

# FAIRMOUNT FOLIO

VOLUME 12 2010



PHI ALPHA THETA  
GAMMA RHO CHAPTER  
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

**FAIRMOUNT FOLIO**

**Journal of History**

**Volume 12**

**2010**

Published by Wichita State University  
Gamma Rho Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta

**Editorial Board**

Dr. Jay Price

*Associate Professor of History*

Dr. Robin Henry

*Assistant Professor of History*

Keith Dater

*Student Assistant*

**Editorial Staff**

*Editor*

Hugo Márquez

*Supervising Faculty*

Dr. Helen Hundley

Copyright 2010 by Gamma Rho Chapter of Phi Alpha Theta  
All Rights Reserved.

Cover Etching of Fiske Hall Property of WSU  
Printed by ADR, Wichita, KS

## CONTENTS

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR.....	iv
UNDERSTANDING HOMOSEXUALITY IN POSTWAR KANSAS HUGO MARQUEZ.....	1
SMALLPOX: THE AMERICAN FUR COMPANY POX OUTBREAK OF 1837-1838 MICHAEL J. ABLES.....	27
UNDERSTANDING THE CHEROKEE WAR MELODY RAMSEY.....	40
PERSECUTION OF HOMOSEXUALS IN THE MCCARTHY HEARINGS: A HISTORY OF HOMOSEXUALITY IN POSTWAR AMERICA AND MCCARTHYISM HUGO MARQUEZ.....	52
PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE WAR: THE SOVIET MILITARY AND INDUSTRIAL BUILDUP FROM 1924 TO 1933 HARVEY D. MUNSHAW.....	77

## From the Editor

Dear Reader:

On behalf of the Editorial Board and Staff, I am proud to present to you the twelfth edition of the *Fairmount Folio*, an annual publication of some of the best historical research from WSU's graduate and undergraduate students.

This issue has a marked emphasis on American history, where minority groups such as Native Americans and gays and lesbians figure prominently. This emphasis is not intentional. The selection was made by the Editorial Board based on the merit of the research papers, and from this process, five outstanding papers were selected.

The opening piece by Márquez is titled "Understanding Homosexuality in Postwar Kansas." In this the author examines some of the major developments that were occurring in the nation's cities concerning the understanding of homosexuality, and how these were reflected in Kansas at a time when the interstate highway system was beginning to emerge. In the second piece, "Smallpox: The American Fur Company Pox Outbreak of 1837-1838," Ables discusses the great smallpox epidemic, and its effects on the Native American population of the Upper Missouri region. Ramsey's "Understanding the Cherokee War" is an analysis of the diplomatic relations between Cherokees and English, and the events that led to the British-Cherokee conflict of 1759, and Márquez's "Persecution of Homosexuals in the McCarthy Hearings" deals with the role that the famous senator played in the lavender scare of the early fifties. The closing piece departs from this thematic pattern. In "Preparing for the Future War," Munshaw analyzes the major Soviet military buildup of the early thirties, as previewed in Stalin's First Five Year Plan.

I would like to extend my gratitude to the Editorial Board members for their hard work in reviewing and selecting these research papers. In addition, I would like to thank professors Robert Owens and Robin Henry for their useful feedback in the improvement of the students' works. Finally, I thank Dr. Helen Hundley for her enthusiastic support and great editorial vision in aiding me with this privileged task. In times of economic stress and budget cuts, publications like this show that supporting the humanities never goes unrewarded.

Hugo Márquez  
April 2010

# Understanding Homosexuality in Postwar Kansas

Hugo Márquez

**Introduction.** In *U.S.A. Confidential*, a sensationalist book of immoral criminal activities published in 1952, the authors stated that “when Kansas does anything, it means the rest of the country did it years ago.”<sup>1</sup> This statement seems to apply to the way authorities and the general population viewed homosexuality in postwar Kansas, which was similar to the way homosexuality was viewed in the bigger cities of the United States at an earlier time of the century, and at odds with some of the changes that were occurring in other parts of the country.

The fifties are a time of paramount importance in the evolution of the conceptualization of homosexuality in the United States, resulting in a major shift with the way society saw homosexuality. Before World War II, homosexuality was an identity only for few very feminine men and masculine females. The act of having sex with a person of the same sex was deemed immoral and grotesque, and as such it was heavily penalized, but it did not determine a person's sexuality. By the fifties people became aware that there could be masculine gay men and feminine lesbians, and the number of homosexuals was thought to be larger than previously assumed. The increased postwar awareness was spurred by the war time experience of veterans as well as the Kinsey report. This awareness was detrimental for gays and lesbians in the short term; however, as it led authorities to focus their efforts to finding and arresting them. By this time the act of engaging in sex with a person of the same sex was enough to make the person a homosexual. The increased awareness about homosexuality was guided by the science of psychology, which had assumed a leading role in society after World War II. Psychologists held that homosexuality was a mental disorder that only a minority suffered, and they positioned themselves as the only ones capable of curing it through therapy. In doing so, psychologists were unconsciously planting the seeds of a homosexual identity, and the notion of an oppressed minority that came about decades later. According to psychologists homosexuals had no control over their affliction;

---

<sup>1</sup> Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer, *U.S.A. Confidential* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1952), 279.

they were victims who more than punished needed to be treated. This shift is what Beth Bailey refers to as the replacement of a moralistic model for a therapeutic one in the explanation of homosexuality.<sup>2</sup>

This article focuses on how homosexuality was viewed during the postwar in Kansas. My argument is that Kansas only partially followed the change of models in the understanding of homosexuality, with some changes occurring in the way homosexuals were punished that went along with the therapeutic model but with a general acceptance of the moralistic model by the general public. This discrepancy between one and the other could be explained by the state's lack of metropolitan centers, which could enable a higher number of gays and lesbians. The distance that Kansas had from the bigger cities where homosexuality was being discussed also produced a lack of awareness about gays and lesbians, and the way in which the view about them was changing. As a result of these elements most homosexuals lived in a condition of individual isolation in Kansas, as opposed to the collective secrecy that gays and lesbians could have in the bigger cities. Whereas in some parts of the nation homosexuals were beginning to be viewed as a minority of sick people, in Kansas there seemed to be a more ambiguous notion of what a homosexual was, which implied a gender non conformity and the "immoral" character of the sin that they committed.

***Homosexuality in an earlier part of the century.*** Before WWII homosexuality was viewed as an identity only in the cases of very effeminate men and masculine women, and a sexual relationship with a person of the same sex was an immoral act that could be heavily penalized, but it did not determine a person's sexuality.<sup>3</sup> The senate report on *Alleged Immoral Conditions at Newport (R.I.) Naval Training Station*, in which both Secretary Josephus Daniels and Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin Delano Roosevelt were accused of using young sailors as baits in an investigation of homosexuality in the Navy reflects this perception. The senators were appalled by the instructions that Daniels and Roosevelt gave to the detectives "allowing immoral acts to be performed upon them, if in their judgment it was necessary for the propose of...capturing certain specified alleged sexual perverts." The outcome of these instructions was that many sailors did indeed find it in their judgment to have "immoral" sex. In a statement that shows how homosexuality was thought of as a conscious immoral behavior that anyone could make, the report stated that:

---

<sup>2</sup> Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999), 5.

<sup>3</sup> George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 13-21.

the 'discretion' or 'judgment' in a service of this revolting character that might be expected of boys fresh from high schools and colleges is questionable.<sup>4</sup>

Notwithstanding these cultural notions, a distinct gay subculture did exist in some of the bigger cities prior to the war, with New York having one of the most visible and active ones. New York's gay subculture intermixed with the mainstream culture at bars and speakeasies in the times of Prohibition, and had as its epicenters Greenwich Village, Time Square, and Harlem. By the onset of the Great Depression this gay subculture reached its apogee in visibility, becoming a fad in nightclubs with pansy shows and drag balls that drew large crowds, and made some of its protagonists famous in the New York scene.<sup>5</sup>

Three major distinctions existed in the gay community; the queers, fairies, and trade. Queers were those more masculine homosexual men who nonetheless frequently preferred their same sex, and they could go back and forth between mainstream society and the gay world without exerting much suspicion. The fairies on the other hand were more easily identified because of their effeminacy; they frequently lived their whole lives within the gay community, finding jobs in gay related businesses and spending most of their time in the gay areas of New York. The important group that marks the shift that later developed in the conceptualization of homosexuality was 'the trade.' Like some of the aforementioned sailors, the trade were predominantly heterosexual men as understood by their most frequent sexual behavior, who could on occasion engage in sex with other men. Trade were frequently paid or solicited by queers and fairies, and they usually worked in masculine jobs such as the military. In this early part of the century, trade could engage in sexual activity with persons of their same sex without seeing this as a threat to their own sexuality.

The repeal of Prohibition and the Great Depression contributed to the disappearance of this gay subculture from the visibility it once had in cities such as New York, where parameters of 'normalcy' were reinforced. Increasingly engaging in homosexual activity was seen in itself as a marker of homosexuality, and there was a decrease of heterosexual men who had sex with their same sex. Representations of homosexuality were banned in all public spheres, with the Motion Picture Association censoring all depictions of lewdness and obscenity in its code of 1934. If anything the etymology and evolution of the word gay is illustrative of this shift in conceptualization. Originally used to identify just the

---

<sup>4</sup> Senate, *Alleged Immoral Conditions at New Port (R.I.) Naval Training Station*, 67<sup>th</sup> Cong., 1<sup>st</sup> sess., 1921, 4-7.

<sup>5</sup> Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 1-4, 227-28, 302-314.



'fairies,' the word gay subsequently extended to include all people who had sex with the same sex, encompassing queers and trade as well. Not all gay people were happy about the changes, as a gay man from the thirties was heard to say:

Most of my crowd [in the 1930s and 1940s] wanted to have sex with a straight man. There was something very hot about a married man! And a lot of straight boys let us have sex with them. People don't believe it now. People say now that they must have been gay. But they weren't.

By the time gay historian Martin Duberman came of age in New York, the word gay was already used to identify people of all homosexual orientation.<sup>6</sup>

**Postwar Awareness.** By the postwar there was a resurgence in awareness of homosexual populations in the bigger cities of the nation; enabled by World War II experiences and the popularity of the publication of Kinsey's *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. This postwar awareness was dominated by the repressive political climate of the red scare, and the emerging leading voice of psychology as the last word in all social problems.

The Second World War had a profound effect on the United States in almost all aspects of its society, and homosexuals were not exempted from this. Gay men and lesbian women found in the environment of the military certain freedoms that they did not find before in the civilian society, as they also became more visible to their comrades in arms. Although the military had a policy of not allowing homosexuals to serve, the lack of awareness prior to the war about homosexual populations outside of the big metropolises, as well as the idea that homosexuals were only very effeminate men and manly women enabled many gays and lesbians to pass entry examinations undetected. Once inside the military provided a sex segregated environment in which sexual contact with the same sex was more possible. Moreover, the extreme battle conditions and the deep bonds of affection forged among troops enabled a relatively more tolerant position towards someone who was gay.<sup>7</sup> After the war

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 15-23, 335-37 (quote taken from page 21); John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 19; Martin Duberman, *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 2002), 22.

<sup>7</sup> After World War II the raising awareness about homosexuality may have curtailed this relatively "tolerant" environment in the military. By the time Southwestern College graduate Dudley Taves joined in 1957, there seemed to have been a much more repressive environment against homosexuality. Dudley Taves (gay male and retired high

many gays and lesbians from rural backgrounds relocated to bigger cities in the United States as well as in Europe, in order to find a more accommodating environment for themselves. The war experience raised awareness that there were persons who liked their own sex, and that this was more prevalent than they may have once thought.<sup>8</sup> In addition to the wartime experiences, more light was cast on the subject of homosexuality after the war, and this came from an emerging science of sex and a remarkable scientist named Alfred Kinsey.

The publication by Alfred Kinsey of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948 became very popular, and the name of the former zoologist immediately became synonymous with sex.<sup>9</sup> Possibly one of the most popular and controversial findings of the research dealt with the prevalence of homosexuality among adult males. Kinsey found that 37% of the adult population had had a homosexual experience at least once in their lifetime, and this number was thought to be an understatement as this was not an activity people were willing to confess.<sup>10</sup> Based on these findings, the scientist proposed a continuum to explain the sexuality of people, with homosexuality at one end and heterosexuality at the other, and with people tending towards one or the other. Kinsey proposed that homosexuality was part of human nature and not abnormal, which was a radical statement to make in his time. Referring to this concept he stated that:

the homosexual has been a significant part of human sexual activity ever since the dawn of history, primarily because it is an expression of capacities that are basic in the human animal.<sup>11</sup>

---

school teacher from Wichita), interview given and recorded by author, December 1, 2009.

<sup>8</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 24, 31; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 16. Gay author and former navy man James Barr referred to the navy as almost like paradise, with “fifty-cent Martinis” and “half-naked sailors” everywhere. For reference see Kennedy, “A Touch of Royalty Gay Author James Barr,” copy obtained from the James (Barr) Fugate Collection MS 2004-02, Wichita State University Libraries, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, 1-2.

<sup>9</sup> Kinsey published *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948, and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* in 1953, for reference on Kinsey's report commercial success see D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 33-35.

<sup>10</sup> Morris L. Ernst & David Loth, *American Sexual Behavior and The Kinsey Report* (New York: Educational Book Co., 1948), 24; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 34; Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1948), 623.

<sup>11</sup> Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, 666.

Among other things the scientist expressed the radical ideas that many gay men and lesbian women were gender normative, and that the alleged abnormality of the homosexual was due to societal stigmas not stemming from his sexuality.<sup>12</sup>

Although Kinsey's report became widely distributed and talked about, the conclusions that the scientist made upon his findings were not shared but by a minority composed of sociologists and sexual scientists in academia. After the publication of *Sexual Behavior of the Human Male*, prominent people denounced the sexologist for his 'immoral' conclusions, with the president of Princeton University comparing Kinsey's findings to "the work of small boys writing dirty words on fences."<sup>13</sup> Most importantly psychologists did not agree with the findings, since the fact that homosexuality was more "common" than assumed did not make it "normal" in their eyes.<sup>14</sup>

Psychology was the main voice on what were considered sexual disorders after the War, and psychologists deemed homosexuality a sexual disorder that had ramifications that could also affect the behavior of the affected person. Historian Martin Duberman referred to the reasons why psychology was so popular in postwar America, stating that:

In a culture that had grown apolitical and conservative, analyzing the inner life had become a primary, praiseworthy enterprise. For intellectuals and egotists especially, (therapy) was the elective choice of the moment, *the* certified path to self knowledge (emphasis as in the original).<sup>15</sup>

Following the Freudian tenet that sexual energy determined a person's behavior, psychoanalysts saw homosexuals as wholly dysfunctional people since their behavior stemmed from a defective sexuality. Frequently the explanation for the homosexuality of a man was rooted on environmental factors in the man's childhood, which would be characterized by the presence of a smothering mother and a non-existent father.<sup>16</sup> For Freud homosexuality was a "sexual aberration," and he considered narcissism to be a characteristic trait of the homosexual, since according to the father of psychoanalysis, gay men:

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 610, 615, 664.

<sup>13</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 36.

<sup>14</sup> Ernst & Loth, *American Sexual Behavior*, 180; Duberman, *Cures*, 11-12.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>16</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 16-17; Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1963), 384.

take *themselves* as their sexual object. That is to say, they proceed from a narcissistic basis, and look for a young man who resembles themselves and whom *they* may love as their mother loved *them* (emphasis as in the original).

Nevertheless, Freud also stated that either consciously or subconsciously everyone had homosexual desires; thus believing that anyone could become homosexual if he followed these desires.<sup>17</sup>

Psychoanalysts of the fifties conveniently paid considerable more emphasis to the 'aberration' part of Freud's views, and less to the idea that everyone was unconsciously bisexual; however they did not deem homosexuality as something irreversible and thought that through proper therapy the "afflicted" person could be "cured." The American Psychiatric Association deemed homosexuality a mental disorder, notion that was supported by a long held popular belief that developed after homosexuals were pushed to invisibility in society, which considered gay men as psychopaths. This view was encouraged by the sensationalizing of few criminal stories involving homosexuals by the media, and some other popular films and literary works in which homosexuals were portrayed as either criminals or victims of a tragedy.<sup>18</sup> With psychology having the leading voice in explaining homosexuality, new notions about the homosexual emerged which differed from the older view that it was just an abominable and immoral sexual act. Psychologists helped propagate the idea that homosexuality was a mental disease, and that even more than punishment the homosexual needed treatment.<sup>19</sup> Summarizing the powerful voice that psychology had for gay men and lesbians of the postwar, the author of the gay novel *Quatrefoil* James Barr stated: "we were the generation that psychoanalysis tried to change."<sup>20</sup>

This increased postwar awareness of homosexuality was produced in a political atmosphere of great anxiety and fear known as the "red scare." Within this context the negative views on homosexuality were enhanced, and unbiased contributions towards the understanding of homosexuality such as the Kinsey report were interpreted to serve the prejudices and misconceptions of the larger society. The idea that more than one third of the adult male population engaged in homosexual activity did not lead to the thinking that homosexuality was

---

<sup>17</sup> Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (Basic Books, 2000), Footnote added 1910, 10-11.

<sup>18</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 16-17; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 359-60; Duberman, *Cures*, 11-12, 15.

<sup>19</sup> Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 54, 60.

<sup>20</sup> Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 9.

something natural; rather it led authorities to see the need for rooting out the problem since it was more serious than they thought. Accordingly, the notion that there could be masculine gay men and feminine lesbians alarmed the authorities, for them this meant that homosexuals, much like the communists, could not be identified by their appearance and moreover were not easy to detect.<sup>21</sup> In a time of foreign espionage and cases of internal subversion that resulted in the Soviet Union gaining atomic secrets, it was thought that a homosexual would imperil the security of the nation because he could be blackmailed. This made homosexuals *security risks* (my emphasis), and it enabled the government to legalize the persecution of gays and lesbians to weed them out from the government departments.<sup>22</sup> The increased persecution in governmental departments was also translated into police repression in many of the bigger cities of the nation, where homosexual arrests increased exponentially.<sup>23</sup>

Although the increased awareness of the postwar worked in detriment of homosexual populations on the short term; it also helped create a gay identity and the concept of an oppressed minority, which was to develop in its fulness by the late sixties. Within months after the release of the Senate report on the *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, the first homophile political organization was formed in Los Angeles, the Mattachine Society. The organization started small and secretly; however within two years it had thousands of members throughout the Californian cities of the coast. By organizing social gatherings to talk about homosexuality, the Society was able to tap into the urban gay and lesbian populations that had been almost invisible hitherto. The communist background of the founders was also instrumental in their thoughts of even creating such an organization, since they already knew what it was like to be on the margins of what was acceptable, and did not have as much of a pressure to conform. Nevertheless, the founders soon saw just how difficult it was to pull together the distinct views and personalities of gays and lesbians into a cohesive group, since the only thing all of the members shared was their attraction to their same sex. The creation of a gay identity was barely in the works in the early fifties, and this seemed to be a great obstacle

---

<sup>21</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 37; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 360.

<sup>22</sup> Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 81<sup>st</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., 1950, S. Doc. 241; David Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 16-17.

<sup>23</sup> William Eskridge Jr., *DisHonorable Passions: Sodomy Laws in America 1861-2003* (New York: Viking, 2008), 95.

that the society ultimately could not overcome.<sup>24</sup>

***Isolation and lack of awareness in the Land of Oz.*** At the onset of the postwar, Kansas seemed to be far away from Kinsey's polemic and the influence of the psychologists, and even farther away from creating anything similar to the Mattachine Society. When comparing gay people living in bigger cities to Kansans, it becomes clear that the latter had a much harder time in getting to know other gay people or have any information about homosexuality. While Martin Duberman reflected with his gays friends from Boston about psychology and Kinsey in the early fifties, Dudley Taves spent years in Hutchinson, Winfield and Oklahoma without even knowing any information about homosexuality, or any other gay person.<sup>25</sup> Taves stated that "it was disgusting that there was nobody that was accessible to talk to," and that during the fifties he spent his time worrying about getting aroused because of other men, and even thought about castrating himself. The difference between Duberman and Taves seemed to have been what the former identified in his book *Cures* as one of collective secrecy versus individual isolation.<sup>26</sup> Whereas Duberman had a secret life of concealed friendships and sexual relationships while deeming himself sick, Taves had no homosexual life whatsoever and did not even know what to think of his orientation, besides that it was something wrong according to society. The difference of life paths between the two can not be more striking and illustrative of their geographic and cultural distance, with Duberman living a life of broken gay relationships and attempted psychiatric cures, and Taves marrying and having two daughters. In reference to his life choice Taves stated that:

It was assumed, you are a male, you will eventually find a female, you will get married, and you will have children, and you will spend the rest of your life with a female.

---

<sup>24</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 58, 65, 68, 74.

<sup>25</sup> The only mention about homosexuality that Taves remembers from this time was when he was a senior in High School, in a psychology class which had in its curriculum a section about homosexuality. Taves remembers that the professor was "moderate" in his stance, and that Kinsey might have been mentioned, although what he remembers from Kinsey is erroneous information. This lack of memory about the views on homosexuality at this time was recurrent among all of the people I interviewed, which is very telling of the fact that the postwar awareness of the bigger cities was not translated to Kansas. This and the following statements are from Taves, interview; Duberman, *Cures*, 22-24.

<sup>26</sup> Duberman, *Cures*, 22.

For gay males in Kansas the only option for living their homosexuality seemed to have been by getting married and having a partner on the side. Taves remembered having sex with his long time high school friend Richard the night before Richard's wedding.<sup>27</sup> Taves himself thought that if he had a male companion whom he could occasionally see, he would not have minded staying married to his wife. This feeling was echoed by another notorious gay Kansan and author of one of the main gay novels of the postwar, James Barr. In his letters the same as in his novel *Quatrefoil*, the author manifested his desire for a long term male companionship and did not object to getting married. Barr seemingly suggested marriage to a woman, who vigorously rejected him.<sup>28</sup>

Rural gay people might have experienced a greater sense of individual isolationism than gay people living in more populated places in Kansas, since every step they made could be known, and they did not seem to have resources available in their town to lead a homosexual lifestyle. James Barr serves as a good example of the type of life that a gay man could have living in a rural area, notwithstanding his particular situation since he had previously served for four years during World War II, and had lived in New York from where he wrote his famous gay novel *Quatrefoil*. Unlike Taves, Barr was already well acquainted with the postwar ideas about homosexuality which are seen in *Quatrefoil*, a fictional/autobiographical gay love story between two navy men that made references to Freud and was written at the suggestion of Barr's psychologist.<sup>29</sup>

Barr preferred the country to the city, and by 1950 he moved back to the Midwest-where he was originally from- to live with his family in a small

---

<sup>27</sup> Taves and Richard were lab partners in high school, and had a friendship with some mild sexual activity. They went to balconies in movie theaters and masturbated to depictions of males bare chested. This innocent sexual activity was something to be expected from teenagers and authorities seemed not to concern much about it in the postwar, as Duberman stated in referring to his own adolescent homosexual play "psychiatry in those days dismissed such boyish antics as altogether natural, an expected, even necessary prelude to achieving 'adult' (heterosexual) identity" (parenthesis as in the original), Duberman, *Cures*, 14.

<sup>28</sup> In his letter to Noel Cortes Barr wrote: "do you remember the young lady I mentioned that I might marry...when trying to express my thoughts to her, via correspondence, she has become furious with me, and behaved in an altogether unexpected manner. She has even hinted at a breach of promise suit to a friend of mine in Washington." Barr to Noel Cortes, Hollyrood, KS, 29 January 1951, James (Barr) Fugate Collection MS 2004-02, Wichita State University Libraries, Department of Special Collections and University Archives.

<sup>29</sup> Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 1-2; James Barr, *Quatrefoil*, (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1982, 1950).

farm in Holyrood, Kansas.<sup>30</sup> During his stay in Holyrood, he corresponded with a gay friend from Philadelphia named Noël Cortes, and in these letters the author of *Quatrefoil* wrote candidly about the struggles that a gay person faced in a small town.

Like Duberman and possibly other gay men of his time, Barr counted with the acceptance and awareness of part of his family, who knew about his homosexuality. This awareness was both a blessing and a curse to Barr, since on the one hand it allowed him not having the pressure of hiding his identity, on the other it limited what he could do and the guests he could have in his house. Although his family tolerated his homosexuality, they still expected Barr to marry and they did not want him to have sex with men. In referring to the negative connotations of his family's awareness the author stated that it was "the price you pay for honesty."<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless within his family Barr had a confidant in his sister, who had a great influence in the author's life. In one of the last letters that Barr wrote to Cortes, he mentioned his decision of stopping communication after his sister recommended it to him.<sup>32</sup>

In referring to his life in town, Barr's perceptions changed as time went by. Whereas in one letter in January 1951 he referred to his community as a "utopia" of simple and kind people, by the next month Barr was lamenting his situation of loneliness since he did not have friends and had to live a "dual" and "dangerous" life.<sup>33</sup> The same as his family, the rest of the town seemed to know of Barr's "comings and goings" at "every hour of the day." It is clear that a gay person in a small town did not enjoy the anonymity that the city could give to him; nevertheless being in a rural area did not stop Barr from having sexual relationships with men. In a detailed letter the author referred to the type of men he encountered in the countryside, with whom he engaged in emotional (meaning sexual) relationships. He stated:

the men one meets here are very gallant and satisfying emotionally...they are simple and wholesome, kind hearted, considerate and gregarious in offering themselves. Their naiveness is refreshing after New York, and their needs are easily satisfied. Their lack of intellectual companionship is often times compensated by a relationship that is deep and clean and appreciative...these relationships do not last as the men out here marry and yes, there is much to be said for some

---

<sup>30</sup> Barr to Cortes, 11 January 1951.

<sup>31</sup> Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1951.

<sup>32</sup> Barr to Cortes, 2 Jan. 1951, 7 Feb. 1952.

<sup>33</sup> Barr to Cortes, 11 Jan. 1951, 7 Feb. 1951.



married men.<sup>34</sup>

Barr's adventures were not limited to Holyrood, Kansas and its surroundings. In order to escape the pressures of his contexts Barr made frequent trips to the closer cities of Kansas City and Wichita. In these cities he met acquaintances "who understand the situation," and made contact with them in hotels. In one of his letters Barr indicated that he was going to meet Lee in Wichita, who was an old friend of his and happened to be "divorced, free, unattached, and very frank in his affection." In the following month Barr expected to see an air force sergeant whom he had met in the military, and the encounter was going to take place at a hotel in Kansas City. In both cases Barr lamented that he could not introduce these men to his family and show them his town, but he recognized that doing so was "risky" and could create discomfort for all sides involved.<sup>35</sup>

Ultimately the impossibility of living his life as a gay man in a small town was one of the biggest sources of tension for Barr, and possibly many other gay men from rural backgrounds. Barr felt more comfortable as a person in a rural space, but as a gay man he felt more at ease in the city, since only in a city he could have the anonymity and the environment to meet other gay men like him. To complicate matters more, Barr did not always like the gay subculture that he found in some of the cities he visited. One of the last letters he wrote to Cortes is very telling in this respect. The author was writing Cortes to inform him that he was no longer going to keep corresponding with him, due to an unstated episode at a party thrown by Cortes in his apartment in Philadelphia. In citing the reasons why he no longer felt at ease with Cortes, Barr showed some of the conflicts that a gay person from a rural background could have with the gay subculture of the bigger cities. The author stated:

I had spent years working on my attitude to myself in relationship to the homosexual world I had made up my mind I was doomed to frequent. Then in a handful of words I was revealed as I must appear to those of my own nature. Normal people are kinder, even when they are deliberately cruel, for one realizes they can not completely understand.<sup>36</sup>

Later in the letter he concluded that he was not "any happier in the homosexual world," as compared to the other worlds he was in. In seeing this one must

---

<sup>34</sup> Barr to Cortes, 11 Jan. 1951.

<sup>35</sup> Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1951.

<sup>36</sup> Barr to Cortes, 7 Feb. 1952.

remember the troubles that the Mattachine Society had in keeping all of its members united, since the only thing in common between homosexual people was their sexuality, specially at a time when a gay identity was still not consolidated. Barr's letters indicate how difficult it was for a gay man living in a small town; however it is also important to take into account that Barr already knew the relative comforts of a collective secrecy from his experiences in New York and the Navy. Although the author took great pleasure from a life of quiet in the country, his situation of an emancipated gay man might have contributed to his eventual departure to the city.<sup>37</sup>

This situation of isolation seemed to have also been true for lesbians living in Kansas; however the ignorance about lesbianism was even greater than about male homosexuality, and this enabled some of them to form relationships and pass undetected in society. Connie was having same sex relationships ever since she was living in Miami, Oklahoma in the late forties. She became acquainted with Marge, her second long term relationship, while playing for the same softball team.<sup>38</sup> By 1955 Connie was transferred to Wichita to work for the telephone company Southwestern Bell, and she brought Marge to live with her. Connie and Marge lived together for twenty one years, and Connie did not remember a single occasion when any of them were harassed or bothered because of their relationship. She explained that "if they knew they accepted it, and the rest didn't care, because we didn't flaunt it; we dressed nice...and nobody suspected it."<sup>39</sup>

Lesbians also seemed to have had a difficult time understanding their sexual orientation. Sue Campbell, who is the current partner of Connie, did not even realize that she was attracted to women until after her mother died in 1958. Sometime after, Sue became involved in a long term relationship with another woman who was around twenty years her senior. Prior to being aware of her attraction to women, the only memory Sue had about homosexuality being

---

<sup>37</sup> Barr lived briefly in Los Angeles in 1951, and a year later he attempted to rejoin the Navy, but he was discharged for having written *Quatrefoil*. He lived most of his time in New York, but he also stayed in Kansas now and then for long periods of time. Throughout the fifties Barr wrote many works to the Mattachine Review, which was the Mattachine Society's magazine. Kennedy, "Touch of Royalty," 4-12.

<sup>38</sup> Before Marge, Connie had had a relationship with a coworker from the same telephone company in Miami, Oklahoma, named Betty. They were together for about four years before they broke up. This and the following statements are from Connie Condray and Sue Campbell (lesbian couple retired from the Southwestern Bell telephone company in Wichita, Kansas ), interview given and recorded by author, November 27, 2009.

<sup>39</sup> Condray and Campbell, interview.

mentioned was one time when she took a ride from a married couple to work, and upon seeing a masculine attired woman the husband made an “insulting remark.” Although she does not remember now what the remark was, Sue remembered thinking to herself “do people do that?”

It becomes clear that the moralistic model was felt even stronger in the case of lesbians, when the ignorance about their orientation was so great that if the women looked gender appropriate, they could “get away” with almost anything.<sup>40</sup> Although this situation may have given women the freedom of discrete relationships, it also robbed them of an identity that was different to the mainstream culture and could have even hindered self awareness, as Sue's case shows.<sup>41</sup>

***Informal homosexuality and its legal framework in Wichita, Kansas.*** Wichita seemed to have had some more resources for gay men and lesbians to live lives of “collective secrecy.” The authors of *U.S.A. Confidential* indicated that Wichita was not only the biggest city in Kansas, but also the fastest growing in the nation, and that the “tough and isolated Kansas” was finally “going homo,” implying how this had already happened to the rest of the nation. It was said that the cops calculated the male homosexual population of Wichita-referred to as fairies- to be around one thousand, but that they missed “ten for every one,” which according to the authors seemed to give credit to Kinsey.<sup>42</sup>

By the early fifties Wichita seemed to have had three places where according to the authors of *Confidential* homosexuals “minced;” these being the “Blue Lantern,” “Curley's Round House” and “an apartment over a business building in the 1200 block of East Douglas,” where “you go through three doors” into an “inner sanctum where a fat old fairy in a Japanese kimono makes

---

<sup>40</sup> There was one instance in which Connie remembered a coworker from her time working in Woodward, Oklahoma who was being too “friendly” to another coworker to the point of bothering her. She was warned about it and that was the end of the trouble. Operators in the phone companies that Connie and Sue worked for were all women until the seventies, when men began being hired. Condray and Campbell, interview.

<sup>41</sup> Connie and Sue have been together since the mid seventies, and both had previous long term relationships with other women. They are very well known in the gay community of Wichita, Kansas, and their long term relationship became almost mythical, to the point that they remember rumors about them having previous marriages with farmers, from which they escaped to Wichita to be together. These rumors stem from the fact that most gays and lesbians contemporaries to the couple married, and Connie and Sue's story seemed implausible to many people. Condray and Campbell, interview.

<sup>42</sup> Lait and Mortimer, *Confidential*, 278-80.

like a geisha girl.”<sup>43</sup> Adding this information to Barr's, there is the impression that Wichita not only was a place where gay people from other parts of the state could meet, but also had its own small gay community. This evidence is reinforced by Robert Stout, currently the executive director of the Wichita Crime Commission, and a police officer for more than twenty years.<sup>44</sup> By the time Mr. Stout began patrolling the streets of Old Town in the late fifties, Wichita had a gay bar in West Douglas and Sycamore named the “Ringside Bar.” According to Mr. Stout, this bar was operated by two gay men named Robert Linsey and Jack Judd, with most of their clientele being gay men, since “lesbians were not as open.” Nevertheless, Stout's experience with Wichita's gay world increased when he joined the vice squad in 1960, since he began to be in charge of “moral offenses” such as drugs, alcohol and homosexuality. The vice squad was created only a few years before Stout joined it, showing that only by the mid fifties there was enough awareness about homosexuals that the police department saw the need of establishing a specialized squadron to deal with the problem. It is important to note that bigger cities had created vice squads several years earlier, and had been devoting their resources more intensely to the persecution of homosexuality since 1946.<sup>45</sup> The fact that Wichita's vice squad only dealt with moral crimes also shows the prevalence of the moralistic model, which dominated authorities understanding of homosexuality in Wichita during the fifties.

By the time Stout began working for the vice squad another gay bar opened in East Douglas named “Chances Are,” in honor of the allegedly gay African American jazz singer Johnny Mathis, and by 1963 “Jack by the Tracks” was already functioning. In “Chances Are” Mr. Stout observed a small gay community in which gay men felt comfortable “dancing together,” and “exchanging kisses and hugs.” Within this bar Stout saw “nothing more than any other bar,” with people dancing, drinking, and smoking, only that instead of couples being composed of a man and a woman, they were composed of two men or two women. These actions were not illegal *per se*, since according to Stout:

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid.

<sup>44</sup> Bob Stout is a well known personality in Wichita, with a reputation for being tough on crime. There is even a song about Mr. Stout titled “Captain Bobby Stout” by Jerry Hahn Brotherhood. The lyrics can be accessed at [http://www.mylyricarchive.com/manfred\\_manns\\_earth\\_band\\_lyrics/captain\\_bobby\\_stout\\_lyrics.html](http://www.mylyricarchive.com/manfred_manns_earth_band_lyrics/captain_bobby_stout_lyrics.html); Bobby Stout (executive director of Wichita Crime Commission), interview given and recorded by author, November 4, 2009.

<sup>45</sup> Stout, interview; Eskridge, *Dishonorable Passions*, 96.

We weren't supposed to just arrest someone because they were gay; they had to be doing something...it wasn't illegal to be gay, but it was illegal to have gay sex.<sup>46</sup>

More specifically, policemen seemed to have had an unofficial policy of containment towards these types of establishments, where they kept watch but did not do anything. On one occasion Mr. Stout remembered that there was a big concentration of gay men in "Chances Are," and that he overheard his boss asking them not to even go there. However, often times drunk heterosexual men did go to gay bars with the specific purpose of harassing "the queers."<sup>47</sup>

Although these public establishments denote the existence of a small gay community in the fifties and through the early sixties, it is also important to note that this was not accessible to many gays and lesbians. The first time Connie went to a gay bar was to "Jack by the Tracks" in 1963 and because of the insistence of her partner's brother; she had not gone out before because she was not even aware that there were places to go to. Dudley Taves was living in Wichita by the late sixties, but he only became aware of the gay bars by the late seventies and early eighties, and Bruce McKinney had moved to Wichita from Coffeyville by 1969 because he knew of a functioning gay bar. It took Bruce almost one year to figure out how to enter to this establishment even when he already knew where it was located.<sup>48</sup>

The "pick up" places seemed to have been where most of the gay action transpired in Wichita. These were places that were open the twenty four hours a day, and had a high public transit. Parks such as Oak Park close to Riverside, Herman Hill Park between Pawnee and Broadway, and Seneca Park in South Seneca were known to be cruising spots where gay men could engage in sex with other men. Homosexual men used certain codes to attract other men, one of which was sitting and waiting with their cars parked, until another car parked close by signaling the possibility of a casual encounter. There were also other public places of more constant traffic where gay men tried their chances; these being the bus station on South Broadway, and a railroad station. In these places there was great traffic from military personnel, such as young sailors and soldiers going back home. Gay men approached military men much in the same way fairies and queers approached the trade "to start a conversation," which according to how it went could develop into a sexual encounter. A last famous pick up place that Stout remembered was the "Rule Building," which was next

---

<sup>46</sup> Stout, interview.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Condray and Campbell, interview; Taves, interview; Bruce McKinney (gay historian, collector), interview given and recorded by author, October 24, 2009.

to a hotel. In the underground level of the building there were public restrooms where gay men hanged around the stalls expecting to make contact with another man, and police officers were expected to arrest them only if they were having sex there. Mr. Stout stated that in one occasion:

a fellow who was the president of a bank (had his car) parked literally at a non parking zone in front of the railroad station and his wife was sitting in the car...we got out to tell her (that) her husband had gone into the railroad station...he's in there having sex with a young sailor with his wife parked in the car up front...but his marriage was a marriage of convenience and I understood that...it was a different time.<sup>49</sup>

According to Stout, gay men who engaged in this type of behavior faced the charge of “lewd and lascivious behavior,” stemming from a city ordinance which stipulated a penalty of “a maximum of one year in jail time,” and a “five hundred dollar fine.” However, most frequently gay men got a small fine and they did not have to register as sex offenders.<sup>50</sup>

The laws of Kansas also demonstrate the lack of a postwar understanding and awareness about homosexuality. It is patently seen that not all homosexual sex was the same for the law, and circumstances such as the context were the act occurred as well as the act itself may have influenced the sentencing of the judge; nevertheless the language of the law is too ambiguous to draw any concrete conclusions about these differences. This ambiguity also seems to confirm the moralistic model; however by the mid fifties the sentences of the judges began to adjust to more modern notions of homosexuality following the therapeutic model, where gay men were sent to state hospitals for therapy and received a lower number of years in jail time.

The *General Statutes of Kansas* penalized same sex sexual behavior under the name of “Crime against nature,” which was included within Article 9 reading “Crimes against public morals and decency.” Section 21-907 of the *GSK* from 1949 stated that,

Every person who shall be convicted of the *detestable and abominable* crime against nature, committed with mankind or with beast, shall be punished by confinement and hard labor not exceeding ten years (emphasis not in the original).<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Stout, interview.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-907 (Corrick 1949).

As one of its sources the statute cited a law from the *Territory Statutes* of 1855, showing just how far back regulations against these types of behavior stretched. Furthermore a legal precedent to the statute established the “proof of actual lecherous penetration *per os sufficient*.” Court sentences stemming from charges of crimes against nature allow for the understanding of the specific behaviors that were punished by the law. From these it becomes clear that the term “crime against nature” was used as an umbrella encompassing all kinds of sexual “perversions,” including bestiality, pedophilia, homosexual and heterosexual sodomy.<sup>52</sup> The strong condemnatory language of the statute and the name of the article within which the statute was included show its strict moralistic nature, and the extremely harsh penalty of up to ten years of imprisonment and hard labor denotes the graveness of the offense. However it is relevant to note that this statute did not condemn homosexuality but rather a specific sexual act within it, which was sodomy. Although originally meant to refer to the anal penetration of another male, female, minor or beast, by 1915 the Kansas Supreme Court expanded the term to include oral copulation.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, a great number of the cases involving crimes against nature were cases of pedophilia of males having sex with children of either sex.<sup>54</sup> The ambiguity of the language of the statute and the types of crimes that it encompassed make it clear that homosexual behavior was not deemed an identity unique to a minority of people in Kansas, but rather an illicit sexual behavior that denoted perversion, not unlike others of its deemed kind. Different was the situation in the statutes of other states such as California and New York, with the first having an explicit language regarding what constituted sodomy, and with both differentiating between sodomy with minors and homosexual sodomy in their 1950 amendments.<sup>55</sup>

The other statute that regulated homosexual practices in Kansas was the subsequent Section 21-908, which regulated “adultery; indecency; lewd

---

<sup>52</sup> In *Kansas v. Spear*, Edward Spear was charged with a crime against nature committed upon an adult female named Charletta Roseann Row, *Kansas v. Spear*, Sedgwick Co. A-61931 (1957); an unusual case was that of Louanna Rhymes, an adult female charged with crime against nature committed against boys of 12 and 10 years of age, *Kansas v. Rhymes*, Sedgwick Co. A-45800 (1953).

<sup>53</sup> Eskridge, *DisHonorable Passions*, 32, 51.

<sup>54</sup> A few examples are *Kansas v. Levassour*, Sedgwick Co. B-4065 (1960), *Kansas v. Williamson*, Sedgwick Co. A-49342/3 (1954).

<sup>55</sup> They also previewed tougher sanctions, with even life imprisonment for recidivists in the state of California, Eskridge, *DisHonorable Passions*, 92.

cohabitation.” Homosexual behavior was understood to be included within indecency, and regarding this the statute stated that:

Every person married or unmarried who shall be guilty of *open*, gross *lewdness*, or *lascivious* behavior, or of any *open* and notorious act of *public* indecency, grossly scandalous, shall on conviction be adjudged guilty of a misdemeanor, and punished by imprisonment in a county jail not exceeding six months, or by fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or by both such fine and imprisonment (emphasis not in the original.)<sup>56</sup>

The key words from this text are “open” and “public.” A person had to commit an *open* sexual offense in order to be charged with this crime, which referred to “lewd and lascivious behavior.” In practical terms men who were having sex in parks, bus stations and railroads were under the threat of being charged with this offense, which unlike the crime against nature only amounted to a misdemeanor and a maximum penalty of six months of jail time. The records of the Sedgwick County Crime Index indicate no charges of lewd and lascivious behavior prior to 1958, which not coincidentally was around the time when the police department created the vice squad.<sup>57</sup>

The sharp difference between the sentencing of these statutes is very puzzling, since the language of the law does not clarify concrete legal demarcations between one and the other. Whereas the crime against nature referred to a concrete sexual act involving anal penetration or oral copulation, not conditioned by any context; lewd and lascivious behavior referred to a vague “indecent” behavior that seemed to have been done “openly,” indicating a particular public context. In reality, these two statutes had a great deal of overlap, since a violator could be charged either by the context in which his act occurred, or by the act itself. Nevertheless, the practical application of the law as reflected in the charges brought about by police officers in their arrests, seemed to have favored charges of crime against nature before the late fifties, and the more relativistic lewd and lascivious behavior from then on. This change reflects the onset of the therapeutic model of understanding “sexual deviance” in the state of Kansas.

***Toward the therapeutic model: The sentencing of the crimes against nature.*** The therapeutic model dominated the way national authorities

---

<sup>56</sup> *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-908 (Corrick 1949); the GSK of 1935 had the same wording concerning statutes 21-907 and 21-908. For further reference see *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-907 and 21-908 (Corrick 1935).

<sup>57</sup> Refer to Appendix.



dealt with “sexual deviants” from the onset of the postwar, when a quiet sexual revolution in the making was barely simmering. Sexual minorities such as gays, lesbians and transgender people were increasingly considered victims of their own “perversions” and a potential danger to their social environments; however as victims, they were treated as psychologically unstable more than punished as morally corrupt people.<sup>58</sup> In Kansas, this therapeutic model began to be observed in the sentences that judges gave to men guilty of crimes against nature and lewd and lascivious behavior, from the mid fifties onward. Whereas before the fifties men convicted of a crime against nature irrevocably faced up to ten years in prison with a possibility of being paroled before the entire term, by the sixties they faced shorter sentences and they were always referred to a psychiatric facility. A pre-postwar example is the case of Bert Davis, who was charged in August of 1944 with the “detestable and abominable crime against nature with one Lawrence W. Buckmaster, age 15,” for being “contrary to 21-907 of the General Statutes of the State of Kansas, 1935.” Mr. Davis was to be taken to “the State Penitentiary at Lansing, Kansas...to be confined at hard labor...for a term of not more than ten years,” from which he was paroled at five. In another similar case James Maynard, age 32, received from one to ten years jail time for having committed the crime against nature in 1948 “with and upon” Henry K. Jessie, age 14. After three years in jail, James was paroled.<sup>59</sup>

By the mid fifties, Kansas courts began to impose different types of penalties on criminals against nature, and the courts prescribed psychological testing and treatment in their sentences. Robert Rhodes' case in 1948 may have foreshadowed the shift. The penalty Mr. Rhodes received for having committed “with and upon Fred L. McFadden...the detestable and abominable crime against nature” was not to exceed ten years of jail time; however the judge stipulated a sentence in which Mr. Rhodes was to be paroled “to Mrs. Edith Shipley, his mother, as patron” after three years and with the “said defendant...permitted to re-enter the Winter General Hospital, Topeka, Kansas, for necessary medical treatment.”<sup>60</sup> By the late fifties and early sixties virtually all

---

<sup>58</sup> Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 42, 60-1.

<sup>59</sup> The fact that the other partner was a minor did not seem to be an aggravating element. Sometimes the sentences of perpetrators of pedophile acts were lower than other types of crimes against nature. Bruce Sharp was charged with a crime against nature against a seven year old girl. He pleaded guilty to simple assault and only got six months, *Kansas v. Sharp*, Sedgwick Co. A-14908 (1945). As a matter of fact, pedophilia seemed to be very prevalent among crimes against nature, see Appendix. For reference on Davis and Manyard cases see *Kansas v. Davis*, Sedgwick Co. A-12752 (1944); *Kansas v. Manyard*, Sedgwick Co. A-28047 (1949).

<sup>60</sup> *Kansas v. Robde*, Sedgwick Co. A-25510 (1948).

cases seen in the Sedgwick County Crime Index concerning homosexuality were deferred to the Larned State Hospital for psychological examination, and the sentence was not pronounced until the superintendent of Larned gave his verdict. This change was only formally included in the statutes with the 1955 supplement to the 1949 *General Statutes of Kansas*, under sections 62-1534, 35, 36, and 37.<sup>61</sup> A good example of how courts usually carried out their sentences was the case of Lawrence Rowland vs. State of Kansas in the year 1957. For committing “an unnatural sex act upon Larry J. Henderson,” Mr. Rowland was “sent to the Larned State Hospital...for observation and treatment” from where he returned to court and was sentenced to the Kansas State Penitentiary for a period of “not less than three years.” Upon Rowland's application to a parole for the entire term of imprisonment, the court granted it to him.<sup>62</sup> The psychological revision also applied to section 21-908. In a case of “lewd and lascivious behavior” that made it to the state records, Gardner Allaire Huber was charged for committing “acts of open, gross lewdness, lascivious behavior” as well as “notorious acts of public indecency, grossly scandalous at Seneca Park, 200 Block South Seneca, Wichita, Kansas,” thus violating “the peace and dignity of the State of Kansas.” The same as in the previous cases the sentence was “deferred until a report of a mental examination of the defendant” could be obtained “to guide the court in determining what disposition shall be made of the defendant.”<sup>63</sup>

By the late fifties, this shift in the way homosexual people were treated by the law was echoed in the policies that universities adopted regarding their homosexual students. In *Sex in the Heartland*, Beth Bailey addressed the problem that the deans of the University of Kansas faced when they had a case of sodomy in the school. On the one hand deans were expected to uphold the moral integrity of their institution, which merited the expulsion of anyone who engaged in sodomy, yet on the other they had to listen to what psychologists prescribed in such cases, as they were deemed the experts on the matter. Frequently the opinions of psychologists and the general public did not coincide, since the former prioritized the well being of the patient while assessing the danger he posed to the school, while the latter only cared about eliminating the problem. In dealing with this conundrum, the deans tended to keep the matter contained and silent to the public so as not to compromise the reputation of the school, and usually followed the psychologist's advice. Such was the case of Fred, a University of Kansas student in 1959 who was allegedly

---

<sup>61</sup> This information appears in the “Journal Entry” for the sentence of Huber Gardner in *Kansas v. Gardner*, Sedgwick Co. A-69036 (1957).

<sup>62</sup> *Kansas v. Rowland*, Sedgwick Co. A-65830 (1957).

<sup>63</sup> *Kansas v. Gardner*, Sedgwick Co. A-69036 (1957).

raped by another male student at an apartment party. Upon hearing the testimony of both victim and victimizer, the dean decided to allow both students to stay under probation, and on the condition that they receive psychological treatment; nevertheless the case was not followed up by the police so as to keep it private.<sup>64</sup> Notwithstanding these examples, the shift toward the therapeutic model in the understanding of homosexuality seemed to have only occurred by the late fifties in these highly specialized academic and legal settings, while the moralistic view of homosexuality dominated the views of most Kansans at least well into the sixties. In this moralistic view religion may have had its share of influence in deeming homosexuality the “unpardonable sin.”<sup>65</sup>

**Conclusions.** The sunflower state seemed to have been late in catching up to what the federal government and the populations of larger cities were “discovering” in the earlier years of the postwar. Kinsey's findings that masculine men and feminine women could be homosexuals, and that a high number of adult men engaged in homosexual behavior were not echoed in Kansas, where people assumed a heterosexual orientation for gays and lesbians who adopted normative gender roles. A lesbian couple could live together without raising any suspicions as long as they looked feminine, and most of the gay men seemed to have lived in isolation and usually married and followed the rules of their society while living a double life. Although Wichita had gay bars throughout the postwar era, they were few and most gays and lesbians seemed to have been unaware of them. The “pick up” places seemed to have been more popular than the bars, where single and married men could engage in sex without raising awareness. Nevertheless, this lack of awareness of homosexual populations proved to also be a blessing in disguise, since units such as the vice squad began to operate after the lavender scare waned, and seemingly without the massive and intrusive operations of other states such as California, D.C., and New York.<sup>66</sup> Kansas law illustrated this lack of understanding about homosexuality in the letter of the statutes that punished the “crime against nature.”

The influence of psychology and the following shift in the understanding of homosexuality began to be seen in the sentences that Kansas judges applied to homosexual behavior by the mid fifties, when gay men began to be prescribed psychological treatment. The deans at the University of Kansas also reflected this shift, delegating decisions concerning homosexual behavior to the school therapist. Nevertheless, the change seemed not to have been

---

<sup>64</sup> Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland*, 62-66, 71.

<sup>65</sup> Condray and Campbell, interview.

<sup>66</sup> Eskridge, *Dishonorable Passions*, 89-94.

transferred to the less specialized and non-academic circles in Kansas, which remained influenced by a moralistic model of viewing homosexual behavior. The lag may be explained by a lack of urban centers in Kansas, as well as its distance from places where homosexuality was an issue. As a consequence, gays and lesbians grew isolated from other people like them, and devoid of an identity that matched their sexual attraction. These elements may be seen as likely reasons for the slowing down of the progression towards the formation of a solid gay subculture, which seems to have begun to take place only by the early seventies.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Bruce McKinney explained how by his time he could form the first homophile student organization in the “Free University,” which was part of Wichita State University; this had taken place by the early seventies. McKinney, interview.

## APPENDIX

## Charges related to homosexuality and their sentences according to the Sedgwick County Crime Index

Date	Accused	Charges	Sentence	District Court Case Number
30s				
1930 July 18	Stagdill, R. W.	Sodomy	10 years (not to exceed)	73194
1930 June 6	Nida, Dr. A.M.	Crime Against Nature	not convicted	72660
1931 April 15	Reed, Glenn A.	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	76130
1933 April 10	Earp, George	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 1-10 years	84023
1934	Turney, Ted	Crime Against Nature	26.65 \$ (plead guilty)	87964
1934 April 28	Lambert, Verling	Crime Against Nature	1-10 years (see Tourney)	87964
1935 May 21	Minters, Ernes	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	91487
1938 January 8	Jackson, Bruce	Crime Against Nature	10 years..paroled	99824
1938 August 18	Slates, George F.	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 10 years	101546
1938 September 15	Pierce, Floyd Allen	Crime Against Nature	10 years (paroled 5 and costs)	101745
1939 May 1	Howell, James	Crime Against Nature	sentenced 20-40 years	102680
40s				
1942 January 6	Hendricks, John	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-2648/9
1942 January 8	Haeth, Arthur	Crime Against Nature	convicted	A-2372/3
1943 November 1	Davis, Theodore	Sodomy first degree robbery 2 counts	sentenced for life	A-9225*
1944 April 3	Pierce, Sam	Crime Against Nature (on a 4 year old girl)	first dismissed (then convicted 5 years parole)	A-11205/6*
1944 April 4	Graham, Richard	Sodomy	dismissed	A-9833
1944 November 17	Davis, Bert	Sodomy (with 15 year old boy)	10years (paroled in 5)	A-12752*
1945 October 9	Sharp, Bruce	Crime Against Nature switched simple assault (7 year old girl)	6 months	A-14908*
1945 November 13	Peak, Victor	Crime Against Nature	convicted	A-15164
1946 April 29	Long, Roy	Crime Against Nature (and assault)	dismissed	A-15311
1946 September 14	Stewart, LeRoy	Indecent Exposure	100\$ and costs	A-20272

1947 June 10	Lindsey, Curtis	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	10 years parole at 5	A-22662*
1948 March 24	McFadden, Fred	Crime Against Nature	10 years parole at 3 (hospital and mother's custody)	A-25370*
1948 April 6	Rohde, Robert	Crime Against Nature	paroled after 3 years referred to hospital and custody by mother	A-25510*
1948 September 14	Shelton, John	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-26467
1949 January 21	Maynard, James L.	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	no more than 10 years paroled after 3	A-28047*
1949 April 25	Gray, James	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year older)	2 years no parole	A-28299*
50s				
1952 March 27	Greysiak, Robert	Crime Against Nature (with minor child)	Dale Clinton Ward	A-39786
1952 March 5	Sickler	Crime Against Nature	dismissed	A-38317
1952 May 5	Little, Charles E.	Crime Against Nature (with 14 year old boy)	guilty, penitentiary	A-40381*
1953 October 19	Rhymes, Louanna	Crime Against Nature switched simple assault (with 12 and 10 year old boys)	30 days	A-45800*
1954 April 9	Williamson, Carroll	Crime Against Nature (with 10 year old girl)	Committed to Larned for treatment	A-49342/3*
1955 March 4	Primm, Robert	Attempted CAN	paroled 5 years	A-52366
1955 October 3	Smith, Roland	Crime Against Nature	paroled at 5 years committed to Larned for treatment	A-52819*
1955 November 10	Reynolds, Charles	Crimes Against Nature (minor 16)	examination at Larned	A-57247*
1956 July 9	Doty, Frank et al. Aikman, Daniel	Crime Against Nature Crime Against Nature	dismissed convicted	A-60855
1957 September 16	Spear, Edward A.	Crime Against Nature	paroled 2 years referred to Larned	A-61931*
1958 January 8	Rawland, Lawrence	Crime Against Nature	3 years examination at Larned	A-65830*
1958 April 17	Huber, Gardner	Lewd and Lascivious Public indecency	dismissed dismissed (ct comm pleas) deferred to Larned	A-69036*

1958 September 17	Oakes, John Elmer	solicit minor under 12 to commit immoral act statutory rape	Larned hospital	A-71313
1959 March 2	Weems, Glenn	Forcible rape and CAN	5 and 3 years in Kansas Reformatory	A-75884
1959 June 2	Orme, Clyde	solicit minor of age 3 to commit immoral act	not less than 1 year	A-76366
1959 October 20	Neu, Walter	Solicit to minor	dismissed	A-77736
60s				
1960 June 30	Roady, Floyd	CAN and solicit minor	7 years probation	B-2838
1960 August 26	Levassour, Louis	Crime Against Nature (3 counts) (upon 9 year old boy)	Larned for reception, care, maintenance, and treatment	B-4065*
1960 September 1	Holland, Frank	licentious advances	dismissed 5/14/62	B-11060
1961 February 14	Gray, Wayne	incest	7 and 17 years	B-7245
		Crime Against Nature entice a minor to commit immoral act	10 years	
1961 September 8	Hayes, William	felonious assault solicit minor to commit act of gross indecency	committed to Larned 3 years probation	B-11171
1961 December 15	Winters, John Jr.	Licentious Advances		B-12879
1962 January 10	Lowe, Ethmer	entice and solicit minor	convicted Larned	B-13251
1962 October 10	Hedrick, Eval	forcible rape and CAN	dismissed in 8/11/64	B-18161
1962 October 23	Hughes, Harold	forcible rape & CAN	Larned for treatment	B-18388
1962 November 10	Dailey, Hart E.	solicit minor to commit immoral act	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-14781
1962 November 12	Churchil, John	Crime Against Nature	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-15240*
1962 November 20	Hawley, Melvin Max	Improper Conduct & Public Indecency	acquitted	B-15648
1962 November 23	Dvorak, Charles	Lascivious and public indecency	Larned Hospital for treatment	B-18909*
1963 April 17	Grube, Arvel	induced minor to commit immoral act (4 counts)	Larned Hospital	B-21331

\* Cases reviewed by he author

## Smallpox: The American Fur Company Pox Outbreak of 1837-1838

Michael J. Ables

**Introduction.** Smallpox is a virus that raged its war upon the people of this world for millennia. Striking the Native American population in the late sixteenth century with the landing of Cortez, smallpox emerged again in the eighteenth century during the American Revolution. During the summer of 1837, smallpox struck the upper Missouri River region. The epidemic caused the near elimination of tribes such as the Assiniboins, Crees and Mandans. The events generated headlines for some major newspapers like *The Connecticut Courant*, *The Pennsylvania Freeman* and *The Waldo Patriot*. Newspapers printed a segment of the events that were occurring in the upper Missouri River region; however a record found in the journal of a clerk at Fort Clark named Francis Chardon, titled “the American Fur Company responsible for the smallpox devastation,” brought the Company's responsibility to light. Fur trading companies were based on goods and services provided by fur exports. The American Fur Company accomplished such goals by navigating the Missouri River with steamboats like the *St. Peter's*, which enabled them to provide such services at a greater speed. Through this rapid way of transportation, the American Fur Company became partly responsible for the alarming rate of Native American deaths due to smallpox, by spreading this disease throughout the upper Missouri River region.

**The American Fur Company.** The fur trading industry provided an opportunity for a plethora of people, and in doing so it opened the door for smallpox. Several fur companies made use of the Missouri River to provide vast amounts of goods to a variety of people, some of which included: the American Fur Company, the Missouri Fur Company, and Pratte & Chouteux Fur Company. These companies represented a major export industry that



shipped furs to places like Great Britain.<sup>1</sup> Although the American Fur Company was one among many that used the Missouri River, it was the only one considered responsible for the smallpox outbreak of 1837-1838.<sup>2</sup>

The American Fur Company was founded on April 6, 1808 by John Jacob Astor. Astor created the Company to compete with the Canadian challengers taking furs from the upper Missouri River region. These were the North West Company, Hudson Bay Company and the Michilimackinac Corporation. North West Company and Michilimackinac Corporation had impressive profits, which according to Upton Terrell amounted to \$1,200,000, and \$800,000 respectively. Astor was aware of the capital gains of these two companies, but he was particularly concerned about the capital they made from the United States; according to Upton Terrell “at least \$400,000 worth of furs were taken by the Canadians each season from the upper Mississippi and Missouri rivers.” The large demand for fur trade in the upper Missouri River region provided an opportunity for the American Fur Company to rise to an elite status among the fur trading companies.

The American Fur Company became the world’s largest fur company. In the time the Company was operational “the capital stock for the first two years would amount to one million dollars, afterward it... increased to two million.”<sup>3</sup> From 1829 to 1831, the Company obtained over 700,000 furs, the majority of which were muskrats, raccoons, deer and beavers. By 1822 nearly 75 percent of all the fur exports from the United States were sent to Great Britain, and by the 1830s these exports were on a steady increase; “(the) depression of 1837-39 had little effect on the American fur trade” despite the smallpox epidemic of the upper Missouri River, and the overall value of these trades had become steady.<sup>4</sup> One of the reasons for the Company's solidity was its use of steamboats. Keelboats had been the medium for ferrying goods and providing transportation up and down the Missouri River, until the steamboat came into use. The keelboat was described as a:

---

<sup>1</sup> Russell W. Fridley, Ed., Clayton, James L., “The Growth and Economic Significance of the American Fur Trade, 1790-1890,” *Aspects of the Fur trade* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1967), 63.

<sup>2</sup> Annie Heloise Abel, Ed., *Chardon's Journal at Fort Clark: 1834- 1839*. (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 319.

<sup>3</sup> John Upton Terrell, *Fur by Astor*, (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1963), 137, 143-44.

<sup>4</sup> Russell W. Fridley, Ed., Clayton, James L., “The Growth and Economic Significance of the American Fur Trade, 1790-1890,” *Aspects of the Fur trade*, (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1967), 63-67.

good sized boat, sixty to seventy feet long, and built on a regular model, with a keel running from bow to stern. It had fifteen to eighteen feet breadth of beam and three or four feet depth of hold.<sup>5</sup>

However, the keelboat was extremely difficult to manage as it took “twenty to forty men” to manage it upriver.<sup>6</sup> The steamboat, on the other hand, “was found to accomplish a great saving over the cost of the keelboat,” and it was a great success for traveling upriver due to its “flat bottom.” Largely, the steamboat was unlike anything ever built at that time, since its main body was above the water except approximately three to four feet.<sup>7</sup> Frequently steamboats were utilized by fur companies like the American Fur Company, which contracted the *St. Peter’s* in the summer of the epidemic. Thanks to this new technology, the Company was provided of transportation that was needed to carry goods and passengers over great distances in a relatively short amount of time. However, these advantages also proved to have brought the greatest demise for the Native American tribes of the upper Missouri River, during the epidemic of 1837-1838.

***The Smallpox Virus.*** The study of smallpox shows that there are two different variations of the virus, named variola major and variola minor.<sup>8</sup> Records indicate that variola virus was considered one of the largest viruses known. Its outer core, or “capsid,” bears a resemblance to a “diamond” like structure with a double stranded DNA, and its inner core resembles a “dumbbell.” Other sources suggest that variola contains approximately 200 genes.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, according to the Centers for Disease Control, Influenza A only has eleven genes.<sup>10</sup> Smallpox is also considered to be very contagious. Frequently the most common form of contagion is through “droplet[s] infection by inhalation;” however another way of transmission could be through direct physical contact with someone who has smallpox. The most

---

<sup>5</sup> Hiram Martin Chittenden, *History of Early Steamboat Navigation on the Missouri River* (New York: Francis P. Harper, 1903), 1, 102-3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>8</sup> Michael K. Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation of the Spread of Smallpox In the Northern Plains Utilizing concepts of Disease Ecology* (Nebraska: J&L Reprint Company, 1986), 24, 33.

<sup>9</sup> Irwin W. Sherman, *Twelve Diseases that changed our world*, (Washington: ASM Press, 2007), 55.

<sup>10</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, “Avian Influenza (Flu),” *Transmission of Influenza A Viruses between Animals and People*, accessed online on April 15, 2009 at <http://www.cdc.gov/flu/avian/gen-info/transmission.htm>.

visible signs of smallpox are its pustules, which once opened and in the proper atmosphere could harvest the disease for a period of a couple of months, and can potentially spread the disease further.<sup>11</sup>

From a closer examination of the minor form of variola virus, we are able to see some interesting characteristic that differ from variola major. Variola minor has a rather low fatality rate of one to two percent, its functionality maintains a consistent pattern or time line that mimics variola major, and variola minor tends to contain an equivalent ratio of pustules to variola major, although “[t]he lesions are more superficial than in variola major.” Records indicate that the process of identifying variola minor from a “milder” form of variola major tends to be quite impossible. Variola major has a completely different zeal, since it “has an overall case fatality rate of 15 – 45%.” Thus far, scientists are aware of five different strands of variola major, which are the haemorrhagic, flat, ordinary, modified, and *sine eruption*.<sup>12</sup> From a thorough comparison between variola major and variola minor, scientists suggest that the main difference is their overall fatality rates.

Records show that smallpox raged upon the upper Missouri River region, but we are not sure about the form that the virus took when it devastated the Native Americans of the region. Nevertheless, we are aware of a frequent clinical symptomatic break down of the variola virus, since it is considered to have a standard pattern, which makes it easy to identify. Upon infection the host is not contagious for approximately thirteen days, but after this period, the infected becomes contagious until the smallpox cycle is nearly complete. Once the pustules or rashes begin to scab over, and fall off, the infected is no longer contagious. The entire cycle from the beginning to the end lasts about thirty two days in all.<sup>13</sup>

Examining the patterns of the smallpox virus helps further understand the timeline of the claims of infestation in the upper Missouri River region, as it shows us the time that passes from the disease entering the body to when the exterior symptoms become noticeable. The body shows no symptoms from the first to the eleventh day of the introduction of the disease; however the virus already begins to work itself into the respiratory tract from the first to the third day. From the third to the fifth day, the virus moves into the “lymph nodes and [enters] into the bloodstream,”<sup>14</sup> when the disease is recorded to replicate itself

---

<sup>11</sup> Sherman, *Twelve Diseases*, 55-6.

<sup>12</sup> Sherman, *Twelve Diseases*, 56; Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 24-26, 33.

<sup>13</sup> Elizabeth A. Fenn, *Pox Americana the Great Smallpox Epidemic of 1775-82* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), 19.

<sup>14</sup> Sherman, *Twelve Diseases*, 56.

within the lymph system. This incubation period can range anywhere between twelve and fourteen days.<sup>15</sup>

After the incubation period, smallpox moves rapidly through its host. Symptoms begin to show around day twelve to fourteen, and the host experiences symptoms such as “headache, fever, chills, nausea, muscle ache, malaise and in worst cases convulsions.”<sup>16</sup> Within few days after the incubation period, the host may suffer from a severe fever as the infected “often becomes delirious at this point and slips gradually into a stupor.” From day fifteen to day thirty rashes are very noticeable on the body, and the smallpox sores begin to develop inside the throat and mouth making it hard for the host to speak, eat, and drink. Within a few days the sores in the mouth and throat swell to a point of “suffocation,” with the face also swelling to enormous proportions, affecting the sight, and in “many cases” ending “in permanent blindness.” Sores spread over the face and forearms, and continue to appear on the host’s trunk, legs and back. On day fifteen the body begins to form “macules,” and from day sixteen to day eighteen “papules” begin to appear on the skin. Between days nineteen and twenty the “papules” transform into “vesicle[s],” which form into pustules between day twenty one and twenty four. From the twenty fifth to the thirtieth day “the pustules” eventually “erupt” and scab over; however these scabs are still capable of infecting others.<sup>17</sup> Around days thirty one and thirty two, the scabs fall off and scarring begins, completing the entire cycle of the deadly variola virus. The shelf life for the virus is rather short, but variola is capable of spreading throughout a community like wildfire. By examining how variola works within the human body, a better understanding can be gained on how the disease traveled up the Missouri River and spread throughout the Native American populations.

***St. Peter’s Journey Upriver.*** In 1835, a 119 ton side wheeler steamboat named *St. Peter* had just been created. The *St. Peter’s* was constructed in the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, under the contract of the American Fur Company. It contained dual, high-pressure engines that successfully propelled its two side-paddles up the Missouri River, providing the needed capacities for the Company.<sup>18</sup> By April of 1837, the *St. Peter’s* arrived at St. Louis, Missouri getting ready to make her way upriver to the far outpost of Fort Union, North

---

<sup>15</sup> Fenn, *Pox Americana*, 19; Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 28, 33.

<sup>16</sup> Fenn, *Pox Americana*, 19; Sherman, *Twelve Diseases*, 56.

<sup>17</sup> Fenn, *Pox Americana*, 16-19; Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 28-30.

<sup>18</sup> R.C. Roberson, *Rotting Faces: Smallpox and the American Indian*, (Idaho: Caxton Press, 2001), 9.

Dakota.<sup>19</sup> During the summer of the same year, the steamboat was under the contract of the American Fur Company.

*St. Peter's* voyage began on April 17.<sup>20</sup> The steamboat's captain, Bernard Pratte Junior, stopped first at Fort Leavenworth.<sup>21</sup> After a short rest the steamboat pressed onward to other ports upriver. Some records indicate that prior to the arrival at Fort Leavenworth, or shortly after departing, smallpox was identified onboard; however other records indicate that smallpox was acknowledged onboard around the Blacksnake region, north of Fort Leavenworth. Captain Pratte Jr. stopped the *St. Peter's* at Fort Leavenworth due to government mandates. At the time, Fort Leavenworth was utilized as a military check point. Due to liquor laws, in particular the Act of July 9, 1832, all liquor was banned from being sold or traded to Native Americans.<sup>22</sup>

A timetable of the smallpox outbreak can be deduced by examining the personal accounts of Major Joseph Pilcher, an American Fur Company clerk stationed at Fort Clark named Frances A. Chardon, and others. Pilcher was an Indian Agent aboard the *St. Peter's*, and he witnessed several cases of smallpox among the passengers. In a letter to the Superintendent of Indian Affairs, General William Clark, Pilcher explained the dire situation that could be upon them, stating:

I am not however without apprehensions of a failure owing to a circumstance which must prove fatal to many thousands of Indians along the line of the Missouri. The Smallpox broke out on board the Steamboat before she passed for Leavenworth.<sup>23</sup>

He also indicated when the first sign of smallpox appeared onboard, and who had contracted it

the first indications of the disease appeared at or near Fort Leavenworth on a Mulato man attached to the boat, though it was not thought to be the Small pox at the time.

Pilcher's sense of urgency could be observed in another of his updates:

---

<sup>19</sup> Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 33, 39.

<sup>20</sup> Roberson, *Rotting Faces*, 9.

<sup>21</sup> Donald Jackson, *Voyages of the Steamboat Yellow Stone*, (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1985), 68.

<sup>22</sup> Chittenden, *The American Fur Trade*, 1, 355.

<sup>23</sup> The following quotes are from Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 33-68.

It is regretted that the apprehensions expressed in my letter of the 10<sup>th</sup> Ultimo respecting the Small pox have been partly realized [sic] & that from all the information I have been able to get, the disease is rapidly Spreading.

In a another letter written by Joshua Pilcher to General William Clark, Pilcher suggested that Captain Pratte was fully aware that smallpox virus was on board, but that he disregarded warnings in order to continue upriver.

a gentlemen of the Indian department [possibly himself] suggested to the Capt of the boat, that it would be well to put the man ashore and leave him- the Capt doubting the maldy [sic] and [the Captain] having use for the man declined doing so.<sup>24</sup>

In a timely fashion, *The St. Peter's* arrived at the Council Bluff Agency on the Nebraska-Iowa border, on May 14, 1837.

At Council Bluff Agency, three Arikara women with children boarded the *St. Peter's*, on their way upriver to Fort Clark, North Dakota. The three Native American women soon experienced the next severe cases of smallpox. After this, nearly one month passed before *The St. Peter's* reached its next rest stop at the Sioux Agency, located near today's Sioux City, South Dakota. Records indicate the date of this arrival to be around June 5. By this point, the three Arikaras Indians who boarded the *St. Peter's* at Council Bluff Agency had advanced smallpox symptoms, having contracted the virus from a deckhand who had it since traveling through the Blacksnake region. Within a day's travel, the *St. Peter's* made its next stop at Fort Pierre, South Dakota. On June 10, Pilcher indicated a pessimistic attitude:

I am taking every possible precaution, and sending messages to all the other bands of Sioux admonishing them to remain out from the river and avoid the trading posts for the Summer.<sup>25</sup>

He however did not loose hope, and expected his message to be communicated to the tribes from the Platte to the Yellow Stone. Chardon's journal provides an adequate account of the severity of this epidemic, and it also gives us important dates to establish the chronology of the disease. In his journal, Chardon wrote that *The St. Peter's* "hove in sight at 2 p.m." on Sunday, June 18.<sup>26</sup> According to

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 65.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 118.

this timeframe, we can establish that it took twenty-six days before smallpox was shown to be abundant amongst the Mandan tribe.

Upon departing Fort Pierre, a gentleman named Jacob Halsey boarded the *St. Peter's*. Halsey was "formerly in charge of that [Fort Pierre] fur trading post." The *St. Peter's* continued its course upriver to the next check point, Fort Clark, North Dakota, arriving on June 19. At this point the three Arikaras Indians had reached their destinations; however they were recorded to be leaving the steamboat while still being contagious with the smallpox virus. The *St. Peter's* continued its course to Fort Union, North Dakota, making port on June 24, with Mr. Halsey onboard and already sick with the early signs of smallpox.<sup>27</sup>

Although a first hand observer of the situation, Pilcher did not seem to be fully aware of the mounting number of fatalities, since no death counts can be seen in his records at this point. However, Chardon's journal was already showing fatal victims as early as July 14. In one of such entries, Chardon wrote:

Friday, [July 14]- One of the warmest days that we have had this summer-Weather smokey- A young Mandan died today of Small pox- several others has caught it- the Indians all being out Making dried Meat has saved several of them.<sup>28</sup>

Soon after Chardon's first encounter, scattered reports of smallpox became clearer until they showed up on a constant basis. On July 20, Chardon indicated that "Mr May and Yoyo arrived from the Little Misso [sic] With two Mules and one horse- No News in that quarter, except the Small Pox." Chardon's journal kept up with daily activities and the effect of smallpox on the community. On July 25, he stated that "small pox has broken out at the Camp," and on July 26, that it "has broke out among them, several has (sic) died." By August 17, Chardon's journal was reflecting despair, "the Indians dying off every day- Were the disease will stop, I know not." By late August, Chardon was able to determine the ratio of people dying around him at Fort Clark. He wrote "the disease still Keeps ahead 8 and 10 die off daily, Thirty five Mandans [men] have died, the Women and children I keep no account of." By the end of August, Chardon wrote:

Month of August I bid you farewell with all my heart, after running twenty hair breadths escapes, threatened every instant to be all

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, 31, 39.

<sup>28</sup> These and the following quotes are from Heloise Abel, *Chardon's Journal at Fort Clark*, 121-33.

murdered, however it is the wish of humble servant that the Month of September will be More favorable, the Number of Deaths up to the Present is very near five hundred- The Mandans are all cut off, except 23 young and old men.<sup>29</sup>

Chardon's numbers of fatalities were not completely accurate, and he even admitted that he did not include women and children in his overall fatality count. By September of 1837, the situation had grown grim. A letter sent to General Clark by Upper Missouri Indian sub-agent William N. Fulkerson read, "it is with regret I have to communicate to you that the Small pox has broken out in this country and is sweeping all before it." Fulkerson continued, "I understand that it has broken out among the Assinaboine and Black feet Indians where it is also causing great havoc and distress."<sup>30</sup>

Whether the stops made by *St. Peter's* were to the benefit of the American Fur Company, or under government decree, the journey of the steamboat upriver during the summer 1837 had a devastating effect on Native Americans. Each of the stops made by the *St. Peter's* brought the deadly virus into the homelands of numerous tribes. Upriver from Leavenworth lies the Council Bluff Agency, a grand trading ground for the Otes, Omahas, and Pawnees Indians. Further upriver from Council Bluff Agency was the Sioux Agency, which was developed for the Sioux and Ponca tribes in the region. Pierre Fort was close to the latter, and it catered to the Lakota tribe. Following Pierre Fort were Fort Clark and Fort Union, both located in North Dakota. Fort Union was the last stop for the *St. Peter's*, and one of the farthest outposts controlled by the American Fur Company. Located on the upper northwest region of North Dakota near the fork of the Yellowstone River, Fort Clark's population for trading was the Mandan's and the Arikara tribes. Fort Union, on the other hand, was a prominent trading site for the Assiniboine tribe. Records indicate that the native populations of Fort Clark and Fort Union were among the hardest hit by the smallpox outbreak, which also struck the Lakota tribe located around Pierre Fort, as well as other tribes north upriver like the Mandans, Assineboins and Arikaras.<sup>31</sup>

The government stepped in by providing vaccinations to save the tribes that had suffered fatalities from the smallpox ravage. General Clark "recommended that the government send agents to the Indian country to vaccinate the tribes, in spite of the fact that Indians were superstitious and might prove difficult to vaccinate." This seems to be a late gesture from the

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 133.

<sup>30</sup> Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 33, 67.

<sup>31</sup> Roberson, *Rotting Faces Smallpox*, 76.



government to the Native Americans suffering from this horrific disease, since a law had already been passed in 1832 for all Native Americans to receive vaccination for smallpox. The law allocated \$12,000 in funds, as it also explained the benefits to whom it was intended.<sup>32</sup> The Government extended its help several years too late. On February 6, 1838, General Clark sent a letter to one C.A. Harris, Esq., Commander of Indian Affairs in Washington, stating that

the suggestions of Major Pilcher on the subject of vaccination, if promptly acted on, may be the means of preventing a great loss of life in the event of the disease [smallpox] spreading among the Indians at a future period.<sup>33</sup>

By March 1838, physicians were hired by the federal government to overcome this epidemic among the Indian population. Records indicate that Pilcher and another Indian agent named Dougherty received \$500 for their services, and \$250 for two other Indian agents to fight epidemic. The vaccination process went rather successfully, despite rumors that the “white man” had “harmful” intentions. The overall indication suggested that the process had saved an estimated twenty or thirty thousand Native Americans.<sup>34</sup>

***Death Toll.*** The total number of Native Americans who were affected by smallpox during the epidemic of 1837-1838 is unclear. On March 15, 1838, the *Pennsylvania Freeman* reported on the devastation of smallpox in the upper Missouri as follows:

[S]mall-pox had been making the most dreadful havoc among the Indians on the Missouri river. A letter from Major Pilcher gives the following summary of mortality among the several tribes, so far as the accounts had been received. But it is feared the destruction will be equal to 30,000 souls.

Mandans	1,000
Minetarees	500
Ricaras	1,500
Assinneboins	10,000
Crees	3,000
Blackfeet	4,000

---

<sup>32</sup> John E. Sunder, *Joshua Pilcher Fur Trader and Indian Agent*, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1968), 137, 319.

<sup>33</sup> Trimble, *An Ethnohistorical Interpretation*, 33, 72-3.

<sup>34</sup> Sunder, *Joshua Pilcher*, 137.

Total: 20,000.<sup>35</sup>

A letter by General Clark on February 27, 1838 provides us with different numbers from ones shown from *The Pennsylvania Freeman*. He stated that the Mandan tribe, once consisting of 1,600 people, had been reduced to only 31 by October 1, 1837. On March 17, 1838, the *Connecticut Courant* released a letter written by General Clark, consisting on a first-hand account of the number of tribal member's devastated by the outcome of the smallpox outbreak. The *Connecticut Courant* stated:

It appears that the effects of the small-pox among most of the Indians tribes of the Upper Missouri surpass all former scourges, and that the country through which it has passed is literally depopulated, and converted into one great grave yard.<sup>36</sup>

The article continued to reveal tribes and tribal members who were deceased. Mandan tribe's fatalities concurred with the information previously stated. The Minetarees consisted of approximately 1000 tribal members and half of them died. Sharing the same fate as the Minetaree tribe was the Ricaras, as they had 3,000 people, and half had perished. In other cases, it is stated that "the great band of Assinneboine, say 10,000 strong, and the Crees, numbering about 3,000, have been almost annihilated..."

Until the mention of the Blackfeet tribe of the Rocky Mountains, the information gathered concurred precisely. According to *The Connecticut Courant*:

[T]he disease had reached the Blackfeet of the Rocky Mountains; a band of 1,000 lodges had been swept off, and the disease was rapidly spreading among the different bands of that great tribe, numbering...60,000 souls.<sup>37</sup>

The letter by General Clark is insisting that the Blackfeet tribe as a whole was equivalent to 60,000. However, records do not indicate an accurate number of souls that were lost from the Blackfeet tribe. According to the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, "only" 4,000 Blackfeet were lost, making them an exception, since the other tribes listed by the *Pennsylvania Freeman* lost at least 50 percent of their entire tribe. Nevertheless, the newspaper stated that the United States

---

<sup>35</sup> This and the following quotes are from Unknown, "Dreadful Mortality among the Indians," *Pennsylvania Freeman*, Vol. 4 no. 1, March 15 1838.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

government expected 30,000 Native American lives lost to smallpox, showing that the number of 4,000 Blackfeet may not be accurate. General Clark's words relating that "the disease was rapidly spreading among the different bands of that great tribe [blackfeet]" supports that the Blackfeet had smallpox to an advance degree, and that their death toll may have been higher. Assuming that the government was correct, the Blackfeet would have lost between 10,000 and 15,000 members, which equals a quarter of the total Blackfeet tribal members.

In an article dated March 23, 1838, the *Waldo Patriot* informed its readers about the smallpox outbreak of the upper Missouri River. Its headline read: "From the *N.Y. Evening Star*, Appalling Destruction of North-West Indians by Small Pox."<sup>38</sup> The newspaper further reaffirmed our understanding of the death toll of the Mandans, Crees and Arickarees. When referring to the Mandan tribe's death rate, the article stated that they "have all died by 31," while the Minatarees were "living near the Mandans, numbering about 1600, were by our last accounts, about on half dead, and the disease still raging." The were several accounts on the spread of the disease and the places it touched, as well as the number of tribal members who were daily affected. Referring to the Assinaboin tribe, the article stated that "the epidemic spread into the most distant part of the Assinaboin country, and this tribe were dying by fifties and hundreds a day." The article referred to the symptoms that some members of the Assinaboin tribe suffered before dying. There was pain concentrating around the head and lower abdominal regions, and "the bodies turned black immediately after" death, "and swelled to three times its natural size." Concerning probable psychological effects of the epidemy, it stated:

The boat that brought up the small-pox made her voyage last summer, and the ravages of the distemper appear to have been greatest in October. It broke out among the Mandans July 15. Many of the handsome Arickarees who had recovered, seeing the disfiguration of their features, committed suicide! Some by throwing themselves from rocks, other- by stabling, shooting, & [etcetera]. The prairie has become a grave yard.<sup>39</sup>

The actual number of Native Americans that perished will never truly be known; however, a strong consensus among the aforementioned newspapers lead us to believe that between 20,000 and 35,000 lives may have been lost due to the smallpox epidemic of 1837-1838.

---

<sup>38</sup> This and the following quotes are from John Dorr, "Appalling Destruction of North-West Indians by Small Pox." *Waldo Patriot*, Vol. 1 no. 13, March 23, 1838.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

**Conclusion.** In the end “the American Fur Company was guilty of criminal negligence in the case of the epidemic of 1837.”<sup>40</sup> The evidence showed that the American Fur Company contracted the steamboat *St. Peter's* and her Captain Pratte Jr. to travel upriver. The Company was clearly responsible for the people onboard the *St. Peter's*; however the responsibility for the smallpox outbreak of 1837-1838 does not fall entirely upon the shoulders of the Company. Evidence has shown that the government of the United States was also partly responsible for the deaths of thousands of Native Americans in the upper Missouri River region. The government was responsible for the oversight of all vaccinations guaranteed to the Native Americans of this region by the Act of May 5, 1832. These vaccinations were not administered in a timely fashion. Due to the negligence of the United States government, and the American Fur Company, smallpox afflicted and killed a high percentage of Native Americans in the upper Missouri River region. The government was prompt to act on providing vaccinations, and eliminating the spread of smallpox before it afflicted more American Indians, and in this way, it helped save hundreds of thousands of lives. However, the damage was already done.

---

<sup>40</sup> Heloise Abel, *Chardon's Journal at Fort Clark*, 319.

## Understanding the Cherokee War

Melody Ramsey

The Cherokee Nation launched a war against its former English allies in the fall of 1759, which lasted until the fall of 1761. The complex diplomatic relationship between the English and the Cherokees led to this relatively brief period of conflict. Against the backdrop of the North American Seven Years' War between France and England, Britain's continued exploitation and condescension toward the Cherokees, and its insatiable hunger for Cherokee land led to a great bloodshed of colonists and Cherokees. An examination of the events leading to the dissolution of this once robust alliance reveals the motivations for both British and Cherokees, as well as the cultural misunderstandings that existed between the two. This in turn helps us recognize and understand the near inevitability of the Cherokee War.

Resulting from tension concerning valuable land in the Ohio River Valley, the Seven Years' War in North America (1754 to 1763) shaped the dynamics and policies for France and England. Britain gained a vast new territory, and France lost some claims in North America. During this conflict, and within the context of a variety of other Indian alliances, England utilized help from the Cherokees in numerous battles. For instance, seven hundred Cherokee warriors offered their services to John Forbes during his 1758 campaign to recapture Fort Duquesne – aid that General Braddock had disastrously scorned in 1755.<sup>1</sup> According to Gregory Dowd:

---

<sup>1</sup> Fred Anderson, *Crucible of War: The Seven Years' War and the Fate of Empire in British North America, 1754-1766* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), 458.

No people as independent and numerous [as the Cherokee] had been a better and more consistent friend of the British colonies. . . with gift exchanges essential to the alliance.<sup>2</sup>

Being one of the largest Native American groups, the Cherokees maintained a mix of an agricultural and hunter-gatherer economy, until trade with the English bound them to the acquisition of European trade goods. The first recorded contact of the British with the Cherokees occurred with De Soto's 1540 expedition to Guasili, located in the western area of North Carolina. This first contact was "chronicled as peaceful, domestic and hospitable."<sup>3</sup> By the 1670s and 1680s, this large group with approximately sixty towns numbered around 22,000, with 6,000 warriors located in present day Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama.<sup>4</sup>

In the early eighteenth century, the Cherokee Nation seemed to be organized into three separate regional clusters of villages. The Lower Towns was located in Western South Carolina, and had towns such as Keowee and Estatoe. The Middle Towns were situated in Western North Carolina, with Etchoe and Stecoe as towns, and the Overhill Towns were farthest inland along the Lower Little Tennessee, with Settico and Tellico, and the seven Chota towns. By 1730 Alexander Cuming was referring to the seven Chota villages as "Mother Towns," each with chiefs elected from matrilineal descended families.<sup>5</sup> The Cherokees lacked a central governing body; instead each town was organized and ruled by the two town chiefs. Whereas the peace chief took charge of the domestic affairs and the ceremonies so important to each individual town, the war chief maintained control over negotiations, alliances, and conflicts that could lead to warfare.<sup>6</sup> During times of conflict, the war chief's power usually exceeded that of the peace chief.

By 1761, and following a power struggle between Chota and Tellico, Lieutenant Henry Timberlake was describing Chota as the "Cherokee capital,"

---

<sup>2</sup> Gregory Evans Dowd, "Insidious Friends," in *Contact Points: American Frontiers from the Mohawk Valley to the Mississippi, 1750-1830*, edited by Andrew R. L. Cayton and Fredrika J. Teute (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 114.

<sup>3</sup> Stanley W. Hoig, *The Cherokees and Their Chiefs: In the Wake of Empire* (Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press, 1998), 8.

<sup>4</sup> John Oliphant, *Peace and War on the Anglo-Cherokee Frontier: 1756-63* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 1.

<sup>5</sup> David Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier: Conflict and Survival, 1740-62* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1962), 3.

<sup>6</sup> Robert J. Conley, *The Cherokee Nation: A History* (Albuquerque: University of Mexico Press, 2005), 6.

or “Mother Town.” Chota's leader was Connecorte, or “Old Hop,” and he was known as the First Beloved Man of Chota (Uku), town over which he presided for the remaining of his life.<sup>7</sup> Notwithstanding Chota's leadership, individual Cherokee towns had considerable independence, with each maintaining local leaders, councils meetings, and making decisions in large council houses. The dual leadership between the peace and war chiefs took place during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In this, the peace chief commanded the respect of the people, which was based on the leader's communication skills, power of political persuasion, and wisdom. Women also held a position of respect in the affairs of the community, as they could sit in council meetings, and participate in warfare. This active political presence of women led Timberlake to remark:

The story of the Amazons is not so great a fable as we imagined, many of the Indian women being as famous in war, and as powerful in the council.<sup>8</sup>

Like with many local native groups, warfare permeated the life of the Cherokees; however this warfare was different from the ones that the Europeans were used to experiencing. Inter-tribal conflict could arise from the extensive trade connections that existed among the tribes, as well as from other cultural interactions. The Cherokees, although considered relatively peaceful, had some cultural practices that previewed war, such as their rite of passage into adulthood for young men, which could only be achieved through the attainment of a war name in combat.<sup>9</sup> The conflicts that existed between native societies prior to the European invasion often resulted in a set of “traditional” enemies. When the British entered into this bag of mixed tribal relationships, they sometimes failed to understand these previously existing struggles. South Carolina's colonists did not seem to take these pre-existing conflicts too seriously, as they “perceived [natives] as serious threats only if they fell under the corrupting influence of another European power.”<sup>10</sup>

Historians such as Steven J. Oatis have argued that to understand the first half of the eighteenth century, one must tackle the:

---

<sup>7</sup> Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*, 4.

<sup>8</sup> Theda Perdue, *Cherokee Women: Gender and Culture Change, 1700-1835* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 55.

<sup>9</sup> Corkran, *Cherokee Frontier*, 6.

<sup>10</sup> Steven J. Oatis, *A Colonial Complex: South Carolina's Frontiers in the Era of the Yamasee War, 1680-1730* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2004), 42.

region-wide pattern of social and economic exploitation driven by the English South Carolinians through their successful trade, diplomatic aggression, and enslavement of racial ‘others.’<sup>11</sup>

According to Oatis, it is important to understand the exchange process not only to know how it affected the Europeans, but also to observe how it affected other native groups. Within the context of the already complex relationships among the various Southeastern native groups, the addition of the British and their desire for land created a situation in which the Cherokee nation was ultimately diminished and devastated.

When Virginians James Needham and Gabriel Arthur arrived at the Overhill villages in 1673, the Cherokee men already possessed muskets from Spanish Florida. In a relatively short time, the Cherokees became increasingly dependent on English trade goods, gradually changing their lifestyle. By the dawn of the 1700s, traders began making regular trips into Cherokee country, and by 1716, they established year-round posts, with South Carolina creating trade alliances with the Cherokees.<sup>12</sup> From this increased trade, South Carolina’s settlers became aware of the importance of maintaining this large and powerful group as allies. By 1713, and within the context of this newly forged alliance, the Cherokees enabled South Carolina to defeat the Tuscarora Indians by providing 300 warriors.

In the eighteenth century, other types of agreements and treaties were reached between South Carolina and the Cherokees. In 1721 Cherokee chiefs from thirty-seven towns met at Charles Town with Sir Francis Nicolson, reaching an agreement on boundaries, as well as making an agreement concerning some practices of the English traders.<sup>13</sup> This was the first of many times the Cherokees would lose land to the English. In March 1730, when Alexander Cuming descended on his whirlwind tour of the many Cherokee towns, he demanded that the Cherokees swear allegiance to King George II. Whether he actually received what he desired is unclear, but Cuming decided that it was to his advantage to appoint an “emperor” for the Cherokees, choosing Moytoy of Tellico.<sup>14</sup> Those in Chota felt that the First Beloved Man should have been chosen; however, some warriors decided to take advantage of Cuming’s presence to ask for a trip to London to meet King George.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 147.

<sup>13</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 18.

<sup>14</sup> Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 7.



Tassetchee, Ookounaka, later known as Chief Attakullakulla, and several other warriors departed for England by May 1730.<sup>15</sup> They stayed in England for four months, being entertained and celebrated by London's society, while at the same time the Board of Trade was revealing a treaty with a series of "Articles of Friendship and Commerce," binding the Cherokees to British mercantile, military, and legal systems.<sup>16</sup> Following the London adventure, Attakullakulla remained loyal to the British for many years, but other Cherokees in Chota began to lean toward a friendship with the French, feeling no allegiance to Great Tellico or the Carolinian-appointed emperor. This division in loyalties ultimately led to many conflicts, as many Cherokees resented the English for presuming authority over the selection of their leaders.

Life continued to change for the Cherokees during the eighteenth century. Their desire for a variety of European goods continued to grow and to become enmeshed in their lives, with a need for daily items such as textiles and other domestic goods, as well as guns and ammunition. The deerskin trade kept Cherokee men away from their villages, and it also decreased the supply of deer for food. Along with this increased dependency on trade there were more land cessions from the Cherokees to South Carolina, as well as an increased departure from traditional Cherokee culture and social relations. It was said that before the English trade expansion "the life of the wealthiest Cherokee was almost indistinguishable from the life of the poorest."<sup>17</sup> The new wealth and loss of hunting grounds provoked an increased competition between the tribes, which was reflected in conflicts with the Creeks and other native groups. The Southeastern tribes also became involved in the fights between European countries for the possession of land. Adding to this situation, the Cherokees felt that the South Carolinian traders refused to treat them with respect, as they refused to understand their need for reciprocity in the giving of gifts, a significant component in the ideology of many Native American cultures.

In answer to this situation, the Cherokees made frequent unannounced trips into Charles Town. In June 1745 the *American Weekly Mercury* printed a report from Charleston, which included an event from April 30 reading:

---

<sup>15</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 20.

<sup>16</sup> Oatis, *A Colonial Complex*, 261.

<sup>17</sup> Michelle Daniel, "Blood Feud to Jury System: The Metamorphosis of Cherokee Law from 1750 to 1840." *American Indian Quarterly* 11 (Spring 1987): 97-125.

the Emperor of the Cherokee Indians . . . arrived in Town. . . The Cherokees had not been in this Province for some years . . . [but] received large Presents.<sup>18</sup>

Misunderstandings between the Cherokee and British cultures, occasioned by their different expectations, eventually led to a break in their relations. According to Oatis, “Cherokees viewed trade as a community rite rooted in reciprocity and mutual respect,” or even as a way of “boost[ing] one’s ego or social standing.”<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, South Carolinians thought of Cherokees as troublesome savages, with little understanding of mutual respect and exchange. This dissimilar perception was even noticed during the times when British and Cherokees fought together, as in the Seven Years’ War.

Cherokee numbers began to decline after 1730, as their continued involvement in conflicts increased. Stemming from a need to satisfy the British, the Cherokees found themselves fighting people against whom they had no quarrel, and becoming allies of traditional former foes. Along with the fighting and increased contact with the British, a smallpox epidemic in 1738 became another disaster for many towns. In May 1746, royal governor of South Carolina James Glen persuaded the Cherokees to drive the Northern natives from their towns, in an attempt to counter French influence. By June 1753, Attakullakulla arrived at Charles Town with a delegation to meet Glen. Glen wanted Carolinian settlers and traders to be safe within the Cherokee country, and he desired peace between the Creeks and Cherokees. Aware of France’s achievements with their own native allies, Glen was seeking to broker agreements and alliances with the Cherokees.<sup>20</sup>

By the following year, the English pursued an assurance of Cherokee loyalty, to secure their help with the fight against the French and their allies. Each group expected a fulfillment of needs for an alliance; however Old Hop from Chota decided on neutrality. Old Hop wanted peace with both the French and their Indian allies so as to trade with them, yet he was also seeking the building of a fort by the British. Glen on the other hand sought an end to Cherokee raids on the Creeks and the Catawbias, and hoped Old Hop would sell Cherokee lands to expand Carolina’s territory. Glen expected to have the loyalty of the Cherokees against the French, and in return he promised guns, ammunition, and forts to protect the women and children while the warriors were away from their villages. With this promise, the Cherokees gave up more

---

<sup>18</sup> *American Weekly Mercury*, “Charles Town, South Carolina, April 30,” issue 1329, June 20 to June 27, 1745.

<sup>19</sup> Oatis, *A Colonial Complex*, 191.

<sup>20</sup> Dowd, “Insidious Friends,” 118.

land, and South Carolina obtained one fourth of the western part of today's state.<sup>21</sup> Carolinian authorities also received a promise from Oconostota of Chota, providing warriors against the French and their allies in Illinois, along with Attakullakulla's continued support of British troops.

By July 1755, the Treaty of Saluda reduced Cherokee territory once more, and in return the Cherokees were promised better prices from the traders, the prohibition of rum, and a new fort to be built by the Carolinians.<sup>22</sup> Attakullakulla felt that an alliance with Governor Glen had been forged; however Glen viewed this as a promise of submission to King George II. This agreement proved to be another failure in the communication between the two parties.

As was typical of many of the promises made by the British, no additional forts appeared for a while since Fort Prince George was built in 1754. Nevertheless, by 1756 the new governor of South Carolina, William Henry Lyttelton, sent Raymond Demere to repair Fort Prince George and to build a new fort called Fort Loudoun. This new fort was to be located in the Tellico River basin, south of modern Knoxville, TN.<sup>23</sup> The Cherokees requested these forts for protection, but the British hoped to keep a watch over the Cherokees, since they had a particularly hard time trusting the Chota Cherokees, who remained on friendly terms with the French. Attakullakulla approached the new governor to assure him of continued support, and to seek promises to force the traders into fair business practices with the Cherokee. In return Attakullakulla made additional promises of support, and continued his assaults on the French forces.

In his 1853 *Annals of Tennessee*, J.G.M. Ramsey reported that the Indians were wary once they saw the large number of troops sent to Fort Loudoun, feeling "displeased at seeing such a large number of white people, well-armed, among them."<sup>24</sup> Although the Cherokees were seeking provisions, they were not only suspicious, but also alarmed by the presence of a large number of armed soldiers within their territory. Division among the Cherokees intensified, with Tellico warriors murdering the pregnant wife of Fort Loudoun's commander, "hoping to cause a break with the English."<sup>25</sup> Attakullakulla forced these warriors to go to Fort Loudoun to renew their pledge of support for

---

<sup>21</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 26.

<sup>22</sup> Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 14.

<sup>23</sup> Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, 96.

<sup>24</sup> J. G. M. Ramsey, *The Annals of Tennessee to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Charleston: Walker and Jones, 1853), 52.

<sup>25</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 32.

England. Consequently, in July 1756 the *Pennsylvania Gazette* printed a report from Charleston, depicting South Carolinians expressing reassurance:

The late alarming rumour concerning the Cherokees seems to have no Foundation; if it had, doubtless his Excellency's Presence among them, with a Body of Men, must have some good effects.<sup>26</sup>

With continued Cherokee support in the Ohio country, George Washington professed appreciation for the fighting of the Cherokees; yet some British soldiers felt differently about their native allies, as they humiliated Cherokee warriors when they requested gifts following battle. The Cherokees saw themselves as equals with the British, and believed that they naturally deserved rewards for their efforts in battle. The British on the other hand, saw Cherokees as crude and unsophisticated people, whom could be useful in battle, but whom were certainly not equal to the "civilized" English soldiers. Gregory Dowd summed up these opposing cultural viewpoints in his *Insidious Friends*, stating:

The British learned that the Cherokees sought not only good rewards but respect from their contribution to the war effort; the Cherokees learned that the British thought their Indian allies would fight in subjection and for cheap pay.<sup>27</sup>

The continuous misunderstanding and ethnocentric outlook of the British was reflected in Virginia's legislation, which offered "seventy-five dollars for the scalps of Frenchmen or their Indian allies."<sup>28</sup> To some Virginians who took up the prompting, all native scalps looked alike, and as a consequence they killed many Cherokees along with their intended targets. Whether by mistake or not, about forty Cherokee warriors were scalped in Virginia as they were on their way back home from fighting with Forbes' successful campaign. In addition, the warriors who returned home discovered an invasion of their hunting ground by English settlers, with a resulting decrease of trade and food supply. These murders sparked an intense anger and need for revenge among the Cherokees, resulting on the killing of Carolina settlers and traders.

Rumors of Attakullakulla's defection began to swirl in the Carolinas, even as he and his warriors continued their assault against the French. However, Old Hop did open up communication with the French, and Mankiller of Tellico

---

<sup>26</sup> *Pennsylvania Gazette*, "Charles-Town, South Carolina, May 22," issue 1436, July 1, 1756.

<sup>27</sup> Dowd, "Insidious Friends," 119.

<sup>28</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 33.

made an alliance with France, resulting in numerous French goods and presents to the Cherokees. In the midst of this muddled situation, Governor Lyttelton halted the trade of guns and ammunition with the Cherokees. Indian agent George Croghan wrote to Sir William Johnson, Superintendent of Indian Affairs in the north, about the impending trouble:

The people of Virginia . . . killed about forty Cherokees, and the General last Fall ordered all the Guns and Cloathing to be taken from the Chief of the Cherokee Indians [Attakullakulla]; these differences I fear will not tend to our advantage . . . He [Lyttelton] seems very backward in doing anything in Indian affairs.<sup>29</sup>

In October 1759, Lyttelton declared war on the Cherokee nation.<sup>30</sup> Oconostota and a party of warriors tried to negotiate peace. At the peace meeting, Lyttelton demanded the surrender of the warriors who had murdered English settlers, holding Oconostota and others in his party as hostages when they refused, and marching them to Fort Prince George. As a result of this action, Cherokee anger intensified, and more English traders and settlers were killed, with more fleeing to Forts Prince George and Moore.<sup>31</sup> Oconostota was eventually released, but others in his delegation remained prisoners, and some died with smallpox while confined. During an attempt by Oconostota to free the prisoners, the British guards killed the remaining thirty Cherokee hostages.<sup>32</sup>

The Cherokee War was the culmination of an accumulation of frustrating events that had been swirling between the two parties for decades. With the advancement of Carolinian settlements, and with their increase in commercial and military power, the question of Cherokee autonomy must have been raised. It appeared that the Cherokees were losing their territory to the same people they were fighting for. They must have asked, when would the English stop taking land that was necessary for our subsistence? With their growing dependence on English trade goods and the hostility shown by the British in the killing of the hostages, many Cherokee warriors wondered about the feasibility of an alternative partnership with France. This possibility may have looked attractive by 1754, when there were reports of a French offer to build a fort for the Cherokees. In addition, English traders became notorious for cheating, while Cherokee's deer population continued to plummet. This

---

<sup>29</sup> William Johnson, *The Papers of Sir William Johnson: Volume III* (Albany: University of New York, 1921), 90.

<sup>30</sup> Oliphant, *Peace and War*, 69.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>32</sup> Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, 95.

decrease in deer caused a reduction in deerskins, and the Cherokees became increasingly indebted to the traders. Along with the killing of the negotiating warriors, Lyttelton's ban on the trade of guns and ammunitions further aggravated the already exasperated warriors. A perfect storm was unleashed, and the Cherokee war began.

Lyttelton seemed to have made a grave mistake in stopping the trade of guns and ammunition, anticipating Jeffrey Amherst's colossal blunder of the early 1760s, which helped bring on Pontiac's War. By refusing to negotiate peace, and by ordering the taking and slaughtering of hostages, Lyttelton provoked the Cherokees mightily. Cherokee anger and hostility became rampant, and Fort Loudoun became a target for the warriors, whom maintained a siege of the fort from February to August of 1760. Captain Paul Demere, commander of the fort, expected the soon arrival of reinforcements, and British commander-in-chief Sir Jeffrey Amherst sent Colonel Archibald Montgomery along with 1,200 highlanders as relief forces. This group of soldiers arrived in Georgia to create havoc, burning twenty Cherokee towns, and killing women and children in the villages of Lower and Middle Towns.<sup>33</sup> In retaliation Oconostota attacked Montgomery and his men, killing up to 140 men, and causing Montgomery to retreat.

With their rescue thwarted, Demere's men became more desperate for food, despite some efforts by Cherokee women of the surrounding areas in supplying their lovers from the fort. This effort was eventually blocked by Oconostota, and the women banned from resuming their deliveries. Concerning this situation, an article by the *Boston Evening Post* reported in Charlestown:

The women who used to come to the fort, were forbidden to go thither again on pain of death; and that there were continually scouts about in search of white people's tracts . . . Oconostota answered [Demere] that they were not guilty of any of the outrages complained of.<sup>34</sup>

Finally, the British reached an agreement with Oconostota for the surrender of the remaining Fort Loudoun garrison, which was set to leave for a 140-mile trip to Fort Prince George. With typical mistrust and lack of communication, the warriors discovered that the soldiers had buried a great quantity of ammunition, despite the agreed upon terms of surrender that banned this. Following these findings, Cherokee warriors attacked the starving soldiers killing many, including

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>34</sup> *Boston Evening Post*, "Charles-Town, South Carolina, November 1," issue 1268, December 17, 1759.

Demere. Attakullakulla saved Lt. John Stuart, who was to become superintendent of the Southern Indian department. He was safely delivered to Virginia.<sup>35</sup>

By the end of 1760, the Cherokees seemed ready to negotiate peace, but the British thought otherwise. Amherst's soldiers began a systematic onslaught in the Lower and Middle Towns, with 5,000 men, women, and children "driven to the mountains to starve."<sup>36</sup> The devastated Cherokee towns were burned, along with fields of crops. In his *Cherokee Women*, Perdue estimates that the Cherokee population became depleted by a half. There were no more than 2,000 warriors left, in a total population between 8 and 10,000 inhabitants.<sup>37</sup> Amherst used similar tactics later, when he confronted the Pontiac in the Great Lakes region.<sup>38</sup>

By August 1761, Attakullakulla and other Cherokee warriors met British commander James Grant at Fort Prince George. They smoked the peace pipe and settled on terms for an end to the fighting. New mandates became a requirement for peace, including death for any Cherokee who murdered an English settler. On the other hand, any settler killing a Cherokee was to be turned over to British authorities, where jury nullification often made conviction and punishment impossible. No Frenchmen or their allies was allowed in Cherokee territory, but English traders were protected. Attakullakulla requested that John Stuart be appointed "British Superintendent of Indian affairs," and the treaty became a signed document on December 30, 1761. New boundaries became formalized, but another boundaries adjustment occurred in 1763, depriving the Cherokees of even more land.

The Cherokee War lasted from the fall of 1759 until the fall of 1761, being the "largest single concerted effort made by an individual Indian nation against the white colonists during the eighteenth century."<sup>39</sup> Given just how divided the Cherokee warriors were, the misunderstanding and lack of trust between Cherokees and Anglo-Americans, and the incessant clamoring of settlers for Cherokee lands, the hostility and aggression of the Cherokee War seemed an inevitable course. Gifts or booty from the spoils of war were never offered with mutual respect, but rather as a manipulative, paternalistic device to

---

<sup>35</sup> Hoig, *Cherokees and Their Chiefs*, 41.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>37</sup> Perdue, *Cherokee Women*, 98.

<sup>38</sup> David Andrew Nichols, "Of Conciliation and Incineration: The Cherokee War and the Remaking of British Imperial Indian Policy," *Reviews in American History* 30 (2002): 373-380.

<sup>39</sup> David A Copeland, *Debating the Issues in Colonial Newspapers: Primary Documents on Events* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000), 180.

maintain order and subordination. The dependency of the Cherokees on European goods drove them to abandon their guard, enabling the British to accomplish a continued encroachment upon Cherokee territory, without any further resistance following the Cherokee War. Division among the Cherokee chiefs led to an inability to control revenge killings among the warriors. English ethnocentrism manifesting in a widening gap in understanding and communication, resulted in a catastrophic event and a decimated nation, which with the ensuing struggles of the American Revolution, the War of 1812, and the presidency of Andrew Jackson, lost its valued native land and was relocated in Oklahoma.



# Persecution of Homosexuals in the McCarthy Hearings: A History of Homosexuality in Postwar America and McCarthyism

Hugo Márquez

**Introduction.** The postwar years were a time of great changes for homosexuals in the United States. The conjunction of the fear and anxiety of the first Cold War years, negative stereotypes held as scientific truths explaining homosexuality, and the greater awareness people had about the existence of gays and lesbians resulted in an environment of misunderstanding and persecution. Within this environment, positive scientific contributions toward the understanding of homosexuality such as Kinsey's report were twisted to fit the larger societal preconceptions, and even influenced the creation of legislation aimed at eradicating homosexuals from the government.

A protagonist in this postwar environment of fear and anxiety was a senator named Joseph McCarthy, who ascended in politics through lies and slander, and became most famous for his relentless persecution of 'infiltrated' communists, liberals, and dissenters. Assisting the senator in his crusade was a legal infrastructure previously laid out by committees who had taken the cause before him, the most important of which was the famous House of Un-American Activities Committee.

Despite the great number of literature written about the senator, there are relatively few studies that deal with McCarthy's persecution of homosexuals. Some historians mention it in the context of his other persecutions, and as an example of one of the many groups who suffered under the senator. In *The Age of Anxiety: McCarthyism to Terrorism*, Haynes Johnson stated that the senator, and his chief council Roy Cohn

took it as their mission to search for, and have fired, all homosexuals in the government. *Page after page after page* of the transcripts consisted of witnesses being grilled about their

sexual preferences, while McCarthy and Cohn dropped numerous innuendos about homosexuality to other witnesses. (my emphasis)<sup>1</sup>

Johnson qualified McCarthy's search of homosexuals as "obsessive," and although his book centered on the senator and his political life, he devoted several pages to McCarthy's persecution of homosexuals, while using as evidence the transcripts from the committee that the senator chaired.<sup>2</sup>

David K. Johnson differs from Haynes in that he focused on the general persecution of homosexuals during the postwar years; persecution which he identified as the "lavender scare." Johnson also has a more nuanced view of the role McCarthy played in these persecutions, deeming the senator a secondary figure. Although the author acknowledged that gay people had the impression that McCarthy was behind the gay purges, he also realized that the senator was not very interested in the matter, and did not become involved in the congressional efforts to rid the nation's capital of 'sexual undesirables.'<sup>3</sup>

The present research specifically focuses on Senator McCarthy and his political actions against gays and lesbians. Concerning this subject, it is my argument that homosexuals *were not* heavily persecuted by the senator from Wisconsin. The records from McCarthy's committee clearly show how restrained the senator was in his pursuit of homosexuals, since out of the more than three hundred witnesses that McCarthy cited in his executive sessions, only three cases dealt with homosexuality and only one witness was called because of his sexual orientation. It appears that the senator was mostly interested in uncovering subversion and cases of disloyalty within government departments, and homosexuality was used either as an example of how ineffective these departments were in detecting undesirables, or as an element of pressure to use against a witness. Although the senator expressed his desire to rid the government offices of homosexuals in more than one occasion, he did not dedicate his efforts to this end. The way McCarthy viewed, and dealt with homosexuals in his hearings was influenced by the congressional report on the *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, which was published in 1950. This report maintained that gays and lesbians constituted a security risk for their propensity to being blackmailed, which made them *security*

---

<sup>1</sup> Haynes Johnson, *The Age of Anxiety: McCarthyism to Terrorism* (Orlando: Harcourt Inc., 2005), 320.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 320-29.

<sup>3</sup> David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 2-9.

*risks*. Notwithstanding this, McCarthy did not seem to consider homosexuals as much of a threat as communists.

In order to arrive at this conclusion, I analyzed both the context of the times and the political actions taken by the senator towards homosexuals. The senator's conduct can not be better observed than in the transcripts of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations. This committee was chaired by McCarthy from 1953 to 1954, and within it the senator enjoyed full and unprecedented latitude to go after his enemies. When analyzing the context I deemed important to observe American society's conceptions of homosexuality in the postwar years, as well as McCarthy's ascension to power and the legal infrastructure that he had at his disposal to deal with homosexuals. Only after taking into consideration these contextual elements could I make a proper evaluation of the actions of the senator from Wisconsin towards the 'lavender menace.'

***The Red Scare and its Legal Heritage.*** McCarthy's rise to power was achieved within the context of the first years of the Cold War, and the radical phase known as the "red scare." Only days before McCarthy gave his famous speech at Wheeling, the *New York Times* was reporting that a British scientist named Klaus Fuchs had given atomic secrets to the Soviet Union. Fuchs had been involved in the Manhattan Project, and was then working in Great Britain in an atomic energy facility. The scientist's betrayal was discovered by the Federal Bureau of Investigations, which considered that Fuchs's action had given the Soviet Union the tools to develop the atom bomb, while also advancing the communist country's position toward developing the first hydrogen bomb.<sup>4</sup> Fuchs's case was not the first dealing with internal espionage, it was preceded by the Hiss-Chambers congressional hearings, which established that high ranking State Department official Alger Hiss had also been involved in selling secrets to the Soviet Union.<sup>5</sup> In charge of Hiss' congressional hearings was a congressional task force created from the ashes of the Dies Committee in 1945, named House of Un-American Activities Committee. HUAC had been created to investigate subversion within the United States.<sup>6</sup>

With dubious claims to constitutionality, HUAC set a legal precedent for further congressional subcommittees to take on the role of judicial

<sup>4</sup> William S. White, "British Jail Atom Scientist As a Spy After Tip By F.B.I.; He Knew of Hydrogen Bomb," *New York Times* (February 4, 1950): 1-2.

<sup>5</sup> John G. Adams, *Without Precedent; The story of the death of McCarthyism* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1983), 24.

<sup>6</sup> Carl Beck, *Contempt of Congress: A Study of the Prosecutions Initiated by the Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945-1957* (New Orleans: The Phauser Press, 1959), 18-19.

investigations.<sup>7</sup> The contempt citation was HUAC's main weapon, which although little used in the past, became employed to its fullest extent by this congressional committee and the subsequent ones of its type. Contempt was established in case the summoned party failed to either appear, provide material requested, or even answer a question. The House committee's procedures raised questions of constitutionality, since they often clashed with individual rights of freedom of speech, protection from unreasonable searches and seizures, and self incrimination as cited in the first, fourth, and fifth amendments of the Constitution.<sup>8</sup>

The procedure for the enactment of these contempt citations was almost as controversial as their use. The committee in charge elevated a contempt resolution based on a report elaborated to the House of Representatives, and after this report the House voted on whether to adopt the resolution or not. If the resolution passed, then the Attorney General was in charge of prosecuting the accused individual. The problem was that most of the hearings from which the report was made were conducted in executive sessions by the committee in charge; thus the full House had to vote based on the information given by the committee acting as the prosecuting party and without any other information available.<sup>9</sup>

With objectives as broad and subjective as 'un-Americanism' and subversion, and with dubious legal methods which were upheld by the lower courts and ignored by the Supreme Court when challenged, HUAC enjoyed great latitude to prosecute communism and other perceived social evils.<sup>10</sup> It is clear that the liberty of action enjoyed by committees such as HUAC was encouraged by the perceived threats of the times, since added to the cases of internal espionage including Hiss, Fuchs and the Rosenbergs was the possibility that the Soviet Union could acquire the hydrogen bomb first, or even more frightening, a communist China. Whereas China becoming communist and engaging in pacts of mutual collaboration with the Soviet Union discredited Truman's containment policy, the possible Soviet development of the hydrogen bomb threatened the security of the nation and its citizens. The environment of fear that the hydrogen bomb created was reflected in statements by Albert Einstein declaring that total annihilation was possible, and the famous 1951

---

<sup>7</sup> Prior to this, congressional committees were used for the control of corruption in the executive organs of the government and no enforcement powers were previewed in the Constitution for them. For further reference see Beck, *Contempt of Congress*, 3-5.

<sup>8</sup> Beck, *Contempt of Congress*, 17-18.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 13, 37.

Civil Defense educational film shown to school children about “ducking” and “covering” in case the bomb exploded.<sup>11</sup>

This environment of fear helped generate enormous power for anyone who was willing to take up the anti-communist cause, as the legal infrastructure to prosecute subversives was already laid out, and a scared population would give such crusader enough political support. Joseph McCarthy proved to be one able to exploit this environment to his advantage, and as it is known he was able to use this power against alleged communists. Nevertheless the question that has not been conclusively answered hitherto is whether the senator also used this power to prosecute other groups, such as homosexuals, and whether he would have been able to do so. The answers to these questions greatly depend on how people viewed homosexuality during these years, and how acceptable could have been to prosecute homosexuals; these points are ultimately what the next sections of this research will address.

***Homosexuality in the Postwar Years.*** The postwar years were a time of profound changes for homosexuals in the United States. Gay communities had been visible earlier in the century in cities such as New York, where “pansy shows” hosted by drag queens were the rage of the late twenties’ speakeasies. However the lifting of Prohibition in the early thirties did away with the underworld nightlife in which the gay subculture thrived, and the establishment of liquor licenses for bars gave authorities the power to subject the issuance of licenses to conditions that they stipulated for them. Within this context authorities pressured bars to prohibit entrance to homosexuals, as part of an agenda to “clean up” the city. Furthermore, the onset of the Great Depression also brought about a masculinization of society, as the adult male breadwinners were losing their jobs, and their sense of masculinity.<sup>12</sup> Partly as a consequence of these developments, representations of homosexuality began to be banned in all public spheres, with the Motion Picture Association censoring all depictions of “lewdness” and “obscenity” in its 1934 code.<sup>13</sup> This growing marginalization of homosexuals did not arrive without its ills, since the lack of visibility of gay people helped spur all kinds of myths referring to their

---

<sup>11</sup> “The Texts of the Agreements Concluded Between the Soviet Union and Communist China,” *New York Times*, February 15, 1950, 11; “Einstein Sees Bid To ‘Annihilation’ In Hydrogen Bomb,” *New York Times*, February 13, 1950, 1; video “Duck and Cover 1951 Civil Defense Film With Bert the Turtle” accessed online on November 20, 2009 at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IKqXu-5jw60>.

<sup>12</sup> George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Makings of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), 353-58.

<sup>13</sup> John D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 19.

condition. By the forties, psychologists considered homosexuals mentally unstable and sexually immature, and in the sensationalist stories in the press they were depicted as dangerous to their society.<sup>14</sup>

The progression toward the marginalization of homosexuals was interrupted during World War II, when many gays and lesbians found a relatively 'freer' environment for their desires in the military. Although the military had a policy for not allowing gays and lesbians to serve, it became a policy difficult to enforce for various reasons. The psychological screening examinations of the draftees were designed to detect character deficiencies, however they rested on stereotypical assumptions of what a homosexual was like. This had the result that only those "visibly" effeminate men and masculine women were weeded out, allowing for a majority of the homosexual population to be drafted undetected. Once inside, the demands of the war made it even more difficult to discharge a combatant in the middle of an assignment. Moreover the strict segregation of the sexes, laxity of moral constraints due to the circumstances of the battles, and deep emotional bonds among troops enabled homosexuals to express themselves, with their heterosexual mates looking the other way or even experimenting in some cases.<sup>15</sup>

Another element that spurred the visibility of homosexuals at this time was the role of scientists in their search of knowledge on topics virtually untouched before. One of these pioneers was zoologist Alfred Kinsey, who during twenty eight years compiled data gathered from more than ten thousand extensive interviews on the sexual behavior of men and women. His first book *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* was published in 1948, and was followed by *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* in 1953. Kinsey's first volume was a success beyond the most optimistic previous expectations, and the zoologist and sexologist quickly became a household name associated with sex.<sup>16</sup>

Kinsey's report contained many controversial 'discoveries' about the sexual behavior of the American population, but possibly none surpassed the revelation that *more than one third* (my emphasis) of the adult male population had had at least one homosexual encounter in their lives.<sup>17</sup> As a consequence of

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 16; Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 81<sup>st</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., 1950, S. Doc. 241, p.3; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 359.

<sup>15</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 24-31; a gay novel published in 1950 reflects this aspect of the military as well, narrating the love story of a young officer and his commander of the navy. For further reference see James Barr, *Quatrefoil* (Boston: Alyson Publications, 1950).

<sup>16</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 34.

<sup>17</sup> The precise figure was 37%, and it referred to the number of adult males who had experienced during their adult life at least one orgasm product of a homosexual

these revealing findings, Kinsey proposed a continuum to understand sexual attraction, which encompassed a numerical scale going from exclusive heterosexuality (0) to exclusive homosexuality (6), with gradations in between.<sup>18</sup> Other conclusions of the report contradicted the prevailing views on homosexuality as articulated by psychologists, which explained that it was a mental disease. By showing that a high percentage of the male population engaged in homosexual activity, even when this was repressed by society, Kinsey concluded that homosexuality was as much part of human sexuality as heterosexuality. In reference to this he stated:

In view of the data which we now have on the incidence and frequency of the homosexual, and in particular on its co-existence with the heterosexual in the lives of a considerable portion of the male population, it is difficult to maintain the view that psychosexual reactions between individuals of the same sex are rare and therefore abnormal or unnatural, or that they constitute within themselves evidence of neuroses or even psychoses.<sup>19</sup>

Kinsey received mixed reviews within academic circles, with some giving lavish praises to his book, and others debunking it as sensational. In a book titled *American Sexual Behavior and The Kinsey Report*, the authors referred to the sexologist as having “done for sex what Columbus did for geography.”<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless the same authors indicated that psychologists were not too pleased by the scientist's findings, arguing that that the commonality of homosexual behavior did not make homosexuality normal.<sup>21</sup> Although Kinsey's report was a commercial success, a number of people criticized the sexologist for the perceived immorality of his conclusions, and many of the scientist's findings were misinterpreted to fit the societal's understandings of sexuality, particularly those having to do with homosexuality.<sup>22</sup>

encounter, be this anal or oral penetration, or mutual masturbation. For further reference see Alfred Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1948), 623.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 617, 637.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 659.

<sup>20</sup> Morris L. Ernst & David Loth, *American Sexual Behavior and The Kinsey Report* (New York: Educational Book Co., 1948), 11.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 180-82.

<sup>22</sup> D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 36; David Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 88-89.

Psychology maintained its privileged position in being the science that explained abnormal sexuality, and according to psychologists the “sexual deviance” of the homosexual not only influenced his sex life, but also his other behaviors. Accordingly the homosexual was not only a sex pervert but also a wholly mentally dysfunctional person. This view of the “sick” homosexual was a shift from the notion that homosexuality was just an immoral behavior that anyone could engage in, and by the mid fifties laws began reflecting this shift by prescribing psychological treatment in sentences to gay people.<sup>23</sup>

Within the political context of the red scare, Kinsey’s findings gave to the people and authorities the understanding that there were more homosexuals than assumed, which led to an intensification of efforts aimed at finding and arresting them. By this time, the former characterization of all gay males as gender deviants had changed, and works like the Kinsey report demonstrated that there were masculine homosexuals just as there were feminine lesbians.<sup>24</sup> Anyone could be a homosexual, just as anyone could be a communist; thus appearances no longer applied as the bases of identification. The charged environment of fear and hysteria of the Cold War was turned towards same sex oriented people, and the government began to take action. As a result of this the police augmented its persecution of homosexuals and the government began to impose, strengthen or in some cases just enforce previous rules dealing with the employment of homosexuals in government jobs.<sup>25</sup>

**Security Risks.** Another unintended consequence of the Kinsey report might have been the need that the government saw in addressing homosexuality, although not in the way the scientist had hoped for. According to Kinsey the commission of the homosexual act had to be de-penalized, due to the vast number of people who practiced it. He recommended judges who considered a homosexual case to “keep in mind that nearly 40 percent of all the other males in the town could be arrested at some time in their lives for similar activity.”<sup>26</sup>

The government’s response to the homosexual threat was seen two years after the publication of Kinsey’s study, in the congressional report titled “Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government,” produced by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This report was aimed at recommending certain measures with the purpose of

---

<sup>23</sup> D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 16; Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 359; Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999), 60.

<sup>24</sup> Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 54, 88-89; Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior*, 615.

<sup>25</sup> Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 360; D’Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 41-44; Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 4-5.

<sup>26</sup> Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior*, 664.



weeding out any 'sexual undesirables' from government positions. It was a senate subcommittee on investigations within the aforementioned committee which carried out the pertinent hearings held in executive session. Although Joseph McCarthy was part of the main committee, he chose not to form part of the hearings by *recusing* himself (my emphasis). The *New York Times* reported that the senator from Wisconsin "bowed out of the inquiry to avoid being in a position of judging his own accusations,"-which knowing the senator it is hard to believe- and that Republican senator from Kansas Andrew F. Schoepel was going to take McCarthy's place on the panel.<sup>27</sup> The chairmanship of the investigative committee fell on Senator Clyde R. Hoey of North Carolina, who was not particularly thrilled with the honor.<sup>28</sup> The conclusions of this report were very influential in the way authorities viewed homosexuality thenceforth, as the later interrogations of homosexuals by McCarthy will show.

For its inquiries, the committee relied on the definitions and concepts of homosexuality stated by the times' "eminent physicians and psychiatrists, who are recognized authorities on this subject."<sup>29</sup> From the testimony of these specialists, the report established as standard definitions sex perverts as "those who engage in unnatural sexual acts," and homosexuals as those "perverts who may be broadly defined as persons of either sex who as adults engage in sexual activities with persons of the same sex." The report also marked an agreement among the specialists interviewed in that homosexuality was brought about by "psychological rather than physical causes." The report also categorized two types of homosexuals, the latent and the overt. A latent homosexual was defined as someone who consciously or not had homosexual tendencies but did not practice them; however the overt homosexuals were those who acted on their desires, and they were to be the focus of the committee. The task was difficult since "contrary to a common belief, all homosexual males do not have feminine mannerisms, nor do all female homosexuals display masculine characteristics."

The committee asserted that according to the authorities on the matter "most sex deviates respond to psychiatric treatment and can be cured if they have a genuine desire to be cured," therefore:

---

<sup>27</sup> "Pervert Inquiry Ordered," *New York Times*, June 15, 1950, 6.

<sup>28</sup> Senator Hoey was an elder Southern gentleman who was not used to discussing matters like these; his lack of knowledge on the matter was evident, as it showed when he allegedly asked chief counselor Flanagan in private about lesbians "can you please tell me, what can two women possibly do?," as cited in David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 102-3.

<sup>29</sup> The following quotes are derived from Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts in Government*, 81<sup>st</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., 1950, S. Doc. 241, pp. 2-5.

The subcommittee sincerely believes that persons afflicted with sexual desires which result in the engaging in overt acts of perversion should be considered as proper cases for medical and psychiatric treatment. However, sex perverts, like all other persons who by their overt acts violate moral codes and laws and the accepted standards of conduct, must be treated as transgressors and dealt with accordingly.<sup>30</sup>

As it can be read, the above recommendation seemed contradictory of itself, since although it proposed psychological treatment for the “afflicted” people, it also recommended a proper punishment by the law for “sex perverts.” It almost seems to make an implicit distinction between “persons afflicted with sexual desires” resulting in acts of perversion, and sex perverts; however it falls short from such distinction, since it concludes by stating that all violators should be punished. It follows from the language that homosexuals who were caught in sexual acts needed to be both treated and punished; an outcome that became standard in the statutes of states like Kansas during the fifties and sixties.<sup>31</sup>

Particularly on the matter that the committee was set to deal with, which was the employment of homosexuals in government positions, three main reasons were given that justified the unsuitability of these individuals. The first reason was that homosexuals constituted *security risks*, since the social stigma of their sin provided a fertile ground for foreign spies to exploit, and get secrets from the government. As an example of this, the committee mentioned the case of Captain Raedl, who was “chief of the Austrian counterintelligence service in 1912.” He allegedly gave the Russians military secrets after they discovered that he was a homosexual and blackmailed him. Accordingly he had also destroyed information on the Russians, causing the misinformation of both German and Austrian commands as to the Russian military plans when the Great War started.<sup>32</sup> Senator McCarthy made use of this example during one

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> *General Statutes of Kansas (Annotated)*, sec. 21-907 (Corrick 1949); indication of a 1955 supplement, sections 62-1534, 35, 36, and 37 with provisions for psychological treatment is given in the sentencing of *Kansas v. Gardner*, Sedgwick Co. A-69036 (1957).

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 5; this was in fact the only concrete example that the senate committee could find on homosexuals as security risks (although it also mentioned vaguely alleged cases in Nazi Germany), and closer scrutiny shows that parts of Captain Redl's story were fabricated and that the blackmail was motivated by greed more than by the need to get military secrets, for more information refer to David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 108-9.

executive hearing of the committee he chaired, concerning one of the few cases he had dealing with homosexuality.<sup>33</sup>

The second reason given was homosexuals' "lack of emotional stability" and "weakness of their moral fiber," which also made them a security risk since they were more "susceptible to the blandishments of the foreign espionage agent."<sup>34</sup> Homosexuals were not believed to be strong enough to sustain an interrogation, and according to the committee they could not be trusted to keep secrets, as they liked to talk about themselves. Of the three reasons given, this was the most directly related to the assumed intrinsic maladies of the homosexual, since the other two had more to do with their reactions to societal pressures. It also spoke to the general unsuitability that gays and lesbians presented, stereotypically considered the same as drunkards and other criminals.

Lastly the third motive that validated the rejection and expulsion of homosexuals from government positions was a belief that they had a tendency to gather among themselves others 'like them.' This belief spoke to both their assumed unsuitability and the potential danger that they constituted for American security. The committee thought that as a general rule homosexuals hired other homosexuals; but even when they could not do so they were still able to spread their "corrosive influence" to otherwise normal workers. Regarding this point the report expressed:

It is particularly important that the thousands of young men and women who are brought into Federal jobs not be subjected to that type of influence while in the service of the Government. *One homosexual can pollute a Government office* (my emphasis).<sup>35</sup>

After having dealt extensively over why homosexuals were not to be desired for government jobs; the committee recommended enforcing the "regulations of the Civil Service Commission," which had always denied appointment to "criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful conduct." Regarding homosexuals who were already working for the government, the committee recommended to initiate the process for firing them immediately.

---

<sup>33</sup> Senate Committee on Government Operations, *File Destruction in Department of State: Hearings on*, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953, 422.

<sup>34</sup> The following quotes are from Senate, *Employment of Homosexuals*, 5-12.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

Because it was considered difficult to identify homosexuality in individuals by mere sight, the committee recommended to make available to the Civil Service Commission information that the FBI and other police agencies had, concerning the arrests of individuals on soliciting or public indecency charges. This recommendation led to the proposition that a full screening, including fingerprinting, be conducted before any individual was appointed to a government position. In the case of those who already worked for the government, the committee recommended the enforcement of existing Civil Service Commission regulations, which were interpreted to ban homosexuals. There seemed to be a relative connivance of employed personnel with their homosexual coworkers, which the committee identified as the principal obstacle for the enforcement of its policies. Once the resignation or expulsion of the homosexual worker materialized, the committee advised to cite the real reasons of the removal in the employee's file, which was to be kept in a centralized archive under the Civil Service Commission. Before any action was taken, the accused person had the right to appeal and present his defense. Stemming from this procedure, the committee saw it as necessary to gather evidence in the shape of psychological examinations and arrest records, before beginning any process of removal.

This report was to govern the handling of homosexuality cases in the McCarthy hearings. The revelation that homosexual people could not always be identified by their appearance evoked the dangers of the other invisible enemy, the communist, while allowing McCarthy to aim for homosexuality when the communism of a person could not be proved. Moreover by incorporating homosexuals in the Cold War lexicon as security risks, all types of civil right violations against them were justified since the potential dangers of letting homosexuals get away were perceived to be greater. Unlike previous decades, discrete homosexuals could no longer hide under their culture's oblivion; they were now studied, analyzed, looked for, and punished.

In any event, the congressional report on homosexuals was not but the legislative culmination of actions taken by the government to rid the capital of homosexuals from years before. The State Department, at the Senate Appropriations Committee's behest, was laying off homosexuals ever since 1947 under the label of security risks. This purge was executed slowly but steadily, and without much fanfare.<sup>36</sup> On February 28, 1950 the deputy Undersecretary of State John Peurifoy revealed to the Senate that 91 homosexuals had been fired from the State Department, to the astonishment of many in the congressional body. By this time, the State Department was already hard pressed from the accusations of a senator from Wisconsin, who charged

---

<sup>36</sup> David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 21.

the department with harboring communists.<sup>37</sup> The accusing senator was Joseph McCarthy, and his charges began a more intense phase of the red scare which came to be identified with the senator's name; the years of McCarthyism had begun.

***McCarthy and the Senate Committee on Government Operations.***

From being an obscure senator from Wisconsin who had been voted the worst in the Senate, McCarthy became one of the most popular political figures of the early fifties, and a name found in every American history textbook ever since.<sup>38</sup> The turning point occurred at Wheeling, West Virginia. On February 9, 1950 the senator from Wisconsin gave a speech which came to pass to the annals of history as the beginning of McCarthyism.<sup>39</sup> Speaking to the Ohio Valley Women's Republican Club, McCarthy stated:

I have here in my hand a list of 205—a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working for and shaping policy in the State Department.<sup>40</sup>

Although the publication of the speech by the *Wheeling Intelligencer* did not gain traction at first, within a few days the State Department was asking McCarthy for the names of the accused, and news spread around the country.<sup>41</sup> Thenceforth McCarthy became the face of the anti-communist crusade. In the same year, General Dwight Eisenhower was elected the first Republican president in twenty years, and the Republicans gave McCarthy the chairmanship of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from the Committee on Government Operations. According to Roy Cohn, McCarthy's chief counsel in

<sup>37</sup> John Peurifoy's revelations before the senate were made under the context of McCarthy's previous accusations. The deputy Undersecretary had denied McCarthy's charges, but he had also revealed that the department had gotten rid of 202 security risks; eventually the State Department's officer clarified what the term meant and how many of these fired employees were homosexuals. For further reference see David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 16-17.

<sup>38</sup> Adams, *Without Precedent*, 20.

<sup>39</sup> The term McCarthyism was coined by a cartoonist from the Washington Post named Herbert Block (Herblock), who had made a drawing of an elephant representing the GOP being led towards standing on a tall pile of buckets of tar, with a barrel on top labeled McCarthyism. Adams, *Without Precedent*, 62; Johnson, *Age of Anxiety*, pictures.

<sup>40</sup> Arthur Herman, *Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator* (New York: The Free Press, 2000), 99.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*; "McCarthy Insists Truman Ousts Reds," *New York Times*, February 12, 1950, 5.

the committee, McCarthy saw the position given to him as a way to divert him from his public crusade on communism, but the senator from Wisconsin would have none of it. He told the lawyer:

I fought this Red issue. I won the primary on it, I won the election on it, and I don't see anyone else around who intends to take it on. You can be sure that as chairman of this committee this is going to be my work.<sup>42</sup>

As later developments attested, this indeed became McCarthy's work. Although the senator did not begin the red scare-neither did he end it- he concentrated the efforts around his figure towards eradicating 'un-American' activities from the United States. By the time McCarthy assumed his chairmanship at the committee on government investigations in 1953, all of the stars were aligned in his favor. The senator counted with unprecedented power stemming from the general public's fear and McCarthy's own personal charisma. Furthermore as chairman of the subcommittee on investigations the senator enjoyed wide latitude to subpoena whom he wanted, and issue contempt and public hearing citations as he saw fit. The senator's abrasive personality and despotic methods alienated the other members of his committee to a point in which many stopped appearing altogether, making his committee a trial of one.<sup>43</sup> It seemed at this point that the senator would have been able to persecute any group that was already out of favor with the public, and homosexuals happened to be a group that was not only disliked, but was also being prosecuted by the authorities, and considered dangerous for the security of the nation.

Upon becoming chair of both the Subcommittee on Investigations and the Committee on Government Operations, the senator gave his position a new role description. The committee which previously focused on investigating waste and inefficiency in the executive branch of the government became aimed at discovering and rooting out subversion. In the two years it functioned between 1953 and 1954, more than three hundred witnesses were called upon to testify in executive session, and little more than two hundred at the public hearings.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Roy Cohn, *McCarthy* (New York: The New American Library, 1968), 46.

<sup>43</sup> John Adams, *Without Precedent*, 36-38.

<sup>44</sup> Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Executive Sessions of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations*, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953-1954. Vol. 1, Introduction, xiii.

There were no cases from the twenty-five heard in executive session that dealt directly with the discovery and prosecution of homosexuality. Nevertheless, the question of homosexual people working in the government did arise in some unrelated situations, and there was one case in which a witness was subpoenaed with the committee having prior knowledge of his homosexuality. When the mere surfacing of the subject of homosexuality is considered, it can be established that there were only three cases that addressed the matter.<sup>45</sup> Ironically the one event in which homosexuality should have been the main issue discussed, was one in which the subject remained fairly mute; by this I am referring to the Army-McCarthy hearings.<sup>46</sup> The first of the cases where the subject of homosexuality surfaced was one dealing with the State Department's filing system; which I will refer to as the case of the "missing" files.

*The case of the "missing" files* dealt with the disappearance of derogatory material from personnel files of the State Department. At the time of the investigation, the Foreign Service Department was undergoing some filing reforms of which no written order was previously given. The area implementing these reforms was the Performance Measuring Branch (PMB), a relatively new organ in charge of preparing personnel records and selecting panels that decided on the promotion of personnel.<sup>47</sup>

The formal protocol of the department indicated that derogatory information on workers could not be added to the files that the panels received

<sup>45</sup> Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Executive Sessions of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations*, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953-1954.

<sup>46</sup> The subject was mentioned very briefly in relation to a CIA high ranking officer named Matthew Baird, however the discussion about Baird's homosexuality did not last long. The irony was on the fact that the winning argument for the Army against McCarthy was the senator's attempt to exempt Cohn's chief aide David Schine from military service. Although not known at the time, Cohn was gay and he was allegedly infatuated with Schine, for this reason he named him his aide even when Schine did not have enough qualifications. He tried to get Schine exempted from military service when the latter was drafted. It is possible that this association between McCarthy and other gay people could have been one of the reasons for the senator's "shyness" on the prosecution of homosexuals. For further reference see Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Alleged Threats Against the Chairman*, Vol. 5, 83rd Cong. 1st sess., 1954, pp. 170-71; On Cohn's homosexuality see Nicholas Von Hoffman, *Citizen Cohn* (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 145-47, 188.

<sup>47</sup> Senate Committee on Government Operations, *File Destruction in Department of State*, Vol. 1, 83rd Cong. 1st sess., 1954, 283-319.

for their decisions on promotions. The rationale behind this practice was that PMB was only concerned with the job performance of the personnel, and if there was derogatory information on them it was to be handled by security. Sometimes derogatory information was still being investigated, so by not including that information in the file to be reviewed the worker was protected against unwarranted biases. Nevertheless before any applicant was hired or any officer or staff member promoted, their files were checked a last time with security and according to the results of the investigations carried hitherto, security either blocked or confirmed the applicant.

Since derogatory information was sometimes included in the main file of workers, PMB removed the derogatory material from the file before it prepared it for the promotion panel, and it kept this information in its own area until the panel was through with it. This practice created confusion for the secretary of the area where the files were being pulled from, and so the case was brought to McCarthy's committee. While the derogatory information in question was mostly related to a worker's poor performance or some other dubious conduct, in the course of the investigation it became obvious that some of these files had material on workers' alleged homosexuality.

McCarthy was interested in the removal of anyone who was a homosexual from government positions, and this could be clearly observed in a statement he made in relation to an alleged homosexual who had been fired. The senator stated:

We will not make the names of any of the perverts public, unless I am outvoted by the committee, but I would like to have that name. I may say, one of the reasons for it is that one of the men from the American Legion Americanism Committee returned from Europe and indicated that apparently a sizable number of the perverts who had lost their jobs in the State Department had shown up in Paris in jobs that paid better, with living conditions better than they are here. So, at some time, it will be necessary for us to get the names of all the four hundred-some homosexuals who were removed from the State Department and find out if they are in other government positions where they may be giving this government a bad name and bad security risks abroad.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Senate Committee on Government Operations, *File Destruction in Department of State: Hearings on*, Vol.1, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953, 166.



The name of that particular employee McCarthy was interested in finding was Thomas Hicock, and it was indicated that he had committed suicide only a week after having been fired.<sup>49</sup>

One obstacle for the Senator in any eventual search for homosexuals was an executive order issued by President Truman to the Secretary of State in April 1952, which stated that no information from the loyalty and security files of the State Department could be divulged to a congressional committee. This order applied exclusively to employees who were working at the State Department at the time of the hearings. Personnel who testified before McCarthy were previously given a letter referring to this Presidential order at their department as a reminder, and this proved to be something the senator could not circumvent.<sup>50</sup>

Nevertheless the senator did show interest in making sure that homosexuals who had already been fired or were allowed to resign were not readmitted. The process for dismissing a homosexual was convoluted, since after there was an allegation the accused person could either resign or appeal and face the charges with the possibility of being dismissed. If the accused person resigned, a letter was kept in the file of the department which did not state the specific reason for the departure, since the allegations at that point were not proven. This bureaucratic knot was what McCarthy was referring to in his aforementioned statement, and under these circumstances the senator asked for a list of all former personnel from the State Department, who were allowed to resign under allegations of homosexuality.<sup>51</sup>

The senator's opinion was that derogatory information, such as homosexuality, should always be included in as many files as possible, even if this was just alleged, showing that in his worldview anyone was guilty until proven the contrary. The senator asked about the practice of not keeping alleged homosexuality in files to a chief of section of the officer personnel named Vladimir Toumanoff:

Why did you, in your department, think that you should keep the homosexuality of an individual from the promotion board? On what possible theory would you want to hide the fact that this man was a homo?<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 284.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 166, 308.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 273.

The logic behind this practice had to do with the fact that allegations did not constitute sufficient evidence for the crime with which the employee was accused; as well as the departmental procedure of keeping that information outside of the reach of the board members deciding on promotion.

Although this information may seem to give evidence to the hypothesis that McCarthy made it a priority to root out homosexuals from the government, the context indicates otherwise. There was not a single witness in this case having been subpoenaed because of his or her homosexuality, and there were no efforts to find out if there were homosexuals among the current workers. One possibility for this was the fact that the senator was impeded from asking about particulars on existing employees, stemming from Truman's order. If the case is taken as a whole, it becomes clear that the senator was more interested in reforming the filing system than in finding homosexuals. McCarthy appeared repeatedly frustrated with the filing system throughout the hearings, and he always cited as his reason for having the hearings—whether this was true or not—the need to enact legislation reforming the way employees' files were kept. The reform proposed by McCarthy could indeed serve to root out homosexuals, but it also served to keep a watch on subversives whom were clearly the object of the senator's fancy.

The ultimate proof of what really interested McCarthy from this case was to be found in the subsequent public hearings that followed the aforementioned case. The testimony of Mr. Toumanoff revealed that there were questions pertaining to his background, since Toumanoff had Russian parents, and was born in a Russian Embassy in Turkey in 1923. The testimony of the State Department employee was brought to public hearings in hope that he turned out to be a communist, showing that even in a case potentially dealing with homosexuality, loyalty remained the only focus of the committee.<sup>53</sup> The second case dealing with homosexuality was the only case in which a known homosexual was subpoenaed, and it dealt with United States' exports to Austria, which were suspected of being deviated to the Soviet zone.

***Deviation of Exports to the Soviet Union.*** In the case that involved the organization in charge of executing the Marshall Plan in Europe, the Economic Corporation Administration, could be seen the only known homosexual to be called by McCarthy's committee. This was a case that entailed an alleged violation of export control statutes, having to do with the shipment of “equipment” or “material” by the ECA from the United States to Austria; this “material” was found in similar quantities on the Soviet occupied part of the European country. The deviation had occurred between 1948 and 1949, and an internal investigation was just beginning to be conducted when a

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., (editor's note), 143.

gentleman by the name of Eric Kohler resigned. Kohler was comptroller of the ECA at the time, and was not even suspected by McCarthy's committee of being responsible for ordering the shipment; the reason why he was called upon was no other than the fact that the committee knew about his homosexuality. Influenced by the previous senate report on homosexuals, McCarthy thought that Kohler, being a homosexual, was not going to be able to withstand the interrogations. The senator thought that if Kohler had any knowledge on possible subversion within his former department, he was going to spill it.<sup>54</sup>

McCarthy began the interrogation by making it known to the witness that he had "material" reflecting on his "morals," but that he was not interested on it "except insofar as it might result in a security risk," since it entered into "the question of being able to blackmail a man because of something he has done in the past."

The interrogation rapidly progressed toward Kohler's background and the government positions that he had held in his past. It was revealed that at the time of the interrogation Kohler was working for the Panama Canal Company as a consultant. He had also worked as a comptroller for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and had set up an accounting system for the ECA. It was so successful it was beginning to be used by other government agencies as well.

Starting from the assumption that homosexuals recruited other homosexuals, the committee repeatedly questioned the recommendations and promotions given to, or being given by Kohler. It became clear that not much could be gathered from the witness on the deviation of exports to Soviet Austria, since he was just an accountant, so uncovering other homosexuals working for the government became the committee's plan B. The grilling began with no other than chief council Roy Cohn, who was himself a homosexual:

Mr. Cohn: Let me ask you this, Mr. Kohler. You are a homosexual, are you not?

Mr. Kohler: Well, that has been stated. I think that is the conclusion of counsel, yes.

Mr. Cohn: Well, sir, I put it in the form of a question. Are you a homosexual?

Mr. Kohler: Well, compared with the people that they describe to me, I am not. But I am perfectly willing to admit that I am for the purposes of your private record here.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> This and the following references can be found in Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Violation of Export Control Statutes: Hearings on*, Vol.1, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1953, 411-27, 470.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 421.

In an intervention of this back and forth, McCarthy gave an extensive explanation of his position towards homosexuals. Here it is clearly seen that McCarthy's issue with gay people was linked to the threat that Soviet espionage posed for the American national security. He stated:

The only reason we are concerned with this, or the principal reason, is because it appears to make a man a bad security risk.

After citing the example of the Austrian officer he added:

It is an extremely touchy subject; and also I am no psychiatrist or psychologist but I understand that there is considerable interdependence among people who have that particular affliction, if we can call it that, and that they do recruit, often, people of the same difficulty to work with them. So it is of interest to know who you have got in the government, whether you have got anyone else with the same difficulty in the government, whether they are still there, and for that reason I was giving counsel some latitude in his questioning.<sup>56</sup>

The latitude he gave to counsel was seized upon and taken advantage of in its entirety. Quickly after McCarthy's washing of hands, Roy Cohn presented to Kohler a letter in which he described a man with whom the witness had had sex, named Bill. Bill had in fact gone to work for the government years later in a position given to him by Mr. Kohler.

A very interesting exchange between Cohn and Kohler followed in regard to the proper definition of a homosexual. Moments before the exchange, the witness was asked a question regarding whether he knew any homosexual who had ever worked for the government; a trap laid out by Cohn. After Kohler answered in the negative he was shown the letter in which he mentioned Bill, to which the witness replied that he did not believe Bill that was a homosexual. Kohler stated that Bill had a wife and kids, and the fact that he had had sex with him did not make him a homosexual, causing the astonishment of the chief counsel.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 422.

<sup>57</sup> Although a rushed defense in a compromised situation, this answer also illustrates the shift that was going on at the time in the conceptualization of the homosexual; whereas in an earlier part of the century heterosexual people could engage in homosexual acts without seeing this as a threat to their sexuality, by Cohn's time a homosexual was

After Bill was identified other questions followed regarding Kohler's associations with other government workers, with no results coming out of the witness' mouth. In order to put more pressure on the witness, the chief counsel produced a second letter, this time narrating a relationship between Kohler, and a sixteen year old boy named Jack Richards to a correspondent named Alex.<sup>58</sup>

What is significant about this letter is the extents to which the attorneys Cohn and Surine went to humiliate the witness in order to put pressure on him. Jack Richards was killed in a car accident only one year before the hearing, and it was clear that there was an emotional bond between himself and Kohler. Right after the mention of this letter McCarthy jumped in to ask one more time about the shipment of material to Austria, of which the witness still had no contributions.

A final push was given by assistant counsel Surine, who tried to compromise Kohler's credibility in order to make him talk. Kohler had testified that he had not had sexual relations with Jack Richards, and after this Surine began to read the letter in question:

Jack came over tonight while I was in the middle of a shower. The bathroom was like a steam room (it was chilly outside) and so he insisted on taking his clothes off and joining me under the shower, pretending he was chilled through and needed to be warmed up. It turned out he'd just taken a bath at home before coming over and, furthermore, his hands and feet were warm; but he wasn't bothered by excuses. He never is. His final reason was, and that one I couldn't shake because it was somewhere near the truth, that he couldn't stand it being outside with me inside, and besides he couldn't trust me in there by myself. I needed protection, apparently, from myself. This isn't the first time he's fathered me.<sup>59</sup>

Kohler still denied that he had ever had sex with Jack, and stated that the letter did not prove that. He was astonished and at one point he asked, "I wonder if all of this detail has to be read. I think it is terrible."

Further questions dealt with Kohler's life as a homosexual, and the information contained in his letters that referred to his 'cruising' the public parks and Times Square in New York, as well as his relationships with "fairies"

---

anyone who had ever had sex with someone of the same sex. This shift is developed in more detail in Chauncey's *Gay New York*, 21.

<sup>58</sup> The following quotes can be found in Senate Committee, *Violation of Export*, 429-50.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 436-7.

and “queers.”<sup>60</sup> Later in his testimony Kohler declared that these letters were an exercise of his imagination, which he did as a literary practice to release the stresses of his demanding work. After this one testimony Kohler was released and his hearing was not made public.

Although the methods used to question the witness were cruel, Kohler's case proves once again that McCarthy's committee was not all that 'obsessed' with homosexuals. The main goal of the questioning was to soften Kohler so that he could spill his secrets on the misappropriation of the Austrian exports. It is true that the witness was asked about other government employees being homosexuals, but it is difficult to assess how much of this was aimed at rooting out 'sexual deviants' and how much was used for the purpose of breaking the witness. The fact is that Cohn and Surnine could not get any names other than Bill, and they did not follow up on acquiring names even when it became obvious that the witness was lying. Kohler was not called for contempt when he could have been, and the case for which he was subpoenaed followed long after the witness was released from having to testify, showing that indeed Kohler's 'literary exercise' defense proved enough to satisfy McCarthy. Furthermore, Kohler did not seem to have been bothered again. Haynes Johnson stated that Kohler's identity as a homosexual was never revealed, and he was able to live a discrete life serving as a trustee at Chicago's Roosevelt University. His colleagues at the university as well as many other acquaintances only learned about his sexual orientation after the records of McCarthy's committee were made public in 2003.<sup>61</sup>

As in the case of the missing files, McCarthy's committee showed what it was really looking for when it asked Kohler about a comment he made in his youth concerning the “Russian idea.” The committee suggested that Kohler had shown sympathy to Soviet consumer practices. The discussion about the witness' possible inclinations toward communism preceded and was interposed with the grilling he got for being homosexual. In the same letter displaying the Russian idea, Kohler had also stated that the Russian oligarchy was no more or less greedy than the American Congress or Administration. It is well known how these innocent comments were interpreted by McCarthy's inquisitorial committee; nevertheless the witness was able to explain himself and seemed to

---

<sup>60</sup> This information shows that Kohler was a very typical homosexual of his time, since he frequented the places where gay people discretely gathered and used names that identified gender variations within the gay subcultures, with queers being the masculine homosexual men and fairies the feminine. For a further discussion of this refer to Chauncey, *Gay New York*, 15-16.

<sup>61</sup> Johnson, *Age of Anxiety*, 329.

have been taken at his word.<sup>62</sup> Another interesting fact about McCarthy's team was that it was not always to identify gay people well, and Dimitry Varley's case was an example of this. Varley's was the last of the cases dealing with homosexuality.

***Communist Infiltration in the U.N.*** Within the context of a perceived communist association of many United Nations' employees, McCarthy's committee cited Dimitry Varley, who was a senior officer for the Department of Economic Affairs. Varley's hearing was typical of most witnesses who underwent McCarthy's chamber; he was suspected of communism stemming from his previous membership in organizations labeled as subversive by the Attorney General. The list of Varley's 'sins' exhibited an association with someone who worked for the *Daily Worker*, a contribution made to the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, a membership to the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, as well one to the Labor Party, and a previous subscription to *In Fact*, which was a communist bulletin.<sup>63</sup>

One thing was unusual about Varley's hearing, and that was the implication made against the witness that he was a homosexual. Although the word homosexual was never said, McCarthy's chief counsel Roy Cohn asked the witness whether he had ever been arrested "on moral charges," in an arrest made in the "men's room" where the witness was found "with another man." Much to the surprise of the committee, Varley denied that such an occurrence ever took place, even under Cohn's threat that he had a police report on it. Apparently Varley had even paid the "other man's fine," a fact that even the witness corroborated.

According to Varley, he was given a fine for loitering. He also explained that the man he paid the fine for could not afford his fine. Varley had never met this other man other than in court, and he only paid his fine as a gesture of charity; thus according to Varley's testimony, Cohn's accusations had been inaccurate. Following his testimony, Varley was threatened with a contempt citation, with McCarthy stating that what the witness was committing "a clear case of perjury." As the hearings continued after a recess, the 'incident in the men's restroom' was not mentioned again, and Cohn proceeded to ask Varley about his other "communist" associations.

Varley's case shows just how incompetent McCarthy and his team were. It became obvious that Cohn had not done his research, and it ended up costing McCarthy the hearing. Dimitry Varley was a high profile functionary at the

---

<sup>62</sup> Senate Committee, *Violation of Export*, 420-28.

<sup>63</sup> This and the following references stem from the Senate Committee on Government Operations, *Security-United Nations: Hearings on*, 83rd Cong., 1st sess., 1849-76.

United Nations, as evidenced by his high wage of \$ 12,000 a year. McCarthy more than likely wanted a high ranking U.N. Functionary for a public hearing. The comments that he made to the press after the executive hearing, as well as his request to the United Nations for Varley's dismissal prove it. The functionary was never cited for a public hearing.<sup>64</sup> This case and the former ones also speak to the connection that existed between communism and homosexuality in McCarthy's mind. About this linkage David Johnson stated that "homosexuality" for the senator "was the psychological maladjustment that led people toward communism." Johnson argues that even though the senator from Wisconsin did not persecute many homosexuals himself, he was still very instrumental in creating the homosexual-communist linkage in the public's mind.<sup>65</sup>

**Conclusions.** The climate of fear and anxiety of the postwar years created a fertile ground for the red and lavender scares to develop. Within this environment a legal infrastructure developed, in which congress expanded the power of its hearings by appropriating judicial powers and circumventing the Constitution. Joseph McCarthy exploited this environment for his own political ascension, which he used to acquire political capital. It is widely known that McCarthy used most of his power for the persecution of communists; however it has not always been clear if the senator used his power to attack homosexuals.

The lavender scare was not started by McCarthy, rather it developed out of the mixture of long held stereotypes towards homosexuals, the political climate of the first years of the Cold War, and the greater awareness of the existence of gays and lesbians. As it has been stated, the government was concerned with ridding its offices of homosexuals years before McCarthy rose to fame; however, it could be argued that the rise of the senator gave strength to a more acute phase of the lavender scare, in which the government both intensified and became more open in its prosecutions against gays and lesbians. After all, Peurifoy's revelations that encouraged the congressional report on homosexuals, were produced from the officer's denials of McCarthy's communist charges against the State Department. The senator was not silent on the issue of homosexuals, as he was known to have claimed that the State Department was "honeycombed with homosexuals," and that homosexuality could lead to communism.<sup>66</sup>

Nevertheless, being part of the environment that intensified the persecution of homosexuals is not the same as being the one who persecuted homosexuals, and this latter is ultimately the issue. When taking all of the

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., (editor's note), 1833.

<sup>65</sup> David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 16-19.

<sup>66</sup> Hank Greenspun, Where I Stand, *Las Vegas Sun*, October 25, 1952.



contextual factors into consideration it becomes evident that McCarthy could have aimed the committee toward homosexuals, since he had the legal power as chairman of the committee on government operations, and the popular support as an anti-communist crusader. Furthermore gays and lesbians did have the sympathy of the public in general, and homosexuals were already declared to be security risks for the nation. According to David Johnson, McCarthy had been advised by Republican senator Styles Bridges through a speech he gave in McCarthy's home state, to redirect his crusade from communists to other "bad security risks" such as drunkards, criminals and homosexuals, since these were easier to find.<sup>67</sup> Notwithstanding these pressures, a closer scrutiny of the actions of the senator demonstrates that he did not seek out gays and lesbians, as even many gay people from his own time thought he did. The small number of cases in which homosexuality was even mentioned in McCarthy's committee, coupled with the non-existent contempt citations or public hearings given to homosexuals by the senator make his restraint clear. This position is even better illustrated when McCarthy had the chance to participate in a previous congressional committee set to weed out homosexuals from the government, and he chose not to do it by recusing himself from being part of the investigations.

The reasons for the senator's passivity in the lavender scare may be a subject for further research. Nevertheless, rumors about McCarthy's own sexuality as well as facts concerning the homosexuality of his chief counsel Roy Cohn could reasonably be part of the explanation, and accordingly McCarthy's reticence could be seen as a move to avoid a type of 'boomerang' effect.<sup>68</sup> In any event the damage that gay and lesbian people suffered during this time is immeasurable, and clearly the senator was not on the right side of history. Paradoxically at this very same time of opprobrium the first seeds of the gay and lesbian liberation movement were planted, in the birth of the first gay rights' organization named the Mattachine Society.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> David Johnson, *Lavender Scare*, 23.

<sup>68</sup> Referent to these allegations Hank Greenspun stated that "Joe McCarthy is a bachelor of 43 years. He seldom dates girls and if he does, he laughingly describes it as window dressing," as cited from Hank Greenspun, *Where I Stand*, *Las Vegas Sun*, October 25, 1952; Von Hoffman, *Citizen Cohn*, 186, 226, 322, 362-78; David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 3; Herman, *McCarthy*, 14.

<sup>69</sup> David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare*, 13-14; D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 58.

## Preparing for the Future War: The Soviet Military and Industrial Buildup from 1924 to 1933

Harvey D. Munshaw

On January 21, 1924 V. I. Lenin, leader of the *Bolshevik* revolution and founder of the Soviet state, died of a cerebral hemorrhage. During the next three years Joseph Stalin consolidated his power over the Soviet state. In 1927 he began preparing the Soviet Union to wage an aggressive war aimed at the heart of Europe, in order to advance Marx's prophesied world proletarian revolution. To achieve this, Stalin's government began the buildup of a massive military industrial infrastructure capable of producing vast quantities of weapons, and other equipment which could support a modern army waging aggressive warfare. To prepare for the anticipated war in Europe, the U.S.S.R. embarked on a revolution in military strategic thought, rapid industrialization, extensive expansion of infrastructure, and widespread economic and industrial espionage. Due to the development of new military theories by Tukhachevsky, Triandafillov and Snitko, as well as its vast expansion of military industrial infrastructure, the Soviet Union was transformed from an agrarian nation incapable of fielding a modern army, into a powerful industrial state capable of waging aggressive warfare.

**Background.** Although the actual buildup of the Red Army began in 1928, its philosophical underpinnings were rooted in the events of the October Revolution of 1917, and the Russo-Polish War of 1920. On November 7, 1917 Lenin led a successful coup to topple the provisional government, which led to the founding of the world's first proletarian state. In the months and years following this coup Lenin's government was forced to engage in a civil war, which it won in early 1920. In 1920 the Polish Army under Marshal Joseph Pilsudski launched an offensive aimed at expansion into the Ukraine, but the Soviet Army led by Trotsky and Tukhachevsky launched a counterattack which drove the Poles back to within ten miles of Warsaw. Although infighting between Trotsky and Stalin ultimately cost the Soviet Union victory over

Poland, Lenin and the other *Bolshevik* leaders believed that they had had a glimpse of the future. The Red Army had nearly succeeded in taking Poland, and in Western Europe various Moscow-led communist groups had launched work stoppages and strikes which crippled France and England's ability to send armaments to Poland. Until Pilsudski turned the Soviets back before Warsaw, delegates to the Second Congress of the Third International in session in Moscow followed with enthusiasm as the Soviet forces advanced. The situation in Western Europe was different; there the Germans saw the Soviet advance with great alarm, fearing that it could happen in their country.<sup>1</sup>

In 1924 Lenin died and a power struggle ensued between Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, and others, resulting on Stalin gaining complete control of the party and the state, with Trotsky exiled and ultimately assassinated, and Zinoviev executed as an enemy of the people. One of the chief contentions in this power struggle was what the future development of the revolution would be. Trotsky and Zinoviev favored revolutions, popular uprisings, and coups inspired by the Soviet model, and accused Stalin of abandoning world revolution. Although Stalin spoke of building socialism in a single state, he had no intentions of forgoing expansionist policies. In his preface to the book *On the Road to October*, Stalin wrote

the victory of socialism in one country is not a self sufficient task. The revolution which has been successful in one country must not regard itself as a self sufficient entity, but as an aid . . . for hastening the victory of the proletariat in all countries. For the victory of the revolution in one country . . . is the . . . beginning . . . and pre condition for the world revolution.<sup>2</sup>

After waging, and ultimately winning the battle for control of the Soviet State, Stalin purged the Communist Party of his opponents and set about transforming the Soviet Union into a modern industrial nation. Many of his critics, especially Trotsky, saw this as proof that he had abandoned world revolution; however in his report to the Seventeenth Party Congress in 1934, Stalin clearly had world revolution on his mind. This could be inferred when he said

some comrades think that, once there is a revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie is bound to get into a hopeless position, that its end is a

---

<sup>1</sup> George F. Kennan, *Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917 – 1941* (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, INC., 1960), 30.

<sup>2</sup> Joseph V. Stalin, *Works*. Vol. 6. 1924 (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1953), 415.

foregone conclusion . . . that is a profound mistake. The victory of the revolution never comes of itself. It must be prepared for and won.<sup>3</sup>

During this plenum, Stalin attempted to portray his program as the construction of a technologically and culturally modern peace loving state; nevertheless Stalin was not able to completely conceal his ambitions of a worldwide revolution, as he prophesied how that the capitalist world would soon be at war, which he felt would ultimately lead to a revolutionary crisis. Even though Stalin implied that the aim of the Soviet foreign policy was to preserve the peace, he made something of a Freudian slip when he said “quite clearly things are headed for a new war.”<sup>4</sup>

***Transformation in Military Thought Leading to Industrialization.***

Stalin was a pragmatist, who realized that global proletarian revolution could not be achieved by the efforts of the militant, but miniscule, communist organizations operating in nations across the world. He felt that the revolution needed a strong military vanguard to advance it, and as such he set about building up an ultra modern military. Stalin was aided in turning his dream of advancing the revolution into reality by three military strategists: Mikhail Tukhachevsky, Vladimir Triandafillov, and Nikolai Snitko. The most important of these was Marshal Mikhail N. Tukhachevsky, Deputy Commissar of Defense and Chief of the General Staff of the Red Army. Tukhachevsky was a *Bolshevik* in his politics, and brilliant in military matters. In 1914 “Tukhachevsky passed out from the Alexandrovsky College as one of the best students in its history” and was commissioned lieutenant in Nicholas II’s army; in 1915 he became a German prisoner of war, and in 1918 he joined the Red Guards during the Russian Civil War.<sup>5</sup> Tukhachevsky first gained prominence during the march on Warsaw in the Russo-Polish War of 1920, when his army marched to within ten miles of Warsaw. Tukhachevsky, like so many other early Red Army commanders, was shaped by this battle. Shortly after the retreat from Warsaw, he declared that “the Communist International should set up a general staff for the executing of the World Revolution.”<sup>6</sup>

Tukhachevsky was a firm believer in revolution at the tip of the bayonet, and this is seen in his study called *The Future War*. This study examined

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Stalin, *The Essential Stalin: Major Theoretical Writings, 1905-1952* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1952), 237.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 232.

<sup>5</sup> Harold Shukman, *Stalin's Generals* (London: Phoenix Press, 1993), 259.

<sup>6</sup> Lennart Samuelson, *Soviet Defense Industry Panning: Tukhachevskii and Military-Industrial Mobilization 1926 - 1937* (Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of East European Studies, 1996), 42.

the vulnerability to revolution of states which were likely to engage the Soviet Union in battle, and it outlined the steps that the Red Army had to take to win the coming clash. *The Future War* hypothesized two scenarios for the next war. In the first scenario the Soviet Union would be attacked by an imperialist power, and in the second “a successful social revolution in a ‘major nation’ would call for an armed intervention by the Red Army.”<sup>7</sup> In 1926, Tukhachevsky commissioned the *Future War* study by issuing orders to several Red Army departments, charging them with researching the strengths and weaknesses of likely enemy states’ coalitions, and with examining the measures needed to guarantee victory in the coming conflict. *Future War* was comprised of six main parts, which covered ideology, enemy demographics, arm requirements, technological aspects of warfare, internal political factors of the states, and a summary of what was discussed before. This 1928 study was aimed at giving rational arguments for massive military investment, and it became the foundation “for the views of the military leadership concerning the economic development required for the new kind of warfare that was expected.”<sup>8</sup> According to Raymond W. Leonard’s *Secret Soldiers of the Revolution*, Tukhachevsky’s study predicted a long war of attrition using tanks, aircraft, machine guns, artillery, and vehicles which caused Soviet authorities to seek to:

set in motion in peacetime the ability to produce military supplies and equipment in quantities greater than those consumed during the world war. . . New weapons and military technologies needed to be researched or ‘acquired,’ tested, manufactured, and liberally distributed to combat units . . . It was necessary to prepare transportation networks . . . to support the massive movement of supplies for continuous operations. All of these tasks were urgent, for the Future War would likely come in a matter of a few years.<sup>9</sup>

The goal was to either “crush” the enemy, or devastate “their material and human resources.” This offensive doctrine was elaborated by Vladimir Triandafillov, and Mikhail Tukhachevsky.

General Vladimir Triandafillov was Chief of Operations and Deputy Chief of the Soviet General Staff. In 1929 Triandafillov wrote *Nature of the Operations of Modern Armies*. In this, the author seemed to focus on the beginning, or the first period of a future war, and the strategies that would be

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 178-9.

<sup>9</sup> Samuelson, *Soviet Defence Industry Planning*, 49.

necessary.<sup>10</sup> Triandafillov's work is divided into two parts. The first part evaluates the development of military equipment following the First World War, possible numerical strength of mobilized armies, and organization. The second part covers operations of modern armies including premises, operations, and successive operations. Triandafillov began by discussing the armament developments following the First World War in western nations, to encourage similar developments within the Soviet Union. He suggested that chemical weaponry, tanks, and aviation were the most crucial weapon developments of the First World War. Triandafillov encouraged the development of chemical weapons because "they promise the most surprises in a future war," and most importantly:

defensive equipment lags behind offensive equipment. Extant filters are applicable only to the toxic agents known today. There are no guarantees against new secret chemical weapons. Moreover, the present state of affairs concerning protective clothing is completely unsatisfactory.

He highly valued the role of tanks, and this is seen when he wrote that:

No one today doubts the great tactical significance of tanks for a future war . . . Suppressive assets (artillery) lag behind defensive assets which promote tanks as one of the mightiest offensive assets for a future war.<sup>11</sup>

He supported tanks because they are fast, well armed, and highly mobile. In a time when airpower theory was being developed by persons such as the American Colonel William Mitchell, British Marshal Arthur Harris, and Italian General Giulio Douhet, Triandafillov called for the development of a modern air force complete with formations of reconnaissance, pursuit, and bomber aircraft.

Triandafillov thought that the quality of an army was going to be more important than its sheer number in troops. The quality was reflected in the possession of modern weaponry and motorization. He stated that "the shock force of these armies manifests itself in a large number of high-speed tanks, motorized artillery, and combat aviation."<sup>12</sup> The mechanization of the

---

<sup>10</sup> V.K. Triandafillov, *The Nature of the Operations of Modern Armies*, (Portland: Frank Cass and Co. LTD, 1994), 7.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 20 - 27.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

armed forces would serve to both strike the “vital centers of the enemy country” and “hurl the enemy back” while seizing its territory.

Triandafillov also envisioned a war involving clashes between million-man armies, predicting the armament of “virtually the entire able-bodied male population,” whom would be called up into the army. He predicted that the U.S.S.R. would win the coming war because the:

Soviet state . . . has every reason to rely upon the broad toiling masses, but the capitalist world must consider the ‘unreliability’ of these masses and undertake mass mobilization with certain circumspection, certain constraints, and additional measures.<sup>13</sup>

The unreliability of the masses in the armies of the capitalist world would lead to problems for the capitalist nations because “primacy in war will go to the side employing high technology and able to field the larger army at the front,” which meant that the capitalist states would have to worry about dissent amongst the members of their large armies and large industrial work forces. The next war was going to require such a great number of ammunition and military equipment that “the entire metallurgical industry of even the most powerful capitalist countries fully mobilize and shift to ‘defense’ work.” This transition of industry to full scale defense buildup signified a reduction of commercial supplies for the civil population, which would cause great stress on the industries. This was likely to result in a revolutionary situation, because dissatisfaction against the capitalist classes would undermine the capitalist states at the front, and in the rear. Triandafillov concluded that the Soviet Union would win the coming conflict because it could arm and fight a total war with the full support of its citizenry, whereas the capitalist world could not.<sup>14</sup>

Tukhachevsky and Triandafillov’s plans for offensive war were supported by the head of *GOSPLAN*’s (State Planning Committee of the U.S.S.R.) Military Division, Nikolai M. Snitko. In March 1930, Snitko wrote a memorandum in which he discussed three likely scenarios of war between the Soviet Union and its capitalist enemies.<sup>15</sup> In the first type of war, the Soviet Union would be attacked by an imperialist power. In the second variant the Soviet Union would ally with one camp of imperialist powers against another camp, and in the third variant:

provided there existed a revolutionary movement in capitalist society and the Soviet Union had a sufficiently solid economic and political

---

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 45- 47.

<sup>15</sup> Samuelson, *Soviet Defence Industry Planning*, 112.

basis, plus the necessary military preparedness (the Red Army would launch 'an armed attack on capitalism.'<sup>16</sup>

Snitko focused mainly on the first variant, which previewed the U.S.S.R. being attacked first. He believed that victory in the coming conflict implied "a total crushing of the enemy's armed forces and state apparatus, and the subsequent transformation of these countries to 'Soviet Republics.'" To enable such an offensive, Snitko called for a great expansion of the Red Army and the Air Force. His plan involved a "maximum effort," in which he argued for a Red Air Force of between 25 to 30,000 airplanes, half of which were attack and light bomber planes, which were supposed to be "in front-line service at the start of the war. Tank requirements in Snitko's scenario were equally shocking as he called for "15000 light and 7000 heavy tanks at mobilization."<sup>17</sup> Snitko's call, along with those of Tukhachevsky and Triandafillov, for a fully mechanized army and powerful air force required full scale industrialization. Therefore, it is not by accident that the five year plans started the same year, 1928, that Tukhachevsky, Triandafillov, and Snitko reported their findings to Stalin.

***The First Five Year Plan*** began in 1928 and lasted until 1933.

Ostensibly, the First Five Year Plan was intended to build a model socialist state; however, the plan was also intended for the "preparation for another world war," with the totality of the industrial buildup "geared to military needs."<sup>18</sup> At a time when the United States, Great Britain, and France were engaged in disarmament and Germany was still six years from launching full scale rearmament, the Soviet Union was building a modern military and the infrastructure with which to support it. The First Five Year Plan was meant to prepare the U.S.S.R. for the type of warfare envisioned by Tukhachevsky, and other leading military strategists, and in terms of output alone it was highly successful. In 1934 the rest of Europe combined had 500 tanks whereas the Soviet Union was manufacturing 170 tanks per year by 1930, and 3,509 tanks per year by 1933.<sup>19</sup> The Soviet Union was also building more combat aircraft than the rest of Europe combined, and one commentator stated in 1935 that the peace loving people of the Soviet Union had more bombers at their disposal than anyone else on the planet. Before the five year plans began, the *NKVM* (People's Commissariat for Military and Naval Affairs) was allocated less than fifteen percent of the annual Soviet budget, but by the conclusion of the First Five Year Plan, the *NKVM* received nearly twenty three percent of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 113-114.

<sup>18</sup> Richard Pipes, *Communism: A History* (New York: Random House, 2001), 58.

<sup>19</sup> Mark Harrison, *Soviet Planning in Peace and War, 1938 -1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 8.



state budget.<sup>20</sup> In addition to the copious quantities of tanks, aircraft, artillery, machine guns, rifles, and ammunition produced during the First Five Year Plan, the foundation for a colossal armaments industry was laid. In his report to the Seventeenth Party Congress on January 26, 1934, Stalin proclaimed the First Five Year Plan a success, because the Soviet Union had been “radically transformed . . . New industries have been created,” which involved “the production of machine tools, automobiles. . . chemicals, motors, aircraft, harvester combines, powerful turbines and generators, high-grade steel, ferro-alloys.”<sup>21</sup>

As implied by Stalin’s speech, one of the aims of the First Five Year Plan was “to transform the Soviet Union from a country importing equipment into a country that manufactures equipment.” In 1933 *GOSPLAN* published the *Summary of the Fulfillment of the First Five Year Plan*, which provides an overview of the achievements of the First Five Year Plan. In 1928 the Soviet Union trailed most of Western Europe and the United States in the manufacture of industrial machinery, but by 1931 the Soviet Union was second in machine production behind only the United States. Machine building created “a powerful base for the technical reconstruction of the . . . economy and for the defense of the country.” The large volume of industrial equipment the Soviet Union constructed enabled it to build a base for mass production of armaments and other goods, as they assured “the precision without which the modern conveyer methods of assembly based on the interchangeability of parts would be impossible.”<sup>22</sup>

In 1933 *GOSPLAN* reported that the First Five Year Plan resulted in the creation of a firm base “for the defence of the country.”<sup>23</sup> Furthermore, *GOSPLAN* proclaimed that “one of the most important results of the First Five Year Plan is that the U.S.S.R. has been transformed from an agrarian country into an industrial country.” In a handbook written for prospective American investors, AMTORG recorded the enormous achievements made during the First Five Year Plan. The Soviet Union tripled iron ore production from six million metric tons in 1928, to fifteen million metric tons in 1933. Pig iron production doubled from three million metric tons in 1928, to six million

---

<sup>20</sup> David R. Stone, *Hammer and Rifle: The Militarization of the Soviet Union, 1926-1933* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 90.

<sup>21</sup> Joseph V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 13 (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1953), 314.

<sup>22</sup> State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R., *Summary of the Fulfillment of the First Five Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy of the U.S.S.R.* (Moscow: State Planning Commission of the U.S.S.R, 1933), 65.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 64 – 69.

metric tons in 1933. Steel production rose from eight million metric tons in 1928, to nearly twelve million metric tons in 1933. Manganese production escalated from 710 thousand tons in 1928, to more than one million tons in 1933. Electricity was needed to fuel industry, and electricity production tripled from five million kilowatts in 1928, to sixteen million kilowatts in 1933.<sup>24</sup>

Electrification was needed to give the Soviet Union a modern industrial base, and *GOSPLAN's Summary of the Fulfilment of the First Five Year Plan* elaborated on this, as it expounded on the significance and development of the U.S.S.R's electrical grid. It stated that "the first plan for the industrial restoration and reconstruction of the economy of the country was the plan of electrification." It continued by saying that the development of electrical infrastructure resulted in the doubling of the capacity of power stations between 1928 and 1932, and a tripling of output during the same period. *Summary* stated that the increase in electrical production was based on the construction of new district power stations. *GOSPLAN's* report emphasized that "in 1928 there were eighteen district stations in the U.S.S.R. with a total capacity of 610,000 kw," and "by the end of 1932, forty-three district stations were working with a total capacity of 2,624,000 kw." *GOSPLAN* credited the construction of these power plants in assisting the development of Soviet industrial complexes, because they reduced "the need for the building of special power plants at factories." By 1932, the Soviet government was able to boast that the capacity of Soviet power stations was better utilized than their western counterparts. One of the chief benefits of electrification was the supplying of sustainable energy sources to provide for:

the mechanization of a number of highly labor absorbing industries, particularly the coal industry; the mechanization of all the main operations at the metallurgical works; the introduction of the conveyer system in the machine building industry; the organization of the manufacturing of ferro-alloys, of high grade steel, aluminum, etc.<sup>25</sup>

Fuel was as vital as electricity for building the Soviet Union's military and industrial infrastructure. According to *GOSPLAN*, the development of the "entire economy of the country during the first Five-Year Plan period depended" on "the development of the fuel base of the Union," for the continued improvement of industry. During the First Five Year Plan the Soviet Union nearly doubled fuel production. In 1932, the total supply of fuel "amounted to 110.6 million metric tons . . . as compared with 56.8 million tons

---

<sup>24</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook of the Soviet Union* (New York: American Russian Chamber of Commerce, 1936), 130, 200.

<sup>25</sup> State Planning Commission, *Summary of the Fulfilment of the First Five Year Plan*, 85 -97.

in 1927-28.” Coal production increased from 35,250,000 tons in 1928, to 62,983,000 tons in 1932. In order to fuel tanks, planes, trucks, ships, and industry, the Soviet Union needed oil, and stemming from this need petroleum production was emphasized during the First Five Year Plan. The number of oil wells increased from 4,760 in 1928 to 5,986 in 1932, which allowed for a doubling of petroleum production. In reviewing the results of the First Five Year Plan, *GOSPLAN* stated that:

the big successes attending the development of the fuel industry . . . ensure the further development of the power resources to the extent required for the completion of the technical reconstruction of the economy of the country as a whole.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to powering Soviet industry, developments of new fuel sources were vital to establishing a firm transportation infrastructure.

Transportation infrastructure, crucial in moving troops, weaponry, food, and supply in wartime, was rapidly increased during the First Five Year Plan. Five thousand new miles of railroad track were laid out, and freight traffic increased from 150 million tons in 1928, to 268 million tons in 1933. Water transportation showed significant increases during the First Five Year Plan, as river freight nearly tripled from eighteen million tons in 1928, to fifty two million tons in 1933. This increase was facilitated by the construction of several canals, including the White Sea-Baltic Canal, and Moscow-Volga Canal. Although the amount of paved roadways in the Soviet Union still lagged behind Europe, after the First Five Year Plan road construction increased “the total length of all roads suited for any kind of vehicular traffic from 24,300 kilometers . . . to 41,000 kilometers.” During the same time there were substantial increases in overland freight traffic, and the number of automobiles in the Soviet Union increased from 18,700 in 1928 to 179,500 in 1934.<sup>27</sup> The epicenters for the Soviet Automotive industry were the Stalin Automobile Works in Moscow, the Molotov Automobile Works in Gorky, and the Yaroslavl Works in Yaroslavl. Because the Red Army needed trucks to transport its troops and supplies, it is not surprising that “a distinguishing feature of the Soviet automobile industry is the large proportion of trucks that are turned out,” and by 1933 *GOSPLAN* claimed that “the Soviet automobile works” could “produce approximately as many trucks as were produced in 1929 by all the automobile works in Europe combined.”<sup>28</sup> The First Five Year Plan resulted in stupendous increases in the production of railroad equipment. In 1928 the

---

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 98 - 108.

<sup>27</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, 240, 259.

<sup>28</sup> State Planning Commission, *Summary of the Fulfilment of the First Five Year Plan*, 78.

Soviet Union produced 479 locomotive engines per year, and by 1932 this number was 827 per year. The Soviet Union built 9,130 freight cars in 1928, and by 1932 this number was 21,612.

Because of its vast distances, the U.S.S.R. benefited heavily from aviation. During the First Five Year Plan Soviet civil aviation networks increased from a little over 10,000 kilometers to more than 43,000 kilometers. While civil aviation made modest strides during the First Five Year Plan, military aviation benefited the most. According to the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, the Soviet Union relied heavily on imported airplanes and motors before 1928, situation that was changed during the first Five-Year Plan. It stated that “at the present time practically all planes in service . . . are of domestic make.”<sup>29</sup> The First Five Year Plan enabled Soviet authorities to boast that:

the production of airplane motors, both air and water-cooled, has been organized, and motors up to 700 hp., are now being built. All types of modern planes for civil and defensive purposes are now manufactured in the U.S.S.R. . . . Important research and experimental work in airplane construction is carried on at three aviation institutes. The foremost of these is the Central Aero-Hydrodynamics Institute (*TsAGI*) in Moscow.<sup>30</sup>

During this time the Soviet Union established several design bureaus, most notably Polikarpov, Ilyushin, Petlyakov, Tupolev, Antonov, Sukhoi, Lachovkin, and Mikoyan and Guryevich. These built planes that flew nonstop over the pole from Moscow to San Francisco, giants such as the *Maxim Gorkey*, heavy bombers such as the TB-3, medium bombers such as the DB-3, advanced fighters such as the I-16, and dirigibles.

Along with the development and expansion of transportation infrastructure in the First Five Year Plan period came the development of radio, telegraph, and telephony. Communications infrastructure was important for linking the distant population centers of the Soviet Union, as well as for improving the command, control, and communication systems of the Red Army. *GOSPLAN's Summary of the Fulfilment of the First Five Year Plan* details the enormous gains made in the Soviet communication infrastructure. The Soviet government proclaimed that “the total length of interurban telegraph and telephone lines in 1934 reached 1, 870,000 km., as compared with . . . 890,000 km. in 1928.” The advancement of telephony allowed for rapid communication across the Soviet Union and between the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world. Radio usage saw gigantic gains as the “number of radio receiving ‘points’ rose

---

<sup>29</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, 267.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

from 348,000 in 1928 to 2.3 million in 1934.” The Soviet government encouraged the development of “an extensive system of local amateur stations.” There was also considerable development of shortwave radio, and the “Moscow radio-telegraph center is the fourth largest in the world.”<sup>31</sup> Although the development of these communication systems served to link the distant population centers of the Soviet Union, they also assisted in military communication. The Moscow radio-telegraph center was used before the abolishment of the *Komintern* in 1938, to communicate with Soviet agents involved in fomenting uprisings and coups across the globe. During the Second World War it was used to communicate with the British and American governments, as well as with the various departments of the Red Orchestra spy ring to communicate intelligence reports from Berlin, London, and Tokyo to the *Stavka* (Soviet General Staff Headquarters).

***Obtaining Foreign Economic and Technological Assistance.*** The Soviet Union needed to acquire capital from the nations of Europe and the United States to finance the construction of an advanced military-industrial infrastructure. The need for foreign money was extreme because “the fund of foreign exchange in the Soviet Treasury was woefully inadequate for the first-line industrial departments.”<sup>32</sup> One of the ways in which *SOVNARKOM* obtained capital was by selling Soviet grain. *SOVNARKOM* also sought funding by normalizing trade relations with the rest of the world, and to do this the U.S.S.R. established several trading companies such as ARCOS (Anglo Russian Shipping Company) and AMTORG (American Trade Organization). Although AMTORG and ARCOS were used as front organizations by the *NKVD* (People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs) and the *GRU* (Military Intelligence) for espionage purposes, they were also successful in obtaining foreign capital. AMTORG and other Soviet trade consortiums were able to collect nearly 50,000,000 dollars from foreign investors in 1928, with 7,150,000 dollars of that sum coming from the United States.<sup>33</sup> In 1929 AMTORG published a prospectus giving a general idea of the possibilities, character, and dimensions of the foreign trade relations of the Soviet Union in the next few years.<sup>34</sup> Pavloff’s pamphlet stated that “capital investments in industry

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 271 - 273.

<sup>32</sup> Walter G. Krivitsky, *In Stalin’s Secret Service: Memoirs of the First Soviet Master Spy to Defect* (New York: Enigma Books, 2000), 102.

<sup>33</sup> Stuart Chase, Robert Dunn, and Rexford G. Tugwell, *Soviet Russia in the Second Decade: A Joint Survey by the Technical Staff of the First American Trade Union Delegation* (New York: The John Day Company, 1928), 348.

<sup>34</sup> Joseph M. Pavloff, *The Upbuilding of Soviet Russia: Five-Year Plan for Industrial Development of the Soviet Union* (New York: AMTORG Trading Corporation, 1929), 1.

enumerated in the plan will become effective only towards the end of the five year period or even later.” In 1936 an AMTORG subsidiary, The American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, published *The Handbook of the Soviet Union*. The book was a guide to foreign investors and was meant to “provide an authoritative basis upon which to build an understanding of the Soviet trade, industry, and agriculture in recent years.”<sup>35</sup> Although the Soviet Union was somewhat successful in attracting foreign investors and raising funds for industrialization through legal means, Stalin’s government also pursued money in more illicit ways. Perhaps the most infamous case of Stalin’s questionable fundraising was his counterfeiting scheme. Stalin’s government counterfeited American currency, mostly 100 and 500 dollar bills, and “put into circulation throughout the world about ten million dollars in bogus American currency.”<sup>36</sup> Another questionable way in which the Soviet Union acquired foreign currency was what was called, the “Dollar Inquisition,” which implied a “systematic extortion from Soviet citizens of relief remittances” sent by their relatives living in the U.S. Many were “imprisoned and tortured by the *OGPU* until ransom money arrived from abroad.”<sup>37</sup>

In addition to acquiring money, Soviet industrial development necessitated the acquirement of foreign technology, technical assistance, and equipment. AMTORG was crucial in procuring American tank technology. According to Leonard,

(In) October 1928 . . . I.A Khalepski, a leading Soviet tank expert and a close friend of Tukhachevsky’s, entered the United States on a visa arranged by AMTORG. His declared purpose was to negotiate a deal with the Ford Motor Company.<sup>38</sup>

Khalepski spent considerable time in the United States visiting arsenals and examining American military technology, and “during his stay he became familiar with the work of J. Walter Christie, who was experimenting with a series of advanced tank design prototypes that incorporated an innovative suspension system.” Christie’s tank designs excited American and Polish interest, and when Christie developed a new design known as the M1930, AMTORG was determined to acquire it for the Red Army. In 1930 AMTORG was able to outbid the Polish government for the revolutionary M1930 *Christie* tank. Initially, the American government was reluctant to provide the Soviet Union with the tank, but the AMTORG representatives were able to convince

---

<sup>35</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, xxiii.

<sup>36</sup> *Krivitsky, In Stalin’s Secret Service*, 101-2.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>38</sup> Leonard, *Secret Soldiers of the Revolution*, 110.

Congress that they intended to use the Christie for agricultural purposes. To complete the deal, Christie shipped two M1930s to the Soviet Union “completely equipped and ready to fight except for mounting the gun,” in crates labeled *tractors*. When the M1930 reached the Soviet Union it became the basis of the BT family of tanks, and its suspension system became incorporated into the superb T-34 medium tank.

AMTORG was able to convince American industrialists to erect factory complexes within the U.S.S.R., and proclaimed that the use of “American equipment and engineering techniques” were very important for the development of Soviet cars and tractors. Ford Motor Co. was one of the American companies that contributed to this development. Foreign technical assistance was crucial to Soviet military buildup and:

beginning in 1928, more than two-score contracts were concluded with American engineering concerns providing for the cooperation of the latter in the design, construction operations of mines, electrical plants and installations, and industrial enterprises of the U.S.S.R. . . . In addition, hundreds of individual engineers and technicians were engaged for various Soviet industries.<sup>39</sup>

The leading American firms in providing technical assistance to the Soviet Union, the Ford Motor Company, RCA, DuPont, Curtiss-Wright, and General Electric, and other western corporations, were extremely interested in investing in the Soviet Union because during the tumultuous economic downturn of the early 1930s, the U.S.S.R. promised a safe market. Although Stalin’s government owned all foreign built and operated factories within the Soviet Union, foreign companies granted leases to build industrial complexes within the U.S.S.R., and were guaranteed “the repayment of capital invested . . . and a certain amount of profit.”<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, Western investors were intrigued by contracts with the Soviet authorities granting the U.S.S.R. ownership of the industrial complexes, while granting themselves ownership of raw materials, finished products and money. The Soviet Union was an appealing target for Western investment because nations like Great Britain could sell to it large amounts of raw materials from its colonial holdings, while other nations such as France, Italy, and the United States enjoyed cheap labor, and extremely favorable balances of trade, as the fledgling Soviet state imported much more than it exported.<sup>41</sup> Germany had a darker motive for seeking strong trade relations with the Soviet Union, as it

---

<sup>39</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, 164, 375-6.

<sup>40</sup> Grigory Grigoryan, *What, How, and Why? The Young Soviet State and Foreign Investments* (Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1966), 34.

<sup>41</sup> American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, 326-340.

Petroleum, in million metric tons	11.6	13.7	18.5	22.4	21.4	21.5
Electricity, in billion kilowatt hours	5.0	6.2	8.4	10.7	13.5	16.4
Motor Vehicles, in thousands of units	0.8	1.7	4.2	4.0	23.9	49.7

*Sources:* Iron and Steel: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 131; Manganese: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 139; Coal, Petroleum, Electricity and Motor Vehicles: Harrison, *Soviet Planning in Peace and War*, p. 253.

#### **Soviet Transportation and Communications Development**

	<u>1928</u>	<u>1933</u>
Length of rail lines in Operation, in thousands of kilometers	76.9	82.6
Volume of Railroad Freight Traffic, in millions of tons	150.6	268.1
Freight carried on inland waterways, in million tons	18.3	46.9
Length of Usable Roads, in thousands of kilometers	24.3	41.0
Aviation lines, in thousands of kilometers	11.4	37.0
Length of Interurban Telegraph and Telephone Lines, in kilometers	890,000	1,870,000

*Sources:* Railroads: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 240; Inland Waterways: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 251; Paved Roads: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 259; Civil Aviation: American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, *Handbook*, p. 264.



could build up large amounts of armaments, flouting limitations placed on it by the Versailles Treaty.

**Conclusion.** Born out of Stalin's dream for Soviet Expansion and the military genius of Tukhachevsky, Triandafillov, and Snitko, the First Five Year Plan transformed Soviet Russia from a backwards, agrarian, and militarily weak nation into a fully industrialized militarily superpower. The call of Stalin and his military commanders for an aggressive war utilizing a highly mechanized army, and incorporating large numbers of planes, tanks, and artillery required the Soviet Union to establish a formidable armaments industry and the infrastructure needed to support it. The First Five Year Plan allowed the Soviet Union to outpace the rest of the world combined in combat aircraft, artillery, tank, and small arms production by its conclusion in 1933. Production of steel, iron, copper, aluminum, manganese, magnesium, potash, and coal, vital to the establishment of an armaments industry, experienced tremendous growth. Dozens of new cities and hundreds of new industrial complexes sprang up, providing the U.S.S.R. with the basis for an extensive military-industrial infrastructure. Transportation and communications systems were greatly expanded as hundreds of miles of canals were dug, thousands of miles of new track were laid, tens of thousands of miles of roads were paved, hundreds of radio stations were built, and several thousand miles of telephone wires were posted. The accomplishments of the First Five Year Plan paved the way for the advances of the second and third Five Year Plans. Despite great loss of human life, chaos, and confusion, the First Five Year Plan achieved its aimed military production. During the execution of the First Five Year Plan the Soviet Union was able to obtain foreign financial and technological assistance for its industrialization program, and was greatly aided in this by its extensive espionage network, which allowed it to acquire weapons systems such as the Christie Tank.

The industrial, transport, communication, and military infrastructure established during the First Five Year Plan allowed for the rapid technological development of the Soviet military. This fact was reflected by the Peoples' Commissar for Defense Kliment Voroshilov's speech in December 1939, on the occasion of Stalin's sixtieth birthday which praised the five year plans for the "industrialization of the country." Voroshilov continued his praise for the five year plan by stating that "It is only thanks to this that our army is now technically better equipped than any other army in the world." Although Triandafillov died in a plane crash in 1931, and Snitko and Tukhachevsky were eliminated during the purge of the Red Army High Command in 1937, the military strategies and the industrial infrastructure they helped create allowed the Red Army to survive the perilous days of 1941, and achieve ultimate victory at Berlin in 1945 while Sovietizing half of Europe in the process. While writing his memoirs in the late 1960s, Marshal Georgi Zhukov said that the five year

## Appendix B: Tables

### Soviet Weapons Production, 1930 - 1933

	<u>1930</u>	<u>1931</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1933</u>
Combat Aircraft	n/a	220	146	627
Bombers	n/a	100	72	291
Fighters	n/a	120	74	336
Tanks	170	740	3,038	3,509
Artillery Pieces	952	1,966	2,574	4,638
Medium and Large Caliber	608	926	1,602	1,754
Machine Guns	9,700	41,000	45,000	32,700
Rifles; Carbines, in thousands.	126	174	224	241

*Source:* Harrison, *Soviet Planning in Peace and War*, p. 250.

### Soviet Heavy Industry Output, 1928-1933

	<u>1928</u>	<u>1929</u>	<u>1930</u>	<u>1931</u>	<u>1932</u>	<u>1933</u>
Iron ore, in million metric tons	6.0	7.8	10.4	10.9	12.2	15.1
Pig Iron, in million metric tons	3.4	4.3	5.0	4.9	6.2	7.2
Steel Ingots, in million metric tons	4.3	4.9	5.8	5.4	5.9	6.9
Rolled Steel, in million metric tons	3.5	3.9	5.0	4.1	4.2	4.9
Manganese Ore Output, in thousand metric tons	710.0	1,237.0	1,543.0	876.0	833.0	1,040.0
Coal, in million metric tons	35.5	40.1	47.8	56.8	62.8	76.3

plans were instrumental in developing the Red Army into “an up-to-date army that measured up to the latest standards.”

### Appendix A: Abbreviations and Terms

AMTORG	American Trade Organization
ARCOS	All-Russian Co-operative Society
GOSPLAN	<i>Gosudarstvennyi Komitet po Planirovaniyu</i> , State Committee for Planning
GRU	<i>Glavnoye Razvedyvatel'noye Upravleniye</i> , Main Intelligence Directorate of the Red Army
NKVD	<i>Narodnyi Komissariat Vnutrennikh Del</i> , People's Commissariat For Internal Affairs
NKVM	<i>Narodnyi Komissariat Voennykh i Morskikh Del</i> , Peoples Commissariat for Military and Naval Affairs
OGPU	<i>Ob'edinennoe Gosudarstvennoe, Politicheskoe Upravlenie</i> , Joint State Political Directorate
SOVNARKOM	<i>Sovet Narodnykh Komissarov</i> , Council of Peoples Commissars. Nominal Government of the Soviet Union, functioning as a cabinet of ministers
TsAGI	<i>Tsentr'al'nyi Aerogidrodinamicheskii Institut</i> , Central Aerohydrodynamic Institute