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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 seventeenth 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 ~ 5 ~ 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.

Kevin Aughinbaugh’s article, “The Castle of Intelligence,” provides a look at the role that Camp Ritchie, Maryland played in training intelligence soldiers during the Second World War. It explores the paths of three men who were trained at this camp: Karl Hornung, William H. Bilous, and Edmund Winslett.

Lauren Bradford’s article, “Through the Eyes of Children,” discusses the experiences of three Berlin native child survivors of the Holocaust through analysis of their oral testimonies. Their unique voices help shed light on the various ways in which lives were forever changed for those who were legally identified as Jewish in Nazi Germany by way of social oppression.

Brandon Katzung Hokanson’s article, “Saving Grace on Feathered Wings,” explores the role of pigeons and their handlers as important tools on the battlefield during the First World War. It primarily focuses on the rigorous training and brutal combat that pigeon and man had to endure during the conflict.

Douglas Kowalewski’s article, “European Jazz,” demonstrates that interwar Parisians were not always receptive of African Americans that played jazz, and that the citizens of the Weimar Republic were more aware of and interested in the African American culture that permeated jazz in the 1920s and 30s.

Jeffery Lauck’s article, “A Divided Generation,” dives into the many divides within groups like Students for a Democratic Society and Young Americans for Freedom during their heyday in the Vietnam War Era. Based on original primary source research on the “Radical Pamphlets Collection” in Musselman Library
Special Collections, Gettysburg College, this study shows how these various student activist groups both overcame these differences and were torn apart by them.

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,

Brianna O’Boyle

Brandon Katzung Hokanson
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Featured Piece

This year the General Editors continued the tradition started last year by creating 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.

Professor Abou B. Bamba

Professor Bamba is an associate professor of history and chair of the Africana Studies department at Gettysburg College.

My interest in history came through my earlier academic focus in college on languages and American Studies. While at the university of Cocody (Abidjan, Ivory Coast), I took several courses in U.S. history. Even though my Master’s degree was ultimately on African American playwright Lorraine Hansberry, I never lost interest in the historical dimensions of studying the United States. Then in 1996, the American president Bill Clinton visited several countries in West Africa, including Senegal, Ghana and others. I was intrigued by the visit, especially the fact that Ivory Coast was not part of Clinton’s itinerary. For someone who grew up in the context of the revival of multiparty politics in Ivory Coast and was in tune with leftist intellectual activism, I longed for explanations, all the more so because I thought Ivory Coast was a major regional partner of the United States. In contrast, many opposition newspapers in the country were arguing that the Clinton
administration was demonstrating that Ivory Coast meant nothing for Washington. What was more, by skipping Abidjan, political commentators also suggested, Clinton was demonstrating his dissatisfaction with the pace and directions of Ivorian democratic reforms in the 1990s. It was in this context that I thus decided to embark on a post-Master’s research project whose aim was to understand the historical basis of U.S. foreign relations with Africa. More crucially, I was interested in mapping the historical role and place of Ivory Coast in the American policy with regard to Africa.

So I did not start my academic career as a “history buff.” Rather, contemporary social/political issues led me to embrace the study of the past in the hope that it would allow me to better understand the present. With hindsight, I must say that I am glad about the choices I made in college and in graduate school. Studying foreign languages (English and Spanish) in college gave me the critical skills and tools that have allowed me to engage primary sources in their original language(s). The numerous archives and repositories that I use for my historical research today would have been impossible to exploit had it not been my initial training in languages. As for the study of literature, it provided me with a deeper understanding of the significance of narratives and storytelling in the production of meaning.

Professor William Bowman

Professor Bowman is the Johnson Distinguished Teaching Professor in the Humanities and is a professor of history at Gettysburg College.

A series of events during my junior year abroad in Innsbruck, Austria inspired me to study history in graduate school and beyond. While there, I had the opportunity to take a wide
range of classes in European history, philosophy, and religion. As almost all of the courses were in German, it was a huge academic challenge. I enjoyed it immensely and knew that I wanted to further my studies. At the time, I gave little thought to future careers in history; I just knew that I wanted to keep on learning more about Europe’s past.

While in Innsbruck, I was also able to travel extensively in Central and Western Europe. A group of friends and I traveled to Rome to attend midnight mass celebrated by the then Pope John Paul II. While in Italy, we also visited Venice, Florence, and Verona. Later, a close friend, my brother, and I set out on a month-long trip crisscrossing as many countries as we could take in, including France, Spain, Portugal, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Germany. It was a typical American college student abroad adventure; we slept on trains, in parks, and, occasionally, in cheap hostels and hotels. We learned about short-term strikes in the Spanish rail system, slurped coffee from bowls in Paris, and rendezvoused with friends studying at Oxford. That trip also opened my eyes to a wide range of European cultures, languages, cuisines, and customs. By the time I returned to Innsbruck, I was exhausted, but also hooked on the idea of studying Europe and its history as deeply as I could. Those experiences influenced me greatly and continue to inspire me to this day as a professor of European history. They are also why I am such a strong advocate of study abroad, anywhere in the world, for Gettysburg College students.
Professor David Hadley

Professor Hadley is a visiting assistant professor of history at Gettysburg College.

Recently, I had the opportunity to host a discussion forum on the Confederate Flag and its legacy at an event in town. The passion and interest evident in that discussion, over a flag that first appeared in Gettysburg with an invading army more than 150 years ago, is a reminder of how important understanding history is; a whole universe of meaning surrounds people, events, symbols, and more that would be lost without a grasp of history.

I first began to grasp that on my first trip to Gettysburg as a boy. While a third-grader, I was told we were taking a family trip here. I was initially suspicious because, when I was younger, my father was in the habit of telling long stories about the Civil War and also retelling stories from The Lord of the Rings; having found out Middle Earth did not exist, I was skeptical about the existence of Gettysburg. Seeing the battlefield first hand was a transformative experience, though. It was the Peace Light, especially, that captured me, that symbol of peace overlooking a field that witnessed intense slaughter. Even as I developed a more complicated understanding of the costs and injustices involved in post-Civil War reconciliation, that monument remains my favorite place to go on the battlefield.

It is somewhat ironic that it was as a student here at Gettysburg that I began to expand my historical understanding beyond the Civil War. I took a senior thesis seminar with Professor Birkner, focused on President Eisenhower. We studied the CIA-sponsored overthrow of Iran’s government in 1953, a topic that aroused fierce debate within the classroom about U.S. activities in the world. This experience helped drive my main areas of interest – the Cold War and intelligence history. As I studied, I saw more and
more resonances between the topics I was studying in the past and the present day. Questions about privacy, foreign intervention, fears of foreign influence – none of these are new questions. Whether the Civil War or the Cold War, the blue and gray at Gettysburg or the shades of grey of espionage – the weight of history lies upon us all. It is inescapable. Rather than cause despair, this fact has always entranced me, as a I hope it does my students, because it means history is not just a dry catalog of events; it is understanding the shaping of the world.

Professor Magdalena S. Sánchez

Professor Sánchez is a professor of history at Gettysburg College.

I’ve had some excellent history teachers since I was in high school, and I’m an historian because of them. In my first semester at college, a western civilization course taught by a dynamic professor with a dry sense of humor spurred my intellectual curiosity. His courses and his example led me to a history major. In college I also studied art history, and thinking about graduate school, I deliberated between history and art history. My adviser pointed out that because history was more encompassing, it would give me greater flexibility. I took his advice, and have never looked back.

I chose to study Spanish history without ever having taken a Spanish history course. Though I was born in Cuba, my mother’s family came from Spain, my father taught Spanish literature at Seton Hall University, and as a family we had visited Spain. It helped, too, that I was fluent in Spanish. I was lucky to choose the Johns Hopkins University for graduate studies; unknown to me, it had one of the best programs in the country for early modern European history. My mentor there was Richard Kagan, the leading American historian in early modern Spanish history. At the
time he was one of few historians teaching early modern Spain in the United States, but he would go on to train a whole generation of scholars now teaching throughout the country and beyond.

I discovered that I love archival research – the challenge of locating sources and the excitement of finding primary documents overlooked by others. My research allows me to travel frequently to Europe, and I’ve worked in archives in Spain, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, England, and Belgium. Entering graduate school in history, I had no idea how fulfilling my career choice would be, but it certainly has been, and my research continues to motivate and excite me every day. I hope that my love of research will infect at least a few of my students, and inspire them as my own teachers inspired me.
The Castle of Intelligence: Camp Richie Maryland and the Military Intelligence Training Center during the Second World War
By Kevin M. Aughinbaugh

Introduction

“German forces have made a landing on the Eastern seaboard, have pushed forward from PHILADELPHIA to HANOVER, PA… ‘you will make a reconnaissance in the area BLUE RIDGE SUMMIT – FLINT – ZORA – McGINLEY HILL – FAIRFIELD – JACKS MOUNTAIN – BLUE RIDGE SUMMIT. Your mission will be to obtain information… concerning the following: Enemy motorized or mechanized movements; enemy identifications; the condition of the road between IRON SPRINGS and BLUE RIDGE SUMMIT.’”  

Although no assault ever touched the continental US during WWII, scenarios such as this were common for the students at the Military Intelligence Training Center (M.I.T.C.) located at Camp Ritchie, Maryland. These exercises were used to train soldiers to quickly respond to new military developments, conduct intelligence operations, and report on the information gathered. Although conflict was located an ocean away, the training exercises that students at the M.I.T.C. participated in brought the war to the mountains of northwestern Maryland.

Camp Ritchie played an important role in the American war effort during the Second World War, as it served to train soldiers and officers in the US Army the various skills they

---

1 “Practical Exercise in the Preparation of Messages and Reporters,” ca. Spring 1942, Military Intelligence Training Center, Karl Horning Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
needed, to gather military intelligence in the field. Although military strength and tactics are important components to winning battles, acquiring and utilizing military intelligence is crucial if commanders wish to reduce risks and capitalize on their gains on the battlefront. Commanders have repeatedly beaten the odds by utilizing gathered intelligence effectively and out-maneuvering their opponent during conflict. The skills the soldiers picked up at Camp Ritchie, which were learned both quickly and methodically, were invaluable on the battlefront. The men who graduated from the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie served their field commanders well during battle by analyzing situations and providing quick reports on enemy movements. Furthermore, these graduates played meaningful roles following the engagement, as they would work to interrogate prisoners and analyze photographs to provide intelligence for the next battle.

**Background and Historiography**

Nestled in a dale in the rolling green hills of the Blue Ridge Mountain Range, a secret military training facility is one of the last things anyone would think to find in such a bucolic location. Once a place for the wealthy to summer, the Cascade area in Maryland became the ideal location for such a base due to its secluded location and terrain. Originally, the land was utilized as part of the Buena Vista Natural Ice Company, which opened for operation in 1889. The company planned to cut and sell natural ice in the winter to sell to the wealthy summer visitors. However due to the combination of the advent of affordable refrigeration in

---

2 These battles include the First Manassas Battle (Bull Run) in 1861, the Battle of Tannenberg in 1914, the Battle for Midway in 1942, and the Battle at Inchon Harbor in 1950. In each of these battles, intelligence played a crucial role in obtaining victory. Gregory Elder, “Intelligence in War: It Can Be Decisive; Winning with Intelligence,” *Central Intelligence Agency*, Accessed December 9, 2017 from https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol50no2/html_files/Intelligence_War_2.htm.
homes and cinders from steam locomotives contaminating the ice during winter, the Buena Vista Ice Company shuttered its operations and closed for good in the early 1920s.³

In 1926, the Maryland National Guard purchased the property along the existing Western Maryland rail line, which was constructed to service the now defunct Buena Vista Ice Company. After purchasing the property, the National Guard proceeded to renovate the location for use as a summer training base for its recruits. The new camp was christened “Camp Ritchie” after the Maryland Governor, Albert C. Ritchie. Between 1926 and 1941, the Maryland National Guard utilized the base primarily as a summer training base. Since training only took place over the summer months, only minor improvements were made to the base. These included a parade ground, firing ranges, and a few structures such as “The Castle,” (fig. 1) which served as the main headquarters, was modeled after the castle unit insignia of the Corps of Engineers that had built the base.⁴

Following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the American war effort began in earnest. Although President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Chiefs of Staff had been trying to prepare the nation for the coming conflict, the nation’s military was underprepared for a war on a global scale. In 1942, the War Department took over control of Camp Ritchie to repurpose the base as a national training center for military intelligence. Camp Ritchie was in an ideal location for such a base, due to it being secluded in the mountains as well as

having a climate and terrain similar to that of Germany. As a result, The Military Intelligence Training Center was established at Camp Ritchie with the mission of training soldiers and officers in interrogation techniques, aerial photography, map reading, and intelligence gathering, along with other important skills that would help the military gather intelligence during combat.⁵

Camp Ritchie played an important role in the war effort, as the skills gleaned here by select soldiers was used overseas in the design of battle plans, the gathering of information, and the interrogation of enemy soldiers. Although Camp Ritchie played an important role in the American war effort, few works have been produced about the base. To date, only two notable accounts of the base exist: a historical documentary titled “The Ritchie Boys,” and a book, Sons and Soldiers. Both follow a select group of soldiers, who would become known as the “Ritchie Boys.” The Ritchie Boys were mostly direct descendants from Europeans, or were German Jews who had escaped to America in the years preceding the war. The army preferred these men, as they already knew European languages such as German, which would prove useful in interrogating captured enemy combatants. Although the two above-mentioned works shed lights on the work of this select group of men, little attention is given to the rest of the roughly 19,000 men, including intelligence officers, interrogators, and photographic analysts who were trained at this camp.

_Karl Hornung, Education at the M.I.T.C._

The selection process to be assigned to Camp Ritchie involved finding men suited to the job of intelligence work. Men

who knew several languages, such as German, French, or a number of eastern European languages were preferred. Additionally, previous experience in working with prisoners or on security details, such as in the Military Police, was also an advantage. These skills would aid the men in their task of gathering intelligence from enemy POWs.⁶

One such soldier who trained at Camp Ritchie during the war was Karl W. Hornung. Arriving in 1942, through the traditional wrought iron gate with the title “Camp Ritchie” proudly displayed above it, Hornung could see that he was one of the first men to pass in to this new camp. At this time, major construction was still taking place at the camp, as it had just recently been turned over to the Army from the National Guard. As Hornung spent his time at Camp Ritchie learning about intelligence gathering, the Camp itself was in the process of expanding and settling in to its new role. For both Hornung and Camp Ritchie, the first year of instruction was a learning process, and a time of expedited development.⁷

Once at the camp, the men would embark on an intensive education regimen that trained them in specialized areas of military intelligence. Hornung arrived at Camp Ritchie in March of 1942 and immediately began his training in intelligence. His training took him through a strenuous course of study, beginning with the basics of army structure and ending with practical exercises on how to react to an enemy attack, all of which prepared him to serve the future unit he would be attached to during battle.⁸

---

⁶“Personnel Placement Questionnaire,” ca. Fall 1942, William H. Bilous Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
⁷Karl Hornung Collection, Box 1, Folder 1, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
⁸1942, Military Intelligence Training Center, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Camp Ritchie Maryland. During the early stages of training, most soldiers were placed in to small groups, which could be attached to larger units in theater. However, this was a constantly evolving practice depending on the specialization of the individual, current war needs. As shown later on, men
Jammed into small, hastily-built classrooms (fig 2.) with class sizes hovering around 18-24 men, Hornung’s instruction began with a need to understand how the US Army was structured and how it operated. He learned the chains of commands for different army groups and divisions. For example, Hornung learned how the chain of command for an infantry battalion is different from an artillery battalion. Additionally Horning learned the roles that the general staff plays in shaping operations and making decisions, as well as how information flows both up and down the command structure. This was important knowledge for Hornung, as he was expected to quickly provide the proper information to the correct officers so that important decisions could be made in a timely manner under chaotic battlefield conditions.9

Once Hornung and his classmates had completed their lessons on the structure and organization of the US Army, they began instruction on the basics of intelligence and information-gathering during conflict. It was important for the men to learn to be able to differentiate between information and intelligence, and then decide what intelligence was actually useful to the current situation. Typically, information is regarded as the raw data that is gleaned by the soldier. This information could range from simple weather reports, to casual conversation with local residents who may have seen military operations taking place. Intelligence, however, is the “value-added” portion of information where the soldier takes all of the threads information that were gathered, sorts through them, and then weaves them together to form a coherent

---

trained in photographic intelligence would be placed in to teams that would serve together in theater.

picture of the entire scene that entails both what is known along with what will likely happen as developments occur.\(^\text{10}\)

Factors such as terrain and weather could play a large role in how the enemy would maneuver and act during a battle; consequently, it was important for Hornung and his classmates to understand these factors in order to provide proper information to commanding officers. Something as simple as a change in the cloud cover could affect how soldiers would react in different situations, such as their ability to utilize aircraft for both reconnaissance, and combat. This lack of aircraft could prove advantageous to the allied forces, as enemy aircraft would not be able to operate effectively under heavy cloud cover. However, it would also hinder the allied efforts to establish air cover. Intelligence analysts such as Hornung had to use weather reports, and knowledge about climatic patterns to anticipate weather conditions, and then create reports on how those weather conditions would affect both the troops and equipment.\(^\text{11}\)

In addition to weather, terrain also played an important role in intelligence gathering as it could both be an advantage and a detriment to forces fighting on the ground. Terrain is an important feature to consider during military campaigns as the landscape can change how a unit is fighting. Forests may provide excellent cover from enemy observation; however, they also increase difficulty in maneuvering vehicles and large numbers of men. Conversely, open fields can allow for easy movement, but also leave units and vehicles exposed to enemy attack. Intelligence officers had to be able to weigh the costs and benefits of the terrain types to their own men, as well as know how to predict enemy movements across the landscape.

\(^{10}\) “Intelligence Exercise,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland.

\(^{11}\) “Military Aspects Climate Elements” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland
To understand how the terrain in a particular area varies, students took a number of map-reading and drawing courses at the M.I.T.C. These included basic map-reading courses, where soldiers learned to identify symbols and locate objects on a map, as well as more advanced courses, where students were required to create and update their own maps of a particular area. For many of these exercises, the instructors at Camp Ritchie utilized the surrounding area. Local small towns such as Sabillasville, Maryland, and Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania, were the object of study for many of these classes. Hornung was required to map out road networks and draw in terrain features as well as the elevations of mountains and hills surrounding the towns.¹²

Another important aspect of mapping taught at Camp Ritchie was how to read and employ maps from other nations. While similar, the symbology on Allied maps could vary in design and meaning, which could lead to confusion. Students learned how to identify which symbols corresponded to the different nationalities among the Allies, and what each symbol meant. For example, the symbol for a dirt road on an American map may be a brown line. However, on a British map, that same dirt road may have been symbolized as a dotted black line. Intelligence soldiers who were interpreting these maps, needed to know the different meanings in symbols to effectively communicate and work closely with the Allied forces in Europe.¹³

In addition to learning how to interpret and utilize different Allied maps, students such as Hornung, at the M.I.T.C. learned

¹² “Conventional Signs and Symbols” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 1, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Military Aspects Climate Elements” Fall 2942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland “Maps and Map Reading Lessons No 1-5,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Hand Drawn Maps, and Mapping tools” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.

¹³ “Test on British Symbols,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “British Identification Marks,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
how to translate and exploit captured enemy maps. In many ways, a captured German map could prove more valuable to an intelligence officer in the field than a comparable map produced by the Allies. Enemy maps could contain information regarding troop placement, lines of fortification, and potential battle plans, all of which were of high value to Allied Commanders who were creating battle plans. Something as simple as a designated road on a German map could tip off a trained officer. Was there going to be a troop movement along the road? Was the road mined or hazardous? Or was this one of the main lines of communications for the enemy army? By taking in this information, along with other information gathered from observations and various reports, a trained intelligence man could interpret the conditions and provide the necessary intelligence a field commander would need to make a well-informed decision.¹⁴

Once the basics of creating, interpreting, and using maps was established, Hornung progressed to more advanced techniques of using aerial photography to gather ground information and make sense as intelligence. The practice of using aerial photography for reconnaissance and intelligence during combat became popular during the First World War. Even before early aircraft could be fitted with armaments, missions were being flown over the scarred European battlefields to photograph the snaking trench lines and gather information on enemy troop to artillery placement. Students at the M.I.T.C. learned how to use images taken from aircraft and deduce enemy ground strength, fortifications, and mechanized units. Using stereoscopes and exact duplicates of images spaced a few inches apart, two-dimensional photographs would appear to be

¹⁴ “German Conventional Map Signs,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Organization of the German Army,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “German Maneuver Exercises,” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 2, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
in three dimensions. This would assist the viewer in picking out anomalies in the areas, such as camouflage netting, tents, or vehicles.15

The troops would use the information they knew about the area based on maps, and then combine that with the information gleaned from the image to create intelligence reports. One of the main advantages of using aerial photography was that with a single aircraft, a unit could gather a vast amount of data and be able to process it rapidly. Previous techniques (which were taught earlier in the course of study) involved sending troops out into the field to observe enemy movements and report back to their headquarters. Although this could be more accurate than a photograph at times, it was also much more risky and time consuming. Furthermore, photographs could provide not only a faster but also more accurate depiction of troop movements. Rather than reports being a day or two old, photographs could be developed and analyzed within a few hours of the aircraft landing, providing a more “up to the minute” view of the battlefield.16

One of the last, and arguably one of the most important skills that Hornung learned during his time at Camp Ritchie was the art of interrogation of both captured Prisoners of War (POWs) as well as noncombatant civilians. In terms of intelligence gathering, having reliable firsthand accounts of enemy troop movements was extremely valuable. If an intelligence soldier gained information from a captured POW regarding unit size and type, other units in the area, or the enemy plans for battle,

16 “Basic Aerial Photographs Lessons 1-4” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “History of the Photo Intelligence Section in the Luzon Campaign,” ca Summer 1945, William Bilous Papers, Box 1, Folder 13, Camp Ritchie Maryland
American commanders would have an advantage during the planning and fighting stages of the battle. Unfortunately, gaining intelligence from enemy prisoners was typically a tough task. Lower-ranking enemy soldiers were normally not told much in terms of the larger picture, and any soldiers who knew information were usually tight-lipped due to their loyalty to their nation and their comrades.\footnote{“Analysis of ‘Name, Rank and Number’ Film” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.}

In order to elicit intelligence from POWs, the M.I.T.C. taught men various interrogation strategies and techniques to use on captured men. The first part of this lesson focused on how to treat and where to place POWs, as they were brought in from the front lines during an active battle. Once away from the front lines, soldiers would first check the POWs for wounds, and if necessary, send them to a hospital for treatment. After this initial process, the remaining healthy POWs would be escorted to a guarded area. During battle conditions, this could be as simple as a temporarily designated area with a ring of American guards surrounding the enemy POWs to await further movement. If necessary, the preliminary stages of interrogation would begin from this ad hoc confinement area.\footnote{“Instruction on building and running camps” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.}

If time was not as vital and the facilities were available, POWs would be escorted to a POW camp near the front. Once at the camp, the American soldiers would segregate the enemy POWs based on nationality and rank. All prisoners from one nation were sent to a designated area of the camp, which enabled the interrogators to quickly select men from the nationality of soldiers they wanted to interrogate. From there, the enemy officers would be separated from the enlisted men, which allowed an American
interrogator to quickly select the group he wanted to interrogate. Once this was complete, the interrogations would begin.\textsuperscript{19}

Hornung was trained to gather intelligence from interrogations in multiple forms. Typically, asking direct questions on battle plans would not lead very far, as most soldiers would not easily divulge that sort of information. Rather, interrogators’ training involved learning how to become friendly with the enemy POWs, and how to “beat around the bushes” to obtain bits and pieces of information that would help to create a larger picture(fig. 3). When working with enlisted men, seemingly mundane questions regarding what they saw along their marches, their diets, or how they felt about their officers could turn up important fragments of information that could be pieced together to form an idea about the general situation these men had faced. It was the intelligence team’s job to sort through the minutia to form a coherent idea of the larger picture.\textsuperscript{20}

As mentioned earlier, the enemy officers were typically better informed in terms of battle plans and the general situation; however, they also tended to be less likely to reveal information. According to some interrogators, these interrogations would last hours and sometimes days if the officer seemed particularly knowledgeable about the battle plans. Again, the interrogators would try to strike up friendly conversations with the enemy officers regarding mundane topics such as their religion, values, hobbies, or home life. The goal was to find areas of the POWs life that they would be willing to discuss. Ultimately, the goal was to get the prisoner comfortable enough to sustain a conversation. Once the prisoner was talking, the interrogator would then try to subtly guide the conversation in a direction that would

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Ibid.
\item[20] “Analysis of ‘Name, Rank and Number’ Film” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Sample Interview Sheet” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.
\end{footnotes}
consequently have the prisoner unknowingly divulge bits of information to the interrogator.²¹

In some special cases, interrogators would find prisoners who were loquacious and not so tight-lipped, providing a goldmine of information to the intelligence team. Typically, however, the men were taught to not expect to gain too much from one individual prisoner. Rather they were trained to focus on small pieces of information collected from many POWs to be combined and used later. Although it was preferred that the integrators attempted to remain amicable toward the prisoners, it was sometimes necessary to try other methods to get prisoners to talk. Once away from the classroom and in the field, the latitude that these soldiers had in which to conduct their interrogations greatly expanded.²²

Guy Stern and Fred Howard were members of the select group known as the Ritchie Boys, and they made great use of this additional latitude to play mind games on the German POWs. Nearing the end of the European conflict, the pair of interrogators devised a strategy to frighten the POWs into divulging information they would otherwise keep to themselves. Knowing that German soldiers were fearful of being sent to Russian POW camps, Stern and Howard utilized this fear for their own purposes. One man in the team would dress as a Soviet representative using previously captured Russian uniforms (from German war trophies) and other authentic Soviet paraphernalia. This “Soviet” soldier would then be used as a ploy to get the Germans to talk with the implication

²¹ *The Ritchie Boys*, directed by Christian Bauer (2004; Toronto, Ont: Tangram, 2007), DVD; “Analysis of ‘Name, Rank and Number’ Film” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Sample Interview Sheet” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Practice Interview Sheets” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.

²² “Analysis of ‘Name, Rank and Number’ Film” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; *The Ritchie Boys*, directed by Christian Bauer (2004; Toronto, Ont: Tangram, 2007), DVD.
that if they cooperated with the Americans they would be sent to American camps. However if they refused, they would be sent back to Russia with the “Soviet” officer, to face the Russian POW camps.\textsuperscript{23}

Once finished with the interrogation, prisoners were again segregated based on nationality and rank. Additionally, they were also separated from the un-interrogated POWs to avoid having information passed on about what questions could be expected. From there, they would be further processed and sent to POW camps to be held until a prisoner exchange or the end of the war occurred. Following the interrogations, the American interrogators would use the knowledge gained at Camp Ritchie to provide a large scale picture of events for their superiors.\textsuperscript{24}

During his final weeks of training at the M.I.T.C., Hornung practiced weaving loose threads of information together to form cogent reports on the larger situation. Lessons would consist of providing men with multiple and oftentimes confusing and conflicting reports. Additionally, the men would practice interrogations on “German prisoners,” and “local witnesses” about the events of the exercise.\textsuperscript{25} From there, the intelligence men would take the information they had been provided and use it to create situational awareness to manage the upcoming “battle.”

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{The Ritchie Boys}, directed by Christian Bauer (2004; Toronto, Ont: Tangram, 2007), DVD.

\textsuperscript{24} “Instruction on Building and Running Camps” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Sample Interview Sheet” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland; “Practice Interview Sheets” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 4, Camp Ritchie Maryland.

\textsuperscript{25} During the war Camp Ritchie held a small contingent of American soldiers who would play the part of German soldiers during war games. This would allow the training American soldiers to get a feel for how the German army maneuvers, as well as how to better spot enemy troops in different scenarios. Although typically on base, at times the “German” soldiers would be seen by unsuspecting local residents who became alarmed thinking that the German army had invaded the US.
Again, the local area was utilized for training purposes. Local towns became the sites of new “battles.” Fairfield PA, - Blue Ridge Summit PA, - Emmitsburg MD, -Westminster MD, Baltimore MD, and many others were all “invaded,” “repulsed,” and “invaded” again by fictitious German armies. Although humorous at times, these exercises taught the intelligence men valuable lessons that they would use once they went in to the field.\textsuperscript{26}

Once the soldiers graduated from the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie, they would have the ability to serve in many different roles in the intelligence section of the military. Some of them would go on to become interrogators in the European Theater of Operations, including the famed Ritchie Boys. Others would go on to serve by analyzing documents and other more mundane duties behind the front lines. Some, such as Sgt. William H. Bilous would serve as aerial photograph interpreters. For Bilous, Camp Ritchie was a career-changing assignment that enabled him to be sent overseas and serve the nation utilizing both his strong character, as well as his newly-acquired knowledge from Camp Ritchie.\textsuperscript{27}

\textit{William H. Bilous, Changes to Camp Curriculum}

William H. Bilous joined the Army in 1939 at the age of 24. After going through basic training, Bilous was sent to Hawaii to serve in the Military Police Hawaiian Department. During his time in Hawaii, Bilous distinguished himself as a reliable, hardworking, and trustworthy soldier. Through his efforts, Bilous

\textsuperscript{26} Many of the exercises, and information that the men received were able to slip in slight jokes and humor in to very serious lessons. For example when discussing effective means for camouflage, “DON’T hide under matted camouflage. It is as conspicuous as a bad haircut.” “Exercises in the German Attack of the area.” Fall 1942, Karl Hornung Papers, Box 1, Folder 8, Camp Ritchie Maryland

\textsuperscript{27} The Ritchie Boys, directed by Christian Bauer (2004; Toronto, Ont: Tangram, 2007), DVD; Papers ca. 1941-1945, William Bilous Collection, Boxes 1, 2, and 3, US Army Research and Education Center.
impressed his superior officers who recommended that he would be an excellent soldier “for any position requiring a person of Intelligence, tact, and reliability.”28 From these recommendations, Bilous would begin a journey culminating in his appointment as head of a distinguished aerial photography intelligence team in the South Pacific by the end of the war.29

Following his recommendation for a new position, Bilous was transferred to the 226th Military Police Company at Fort Mason, California in early 1942. Following his transfer, Bilous was first promoted to Corporal on March 28, and was again promoted to Sergeant less than three months later on June 1. For Bilous, his hard work and character quickly paid off as his promotion to Sergeant came with a new base assignment. From Fort Mason, Bilous was sent to the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation in South Central Pennsylvania. While serving at the Military Reserve, Bilous was tasked with guarding prisoners of war. He served in this capacity to the best of his ability, again distinguishing himself. His commanding officers urged him to apply for the infantry Officer Candidate School (OCS) in late 1942, however, by then all available slots were full. Not one to give up, Bilous then applied to the OCS for army administration.30 Luckily, for Bilous, he was able to secure a spot in the Army Administration OCS.

Upon graduation on June 23 1943, Bilous was once again promoted, this time receiving his commission as a second lieutenant. He returned to the base at Indiantown Gap to continue

28 “Major, J. P. Evans, to whom it may concern,” September 5, 1941, William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 1, US Army Research and Education Center.
29 Papers ca. 1941-1945, William Bilous Collection, Boxes 1, 2, and 3, US Army Research and Education Center.
30 “Certificate of Corporal” March 28, 1942, William H. Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 2. US Army Heritage and Education Center; “Certificate of Sergeant” June 1, 1942, William H. Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 2. US Army Heritage and Education Center; “Application to OCS” September 1942, William H. Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 2. US Army Heritage and Education Center.
serving as a Military Policeman (MP) until further orders arrived. After seven months, those orders arrived: He was sent to the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie to become trained in Aerial Photography. On February 2, 1944, Bilous reported for duty at the front gate of Camp Ritchie. During his five-month stay at Camp Ritchie, Bilous learned about and worked closely with the aerial photography unit. Rather than becoming a general intelligence soldier, Bilous was to become a specialist in aerial photography interpretation.  

In the two years between training Hornung (1942) and Bilous (1944), much had changed at Camp Ritchie. During the first training secession, the trainees learned as much as the Army did. This first group in 1942 was trained to be general intelligence personnel. As discussed earlier, Hornung learned a varied range of skills, including weather interoperation, map navigation, and prisoner interrogation. The first cadres of men were trained to be flexible in the field since they were able to perform a multitude of roles depending on the challenges presented by the location of their deployment and the needs of their commander. Although this may sound like a good idea, the army quickly realized that this training style was not ideal in battle. After this training was applied in North Africa, the army quickly changed its requirements for intelligence training, refining the roles of intelligence personnel in the field.  

Changes to the training regimen at Camp Ritchie continued throughout the war. However, the most drastic change came in early 1943. Taking what was learned from training the initial cadre of men in 1942, the commanders and educators at Camp Ritchie

---

altered the curriculum so that men could better demonstrate what was learned. This was due in part to the Army’s need to have more specialized intelligence personnel in the field. Rather than training the men in a variety of fields to an adequate level, Camp Ritchie morphed into a training base for army specialists. Additionally, the change in curriculum was due to a better understanding of what skills were needed in the field. Training hours were increased to allow time to teach soldiers about German and Nazi culture, beliefs, and economics, as well increased attention to unit identification.\textsuperscript{33}

As the Allied armies advanced through North Africa and Italy, better information was collected on tactics and strategies utilized by the Axis powers. In addition to these strategies, enemy equipment and personnel were captured. As intelligence officers in the field collected this information and equipment and provided it to their commanders, some would be shipped back to the US as training aids for soldiers. Over the course of the war, Camp Ritchie began to acquire a cosmopolitan identity. Although all of the soldiers stationed there were American, various sectors of the camp were demarcated as “German,” “Italian,” and “Japanese” sectors. In these areas, mock towns and structures (fig. 4) were created to train the men in what to expect in each region. Additionally, Camp Ritchie installed captured enemy equipment to further enhance the training environment. Selected American troops would play-act enemy roles using captured equipment in these mock villages to assist in the training.\textsuperscript{34}

Two of the most unique structures that were utilized to assist in training the men were a mock Nazi Rally Arena, and half of a farmhouse. American soldiers would be sent to the Mock Nazi

\textsuperscript{33} US War Department, \textit{History of Military Intelligence Training at Camp Ritchie Maryland: 19 June 1942 – 1 January 1945.} (Washington DC, War Department, ND), 72-25, 86-90.

\textsuperscript{34} Blizard, \textit{Fort Ritchie 1926-1998}, 39, 52-54.
Arena to participate in a fake Nazi Rally. American actors would dress as high-ranking Nazi party officials, while other actors would play the part of Nazi Storm Troopers. Additionally, other actors would be placed among the crowd of GIs to act as German civilians. German nationalistic songs were played, and the actors used Nazi tactics to “stir up enthusiasm” among the Americans.\textsuperscript{35} The mock arena was constructed as a way to demonstrate to the soldiers the psychological background German soldiers would have been accustomed to during over the past ten years. Throughout the mock rally, American interjections were broadcast over the loud speakers to alert the soldiers to the blatant lies that Nazi Propaganda promulgated during the rallies, as well as to bring attention to the tactics that were used to further indoctrinate German soldiers under the Nazi movement. \textsuperscript{36}

Less exotic than a US-staged mock Nazi rally on an American military base was the cut-away farmhouse (fig. 5). Built prior to the construction of the Buena Vista Ice Company in 1889, this farmhouse was situated at the base of a small hill. Sitting abandoned for well over fifty years, it was transformed into a demonstration area. Bleachers were installed on the hillside and the wall facing the bleachers was demolished. This produced an area where a group of men could watch instructors demonstrate how to raid a house and check for both enemy combatants as well as important documents. Demonstrating invaluable lessons, such as room clearing and searching for documents among the nooks and crannies in a house, this location played an important role in the education of soldiers. \textsuperscript{37}

Although specializing in aerial photographic interpretation, Bilous still had to take other courses, such as map interpretation and weather prediction, to round out his education. Along with

\textsuperscript{35} Ibid., 42
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 34.
general classes, to become specialized in aerial photographic interpretation he has set of specialized courses to train him in this field. This course of study consisted of ten hours of instruction in basic aerial photography, six hours of ground photography, five hours of camouflage study, and eight hours of selection of battle positions. One of the unique techniques that Bilous learned during the course was called the “Floating Line Method of Photographic Observation.” In essence, this technique was used to determine unobstructed lines of sight. The intelligence officer was to assess an aerial photograph and imagine a floating line from a vantage point toward the region where he wished to observe. If this imaginary line “floated” to that point, there was a clear line of sight. If the line “dug in” to a mountainside, or other obstacle, the line of sight was blocked. By all accounts, this floating line method worked reasonably well. However, this aerial photography course was not the only redesigned class that Bilous took while at Camp Ritchie, as he was also able to take advantage of a new set of courses on the Japanese.³⁸

Unlike with the Nazis and the Italians, capturing Japanese prisoners and equipment proved difficult. The tradition of bushido in the Japanese culture encouraged soldiers to either die fighting or commit suicide; becoming a prisoner of war was considered dishonorable. Additionally, it has been noted that unlike the European Theater, the Pacific Theater was regarded as more of a race war, in which American soldiers tended to be less merciful toward any Japanese prisoners. This combination made it extremely difficult for Americans to collect and capture significant

³⁸ US War Department, History of Military Intelligence Training at Camp Ritchie Maryland, 96, 97.
amounts of intelligence, equipment, or prisoners during the early part of the war (1942-43). ³⁹

By the time Bilous was training at Camp Ritchie, enough Japanese equipment and materiel had been captured to allow the creation of a new course on the battle tactics of the Japanese. This course was similar to those courses teaching men about the German or Italian armies. Men would learn the unit identification, army structure, tactics, and battle psychology of Japanese soldiers. To enhance this class, a few Japanese-Americans reenacted Japanese battlefield tactics by dressing up in available gear and using captured weapons. Although small in number, those actors provided a great deal of important training to the men slated to serve in the Pacific Theater. Bilous’ increased training in aerial photography analysis along with the newly developed courses on the Japanese Army would serve him as he went to serve in the Pacific theater.⁴⁰

William H. Bilous, Putting the Knowledge to Work

Upon graduation from the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie, Bilous received orders to report to Camp Stoneman, in Pittsburg California on June 18, 1944. Camp Stoneman was built in early 1942 to provide a staging ground for American forces entering the Pacific Theater. Units from across the nation’s training facilities moved through Camp Stoneman to be processed, outfitted, and shipped out in a matter of a few days. As Bilous left the front gate of Camp Ritchie, he would have had an inkling of where he was going to be sent. Having been made chief of a photographic interpretation team and ordered to one of the major processing

⁴⁰US War Department, History of Military Intelligence Training at Camp Ritchie Maryland, 92.
camps for the Pacific Theater, Bilous would have deduced the basics of his next assignment as he watched the US countryside rush by on his three-day train trip to California.41

During his three-day stint at Camp Stoneman, Bilous checked over his equipment one last time. Rifles and pistols were fired for reliability and accuracy, shoes and clothing were checked for excessive wear, and last minute medical care was given to those who needed it. Camp Stoneman would be the last location that on the US mainland that these men would stand on for quite some time. Once Bilous’ unit passed final inspection, it was loaded onto a troop ship and shipped off to the South Pacific. Crammed onto a troop ship, Bilous, his team, and hundreds of other GIs embarked on a cruise crossing the largest ocean in the world.42

Upon entering the South Pacific, Bilous was ordered to the headquarters of the 5th Replacement Department of the US Army Air Forces in the Far East (USAFFE). Here, Bilous was placed in command of the 104th Photographic Intelligence Team. In this role, Bilous and his team distinguished themselves by providing valuable analysis of aerial photograph taken by American planes. By the spring of 1945, Bilous was recommended for a promotion to First Lieutenant. In addition to the promotion, Bilous also received a Bronze Arrowhead as he and his team “participated in the initial assault wave (H/2) of the Lingayen Gulf Landing, 9 Jan 45.”43 Not only did Bilous provide valuable services to the ground forces through analysis of aerial photography, but he also endured

43 “Citation for Bronze Arrowhead,” March 18, 1945, William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 12, US Army Research and Education Center.
similar conditions to the assault troops as well. Coming ashore during an assault landing to quickly provide intelligence to the men on the battlefield, Bilous was an effective and flexible leader and intelligence officer.\textsuperscript{44}

Recognition of Bilous’ ability continued throughout 1945. As a first lieutenant, Bilous was ordered commander of two photographic intelligence units, the 103\textsuperscript{rd} and the 104\textsuperscript{th}, which were selected to provide aerial intelligence for the Luzon campaign from the fall of 1944 to the summer of 1945. Both the 103\textsuperscript{rd} and the 104\textsuperscript{th} were bedeviled by setbacks throughout the campaign when dealing with aerial intelligence. During his time with the 104\textsuperscript{th}, Bilous encountered many of the problems that negatively affected performance of aerial photography in the Luzon campaign. \textsuperscript{45}

To his credit, none of the responsibility for reported problems with aerial photography fell upon Bilous’ shoulders. Rather, Bilous and his team had to deal with the problems and find solutions. The first few sorties for aerial photography returned poor photographic coverage of important sites such as beachheads. Rather than designating specific squadrons for the disposal of the 103\textsuperscript{rd} and 104\textsuperscript{th} Aerial Photographic Intelligence teams, the Army forced these teams to work alongside the Air Force and Naval intelligence sections, forcing all three intelligence sections to share both aircraft and equipment as they carried out their duties. Although this may have seemed like a sound idea as a way to save manpower, fuel, and time, it turned out to be a major error. The Army intelligence teams were tasked with different missions and objectives than those of the Air Force and Navy, resulting in inconsistent and inaccurate photographs for analysis. Although this issue was sorted out with time and stronger communications, other

\textsuperscript{44} “Official Papers - Personnel Papers” February 14 -March 18, 1945, William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 12, US Army Research and Education Center.
\textsuperscript{45} “Official Papers – Personnel Papers” May 12 – October 21, 1945. William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 13, US Army Research and Education Center.
issues continued to plague Bilous and his team throughout the Luzon campaign.⁴⁶

For Bilous’ team to operate effectively, a number of items required coordination. Proper cameras in aircraft were crucial to producing high quality images, which could be analyzed both quickly and accurately. Aircraft had to fly at the proper altitude and speed for the cameras to snap high quality shots. Once grounded, film needed to be quickly developed so that prints could be disseminated throughout the intelligence team for analysis. Finally, analysis had to be rapid enough to make up-to-date, informed decisions, while still being highly accurate. At one point or another, Bilous’ team faced a breakdown in each of these sections.⁴⁷

During the early portion of the Luzon campaign, cameras used in reconnaissance aircraft were not the correct type. Using what was available, gun target cameras rather than proper aerial intelligence cameras were loaded in to reconnaissance aircraft. Although useful at noting which structures had been destroyed or which aircraft had been shot down, target cameras did not provide the clarity or resolution required for proper photographic intelligence. Another issue that beset Bilous’ team was a lack of developing facilities. This slowed down the analysis process by producing a backlog of undeveloped photographs. Furthermore, this hindered wide dissemination of photographs, as only a minimal number of images were printed as a way to increase the speed. There were enough images be analyzed at the team’s headquarters, but not enough to spread throughout the rest of the division and for other officers to have a copy. Although these

⁴⁶ “History of the Photo Intelligence Section in the Luzon Campaign,” ND, William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 13, US Army Research and Education Center.
⁴⁷ Ibid.
problems existed, Bilous and his men were able to provide adequate intelligence for the Luzon campaign.\textsuperscript{48}

In total, the 103\textsuperscript{rd} and 104\textsuperscript{th} Aerial Intelligence Teams produced over 750,000 photographic prints of the battle area. Additionally, with the help of the Army Airforce and Naval Airforce, over 1,000 individual reconnaissance sorties were flown during the Luzon campaign, each returning hundreds of images for analysis. Furthermore, with practice, the Aerial Intelligence units were able to predict future requests, and with available time, would process images that might prove useful to commanders before a request was ever submitted. Finally, these units utilized innovative photography and analysis techniques to provide more accurate images and intelligence reports. These techniques included taking images from both vertical (straight above) and oblique (from the side) angles to locate and identify enemy emplacements and supply dumps in the mountainous areas. Although these techniques were time consuming, they proved to be exceedingly accurate. \textsuperscript{49}

For coping with these hardships and successfully commanding his teams, Bilous was once again recommended for a promotion. Following the surrender of the Japanese, Bilous was promoted to the rank of Captain as he “conducted the work of his team in a highly efficient manner and has amply demonstrated his fitness for promotion to the next higher grade.”\textsuperscript{50} With promotion in hand, Bilous was shipped back home on the SS Marine Falcon. Once ashore, Bilous once again traveled across the nation this time to Fort Dix, New Jersey. From there he was provided with 45 days leave and accompanying rations to return home and rest. However Bilous’ service did not end in late 1945 with an honorable

\textsuperscript{48} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{50} “Recommendation for Promotion,” October 6, 1945, William Bilous Collection, Box 1, Folder 13, US Army Research and Education Center.
discharge from the US Army; rather, Bilous reenlisted to continue serving.⁵¹

Using skills learned at Camp Ritchie, Bilous would continue to serve with the US Army until he retired in 1959. He worked in a variety of roles, including Assistant Supervisor of Prisoners, at Green Haven, New York and Fort Hancock, New Jersey, and Captain of a unit of MPs. Going overseas again, Bilous became Chief of Criminal Investigation in occupied Japan, and finally was promoted to the Officer in charge of Army Photo Identification Center, Korea Forward, during the Korean Conflict. In his multitude of roles in the US Army throughout his career Bilous was able to use the skills he had learned at the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie to lead his men successfully, and provide valuable intelligence reports to his commanding officers.

*Edmund Winslett, Planning the Invasion of Japan*

Commissioned in 1917 as an infantry officer, Edmund J. Winslett was a career military man. At the outbreak of WWII, Winslett had been an officer for 24 years. Serving as an infantry officer had taught him many things; however his experience in WWII would tremendously increase his education. At the outset of WWII, Winslett was assigned to a coastal protection artillery battery. As commander of the battery, Winslett was in charge of ensuring the protection of the American homeland from enemy invasion. Although chances of a cross-ocean invasion force from either Germany or Japan were slim, Pearl Harbor had shown that American Territory was vulnerable to enemy naval attack. ⁵²

---

⁵¹ Papers ca. 1941-1945, William Bilous Collection, Boxes 1, 2, and 3, US Army Research and Education Center.

⁵² Papers ca. 1944-54, Edmund J Winslett, Boxes 1, and 2, US Army Research and Education Center.
After the US composed itself from the initial shock of the attack on Pearl Harbor, Army plans were refined and put into action. Although older than many of the new recruits to the US Army, Winslett was a valuable asset. He had years of experience as an officer. He was sent off to Camp Ritchie to train at the M.I.T.C. as an intelligence officer. Taking many of the same classes that Bilous and Hornung did, Winslett gained a valuable education that would serve him later in the war. Upon graduation, Winslett became commander of his own intelligence unit. Initially shipped off to serve in Europe, he served only briefly, before being ordered to the Pacific.53

While at Camp Ritchie, Winslett studied photographic interpretation and found himself as part of a photographic intelligence team. Following a similar path to that of Bilous, Winslet was shipped off to the pacific. Serving in the 131st photographic interpretation team, Winslett and his team were tasked to aid in the invasion of Luzon. Under similar difficult conditions to those of Bilous, Winslet and his team performed their duties to the best of their abilities. Poor communications, inadequate cameras, and a lack of supplies took their toll; however, much like Winslett’s European assignment, this assignment did not last long.54

As the tides of the Pacific War began to turn, the likelihood of an invasion of the Japanese Home Islands was becoming all too apparent. With increasing resistance during battle and the advent of the Kamikaze aircraft in 1944, the Americans had a bitter taste of the resolve of the Japanese people. If the American Army was forced to land on the Japanese Home Islands, it was understood that the logistics involved would be tremendous and that the casualties would be exceedingly high. Similar to the D-Day

53 Ibid.
54 “Personnel Papers,” ca 1945, Edmund Winslett Collection, Box 2, Folder 1, US Army Research and Education Center.
invasion of 1944, any invasion of Japan proper would be a large undertaking, involving massive amounts of men and materiel along with a high degree of coordination between air, ground, and naval forces. A key element to ensuring this invasion would succeed was ensuring high quality intelligence.\textsuperscript{55}

In 1945, Winslett was ordered to assist in the Japanese invasion planning.\textsuperscript{56} Reporting in, he was tasked with using his skill set that he acquired at the M.I.T.C. and during the war to plan a portion of the invasions. Providing his skills of both photographic interpretation and his long experience in the Army, Winslett and his team aided in creating a battle plan for the invasion of Japan. The basic invasion strategy was to commence with invasions originating in the southern parts of the island. American forces were to come ashore at the isthmuses between the Kyushu and Shikoku regions, and between the Shikoku and Honshu regions, thus splitting Japanese forces in to three separate areas. This would cut lines of communications, and allow American forces to perform an envelopment maneuver to attack and capture objectives in discrete sections of the country. After these initial invasions, two additional invasions were to commence in each region to further pressure Japanese forces and capture land area.\textsuperscript{57}

Although planned for the fall of 1945, the military invasion of Japan never happened. With the dropping of the two atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Japanese


\textsuperscript{56} Due to the highly secretive nature of such an operation, much of the individual information pertaining to Winslett and his involvement is not accessible. Either through being blacked out, destroyed, or simply not listed, much of the data that would describe times and places were not to be found.

\textsuperscript{57} “Map of Chosen –Honshu invasion,” Ca. July 1945, Edmund Winslett Collection, Box 1, Folder 7 and, Box 2, Folder 9, US Army Research and Education Center.
government soon capitulated, thus ending WWII. Still, similar to Bilous, Winslett did not immediately leave the army. Following the end of the war, Winslett was promoted to Major and given command of the Visitors Liaison Office, Headquarters I Corps, in Japan. He remained at this post throughout the end of the Korean Conflict, working in public relations as well as negotiating various issues.  

Towards the end of the Korean Conflict, Winslett became part of the group that negotiated prisoner exchanges with the North Korean government. In this role, Winslett was responsible for bringing American POWs safely home after the harsh condition in Korean prisoner camps. Utilizing interrogation skills learned at the M.I.T.C. at Camp Ritchie, Winslett was prepared to read body language and use discussion tactics to deduce the real intentions of his counterpart negotiator. After a long, hard and fulfilling 30-year career in the military, Winslett retired following the end of the Korean Conflict.  

Conclusion

Following the end of WWII, Camp Ritchie maintained an air of secrecy. Following a rapid decommissioning process, it was once again chosen to be the site of a secret communications base during the 1950s. As tensions between the US and USSR increased during the Cold War, new installations were needed to protect high-level officials from the threat of nuclear war. Carved out of a mountain less than five miles away from Camp Ritchie, Site-R, or “The Underground Pentagon,” was designed to house high-level military officials during any nuclear standoff between the US and its Soviet counterpart. Now christened “Fort Ritchie,” it was ideally located to act as one of the main communications basses for

58 “Personnel Papers,” ca 1945, Edmund Winslett Collection, Box 2, Folder 2-8, US Army Research and Education Center.  
59 Ibid.
Site-R, as it was so close to the new base. Fort Ritchie fulfilled this duty throughout the remainder of the Cold War. Finally, in 1998, Fort Ritchie closed its doors for good as the US military shuttered the base in an attempt to reduce costs.⁶⁰

Although Camp Ritchie now stands a silent hollow shell of its former self, the camp continues to live on in the memories and actions of men like Hornung, Bilous, and Winslett. By providing highly trained officers and soldiers in the field of intelligence, Camp Ritchie helped win battle from across the sea. Men trained at Camp Ritchie provided vital information to their commanders as well as to units on the ground, helping to find enemy units and reduce American casualties by cutting through the fog of war to provide a clear battlefield picture. Although one man’s life is not any more important or valuable than another man’s, the men trained at Camp Ritchie became force multipliers once in the field. Taking skills learned at Camp Ritchie and applying them to actual battle situations, these men gave a decided advantage to American forces in battle. Whether it be prisoner interrogations, aerial photography analysis, or map-making, the skills learned at Camp Ritchie proved to be important for the 19,000 men who graduated from the M.I.T.C. as they assisted in the American war effort during WWII as well as throughout the rest of their service to the nation.

---
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Appendix

Figure 1. A military parade rolls in front of Camp Ritchie’s Headquarters, the “Castle” during WWII.61

61 “Drive by of Jeeps in Front of the Castle” Photographic Image Scans, Western Maryland Reading Room, Hagerstown Library, Hagerstown MD.
Figure 2. Men at Camp Ritchie during a coding exercise in the Signal Intelligence Code Room. Cramped classrooms such as this were common while Hornung was training at Camp Ritchie in late mid to late 1942.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{62} “Signal Intelligence Code Room” Photographic Image Scans, Western Maryland Reading Room, Hagerstown Library, Hagerstown MD.
Figure 3. Demonstrations of how to properly capture, handle, and interrogate prisoners were common as they would allow soldiers see firsthand how their classroom instruction was be used. The “prisoner” in the middle is an American serviceman playing the part of a captured German soldier during one such demonstration.63

63 “Three Actors” Photographic Image Scans, Western Maryland Reading Room, Hagerstown Library, Hagerstown MD.
Figure 4. Mock villages and towns, such as this mock German village, were constructed and used to help train soldiers on what to expect and how to fight once they reached Germany. 64

64 “German Man Poses in Snow,” Photographic Image Scans, Western Maryland Reading Room, Hagerstown Library, Hagerstown MD.
Figure 5. The cutaway farmhouse allowed soldiers to watch actors carry out maneuvers in confined spaces and search for hidden documents, offering valuable lessons for intelligence men in the field. 65

65 “Scene with a Soldier” [Top] and “Spying [Bottom],” Photographic Image Scans, Western Maryland Reading Room, Hagerstown Library, Hagerstown MD.
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Through the Eyes of Children: Social Oppression Under Nazi Rule from 1933 to 1938
Reflections of Three Holocaust Survivors
By Lauren Ashley Bradford

— Introduction —

The economic and social segregation of the Jews on all levels of German society, beginning in 1933 and continuing on for more than a decade, was the platform from which the National Socialists established and developed their antisemitic ideologies that ultimately brought about the near-extinction of an entire group of people.¹ This paper will show how three child survivors directly experienced the effects of the political corruption and antisemitic policies that were implemented during the Nazi era by way of social measures and constrictions. It is these forms of social segregation and persecution that directly reflect how Nazi ideology and political oppression were practiced by members of the German community, of all ages and genders, reaching across every economic and social class at various times throughout the 1930s. The buildup of these pressures enabled events such as the “Reichskristallnacht” to occur in 1938. The Nazi philosophy and system in place allowed for an atmosphere of violence and hatred that led to direct and personal attacks on the Nazi-labeled Jewish community.

The years ranging from 1930 to 1938 can be better understood if dissected into three distinct events. First, there was the ascension and initial execution of power by the Nazi party

when Hitler was named Chancellor in 1933. This officially begins the mental molding and preparation for German society to accept Jewish persecution throughout the 1930s and early 40s. The second significant happening was the introduction of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, which consisted of the removal of basic rights from those now labeled Jewish by law. From this time onward, the prohibition of Jews from economic and social life through “Aryanization” occurred. The third and final distinct event was the “Reichskristallnacht” on November 9, 1938 that caused the most unrest amongst German Jews. November 9 marked the active destruction and socially accepted eradication of Jews in Germany that eventually spreading all throughout Europe and affected those located in what would become German-occupied territory. The overarching connection and effect of these key events are the signifiers of three separate time periods during the Nazi Zeit in pre-WWII Germany. The three resulted in the constriction and extermination of Jews in society through political means.

German historian Michael Wildt’s position on the systematic Nazi persecution of the Jews - and all others who were legally deemed non-Aryan - aids in demonstrating how the effects of a politically oppressive government system is able to not only impact everyone under its control, but more importantly the way in which the persecution develops over time. According to Wildt, it has become common practice to follow political scientist and historian Paul Hilberg’s research – definition, expropriation, concentration, annihilation – and have it stand for the clear cut

---

3 Wolfgang Benz, “Exclusion as a Stage in Persecution” 40.
4 A German word that is used to represent the time period in which the Nazis were in power.
chronological development of the National Socialist policy on the Jews in “well-defined” and unambiguous phases.”\(^6\) Wildt claims that Hilberg’s argument leads the reader to believe that the Nazi regime pursued an antisemitic policy that was clear in definition and contained a knowingly linear progression.\(^7\) Most importantly, Wildt argues that Hilberg’s work reflects an “above” vantage point. Hilberg’s theory claims that the persecution of the Jews was solely a sequence of acts carried out by the state from above, therefore disregarding the involvement of others in non-government positions or rank. According to Wildt,

> From this perspective, the praxis of social antisemitism, the actual practice of neighbors, colleagues, customers, acquaintances and relatives is blocked out. Third and most particularly, this approach causes the observer to lose sight of the constant ongoing antisemitic violence to which the Jewish population in Germany was exposed from the beginning of National Socialist rule.\(^8\)

Wildt’s argument helps to explain and clarify the importance of showing the effects of how the actions of political and social oppressors affect people from the ground level up. One cannot look at history from a strictly top-down view. By solely focusing on the actions of the government, there is a complete lack of understanding. Knowledge about how the oppressors’ actions directly affected people on a personal level as well as the experiences of those citizens both individually and as a general


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Michael Wildt, “The Boycott Campaign,” 53.
conglomerate, in Wildt’s argument, is lost. When studying such a difficult and intricate time period as the Nazi era, it is especially important to look at all aspects of German society, not only as a whole, but also on an individual basis.

Hitler’s rise to power in 1933, the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, and the “Reichskristallnacht” in 1938 were all discussed in the written and verbal testimonies of three children survivors whose experiences are discussed at length in this paper. Regina Steinitz, Israel Löwenstein, and Leonie Hilton have all given detailed accounts of their encounters and reactions connected to these dates without being given direct questions or outlined discussion topics. Their choosing to specifically point out these three separate events clearly demonstrates their importance. All of these key years occur before the outbreak of World War II and are crucial in understanding the development and practices of the Nazi persecution of the Jews in Germany. All are linked to the seizure of power by the National Socialists as well as the hardships faced by approximately 600,000 Jews in Germany and eventually those in German-occupied territory, due to the direct effects of antisemitic rule. Although antisemitism existed throughout all of Europe for hundreds of years, it was not until the late nineteenth century that it began to take on a new form in Germany. This new practice of antisemitism would continue to spread through German-speaking lands, resulting in the use of the Jewish population as a scapegoat for the failure of WWI. During the tumultuous times of the Weimar Republic, this negativity and hatred became connected with the rising National Socialist German Workers Party (NSDAP). However, it was not until the NSDAP seized full control of the German government that antisemitic ideology became law. The first hardship under the National Socialist party began in 1933, the year that marked the official start of Nazi control after Hitler was appointed as Chancellor of Germany by then German President Paul von Hindenburg. January
30, 1933 would forever be the day that marks the beginning of the cruelty faced by millions of people, including, but not limited to, political opponents, Jews, Roma Sinti, homosexuals, people with disabilities, Jehovah’s Witnesses, “asocials,” Poles, Soviet prisoners of war, and people of African descent from all over Europe.

The Nazis were known for their careful recording of the cruelties they inflicted on people exterminated during the Holocaust, but it was not possible for even them to record them all. Some victims are merely numbers in history books, and some will be forever lost to history - nameless and voiceless. It is difficult to grasp the scope and extent of Nazi terror, but to prevent future genocides the names and the stories of victims no matter the age, gender, or background must be recalled, acknowledged, and documented. Focusing only on numbers denies the individuality of Holocaust victims and ignores their inhumane treatment and profound experiences. Each victim and every survivor endured unique experiences, exhibited strength and adaptation, and tested their endurance at the hands of the Nazis.\(^9\) Responses to severe events can be triggered and explained by any number of factors such as gender, age, or aspects of a person’s upbringing, such as socio-economic status. But survival may have depended upon past experiences or a sense of identity that aided in the ability to survive.

— Oral Testimony —

Three Jewish children, all survivors, Regina Steinitz, Israel Löwenstein, and Leonie Hilton, gave oral testimonies when interviewed about their childhood and lives during Nazi Germany. Regina and Israel’s oral interviews were both spoken and transcribed in their native German language. Leonie’s oral

interview however, was spoken in English and later transcribed in English. The German-to-English translations used in this paper were translated by the author by listening to the three survivor oral testimonies and reading the transcriptions. The video recordings of the oral testimonies were coordinated by two separate groups: the USC Shoah Foundation and the Stiftung Denkmal für die ermordeten Juden Europas: Sprechen Trotz Allem. Both organizations have websites with online archives and databases containing these videos. Whether recounted in German or English, their stories each have powerful tones of endurance.

The three children were born and raised in the middle of the major political hot spot and capital of the new “Third Reich”: Berlin. They were each chosen out of the many survivor tales that have been audio-recorded throughout the years for three main reasons: age, location, and self-identification. Their age plays a major role in the telling of their stories. It is through the eyes of children that one is able to see how these new rules, regulations, and societal structures brought about an increasingly volatile climate in Germany, ultimately altering their lives and the very existence of German Jews. Throughout the paper, the three survivors will be addressed using their first names in order to assist the reader in remembering their age; they are minors at the time of Nazi occupation and will be addressed as such in this paper in order to further solidify the fact that the topic is children survivors.

The process of choosing these three survivors began with choosing a central and important location. Berlin, an epicenter of political and social activity, offers a wide range of oral testimonies resulting from its population size and socio-economic environment. The city is also the location where this paper was written, which allowed for the understanding of and access to the

---

10 The Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe Foundation: Speak in Spite of Everything. The memorial, museum, and archives are located in Berlin Mitte, Germany.
physical geography and specific documentation needed to properly write this piece. Leonie, Regina, and Israel were specifically chosen out of all of the Berliner accounts because of their self-identification in relation to religion. Israel embraced his Jewishness and was raised as a devout Jew. Leonie was unaware of her connection to Judaism for the majority of her childhood, but after her discovery she refused to accept the information. Regina was aware of her connection to Judaism in relation to her father, but did not fully understand the concept behind religion and what being Jewish entailed. All three children had different relationships and experiences with the term Jewish. Although they all had their own personal identity, they were amassed together and viewed as belonging to one sole group in the eyes of the Nazi government.

Documented stories and recollections of the survivors can explain factors that ultimately aided and kept them alive through unimaginable atrocities. Researching and studying survivor testimonies is important to understand each victim’s background and firmly grasp their personal perspective on life. This leads to a fuller understanding of their actions and commentary. Choosing to use audio and video testimonies in the survivor’s native language gives the researcher a better understanding of the survivor’s story.

The video recordings of Israel, Regina, and Leonie were found through research at the Denkmal für die emordeten Juden Europas. The vast archives and online database filled with survivor testimonies was the catalyst for this paper and the search for Jewish Berliner victims of Nazi persecution during the Nazi

---

11 This paper was written in Berlin, Germany during an academic semester abroad. The location is important because of the access it granted to on the ground information needed to better understand the survivor’s stories.
13 The Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin Mitte, Germany.
Zeit before the war began. By interpreting and examining the specific word usage, and noting the tone of voice used for discussing certain topics, the researcher can form a stronger connection with the survivor than is possible using only written accounts.

With the advantages come disadvantages when it comes to using video testimony as a primary source. The interviewer is relying on the memory and willingness of the person being interviewed. There are many factors that need to be addressed and taken into account when conducting or using an interview. The person’s current age, in relation to how old they were when the particular event took place, as well as the language that the interview is being conducted in are two crucial pieces of information to know in order to better understand the interviewee. Regina, Leonie, and Israel’s interviews were all conducted fifty to sixty years after the events in which they are discussing took place. They were also able to choose the language spoken during the interview, two of the three choosing to speak German and only Leonie choosing to speak English. The value of the information gained from these videos is heavily based on the quality of the video, the length of time since the person experienced the event which they are discussing, how detailed the speaker is when answering the questions, and what they are saying. Nonetheless, even a short video of a quiet speaker can aid in the better understanding of what the person experienced and how it has affected them since. When researching major historic events and time periods that involve horrific crimes and high mortality rates, it is possible to become numb to the number of victims. It is difficult to fully grasp or understand the severity of events or comprehend astronomical figures. By using video recordings of survivor testimonies, a piece of living and breathing history can have a profound impact.
The motivation to survive was the incentive for three young Jews living in Berlin at the start of Hitler’s rise to power. Their stories reveal how the Nazis were able to indoctrinate a whole society and turn it against a minority by way of social exclusion through governmental action. Through the restrictions on their everyday lives and social settings, political changes became personal. The question of the economic conflicts that their families may have experienced throughout the 1930s, due to their legally designated labels brought about in 1933 and fully established through the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, is, although important, beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, the focus is on the way in which political policies were made personal and affected Jewish children’s daily lives. The use of adolescent perspectives during the Nazi era requires special attention to be given to the social pressures and cruelties they face, as opposed to economic issues, due to their age and lack of experience with the fiscal world.

From 1933 to 1945, these children were among the millions who were persecuted and “othered” by the Nazis based on their “non-Aryan” status. Prior to the Nazi period, many German Jews were unaware of their Jewish lineage. When Hitler rose to power, the National Socialists decided who was Jewish, and the concept of Jewishness as a mindset, identity, and an irrevocable connection to one’s race or ethnicity, dependent on whether or not these legally labeled Jews as individuals felt as though there could be a connection between Judaism and race or ethnicity, no longer played a role in society. Regardless of the practiced religion, conversion, or the way they lead their lives, Jewishness was determined by each individual’s documentation and family tree.\(^\text{14}\)

Without proof of non-Jewish family lineage in documentation form

and regardless of their personal identities, Jews were labeled and subsequently mistreated, abused, and forced to live under restrictive and cruel laws. They were increasingly separated from their German non-Jewish neighbors. Because of this growing distance between the two groups on social, economic, legal, and psychological levels, the Nazis were able to eventually “remove” almost an entire community of people with little protest from the rest of the population.15

Hearing the voices of the victims that experienced atrocities makes the history more tangible and poignant than what is merely recounted in books, articles, and journals. Historian Lawrence Langer has contrasted written and oral narratives, noting that survivor testimonies and memories by known authors, such as Primo Levi and Charlotte Delbo, create a coherent moral vision. However, it is through oral testimonies that he has found the resistance of “organizing impulses” that allows for an “unshielded truth” to be found.16 Only through these personal accounts can we appreciate the scope of the Holocaust’s brutality toward certain members of the German state.

When looking at the extent of Nazi power and social oppression through political policies, it is important to understand the significance of the progression and removal of human rights that continued to accumulate over the period of 1933 to 1939. Hitler’s new role as Chancellor in 1933 marked a clear shift in the history of antisemitic acts of violence in Germany. Even though the “Decree by the Reich President on the Protection of the People and State” of February 28, 1933 revoked the key basic rights guaranteed in the Weimar constitution to the Jews, it was the introduction of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 that more forcibly

demonstrated the effect of Nazi rule on Jewish life. These new laws touched the Jewish community on a deeper and more personal level than ever before. It was from 1935 to 1938 that the antisemitic violence increased, and on November 9, 1938, the “Reichskristallnacht” was a clear indicator of the success of Nazi propaganda and indoctrination of the German Volk. Although there had been some German opposition after the “Night of Broken Glass,” also called the “November Pogrom,” this event demonstrated how Nazi ideology had altered the mind of the masses. However, violence and antisemitism do not just appear from nothing. They must be created, developed, and practiced by active participants. It was the planned barrage of antisemitic propaganda, repeated and expanding violence against Jews, and the political policies that formed the foundation for the exclusion of the Jewish community that ultimately enabled the violently antisemitic psychological and social climate of Germany to come about. The government invoked the right of any German citizen to practice psychological and physical hate, which allowed for the majority of society to accept the deportation and destruction of the Jews. In short, if the “Reichskristallnacht” had taken place in 1935, it would not have had the same effect due to the build up and change in the social atmosphere that occurred throughout the years leading up to 1938.

With ages ranging from three to seventeen in 1933, all three of the survivors, Regina, Leonie, and Israel, indicated that that there had been a major shift in society that did not become fully tangible until 1935. For each of the three, 1933 is a date that would forever symbolize their introduction to antisemitic prejudice. As they remember their experiences during this dark

17 Wolfgang Benz, “Exclusion as a Stage in Persecution,” 42.
18 A German word, frequently used by the Nazi party that means “People.”
20 Wolfgang Benz, “Exclusion as a Stage in Persecution,” 44.
time in German history, 1933 stood out. It was the beginning of an era of hate, brought about and enforced by political action. In their testimonies, each of the speaker’s memories follows a chronological and linear flow of events, each date correlating with their different experiences. It is clear that they were acutely aware of the years 1933, 1935, and 1938 as being major turning points, but what is unclear is how they experienced these benchmark years at their different stages of childhood. However, according to historian Chaim Kaplan, it is impossible for these victims to “know all the facts.”²¹ With ages ranging from three to seventeen in 1933, all indicated that there had been a major shift in society that did not become fully tangible until 1935.

As soon as they came to power, the Nazis were able to launch a program of subtle conditioning and indoctrination of their own people, leading to the harsh treatment and segregation of the Jewish community.²² It was in 1933 that the three survivors saw SA men, the first paramilitary group created by the Nazis, marching in the streets and were first introduced to antisemitic propaganda, but the real changes occurred when their day-to-day lives were constricted by the new laws and actions of those around them. Regina, similar to the other two survivors, recalls hearing the voices of Hitler and Goebbels on the radio, while the SA men marched through Berlin holding both flags and fire. At only four years old, the brutal words from their speeches, such as Judensau and Judendreck filled her ears, exposed her to a world of hatred. By her personal account, “So we grew up in an environment where we were discriminated against and therefore came to our consciousness, we were led to believe that we are not actually wanted here, second-class human minority, and in this atmosphere

²² Landau, The Nazi Holocaust, 5.
I grew up despite all of this.”

Regina grew up surrounded by animosity and hostility that stemmed from concepts she had yet to understand. All three oral testimonies given by the victims contain a wealth of information about the different forms of persecution that occurred throughout daily life of Jewish victims from varying backgrounds, all with a very noticeable trend and perception of the three main events taking place. Their experiences of exclusion and segregation are present throughout their interviews and centered around three major years: 1933, 1935, and 1938.

—Survivor Profiles—

Leonie lived a drastically different life from Regina. She did not have the same closeness with her family members as Regina did and she refused to accept any connection to Judaism. Her family’s upper-class status allowed her to live comfortably, but could not completely shield her from the effects of Nazi anti-Semitism. Regina greatly benefited from her family’s strong bond and upper middle-class status, whereas Leonie, who was a teenager during the Nazi period, relied on her peers for acceptance and affirmation. Both of these young women, of similar upper-middle-class statuses and backgrounds, went through the tumultuous 1930s living in Berlin, but both would experience each passing year in a drastically different way.

The youngest of the three victims, Regina Steinitz, and her twin sister Ruth, began life in an environment where they were not

---

23 Regina Steinitz, Interview by Barbara Kurowska and Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe Foundation: Sprechen Trotz Allem, November 28, 2011. (Time 00:11:36) “Also damit wuchsen wir auf in einer Umgebung, die uns diskriminierte rassistisch war und also zu unserem Bewusstsein kam also uns verstehen ließ dass wir eigentlich hier nicht erwünscht sind zweiter Klasse Menschen Minderheit und in dieser Atmosphäre bin ich aufgewachsen trotzdem.”
considered second class. Regina was born on October 24, 1930 in Berlin to a Christian mother, Martha Raifeld, and a self-identified Jewish father, Simon Welner. Martha’s former husband, Jewish photographer Moritz Raifel, fathered her two sons, and then died of tuberculosis. Before his death, Moritz asked his friend, Simon Welner, to look after his family. Although Simon never married Martha, they had Regina and Ruth, who were allowed to use their mother’s maiden name of Anders. This caused confusion and problems throughout their childhood, but it ultimately secured their safety.

A major factor that aided in Regina’s survival was her strong bond with her family and community members. On multiple occasions throughout the 1930s, Regina experienced the sting of anti-Semitism, but was able to persevere because of her social connections. Her parents attempted to make childhood as enjoyable and normal as possible, given the circumstances of the time period. Regina and her family members were practicing Jews and she felt as though it was an important part of her identity and social life. Although the family was persecuted under Nazi rule, they managed to maintain a comfortable upper-middle-class lifestyle. The family endured experiences similar to other Jews in Berlin, but Regina’s level of understanding and adjustment to traumatic events allowed her to rise above most situations, which is remarkable given that she was only three years old in 1933.24

Leonie (Hirschberg) Hilton, born in Berlin on April 13, 1916 and the oldest of the three survivors discussed in this paper, was independent and pampered, a very different child from Regina. She enjoyed a carefree and wealthy childhood, but was starved for affection from her family members. Her non-practicing Jewish father, Erich Hirschberg, remarried a Christian woman

---

24 Regina Steinitz, Interview by Barbara Kurowska and Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe Foundation: *Sprechen Trotz Allem*, November 28, 2011.
when Leonie was too young to remember her birth mother. The relationship of stepmother and child was strained. She was “not her step-mother’s type.” Their large and extravagant ten-room apartment, a mansion, also included a three-room office dedicated to her father’s business as a lawyer. She loved her father, but he was always busy in his office. Cleverly, she avoided her stepmother by spending her days at the tennis courts, in parks, or biking through the streets of Berlin.

To outsiders, Leonie’s life must have seemed perfect, and she appeared to be happy, but the only times her family was together outside of the house were for a few holidays and events. Her family—including biological sister Vera, a stepsibling, and stepmother—took frequent holiday trips to the Baltic Sea, but her father often stayed behind to work. At Christmas, the family would attend a Christian Mass and she described her family’s religious practices as “old fashioned Church of England, easy style religion.” Her father had been baptized, but she was unsure of her own baptismal records and was unaware of her biological mother’s life or childhood. Leonie believed her childhood to be normal, although in lacking affection and attention, and had no reason to think about Judaism or being Jewish. Before Hitler, children at her school were treated the same, regardless of their religious practices. None of them really knew what being Jewish meant, and before National Socialism, people more commonly discussed and argued about politics rather than race and religion. Leonie, like many others, lead a life completely absent of all things spiritual and religious aside from the annual Christmas Day Mass.

27 Ibid., (Time 00:05:43).
The third survivor had a background radically different from Regina and Leonie. Jürgen Rolf Sochaczewer, who later chose to be known as Israel Löwenstein, was born in Berlin on March 28, 1925 to a poor Jewish mother who worked as a maid and lived with her retired parents. The midwife at the Jewish convent where he was born said that he would be a lucky child, but it would be a decade before that prophecy would come true. Abandoned by his father soon after his birth, Israel and the family lived on Gipsstraße in the northern middle section of Berlin. He attended school, but by age ten, Israel was sent to work. All family members had to work or do something productive to support the household, which just barely managed avoiding the need of government assistance. He wanted to play with the other children and be able to bike or ride a scooter, but most of all to enjoy ice cream on a hot day. Too poor for even those few luxuries, his grandparents would tell him, “Ice cream is nice, but we don’t have any money...” Even though his family was part of the lower class, there was still a strong connection amongst the members of Israel’s family and throughout their community. Although his family was aware of its Jewish heritage, they only loosely practiced the religion. Unlike Regina and Leonie, Israel’s family lacked the money needed to allow for easy and comfortable living. However, like Regina, his life was filled with love and support from family and friends. He felt fortunate enough to have those that he loved surrounding him.

28 The three survivors whose stories are discussed in the paper come from three very different backgrounds. However, regardless of their socioeconomic status, they all lived within close proximity to one another in an area with a high volume of Jewish people in the Mitte neighborhood of Berlin. Their confined location and living space demonstrates just one way in which the Jewish community was segregated from the rest of German society during the Nazi Period.

29 Israel Löwenstein, Interview by Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe Foundation: Sprechen Trotz Allem, August 15, 2010 (Time 00:09:30) “Es ist ja schön aber wir haben kein Geld dazu und verdienen das selber.”
Compared to the other two victims, his lower-class status and single-parent household change the lens in which he viewed life under Hitler. Although the three children grew up living within a close radius of each other, his home, unlike the two girls’, is located in the poor and disproportionally Jewish area of Berlin Mitte. Regardless of the deprivations that Israel experienced in his youth, to this day he believes the midwife’s words, “Yes, a lucky child, I needed a lot of luck in my life because I have gone through a lot and I need luck to survive and to understand what has happened with me.”

According to Israel, without his luck he would not have survived under Nazi rule. However, his lower-class-status alongside his supportive Jewish and Christian community aided him in his survival and allowed him to avoid severe persecution into the late 1930s.

—The Nuremberg Laws of 1935—

In September of 1935, the Nuremberg racial laws were introduced and established a new and noticeable radicalization in the levels of persecution. Jews had officially and legally been demoted to second-class citizens, for the new laws carefully defined who was a Jew, and forced those who had never identified with or were unaware of their Jewish lineage to be categorized as Jewish. Marriage and sexual relations between Jews and Germans were prohibited, resulting in countless divorces. Additionally, criminal prosecutions against Jews were easily possible due to their “defiling of the German race.”

30 Israel Löwenstein, Interview by Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe Foundation: Sprechen Trotz Allem, August 15, 2010 (Time 00:00:26) “ja ein Glückskind ich brauchte sehr viel Glück in meinem Leben, denn ich habe viel urgeschmacht und äh ich brauchte Glück um zu überleben, und alles das zu verstehen was mit mir passiert ist.”

31 Landau, The Nazi Holocaust, 5.

32 Ibid.
emigration began to rise and Jews were becoming more aware of the severity of Nazi rule. Signs placed at the entrances to towns and public squares, as well as restaurants and stores, contained threatening and insulting anti-Jewish messages and were a part of every day life from 1935 onward. The underlying murderous and violent implications were still not completely apparent, even to those affected the most, but would increasingly come to light within the coming years.

With the introduction of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, the three children noticed a major change in their daily lives as they were forced to adapt to the new rules. This was the second of the three main years that each individual speaker discussed at length in his or her oral testimony. They all claimed it was a critical juncture in their lives and experiences under Nazi control in the 1930s. Regina and Israel both remember the influx of new students to their gender-segregated Jewish schools because although they were allowed an education, Jews were no longer permitted to attend non-Jewish schools. It was during this time that Regina noticed that “unexplainable” differences were apparent. She states, “then something would have happened to you, so it was what nobody can imagine, it is not at all explicable what differences suddenly appeared which friendships were destroyed, as love suddenly ceased to be among people, and in this case how children were raised to hate.”

Regina was growing up in a politically charged environment. She was surrounded by hate and cruelty for reasons she could not fully comprehend.

---

33 Regina Steinitz, Interview by Barbara Kurowska and Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe: Sprechen Trotz Allem, November 28, 2011. (Time 1:00:25) “dann wäre dir schon etwas passiert, also es ist es war das kann sich niemand vorstellen, es ist überhaupt unerklärbar welche Unterschiede plötzlich erschienen, welche Freundschaften zerrissen wurden, wie die Liebe plötzlich aufhörte unter den Menschen und in diesem Falle und wie Kinder zum Hass erzogen wurden.”
Regina began to experience hatred from non-Jewish people, specifically the Hitler Youth. Jews were assaulted both verbally and physically, but could not retaliate. She would go home from school in tears, but her parents were unable to provide Regina with any comfort aside from a warm embrace. After Hitler was elected Chancellor, contacting the authorities about assaults on Jews was useless because police turned a ‘blind eye’ to the violence. The introduction of the new laws made the Jews open targets for hatred and violence, and their social circles were limited by their inability to participate in leisurely and public events.

For Leonie, it was not until these laws were implemented that she discovered her true lineage and Jewishness. Her non-denominational school requested documented proof of her status, and although she was told by her father to keep information a secret, word spread of her discovery and school became torturous. She stated that her, “entire class beat me up more or less, I could not go on.”

Her best friend and all of her other friends, except one, abandoned her. Leonie’s rejection and experiences of antisemitism were directly linked to Hitler’s rule and newly passed laws. As a teenager she had relied on her peers and friends for comfort due to lack of affection at home, but after 1935 Leonie became almost completely socially excommunicated. One of her only other comforts in life was her ability to bike around the streets of Berlin and play tennis in nearby parks, but even those luxuries were taken away from her once her peers and community learned of her newly established Jewish identity.

In contrast to both Regina and Leonie’s experiences, Israel initially experienced the laws as more of a bystander than a victim. Before the laws were enacted, he identified as a Jew. The main immediate effect that the laws had on him was his forced relocation to a different area of Berlin Mitte. However, he
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benefited from the move given that his school was now only a five-minute walk away. Israel had attended a Jewish school so he avoided the major confusion and disruption felt among many wealthy Jews his age whose families could afford the non-denominational or Christian private schools before they were forced to attend Jewish schools. Although he did not feel the direct effects of the new law right away, he took note of the constant changes around him. To this day he clearly remembers the removal of Jewish men from his small social circle, as well as the entirety of the Jewish community around him, after they were accused of violating the Nuremberg Laws. The victims of such convictions were often re-arrested by the Gestapo after their sentence had been served and sent to political prisoner or work camps.

All three of these survivors experienced the immediate effects of the Nuremberg Laws differently, but all on a social level. They witnessed firsthand how these political changes affected their individual lives and the lives of their fellow Jews. From changing schools and relocating, to losing friends and experiencing antisemitic violence, the laws only narrowed their ability and opportunity for social interactions. Despite all of this, 1935 was still relatively toward the beginning stages of Jewish persecution. The events of 1935 were not alarming enough to warrant an exodus of a large amount of the Jewish population residing throughout Germany. This meant that the majority of the Jewish population still resided in Germany by 1938. The next three years would only prove to be increasingly disheartening. It was this gradual progression of disparity and hardship due to the continuous restrictions on the everyday lives of the Jews that would allow the events of 1938 to be possible.
By 1938, the relationships that had once bonded friends and neighbors, both Germans and those who had been labeled Jewish by law, were becoming increasingly less common. Whether it was to ensure one’s personal safety or due to outright anti-Semitism, there were relatively few non-Jews who were willing to maintain personal or cordial relations with a Jew. Though there had been no agreement amongst the Nazi leaders about an open, mass physical attack against the Jews in Germany, high-ranking Nazi officials, such as Reich Minister of Propaganda Joseph Goebbels, had devised a multipronged plan for a major attack.

After the assassination in Paris of Nazi German diplomat and Third Secretary Ernst vom Rath on November 7, 1938 by Polish Jewish teenager Herschel Grynszpan, Goebbels found his opening and moved quickly. He decided to use this event to “punish” the Jews by condemning Grynszpan’s actions as another example of the worldwide Jewish conspiracy of evil intent directed at Germany.35 On the night of November 9, 1938, all across Germany and in parts of Austria, swarms of SA men, party members, and regular non-Jewish citizens wandered the streets and participated in what many have deemed an “orgy of violence.”36 What started late in the evening carried on well into the early hours of the morning of November 10. The mass violence that took place was in the form of looting Jewish shops and property, destroying and burning synagogues, and intimidating, assaulting, and murdering Jewish individuals. According to Nazi reports, “91 Jews were killed, more than 7,000 Jewish-owned shops destroyed, and approximately 300 synagogues razed to the ground.”37 It was after the destruction had ended, due to the amount of broken glass from

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
the synagogue windows, the Nazis named the violent night the "Reichskristallnacht."\textsuperscript{38} Today, this event is often referred to as the November Pogrom.

For all three of the survivors, their families had similar moments of horror and realizations in early November, 1938. Approximately 550 to 600,000 Jews were affected by the events that took place on November 9, and for many it was a sign that residing in Germany was no longer an option. The initial reactions of the three children were of shock and apprehension, and none of the three could understand how such events were possible. For Leonie and Regina, their experiences of confusion and fear left them stunned. However, it was after this event that steps were taken to ensure their future safety.

For Regina, the end of the decade brought misery and hardship as her mother’s health increasingly worsened and the laws became stricter. It was on November 9, 1938, that it all reached a climax for her and many others. She describes, “and then it was somehow ever more dangerous, there were more and more laws, more and more people were arrested, and the worst that happened then was Kristallnacht.”\textsuperscript{39} After a neighbor told Regina’s family that Jewish synagogues were being burned, the four children ran to their synagogue to save the Torah and other holy books. By the time they reached the synagogue, the Torah had been taken and very few books that remained were uncharred. They fled the burning building, saving some books and other escaping worshippers. Regina separated from her siblings and ran to Alexanderplatz to see if a large Jewish-owned store had been

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{39} Regina Steinitz, Interview by Barbara Kurowska and Daniel Baranowski, Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe: \textit{Sprechen Trotz Allem}, November 28, 2011(Time 1:05:10 ) “\textit{und dann wurde es irgendwie immer gefährlicher, also es gab immer mehr und mehr Gesetze mehr und mehr Menschen wurden abgeholt, und das Schlimmste was geschah war dann die Kristallnacht.”
burned as well.\textsuperscript{40} Weaving through hundreds of looters and rioters, her curiosity spurred her on through the dangers. Before she made it to the shopping center, her brother Theo stopped her. She recalls: “Yes, he was so amazed that I was not even eight years old when it happened. I remember these situations so well, but these are the things that remain. They accompany you all your life. I have never forgotten Kristallnacht.”\textsuperscript{41} Regina clearly recalls the events of that night in detail. She had seen more violence and hatred than the typical eight-year-old should. She believes she will never forget.

After the November Pogrom ended, Regina’s mother, Martha, though very ill, knew that she must find safety for her children. Her two sons received a notice that they had only twenty-four hours to leave Berlin, and she arranged their transport to England with 5,000 other Jewish children of Berlin. Soon after, Regina’s mother died of tuberculosis and the sisters were forced to rely upon the good will of others to survive. It took only one night to disturb and alarm the majority of the remaining Jews into action, but it took a span of five years, from 1933 to 1938, for this night to be possible.

Regardless of all of the hate Leonie regularly experienced, it was not until November 9, 1938 that she would be pushed to the point of fleeing the country. “You would not believe that it was

\textsuperscript{40} The store she is referring to in her recollections of November 9, 1938 is the Tietz department store, which was owned by a German merchant of Jewish decent. The store received a new owner during the Nazi period and was further “Aryanized” with the less “Jewish-sounding” name of “Hertie Department Stores.” For more information on Jews and department stores, see: Paul Lerner, \textit{The Consuming Temple: Jews, Department Stores, and the Consumer Revolution in Germany 1880-1940} (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015).

possible,”\textsuperscript{42} were the words Leonie stated about the night that would be forever known for the glass that littered the roads, the "Reichskristallnacht." After experiencing the hordes of people flooding through the streets, lighting fires, chanting antisemitic phrases, and ransacking Jewish shops, synagogues, and homes, she knew she had to leave immediately. It was no longer safe for her. After the events of November 9 were over, her only remaining non-Jewish friend, Bronia, stated to Leonie, “I don’t want you to stay another minute, as soon as you can get out you have to go.”\textsuperscript{43}

Packing only what she could carry, she joined the few remaining friends at the train station. Without telling her family goodbye, she, like many Jewish victims, fled her home, leaving Berlin and Germany behind in search of a better life.

On November 9, 1938, Israel’s world was once more shaken. He remembers being sent home from school due to the aftermath of the "Reichskristallnacht." He heard reports of approximately thirty thousand Jews being sent to concentration camps within a twenty-four hour time period. He walked by shops that had been destroyed and synagogues that were burned. Torahs that had been lit on fire were still smoking and tossed onto the street. As he went down Münzstraße, he specifically noticed that all of the Jewish shops had been vandalized with goods stolen, while the police were standing there doing nothing. Still, he was not afraid because he had Christian friends and he had been otherwise unharmed. He remembers,

I went through Münzstraße and the Jewish businesses, one of them a Brandmann a Jeweler, all had broken windowpanes. The people had stolen what was possible from it and the police stood there and smiled. They failed to intervene for us, it was a blow indeed, who

\textsuperscript{42} Leonie Hilton, Interview by Jacqueline Ruchmond-Wade, USC Shoah Foundation, February 7, 1996 (Time 0:15:26).
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., (Time 0:15:37).
would have had believed that it could happen? But I had no fear, because it was clear as I said, we had very many friends yes and also very many Christian friends. Who, even in the time of National Socialism, did not say ‘yes, we have no connection with the Jews.’

Israel survived many horrors under the Nazi rule in the 1930s, but with few violent affairs, unlike many Berlin Jews. He was a poor, young boy, so when the Nazis confiscated the wealthier Jews’ homes, businesses, and possessions, and displaced them from their schools and social supports, Israel and his family were only marginally disturbed. They had few possessions, no social status, and lived frugally on whatever income they could gather. Israel kept his friends because, like him, they were poor, lower class children who were overlooked by the Nazis in control. Even his reaction to “Reichskristallnacht” was tempered by his fascination with the crowds and the lights, as well as his sense of security because of his strong connection to people in the Christian community. Israel had an ability to avoid direct Nazi confrontation due to his low class status, which left generally unharmed by the continued pressures of National Socialist control.

The “Reichskristallnacht” marked the beginning of the final and most horrific phase of Jewish persecution. After years of

torment and social unrest, the remaining Jews in Germany would face the true hatred that the Nazi party provoked. By this time, families were separated, jobs were lost, and property was damaged. All social aspects of Jewish life had been depleted. Regina, Leonie, and Israel all experienced the events that took place on November 9, 1938 differently. However, the overall outcome and conclusion shared by their families, themselves, and countless others were clear: survival would come at the cost of fleeing their homeland.

—CONCLUSION—

The political changes made by the Nazis opened up a social space for the German society at large to be antisemitic or act on existing prejudices. Within five years, the Nazis were able to infuse antisemitic propaganda into aspects of everyday life in Germany. Over time, German society as a whole felt empowered with hate. These antisemitic policies resulted in the manifestation of a feeling of power in all recognized Germans, those whose identities did not legally change after the installation of the Nuremberg Laws, and the beginning of the National Socialist government. The new ideals were to be spread and shared with all Germans, regardless of their social class or socio-economic status. From the powerful upper class to the impoverished factory workers, all German citizens were given a newfound sense of authority. What had begun as a few directed verbal and physical attacks from a smaller circle of perpetrators targeting individual Jews, regardless of their self-identification, would ultimately turn into full-scale attacks on millions of people, both in and outside of Germany.

Regina, Leonie, and Israel’s stories all demonstrate the ways in which the Nuremberg Laws and the gradual implementation of Nazi policy by non-Jewish members, both with
and outside of their surrounding communities, became personal and led to the elimination of their social lives outside of Jewish circles. According to Historian Wolfgang Benz, “the exclusion of the Jews was a successive process, the product of the interplay between government measures and social interactions.” Various associations, groups, and individuals in Germany over the entirety of Nazi rule voluntarily practiced the exclusion of Jews from social life.

Social segregation and sanctioned persecution of the Jews formed the core of Nazi ideology that influenced the action and beliefs of Germans of all economic and social classes. Protected by laws, the work to demonize the Jews escalated. By their own accounts, Regina, Leonie, and Israel chose three distinct periods of time to explain not only the rise of this ideology and persecution, but also how the years 1933, 1935, and 1938 brought progressive and volatile changes that altered their lives and the existence of German Jews. The first wave of change under Nazi rule in 1933, the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, and the “Reichskristallnacht” in 1938 were vividly recounted in their testimonies. With each passing year, their freedoms became increasingly limited as shown in the documentation of their experiences, which provide a deeper understanding of how the antisemitic Nazi policies gave way to life altering social changes. The changes affected not only these three children, but all persons labeled Jewish by law, regardless of social class, economic status, or gender. In hindsight, the progression of evil allowed for an identifiable escalation of the plan to eradicate the Jewish community.

These three children survivors were specifically selected because of the wide breadth of knowledge that can be gained after analyzing each of their stories. It is important to look at their experiences, not only individually, but also together to form a

---

45 Wolfgang Benz, “Exclusion as a Stage in Persecution,” in Nazi Europe and the Final Solution, ed. Bankier and Gutman, 42.
larger and more detailed narrative. The comparison between the three stories clearly demonstrates the progression of Nazi control in relation to societal constraints and how it influenced the lives of Jewish children. Regina, Leonie, and Israel’s contrasting backgrounds and varied reactions to their experiences allows one to gain an unequivocal understanding of the major events that took place between 1933 and 1938 through the personal accounts of children survivors.

The year 1933 was the match that the National Socialists needed in order to light the fuse of Nazi ideology and the build-up to antisemitism and hate. The fuse sizzled from 1933 to 1935 when the Nuremberg Laws would add increased hatred and heat to the explosion of 1938. The "Reichskristallnacht" brought what was left of the semblance of Jewish public and cultural life to an end. Without the progression of social aspects and actions, events such as the “Reichskristallnacht” would not have been possible. Without the testimony of survivors, the story of the Nazi atrocities and the indoctrination of the German people may never have been told.
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It might seem bizarre to place the lives of thousands of soldiers in the hands, or in this case the wings, of a pigeon. Yet this is precisely what happened in the First World War. Homing pigeons were utilized by both the Allied and Central Powers during the conflict and served as a last-resort form of communication between the frontlines and headquarters with an exceptional rate of efficiency. Countless soldiers depended their lives on homing pigeons. However, the full picture of how pigeons managed to complete their dangerous and difficult mission is overlooked. Actions taken on the home fronts, the care and training of both the pigeon and the handlers, and pigeon performance in actual combat were the contributing factors that allowed pigeons to complete their task of saving human lives.

Using pigeons for military purposes was not a new idea at the outbreak of the First World War. Since Ancient Rome, the sole purpose of the pigeon was communication. Homing pigeons proved to be excellent at transporting handwritten messages attached to their legs. By the beginning of the twentieth century, not every nation continued to see pigeons as useful tools for war. Military officials in several nations believed the practice had been antiquated by 1914 with the advent of telephone communication. Others looked upon using military pigeons as a mere joke. It did not take long, however, for military officials to realize that relying on telephone communications was a flawed idea. The telephones used in the First World War were, while revolutionary for the time,
terribly unreliable. Telephone’s greatest flaw in this period was that it relied on wires—hundreds of yards of wires stretching from station to station. The Western Front was not a good place to rely on exposed or slightly buried wires. They were easily cut by artillery shells or sabotaged by enemy soldiers. Communications soldiers known as linesmen would have to step out of the relative safety of the trench and repair cut lines, often several times a day. Countless linesmen were killed while trying to do so. When soldiers realized they needed a different form of communication to rely on after telephones and radios had failed, they simply had to look to the pigeon as the solution.¹

France and Belgium entered the First World War already with effective pigeon communication units within their armed forces. These two nations especially recognized the value that homing pigeons still presented. France and Belgium had been wary of the possibility of a major European war, likely against Germany. Trained communication pigeons were viewed as key to national defense, and France was the first to experience the benefits of pigeons in military service. During the Siege of Paris in the Franco-Prussian War, Parisians successfully used homing pigeons to send and receive letters to and from London. One pigeon alone managed to carry 40,000 messages on a micro-film that required a special magnifier to read. When the First World War broke out, the French rushed their pigeons to the front en masse, often using civilian autobuses as makeshift pigeon lofts.²

Belgium was known for having some of the finest breeding stock of pigeons in all of Europe. Their pigeon communication units functioned like a well-oiled machine. Unfortunately for the Belgians, this avian-run machine ran into a serious setback early

into the First World War. When it became evident that Germany would capture Antwerp in late 1914, the commander of the Belgian Pigeon Service wept as he burnt alive nearly 2,500 of his much-beloved pigeons to prevent them from falling into German hands. Up with the flames went some of the best pigeons in Europe and the majority of Belgian Pigeon Service. ³

Before the war, Germany had maintained a small Pigeon Service, but, like Britain, Germany believed that new technology would prevail. The Germans soon found out after initial battles with the Belgians and French that pigeons were still extremely reliable forms of military communication. To reinvigorate their Pigeon Service, Germany used pigeons donated by and, in some cases, were confiscated from civilians. Other pigeons were acquired by capturing French pigeon lofts. Not too long into the war, Germany went from having only a handful of pigeon stations to 384 located on all of its fronts.⁴

Great Britain struggled to put together effective pigeon units within the ranks of its army. The mobilization of thousands of pigeons for war was no simple task. Immediately after the outbreak of hostilities, Britain placed restrictions on pigeon movement by train because of the possibility of German spies using pigeons to send messages to Germany about British troop preparations. Their fear was legitimate because several German spies were living in Britain and raising pigeons for that purpose, but they were quickly caught by the local police and detained. Despite the rumors about traitorous pigeons roaming the landscape, the British realized they had to incorporate them into their own military. If there was one man who could build an entire British Pigeon Service from scratch, it had to be Alfred H. Osman. He was perhaps the most well-known and well-connected Briton within the British pigeon fancier

The British War Committee contacted Osman and offered him a commission in the Royal Army to create an Army Pigeon Service. Osman accepted this position under the conditions that he be given the honorary rank of captain and would not be paid. Osman sought birds from civilian pigeon breeders. Letters “were addressed to the owners asking for their cooperation and use of their birds,” Osman reported. “In no single case was refusal met with.” Osman himself donated 60 of his own birds to the Royal Navy Pigeon Service. The British Pigeon Service was officially organized in October 1914, first with the Navy, then the Army.⁵

“At the outbreak of the war the British Army had not paid any serious consideration of the use of pigeon,” remarked Osman after the war.⁶ Despite this hurdle, Osman managed to start the Army Pigeon service with sixty enlisted men. As the war prolonged, this number greatly expanded when pigeon breeders and experts were recruited to make up the majority of men serving in the British Pigeon Service. Those who handled the birds had to be knowledgeable about them. Due to his strong connections, Captain Osman found many patriotic pigeon breeders who donated their birds, without compensation, to defend Britain. Osman noted that “100,000 birds passed through my hands for active service.”⁷ The sacrifice that pigeon breeders made to the war effort did not go unnoticed. Nearly 600 pigeon breeders were awarded certificates by the British government as a thank you “for the meritorious performance of the birds they lent,” for the naval service alone.⁸

When the United States entered the First World War, its Pigeon Service was in a semi-ready state. This meant that, while the U.S. military initially had few pigeons in its ranks, American
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⁶Osman, Pigeons in the Great War, 24.
⁷Osman, Pigeons in the Great War, 6.
⁸Osman, Pigeons in the Great War, 22.
pigeon breeders were certainly ready to supply pigeons to the war effort. Since the beginning of the war in 1914, Americans cautiously watched the conflict engulf Europe. A movement of preparedness spread throughout the nation, such as men going to specific camps to receive some military training. For those who could not physically train for or fight in a potential European war, a 1916 *New York Times* article titled “Carrier Pigeons an Aid to Preparedness” suggested that raising homing pigeons was a worthy way to express patriotism. The article described the benefits of the homing pigeon, stating “nothing yet made can recall a pigeon once on the wing with news of his country’s invasion or peril . . . one man with pigeons could divide the labor by five.” The article described that “preparedness lofts should be created by Americans.” The article eerily prophesized the future, stating “Perhaps not this year or the next, but sometime your pigeons are going to be useful to your country.”

In June 1917, two months after America’s declaration of war on Germany, General John Pershing requested immediate mobilization of military homing pigeons. In the 1917 edition of *American Squab Journal*, a journal for pigeon breeders, an article was written by the United States Department of Agriculture to ask American farmers to help raise more pigeons for the war effort. “The modest pigeon can play a prominent part in preventing progress of the Prussian peril,” began the article. It emphasized that “EVERY farm must have poultry, or more poultry by next year. It will help win the war.” In order to construct an American Pigeon Service, Frank J. Griffin, an American authority on pigeons, was commissioned a major in the U.S. Army. In a matter of weeks, Major Griffin managed to construct the American Pigeon Service, consisting of 8 officers, 634 enlisted men, and
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approximately 10,000 donated pigeons. Compared to the British, the speedy American mobilization was largely due to the preparedness of America’s pigeon breeders.11

After the pigeons had been taken in by the military, training of both pigeon and the handlers immediately commenced. The donated birds, however, were not quite enough to keep up demand. All nations that had efficient Pigeon Services had a thorough breeding program. The pigeon is a perfect bird for mass production; they reproduce like rabbits. Unlike other animals, when a male meets with a female, they partner for life. The 1920 U.S. Military manual on training pigeons even dedicates an entire section to cover proper pigeon breeding. The manual advised that it was best for the pigeons to choose their mates without human intervention. Pigeons become sexually active between the ages of four to nine months. They typically lay and sit on two eggs. During the First World War, pigeons sat on and incubated their eggs in a military-issued earthen bowl, somewhat resembling a wooden salad bowl. It usually took 17 days for a pigeon to hatch. Pigeon cocks and hens naturally take equal turns sitting on the egg so neither gets too fatigued. A few days after hatching, the squeakers, an appropriately given name for infant pigeons, were given a government band containing a serial number on their leg. After four weeks, the squeakers left their parents and began their military training.12

The first step for young pigeons was to be placed in a loft with windows. A loft is essentially the same thing as a chicken coop but specifically made for housing pigeons. In the loft, they see their surroundings for the first time, whether it be the British

hills, American heartland, or the woodlands of Continental Europe. Soldiers were encouraged to handle the young pigeons daily, which trained the pigeons to become accustomed and comfortable with their human handlers.\(^3\) When the time for flight training came about, the pigeons were allowed and trained to fly more miles away from their home loft day by day. Due to the homing pigeons’ instincts and intelligence they were extremely talented at finding home. Pigeoneers were instructed to feed the pigeons on light rations before a training flight, thus using the bird’s appetite as an additional form of encouragement to return home. To increase the distances pigeon could fly, the pigeoneers released them, depending on their age, between 75 and a couple hundred miles away from their home loft. The pigeoneers simply had to wait for their pigeon comrades to return.

During these stages of training, pigeoneers often faced an annoying adversary—civilians. Especially in the United States and Great Britain, it was not uncommon for civilians to shoot the pigeons-in-training en-route back to their home lofts. Civilians did this because they unfortunately thought pigeons were a nuisance. It became so problematic that both the British and American governments placed heavy fines for shooting pigeons serving the military. Newspapers also advocated against the shooting of military homing pigeons, saying that the death of each military pigeon at civilian hands was damaging to the war effort and criminal. A 1918 article of the *San Francisco Chronical* described Congress passing a law that included “maximum penalty of $100 fine and six months imprisonment for killing Government pigeons.”\(^4\)

If the pigeons did not happen to be shot by the civilians, they began advanced training. This step consisted of the pigeon
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\(^3\) U.S. War Department, *The Homing Pigeon*, 12.

being trained to now use mobile lofts. This was perhaps the most important part of training because it was the mobile lofts most commonly used at the front. They served the same function as home lofts did for the pigeons but with the added difficulty of being moved, often weekly, from place to place. Training began by changing the location of the mobile loft little by little. The pigeons were released miles away and expected to return to the mobile loft. Once this stage of training was mastered, pigeons were then ready for war.\textsuperscript{15} In the case of American pigeons, this meant traveling overseas. In December 1917, the \textit{New York Times} noted that “4,000 young birds are being shipped each month to France.”\textsuperscript{16}

Just as important as the pigeons themselves were the men who handled them. The majority of the personnel that entered the Pigeon Service, regardless of their nation, had backgrounds raising pigeons. Soldiers in the Pigeon Service were given unique ranks, such as Chief Pigeoneer and Loft Master. The requirements for these two ranks included “leadership material,” “homing pigeon expert,” and “homing pigeon fancier.”\textsuperscript{17} Even the mechanics who maintained pigeon lofts and the vehicles that transported them were to preferably have some sort of pigeon background. On the front, pigeons were distributed in a specific format. At least one mobile loft with pigeon personnel was stationed with a single division. After formal assignment to a division, additional men were added to the pigeoneer personnel serving the loft. They were drawn from the regular soldiers in the division who would take the pigeons into battle. Along with their rifles, these men would enter


combat with pigeons inside wicker baskets on their backs. These baskets could hold several pigeons at once. While these new additional men did not come from a pigeon-based background, they were efficiently trained by the pigeoneers at the lofts in basic pigeon care, release of pigeons for flight, and the writing and fastening of messages to a pigeon’s leg. Pigeoneers in the army, navy, and air corps were instructed to write clear, complete, and brief messages. The messages, once written, were then inserted into a small metallic cylinder attached to the pigeon’s leg. With this last step of training of both bird and man complete, they were ready to enter combat.  

The majority of pigeons that served in the First World War served in a land-based army which was particularly hazardous. Countless pigeons were killed by enemy artillery fire. Pigeons were also exposed to the horrors of gas-warfare. While most of the pigeons saw service with infantry, they were also utilized by cavalry, artillery, and even tank units. Despite these calamitous obstacles, army pigeons relayed accurate information from the front lines back to division headquarters in record time.

Perhaps the most well-known army pigeon from the First World War was Cher Ami. He was a British-born male homing pigeon in the American Pigeon Service and attached to a battalion of the 77th Division of the American Expeditionary Force. In the midst of battle in 1918, the battalion, commanded by Major Charles Whittlesey, advanced too far and became entrapped by the enemy. As his battalion became whittled down by enemy fire and fatigue, Major Whittlesey desperately sent requests for help, using seven of his eight pigeons. The German gunfire and artillery shrapnel was so thick that all seven of these pigeons fell dead or mortally wounded. In addition to the Germans, the American
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battalion also came under fire from friendly artillery. Major Whittlesey, down to his last pigeon, Cher Ami, desperately sent a message to cease the friendly fire. After initial release, Cher Ami, hesitant to enter the hail of German firepower, perched on a tree instead of flying to the home loft. Frustrated, Major Whittlesey and a few men attempted to spook the pigeon to do his duty. Soon, Cher Ami’s homing instinct kicked in and he entered the fray. Not long into the flight, he was struck by shrapnel. Cher Ami flapped on, becoming a literal bloody, flying mess. He reached his home loft in 25 minutes, covering a distance of nearly 24 miles. Because of Cher Ami, many men of the “lost battalion” were saved from certain death. With a torn breast and nearly severed leg, he delivered Major Whittlesey’s message. For his efforts, Cher Ami was awarded the Croix de Guerre.19

Another pigeon, named Mocker, was recognized for providing valuable service. During battle on September 12, 1918, a message containing the coordinates of German gun emplacements were attached to Mocker’s leg. As Mocker flew back towards his loft to relay the information to American artillery, he was severely wounded. Despite suffering several gunshot wounds and a missing eye, Mocker shocked his handlers by finding his loft in good time, successfully accomplishing his mission. Surviving his wounds, Mocker was awarded the Croix de Guerre by France and given a Distinguished Service Cross by the Americans.20

French army pigeons became famous for their service in the battle of Verdun. One such pigeon delivered a message stating “We are undergoing a devastating gas attack. This is my last pigeon.”21 The pigeon flew through clouds of mustard gas and,

despite its lungs being severely eaten away, managed to return to its loft with the message. One French pigeon that emerged from the hell that was Verdun was awarded the Croix de Guerre and another was awarded the Legion d’Honneur. Newspapers also took notice of brave pigeons at Verdun. A 1917 San Francisco Chronicle article claimed that German artillery totally destroyed wireless communication and that the French soldiers of Verdun were “saved only by delicate little creatures being thrown into the breach—the cooing pigeons.”

Another amazing example was the homing pigeon named President Wilson. He was a pigeon who served in the American Expeditionary Force’s new tank corps. Soon after being released from his tank with message in tow, President Wilson became severely wounded. After pushing through a dense fog, President Wilson found his home loft, where just outside its entrance, he collapsed out of sheer exhaustion and blood loss from a missing leg. Pigeoneers found him on the ground with the message still attached to his remaining leg. President Wilson was saved due to the gentle veterinary care provided by his handlers.

Pigeons notably saved sailors and airmen as well. The main mission for naval and air force pigeons was to relay the location of sinking ships, seaplanes, and shot-down fighter planes. 717 messages were delivered to Britain alone by pigeons from planes downed at sea and sinking ships. One famous example was a pigeon named Crisp. Crisp was a pigeon serving on the navy trawler Nelson when it was attacked and left severely disabled by a German U-boat. The mortally wounded captain scribbled out a message pleading for help and sent it off with Crisp. The pigeon
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successfully managed to deliver the message and the surviving crew of the *Nelson* were located and saved.\textsuperscript{25}

Each seaplane serving the British Air Corps carried one to two pigeons kept in a box high up in the fuselage to prevent them from drowning. The pigeons were a last hope for airmen downed at sea to be rescued. One British homing pigeon, named Pilot’s Luck, managed to save his entire seaplane crew. After crashing at sea on a freezing November evening, one airman scrawled “Airship foundered twenty miles seaward,” on a message attached to the leg of Pilot’s Luck. Despite being soaking wet and freezing, Pilot’s Luck took off from the sinking wreckage, soon finding his home loft. Because of weather conditions and the darkness of night, it took 11 hours for rescuers to find the wrecked seaplane. Although nearly frozen to death, all six airmen were pulled from the sea alive, thanks to Pilot’s Luck.\textsuperscript{26}

The majority of pigeons did not receive accolades for their service. However, this did not mean their service went unnoticed. The men they served learned to appreciate and praise their winged heroes. Pigeons and pigeoneers received gratitude’s from privates to generals. American General John Pershing, a man once critical of pigeon usage by the military, even praised their service. At the conclusion of the war in 1918, both men and pigeons returned home. In the United States, pigeons were paraded alongside soldiers as heroes of the war. Some pigeons, like Cher Ami and President Wilson, were preserved via taxidermy and are currently kept the National Smithsonian Museum in Washington, D.C. for all to see. Britain and France commemorated the service of their pigeons by dedicating numerous monuments to them across the


battlefields of Europe, while pigeons donated by civilians were returned to their owners by a thankful government. Pigeons hatched and raised by the military during the war remained government property. The fate of German pigeons was somewhat less glamorous, yet intriguing. Captured German pigeons were paraded and exhibited as mock prisoners of war. German pigeons were also put to work to breed more pigeons for the American Signal Corps. An example of such is the captured German pigeon appropriately named Kaiser. Kaiser, allowed to keep his leg band stamped with the German Imperial Crown, produced many offspring that would serve the United States Signal Corps. Some of his direct descendants even served in the American Signal Corps against Germany in World War II.²⁷


It is hard to say exactly how many pigeons served in the First World War. Possibly as many as 500,000 pigeons served on all fronts during the conflict. It is important to remember that the pigeons, civilians, pigeoneers, and training were equally important. Because of them, pigeons managed to save the lives of thousands of soldiers. The men who served in or with the Pigeon Service were pushed to the ultimate test under combat. Whether it was on a sinking ship sending out a last SOS or an infantry battalion surrounded by the enemy, the pigeons and pigeoneers were there as a last hope. Despite the challenges of war, the pigeons had a success rate of ninety-five percent. The pigeoneers devotedly respected and cared for their pigeons just as a cavalryman genuinely cared for his horse. While they may have just seemed like regular birds to other soldiers, the pigeoneers knew their birds were special. Many pigeoneers sent individual pigeons they raised into battle. Thousands of pigeons died or were horribly mutilated by battle while doing their job. Pigeons and the pigeoneers "came through with messages of weal and woe; came through when
shattered troops were crying for aid—when every other line of communication had failed.”
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European Jazz: A Comparative Investigation into the Reception and Impact of Jazz in Interwar Paris and the Weimar Republic

By Douglas A. Kowalewski

The effects of jazz on places other than its American birthplace have been widely studied. More particularly, the European reception of jazz in the period between the world wars has been a common topic of study for both historians and musicologists alike. Typically, scholars have focused on one particular region in their study of jazz's impact on interwar Europe. Interwar Paris – the cultural center of Europe at the time – has had its story intertwined with that of jazz numerous times.\(^1\) The Weimar Republic – the short-lived German democratic experiment – has also had its art-driven history interwoven with that of jazz.\(^2\)

While both of these areas, to some extent, welcomed jazz and the changes that it signified and caused, there is a paucity of research that compares the two. This work will attempt to review the scholarly work pertaining to these two areas and lay the groundwork for a comparative study investigating how interwar Paris and the Weimar Republic both received and were impacted by jazz – America's contribution to worldwide popular music. In reviewing this literature, several issues are raised. First, why did interwar Parisians and Germans embrace jazz? Second, what


factors contributed to how these nations responded to and allowed jazz to impact their cultures?

The reception and impact of jazz on interwar Paris has invited an abundance of scholarly research. In reviewing past literature in this field, several themes emerge. The first of these is a fascination with Americans – and, more particularly, with African Americans – and their cultural products. Nicholas Hewitt argues that the sudden popularity of "black American dance and spectacle" following the First World War led to an increasing recognition of jazz and the musicians that played it in the interwar period.\(^3\) Also subscribing to this argument, William Shack presents jazz in Paris as arising from a fascination with everything American following the horrors of the European-based (and caused) Great War.\(^4\)

Echoing Shack's claim, other historians have argued that Parisians of the 1920s and 30s embraced jazz not only because it was American – but simply because it wasn't European. According to Thabati Asukile, Parisians adopted jazz because it represented a change in what they saw as a corrupt European culture. In addition, jazz fit in well with the Dadaism and Surrealism that was emerging at around the same time in Paris because of the former's spontaneity, freedom of expression, and its ability to challenge deep-rooted conventions. Jeremy Lane argues that jazz challenged old European ideals and therefore quickly gained traction with the citizens of post-war Paris. In this way, jazz became a dynamic and vital component of interwar Parisian culture.\(^5\)

---


Other historians have woven the Paris fascination for jazz into the broader narrative of a French crisis of identity following World War I. Generally, scholars disagree as to whether jazz remedied or perpetuated this crisis. Carter O'Brian suggests that jazz – and the dancing that often coincided with it – helped Parisians to forget the pains of the First World War and helped them move on from it. Hewitt, Asukile, and Lane – although they all also argue that the adoption of jazz in Paris led to a positive restructuring of race relations – all argue that the black experience in interwar Paris was far from perfect. The fact that blacks were merely made a spectacle of and were not really integrated into interwar French culture perpetuated the idea that France was not really as color-blind as it claimed to be. According to the aforementioned authors, this occurred because the perceived "primitivism" of African American jazz was resisted by members of the older generations in Paris – that is, the older, landed classes of Parisian culture saw jazz as an uncivilized art form because they also saw African American culture as uncivilized. This further complicated French identity and, while jazz was there as a way to turn away from European ideals, it could not solve all of Paris's problems. Indeed, while Jeffrey Jackson cites jazz's positive impact on French identity as the chief reason why it became such an important component of Parisian nightlife, he also concedes that older Parisians also resisted the modern lifestyle that came along with it.6

Generally speaking, then, historians have linked Paris's fondness for jazz in the interwar years to its inhabitants' fascination

with American and African American culture. In addition, these historians suggest that jazz represented a mode of expression that allowed individuals to think outside of standard, antiquated European norms. Furthermore, these scholars also suggest that Paris's embracing of jazz was linked to remedying, hopefully, the French identity crisis that arose after the First World War – and that jazz could only help to address some of this crisis. While race relations were undoubtedly improved with the advent of jazz in Paris, these historians contend, they were not wholly rectified. The claim that interwar Paris was mostly color-blind, then, is not completely convincing.

The literature on jazz's impact on the Weimar Republic, while still sizeable, does not approach the amount that has been written about interwar Paris. Still, several familiar themes emerge. First, a fascination with all things American (the German idea of *Amerikanismus*, or Americanization) plays a role, albeit in a slightly different way. Unlike the historians that write about Paris and its interactions with jazz, Weimar scholars suggest that Germany's obsession with America had less to do with African American culture and the "primitive blackness" of its cultural products. In contrast, German fascination with America was more broadly based. Cornelius Partsch and Susan Cook argue that basic American uniqueness, irreverence, and the United States' overall position in world hegemony in the interwar period led Germans to take a liking to jazz. Of course, there were opponents to this school of thought, such as those individuals that feared that the worldwide success of jazz would end the German musical hegemony that had been held for centuries. Jonathon Wipplinger argues that jazz came about at a time of great turmoil in the Weimar Republic and, therefore, stood to reform the German way of thinking. So, like
Paris, Germany's affair with jazz was also about German identity—and jazz could only appeal to so many people.\(^7\)

Saying that Germans did not take race into account when they adopted jazz in the interwar years would be very far from the truth, according to these same scholars. Even though their fascination with American culture did not include African American culture, race certainly played a role in how the Weimar Republic reacted to jazz. Indeed, even though Cook argues that jazz was generally embraced by the German people, she also states that German conservatives hated it because of its links to African American primitive culture. Furthermore, Michele Ferm—in studying visual representations of Weimar jazz musicians—argues that the black musicians themselves were often portrayed as stereotypical figures, with their unique appearance and individuality often de-emphasized for the white mainstream audience. Theodore Rippey goes one step further and states that the Weimar reception of jazz was all due to how the white German population thought of primitive blackness and how it sat starkly different from mainstream culture. Even so, Wipplinger states that jazz forced Germans to reconsider the boundaries of what was "German" and "non-German" when it came to race relations.\(^8\)

Similar to the advent of jazz in Paris, the citizens of the Weimar Republic adopted jazz because it represented an American cultural product that they wanted to emulate. However, the German obsession with America did not include a fascination for African American culture. Nevertheless, race relations played a


large part in how Germans responded to the advent of jazz in the interwar period. While some in the mainstream stereotyped the black musicians that brought jazz to the nation, others began to think of these same musicians as distinctly "German." All of this points back to the fact that the people of the Weimar Republic embraced jazz in order to solve a German identity crisis. While I do subscribe to the idea that the Germans acted generally negatively toward the black musicians that brought them jazz, I do feel that the current literature understates the fact that many individuals embraced jazz in Germany simply because it sounded good and served a specific function – that is, it provided entertainment. Also, considering that the literature on interwar France mentions Parisians' fascination with African American culture so often, I feel that that piece in Weimar scholarship is somehow missing. I do not see how it would be possible to embrace jazz if there were not a greater sense of fascination with – or at least an awareness of – African American culture.

Overall, the literature of jazz's reception and effects on interwar Paris and the Weimar Republic center on three major themes: that of Americanization, crises of identity, and race relations. While I do subscribe to the majority of these authors' claims (most notably the basic notion of a fascination with America and the fact that jazz acted to help heal identity crises in the two regions), it seems that their claims regarding race relations are less convincing and clear – especially if one were to compare the two areas. Keeping this in mind, I intend to compare jazz's reception and impact on interwar Paris and the Weimar Republic through the lens of race relations. Specifically, I will show that interwar Parisians did not act as color-blind toward black jazz musicians as previously thought and that citizens of the Weimar Republic were more interested in African American culture than previous works have claimed.
Before such a comparative study is conducted, however, it is imperative that a brief historical background of jazz's arrival in both interwar Paris and the Weimar Republic be outlined. Emerging from the First World War a victorious, albeit decimated, nation, France—especially Paris—first encountered jazz in the form of American bands that came over during the war to play the music for both soldiers and civilians alike. A number of these bands remained in France following the end of the conflict; their popularity in cities increasing with the demand for both live and recorded music, which came about during the relative economic prosperity of the 1920s. By the end of the decade, jazz had firmly rooted itself in Parisian culture, with nightly or weekly jazz performances taking place in nearly every single one of the city's venues. With its roots in visiting American bands, jazz became synonymous with the glittering, seductive allure of interwar Parisian culture.⁹

The Weimar Republic emerged from the First World War after citizens of a defeated Germany sought to create a system that repudiated the militaristic regime of the German Empire, the vices of which were perceived as the causes of the horrific conflict. Beginning in late 1919, German writers began to speak of jazz music as it came along with the nearly 100,000 occupying American soldiers stationed there following the Allied victory. The Weimar Republic was soon peppered with jazz bands of both American and French origin, of both white and black musicians. However, jazz was not as immediately prominent as in interwar Paris—jazz developed more in patches where Weimar citizens had more contact with Allied soldiers. Ultimately, however, jazz would come to define the short-lived Weimar Republic, with jazz culture centering around Berlin in the mid-to-late 1920s and throughout the early 1930s. Even though its roots can be traced to occupying

American troops, the prominence of jazz in the Weimar Republic long after their departure has led scholars to call the German democratic experiment, with its celebrated focus on progressivism and the arts, Germany's own "Jazz Age."¹⁰

Both Paris and the Weimar Republic were introduced to jazz through American jazz bands that either arrived near the end of or after the First World War. Since jazz is an American art form, this should come as no surprise. But what is more important about how jazz was transmitted to Parisian and Weimar citizens was the aspect of Americans themselves. Not only did jazz music captivate Parisians and Germans, but the American culture that it represented – which was predominantly transmitted through the lens of African American culture – also fascinated them. And as both nations were looking to move past the First World War and define themselves in a postwar world, race relations in France and the Weimar Republic – brought out into the open by the interactions between African American jazz musicians and the rest of the population – became a central component of how each nation defined themselves in the interwar period. While some historians have discussed this at length, I intend to show that Paris was not as color-blind in its treatment of African American jazz musicians as is generally thought of as being true. In addition, I intend to show that Weimar culture was more interested in African American culture than has been previously shown.

In examining interwar Paris's fascination with jazz, a discussion of race relations and its relation to the art form, as aforementioned, is not novel. To understand how Parisians thought of and treated African Americans in the interwar period, it is important to start at the end of the First World War with the interactions between the earliest of American jazz bands and the French populace. Just after the conflict, the Parisian fascination

¹⁰ Wipplinger, The Jazz Republic, 11; 24-30.
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with jazz was already well underway. In 1919, African American bandleader James Reese Europe described in *The Literary Digest* a curious story concerning a French band attempting to play one of his pieces following his band's 1918 tour through Paris:

The great band played the composition superbly— but...the jazz effects were missing. I took an instrument and showed him [the leader of the French Garde Républicain band] how it could be done, and he told me that his own musicians felt sure that my band had used special instruments. Indeed, some of them, afterward attending one of my rehearsals, did not believe what I had said until after they had examined the instruments used by my men.\(^{11}\)

While at first glance this story may seem perfectly innocuous, the fact that the French musicians immediately came to the conclusion that the African American band had to be using special instruments in order to make the "jazz effects" that Europe alludes to suggests that the French musicians did not quite understand the African American inflections that had inspired jazz in the first place. Indeed, Europe went on to say in his description that "jazzing" with instruments – that is, playing jazz – was "natural for us...it is, indeed, a racial musical characteristic."\(^{12}\) This inoffensive anecdote would come to represent one of the central issues in Parisian race relations: the disparity in jazz knowledge and talent between African American and French musicians.

This disparity would come to a head as early as the 1920s, and would have real consequences for African American jazz musicians. In the July 22\(^{nd}\), 1922 issue of the *Chicago Defender*,

---

\(^{11}\) James Reese Europe, "A Negro Explains 'Jazz,'" *The Literary Digest*, April 26, 1919, 28-29.

\(^{12}\) Ibid.
the issue was raised of African American musicians losing their Parisian gigs to French musicians beginning in October of that year. The lost jobs were due to a new French law that limited the employment of foreigners to only account for 30 percent of the total French workforce. While the measure was undoubtedly an attempt to protect the rights of French workers, it no doubt had other intentions. As the previous story by Europe suggests, French bands could not play jazz like their African American counterparts. It is possible, then, that the new law was passed in order to stop the complete monopolization of Paris's beloved jazz by African American musicians and reopen the entertainment industry for French nationals. Indeed, the Chicago Defender estimated that several thousand African American musicians were going to lose their jobs in late 1922. This certainly does not fit in with the traditional narrative that interwar Paris acted color-blind in its treatment of African American jazz musicians.  

Another issue permeating interwar Parisian race relations was that of the racism of white Americans who were either living or vacationing in Paris throughout the period and the influence they had on the city. The Chicago Defender reported on a particular story that occurred in the same month as the new French labor law that took the jobs of many African American musicians living in France. Following the stunning victory of French-Senegalese boxer Battling Siki over his white opponent, numerous white Americans traveling through Paris picked fights with African Americans in what the Defender had as the title of its report: a protest of equality. An investigation into white American racism does not belong here, but it is important to note that white Americans had no quarrels with discriminating against Frenchmen.

13 "Jazz Players To Lose Paris Jobs," Chicago Defender, July 22, 1922.
of African descent either, as the *Defender* reported on in mid-
1923.\(^{14}\)

It did not take long for the racism of white Americans to
permeate Parisian culture. In March of 1925, Parisian writer Albert
Guérard described situations during which jazz clubs throughout
the Montmartre district of Paris would have to refuse patrons of
African descent "...in order not to displease its American
clientele...."\(^{15}\) While this type of interaction was undoubtedly not
universal in interwar Paris, it illustrates that white American
racism toward blacks in Paris led to increased institutional racism,
at least among several Parisian jazz clubs and venues. This – like
the measures taken to stop the African American domination of the
Parisian jazz scene – does not fit in with the traditional narrative
that interwar Parisians were color-blind in their treatment of
African American jazz musicians. Through a combination of the
disparity in jazz knowledge and ability between African Americans
and Parisians and the influence of white American racism, African
American jazz musicians could expect to feel the effects of racism
even in interwar Paris.

As we have seen, jazz did not immediately reach
widespread popularity in the Weimar Republic until after the end
of the First World War. And while we have seen that Germans
were fascinated by the American culture that jazz represented, their
interest in African American culture is a much less discussed topic.
In 1922, Alice Gerstel wrote in the German magazine *Die Aktion*
concerning the coming of jazz bands to the Republic. According to
Gerstel the jazz band symbolized, with its "Negro" musicians and
strange dances, the "dying era of the bourgeoisie."\(^{16}\) To Gerstel,

\(^{14}\) "Americans Take Hate to Paris," *Chicago Defender*, August 11, 1923.
\(^{15}\) Albert Guérard, "The Black Army of France," *Scribner's Magazine*, March
1925, 238-39.
\(^{16}\) Alice Gerstel, "Jazz Band," in *The Weimar Republic Sourcebook*, ed. Anton
Kaes, Martin Jay, and Edward Dimendberg (Berkeley, CA: University of
the coming of Negro jazz bands to Germany represented the last sliver of "creative force" left in Europe, at least in regards to Europe's music-making prowess. Gerstel suggests that African American jazz, then, was a part of the European music-making tradition that continued on past the First World War. While this viewpoint is most certainly one of appropriation of African American jazz, it also illustrates the general idea that was surfacing in the Weimar Republic of an African American takeover of German musical culture. This is especially important because it demonstrates that it was the African American culture, and not the entirety of American culture, that was seen as the forerunner of this new musical type and the culture that surrounded it.

This focus on African American culture grew as jazz's popularity soared in the Weimar Republic. In 1926, two writers focused on theatre and music – Frank Warschauer and Kurt Weill – wrote their thoughts on the origins of the jazz that was sweeping the nation. In a piece mainly concerning the Berlin concerts of white American jazz musician Paul Whiteman, Warschauer explicitly conceded that African American talent and experimentation with rhythm and melody was "primarily responsible for both the origins of jazz and the boldest departures within it." Indeed, Warschauer went on to comment that many jazz musicians, including Whiteman himself, see jazz as symbolic of the entirety of American culture. However, it is clear in the piece that Warschauer believed that jazz was imbued with "the youthful energy of America," but still had most of its roots within the confines of a purely African American culture. Weill (who was himself an accomplished musician who blended elements of

---

17 Ibid., 555.
19 Ibid., 572.
art music and jazz in his compositions) wrote in his piece something that echoes the sentiment of music writers in Paris at the time – that African Americans were the best at jazz and were, as a result, the most representative of the new art form. Together, Warschauer and Weill's writings of the mid-1920s show us that the Weimar Republic was impressed with the African American roots of jazz, and more readily associated African American culture in particular to the art form than has been suggested by prior research.

One Weimar-era publication produced in 1926 most explicitly outlines the above argument. In a piece entitled "The Negroes Are Conquering Europe," writer Ivan Goll outlined his viewpoint: African American music and dance were taking Europe by storm, and that was most certainly a positive development.

And yet, why complain? The Negroes are here. All of Europe is dancing to their banjo. It cannot help itself. Some say it is the rhythm of Sodom and Gomorrah...Why should it not be from paradise? In this case, rise and fall are one...This is the dance of the Negroes. One can only envy them...Their revue is an unmitigated challenge to moral Europe.

Goll makes it clear that African American music and dance, of which jazz is a part, was something that should be celebrated throughout Europe as a potent confrontation of old ideals. Carrying his argument further, Goll links African American cultural products to the culture itself and puts forth his idea that with music


like jazz "Negro blood" is "slowly falling over Europe, a long-
since dried-up land that can scarcely breathe."\textsuperscript{22} He ends with a
question that brings his entire claim into sharp focus: "Do the
Negroes need us? Or are we not sooner in need of them?"\textsuperscript{23} Taken
together, the components of Goll's argument suggest that there was
sentiment in the Weimar Republic that celebrated jazz as purely
African American, and that African American culture – with its
novel and dynamic products such as jazz – was needed to revitalize
a Europe still faltering following the First World War. This
argument stands in sharp contrast to the idea that citizens of the
Weimar Republic were only concerned with jazz's connections to
American culture as a whole and that they mostly ignored the
influence of African American culture on the new art form.

Following the major crisis that was the First World War,
Europe entered into a period of relative stability that saw the rise in
popularity of American cultural products throughout the entire
continent. The populations of two areas in particular – interwar
Paris and the Weimar Republic – quickly became fascinated with
the introduction of jazz into their daily lives. Historians of this
period have focused on several themes in engaging with writings
and scholarly thought on the topic. The most prominent theme is
that of jazz's impact on race relations in the two areas and how
those race relations were linked with how both areas defined their
identities in the interwar period. With the writings in the columns
of the \textit{Chicago Defender}, as well as testimony by African
American bandleader James Reese Europe and French writer
Albert Guérard, we have seen how the usual picture of Parisian
color-blindness toward African American jazz musicians was
anything but widespread. The disparity in jazz talent and
knowledge between African American and French musicians – as
well as the influence of white American racism – created a sort of

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid., 560.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
institutional racism in the form of labor laws that limited the number of African Americans who could earn money while playing jazz in France and also limited their access to Paris jazz clubs. In the writings of several Weimar scholars – including Alice Gerstel and Kurt Weill – we found that Germans saw African Americans, but not Americans in general, as the most representative artists associated with jazz. And in the work of Ivan Goll, it was discovered that a general feeling existed in the Weimar Republic in which African American jazz was a blessing to the nation and that African American culture and cultural products – which included jazz – was exactly what Europe needed to fully rejuvenate its cultures following the First World War.

Therefore, it can be said that the interwar Parisian citizens were not as color-blind in their attitudes and actions toward African American jazz musicians as has been previously stated, and that the people of the Weimar Republic were more interested in African American culture than scholars have previously posited. Knowing this, one can be confident that African American culture played a major role in how Europeans received and responded to the advent of jazz on their continent in the interwar period; however, the response to African American culture differed from country to country. While African American culture was praised in interwar Paris for its spontaneity and its novelty, discrimination toward African Americans was certainly not absent; at the same time, citizens of the Weimar Republic found youthful hope in African American cultural products, not just in the vague ideal of American culture. Jazz had come to Paris and Weimar at the end of the First World War – they celebrated and, at times, wrestled with it and the African American culture that accompanied it throughout the interwar period.
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A Divided Generation: How Anti-Vietnam War Student Activists Overcame Internal and External Divisions to End the War in Vietnam

By Jeffrey L. Lauck

Introduction

On the evening of Tuesday, May 5, 1970, roughly 125 students from Gettysburg College marched over a mile from Christ Chapel to the Eternal Peace Light Memorial as part of a memorial service for the previous day’s victims of the Kent State Massacre. Their march followed a day-long demonstration on Stine Lake, where members of the Gettysburg community listened to music and heard speeches from college faculty, staff, and students denouncing the escalation of the War in Vietnam. Gettysburg College students were not alone in their vocal opposition to the Vietnam War; nor was the Kent State Massacre the only event that sparked outrage among college students. Throughout the Vietnam War era, college students mobilized as part of groups and as individuals to demonstrate their views on the war. However, college activists were not a homogenous group. Often, anti-war groups were collections of loosely related sub-movements that agreed on little more than their opposition to the war. Nor did all students or student organizations universally oppose the war, either. The college activists who organized during the Vietnam War era represented a wide spectrum of ideas, beliefs, and views regarding the War and the world around them. This diversity

---

1 “Senate Sanctions Strike; Faculty Cancels Classes,” The Gettysburgian, May 8, 1970; “Strike-1,” MS 036, Box 24, Folder 24-4, Radical Pamphlets Collection, Musselman Library Special Collections.
within groups and movements inevitably led to divisions that ultimately undermined the success of student activists’ agendas and threatened the stability of student activist groups.

Historians tend to look at the phenomenon of college activism during the 1960s as “the movement.” Mike O’Donnell dissects “the movement” into two parts: the “New Left,” or the political groups that emerged during the era, and the “counterculture,” a radical and ‘alternative’ lifestyle adopted by many college youths. The two developed together into the movement that we typically think of when we look at college campuses around the nation in the 1960s. However, this paper will focus mostly on the “New Left” political groups, as well as the “New Right” student groups that developed in reaction to “the movement.”

College campuses in the 1960s and early 1970s were the perfect breeding ground for the birth of widespread political activism. In 1960, there were roughly 5 million university students in the United States. This number was greater than ever before in American history and was larger than many small nations at the time. As a result, the college age demographic had great potential to effect change just as a result of its size in numbers. The higher education system also allowed well-educated students to be dispersed around the country and gather together to discuss the issues that affected them directly and issues that had broader domestic and even international repercussions. Workers before them had used factories as a natural organizing venue – students used college campuses.

---

3 Ibid., 94.
Student activism was also not new in the 1960s. Students that graduated in the 1950s had already begun this tradition of activism with sit-ins to challenge racial inequality in the previous decade.\textsuperscript{4} Even before the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, college students were engaging in counter-establishment activities. In the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century, students at Harvard blew up a building on campus. At Princeton, students started a revolt by firing pistols and proceeded to take over administration buildings and terrorize villagers. At the University of North Carolina, students stoned professors and horsewhipped their president to protest school policies.\textsuperscript{5} College students in the 1960s were building on an already well-established legacy of activism. However, student activism in the Vietnam War Era was remarkably distinct from its predecessors in its nonviolence and global outlook. By the 1960s, students began challenging the paternalistic nature of college campuses, asserting their own political voice while demanding a normalized freedom of speech and expression that was not within social norms a decade earlier.

While not all protesters belonged to formal organizations, two prevalent groups were founded in the 1960s that served to facilitate activism. Students for a Democratic Society and Young Americans for Freedom were arguably the two most influential youth organizations to come out of the 1960s. Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was founded in 1960, before the United States had even formally sent troops into Vietnam. The organization was originally part of the Student League for Industrial Democracy, but some members, led by Al Haber, believed the parent organization had a far too narrow focus and

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., 94.
\textsuperscript{5} Penny A. Pasque and Juanita Gamez Vargas, “Performances of Student Activism: Sound, Silence, Gender, and Dis/ability,” \textit{New Directions for Higher Education} 167 (Fall 2014), 59.
broke away to focus on the broader topic of civil rights.\textsuperscript{6} However SDS, with Haber as its first President, would never quite fully divorce itself from its pro-worker beginnings. Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) evolved out of support for the loyalty oath included as part of President Eisenhower’s National Defense Education Act. Students and university administrators across the country immediately opposed the loyalty oath that was required of student applicants for federal education loans, but students David Franke and Doug Caddy organized a conference to support the oath and answer Barry Goldwater’s call for conservative youths to organize. In September of 1960, the pair met with over 100 other young conservatives at the Sharon, Connecticut estate of William F. Buckley. The meeting, which would come to be known as the Sharon Conference, resulted in the creation of Young Americans for Freedom.\textsuperscript{7} Though these groups occupied opposite ends of the political spectrum, neither could be considered a monolith. Indeed, internal politics affected the messages of each group and threatened their stability throughout the 1960s and early 1970s.

**Students for a Democratic Society**

By 1970, the Vietnam War—and certain students’ opposition to it—was in full swing. A June 1970 publication by Students for a Democratic Society titled “Vietnam: No Mistake! How the U.S. Got Involved; Why the U.S. Should Get Out Now!” seems to summarize the organization’s main goals and messages. These different messages can be equated to the different factions that developed within the organization. Throughout the document, appeals to each of these messages/factions are made in an attempt to rally them behind SDS and the anti-war movement. Five major


\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 18-21.
factions become apparent: any-business, anti-military, anti-politician, anti-sexism, and anti-racism.

Anti-Business

Perhaps the strongest message embedded in the SDS document is an anti-business, pro-worker one. The writers frame the Vietnam War as an attack on U.S. workers, citing that real wages have fallen since the war began while taxes used to fund the conflict take up as much as a third of wages. The document also states that “only a movement unified against the big business rulers can succeed in fighting them and their imperialist wars.” Allies in this fight were not to be politicians or businessmen, but rather the “masses of working people in this country.” One effort to cement this cooperation between the SDS members and workers was the Campus Worker-Student Alliance (CWSA). This effort, underway in over 30 SDS chapters nationwide in 1970, encouraged SDS members to work at jobs on campus alongside nonstudent workers. The goal was both to “face the same exploitation and harassment they [nonstudent workers] face, and take part first-hand in the same daily struggle against the administrative bosses” as well as to evaluate their own prejudices towards the working class that “the U.S. education system has drummed into us.” Clearly, SDS never quite lost its pro-worker roots in the Student League for Industrial Democracy.

The CWSA resulted in a mutually beneficial relationship between students and nonstudent campus workers. At Yale, students fought hard to reinstate a black female cafeteria worker who had been fired after standing up to racism and sexism in the workplace. At Wayne State University in Detroit, the janitors and
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matrons union voted unanimously to prohibit military recruiters from visiting campus. An April 1970 flyer from the University of Chicago chapter of SDS called on its members to oppose the layoff of 40 predominately black janitors and support the matrons union in its fight for a higher wage. The flyer went on to claim that “the University has always fought and will always fight this effort to build an alliance between workers and students.” SDS members at the University of Chicago then planned a rally in support of campus workers scheduled for April 9th outside the Administrative Building.

While efforts to advocate for working class Americans through the Campus Worker-Student Alliance reveal the influence of the pro-worker, anti-business faction within SDS, they also demonstrate an effort to win over public opinion in the fight against the war. As Penny Lewis notes in *Hardhats, Hippies, and Hawks: The Vietnam Antiwar Movement as Myth and Memory*, we remember the war dividing the country into groups of doves and hawks. Doves were usually seen as upper-middle class youths (the stereotypical college student), while hawks were seen as “ordinary Americans: white people from Middle America who supported God, country, and ‘our boys in the 'Nam.’” Working class Americans—“hardhats”—were the stereotypical hawks. The AFL-CIO, the largest labor union at the time, was very vocal in its support for the war and its opposition to communism. However, as Lewis notes, working class opposition to the war was more significant than is often noted. Much of the classist rhetoric of the Vietnam Era, painting the liberal student movements as those of a privileged and naïve upper class, helped create the illusion of a
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schism between the movement and the working class.\textsuperscript{16} However, it appears that the pro-worker, anti-business wing of the Students for a Democratic Society was cognizant of this artificial divide and worked hard to counteract it. By working with the working class, members of SDS helped to garner their support in opposing the War in Vietnam. Perhaps more importantly, they also gained a better understanding of their own reasons for opposing the war. Ultimately, the efforts helped SDS create a coalition of pro-worker and anti-war forces.

\textit{Anti-Military}

Students for a Democratic Society also featured a determinably anti-military wing that opposed many military-oriented institutions on college campuses. According to one SDS publication, “On campus after campus, anti-war students have led actions against ROTC, recruiters, and trustees with ‘defense’ interests.”\textsuperscript{17} In addition to opposing ROTC and recruiters, SDS students also opposed foreign policy institutes that contributed to the American war effort. The students saw these on-campus activities as the closest, most tangible connections they had to the war effort. Consequently, on-campus military programs were seen as the easiest and most obvious targets of their movement.

At Harvard University, thousands of students organized a “militant abolish ROTC campaign” that led to the faculty agreeing to phase out Army ROTC by the end of 1970 and Air Force and Navy ROTC by the end of 1971. Across the nation, anti-ROTC student movements were seeing results. National enrollment in ROTC programs dropped by 25\% between 1969 and 1970 and dropped by 40\% between 1966 and 1970. At a time when campus ROTC programs produced roughly 85\% of junior officers in the military, this added up to a very significant reduction in the war

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{17} “Vietnam: No Mistake!,” 27-28.
Anti-war student protests combined with a growing public uneasiness toward the war to contribute to these reductions.

Even if college campuses did not have an active ROTC program or accept classified military research grants, they were not necessarily immune to scrutiny from their students regarding institutional support for the war. Amid a student strike at the University of Chicago in 1970, the “Right On Training Center” (mockingly abbreviated ROTC) sponsored research into other ways in which the school might have been helping the United States wage war in Vietnam. The group found that the University, which claimed to be “clean” of any war involvement, had actually contributed to weapons research. Professors who had previously served in or advised the military came under fire from the group. One professor in particular, Morris Janowitz, the chair of the Sociology Department, was condemned for writing a book, *The Professional Soldier*, that was used to train U.S. officers and his ongoing work with the Pentagon. Professor Janowitz responded to these criticisms, saying that all research at the University of Chicago was done voluntarily by professors and students and that nobody was forced to do any war effort research against their will. He added that “I do not serve the military as a consultant because of my longstanding opposition to American military operations in Indochina.”

Opposition to the war was clearly very strong at the University of Chicago if it warranted the investigation of faculty members’ professional histories to expose subliminal connections between the college and the military.
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While the organization was determinably anti-military, it was not anti-soldier. In fact, SDS celebrated the efforts of GIs who fought against the military “brass,” often literally. Citing a GI prison riot against bad food and living conditions in February of 1970, the SDS magazine was not coy in its support for open revolt of the soldiers themselves against the military hierarchy. The students’ support for grunts and disdain for the brass suggests they may have identified closely with the enlisted men, who were often roughly the same age as the students themselves.

**Anti-Politician**

While Students for a Democratic Society clearly wished to change the policies of the American government, they were not willing to join forces with any particular politician. Much of their rhetoric reveals a very anti-establishment view of politicians, even liberal politicians. SDS criticized “scores of various liberal misleaders” who “jumped on the anti-war bandwagon.” However, liberal politicians should not have taken that as a personal affront; Republicans, too, were guilty of anti-war bandwagoning. “This is not the first movement to be misled by political opportunists. Eisenhower was elected in promises to pull out of Korea, and there are still 50,000 U.S. troops there engaged in combat,” one SDS pamphlet wrote. The group had a point. Many politicians were critical of the war, yet the conflict continued into the 1970s. Even George McGovern, the outspoken critic of the Vietnam War and Democratic nominee for president in 1972, was not spared attacks. One flyer called him the “Thousand Percent Candidate,” ridiculing him for being “one thousand percent” for and against some of his major campaign items. “McGovern is losing the debate with
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himself,” the flyer proclaimed. While part of the anti-war message, the organization’s anti-politician rhetoric shows the influence of anti-establishment members over others who might favor working with Washington insiders to end the war.

**Anti-Sexism**

Students for a Democratic Society even managed to draw connections between feminism and opposition to the war. While seemingly only marginally related to the Vietnam War, SDS made the case that the fight against sexism was crucial to ending the war in Vietnam. One publication from the group claimed that U.S. imperialism and male chauvinism exploited women abroad. “The only Vietnamese women you ever read about in the U.S. press are prostitutes, who are always castigated for supposedly giving VD to American GIs.” This SDS publication points out that popular media representations of Vietnamese women were determinably sexist and mirrored the stigma surrounding women who relied on government welfare programs. By making this connection, SDS helped compare the stigmas of women in Vietnam to those of American women, which had become a major gripe of the feminist movement at the time. In addition to increasing empathy for Vietnamese women, SDS also explained how male chauvinism at home hurt the anti-war movement. Gender roles and a lack of childcare forced women to stay at home with children, which prevented them from being active anti-war protesters. SDS argued that women were the ideal activists for the fight against the exploitative nature of the war as they themselves already had deep experience with oppression. This anti-sexist language reveals the
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existence of a determinably feminist faction of Students for a Democratic Society.

Anti-Racism

Besides its anti-war activism, SDS is best remembered for its actions in combatting racism. However, SDS managed to blend these two aspects of its identity. A writer for The Maroon, the University of Chicago student newspaper, spoke in favor of SDS and its fight against racism and the war in response to criticisms that the organization was infringing upon the rights of other students in calling for a student strike. “When thousands of American soldiers, Vietnamese, Cambodians, and black Americans are being maimed and killed with no end in sight,” she argued, “it is perfectly proper to withdraw the ‘right to go to class’” in order to fight the university’s pro-war efforts.27 SDS often referred to the war as an “imperialist” war and argued that imperialism inevitably relies on racism to exist. “Racist slurs and propaganda laid the basis for genocide like the Song My [My Lai] Massacre,” argued one SDS booklet.28 A flyer from the University of Chicago chapter of SDS called for the execution of Lt. William Calley, one of the perpetrators of the My Lai Massacre, arguing that there should be “no excuse for racist murder” and that “Calley and his bosses deserve what they gave to the My Lai peasants.”29 Here, SDS made an explicit link between its fight against racism and its fight against the Vietnam War.

In other cases, the link was not so explicit. In a letter to its supporters, the SDS National Office said that “Universities serve as the planning center for attacks on third-world peoples who are

27 Fairinda West, “Artificial Chasm Divides Moderates, Radicals,” The Maroon June 5, 1970, MS 036, Box 22, Folder 22-3, Radical Pamphlets Collection, Musselman Library Special Collections.
29 “Calley & All Bosses: Guilty of Racist Murder!,” MS 036, Box 22, Folder 22-3, Radical Pamphlets Collection, Musselman Library Special Collections.
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struggling for self-determination.” The same letter exalted students at Harvard who demanded that their university “not be used as the ‘brain center’ of world imperialism,” adding that students from Harvard, San Francisco State, and Columbia Universities “will not sit idly by…while their schools train officers to lead GIs to fight against Vietnamese.”  

The explicit and implicit links between racism and the war in Vietnam were also discussed at the SDS Mid-West Conference Against Racism at the University of Chicago in 1974, which served as a meeting for members of SDS all across the Midwest to discuss racial inequality and institutional racism as well as potential actions to address these issues.

Most of SDS’s anti-racism efforts, however, were directed towards prejudice at home and appear at first glance to have little to do with the war. The group lauded poor housing and sanitation conditions for African Americans, as well as police brutality and low job security that affected black communities more than white ones. One publication pointed out that “per capita income for blacks is $1000/year less than for whites.”

At the University of Chicago, members of SDS challenged Professor Milton Friedman to a debate regarding Friedman’s contributions to the “current government policy of racist unemployment.” The group even compared their professor to Hitler in his “racist propaganda” that blamed welfare recipients for the nation’s economic woes.

The group’s Midwest Conference was advertised as a way to coordinate SDS chapters’ efforts across the country to fight racist
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professors, textbooks, immigration laws, and admissions policies.\textsuperscript{34} While these efforts all seem to focus on domestic racism, SDS managed to tie these activities back to anti-war efforts by arguing: “If we do not fight racism, black and third world people will have no reason to trust the mainly white anti-war movement.”\textsuperscript{35} SDS chapters were clearly cognizant of their racial imbalance. By linking the fight against racism to the fight to end the war, SDS leadership encouraged members who were predominately focused upon one cause to help out with the other as a way of advancing their own primary issue. The wide variety of sub-movements included under the umbrella of SDS shows the heterogeneous nature of the organization. Students in the New Left were not single-issue activists, nor did every student in SDS support every issue covered in the umbrella organization.

\textbf{Conservative Students’ Rebuttal}

Similarly, not all students during the era supported SDS or the New Left movement. Many even supported the war in Vietnam. Student anti-war activists organized a rally for peace in 1965 in Boston Commons. Six Harvard freshmen showed up with a “We support LBJ in Viet Nam” banner. They joined 300 other members of Young Americans for Freedom in an attempted counter-protest of the event, managing to get close enough to the stage to disrupt the event organizers from speaking to the group. The two groups of students quickly erupted in a war of chants, with anti-war activists shouting “We want peace in Vietnam! We want peace!” only to be answered by pro-war activists shouting “We want victory in Vietnam! We want victory!”\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} “SDS Mid-West Conference Against Racism,” MS 036, Box 22, Folder 22-2, \textit{Radical Pamphlets Collection}, Musselman Library Special Collections.
\textsuperscript{35} “Vietnam: No Mistake!,” 39.
Claiming that “The New Left, in all its various hues of crimson, is determined to destroy society,” Young Americans for Freedom claimed to be an “alternative to change” from groups like SDS. YAF, claiming to represent the “majority”—likely a reference to President Nixon’s “silent majority” message—argued that leftist organizations like SDS were affiliated with Marxists and communists and were throwing universities all across the country into chaos. YAF aggressively attacked SDS’s anti-ROTC movement. Equating the decrease in ROTC programs to a decrease in U.S. defense capabilities, YAF argued “with both Russia and China sworn to destroy us we would go faster than Czechoslovakia if we got rid of our defenses as some nuts advocate.” YAF also protested SDS’s focus on race issues. Instead, YAF advocated a “colorblind” argument that people should not be classified by race, maintaining that because SDS focused on how different races are treated rather than how they are the same as humans, they were the ones who were the racists.

Bridging the Ideological Gap

While YAF and SDS clearly disagreed on many issues, they shared some common ground. First, both organizations promoted youth activism. Even though each organization accused the other of being toxic to campus culture, this did not stop either from continuing to mobilize students across the nation. Second, both organizations were determinably anti-establishment. YAF, like SDS, made it very clear in its own publications that it is not
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part of the Washington “establishment.”\textsuperscript{40} Most interestingly, both organizations opposed the draft. While YAF supported the war in Vietnam, it had major objections to the draft, which it saw as “selective slavery.” Forcing nonconsenting Americans to fight went against the principles of individual liberty and freedom that the group promoted. Rather than a coercive draft, YAF proposed a volunteer army, which it argued would better promote social justice, cost the taxpayers less, and fall more in line with American ideals of freedom.\textsuperscript{41} Neither SDS nor YAF would go as far as to advocate for illegal draft resistance activities, deeming these as “too radical.” The groups instead endorsed vocal draft opposition, believing that draft resistance would undermine their message as they appealed to the American public.\textsuperscript{42}

**Challenges for Student Activists**

In addition to a select few policy similarities, both YAF and SDS were also similar in that both groups served as umbrella organizations that included a wide variety of factions and movements. Consequently, both organizations were ripped apart by factional tension. Both organizations were founded in 1960 and, ironically, both erupted in civil war nine years later in 1969. SDS bureaucratically expelled the Maoist Progressive Labor Party following tension over disagreements over violence, women’s issues, and Black Nationalism.\textsuperscript{43} For YAF, dissent was primarily sown by the rebellious libertarian faction. Libertarians did not universally support the war in Vietnam as most other young

\textsuperscript{40} Phillip Abbott Luce, “Alternative for Change,” MS 036, Box 21, Folder 21-2, *Radical Pamphlets Collection*, Musselman Library Special Collections.
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conservatives did. According to an influential libertarian pamphlet distributed during the era, libertarians favored “friendship and peace with his neighbors at home and abroad.” This did not jive well with YAF’s message of radical leftist enemies in the streets of Chicago and the jungles of ‘Nam. The division came to a boiling point at the 1969 YAF Convention when a libertarian member used his speaking time to burn his draft card on the floor of the convention. Chaos ensued as emotions flared. The organization then voted to purge the libertarian faction from YAF, but not before 25-33% of the convention, mostly libertarians, stormed out once and for all. It appears that both organizations’ efforts to appeal to wide swaths of college students with many different interests could only last so long. Mass exoduses and internal political fights exerted each organization’s political capital that could have been used to help expand their appeal. These tensions also undercut each group’s message and allowed opponents of the groups to point out the lack of organization in the student groups.

In addition to internal threats, youth organizations were threatened by attacks from outsiders. Faculty in particular represented a hurdle to anti-war student activists. Many professors, such as those at the University of Chicago, adhered to strict concepts of institutional neutrality that bordered on political phobia. At Gettysburg College, President Hanson refused to take a definitive stance on behalf of the entire school as he did not want to speak for everyone. In the end, however, the faculty voted to condemn the war due to increasing pressure from students who began protesting on and off campus. Some professors compared
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their students’ demonstrations to those of the Nazi youth movement in the 1920s and 1930s.\textsuperscript{48} In reality, most professors were likely scared that a massive student movement could upset the status quo on university campuses across the nation.

Conservative pundits relentlessly waged war on SDS and other anti-war activists. According to one, communists were active in SDS during the Student March on Washington and the Easter Vigil at President Johnson’s Texas ranch.\textsuperscript{49} The article even quoted a Communist leader as saying the party was planning on using the student organization as a proxy for their own actions.\textsuperscript{50} The “Communists,” which came to include organizations like SDS in the eyes of the right, were also accused of fomenting race riots in their pursuit for racial equality.\textsuperscript{51} By lumping all left-leaning organizations under the collective label “communists,” conservative pundits played off the public’s hatred and fear of communism to undermine the efforts of groups like SDS. Through


\textsuperscript{49} On April 17, 1965, SDS assembled over 20,000 protesters in the First National March Against the Vietnam War, or simply the Student March. SDS allowed communist sympathizers to participate, fueling reports that communists had “infiltrated” the group and causing a break with SDS’s parent organization, the League for Industrial Democracy. During Easter weekend, 1964, SDS members from the University of Texas organized a peace vigil at President Lyndon Johnson’s ranch. The vigil became an annual event, and was frequently threatened by the Ku Klux Klan and American Nazis. “SDS in the 1960s: From A Student Movement to National Resistance,” \textit{The Indypendent}, September 21, 2006; Joseph A. Fry, \textit{The American South and the Vietnam War: Belligerence, Protest, and Agony in Dixie} (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2015), 302.
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their rhetoric, they created the illusion of communists infiltrating the innocent minds of students, suggesting they were being controlled rather than acting based on their own free will. This patronizing view of students and student organizations tarnished their reputations in the eyes of many older Americans.

Anti-war student activists during the Vietnam War era overcame countless hurdles in their fight to sway public opinion against the war. The most memorable of these hurdles was the attacks from pro-war outsiders. Ultimately, however, these attacks did not pose as big a threat as the divisions within the organizations themselves. From the start, student activist organizations tried to function as umbrella groups that could court the support of many different types of students, each with their own special interests. While these differences ultimately resulted in tension and divisions in groups like Students for a Democratic Society and Young Americans for Freedom, both groups weathered their respective storms to continue a legacy of student activism despite their internal divisions.

Conclusion

The 1960s and 1970s saw the greatest volume of student protests and activism in American history. Never before or since have American students organized in such great numbers all across the nation to vocalize their political beliefs. Yet students were not unified in their opinions on the Vietnam War or other policies either. Students for a Democratic Society and Young Americans for Freedom represented the two largest camps of politically active students, but even these seemingly united groups were nothing more than broad coalitions of often disparate factions. Internal divisions stemming from these inter-coalitional disagreements combined with external threats from critics to pose serious challenges to student groups. Yet despite these difficulties, student
activists prevailed in creating a politically-active generation and leaving a lasting legacy on the American political landscape.
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