



2004

Gettysburg Historical Journal 2004

Follow this and additional works at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj>

 Part of the [History Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

(2004) "Gettysburg Historical Journal 2004," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*: Vol. 3 , Article 9.
Available at: <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/ghj/vol3/iss1/9>

This open access complete issue is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

Gettysburg Historical Journal 2004

THE
GETTYSBURG
HISTORICAL
JOURNAL

VOLUME III

FALL 2004

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
GETTYSBURG COLLEGE
GETTYSBURG, PA 17325

The Gettysburg Historical Journal
An Undergraduate Student Annual
Published by the Students of
The Gettysburg College Department of History

Volume III – Fall 2004



EDITORIAL BOARD

Keith R. Swaney, *General Editor*
Meggan D. Emler, *Assistant Editor*
Katie E. Farrer, *Managing Editor*
Ryan F. Stauffer, *Submissions Editor*
Molly K. Gale, *Publicity Editor*

William D. Bowman, *Department Advisor*
Timothy J. Shannon, *Department Advisor*
Carla E. Pavlick, *Production Consultant*



The Gettysburg Historical Journal is published annually by the Journal's Editorial Board, which is composed of students and advised by faculty members of the Gettysburg College Department of History. The Journal seeks to exhibit examples of the best work done by students within the area of history at Gettysburg College.



Department of History, Gettysburg College

Shawn Alexander, *Visiting Assistant Professor*
Michael J. Birkner, *Professor*
Gabor S. Boritt, *Professor*
William D. Bowman, *Department Chairman and Associate Professor*
Allen C. Guelzo, *Professor*
Scott Hancock, *Assistant Professor*
Christina Ericson Hansen, *Adjunct Instructor*
Dina Lowy, *Assistant Professor*
Magdalena S. Sanchez, *Associate Professor*
Timothy J. Shannon, *Associate Professor*
Barbara A. Sommer, *Assistant Professor*

Contents

Letter From the Editor.....4

‘Sing to the Lord a New Song’: The Regular Singing Movement in Colonial New England
Katie Farrer, ’045

In Quest of True Equality: A Study of the Climate for Women at Gettysburg Since 1975
Sara Gustafson, ’05.....23

An Ideological War of ‘Blood and Soil’ and Its Effect on the Agricultural Propaganda and Policy of the Nazi Party, 1929-1939
Keith Swaney, ’04.....45

The “Powerful”
Molly Gale, ’05.....75

The 55th College Training Detachment of the Army Air Corps Program On the Gettysburg College Campus, 1943-1944
Julia Grover, ’0590

Readers,

Whether one seeks to improve in the classroom, on the athletic field, or in the editing of Gettysburg College's third issue of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*, progress is a concept that one often takes for granted. In the words of James Bryant Conant, a renowned chemist, educator, and public servant, "Behold the turtle. He makes progress only when he sticks his neck out."

I trust that this third issue of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* has compelled both the editors and the authors included within this work to reach above and beyond expectations and to "stick [our] neck[s] out," demonstrating the potential that lies within amateur editors and writers at the undergraduate level.

In this third issue of "our journal," we present a work that is diverse in its scope and content. Women's history, discussed in the contexts of Renaissance Europe and Gettysburg College; German history; and the history of Early America are all themes that are included within this work. We argue that the authors of these works have not presented historical "reports," so to speak, but pieces of writing that offer cogent arguments and comprehensive research.

These authors have dared to "stick [their] neck[s] out" and have thus shed new light on to a number of topics. They, as well as the editors of the third issue of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal*, invite you to enjoy this work by remembering the lesson of the turtle.

Keith R. Swaney
General Editor

**‘Sing to the Lord a New Song’:
The Regular Singing Movement in Colonial New England**

Katie Farrer

“Outward Melody in Religious Singing is no small Help to inward Devotion. In this our imbodyd [sic] State the Senses do very strongly impress the superior Power of the Mind; especially the Ear and Eye do variously affect the Heart.”¹ Cotton Mather penned these words in April of 1721 as part of a sermon that he wrote endorsing Regular Singing, or singing by note rather than by ear. Mather, along with several other Puritan ministers were the driving forces behind the Regular Singing movement, which in essence was a sea change for music in religious services in New England, involving the abandonment of a tradition of lining out psalms for a congregation to sing and introducing books that contained tunes to which psalms could be easily set.² Such a change was not implemented quickly or without a battle from both sides, but it ultimately changed the course of Puritan worship forever.

One of the reforms that John Calvin insisted upon during the Protestant Reformation involved the role of music in public and private worship. He believed that music was an effective and completely valid way to praise God, but only when God himself divinely inspired the texts for the songs. This rhetoric applied most readily to the singing of psalms.³ Calvin instructed his followers that these psalms should be performed simply, without instrumental

¹ David McKay, “Cotton Mather’s Unpublished Singing Sermon,” *The New England Quarterly* 48, no. 3 September 1975, 420.

² “Lining out” meant that the preacher or deacon would speak (or sometimes sing) a line of text before the congregation would sing it. The tradition came about because of a paucity of psalm books, but was continued through the eighteenth century because of a lack of leadership from instrumentalists in Puritan churches. The tradition can be seen today in some gospel music.

³ Joyce Irwin, “The Theology of ‘Regular Singing’” *The New England Quarterly* 51, no. 2, June 1978, 178.

accompaniment, which could lead to “frivolous music lacking moral purpose.”⁴ Music, he alleged, should not be judged by its aesthetic beauty, but rather by the level of spirituality it inspired or created.⁵ By singing unaccompanied and in unison, Calvin believed that the Protestants could further separate themselves from the Catholics and the pageantry that surrounded their worship services. Such beliefs ultimately led to the Regular Singing debates in Puritan New England churches in the early eighteenth century. The Puritans of New England were primarily Congregationalists, which meant that in order to create a tight-knit religious community, they avoided the hierarchical organization structure of churches that included bishops, synods or presbyteries. They believed that churchgoers should and would be willing to submit to the clergy and other church leaders.⁶ This lack of commanding leadership was evident throughout the entire church service, including the parts that called for worship in song. In an effort to free further the Puritans from the level of control that the Catholic Church exerted on its followers, John Cotton and his contemporaries believed that the psalms should be sung with little accompaniment and little direction, so as to diminish opportunities for solo artistry or virtuosic performances.⁷

The melodies for the psalms in the Old Way style of singing were not fixed in a songbook. Typically they were sung to English ballad tunes or something similar that the congregation knew. Because these tunes most frequently were learned through oral transmission, different families, congregations, regions, and countries all had slightly different variations on the same tune. The congregation was given no indication of a meter, key, or general tune, beyond what was “lined out” to them by a deacon, so one can only imagine the

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., 179.

⁶ Bruce C. Daniels, *Puritans at Play: Leisure and Recreation in Colonial New England* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1995), 53.

⁷ Ibid.

cacophony that resulted.⁸ Some ministers like Cotton Mather believed that members of the congregation could indeed experience rapture by “contemplating the words while singing them,” yet religious leaders spoke out against the “old way” of singing psalms because they saw the disorganized music as shrouding the text.⁹ Such ideas led to the singing reform within Puritan churches in 1720, although the actual process began earlier.

A common trend in Puritan worship throughout the seventeenth century was for the congregation to follow a cantor or deacon, who would “line out” every phrase of every verse of a psalm. Lining out became a common tradition through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries for gospel music or for folksongs to provide singers with the lines of a song when they did not have written music. It has been credited with permitting more people, including those who may not have been literate or able to read music, to participate in music, but in its seventeenth and early-eighteenth century contexts, it frequently created cacophony among churchgoers.

In a typical Puritan church service, a passage from the Bible that would serve to unite the entire service would be read following the opening prayer. John Cotton wrote that after reading the initial passage, he “expoundeth it, giving the sense, to cause the people to understand the reading.”¹⁰ This passage would be referenced again in the minister’s sermon, but also in other aspects of the following two to three hours during which time the congregation would be worshipping. It was not uncommon for “forty or fifty scriptures [to be] distinctly quoted in one discourse” (sermon) and for there to be many indirect references as well.¹¹

What was the purpose for this concentrated emphasis on scripture within a Puritan worship service? The Bible recorded the words of God and therefore itself was a means of

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Richard Crawford, *America’s Musical Life: A History* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001), 30.

¹⁰ Hambrick-Stowe, 110-111.

¹¹ Ibid., 10.

grace. Therefore, the singing of psalms provided an additional “emotional outlet for the pious” although not always an aesthetically pleasing experience for those who were musically inclined.¹² Lining out the psalm verses also reinforced the centrality of scripture in Puritan worship because congregation members, especially in churches that did not have songbooks, had to listen, internalize, and then repeat the lines. Therefore, as John Cotton believed, “the end of singing is . . . to instruct, and convince, and to reprove the wicked,” in other words, to guide those singing or listening to the music in the way of the Lord.¹³ Cotton Mather would express similar sentiments a generation later in writing, “It is wonderfully fitted to brighten the Mind, and warm the Heart, to enliven and refresh all our Powers and cherish every holy Frame, to calm and silence our evil noisy Passions, to actuate and invigorate pious and devotional Affections. And hence religious Singing is a good Preparatory for other subsequent Parts of Divine Service; and tends to render the Word and ordinances more improving and advantagious.”¹⁴

The psalm texts could be sung directly from the Bible itself, but for the sake of music and economics, were more frequently sung from psalm books, because these books were less expensive than Bibles. The first psalm book used in New England was brought by the Pilgrims from Europe and was written in Amsterdam in 1612 by Henry Ainsworth. Not only did it contain a metrical version of the psalms, but *The Book of Psalms* also included annotations at the end of each psalm to provide opportunities for those who desired a deeper understanding of the texts, as well as the outlines for thirty-nine tunes that should be used in the singing of the psalms.¹⁵ The version was used at least through the 1690s, when many ministers decided the

¹² Louis B. Wright, *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies: 1607-1763* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 192.

¹³ Hambrick-Stowe, 113.

¹⁴ David P. McKay, “Cotton Mather’s Unpublished Singing Sermon” in *The New England Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (Sept. 1975), 417.

¹⁵ Earle, *The Sabbath in Puritan New England*, (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1891), 126-132 passim.

tunes in the Ainsworth version were too difficult to sing and the *Bay Psalm Book* was adopted almost universally within the New England colonies.

The Whole Book of Psalms Faithfully Translated into English Meter, henceforth referred to as *The Bay Psalm Book*, was the first book to be printed in New England in 1640. The following was printed on the cover page in later editions: “Whereunto is prefixed a discourse declaring not only the lawfullnes [sic], but also the necessity of the Heavenly Ordinance of Singing Psalmes in the Churches of God.”¹⁶ The *Bay Psalm Book* was created and compiled by three Massachusetts Bay clergy members (Thomas Symmes, Thomas Walter, and Richard Mather) and was the catalyst in the movement towards standardizing psalmody, and later singing in general within the services. Because the authors were so well educated, they were able to study texts such as the Ainsworth psalm book, the Geneva Bible, and the Bible in Hebrew to determine the best translation of every word, line, and phrase rather than merely paraphrasing the psalms from the Geneva Bible as previous versions had. Its success is credited to this translation, which permitted congregation members to sing in the vernacular so that what they were experiencing in musical worship was as understandable and accurate as possible.

The psalms were intended to be sung by everyone, to “join together in heart and voice to praise the Lord, for as David’s psalms have been showed, were sung in heart and voice together by the twenty-four orders of the musicians of the temple.”¹⁷ The authors argued that the psalms should be translated as they were in this book to mirror the poetic nature of the original Hebrew texts. They defended their work by writing in the preface that all lines may not be as smooth as expected or desired because they chose to pursue a colloquial translation and to refrain from

¹⁶ Ibid., 144; Hambrick-Stowe, 111.

¹⁷ “The Preface” from *The Bay Psalm Book*, imprinted 1640, modern edition: (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956), 6. I have taken the liberty to quote this passage in twenty-first century English, rather than as was printed in the original *Bay Psalm Book*.

paraphrase “so we may sing in Zion the Lord’s songs of praise according to his own will; until he takes us from hence, and wipes away all our tears, and bids us enter into our master’s joy to sing eternal Hallelujahs.”¹⁸

For example, verses one through three of the Twenty-Third Psalm in the *Bay Psalm Book* read:

The Lord to me a shepherd is,
Want therefore shall not I.
He in the folds of tender-grass,
Doth cause me down to lie:
To waters calm me gently leads
Restore my soul doth he:
He doth in paths of righteousness:
For his namesake leads me.¹⁹

This brief example exhibits the poetic nature of the familiar psalm. Its structure, which more closely resembles a poem than a passage of scripture, demonstrates how easily it might lend itself to song. This accessibility was attractive not only to churches as a whole but also to individual members who used *The Bay Psalm Book* in personal devotion as well. Such a setting for the songs was so accessible for New Englanders because it mirrored ballads, which surely were sung throughout the region, preserved orally by immigrants from Europe or created and transmitted within the colonies.

Devotional singing was permitted and encouraged in colonial New England because like congregational singing, it placed the worshipper on a level that was closer to God and His kingdom. The prominence of the *Bay Psalm Book* throughout New England permitted Puritans the opportunity to worship at home with the same music and texts as they experienced in church,

¹⁸ *The Bay Psalm Book*, 5. Zion is often used as a reference to heaven or a resting place at the end of a religious journey such as a pilgrimage. In this case, Mather seems to be referring to New England, a peaceful, holy resting place one resides before reaching heaven.

¹⁹ *The Bay Psalm Book*. This translation is opposed to the King James Version of the Bible, which was completed in 1611: “The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures, he leadeth me beside the still waters: he restoreth my soul. He restoreth my soul: he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name’s sake.”

but in a more comfortable setting. Restrictions on personal and private worship were also much more lax—so much that Puritans were permitted to even write their own songs (assuming, naturally that they were religiously-based) and perform them and various psalms with instrumental accompaniment. According to John Cotton, “Any private Christian, who hath a gift to frame a spiritual song, may both frame it, and sing it privately, for his own private comfort, and remembrance of some special benefit and deliverance.”²⁰ The musical instruments were permitted so long as their presence did not interfere with an individual’s or family’s devotional worship by obscuring the text.

It is somewhat ironic that the book that began the motion towards the Regular Singing controversy within the Puritan community did not actually contain any music. The first sign of actual music or suggestion for worship practices using *The Bay Psalm Book* did not appear until 1698, nearly sixty years after its first printing. This means that although the psalms had been altered to make their singing easier, congregations still had to rely on the process of lining out the tunes, which did not change the cacophony of voices for the better in any sense. It would seem that during the period between the first version and the version that contained music, Cotton and the other authors were somewhat ambivalent about the musical crisis in the churches. Their purpose in writing the psalm book was to make it more possible for everyone to participate in musical worship within a church service and enable them to experience God’s grace through song.²¹ For as long as possible, a “hands-off” approach was taken to controlling the singing for fear of creating an environment that was governed by rules, orders, and hierarchy, which suggested Catholicism.

²⁰ Hambrick-Stowe, 113.

²¹ Ibid.

Reverend Thomas Walter, a writer in seventeenth-century New England recorded, “The tunes are now miserably tortured and twisted and quavered . . . into a horrid Medly of confused and disorderly Voices. Our tunes are left the Mercy of every unskilful [sic] Throat to chop and alter, to twist and change, according to their infinitely divers [sic] and no less Odd Humours and Fancies . . . no two Men in the Congregation quaver alike or together . . . it sounds like *five hundred* different Tunes roared out at the same time.”²² Frustrations with and criticisms of the creative interpretation of psalm tunes grew more frequent, particularly among clergy members or musically literate throughout the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. Puritan ministers began to fear that the “Jarrs [sic] and Discords and Howling” resulting from old style singing and individual embellishments and interpretations of psalm tunes were weakening the power of the words being sung.²³ Ministers began to grow concerned with the singing practices as the weekly cacophonies escalated. They began to fear that the Old Way of singing was dangerous to their faith because although the psalms were set to music, the actual texts were becoming obscured. After all, since the words brought congregation members closer to God, what would happen if He could not understand them on account of the discordant music?

So at what point did ministers and other leaders in Puritan New England decide that a change needed to be made in the musical part of worship? The 1698 version of *The Bay Psalm Book* was the first American psalter (book of psalms) to include not only tunes, but also recommendations on ways to control one’s voice, as well as helping people “avoid squeaking above or grumbling below” the intended psalm tunes.²⁴ But these suggestions would serve as

²² Alice Morse Earle, *The Sabbath in Puritan New England* (New York: Scribner and Sons, 1891), 205

²³ Cynthia Adams Hoover, “Music and Theater in the Lives of Eighteenth-Century Americans” in *Of Consuming Interests: The Style of Life in the Eighteenth Century*, ed. by Cary Carson, Richard Hoffman, and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville, VA: The University Press of Virginia, 1994), 319.

²⁴ Daniels, 54.

ammunition for the debate involving the changes in singing practices in Puritan churches for at least the next sixty years.

As the seventeenth century progressed, the congregations lost or forgot the tunes that were supposed to accompany the psalms. No musical instruction within the churches existed, so individual interpretations of the tunes continued to be perpetuated within the services. By the 1720s, however, the debate over singing by rote (by having someone line out verses) or by notated psalm tunes escalated. The lines had been drawn, between rural conservative communities and “urbane, liberal one[s] centered in the large towns.”²⁵ The intellectual urbanites (mostly clergy members) that supported regular singing did so in order to combat what they perceived as laxity within the Puritan churches. It would seem that they could no longer support or recognize the cacophony that arose from their congregations every Sunday morning and afternoon as worshipful and or devotional. They saw the old style of singing as fostering confusion, which would not please God nearly as much as orderly music making might.²⁶

Many of the congregation members tended to argue for the Old Way out of fear of ritualizing their worship services as the Catholics had. In 1723, one such person wrote in the *New England Chronicle*, “Truly I have a great jealousy that if we begin to *sing* by *rule*, the next thing will be to *pray* by rule and *preach* by rule and *then comes popery*.”²⁷ Although the debate may seem rather simplistic on paper, it is important to note that the clergy and congregation members were not merely arguing over how a psalm would be sung in worship, they were, in essence, struggling over the acceptance of a movement away from orthodox Calvinism to Puritanism influenced by “rationalism, Pietism, and Baroque thought.”²⁸

²⁵ Daniels, *Puritans at Play*, 54.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 53, 55.

²⁷ Earle, *The Sabbath in Puritan New England*, 208-209.

²⁸ Irwin, “The Theology of Regular Singing,” 177.

For many, regular singing was not only haunted by the threat of papacy, but also an intrusion of the secular world into a sacred sphere. If people were taught to sing reading from notes, what was to prevent them from adding secular music to their newly acquired musical repertoire? Furthermore, what was to prevent them from singing such songs within the meetinghouse?²⁹ Therefore, although some churches quickly embraced their new musical traditions, most congregational reforms did not occur overnight, as may be referenced by the thirty-one sermons discussing the validity of Regular Singing within a Puritan church service published between 1721 and 1730. The confusion, arguments, and ambiguity on the matter can be viewed as a direct result of democratic organization of the Puritan church. The change to Regular Singing would have been much easier if a bishop or a pope could have distributed a decree demanding congregations to adopt “note singing,” but instead congregations had to compose their own policies, based on popular vote.³⁰

Therefore, to say that change came slowly to most congregations would be an understatement. Objections to regular singing appeared in churches until at least the Revolutionary era. Despite Cotton Mather’s instruction that “the Christian and the musician must bear each other company. The one must not say to the other, I have no need of thee,” there are records of people in a church in Westfield, Massachusetts, in 1769 of walking out of services because they felt such strong opposition to the new style of singing.³¹ Alice Morse Earle described another scenario in *The Sabbath in Puritan New England*, “The impetuous and well-trained singers at first cut off the last word only of the deacon’s ‘lining;’ they then encroached a

²⁹ Crawford, 33.

³⁰ Ibid.; Daniels, 54.

³¹ Daniels, 56.

word or two further, and finally sung boldly on without stopping at all to be ‘deaconed.’”³²

Parishes took different approaches to introducing Regular Singing as a result of their autonomy, however. In 1770, one church decided that the choir could “sing once on the Lord’s Day without reading by the Deacon” and another church decided to allow a deacon to lead the psalms in the morning while the singing school had control over the music in the afternoon. Both cases inevitably led to the new singing tradition being permanently introduced into the service, but only after each congregation voted on the matter.³³

John Calvin taught that only songs revealed by God himself in the Old Testament and sung unaccompanied and in unison were worthy of being sung in church. His teachings did not differ radically from that of Plato, who believed that in music, the text should subordinate harmony and rhythms. For over a century, Puritans staunchly embraced these beliefs, even when laxity in membership requirements and definitions of the conversion experience prevailed in the churches.³⁴ However, in the early-eighteenth century, New England clergy believed they no longer needed to be concerned with the polyphonic excesses that once plagued Protestant and Catholic worship services.

Thomas Symmes, one of the original authors of *The Bay Psalm Book*, was one of the first people to defend the presence of artistry in worship by arguing “one does not fulfill Scripture merely by singing, but rather by singing skillfully.”³⁵ He further supported his arguments with references to scripture, like I Corinthians 14:15b: “I will sing with my spirit, but I will also sing with my mind” and I Chronicles 15:22, which could be the first reference of a singing school: “Kenaniah the head Levite was In charge of the singing that was his responsibility because he

³² Earle, 214. This passage refers to the process of lining out and how choir members would assert their power and knowledge to encourage others into singing via note as well.

³³ *Ibid.*, 215

³⁴ Irwin, 178; Daniels, 55.

³⁵ Irwin, 183.

was skillful at it.” He saw these verses as indications that the effects of singing within a worship service were improved when performed skillfully.³⁶ People like Tufts, as well as Thomas Walter, Thomas Symmes, and of course, Cotton Mather, endorsed similar ideas upon writing *The Bay Psalm Book*. They published their own sermons on the matter, sermons that all reflect a sentiment in which music need not appeal to the intellect rather than the emotions, but that “passions and affections ‘are subservient to the same designs of religions and devotion’ as the intellect and will” because in order to be effective, the heart must believe what the mouth is singing.³⁷ This, according to the Puritans fighting for a change in psalmody, was most possible when the mouth was making beautiful and aesthetically pleasing music to accompany God’s divinely beautiful words. In other words, merely singing in the old way was denying gifts that God had given his people to cherish and use. Mather expressed similar sentiments when he wrote in a singing sermon that was posthumously published, “And We would now call upon All capable of it, and particularly the Rising Generation among us, to improve the Advantages They have in their Hands to learn the Rules of Singing, I exhort Them to take Pains for the acquiring some competent Skill; that this part of Divine Worship may be more generally attended [sic] and more decently performed in Times to come.”³⁸

However liberal Mather might have appeared in terms of adopting the Regular Singing practices, he, like Calvin, was still staunchly opposed to the introduction of instruments into a Puritan meetinghouse.³⁹ Just as many of the members in his congregations feared that singing by note would introduce elements of the secular world into their sacred realm, so did Mather fear

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Irwin, 185, 188.

³⁸ McKay, 418.

³⁹ Daniels, 56.

that instruments would encourage “dancing as well as playing in the aisles.”⁴⁰ However, one must not interpret this quote as believing that Puritans did not endorse instrumental music for private or social uses. Quite the contrary occurred, actually. Instruments were owned by everyone from merchants to craftsmen and isolated farmers, and could even be used for individual devotional worship, so long as the presence of instrumental accompaniment did not interfere with the sacred texts. A generation before Cotton Mather, John Cotton wrote “singing with Instruments was typicall, and so ceremoniall worship . . . singing with heart and voice is morall worship, such as is written in the hearts of all men by nature.”⁴¹ In other words, to John Cotton, singing with instruments was fine if celebrating certain event with a ceremony, but when a Puritan was worshipping, instruments ought not to interfere in the communication between the individual and God himself.

Despite the strong endorsements that Puritan ministers put forth for Regular Singing, they soon discovered that increased musical literacy within their congregations created changes beyond merely the way in which the psalms were sung. The musical literacy inspired by the Regular Singing Movement within the Puritan church spawned the creation of choirs and the “fostering of independent musical tastes,” which soon spiraled out of the clergy’s control.⁴² This said, however, the change to this new style of music making was typically not quite as drastic or severe as the examples that have been previously presented might suggest. It was not uncommon for a person or several congregation members who were interested in learning the finer points of singing by note to attend a singing school and after learning “to sing according to rule,” they may have demonstrated their newly-found musical skills in a church service to fellow congregation members, perhaps thus persuading them of the benefits of Regular Singing and

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Hambrick-Stowe, 113.

⁴² Crawford, 34.

convincing the congregation to vote in favor of adopting Regular Singing practices in all services of worship.⁴³

Thomas Clap, the president of Yale from 1740 until 1766, believed that it was “the duty of all persons to sing” and to “learn to sing by Rule” because all who were not “idiots may learn to Read, or to Cypher.” In other words, those who could not sing or read music ought to learn so that the musical portions of church services may have full participation.⁴⁴ So that everyone might learn musical skills, singing schools were established in most New England communities. The institution of such schools was inspired by works similar to *A Very Plain and Easy Introduction to the Singing of Psalm Tunes*, written by John Tufts first in 1714 and popular enough to have eleven editions published.⁴⁵

On its most innocent level, the singing school was designed to help people do all of these things. American singing schools, beginning in the 1740s, were led by music teachers and were held in the evenings so as to not interfere with daily commitments or chores. They were temporary in nature—designed to only last two or three months (just long enough to introduce beginning musicians to rudimentary elements of Regular Singing) and were aimed at those who had had no previous musical training.⁴⁶ A social aspect was included within the schools from their inception. Schools typically held at least two classes for students of different ages and these students were drawn from nearly every element of the social strata. By the 1750s and 1760s, their popularity surged and the schools were frequently oversubscribed. In addition to the concerts or “singing lessons” that would occur at the end of their three month period, singing

⁴³ Ibid., 33.

⁴⁴ Hoover, 319-320. Clap was a congregational minister prior to becoming the president of Yale College. He established the Church of Christ of Yale College and insisted that following presidents also publicly endorse the Westminster Catechism. Such establishments led to student rebellions and ultimately his resignation. Bruce P. Stark, “Thomas Clap” from “Connecticut’s Heritage Gateway” accessed 13 November 2003. <<http://www.ctheritage.org/encyclopedia/ctto1763/clap.htm>>

⁴⁵ Wright, 192. This book also contained approximately thirty psalm tunes that could be sung to the scripture.

⁴⁶ Crawford, 32.

schools became known for their fun and frivolity, among other things.⁴⁷ One young man recorded in his diary his feelings about the singing school that he attended: “I have no inclination for anything for I am almost sick of the world and were it not for the hope of going to singing-meeting tonight and indulging myself in some of the carnal delights of the flesh, such as kissing, squeezing, etc., I should surely leave it now.”⁴⁸ Students at Yale University shared similar sentiments about the singing schools, as they viewed the “weekly singing meeting, which they attended not only to make music” but to also escape from scholarly life and partake in some of the “carnal desires of the flesh” that have already been discussed.⁴⁹

Although the singing schools only lasted for a few months at a time, it was not uncommon for students who attended them to continue singing as a group, and in doing so improve their vocal quality and ability to read notes, by performing the music on which they had been concentrating.⁵⁰ As the performances grew more and more frequent, the groups developed into a meetinghouse choir, which brought “energy and musical diversity” to worship services, but also disrupted the hierarchical seating patterns of the congregation members and for some parishioners, they became a source of distraction because they turned psalmody into a display of human talents rather than into an element of sacred worship. In some cases, the worship services turned into a musical competition between the choir (who was not content to sing “those plain and easy Compositions” that the congregations sang) and the congregation. By the mid-1760s, it was not uncommon for specialty choirs to be present within a congregation. These choirs sat together, typically in the church gallery, and sang music other than the psalm tunes that had originally been designated for the purpose of music in worship. As tunebooks containing

⁴⁷ Daniels, 62.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Hoover, 321.

⁵⁰ Crawford, 34.

compositions by William Billings, Isaac Watts, or other New England “tunesmiths” gained prominence throughout the region, these choirs began singing more elaborate music that in some occasions even contained polyphony and fugue-like sections.⁵¹

It is nevertheless important to recognize the impact that singing schools had on music in the colonies. Many New Englanders did not have the means to pay for music lessons that represented the European “high art” style, nor were they especially interested in obtaining the skills needed to play or sing the music properly. Singing schools were attractive because they not only provided a Puritan with the basics needed to sing music by note, but they also presented an opportunity beyond Sundays meetings during which neighbors and congregation members could come together and socialize.⁵²

Perhaps the tunebook that had the most influence on sacred music in New England since *The Bay Psalm Book* in 1640 was *The New-England Psalm-Singer: or, American Chorister*, written in 1770 by William Billings, a Boston tanner and singing master. It was the first tunebook that contained only the music of one composer, and this is especially significant because that one composer was American born and bred.⁵³ If anyone was in any doubt as to on which continent he and his loyalties resided, one needed to only examine the titles of the songs as they referenced Massachusetts towns and cities, Boston churches and streets, and even expressions such as freedom, liberty, and union.⁵⁴

Musicians appreciated Billings works because the composer wrote interesting musical lines for all of the vocal parts, rather than merely the soprano or the tenor, which seemed to be rather customary in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Billings described the challenges

⁵¹ Hoover, 321.

⁵² Daniels 62-63.

⁵³ Crawford, 38.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 40.

involved in undertaking such efforts by writing, “The grand difficulty in composition is to preserve the air through each part separately, and yet cause them to harmonize with each other at the same time.”⁵⁵ His work gained popularity because *The New-England Psalm-Singer* was published in the same year as the Boston Massacre. The tunebook contained religious as well as patriotic music and on occasion combined them, as was the case in one of Billings’ most popular tunes, “Chester.” Billings’ music excited choir members and other musicians because he was able to present successfully “a confluence of independent, interlocking melodic lines [that were] . . . tailored to fit metrical verse,” an important part of Puritan worship since *The Bay Psalm Book*.⁵⁶

Most churches did not jump immediately from *The Bay Psalm Book* to *The New-England Psalm-Singer*, because in the period of over a century that separated the two tunebooks, other sacred musical developments were made. Isaac Watts, for example wrote *Hymns and Spiritual Songs, in Three Books* between 1707 and 1709 and followed this with *The Psalms of David, Imitated in the Language of the New Testament* in 1719. These sources gained popularity and notoriety in Great Britain and then the colonies. They were at first nearly scandalous because Watts’ versions of the psalms and hymns, despite being quite singable, “departed too far from literal translation.”⁵⁷ Although some Protestant groups, like the Presbyterians, refused to sing the hymns until well into the nineteenth century for these reasons, most had accepted and

⁵⁵ Ibid., 43.

⁵⁶ Crawford, 42-44. The lyrics to verses 1, 3, and 4 of “Chester” read: “Let tyrants shake their iron rod. / And Slav’ry clank her galling chaing, / We fear them not we trust in God. / New England’s God forever reigns. / The Foe comes on with haughty Stride. / Our troops advance with martial noise, / Their Vet’rans flee before our Youth. / And Gen’rals yield to beardless boys. / What grateful Off’ring shall we bring, / What shall we render to the Lord, / Loud Hallelujahs let us Sing. / And praise his name on ev’ry Chord.” The verses contain four-line stanzas.

⁵⁷ Wright, 193.

incorporated these tunebooks into their elements of worship much earlier. Hence, Watts paved the way for William Billings and hundreds of composers of sacred music to come.⁵⁸

From this point, it was not a surprise to soon find organs and other instruments as playing a major part in Puritan worship services. However, it was not until 1770, the same year as Billings' *New-England Psalm-Singer* was introduced, when the Congregational Church of Providence became the first Puritan church to allow an organ. Its introduction into Puritan worship was so reluctant and gradual because of the instrument's connection to the Roman Catholic Church, as well as secular entertainment.⁵⁹ However, taking into account that "simplicity and scripturalism were the fundamental principles of Puritan worship, then regular singing, which was based on principles of beauty, reason, and the natural order" was completely foreign to the Puritans, it is rather easy to understand the long progression of changing from singing by rote to singing by note and why more sacred tunesmiths did not make names for themselves earlier than Isaac Watts or William Billings.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, it would be impossible to say that *The Bay Psalm Book*, William Billings' compositions, singing schools, or the forward-thinking Puritan clergy were singularly responsible for sparking the Regular Singing Movement. Rather all of these elements had to and did combine at the right time in colonial New England in order to increase the musical literacy of that region and to give America her own musical heritage.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Daniels, 60.

⁶⁰ Irwin, 192.

In Quest of True Equality: A Study of the Climate for Women at Gettysburg Since 1975

Sara Gustafson

In 2003, the election of Katherine Haley Will as Gettysburg College's thirteenth president began a new era for women on campus. Will will be the first female president in the history of the college, and her election signifies the tremendous legal and psychological changes that have shaken both the college and the nation over the past quarter century. Federal legislation, the slowly-broadening vision of the school's administration, and the proactive stance taken by women themselves have contributed to making Gettysburg College a place of seemingly strong gender equality.

For example, in January of 1985, President Charles Glassick took a large step toward gender equality with his establishment of the President's Commission on the Status of Women. Given nine charges by which to address women's issues, the Commission's overall duty, as defined by Glassick, was "to study and evaluate all matters related to the environment for women, both inside and outside of the classroom."¹ Made up of students, faculty, administrators, and staff, the Commission has, since its inception, investigated women's roles and treatment in athletics, Greek society, and academic life. Its findings, especially in its 1986 Assessment of Educational and Social Climate for Women at Gettysburg College,² have led to greater attention to and awareness of the concerns of women, and its many recommendations have improved the climate for all women on campus. This and other actions taken by the college within the

¹ President's Commission on Women, January 1, 1985, Gettysburg College Archives (hereafter GCA).

² Karen Bogart and Marcia Boyles, Assessment of Educational and Social Climate for Women at Gettysburg College (July, 1986) pp. 6-36.

past twenty-five years have given women, both students and employees, a greater sense of acceptance and belonging. 1999 graduate Colleen Gormley spoke of the sense of empowerment the school had given her, saying, “Gettysburg instilled this attitude in me that I can do anything I left Gettysburg with an independence and confidence I did not have when I entered.”³

Gormley’s words support a general consensus that the climate for women on campus has improved since the early 1970s; however, one runs the risk of becoming too complacent by looking only at the college’s achievements in the quest for gender equality and ignoring its failures. While blatant sexism has slowly disappeared from the college’s hiring, admission, and classroom policies, a current of subtle discrimination and even harassment still runs below the surface. Male members of the community, and even many female members, may not notice it; however, these subtle sexist attitudes still sometimes contribute to making the climate for women on campus less than friendly. While legally, discrimination has diminished over the past twenty-five years, psychologically, women are still second class citizens in many ways. By looking at the college’s record on issues of athletics, admissions, employment policies, and awareness of women’s health and safety, as well as general attitudes toward women and sex, one can see both the progress that Gettysburg has made since 1975 and the distance it still has to go in order to become a place of true gender equality.

Nationwide, one of the most obvious shifts in favor of women’s equality has occurred in the area of athletics. Since 1972 when Title IX of the Education Amendments made it illegal for educational institutions to discriminate on the basis of

³ Colleen Gormley, email interview by Sara Gustafson, 12 February 2004.

sex in any educational program or activity⁴, women's participation in athletics has increased dramatically. According to one government study, the number of women participating in intercollegiate athletics in 1997 had grown to be four times the number of female participants in 1971.⁵ In the wake of Title IX, colleges across America were adding more women's sports, and women athletes were demanding facilities, budgets, equipment, coaching staffs, and salaries that were equal to the men's teams. Some federal administrations enforced the law more strictly than others; for example, the first Bush administration hardly enforced it at all.⁶ However, despite the occasional laxness in enforcement, Title IX drastically changed the place of women in college athletics.

Like at most other coed institutions, the attention and respect paid to female athletes at Gettysburg before Title IX was minimal. As of 1960, only three sports were offered for women: swimming, field hockey, and basketball; women's facilities and equipment were sub-par, and the number of scholarships reserved for female athletes was not regulated.⁷ The enactment of Title IX changed all that, drawing more attention to the inequities within the athletics department. The restructuring of the women's intramural program in 1975 offered more women the opportunity to participate in athletic activities: tennis, volleyball, badminton, and archery among others.⁸ In 1976, the girls' intercollegiate volleyball club petitioned for the right to have a team; soon after, volleyball became the second varsity sport open to women.⁹ It can be argued that without

⁴ Title IX Section 1681a, U.S. Department of Labor. <http://www.dol.gov/oasam/regs/statutes/titleix.htm>.

⁵ Title IX: 25 Years of Progress, U.S. Department of Education. <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/TitleIX/part2.html>.

⁶ Carol Cantele, interview with Sara Gustafson, 1 March 2004.

⁷ Charles Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence* Vol. II (Gettysburg, PA: Gettysburg College, 1987) pp. 951.

⁸ "New Women's Intramural Program Replaces WAA," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 1 (19 September 1975) pp. 9.

⁹ Leslie Shindel, "Women's Volleyball Begins First Year," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXX No. 1 (17 September 1976) pp. 7.

the federal ruling from Title IX, the school's administration and Board of Trustees may have been reluctant to make the budgetary changes needed to extend women's athletics; regardless of that speculation, however, the fact remains that Gettysburg did make an effort to abide by the standards of nondiscrimination set by Title IX.

Still, as in the rest of the nation, change at Gettysburg was slow. For years after the enactment of Title IX, women athletes and coaches found themselves struggling to receive equal benefits and recognition. While the number of women's sports slowly increased with the addition of lacrosse, tennis, volleyball, cross country, softball, and track and field, the women's soccer club was still struggling to gain team status as late as 1987.¹⁰

At the same time that female athletes were pushing for more team sports to be opened to them, they were also fighting for equal facilities and budgets. On its page about the cheerleading squad, the 1975 *Spectrum* showed that women's sports were not fully funded. A caption to the squad's picture stated that the girls raised their own funds in order to be able to cheer at away games.¹¹ Similarly, an article by the women's field hockey team in the fall of 1975 exposed numerous inequities within the athletic department's treatment of male and female athletes. For example, the article stated that the women were not allowed to use the steam room with the men, despite the fact that the college could not afford to fund a similar facility specifically for women. The number of coaches was also radically unbalanced; the article cited the fact that the football team had a total of eight coaches, while not a single women's team could afford a junior varsity coach. Plank Gym, the facility used by the women's teams, was in such a state of

¹⁰ Mary E. Allen, "Women's soccer goal; Division III status," *Gettysburgian* Vol. XCI No. 1 (18 September 1987) pp. 16.

¹¹ *Spectrum*, 1975, pp. 67. GCA.

disrepair that the roof leaked when it rained. Furthermore, many male athletes received full grant scholarship packages, a benefit that was not available to any of the women.¹² Unequal funding also affected female coaches. In its 1986 assessment statement, the Women's Commission discovered that newly hired male coaches were often paid more than women who were already on the staff, ignoring the women's seniority.¹³

In addition to drastically unequal facilities and budgets, female athletes were afforded less recognition and respect from the college administration. Carol Cantele, alumna of the class of 1983, head women's lacrosse coach, and full-time athletics administrator, told one story of discrimination during her undergraduate years as a member of the women's field hockey team. Having made it all the way to the national championships, the women almost did not receive approval from the administration to go to the championship game. The administration was reluctant both to spend the money for the bus, hotel, and meals and to excuse the team from a day of classes; they did not see the point because, in Cantele's words, "we were just girls."¹⁴ Clearly, while Gettysburg's policies did not bar women from participating in athletics, even after Title IX discrimination and inequalities still existed within the athletics department in fairly obvious ways.

According to Cantele, Title IX began to take strong hold more recently in the 1990s with the establishment of the Equity and Disclosure Act, an amendment that acts as a watchdog to educational institutions. The act forces institutions to review their budgets and funding every October and to submit their findings to the federal government

¹² "Sports Inequalities Irk Women's Hockey Squad," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 3 (3 October 1975) pp. 7.

¹³ Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 20.

¹⁴ Cantele, interview.

for review. This encourages institutions to pay closer attention to a more equal allocation of funds for both male and female athletes.¹⁵ Cantele said that in her twelve years of coaching for Gettysburg, she has seen support for women's athletics grow. The athletics department now keeps adequate records and statistics on women's teams and athletes, and much more time is devoted to the recruitment of women.

While she is of course pleased by these developments, Cantele said she hopes to see the day when all athletics programs are viewed practically and realistically, instead of being divided into male or female and subjected to an almost obsessive scrutiny to determine whether they are completely equal. Some sports by necessity require a larger budget and more equipment than others. For example, the football team needs to be larger than the women's tennis team, so it makes sense that the football team would receive more funding. The fact that the football team takes a bus to away games while the women's tennis team takes a van is not a matter of sexual discrimination; it is simply a matter of practicality. Cantele said that by using common sense in these situations and not putting all of the focus on the issue of gender, Gettysburg's athletics department will be able to make its teams truly equal. What equality means, and what Title IX is all about, according to Cantele, is, "Would a male football player feel equally valued and satisfied playing on the women's lacrosse team? In the end, I think the answer is yes, because Gettysburg values its female athletes. Girls are proud to put on the Gettysburg uniform."¹⁶

Female faculty, staff, and administrators shared in the women athletes' demand for equal rights and recognition. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 had made it illegal for

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

employers to base hiring or promotion policies on gender; however, a wide disparity between male and female employees nationwide still existed. For many years, Gettysburg was no different. A 1976 study conducted by the campus's Affirmative Action Task Force showed that over a span of ten years, from 1966-1976, the ratio of male to female faculty members showed no change; women still represented only twenty-two percent of the total faculty, while men represented seventy-eight percent.¹⁷ In 1975, there were only twenty women on the faculty. Most of those women were instructors or assistant professors; very few held high-standing or tenured positions.¹⁸ Despite more attention given to women's rights in the workplace, this trend was slow to change. The Women's Commission's assessment found that in 1985-6, out of 141 faculty members only thirty-three were women; men held ninety-two percent of the college's professorships, while women held only eight percent.¹⁹ Conversely, the assessment also found that the college's low-status clerical positions were held exclusively by women; these positions had little opportunity for advancement or salary increases.²⁰ Even into the 1990s, decades after the sexual revolution had taken place in America, men at Gettysburg had more opportunity for advancement into high-paying and highly-respected positions.

The college has taken steps over the past twenty-five years to institute more equal promotion and hiring practices. There have been cases of women breaking the psychological gender barrier and being hired for high-profile positions; an example of this was the appointment of the first female Treasurer, Dr. Jennie Mingolelli, in 1993.²¹

¹⁷ Karen Dworski and Linda Espenshade, "Women With Class," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 11 (23 January 1976) pp. 3.

¹⁸ *Spectrum*, 1975, GCA.

¹⁹ Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 23.

²⁰ Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 30.

²¹ Stephen Petrus, "College Appoints First Female Treasurer Ever," *Gettysburgian* Vol. XCVII No. 3 (9 September 1993) pp. 1.

It is unlikely that women like Dr. Mingoelli were appointed simply as token women to balance out the ratio of male to female faculty; these appointments truly show the movement of the college toward more equal hiring practices. Even with such developments, however, women still tended to hold fewer and lower positions on campus. Today, almost twenty years later, it is possible to see disparities in the number of male and female faculty, especially in certain departments. According to Dr. Kathleen Iannello, today's political science department has nine full-time professors; of these nine, only three are tenured women.²²

Along with addressing a disparate male to female faculty ratio, women faculty members and other employees also found themselves faced with the issue of equal pay for equal work. Nationwide statistics showed that female faculty and staff on college campuses received lower salaries than men. In some cases, this was because women typically held lower positions; however, many times, women were paid less even if they held the same position and did the same amount of work as their male counterparts.²³ The same disparities existed at Gettysburg. However, at a certain point, the college did take steps to address the issue of equal pay. Iannello remembered that in 1990, her first year at Gettysburg, she received a check for two hundred dollars in her mailbox, along with a letter stating that the check was to make up for the difference in wages that had been discovered by a recent investigation.²⁴ While an extra two hundred dollars most likely did not equal up to the amount made by male faculty members, this story does

²² Kathleen Iannello, interview with Sara Gustafson, 5 March 2004.

²³ Roberta Hall and Bernice Sandler, *The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students*, Project on the Status and Education of Women pamphlet (October 1986) pp. 2.

²⁴ Kathleen Iannello, interview.

show the steps that the college was taking in order to promote gender equality for its employees.

As hiring practices and salaries gradually became more equal, women employees at Gettysburg experienced more subtle forms of discrimination. One of the largest struggles female employees faced was over the issue of maternity leave. As recently as 1997, the college did not offer maternity leave to its female employees. As a result, women who wanted to have children needed to find alternate, and in many cases creative, ways to do so without losing their salaries and positions. Many women timed their pregnancies to coincide with their sabbaticals;²⁵ others timed it so their due date would fall in late May, after the end of the spring semester.²⁶ Women who had C-sections could apply for Disability Leave, since it was a surgical procedure; others made special deals with the Provost, such as agreeing to teach an overload of courses in their returning semester.²⁷ The attitude toward maternity leave shows how women faculty members were discriminated against. Dr. Janet Riggs, alumna of the class of 1977 and professor of mathematics and psychology, remembered when she mentioned to President Glassick that she was pregnant for the second time; he responded with a dig, saying, “Oh. I suppose this means you’re going to ask for another semester off.”²⁸

Even after the establishment of parental leave policies and the campus daycare center, The Growing Place, the college has still made it difficult for women to have a career and a family at the same time. The Growing Place formally addressed the issue of childcare; however, it remains under-funded and under-staffed. Important departmental

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Janet Riggs, interview with Sara Gustafson, 5 March 2004.

²⁷ Kathleen Iannello, interview.

²⁸ Janet Riggs, interview, March 5, 2004.

and committee meetings are still scheduled for four o'clock in the afternoon, an inconvenient time for any faculty member with school-aged children. Unlike other schools, according to Iannello, there is an "informal norm" at Gettysburg that employees do not bring their children to meetings.²⁹ These policies and standards do not familial responsibilities into account. Since the societal norm is still for women to take on most of the duties of child-rearing, the burden of trying to juggle these inconvenient policies with their family responsibilities falls mostly on women employees. Policies like these provide excellent examples of the kind of subtle discrimination that still exists, despite federal legislation, against female employees at Gettysburg.

Female students faced obstacles of their own in their search for equality. Involvement in social life is an important part of the college experience, and as such, is an excellent indicator of the level of gender equality on campus. Over the years, female students have struggled to carve a niche for themselves in the campus social life. In the years since 1975, the easiest way for women to get involved has been to join a sorority. After Sigma Sigma Sigma was established in 1978, Gettysburg was home to seven national sororities.³⁰ During the early 1980s, half of the women on campus were in a sorority.³¹ Greek life offered women a way to become active and visible on campus; it also allowed them to connect with one another and form a strong sense of fellowship. Involvement in sororities was the easiest way for female students to become a vital part of the campus community, so it is not surprising that the number of girls pledging to sororities has remained high over the years.

²⁹ Katherine Iannello, interview.

³⁰ Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence*, pp. 933. Since the publication of Glatfelter's history in 1987, the number of sororities has changed; today there are only five.

³¹ Ibid.

Despite the opportunities that sororities offered women, looking at sorority activities and experiences since 1975 does provide two examples of gender inequality that existed, and exists even today. The first and most obvious example is the fact that fraternities were given houses, while sororities only had offices in the basements of various buildings. The Women's Commission assessment touted this as a clear inequity³², and it is one that has existed even to recent years. Gormley commented on the double standard, saying, "Sororities had suite rooms, but no house, another advantage the men had. We were always told it could be traced back to some old Pennsylvania law that said if more than six women lived in the same house it was seen as a brothel So the sororities were not given houses."³³ Whatever the justification, it cannot be denied that sororities did not, and still do not, receive the same benefits as fraternities.

The second example of gender inequality that can be seen by looking at sorority life is the lack of other activities available for female students. The importance of Greek life to women on campus during the 1970s and 1980s gives evidence of a certain amount of gender inequality, in that it was one of few activities in which women felt truly welcomed and valued. Riggs remembered pledging to Chi Omega in the fall of her sophomore year simply because there was a lack of anything else to do. If a woman was not in a sorority, Riggs said she "felt like second-class merchandise."³⁴ The fact that women's involvement in campus activities was somewhat limited is evidenced through several letters to the *Gettysburgian* in 1975. These letters, written by two women campaigning for a position on the Student Senate, highlighted the lack of representation of women in campus life. Carolyn Reaves-Bey pointed out that only one female student

³² Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 14.

³³ Colleen Gormley, email interview

³⁴ Janet Riggs, interview.

had ever served as Senate President.³⁵ Jeanne Treacy cited the under-representation of female students in areas such as Residential Life and athletics.³⁶

The fact that, for many years, sorority activities constituted the majority of women's involvement in campus social life shows that women did not have, or at least felt that they did not have, equal access to greater social involvement. The social climate for women on campus does seem to have improved in recent years. Riggs said that the social atmosphere for women today is healthier, because, with more educational and cultural activities for women, there is not as much pressure to join a sorority.³⁷ Gormley agreed, pointing out that during three out of her four years as an undergraduate, the Senate President was a woman, as were the majority of her class officers. Her experience would suggest that the social climate for women has become more welcoming; she said, "I never felt . . . like my options on campus were limited because I was a woman."³⁸ The increase in women participating in activities other than Greek life since 1975 shows that the campus social life has seen vast improvement in gender equality.

At the same time the women of Gettysburg were fighting to gain equal rights in the classroom and the social community, they were also fighting to gain equal respect for their bodies. The sexual revolution in America in the 1960s and 1970s helped women to take control of their lives and their bodies and to redefine themselves in terms of their identity as complete human beings instead of simply in terms of their sexuality or reproductive capabilities. During this revolution, and for many years after, however, women still struggled against the male-dominated society that attempted to limit them to

³⁵ Carolyn Reaves-Bey, Letter to the editor, *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 15 (7 March 1975) pp. 3.

³⁶ Jeanne Treacy, Letter to the editor, *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 16 (14 March 1975) pp. 2.

³⁷ Janet Riggs, interview.

³⁸ Colleen Gormley, email interview.

purely domestic or sexual roles. Female students at Gettysburg after 1975 faced this same struggle. Below the surface of the college community ran the view, sometimes subtle and sometimes overt, that women were sexual objects. For example, into the late 1970s, the annual Homecoming festivities included the election of a Homecoming Queen and her court³⁹; like all pageants and competitions of the sort, the women were judged on the basis of beauty and sexuality. The election of a Queen was protested in 1976, however, by a campus group that found the competition degrading to women. In a letter to the *Gettysburgian*, the group stated that, “The criteria of beauty and popularity have long been stereotypes which women have been conditioned to live up to We feel that it is wrong to define womanhood in these terms.”⁴⁰ This protest was apparently successful because there was no mention of a Homecoming Queen in the *Gettysburgian*’s 1977 coverage of Homecoming Weekend. While it addressed only a minor issue in campus life, this protest showed the growing awareness of and concern about how women were viewed on campus.

Another example of this growing trend was a letter to the editor in a 1976 issue of the *Gettysburgian*. In this letter, a concerned group of students, including two men, addressed the issue of certain fraternities’ pledging activities that promoted a degrading attitude toward women. Of particular concern to these students was the practice of showing pornographic films to pledges; these films contained graphically obscene images, such as women being urinated on or engaging in intercourse with dogs. According to this group of students, viewing these films “. . . reinforces the feeling that

³⁹ “Seven Senior Women Nominated to Serve as Homecoming Queen,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXX No. 5 (22 October 1976) pp. 3.

⁴⁰ Karen Dworski and Joy Keller, “More Than Meets Your Eye,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXX No. 7 (5 November 1976) pp. 3.

women are powerless and valueless other than as manipulatable [sic] things.”⁴¹ They also illustrated the potential connection between these films with their violent sexual images and the incidence of gang rapes and other “sexual atrocities” on campus.⁴²

While these letters and other actions of protest showed a growing concern over the existence of demeaning attitudes toward women, they also showed that these attitudes were prevalent enough on campus for students to feel the need to take action. Despite the great strides that women all across the country had made in terms of asserting their equality and worth as human beings, much of society, both in Gettysburg and in the nation in general, still defined women in terms of their sexuality or domesticity. A campus-wide survey conducted in 1976 showed that twenty-eight percent of the men on campus still believed that women should be kept in the home; even more surprising, perhaps, is the fact that twelve percent of the women on campus shared this belief.⁴³ The fact that female students receiving a liberal arts education (which would ideally prepare them to take their place in the larger world) would believe that they had no place in that world, showed the extent to which women still had to struggle against a society that viewed them as second-class citizens.

Even in more recent years, the view of women as sexual objects endured. In a letter to the editor in a 1993 issue of the *Gettysburgian*, a male student made a crude and blatantly sexist suggestion: the establishment of college-run brothels. He went on to list several of the benefits of his plan: an enormous source of revenue for the college, a

⁴¹ Letter to the editor, *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXX No. 12 (13 February 1976) pp.2.

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ “Profile Compares Gettysburg Students to National Norms,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXX No. 18 (9 April 1976) pp. 8.

“perfect, controlled market environment for economics and management majors,”⁴⁴ and lastly, an incentive to sports recruits.⁴⁵ While there is a good chance that this student’s suggestion was facetious, it still revealed the continuing sexual objectification of women on campus. Even the tongue-in-cheek suggestion that the sexual exploitation of women should be used to benefit the college financially was an offensive statement showing that women at Gettysburg still had to contend with a certain amount of sexual discrimination.

Since the 1970s, in addition to fighting degrading sexual attitudes, women have also had to fight to receive consideration for, and control of, their bodies. A major aspect of the sexual revolution was the growing attention paid to women’s health issues; this included women’s efforts to gain greater sexual and reproductive controls and freedoms. Female students at Gettysburg had an especially difficult time bringing attention to their health and reproductive needs. In many ways, the administration and the Board of Trustees turned a blind eye to the issue of sex because it was a controversial subject. It is human nature to ignore uncomfortable subjects because it is simply easier to pretend they do not exist and hope they will disappear. However, ignoring an uncomfortable subject never does resolve the issue, and this was true for the college’s neglect of women’s health and reproductive issues.

The birth control pill had been introduced in the 1960s, and as female students’ awareness of their rights grew, so did their demand for access to this and other methods of contraception. In fact, demand for on-campus access to contraception was not limited to female students; male students wanted access to contraception as well. In a 1975

⁴⁴ Larson E. Whipsnade, “Proposed brothel would be sports recruiting incentive,” *Gettysburgian* (1 April 1993) pp. 12.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

article in the *Gettysburgian*, Duncan R. James wrote about the “sexual situation”⁴⁶ on campus. He mocked the college’s naïve and negligent attitude toward sexual activity among students, saying, “. . . if the College regulates visitation hours and refuses to allow distribution of birth control methods at the Infirmary, then obviously, sexual intercourse will cease to exist.”⁴⁷ Reminding readers of the Infirmary’s duty to provide services that would benefit all students, he pointed out that sexually active students were being denied benefits to which they had a right as mature, responsible adults.⁴⁸ The lack of available birth control would continue to be an issue for the college, and in particular for female students, since it has long been the norm that contraception is a woman’s responsibility. Ten years after James wrote his demand for access to contraception, birth control was still not available at the campus health center. A student survey conducted by Barb Nilan and Christine Theiman in 1985 showed that students, both male and female, still disagreed with this policy, saying that the availability of birth control was the responsibility of the health center because it would address a serious health issue on campus.⁴⁹

Often, students were on their own in the fight to gain access to contraception. Janice Onieal, a nurse practitioner at the Health Center, remembered several faculty members who were very vocally opposed on religious and moral grounds to the distribution of condoms.⁵⁰ Even after the Board of Trustees gave the health center permission to prescribe contraception on-site, employees still had to “jump through

⁴⁶ Duncan R. James, “Inconceivable!”, *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXIX No. 2 (26 September 1975) pp. 2.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Barb Nilan and Christine Theiman, “Birth Control Questions,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXIX No. 9 (8 November 1985) pp. 6.

⁵⁰ Janice Onieal, interview by Sara Gustafson, 3 March 2004.

hoops,” according to Onieal.⁵¹ Still, the college did make gradual progress in paying attention to the reproductive rights of students, as evidenced by an article in a 1987 issue of the *Gettysburgian* by a health center nurse practitioner, who educated students on the different types of contraception.⁵² This article showed that the college was finally paying attention to the issue of reproductive rights, and by extension, women’s health issues. In fact, as access to contraception increased, so did access to gynecological services. Where female students had once been forced to seek out gynecological care in town, in the mid-1990s the health center began offering on-site exams, STD testing, and pregnancy testing.⁵³ Although for many years, the college’s refusal to address these issues of women’s health and reproductive rights detracted greatly from women’s equal status on campus, its policies gradually changed to allow for less discrimination against students, particularly women, who chose to be sexually active.

Women at Gettysburg have come a long way in gaining equality in athletics, academics, and social life. However, the largest remaining obstacle to true gender equality on campus is, and has always been, the incidence of sexual harassment, assault, and rape. According to William Lafferty, Director of Security Services, the number of reported sexual assaults has been at an average of three or four per year during the last several years; however, national statistics show that up to eighty percent of sexual assaults on college campuses go unreported.⁵⁴ Lafferty also stated that most incidents of

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Connie Songer, “Health Information Project,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LCI No. 3 (2 October 1987) pp. 7.

⁵³ Janice Onieal, interview.

⁵⁴ William Lafferty, email interview by Sara Gustafson, 2 March 2004. Statistics prior to 2001 were impossible to retrieve, since federal legislation only requires Safety and Security to keep records on file for a specified period of time.

sexual violence occur between students in some form of a relationship, and that in nine cases out of ten, alcohol has been used by both the victim and the perpetrator.⁵⁵

Despite the ground gained by women at Gettysburg in areas such as athletics and employment, sexual violence has remained a constant threat to both women's safety and to gender equality over the past twenty-five years. The years 1978-1983 saw a string of sexual assaults, indecent exposures, and even rapes.⁵⁶ The most high-profile case came in 1992 with the arrest of a senior male student for six counts of forcible rape and nine counts of other sexual assaults.⁵⁷ These and other instances of sexual violence created, and continue to create, an atmosphere of danger and mistrust that could make the climate for female students extremely uncomfortable.

While the majority of sexual violence since 1975 went unreported, there was an informal consciousness on campus that such violence was occurring. Riggs remembered gang rape at fraternity parties being a "not infrequent occurrence."⁵⁸ In more recent years, date rape drugs have become a new issue of concern for female students. In the late 1990s, the security office declared several instances of date rape to be unfounded because of a lack of evidence⁵⁹; however, Riggs said that she knows "date rape goes on for sure" because she has personally talked to female students who have been victims.⁶⁰ Not only do these instances show that women have continued to be subject to sexual

⁵⁵ William Lafferty, interview by Sara Gustafson, 5 March 2004.

⁵⁶ "Unknown Assailants Use Scare Tactics on Women," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXI No. 23 (12 May 1978) pp.1; "Glassick Confirms Board; SAE Suspended for 3 Years," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXII No. 18 (21 March 1979) pp. 1.; "College Co-ed Raped in Pre-Break Incident," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXIII No. 9 (11 January 1980) pp. 4.; "Three Assaults Occur in Past Ten Days," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXIII No. 11 (25 January 1980) pp. 1.; Dan Cicala, "Sexual Assault Spurs Tighter Security," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXVII No. 1 (26 September 1983) pp. 1.; Dan Cicala, "Another Sexual Assault Occurs, Spurs Urgings for Security," *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXVII No. 7 (14 November 1983) pp. 3.

⁵⁷ Tim Bish, Shawn Bunting, and Heather Wissner, "Senior arrested for rapes," *Gettysburgian* Vol. XCVI No. 6 (22 October 1992) pp. 1, 17.

⁵⁸ Janet Riggs, interview.

⁵⁹ William Lafferty, interview.

⁶⁰ Janet Riggs, interview.

objectification and violence since the 1970s, the fact that most victims of sexual violence fail to report their attackers shows that there is still an air of discrimination and animosity toward women on campus. Riggs clearly remembered this unfriendly, unsupportive climate toward female victims of sexual violence. She said that many times during her undergraduate years, she saw female victims, and not their male attackers, being blamed for the incident by both male and female students. According to Riggs, “People would look at these women and label them, like, ‘She’s a slut.’”⁶¹ This tendency to blame the victim instead of the perpetrator created a hostile environment for women struggling with sexual violence at Gettysburg.

As the incidence of sexual violence grew, the college tried to address the issue in various ways. In 1978, a group of male students formed an escort service for female students.⁶² The administration, in conjunction with the security office, encouraged female students to walk in groups, stay in well-lit areas, and lock their doors. In more recent years, Gormley said, “The number of emergency call boxes increased and I think residence halls were moving to being locked twenty-four hours a day.”⁶³ Educational programs run by the health center and the security office have resulted in a slight decrease in the number of sexual assaults reported. However, the fact that the security office received reports of six forcible rapes and five other sexual offenses between 2001 and 2003 shows that sexual violence has remained an obstacle to gender equality on campus.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² “Student Service Offers Women Campus Escorts,” *Gettysburgian* Vol. LXXXI No. 21 (28 April 1978) pp. 8.

⁶³ Colleen Gormley, email interview.

In addition to sexual violence, sexual harassment has existed on campus since 1975 for both female students and female faculty. Sexist jokes, disparaging remarks, and unwelcome attention such as touching or suggestive comments were common occurrences on campus. While the majority of sexual harassment occurred between male and female students, there were also reports of sexual harassment and sexist behavior by the faculty toward the students. The Women’s Commission assessment stated that seventy-five percent of the students interviewed reported sexual harassment between students; twenty-five percent reported harassment or sexism on the part of a faculty member.⁶⁴ Iannello spoke of two instances when female students were sexually harassed by a male faculty member. In one case, the faculty member would blatantly hit on his students, going so far as to attend weekend fraternity parties and make passes at female students. In another case, a male professor would insist on hugging his female students and would ask them to do such things as straighten his tie for him.⁶⁵ The Women’s Commission assessment also reported a certain amount of sexist behavior on the part of male faculty members toward their female counterparts. These behaviors included male professors referring to each other as “professor” or “Dr.” while referring to female professors with the same degrees as “Ms.”⁶⁶ Sexual harassment and sexist behavior continues to negatively impact the climate for women on campus because it discourages them from fully participating in academic life, and it demeans their contributions as members of the college community. The areas of sexual violence and sexual harassment were, and continue to be, the most obvious areas of gender inequality.

⁶⁴ Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 19.

⁶⁵ Kathleen Iannello, interview.

⁶⁶ Bogart and Boyles, *Assessment on Climate*, pp. 19.

On the other hand, the area where Gettysburg most obviously fostered gender equality was the establishment of the Women's Center and the Women's Studies Department. In 1988, the Women's Center was founded. While the Center did not address the issue of women's studies in the curriculum, it did provide programs of special interest to women, such as sexual abuse counseling and speakers on women's rights. As interest in women's studies and gender issues grew nationwide, female students and faculty at Gettysburg began to demand courses dealing with women's issues. Some students took this to the extreme. In 1986, members of the Women's Action Group, a student-run women's group, boycotted classes in protest of the lack of courses specifically dealing with women.⁶⁷ Showing how their vision of the college had broadened to include women and women's issues, later that same year the faculty voted to establish a Women's Studies Program.⁶⁸ The expansion of the program, and the establishment in 1993 of Women's Studies as a major,⁶⁹ helped to improve the general academic climate for women by enhancing the value placed on women's contributions to the college community. The major faced, and still faces, some instances of inequality; for example, any student who majors in Women's Studies must also major in another department, and until this year, no Women's Studies faculty member was offered a tenured position in that department.⁷⁰ However, despite these inequalities, the fact that such a department has received so much positive reaction and undergone so much growth since its inception shows that Gettysburg has been slowly developing a more fair and positive attitude toward women.

⁶⁷ Lisa J. Palm, "WAG Probes Inequities," *Gettysburgian* Vol. XC (11 April 1986) pp. 3.

⁶⁸ "The Women's Studies Program," flier (2004-5) pp. 2.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Joyce Sprague, interview by Sara Gustafson, 5 March 2004.

In the years since 1975, women at Gettysburg experienced changes that affected everything from their academic pursuits to their reproductive health. Like the rest of the nation, Gettysburg responded to the sexual revolution by expanding the roles and opportunities open to women and by ensuring the equal treatment of women. Despite the advances made in women's athletics, employment opportunities, and academic life, however, women at Gettysburg continue to experience instances of sexual harassment, discrimination, and even violence. Because of these continuing incidents, Gettysburg has not yet been transformed into a place of true gender equality. True equality can only be achieved when all members of the college community feel equally valued, appreciated, and protected. While the college has made great strides toward gender equality, there still remains work to be done to ensure that women at Gettysburg feel truly respected as members of the college community.

An Ideological War of ‘Blood and Soil’ and Its Effect on the Agricultural Propaganda and Policy of the Nazi Party, 1929-1939

Keith Swaney

What is Propaganda?

One then builds a whole system of thought on such a brief, crisply formulated idea. The idea does not remain limited to this single statement; rather it is applied to every aspect of daily life and becomes the guide for all human activity. It becomes a worldview.¹

Dr. Joseph Goebbels spoke those words on January 9, 1928 to an audience of party members at the “Hochschule fuer Politik,” a series of talks that investigated the role of propaganda in the National Socialist movement. A few months prior to this event, voters had elected a farmer, Werner Willikens, in the South Hanover-Brunswick district of the Reichstag over a railroad worker.² Seemingly, this election was unrelated to Goebbels’s speech on the purpose of propaganda; however, Willikens’s election to the Reichstag reflected Goebbels’s call for diversified propaganda that would highlight “every aspect of daily life.”

How did this propaganda campaign drive the Nazi movement throughout the late-1920s? Propaganda, first of all, became the core of the Nazi campaign. The “worldview” about which Goebbels spoke explains why the National Socialists started to target German peasants with propaganda by early 1928. Naturally, propaganda—speeches, film, visual art, and even legislative proposals—remained linked to the party’s attack on the inability of the Weimar government to battle the Great Depression. According to a police report written in April 1930, Germans in the Mosel Valley

¹ Excerpt from Joseph Goebbels, “Knowledge and Propaganda,” as cited in *Signale der neuen Zeit. 25 ausgewaehlte Reden von Dr. Joseph Goebbels*. 1932. German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb54.htm>.>

² John Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika: The NSDAP and Agriculture in Germany, 1928-1945* (London: Sage, 1976), 3.

encountered the Nazis' propaganda techniques first hand. The writer observed, "They [the National Socialists] first test the mood of the population and then shape their propaganda meetings accordingly. Their tactics are basically the same everywhere: opposition to taxes and higher salaries for government officials. But the National Socialist idea has taken root in the minds of many. . . ."³ Even though the Nazis continued to bash verbally the Weimar leaders, the party needed a group of people, namely the peasantry, who would be living, breathing specimens of the Nazi ideology.

During the "Hochschule fuer Politik," Goebbels noted that propaganda becomes effective when a "brief, crisply formulated idea" evolves into a "worldview." Furthermore, as he commented later in the address, "as propaganda draws an ever-growing following to the idea, the idea broadens, becomes more flexible. It no longer stays in a few heads, but wants to include everything."⁴ In 1928, the Nazis not only re-examined their propaganda objectives to broaden their electoral appeal, but realized that the nation had changed as well. The election of Farmer Willikens proved to the Nazis that only a diversified propaganda campaign, tailored to the different strata of German society, would be effective.

As a result, the Nazis continued to attack the economically impotent Weimar government. However, economic promises could not possibly hope to drive the entire movement forward, and thus propaganda became the tool by which the Nazis could instill new ideas into the people. Consequently, the National Socialist movement reached out to the grassroots of German society, especially the peasantry, during the late 1920s. In

³ "Police report from Mosel Valley" of April 1930, in *Inside Hitler's Germany: A Documentary History of Life in the Third Reich*, ed. Benjamin Sax (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1992), 101.

⁴ Joseph Goebbels, "Knowledge and Propaganda." German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb54.html>>

Lower Bavaria, for instance, Gregor Strasser emerged as one of the influential leaders whose ideas helped to pique farmers' interest in Nazi politics. According to a report published in the *Straubinger Beobachter* on September 3, 1932, Strasser announced the party's commitment to the German farmer: "The first priority [of the NSDAP⁵ is] to revive the productive capacity of the German people to feed itself. . . ."⁶ A month later Strasser provided the ideological context for the National Socialist policy: "the problem of the German peasant is fundamentally a problem of finding a new conception of [the] state."⁷ Strasser not only explained that the peasants would feed the soldiers, industrial laborers, and white-collar workers of the economy; he recognized their importance to a "new conception of the state." The peasant became the key to the Nazi ideological puzzle. As a result, he became the foundation on which the Nazis built their "worldview." From the propaganda program of 1930 to the policy measures instituted during the years of the Third Reich, the Nazi regime ideologically revered the peasant and glorified his role in German society. The Nazis developed an agricultural policy based on the peasant as the core of their "worldview," known as "Blood and Soil."

Nazi Agrarian Theory: Background to the Propaganda Campaign

As Adolf Hitler sat in his Landsberg prison cell and dictated *Mein Kampf* in 1924, he iterated similar ideas regarding the mission of propaganda. "The function of propaganda," Hitler stated, "does not lie in the scientific training of the individual, but in calling the masses' attention to certain facts, processes, necessities. . . ."⁸ Crucial to Hitler's definition of propaganda was his reference to the "masses"—the Germans who

⁵ The Nazi party.

⁶ Gregor Strasser, as cited in Kim Holmes, *The NSDAP and the Crisis of Agrarian Conservatism in Lower Bavaria: National Socialism and the Peasants' Road to Modernity* (New York: Garland, 1991), 100.

⁷ Holmes, *The NSDAP and the Crisis of Agrarian Conservatism in Lower Bavaria*, 99.

⁸ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, trans. Ralph Manheim (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971), 179.

would build a new “worldview” for the Nazis by their adherence to certain principles. However, racial theory also shaped Hitler’s conception of propaganda; that is, propaganda was intended only for the racially pure German. Only this type of individual would understand the party’s “worldview” depicted in propaganda sources, for only he or she possessed the ability to carry out Hitler’s dream of a noble, vibrant *Volksgemeinschaft* (“national community”) based on racial homogeneity.

Hitler spoke of “true idealism” in *Mein Kampf*—the “subordination of the interests and life of the individual to the community . . . to the ultimate will of Nature.”⁹ Pertinent to Hitler’s vision of the German community was the hierarchical system on which it would be based. In other words, German citizens were meant to serve the state and ultimately nature by producing strong, healthy children who would ensure the future of the racially superior “national community.” Hitler similarly reasoned:

A philosophy of life which endeavors to reject the democratic mass idea and give this earth to the best people—that is, the highest humanity—must logically obey the same aristocratic principle within this people and make sure that the leadership and the highest influence in this people fall to the best minds.¹⁰

This Darwinian notion of a “selected race” permeated Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. For both Hitler and the Nazi party, this “selected race” was an elite aristocracy—a noble group composed of the “best people” selected by nature to be the representatives of the German *Volk*.

According to the “worldview” envisioned by Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, one of the earliest sources of Nazi propaganda, the peasants were the group of noble Germans who would build the new Reich. Ostensibly, the peasants would feed the physical needs of all

⁹ Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, 299.

¹⁰ Adolf Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*, in *Inside Hitler’s Germany: A Documentary History of Life in the Third Reich*, ed. Benjamin Sax, 256.

Germans by their work as farmers. Yet, on a figurative level, Hitler held that the peasantry fostered not only the physical needs of the *Volk*, but their spiritual ones as well. To Hitler, the plough became the means by which the farmers would give the nation its daily bread.¹¹ In addition to the plow as an economic symbol, it would come to represent the biological significance of the peasantry as well.¹² Hitler stated in *Mein Kampf*, “For a time a people and a state walk on this path, they will concentrate their attention to augmenting the racial, valuable core of the people and their fertility.”¹³ Consequently, Hitler wanted to revert back to a traditional, pre-modern state where the toil of peasants enabled people to earn their daily bread without the fears created by modernity, including poverty, disease, and racial miscegenation. In the pre-modern, romantic German past, liberalism exerted no influence on the *Volk*. Rather, according to Hitler’s *Weltanschauung*, people lived in tight-knit families that exhibited proper gender roles both economically and socially. Women, for example, concentrated on the family sphere and took pride in their roles as mothers and wives. Unlike the post-World War I era and the liberal tenets that motivated women to pursue new endeavors, the traditional, agrarian world depicted life in its purest form for Hitler and the Nazi party. Thus, by ascribing certain moral characteristics to the peasantry, Hitler hoped to portray two contrasting worlds: one was a place in which the content, noble peasant toiled for the German race; conversely, the ideas of liberalism, Communism, and modernism influenced the degeneracy of the other one.

¹¹ Gustavo Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants: Agrarian Policy of the Third Reich, 1930-1939* (New York: Berg, 1990), 19.

¹² Mai, *Rasse und Raum*, 39.

¹³ Adolf Hitler, as cited in Uwe Mai, *Rasse und Raum: Agrarpolitik, Sozial- und Raumplanung im NS Staat* (Muenchen: Ferdinand Schoeningh, 2002), 38. From this point forward, the English translations of German texts are my own. In German the cited text reads: „Denn hat erst ein Volk und ein Staat diesen Weg einmal beschritten, dann wird sich von selbst das Augenmerk darauf richten, gerade den rassisch wertvollen Kern des Volkes und gerade seine Fruchtbarkeit zu steigern.“

Alfred Rosenberg, a major Nazi philosopher who, like Hitler, argued for a racial definition of the peasantry, claimed that a “struggle between race and race” characterized the essence of the peasant’s life. According to the NSDAP, this biological war undermined the class warfare that Karl Marx had claimed was the basis of society.¹⁴ Rosenberg held that the German peasantry was not an international class, fighting against the evils of a modern, capitalist economy, but rather a people who existed *within* and *for* Germany. To the Nazis, the Weimar economy represented the inefficacy of the international, modern economy as a whole. The party, especially under the leadership of Minister of Agriculture Richard Walther Darré, championed a society in which the peasant fought to uphold the sanctity of the German race against the evils of liberalism and modernity: “Whoever wants to urge liberal methods, sins against the spirit of the German peasantry and therefore against the German people.”¹⁵ Whether a farmer lived in the middle regions of Germany or in Lower Bavaria, this spirit of anti-liberalism, reflected in NSDAP propaganda, was intended to unify the peasantry in a war for racial survival.

“There is no doubt, that we [the German people] owe to liberalism the solution of individualism that has produced a relationship-less society,” Darré wrote in *Ziel und Weg der nationalsozialistischen Agrarpolitik*. In the same piece he built an argument against economic individualism:

¹⁴ Alfred Rosenberg, as cited in Mathias Eidenbenz, *Blut und Boden: Zu Funktion und Genese der Metaphern des Agrarismus und Biologismus in der nationalsozialistischen Bauernpropaganda R.W. Darrés* (New York: Lang, 1993), 5. The German text reads: „Geschichte und Zukunftsaufgabe bedeuten nicht mehr Kampf von Klasse gegen Klasse, sondern Kampf zwischen Rasse und Rasse.“

¹⁵ Speech given by Darré in defense of the Reichsnaehrstandsgesetzes on September 19, 1933, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie und Agrarpolitik im Staat Hitlers*, ed. Gustavo Corni (Idstein, Germany: Schulz-Kirchner, 1994), 86. The German text reads: „Wer . . . liberalistischen Methoden draengen will, versuedigt sich damit am Geist deutschen Bauertums und damit am deutschen Volk.“

Strong countries attempted to restrict the economic egoism of the individual . . . this means that one attempts to mobilize the economic egoism of the individual in the interests of the national economy of the people. Here we have the key to understanding the things of a national economy, which exists in most large states of the world.”¹⁶

Darré insisted that only a national economy would rid the German people of the evil of “economic egoism” and thus resurrect the nation. The international economy supported by the Weimar Republic, according to Darré, caused the Great Depression and would lead to more financial instability in the future. The Nazi party needed two things to occur in order to convince peasants that they were the solution to rebuilding the nation and the German race: first of all, it needed to construct a propaganda program based on concrete objectives; secondly, the party needed to *prove* that destructive forces had infiltrated the nation.

The NSDAP used an incident in the town of Wohrdener, Germany to drive its propaganda campaign forward. During the month of March 1929, Communists and Nazi party members clashed in the town; a brawl ensued, leaving two Nazis dead. Behind a campaign which claimed that international Marxism had permeated the entire country, National Socialists were able to convert this village, as well as other peasants who started to believe that the Nazis spoke the truth. As John Farquharson appropriately noted, “A factor here was the close-knit rural society, which induced pressure from existing peasant members on others in the parish still outside, which in some cases amounted to the threat

¹⁶ Richard Walther Darré, *Ziel und Weg der Nationalsozialistischen Agrarpolitik* (Muenchen: Zentral Verlag der NSDAP, 1934), 7 and 11. The first text reads in German: „Es ist kein Zweifel, dass wir dem Liberalismus die Loesung des Individuums von beziehungslos gewordenen Bindungen verdanken.“ The second excerpt, in which Darré discussed the nature of a national economy, reads: „Zwar versuchten starke Laender den wirtschaftlichen Egoismus des Einzelnen dadurch einzuzengen, dass man sich zu einer Art von nationalem Wirtschaftsgebilde entschloss, d.h., dass man den Wirtschaftsegoismus des Einzelnen im Interesse der nationalen Wirtschaft des Volkes zu mobilisieren versuchte. Hier haben wir den Schluessel zum Verstaendnis der Dinge, die bei den meisten grossen Staaten der Welt zwangslaeufig eine Art nationaler Wirtschaft ins Leben gerufen haben.“

of a boycott if they did not join in.¹⁷ Of course, many of the Nazi warnings against Marxism consisted of pure emotion over reason. One NSDAP account later claimed, “the movement would never have conquered the people . . . if its propaganda speeches had been based upon reason only.”¹⁸ Did the peasants across Germany completely understand the Nazi doctrine? No. As Farquharson argued, even the Bavarian peasantry joined the NSDAP in groups, rather as individuals. This trend, however, was significant because it suggests that the Nazis induced group conformity within the peasantry. As Goebbels stated in 1928, propaganda is a “means to an end” that should depict the Nazi party as a “movement that can conquer the broad masses.”¹⁹ To increase communal and regional support for their programs, therefore, the Nazis used various incidents, such as the one in Wohrdener, to attack the status quo and thus drive their propaganda campaign forward. The next step in the Nazi movement to mobilize the peasantry was the formation of distinct, yet ideologically-inspired agricultural programs.

The 1930 Program

1930 was a pivotal year for the Nazi propaganda machine. First of all, the NSDAP published “The Official Party Manifesto on the Position of the NSDAP with Regard to the Farming Population and Agriculture.” This document officially labeled the peasant as the guardian of the nation’s rural health, the source of its youth, and the “backbone of its military potential.” In addition, it ascribed a number of powers to the state regarding agricultural administration. Under the manifesto, the state would control agricultural credit as well as the number of small and medium-sized farms across

¹⁷ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 9-10.

¹⁸ NSDAP party member, as cited in Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 19.

¹⁹ Goebbels, “Knowledge and Propaganda.” German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb54.htm>>

Germany.²⁰ According to the Nazi party's agrarian spokesman, the aforementioned Werner Willikens, the program would decrease the number of agricultural products imported into Germany, facilitate industrial growth, and give farmers more purchasing power. In addition, the plan would help remedy the shortcomings of the current government—high taxes, high fertilizer prices, and a lack of protection against the foreign market.²¹

Enter Richard Walther Darré, Nazi expert on animal husbandry and Minister of Agriculture from 1933 to 1942. Darré had fought on the Western Front during the First World War and earned a degree in agronomy at the University of Halle in the early 1920s. At the end of the decade, he produced a series of publications on livestock selection that applied to racial theory. Evidently, this individual attracted the attention of Adolf Hitler, for Darré also believed that the German peasantry should pursue selective breeding.²² Even though he would not become Agricultural Minister until the Nazis seized political power, Darré's work prior to 1933 was extremely important, as it established how the party would formulate agrarian legislation when it came to power. In a speech delivered in June of 1930 he announced:

In such a state [as Germany] the German farmer is the cornerstone of the state's policy. That should not only mean that agricultural romanticism should be promoted, but rather that the laws of blood and soil must find their point of reference as a top priority.²³

²⁰ Clifford Lovin, "R. Walther Darré, Nazi Agricultural Policy, and Preparation for War," *Occasional Papers in German Studies* No. 7 (Dec., 1995): 3-4.

²¹ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 14.

²² Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 21.

²³ Speech of Darré's delivered on June 22, 1930 to the "Nordic Ring," in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 68-69. For this excerpt the German text reads: „In einem solchen Staat ist der deutsche Bauer wieder der Eckstein des Staatsgedankens. Das soll nun nicht heissen, dass bauerliche Romantik getrieben werden soll, sondern dass die Gesetze von Blut und Boden in erster Linie in diesem Staate ihre Beruecksichtigung finden muessen.“

In August of that year, Darré laid out two memorandums before the Nazi leadership. The first suggested that the NSDAP bring all food-producers under its control, isolate urban areas, and economically destroy the Republic. Despite the concrete plans laid out in this memorandum, the party considered Darré's ideas too radical; his plan involved illegal methods of obtaining power. Moreover, the NSDAP only had twelve seats in the Reichstag when Darré composed this document. More important for the Nazi propaganda movement, however, was Darré's second proposal. In it he suggested that the Nazis needed a structure to oversee agriculture and the agrarian propaganda campaign. Darré once commented, "There must be no farm or holding, no co-operative or rural industry, no local farmers union . . . where our [party members] have not so worked that we cannot immediately paralyze the structure."²⁴ According to Darré, the apparatus would consist of regional and local leaders under the supervision of the Agricultural Minister. Even though "reliable farmers" would be taken on as "honorary advisers" at the village level, Darré constructed the system so that advisers in the village community did not need to be professional farmers, but efficient technicians of propaganda; they would carry Darré's philosophy of "Blood and Soil"—and with it a revolution in ideas to "paralyze the structure" of society in Weimar Germany—directly to the local peasantry.²⁵

All of these radical promises could not take root at the local level unless the party addressed how each proposal would work. In the area around Northeim, Germany, for instance, a large number of conservative voters supported the "Guelphs," the *Deutsch-Hannoverische Partei*, during the later years of the Republic. This party supported the

²⁴ Darré, as cited in Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 24.

²⁵ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 13.

“peasantry, shopkeepers, and artisans—particularly in the oldest Guelph lands” and advocated states’ rights and even separatism. However, by early 1930 the party’s influence had waned, and the Nazi propaganda machine accelerated its efforts to mobilize the people of the town. By supporting a platform that attacked the SPD²⁶ as Marxists, the Nazis, both in Northeim and throughout Germany, recruited local support and new party members.²⁷ Unlike the SPD, which believed a class struggle was inherent to Germany’s past and present, the emerging Nazis theorized that a racial struggle, which required the solidarity of the peasantry, had engulfed the nation.

With the propaganda machine in place, the NSDAP could begin to showcase the nationalist, revolutionary nature of its program. In Northeim, the movement attracted farmers and other citizens by promoting recreational and social programs, including sporting events, free “cultural movies,” and vocational training courses for the large number of unemployed persons.²⁸ Furthermore, the Nazis established agricultural training courses in German villages to preach “Blood and Soil” to the peasantry. In an article entitled “Coming Tasks of Rural Propaganda,” Gustav Straebe described the nature of this training:

The farmers’ educational courses also gave rhetorically gifted party members, and not only those from rural areas, but also those from cities who wanted to learn more, fundamental knowledge on overcoming liberalism, and therefore the proletariat. It gives him the resources he can use in future public meetings to build the worldview of National Socialism brick by brick.²⁹

²⁶ *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*

²⁷ For information regarding the propaganda machine and *Gau* leadership in Northeim, see William S. Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power: The Experience of a Single German Town, 1922-1945* (London: Franklin Watts, 1984), 33.

²⁸ Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power*, 72.

²⁹ Gustav Straebe, “Naechste Aufgaben der laendlichen Propaganda.” German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/wilweg01.htm>

Staebe's work was important on two levels. First of all, it reestablished how propaganda should transmit a "worldview" to its audience: specifically, as a mason builds a wall, "brick by brick." Secondly, it utilized technical terms. The text referred to Marxist doctrine and included words such as "liberalism," the "proletariat," and "worldview." During this early stage of agrarian propaganda, the Nazis used these terms to show that the party's struggle was between "us" and "them," as they needed to promote conformity within the peasantry.

Uwe Mai has argued that 1930 provided the basis for a "biologicalization" of the NSDAP's agrarian program.³⁰ Darré's "Blood and Soil" theory, in other words, focused on the peasant's duty to the German race. A *Protokoll* from the Reich cabinet meeting of September 26, 1933 discussed how the Nazi leadership conceived the biological function of the peasant: "In all states of the world, the peasantry is the nation's source of blood. The existence of a people rises and falls with the stability of the peasantry."³¹ The author of the *Protokoll* remarked that the peasantry ensures the survival of a nation by producing food. This is true in an economic sense. However, the Nazis took this philosophy one step further and claimed that the peasant was involved in a biological war to "feed" the pure, mighty German race. As a result, the Nazi propaganda movement disseminated sources that glorified the peasantry on a higher level than mere food producers. Behind "future [economic] rewards and answers to the profound identity crisis into which they had been plunged for some time by the inexorable process of mechanization and

³⁰ Mai, *Rasse und Raum*, 40. Mai argued, „... gab 1930 der Partei die entscheidenden Impulse fuer eine „Biologisierung ihres Agrarprogramms.“

³¹ From the minutes of the Reich cabinet meeting on September 26, 1933, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 103. The German text reads: „In allen Staaten der Welt sei das Bauernvolk die Blutquelle der Nation. Die Existenz eines Volkes stehe und falle mit der Stabilisierung des Bauerntums.“ Later on in the report, the author notes, „Er [der Bauer] muesse deshalb dem Kampf des Wirtschaftslebens entruueckt werden.“ In other words, this passage stated that the peasant must bear the struggle of the German economic life.

industrialization,” the party praised German peasants to highlight their worth to the Nazi “worldview.”³² Ideologically, they became the keys to national revitalization.

Between 1930 and 1932, the NSDAP swept up increasing support in the rural areas of Germany. During the last years of the Weimar Republic, peasants experienced falling prices for their agricultural products, low protective tariffs when selling their goods in the international market, and constant bickering and division within the agrarian communities across Germany.³³ Darré’s “Blood and Soil” ideology, whether or not the peasants grasped the essence of it—most probably did not—accomplished its task, especially during these financially challenging years. “Blood and Soil” rejuvenated a lost sense of pride within the German peasantry. In the *Voelkische Beobachter*, a NSDAP-backed newspaper, a writer claimed:

On the one hand we have the strong, robust virile peasant, moulded by the eternal struggle with nature and the land. A product of the earth, a fighter, a born warrior. At his side is a German woman, a peasant woman, his faithful companion and proud mother of their children through whom the future will be made and history was made. On the other hand, the debased city-dweller, weak, effeminate and cowardly.³⁴

The author of this passage was consistent; he ascribed all of the positive qualities of German-ness to the peasantry: males were “robust” specimens, while females were “faithful companions” and “proud mothers.” According to the author’s logic, “Blood and Soil” was a philosophy that reinforced both history and traditional gender roles.

Historically, the Nazis claimed, it had always existed within peasant families. At the family level, men and women possessed equal, yet different roles in terms of their value

³² From the minutes of the Reich cabinet meeting on September 26, 1933, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 103.

³³ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 25-26.

³⁴ Article in the *Voelkische Beobachter* from January 9, 1932, as cited in Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 28.

to this ideology. As Jill Stephenson argued in *Women in Nazi Germany*, the functional differences between both sexes stemmed from their “contrasting natures and their complementary functions. In essence, this affirmed the traditional division of labor, with men dominating the public sphere and women controlling the private sphere. . . .”³⁵ Men were supposed to be healthy, strong specimens who fought the “eternal struggle with . . . the land”; conversely, women protected the health of the German race because they fought the “eternal struggle with nature.” They would accomplish this mission by remaining loyal and subordinate to their husbands and raising their children to be obedient servants of the state.

One could say that the Nazis envisioned the woman as the spiritual head of the family, while the man was the economic head. Maternal strength, although not conceptualized in similar terms to the physical strength of men, would lead to a new “worldview” envisioned by Dr. Walther Gross in a speech to German women: “Let us then together follow the path to a new worldview. Let us go the path of blood and race . . . to build a state. . . . German women today have the good fortune to see a strong and loyal woman at their head.”³⁶ In addition to a plethora of propaganda speeches addressed to the German peasantry, the NSDAP propaganda machine utilized art as well. Fitting with Joseph Goebbels’s belief that propaganda should convey a “worldview,” art would specifically target the peasantry by illustrating the harmony and order of agrarian life. In 1932 an officer of the German government noted, “In the German art rages a struggle about death and life, nothing different than the field of politics. And besides the

³⁵ Jill Stephenson, *Women in Nazi Germany* (London: Pearson, 2001), 19.

³⁶ Walter Gross, “National Socialist Racial Policy: A Speech to German Women.” German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 4 April 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/gross.htm>.>

struggle for power the struggle about art should be led by the same sense of seriousness and determination.”³⁷

The Nazi “Worldview” in Painting

For the Nazi propaganda campaign, art would convey highly technical ideology to the peasantry by illustrating ordinary people doing ordinary tasks. Thus, it would simplify the Nazi doctrine and make it practical. Moreover, art would depict the noble qualities of the peasantry about which Darré spoke and wrote. By showing the peasant in romanticized, agrarian settings, the NSDAP used art to depict what author J.G. Fichte had noted about the “genuine German” as early as 1808: “The genuine German is loyal, modest, pious, and hard working, the courageous defender of the fatherland.”³⁸ In a painting entitled “Harvest,” for instance, the artist captured a group of farmers cutting and binding wheat from the fields. Despite their intense labor in the foreground of the image, however, the beautiful scenery of the “Fatherland” dominates most of the painting. Stately mountains guard the river valley; in addition, the viewer sees lush, healthy land that produces a rich harvest. The Nazis used propaganda like this image to educate the peasants ideologically about their proper place in the world. Even though their labor was vital to the survival of the German people, as the party contended, nature was still superior to them. According to “Blood and Soil,” the peasants were the noble

³⁷ Words of Reich minister Paul Schultze-Naunburg, as cited in Harald Olbrich, *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst, 1918-1945* (Leipzig: E.A. Seeman Verlag, 1990), 302. The German text reads: „Denn in der deutschen Kunst tobt ein Kampf um Tod und Leben, nicht anders auf dem Feld der Politik. Und neben dem Kampf um die Macht muss der Kampf um die Kunst mit demselben Ernst und derselben Entschlossenheit gefuehrt werden.“

³⁸ J.G. Fichte, *Reden an die deutsche Nation*. <<http://www.thorstenspahr.de/p10.html>> The original German text states: „Der echte Deutsche ist treu, bescheiden, fromm und fleissig, der mutige Verteidiger des Vaterlands. . . .“

figures who would safeguard the strong, healthy *Volk*—in the painting their vibrancy was connected to the health and vibrancy of nature—even as they remained the inferior servants of nature.³⁹

Based on the fear that liberalism and Marxism threatened the concept of “Blood and Soil,” Hitler advocated artwork that condemned modernity as a disease. Art, according to Hitler, needed to compel Germans to look for their roots in the golden age of the past.⁴⁰ Painting that supported the National Socialist “worldview” was integral to the propaganda movement, for it could teach people better than any leaflet or book. In a painting by Oskar Martin-Amorbach also entitled “Harvest,” the artist depicted a family—a father, mother, grandfather, and two children—to show that the true German family was orderly and behaved according to certain gender roles. Each person carries a sickle in the painting except the small child who stays close to his mother’s side. It appears as if this family is an infantry unit: its members march in a line to maintain cohesion. The father is at the head of the column, while the mother, the nurturer of the children according to the Nazi doctrine, holds the young boy’s hand. The image not only portrayed the hierarchy and order within the farming family, but the hierarchy in nature as well. Again, the subject of the work was the farm family; however, the artist, by portraying the power of nature in the background of the painting, showed the hierarchy of the natural world.⁴¹

National Socialist art reinforced what Darré said about the racial differences between Germans and Slavs: the “deep-rooted peasant nature” of Germans distinguished

³⁹ For the image of Fluegel’s “Harvest,” see the appendix, image no. 1.

⁴⁰ Henry Grosshans, *Hitler and the Artists* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1983), 23.

⁴¹ For an image of Amorbach’s “Harvest,” see the appendix, image no. 2.

them from Slavs.⁴² Moreover, according to Kim Holmes, the peasants flocked to the NSDAP program that promised a “new social order” for the peasantry, “one which simultaneously stressed hope for the future and respect for the past.” She maintained that the core of Nazi agrarian policy was not in its philosophical content, but “in its message that the Nazis would create a moral system which would reconcile the cultural and economic lives of the peasantry. . . .”⁴³ When the Nazis finally seized political power in 1933, this agrarian ideology, centered on a racial “worldview,” became legal reality.

Although the Nazis encouraged a traditionalist interpretation of history, as Holmes argued, they destroyed much of the old order throughout Germany. After the Nazis gained political power, they abruptly transformed the entire system of agrarian organization: Darré debilitated the historic, often quarrelsome agrarian unions by replacing them with one “comprehensive corporation.”⁴⁴ By 1932, these regional organizations, which had stirred up dissent in rural communities during the latter years of the Republic, had virtually disappeared.⁴⁵ In order to coordinate the remaining unions under Nazi leadership, Darré told his regional directors to get on the local governing committees by election or by “some other way.” Consequently, the SA stepped up its efforts to institute Darré’s agricultural system. In Schleswig-Holstein, for example, the SA physically attacked members of a farm union who opposed a Reich election manifesto. The police justified their response by claiming that the union had abused state funds.⁴⁶

⁴² Richard Walther Darré, as cited in Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 22.

⁴³ Kim Holmes, “The Foresaken Past: Agrarian Conservatism and National Socialism in Germany,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 17 (Oct., 1982): 681.

⁴⁴ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 44.

⁴⁵ Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 32.

⁴⁶ Material on the Coordination of the NSDAP Agricultural Administration taken from Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 45.

The *Erbhofgesetz*: “Blood and Soil” in Action

On October 1, 1933 Darré celebrated an easy political victory by holding an *Erntedanktag* (harvest festival of thanksgiving) in Bueckeberg, Germany. Over 500,000 people attended this event and listened to Darré’s words:

The German Harvest Thanksgiving Day represents the gratitude for the rich harvest of heaven and earth. It is the day of the German farmer. All groups, all classes, young and old, of the German people greet the German farmer on October 1, 1933, who was called and led by National Socialism to new freedom and new service.⁴⁷

Darré may have been correct in saying that National Socialism led the farmer to a “new service” and a new function in German society. However, during the Reich years, Darré hardly deviated from this ideological, “Blood and Soil” course. His policies never provided the peasantry with “new [economic] freedom.”

One of his first legislative moves was the Law of Hereditary Entailment (*Erbhofgesetz*). By reverting back to the agrarian program of March 1930 that stated, “German soil will not be allowed to be the object of financial speculation,” this law intended to preserve the peasantry under old German inheritance customs. Moreover, the act stipulated that no land could be sold, ensuring that it would always remain in the same family. As J.E. Farquharson argued, the peasant family had gained both security of tenure and guaranteed prices for agricultural products; additionally, the peasant family had become a privileged class, sheltered from a fluctuating world market.⁴⁸ Clearly, “Blood and Soil” continued to shape Nazi agricultural programs. As a result of this legislation, the family unit became the building block for future agrarian measures, as the

⁴⁷ Darré’s *Erntedanktag* speech (October 1, 1933), as cited in Lovin, “R. Walther Darré, Nazi Agricultural Policy, and Preparation for War,” 7.

⁴⁸ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 114.

Nazis maintained that the family, held together by distinct gender roles and a respect for order and discipline, was at the heart of the nation's revival.

Furthermore, the *Erbhofgesetz* defined the peasant based on Darré's "Blood and Soil" philosophy. "We need the peasant as the source of blood of the German people and we need him as the breadwinner of the German people," Darré remarked in a political speech.⁴⁹ What the *Erbhofgesetz* established, however, was a distinction between the peasant, the noble representative of the German people, and the independent farmer. In an essay entitled "Das Ziel" (the goal), Darré described both groups of people: the *Bauer* (the noble peasant) and the *Landwirt* (the independent farmer). He stated:

The difference lies in the fact that the *Bauer* is a term based on family law, while the *Landwirt* . . . is an economic term. That means: the peasantry safeguards the law of the family. . . . With the *Bauer* the earth is never merchandise, as it is only a part . . . of the family. The *Bauer* thinks in terms of 'we' regarding the family. The *Landwirt* thinks in terms of 'I' . . .⁵⁰

The *Erbhofgesetz* provided for the formation of hereditary farms consisting up to 125 hectares. According to the law, "the property owners of the *Erbhof* are called *Bauer*."⁵¹ In addition, the word *Bauer*, meaning "farmer" in the German language, would now refer exclusively to the *hereditary* farmers. As a result of this act, Darré's "Blood and Soil" ideology became inextricably linked to the family. Moreover, the hereditary farmers became the cultural and racial defenders of German civilization, because one had to be

⁴⁹ Speech given by Darré regarding the *Reichsnaehrstandsgesetzes* (September 19, 1933), in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 86. The German text reads: „Wir brauchen den Bauern als Blutsquell des deutschen Volkes und wir brauchen ihn als den Ernaehrer des deutschen Volkes.“

⁵⁰ Darré's „Das Ziel,“ published in the magazine *Deutsche Agrarpolitik*, 1932/33, No. 1, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 76-77. The German text for this passage reads: „Der Unterschied liegt kurz gesagt darin, dass der Bauer ein familienrechtlicher Begriff ist, waehrend der Landwirt, wie schon sein Name sagt, ein wirtschaftlicher Begriff ist. Das heisst: Bauertum bedeutet die familienrechtliche Sicherung Beim Bauern wird der Boden daher nie zur Ware, denn dieser ist ja nur ein Teil, sozusagen der ernaehrende Teil, eines Familiengedankens. . . . Der Bauer denkt daher weltanschaulich im „Wir“ des Familiengedankens. Der Landwirt denkt im „Ich“ des bestmoeglichsten Reingewinnes.“

⁵¹ The Preamble of the *Erbhofgesetz*, as cited in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 105.

racially pure and bound to the land to receive this distinction. The *Bauer* could focus his attention on the family and, as Darré envisioned, serve the German *Volk* without fearing the influences of market fluctuations or foreclosure.⁵²

Aside from the honors that the Nazi regime bestowed on the *Bauern*, the *Erbhofgesetz* limited their individuality. Because they sat at the top of the social ladder, the Nazis expected these individuals to behave as model Germans. “It is necessary that he [the *Bauer*] feel conscious of the solidarity between the city and the country,” a government official wrote, “he . . . is to work for the benefit of the community.”⁵³ As Thomas Phelps pointed out, a *Bauer* could lose his right to farm-management for not abiding by the “Peasant Code of Honor.” One individual who lived in the village of Bamberg, Bavaria, for instance, lost his noble status due to public drunkenness. In another case near Dortmund, a peasant lost his *Bauer* title for not properly providing for his aged mother.⁵⁴ All of these cases demonstrated how the Nazis conceptualized the *Bauern*—peasants, unlike the *Landwirten*, who had both economic and ideological duties to the German state.

Robert Brady, author of *The Spirit and Structure of German Fascism*, once wrote:

This program [the *Erbhofgesetz*] is destined to achieve three effects: *fixity of occupation* will be the product of bringing the peasants to the soil in a rigid and permanent relationship. *Fixity of status* is to be brought about by fitting the peasantry into a rigid social-economic class hierarchy. . . . *Fixity of residence* will ensure from the fixity of occupation and status. . . .⁵⁵

⁵² Lovin, “R. Walther Darré, Nazi Agricultural Policy, and Preparation for War.” 8.

⁵³ Lichtenberger, as cited in Thomas Phelps, *The German Peasant Family, 1925-1939: The Problems of the Republic and the Impact of National Socialism* (Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International, 1997), 127.

⁵⁴ Information regarding the poor behavior of the peasantry taken from Phelps, *The German Peasant Family*, 129-30.

⁵⁵ Robert Brady, as cited in Phelps, *The German Peasant Family*, 128.

By bestowing the title of *Bauer* on these peasants, the Nazi state created an interesting paradox. Even though the regime elevated the *Bauern* to a noble status, their adherence to the law made them “virtual serfs,” as the state confined them and their families to the land.⁵⁶ The law restricted *Bauern* and made it impossible for them to modernize their farms and purchase new equipment, seeds, and fertilizer to increase production. According to Darré, the *Landwirt* was the independent farmer who was concerned with modernity and self-sufficiency. *Bauern*, on the contrary, reflected higher ideals and were not supposed to worry about profit.

The *Erbhofgesetz* caused other problems for the peasants as a result of the Nazi “Blood and Soil” doctrine. The law, as Clifford Lovin contended, legalized the inferior status of women. The *Erbhofgesetz* made it virtually impossible for them to own farms, as it created an order of inheritance that catered to males and suppressed females.⁵⁷

According to the legislation:

The following order determines the order of farm inheritance: (1) the sons of the original owner; in the condition of a deceased son his sons follow; (2) the father of the owner; (3) the brothers of the owner; in the condition of a deceased brother his sons follow; (4) the daughters of the owner. . . .; (5) the sisters of the owner. . . .; (6) the female dependents of the owner and such descendants. . . .⁵⁸

Wives of hereditary farmers were last in this inheritance order. In addition to her work as wife and mother, necessity compelled the peasant woman to cook, clean the house, make clothes, milk the cows, feed the pigs, and clean the stable. The Nazis wished to reverse

⁵⁶ Phelps, *The German Peasant Family*, 129.

⁵⁷ Lovin, “R. Walther Darré, Nazi Agricultural Policy, and Preparation for War,” 9.

⁵⁸ The *Erbhofgesetz*, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 107. The German text that describes the order of inheritance is as follows: „Zum Anerben sind in folgender Ordnung berufen: (1) die Soehne des Erblassers; an die Stelle eines verstorbenen Sohnes treten dessen Soehne und Sohnessoehne; (2) der Vater des Erblassers; (3) die Brueder des Erblassers; an die Stelle eines verstorbenen Bruders treten dessen Soehne und Sohnessoehne; (4) die Toechter des Erblassers. . . .; (5) die Schwestern des Erblassers. . . .(6) die weiblichen Abkoemmlinge des Erblassers und die Nachkommen von solchen. . . .“

this trend and therefore instructed women to be the spiritual nurturers of the household, even though their daily work on the farm, according to a study published in 1933, restricted them to only five and a half hours of sleep each day.⁵⁹

The NSDAP realized this trend and thus crafted the *Erbhofgesetz* to isolate *Bauern* families from the stresses of a modern, capitalist economy from which they should not be harmed. According to the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, “It is easy to see the consequences for the health of women and their offspring. A woman who has to perform hard physical work from her fifteenth year is old and exhausted by the time she is forty.”⁶⁰ Additionally, Darré demanded that the peasant wife be freed from all things economic and concentrate solely on her biological duties. In an essay entitled *Die Frau im Reichsnaehrstand*, he wrote, “Aid must be provided to the female workforce on the farm so that they can be freed from the curse of liberalism . . . and a lust for economic profit.”⁶¹ These excerpts relate that the Nazi movement expressed deep concern regarding the role of the peasant woman on the *Erbhof*. By listing women at the end of the inheritance order—the peasant wife was *dead last*, following male and female family members—Darré wanted women to get back to their natural roles as wives and mothers. In turn, this would hopefully increase the German birthrate and, as he rationalized, protect the racial purity of all *Bauern*.

However, the birthrate actually declined in large peasant families because of the *Erbhofgesetz*. First of all, the law established an immutable pattern of inheritance. Many siblings who received no inheritance from the law moved to the cities to find better jobs.

⁵⁹ Information regarding the life of a farm wife on an *Erbhof* taken from Lovin, “R. Walther Darré, Nazi Agricultural Policy, and Preparation for War,” 9.

⁶⁰ *Voelkischer Beobachter*, 13/14 May 1934, in Stephenson, *Women in Nazi Germany*, 152.

⁶¹ Richard Walther Darré, “Die Frau im Reichsnaehrstand,” in *Um Blut und Boden: Reden und Aufsätze* (Muenchen: Zentralverlag der NSDAP, 1940), 144.

Consequently, this migration decreased the number of people working on the land and the number of marriages that could occur. As Thomas Phelps argued, peasant parents also tended to have fewer children as a result of the *Erbhofgesetz*, for they did not want to create hostilities between siblings or burden the heir with too many responsibilities that stemmed from the law.⁶²

Another reason for the decline in birthrate resulted from the time at which peasants married. Before the *Erbhofgesetz*, children gained their inheritance while both parents were alive. When the parents retired they would divide up the farm among the siblings. Therefore, the children would have some inheritance with which they could start their own families. After the passage of the *Erbhofgesetz*, however, parents would retire later or not at all, as the legislation stipulated that they could not divide up their property. Darré and the NSDAP held that the farm was a fixed entity to be preserved by a single individual from generation to generation. Peasant children, after the emergence of the *Erbhofgesetz*, generally waited until they could acquire enough capital to get married and start a family. A case study from southwestern Germany illustrated the peasants' attitude towards marriage. Between 1935 and 1936, peasant males in this region placed 224 advertisements for wives in local newspapers. Seventy-one percent of all requests, however, were left unanswered.⁶³ Without the inheritance from their parents' farms, peasants—those who actually wanted to get married—had no choice but to wait and save money. The ideological principles behind the *Erbhofgesetz*, although

⁶² Phelps, *The German Peasant Family*, 102.

⁶³ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 190.

meant for the improvement of the German peasants, detrimentally altered their way of life.⁶⁴

In *Ziel und Weg der nationalsozialistischen Agrarpolitik*, Darré had claimed, “It seems paradoxical; therefore I must say that the peasantry is the basis for an organic exchange of goods. The peasantry . . . is called to protect the national identity. . . .”⁶⁵

According to this revolutionary scheme implemented by Darré, the peasants became the defenders of Germany against the influences of liberalism. The “organic” economy about which Darré wrote was based on domestic production: if the domestic sector could increase production, the regime would have less need to import foreign goods.

Moreover, the Nazis contended that the peasants would be isolated from the insecurity of the international market. Just as Darré intended to isolate the esteemed *Bauern* by limiting their mobility on the land, he planned to isolate them from the evils of market capitalism. Therefore, in November of 1934 Darré launched the *Erzeugungsschlacht*, the so-called “Battle for Production.”

An Ideological “Battle for Production”

Despite Darré’s obsession with the ideological implications of the *Erzeugungsschlacht*, he needed a plan that could free the German peasants from the “iron laws of economics” that had brought them virtually to extinction.⁶⁶ Consequently, Darré developed a system known as the *Marktordnung*—market regulations established to oversee the distribution and production of agricultural goods. Under himself, Darré

⁶⁴ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 103.

⁶⁵ Darré, *Ziel und Weg der nationalsozialistischen Politik*, 18. The German text reads: „So paradox es klingt, so muss ich doch sagen, dass das Bauerntum auf der Grundlage dieses Weges der Wegbereiter eines organischen Gueteraustausches wird. Das Bauerntum . . . berufen ist, unter voller Wahrung seiner nationalen Eigenarten und nationalen Selbstbehauptung. . . .“

⁶⁶ Darré, as cited in Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 89.

established the *Reichstellen* offices to regulate foodstuffs imported into Germany.

Additionally, the *Reichstellen* were to buy up excess quotas of agricultural products at current world prices and then add tariffs to bring them up to domestic prices.⁶⁷ Darré, in an address to the NSDAP party congress, claimed:

The market regulation has a dual function. In times of overproduction or oversupply due to high importation, it serves to ensure that the peasants receive just prices [for their products]. In times of scarce production or unsatisfactory supply, the regulation secures a stable price for the consumer. With the regulation of the market, we mastered the problem of sales for the peasants . . . so that agriculture can be healthy. . . .⁶⁸

Ostensibly, the *Marktordnung* was an economic program with defined objectives. Darré established a system of price regulations that he hoped would protect the peasant against the market. However, as Daniela Meunkel argued, “The installation of the *Marktordnung* was substantiated, like all agrarian-political measures of the Nazi period, by ideologically tinted statements.”⁶⁹ In comparison to other agricultural policies, the Nazi “worldview” determined why Darré established the *Marktordnung* to oversee the “Battle for Production.” If the peasants felt safeguarded from economic fears, Darré reasoned, they would be ready to fight this impending battle.

The Nazi propaganda machine championed the *Erzeugungsschlacht* throughout Germany. Not only did the Nazis use public speeches to advocate this policy, they utilized other means of propaganda to drive this ideology into the heads of the peasants.

⁶⁷ Corni, *Hitler and the Peasants*, 93.

⁶⁸ Darré’s speech to the *Parteikongress der NSDAP* on September 12, 1935, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Corni, 135. The German text reads: „Die Marktordnung hat ein doppeltes Gesicht. In Zeiten der Ueberproduktion oder bei Uebersorgung durch ueberfluessige Einfuhr bietet sie den Schutz des gerechten Preises gegeneuber den Bauern. In Zeiten der Unterproduktion oder bei nicht genuegenden Zufuehren sichert sie den Preis fuer den Konsumenten. Mit der Marktordnung meisterten wir das Absatzproblem fuer den Bauern . . . so dass die Landwirtschaft gesunden konnte. . . .“

⁶⁹ Daniela Meunkel, *Bauern und Nationalsozialismus: Der Landkreis Celle im Dritten Reich* (Bielefeld, Germany: Verlag fuer Regionalgeschichte, 1991), 65. The German reads: „Begrundet wurde die Einfuehrung der Marktordnung, wie alle agrarpolitischen Massnahmen der NS-Zeit, mit ideologisch gefaerbten Aussagen.“

In several towns, for instance, loudspeakers played a recorded conversation between two peasants, one against the production drive, and the other convinced of Germany's need to increase its agricultural output.⁷⁰ Furthermore, propaganda leaders continued to stress the idea of a national, coordinated production drive that would revive the national economy. In the June 22, 1934 issue of the *Cellesche Zeitung*, for example, an author demanded an "end to the peasant migration. It is the sabotage of the workers' struggles."⁷¹ Daniela Meunkel contended in *Bauern und Nationalsozialismus: Der Landkreis Celle im Dritten Reich* that the rural migration to the cities endangered the Reich's agricultural objectives.⁷² Furthermore, as peasants migrated from the *Erbhof* and left their "noble positions" on the land, their actions jeopardized the Nazi ideological stance. "The Germans named those people 'Bauern,'" Darré noted in *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell der nordischen Rasse*, "who had an organic ownership of the land integrated with family unity."⁷³ Darré, by stressing the peasant's "organic" importance, believed that the peasant was intrinsically tied to the earth. To him, the land would never let the noble peasant and his family down, for unlike the insecurity of the world market, influenced by greed, corruption, and severe price fluctuations, the land would ensure both economic and spiritual well-being.

Consequently, the Nazis accelerated their efforts to promote the agrarian life and the *Erzeugungsschlacht* through propaganda. In Thuringia, one story related that a *Bauer*

⁷⁰ Story cited in Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 165.

⁷¹ June 22, 1934 issue of the *Cellesche Zeitung*, as cited in Meunkel, *Bauern und Nationalsozialismus*, 86. The German text for this passage reads: „Schluss mit der Landflucht. Sie ist die Sabotage der Arbeitsschlacht.“

⁷² Meunkel, *Bauern und Nationalsozialismus*, 86.

⁷³ Richard Walther Darré, *Das Bauerntum als Lebensquell der nordischen Rasse* (Muenchen: J.F. Lehmanns Verlag, 1937), 112. The German text for this citation is as follows: „Zusammenfassend duerfen wir sagen: Den Vorstand oder das Haupt einer mit dem Bodenbesitz organisch verkneupften Familieneinheit nannte der Germane einen Bauern.“

gave an ornate spade to the heir of his farm, symbolizing the hard-working nature of the German people. When he presented it, he told the heir, “May it [the spade] never rust and you never rest until you give the farm to your heir.” Next, the father presented his son with soil, water, and the key to the house to show his son what he had inherited. The Nazi propaganda leaders in the town then thanked the old peasant for his dutiful service and reminded the son of his responsibilities. Following this procedure, the peasants lit a hearth-fire next to the housewife to symbolize her new familial responsibilities as a wife and mother, the guiding light of the *Erbhof*.⁷⁴ This type of story, however romanticized it may appear, shows how the Nazi propaganda machine targeted local communities ideologically after the start of the *Erzeugungsschlacht*.

At a meeting of the Nazi Agrarian Office in February 1935, Darré continued to stress the importance of ideological indoctrination when promoting the *Erzeugungsschlacht*. In the villages across Germany, the propaganda machine continued to preach both the values of hard work and *voelkisch* duty to the state. More importantly, the Nazis hoped to encourage a feeling of peasant consciousness by inducing conformity within the local peasant communities. Nazi officials held mandatory “work evenings,” for instance, to lecture entire villages of women about their “biological-racial” duties to their husbands and families.⁷⁵ In addition, the Nazi authorities employed coercion to promote conformity. In the village of Coppenbruegge in Lower Saxony, a peasant tried to withdraw from a cattle cooperative because of his discontent with agricultural prices. The Nazi officials told him that if he withdrew, authorities would take appropriate

⁷⁴ Story cited in Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 207.

⁷⁵ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 210.

measures against him.⁷⁶ Whether the prices were unfair or not, the Nazi leadership would not tolerate insubordination to the community, for the core of the NSDAP agrarian ideology was based on peasant solidarity. First of all, Darré needed to maximize agricultural output to carry out the *Erzeugungsschlacht*, the “Battle for Production” that Germany would fight against the modern world market. Furthermore, the peasants could not hope to wage this war, or any other Nazi racial war for that matter, without solidarity. Even though economic goals drove the *Erzeugungsschlacht*, the Nazis, particularly Darré, stressed its ideological importance in order to produce a cohesive peasantry.

Conclusion

To evaluate the effectiveness of Nazi agricultural policy on the basis of propaganda is sheer folly. Programs such as the *Erbhofgesetz* and *Erzeugungsschlacht* completely failed. The Third Reich faced large-scale peasant migrations, and the Reich Agricultural Office, headed by Richard Walther Darré, was so fixed on the “Blood and Soil” concept that it could not better the peasant’s economic lifestyle. As Thomas Phelps noted in his study of the German peasant family, Darré’s agrarian policy ironically *hurt* the family in some respects. Many peasant families, for example, lived in “primitive” conditions. A house with enough heat and electricity to service the family was quite rare. During the Reich years, the cost of household expenses and overall living increased and forced peasants into greater debt than they previously were. Incidentally, the largest price increase was in seeds, which surpassed even the Republic prices during 1934 and 1935.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Farquharson, *The Plough and the Swastika*, 211.

⁷⁷ Phelps, *The German Peasant Family*, 130, 223.

Despite the economic goals that each agricultural policy promoted, Darré and his agrarian cadre crafted policy based on ideological statements. To Darré, the peasants were the individuals who would put the Nazi “worldview” into effect. In retrospect, it would be very easy to discuss the economic implications of the Reich’s agricultural legislation. One could analyze the advantages and disadvantages of a given law and interpret it based solely on the market trends of the 1930s. However, the legislation requires a deeper, more penetrating analysis predicated on “Blood and Soil.” For example, why did the Nazis institute the *Erbhofgesetz* and thus alter the pattern of inheritance throughout the peasant community? Why try to alienate a segment of German farmers as a result? Moreover, why put the peasant’s own wife last in the inheritance order?

The answers to these questions stem from the ideological principles of the NSDAP. Peasant families prior to the Nazis, for instance, divided up the farm among the children. Consequently, each child had capital with which to start a family and an agricultural life of his or her own. With the emergence of the *Erbhofgesetz*, on the contrary, the Nazis transformed ideological tenets into real legislation. They changed the meaning of an ordinary term, *Bauer*, meaning “farmer” in German, and used it to glorify the peasantry. According to Darré, “The existence of a people rises and falls with the stability of the peasantry.”⁷⁸ *Stability* was the key term to the overall picture, for the Nazis believed that the peasant was the life source of the entire German nation. Without the peasant, their entire “worldview” would lack substance.

⁷⁸ From the minutes of the NSDAP cabinet meeting of September 26, 1933, in *Blut und Boden: Rassenideologie*, ed. Gustavo Corni, 103.

The NSDAP disseminated a broad spectrum of propaganda during the late Weimar period and the years of the Third Reich. Whether the propaganda consisted of speeches, artwork, or ideologically-inspired legislation, it exhibited the principles stated by Joseph Goebbels in “Knowledge and Propaganda.” According to Goebbels, propaganda should “put in words everything [individuals] have been searching for.” It should give “form” to what people want.⁷⁹ Agrarian propaganda was no different. Darré and the Nazi propaganda machine used these sources to portray a revolutionary “worldview” of which the peasant was the center. By honoring the peasant as the true representative of the German *Volk*, the Nazis gave him a reason to be proud of his occupation and its ideological value to the nation. When the Nazis seized power, they finally had the opportunity to put their “worldview,” namely the concept of “Blood and Soil,” into practice. Joseph Goebbels ended his 1928 address by emphasizing the necessity of propaganda: “That is our [the Nazis] task on this planet: to create the foundation on which our people can live. When we do that, this nation will create works of culture that will endure for eons in world history!”⁸⁰ On the eve of the Second World War, German peasants would have disagreed with Goebbels’s claim that the Nazi party “create[d] the foundation” on which people could live, for agrarian policy was one-sided: the Nazis built it on superficial promises that could not be transformed into reality. In 1933 it gave the peasants hope. By 1939 it became the bane of their existence.

⁷⁹ Joseph Goebbels, “Knowledge and Propaganda.” German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb54.html>.>

⁸⁰ Goebbels, “Knowledge and Propaganda.” German Propaganda Archive Project, Calvin College. 20 October 2003 <<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/goeb54.htm>.>

The “Powerful”

Molly Kay Gale

History is written by the powerful. It is true that since the 1960s and the beginnings of the democratization of history, less powerful minorities have taken up the pen and more profusely expressed their views of history, but to a great extent, white males have engrained their view of history into people’s minds. Perhaps for this reason, perhaps because of its appealing nature, or perhaps for both reasons, the Renaissance stands out in people’s minds as a definitive period in history—a period during which, arguably, intellectual and cultural progress swept across Europe.

The driving force behind much of the intellectual and cultural changes was the humanist movement; focusing on a devotion to and re-analysis of the classics, humanism arose between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. Through their devotion to the *studia humanitatis* (the study of rhetoric, grammar, history, poetry, and ethics), humanists strove to improve the human condition. These developments, most frequently identified in the cultural, intellectual, and social realms, altered many people’s lives for the better. These same developments, however, were also gender-biased.

Upper-class men may have experienced intellectual and cultural growth, but several barriers kept upper-class women from following in their footsteps. At the forefront of these barriers, and one which overshadowed and encompassed all others, was the structural barrier in which women were confined. Women had to function within a social and mental structure that was created by men and which viewed women as subordinate to them. Within this structure, women were constricted and given no alleviation of the numerous emotional, as well as social, stresses that they endured. While males could claim to have experienced a Renaissance—a time of classic revival, of intellectual and social freedom—elite women

could not. Between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries, women were continually burdened by both emotional and social stresses as they attempted to maneuver under a male power structure that limited their development.

One source of emotional stress that persistently belabored women was the high reproduction rates that the urban elite experienced. David Herlihy explains in his “Social Mobility in Florence,” that “the rich households, in other words, were prolific in the number of children they were supporting.”¹ High reproduction rates were viewed by many families as desirable because they ensured their survival of at least a couple of the children into adulthood. These children, in turn, could take care of their parents in their old age. Thus, women bore a large number of children in their lifetimes because they felt the need to preserve their families: “High fertility was in the interest of the propertied family, whose ability to prevail ‘against the powerful forces of death’ required at least one surviving male heir.”²

These high rates of reproduction also meant that women were repeatedly pregnant throughout their childbearing years, and they were thus under constant emotional stress. Margaret King explains in her *Women of the Renaissance* that “most Renaissance women became mothers. Motherhood would define their lives and occupy most of their years. From their mid-twenties in most social groups, from adolescence in elite circles, they experienced a cycle of childbirth and nursing and childbirth again.”³ And elite women bore the most children of all social groups: “Since rich women did not nurse their own children . . . they conceived again soon after each birth.”⁴ How many children did elite women have? While this number was obviously dependent upon each woman’s condition, “in the sixteenth

¹ David Herlihy, “Social Mobility in Florence,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 96.

² Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 2.

³ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

century, a wealthy Frenchwoman might rear six or seven children.”⁵ On the other hand, “from the fourteenth through the seventeenth century, the women of the noble Venetian Donato family may have achieved in each generation the average maximum biological fertility for the human female: twelve births.”⁶ With each of these births, women bore an incalculable amount of pain and stress, both physically, but even more so, emotionally.

The emotional stress that a woman endured extended far past her pregnancy and into childbirth and infancy, if the child—as well as the mother—survived the delivery. King explains that “nothing could save women from the torment of childbirth, a torment so great that it was acknowledged even by men.”⁷ The pain of childbirth, however, was only one aspect of the travail through which women went; they also had to face the possibility of their own death, or the death of their child. King explains that “for many women, ‘unkindly’ labor meant death: perhaps as many as 10 percent of mothers died as a consequence of childbirth; even the more conservative estimate of 2.5 percent for England in the late Renaissance is five or six times higher than the rate recorded in the nineteenth century.”⁸

Even greater than fearing her own death, a woman feared the death of her child. King writes that “the mothers who survived often lived to face the death of the baby they had borne at such risk. Child mortality was a fact made relentless by epidemic disease, chronic malnutrition, and unrelieved filth.”⁹ While infant deaths were greatest among the poor, upper-class Europeans faced extremely high infant mortality rates: “in French Argenteuil, approximately 19 percent of infants born to wealthy families, died, compared to 23 percent for the middle class and 26 percent for the poor.”¹⁰ An examination of the merchant class is also helpful because this class constituted a large portion of the population and conveys some

⁵ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 6.

of the shared feelings with the upper class since the infant mortality figures are very similar for both classes.

In 1420, a merchant by the name of Gregorio Dati recorded his comments in relation to his family and his accounts. Dati explains that his second wife, Genevra, gave birth in March of 1405, in June of 1406, in June of 1407, in July of 1411, in October of 1412, in May of 1415, and in April of 1416. Their first son, Manetto, survived infancy only to die in 1418, before the age of twenty, while their first daughter did not survive but a few days: “It died at dawn on Sunday morning, 22 March, and was buried before the sermon.”¹¹ Their third child, Lisabetta, survived infancy but died after an illness in 1414: “She was seven years and seven months, and I was sorely grieved at her death.”¹² Another daughter, Antonia, survived infancy again only to die in 1420 of the plague at the age of 13. Their next child, a son named Niccolo, died of dysentery after approximately three months: “God was pleased to call the child very shortly to himself.”¹³ Their next son, Girolamo, appears to have survived to adulthood, and their next child, Ghita, appears to have survived as well, “after a painful and almost fatal labor.”¹⁴ Their next child, Lisa, died shortly after childbirth. Dati writes that “altogether Ginevra and I had eleven children: four boys and seven girls.” One cannot help but empathize with Ginevra’s suffering, though. After bearing eleven children, enduring painful, near-fatal labors, and watching at least six of her children die, Ginevra “died in childbirth after lengthy suffering, which she bore with remarkable strength and patience.”¹⁵

One must ask herself whether a woman such as Ginevra could possibly have experienced a Renaissance. One could argue that a Renaissance is based on economic or

¹¹ Gregorio Dati, “A Merchant Comments on Family Matters, 1420,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 113.

¹² *Ibid.*, 114.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 113.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 114.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 114.

political freedom, or she could even argue that it is based on access to education, but underlying all of these tenets is one from which women were excluded: freedom of mind. How can anyone be excluded from freedom of mind? The social structure under which elite Renaissance women lived constrained them in numerous ways. Throughout their childbearing years, which made up the vast majority of their lives, women underwent emotional strain that gnawed away at their minds, as well as their bodies; in the Renaissance world, women could not free their minds of this oppression. Moreover, women could not even attach themselves to sturdy figures on which to lean. Their precarious family situation rendered them unable to unburden themselves, and that weight which they carried never subsided.

In the Renaissance world, women could not even fasten themselves too greatly to their own children, because they had to face the fact that the child whom they had carried for nine months might be taken away at any moment: “The apprehension of child death hovers over birth. The newborn child could have been viewed by some Renaissance mothers as an ephemeron in whom only a tentative affection could be invested.”¹⁶ The emotional burden that women carried could not even be relieved among the comforts of one’s own home life. Merry E. Wiesner explains in her *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* that “the deaths of illnesses of their children often led women into depression or even suicidal despair, and those who showed no attachment to their children were viewed as mentally disturbed.”¹⁷ Thus, women were stuck in a three-sided pit. On the one side, they had to endure the pains of childbirth and struggle for their own, as well as their child’s, survival. If they succeeded, they faced a second side; women could attach themselves to their infants, only to undergo severe depression upon the deaths of these children, either during infancy or in their early

¹⁶ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 7.

¹⁷ Merry E. Wiesner, *Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 73.

childhoods. On a third side, a woman could deliberately detach herself from her newborn infant, only to be viewed as “mentally disturbed” and heartless. So instead, women were left grappling in this pit, hopelessly at the whim of the structure in which they lived.

What about those women who survived childbirth and whose children survived childbirth? Could they then become attached to that child and relieve themselves of some of their emotional encumbrance? One reason why women could not become attached to their surviving child—at least for the first several months—was because elite women did not nurse. The reasons for this are many and varied, but husbands more times than not made this decision. Lactation has a contraceptive effect, so if an elite woman was nursing, she would not have been able to conceive another child until she had completed breast feeding her baby. Furthermore, “sexual intercourse was both forbidden and feared during lactation because it was universally thought that the milk would become corrupted by intercourse or a new conception and kill the child.”¹⁸ For this reason, husbands secured wet nurses for their newborn children to avoid this “hassle.”

Husbands were responsible for locating a wet nurse, who was almost always of the lower class. Perhaps not surprisingly, Christiane Klapisch-Zuber explains in her *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy* that “an examination of all the nurses studied revealed that Florentines were more apt to keep their boys at home than their girls: for the whole of the period scrutinized (1300-1530), 23 percent of boys were entrusted for a relatively long period to a nurse who lived in the house, as opposed to only 12 percent of the girls. Conversely, 68.5 percent of girls and 55 percent of boys were sent to the country.”¹⁹ Klapisch-Zuber bluntly explains that “the parents’ preferences, without being systematic, are beyond doubt: it was easier for them, generally speaking, to separate themselves from a

¹⁸ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 14.

¹⁹ Christine Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family, and Ritual in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 138.

female baby than from a little boy and future heir.”²⁰ The effects of this transfer of infants to the countryside to nurses were varied. For one, women could not form immediate attachments to their newborn children, and vice versa: “The custom of exporting the babies of the upper classes to foster mothers for several years resulted in a toll of death and sadness over several centuries.”²¹

If women had little choice and heightened emotional stress in relation to their role as mothers, did they have greater freedom in their roles as wives? Even the choice of a woman’s marriage partner was dictated by a woman’s parents, and usually more specifically, her father. Federica Ambrosini explains in her “Toward a Social History of Women in Venice: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment” in John Martin and Dennis Romano’s *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797* that “apart from the impossibility of verifying to what extent such freedom could actually be exercised, a girl destined to marriage had little or no say in the choice of her husband. On the contrary, she was generally completely dependent on the approval of her parents or their executors.”²² Ambrosini further explains that “in this class arranged marriages were more or less the rule, as such unions were not meant to satisfy the sentimental needs of individuals but, rather, to fulfill a duty toward the family.”²³

Some scholars would still argue that despite the fact that women had little or no choice in their marriage partner, they still wielded significant power in the marriage in relation to their dowry. Stanley Chojnacki explains in his *Patrician Women in Venice* that “a girl’s dowry had to be not only ‘congruent’ with her family status, but in fact should

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 138.

²¹ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 17.

²² Federica Ambrosini, “Toward a Social History of Women in Venice: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment,” in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, edited by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 431.

²³ *Ibid.*, 431-432.

represent an amount roughly equal to a full share of the patrimony.”²⁴ Additionally, during the Renaissance, women’s dowries grew substantially, and this in turn gave women greater power within the family, earning them more respect from their husbands: “It was the capacity to dispose of their wealth as they liked—on the basis of calculation but also of inclination as much as the wealthy itself, that gave married women their potent new presence in patrician society.”²⁵ While women’s dowries undoubtedly increased in size during the Renaissance and while women may have experienced some type of “potent new presence,” however small that change may have been, this fact did not free them from the constrictive structure under which they functioned, and it did not constitute them experiencing a Renaissance.

Women did indeed have legal rights to their dowries. A woman’s husband was bound, upon his death, to ensure its return to his wife should she ask for it, and the assurance of its return, in fact, became the foremost duty of the husband’s surviving relatives. The dowry, while providing women with some power within the family, perhaps caused them more stress than it relieved. To begin, women were still dependent on males for the dowries themselves and the structure in which they could wield their “power.” A woman’s dowry, for instance, was managed by her husband, and he was free to invest it as he pleased.²⁶ Sally McKee explains in her “Women Under Venetian Colonial Rule in the Early Renaissance: Observations on Their Economic Activities” that “a widow’s right to control her own property had at least a legal basis. In most Italian cities, a widow took back into her control her dowry and exercised free use of it, although the degree of that freedom varied from city to

²⁴ Stanley Chojnacki, “Patrician Women in Early Renaissance Venice,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974): 186.

²⁵ Stanley Chojnacki, “Wives and Husbands in Late Medieval Venice,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 330.

²⁶ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 49.

city.”²⁷ Chojnacki further explains that “because the dowry was regarded as a means of helping the husband bear the economic burdens of marriage, his wife could not invest or otherwise use it without his consent.”²⁸ Thus, elite women exercised their dowry rights within an established framework of male power.

A woman’s decision to claim her dowry from her deceased husband’s family, however, was not a clear-cut decision. It was, in fact, perhaps one of the most difficult decisions that she would encounter in her lifetime because inherent in that decision, was her decision of whether or not to remarry. For some widows, the decision was simple; if a woman was past her childbearing years, then she would not be able to remarry because men seeking wives were looking for women who could bear them children. In this case, she would live out her days under her husband’s family’s roof, close to her children. If she was still in her childbearing years, however, the decision was more complicated. A woman could choose to live independently near her children, but this decision was extremely rare because of the stress she felt from her own, as well as her husband’s, family.

Husbands did not want their wives, upon their own deaths, to ask for the return of their dowries because that drew wealthy away from their own families and that of their children. Ambrosini explains that “it was mainly husbands who belonged to the upper classes who urged their wives, or rather insistently begged them, not to ask for the restitution of their dowries and to keep living in widowhood together with their offspring.”²⁹ A woman’s alternative choice was to ask for her dowry back, remarry, and leave her children with her husband’s family. Her own family would have pushed for this decision because the

²⁷ Sally McKee, “Women Under Venetian Colonial Rule in the Early Renaissance: Observations on Their Economic Activities,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (1998): 52.

²⁸ Stanley Chojnacki, “Patrician Women in Early Renaissance Venice,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 21 (1974): 190-191.

²⁹ Federica Ambrosini, “Toward a Social History of Women in Venice: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment,” in *Venice Reconsidered: The History and Civilization of an Italian City-State, 1297-1797*, edited by John Martin and Dennis Romano (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 434.

dowry would be returned to the woman and her family could arrange another, usually economically beneficial, match with a new family.

What would a woman choose to do? Klapisch-Zuber explains in her “Maternity, Widowhood, and Dowry in Florence” that “widows had few legal weapons, their whole upbringing had inculcated docility in them, and only in exceptional circumstances could they avoid remarriage if their relatives had decided in favor of it.”³⁰ Thus, a woman was often forced to claim her dowry and leave her deceased husband’s family, along with her children. This decision, however, would result in her being regarded as a “cruel mother”: “The mother who deserted the roof under which her children lived placed the interests of her own lineage and her own family above her children’s interests, and that is why she was stigmatized.”³¹ A “good mother,” on the other hand, would refuse to remarry and act as both a mother and a father to her children under her husband’s roof.³²

A woman could attempt to maneuver within this male-dictated familial structure, but in either situation, a woman essentially lost. If she chose to stay with her children under her husband’s roof, she was ostracized by her own family, who was angry that she did not reclaim her dowry in order to forge a new marriage contract with another family. On the other hand, if she left her husband’s family, she would have to abandon her own children, most likely never to see them again, and be labeled as a “cruel mother.” So did her increasingly large dowry bring her more “power?” Perhaps.

Chojnacki has argued that women’s dowries allowed them to wield power within the family to influence their husbands’ wills, for instance. Chojnacki explains that “husbands were obliged, by self-interest and lineage interest—and specifically by the centrality in

³⁰ Christine Klapisch-Zuber, “Maternity, Widowhood, and Dowry in Florence,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 323.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 324.

³² *Ibid.*, 324.

family strategy of favorable marriage alliances—to pay more attention to their well-dowered wives (and daughters).”³³ But this increased attention that women received from their husbands and the increased influence that they may have had on their husbands did not overshadow the emotional and social stresses that they had to face in relation to their dowries. Klapisch-Zuber movingly presents a woman’s predicament when she writes:

For how could the “honor” and the “status” of a lineage be increased by taking back a woman and her dowry in order to give them elsewhere, without offending the honor and the standing of the family to which she had given children? How could such a family reassert its rights over the persona and the wealth of a woman without depriving another family of those rights? How could the separation of mother and child be avoided when the mother’s identity was always borrowed and the child could belong only to his paternal kin? How could a woman be reproached for her docility before men when society denied her economic and legal autonomy?³⁴

The torment that a woman underwent as a result of being widowed outweighed any power that a Renaissance man might have brought her. A woman’s mind was not free when she carried around the burden of whether or not to abandon her children.

At the core of a woman’s predicament was her lack of identity, or perhaps, the plethora of identities that she held. Sharon T. Strocchia explains in her “Remembering the Family: Women, kin, and Commemorative Masses in Renaissance Florence” that “the conflict between family regimes worked to carve out a central social position for patrician women, on the one hand, and to fragment their social identity on the other.”³⁵ One needs to keep in mind that “from the instant of her birth, the prospect of a dowry loomed large over the female: she represented potential loss rather than potential gain.”³⁶ Strocchia further

³³ Stanley Chojnacki, “Wives and Husbands in Late Medieval Venice,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 336.

³⁴ Christine Klapisch-Zuber, “Maternity, Widowhood, and Dowry in Florence,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 326.

³⁵ Sharon T. Strocchia, “Remembering the Family: Women, Kin, and Commemorative Masses in Renaissance Florence,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1989): 638.

³⁶ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 26.

explains that “the agility and variety with which women moved both within and across family units resulted in a plurality of overlapping identities that reflected women’s experiences as wives, mothers, sisters, and daughters.”³⁷ This constantly changing and continually indefinite identity resulted in women’s inability to fit completely into one familial sphere or another, thus complicating their decisions in relation to their dowries: “women positioned themselves as the structural nexus not only within but between families by commissioning bequests for their natal kin.”³⁸

Women forever lived within a male-constructed society, and any power with which they were blessed was to be utilized only within this patriarchal structure. Women could not experience the Renaissance—a change in mindsets and social opportunities—when their very lives and minds were controlled by males. Klapisch-Zuber explains that “the marriage that brought a woman out of the paternal house and lineage, the widowhood that often led to her return, these incessant comings and going of wives between *case* introduced a truly indeterminate quality in the ways they were designated: since reference to a male was necessary, a woman was spoken of in relation to her father or her husband, even when they were dead.”³⁹ Women were, at all times, essentially pawns—pawns to be played by their fathers or their husbands. Chojnacki explains, for instance, that “practical interest blended with cultural principles to make daughters instruments of the family strategies pursued by their fathers.”⁴⁰

³⁷ Sharon T. Strocchia, “Remembering the Family: Women, Kin, and Commemorative Masses in Renaissance Florence,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 42, no. 4 (1989): 649.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 648.

³⁹ Christine Klapisch-Zuber, “Maternity, Widowhood, and Dowry in Florence,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 319.

⁴⁰ Stanley Chojnacki, “‘The Most Serious Duty’: Motherhood, Gender, and Patrician Culture in Renaissance Venice” in *Refiguring Woman: Perspectives on Gender and the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Marilyn Migiel and Juliana Schiesari (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991), 143-144.

One could argue, however, that women were emerging with greater power as the Renaissance wore on. As was previously explained, Chojnacki writes that “later marriages, larger dowries, and the choice of vocations altered the gender balance in patrician society, giving each successive generation of wives greater means of affecting the culture of the ruling class.”⁴¹ This may be true, but all of these changes, arguably slight, occurred *within* the construct of male power. Women married later *through their fathers’ permission*. Women had larger dowries *through their fathers’ graces*. Women had greater choice of vocations *through their fathers’ acknowledgement*. Chojnacki succinctly expresses this point when he writes that these “possibilities of alternative gender identities were contained within the formal boundaries of patriarchy. . . .”⁴²

One can see this pattern playing out in the economic realm, for instance. Judith C. Brown has argued in her “Women’s Work in Renaissance Tuscany” that in the 1500s and 1600s, women’s economic options extended to new trades, and thus, women may have experienced a Renaissance at this time. One cannot deny, however, that all of the options that were opened for women were dictated by the decisions of men. Brown explains that “as men shifted from the production of textiles to that of luxury crafts, the women began to perform many of the previously male tasks in the wool and silk industries. This, more than anything else, probably explains the larger participation of women in the labor force.”⁴³ Not only did women get to work in these industries *only* as males vacated them, but they were also restricted to these opportunities because “women have had first and foremost a reproductive responsibility in the home.”⁴⁴ Brown further explains that “other occupations in

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 151-152.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 154.

⁴³ Judith C. Brown, “Women’s Work in Renaissance Tuscany,” in *Major Problems in the History of the Italian Renaissance*, edited by Benjamin G. Kohl and Alison Andrews Smith (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1995), 69.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 71.

the textile sector, such as cleaning or carding, were done in central workshops and would have required women to give up their productive roles within the household.”⁴⁵

Women were thus restricted to the home in their economic pursuits. But as has been delineated, women were not just restricted economically or physically, but mentally and socially as well. They were left in the home to bear the stresses of pregnancy and childbirth. They were left in the home while their infants were sent to the countryside to nurse, and they were left to endure the pain of their infants’ deaths. They were left to watch their spouses die, and to ponder whether to take their dowry or to stay with their husband’s family. They were left to be “good mothers” or “cruel mothers.” They were left to bear the burdens of a male-dominated society that restricted their own thoughts. King explains that “injunctions of the preachers and the humanists alike restricted woman to the home, to silence, to plainness; they required a total flattening of her expressive will, her body, her voice, her ornament.”⁴⁶ Moreover, “subject to the will of others I the management of her own body, as she was in her social relations, women’s identities faded to anonymity within the marriage bond. Male control was matched by female insignificance. The patriarchal form of marriage was grounded in a fundamentally negative attitude toward women.”⁴⁷

Women of the Renaissance lacked a clear identity. They were daughters, wives, and mothers, but they could not claim any identity that was not almost entirely dependent upon males. Their sense of identity, or lack thereof, was dictated by the male-dominated structure in which they lived. Within this structure, women were confined physically to a point, but more importantly, mentally and socially. Within this structure, women were given no alleviation of their emotional and social stresses. Within this structure, women attempted to maneuver, and while they may have made some progress in limited areas, they did not

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 71.

⁴⁶ Margaret L. King, *Women of the Renaissance* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 40.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 47.

succeed to a great enough extent to constitute experiencing a Renaissance. History is indeed written by the powerful. When will that be women?

The 55th College Training Detachment of the Army Air Corps Program
On the Gettysburg College Campus,
1943-1944

Julia Grover

‘Gettysburg College ... is sincerely appreciative of the honor of having as her collaborators in this latest chapter of her history the officers and students of the Army Air Corps.’ (Air Crew Bulletin)

The 55th College Training Detachment of the Air Force Cadet Program came to Gettysburg College in 1943. It was a separate program designed to provide educated officers for the Air Corps in the United States Army. These trainees would not only learn military drill, physical training, medical aid and flight skills, but they would also study physics, math, English, history, and geography. They were taught by members of the Gettysburg College staff and housed on campus, in dorms and fraternity houses.¹ Their presence on campus was a constant reminder for regular students that the country was in the midst of a war.

The outbreak of World War II hit Gettysburg College in the fact that many of the male students signed up or were called into service in Europe and the Pacific. This left

¹ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutory Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 733.

the college with a significant number of vacancies. Although the female population on campus had grown a little, the number of male students in 1943 was only about one hundred, compared with five hundred just a year earlier.² The decrease in enrollment also brought about a considerable decrease in income for the college. This was not only an isolated problem for Gettysburg College, as “many smaller colleges throughout the country were beginning to feel the financial strain of losing a great number of students to the Army and the Navy.”³ The Army took advantage of this situation to institute a military training program at colleges and universities affected by this decline in enrollment. Not only did the colleges have the need for financial help, but they also had space to house and train the cadets, as well as the faculty who were already trained in teaching academics.

The Army was interested in making sure that their cadets had an academic education as well as military training. They saw from experience that men who understood mathematics, physics, and geography made better pilots, bombardiers, and navigators.⁴ Thus, they had a vested interest in making sure that their recruits were educated at the college level. Holding these training programs at colleges and universities was a way to ensure that these courses would be taught. Gettysburg College was one of many across the nation chosen by the War Manpower Commission and the Army Air Corps to participate in this program. Other institutions chosen included the University of Arkansas, Oklahoma A&M, Eastern Oregon University, and ten other

² Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutory Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 732.

³ Lt. Frederick H. Willcox, “The Birth of the College Program,” *Gettysburg College Bulletin* (October 1943): 2.

⁴ Lt. Frederick H. Willcox, “The Birth of the College Program,” *Gettysburg College Bulletin* (October 1943): 2.

Pennsylvania colleges, including Clarion State College, Penn State University, and Dickinson College.⁵ After a cadet's graduation from these programs, he would be sent to a more specialized army flight school.

Gettysburg's president, Henry W. A. Hanson, first announced the plans for the college's participation in this program in February of 1943. He informed the campus that about 550 men would come with the program to be trained, and they would be housed in Pennsylvania Hall and McKnight Hall, the two men's dorms on campus. Fraternities were warned that their houses might be used as well. The Phi Kappa Psi house was turned into a military infirmary.⁶ The Army also took over the dining room in Huber Hall, and the girls who usually ate there were sent to eat at various fraternity houses on campus. Later on, the rest of Huber Hall was turned over to the Army as more housing was needed. The approximately sixty girls who lived in Huber were moved to Stevens Hall, the James Gettys Hotel in town, or a professor's house.⁷ While things were crowded and inconvenient, the college students cooperated with little interruption or complaining. Subsequently, Huber was renovated to include a new cafeteria, pay phones, and bunk beds.⁸

In regards to curriculum, the cadets were taught academics, military science, physical training, and flying, of which academic and physical training were taught by Gettysburg College faculty.⁹ The commanding officer of the training program at Gettysburg, Captain John R. Coshey, was in charge of the military education, including

⁵ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 732.

⁶ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 732.

⁷ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 25 March 1943.

⁸ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 1 March 1943.

⁹ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 25 February 1943.

drilling and ceremonies. Captain Coshey had formerly been stationed at Maxwell Field, in Montgomery, Alabama, which was the headquarters of the College Training Detachment program.¹⁰ There he had trained himself on how to run this program. The flying portion of the training would be taught at the Boulevard Airport on the Mummasburg Road.¹¹

In addition, Gettysburg College would still operate for its civilian students. The Army College would operate separately, and students would not be in the same classes. For women students and the men who were still in college, scholastics would go on as usual. Inter-collegiate football and soccer were cancelled for the duration of the Army Air Corps' stay, however, in obedience to an Army Air Corps requirement that did not allow the cadets to participate in these sports.¹² More intramural sports were played instead.

The first group of 275 cadets arrived on campus on March 3, 1943. They had already been through four or five weeks of basic training and "knew the elements of drilling, military courtesy, and discipline."¹³ These men were mostly from states such as Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana. They registered in Plank Gym and were introduced to Captain Coshey. Classes did not start until the beginning of the next week. The second half of the men arrived at Gettysburg on April 1, 1943. They were mostly from New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts. The total of 550 cadets now made up almost two-thirds of the college population.¹⁴

¹⁰ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 18 February 1943.

¹¹ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 4 March 1943.

¹² *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 11 February 1943.

¹³ Lt. Frederick H. Willcox, "The Birth of the College Program," *Gettysburg College Bulletin* (October 1943): 3.

¹⁴ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 733.

A survey of the cadets then on campus revealed an average age of about twenty-one years old, with extremes being seventeen and twenty-seven. The majority was Protestant, but there were also Catholics and Jews. Many men had held jobs that dealt with mechanics and industry, and about one eighth of the cadets were married. There was also a wide range of education levels among the cadets, from those who had only received a grammar - school education to those who were college graduates. However, the majority were high school graduates.¹⁵ This range of education was a challenge to the faculty in teaching classes. The cadets stayed for five months and received 700 hours of academics and ten hours of flight training. In all, a total of 1,659 men went through the training program in Gettysburg during the period from March 1943 to May 1944 when the College Training Detachment was on campus.¹⁶

The student body welcomed the arrival of the cadets. The country was at war, and while the students were not fighting, they could do their patriotic duty by making the cadets feel as welcome as possible. An editorial in *The Gettysburgian* stressed that, “It is up to the Gettysburg student body to make every member of the United States Army Air Corps feel at home among us.”¹⁷ The College Senate held dances for the cadets as well, in an effort to make them feel at home.¹⁸ According to Robert Koons, a 1943 graduate of Gettysburg College who returned to teach basic English to the cadets, the campus “adjusted pretty well to it. I think we more or less – I don’t remember students seeming to resent it or feel in any way that their style was cramped by the presence of those Air

¹⁵ *Air Crew Bulletin*, 13 April 1943, Special Collections, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.

¹⁶ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutary Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 733.

¹⁷ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 25 February 1943.

¹⁸ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 11 March 1943.

Force Cadets. I don't remember that, we just seemed to accommodate ourselves to each other as far as I know."¹⁹

A regular day for the cadets on campus started early. Reveille was played at 5:25 AM, assembly was five minutes later, and breakfast was at 6:30. Sick call and police call were at 7:30, and classes began at 7:45. These classes were the academic subjects and physical education. Drill was from 11:00 until noon, then lunch. Classes began again at 1:00 PM and retreat was at 5:15. Dinner was at 5:30, and after that there was some free time, study time, and taps was played at 10:00 PM.²⁰ On Sunday mornings, cadets were required to attend one of the many churches in town.

The cadets were taught mathematics, physics, geography, history, and English by the Gettysburg College faculty. Each of these subjects lasted for three months, except for math, which went on for four months. As there was such a variety in the levels of previous education among the cadets, some men were allowed to test out of regular courses or take accelerated courses. These men also had the option of taking electives that furthered their education and would be of help to them later on in their Army careers. Some examples of these courses included calculus, navigational aids, military German, and conversational French or Spanish.²¹ The cadets marched in formation to and from class, and discipline was very strict. Demerits were given for delinquency, and punishment usually involved extra walking and a restriction of privileges.

¹⁹ Robert W. Koons, interview by Daniel A. Jewett, 23 March 1998, transcript, Oral History Collection, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.

²⁰ "Aviation Student Training Regulations Army Air Forces Eastern Training Command 55th College Training Detachment (Aircrew) Gettysburg College, 1944," Special Collections, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.

²¹ *Air Crew Bulletin*, 13 April 1943, Special Collections, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.

Physical training continued for all five months that the cadets were on campus. This was led by Head Coach Hen Bream of the College's Athletic Department. In March of 1943, he attended a training session at Maxwell Field that would help him to run this part of the College Training Detachment. Upon his arrival back on campus, a new system was set up. Adapting the athletic fields already used by the college, volleyball and basketball courts were set up. The soccer fields were converted into an obstacle course, and the football field was set up to include chin-up bars. Men ran an almost two mile cross-country course. In addition to all of this, the cadets trained with calisthenics, dumbbells, boxing, tumbling, tug of war, marching, swimming, and sprints.²²

Headquarters for the Army on campus was located in Glatfelter Hall, along with the President's and Dean's offices. The presence of the 55th made Gettysburg an official Army post, and it was run accordingly. There were four other officers on campus in addition to Captain Coshey. The adjutant was in charge of paperwork, personnel, supplying the aviation students, and transportation. The intelligence officer also served as mess officer and summary court officer. There were two tactical officers who were in charge of drill and training the cadets.²³

While the 55th College Training Detachment worked hard on campus with both military and academic training, the aviation students also found time for extracurricular activities and entertainment. They gratefully took advantage of the civilian students' offer to share publication of *The Gettysburgian* until they were able to start their own paper. The 55th's section was entitled the DODO. A call went out to any cadets who had experience in journalism or were interested in helping out. A twenty-four piece marching

²² *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 15 April 1943.

band was also formed by the aviation students. By borrowing instruments from the college and practicing during drill, “the band has grown from a drum and bugle corps to a well organized marching band.”²⁴ Banquets were held on special occasions and dances with the Gettysburg College girls brought entertainment to campus as well.

Weidensall Hall, the Student Christian Association Building, was also open to cadets during their free time. As with the civilian students, they were free to make use of the ping-pong tables, the pool, and the building to relax, play checkers, and listen to the radio and records.²⁵ The cadets also put on a number of plays and variety shows that the rest of the college and the people in town were welcome to attend. The casts were made up of aviation students, and these shows were meant to both entertain and show Gettysburg what the Army Air Corps was all about. In cases where girls were needed in the cast, female students were asked to help out.

So, while the war changed life on campus, Gettysburg College students adapted and not only became used to, but enjoyed their guests. Some civilian students were moved to different living quarters and dining facilities. The Army could be seen drilling on Nixon Field, the baseball field, where the present day library and freshman quads are located, as well as across the street from Weidensall Hall, where the Chapel presently stands. Obstacle courses took over other athletic fields and there was no intercollegiate football or basketball. One change that might not have been noticeable to all was that the flag that always flew over Pennsylvania Hall did not fly during the 55th College Training

²³ Lt. Frederick H. Willcox, “The Birth of the College Program,” *Gettysburg College Bulletin* (October 1943): 4.

²⁴ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 5 August 1943.

²⁵ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 25 February 1943.

Detachment's stay on campus. This was because Army posts were only allowed one flag, and they decided to place it in front of Huber Hall.²⁶

The college students were not the only ones who embraced the aviation students. The town of Gettysburg also adopted the cadets as their own. The first issue of *The Gettysburgian* that came out after their arrival included welcome messages from area businesses that advertised in the college's paper. In September 1943, members of the community presented the 55th with an American flag and an Army Air Corps flag that they had bought with money raised from different organizations. Captain Coshey told the crowd attending the ceremony, "I know that we of the 55th College Training Detachment all feel that we are a Gettysburg outfit, and therefore it is singularly appropriate for us to receive our banners from you, the representatives of this community."²⁷ The churches in town were very welcoming towards the cadets and enjoyed having them attend their services as well.

Once a cadet graduated from the Army Air Corps training program, he was sent to further flight school and eventually became a pilot, navigator, or bombardier.²⁸ The knowledge gained at Gettysburg made the men better at flying. The basic education they received and the military training would go on their record and show that they were skilled. After the further flight school, the only instruction needed was operational training, which basically taught aviation students how to apply this knowledge to wartime situations.

²⁶ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 1 September 1943.

²⁷ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 1 September 1943.

²⁸ Lt. Frederick H. Willcox, "The Birth of the College Program," *Gettysburg College Bulletin* (October 1943): 3.

The contract between the college and the Army was only for a year. Because of the preparation at Gettysburg College and colleges around the country as well as the Allies' progress on the war front, the Army began to prepare for the end of the war. As a result, the 55th College Training Detachment was discontinued and scheduled to leave campus by May 1944. The school was then to open as fully civilian in the fall of 1944. President Hanson thanked the students for their cooperation through the whole experience and said that "at no time in history has the college accomplished any task more creditably than the present task allotted to it as war time service."²⁹

The college had participated in wartime service before. During World War I, members of the Student Army Training Corps had their barracks in Pennsylvania Hall from September until December 1918. The ROTC program had been active on campus and by the time the Army Air Corps came to Gettysburg, over two thousand students had been through the program. In early 1943, Gettysburg had over a thousand students or alumni in the service, which was about twenty percent of all living alumni and former students.³⁰ So the 55th College Training Detachment was not the first military presence to have lived and trained on campus.

Nor however, would it be the last. The withdrawal of the Army Air Corps left the college without the financial help that it had received from housing the cadets. In June of 1944, the college again opened its doors to servicemen when it welcomed a Service Command Unit of the Army Specialized Training Unit of the Army Air Forces. This unit was comprised of seventeen-year olds waiting to turn eighteen so they could join the Army. There was a six-month training period for the approximately two hundred men in

²⁹ *The Gettysburgian* (Gettysburg), 10 February 1944.

the Specialized Training Unit.³¹ This program lasted until March of 1945, when success abroad made it clear that the war could not last much longer. Finally, all buildings on campus were able to be returned to their regular college functions.

President Hanson wrote to the aviation students about their arrival on campus in April of 1943.

In devoting her resources without stint or reservation to the war-time training of men of the Army Air Corps, Gettysburg College feels that she is performing a patriotic duty and receiving a memorable honor. She is proud of the material facilities and spiritual stamina which makes it possible for her to serve, to their mutual advantage, both the remainder of her civilian student body and the men of her nation's Army. And she is sincerely appreciative of the honor of having as her collaborators in this latest chapter of her history the officers and students of the Army Air Corps.³²

His statement echoed the sentiments of many students on campus. Gettysburg College played a crucial role in the Army Air Corps Training Program. Although they were only here for fourteen months, they left a big impact on campus as well. They were a constant reminder that the country was at war and that sacrifices were being made by many. The college and the community were doing what they could to help serve their country, and the service men appreciated it.

³⁰ *Air Crew Bulletin*, 13 April 1943, Special Collections, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.

³¹ Charles H. Glatfelter, *A Salutory Influence: Gettysburg College, 1832-1985* (Gettysburg: Gettysburg College, 1987), 733.

³² *Air Crew Bulletin*, 13 April 1943, Special Collections, Musselman Library, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.