterans as he would white veterans, by 1920 the *Savannah Tribune* had declared him guilty of blatantly discriminating against the future black servicemen of the post-war army. Citing military policy

> "to assign national guard units recruited from colored men to duty that will not incorporate them in a division composed of white organizations…. it has been decided that colored troops… shall be organized into pioneer infantry units that can be

[37] "Says All Soldiers Treated Fairly," *Savannah Tribune*, December 8, 1917.
[38] Ibid.
[39] "Secretary of War: Negro Soldiers to Insure," *Savannah Tribune*, March 16, 1918.

assigned to duty under command of corps headquarters."[40]

He cites "considerations bearing upon military efficiency"[41] as the sole reason behind relegating all black servicemen to labor battalions in the future. However, as the *Tribune* notes, the absence of any other minorities from exclusive service in the "drudgery corps" makes it clear that any lack of efficiency surrounding black troops, in light of their established competence in combat, must come from white discrimination.[42] Baker seemed unwilling to rescind his position on the issue, considering it born of solid, "dispassionate thought."[43]

Even more blatantly biased policy neglected the needs of black victims of shell-shock, gas, and other lingering wounds. The *Washington Bee* reported in 1921 on the decision by the Alabama Chamber of Commerce to stonewall the construction of two hospitals in Montgomery for colored Great War veterans, "one for tubercular and one for shell-shocked soldiers."[44]According to the *Bee*, "the board, unaware at first that the hospitals were for Colored Americans made every effort to secure them through Congressman J. R. Tyson."[45] Unsurprisingly, as soon as "Tyson informed the board that the two hospitals were for Colored soldiers," the board "emphatically and unanimously rejected the idea."[46] Blistering at the injustice of the decision, the *Bee* protested

---

[40] "Secretary of War Taken to Task," *Savannah Tribune*, August 14, 1920.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.
[44] "Oppose Erection of Hospital for Colored American World War Heroes," *Washington Bee*, July 9, 1921.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.

the horror that black soldiers were left "alive but in such a condition that they are not able to take advantage of the opportunities in life. They must now take as their reward such conditions that are now facing them."[47] Sadly, except for independent philanthropy, there were few ways to overcome such vindictive obstacles placed before the black veteran.

Similarly, dissenting media as a whole seemingly found it difficult to shout above the comfortable silence that the nation wrapped itself in. It seems that black soldiers had become a liability—a nuisance, even—as their existence clashed with the national desire for a "Jim Crowed" memory, as Chad L. Williams recounts.[48] After 1920, even the *Savannah Tribune* focuses almost solely on the economic effects of the war on black workers, not soldiers, with the exception of a 1921 article on, again, Captain Needham Roberts, "one of the two Negro soldiers of the New York 15th who had the distinction of being the first American soldiers to be decorated in France."[49] By 1927, only one rather unsettling article on black soldiers, from the *Topeka Plaindealer*, appears, one that encapsulates how little had come of black hopes in the Great War.

Whether or not the posting was strictly racially motivated or not, the condition of the 10th U.S. Cavalry Regiment (Colored) as of August 1927 offers a further poignant visage of the black soldier, so successful in war, losing the peace and returning to his "proper" place in American society. A decade after the U.S.'s

---

[47] Ibid.
[48] *Torchbearers of Democracy*, p. 300.
[49] "Great Negro Hero of World War," *Savannah Tribune*, August 4, 1921. The other two articles from 1921 on that pertain to the war at all are "The Coming of War Meant New Day for Negro Labor," Feb. 5, 1921 and "Negro Workers During the World War," March 12, 1921.

entry into the First World War, as "Uncle Sam's only cavalry division" marched out of Ft. Bliss, E Troop of the "famous 10th Cavalry Colored" regiment left Ft. Huachua to escort them en route."[50] By "escort" the Army meant "look after [dignitaries and military officials], care for their horses, etc." After yet again answering the call of their country—and, indeed, of the budding Free World—colored soldiers of the United States were still singled out for use as "flunkies," as manservants and horse handlers.[51] Serving in segregated units, and serving as literal servants was customary long after the sacrifices of the Argonne Forest, to say nothing of Yorktown, New Orleans, or Ft. Wagner.

American newspapers apparently saw nothing to criticize in that; the headlines stayed silent on the matter, even amongst black newspapers. By 1927, the black soldier had again been reduced to a caricature, something that could be "famous" while still consigned to holding horses for white superiors, be they officers or rank-and-file soldiers.[52] While the war was afoot, this caricature was arguably manipulated and romanticized for propaganda purposes, as with the tale of privates Johnson and Roberts. Those taken in by the image of a son of slaves liberating the downtrodden of France and Belgium seemingly ignored the hypocrisy of returning such a man to Jim Crow and further decades of socially abided racial violence. With the peace, the names of colored soldiers on monuments across France were left to molder on the edge of national memory, sustained by fewer and fewer voices with each passing year. Even the tradition of dissent set forth by a core of black newspapers could not sustain the outcry for

[50] "Colored Troop Attend Cavalry Division Maneuvers—As Flunkies," *Topeka Plaindealer*, August 30, 1927.
[51] Ibid.
[52] Ibid.

recognition. The promise of citizenship, although written with blood, was thought certain to invigorate the black "menace of degeneracy" in countless imagined forms.[53] For most, the uncertainty of equality was too dangerous for interwar America to deliver—so America did not deliver.

[53] Nina Mjagkij, *Loyalty in Times of Trial*, p. 176.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"Colored Troop Attend Cavalry Division Maneuvers—As Flunkies." *Topeka Plaindealer*. August 30, 1927.

"Dr. Moton Writes of the Colored Man in the World War." *Washington Bee*. May 18, 1918.

"Great Negro Hero of World War." *Savannah Tribune*. August 4, 1921.

"Heroic Colored Sailors." *Cleveland Gazette*. August 7, 1915.

"Honor Colored Soldiers." *Freeman*. July 1, 1916.

"Letter Received from a Satisfied Colored Soldier." *Savannah Tribune*. February 23, 1918.

"Lufbery's Death is Announced in Communique." *Duluth News Tribune*. May 21, 1918.

"Negro Workers During the World War." *Savannah Tribune*. March 12, 1921.

"Oppose Erection of Hospital for Colored American World War Heroes." *Washington Bee*. July 9, 1921.

"Our Country At War—Will the Colored Soldier Do His Duty?" *Washington Bee*. April 13, 1918.

"Pershing Puts Thrills in Official Communique." *Fort Wayne News Sentinel*. May 20, 1918.

"Says All Soldiers Treated Fairly." *Savannah Tribune*. December 8, 1917.

"Secretary of War: Negro Soldiers to Insure." *Savannah Tribune*. March 16, 1918.

"Secretary of War Taken to Task." *Savannah Tribune*. August 14, 1920.

"The Coming of War Meant New Day for Negro Labor." *Savannah Tribune*. Feb. 5, 1921.

"The War and the Colored Races." *Western Outlook*. May 29, 1915.

"Two Colored Soldiers Keep Off Hun Raid." *Grand Forks Herald*. May 21, 1918.

"War Outlook and the Colored Soldier." *Topeka Plaindealer*. June 30, 1916.

Secondary Sources

Barbeau, Arthur E., and Florette Henri. *The Unknown Soldiers: African-American Troops in World War I*. Philadelphia. Temple University Press. 1996.

Mjagkij, Nina. *Loyalty in Time of Trial: The African-American Experience During World War I*. Lanham, MD. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2011.

Williamns, Chad L. *Torchbearers of Democracy: African-American Soldiers in the World War I Era*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina. University of North Carolina Press. 2010.

Helpers in a "Heathen" Land?: an Examination of Missionary Perceptions of the Cherokees

By
Andrew Nosti

~ ♦ ~

Introduction

From the earliest contact between Europeans and Indigenous Americans, traces of cultural conversion and coercion underpinned the emerging interactions. These cultural pressures often materialized through religion, chiefly Christianity. As the "white man's burden" of bringing what they considered civilization to the newfound lands pervaded the public conscience, spreaders of the gospel permeated Indigenous American communities. A special relationship between Christian missionaries and Native peoples developed, often serving as the first and sometimes only forms of interracial interaction.

Following their revolutionary victory, America's first wave of officials had a challenge to confront: how to handle the Native tribes within and around American-claimed lands. The initial conquered lands approach soon gave way to Secretary of War Henry Knox's civilization program. This directive, begun during George Washington's presidency, established Native tribes as sovereign nations while simultaneously working towards their eventual assimilation into the dominant American culture. Knox and Washington, like most leaders of their day, viewed the Natives as uncivilized, which meant living and functioning under non-

Euro-American standards and mores. As these officials depicted the Indigenous inferiority as cultural instead of racial, they pursued a process through which the Native people would gain the intellectual, moral, and physical tools required for their acculturation. The early American government quickly endorsed Christianization as integral to this acculturation process.[1]

As missionaries sought out distant lands to transform tribal peoples, the U.S. experienced a transformation of its own in the Second Great Awakening of the early nineteenth century. This religious revolution formed a new frontier of American Christianity. Doctrines of self-improvement and revivalist reformation replaced stricter Calvinistic teachings of preordination. New forms of socio-religious egalitarianism undermined past religious hierarchies, especially in New England parishes only recently adjusted to the effects of the First Great Awakening of the mid-eighteenth century. These undercurrents sent shockwaves through the American populace and catalyzed a number of reform efforts. The combination of democratic egalitarianism and zealous self-improvement energized an individualistic approach that focused on changing society one person at a time, viewing the body politic as an atomized collective only alterable from the atom up.[2]

The Second Great Awakening had perhaps its greatest effect on religious institutions and efforts themselves. These effects extended beyond pulpits and congregations to missionary causes. Sometimes already structurally in place due to previous outreach and the federal government's civilization program, the

[1] Theda Perdue, "Introduction: The Cherokees and U.S. Indian Policy," *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016), 7-11.

[2] For more information on the reform movements stemming from the Second Great Awakening, see John Thomas, "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 17, Issue 4 (Winter, 1965): 656-681.

Second Great Awakening's religious revivalism revitalized the missionary cause. A new generation of preachers swelled the missionary ranks and descended upon tribal peoples, bringing their gospel fervor to the "heathen" lands. As the atomized conceptions of self- and societal reform combined with the doctrine of Millenialism, which demanded faith across all people to usher in the holy millennium prophesied in scripture, many believers turned to the Indigenous Americans to prove their worth, craft a better society, and swell the ranks of the devout.[3]

While all missionaries provide a profound insight into early American perceptions of their Native neighbors, the missionaries to the Cherokees prove remarkable and worthy of special attention for a variety of reasons. These missionaries came from diverse backgrounds and held diverse beliefs. Some followed Congregationalist doctrines; others Methodist, Baptist, or Moravian. Many came from New England; others Tennessee, North Carolina, or elsewhere. By the time of removal, Congregationalists had established nine mission stations in the Tennessee, Alabama, and Georgia regions of the Cherokee Nation and sent thirty-five ministers, school teachers, and artisans to these outposts; the Moravians boasted two mission stations in Cherokee Georgia; the Methodists had eight circuit-riding missionaries; and

[3] For more about the causes and propagation of the Second Great Awakening, see Donald G. Mathews, "The Second Great Awakening as an Organizing Process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1969): 23-43. For more on the effects of the Second Great Awakening, see Louis P. Masur, "Religion and Politics," *1831: Year of Eclipse* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 63-114; and Richard D. Shiels, "The Scope of the Second Great Awakening: Andover, Massachusetts, as a Case Study," *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Religion in the Early Republic (Summer, 1985): 223-246. To see how missionary-like effects affected other portions of the United States during the Second Great Awakening, turn to Carol Sherif, "The Perils of Progress," *The Artificial River: The Erie Canal and the Paradox of Progress, 1817-1862* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), 138-171.

the Baptists had sent a total of nine missionaries, teachers, and artisans.[4]

The fact that they worked with and lived among the Cherokees gives them a prominent position within the history of American-Indian affairs. The Cherokees held a special place in the minds of white Americans. They had long attempted to adopt the norms of white society and, subsequently, gained the moniker the "most civilized tribe" in America. The missionaries' arrival in the 1810s, 20s, and 30s occurred during a pivotal era for the Cherokee Nation. Always attempting to halt the approach of the white man onto their lands, the Cherokees faced a crisis in the 1820s and 30s when Georgia and, beginning in 1829, the federal government demanded they relinquish their homelands to the state and encroaching settlers. The missionaries continued to live among the Cherokees throughout this period, and, consequently, through extant letters, diaries, and journals, they provide a crucial source of information for decoding the complex conceptions surrounding the Cherokees and Native Americans that pervaded the white psyche in the Early Republic. An examination of such documents complicates traditional, bifurcated understandings of helper and harmer in relation to Native Americans.

Civilized vs Savage

Before deciphering the missionaries' conceptions, one must first define and decode the language they employed in their discussions of the Cherokees. When Revered Cyrus Kingsbury marched from Boston to what is now Chattanooga, Tennessee, in January 1817, to establish the Brainerd School on behalf of the American Board

[4] William G. McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity, 1794-1870: Essays on Acculturation and Cultural Persistence*, Ed. Walter H. Conser, Jr. (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press), 60-61.

of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) – the Congregationalist missionary organization – he framed his impending work in the same binary context of civilization and wilderness, civilized and savage, that white Americans had applied to Indigenous Americans for centuries. On March 4, 1817, Kingsbury noted the enthusiasm among the missionaries over "the great and good work of building the cause of the Redeemer in this Heathen land." Two days later, Kingsbury penned, "Here for the first time I beheld the dear sisters who are devoted to the arduous work of civilizing and converting the savages of our wilderness."[5] In January 1818, Ard Hoyt, another ABCFM missionary, commented, "It is truly painful to see the ignorance of these people…in several instances when first speaking with them on the most solemn and momentous subjects, they would laugh like [mere?] idiots."[6] As displayed by Kingsbury's and Hoyt's entries, missionaries, and others, constantly incorporated words such as heathen, savage, ignorant, and wilderness (or wild) in discussions of Native Americans. The strikethrough of "like [mere?] idiots" suggests that Hoyt may have reconsidered the original inclusion of such condescension, but its original insertion says more than his change of mind.

Other words and phrases, such as darkness, similarly coated their language. When facing the loss of Catharine Brown, a student whose model example would gain her fame and turn her memory into a partially fictionalized figure, because of her family's western emigration, Ard Hoyt lamented, "Precious babe in Christ! a few months ago brought out of the dark wilderness; here illuminated by the word & spirit of God, & now to be sent back to the dark &

[5] Cyrus Kingsbury, March 4 and March 6, 1817, entries in *The Brainerd Journal: A Mission to the Cherokees, 1817-1823*, eds. Joyce B. Phillips and Paul Gary Phillips (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998): 31.
[6] Ard Hoyt, Jan. 28, 1818, entry in *ibid*., 45.

chilling shades of the forest."[7] The constructed dichotomies became almost Biblical: a confrontation between light and dark.

This cultural lexicon functioned as much more than a conglomeration of abstractions; concrete notions grounded words such as heathen, savage, civilization, ignorant, and darkness in clearly defined ways. A host of long-standing standards combined to make a person or a people civilized or savage, and, in order to understand the missionaries' perceptions of Native Americans, we must first understand these concrete qualifications.

One of the first requirements for "civilization" was a Lockean approach to economic living. As Roy Harvey Pearce explained in his work *Savagism and Civilization*:

> This is agrarian idealism, the belief that men, having a natural right to their land by occupation and labor, achieve status and dignity by exercising that right and becoming freeholding farmers…. For Locke—and virtually all Americans were, in the most general sense, Lockeans—man achieved his highest humanity by taking something out of nature and converting it with his labor into part of himself. His private property, conceived of in terms of the close, personal relationships of an agrarian society, was his means to social maturity."[8]

Thomas Jefferson echoed this ideology in his *Notes on the State of Virginia*: "Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of

[7] Hoyt, Nov. 20, 1818, entry in ibid., 94. Catharine Brown would become a popular figure through her published memoir – published with the assistance of a missionary helper – and then dramatized in a play about her titled *Catharine Brown, the Converted Cherokee*.
[8] Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 67-68.

God, if ever He had a chosen people. Whose breasts he has made his particular deposit for substantial and genuine virtue."[9] When whites first encountered Native Americans, the indigenous peoples had no conception of land ownership or the linear territoriality that caused Europeans to divvy up and fence off land. Over time, American Indians developed a sense of land ownership, but it functioned as a communal commodity for the public good as opposed to a privatized parcel. Most Europeans and then Americans – and, therefore, the missionaries – viewed these clear set private boundaries as requirements for civilization, leading to what Jeremiah Evarts terms the "controversies about unappropriated lands," or the discussions during the Early Republic over whether Indigenous Americans had a rightful claim to lands they did not separate and cultivate or whether state governments controlled such lands.[10]

---

[9] Thomas Jefferson, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, Memorial Edition, II, 229, as quoted in Roy Harvey Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American* Mind (Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1988), 67. This economic system espoused by Jefferson would come to be known as the "yeoman republic," and, albeit meaning different things to different people, would come to dominate a large swath of the American public as Jeffersonians took power after the election of 1800. Contemporaneous to missionaries visiting the Cherokees and Georgia asserting its claims over Cherokee lands, Jeffersonian political economy had a resurgent reverberation throughout America through the ascendancy of its second great champion: Andrew Jackson. Jackson's stance on political economy would, of course, influence his eventual stance on Indigenous Americans, which would have profound consequences for the Cherokees. For more on Jeffersonian political economy, see Drew R. McCoy, *The Elusive Republic: Political Economy in Jeffersonian America* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press, 1980).

[10] Anna Rosina, *The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokee*, eds. Anna Rosina Gambold, John Gambold, and Rowena McClinton. Abridged ed. (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010): 65; Jeremiah Evarts, "No. XVII," *The "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings*, ed. Francis Paul Prucha (Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981): 134.

This cultivation requirement and agrarian ideal caused agriculture to take precedence in American conceptions of civilization. Since Americans almost universally viewed their native neighbors as savages, they also largely believed Native Americans subsisted off of the "hunt," despite apparent agricultural tendencies within all eastern American Indians.[11] These misconceptions led white Americans to endorse the proliferation of agricultural practices among the tribes. This effort manifested in the 1791 Treaty of Hopewell between the federal government and the Cherokees, stating, "That the Cherokee nation may be led to a greater degree of civilization, and to become herdsmen and cultivators, instead of remaining in a state of hunters, the United States will, from time to time, furnish gratuitously the said nation with useful implements of husbandry."[12] Missionaries followed this example when among the Cherokees. At Springplace Mission, a mission nestled into the Appalachian Mountains along the border of Tennessee and Georgia, the Moravians set up orderly orchards to teach Cherokees agricultural methods.[13] The missionaries at Brainerd displayed a constant anxiety over what they considered the hunter state of the supposedly ignorant Cherokees and did all they could to eradicate

[11] Pearce argues that the idea of Native Americans as uncivilized penetrated so deep into the American conscience that it effectively blindfolded them to information which would refute their perceptions, creating a system of cultural cognitive bias that perpetuated the Native mythology: "Universally Americans could see the Indian only as hunter. That his culture…was as much agrarian as hunting, they simply could not see. They forgot too, if they had ever known, that many of their own farming methods had been taken over directly from the Indians whom they were pushing westward. One can say only that their intellectual and cultural traditions, their idea of order, so informed their thoughts and their actions that they could see and conceive of nothing but the Indian who hunted." Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 66.

[12] Quoted in Perdue, "Introduction," *The Cherokee Removal*, 11. The Treaty of Hopewell comprised one portion of the civilization program.

[13] Rosina, *The Moravian Springplace*, 2, 74.

this perceived way of life. When first establishing the Brainerd school, Reverend Kingsbury explained his hopes that "we may be instrumental of putting them in a way to obtain an abundance of bread, & all other necessaries of life, by teaching them & their children to cultivate the earth."[14] Over a year later, when a twenty-four-year-old Cherokee applied to live at their school, the Brainerd missionaries marked his "rambling li[f]e" and how he "obtained his living by hunting." They went on to tell him "hunting could not be permitted, but we would put him in a better way to purchase clothes, viz., that we would employ him to labor with our men in the field a sufficient time to buy his necessary clothing."[15] This value system of agricultural labor caused the characterization of "industrious" to become one of the most highly regarded traits among the students.

Connected to the view of the hunter state came an evaluation of backwards gender dynamics among the Cherokees. In the traditional Cherokee way of life, men typically hunted while women farmed. The rigidity of these gender roles broke down slightly when men assisted with clearing fields and planting crops and women dressed and tanned deerskins, but generally these separated roles defined Cherokee gender dynamics. At the same time, the Cherokees lived under matrilineal and matricentric societal and cultural structures, a dichotomous opposition to the patriarchal Euro-American society.[16] Since white Americans and Christian missionaries presumed the inferiority of the hunter state and associated masculinity with agricultural manual labor, public

[14] Kingsbury, May 1, 1817, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 34.
[15] Hoyt, June 2, 1818, entry in *ibid*, 61-62.
[16] Perdue, "Introduction," *The Cherokee Removal*, 2; M. Amanda Moulder, "Missionary Intentions: Literacy Learning Among Early Nineteenth-Century Cherokee Women," *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 63, No. 1, Indigenous and Ethnic Rhetorics (Sept., 2011): 76-77.

leadership, and the head of house, a clear effort was made to redefine Cherokee gender roles.

As Barbara Welter lays out in her essay "The Cult of True Womanhood," America experienced a firm tightening of gender roles at the same time as missionaries ventured to Cherokee land. These evolving gender roles created two distinct spheres for men and women: men would operate in the public sphere, working and bringing home the means to survive, while women would operate within the private sphere of the home, cultivating a domain of comfort for her wearied husband.[17] These sentiments rang true for the missionaries, displayed by Hoyt's assertion that "our dear sisters at the north would gladly take part with their sisters here in the labor of making clothes for these naked sons of the forest."[18] The acculturation of these emerging, or tightening, gender dynamics would force Cherokee women into the home and Cherokee men into the fields. To accomplish this, missionaries taught women how to cook, spin, weave, sew, and mend, as well as make butter, cheese, soap, and candles, while they taught men how to prepare lands and plant and harvest crops. William G. McLoughlin summed up this effort in his essay "Two Bostonian Missionaries": "The Board [ABCFM] used the mission farm to teach young Indian boys how to become farmers; missionary wives educated young Cherokees girls to become farmers' wives."[19] The missionary drive to separate boys and girls in order to demarcate their separately defined roles caused the Brainerd missionaries to flirt with the idea of establishing a separate school for girl pupils,

[17] Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Part 1 (Summer, 1966): 151-174.
[18] Hoyt, June 19, 1818, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 65. Neither Hoyt nor any other missionary appears to have reasoned that any men could contribute to this clothes-making labor.
[19] McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 63.

with male missionaries teaching the boys and female missionaries the girls.[20]

The attempted application of patriarchal gender roles extended into missionary efforts to reform Cherokee marriage practices. Cherokee marriage practices had long included polygamy, specifically sororal or intra-familial polygamy where a man would marry a set of sisters. No laws bound husbands to their wives, so when a husband grew upset with his wife he would sometimes simply leave the household and live with his relatives until he married again and moved in with his new wife, still technically married to his previous one(s).[21] This practice often shocked missionaries. When Anna Rosina of the Moravian Springplace mission encountered John Rogers, a Cherokee, she noted "Mr. Rogers's two women, namely a mother and her *daughter!* [author's emphasis]."[22] This small notation conveys both the utter surprise, and judgment, in regards to Mr. Rogers's union with both a woman and her daughter and the missionaries' perceptions of marriage as a form of property ownership – "Mr. Rogers's two women." Missionaries worked hard to explain the flaws and sin of polygamy and to institute the "correct" form of marriage within the Cherokee nation. When one polygamous relationship led to complications with one Cherokee man's

[20] One missionary, a Father Gambold, "who has resided as a teacher, more than 12 years in the nation," went so far as to say they "shall find it quite necessary to keep the sexes more separate. Being himself unable to have more than one school, he has, after repeated experiments of both sexes together, excluded the females entirely." Hoyt, July 3, 1818, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 69. This prioritization of male learning over female learning reflects Welter's conclusions regarding women's education in this time period. For more information on this, see Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860," *American Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Part 1 (Summer, 1966): 166-168.
[21] Joyce B. Phillips and Paul Gary Phillips, Note 89 in "Notes for 1818," *The Brainerd Journal*, 465.
[22]Rosina, *Moravian Springplace*, 80.

children's enrollment at the Brainerd school, Hoyt wrote, "How much better for this man & his children if he had adhered to the original institutions of marriage; few, however, of the natives pay attention to it."[23] The missionaries work to propagate their "original institutions of marriage" and ensure such complications would not happen again.

Similar to the social institution of marriage, Americans also attempted to enforce white governmental institutions on the Cherokees, believing these the best means to attain and maintain civilization. Cherokee society had long functioned under the structures of clan and kinship. Seven clans banded together to make the Cherokee nation, and blood ties rooted in shared ancestry held the clans together.[24] A combination of clan ties and adherence to a faith in cosmic harmony created an effective societal structure of clan governance. As Theda Perdue outlines in her introduction to *The Cherokee Removal*, "The obligation of clan members were [sic] so strong and so scrupulously fulfilled that the Cherokees had no need for a police force or court system: Protection, restitution, and retribution came from the clan."[25] Many Americans, including the missionaries, mistook the clan forms of governance and blood retaliation as anarchy and barbarism, and thus pressure caused the National Council to outlaw blood retaliation in favor of the Nation to resolve future injuries and disputes through legal meams.[26] This same process caused an increasing centralization of power and, subsequently, more rigid social hierarchy within the Nation. Over time, the National Council, developing into an elite body made up of wealthy, English-literate, Christian Cherokees of partial white ancestry, instituted a number of laws that dissuaded polygamy,

[23] Hoyt, Sept. 5, 1818, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 82.
[24] Gambold, Gambold, and McClinton, *The Moravian Springplace*, 88-89.
[25] Perdue, "Introduction," *The Cherokee Removal*, 4.
[26] Gambold, Gambold, and McClinton, *Moravian Springplace*, 89.

transitioned away from the matrilineal genealogy, and generally promoted a restructuring of the broader social order. These pressures eventually compelled the National Council to adopt a constitution in 1827 modelled on the American republican system, replete with a bicameral legislature and judicial system.[27]

Christianity

Americans and, perhaps even more so, missionaries combined Christianity and civilization; civilizing and converting went hand in hand. As displayed in the Kingsbury quote above, Kingsbury places the "arduous work of civilizing and converting the savages of our wilderness" in the same train of thought.[28] The fervor of the Second Great Awakening and its resulting Millenialism and revivalism caused an even greater emphasis on conversion among Native Americans in the early nineteenth century. Missionaries disagreed as to the process of Christianization; Congregationalists favored a stricter, more hierarchical and local approach while Baptists and Methodists preferred a more itinerant, egalitarian, and open one. They also sometimes disagreed as to the steps within that process – whether Christianization directly meant civilization, whether civilization should precede Christianization, and vice versa. They did all, however, agree on one thing: the absolute necessity of Christianity for a civilized society. As McLoughlin puts it, this meant that "To Christianize was to Americanize."[29]

Despite assertions by missionaries and other Americans, the Cherokees had long had religious and spiritual practices. They held a spiritual sense of cosmic harmony, a balance of the universe

[27] For more on the background to the Constitution and the Constitution itself, see Perdue, "The Cherokee Constitution of 1827," *The Cherokee Removal*, 58-70.
[28] Kingsbury, March 6, 1817, entry *in The Brainerd Journal*, 31.
[29] McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 38, 63-69.

that held everything together. Ancestry and ancestral lands contained spiritual significance for the Cherokees. They also had a ritualistic belief system that included ceremonial events, such as rain dances. Beyond these views and practices, they did have some beliefs akin to Christian theology. One such similarity came through their origin story, which consisted of a deity figure creating life, potentially in a seven day cycle and out of clay, and told the story of the first man and woman and an eventual fall of humanity.[30]

Despite the rather clear presence of spiritual and/or religious beliefs and practices among the people, some missionaries depicted the Cherokees as completely areligious. In April of 1818, Hoyt wrote

> There is nothing among this people to oppose the gospel, except their ignorance & the depravity of the human heart. They have not, as is the case with most heathen nations, a system of false religion, handed down from their fathers, which must be overturned in order to make way for the Gospel. They are rather, as the Prophet foretold the children of Israel would be, 'Without sacrifice, & without an image, & without an ephod, & without a teraphim.'[31]

[30] For more information on the Cherokee Origin stories and missionary understandings of them, see *Moravian Springplace*, 106-110. For more information on rainmaking practices, see pages 84 to 86 of the same work.
[31] Hoyt, April 9, 1818, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 51-52. The use of "handed down from their fathers" demonstrates the patricentric mindset of the missionaries. As opposed to the exclusively male clergy of the missionaries, Cherokee women actually passed down the oral traditions that would contain the Cherokee spiritual or religious narratives.

Roughly three and a half months later, Hoyt noted a conversation the missionaries had with a band of visiting Cherokees in which the visitors expressed "they had no expectation of any thing after death." Apparently, these Cherokees "seldom or never bestowed any thoughts on these things . . . they were not conscious of ever having done, said, or thought any thing that was wrong or sinful." Hoyt concluded that "they appeared as stupid, ignorant & unconcerned as the hearts that perish ever destitute of that conscience which St. Paul speaks of as 'accusing or excusing,'" and then goes on to say, "But it is not thus with all the Natives around us. Some of them are considerably enlightened, & feel the importance of receiving further instruction. Darkness itself cannot be seen without some light."[32] The final comment perhaps proves the most fruitful within this entry, that "considerably enlightened" Natives "feel the importance of receiving further instruction." Hoyt clarifies that this band did not include some particularly areligious or unthinking Cherokees, but instead could stand in for the whole of the people outside of those who actively turned to the missionaries for enlightenment. Thus, only involvement with the missionaries and conversion to Christianity could break apart "the thick darkness that shrouds their minds."[33]

This sentiment extends the ethnocentrism previously outlined to religion, and creates a belief system which places value on the missionaries as a saving, guiding force of light. The emphasis on the missionary role of illuminating the ignorant and darkened Cherokees has the practical effect of making missionary ventures directly necessary, but it also furthers the paternalistic approach that treated the Cherokees like children who did not know better. Hoyt did not paint a picture of paganist people, but

[32] Hoyt, July 26, 1818, entry in *ibid*, 75-76.
[33] *Ibid*, 76.

instead took all religious/spiritual agency away from the Cherokees and placed it within the hands of the missionaries, who could pull the Cherokees from the grips of the darkness that surrounded them. He fails to recognize, in any manner, that their belief systems and abstract approaches may have little or nothing to do with an afterlife, and may develop in a complex way in which he never imagined. Instead, he characterizes these people as "stupid, ignorant & unconcerned," seemingly without any conscience irony regarding the fact that they willingly entered into a discussion of his beliefs while he failed to inquire about, and therefore even remotely comprehend, theirs. Their lack of knowledge in regards to his faith gave Hoyt enough evidence to draw conclusions of their ignorance.

Not all missionaries diminished Cherokees' agency to the extent or in the way that Hoyt did in this instance, and not all required the same strict white standards out of their converts. The Methodists and Baptists, already less rigid in their missionary structures, primarily due to their itinerancy, more openly admitted Cherokees among their religious ranks. Similarly, the Methodists and Baptists proved much more likely to ordain Natives as well as admit them. The ABCFM ordained a few, but their nearly impossibly unrealistic standards kept them from propagating a Cherokee class of Congregational preachers, and correspondingly made them rather critical of the Baptist and Methodist ordained Native ministers.[34]

In a parallel vein, the different denominations differed over usage of the Cherokee language within conversion efforts, both verbal and written, since Sequoyah had established the Cherokee syllabary in 1827. Baptist and Methodist missionaries had a much greater inclination to support utilization of the Cherokee language,

[34] McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 83-90.

believing, in their more egalitarian approach, it could help them reach a much wider audience. Some Baptist and Methodist ministers did their best to learn at least conversational Cherokee and the larger organizations set out translating the Bible into a written Cherokee format. Congregationalists, on the other hand, resisted these bilingual efforts. The ABCFM summarized the Congregationalist view in its first annual report when it claimed, "Assimilated in language, they will more readily become assimilated in habits and manners to their white neighbors."[35] Samuel Worcester, the first corresponding secretary of the ABCFM, expressed a similar sentiment when he said using the Cherokee language "would perpetuate the dying Indian tongue."[36] The Congregationalists eventually relented and submitted to the usage of the Cherokee language, but they always viewed this as a temporary measure.[37]

Missionaries in Relation

The savage mythos that surrounded Indigenous Americans penetrated deep into the American psyche. Indian captivity narratives circulated throughout early America and bloody stories of Native barbarity – of hatchets, scalps, and war-whoops – flooded the popular imagination and drowned out the voice and

[35] Cited in McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 68. This sentiment – that the tools of conversion should function within the process of acculturation – furthers the supposition that Christianization and civilization served the same purpose.

[36] Samuel Worcester to Jeremiah Evans, July 1, 1815, ABCFM Papers, as cited in McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 68

[37] For a much more intricate examination of Americans' attitudes and intellectual approach to Native American languages, see Sean P. Harvery, "'Must Not Their Languages Be Savage and Barbarous Like Them": Philology, Indian Removal, and Race Science," *Journal of the Early Republic*, 30 (Winter, 2010): 505-532.

presence of the actual Native Americans, as they became caricatures or stereotypes, more animal than human. In his letter to Andrew Jackson, then forwarded to Congress in February of 1832, Secretary of War Lewis Cass outlines some of the prevailing American views of the southeastern Indigenous tribes and the Native American peoples in general. He accuses them of a "predisposition to war," of being "like children," and of an "indolence and improvidence" characteristic "of the Indian race."[38]

These assumptions of Indigenous character led Cass, and many others, to conclude that the "Indian race" would soon go extinct, especially if it maintained contact with the superior race and culture of the white man. This argument stemmed from an acceptance of the inevitability of white settlers encroaching upon Native lands, which would shrink their lands to a size unsustainable for their hunting way of life, thus ending it altogether. This reality proved unavoidable in the march of progress. In his Second Annual Message, President Jackson articulated this racial determinism and its inexorability

> Humanity has often wept over the face of the aborigines of this country, and Philanthropy has been long busily employed in devising means to avert it, but its progress has never for a moment been arrested, and one by one have many powerful

[38] U.S. Congress, 22nd Congress, 1st Session, *Removal of Indians Westward, Message from the President of the United States, upon the subject of the contemplated removal of the Indians to the west of the River Mississippi*, February 16, 1832, Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, 1832, (H.exdoc. 116), Washington: Thomas Allen, 1832 (Serial Set 219), 7, 9, 14. Americans managed, seemingly without any hint of cognitive dissonance, to hold several somewhat contradictory views of Native Americans. The popular image of Native Americans cast them as both threatening and incapable, both powerful and powerless.

> tribes disappeared from the earth. To follow to the tomb the last of his race and to tread on the graves of extinct nations excite melancholy reflections. But true philanthropy reconciles the mind to these vicissitudes as it does to the extinction of one generation to make room for another . . . What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms, embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization, and religion?[39]

People who held these views of Indigenous extinction often predicated them upon the inability of the "savage" to change and achieve the civilized way of life of their white neighbors. Once again, Lewis Cass perfectly summarizes this view: "To collect savage men together, who are ignorant of the very first rudiments of civilization, who have, in fact, neither government, law, religion, property, arts, nor manufactures; who are actuated by impulse, and not by reflection; by whom the past and the future are almost equally disregarded, and to teach them abstract principles, is a process which seems, on calm reflection, to promise as little as it has performed."[40] Cass depicts the missionary efforts, and all similar efforts to bring white civilization to the Indigenous

[39] *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897,* II, ed. J.D. Richardson, 520-521, cited in Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 57. Especially note Jackson's closing question again linking civilization and religion.

[40] U.S. Congress, *Removal of Indians Westward*, 11.

Americans, as vain; due to the inferiority of the race of "savages," this race could never gain the implements of civilization and, as a result, would go extinct.

Some have argued that the missionaries worked among the Indigenous Americans throughout this era to grant salvation for their charges in the next life, as opposed to civilization in this one. Such an approach indicated a resignation, or perhaps acknowledgment, or this-worldly betterment in the form of missionary civilizing efforts. Roy Harvey Pearce followed this train of thought in regards to the missionaries: "Missionary societies proliferated; for conversion of the heathen Indian seemed to be the only way to save him, Christianity being the one thing which civilization could give him and not take away."[41] Perhaps this was true for some missionaries, as many expressed concern over the souls of Natives: on January 11, 1818, Ard Hoyt wondered, "And, if they are not enlightened by the Gospel, where will be their immortal souls?"[42] Yet efforts to save Cherokee souls does not exclude efforts to civilize them; missionaries taught civilization alongside scripture, practical living alongside theological ideals.

Beyond solely enacting plans to civilize Native Americans, many missionaries posited that Indigenous Americans could change, and some expressed satisfaction over past changes and optimism over future prospects. Revered Thomas Roberts, a Baptist missionary among the Cherokees, remarked, "The Cherokee children learn as fast as any children I ever saw. They are kind, obedient, and industrious. Their mental powers appear to

[41] Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization*, 61.
[42] Hoyt, Jan. 11, 1818, entry in *The Brainerd Journal*, 42.

be in no respect inferior to those of whites."[43] Jeremiah Evarts, in his essayistic refutation of Indian Removal, went a step further in his depiction of the Cherokees:

> the Cherokees are neither savages, nor criminals . . . they are peaceful agriculturists, better clothed, fed, and housed, than many of the peasantry, in most civilized countries . . . they have been encouraged and aided, in rising to a state of civilization, by our national government, and benevolent associations of individuals;—that one great motive, presented to their minds by the government, has uniformly been the hope and expectation of a permanent residence, as farmers and mechanics, upon the lands of their ancestors, and their enjoyment of wise laws, administered by themselves, upon truly republican principles . . . and aided in the cultivation of their minds and hearts by benevolent individuals stationed among them at their own request, and partly at the charge of the general government, they have greatly risen in their character, condition, and prospects;—that they have a regularly organized government of their own, consisting of legislative, judicial, and executive departments, formed by the advice of the third President of the United States, and now in easy and natural operation . . . that a considerable number of the young, and some of the older, can read and write the English language . . . and, to crown the whole, that they are bound to us

[43] *Christian Watchman*, March 9, 1822, cited in William G. McLoughlin, *Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 155.

> by the ties of Christianity which they profess, and which many of them exemplify as members of regular Christian churches.[44]

Evarts, in his defense of the Cherokees remaining in their ancestral homeland, pointed out the progress they had made towards adopting white civilization. He displayed no signs of the extinction expectation so common to prevailing contemporary American racial thought.

Roberts and Evarts may have avoided the overt racism inherent in the arguments of Jackson and Cass, but they still fell prey to the ethnocentrism so vital to the construction of the Indigenous image.[45] Evarts never attempts to depict Cherokee culture as civilized, never considered it as a stand-alone equal to white civilization. Instead, Evarts argues that the assistance of "benevolent individuals" – whites – and their government pulled the Cherokees out of the darkness of their savagery and into the light of white, Christian civilization. Roberts, similarly, does not remark upon the abilities of the Cherokee children as impressive in and of themselves, but instead asserts their mental prowess in relation to white children.

Although relatively sympathetic, missionaries construed the Indigenous image through the lens of an all-encompassing ethnocentrism, the same lens which framed and sustained the

---

[44] Evarts, "No. XXII," *The "William Penn" Essays*, 175-177.

[45] This is not to say that missionary perceptions did not contain racial overtones. Missionaries' ethnocentrism relied heavily upon the subtleties of racism. Many missionaries, especially the Congregationalists, utilized the pseudoscience of their day to classify Cherokees as "full-blood," "half-blood," or "mixed-blood," and some tended to target the Cherokees with some form of white ancestry, exasperating the stratifications that had taken root in Cherokee society since the acculturation process. For more on this, see McLoughlin, *The Cherokees and Christianity*, 65-67.

racism which pervaded their white contemporaries. The prioritization of Euro-American agricultural pursuits, Christian knowledge, and republican governance display more than solely a desire to spread the American way of life. These efforts, combined with depictions of the Cherokees prior to missionary and government intervention, demonstrate a potent ethnocentrism which bounded the missionaries' objective ability to perceive their Native neighbors. Barbara Perry explores this process in her work *Silent Victims*. The inability to recognize value in the Cherokees as the Cherokees, and instead of placing worth on Cherokees in relation to whiteness, constructs an ethnocentric dynamic that operates on multiple levels. Missionaries' inability to recognize Native religion as religion, Native agriculture as agriculture, and Native government as government represents a broader trend in which whites denigrated Native knowledge systems, and, by extension, Native life. This inability to accept Native knowledge systems as knowledge systems and Native life as a legitimate way of life both manifested from white ethnocentrism and conversely authenticated it. Usage of terms like "ignorant" and "darkness" and then the eventual knowledge acquirement, or "enlightenment," that invariably came through a guiding white presence exposes the valuation of understanding only in relation to white understanding. Similarly, usage of terms like "savage" and "heathen" work in the same manner, evaluating and valuing civilization only in relation to white civilization, life only in relation to white life. This process functioned within the larger undercurrent of what Perry categorized as the racial/cultural genocide of Indigenous Americans.[46]

[46] Barbara Perry, *Silent Victims: Hate Crimes Against Native Americans* (Tucson, AZ: The University of Arizona Press, 2008): 42-43. She goes on to lay out how this process served to promote Euro-American interests: "It comes as no surprise, then, that through the process of colonization, indigenous

Conclusion

Throughout the early nineteenth century, missionaries worked on behalf of the Cherokees and did their best to give voice to their cause. Many missionaries, such as Jeremiah Evarts, passionately championed the Cherokees and continually defended their rights to their land. Samuel Worcester and others went to jail instead of recognizing the rights of Georgia over Cherokee land, and helped build a public outcry against the injustice of the Georgian landgrab and legal assertion over the Cherokee people. Some missionaries, such as the Methodist Reverend James Jenkins Trott, married Cherokee women and started families with them, becoming a part of the tribe per Cherokee beliefs. Once anti-Removal efforts collapsed and forced emigration became a reality, some missionaries, like Evan Jones, trekked the horrors of the Trail of Tears alongside the Cherokees.[47]

And yet, despite these relationships, and despite their comparative racial progressivism, missionaries almost universally viewed the Cherokees and other Indigenous Americans through the same ethnocentrism that partially lent justification to Cherokee removal and propagated the popular view of the warring and degenerate savage. The framework of this ethnocentrism constricted the friendships between the missionaries and the Cherokees and their defense of the tribe. The missionaries believed in Cherokee rights, but their Euro-American cultural centricity

---

knowledge and perspectives have been ignored and denigrated by colonial powers seeking to exploit indigenous resources." For more on how Euro-American/colonial beliefs had a self-validating function, see Pearce, "Character and Circumstance: The Idea of Savagism," *Savagism and Civilization*, 76-104.

[47] William G. McLoughlin, "Cherokees and Methodists, 1824-1834," *Church History*, Vol. 50, Issue 1 (March 1, 1981): 44; Letters of Evan Jones, *The Cherokee Removal*, 158-162.

made them only able to assert these rights within the confines of white values: private property ownership, cultivation and/or exploitation of land, republican governance, and, most of all, Christianity. The missionaries supported the Cherokees, not in their right to live as Cherokees, but in their right to live as acculturated Americans.[48]

Recognition of the ethnocentrism present within missionaries – who perhaps held the gentlest view of Indigenous Americans – constructs a more complex comprehension of American-Indian affairs in the early nineteenth century. Instead of demonstrating a coalition of missionaries and Cherokees versus Georgia and Jackson, such ethnocentricity breaks down this binary-like dynamic and layers our understanding of the associated relations, language, policies, and events of the time. One begins to see that the Cherokee way of life faced an assault on all fronts: Georgians and Jackson threatened their homeland while the missionaries, their supposedly benevolent friends, assaulted their culture and traditions. This enhanced complexity subsequently lends itself to a more complex, nuanced understanding of American-Indian relations overall, both past and present.

[48] Beyond the ethical dilemmas surrounding forced assimilation, a slew of practical issues arises as well. The scope of this analysis disallows a more refined explanation of these practical issues, but a quick explanation suffices for a cursory understanding. Cultural assimilation requires, and its advocates often seem to assume, a monolithic and static nature to culture. This has no grounding in truth. A national, societal, communal, and even familial culture means something different to each individual within those groups. This expansive difference effectively bars any form of assimilation, as acculturation to so many separate, and sometimes competing, cultures is, of course, impossible. In effect, Native Americans were damned if they did not attempt acculturation – likely continually viewed as "savages" in their traditional ways – and damned if they did attempt acculturation – forfeiting the ways of life so vital to their self-identities in pursuit of an impossible goal, which would leave them still depicted as "savages."

Similarly, these conclusions and the general approach can serve to foster a greater understanding of early Americans and, thus, early America. The significance of prevalent ethnocentrism within missionary depictions and interactions with the Cherokees raise the question of how ethnocentricity coated other contemporaneous affairs. How did Americans view immigration and assimilation, especially from non-Protestant, non-Anglo-Saxons, who they likely perceived as drastically different from themselves? How did ethnocentricity inflect Manifest Destiny, in both land acquisition from Indigenous tribes and from Mexico? In what way does the assertion that "inferior" cultures/races face extinction while in contact with "superior" cultures/races affect an understanding of the support and effort to colonize freed blacks? These questions fall well beyond the scope of this analysis, but they all have intricate ties to the approach and conclusions of this piece. Ethnocentrism saturated early American thought, and an understanding of this creates a greater, more complex understanding of American history, whether dealing with Cherokee missionaries or something else entirely. When writing about the Cherokees, nineteenth century missionaries provided us with a tool to examine contemporary racial/cultural attitudes that illuminate both topics directly and indirectly dealt with by the missionaries and other topics they had no knowledge of.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897, II. Edited by J.D. Richardson. 520-521. Cited in Roy Harvey Pearce. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. 57. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1988.

Christian Watchman. March 9, 1822. cited in William G. McLoughlin. *Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839*. 155. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984.

Evarts, Jeremiah. *The "William Penn" Essays and Other Writings by Jeremiah Evarts*. Edited by Francis Paul Prucha. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981.

Letters of Evan Jones. In Theda Perdue. "Forced Removal." *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*, 3rd ed. 159-162. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016.

Rosina, Anna. *The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokee*. Edited by Anna Rosina Gambold, John Gambold, and Rowena McClinton. Abridged ed. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010.

Samuel Worcester to Jeremiah Evans, July 1, 1815, ABCFM Papers. cited in William G. McLoughlin.. *The Cherokees and Christianity, 1794-1870: Essays on Acculturation and Cultural Persistence*. Edited byWalter H. Conser, Jr. 68. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1994.

The Brainerd Journal: A Mission to the Cherokees, 1817-1823. eds. Joyce B. Phillips and Paul Gary Phillips. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

U.S. Congress. 22nd Congress, 1st Session. *Removal of Indians Westward. Message from the President of the United States, upon the subject of the contemplated removal of the Indians to the west of the River Mississippi*. February 16, 1832. Referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, 1832. (H.exdoc. 116). Washington: Thomas Allen, 1832 (Serial Set 219).

Secondary Sources

Demos, John. *The Heathen School: A Story of Hope and Betrayal in the Age of the Early Republic*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014.

Kimberly, David R. "Cherokees and Congregationalists vs. Georgia and Andrew Jackson: The Attempt to Prevent the Trail of Tears." *International Congregational Journal*, Vol. 11, Issue 1 (Summer, 2012): 91-115.

Matheson, Donald G. "The Second Great Awakening as an Organizing Process, 1780-1830: An Hypothesis." *American Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (Spring, 1969): 23-43.

McLoughlin, William G. "Cherokees and Methodists, 1824-1834." *Church History*, Vol. 50, Issue 1 (March 1, 1981): 44-63.

McLoughlin, Willian G. *Cherokees and Missionaries, 1789-1839*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.

McLoughlin, William G. *The Cherokees and Christianity, 1794-1870: Essays on Acculturation and Cultural Persistence*.

Edited by Walter H. Conser, Jr. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1994.

Moulder, Amanda M. "Cherokee Practice, Missionary Intentions: Literacy Learning among Early Nineteenth-Century Cherokee Women." *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 63, No. 1, Indigenous and Ethnic Rhetorics (Sept., 2011): 75-96.

Pearce, Roy Harvey. *Savagism and Civilization: A Study of the Indian and the American Mind*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1988.

Perdue, Theda. "Introduction" *The Cherokee Removal: A Brief History with Documents*, 3rd ed. 1-21. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2016.

Perry, Barba. "Imaging American Indians." In *Silent Victims: Hate Crimes Against Native Americans*. 38-54. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press, 2008.

Sayre, Robert F. "Savagism." In *Thoreau and the American Indians*. 4-27. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Shiels, Richard D. "The Scope of the Second Great Awakening: Andover, Massachusetts, as a Case Study." *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Religion in the Early Republic (Summer, 1985): 223-246.

Thomas, John. "Romantic Reform in America, 1815-1865." *American Quarterly*, Vol. 17, Issue 4 (Winter, 1965): 656-681.

Welter, Barbara. “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860.” *American Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Part 1 (Summer, 1966): 151-174.

A Divided Front: Military Dissent during the Vietnam War

By
Kaylyn Sawyer

~ ♦ ~

Emerging from a triumphant victory in World War II. American patriotism surged in the 1950s. Positive images in theater and literature of America's potential to bring peace and prosperity to a grateful Asia fueled the notion that the United States could be the "good Samaritan of the entire world."[1] This idea prevailed through the mid-1960s as three-quarters of Americans indicated they trusted their government. That positive feeling would not last, and America's belief in its own exceptionalism would begin to shatter with "the major military escalation in Vietnam and the shocking revelations it brought."[2] The turmoil in social and economic spheres during the 1960s combined with contradictions about America's role in Vietnam and realization of the government's deception regarding the nature and progress of the war itself fueled the largest movement of servicemen and veteran dissent in this nation's history.

The year 1965 would be pivotal in turning public opinion against the war as three significant events coincided to raise public consciousness. First, *Ramparts* magazine, founded in 1962 as a liberal Catholic quarterly, published its first article on the war in Vietnam in January of 1965 highlighting the contradictions

[1] Christian G. Appy, *American Reckoning* (New York: The Penguin Group, 2015) 13.
[2] Appy, *American Reckoning*, xv.

between what America had been told about Vietnam and what was actually occurring there politically.[3] Second, President Johnson announced in July, that he would increase the number of troops sent to Vietnam by 50,000. This would necessitate a doubling of draft calls, seemingly in contradiction to the administration's stated goal of peace.[4] Finally, America was exposed to its first shocking images of the war's reality through television. CBS correspondent Morley Safer, while accompanying US Marines on a search and destroy mission, produced what is considered to be one of the most controversial reports of the war. With images of US soldiers torching civilian houses as a backdrop, Safer simply stated, "This is what the war in Vietnam is all about."[5] For the first time, Americans saw that their troops were capable of committing atrocities. These events galvanized civilian activists and sparked the beginning of a dissent movement within the armed services.

GI resistance to the Vietnam War began in 1965 similar to a ripple; it started with "individual acts of conscience," but then spread into collective acts of organized dissent within the ranks.[6] The earliest known example of GI protest occurred on November 6, 1965 in El Paso, Texas. Lieutenant Henry Howe joined a small civilian peace demonstration, carrying a sign that stated, "End Johnson's Facist [sic] Aggression."[7] Although Howe was not in uniform, not on duty, and in apparent compliance with military

---

[3] Robert Scheer, "Hang Down Your Head, Tom Dooley," *Ramparts*, January 1965.

[4] *Pomfret, John D. "Johnson Orders 50,000 More Men to Vietnam and Doubles Draft; Again Urges U.N. to Seek Peace."* New York Times. *July 29, 1965.*

[5] Morley Safer's Cam Ne News Broadcast. Accessed February 29, 2016. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hNYZZi25Ttg.

[6] Richard Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996) 69.

[7] David Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War* (Chicago:
Haymarket Books, 1975) 52.

regulations, he was court-martialed and sentenced to two years hard labor. In February of 1966, former Green Beret Donald Duncan became the first Vietnam Veteran to publicly speak out against the war. In his *Ramparts* magazine article entitled, "The whole thing was a lie!" Duncan praised antiwar protestors, arguing they were "opposed to people, our own and others, dying for a lie, thereby corrupting the very word democracy."[8] In October 1966, Army doctor Howard Levy refused to train Green Beret medics headed to Vietnam. His court-martial defense was based on the Nuremberg principle requiring non-participation in war crimes or genocide. Despite a protracted and publicized trial process, Levy was convicted and sentenced to three years at Fort Leavenworth.[9]

Before the summer of 1966, soldiers operated as individuals in their dissent to the war. However, on June 30, 1966, PFC James Johnson, PVT Dennis Mora, and PVT David Samas—later known as the Fort Hood Three—became the first soldiers to collectively oppose the war. They refused direct orders to board a ship bound for Vietnam and stated in a press conference, "We have decided to take a stand against this war, which we consider immoral, illegal, and unjust."[10] In an article published in *The Peacemaker* periodical, Private Samas is quoted as saying during his court-martial, "The Nuremberg trials established that soldiers have the obligation to use their consciences in following orders."[11]

The GI resistance movement further grew to include issues of racial identity. Marines William Harvey and George Daniels—both African American—were the first Marines to openly question

---

[8] Donald Duncan, "The Whole Thing Was a Lie!," *Ramparts* 4, no 10, February 1966.
[9] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 52.
[10] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 69.
[11] "Long Sentences for Three GI Refusers," *Peacemaker*, September 17, 1966, Gettysburg College Special Collections, Box 14 Folder 1, 5.

whether African Americans should fight at all in Vietnam. The two men were arrested for asking to speak with their commanding officer, charged with "insubordination and promoting disloyalty," and sentenced to prison.[12] African Americans again rose up as a group on the night of August 23, 1968 in response to an executive decision to send troops to the Democratic Convention in Chicago. Over one hundred African American troops gathered at Fort Hood to "discuss their opposition to Army racism and the use of troops against civilians."[13] The forty-three African American GIs arrested became known as the Fort Hood Forty-Three.

While civilian peace activists had organizations to promote their cause, it was not until April of 1967 that Vietnam veterans had an organization of their own. In the streets of Manhattan, over 100,000 protestors gathered for what would be the largest rally in New York since the war began. Vietnam veterans were asked to march at the front, and the six who did so conceived Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW). One of the six veterans, Jan Barry recalled how the organization came to be during the march:

> Just as we got close…somebody said, "Vietnam veterans go to the front"…Somebody had provided a banner that said Vietnam Veterans Against the War…So I tracked down this Veterans for Peace group, went to one of their meetings, and discovered there was no Vietnam veterans group, they just brought along the sign, hoping some Vietnam veterans would show up.[14]

---

[12] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 52.
[13] Ibid., 56.
[14] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 104.

Early statements of the VVAW claimed Vietnam was a civil war with no American solution, and that the American people were lied to about the nature of their country's involvement.[15] GI resistance was now represented by an official organization comprised of men who had fought in the conflict and witnessed first-hand the realities of the war.

The GI movement continued to grow and gain momentum in 1968 as the war effort in Vietnam suffered. In April, forty GIs led an antiwar demonstration in San Francisco, marking the first time active-duty soldiers were at the head of a protest march.[16] Outside Fort Hood in Texas, soldiers gathered for a "love-in" to listen to rock music and antiwar speeches. Again in San Francisco, nine enlisted men went AWOL and took sanctuary in a church "in moral opposition to the war."[17] Later that year, twenty-seven inmates from the Presidio stockade in San Francisco held a "sit-down strike" to protest the shooting of a fellow prisoner. The goal of this "Presidio Munity" was to call attention to the unbearable living conditions in the stockade.[18] The GI movement was now widespread and organized. Americans, both outside and within the military ranks, became increasingly disillusioned with their country's war effort in Vietnam.

Dissent and disobedience took many forms. Single protests, collective demonstrations, and organized actions were not the only ways for soldiers to dissent. Other effective ways of undermining support for the war within the ranks were through the publication of underground GI newspapers and through the founding of coffeehouses near large military bases. GI newspapers were a fundamental expression of political opposition within the

---

[15] Ibid.
[16] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 57
[17] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 57.
[18] *Sir No Sir!*, DVD, Directed by David Zeiger (Displaced Films, 2005).

military. By 1971, there were an estimated "144 underground newspapers published or aimed at U.S. military bases" written by active duty GIs, veterans, and civilian supporters.[19] These underground newspapers were successful in reaching thousands of service members, with some of the largest papers, such as *Vietnam GI*, *Camp News* and *The Bond* claiming to reach tens of thousands.[20] The GI Press Service was formed in June of 1969 as an "associated press" of GI underground newspapers, functioning as a national center for the distribution of articles.[21] The primary function of most underground newspapers was to spread news of the GI movement, acts of resistance, the military responses, and general war news. Many of these papers were short-lived, but the impact of their message was not.

August 1969 was a milestone in military underground newspaper publishing when the antiwar paper *Rough Draft* gained permission to be openly distributed at Fort Eustis in Williamsburg, Virginia. Approval came from Major General Howard Schiltz after a four-month-long effort by *Rough Draft* representatives.[22] In an issue of the local newspaper, an army spokesman emphasized, "This action cannot be construed in any way as an official endorsement of the contents of the newspaper."[23] On August 28, 1969, the *Rough Draft* was openly distributed on post. Future permission for distribution would be granted on an "issue-by-

---

[19] "The Collapse of the Armed Forces," in *Vietnam and America: A Documented History*, Marvin E. Gettleman, Jane Franklin, Marilyn Young, H. Bruce Franklin (New York: Grove Press, 1985), 326.
[20] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 96.
[21] "GI Movement: Timeline, 1965-1973," *Antiwar and Radical History Project—Pacific Northwest*, University of Washington, 2009, Accessed February 28, 2016, http://depts.washington.edu/antiwar/gi_timeline.shtml.
[22] Dale M. Brumfield, *Independent Press in D.C. and Virginia: An Underground History*, Charleston: The History Press, 2015, 183.
[23] "'Rough Draft' Distribution at Ft. Eustis Pleases Editors, Astonishes Some GIs," *Rough Draft*, September/October 1969, Accessed February 29, 2016, 1.

issue" basis.[24]The *Rough Draft* was fulfilling part of its stated mission "to be a forum and a rally point for dissent" and "to destroy the negative influence of apathy among the servicemen of the armed forces and encourage them to stand for their rights."[25] As a result of the victory at Fort Eustis, more antiwar papers were allowed distribution on bases across the United States. The underground newspaper no longer had to be underground.

In the absence of official approval for distribution on post, newspapers found their way out to the soldiers through a series of off-base coffeehouses, which served as a relaxed setting for GIs to interact with each other and to read antiwar material. The dissenting GIs who supported underground newspapers and coffeehouses were not officers, but enlisted soldiers. Army veteran Fred Gardner wanted the mainstream peace movement to see GIs as potential antiwar allies instead of enemies. In January of 1968, Gardner opened the first coffeehouse in Columbia, South Carolina outside of Fort Jackson, and named it the UFO. Within a few months of its opening, "an average of six hundred GIs a week were visiting the place and antiwar activities were beginning to develop."[26] Gardner went on to open two more coffeehouses: the "Oleo Strut" near Fort Hood, Texas and "Mad Anthony Wayne's" near Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. The coffeehouses were strategically located outside major military training bases to attract unhappy GIs and give them an environment to voice their complaints. Often staffed by civilians, coffeehouses fostered a bond between soldiers and civilians, and served as a place where they could come together and work collaboratively.[27] By 1971,

---

[24] "Ex-Servicemen, Wives Distribute Antiwar Papers," *The Bee* (Danville, VA), August 29, 1969, 4.
[25] "The Mission," *Rough Draft*, September/October 1969, 1.
[26] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 53.
[27] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 99.

there were as many as twenty-six established coffeehouses.[28] The network of coffeehouses and the proliferation of underground newspapers reflected the growing frustration and disillusionment over the stalemate that war in Vietnam was becoming.

Racial and economic inequalities in the country during the 1960s provided motivation for dissent within the ranks as military service did not eliminate the injustices of society at large. The draft itself was biased against the poor and those without powerful connections. The draft was appropriately compared to a regressive tax, "falling on individuals whose income is low."[29] Most often, the drafted soldier belonged to the working class. The wealthy could choose alternate avenues for service, afford full-time college draft deferments, and obtain medical exemptions from private physicians. Vietnam veteran Ronald Spector writes, "The consideration that most determined a man's chances of fighting and dying in Vietnam was not race but class. It was the poor who bore the lion's share of the fighting and dying."[30] The American Serviceman's Union (ASU), organized in trade union style to lobby for more equitable conditions within the military, established "a clear tradition of working-class resistance to military authority and unjust war."[31]

Economic exploitation was only one issue raised within the ranks as evidence of injustice. Racial prejudice and inequality would prove to be a powerful source of dissidence and disobedience, reaching crisis levels in 1968 and the following years. The antiwar movement brought increased attention to racial

---

[28] Ibid.

[29] *The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force*, Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, February 1970.

[30] Ronald H. Spector, *After Tet: The Bloodiest Year in Vietnam* (New York, The Free Press: 1994) 38.

[31] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 71-72.

issues within civilian society as well as within the ranks. African American soldiers' antiwar sentiments were encouraged by leaders such as Mohammed Ali, Malcolm X, and Martin Luther King Jr., who all spoke out against the war.[32] One of the main issues raised was whether African American soldiers should risk their lives for a country that denies them basic rights at home. Civil rights leader Julian Bond echoes this feeling in his graphic novel as he writes, "Why are we always first citizens on the battlefield and second class citizens at home."[33] These were valid questions, as discussion of the condition of American society and of the armed forces in the mid-sixties will show.

Vietnam was the first war in American history in which the military was fully integrated, and thus African American men could see the potential for greater career opportunities and mobility in the armed forces than in the civilian sector. In one study of volunteer enlistments, African American soldiers often cited "self-advancement" as the reason for enlisting while white soldiers cited draft avoidance.[34] Once in the military, however, black soldiers experienced the continuing consequences of racial discrimination and institutionalized segregation and found "that educational deficiencies barred them from qualifying for many of the highly skilled or highly technical jobs."[35] They felt discriminated against in promotions, and they felt they were disproportionately represented in combat units. These factors combined to spur African American troops to be among the first antiwar advocates

---

[32] David Cortright, "Black GI Resistance During the Vietnam War," *Vietnam Generation*: Vol. 2, Article 5, 1990, 2.

[33] "Vietnam: An Antiwar Comic Book," *University of Virginia*, 4, Accessed March 5, 2016.

[34] Charles C. Moskos Jr., "The American Dilemma In Uniform: Race in the Armed Forces," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, March 1973, 102.

[35] Spector, *After Tet: The Bloodiest Year in Vietnam*, 37.

inside the military.[36] Because many black men could not afford deferment status, African Americans were over-proportionately drafted. The disproportionate assignment of blacks to combat arms in a supposedly equal and desegregated military reflects the continued impact of inequality in education.[37] Between 1961 and 1966, blacks accounted for 16% of soldiers killed in Vietnam, a number out of proportion to their participation.[38] By 1967, the military took action to reduce the number of black casualties by reducing their numbers in front-line combat units.[39] By 1972, black representation in the military (11%) and in casualty lists (12%) was in proportion to their presence in the total population (11-12%).[40] While racial unrest was making headlines in the United States, racial tension did not reach crisis levels among soldiers in Vietnam until the 1968 assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. After that, "signs of racial polarization and tension became clear and unmistakable."[41]

African Americans were not the only minority group to be affected by heightened racial consciousness and subjected to the racial injustices of the Vietnam War. Latino and American Indian communities had similar frustrations and offered a strong antiwar presence as they found ways to collaborate with the black community to voice their dissent. GIs United Against the War was a dissent organization founded by African American Joe Miles that

---

[36] Appy, *American Reckoning*, 140.

[37] Moskos Jr., "The American Dilemma In Uniform: Race in the Armed Forces," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 99-101. Army statistics show that 16% of those drafted between 1960-1970 were black.

[38] Ibid., 101.

[39] Spector, *After Tet: The Bloodiest Year in Vietnam*, 37.

[40] Moskos Jr., "The American Dilemma In Uniform: Race in the Armed Forces," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 99.; "Statistical Information About Fatal Casualties of the Vietnam War," National Archives, Accessed February 29, 2016.

[41] Spector, *After Tet: The Bloodiest Year in Vietnam*, 249.

included black, Latino, and some white soldiers. Private Mora of the Fort Hood Three was Latino, and at his trial stated, "We lived in a tenement because we were Puerto Ricans" and implied that he was limited in career opportunities because of his race.[42] While an integrated Armed Force might have been able to soften the social and educational deprivations suffered by minorities, it could not eliminate them. In the heat of a highly- contested war, these differences became magnified as race-based dissent within the military was clearly linked to greater civil rights struggles for minority and oppressed groups.[43]

Meanwhile, the war effort in Vietnam was floundering. In January 1968, the Tet Offensive revealed how desperate the situation in Vietnam really was. On January 30, forces from North Vietnam "struck seven major South Vietnamese cities, burning government buildings, freeing prisoners, and lobbing rockets and mortars onto military installations."[44] This massive attack repudiated any idea that a victory for the United States was within sight. Tet exposed the government's propaganda about the success of the war, destroyed the sense of optimism about the war's progress, exposed the lies about the support of the South Vietnamese for the American presence, served as a catalyst for increased veteran resistance, and, in the words of Walter Cronkite, demonstrated that "it seems now more certain than ever that the bloody experience of Vietnam is to end in a stalemate."[45] While deemed a military success, the Tet Offensive convinced many

---

[42] "Long Sentences for Three GI Refusers," *Peacemaker*, September 17, 1966, Gettysburg College Special Collections, Box 14 Folder 1, 5.
[43] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 70.
[44] Scovill Currin, "An Army of the Willing: Fayette'Nam, Soldier Dissent, and the Untold Story of the All-Volunteer Force," PhD diss., Duke University, 2015, 64. Accessed February 20, 2016.
[45] Walter Cronkite's 'We Are Mired in Stalemate' Broadcast, February 27, 1968," *University of Richmond*, Accessed February 28, 2016.

Americans of the war's futility and is considered to be a significant turning point in the war, one that decimated troop morale and galvanized veteran resistance.[46]

Following revelations from the Tet Offensive, two additional events served as key catalysts for increasing antiwar activism among veterans. From December 1968 to May 1969, the United States undertook a major offensive to gain control of a large and heavily populated region of the Mekong Delta.[47] The success of Operation Speedy Express was measured, as all ground and air missions were, by body count of those killed. This created a "single-minded focus on killing" which filtered down from a command level through the ranks. The body count as a measurement system was later denounced by one general as "A great crime and cancer in the Army in the eyes of young officers."[48] By official standards, Operation Speedy Express was a success because of the high body count. Later investigation would reveal that many of those killed were noncombatant civilians, exposing the indiscriminate brutality of this war. The second incident occurred in 1969 in the village of My Lai when American soldiers murdered hundreds of unarmed civilians. Once the story was exposed in 1971, Americans were appalled that their "boys" were capable of such violence. Antiwar veterans were further frustrated by the lack of accountability at a command level and the prosecution of low-level officers such as Lieutenant William Calley, who was perceived as a scapegoat. This incidence of brutality at My Lai led the Vietnam Veterans Against the War to conduct the Winter Soldier Investigation, a hearing on war crimes, in 1971. Their goal was to prove that "the use of terror and mass destruction tactics against Vietnam's civilian population was a

[46] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers,* 41-42.
[47] Appy, *American Reckoning*, 179-181.
[48] Ibid., 181.

pervasive phenomenon directly resulting from U.S. war policy."[49] Operation Speedy Express and the My Lai Massacre exposed the brutality of tactics, the failure of leadership, and the utter immorality of the body count strategy that could no longer be overlooked.

Men serving in the Armed Forces, by this time, had seen enough hypocrisy, deception, and immorality in their leadership to justify dissent and outright disobedience. Over in Vietnam, soldiers saw clear evidence that the United States was neither supporting democracy nor the will of the South Vietnamese people. One Marine wounded in Vietnam recalled, "I think any other war would've been worth my foot. But not this one. One day, someone has got to explain to me why I was there."[50]American soldiers were demoralized by the war's brutal tactics and senseless casualties.[51] Army veteran James D. Henry explained why he became an outspoken critic of the war in Vietnam: "My sole motivation was and is to stop the atrocities and to stop the taking of otherwise average young Americans and transforming them into people capable and willing to perform atrocities."[52] Embittered by immoral rules of engagement, veterans returned home from the war, "dehumanized by the senseless and indiscriminate destructiveness of American policy."[53] Additionally, tension between drafted soldiers and career men created an environment of distrust. Draftees made up half of the US Army by the summer of 1968, and as people who did not choose service; they found the

---

[49] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 111.
[50] Murray Polner, "Vietnam War Stories," *Special Collections at Gettysburg College, Radical Pamphlets Collection* Box 16, Folder 1, 9.
[51] Appy, *American Reckoning*, 211.
[52] James D. Henry (as told by Donald Duncan), "The Men of 'B' Company," *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection*, Box 17 Folder 1, 31.
[53] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 27.

strict regimen of military discipline to be overwhelming.[54] Career officers resented the dissenting draftees. As the war dragged on, resistance exploded, eventually reaching Vietnam itself.

The antiwar movement in the United States focused on politics and thus differed from the antiwar movement that occurred later in Vietnam, which focused on practical aspects of survival. Instead of marching in protests or reading literature in coffeehouses, soldiers in Vietnam protested the war by refusing orders, avoiding the enemy, or by violently attacking the officer in command. One of the most effective forms of GI resistance was combat refusal, when soldiers refused, disobeyed, or negotiated an order.[55] The first incident of combat refusal to appear in the news occurred in August 1969. Alpha Company, 3rd Battalion, 196th Light Infantry refused a direct order to attack, and the story appeared in the *New York Times*.[56] Instances such as this brought about a democratic form of military decision making with soldiers having power over command. As a result, many commanders found they would have to negotiate with their units over what they were willing to do under certain circumstances. However, if negotiations failed, antiwar soldiers would resort to fragging—a term used to describe violence directed at superiors.[57] It was organized and deliberate, with many of these attacks occurring on base instead of during the fury of battle. By the time the last American troops were leaving Vietnam in July 1972, the total number of fragging incidents has escalated to 551 with eighty-six

---

[54] Scovill Currin, "An Army of the Willing: Fayette'Nam, Soldier Dissent, and the Untold Story of the All-Volunteer Force," 85; Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 154.
[55] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 44.
[56] Horst Fass and Peter Arnett, "Told to Move Again on 6th Deathly Day, Company A Refuses," *New York Times*, August 26, 1969, 1.
[57] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 48.

soldiers dead and over seven hundred wounded.[58]Mutinous or rebellious soldiers were imprisoned, and as a result, "prisons became schools of resistance and sites of rebellion."[59] The most notorious prison riot occurred in 1968 at the Long Binh Jail, with soldiers rising up to protest the poor living conditions they were subject to. The unrest lasted for over one month, and is considered to be the largest and most explosive episode of soldier resistance in Vietnam.[60]

Other GIs who opposed the war expressed dissent in a less violent and direct way. The most pervasive kind of antiwar activity in the military was known as "combat avoidance," where "search-and-destroy missions were turned into search-and-avoid missions."[61] Instead of going out and fighting the enemy, soldiers would go out and do their best to avoid any contact with the enemy. One soldier recalled, "The military teaches you mission first, man second. But because I felt the mission was stupid…the men were much more important to me than the mission."[62] This was part of a larger nonviolent resistance movement that included shamming: "the use of deception, stealth, ruse, and petty sabotage."[63]

Soldiers also turned to drug use as a form of passive resistance. Smoking marijuana was symbolically tied to the antiwar movement back home, so soldiers were using drugs to connect themselves to an antiwar stance.[64] By 1967, more servicemen in Vietnam were arrested for marijuana charges than

---

[58] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 43.
[59] Moser, *The New Winter Soldiers*, 51.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibd., 53.
[62] Ibid., 54.
[63] Ibid., 54-55.
[64] Ibid., 63.

for any other major offense.[65] Colonel Robert Heinl reported that a Congressional investigating subcommittee found that drug addiction in the Armed Forces was "of epidemic proportions."[66] When mental escape through drug use would not suffice, GIs would simply walk away from the war they no longer believed in. In 1967, American soldier William Percell applied for political asylum in Sweden. He stated, "The United States war in Vietnam is not my war. I have no wish to be an American any longer."[67] He was not alone. Between 1966 and 1971 army desertion rates increased nearly 400%.[68] The Army desertion rate peaked in 1971 and steadily decreased afterward as internal reforms were implemented and the burden of war shifted from ground assaults to air assaults. Other branches of service then experienced internal disruption with Air Force desertion rates peaking in 1972 and Navy desertion rates peaking in 1973.[69] These branches also experienced the same kind of dissent that had plagued the Army: combat refusals, mutiny, and sabotage.[70]

As the war effort was winding down and ground forces were being withdrawn, dissent within the Army began to wane. With fewer ground troops needed, the number of draftees was likewise reduced and fewer men were pressed into service against their will. On January 27, 1973, a peace agreement was signed that officially ended America's involvement in the war. On that same

---

[65] "Marijuana Termed Big Problem Among U.S. Troops in Vietnam," October 26, 1967, *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection*, Box 15, Folder 4.
[66] "The Collapse of the Armed Forces," in *Vietnam and America: A Documented History*, Marvin E. Gettleman, Jane Franklin, Marilyn Young, H. Bruce Franklin, 325.
[67] *"US Soldier Asks Asylum in Sweden," December 1, 1967,* Gettysburg College Special Collections Radical Pamphlets Collection, *Box 15 Folder 4.*
[68] Cortright, *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*, 10.
[69] Ibid., 11, 13.
[70] Ibid., 4.

day, the Secretary of Defense announced that the draft would end.[71] The Army would move towards an all-volunteer force, one that would theoretically breed less dissent and disobedience. The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force predicted, "Problems raised by the forced military service of those who are unwilling or unable to adjust to military life will be largely overcome by voluntary recruiting."[72] The Armed Forces would have stable ground upon which they would reconstruct themselves after being nearly destroyed from within. The divisive Vietnam War sparked radical dissent movements first from civilian activists and then from activists within the military itself. What began as isolated incidences of protest grew into collective acts of dissent and disobedience within the ranks.

By the early 1970s the Army was no longer an effective fighting force in Vietnam. Marine Colonel Robert Heinl wrote that "by every conceivable indicator, our army that now remains in Vietnam is in a state approaching collapse, with individual units avoiding or having refused combat, murdering their officers and noncommissioned officers, drug ridden, and dispirited where not near mutinous."[73] False and hypocritical war justifications, deception about progress, indiscriminate brutality against civilians, immorality in leadership decisions, and preexisting social inequalities all combined to threaten the cohesiveness of the service. This gave rise to the largest movement of servicemen and veteran dissent in this nation's history, one that would play a

[71]Currin, "An Army of the Willing: Fayette'Nam, Soldier Dissent, and the Untold Story of the All-Volunteer Force," 293.
[72] *The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force*, February 1970. [73] "The Collapse of the Armed Forces," in *Vietnam and America: A Documented History*, Marvin E. Gettleman, Jane Franklin, Marilyn Young, H. Bruce Franklin, 323.

significant role in the decision to end the war and one that would lead to lasting change in the armed services.

Bibliography

Appy, Christian G. *American Reckoning*. New York: The Penguin Group, 2015.

Brumfield, Dale M. *Independent Press in D.C. and Virginia: An Underground History*. Charleston: The History Press, 2015.

"The Collapse of the Armed Forces." in *Vietnam and America: A Documented History*. Marvin E. Gettleman, Jane Franklin, Marilyn Young, H. Bruce Franklin. New York: Grove Press, 1985.

Cortright, David. "Black GI Resistance During the Vietnam War." *Vietnam Generation*: Vol. 2, Article 5. 1990.

Cortright, David. *Soldiers in Revolt: GI Resistance During the Vietnam War*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 1975.

Currin, Scovill. "An Army of the Willing: Fayette'Nam, Soldier Dissent, and the Untold Story of the All-Volunteer Force." PhD diss., Duke University, 2015. Accessed February 20, 2016. http://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/handle/10161/10533.

Duncan, Donald. "The Whole Thing Was a Lie!" *Ramparts* 4, no 10. February 1966.

"Ex-Servicemen, Wives Distribute Antiwar Papers." *The Bee*. Danville, VA. August 29, 1969.

Fass, Horst and Peter Arnett. “Told to Move Again on 6th Deathly Day, Company A Refuses.” *New York Times*. August 26, 1969.

“GI Movement: Timeline, 1965-1973.” *Antiwar and Radical History Project—Pacific Northwest*. University of Washington, 2009. Accessed February 28, 2016. http://depts.washington.edu/antiwar/gi_timeline.shtml.

Henry, James D. (as told to Donald Duncan). “The Men of ‘B’ Company.” *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection*. Box 17 Folder 1.

“Long Sentences for Three GI Refusers.” *Peacemaker*. September 17, 1966. *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection*. Box 14 Folder 1.

“Marijuana Termed Big Problem Among U.S. Troops in Vietnam.” October 26, 1967. *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection*. Box 15, Folder 4.

“The Mission.” *Rough Draft*. September/October 1969. Accessed February 29, 2016. http://demo.revealdigital.com/cgibin/independentvoices?a=d&d=EGHHAEFI19691001.1.1&e=-------en-20--1--txttxIN----------1#.

Morley Safer’s Cam Ne News Broadcast. Accessed February 29, 2016. See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hNYZZi25Ttg

Moser, Richard. *The New Winter Soldiers.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1996.

Moskos, Charles C. Jr. "The American Dilemma In Uniform: Race in the Armed Forces." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. March 1973.

Polner,Murray. "Vietnam War Stories." *Gettysburg College Special Collections, Radical Pamphlets Collection.* Box 16, Folder 1.

Pomfret, John D. "Johnson Orders 50,000 More Men to Vietnam and Doubles Draft; Again Urges U.N. to Seek Peace." *New York Times*. July 29, 1965.

The Report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, February 1970.

"'Rough Draft' Distribution at Ft. Eustis Pleases Editors, Astonishes Some GIs." *Rough Draft*. September/October 1969. Accessed February 29, 2016. http://demo.revealdigital.com/cgibin/independentvoices?a=d&d=EGHHAEFI19691001.1.1&e=-------en-20--1--txttxIN----------1#.

Scheer, Robert. "Hang Down Your Head, Tom Dooley." *Ramparts*. January 1965.

Sir No Sir!. DVD. Directed by David Zeiger. Displaced Films, 2005.

Spector, Ronald H. *After Tet: The Bloodiest Year in Vietnam*. New York, The Free Press: 1993.

"Statistical Information About Fatal Casualties of the Vietnam War." National Archives. Accessed February 29, 2016. http://www.archives.gov/research/military/vietnamwar/casualty-statistics.html.

"US Soldier Asks Asylum in Sweden." December 1, 1967. *Gettysburg College Special Collections Radical Pamphlets Collection*. Box 15 Folder 4.

"Vietnam: An Antiwar Comic Book." *University of Virginia*. Accessed March 5, 2016. http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Exhibits/Bond/Bond.html.

"Walter Cronkite's 'We Are Mired in Stalemate' Broadcast, February 27, 1968." *University of Richmond*. Accessed February 28, 2016. https://facultystaff.richmond.edu/~ebolt/history398/cronkite_1968.html.

Author Biographies

Parker Abt ‘19 is a sophomore majoring in History at University of Pennsylvania. His primary interest is the intersection of American legal and economic history. Last summer, he worked at the American Enterprise Institute where he published research on violent crime and opioid abuse. This summer, Parker will pursue independent research on the history of underserved communities along the American-Mexican border known as colonias.

Abigail Currier ’17 is a Senior Spanish and History double major who is honored to have her piece selected to be in this year's history journal. This rather long essay was written for her senior capstone, which focused on the various American experiences of World War II and she used resources and materials from both the college's archive, Special Collections, and from the Army Heritage Center in Carlisle. As the title of her piece suggests, it focuses on one soldiers experience in World War II from fighting in France to being captured and his life as a Prisoner of War. Abigail really enjoyed both learning about this topic and writing this piece.

Matthew LaRoche ‘17 is a senior, with a major in History, and minors in Civil War Era Studies, Writing, and Peace and Justice Studies. This year, he had the honor to serve as an editor for the historical journal. Last year, he had the honor to serve with the Journal of the Civil War Era. For the past three years, he has participated as a Civil War Institute Fellow, and as a Pohanka Intern at Harpers Ferry NHP, Gettysburg NMP, and Gettysburg College Special Collections. In the coming years, he will be pursuing a PhD in Intellectual History, and an MFA if time allows.

Andrew C. Nosti ‘18 is a junior with a double major in History and English with a Writing Concentration. He has worked with the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* since his sophomore year. Andrew also works as a peer learning associate for the history department and a tutor in the Writing Center. He wrote this paper in Dr. Michael Birkner's "The Early Republic" class.

Kaylyn Sawyer ‘17 is a senior History Major with a double minor in Civil War Era Studies and Public History. She is one of the fellows for the Civil War Institute, treasurer of the campus reenacting unit (26th PCG), and a member of Alpha Phi Omega, the service fraternity. She will be working in Richmond, Virginia this summer and then take a gap year before graduate school.

Editor Biographies

Jesse Campana '18 is a junior and History major at Gettysburg College. This is his first year as an editor for the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* and proud to be a part of the team. He is currently the Vice President of the Gettysburg College Civil War Club and an affiliate of other historical clubs on the Gettysburg College campus. He is an avid living historian, portraying the American soldier throughout numerous eras. Currently working as a seasonal park ranger with the New Jersey State Park system, Jesse will be continuing his time at Monmouth Battlefield State Park and return to Gettysburg College this fall.

Caitlin Connelly '17 is a senior History Major with a double minor in Spanish and Classics. She has been a part of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* since her Junior year. This year she served as a Co Editor-in-Chief. She is also a student employee at Musselman Library and a Peer Learning Associate for the History Department.

Abigail Currier '17 is a senior Spanish and History double major who is excited to be working on the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* for the first time. When she is not reading papers for the journal, she fills her time with a variety of jobs around camps. From supervising an after school tutoring program twice a week to doing technical work at the two theaters owned by the college; Kline Theater and the Majestic. In the fall, Abigail will be traveling to Indiana to attend Indiana University in Indianapolis to get her masters in Library Science.

Julia Deros ’17 is a senior with a double major in History and Environmental Studies with a concentration in Earth system science. She has been a part of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* since her junior year, and this year has served as an Editor in Chief. She has also been a member and secretary of the Phi Alpha Theta history honor society since her sophomore year as well as a member and officer of the 26th Pennsylvania College Guard reenactment group. Next year, she will be attending Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis for a dual degree M.A-M.L.S program in Public History and Library and Information Science.

Keira Koch ‘19 is a sophomore History major and Public History minor. This is her first year serving as an editor for the *Gettysburg Historical Journal*. Besides being an editor for the journal she is also a student office aid for the History and Classics Department, Musselman Library Digital Scholar, and Resident Assistance for Rice Hall. Keira is very grateful to work with such wonderful writers and editors, she would like to thank them for all their hard work.

Matthew LaRoche ‘17 is a senior, with a major in History, and minors in Civil War Era Studies, Writing, and Peace and Justice Studies. This year, he had the honor to serve as an editor for the *Gettysburg Historical Journal*. Last year, he had the honor to serve with the Journal of the Civil War Era. For the past three years, he has participated as a Civil War Institute Fellow, and as a Pohanka Intern at Harpers Ferry NHP, Gettysburg NMP, and Gettysburg College Special Collections. In the coming years, he will be pursing a PhD in Intellectual History, and an MFA if time allows.

Jeffrey Lauck ‘18 is a junior History and Political Science double major with minors in Civil War Era Studies and Public History. He has been on the editorial staff of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* since his sophomore year and is the co-Editor-in-Chief of the Gettysburg College Journal of the Civil War Era. He is also the current managing editor of The Gettysburg Compiler, a student-run blog run by the Fellows at the Civil War Institute at Gettysburg College.

Andrew C. Nosti ‘18 is a junior with a double major in History and English with a Writing Concentration. He has worked with the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* since his sophomore year. Andrew also works as a Peer Learning Associate for the History Department and a tutor in the Writing Center.

Brianna O’Boyle ‘18 is a junior East Asian Studies Major with a Concentration in Chinese along with a double minor in Spanish and History. This is her second year working with the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* and her first year as a Co-Editor-in Chief. She is also an editor for SURGE, Gettysburg College’s Social Justice blog. She will be working in Shanghai this summer tutoring students in English.

Meghan O’Donnell ‘18 is a junior at Gettysburg College majoring in History and French. She began working as an editor of the *Gettysburg Historical Journal* this spring. She also works as a Peer Learning Assistant for the History Department and is the student assistant for The Jack Peirs Project.