

REPORT
WEST POINT
UNDERGRADUATE
HISTORICAL REVIEW
VOLUME 5, ISSUE 2
SPRING 2015

Report, 2

REPORT

WEST POINT UNDERGRADUATE HISTORICAL REVIEW
VOLUME 5, ISSUE 2; SPRING 2015

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Lucas Hodge (2016)

International History; German

EDITORS

Erica Macswan (2016)

American History

Andrew Mengle (2016)

American History

Brittany Deslauriers (2017)

International History; Russian

John McCormick (2017)

International History; Mathematical Science

Ian Dome (2017)

Military History

COPYRIGHT AND PHOTOCOPYING

© 2015 Department of History
United States Military Academy
West Point, New York 10996

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Editorial Board would like to thank the faculty of the History Department for their submission recommendations, all the students who submitted papers, and Captain Mark Ehlers for his extensive guidance and technical support. Without their help, *Report* would not have been possible.

ABOUT THE REVIEW

Report is a non-profit publication produced by undergraduate cadets at the United States Military Academy. It accepts and encourages submissions from undergraduates in the fall and spring. Reproduction in whole or in part without written permission is prohibited.

ON THE INTERNET

<http://www.westpoint.edu/history/SitePages/report%20history%20journal.aspx>

DISCLAIMER

The contents of *Report*, including words, images, and opinions, are unofficial and not to be considered as the official views of the United States Military Academy, the United States Army, or the Department of Defense. Readers accept and agree to this disclaimer in the use of any information obtained from *Report*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

Lucas Hodge, US Military Academy

5

SNATCHING BODIES

Scott Nelson, University of North Carolina

7

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION OF 1917

Stephanie Merinoff, Brandeis University

31

JACKIE KENNEDY AND HER EMPIRE

Adrienne Wood, Louisiana State University

41

FOR COUNTRY OR FOR YALE?

Charlotte Juergens, Yale University

49

FIDELITY OR FURY? A STUDY OF EAST GERMAN, HUNGARIAN, AND POLISH LOYALTY TO THE SOVIET UNION DURING THE EARLY COLD WAR

David Shimer, Yale University

67

FROM THE EDITOR

In this edition of *Report*, we did our best to capture history by encompassing a broad view of history without restriction to any theme, time period, or region. This edition of *Report* is a direct result of that goal, with essay submissions from across the United States and the world covering a wide range of topics.

In this edition, we present a variety of pieces. Our leading piece, by Scott Nelson of the University of North Carolina, examines the history of “body snatching” and the social implications of the development of autopsy science in early twentieth-century America. Stephanie Merinoff, a student from Brandeis University, investigates the role of the Orthodox Church in Russia’s 1917 revolution. Adrienne Wood of Louisiana State University then explores Jackie Kennedy’s personal empire within America. Charlotte Juergens of Yale University dives into a detailed account of Yale’s involvement in the American military in World War II, and the military’s impact on Yale. Finally David Shimer of Yale University dives into a detailed argument over the loyalty of the Soviet Union’s satellite states in the opening decade of the Cold War.

At West Point, we like to say that the history we teach was often made by those we taught. Working on the staff of *Report* has been a valuable component of my experience at the Academy. As a member of the Editorial Staff, and subsequently as Editor-in-Chief, I have had amazing opportunity to read papers from leading institutions across the United States and the world. Additionally, our efforts were carried out under the guidance of our faculty advisor, Captain Mark Ehlers, without whose assistance this publication would not be possible. Thanks must also go to West Point’s History Department, which offers us this opportunity among so many others and supports our education and development into Army officers.

I hope you enjoy our publication. *Sapientia per historiam!*

In History,
Lucas Hodge
Editor-in-Chief, *Report*
West Point, NY

Report, 6

SNATCHING BODIES

BY SCOTT NELSON

*Scott Nelson is a senior studying History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and will graduate in 2015. Prior to college, Scott graduated from H.B. Plant High School in Tampa, Florida. He wrote this paper during the fall semester of 2014 in a history seminar entitled *Bodies on Display: Perspectives of the Body in American Culture*. Scott was inspired to research the history of body snatching because of his passion for medicine -- he plans on attending medical school after graduation. Scott would like to thank Professor John Kasson for his tireless enthusiasm and helpful guidance throughout the entire research process.*

On the thirteenth page of W. Reece Berryhill's book, *Medical Education in Chapel Hill: The First One Hundred Years*, one finds a particularly telling photograph. Its accompanying caption reads:

"Students working in the second dissecting hall around 1900. Located near the present site of Venable Hall, this building was abandoned after Caldwell Hall was occupied in 1912." ¹

Indeed, taken at the turn of the 20th century, this picture shows seven aspiring medical students learning their trade. They are smartly dressed, some wearing aprons and others not. As the caption informs viewers, they are inside a "dissecting hall," a space designated specifically for exploring and understanding human anatomy. The caption ignores the focal point of this photograph, however. Under the gaze of each of the seven living men is one who has long since taken his last breath. With legs bursting into the foreground and threatening to fall off the dissecting table, this figure commands attention from its audience, which sits both within and beyond the photographic frame.

The longitudinal perspective of the cadaver on the dissecting table is rarely seen in photographs taken at this time. More commonly, the dissected body appears horizontally in the photographic frame with students and instructors positioned behind it. ² The decision to photograph the cadaver from this angle allows for the observation of revealing details that would have otherwise gone unnoticed. The most important of these is that the body on the dissecting table, that which remains of it, once

¹ W. Reece Berryhill, William B. Blythe, and Isaac H. Manning, *Medical Education at Chapel Hill: The First Hundred Years* (Chapel Hill: UNC Medical Alumni Office, 1979), 13.

² John Harley Warner and James M. Edmonson, *Dissection: Photographs of a Rite of Passage in American Medicine 1880-1930* (New York: Blast Books, 2009), 40-89.

belonged to a living, breathing, black man. Although the photograph is poorly lit and the right leg of the cadaver has been so sufficiently dissected that it makes racial classification difficult, there can be no doubt that the man is of African descent: the paleness of the sole of his left foot contrasts substantially with his dark upper thigh.

How then, did this black man arrive on the table in a dissecting hall of a Southern medical school? It is doubtful that he “donated his body to science,” a modern concept that became popular much later than 1900.³ Furthermore, it is unlikely that his body was obtained legally. In fact, at the time of this photograph, not one law existed in North Carolina that directed medical schools on the acquisition of bodies, black or white, for dissection.⁴ Rather, it was at this time that medical schools in North Carolina, like many others across the American South, relied on more dubious means to supply their students with necessary “clinical material.” On one hand a horrifying desecration of the deceased, on the other a lucrative business practice supplying a scientific necessity, body snatching as a means of supplying cadavers to Southern medical schools was a practice that not only existed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries — it thrived.

Dissection, a Necessary Science

When the medical students in the photograph described made their first incisions into the human subject that lay before them, they were not engaging in a novel or innovative mode of academic exploration. In fact, human dissection has existed since at least the third century B.C. when Greek physicians made “extensive anatomical and physiological discoveries” by way of the ancient surgical knife.⁵ Although dissection was not widely practiced in the first thousand years A.D., its prevalence picked up again in the fifteenth century. During this time, however, dissections were not for medical purposes, but rather for artistic ones. The firsthand study of human anatomy was especially beneficial for artists like Michelangelo and Leonardo da Vinci, evidenced by their masterful renderings of the human form and its detailed musculature.⁶ Later in the 18th century, the practice of dissection spread from the realm of art back

³ Ann Garment, et al., “Let the Dead Teach the Living: The Rise of Body Bequeathal in Twentieth-Century America,” *Academic Medicine*, 82 (2007): 1002.

⁴ Isaac Manning, “History of the Medical School of the University of North Carolina” (unpublished manuscript, ca. 1940), annotated typescript, 18-19.

⁵ Heinrich von Staden, “The Discovery of the Body: Human Dissection and its Cultural Contexts in Ancient Greece,” *Yale Journal of Biology and Medicine* 65 (1992): 224.

⁶ Suzanne M. Schultz, *Body Snatching: The Robbing of Graves for the Education of Physicians in Early Nineteenth Century America* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1992), 1.

into the medical arena, where it would cement itself as a quintessential teaching tool; in London and elsewhere in Europe, “experience in dissecting was conventional practice” for aspiring physicians and surgeons.⁷ Yet it wasn’t until the nineteenth century that dissection for educational purposes was regularly practiced in the United States. At this time, students including Thomas Eakins, whose later paintings *The Gross Clinic* (1875) and *The Agnew Clinic* (1889) accurately depict contemporary surgeries, began the intense study of human anatomy through dissection in medical schools located in Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore.⁸ From the first decades of the nineteenth century onward, the practice of dissecting human cadavers became increasingly common as more medical schools were established across the United States.

Human dissection was not always a mechanism for scientific enlightenment, however, and in some cases it was employed in a grisly manner. In sixteenth-century British law, for instance, public dissection was included as a means of punishment that was worse than death.⁹ This penalty was transferred into New York state law following the American Revolution, for in 1792 Albany man Whiting Sweeting was sentenced “to be hanged by the neck until [he was] dead, and [his] body delivered to the surgeon for dissection.”¹⁰ At this same time, the Massachusetts General Court ruled that anyone who died as a result of a duel would be sentenced to post-mortem dissection and dismemberment, a harsh punitive threat.¹¹ Of course, perhaps the most infamous, and chilling, use of dissection for non-medical purposes was the series of murders in the Whitechapel district of London in 1888 at the hands of the unidentified Jack the Ripper. At least three of Jack’s victims were found with their abdominal organs carefully removed.¹² Such gruesome applications led some to believe that dissection was a “desecration of the corpse” that “represented a gross

⁷ Helen MacDonald, *Human Remains: Dissection and its Histories* (London: Yale University Press, 2006), 12.

⁸ Michael Sappol, *A Traffic of Dead Bodies: Anatomy and Embodied Social Identity in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 49; Shultz, *Body Snatching*, 6.

⁹ Ruth Richardson, *Death, Dissection and the Destitute* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 32.

¹⁰ “The Narrative of Whiting Sweeting, Who was Executed at Albany, the 26th of August, 1792,” in Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 103.

¹¹ John B. Blake, “The Development of American Anatomy Acts,” *Journal of Medical Education* 30 (1955): 433.

¹² Detailed accounts of the Ripper’s mutilated victims can be found in tens if not hundreds of works. Here I will cite Peter Ackroyd, introduction to *Jack the Ripper and The East End*, ed. by Alex Werner (London: Chatto & Windus, 2008), 8.

assault upon the integrity and identity of the body.”¹³ Nevertheless, for the past three centuries, dissection has remained an important avenue for the mastery of human anatomy. Its continued practice today suggests that any moral shortcomings have been sufficiently outweighed by its educational value. This value is nowhere more apparent than within the confines of the formal medical school.

The Medical School

The first medical school in British America was established in Philadelphia in 1765. In the decades that followed, additional schools were founded in New York City and Cambridge, Massachusetts.¹⁴ While the study of anatomy was indeed emphasized, the lack of cadavers available for dissection limited instructional experiences. At the Harvard Medical School in Cambridge, “a single body was made to do duty for a whole course of lectures.”¹⁵ The shortage of clinical material in medical schools restricted class sizes and reduced students’ opportunities for a hands-on experience. As a result, fewer physicians than society required graduated from medical schools in the United States’ earliest years. Historians Robert L. Blakely and Judith M. Harrington explain the dire consequence: “the dearth of anatomical training was evident in the poor treatment given to patients by physicians...if [medical students] were to become more than haphazard and butchers, they needed the intimate knowledge of the human anatomy provided by direct dissection.”¹⁶ Under pressure from the public, the medical school curriculum evolved. The result was a shift to the “Paris method” in which students were permitted to dissect cadavers first-hand, no longer resigned to the role of audience member in an impersonal lecture

¹³ Richardson, *Death, Dissection and the Destitute*, in Edward C. Halperin, “The Poor, the Black, and the Marginalized as the Source of Cadavers in United States Anatomical Education,” *Clinical Anatomy* 20 (2007): 489.

¹⁴ Blake, “American Anatomy Acts,” 432.

¹⁵ Founded in 1782, the original Harvard Medical School was located in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The school was moved to Boston, where it is currently located, in 1810. Quote from *Boston Gazette*, May 5, 1788, in Jules Calvin Ladenheim, “‘The Doctors’ Mob’ of 1788,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* Winter (1950): 25

¹⁶ Robert L. Blakely and Judith M. Harrington, “Grave Consequences: The Opportunistic Procurement of Cadavers at the Medical College of Georgia” in *Bones in the Basement: Postmortem Racism in Nineteenth-Century Medical Training*, ed. Robert L. Blakely and Judith M. Harrington (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1997), 165.

hall.¹⁷ Eventually, courses in anatomy styled in this fashion were not only preferred by medical students, they were required for their graduation.¹⁸

Of course, an increased emphasis on individual, “hands-on” dissection required a greater supply of cadavers. Yet in Massachusetts, where state law included dissection after death as a possible punishment, the number of executed criminals was scarce -- only forty between 1789 and 1830.¹⁹ A similar dilemma existed elsewhere. As medical schools in the United States multiplied with rapidity in the 19th century, increasing in number from five in 1810 to sixty-five in 1860 -- mirroring the rapid growth of the nation’s population -- the number of cadavers obtained through legal means could not keep pace with the demand.²⁰ For many schools, this created a critical problem. One university president warned that “without dissecting material, it will be necessary to close the [medical] school.”²¹ In an effort to avoid this outcome, snatching cadavers for dissection became a widespread occurrence. In Vermont alone, it is estimated that around 360 bodies were snatched between 1820 and 1840.²² By far the most effective method for procuring bodies, body snatching provided a means to an end and kept medical schools in operation.

Body Snatching: the History and the Act

Evidence of body snatching,²³ defined in this essay as the physical removal of bodies from their graves for the purpose of medical dissection, was recorded as early as 1763 in British America. It was in this year, according to the November 28 issue of the *New York Gazette*, that a “body has since been taken up, and likely to become a Raw Head and Bloody Bones, by our Tribe of Dissectors, for the better instruction of our young

¹⁷ Ibid., 166.

¹⁸ Meghan J. Highet, “Body Snatching & Grave Robbing: Bodies for Science,” *History and Anthropology* 16 (2005): 419.

¹⁹ Blake, “American Anatomy Acts,” 433.

²⁰ Linden F. Edwards, “Resurrection Riots During the Heroic Age of Anatomy in America,” *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 25 (1951): 178; Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 48.

²¹ Edwin Anderson Alderman’s Report at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, February 1899, in Manning, “History of UNC Medical School,” 16.

²² Shultz, *Body Snatching*, 15.

²³ This essay will use the term “body snatching,” rather than “grave robbing,” to indicate the removal of bodies from their graves. The decision is in accordance with historian Suzanne Shultz’s assertion that “would-be thieves took only bodies for their purposes, leaving behind all of the personal effects that were buried with the deceased” (Shultz, *Body Snatching*, ix). Grave robbing, as opposed to body snatching, is commonly associated with the stealing of material items within the grave, like clothes or jewelry, and was not usually practiced by body snatchers.

Practitioners.”²⁴ Body snatching in the Northeast United States continued throughout the end of the eighteenth century, evidenced by numerous newspaper accounts detailing public opposition to the practice. In 1788 alone, riots broke out against anatomy students and their professors in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York City due to body snatching activity.²⁵ Furthermore, one student at Harvard Medical School wrote that it was in 1796 when he “began the business of getting subjects.”²⁶

As the number of medical schools expanded in the first decades of the nineteenth century, so did the act of stealing corpses. Vast regional networks connecting body snatchers and medical schools developed in the Northeast and Midwest United States as well as the South and numerous newspaper reports from across the country detailed instances of body snatching in local communities.²⁷ In some regions, the body snatching business boomed. In a letter to a colleague in 1858, University of Virginia Medical School professor John Staige Davis wrote of the “extreme inconvenience” the abundant supply of cadavers was causing him; his dissecting room had become overcrowded with subjects.²⁸ In 1854, body snatchers were “emptying at least six hundred or seven hundred graves annually in and about New York City.”²⁹ At the dawn of the Civil War, however, body snatching came to a halt. There was no need to steal bodies from graves -- over half a million corpses were available if students had the time to dissect them. More commonly, however, students and physicians were kept busy tending to the masses of the wounded.³⁰ In the years following the war, body snatching resumed. In 1879, the author of a contemporary periodical suggested that “at least a majority” of the five thousand cadavers dissected each year in the United States were acquired

²⁴ Claude Heaton, “Body Snatching in New York City,” *New York State Journal of Medicine* 43 (1943): 1861-1865 in Sappol, “Traffic of Dead Bodies,” 104.

²⁵ Sappol, “Traffic of Dead Bodies,” 45 and Ladenheim, “Doctors’ Riot,” 23-43

²⁶ Edward Warren, *The Life of John Collins Warren, MD. compiled chiefly from his Autobiography and Journal* (Boston: Ticknor and Fields, 1860), 409.

²⁷ James O. Breeden, “Body Snatchers and Anatomy Professors: Medical Education in Nineteenth-Century Virginia,” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 83 (1975): 329; Martin Kaufman and Leslie L. Hanawalt, “Body snatching in the Midwest,” *Michigan History* 55 (1970): 31; Frederick C. Waite, “Grave Robbing in New England,” *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 33 (1945): 283.

²⁸ Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 342.

²⁹ David C. Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination: The Social Origins of Cadavers in America, 1760-1915,” *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 49 (1973): 821.

³⁰ Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 238.

illegally, most likely through body snatching.³¹ For those schools engaged in the ghastly deed, long gone were the days of cadaver scarcity. In the nineteenth century, the decade of the Civil War notwithstanding, body snatching was having its heyday.

While the act of body snatching varied slightly in each instance it was practiced, the overall structure of the process remained fairly constant. In most cases, body snatching consisted of three distinct steps, the first of which was learning of an upcoming burial. This was often achieved by communication with informants in a local community. In 1820, a New York man described a conversation he had with a body snatcher passing through town who “inquired...about the sick, wanted to know their size, proportions, &c.”³² After acquiring all of the necessary information, the second step for snatching was locating the grave site. This was done in daylight, often times under the guise of hunters in search of small game or family members going to pay their respects to a deceased relative. Hours later, under the cover of night, the last step of disinterment commenced.

The actual snatching of a body required at least three men, two to exhume the corpse and one to hide and then return in a getaway vehicle. Before anyone broke ground, the grave site was carefully surveyed by shaded lantern light for any sticks, rocks, or flowers that if displaced, might suggest a disturbance. A large tarpaulin or cloth was then set adjacent to the grave to catch any dirt removed in the disinterment. To maximize efficiency, the entire coffin was not removed. Historian Suzanne M. Schultz writes that “no self-respecting [body snatcher] would have loitered in a cemetery for the length of time it would have taken to accomplish this task.”³³ Instead, an approximately three-foot-square hole was made at the head of the grave, determined by the position of the surrounding grave stones. Loose dirt as a result of the recent burial made digging easy. Once the coffin was exposed, an auger was used to bore holes into the lid, a much quieter alternative to a saw or an ax. After removing the lid, the corpse was strapped into a unique apparatus that involved a harness with a ring attachment. A rope was fastened to the ring and the body was slowly removed. Any clothes or jewelry found on the body was thrown back into the grave; the snatchers wanted to avoid any chance that their subject would be later identified. After restoring the site to its original condition, the party of men, now one more in number,

³¹ T.S. Sozinsky, “Grave-robbing and Dissection,” *Penn Monthly* 10 (1879): 216-217 in Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 822.

³² N. P. Wiley to I.B. Van Schaik, New York, January 14, 1820? in Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 113.

³³ Schultz, *Body Snatching*, 32.

hurried away to the escape vehicle. The most experienced of body snatchers could exhume a body in under an hour.³⁴

Initially, bodies were delivered directly to medical schools following disinterment, usually by wagon. As body snatching operations expanded, however, bodies were stuffed into large barrels, whiskey casks, or boxes, packed in bran, and shipped long distances via railroad.³⁵ An excerpt from the 1879 *Galveston Daily News* details the arrest of a body snatcher who shipped bodies in boxes from Chattanooga all the way to Cincinnati and Atlanta under the impression that such boxes contained fish or fur.³⁶ To avoid similar detection, body snatchers in Virginia cut a deal with the Virginia Central Railroad, which “received increased freight rates” as payment for the transport of corpses.³⁷ Even with this additional cost, many body snatchers made a handsome profit. Adult corpses in Virginia could be procured for \$12 per body, excluding shipping rates. In New York, this price could be as much as \$30 per body. A pricing list from 1850 shows that body snatchers were not above stealing the youngest of corpses: “infants from birth to 8 years” were \$4 each.

Body snatching was a seasonal practice that only occurred when medical schools were in session, usually between November and February. Of course, this was the optimal period for snatching anyway, as cold weather delayed the body’s natural decomposition and therefore preserved corpses for dissection. Anything other than this natural refrigeration could wreak havoc on the body snatching trade. In November of 1849 in Virginia, for instance, uncharacteristically warm weather led to an “unavoidable” delay in the acquisition of cadavers. It had been so warm, stated one body snatcher, that, “the subjects are all in incipient putrefaction when buried.” Two attempts at exhumation were all for naught, the bodies were “too far gone.”³⁸

Since its inception in the eighteenth century, body snatching in the United States has served the vital purpose of supplying cadavers to medical schools for anatomical education. In the 19th century, the exhumation of corpses became systematic and as a result, snatchers located and unearthed bodies with swiftness and ease. Keeping well aware of unexpected weather and its potentially disastrous effects, some snatchers made respectable profits, transporting bodies to medical schools both

³⁴ The entire process of body snatching is paraphrased from Waite, “Grave Robbing in New England,” 279-281.

³⁵ Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 334.

³⁶ “Wholesale Body Snatching,” *Galveston Daily News*, November 30, 1879, col. D.

³⁷ Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 328.

³⁸ H.L. Thomas to John S. Davis, Charlottesville, September 25, 1849, in Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia”, 331.

locally and across great distances. But just who were these people that busied themselves with the traffic of the dead?

The Snatchers

On December 6, 1875, the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* printed an editorial that described body snatchers as “unprofessional bunglers” who partake in “nefarious work.” Careful not to let the snatchers’ employers off the hook, the author added that “the respectable professors who hire such miserable starvelings...to get corpses for them are even more guilty than their wretched tools.”³⁹ The editorial sheds light on a critical aspect of body snatching in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: the act of snatching was almost always instigated by medical schools, even when middlemen executed the disinterment. This fact is underscored in a brief report from an 1879 issue of the *Louisville Courier Journal* in which two men were arrested in Nashville for “attempting to unearth a corpse” at a local cemetery. Upon conviction, one of the men revealed that “he was employed by the medical department of the University of Tennessee to which place, if they had been successful, the body would have been taken.”⁴⁰ Indeed, many medical school administrators and instructors, including the aforementioned Davis in Virginia, dealt either directly or indirectly with professional body snatchers to secure their supply of cadavers.⁴¹ It is therefore important not to underestimate the role of the medical school establishment as the primary driving force for body snatching at this time. It was at the request of the schools and the promise of their patronage that professional body snatchers removed corpses from their graves.

These professional body snatchers, also labeled at the time as “resurrectionists,” “sack-um-up men,” and “night doctors,” are often portrayed by historians as shady, unreliable figures who were mostly “free-lancing rustics.”⁴² However, they were also enterprising opportunists, capitalizing on the spike in demand for cadavers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. What is more, they were often quite clever. One man who personified this ingenuity was William Cunningham, known as “Old Cunny” to his peers, who worked in the 1860s as a wagon driver by day and a body snatcher by night in Cincinnati, Ohio. On a typical evening, “Old Cunny” would remove a body from the grave, dress it in old clothes, and position it in his wagon beside him. If anyone came too close,

³⁹ “Body-Snatching,” *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, December 6, 1875.

⁴⁰ “Body Snatching: Jordan, the Nashville Grave Robber, Fined \$25 – The Sexton Implicated,” *Louisville Courier Journal*, November 25, 1879.

⁴¹ Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 328.

⁴² Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 490; Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 322.

Cunningham would reprimand his dead companion by shouting, “Sit up! This is the last time I am going to take you home when you get drunk,” and then, perhaps ironically, as “Old Cunny” was a heavy drinker himself, adding “The idea of a man with a family disgracing himself in this way!”⁴³ Around the same time in Washington D.C., another cunning body snatcher practiced her craft. Maude Pratt frequently attended funerals of the recently diseased where she acted genuinely distressed, accompanying the coffin all the way to the cemetery. Once the ceremony concluded, she would drop flowers at the site of the new grave, marking it for later resurrection.⁴⁴ Stories like these suggest that body snatchers were not all the “unprofessional bunglers” described above. Some resurrectionists were masterful at their jobs and, willing to risk arrest and public condemnation, could profit handsomely from their “nefarious work.”

While employing professional resurrectionists as middlemen distanced medical schools from body snatching, it was often easier, and less expensive, for professors and students to exhume bodies themselves. In 1818, Dr. Thomas Sewall, who would later go on to establish the George Washington University School of Medicine in Washington, D.C., was suspected of removing bodies from eight different graves. The bodies were eventually found in Sewall’s possession -- he was using them to teach surgery to a group of medical students.⁴⁵ In another instance, Dr. Valentine Mott, a surgical teacher and president of the New York Academy of Medicine in 1850, assisted in unearthing and transporting eleven corpses for dissection, all in one night. Mott was not the only president of the Academy to participate in body snatching; each of the first six men to hold the title were involved in body snatching at some point during their careers.⁴⁶

Students played an integral role in snatching bodies as well. Edward Dixon, a medical student at Rutgers in the early 1830s, remembered his educational experience years later as one characterized by “diligent use of the shovel and the scalpel.”⁴⁷ Students at the Columbus Medical College in Ohio could echo this sentiment forty years later. It was they, and not their professors, who were responsible for stealing bodies from the cemetery at the Columbus State Hospital.⁴⁸ Some students benefitted financially from body snatching. One 1872 Detroit Medical

⁴³ Schultz, *Body Snatching*, 59.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 61.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 51, 52.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁴⁷ Edward H. Dixon, “Scenes in a Medical Student’s Life – Resurrectionizing,” *The Scalpel* 7 (1855): 93-100, in Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 116.

⁴⁸ Shultz, *Body Snatching*, 54.

College graduate paid for his medical studies by moonlighting as a body snatcher, stealing corpses from a Canadian cemetery and selling them to the University of Michigan.⁴⁹ In other places, body snatching helped offset the cost of procuring a body for dissection. This was as much as five dollars at one medical school, a steep price in the early 19th century.⁵⁰

Although body snatching was very much an illegal enterprise, it was deemed absolutely necessary by medical schools across the United States. Many schools relied on professional body snatchers who eagerly participated in the “traffic of dead bodies”⁵¹ for personal income. While the employment of middlemen (and, like the case of Maude Pratt, middlewomen) distanced respectable professors and their students from criminality, it was often simpler and more economical to do the snatching themselves. A rich history exists of professors and students who braved both the law and personal trepidations to procure bodies for dissection. There is no doubt that these corpses, utilized as educational tools, became a vital aspect of medical learning. Equally important, however, were the living people to whom those bodies once belonged.

The Snatched

“There was a hierarchy for the 18th-century dead as surely there was one for the living,” historian Steven Wilf once observed.⁵² In the 19th century and at the turn of the 20th, this assertion continued to ring true. Usually, the wealthiest of the deceased were buried under a church floor or close enough to its walls to be guarded by a warden or a hired watchman.⁵³ Those families that could afford to protect their buried relatives with a host of mechanisms, including iron cages called “mortsafes.”⁵⁴ Also useful in fending off body snatchers was the invention of the iron coffin; an advertisement from 1894 claims that it is “burglar proof” and “cannot be penetrated by chisel or drill.”⁵⁵ More natural deterrents to potential resurrectionists also existed. One African-American newspaper from 1827

⁴⁹ Kaufman and Hanawalt, “Body Snatching in the Midwest,” 31-32.

⁵⁰ *Report of a Committee of the Regents of the University Appointed to Visit the College of Physicians and Surgeons in the City of New-York, Made to the Regents, January 12, 1826* (Albany, NY, 1826), 18-20, in Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 112.

⁵¹ This rather macabre phrase is borrowed from the title of Michael Sappol’s book on the subject of body snatching.

⁵² Steven Robert Wilf, “Anatomy and Punishment in Late Eighteenth-Century New York,” *Journal of Social History* 22 (1989): 511, in Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 106-107.

⁵³ Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 107.

⁵⁴ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 491.

⁵⁵ “Coffins That Can Be Relied On: They Are Made Burglar and Fire Proof and Will Give Satisfaction,” *Chicago Daily Tribune*, September 23, 1894.

suggests layering wheaten straw between a coffin and the surface of the ground, assuring that “the longest night will not afford time sufficient to empty the grave.”⁵⁶ Of course, the simplest and least expensive method to inhibit body snatching was to have family members stand guard at the grave site for several days until the body decomposed, thereby becoming unfit for dissection.⁵⁷ Unfortunately, the safeguarding options listed above required considerable amounts of money, a willing family, or both, things the impoverished and lonely lived without. Consequently, body snatchers concentrated their efforts on the cemeteries that held the bodies of this destitute demographic, those buried in potter’s fields. It was here that medical historian Frederick C. Waite observed, a body “did not remain long in the grave.”⁵⁸

In some cases, the bodies of those snatched did not even make it into the grave. In 1879, one doctor claimed that bodies frequently disappeared from morgues and the “dead rooms of hospitals.”⁵⁹ Those bodies that were interred in potter’s fields and cemeteries for the impoverished were often poorly guarded, if at all. Guards could be bribed by money and whiskey, and some were regular accomplices in the act of snatching.⁶⁰ In one instance in Nashville in 1879, a body snatcher “proved conclusively that he had been in the habit of purchasing stiffs [(bodies)] from the sexton of the cemetery at \$3 apiece.”⁶¹ Other sources of bodies were prisons, train stations, docks, asylum burial grounds, and almshouses.⁶² The number of bodies acquired from one almshouse in Philadelphia was so high that its guardians came to be known as the “Board of Buzzards.”⁶³

Indeed, some bodies of those at the higher echelons of society made their way onto the dissecting table. The most famous example occurred in 1879 when the body of United States congressman John Scott Harrison, son of President William Henry Harrison was found at the Ohio Medical College.⁶⁴ Reports of such instances of body snatching that involved the well-to-do members of society often made the newspapers, but these were few and far between. The great majority of bodies snatched

⁵⁶ “Varieties: An easy Way to Secure Dead Bodies in their Graves,” *Freedom’s Journal*, New York, NY, March 30, 1827, 4.

⁵⁷ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 491.

⁵⁸ Waite, “Grave Robbing in New England,” 279.

⁵⁹ Sozinsky, “Grave-robbing and Dissection,” 216-217 in Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 821.

⁶⁰ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 491.

⁶¹ “Body Snatching,” *Louisville Courier Journal*, 1.

⁶² Hight, “Body Snatching & Grave Robbing,” 421.

⁶³ Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 823.

⁶⁴ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 491.

in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries belonged to the impoverished and disenfranchised and often went unnoticed. While “white paupers crowded the country’s almshouses,” another group, the black community, was far more vulnerable to body snatching, particularly in the South. It is here where this essay turns to focus on this group and their vital role in shaping American medical education.

Black Bodies: the Vulnerable

“In Baltimore the bodies of coloured people exclusively are taken for dissection,” commented English sociologist Harriet Martineau during her visit to Maryland in 1835, “because the whites do not like it, and the coloured people cannot resist.”⁶⁵ Indeed, voiceless and marginalized in society, the American black community was afforded little protection for their dead in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As a result, blacks fell victim to body snatching and, as easy targets, were often the preferred source of anatomical material for medical schools. As historian D.C. Humphrey put it, “Dissecting a white was risky business. Dissecting a black was largely a matter of finding a body.”⁶⁶

As early as the eighteenth century, black bodies were singled out for snatching in the United States. In 1788, free and enslaved blacks petitioned the New York City Common Council to put an end to body snatching in black cemeteries by white medical students. The appeal was ignored.⁶⁷ As one New Yorker wrote, “the only subjects procured for dissection are the productions of Africa...and if those characters are the only subjects of dissection, surely no person can object.”⁶⁸ Almost a century later, black bodies remained a vulnerable target. In one black cemetery in Philadelphia in 1883, melting snow revealed a number of empty graves, as if the ground “had been subjected to an aerial bombardment.”⁶⁹ It is important to note here that the medical school establishment at this time was one that was dominated by whites; black students were simply not admitted to medical schools. This trend would continue throughout most of the nineteenth century -- it was not until 1868 that the first medical school for African Americans was established in the United States and even then black doctors worked in a “Negro medical

⁶⁵ Harriet Martineau, *Retrospect of Western Travel* (London: Saunders & Otley, 1838) vol. 1, 140; Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 819.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 820.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 820.

⁶⁸ T. M. Gallagher, *The Doctors’ Story* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World: 1967), 48-49, 53 in Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 820.

⁶⁹ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 490.

ghetto.”⁷⁰ Therefore, as long as body snatching existed, it was the corpses of the poor and marginalized that served as favored specimens for dissection. In an era characterized by racial discrimination, the black community was virtually defenseless against wily resurrectionists.

Snatching in the South

In the American South, the dilemma facing black communities was even more acute. For it was here that the concentration of blacks was the greatest and where, as historian Todd L. Savitt noted, “they were rendered physically visible by their skin color but were legally invisible because of their slave status.”⁷¹ The discrimination did not cease following Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation in 1863. Instead, throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, blacks remained the primary subjects for dissection in southern medical schools.

A fascinating discovery in 1989 gives credence to this point. It was during this year at the Medical College of Georgia that construction workers stumbled across bones and other remains buried in the basement of the medical college’s dissecting hall. Archaeologists were called to the scene and by way of forensic technology, were able to classify by race those bones which are believed to have belonged to dissected bodies. In an examination of twenty four buried tibiae, it was determined that 79 percent belonged to African Americans, the other 21 percent to Euro-Americans. The result is particularly telling, as census counts during the period of dissection suggest that only 42 percent of the college’s surrounding population was African-American.⁷² Although a minority in the general population, black bodies were frequently employed as instruments for anatomical education.

There is no doubt that medical schools in the South were well aware of their geographic proximity to black communities and in turn, the access they had to their graves. Some schools openly advertised the fact. In

⁷⁰ The medical school designated specifically for black students was the School of Medicine at Howard University in Washington, D.C., founded in 1868. However, it is worth noting that Howard’s first graduating classes included a “large percentage” of white students. Other black medical schools established later, like Meharry Medical College in Nashville, TN, founded in 1876, had a significantly larger proportion of black students. See W. Montague Cobb, “Surgery and the Negro Physician: Some Parallels in Background,” *Journal of the National Medical Association* 43 (1951): 151.

⁷¹ Todd L. Savitt, “The Use of Blacks for Medical Experimentation and Demonstration in the Old South,” *The Journal of Southern History* 48 (1982): 332.

⁷² Robert L. Blakely, “A Clandestine Past: Discovery at the Medical College of Georgia and Theoretical Foundations” in Blakely and Harrington, *Bones in the Basement*, 3; Blakely and Harrington, “Grave Consequences,” 174.

an 1831 issue of the *Charleston Mercury*, the Medical College of South Carolina was described as follows: “No place in the United States offers as great opportunities for the acquisition of anatomical knowledge. Subjects being obtained for the coloured population in sufficient numbers for every purpose and proper dissection carried out without offending any individuals in the community!”⁷³ Similarly, the Louisiana Medical College in New Orleans advertised that among its “admirable advantages for instruction of medical students – particularly those destined for southern practice,” was “the great facility of obtaining subjects for dissection” from the nearby New Orleans Charity Hospital, one that admitted black patients.⁷⁴ Other schools, while avoiding the specific mention of dissection, did exalt the usefulness of black bodies for the advancement of medical knowledge. In 1853 the Hampden-Sydney College Medical Department (named the Medical College of Virginia after 1854) proclaimed that “The number of negroes employed in our factories will furnish materials for the support of an extensive hospital, and afford to the student that great desideratum – clinical instruction.”⁷⁵

Not all clinical material for dissection was supplied from local sources, however. In some cases, black bodies were disinterred in the North and shipped to the South. In the 1830s, one New York newspaper published an article under the headline, “More Pork for the South.” The text below described the intended transport of “two dead negroes” from New York City to Charleston, South Carolina.⁷⁶ Likewise, body snatchers in the South routinely shipped black bodies to medical schools in the North. During the 1880s and 1890s, an anatomy professor at one New England medical college received “twelve bodies of southern Negroes,” twice each academic session.⁷⁷ Such transport between the North and South underscores the importance of the black body for dissection purposes. Once snatched, black bodies became commodities in high demand that could be shipped hundreds of miles before they were laid on the hard surface of a dissecting table.

⁷³ “Prospectus of the South Carolina Medical College” in Theodore Dwight Weld, *American Slavery as it is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses* (American Anti-Slavery Society: 1839), 169.

⁷⁴ *New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal* (1833): 643-647, in Walter Fisher, “Physicians and Slavery in the Antebellum Southern Medical Journal,” *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 23 (1968): 46.

⁷⁵ Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 335.

⁷⁶ J.S. Buckingham, *America, historical, statistic, and descriptive* (London: Fisher, Son & Co., 1841) 159.

⁷⁷ Humphrey, “Dissection and Discrimination,” 823-824.

In lieu of body snatching, professors and students at some medical schools in the South attempted to lure living black bodies into their examination rooms. Of course, blacks would never enter such places at their own will. Savitt writes that even “illiterate slaves did not have to read [the advertisements] to learn about medical-school hospitals; their reputations preceded them.”⁷⁸ Instead, advertisements for anatomical material were directed towards slaveholders. One rather frank example comes from a certain Dr. T. Stillman, affiliated with the Medical College of South Carolina:

“To planters and others – wanted 50 Negroes. Any person having sick Negroes, considered incurable by their respective physicians, and wishing to depose of them, Dr. S. will pay cash for Negroes affected with scrofula, or king’s evil, confirmed hypocondriasm, apoplexy, diseases of the liver, kidneys, spleen, stomach and intestines, bladder and its appendages, diarrhea, dysentery, &c. The highest cash price will be paid on application as above.”⁷⁹

Although there is no evidence to suggest Dr. Stillman’s advertisement found willing slave contributors, support for the vital role of the black slave in the advancement of medical knowledge can be found elsewhere. For instance, four of the eight articles in an 1836 issue of the *Southern Medical and Surgical Journal* mentioned the treatment of slaves.⁸⁰ In an 1838 issue of the same journal, a professor from Georgia reported that slaves served as the subjects of 80 percent of the eye operations he conducted. Also of note was the performance of six surgeries in the presence of students in the Medical College of Georgia’s anatomical theater in 1838, three of which involved slaves.⁸¹ A particularly vulnerable subgroup of the American black population, slaves could be forced to participate in medical procedures against their will, much to the benefit of medical students practicing their craft. Moreover, accepting slaves whose afflictions were “considered incurable,” allowed for the possibility of medical enlightenment before and after the subject’s inevitable death. While body snatching was often a criminal and burdensome task,

⁷⁸ Savitt, “Physicians and Slavery,” 336.

⁷⁹ *Charleston Mercury*, October 12, 1838, in Weld, *American Slavery as it is*, 171.

⁸⁰ *Southern Journal of Medicine and Surgery* 2 (1836): 335 in Fisher, “Physicians and Slavery,” 46.

⁸¹ *Southern Journal of Medicine and Surgery* 2 (1838): 643-647 in Fisher, “Physicians and Slavery,” 46.

admitting infirmed slaves and dissecting their corpses post-mortem was a much simpler yet less common alternative to body snatching.

A Range of Reaction

Public reaction towards body snatching during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries varied widely. Some raged against medical schools when they caught word of the removal of corpses for scientific purposes. Following the disinterment of bodies from a grave in Painesville, Ohio in 1845, a group of citizens adopted a series of resolutions, one of which proclaims:

Resolved, that we most solemnly believe that those who have no regard for the dead, can have but little respect for the living, and those who respect neither dead or living, should never receive the confidence of the public.⁸²

Other responses were far more violent. Following the precedent set by the “Doctor’s Mob Riot” of 1788, in which a mob of New York City citizens hunted down the anatomy professors of the city’s medical college for secretly unearthing bodies from a local cemetery for dissection, numerous rowdy protests broke out in the 19th century in states including Maryland, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, Illinois, and Missouri.⁸³ In Baltimore, following an 1807 riot that demolished the dissecting hall, architects designed a new medical building that still stands today, complete with “maze-like corridors to thwart potential mobs trying to break into the anatomy laboratory.”⁸⁴ Even after building this safeguard, the threat of continued riots prevented dissection at the medical department of the University of Maryland until 1832.⁸⁵

Following the Civil War, it was widely regarded that the nation was lacking in medical expertise. Historian Michael Sappol writes that “many diplomaed practitioners were exposed as incompetent, unable to perform amputations, set fractures, remove bullets, or do other basic surgeries.”⁸⁶ As such, there was a push to revamp medical education across the newly united country with an increased emphasis on first-hand dissection to develop critical skills. In turn, some members of the public adopted more moderate opinions of body snatching. These views were generally characterized by a criticism of the means but an appreciation for

⁸² *The Ashtabula Sentinel*, November 4, 1845 in Edwards, “Resurrection Riots,” 178.

⁸³ Edwards, “Resurrection Riots,” 180-184.

⁸⁴ Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 491.

⁸⁵ Edwards, “Resurrection Riots,” 180.

⁸⁶ Sappol, *Traffic of Dead Bodies*, 238.

its ends. That is, while many people abhorred the idea of ripping corpses from their coffins, they understood the importance of dissection for the education of future physicians. This point is illustrated in an 1875 article titled “Body-Snatching” which includes both assertions that “dissections of the human body are absolutely necessary for a medical course” and that “the crime of body snatching is one that should be punished with hard labor in the Penitentiary for life.”⁸⁷

Public opinion was also shaped by popular literature. When the American version of Charles Dickens’ *Tale of Two Cities* was published in *Harper’s Weekly* in 1859, readers were introduced to the character of Jerry Cruncher, who, like many actual body snatchers, had an ordinary job by day and resurrected corpses by night.⁸⁸ Body snatching also made its way into Mark Twain’s literary classic, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*. When Tom and Huck Finn snuck off to a cemetery at midnight to cure a wart, they witnessed the snatching of “old Hoss Williams” by the hands of Injun Joe and Muff Potter on behalf of “Sawbones,” the “young Dr. Robinson.”⁸⁹ Such fictional accounts of body snatching, laid out clearly for public consumption, suggest that the subject was far from taboo. Rather, body snatching was a significant reality in American society and affected more than medical students and their procured specimens.

In some instances, the public called directly on the government to intervene so that cadavers for dissection could be obtained legally. In an 1881 letter to the editor, one Tennessee citizen suggests “allowing [medical] colleges to have the bodies of criminals and unclaimed paupers” for dissection.⁹⁰ Indeed, since 1831, legislative measures known as Anatomy Acts existed in the United States, authorizing local officials to deliver the bodies of those who would otherwise be buried at the public’s expense (those who died in state hospitals, prisons, almshouses, or other state facilities). In turn, body snatching was made illegal and could be punished by heavy fines. States in both the North and the South established their own Anatomy Acts throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.⁹¹ Not all acts were the same, however. Those written in the South commonly sought to assuage the fears of the white community and ensure that only blacks would be handed over to dissectors. One bill proposed in the Kentucky House of Representatives in 1833 called on the courts of the state to “adjudge and award [only] the corpses of negroes

⁸⁷ “Body Snatching,” *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*.

⁸⁸ Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1859), 183-187.

⁸⁹ Mark Twain, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (Hartford: American Publishing Co., 1876), 63-68.

⁹⁰ “Body-snatching Again,” *Daily American*, February 4, 1881.

⁹¹ Blake, “American Anatomy Acts,” 436.

executed by sentences” to medical schools “for dissection and experiment.”⁹² Years later in 1903, an Anatomy Act in North Carolina was amended to include that no white cadaver would ever be delivered to a black medical college for dissection.⁹³ Whatever their content, the Anatomy Acts were often weakly enforced and did not deter body snatchers. No clearer is this disregard for the law than in a report that stemmed from the arrest of a certain body snatcher named Richard Jordan. The report concludes with a line stating that, “Jordan, after securing the [punitive] fine, stated publicly that he would resume operations again as soon as the excitement blew over.”⁹⁴

Racialized Responses

Owing to the aforementioned preference resurrectionists had for black bodies, it is understandable that blacks and whites harbored different fears in regards to body snatching and dissection. Most members of the white population were concerned only about the deceased who shared their rung on the social ladder. This was evident in New York in 1788 when the exhumation of numerous bodies from a black cemetery went ignored while the snatching of a single white female led to rioting.⁹⁵ Exemplary of the racialized rhetoric of the time, some believed that body snatching allowed for blacks and other disadvantaged populations to “repay their debt to society.”⁹⁶ As long as it did not involve them or those they knew, many members of the white population were not overly concerned with body snatching. In the words of an anatomy professor at the University of Michigan, “the ‘better people’ could rest easy.”⁹⁷

Members of the black population, particularly in the South, were not afforded this luxury. Savitt wrote that “blacks usually knew full well how the bodies of their friends and relatives were being used, and they were both offended and frightened.”⁹⁸ For instance, in 1856, an elderly black woman exclaimed to her friend as they passed by the city’s medical school, “Please Gawd, when I dead, I hope I wi’ dead in de summah time,” alluding to the previously noted fact that body snatching and dissections

⁹² *Journal of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky* (Frankfurt, Ky., 1833), 107.

⁹³ *1903 N.C. Session Laws*, 666, 1056.

⁹⁴ “Body Snatching,” *Louisville Courier Journal*.

⁹⁵ Wilf, “Anatomy and Punishment,” 512.

⁹⁶ Mieke M.F. Curtis-Richardson, “Corpses As Commodities: The Ethnography of Covert Medical Practices in Georgia, Ca. 1835-1997,” in Blakely and Harrington, *Bones in the Basement*, 340-370.

⁹⁷ Kaufman and Hanawalt, “Body Snatching in the Midwest,” 35-36.

⁹⁸ Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 340.

only occurred in the winter months, when medical schools were in session and the body could be sufficiently preserved.⁹⁹ Following the Civil War, whites, as a means of controlling recently emancipated black men and women, invented rumors of supernatural “night doctors” who stole, killed, and dissected blacks.¹⁰⁰ Although fictitious, the fear that such rumors bred was very much real. Four verses of a poem ominously titled, “The Dissecting Hall,” details the anxieties of the black community:

Yuh see dat house? Dat great brick house?
Way yonder down de street?
Dey used to take dead folks een dar
Wrapped een a long white sheet.

An’ sometimes we’en a nigger’d stop,
A-wondering who was dead,
Dem stujent men would take a club,
An’ bat ‘im on de head.

An ‘drag dat poor dead nigger chile
Right een dat ‘sectin hall
To vestigate ‘is liver – lights –
His gizzard an’ ‘is gall.

Tek off dat nigger’s han’s an’ feet –
His eyes, his head, an’ all,
An’ w’en dem stujent finish
Dey was nothin’ left at all.¹⁰¹

Blacks did not only play the role of “the snatched.” In several cases, blacks were complicit in the act of resurrecting bodies. In one 1883 episode, it was the black superintendent of a Philadelphia cemetery who permitted resurrectionists to unearth bodies at will.¹⁰² Four years earlier, a report out of Nashville highlighted the activities of three “negro body-snatchers.”¹⁰³ Blacks were also accomplices to body snatching in situations

⁹⁹ Robert Wilson, “Their Shadowy Influence Still Hovers About Medical College,” *Sunday News Courier*, Charleston, S.C., April 13, 1913, in Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 340.

¹⁰⁰ Gladys-Marie Fry, *Night Riders: In Black Folk History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 3 and Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 340.

¹⁰¹ *Scribe*, I, (December 1951), 17 in Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 341.

¹⁰² Halperin, “The Poor, the Black,” 490.

¹⁰³ “Body Snatching,” *Louisville Courier Journal*.

in which they had little choice. In the mid-nineteenth century, the previously mentioned Medical College of Georgia employed “resurrection slaves” to steal black corpses. Between 1842 and 1852, these slaves obtained no less than sixty-four bodies for dissection.¹⁰⁴

In 1852, the Medical College of Georgia officially purchased one of these slaves, a man named Grandison Harris. Harris’s task was to snatch black bodies from a local cemetery and deliver them to the medical college’s dissecting room. After several years of work, Harris gained an impressive degree of familiarity with human anatomy, and he often served as a teaching assistant alongside fledgling medical students. In fact, Harris’s expertise garnered great respect -- it was said that “students freely went to him, much more than they did to the instructors.”¹⁰⁵ Unfortunately for the black man, he was likely loathed in his local community. Historian Tanya Telfair Sharpe compared Harris’ presence in black neighborhoods to that of a drug dealer in today’s society: one that evoked both fear and jealousy. Following the one-time slave resurrectionist’s retirement in 1905, he was granted a pension of \$10 a month and his son was hired on as a janitor.¹⁰⁶ Although Harris was a rare example of a black man benefitting from the practice of body snatching, his story does add gray to a broader narrative that is often painted solely in black and white.

The Big Picture: Body Snatching and the Role of the Black Body

Placed in a larger context, body snatching and the subsequent dissection of cadavers was only one way in which the black body served to advance medical education in the American South in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indeed, Dr. James Marion Sims, who practiced gynecological surgery in Alabama, had no known experiences with snatching bodies for dissection. Yet, in the 1840s and early 1850s, he performed numerous experimental surgeries on black slave women by which he developed a cure for vesico-vaginal fistula.¹⁰⁷ Years later, Dr. Sims reflected on his brave patients, who, without their “indomitable courage” would have left the “broad domain of surgery” without “one of

¹⁰⁴ Harold Jackson, “Race and the Politics of Medicine in Nineteenth-Century Georgia” in Blakely and Harrington, *Bones in the Basement*, 200.

¹⁰⁵ Tanya Telfair Sharpe, “Grandison Harris: The Medical College of Georgia’s Resurrection Man” in Blakely and Harrington, *Bones in the Basement*, 213.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 220.

¹⁰⁷ A “vesico –vaginal fistula is a break in the wall separating the bladder from the vagina, which allows urine to pass involuntarily to the outside from the vagina rather than the urethra. Women suffering from this defect, usually the result of trauma during childbirth, are incontinent of urine and continually uncomfortable.” See Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 344-345.

the most useful improvements that shall forever hereafter grace its annals.”¹⁰⁸ Additional medical breakthroughs, including the first successful ovariectomy, the first operations on anesthetized patients, and the perfection of the Caesarean section, relied on the black body.¹⁰⁹

Yet, even in the larger narrative of the black body as a useful medical tool, body snatching stands out in bold. This is because the very act of resurrecting the dead black body bestows an importance on it that never existed while the body was alive. Borrowing the words of anthropologist Lesley A. Sharpe, the black community in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries served as one example of the “socially expendable categories of persons [who were] ironically transformed into valued objects through their involvement in medical research.”¹¹⁰ In 1951, black anatomist W. Montague Cobb wrote on this irony, stating, “...our [white] colleagues recognized in the Negro [on the dissecting table] a perfection in human structure which they were unwilling to concede when that structure was animated by the vital spark.”¹¹¹ This is not to say that body snatching and dissection eliminated racialized and hierarchical feeling. In fact, the act of manipulating a helpless body is in many ways one that carries immense power. As medical students were educated during “that stage of life, when the transformation of character is inevitable,” it is possible that the body snatching and dissection of black corpses led them to perceive the black man as inhuman or subordinate.¹¹² Upon the dissection table however, a certain education in equality cannot be ignored. As aforementioned traveler Martineau claimed, white medical students who dissected black cadavers “cannot say that coloured people have not nerves that quiver under moral injury, nor a brain that is on fire with insult, nor pulses that throb under oppression.”¹¹³ Through dissections, students learned, whether they realized it or not, that differences between black and white bodies were, quite literally, only skin deep. It was body snatching that made this lesson possible.

Decline and Legacy

¹⁰⁸ J. Marion Sims to H.V. Wooten, January 23, 1850, Hardy Vickers Wooten Papers (Manuscripts Division, Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, Ala.) in Savitt, “The Use of Blacks,” 346.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 346-347.

¹¹⁰ Lesley A. Sharpe, “The Commodification of the Body and Its Parts,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29 (2000): 296.

¹¹¹ Cobb, “Surgery and the Negro Physician,” 148.

¹¹² Warner and Edmondson, “Dissection,” 9

¹¹³ Martineau, “Retrospect of Western Travel,” 141.

While the bulk of body snatching activity occurred in the nineteenth century, some sources date its existence well into the twentieth. According to one author, body snatchers still operated in Tennessee in the 1920s, selling cadavers to four medical schools in Nashville and sending surplus bodies to Iowa.¹¹⁴ Eventually, however, the passage of Anatomy Acts, in conjunction with an improved public opinion of medicine, eliminated body snatching in the United States.¹¹⁵ Medical breakthroughs in bacteriology, surgery, and preventative medicine confirmed the importance of research, and an increasing number of people began donating their bodies to science.¹¹⁶ In 1968, this process was made easier with the passage of the Uniform Anatomy Gift Act. Adopted by all fifty states, it replaced the patchwork of previous state legislation and ensured the right of a donor to bequeath his or her own body to medical science and education.¹¹⁷

Without daily reminders, it is vital that the history of body snatching remains intact. Eased by the existence of donation programs today, the process of procuring bodies for dissection in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was complex and in most cases, criminal. Body snatching was meticulously planned and executed by aspiring medical students, their desperate professors, and enterprising middlemen, who all attempted to meet the rising cadaver quotas that resulted from the evolution of the medical school curriculum. From the beginning, the marginalized and disadvantaged populations of society were the most vulnerable to body snatching. In an era brimming with racial prejudices, the black community was an easy target. While public reactions to body snatching varied, the white population was generally content as long as their graves remained immune to desecration. On the contrary, the black community lived in fear of white doctors, as well as the black men that helped them. The institution of slavery and the greater concentration of black populations in the South made it a hotspot for body snatching, a practice that continued in the region into the early decades of the twentieth century.

The history of body snatching in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the American South provides more than evidence

¹¹⁴ Rhoda Truax, *The Doctors Warren of Boston: first family of surgery* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968), 313, in Humphrey, "Dissection and Discrimination," 824.

¹¹⁵ Humphrey, "Dissection and Discrimination," 824.

¹¹⁶ Blake, "American Anatomy Acts," 437.

¹¹⁷ Aaron D. Tward and Hugh A. Patterson, "From Grave Robbing to Gifting: Cadaver Supply in the United States," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 287 (2007): 1183.

that “violation of the sepulchre [was] essential to the study of anatomy.”¹¹⁸ Rather, the purposeful resurrection of unguarded, and most often black, corpses, contributes to the greater assertion that blacks were vital in the advancement of medical knowledge. Of course, the role of race in medicine did not disappear when body snatching dissipated in the 1920s. Between 1932 and 1972, six hundred rural black men were the sole subjects of the Tuskegee syphilis experiment performed by the U.S. Public Health Service. As a part of the experiment, doctors and scientists allowed subjects infected with syphilis to go untreated. At least 128 men died of syphilis or related complications, causing outrage in the black community.¹¹⁹

The Tuskegee experiment, in addition to instances of forced sterilization, radiation testing, and “corrective” surgeries particular to blacks suggest that any strained relationship between the medical and African-American communities that exists today is one that began developing years ago. While it is impossible to pinpoint just when such an uneasy coexistence -- one characterized by suspicion, exploitation, and fear – truly began, there is no doubt that body snatching during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries had a significant impact. When historian Harriet A. Washington asserted that today’s “much bewailed racial health gap is not a gap, but a chasm wider and deeper than a mass grave,” she was halfway there. Such a chasm did not appear on its own. It was body snatchers that helped to dig it.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Z. Pitcher, “Historical Notice of the Territorial and State Medical Societies of Michigan,” *Peninsular Journal of Medicine and the Collateral Sciences*, I (May 1854), 501 in Breeden, “Body Snatchers in Virginia,” 321.

¹¹⁹ S.B. Thomas and S.C. Quinn, “The Tuskegee Syphilis Study, 1932 to 1972: implications for HIV education and programs in the black community,” *American Journal of Public Health* 81 (1991): 1498-1505, DOI: 10.2105/AJPH.91.11.1498.

¹²⁰ Harriet A. Washington, *Medical Apartheid: The Dark History of Medical Experimentation on Black Americans from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Doubleday, 2006), 189-190, 216-217, 284-285, 20.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION OF 1917

BY STEPHANIE MERINOFF

Stephanie Merinoff is a junior at Brandeis University pursuing a double major in History and Classics. Stephanie wrote the following paper in Spring, 2013 for her Twentieth Century Russia class. While she studies primarily the ancient and medieval periods, this paper was inspired by her interest in how religion and religious institutions have shaped the course of history. Stephanie enjoyed writing this paper immensely and extends her gratitude towards Professor Gregory L. Freeze at Brandeis University for his guidance in the writing process.

In the decades before 1917 the Russian Orthodox Church experienced a gradual decline in its privilege and power. Although it still claimed the allegiance of approximately 115-125 million parishioners, the Church found the autocracy increasingly disposed to sacrifice the special interests of the Orthodox Church in an effort to mollify the non-Orthodox in this multi-confessional empire.¹ The Revolution of 1905 signaled a sharp decline in the Church's status: the Manifesto on Freedom of Religious Conscience (April 17, 1905) in effect abolished the privileged status of the Orthodox Church. Determined to regain their advantaged status, the majority of parish clergy and even many bishops joined the liberation movement and demanded far-reaching reforms throughout society and also within the Church itself. While a minority continued to be loyal to the ancient regime, a growing number concluded that only a reformed Church could combat the threat of secularization. Priests, whose political attitudes ranged from moderate to radical left-wing, sought to mobilize pious laity by creating parish brotherhoods, publishing journal articles, reviving evangelism, and supporting the social and economic demands of their flock.² Many clergy also sought to refurbish the Church, primarily by transferring power from imperious bishops to the parish clergy and parishioners. The autocracy did all it could to prevent such reform, thereby making the clergy only more discontented and further alienating them from the old regime.

The February Revolution appeared to represent an opportunity for the Church to regain its traditional place in Russian society. With the overthrow of the Romanov dynasty, the Church believed that the new

¹ Mikhail V. Shkarovskii, "The Russian Orthodox Church," in *The Critical Companion to the Russian Revolution 1914-1921*, ed. Edward Acton, Vladimir Iu. Cherniaev, and William G. Rosenberg (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1997), 416.

² *Ibid.*, 416.

Provisional Government would endorse its demands for reform and pave the way for a national Church Council to address the main problems that had accumulated over the decades. Although most clergy (bishops as well as priests) welcomed the February Revolution, they had multiple visions of the reforms that the Church should pursue. Moderate members of the clergy sought only to restore the Church's privilege in Russian society. They primarily wanted to procure support for the Church, especially financial, and restore the traditional authority of bishops in addition to reestablishing the Church's sovereignty in all affairs through the convocation of Church councils.³ Left-wing clergy members sought to 'laicize' the Church and transfer power from the clergy to the parishioners themselves. There were two left-wing factions within the Church – liberals and radicals. The liberal clergy envisaged a greater role for the parish clergy. They primarily wanted to grant greater autonomy to local dioceses in decision-making processes.⁴ Radical clergy members not only wanted to increase the power of parishioners in diocesan affairs but in the parish itself. Their primary goals for reform included curbing the power of the Holy Synod, assembling Church councils, and allowing parishes to elect their own priests.

There were three visions clergy members held for reforming the Church. The 'moderate restorationist vision' was to restore the Church's privileged position, chiefly by providing more support for the Church, particularly financial, and by restoring the bishops' traditional authority. Some moderates even wanted to reestablish the patriarchate; a supreme clerical office that had been abolished in 1700 by Peter the Great, although emphasizing that it would be delimited in its role in Church administration.⁵ The moderate clergy did not desire to abolish the monarchy. Instead, they wished to create reform within the existing marriage of Church and State. Even in the last months of the old regime, moderate clergy supported the autocracy and opposed enemies of the tsar.⁶ Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev summed up this attitude as in 1917 he said: "We are Orthodox Christians, members of a monarchical state, to the bottom of our souls loving our tsars.... The waves of party strife must not undermine love and respect for the ruling house."⁷ The moderate restorationist faction, although its dreams did

³ Edward E. Roslof, *Red Priests: Renovationism, Russian Orthodoxy, and Revolution, 1905-1946* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002), 4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁶ John Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State 1917-1950* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1953), 10.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 10, taken from R.S.F.S.R., *Sobr. Uzak.*, No. 2, 1936.

not come to fruition, represented an important number of clergy, both priests and bishops, on the eve of revolution in 1917.

A more liberal program envisaged a greater role for the parish clergy. Liberal clergy sought to increase the independence of local dioceses in decision-making processes.⁸ They rejected the monarchy, denouncing it as “harmful for both Church and people” and promoted increasing popular participation in the Church and curtailing the influence of the upper clergy.⁹ The liberal clergy eventually organized an All-Russian Congress of Clergy and Laity in Moscow in June of 1917. The congress lasted ten days and 1,200 elected delegates were present. Historian Gregory Freeze writes that the Congress “impell[ed] diocesan assemblies not only to include lay representatives but informing their determination to purge reactionary bishops, countenance church reform, and address social issues.”¹⁰ The Congress represented the strength of the liberal clergy, which surpassed that of the moderate restorationist vision and remained dominant in April and May of 1917. However, as tensions between the clergy and parish grew throughout 1917, the prevailing liberal vision held by clergy for Church reform would, like its moderate counterparts, lose purchase.

A third, radical vision sought to give power to parishioners, not only in diocesan affairs, but also in the parish itself. In its most extreme form this radical program sought to allow parishioners to elect priests, control the parish budget, and regulate precisely how a given village celebrated specific religious rights.¹¹ In the wake of the February Revolution, which seemed to emphasize the power of the common people, this “democratic” vision thus found a role inside the Church itself. The idea of “parish power” developed and became widespread. Historian Dimitry Pospelovsky writes that “after the fall of the monarchy, the more radical representatives began to oppose the idea of a patriarch as monarchic, preferring a popularly elected synod made up of bishops, the lower clergy and laymen – all with equal voting rights.”¹² Additionally, radical members of the clergy were also responsible for great numbers of priests being exiled from their parishes by parishioners, and “reactionary” bishops losing their

⁸ Roslof, *Red Priests*, 4.

⁹ Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 14.

¹⁰ Gregory L. Freeze, “Diocesan Assemblies in 1917: Revolution in the Church,” *Tserkov' I Revoliutsiia* (2014), 11.

¹¹ Curtiss, *The Russian Church and Soviet State*, 14.

¹² Dimitry Pospelovsky, *The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime 1917-1982 vol. I* (New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 28.

positions.¹³ The radical push for equal voting rights in particular represented the parish power movement in that radicals believed a simple believer, perhaps even illiterate, held the same amount of authority as a parish priest. This idea of parish power, along with other radical ideas, would become very controversial as 1917 progressed.

Most clergy, whether moderate or radical, strongly supported Russia's cause in World War I. This was driven largely by patriotism for the newly evolving Russian State as well as support for fellow Orthodox believers in the Balkans. The Orthodox Church supported the Provisional Government and preached for the safety of Russian soldiers fighting overseas and the continuation of the Provisional Government's success.¹⁴ However, the question of material support for the Church was important. The clergy wanted the Provisional Government to provide salaries and thereby to reduce their dependence on the local parish. Given the outbreak of World War I, however, and the increasingly radical mindset of those in government, the Provisional Government increasingly decreased its support of the Orthodox Church and eventually would stop providing the Church with government subsidies.¹⁵

A related issue was the Church's property: the substantial real estate of the Church was an important source of income for the clergy and for Church institutions, such as the seminary and parish school. Radical representatives of the clergy became more vocal about democratic reform within Russian society and advocated the allocation of land to the peasants, labor rights for workers, and a decreased clerical role in government.¹⁶ Given this and the growing support of Russian society to nationalize both schools and land holdings, the Orthodox Church would lose significant income in the form of land and privilege as the revolution continued.

Both the issues of parish power and patriotism became increasingly controversial in 1917. In the case of parish power, it meant that simple believers, even illiterates, asserted authority over the parish priests. Moderate clergy and increasingly more liberal clergy members found this "laicization" contradictory to Church canon and tradition. Priests had many years of seminary training and the exclusive right (through ordination) to perform religious sacraments. Common parishioners did not. Yet, after the February Revolution, parish laity

¹³ Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 20.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 18.

¹⁵ Shkarovskii, "The Russian Orthodox Church", 419.

¹⁶ Pospelovsky, *The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime*, 28.

increasingly voiced their demands for greater involvement in Church affairs.¹⁷ Bishop Sergii of Finland remarked on this, commenting: “the Orthodox faith at the present time finds itself under great danger from every kind of pressure, attacks, and limitations,” for now the “propagation of non-Orthodox and non-Christian beliefs and simple disbelief, although rather strong before, has now begun to boldly, proudly, and with far greater threat and power (especially sectarianism and Uniates).”¹⁸ The issue of parish power escalated in the summer of 1917 as parishioners continued to expel disliked priests and bishops and asserted control over their local church.¹⁹ The parishioners’ demands were not new, however, and with a weakened Church, they became more effective in gaining control over Church administration. It should be noted, that despite the Church’s objections, parish power, fed by the rise of anticlericalism propagated by the radical laity and the Bolshevik party, eventually became dominant.

The war itself became a critical issue in 1917, especially as antiwar sentiment mounted. Having suffered monumental defeat in World War I, with 1.7 million casualties, the Russian people withdrew their support for the war effort. However, the Orthodox Church in 1917 had not. As a result, the Orthodox Church lost a great amount of popular support.²⁰ The Orthodox Church supported the war because the Russian army supported the Church. The Church often directly aided the Russian army. For instance, on May 9, General Alexeev, Commander in Chief of the Russian army, requested three Petrograd priests visit the front lines to raise morale among the soldiers.²¹ Additionally, the leaders of the Russian army agreed with the Church’s emphasis on discipline and the falseness of the Bolsheviks as General Alexeev requested the former points be included in the priests’ sermons to the soldiers on the front.²² The Church’s support of the war and more specifically the Russian army is logical given that the Church is supposed to be the spiritual and moral authority of Russian society and there was a strong push by moderate clergymen to restore the Church’s status and privilege, as well as gain material support. However, the Church’s support of the Great War caused them to lose support among the majority of the Russian populace, which contributed to the growing

¹⁷ Roslof, *Red Priests*, 13.

¹⁸ Freeze, “Diocesan Assemblies in 1917”, 33. From GARF, f. r-4652, op. 1, d. 3, l. 214 (memorandum quoted in Synodal resolution of 5.7.1917).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 33.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 15.

²¹ Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 18.

²² *Ibid.*, 18.

agency of the parish power movement and anticlerical ideology.

Finally, property was a factor: many land-hungry parishioners demanded that the church's substantial landholdings be nationalized and transferred to the people. Additionally, radical churchmen began meeting together in Petrograd after the tsar's abdication in March 1917. They formed the Union of Democratic Clergy and Laity and were devoted to supporting the people in opposing the restoration of the monarchy, creating a democratic government in Russia, and reforming the Church with the goal of separating it from the State.²³ The primary way to separate the Church from the State was to nationalize its landholdings and parochial schools. The Union of Democratic Clergy and Laity supported this, favoring a socialist economic policy that gave peasants and workers control over land and industry.²⁴ The Orthodox Church rejected the idea of confiscating Church lands, claiming that clergy needed the lands for support as a significant portion of their income stemmed from them.²⁵ At the last meeting of the All-Russian Congress of Clergy and Laity, liberal churchmen also condemned the confiscation of church and private lands, arguing that all agrarian matters should be dealt with by the Constituent Assembly.²⁶ The debate on the confiscation of Church property would continue, however, until November 8, 1917 after the Bolsheviks seized power when Lenin issued a 'Decree on Land' that announced the nationalization of all land, including those held by the Orthodox Church and monasteries, crippling the Church economically.²⁷

The relations between priests and parishioners grew increasingly problematic by the summer of 1917. Anti-religious attitudes were spreading throughout Russia from the top of society, the government and the intelligentsia, to the masses of laborers and even some peasants who were previously believers. As mentioned in the above section, parishioners chose to assert their control over their local church and engaged in practices such as expelling disliked parish priests and in some cases bishops.²⁸ However, in the summer of 1917, parishioners' behavior escalated as they pressed their claims further against the Church. Parishioners claimed control of Church lands and withdrew their monetary support for the Church. The former had a significant impact on the Church as the Church's main source of income came from their lands and from donations given by believers. The Church rebelled against this treatment

²³ Freeze, "Diocesan Assemblies in 1917", 14.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 14.

²⁵ Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 15.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 21.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 44.

²⁸ Freeze, "Diocesan Assemblies in 1917", 34.

with a decree to the Synod on June 20. The Church demanded new legislature stating that the Church's land and monetary support were necessary to the survival of the Church and could not be taken away by parishioners or local state authorities. However, the Church did not receive responses from the government or believers championing the Church's cause. Instead, there was silence. As Gregory Freeze writes, "while the conservative clergy (above all, monastics) fought back, the revolutionary tide had plainly come to threaten the very edifice of institutional Orthodoxy."²⁹

As a result of the increasingly aggressive claims made by parishioners, the clergy became dismayed. The clergy's mentality changed as liberal churchmen realized that in order to ensure the survival of the Church, they needed to assert their traditional role in society, which had been the agenda of the moderate clergymen since the beginning of the revolution. The Church asserted the claim it made to the Synod on June 20 by advocating in speeches and ecclesiastical writings its right to possess parish lands and to demand the material support they required to support Church infrastructure. However, the parish power movement only gained more force among the laity who continued to assert their right to control the Church on the local level. This was compounded by the increasing aggressiveness of the lower ranking clergy who exploited the chaos in the Church caused by the parish power movement to press their own demands such as increased income and land holdings.³⁰ While there were attempts made by the clergy, such as the unionization of expelled parish priests and increased attempts to gain support for the Church in the provinces, none of these pro-Church movements gained enough traction to combat the growing anticlericalism among parishioners. Gregory Freeze quotes A. Glorizov as he says, "with good reason, many of the clergy came to the conclusion that 'since the time of the revolution the legal position of priests has changed not for the better, but for the worse: the clergy has ridden itself of arbitrariness and despotism from above, but now is subjected to pressure, and sometimes arbitrariness, from below.'"³¹

The Orthodox Church was defenseless against the onslaught waged by the parishioners. Church and State were separated and there were few secular authorities present in the provinces to help stop the physical expulsion of priests or the seizing of Church lands.

²⁹ Ibid., 35.

³⁰ Ibid., 38.

³¹ Ibid., 39. From A. Glorizov, "Pastyrskii soiuz," *Vladimirskie eparkhial'nye vedomosti*, 1917, no. 24/25 (30.6.1917): 245.

Furthermore, if there were any secular authorities present, they were usually radical and would look the other way. Church funds evaporated as their properties became fewer and their material support dwindled. Additionally, inflation in the Russian economy devalued the remaining funds the Church had saved.³² The Church could not communicate its plight with others because local Soviets controlled the typographies, claiming the revolution was more important than Church affairs. The Orthodox Church administration became increasingly powerless and less able to withstand the attacks wielded by parishioners. The moderate restorationist visions of restoring Church authority became more popular, but at the same time, less feasible. After 1917, the survival of Orthodoxy would require a new liberal vision that restored the authority of the Church and rebuilt its infrastructure, but also included laity and parishes in Church affairs and decision-making.

Historian Dimitry Pospelovsky eloquently describes the crisis the Church was facing at the beginning of the 1917 revolution.

Lacking a canonical administration (a patriarch) and the traditional conciliar system...the Church as an institution entered the revolution divided and uninformed about the ideas and feelings of her own lower clergy and parishioners... at such a decisive moment of general collapse the Church lacked the organizational mechanism of a self-ruling institution. And it was common knowledge to every responsible churchman that the old monarchic establishment was to blame for this sorry state of affairs.³³

The February Revolution provided the Orthodox Church with the opportunity to restore its traditional authority in Russian society that it lost under the reign of Nicholas II and to institute reforms long denied to the Church. However, the clergy was divided in regards to how to best achieve this goal. Moderate restorationists, liberals, and radicals argued over the degree to which the Church should be involved in government and what the role of the laity should be in the Church. As the revolution continued and anticlericalism spread and members of Russian society, including members of the clergy, became more radical in their ideas, the Church suffered a wave of attacks by parishioners asserting their control over their local churches and church lands. The Church responded with increased propagation of their

³² Ibid., 40.

³³ Pospelovsky, *The Russian Church Under the Soviet Regime*, 25.

struggles, however, this proved futile. As the Bolsheviks came to power, the new regime waged war against the Church, separating Church from State and removing its rights to own property, educate children in parochial schools, and eliminated the Church's avenues for material support. The Church was helpless to the growing strength of the parish power movement. However, many scholars argue, as does Pospelovsky that in the face of the attacks the Church endured from the new regime, "the new responsibility granted to the parish councils and the security of priests' tenure... saved the Church from disintegration in the years of the practically total collapse of the central church administration caused by the cited state legislation, by periodical arrests of bishops and by the proliferation of schismatic groups."³⁴ Indeed, Gregory Freeze also offers a similar opinion claiming "parish power would ironically became the main bastion of Orthodoxy, with "parish power" becoming the key to the survival and defense of the faith."³⁵ Despite the turbulence the Orthodox Church faced in the months after the February Revolution, the increased freedom acquired by the Church gave it the stamina to withstand attacks on the Church by the Bolsheviks in the early part of the twentieth century and continue as an institution in Russia.

³⁴ Ibid., 37-38.

³⁵ Freeze, "Diocesan Assemblies in 1917", 41.

JACKIE KENNEDY AND HER EMPIRE

BY ADRIENNE WOOD

Adrienne Wood is a senior at Louisiana State University and will graduate in May of 2015 with a degree in History and a minor in Italian. She will attend the LSU Paul M. Hebert Law Center or the Pennsylvania State Dickinson School of Law in the fall of 2015. As for dedications, she would like to thank her family, friends, and the wonderful History Department of LSU and in particular, Professor Mona Rocha who aided her in her research. Last but not least, she would like to thank Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis for always being inspiring, captivating, and brilliant.

The people of the 1960's remembered Jacqueline Kennedy for her appearance, whether it was her natural beauty, her Parisian style of dress, or her beautiful family. Although it has been over fifty years since her husband's death and her family's descent from the White House, Americans have yet to grow tired of the Kennedy family and the greatest, most tragic love story in American politics. Jackie breathed fresh air into the lungs of the American Presidency and gave life to the role of first lady. Despite living a tragic yet beautiful life, Jacqueline Kennedy augmented the role of the First Lady while maintaining a precarious balance between preserving and yet defying traditional gender roles associated with the position. Through her public work while in the White House, Kennedy redefined the First Ladyship position from a role many considered involuntary servitude to a role of major cultural significance.

Jacqueline Lee Bouvier was born on July 28, 1929 to John "Black Jack" Bouvier and Janet Lee Bouvier in Southampton, New York. Jackie and her younger sister, Lee, lived a privileged and happy childhood despite their parents' divorce in 1940. She was of Irish Catholic descent, which made her an acceptable marital candidate according to the standards of the Irish Catholic, Joseph P. Kennedy Sr., patriarch of the American political dynasty, the Kennedys. Jackie was an accomplished equestrian and attended the prestigious Miss Porter's School for girls then went on to Vassar College in 1947. As a child, she loved reading fiction and poetry, and her favorites included Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* and poetry by Lord Byron.¹ This love of reading followed her throughout her life and eventually led to her post-White House career as a book editor. Jackie attended Vassar for two years before studying abroad in Paris and

¹ "Life of Jacqueline B. Kennedy - John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum," John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum, accessed December 6, 2013, <http://www.jfklibrary.org/JFK/Life-of-Jacqueline-B-Kennedy.aspx>.

finishing her collegiate career at George Washington University with degrees in French literature and American history. Her year spent in Paris instilled a love for Europe of which Jackie once said, “ I am afraid will never leave me.”² Her interest in European culture as well as the liberal arts would play a defining role in her White House career.

Post-college, Jacqueline worked as the “camera girl” for the *Washington Times Herald*. Through this position, she met many influential people in the political world and was eventually assigned to interview her future husband, Congressman John F. Kennedy, in 1952. They were married in a elaborate ceremony at St. Mary’s Roman Catholic Church in Newport, Rhode Island on September 12, 1953.³ Since Jackie married into a family with grand political aspirations, the wedding was treated as a political event. The guest list stretched on for miles and included major diplomatic figures as well as Hollywood luminaries.⁴ The extravagant wedding signified a momentous change in her life with John; from then on, her life revolved around appearances, as his ostentatious political hopes would become the focus of their life together. Her stepfather, Hugh Auchincloss, walked Jacqueline down the aisle in a fifty-yard long gown, as her father was too drunk to do the honor. The reception had 1,300 guests that Jack and Jackie spent three hours greeting.⁵ The wedding was part of a larger political plot in the scheming mind of U.S. Ambassador to England and John’s father, Joseph P. Kennedy Sr. From the beginning of the marriage, it was evident that there was a spotlight on both John and Jackie.

Three years after the wedding, Caroline Bouvier Kennedy was born on November 27, 1957. Two years later in early 1960, John F. Kennedy announced his candidacy for the President of the United States of America. Joseph “Joe” Kennedy had grandiose plans for his three sons and high hopes that one would reach the presidency one day. With the aid of political favors, strong rhetorical skills and All-American good looks, John F. Kennedy was elected President of the United States on November 8, 1960 on marginal win against Richard Nixon. Throughout the campaign process, Jackie was considered almost a liability. In an interview with Jackie after her husband’s death, she described her difficulty with the campaign when she noted:

Everyone thought I was this snob from Newport who had bouffant hair and had French clothes and hated politics.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Richard Cavendish, "Marriage of Jacqueline Bouvier and John F. Kennedy," *History Today* 53, no. 9 (2003): 54.

⁵ Ibid.

And then because I was off and having these babies I wasn't able to campaign and be around as much as I could.⁶

Overtime, public opinion toward Jackie changed significantly. The Kennedys' time in the White House was, in Jackie's opinion, their "happiest years."⁷ Although originally considered a danger to her husband's campaign, she ended up being one of his best assets during his time in office. After less than a year as the first lady, *The Public Opinion Quarterly* reported that only 13 percent of men and 10 percent of women had unfavorable opinions of Jackie.⁸

She entered the White House at the young age of 31 and her family quickly became the most iconic family of their time. Well-dressed and beautiful with two young children, Jacqueline set the bar very high for presidential families. With the growing prevalence of television, the apparent dissimilarity between the Kennedys and the Eisenhowers would affect the American Presidency forever.⁹ The American people experienced a huge shift from Mamie Eisenhower's matronly look of flowered hats and shirtwaists to Jacqueline Kennedy's French style of pillbox hats and collarless suits. Jackie's polished appearance and proclivity for fashion set the tone for future First Ladies. Herbert S. Parmet describes how Jackie shaped John's Presidential identity in *The Kennedy Myth and American Politics*:

Successors had to cope with the standards set by Kennedy-his rhetoric, his sparkling press conferences, the attractiveness of the First Family, his sense of style, his efforts to set the tone for American culture."¹⁰

Both John and Jackie embodied the ideal American man and woman, particularly in their sense of style and demeanor. The Kennedys were the closest thing to royalty America had ever seen.

Throughout Jacqueline Kennedy's reign as First Lady, she made it known that her role as a wife and mother came first. This reflected the

⁶ "Recordings of Jacqueline Kennedy," *PBS Video*, September 15, 2011.

⁷ Scott Janny, "In Oral History, Jacqueline Kennedy Speaks Candidly After the Assassination - NYTimes.com," *The New York Times*, September 11, 2011, accessed November 26, 2013.

⁸ Hazel Gaudet Erskine, "The Polls: Kennedy as President," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1964): 342.

⁹ Herbert S. Parmet, "The Kennedy Myth and American Politics," *The History Teacher* 24, no. 1 (1990): 33.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 37.

gender ideals of the time and made her irresistible to traditional Americans. She expressed her motherly passions frequently, and once told a reporter, "If you bungled raising your children, I don't think whatever else you do well matters very much."¹¹ She took her role as a mother seriously and revamped the White House into a child's dream play place by requesting a swimming pool, a swing set, and tree house to be built on the White House lawn.¹²

Jacqueline made sure Caroline and John Jr. felt at home at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. For example, she would not allow the children to move in until their rooms were painted their desired colors, despite complaints from their father who preferred to have his children nearby.¹³ In Jackie's interview with Arthur Schlesinger, she described Jack Kennedy as an adoring father, citing little anecdotes about bath time fun with rubber ducks, sneaking candy, and play time in the midst of important meetings.¹⁴ Classic photographs of John Jr. playing in the Oval office while his proud father lovingly looks upon him are a familiar image to the American people. Those images confirmed to the Americans that JFK was America's best dad. Jacqueline once told a reporter that what she really wanted was "to be behind [her husband] and to be a good wife and mother."¹⁵ Her words reflect a mother who confined herself to the home.

Yet her trips abroad and her role in the White House restoration showed a completely different kind of First Lady than the American people had not seen since Eleanor Roosevelt. Jacqueline Kennedy's trips abroad as a Goodwill Ambassador for the United States paved the way for future First Ladies to extend their realms of influence. In contrast to Mamie Eisenhower who felt her role was primarily in the home, Jacqueline spent a significant time abroad such as trips to Paris, Vienna, Greece, Italy, India, and Pakistan despite her desire to stay within the realm of domesticity.¹⁶ Her ability to speak French, Spanish, and Italian, as well as her knowledge and interest in other cultures, helped her husband in multiple aspects of his career.¹⁷ In her 1961 trip to France with her husband, Jack capitalized on Jackie's ability to speak fluent French, her understanding of French culture (she lived in Paris for a year) and her

¹¹ "Life of Jacqueline B. Kennedy," John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Caitlin Flanagan, "Jackie and the Girls," *The Atlantic Monthly*, June 13, 2012, 137.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Diane M. Blair, "The Rise Of The Rhetorical First Lady: Politics, Gender Ideology, And Women's Voice, 1789-2002," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 4 (2002): 577.

¹⁶ "Life of Jacqueline B. Kennedy," John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum.

¹⁷ Ibid.,

natural charm to improve France's view of America. Then President of France, the infamously imperious Charles de Gaulle, was impressed with Jackie though other French government officials did not take her young and relatively inexperienced husband seriously.¹⁸ Jackie's appeal extended beyond France as she was selected as woman of the year in 106 international periodicals at the end of 1961.¹⁹ Together, this illustrates Jackie's role outside the home and her importance to the national image.

One of Jackie's most noteworthy contributions to her husband's administration was the trip she took to South Asia with her sister, Lee, in 1962. Jackie originally planned to travel only to Pakistan but added a stop in India. India was the leading country in the nonaligned nations movement, a movement that at the time included many communist states.²⁰ Before Jackie's visit, India held significant anti-U.S. sentiments as tensions were growing between the two countries due to India's relations with the Soviets and the U.S.'s relations with Pakistan.²¹ Despite the people's current distaste for the U.S., the people of India flocked to see Jackie. It was reported that Jackie's visit attracted more people than Queen Elizabeth's visit the previous year.²² No other political figure could have generated such positive reviews in India.

The people of India appreciated Jackie's efforts to establish personal connections. For example, laying a wreath on Mahatma Gandhi's shrine, expressing genuine curiosity about Indian culture, and purchasing travel presents for her children in order to bring Indian culture back to the United States.²³ Her good work did not go unnoticed as her husband described her as his "number one ambassador of good-will," and he felt she "took all the bitterness out of our relations with India."²⁴ Jackie's ambassadorship overseas might signify a more liberal First Ladyship. However, a close study of her trip reveals a calculated attempt to exemplify gender norms associated with women at the time, such as her famous soft voice, her focus on children, and her lack of commentary. Thus, although Jackie was more active than previous First Ladies, she still

¹⁸ Barbara Marazani, "A First Lady Brings a French Icon to American Shores — History in the Headlines," History.com, January 8, 2013, accessed November 25, 2013, <http://www.history.com/news/a-first-lady-brings-a-french-icon-to-american-shores>.

¹⁹ Carol B. Schwalbe, "Jacqueline Kennedy and Cold War Propaganda," *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 49, no. 1 (2005): 113.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 119.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, 121.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 122.

adhered to the majority of gender norms of the time, precariously balancing the old and new.

The State Department and the United States Information Agency (USIA) recognized the potential of Jackie as an ambassador and used this to increase American presence abroad and better the national image of America so the USIA made two documentaries about her trips: *Invitation to India* and *Invitation to Pakistan*. According to the director, George S. Stevens Jr., the films were supposed to reflect, “America’s outward-looking interest in other peoples.”²⁵ The USIA had been making films for years but there was a distinct difference in the films made during the Kennedy administration: The films made during the Kennedy years were described as, “tolerant, nurturing, and culturally sensitive” whereas the films during the Eisenhower era were considered, “short, stiff ideological, and low budget.”²⁶ Although a film of that scale that focused on a First Lady was unprecedented at the time, the film still upheld Jackie’s motherly and feminine attributes associated with the First Ladyship by featuring Jackie purchasing presents for her family, visiting a children’s hospital, and having a male narrator convey the story.²⁷

In addition to the two films abroad, Jacqueline has another major documentary on her resume: “A Tour of the White House With Mrs. John F. Kennedy.” Besides family, culture was the other dominating force in Jackie’s life. She always was a lover of fashion, art, books, and history. So, when she moved into the White House, the most notable building in America’s history, it was only natural for her to champion the cause of restoring and revitalizing America’s mansion. In September of 1961, the First Lady was on the cover of *Life* magazine with the cover story on her very detailed plans for the restoring of the White House. Jackie’s sincere quest for historical accuracy and cultural revival were explicitly expressed when she told *Life* reporter, Hugh Sidney:

Everything in the White House must have a reason for being there. It would be sacrilege merely to redecorate it – a word I hate. It must be restored, and that has nothing to do with decoration. That is a question of scholarship.²⁸

Jackie’s task was certainly ambitious for a first lady, requiring a great deal of knowledge and work. At the same time, this cause was still located

²⁵ Carol B. Schwalbe, “Jacqueline Kennedy and Cold War Propaganda,” 119.

²⁶ *Ibid*, 113.

²⁷ *Ibid*, 121.

²⁸ “Life of Jacqueline B. Kennedy,” John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum.

within the home and reinforced the idea of the cult of domesticity, thus making it a safe choice as far as first lady realms of influence.

On February 14, 1962, an estimated 46 million Americans watched Mrs. Kennedy give an hour-long tour of her home, the White House. The special played on three major television networks and later that year received an Emmy award.²⁹ The documentary became an international success and was distributed in 106 countries, making it the most widely seen documentary of the time.³⁰ Internationally, Jackie received widespread praise and managed to project onto other countries a more positive view of the United States without ever uttering a word of politics as Jackie did not feel it was her place to make political commentary as the political realm was her husband's domain. The newly refurbished White House became Jackie's new showplace that would attract a more diverse and lively crowd than the White House had ever seen.

Jackie Kennedy, a valued member of the political world by marriage and a patron of the arts by heart, reinvented White House events through an atmosphere that represented both spheres accordingly. Jackie took the typically stuffy White House dinners and turned them into an affair where artists like writers, poets, musicians could mingle with politicians and scientists could rub elbows with Hollywood celebrities.³¹ Isaac Stern, a famous violinist, wrote to Mrs. Kennedy after a visit to the White House and expressed his gratitude for her, "serious attention and respect for the arts."³² Jackie's knack for befriending artists paid off when she persistently called upon Andre Malraux, France's Cultural Minister and a fan of Mrs. Kennedy's. Jackie and Malraux began negotiations between France and the U.S. to arrange for Leonardo Da Vinci's masterpiece, the Mona Lisa, to make its first and only journey to America.³³ After much talk and negotiations, the Mona Lisa made her appearance in Washington, D.C. at a star-studded event on January 8, 1963. Every major political player and many giants in the art world came together to witness a beautiful moment between France and the United States. Once again, Jackie Kennedy somehow managed to create peaceful diplomatic relations while keeping the focus on culture, not politics.

²⁹ Schwalbe, "Jacqueline Kennedy and Cold War Propaganda," 111.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 116.

³¹ "Jacqueline Kennedy Entertains: The Art of the White House Dinner," - John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum, April 11, 2007, accessed November 22, 203. <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Exhibits/Past-Exhibits/Jacqueline-Kennedy-Entertains.aspx>.

³² "Life of Jacqueline B. Kennedy," John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum.

³³ Marazani, "A First Lady Brings a French Icon to American Shores — History in the Headlines."

November 22, 1963 is a day that can be identified with a strong and dignified Jacqueline Kennedy in a bloodstained pink Chanel suit as she watched the swearing in of Lyndon B. Johnson as the thirty-sixth President of the United States. On that fateful day in Dallas, John F. Kennedy was assassinated in the presence of his beloved wife. Jackie, a very private person by nature, never spoke of that day. The assassination of John F. Kennedy was a defining moment in American history. According to a 1983 Gallup survey, 65 percent of Americans felt the United States would have been “much different” if Kennedy had not been assassinated.³⁴ The assassination of John F. Kennedy is just another tragedy in the long line of what some speculate to be a curse upon the Kennedy family, and only the first of many tragedies Jackie Kennedy experienced.

Jacqueline Kennedy remarried and became a widow a second time before her death in 1994. Her later life, a life spent focused on books and her grandchildren, reflected her priorities well. Although the public kept a spotlight on Jackie’s life, she often preferred the comfort and privacy of her own home. Jacqueline Kennedy was a very smart woman whose time in the White House was spent focused on bettering her husband’s career, raising her children well, and pursuing culture. She changed what the American people considered the “ideal” woman by giving that archetype a brain without losing any femininity. Jacqueline Kennedy’s White House years are truly a social paradox as her words expressed a woman who desired to stay within the comfortable domestic expectations of her time. Yet her actions and interests reflect a woman whose thirst for knowledge and sophistication raised the bar for the American people’s expectation of the first lady.

³⁴ Parmet, "The Kennedy Myth and American Politics," 33.

“FOR COUNTRY, OR FOR YALE?”

BY CHARLOTTE JUERGENS

Charlotte E. J. Juergens is a junior studying History at Yale University. Outside of Yale, Charlotte explores historical and commemorative themes through documentary filmmaking and archival research. She wrote this paper during the fall semester of 2014 for a seminar on the history of Yale and America. Charlotte found inspiration for this paper from the underutilized wealth of archival resources on the subject available in the Sterling Memorial Library at Yale. Charlotte would like to thank Professor Jay Gitlin for his guidance with this assignment and for a fascinating semester of historical investigation.

The hardwood floors have been shorn of their carpets and left bare, to be dusted each morning by the occupants. Comfortable single beds have been replaced by the well-known GI double decker. In the dining hall, instead of eating from china dishes, the soldier finds himself consuming his meal from the standard Army trays, so familiar to reception center camps. And we find that even in the insignificant butt can, familiarity lining the walls at numerous bases, has found its way to Berkeley College, Yale.¹

Member of the ASTP boarding in Berkeley College

Along with the presidency of Yale, Charles Seymour inherited the dismal legacy of the Great Depression. Not only was Yale short on funds in 1939, but also the effects of Depression-era cutbacks had begun to show: Yale’s cherished concepts of small classes and individual attention were in grave danger.² Seymour committed himself to reviving Yale’s academic community by strengthening the liberal arts. After all, the liberal arts had been an essential aspect of Yale’s identity since its founding—its original 1701 charter had called for a school “wherein Youth may be instructed in the Arts and Sciences.”³ Yet, America’s participation in World War II shifted Yale’s focus to the second foundational principle outlined in its charter: the university’s obligation to prepare its students for “Publick employment both in Church and Civil State.”⁴ Seymour stressed the university’s obligation to support America’s war effort in all ways possible. In the coming years, his twin commitments of protecting Yale’s liberal arts and maximizing its civic character appeared increasingly

¹ Brooks Mather Kelley, *Yale: A History*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999, 402; Ralph Thompson, “The Aristocrats The Excuse,” *New York Times*, 14 July 1938.

² Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 395.

³ Judith Schiff, “A Brief History of Yale,” *Yale University Library*, <http://guides.library.yale.edu/yalehistory> (accessed 2 Dec 2014).

⁴ *Ibid.*

incompatible. Seymour's ultimate prioritization of the latter commitment set him at odds with Yale's liberal arts faculty such as George W. Pierson, who saw the massive new military role on campus as a threat to the liberal arts. Seymour's choice to prioritize Yale's national identity over its academic one began the university's fundamental shift from a community of scholars to a national brand.

The outbreak of WWII corresponded with an internal reassessment of Yale's identity. "We know in outline what we want our University to be," observed Robert D. Heinl Jr. in the April 1937 *Yale Literary Magazine*, "But the task of balancing every factor and evaluating every force which will affect the precise structure of 1954's Yale remains to be done. It has been entrusted to efficient and meticulous Charles Seymour... it will again be time to storm new positions."⁵ Seymour shared Heinl's view that the university had reached the edge of a developmental burst. He readied himself for the presidential task of resuscitating Yale's academic life.⁶ Seymour's reevaluation resulted in renewed commitment to Yale's character as a community of scholars, which had suffered from the school's Depression-era financial woes. Seymour outlined a strategy centered around two features: recruiting a larger faculty and strengthening the liberal arts. Yale's new dean William C. DeVane (who would go on to be a key figure in creating Yale's Directed Studies program in 1946) also supported the liberal arts.⁷ The two worked together to add sixteen new professors to the faculty from 1938-39 and skillfully obtained funding for those salaries from the Corporation and a gift from Edward S. Harkness.⁸

Despite Seymour's promises and initial motions to bolster the liberal arts, the school's continued money troubles stymied Seymour's efforts to institute substantial changes. This stagnancy troubled Seymour, for he understood the importance of strengthening not only the faculty, but the "aspects of learning which without protection run the danger of death."⁹ Seymour knew that liberal arts "may attract merely a handful of students and to the general public they may appear quite without value," but he felt that classical philology, linguistics, Semitic languages and other fields "without any apparent relation to any so-called "useful" application... represent scholarly effort which it is the university's duty to foster simply for their own sake, and because without them the heritage of human experience is impoverished."¹⁰ Seymour's professed prioritization

⁵ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 394.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 409.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 395.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

of the liberal arts tapped into an old notion of a Yale education, which had originated in the 1701 charter and had been promoted by the university throughout the subsequent decades. The nationally-read Yale Report of 1828 by Yale's Faculty Committee articulated a defense of the liberal arts, arguing for their relevance in modern life and usefulness in building mental discipline and strong character in young people.¹¹ Seymour resolved to perpetuate the legacy of the 1828 report but worried that he lacked the means to do so.

The outbreak of WWII in Europe introduced a new set of complications to the already precarious endeavor of revitalizing Yale. Seymour considered the looming prospect of American involvement in the war and asserted that, "For the immediate future and... for years to come, we must all of us, students and professors, recognize that whatever demands the necessities of national defense lay upon us; they are paramount."¹² By 1940, Seymour began forming ties between the university and the war effort, approving measures to take in wives and children from Oxford to keep them safe from bombings and linking the 39th General Army Hospital with the Yale School of Medicine.¹³ New patriotic tasks began to upstage Seymour's academic priorities. Later that year, a member of Seymour's Committee on Educational Planning noted that "Yale's prestige as a teaching institution has been achieved and is being maintained at the expense of her reputation as a body of productive scholars."¹⁴ Simultaneously with the start of WWII, Yale developed new concerns as a national patriotic institution and as national competitive educational brand, both of which would prove to have corrosive effects on Yale's identity as an intimate intellectual community.

Some Yalies clashed with their president's beliefs about the just nature of the war and the role that Yale ought to play in it. Their resistance began as an expression of general anti-military sentiment. The *Yale Alumni Weekly* observed that war was "distinctly unpopular with the present college generation"—a sentiment held by underclassmen such as Kingman Brewster, Jr. (Yale College class of 1941 and future president of the university), who helped to organize a "Committee to Defend America First."¹⁵ The antiwar contingent of Yale's student body participated in a

¹¹ Yale University, "1828 Report by Faculty Committee," http://www.yale.edu/about/documents/specialdocuments/Historical_Documents/1828_curriculum.pdf (accessed 12 Dec 2014).

¹² Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 395.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 396.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 395.

¹⁵ Geoffrey Kabaservice, *The Guardians: Kingman Brewster, His Circle, and the Rise of the Liberal Establishment*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2004; Kelly, 396.

“Peace Week,” supported a nationwide demonstration against the war, and signed a non-interventionist petition protesting use of convoys.¹⁶ One Yale group called the “American Peace Committee” used the Yale mailing system to circulate postcards among the student body with messages like, “Americans: We are fighting a war for Communism, British Imperialism, and the Roosevelts. Russia will turn on us when we are too weak to fight. We must ask for peace now. Write your Congressman and demand Peace.”¹⁷ Yale protestors perceived a potential military infringement upon the nation’s interests; they did not yet anticipate a national infringement upon their school’s identity.

In the months leading up to Pearl Harbor, over a hundred members of Yale’s faculty left the school for governmental positions related to the war effort and, according to the November 1941 *Yale Alumni Magazine*, some of Yale’s seniors were “gaunt, unshaven, and hollow-eyed” over the preemptive institution of the draft in 1940.¹⁸ The draft created tension not only among Yale students, but among its faculty as well. Four professors joined with 236 non-Yale educators, religious leaders, businessmen and professional workers to sign a declaration against conscription, “which flatly stated that peace-time drafting of manpower ‘smacks of totalitarianism’.”¹⁹ Yet Seymour articulated the opposite argument in his 1939-40 report to the Yale alumni, stating that “The universities... are the most keenly alive to the spiritual values that disappear in a totalitarian system; to them is entrusted the guidance of the youth of the land whose lot it is to defend and carry on the American tradition. This is a responsibility that has fallen upon our scholars and which we cannot evade.”²⁰ Despite Seymour’s belief in the vital role of education in American life, he felt it would be his patriotic duty to support the draft and encourage Yalies to set aside their studies to serve their

¹⁶ “Non-Interventionists Send Capitol Letter Protesting Use of Convoys,” *Yale Daily News*, 26 May 1941, “*Americans United*” and “*American Peace Committee*,” box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Kelly, 395.

¹⁷ “Unknown Group Flays FDR and British; Warns Soviet Russia “Will Turn on Us,” *Yale Daily News*, 23 Jul 1942, “*Americans United*” and “*American Peace Committee*,” box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

¹⁸ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 397.

¹⁹ “Selective Service & Petitions,” *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

²⁰ “Report of the President of Yale University to the Alumni,” *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

nation at war. Even before America entered the conflict, WWII had instigated the beginnings of a rift between Yale's professors and its president that would continue to widen over the coming months.

America's declarations of war on Japan and Germany in December 1941 violently disrupted Seymour's endeavor to reinvigorate Yale's identity as a community of scholars. In *Yale: A History*, Brooks Mather Kelly notes, "Since Seymour believed that "the justification of a university is to be found in the service which it gives to the nation," university planning shifted to how Yale could help the government."²¹ Patriotic service constituted a key part of Yale's original creed (as delineated by the 1703 charter) and over the centuries, service had become nearly as deeply-rooted an aspect of Yale's character as had the liberal arts. WWII pitted Yale's twin foundational principles—instructing students in the liberal arts and preparing them for civic life—against each other. Seymour believed that during time of war, "long range [academic] values," must be "subordinated to the immediate demand from the battle front."²² For the first time in Yale history, the school's commitment to its duty as a national institution appeared at odds with its existence as an intimate congregation of scholars.

At this point, the Yale administration began converting its students into soldiers. The Committee on Student Preparation for War Service made a concentrated effort to combat student discontent regarding the war effort, allocating funds to various individuals, the Yale Co-Op, the Yale Daily News and the Office of Education for this purpose.²³ The administration distributed a bulletin informing Yalies of their options with the armed services and encouraging enlistment.²⁴ Despite the proliferation of antiwar sentiment at Yale, many Yalies rallied in support of the war, and many others enlisted to fight in it.²⁵ The WWII Correspondence between Christine J. Northrop (first master's wife of Silliman College) and 328 Silliman men in the armed services affords a view into the lives of numerous Yalies in the classes of 1941-45 who were buoyant with patriotic enthusiasm. Omar "Shorty" Simonds was among those who

²¹ Kelly, *Yale, A History*, 395.

²² *Ibid.*, 397.

²³ Marcus Robbins to Edgar S. Furniss, 23 March 1942, *Student Preparations for War Service*, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

²⁴ "Bulletin of Yale University: Student Opportunities for War Service," 15 July 1942, *Student Preparations for War Service*, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

²⁵ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 395.

quickly enlisted, missing graduation to leave directly for flight school.²⁶ “My flight instructor is a peach, and flying has gone pretty rapidly for me, thanks to my C.A.A. at Yale and driving one summer,” wrote Shorty. “And how wonderful it was to hear that Yale beat Dartmouth. How I would like to have seen that.”²⁷ Some of the younger boys left too, jovially discarding their last years of liberal arts education. Knowledge was now to be sought in the Italian skies, the Pacific, the Normandy hedgerows.²⁸

Yale faced a disturbing drop in undergraduate numbers and, as Kelly notes, “Seymour pursued the military for replacements.”²⁹ In this way, Yale’s relationship with the army began to expand and intensify. In December 1941, in response to Yale’s reports of its nearly empty campus, the Army requested use of Yale facilities for an aviation technical training school. Yale assented and, as Kelly writes, was soon “well on its way to becoming little more than a military base... So Yale converted to war... By February three thousand cadets, officers, and instructors had taken over most of the Old Campus, Silliman College, and the Law School.³⁰ The military had begun to sew the seeds of Yale’s new and debilitating level of dependency on the nation.

In 1942, Seymour instituted a new “Yale Plan” for war service, which included “an all year ‘round twelve months’ basis, compulsory physical training of all students and academic preparation at a stepped-up tempo with the inclusion of military courses in addition to the major course of study” for every Yale student.³¹ Seymour’s requirement that professors teach year-round (without an increase in pay) prevented them from completing their own research over summer vacations, which Seymour dismissed as “intellectual play-time.”³² “This is tough,” Seymour admitted,

²⁶ Omar “Shorty” Simonds to Christine J. Northrop, 10 June 1942, box 1 folder 1, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Kelly, 395.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Christine J. Northrop to Carl V. Hansen, 16 Jan 1943, box 1, folder 4, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Address Book & Correspondence Record, Christine J. Northrop, box 6, folder 40, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

²⁹ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 397.

³⁰ Ibid., 398-99.

³¹ “Yale Goes All-Out for the War,” 3 Sep 1942, *Yale at War*, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

³² “Yale University News Bureau,” 23 Feb 1942.

“I’m sure it’s right.”³³ Seymour sought a way to fulfill both of Yale’s fundamental duties—fostering academic and civic excellence among its students—but the turbulence in Europe rendered a balance between the two nearly impossible.

At this point, alarm amongst the faculty intensified and spread. Professors began to panic when the administration ordered departments to prepare emergency programs in case “the situation of the University is drastically modified by the War,” and when dean DeVane noted that “We have, in effect, already taken some steps towards the emergency program.”³⁴ More and more professors wanted out. In response to “isolationist-interventionist hubbub” amongst the Yale faculty, Professor Leonard W. Labaree observed,

Those who had been in the armed forces during the First World War were better equipped to deal with the services when they arrived on campus—they said, “Well, the Army hasn’t changed much, has it?” kept a good-humored attitude about the whole thing and made adjustments readily. Those who were faced with the military services for the first time never could comprehend the red tape and had a more difficult time.³⁵

Yet even though the military presence felt familiar to older members of the faculty and though it seemed that the Army hadn’t “changed much,” its relationship with the University certainly had. The faculty’s fears were augmented by the unprecedented nature of the changes occurring at Yale. There were, of course, points of similarity between Yale’s WWII experience and its experience with past wars; other wars had also brought moral and physical disruption to college life, high levels of undergraduate enlistment, difficulty in maintaining a sense of academic normalcy, and a greater role for the Yale administration in daily life. Yet before WWII, Yale had never surrendered parts of the campus to the federal government on a rental basis like, and Yale had never seen a major struggle in which the faculty provided a normal course of study for the armed forces.³⁶

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ “Yale College— Dean William C. DeVane.”

³⁵ “Interview with Professor Leonard W. Labaree, Chairman of the Department of History,” *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

³⁶ “Yale in other Wars,” *Part 1— Historical Background, Yale in Other Wars*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale

The departure en masse of Yale's civilian student population proved draining not only to the university's academic vitality but to its finances as well. Seymour saw that an expanded relationship with the army would generate enough profit to alleviate Yale's financial desperation. In fact, droves of new ASTP and ROTC students meant a fortune to Yale. Kelly describes how, once Yale "became a crowded military post with 8,000 instead of 5,000 students...Treasurer Laurence Tighe found himself in 1943 with what he described to fellow Reeve Schley as an embarrassing surplus that needed careful handling."³⁷ Yet these financial benefits came with governmental requirements that would alter the meaning of a Yale education. A New York Times article from July 12 1942 decried Yale's new policy of mandatory military training and registration for all students (physically qualified or not), citing a quote by the secretary of the Yale War Council that, "The university is following the concept that students are only loaned to universities in order to prepare them better for duty with the armed forces and industry."³⁸ Yale became a place where students developed the technological, scientific, political and language skills that created good soldiers for the war effort, rather than the abstract, academic skills that created independent thinkers and leaders for a nation at peace. In exchange for financial benefits, Seymour accepted Yale's new identity as "little more than a military base," as an national institution rather than a community of scholars. Even when Yale ceased to require those benefits, having gained an "embarrassing surplus" of funds, Seymour continued to strengthen the Army presence at the expense of the liberal arts.

The implementation of Seymour's "Yale Plan" for war service caused a climax of consternation among those faculty members dedicated to Yale's identity as a liberal arts institution. Eleven of Yale's preeminent professors—George W. Pierson along with Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman— drafted a letter to Seymour to voice their concerns.³⁹ "We do not speak as individuals, or on behalf of individuals," they wrote. "what happens to us as a collective body may be tragic and enduring." Like Seymour in his alumni address earlier that year, these professors asserted that Yale's collective character must be held above the needs of the

University Library.

³⁷ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 404.

³⁸ "Yale Requires All to Take War Training," 12 July 1942, *The New York Times*, box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

³⁹ Azeezat Adeleke, "What Does DS Really Stand For?" 27 Oct 2013, *The Politic*, Accessed 9 Dec 2014, <http://thepolitic.org/what-does-ds-really-stand-for/>.

individuals that comprised it. Yet according to Pierson and his colleagues, total subservience of the college to the nation did not imply benefit to that collective interest:

As teachers and scholars of the several liberal arts, it has daily been becoming plainer to us that the American colleges, and in particular the University to which we are devoted, are failing—and are seemingly willing to fail—in the discharge of their obligation to this country. It is not necessary, known your convictions, to argue the **value** of liberal studies in the spiritual life of individuals, and in the social and political life of democratic states. We all feel that it is as imperative to make wars worth winning as it is to win them; and that the apparent choice between survival of a people and the survival of their intellectual life is generally a false choice... We urge collaboration between Yale and tend the other Universities, in representing the cause of liberal education as an organic element in the commonwealth... We look to those who lead us for a recognition that in the University, no more than in private life, can moral disintegration be avoided if crises are met with the obvious and easy compromises. We are Yale men, all of us, whatever the colleges of our degrees. We have seen that upon her faculties, old and young, the spirit of Yale depends. We do not want to see this spirit grow dim.⁴⁰

Additionally, Pierson wrote an article for the *Yale Alumni Magazine* titled “Democratic War and Our Higher Learning” in which he posed a similar question to the one asked in the letter he co-authored with the other ten faculty members: can the American university president, “unaided, somehow convert the university to the all-out service of the nation *without*, by that very act, destroying its usefulness for future generations?”⁴¹ Pierson and his colleagues urged several courses of action, including the establishment of planned liberal arts sequences within the curricula of soldiers, collaboration with other colleges and universities to strengthen the liberal arts, and the creation of a committee that would study liberal

⁴⁰ G.W. Pierson, Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman to Charles Seymour, 10 Dec 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁴¹ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 398.

arts ideas and methodology and work with members of the Course of Study Committee to overhaul the Yale Course of Study.⁴² These signees approached Seymour not with a lament for a lost-cause, but with an appeal to logic and morality. Given Seymour's past pro-liberal arts rhetoric and DeVale's inclination towards the humanities, the signees had reason to hope for the success of their suggestions.⁴³

Seymour rewarded their hope to a certain degree. His recent demotion of Yale's educational priorities to its patriotic ones did not reflect an antipathy towards the liberal arts. He was, after all, the same man who had once voiced alarm that,

in spite of...discussion [of preparation for the post-war world], we haven't taken time to begin to learn about the world through which we are now passing. Precedents are being broken, laws and administrative decrees passed, social and psychological forces released so fast that we have no time to study their separate meanings, much less take a whole view of what is happening to us. Whose job is it to discover by careful research these separate meanings, whose job is it to seek that whole view, if not the university's?⁴⁴

Seymour responded to the faculty's letter with an attempt to prove that he had not abandoned his prewar ideals. He promptly created eight new research fellowships for liberal arts students.⁴⁵ In his annual report for 1941-42, Seymour announced his intention to defend the liberal arts, that "otherwise it will not profit us to win the war, for we shall have lost the values essential to the national soul."⁴⁶ Yet at the same time, Seymour firmly believed in absolute cooperation with the government. In a 1942 address to 1,000 Yale graduates in Woolsey Hall, he declared that,

Our job is to put the University in a position to help our

⁴² G.W. Pierson, Maynard Mack, Richard B. Sewall, Lewis E. York, George Kubler, Louis L. Martz, James G. Leyburn, Frank McMullan, Thomas C. Mendenhall, John C. Pope and Dan Merriman to Charles Seymour.

⁴³ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 409.

⁴⁴ Charles Seymour, "Challenge and Opportunity for the College at War," 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁴⁵ "Office of the President," 6 April 1943, *The Faculty* box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁴⁶ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 398.

government equip and train our armed forces in the shortest possible time. High gear is no longer fast enough. We must all use the over-drive... We, both as individuals and as an institution, must fit into a total plan of a nation in arms. We cannot afford to do what each of us thinks would be wise or smart. We must do what the government wants. I am frequently asked the question: 'How much of Yale will live through this war?' In the circumstance, that question is of relative unimportance, for in these times Yale can think only of the nation and how she as an institution and through her members may serve the nation.⁴⁷

The war years initiated a shift in priorities; in Seymour's eyes, Yale's new national identity had trumped the one that he had vowed to protect before the war. Yale the national institution had superseded Yale the "collegiate school."

Yale's recently refreshed pool of faculty was by now already drained.⁴⁸ Professors had departed in a mass exodus that left no department unscathed.⁴⁹ Considering Seymour's prewar assertion that increasing Yale's faculty would bolster its identity as a liberal arts institution, the loss of so many professors in the liberal arts to governmental positions proved a heavy blow to that identity. Seymour was aware of the war's destructive impact on Yale's academic life, particularly on its professors. "In the departmental reports the story is always the same," he said. "able men of the younger group called into service, with no adequate replacements available."⁵⁰ The appeasement of Yale's professors became a matter of terribly high stakes, and the disturbance of faculty life posed an existential crisis to the school. The war had claimed 13 percent of faculty, 30 percent of young instructors, 43 percent of graduate students and two thirds of the student body.⁵¹ "The loss of our students during wartime is an inevitable sacrifice," Seymour wrote, "but it still remains possible for us through our faculty to maintain our scholarly tradition. If they should die, Yale would cease to be a university."⁵² Nervous that faculty discontent would compel

⁴⁷ "Yale University News Bureau," 23 Feb 1942, *Part 4—Section A— At Yale During the War*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁴⁸ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 397.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 397.

⁵¹ "Statistics," 1942, box 8, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁵² Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 398.

many to transfer to other institutions, Seymour suggested that each professor be allowed periodic breaks to conduct their own research.⁵³

At this point, the military began to infiltrate Yale's residential college system. Kelly notes the repurposing of most residential colleges to accommodate the influx of servicemen, which had raised Yale's population 2,000 men over its average prewar enrollment. One ASTP man living in Berkeley noted that "Built originally for only two men, the spacious three room suites have found themselves crowding six within their doors." Only Jonathan Edwards, Timothy Dwight, and Trumbull remained as housing for the mere 700 civilian undergraduates left on campus. The Army delegated the duty of educating troops to the Yale faculty, who then had little choice but to shelve most of their substantial research projects.⁵⁴ In the spring of 1943, the nascent rhythm of Silliman life was jarred by military tattoo. Sophomores and juniors in this brand-new residential college were distributed among the other nine, and 600 trainees in an Army Aviation Ground School Officers program took their places. Unlike Shorty Simonds and his friends, these men did not play baseball in the courtyard. They wore uniforms at graduation instead of caps and gowns.⁵⁵

The negative consequences of the Army presence in Yale's residential colleges must be attributed to the relationship between Yale's administration and the U.S. government rather than the individuals in military programs who studied at Yale during these years. These men appreciated the opportunity to complete their training at Yale and devoted themselves to their work, different though it may have been from Yale's prewar course of study. Like many Yale freshmen, these military students struggled to find a home within Yale culture and tradition. Like many alumni, they proudly identified as Yalies and looked back on their years spent there with immense nostalgia. One ASTP man who lived in Berkeley reminisced,

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 401.

⁵⁵ Christine J. Northrop to Carl V. Hansen, 16 Jan 1943, box 1, folder 4, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Christine J. Northrop to "Charlie" [surname unknown], 21 May 1944, box 2, folder 18, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Northrop 16 Nov 1943; O.H. (Shorty) Simonds to Christine J. Northrop, 20 Aug 1943, box 1, folder 8, Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

Long after we leave Yale we shall remember everything Berkeley College has given us, its foster members. We will remember the luxurious living quarters, the library, and the common room, in which we spent so many pleasant hours reading, talking, or listening to the radio or piano. We can never forget the meals in the college dining hall, reputed by the New York *Sun* to serve some of the best food offered to the Army. And we can never forget Professor Hemingway, the ever-patient Master, with always a smile for each of his hundreds of foster charges. We can never forget the Friday evening receptions and Sunday afternoon teas in the Master's House which helped to make us feel that we are really a part of Berkeley. As is true with the hundreds of graduates since the college was opened in 1934, and with the thousands who will graduate in years to come, the memories of Berkeley which we take with us when we leave at the end of this month will always linger on.⁵⁶

William "Bill" O'Shea was one of the new Silliman military men. Bill was not part of the aviation training program; the Army had sent him to Yale to learn Japanese. "It was spacious living," he remembers, "We were happy campers. I had a wonderful time. The students educated one another... the Silliman crowd would discuss everything. They'd get together all the time. It was very informal. We'd just sit down, you just talked about things and ideas."⁵⁷ Bill's memory suggests that some ASTP students felt that they did receive a liberal arts education of sorts, even with the academic focus on military-related topics. Despite the disruption that the Army represented to Yale's student life, O'Shea felt entirely at home at the school and looked back upon those days with the same sunny nostalgia expressed by Shorty Simonds and the other Silliman men who wrote to Christine Northrop.⁵⁸

Language programs like the one attended by Bill O'Shea followed an intensive approach dictated by the Army, which diverged entirely from Yale's prewar approach to teaching languages. Once the Army began sending soldiers to Yale to learn the Japanese language, the Office of the Commanding General issued frequent memorandums and bulletins to provide Yale and other Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) with

⁵⁶ Resident of Berkeley College in the ASTP program, as quoted in Kelly, 402.

⁵⁷ William "Bill" O'Shea, in discussion with the writer.

⁵⁸ Correspondence of World War II Servicemen from Silliman College, Yale University (RU 85), Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library

information on subjects ranging from the nature of Japanese totalitarianism to Japanese food.⁵⁹ Yalies attended military lectures, such as one made by Sir George B. Sansom of the British Embassy in Washington, which covered both historical context and modern developments in Japanese Economic structure.⁶⁰ The Army sent lists of Japanese military, governmental, commercial and social figures to brief the CATS on key Japanese personalities.⁶¹ A federal committee assembled abstracts of Japanese publications, and then shared them with CATS Directors and Associate Directors.⁶² This same level of detail was also provided for ASTP students studying other areas, such as Germany and the Far East. The Army wished to ensure that Yale's Military Instructional Staff would "become thoroughly familiar with these developments, interpolating them into terms of what might be parallel future situations... and using them as a basis for lectures and conferences to be given to the student officers at regular periods throughout the course."⁶³ The language programs proved to be immensely successful; one group of officers studying Chinese in order to train Chinese groups achieved fluency in the Mandarin dialect by the end of their four-month course.⁶⁴ Language students gained skills that would be as useful in times of peace as in times of war.

The thoroughness and effectiveness of the ASTP language

⁵⁹ Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 26 April 1945, box 1, folder 9, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 22 May 1945, box 1, folder 10, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 25 May 1945, box 1, folder 12, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 27 Jan 1945, box 1, folder 15, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library; Robert N. Gorman to Directors and Associate Directors, CATS, 2 July 1945, box 1, folder 16, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶⁰ George B. Sansom, "Japan: Economic and Industrial System," lecture for the Civil Affairs Training School, Yale University, New Haven, 11-12 Sep, 1944, box 1, folder 24, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶¹ Box 3, folder 88, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶² Box 2, folders 26-30, 32-37, 43-55, box 3, folders 56-95, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶³ Robert N. Gorman, Washington 25, D.C., 15 Dec 1944, box 1, folder 6, Army Specialized Training Division, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶⁴ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 401.

programs prompted a group of ten Yale linguists to propose to Seymour in early 1944 that the ASTP methods be permanently adopted for elementary language classes. Seymour implemented a slightly-reworked policy modeled off of the linguists's proposal. The main changes to the prewar policy were the creation of an intensive ten-hours-per-week period for beginner students and a shift from a more literary focus on translating great works to a more practical focus on conversational skills.⁶⁵ Not only does this method of teaching languages remain in effect at Yale today with few significant changes, but it has become the standard model for American military and government language instruction.⁶⁶ Programs like Bill O'Shea's constituted the slim beneficial legacy of Yale's wartime relationship with the Army for its academics.

For Yale's civilian students, the war proved to be an intensely confusing and distracted time. As one student observed, "People keep moving in and out so fast that you're liable to find a complete stranger moving in on you one day... and next find everyone, including your roommate, evacuated from the entry."⁶⁷ DeVane observed that "The near approach of the war to our country made steady work seem temporary."⁶⁸ Seventeen students in the Class of 1940 failed to graduate, and Dean DeVane observed that "There was some falling off in the general scholarship standing of many of those who did graduate. I suspect that the disturbed condition of the world has something to do with this."⁶⁹ Yale's scholarship had taken a definite hit. According to Kelly, the academic year of 1943-44 "marked the peak of Yale's war effort."⁷⁰ By May 1944 the undergraduate civilian population had fallen to 565 and the total university civilian student population was only 1,720, but the military cutback had begun, to be followed by a second stage of navy and air force school cutbacks in the fall.⁷¹ To a certain degree, the Army's provision of extra

⁶⁵ Bernard Spolsky, *Behind the ASTP Myth*, Bar-Ilan University, paper was read at the Annual meeting of the Deseret Linguistic Association held at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, on 3-4 March 1994. A modified version was presented as a plenary address at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Applied Linguistics at Baltimore, MD, 116-117.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 400.

⁶⁸ "Yale College— Dean William C. DeVane," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁶⁹ "Report to Press," *Part 2— Pre-War Transition Period: September 1939 to Dec. 7, 1941*, box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁷⁰ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 402.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

men and thereby 3,000 more tuitions than the prewar years financed the recovery of Yale's identity from the violation of these years. DeVane worked with Pierson and other members of the faculty to formulate an entirely new and controversial course of study centered around the liberal arts. Directed Studies was created as part of this project.⁷²

The question remains, however, as to what extent and in what direction Yale did manage to recover. Kelly writes of Seymour's view that the university "had justified itself by its service in the national defense" through its preservation of the humanities, heightened morale, creation of new programs of study and teaching methods, and much-needed administrative organization. Moreover, "the Yale experience of the students assigned to us by army and navy has broadened our reputation and our contacts with distant parts of the country."⁷³ The main benefit Seymour saw as resulting from the Army's presence at Yale was to its reputation as a national institution rather than to its identity as harbor for scholastic development. "Neither government nor industry should be trusted in education," said dean DeVane after the war, but that is exactly what Seymour's administration had permitted.⁷⁴

The intimacy of Stover's Yale was now confined to novels and nostalgia. By September 1946, nine thousand veterans enrolled in Yale on the GI Bill, and as Kelly explains, the school's character became much more institutionalized in order to accommodate them:

As school opened, students were jammed into the residential colleges: four were housed in what was formerly a two-man suite, three in a one-man suite and two in a single room... two hundred were housed with faculty and alumni about town; some three hundred were temporarily located in the gymnasium until former navy barracks were thrown up on Pierson-Sage Square. The faculty housing problem was even worse... In the college dining halls, where once there had been printed menus at each table, white tablecloths, and meals served by waitresses, there were now cafeteria style lines and metal trays.⁷⁵

⁷² Box 2, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁷³ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 404-405.

⁷⁴ William Clyde DeVane, "American Education After the War," *The Yale Review*, Autumn 1943 issue, 35, Box 5, Eugene Harold Kone Papers, Yale University, records, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University Library.

⁷⁵ Kelley, *Yale, A History*, 405.

The war years saw Yale's permanent transformation from a community of scholars to a national institution— a transition which mirrored a larger American phenomenon of the subjugation of the province to the nation. This had been a paramount question in the Yale consciousness for over a century, beginning with the publication of the Yale Report of 1828.

Although in some ways, Yale has restored its identity as a liberal arts institution, in others, Yale has never recovered from the tradeoff Seymour made during the war. Yalies today often hear that their school only cares for them in as much as their success will credit its name and feed its national, and international, reputation. The same applies to Yale's relationship with its faculty; Yale now values them for their contribution to the success of its brand, where it once valued them for their contribution to a comparatively provincial, self-contained intellectual asylum. The nation's invasion of Yale during WWII exploded the university's notion of scholarship, success and collegiate character, and by doing so, it altered Yale's approach to student and faculty recruitment. Instead of seeking those who would best suit the traditions of its community, Yale began to seek those who would best promote its name. Although this adjustment of Yale's priorities happily lead to a more diversified population of students and professors, it also lead to the demotion of Yale's liberal arts character below its national reputation. Today's Yale students travel the world through a host of programs bearing the school's name, and Yale speakers appear on television before banners swarming with countless blue and white Yale's. Unlike schools such as St. John's College, which has remained comparatively distant from the national market of luxury-brand educational institutions and continues to prioritize education above reputation, Yale has proudly become one of the most competitive brands in that market. Yale's foundational principles might have shielded it from the growing pressure on all American colleges to embrace branding and enter an elite education market, if Seymour's decisions during WWII hadn't created fissions in the core ethics of Yale's 1701 charter. As WWII generated fundamental changes in countless aspects of the American nation, it permanently altered one of America's most prized institutions. The war instilled in Yale a new national, institutional consciousness that once gained could never be lost.

FIDELITY OR FURY? A STUDY OF EAST GERMAN, HUNGARIAN, AND POLISH LOYALTY TO THE SOVIET UNION DURING THE EARLY COLD WAR

BY DAVID SHIMER

David Shimer is a freshman studying History at Yale University. Before Yale, he attended Horace Greeley High School in Chappaqua, NY. He was inspired to research Eastern European military disloyalty toward the Soviet Union during the summer of 2012, and has been researching this original thesis ever since. David would like to thank Professor John Gaddis of Yale University and Professor Steven Houser of Grand Valley State University for their guidance and mentorship over the past two and a half years.

Throughout the Cold War, the world waited for the Soviet Union and its Eastern Bloc allies to instigate an armed conflict with the West. Yet a military confrontation in Europe never materialized. The two most common explanations as to why Soviet leaders allowed the Cold War to remain “cold” are that they recognized the catastrophic ramifications of nuclear war and believed capitalist nations would collapse naturally due to their underlying ideological flaws.

In 1951 and 1952, Joseph Stalin armed his Eastern European satellites. But following Stalin’s death, three of these nations quickly revolted against Moscow. These uprisings led the Soviets to realize that their allies were not reliable, giving rise to another possible reason why they let the Cold War stay cold: *the Soviet Union was not willing to invade Western Europe because it knew that it could not count on the loyalty of its satellite soldiers or civilians.*

Eastern European nations could have used war as an opportunity to rebel, not only costing Moscow millions of soldiers, but also crippling its supply lines to Western Europe. Dr. Pakh Tibor, a Hungarian soldier during World War II and a 1956 revolutionary, said in an interview that “the majority of the military was not loyal to the Soviet Union,” and “of course the Russians knew the Hungarian army would not fight for them – they had spies everywhere.”¹ Soviet intelligence networks and Eastern European rebellions forced Moscow to recognize this disloyalty, making an invasion of Western Europe too big of a risk to take. Yet the Soviets continued to hang the threat of war over the West, which may have been one of history’s greatest bluffs.

¹ Dr. Pakh Tibor, Interview conducted in Budapest, Hungary, by the author, 12 March 2015.

American intelligence would have been tasked with unearthing this bluff, but Moscow hid it well. Former CIA Director Allen Dulles admitted in 1953 that his Agency's understanding of the Soviet Union was crippled by "shortcomings of a serious nature."² While discussing the time period with Donald Gregg, who served in the CIA from 1951 until 1982 and then as National Security Advisor to George H.W. Bush, he acknowledged, "The Agency missed most of the big calls on the Soviet Union during the early Cold War, the largely unexamined assumption being that the Warsaw Pact was far more monolithically loyal than it really was."³

It took the United States decades to catch on. A report from the Office of Technology Assessment dated 1987 finally explained, "Questions have been raised as to whose side the East Europeans would fight on should hostilities begin."⁴ America may have misjudged the loyalty of Eastern Europe for decades, but the Soviet Union did not. Former Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Russia on the National Security Council Thomas Graham said, "There definitely would have been Soviet doubts about the capabilities and loyalties of most satellite countries, particularly in an offensive operation."⁵ A CIA publication dated 1983 and recently declassified also suggests that the Soviets were aware of this disloyalty early on. While describing Eastern European revolts from the 1950's, the report states, "Soviet armed might or the threat of it has been required to quell internal disorders," which "undoubtedly contributes to their concern when assessing the overall reliability of their Allies." To the Soviets, East Germany remained a "recent enemy" and Poland and Hungary had become "suspect allies."⁶

The cases of East Germany, Hungary, and Poland are examined as a proxy for the Eastern Bloc theory as a whole herein. This analysis will attempt to prove that: 1) These nations deeply resented the Soviet Union; and 2) After the revolts of 1953 and 1956, Moscow fully recognized the magnitude of their animosity and its implications on their reliability as allies.

² Stephen Kinzer, *The Brothers: John Foster Dulles, Allen Dulles, and Their Secret World War* (New York: Times Books, 2013), 155.

³ Donald Gregg, Interview conducted in Armonk, New York, by the author, 15 March 2014.

⁴ John Gibbons, *New Technology for NATO: Implementing Follow-on Forces Attack*, (Washington D.C: U.S Government Printing Office, 1987.), Office of Technology Assessment, June 1987, (accessed February 22, 2013).

⁵ Thomas Graham, Interview conducted at Yale University by the author, 22 February 2015

⁶ "Military Reliability of the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact Allies," *CIA Historical Review Program* (1983): 1-10.

Part I: World War II - "Liberation"

The resentment that would have caused soldiers in Hungary, East Germany, and Poland to not remain loyal to the Soviet Union originated during and immediately after World War II. The first impression is often the one that counts the most, and the Soviet Union did not make a good one. While moving across Eastern Europe, the Red Army destroyed, stole, raped, and, in Poland, infamously murdered thousands of officers in cold blood. Once the war ended, millions of ethnic Germans were forced to undergo brutal migrations, and thousands of Poles, Hungarians, and East Germans were imprisoned. These actions were all supported by Moscow, and had a lasting impact on the way in which the citizens of these three nations viewed the Soviet Union.

Destruction, Theft, and Rape

As the soldiers of the Red Army marched toward Berlin in 1944, they finally had the chance to avenge the 24 million Soviets who had died during World War II. There was unavoidable collateral damage along the way; however, the Red Army subjected these three nations to needless destruction. For example, in the militarily unimportant Polish city of Gniezno, Russian tanks destroyed a thousand year old cathedral, and after capturing the city of Breslau in western Poland, the Red Army promptly burned it to the ground.⁷ In Hungary, the Red Army eliminated 40 percent of the nation's non-human wealth between October 1944 and April 1945.⁸ But the destruction was most severe in East Germany, as soldiers sought to punish their historic enemy. These violent acts were often inflicted upon innocent civilians, and, in most cases, contrasted starkly with the Anglo-American liberation of Western Europe.

The Red Army stole from the towns that it passed through, at least partly in response to Eastern Europe's high standard of living compared to that of the Soviet Union. Many soldiers believed these countries must have robbed the rest of Europe, so they felt justified in their looting.⁹ They took anything that was not rooted to the ground, from liquor, furniture, and bicycles to linens and watches.¹⁰ They robbed warehouses, stores, and private homes, with one Communist informant reporting that the soldiers

⁷ Anne Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956* (New York: Doubleday, 2012), 28.

⁸ William A. Bomberger and Gail E. Makinen. "The Hungarian Hyperinflation and Stabilization of 1945-1946," *Journal of Political Economy* 91.5 (1983): 801-810.

⁹ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 26-27.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

“take absolutely everything and exchange it for vodka.”¹¹ As time passed, theft worsened. A report from a Polish Citizen living in Cracow in July 1945 stated, “Occurrences of looting, in daylight as well as during the night, by Soviet soldiers stationed in specific areas or passing through are multiplying,” and, as a result, “the attitude of the civilian population towards the Red Army is deteriorating daily.”¹²

The Red Army unleashed a third form of abuse upon Eastern Europe: mass rape. While destruction and theft are unfortunate aspects of warfare, the systematic mass rape that the Red Army engaged in while moving through Poland, Hungary, and East Germany beginning in January 1944 and ending well after May 1945 was unprecedented. Poland comparatively suffered the least; a few thousand of its women were assaulted.¹³ In Hungary, about 250,000 women were raped - 50,000 in Budapest and the balance across the rest of the nation.¹⁴ East Germans were brutalized, with an organized campaign of “gang rape” leading to the sexual abuse of an estimated 2 million women.¹⁵ Tibor described one dark night in Hungary near the end of the war, during which Soviet soldiers forced his mother into an empty home. “We don’t know exactly what happened inside,” he said. “But in the morning she was dead.”¹⁶

Some soldiers said the rapes never occurred. Others said Eastern European women either consented to have sex with them or did so to infect the Red Army with disease. Boris Slutsky, a poet who travelled with the Red Army in Hungary, explained that the “Hungarian women loved the Russians in their turn,” and even enjoyed being raped.¹⁷ Such attempts at justification show how indifferent the Russians were toward the suffering of their victims.

Their amoral actions had lasting consequences. A Polish soldier explained that he “heard from Poles that the Red Army was regarded in 1944 as an army of liberation, but after their arrival these friendly feelings

¹¹ Bartholomew Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," *East*

European Quarterly XXXII.2 (1998): 139-61.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 30.

¹⁴ James Mark, "Remembering Rape: Divided Social Memory and the Red Army in Hungary 1944-1945," *Past & Present* 188.1 (2005): 133-161.

¹⁵ Adam Jones, "Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction - by Adam Jones." *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction - by Adam Jones*. Routledge, 2006.

<<http://www.genocidetext.net/>>. (accessed June 23, 2013)

¹⁶ Dr. Pakh Tibor, Interview conducted in Budapest, Hungary, by the author, 12 March 2015.

¹⁷ Mark, "Remembering Rape: Divided Social Memory and the Red Army in Hungary 1944-1945," 133-161.

changed to feelings of hatred [because of the] NKVD (Soviet Secret Police), looting of Polish property, and raping of Polish women.”¹⁸ Worse still, Eastern Europe was falling under the control of Joseph Stalin, who encouraged rape. He famously stated that people should “understand it if a soldier who has crossed thousands of kilometers through blood and fire and death has fun with a woman or takes some trifle.”¹⁹ Innocent Eastern European women were suffering, and the leader of the Soviet Union approved.

The Katyn Massacre, the Home Army, and the Warsaw Uprising

In 1939, the Soviets invaded Poland in concert with the Germans and imprisoned 14,300 military officers, many of whom were fleeing from the Wehrmacht. In 1943, the Nazis found a mass grave in the Katyn Forest filled with thousands of dead Polish officers.²⁰ Despite Soviet denials, it was widely understood that the NKVD had perpetrated what became known as the Katyn Massacre.²¹ Additionally, in eastern Poland, the Soviets deported an estimated 315,000 Poles, arrested 110,000, and executed 30,000 between 1939 and 1941 from a region in which approximately 13 million had lived.²² The Katyn Massacre and these other brutal actions gave the Polish population powerful reasons to resent the Soviets.

Similar to those executed in the Katyn Forest, members of an underground group known as the Home Army attempted to fight the Nazis. Loyal to the exiled London Government, the Home Army had an estimated 300,000 members in 1944.²³ However, the Soviets did not trust the Home Army, and by July 20, 1944, the NKVD had arrested 6,000 of its members.²⁴

The remaining Home Army soldiers desperately launched the Warsaw Uprising on August 1, 1944 to reclaim Warsaw from the Nazis before the Red Army arrived. Rather than help, the Red Army set up camp

¹⁸ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

¹⁹ Andrew Roberts, "Stalin's army of rapists: The brutal war crime that Russia and Germany tried to ignore" <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1080493/Stalins-army-rapists-The-brutal-war-crime-Russia-Germany-tried-ignore.html> (accessed November 22, 2012).

²⁰ Richard Starr, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," *Studies on the Soviet Union* 11.4 (1971): 310-320.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Timothy Snyder, *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*, (New York: Basic Books, 2010) 151.

²³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 91.

²⁴ Ibid., 94.

at the Vistula River and watched as the Nazis slaughtered 200,000 Poles.²⁵ The Allies airlifted supplies to Warsaw, but Stalin would not allow their planes to refuel on Soviet territory.²⁶ In bulletins, Home Army leaders explained that they had received little assistance from the Soviets but large amounts from the Anglo-American effort.²⁷

This anti-Soviet atmosphere led many to support the West. A British agent in Poland explained in 1945: "In general, the intervention of the allies is counted on. The general opinion is characterized by the often-expressed view that we have lived through five years of German occupation, and we shall also live through these few months to independence."²⁸ If this account is accurate, a large number of Poles were waiting for the West to save them from Soviet occupation.

Mass Migrations

Following World War II, many Eastern Europeans felt unsafe around ethnic Germans.²⁹ Under Soviet direction, Eastern Europe rallied around the idea of sending these ethnic Germans to East or West Germany. Between 1945 and 1950, 12 to 14 million German-speaking civilians, consisting mostly of women, children, and the elderly, were forcibly removed from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, and western Poland.³⁰ An estimated 400,000 of them died in the process.³¹

Polish leaders told soldiers to celebrate "the expulsion of German filth from Polish land" and that "every officer, every soldier should be aware of the fact that today he fulfills a historic mission, for which generations have been waiting."³² A remarkable 75.9 percent of Hungarians either approved of or wanted to intensify German deportations.³³ Czechoslovakian President Edvard Benes claimed that Germans had behaved so cruelly that they "must pay with a great and

²⁵ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 95.

²⁸ Public Records Office, Foreign Office, London, England, 371 47578 N155476G55 (Accessed September 15, 2014)

²⁹ R.M Douglas, "The European Atrocity You Never Heard About"

<http://chronicle.com/article/The-European-Atrocity-You/132123/> (Accessed October 24, 2012)

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 121-122.

³³ A.f. Noskova, "Migration of the Germans after the Second World War: Political and Psychological Aspects," *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 16.1-2 (2000): 96-114.

severe punishment.”³⁴ In the Benes Decrees, ratified in March 1946, Czechs were given permission to seize German property, evict German residents, revoke German citizenship, and resettle German land.³⁵ As hundreds of thousands of ethnic Germans left Czechoslovakia, many despaired, leading 5,558 of them to commit suicide in 1946 alone.³⁶

By 1950, 16.5 percent of West Germany and 25 percent of East Germany were comprised of refugees.³⁷ Some hoped to return to the homes they had abandoned in the East, but unlike Germans in Poland following World War I, returning was never an option. Instead, they had to make the best of the situation imposed upon them by the rest of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Moscow supported these migrations. Stalin brazenly told Czech leaders to “throw them (the Sudeten Germans) out. Now they will learn themselves what it means to rule over someone else.” He also told Poland to “create such conditions for the Germans that they want to escape themselves.”³⁸ Stalin had approved of the mass rape of 2 million German women as well as the forced migration of more than 12 million ethnic Germans. Such harsh treatment was shortsighted, as the Soviets wanted, and, in 1952, would begin to rely upon, East German military support.

Widespread Arrests

The secret police targeted any potential anti-Soviets to solidify Moscow’s control over Eastern Europe. Arthur Lane, US ambassador to Poland, explained that in 1945 “anyone not supporting the government was in danger of arrest.”³⁹

Between January and April of 1945, the NKVD arrested 215,540 Eastern Europeans, including 138,000 East Germans and 38,000 Poles, with many civilians simply disappearing overnight.⁴⁰ In 1945, 140,000-200,000 Hungarians were imprisoned. Often, the Hungarian secret police arrested civilians for the sole purpose of meeting their quotas.⁴¹ They even arrested proven antifascists, including those who did not speak a word of German. One Hungarian remarked, “Anyone who had ever worked for or

³⁴ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 119.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 120.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 124.

³⁷ Rainer Schulze, “The Politics of Memory: Flight and Expulsion of German Populations after the Second World War and German Collective Memory,” *National Identities* 8.4 (2006): 367-82.

³⁸ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 125.

³⁹ Goldyn, “Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946,” 139-161.

⁴⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 193.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 110.

praised any of the prewar governments, party leaders, or politicians was at risk.”⁴² Fifteen year-old Gisela Gneist, for example, started a club for democracy. Soon afterward, she was arrested and jailed. Gneist was beaten before finally admitting to leading counter-revolutionary activities, resulting in her incarceration.⁴³

An additional 150,000 East Germans were jailed between 1946 and 1953, a third of whom ultimately died in prison. To be clear, they were not murdered – horrid conditions led to their deaths.⁴⁴ Because of these seemingly arbitrary arrests, the citizens of these three nations grew to further distrust the Communists. In September 1945, a delegate at a district conference in Cracow declared, “If there is a democracy, then the prisons should be set free.”⁴⁵ But these three nations were not democratic, and innocent civilians were left in prison for years.

Conclusion

Wartime abuse strongly impacted the way in which Poles, Hungarians, and East Germans viewed the Soviet Union. A Polish security officer explained in February of 1945 that Red Army soldiers “behave toward Poles in a manner that is harming Polish-Soviet friendship and weakens the feelings of gratitude the people of Poznan had for their liberators.”⁴⁶

Eastern Europeans had hoped for heroes. Instead, they gained new oppressors. An unidentified woman from Berlin explained in 1946 that Soviet violence added to the “fear and mistrust with which we approach everybody who wears a certain uniform.”⁴⁷

East Germans, Hungarians, and Poles witnessed the brutality of the Red Army first hand. Henry Minc, Minister of Polish Trade and Industry, explained on July 12, 1945 that due to “incidents of marauding, the presence of a large army on a small area of territory, and the centuries-old hatred toward Russia, a black tide of hatred towards the Red Army is rising.”⁴⁸ As upcoming elections would soon illustrate, this acrimony did not fade with time.

⁴² Ibid., 111.

⁴³ Ibid., 108.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 107.

⁴⁵ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

⁴⁶ Andrew Roberts, “Stalin's army of rapists: The brutal war crime that Russia and Germany tried to ignore” <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1080493/Stalins-army-rapists-The-brutal-war-crime-Russia-Germany-tried-ignore.html> (accessed November 22, 2012)

⁴⁷ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 30-31.

⁴⁸ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

Part II: The Illusion of Political Loyalty

Communist governments took control of Poland, Hungary, and East Germany following World War II. To the West, it appeared as if Eastern Europe had united under communism. But the Soviets knew that these governments had taken power through violence and intimidation. When fair elections were held, the Communists did not win a single one. The alternative political factions that did win these elections were quickly eliminated. Deprived of the protection of a true multi-party political system, anti-Communists were unable to safely voice their opinions. This cowering of the civilian population led to the illusion of Communist support within these three nations, even though their citizens truly supported other parties.

Poland

The fall of the Home Army forced Poles to accept that armed resistance was pointless for the time being. The secret police was too adept at finding and eliminating military opposition. But the Polish People's Party (PSL) did give citizens an opportunity to resist through elections.

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, President of the PSL prior to the war, became Prime Minister of the exiled London Government in 1943. In the spring of 1945, Stalin invited him to return to Poland to help lead the provisional government.⁴⁹ Anti-Communists criticized him for returning, because doing so increased the legitimacy of the interim government. But to Mikolajczyk, he was returning to save Poland from communism.⁵⁰

Thousands gathered to greet Mikolajczyk upon his arrival in Warsaw on June 27, 1945. Citizens cheered, followed, and in some instances lifted him into the air in celebration. Mikolajczyk himself explained that he would "never forget these starved but hopeful people, men and women who lifted the entire car on their backs and carried it."⁵¹ According to a British informant, in April 1945 "Mikolajczyk's name still carried the same prestige and he could count on the support of the great bulk of the peasants."⁵²

In response to Mikolajczyk's popularity, the NKVD tried to intimidate him. For example, one night a soldier with a machine gun fired a warning shot at Mikolajczyk as he walked home from a meeting in

⁴⁹ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

⁵² Ibid.

Cracow. Despite this show of force, Mikolajczyk and his followers continued to lead a brave campaign against the Communist Party.⁵³ All anti-Communists in Poland, from socialists to nationalists, were behind him. Jan Frey-Bielecki, Chief of Security in Cracow, admitted that the Communists were often “treated as representatives of a foreign power,” and even Wladyslaw Gomulka, the Party’s First Secretary, admitted on July 12, 1945, “In Polish Society, old anti-Russian traditions and new anti-Soviet feelings run deep.”⁵⁴

The PSL famously published the popular *Gazeta Ludowa* (People’s Paper). Although 500,000 Poles wanted a copy, only 70,000 could be printed initially. The paper described the arrests, torture, and mistreatment of Polish citizens and PSL members. It revealed that when Mikolajczyk spoke in parliament, Communists booed so loudly that no one could hear him.⁵⁵ These revelations further reduced Communist support, which was exemplified on January 19, 1946 at a workers meeting in Cracow. When a Communist official began to speak, Poles shouted, “We don’t want Communism! Don’t let him talk further!”⁵⁶

The Communist Party wanted to prove that it had more support than the PSL did, so its leaders decided to hold a referendum in the summer of 1946. The referendum asked three questions, and the Communists spread the slogan, *Three Times Yes*, which meant that they wanted all Poles who supported them to vote yes to each question. In retaliation, Mikolajczyk told his supporters to vote no to one of the questions.

The Communists printed 84 million posters, leaflets, and brochures to entice Polish voters. They even arrested citizens who were planning on voting “once no” in a desperate attempt to ensure victory.⁵⁷ These overly aggressive policies actually hurt the Communist Party. During a soccer match between Yugoslavia and Poland, Communist representatives briefly spoke of the referendum. The crowd responded by booing and chanting Mikolajczyk’s name.⁵⁸

A remarkable 85.3 percent of eligible voters, or 11 million people, voted in the referendum. The “official” results stated that 68.2 percent of Poles voted yes to the first question, 77.3 percent to the second, and 91.4 percent to the third.⁵⁹ But the Communists had manipulated these results.

⁵³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 198.

⁵⁴ Goldyn, “Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946,” 139-161.

⁵⁵ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 199.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 201.

⁵⁹ Goldyn, “Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946,” 139-161.

The actual data revealed that just 25 percent of Poles voted three times yes. Whether they liked it or not, the Communists now knew that they did not have the support of the Polish population.⁶⁰

The only way for the Communists to achieve total control was to eliminate the PSL.⁶¹ In between the referendum and parliamentary elections, which were held on January 17, 1947, the secret police arrested PSL leaders, held show trials, and interrogated the PSL's press department.⁶² The night before the general election, Communist agents spread a rumor that Mikolajczyk was dead, only worsening electoral corruption.⁶³ On Election Day, soldiers often reviewed votes before they were cast and, in some cases, removed the PSL from the ballot.⁶⁴

The results were predictable, with a reported 80 percent of the vote going to the Communists and just 10 percent going to the PSL.⁶⁵ Mikolajczyk believed that he had truly received 65 percent to 85 percent of the vote. Lieutenant Colonel Jozef Swiatlo affirmed Mikolajczyk's suspicions, explaining, "Falsification of election returns in 1947 took place at all levels, from top to bottom."⁶⁶ Either way, Mikolajczyk could not change the results. He resigned in protest and Boleslaw Beirut became President. Mikolajczyk then fled to England in October 1947 to escape arrest.⁶⁷ With Mikolajczyk gone, the PSL lived on only in name. The Communists had taken power in Poland.

Hungary

The first free elections in Hungary's history were held at the end of 1945. Women, peasants, and the uneducated were allowed to vote. Mátyás Rákosi, the Communist leader in Hungary, expected an electoral victory because unemployment and discontent were high.⁶⁸

The Communist slogans of 1945 focused on patriotism, reconstruction, and unity. The Party's major adversary, the Smallholders Party, attracted those who supported neither communism nor democratic socialism. Although the name suggests an affinity for peasants, the

⁶⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 201.

⁶¹ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320.

⁶² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 204.

⁶³ George Sakwa and Martin Crouch, "Sejm Elections in Communist Poland: An Overview and a Reappraisal," *British Journal of Political Science* 8.04 (1978): 403.

⁶⁴ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320.

⁶⁵ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

⁶⁶ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320.

⁶⁷ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 205.

⁶⁸ Paul Ignotus, "The First Two Communist Takeovers of Hungary: 1919 and 1948," *Studies on the Soviet Union* 11.4 (1971): 338-352.

Smallholders Party primarily represented the middle class. Skilled workers benefited most from its policies, but farmers, workers, and bourgeoisie who believed in a compromise between capitalism and communism also joined.⁶⁹ According to Tibor, whose father was an officer in the Smallholders Party, Hungarians opposed to communism usually sided with the Smallholders.⁷⁰

In a municipal election held on October 7, 1945, the Smallholders Party received more than half of the vote. In response, Rákosi was as “pale as a corpse, and sank into his chair without saying a word.” In the November 1945 national elections, the Communists received just 17 percent of the vote versus 57 percent for the Smallholders.⁷¹ The success of the Smallholders Party was largely considered a result of the abuse that the Red Army had inflicted on Hungary.⁷²

Upon the victory of the Smallholders Party, Zoltán Tildy, the Party’s leader, asked for half of the seats in the cabinet and control of the Interior Ministry. Under instructions from Moscow, Rákosi informed Tildy that the 17 percent of the vote that the Communists had received represented the strongest force in the country: the working class.⁷³ Consequently, he reasoned that the Interior Ministry should be put under Communist control. Tildy agreed out of fear for his safety.

After Tildy’s capitulation, Rákosi began to “slice off” the Smallholders Party “like pieces of salami.”⁷⁴ He first eliminated the “right wing” Smallholders, who consisted of outspoken Communist opponents. He then targeted the bulk of the Party through a false conspiracy. Béla Kovács, one of the Party’s leaders, was accused of taking part in the plot. The Communist Minister of the Interior, László Rajk, prepared to arrest him. Rather than wait for Rajk, Soviet police seized Kovács. This was one of the few times that the Russians directly interfered in Hungarian affairs, and their actions proved worthwhile. The Smallholders were intimidated, leading Prime Minister Ferenc Nagy and many of his followers to flee Hungary in May 1947.⁷⁵

⁶⁹ Ignotus, "The First Two Communist Takeovers of Hungary: 1919 and 1948," 338-352.

⁷⁰ Dr. Pákh Tibor, Interview conducted in Budapest, Hungary, by the author, 12 March 2015.

⁷¹ Ullin McStea, "Slowing Sovietization: The Labour Party, the Hungarian Social Democrats and the Elections of 1947," *European History Quarterly* (2006): 350-68.

⁷² Ignotus, "The First Two Communist Takeovers of Hungary: 1919 and 1948," 338-352.

⁷³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 208.

⁷⁴ Ignotus, "The First Two Communist Takeovers of Hungary: 1919 and 1948," 338-352.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

Following Nagy's escape, an election was held on August 31, 1947, during which 700,000-800,000 Hungarians were barred from voting. The Communists won by default. Their major opponent, the Social Democrats, eventually ceased to be an independent political force, and all other opposition resulted in imprisonment. So again, from a political standpoint, the Communist Party had achieved total control.⁷⁶

East Germany

A similar story unfolded in East Germany. The Communist Party had forcibly merged with the Social Democratic Party in 1946, and was known as the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED).⁷⁷ Elections were to be held to satisfy the West and legitimize the SED.⁷⁸

Moscow commandeered the SED's electoral campaign. The leader of election propaganda, Colonel Tiul'panov, explained in internal communication that, "All of the SED's decisions must be agreed upon by the leadership of the Soviet Military Administration."⁷⁹ The Soviets were determined to win, so they temporarily halted reparations, sent more raw materials to East Germany, and increased food rations.⁸⁰ The SED also printed more than a million leaflets to strengthen its popularity. While campaigning, SED officials rarely mentioned communism or the Soviet Union, because they understood that many East Germans resented the USSR.

The Christian Democratic Party (CDU), a strong adversary to the Communists, ran with a primarily religious platform. Jakob Kaiser led the party. His major goals were to make Christianity the heart of German culture, care for German refugees, limit Soviet land reform, and resist one party rule.⁸¹ The Soviet Military Administration in East Germany delayed the establishment of local Christian Democratic Party organizations, so only 2,100 out of 11,600 East German communities had CDU representatives by 1946.⁸²

⁷⁶ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 209.

⁷⁷ Hans W. Schoenberg, "The Partition of Germany and the Neutralization of Austria," *Studies on the Soviet Union* 11.4 (1971): 321-327.

⁷⁸ Stefan Kreuzberger, "The Soviet Military Administration and East German Elections, Autumn 1946," *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 45.1 (1999): 89-98.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 216.

⁸¹ Sean Brennan, *The Politics of Religion in Soviet-Occupied Germany: The Case of Berlin-Brandenburg 1945-1949*, (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2011), 503.

⁸² Kreuzberger, "The Soviet Military Administration and East German Elections, Autumn 1946," 89-98.

Elections were held on October 20, 1946. The Communists did not win a majority at the regional level, so they were forced to share power with the CDU. The SED had hoped for a firm victory, but they received barely 50 percent of the vote. In Berlin, the Social Democrats had not yet been absorbed by the SED. They won 49 percent of the vote, with the CDU winning 22.2 percent, followed by the SED's 19.8 percent.⁸³ To the Communists, these results were a disaster. When comparing 1946 electoral results to those of 1933, Communist support had actually decreased.⁸⁴

The CDU was slowly dismantled following the 1946 election. Secret policemen began targeting CDU members. In the spring of 1947, CDU leader Manfred Klein was arrested.⁸⁵ In March 1948, Ernst Benda, the chairman of the students' association of the CDU, was on the phone with another party member when a third voice spoke into the phone and told him, "Just do be careful."⁸⁶ Benda then fled East Germany and did not return for another forty years.⁸⁷ Similarly, Jakob Kaiser resigned as the head of the CDU in 1947 and fled to West Berlin in 1948. In the blink of an eye, the leaders of the SED's major opponent were gone.⁸⁸

Conclusion

By the end of 1947, Mikolajczyk had escaped to Britain, Nagy was en route to the United States, and Kaiser was preparing to leave East Germany. It had been less than three years since the end of World War II, yet all political avenues of Communist opposition had ceased to exist.

A majority of Poles, Hungarians, and East Germans had tried to prevent Communists from taking control. They voted against them whenever they had the chance to and rallied around leaders who gave them hope and presented a viable alternative to communism. Unfortunately, mere hope was not enough to stop the might and will of Moscow.

These civilians kept their doubts to themselves and bided their time until an opportunity to replace the Communists presented itself. While an invasion of Western Europe might have presented such an opportunity, revolt was another option. Unsurprisingly, within the next decade, citizens in all three countries would protest against their fraudulently elected governments.

⁸³ Schoenberg, "The Partition of Germany and the Neutralization of Austria," 321-327.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 218.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Brennan, *The Politics of Religion in Soviet-Occupied Germany: The Case of Berlin-Brandenburg 1945-1949*, 504.

Part III: Destruction of Religious Institutions

When the Smallholders Party and the PSL were eliminated, Hungarians and Poles could no longer look to politicians for support. Consequently, local priests and church leaders became an alternate source of authority. In East Germany, the CDU was inextricably bound to religion, so when the CDU was attacked, religion was as well.

Communist ideology considered religion to be an opiate that undermined class-consciousness and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Worse yet, Communist leaders believed that religion undermined their power because millions of people looked to their religious leaders for guidance. To gain the loyalty of these civilians and to stay true to their ideology, the Communists targeted religion. They arrested thousands of priests, confiscated church lands, and nationalized church schools, effectively removing religion from public life in just a few years.

Rather than increase Communist support, the suppression of religious institutions only deepened popular resentment. Priests and national religious leaders, most notably József Mindszenty, served as religious martyrs for the millions who adored them, and through their persecution emerged a powerful hatred, shared by millions, of communism and the Soviet Union.

Initial Suppression of Religion

When the Communists first arrived in Poland, Hungary, and East Germany, they largely left religious institutions alone. Starting in the fall of 1945, however, the Red Army began to arrest Polish priests.⁸⁹ In Hungary, the targeting of priests began with the arrest of Father Kiss, who was accused of murdering Red Army soldiers in 1946.⁹⁰ In East Germany, the Soviets moved relatively slowly, although some Protestant and Catholic parishes were targeted as early as 1945.⁹¹

The Communists abandoned the pretense that they had any affinity for the church after elections revealed their unpopularity in 1946 and 1947. They used these elections as an excuse to attack religion, coming to the conclusion that religious leaders were not dying quickly enough and that the church was preventing young citizens from joining the Communist movement.⁹²

⁸⁹ Michael Szporer, "Managing Religion in Communist-Era Poland: Catholic Priests versus the Secret Police," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 12.3 (2010): 115-120.

⁹⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 258.

⁹¹ Brennan, *The Politics of Religion in Soviet-Occupied Germany: The Case of Berlin-Brandenburg 1945—1949*, 502.

⁹² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 503.

Unlike in Poland and Hungary, East German elections were directly related to religion. The CDU, led by Jakob Kaiser, was committed to the doctrines of Christian Socialism. As described in the previous section, the Communists were responsible for the Party's downfall.⁹³

Land reform offered the Communists an easy way to target religious institutions in Hungary and Poland. For centuries, churches of various faiths had held enormous amounts of land in these two nations, giving them wealth and power. Through extensive reorganization, their land was nationalized and their influence diminished.⁹⁴ In Hungary, for example, the government confiscated 75 percent of Roman Catholic land and 50 percent of Protestant land.⁹⁵

Religious youth groups gave the Communists another opportunity to lessen church influence. Approximately 6,500 of Hungary's religious schools were converted into state schools by 1950.⁹⁶ In 1947, the SED passed laws that pressured children to abandon CDU youth groups and join the Free German Youth.⁹⁷ These students had to choose between religion and education. Many young adults realized how unfair such an ultimatum was, so they fled to West Berlin.⁹⁸

By the early 1950's, thousands of Eastern European priests were incarcerated. In Poland, church property continued to be seized, church publications continued to be limited, and church housing projects continued to be closed.⁹⁹ Influential priests like Lajos Ordass and Laszlo Ravasz were in prison, and Catholic charities were under attack. The Catholic charity Caritas, for example, cared for 166,700 orphans and controlled 241 soup kitchens at its peak, but the Communists decided to dismantle it anyway.¹⁰⁰

Cardinal Mindszenty and the Lublin Miracle

With so many priests in prison, remaining religious leaders became beacons of hope for Eastern Europe. Some of these figures negotiated with their new governments, but others fought. Jozef Mindszenty, appointed Hungarian primate in 1945, led rallies against the

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Szporer, "Managing Religion in Communist-Era Poland: Catholic Priests versus the Secret Police," 115-120.

⁹⁵ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 259.

⁹⁶ Brennan, *The Politics of Religion in Soviet-Occupied Germany: The Case of Berlin-Brandenburg 1945—1949*, 503.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 504.

⁹⁸ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 260.

⁹⁹ Szporer, "Managing Religion in Communist-Era Poland: Catholic Priests versus the Secret Police," 115-120.

¹⁰⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 261.

Communist government. Hundreds of thousands of citizens travelled large distances to attend.¹⁰¹ They watched Mindszenty rebel with excitement and horror, as a Cardinal fought an empire.¹⁰²

Mindszenty spoke out against the closure of church schools, the imprisonment of priests, and the authoritarian government, going so far as to state, "It seems a totalitarian dictatorship is starting to replace the previous one."¹⁰³ The government even closed roads and shut down trains in an effort to prevent civilians from attending his speeches.

Despite potential danger, Mindszenty would not negotiate with the Hungarian government. He was finally arrested in December 1948, but his message gave Hungarians hope for years to come and scared Communist regimes all over Eastern Europe. He became one of the first "symbolic" victims of totalitarianism.¹⁰⁴ It was not until 1956, during the Hungarian Revolution, that he was finally released from prison and granted asylum by the United States.

Mindszenty's rallies helped lead to the further suppression of the Hungarian Church. After his arrest, Hungarian bishops were forced to sign a church-state agreement that was harsher than those signed by other Eastern European nations, such as the Polish version, negotiated by the more conciliatory Stefan Wyszynski. A week after the agreement was signed, the state dissolved Hungary's Monastic order, further weakening the Hungarian church.¹⁰⁵

Behind closed doors, many citizens retained their religious beliefs, as exemplified by Mindszenty's mass rallies and the "Lublin Miracle," which began on July 3, 1949.¹⁰⁶ Rumors spread all around Poland that a statue of the Virgin Mary, located in a cathedral in Lublin, was crying. Thousands of Poles traveled hundreds of miles to see the miracle. The crowds became so large that policemen arrested spectators for up to three weeks in the hopes that others would not come.¹⁰⁷ This symbolic event illustrates that a supposedly secular Poland was only an illusion.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 263.

¹⁰² O'Sullivan, John. "News." *Cardinal Mindszenty: The Power of the Prisoner*. <http://www.hungarianreview.com/article/cardinal_mindszenty-power_of_the_prisoner> (Accessed July 28, 2013).

¹⁰³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 263.

¹⁰⁴ O'Sullivan, John. "News." *Cardinal Mindszenty: The Power of the Prisoner*. <http://www.hungarianreview.com/article/cardinal_mindszenty-power_of_the_prisoner> (Accessed July 28, 2013).

¹⁰⁵ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 265.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 425.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 426.

In fact, church authorities helped religious Poles live a pious life throughout the Cold War.¹⁰⁸

Conclusion

As evidenced by Mindszenty's rallies, the Lublin Miracle, and the CDU's popularity, millions of Poles, Hungarians, and East Germans remained deeply religious. Once the Soviet bloc disintegrated decades later, these civilians finally were able to worship freely once again.

The Soviets unleashed violence, installed corrupt governments, and suppressed religion in a matter of years. These abuses gave the citizens of these three nations many reasons to oppose their new Communist governments. If the Communists had rapidly improved economic conditions, however, perhaps these abuses would have been partially offset. Instead, living standards grew at a rate slower than that of the West, leading to even greater discontent within Poland, Hungary, and East Germany.

Part IV: Economic Mismanagement

The economies of East Germany, Hungary, and Poland were in shambles following World War II. There was hope that the ideas of the Communists would repair this situation and create a paradise for workers; instead, their policies led to stagnation.

Severe economic shortcomings contributed to the long-term resentment that Poles, Hungarians, and East Germans felt toward the Soviet Union. Destruction during World War II, reparation programs, an inability to participate in the Marshall Plan, the nationalization of industry, and hyperinflation were all either Soviet policy or a direct result of such policy. Each of these factors contributed to the slow economic recoveries of these three nations.

Wartime Destruction, Reparations, and the Marshall Plan

As discussed previously, the Red Army's destruction and theft had a detrimental impact on East Germany, Hungary, and Poland's economies. Logically, once the Soviets established their control over Eastern Europe, it would have been in their best interest to actively improve economic conditions, thereby producing reliable allies. Instead, Moscow opted for revenge.

The Treaty of Versailles, signed in 1919, forced Germany to pay reparations for the damage it had caused during World War I. These

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 428.

reparations helped lead to German resentment, jingoistic nationalism, and, ultimately, renewed military aggression. Ignoring this historical lesson, the Soviets forced East Germany, Hungary, and Poland to pay reparations after World War II. These reparations produced similar feelings of anger, this time throughout Eastern Europe and directed toward the Soviet Union.

While the Polish reparations were less demanding than those placed on East Germany and Hungary, they were also the most unjustified. Following World War II, international agreements stated that Poland would not have to pay reparations.¹⁰⁹ Unfortunately, the Polish people could do nothing to stop the Soviets from defying these agreements. The Red Army dismantled and shipped entire factories from Poland to the Soviet Union. Any factory, from steel mills to pipe manufacturers, was at risk of confiscation. The Soviets claimed that they only targeted German property. But most of the time such justification was merely an excuse. In Katowice, a factory that produced zinc oxide was dismantled and sent to the Soviet Union. The factory was entirely Polish - it was located in Polish territory and had been owned by Poles prior to the War. Yet it was still targeted. It was as if the Soviets saw Poland as an enemy.¹¹⁰

International agreements allowed Moscow to impose up to \$300 million of reparations on Hungary because Hungary had been a Nazi ally. Between January 1945 and January 1946, Hungary had to provide the Soviet Union with \$33 million worth of goods or else 5 percent interest would accrue monthly.¹¹¹ These reparations led to the confiscation of oil, ships, and industrial equipment. The Soviets also dismantled and moved roughly 100 factories from Hungary to the Soviet Union. The assets of any company connected to Germany were seized. Often, Czech and Austrian companies, along with companies that had German shareholders, were targeted too. The Soviets also continued to steal random possessions, such as clothing, artifacts, and food.¹¹²

The reparation payments, combined with the occupation costs of the Red Army, accounted for 25 percent to 50 percent of Hungary's monthly expenditures and ultimately catalyzed the worst hyperinflation in human history.¹¹³ The reparations accounted for 17 percent of Hungary's GDP in 1945 and 1946, 10 percent in 1946-1947, and 7 percent for all

¹⁰⁹ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 38.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹¹ Bomberger and Makinen, "The Hungarian Hyperinflation and Stabilization of 1945-1946," 801-810.

¹¹² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 38.

¹¹³ Bomberger and Makinen, "The Hungarian Hyperinflation and Stabilization of 1945-1946," 801-810.

remaining years up until 1952, at which point they finally ended.¹¹⁴ In total, it is estimated that the Soviet Union took \$300 million worth of goods (adjusted to 1938 American price levels) from Hungary during this period.¹¹⁵

The reparation programs imposed upon East Germany were predictably severe. Anything of value was taken, including broken pipes and old machinery. Moscow's ultimate goal was to dismantle East Germany's economy to the point that East German living standards were equal to those of the Soviet Union.¹¹⁶ To accomplish their goal, the Soviets confiscated 1.28 million tons of "materials" and 3.6 million tons of "equipment." Between 1945 and 1947, an estimated third to a half of East Germany's industrial capacity disappeared.¹¹⁷ The Red Army took currency, gold, food, and even animals.¹¹⁸ Although reparations were reduced over time, they helped lead to an economic crisis in 1952 and revolt in 1953.¹¹⁹

In contrast to harsh Soviet reparations, the Marshall Plan aided Western Europe's post-war recovery. The Plan advanced about \$13 billion to various nations, ultimately leading to remarkable economic growth throughout Western Europe. Despite its benefits, the Soviet Union would not allow any Eastern European nation to take part. Stalin believed that the Plan was a manipulative ploy, through which Washington hoped to increase its influence in the post-war world.¹²⁰ He was so infuriated by the Plan that in late July of 1947 he told his satellites to prepare for war with the West.¹²¹ He was counting on the military support of Eastern Europe, while simultaneously denying the region an economic recovery as well as religious and political freedom.

A conference was held in Paris in July 1947 to discuss the Marshall Plan.¹²² Although nations like Poland wanted to attend, Stalin ordered them not to.¹²³ Czechoslovakia is not formally studied in this paper, but it is worth noting that its leaders insisted on attending the conference. Stalin summoned Klement Gottwald, the head of the Czech

¹¹⁴ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 38.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 37.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 34.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.

¹¹⁹ Jonathan Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," *German History* 22.4 (2004): 619-643.

¹²⁰ Vladislav Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2007) 71.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*

¹²² *Ibid.*, 72.

¹²³ Staar, "The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947," 310-320

Communist Party, to Moscow to tell him that the Americans were “trying to form a Western bloc and isolate the Soviet Union.”¹²⁴ He explained that if Czechoslovakia went to the meeting, it would be seen as an act of hostility toward the Soviet Union. But if the Czechs chose not to go, they would be given 200,000 tons of wheat, barley, and oats. Czechoslovakia’s leaders had to choose between violence and aid. On June 10, 1947, they cancelled their plan to attend the Paris meeting, effectively putting an end to any potential Eastern European participation in the Marshall Plan.¹²⁵

Nationalization of Industry and Hyperinflation

Rather than support the Marshall Plan, the Soviets forced their own economic agenda upon Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. In 1946, the Polish government nationalized 3,300 industrial enterprises, and in Hungary all factories with more than fifty workers were seized.¹²⁶ The SED attempted to convince the East German population that the best way to fight fascism was to nationalize industry.¹²⁷ Many resisted nationalization, because they thought it would lead to two different economies within one former nation, potentially preventing German reunification. But in 1946 nationalization was approved through a manipulative referendum that “represented” the will of East Germany.¹²⁸ By 1948 all factories with more than 100 workers, which included 90 percent of heavy industry and 85 percent of light industry, were under state control.¹²⁹

In addition to nationalization, the Communists introduced new currencies and confiscated large bank accounts. In 1945, East German accounts holding more than 3,000 Reichsmarks were put under state control, virtually eliminating the wealthy class. Rather than aid the economy, new currencies like the East German m-mark helped lead to hyperinflation.¹³⁰ In Hungary, differing currencies, the nationalization of industry, the cost of reparations, and economic stagnation led to extreme hyperinflation between July 1945 and August 1946.¹³¹ By the time its currency had stabilized in August, the exchange rate of old for new was

¹²⁴ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 219-220.

¹²⁵ Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, 73.

¹²⁶ Staar, “The Communization of a Captive Nation: Poland, 1944-1947,” 310-320.

¹²⁷ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 236.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 238.

¹³¹ Bomberger and Makinen, “The Hungarian Hyperinflation and Stabilization of 1945-1946,” 801-810.

400 octillion to one.¹³² Polish inflation similarly resulted in economic decline and renewed anger toward the Communist government, as countless families lost their life savings in the blink of an eye.¹³³

There is a common misconception that the economies of Poland, Hungary, and East Germany faltered only toward the end of the Cold War, but historian Anne Applebaum explains, “Shortages and imbalances plagued the People’s Democracies from the very beginning and lasted until the very end. The economies of Eastern Europe grew after the war because they were starting from nothing. They began literally from ground zero, but they quickly fell behind their counterparts in Western Europe.”¹³⁴ These nations needed to recover quickly, but because they were forced to pay onerous reparations, unable to partake in the Marshall Plan, and made to watch as industry was nationalized, their economies remained vastly inferior to those of their Western counterparts from the start of the Cold War to its finish.

Poor Conditions and East German Migrations

Poor urban conditions grew noticeable during the 1950s. Communist governments had assured their citizens that they would create socialist cities with luxurious apartment buildings. They even approved of restaurants and theaters to entertain the working class.¹³⁵ But as cities and factories grew, living standards decreased. When places like Sztalinvaros and Nowa Huta increased in size, for example, civil disorder, overcrowding, and crime followed.¹³⁶

While some workers did live in apartments, the vast majority lived in barracks with ten people to a room. As cities continued to increase in size, the gap between utopian propaganda and reality widened.¹³⁷ Over time, the people of East Germany, Poland, and Hungary grew tired of the impoverishment that had defined their nations since the beginning of World War II.¹³⁸

The East German economy fell into crisis in 1952 and 1953. The immediate origins of the crisis can be traced to April 1952, during which Stalin ordered Ulbricht to raise an army known as the “garrisoned people’s police.” The organization required artillery, tanks, jets, frigates, and

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 238.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 241.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 376.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 377.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 378.

¹³⁸ Andrew Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," *Studies on the Soviet Union* 11.4 (1971): 549-558.

submarines. With its forces numbering 113,000 by mid-1953, the demand for equipment put a heavy toll on the East German economy. To pay for these hefty expenses, social insurance and welfare were cut, taxes were raised, and the production of consumer goods was scaled back, only adding to the strain of nationalization. By the winter of 1952, supplies of simple foods such as bread and potatoes were low, leather was nearly impossible to find, and coal was in short supply, cumulatively leading to an extremely harsh winter.¹³⁹ Most of the available food was tainted and rotten. Cookies in Potsdam, for example, “reeked of petrol” and sickened their consumers.¹⁴⁰

SED officials held an emergency meeting at the end of 1952.¹⁴¹ They knew the quality of life in East Germany was not improving, with some going so far as to suggest that living conditions were at the same levels as those of the war torn and desperate East German sphere of 1947.¹⁴² These poor conditions would soon lead to violence, as the general public realized that disappointment, not prosperity, was to be the order of the day in Communist Eastern Europe.

In contrast to East Germany’s economic crisis, West Germany experienced an “economic miracle” in 1950 and 1951.¹⁴³ Suddenly, East Germans found themselves in a unique position. Unlike in Poland and Hungary, it was relatively easy for them to sneak into the West, thereby escaping economic hardship and joining a nation on the rise.

More than 500,000 East Germans left for West Germany between January 1951 and April 1953 alone.¹⁴⁴ It was not just the working class that was leaving, but educated members of society as well.¹⁴⁵ The SED tried to stop this mass movement by increasing border security, but their drastic policies instead convinced more East Germans to cross over. A Communist report issued during the migration states that there was “growing unrest among the East German population stemming from the hard line policies of the GDR leadership.”¹⁴⁶

In total, 3.5 million people, or about 20 percent of post-war East Germany’s population, migrated to West Germany between 1945 and

¹³⁹ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

¹⁴¹ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 380.

¹⁴² Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁴³ Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, 85.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History*, (New York: Penguin, 2005) 113.

¹⁴⁶ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 436.

1961, crippling the East German economy and demonstrating that many East Germans felt no loyalty to communism or the Soviet Union.¹⁴⁷

Lavrentiy Beria tellingly explained that these migrations were partially motivated “by the desire of some young people to evade service in the GDR armed forces.”¹⁴⁸

Conclusion

Because of wartime destruction, the banning of the Marshall Plan, and ineffective communist policies, East Germany, Hungary, and Poland were denied an economic recovery similar to that of the West. This inequality in living standards, combined with the brutality of the Red Army, the suppression of religion, and falsified elections, gave the citizens of these three nations economic, political, and religious reasons to loathe the Soviets. They would soon express their resentment, and their disloyalty, through open rebellion.

Part V: Protests, Revolt, and Revolution

After examining the abuses that the Soviet Union inflicted upon East Germany, Poland, and Hungary during and immediately after World War II, one can understand why these three nations might have resisted fighting alongside the Red Army. If post-war elections did not make the feelings of these three satellites clear to Moscow, the revolts of 1953 and 1956 certainly gave the Soviets significant reason to pause as they considered an invasion of Western Europe.

As Moscow’s tight grip upon Eastern Europe began to loosen following Stalin’s death in March 1953, countries revolted and portions of their armies refused to fight for the Soviets. Instead, these soldiers sided with their own people, exposing the cumulative impact of years of mistreatment. Although the Red Army crushed these revolts, they underscored the depth of distrust that existed between the Soviets and their supposed allies.

East German Revolt - 1953

The East German revolt was the first major sign of discontent within the Eastern Bloc. Its short-term causes can be traced to 1952, when Stalin ordered East Germany to rearm. As explained previously, the creation of the East German army led to food shortages and the termination of social welfare programs. Worse yet, secret policemen pressured German

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

youth to “volunteer” for the army.¹⁴⁹ Signs of dissatisfaction soon surfaced, with workers in Magdeburg taking to the streets after their Christmas bonuses were cut in December 1952.¹⁵⁰

By early 1953, the East German economy was in shambles. The SED reported a very hostile public opinion, and its leaders decided that something had to be done. SED official Vladimir Semenov traveled to Moscow in May 1953 (just two months after Stalin’s death) to meet with Vyacheslav Molotov, and the two sides agreed that East German reparations had to be reduced.¹⁵¹ This new course would also relax the totalitarian nature of the Stalinist era and give greater priority to the production of consumer goods.¹⁵² SED leaders wanted to close the Berlin border, but Molotov refused. While the outcome of the meeting was significant, it did not address a major demand of East German workers - lower quotas.¹⁵³

On June 10 and June 11, the East German government announced these changes. Aggressive policies against farmers and businessmen ended, the campaign against the Protestant Church stopped, those who had gone to West Germany were invited to return, and the government promised to review the arrests of civilians who had been detained for economic violations. Instead of garnering more support for the Communists, those who supported them felt disillusioned, and those who did not demanded that Ulbricht and his colleagues resign.¹⁵⁴

Construction workers were discontent because they wanted more favorable piecework rates, so they took to the streets on June 12. The next day, workers rebuilding the Friedrichshain hospital went on strike and demanded a return to piecework rates. Union leaders and party officials attempted to negotiate with the workers but were unable to placate them. On the morning of June 16, protestors marched toward central Berlin to force the government to listen to their demands.¹⁵⁵ They wanted lower consumer prices, free elections, a return to the piecework norm, and the guaranteed safety of all strikers.¹⁵⁶

¹⁴⁹ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, 87.

¹⁵² Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁵³ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 438.

¹⁵⁴ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Gregory R. Witkowski, "Peasants Revolt? Re-evaluating the 17 June Uprising in East Germany," *German History* 24.2 (2006): 243-66.

East Germans in Berlin carried banners stating, “Berliners, join us!”¹⁵⁷ The protests then spread beyond Berlin, with government officials telling Otto Grotewohl, Prime Minister of East Germany, that Berlin was much calmer than the rest of the state on June 16.¹⁵⁸ The unrest worsened that evening when RIAS, an East Berlin radio station, broadcasted the protestors’ four demands, which transformed the scattered strikes into a full-blown uprising.¹⁵⁹

On June 17, thousands of East Berliners marched toward the House of Ministries (the headquarters of the East German government). German historian Ilko-Sascha Kowalczyk explained that “in most cases the impulse came from the construction and factory workers but the wave of revolt spread quickly to other social groups so that in addition to workers, masses of peasants, intellectuals, students, housewives, unemployed and retired workers took part.”¹⁶⁰ The countryside actively joined the revolt, including citizens from 7,000 cities, towns, and villages.¹⁶¹

In some cities, demonstrators numbered in the tens of thousands.¹⁶² Protestors freed 1,317 inmates from prison and attacked police stations, SED headquarters, and local government buildings. A few SED officials were physically dragged away from their offices – one was unceremoniously placed in a dung heap, another was beaten to death.¹⁶³

SED leadership could not believe that workers would protest against a workers state. Leipzig’s mayor insisted that the demonstrators were marching toward the center of the city not in protest, but in support of the Rosenbergs, who had been charged with espionage in the United States. Once SED leaders understood reality, they hid. The garrisoned people’s police could have been deployed, but Walter Ulbricht did not believe in its loyalty to his regime.¹⁶⁴

The Red Army received authorization to crush the protests on June 17. Over the next two days, its soldiers put down the revolt. In some locations, demonstrators were killed. However, most soldiers exercised caution.¹⁶⁵ In East Berlin, tanks drove protestors away from the House of Ministries. Some threw stones at the tanks, but the majority fled. As tanks

¹⁵⁷ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 439.

¹⁵⁸ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ Witkowski, "Peasants Revolt? Re-evaluating the 17 June Uprising in East Germany," 243-266.

¹⁶¹ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ Witkowski, "Peasants Revolt? Re-evaluating the 17 June Uprising in East Germany," 243-266.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

began to fire on Potsdamer Platz and Unter der Linden, protestors accepted that they could not win.¹⁶⁶ Eastern Europe's first major revolt was over.

Approximately fifty East Germans died during the uprising. Hundreds were arrested, thirteen of whom were ultimately sentenced to death. In total, an estimated 1.5 million East Germans participated in demonstrations.¹⁶⁷ The breadth of the protests startled Moscow.¹⁶⁸

Although the 1953 East German Revolt was brief, lasting barely a week, it held enormous significance. Memories of mass rape from 1945 overtook many East Germans, as men made protecting their wives a priority. Workers in Stralsund yelled "no rape" and "no 1945."¹⁶⁹ Perhaps most importantly, Ulbricht's decision not to use the garrisoned people's police revealed that he did not trust his own men.

By the end of 1953, it had become clear that East Germans did not want to be a part of the Eastern Bloc. In a memorandum to Nikita Khrushchev (The First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union), East German officials explained, "Abuse, vulgar insults, and violent threats were directed at Soviet soldiers and officials, not to mention the stones thrown at them. The mass of the population has retained a hatred toward Soviet officials, which has now been inflamed again. This hatred was openly on display during the demonstrations."¹⁷⁰ Although the revolt was suppressed, East German hatred simmered.

Poznan Uprising - 1956

The Poles had protested against the Soviets on several occasions prior to 1956, from Mikolajczyk's rallies in 1945 to the Lublin Miracle in 1949. Another notable example of Polish protest occurred in Cracow. On May 3, 1946, 10,000 Poles marched in the city's Main Square. They chanted, "Down with the PPR bandits! Down with Marxism! Democracy does not need propaganda! Mikolajczyk for President!"¹⁷¹ Police responded, a marcher was killed, and nearly 1,000 citizens were arrested. In response, youth across the country protested. Similar to these demonstrations, the Poznan Uprising of 1956 also revealed anti-communist sentiments.

The Poznan Uprising centered on an ideological struggle between two political factions: the Neo-Stalinists, led by Boleslaw Bierut, and the Liberalizers, led by Wladyslaw Gomulka. Contrary to Bierut, Gomulka

¹⁶⁶ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 440.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 432.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 443.

¹⁶⁹ Sperber, "17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution," 619-643.

¹⁷⁰ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 444.

¹⁷¹ Goldyn, "Disenchanted Voices: Public Opinion in Cracow, 1945-1946," 139-161.

hoped to adopt a more progressive version of communism. Naturally, the Soviets did not trust Gomulka, so their agents arrested him in 1951.¹⁷² At the same time, Moscow was expressing “great concern about the ideological direction of the Polish Army, whose leaders were also never quite pro-Soviet enough for Moscow’s taste.”¹⁷³

Soviet doubts increased when Jozef Swiatlo, a senior secret policeman, defected to the West on December 5, 1953. He then went on Radio Free Europe and discussed the corruption of Soviet advisors, the existence of a “party elite,” and the unfair arrest of Gomulka. Millions of Poles heard what he had to say, including informants who feared he would disclose their identities. Swiatlo’s broadcasts helped lead to the release of Gomulka in December 1954.¹⁷⁴

Classic Stalinism in Poland met the beginning of its end at the Polish Youth Festival in August 1955. Hundreds of thousands of Poles came to see dancing, shows, and other attractions.¹⁷⁵ The festival proved to be a public relations nightmare for the Communists, as the Polish population was exposed to exotic, well-dressed foreigners. As Poles noticed their own distasteful clothing, many began to question anti-West propaganda. Anger swelled, and Poles began to complain about almost everything, from food shortages to low quality events.¹⁷⁶

Discontent openly erupted on June 28, 1956, when 100,000 workers went on strike in Poznan. They demanded better pay, fewer working hours, an end to dictatorship, and “Russians out.”¹⁷⁷ In response, the Polish Army was ordered to fire on the strikers at approximately 11:00 AM, resulting in an estimated 100 casualties. The public held the Soviets accountable for these deaths, though, as they were the ones who issued the attack orders and held senior military positions.¹⁷⁸ The Polish United Workers Party demanded that Soviet officers be permanently removed from the military and that Gomulka become Party Secretary.¹⁷⁹ Moscow feared that Poland would leave the Warsaw Pact, which could lead to another revolt in East Germany. The Soviets were concerned that a reunified Germany would then align with the West.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 445.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 283.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 446.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 446.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 447.

¹⁷⁷ Sperber, “17 June 1953: Revisiting a German Revolution,” 619-643.

¹⁷⁸ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 456.

¹⁷⁹ Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, 114.

¹⁸⁰ Louis Halle, *The Cold War as History*, (New York: Harper & Row) 325.

When Polish soldiers began to side with the general population, Moscow had to make several hard choices. According to a report on the Warsaw Pact from the Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress, at first, "When the Polish Army and police forces refused to suppress rioting workers, the Soviet Union prepared its forces in East Germany and Poland for an intervention to restore order in the country. However, Poland's newly appointed Communist leader, Wladyslaw Gomulka, and the Polish Army's top commanders indicated to Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders that any intervention in the internal affairs of Poland would meet united, massive resistance."¹⁸¹

Gomulka insisted that he could control the country without Soviet interference. He also told armed groups loyal to him to prepare to defend the new government. A battle between Polish troops and the advancing Red Army seemed inevitable.¹⁸² However, Gomulka threw Khrushchev an olive branch by agreeing to stay in the Warsaw Pact, which ensured that the Soviet Union's most vital interests would remain intact. Khrushchev backed down, resulting in Poland achieving a greater degree of autonomy.

Hungarian Revolution - 1956

The most extreme revolt occurred a few months later in Hungary. At the start of the 1950s, many Hungarians blamed the Soviets for the mass arrests, suppression of religion, and fraudulent elections.¹⁸³ The "New Course," which was put in place after Stalin's death in 1953, can be seen as the first direct step toward revolution, because its relaxed policies gave citizens an opportunity to revolt.¹⁸⁴ Imre Nagy's releasing of political prisoners like Bela Kovacs also contributed to the revolutionary environment.¹⁸⁵ Besides the more famous captives, regular citizens were released as well. Hungarians grew more discontent as they welcomed their old friends home.¹⁸⁶

Hungarian working conditions remained poor. In many ways, the Hungarian Revolution can be viewed as a revolution of "rising expectations," because workers were tired of the hardship that had enveloped Hungary since the end of World War II.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸¹ "APPENDIX C: THE WARSAW PACT -- Soviet Union," *Library of Congress / Federal Research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook Series / Soviet Union / Appendix C* (Accessed July 12, 2013).

¹⁸² Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 457.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 450.

¹⁸⁴ Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," 549-558..

¹⁸⁵ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 451.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁷ Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," 549-558.

Khrushchev's "Secret Speech," given on February 25, 1956 and almost immediately leaked to the public, turned revolutionary thoughts into revolutionary actions. In the speech, Khrushchev attacked Stalin and his policies, destroying Stalin's infallibility and Marxist-Leninist reliability in the process.¹⁸⁸ For over a decade, Hungarians had been told to believe in Stalin. But if Khrushchev did not believe in him, why should they?

The Revolution officially began when Hungarians, inspired by the Poznan Uprising, demanded that Nagy be put in power. On October 22, 5,000 students went to the Budapest Technological University and announced their "Sixteen Points," which called for the withdrawal of Soviet troops, free elections, economic reform, and the reestablishment of March 15, which marks the Hungarian Revolution of 1848, as a national holiday.¹⁸⁹ The following morning, 25,000 protestors gathered around a statue of General Louis Bem, a famous Polish military general and a national Hungarian hero, to honor the four-month anniversary of the Poznan uprising.¹⁹⁰ Shouting, "Russians go home!" the protestors marched down streets and destroyed a Russian radio station. That night, a crowd at Hero Square tore down a statue of Stalin himself.¹⁹¹

In a confused state, Ernő Gerő, General Secretary of Hungary's Communist Party, demanded Soviet military support. On October 26, the Soviet Presidium agreed to send troops to Hungary. On October 30, the Soviets changed their minds and instead decided to negotiate.¹⁹² This indecision reflected the intense debate going on in the East. Mao Zedong, leader of China's Communist Party, did not support Soviet military intervention. He encouraged the Soviets to simply coexist with Hungary, which he hoped would lessen Soviet influence on the world stage.

In another reversal, the Presidium voted on October 31 to prepare for intervention. Khrushchev explained, "If we depart from Hungary, it will give a great boost to the Americans, English, and French - the imperialists. To Egypt they will then add Hungary."¹⁹³ Soviet leaders feared a "domino effect," just as they had during the Polish and East German revolts. Gomulka had told Moscow that a Hungarian success could lead to another Polish uprising.¹⁹⁴

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 458.

¹⁹⁰ Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," 549-558.

¹⁹¹ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 459.

¹⁹² Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*, 115.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 117.

¹⁹⁴ Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," 549-558.

Moscow accepted Poland's relative autonomy because Poland agreed to stay in the Warsaw Pact. Rather than follow the Polish example, Nagy withdrew Hungary from the Warsaw Pact on November 1. The Soviets crushed the revolt soon after.¹⁹⁵ Their response was swift - Nagy called for free elections and neutrality on November 1, and on November 4 the Red Army invaded Budapest. For ten days, Hungarians fought a hopeless battle against the Red Army.

Hungarian soldiers "deserted the army in droves and began distributing weapons to their fellow citizens. One of the first senior officers to defect, Colonel Pal Maleter, was quickly named Nagy's new Defense Minister. The Budapest Chief of Police, Sándor Kopácsi, also switched sides and joined the revolutionaries."¹⁹⁶ Tibor recalled watching a Hungarian military leader refuse to fire on civilians, stating, "We are for the people, not against them."¹⁹⁷ Because of this widespread disloyalty, Moscow would view the Hungarian army with suspicion for years.¹⁹⁸

Although Radio Free Europe supported the revolutionaries, the Hungarians did not stand a chance without Western military assistance. General Ivan Serov and his troops arrested Nagy on November 22, 1956 and executed him on June 16, 1958. Miklós Gimes, a politician who played an instrumental role in the uprising, was executed as well.¹⁹⁹

During the Revolution, 8,000 political prisoners were released, including Cardinal Mindszenty. Tens of thousands lost their homes, strikes continued into January, and almost 200,000 fled.²⁰⁰ In total, 26,000 Hungarians were put on trial for involvement in the revolt, 22,000 were imprisoned for five years or more, and 341 were hanged.²⁰¹

As 1957 progressed, the Soviets were still "unable to rely on Hungarian forces to maintain order." In response, Moscow "increased its troop level in Hungary from two to four divisions and forced Hungary to sign a status-of-forces agreement, placing the Soviet military presence on a solid and permanent legal basis."²⁰² Rather than let Hungary leave the

¹⁹⁵ Halle, *The Cold War as History*, 328.

¹⁹⁶ Applebaum, *Iron Curtain: The Crushing of Eastern Europe, 1944-1956*, 460.

¹⁹⁷ Dr. Pákh Tibor, Interview conducted by the author in Budapest, Hungary, 12 March 2015.

¹⁹⁸ "APPENDIX C: THE WARSAW PACT -- Soviet Union," *Library of Congress / Federal Research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook Series / Soviet Union / Appendix C* (Accessed July 12, 2013).

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁰¹ Gyorgy, "The Nationalist Counter-Revolution in Hungary in 1956," 549-558.

²⁰² "APPENDIX C: THE WARSAW PACT -- Soviet Union," *Library of Congress / Federal Research Division / Country Studies / Area Handbook Series / Soviet Union / Appendix C* (Accessed July 12, 2013).

Warsaw Pact, the Soviets would continue to use force to keep their unwilling ally superficially loyal.

Part VI: Conclusions

The factors laid out in Parts I-IV directly led to the East German revolt of 1953 and the Polish and Hungarian revolts of 1956. The significance of these uprisings cannot be overstated. Eastern European soldiers were not just part of command structures – they also were members of their societies. And through open rebellion, these societies demonstrated that they deeply resented the Soviet Union.

Stalin, however, had assumed the opposite. He thought Eastern Europe would remain loyal to the Soviets because they had freed the region from Hitler and installed “workers’ paradises” soon after. Stalin trusted his satellites to the point where he ordered Eastern Europe, excluding East Germany, to rearm on January 9, 1951; he ordered East Germany to do the same in April 1952. Believing that a conflict with the West was inevitable, Stalin wanted Eastern Europe “poised to go to war” at any moment.²⁰³ After he died on March 5, 1953, however, revolts forced his successors to face reality: East Germany, Hungary, and Poland could not be relied upon in a potential war effort, making an invasion of Western Europe tactically impossible.

A 1983 CIA assessment of Eastern European reliability states that before 1956, “Soviet leadership believed that the Stalinist policy of heavy political indoctrination and enforced Sovietization had transformed the national armies into reliable instruments of the Soviet Union. However, the East European armies were still likely to remain loyal to national causes. Only one Hungarian Army unit fought beside the Soviet troops that put down the 1956 revolution. In both the Polish and the Hungarian military establishments, a basic loyalty to the national Communist Party regime was mixed with a strong desire for greater national sovereignty.”²⁰⁴ The report ultimately suggested that the revolts of 1953 and 1956 revealed to Moscow that the armies of these three nations were not unfaithfully loyal to the Soviet Union.²⁰⁵ By alienating their own allies, the Soviets had undermined any realistic plan to fight the West.

²⁰³ Mark Kramer, "Stalin, the Split with Yugoslavia, and Soviet-East European Efforts to Reassert Control, 1948-1953," (Accessed July 27 2013).

²⁰⁴ "Military Reliability of the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact Allies," *CIA Historical Review Program* (1983): 1-10.

²⁰⁵ "Military Reliability of the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact Allies," *CIA Historical Review Program* (1983): 1-10.

Soviet military leaders understood their lack of support in Eastern Europe after 1956, so they monitored their satellite armies more closely. In March 1957, Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Georgii Zhukov told his officers that “Soviet personnel must not trust Germans,” and “strict security measures must be maintained by the Soviet Army in regard to the GDR army.”²⁰⁶

The Soviets rightfully viewed Eastern European armies with suspicion. While these forces had been loyal during peacetime, they had never been asked to fight the West. Events like Stalin’s death and the Secret Speech – which few foresaw – had led to widespread instability in Eastern Europe. The Soviets understood implicitly that an invasion of Western Europe likely would have led to an equally unpredictable reaction from the region, which had grown to resent the Soviet Union during the early Cold War period.

Although the Soviets internally were concerned with the reliability of their satellites, they chose to preserve their global influence by suppressing dissent and externally projecting a united “Red Menace.” But their influence was expressed through proxy wars across the globe, never in Western Europe. Because while the West lived under the threat of invasion, Moscow’s leaders already knew that without Eastern European support, a potential assault on Western Europe was no more than a bluff designed to maintain their superpower status.

²⁰⁶ CIA Information Report, 29 March 1957. Subject: “Zhukov Address”. *Central Intelligence Agency Historical Review Program* (CIA-HRP)