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Have you ever spent so much time and effort on something that you wanted to share it with other people? Have you ever felt unfulfilled receiving only a grade and your own satisfaction as rewards for your hard work? Have you ever wanted to get your work published?

For these reasons History Matters was founded. In the spring of 2003, Eric Burnette, a freshman at Appalachian State University, was looking for an outlet for his research paper. He was frustrated by the lack of venues for undergraduate research, and he figured that other students probably felt the same way. Dr. Michael Moore, who had edited Albion, a professional journal of British history, for over 25 years, began advising Burnette on how best to go about starting an academic journal for undergraduate historical research. Another Appalachian student, Matthew Manes, was asked to join the interesting experiment, and together they laid the groundwork for History Matters.

Our first deadline was in late January 2004. For the editorial staff, it was an extensive and time-consuming process of reading, revising, and communicating with both the authors and the Faculty Editorial Board. In the end, the collaboration published one research paper, one research essay, and three editorial book reviews. This first issue of History Matters: An Undergraduate Journal of Historical Research was published online on April 28, 2004.

From the beginning, Burnette and Manes wanted to expand the journal. The more students who were involved, the more students who had the opportunity to be published and the better those papers would be. The 2004-2005 school year saw the participation of the University of North Carolina Asheville and Western Carolina University, as well as submissions from half a dozen schools nationwide. The 2005 issue was published with two research papers, one from Appalachian State University and one from a student at Villanova University. Five book reviews from all three participating departments were also published.

Since 2004, History Matters has grown drastically. Over the years our submission base increased from 11 papers in 2004-2005 to 136 papers in 2016-2017. We now receive submissions from all over the United States from distinguished universities including Yale, Harvard, Brown, Cornell, UC Berkeley, and Stanford. History Matters has also expanded internationally. We have received submissions from Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and South America while also employing international staff members as contributing editors.

Today History Matters continues to grow and prosper thanks to a supportive faculty, department, university, and, most importantly, the students who have worked hard on their papers and work with us to get them published.
FACULTY EDITORIAL BOARD

Dr. Edward Behrend-Martinez
Dr. Antonio Bly
Dr. Thomas Kaplan
Dr. Michael Krenn
Dr. Michael Wade
Dr. Karl Campbell
Dr. Judkin Browning
Dr. Allison Fredette
Dr. Lucinda McCray
Dr. Lynne Getz

FACULTY ADVISORS

Dr. James Goff
Dr. Kristen Baldwin Deathridge

SPECIAL THANKS TO

Donna Davis
Renee Gamble
Dr. Sheila Phipps
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Nicholas Racine
*James Madison University*

Blood, Meth, and Tears: The Super Soldiers of World War II

Blake Davis
*Liberty University*

Magical Battlegrounds: The Creation of Disneyland and The Culture of Cold War America

Eesha S. Khan
*Fordham University*


H. Michael Shultz, Jr.
*Eastern Kentucky University*

Watchtower Under Siege: The Swiss Experience of World War I

Marissa M. Brinkman
*North Carolina State University*

Through the Eyes of Europeans: Perceptions Regarding and Resiliency of the American Dream at the Turn of the Twentieth Century
Blood, Meth, and Tears: The Super Soldiers of World War II

Nicholas Racine
James Madison University

Day and night, soldiers in World War II were physically and mentally strained by fatigue, long missions, and life-threatening combat operations. Consequently, many soldiers were left tired and demoralized. War efforts hinged on soldiers succeeding in missions, thus a fast-acting solution was needed. Development of the psychostimulant drugs Benzedrine and Pervitin in the 1920s and ‘30s spurred enthusiasm among scientists, the media, the public, and various governments. Potent and powerful, these drugs exert effects that promote wakefulness, elevated mood, and improved field performance. Governments quickly began researching the use of stimulants to improve their war efforts. By the early 1940s, both drugs had millions of tablets in circulation. Though controversial, both scientific and anecdotal accounts showed psychostimulants as effective combatants of fatigue, low morale, and were even proclaimed as life-saving.¹

This essay will examine historical and scientific evidence to show how amphetamines served as soldier-enhancement drugs in World War II. Two areas, fatigue and morale, will be discussed. Previous scholars have debated the reasons governments sanctioned amphetamines. Nicolas Rasmussen argued that research did not support amphetamine for military use. Rather, it was amphetamine’s mood enhancement that was favored by soldiers and military officials. James Pugh, in researching Benzedrine use in the British Royal Air Force (RAF) and Royal Navy (RN), provides evidence in disagreement. While the British noted Benzedrine’s morale enhancement, Pugh argues emphasis was placed on fatigue and not mood. Another issue this essay will discuss is the “super soldier myth”. This myth holds that amphetamines were not dispensed by war leaders to create “super soldiers”. Rather, they were willingly taken against military sanctions by individual soldiers. All known scholars have argued against the notion that amphetamines were used to create “super soldiers”. Stephen Snelders and Toine Pieters argue that German soldiers chose to take and misuse Pervitin rather than being ordered to. Treading middle ground is Peter Steinkamp, who provides evidence that liberal drug use violated German regulations. However, Steinkamp concludes his essay by stating the “greed” of pharmaceutical companies created German Pervitin addiction. Evidence does support the notion that soldiers were not coerced to take drugs. However, evidence also indicates that many soldiers benefited from using amphetamines. The idea of “super soldiers” might conjure mental images of stormtroopers from a dystopian science fiction world. This essay will offer an alternative narrative to what makes a “super soldier”. Scientific evidence indicates that amphetamines enhance biological functioning beyond normal limits. That is, amphetamines did allow many soldiers to stay awake, alert, and energized longer than otherwise possible. In addressing this “myth”, I will argue that the introduction of amphetamines created “super soldiers” with enhanced mental and physical functioning.

World War II was a milestone that marked the beginning of war as a non-stop phenomenon. Alan Derickson notes that, before World War I, wars typically took place during

---

daylight hours of warm-weathered, grazing seasons. Innovations in military technology created faster aircraft, submarines, and tanks that required long, careful, and precise operation. For example, the German Navy’s (Kriegsmarine) so-called “Schnell Boote” were small torpedo boats that had operation duties lasting up to 12 hours. Advances in communication technology also changed aircraft and ship operations. Faster communications could keep ship commanders awake at all hours of the day. Introduction of the radar allowed militaries to track enemy movements in real time. The Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor demonstrated the devastation of a surprise enemy attack. Long missions, watch duties, and tactical nighttime operations took their toll on soldiers. Robert Franklin, an American soldier who served in Germany and Italy said, “we slept when we got the chance, but chances rarely lasted more than three or four hours”. Colonel James Fry viewed his nighttime battles as “a heavy drain on the physical and mental stamina of every participant.”

Air supply crews in Burma slept in uncomfortable humid conditions. GIs and air troops in Belgium were stuck sleeping in freezing conditions. Cramped tropical battlefields and the crackling of loud gunfire rendered sleep near impossible to soldiers. Sleep deprivation can have profoundly negative impacts on global functioning. The average adult human requires roughly eight hours of sleep to maintain proper physical and mental health. According to Derickson, 85 percent of American soldiers in the Italian campaign slept fewer than 6 hours, while 31 percent slept fewer than 3 hours per night. Sleep deprived individuals are more prone to task errors, experience higher levels of psychological stress, are less likely to properly follow orders, are more likely to take shortcuts in decision making, and suffer from potential muscle atrophy. The need to overcome fatigue was a challenge, one that needed a fast-acting solution. For many governments, psychostimulant drugs would answer the call.

Psychostimulants are a class of psychoactive drugs that exert energizing effects, enhance cognition, raise mood, and reduce fatigue in their user. Ephedrine, a naturally occurring

---

2 Derickson, p. 4, 5.
3 Derickson, p. 2; 4; Defalque and Wright, p. 23; Pugh, p. 510.
psychostimulant, has been used in human medicine for several millennia. In 1887, Romanian chemist Lazar Edeleanu created amphetamine, a synthetic stimulant derived from ephedrine. In 1927, American chemist Gordon Alles perfected the sulphate (salt) form of amphetamine. In 1933, American pharmaceutical firm Smith, Kline, and French (SKF) introduced a gaseous form of amphetamine as a decongestant inhaler under the trade name “Benzedrine”. Alles sold his patent of amphetamine sulphate to SKF in 1934, after which Benzedrine Sulphate was quickly pushed to market. Methamphetamine was first synthesized by Japanese chemist Nagayoshi Nagai in 1893. Methamphetamine found its way to Nazi Germany when Fritz Hauschild synthesized it in 1937. Hauschild’s employer, German pharmaceutical firm Temmler, patented and pushed methamphetamine to market under the trade name Pervitin in 1938.6

The ability of Benzedrine and Pervitin to improve energy and mood made both drugs sensational to society. During the 1930s, psychiatry had few pharmacological treatments available, relying instead on Freudian psychoanalytic methods. Newspapers and scientific articles alike praised amphetamines as “miracle pills”. Amphetamines were medically used to treat symptoms of depression, narcolepsy, obesity, Parkinson’s Disease, schizophrenia, sexual dysfunction, addiction, common colds, and hyperactive behavior. In Germany, Pervitin became a staple of daily life. Temmler successfully promoted Pervitin to numerous German physicians, who seemed zealous to prescribe it. Doctors also prescribed Pervitin for productivity, being used by office workers, armament workers, and late-night workers. Young people used Pervitin recreationally for partying and enhancing sex. In the United States, Benzedrine’s numerous endorsements and popularity made it SKF’s most successful product. By 1941, after only seven years in public markets, SKF’s sales of Benzedrine topped $500,000 and accounted for 4 percent of its revenue. In 1945, Americans consumed between 13 million and 55 million tablets of Benzedrine and SKF’s sales topped over $2 million annually. Both Benzedrine and Pervitin could be purchased cheaply over the counter, and consequently, many citizens became addicted. Pervitin came to German markets in 1938 and had thousands of addicts by 1939. Some users of Benzedrine cracked open their inhalers for one large dose. The British and German governments listed each drug a controlled substance to curb public abuse in 1938 (Benzedrine) and 1941 (Pervitin). Federal drug laws in the US were weak in the 30s and largely ignored amphetamines. Despite regulations limiting civilian use, by the early 40s, both SKF and Temmler began supplying their biggest, most lucrative customer possible: the military.7

---

6 Kemper, p. 123; Rasmussen, p. 974; Rasmussen, p. 300; Lewy, p. 148; Steinkamp, p. 61; Hauschild, p. 1257; Defalque and Wright, p. 21.

Amphetamines first gained notoriety through scientific studies. George Barger and Henry Dale first noted the excitatory actions of synthetic stimulants in 1910 using animal models. Studies in the 30s explored the therapeutic potential of amphetamines in humans. Benzedrine administration was noted to increase confidence, talkativeness, energy, wakefulness, alertness, attention, memory span, immune system functioning, and intelligence test scores. Pervitin was found to increase energy, alertness, work capacity, decrease fatigue, and improve mood in both animals and humans. Both drugs also induced negative subjective effects including anxiety, psychosis, hallucinations, nausea, increase blood pressure, and increase heart rate.8

While initial scientific research showed promise for Benzedrine and Pervitin, early military research was mixed on their utility to soldiers. Dr. Otto Ranke, a researcher at a Berlin military academy, began studying the effects of Pervitin in September 1938. Ranke concluded Pervitin was useful for wakefulness and superior to caffeine, but not a substitute for sleeping. Ranke stressed the importance of Pervitin in stimulating fatigued soldiers, however, his pleas for more testing were ignored. As Germany prepared to invade Poland in 1939, Ranke was granted his wish. With the approval of Dr. Leonardo Conti9, Ranke began testing Pervitin in the military. Ranke supplied Pervitin to medics in motorized convoys and Krad drivers. In 1940, Ranke’s research helped secure Temmler’s request to approve Pervitin for soldiers in the Wehrmacht. Medical officers (MOs) were authorized to dispense 5mg doses of Pervitin to soldiers strictly for life threatening fatigue.10

In 1940, the British discovered Pervitin on a crashed German pilot and began testing Benzedrine themselves. Dr. Roland Winfield and Dr. Frederick Bartlett tested Benzedrine on flight crews in the RAF. Winfield found Benzedrine successfully improved attention and morale, but noted some pilots were reckless and aggressive. Bartlett found Benzedrine did not improve pilot performance but prevented performance deterioration. Winfield advised pilots get two 5mg tablets for long missions and that Benzedrine be taken under medical supervision. Winfield and Bartlett together helped persuade the RAF to sanction Benzedrine in 1942. Dr. Norman Mackworth and Bartlett conducted field studies on Benzedrine for the RN. Mackworth and Bartlett both concluded Benzedrine had no effect on improving physical performance but kept sailors awake and improved morale. Bartlett advised Benzedrine be taken only once every 8-12 hours in doses not exceeding 10 milligrams.11

Dr. Andrew C. Ivy conducted Benzedrine studies for the American military. Ivy’s 1941 paper recommended against using Benzedrine in fatigued individuals or those operating advanced equipment under anxiety. Ivy also noted Benzedrine’s superiority to caffeine was not proven in some instances. However, Ivy found amphetamine did have positive utility in fatigued and depressed individuals. Other studies Ivy partook in found some positive results. Using an atmospheric pressure chamber, Ivy found amphetamine useful at high flying altitudes and helped improve visual discrimination in pilots. The US Navy found no improvements in marksmanship

9 Dr. Leonardo Conti (1900-1945) was a German physician and leader of the Reich Health Office in Nazi Germany.
10 Defalque and Wright, p. 21-22; Snelders and Pieters, p. 691.
11 Pugh, p. 503, 505-507, 509, 512; Pugh, p. 9-10; Rasmussen, p. 212, 214-215.
of marines given Benzedrine but found it heightened morale. Despite mixed results, by 1943, all armies in Europe approved amphetamines for their militaries.\textsuperscript{12}

A large component of the “super soldier myth” is that war leaders did not order their soldiers to take amphetamines. Amphetamines were plentiful in Europe and, despite strict regulations, not all MOs or soldiers took them responsibly. In 1940, an estimated 35 million tablets of Pervitin circulated the Wehrmacht. When Germany invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, a force of 3 million soldiers used an estimated 29 million tablets that year. After the Poland and France campaigns, Ranke surveyed MOs and found that 70 percent had misused or given out Pervitin for unsanctioned reasons. In one case, a commander of the 12\textsuperscript{th} tank division died of a heart attack after taking Pervitin. Despite efforts by Ranke and Conti to tighten regulations, abuse continued in the Wehrmacht.\textsuperscript{13}

The British military supplied an estimated 72 million tablets across its military throughout the war. In the RAF and RN, MOs were tasked with dispensing Benzedrine. However, RAF bases were often short on manpower, leaving one MO to manage up to 2000 individuals. Nicknamed “wakey wakey pills”, a pilot of the no. 115 squadron recalled “there wasn’t a wakey wakey philosophy, you just took one if you were sleepy”.\textsuperscript{14} RN regulations required an MO to be present on ships that carried Benzedrine, though this wasn’t always the case. A 1943 amendment allowed small and coastal ships to carry Benzedrine, even in the absence of an MO. Additionally, long voyages at sea motivated some sailors to take Benzedrine out of boredom.\textsuperscript{15}

The US Army Supply began selling Benzedrine in 1943 to any soldier who wanted it. Despite its wide distribution, the US military implemented no regulations on Benzedrine’s sale or use. An estimated 16 million young enlistees were exposed to Benzedrine through the war. Consequently, 15 percent of surveyed air force pilots admitted to misusing Benzedrine while enlisted. These accounts indicate that many soldiers consumed amphetamines willingly and not coercively. This does not mean, however, that amphetamines did not create “super soldiers”.\textsuperscript{16}

The primary reason for providing soldiers amphetamines was preventing fatigue. Fatigue was a threat to soldier functioning and had many causes. In addition to sleep deprivation, the simple workload during day to day operations were strenuous. Infantrymen spent much time engaged in marches, during which they carried an estimated load of 77lbs (35kg). Terrains like snow, sand, and heavy brush added further strain to the load carrier. Amphetamines helped soldiers overcome their fatigue and pain from long, heavy marches. For example, one German soldier endured fatigue marching in -38 degree cold after taking Pervitin. The soldier said, “Ultimately I walked as if in trance, my wounded legs moved automatically, I didn’t feel the cold anymore, nor hunger or thirst.”\textsuperscript{17} In some cases, soldiers had to endure their load with haste. In the Soviet Union, a group of 500 German soldiers became encircled by the Red Army. When all
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but certain death seemed to befall them, many soldiers credited Pervitin with giving them the needed energy to escape the Soviets.¹⁸

Airmen also used stimulants for reducing fatigue on long flight missions. Fatigued pilots steered their plane more erratically and risked crashing. The war caused the RAF to shorten its training program and reduce in-craft bomber pilots from two to one. This placed greater pressure on the sole pilot to achieve high performance in battle. Benzedrine was found to reverse performance deterioration induced by fatigue and hypoxia.¹⁹ A member of the no. 50 squadron stated that Benzedrine helped prevent “adrenal crash” during his long return flight. Benzedrine was also included in emergency bail out kits, enabling crashed pilots to escape capture or death. Mission failures often resulted in the loss of trained pilots and expensive aircrafts. Thus, amphetamines played an important role in reducing the cost of war. Pilots in the Luftwaffe did not use Pervitin, opting for either caffeine or cocaine-infused chocolate bars instead. However, Pervitin was included in bail out kits.²⁰

Amphetamines helped reduce fatigue at sea as well. The Royal Navy used an estimated 28 million Benzedrine tablets during the war, most carried by large ships and vessels. The complexities of running a large war ship required synchronized efforts by a large, skilled crew. Benzedrine was used in a wide array of field operations such as convoy workers, surface engagers, submariners, and naval aviators. Benzedrine helped radar monitors stay vigilant and reduced sea sickness. The wakefulness effects of Benzedrine were valued highly by the RN, particularly in survival at sea. Shipwrecked sailors could be at sea for long periods of time, and without rescue, would die a slow, agonizing death. Life rafts were approved to carry Benzedrine, and some RN researchers praised the drug’s ability to prolong sailor survivability. For the Germans, there is some evidence that Pervitin relieved fatigue in the Kriegsmarine. In 1942, the Kriegsmarine undertook the Channel Dash operation in which several vessels fled the French port Brest. German submariners were given Pervitin to help them remain vigilant during a tedious and long operation. Whether land, air, or sea amphetamines provided valuable, life-saving, and tactically important fatigue relief.²¹

A second factor driving amphetamine use was improving soldier morale. World War II was the deadliest conflict in recent history, and the witnessed horrors left many soldiers anxious and demoralized. A post-war survey suggested that just 15 percent of American infantrymen used their weapons proficiently in combat. The majority of American soldiers either shot above enemies or did not shoot.²² This meant, theoretically, that some battles hinged on a mere fraction of soldiers. Indeed, the mere thought of killing a fellow human typically induces feelings of anxiety. Some researchers theorized that soldier distress was intricately linked to morale. Morale was linked not just to mood, but confidence in personal ability, leaders, fellow soldiers, and


¹⁹ Hypoxia refers to a state of low oxygen.


²¹ Pugh, p. 499, 508, 510, 514-515; Defalque and Wright, p. 23.

²² This statistic has been disputed as flawed, exaggerated, and even fabricated. As such, use of it is purely rhetorical.
received support. For example, early war losses in the RAF decreased pilot confidence in their technology and leadership. Demoralized soldiers could become dysfunctional and hinder battlefield operations. Some may socially withdraw and weaken group cohesion.²³

The biggest threat to soldier morale was “psychoneurosis”, a state of psychiatric distress commonly known as “shell shock”. Shell shocked soldiers often suffered from panic attacks, insomnia, amnesia, mutism, blindness, deafness, nightmares, and physical health problems. Soldiers typically broke down in response to prolonged stressors such as long missions and dangerous combat situations. For example, a 20-year old American sergeant in the Tunisia Campaign became shell shocked after witnessing his platoon die to German gunfire. In the US Army, psychoneurosis accounted for 72.2 percent of psychiatric hospitalizations and 30.3 percent of all discharges during the war. The war’s escalation only increased incidences of psychoneurosis. In 1943, there were, on average, 25.4 cases per 1,000 soldiers compared to just 11.2 in 1942. Military guidelines disqualified diagnosed soldiers from combat and sent them home for treatment. This resulted in increased soldier turnover and, consequently, significant manpower shortages in North Africa and the Pacific.²⁴

Given the war costs associated with shell shock, treating or preventing it was critically important. Treating shell shock, however, encountered numerous pitfalls. First, treatment availability was limited. The US Army suffered a shortage of psychiatrists during the war, with most present lacking proper training or required certifications. Second, a liberal discharge policy was enacted to curb loss of manpower and left numerous soldiers undertreated. And third, contemporary attitudes shied from recognizing shell shock as a disorder. The British military banned use of the term “shell shock”, viewing broken down soldiers as cowards instead. The RAF began labelling anxious pilots as “lacking moral fiber” in 1940. Those deemed lacking moral fiber were shamed and punished with loss of rank and privileges. By stigmatizing psychiatric distress, the RAF hoped to reduce casualties and loss of manpower. Consequently, this stigma complicates measuring the true incidence of shell shock in the British military. In contrast, American officers glorified some broken-down soldiers as heroes surviving hardship. Nomenclature, however, did not detract from the real, terrifying reality shell shocked troops experienced.²⁵

Amphetamines proved a fast-acting tool for improving morale and confidence. These increases to morale allowed some soldiers to succeed in risky attacks. Over Cologne, Benzedrine enabled an RAF pilot to make a risky attack in the face of heavy anti-aircraft fire. The risk worked as the pilot landed a direct hit. During an RAF bombing near Paris, another risk-taking

Benzedrine pilot successfully took out an enemy anti-aircraft team. In the RN, Benzedrine was regarded as valuable for morale in the wake of stress and shipwreck. The Arctic Theater resulted in high incidence of “stress related disorders”. Sailors became anxious over long watch duties, inconsistent weather patterns, and fear of bombings. The RN recognized morale as a crucial factor in using Benzedrine. During instances of shipwreck, Benzedrine could potentially help sailors prolong their survival by lifting their spirits. In North Africa, Bernard Montgomery took interest in using Benzedrine as “pep pills”. Montgomery was facing feared German commander Erwin Rommel26 and saw Benzedrine as a method to increase soldier confidence.27

Few positive accounts of Pervitin’s euphoric effects for German soldiers have been found. However, some evidence does indicate that Pervitin caused many soldiers to be more confident when engaged in battle. The notion that Pervitin was the “fuel” for Germany’s successful Blitzkrieg strategy has been controversial. Many Nazis enjoyed Pervitin’s euphoria, but most reported instances involved partying not war. As such, conclusions cannot be drawn about Pervitin’s role in boosting morale in the Wehrmacht.28

In general, available evidence indicates that amphetamines had positive effects on soldiers, pilots, and sailors during the war. However, the narrative is far from complete. First, few primary sources on Benzedrine’s use by American soldiers could be located. Thus, conclusions on Benzedrine’s precise role in the American military cannot be drawn. Second, no data has been found on Benzedrine use by British civilians. Understanding wider societal trends that could have influenced military use is important. Third, the British military ordered an estimated 72 million Benzedrine tablets and inhalers during the war. Despite this number, we still do not know the full extent to which this supply was distributed and used. More particularly, there is currently no essay exploring Benzedrine use in the whole British army. Lastly, the lack of primary accounts means the benefits of amphetamines are inferred rather than proven. Several authors have shown that amphetamines did not benefit all soldiers, as some suffered adverse side effects. More primary accounts from all soldier types (i.e. infantrymen, medics, pilots, etc.) are necessary to illustrate the positive and negative effects most soldiers experienced while taking amphetamines.29

The purpose of this essay was to use scientific and historical evidence to address the “super soldier myth”. Many soldiers who took amphetamines reported longer wakefulness, higher confidence, and increased alertness. All such effects show users operating at levels beyond normal human biological limits. For this reason, it cannot be reasonably denied that amphetamines created “super soldiers”. Manufacturing and consumption of amphetamines increased drastically as the was escalated in 1940. Their wide presence coupled with recognized utility to soldiers suggests that leaders sought amphetamines to enhance soldier performance.

26 Erwin Rommel (1891-1944) was a German general who led staunch defenses in North Africa and Normandy. His service earned him the nickname “the Desert Fox”.
27 Rasmussen, p. 214-217; Pugh, p. 506, 512, 516.
28 Snelders and Pieters, p. 691-692, 695; Defalque and Wright, p. 22-23.
29 Bett, p. 215.
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Magical Battlegrounds:
The Creation of Disneyland and The Culture of Cold War America

Blake Davis

Liberty University

When analyzing the influence of the Cold War on the American cultural landscape, topics such as television broadcasts, the promotion of idealistic American values, and the creation of wartime propaganda are among the most popular for historians. Touching upon each of these areas, Walt Disney’s development of Disneyland played a tremendous, yet underappreciated role in promoting American values during the very period when tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States reached a peak. From the earliest planning stages and through the expansion of the park with rides developed for the 1964 New York World’s Fair, Walt Disney created his content with the cultural context of the Cold War in mind. Every decision in producing the park, from which attractions would be included to the use of advertising strategies that promoted Disneyland to the American public, stemmed from Walt’s guiding motivation. Beyond merely turning a profit, he wanted to create a park which tapped into the cultural temperature of the times. By developing the park in such a manner, Disney played a key role in promoting fundamental American values at a time when America sought refuge from the constant threat of communism.

The development of Disney theme park attractions, beginning with the creation of Disneyland in 1955, stemmed from the multifaceted strains of Walt Disney’s philosophical viewpoints, as well as the prevailing psychological state of Americans during the Cold War era. One factor which influenced the company’s creation of themed entertainment experiences consisted of Walt and his brother Roy’s love of the United States and American culture. The intensity of the Disney brothers’ patriotism developed during their young adult years when the duo served their country during World War I. Although the Army rejected Walt’s request to enlist since he did not meet the age requirements, the younger Disney brother joined the Red Cross to become an ambulance driver in Europe in order to help with the war effort. After the pair founded the Disney Studios in the 1920s, they continued letting their patriotism influence the development of their projects, going so far as to develop wartime propaganda and military training films for the Allies during World War II.

This pro-American stance did not end with the conclusion of the war. After the conflict’s completion, Disney became entangled with the federal government’s review of communist influence in Hollywood. Directed by the specially instituted House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), the 80th United States Congress subpoenaed dozens of prominent Hollywood personalities, including Walt Disney, to testify about supposed socialist subversion occurring in the Los Angeles area. At the hearing, Walt claimed communists had attempted to

institute a strike at his studio in 1937. Historian Robert K. Carr, noted, “[Disney] testified that Communists had been responsible for labor troubles in his studio and asserted that...Communist front organizations...had tried to ‘smear’ him and to encourage boycotting of his pictures.”

Film footage from the hearing demonstrates a calm and somewhat subdued Disney sitting confidently before the committee, ready to relay his personal experiences combatting communists for the congressional record. During the hearing, Committee Chairman J. Parnell Thomas asked Disney, “Supposing you had given in to him [the leader of the strike], then what would have been the outcome.” Walt responded, “Well, I would never have given in to him, because it was a matter of principle with me, and I fight for principles.” This statement reveals how Walt’s personal ethical code governed his role as an entertainer.

The fact that Walt viewed his position of influence in crafting American culture with such responsibility is supported by his prior statements from earlier in the hearing. When asked by Chairman Thomas, “From those pictures that you made [during World War II] have you any opinion as to whether or not the films can be used effectively to disseminate propaganda?” Walt admitted, “Yes, I think they proved that.” Disney went on to explain how in creating the Studios’ productions:

We watch so that nothing gets into the films that would be harmful in any way to any group or any country. We have large audiences of children and different groups, and we try to keep them as free from anything that would offend anybody as possible. We work hard to see that nothing of that sort creeps in.

The experience before the HUAC panel represents one of the clearest instances where Walt outlined his anti-Communist stance. In the days that followed the hearing, newspapers around the country picked up Disney’s testimony as headline news. Walt’s vigilance against any content which could be “harmful...to any group or to any country” reflected how his personal ideological convictions and the climate of the Cold War influenced the studio’s creation of content. As Walt Disney’s biographer, Neal Gabler, explains:

[For Disney, it] had always been about control, about creating a better reality than the one outside the studio, and about demonstrating that one had the capacity to do so. That was what Walt Disney provided to America—not escape...but control and the vicarious empowerment that came with it. And that was what America seemed to want from him.

---

9. Ibid.
Indeed, in the context of the postwar period, the Disney Studios provided a beacon of hope for Americans in the dark days of the early Cold War era. For millions of Americans who were filled with disquieting emotions over the prospect of nuclear war with the Soviets, the Disney Studio provided them a sense of control by producing entertainment experiences set in fanciful worlds where good conquered evil as a temporary relief from the realities of the Cold War.\(^\text{12}\)

Against this backdrop of Cold War foreboding, Walt Disney began actively considering creating an escapist environment where entire families could step into an idealized version of reality. The spark for this idea came one Sunday afternoon when he took his daughters, Diane and Sharon, to ride a carousel in a local park in Orange County, California. As he sat on a bench watching his daughters laughing and enjoying themselves, Walt imagined creating a place where parents and children could play together.\(^\text{13}\) The desire to create such a destination stemmed from Walt’s mentality as a utopian visionary. Referencing his experience working alongside Walt from the development of Disneyland, through the 1964 World’s Fair, and to the eventual creation of the parks in Florida, Disney Imagineer Marty Sklar recalls, “Utopias are created by dreamers, and Walt Disney’s dreams just happened to be bigger than those of all the other kids on the block and in his business.”\(^\text{14}\) At a time when the state of international affairs appeared bleak, Walt Disney’s utopian dreams stood as a refreshingly stark contrast to the prevailing sense of dread sweeping across the United States.

The period when Walt began considering the development of an amusement park marked the first opportunity he had to legitimately consider such an ambitious endeavor. Prior to the 1950s, the development of an entire theme park would have been too risky for Disney to undertake. Previously, the company had spent years struggling to make ends meet during the Great Depression and World War II.\(^\text{15}\) By the early 1950s, the studio began to thrive financially, and, freed from fiscal constraints, Disney began dreaming of a far more adventurous undertaking.\(^\text{16}\)

To accomplish this goal, Disney knew he needed to create a separate company from that of the Studios, where shareholders and other members of the board would not be able to prevent him from pursuing his amusement park dream. To that end, in December 1952, Disney created a separate entity which he dubbed WED (Walter Elias Disney) Enterprises.\(^\text{17}\) Assembling some of the best talent from the Disney Studios, Walt founded WED Enterprises with the goal of creating a team that could help him bring the worlds of his silver screen creations alive for families attending his theme park.\(^\text{18}\) Since their job description required the team to combine elements of animation, engineering, and imagination in ways never before combined, Walt dubbed the members of WED to be “Imagineers,” a name which has stuck with members of the Disney company’s theme park division throughout its corporate history.\(^\text{19}\)

\(^{12}\) Ibid., 480.
\(^{13}\) Modern Marvels: Walt Disney World, DVD, History Channel, 2005.
\(^{15}\) Stein, Why We Love Disney, 22.
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\(^{18}\) Stein, Walt Disney, 23-24.
\(^{19}\) Modern Marvels: Walt Disney World, DVD, History Channel, 2005.
The Imagineers aided Walt as he began conceptualizing and designing what Disneyland would ultimately look like. In a fundamental instance during the park’s development, Walt contacted Herbert Ryman, one of the most skillful freelance animators in Hollywood, and told Ryman he needed him to draw the concept art for Disneyland. While Ryman had been unaware of the Disneyland project prior to Walt’s surprise request, he dutifully drew the designs which had previously only consisted of concepts within Walt’s brain. Ryman’s skillful drawing of the Disneyland designs proved crucial to the park’s eventual existence; Roy Disney needed them before boarding a flight to New York City in order to obtain financial backing for the Disneyland project. To finish the designs in time for Roy to utilize them in the presentation, Ryman worked for thirty-six hours with almost no breaks, finishing the drawings a mere few hours before Roy boarded his flight. When he arrived at the meetings with the New York bankers, Roy relied upon the drawings supplied by Ryman and successfully made his appeal for funding.

After the success of the Disneyland designs, Walt recruited Ryman from merely working at the studios to also becoming a permanent fixture at WED, where the newly minted Imagineer would go on to help in the development of Disneyland, the 1964 World’s Fair, and EPCOT at Walt Disney World. The process of selecting Ryman to be one of his right hand men in the development of Disneyland exemplified how Walt went about choosing most of his Imagineers. As Disney historian Jeff Kurtti notes, “Walt seems to have chosen each of them for a number of reasons: their confidence in his ideas, their ability to voice and substantiate their opinions, their varied and disparate artistic styles, and their character traits.” By assembling his team in such a manner, Walt felt confident that the men at WED would see his fantastic dream become reality.

As WED proceeded in developing the rides, shows, and attractions, Walt and Roy turned their attention to raising the funds necessary to open Disneyland. In order to promote the park’s development, the Disney Brothers contacted ABC about producing a weekly one hour television show named after the park. This deal proved beneficial for both sides. ABC received a weekly broadcast from one of the most prominent members of the entertainment industry. During its initial season, the television special starring “Uncle Walt” drew over fifty percent of all television viewers nationwide during its primetime slot on Wednesday nights. Ultimately, as viewership and the fervor for information about the Disneyland project increased, even rebroadcasts of the program outpaced all other television programs except *I Love Lucy*. On Walt’s end, Disneyland, Inc. would receive a $500,000 sponsorship from ABC, which allowed Walt and Roy to increase the amount of their loans from the banks funding the project. Additionally, Walt Disney Productions received between $50,000 and $70,000 for every episode of *Disneyland*, with fifteen percent of all proceeds being redistributed to the Disneyland project.
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This strategy proved very advantageous to the brothers. As Lauren Rabinovitz keenly notes, their advertising plan meant that “Disneyland required neither postcards nor movie theaters to disseminate an idealized, ideological view of itself as a preeminent cultural symbol (although the park certainly sold postcard souvenirs): it had television and a weekly timeslot that carried it to millions of American homes.”32 The advertising campaign proved to be an amazing success for the Disneyland project as audience members around the country eventually came to view Walt, who served as the show’s host, as a loveable relative who visited their families every Wednesday night.33 By pursuing this strategy of receiving funding in exchange for the production of a show advertising their own theme park, the Disney Brothers positioned Disneyland’s debut for success.

The popularity of the broadcasts demonstrates how Disney’s proposed park tapped into the public’s imagination. Every Disneyland television show consisted of several advertisements and speeches where Walt described the various attractions and themed areas guests could visit once Disneyland opened interspersed with clips from Disney animated films and cartoon shorts.34 In the segments describing the parks layout, Walt explained how Disneyland would be comprised of several “lands” within the scope of the larger theme park.35 In the initial episode, the broadcast included an animated segment where Tinker Bell, a character from the newly released and wildly popular Peter Pan flies over an animated castle, waves her magic wand, and repeatedly changes the screen to display the various lands which would comprise Disneyland.

As Tinker Bell flew off the screen, the song “When You Wish Upon a Star,” which was already becoming an anthem of the company, began to play in the background. While Cliff Edwards’ voice came over the airways, the camera panned onto an animated train station situated before a turn-of-the-century American town with an enchanting Medieval castle in the background. As the song faded out, the narrator exclaimed, “Each week as you enter this timeless land, one of these many worlds will open to you!” Suddenly, Tinker Bell appeared in a coonskin cap and bearing a rifle as the narrator describes “Frontierland” where one can experience, “tall tales and true from the legendary past.” The animation shifted as the western outfit disappeared and an atom with electrons circling the nucleus appeared on the screen. The narrator then announced “Tomorrowland,” where one can discover “the promise of things to come.” As the narrator finished speaking, the atom faded to black as a rocket ship replaces it on the screen before blasting off into outer space. After the rocket scene, a globe centered on the nations around the South China Sea appeared inside of a compass. The narrator then announced, “Adventureland, the wonder world of nature’s own realm.” Finally, the animated segment transitioned back to a close-up view of the castle, which the narrator explained exists in “Fantasyland, the happiest kingdom of them all.” After one more blast of magic pixie dust from Tinker Bell’s wand, the scene faded and the credits began to roll.36

The narration for this segment from Disneyland reveals how the Cold War impacted the design of the theme park. The four lands, along with stereotypical small town Main Street USA, which would comprise the park’s entrance, reflected five different sanitized, idealized, American values which Walt hoped to promote in his theme parks. Adventureland embodied American
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imperialism, Frontierland represented America’s “pioneering spirit,” Fantasyland symbolized the
Americans’ imagination and escapist tendencies, and Tomorrowland represented American progress. Collectively, these five themed entertainment experiences reflected both Walt’s own ideology as well as the cultural context in which he developed Disneyland. Biographer Gabler observes, “One of the sources of the power for Hollywood was that it created archetypes that…managed to plumb some deep Jungian ocean of collective consciousness. Disneyland, essentially a giant movie set, would deploy the same archetypes and explore the same depths.”

This becomes critical to understanding Disneyland in the context of the times of its development. The 1940s and 1950s, which saw America’s official arrival as one of the world’s two polar superpowers, brought about a wave of intense national pride and cultural idealism. In contrast to an old era where amusement parks served as havens for culturally taboo affairs, the Disney approach constituted a novel take with a distinctly 1950s flair. Rabinowitz writes,

[Disney capitalized on the] concepts of technological utopianism, giving one’s body over to new machines for an effect of wonderment, and sharply differentiating between work and play…to undergird the definition of a national collective identity at the moment the United States was becoming a world power.

By utilizing idealized American values, as embodied by the underlying themes of Frontierland, Main Street USA, Adventureland, Fantasyland, and Tomorrowland, Walt, following the public’s desires and his own American ideology, capitalized on the public’s underlying desire for security and control within the context of the Cold War. Frontierland reflected a national nostalgia for old Americana, a countrywide obsession which became very prominent during the 1950s. This infatuation with tall tales of western legends found its embodiment in one of Disney’s most beloved characters of the 1950s, Davy Crockett. Throughout the decade, the Disney Studios produced several television shows inspired by legends about the famous frontiersman. Making their debut on Disneyland, the Davy Crockett productions, with the titular character portrayed by Fess Parker wearing the soon iconic coonskin cap, tapped into the cultural zeitgeist of the day.

At the height of its popularity, children throughout the United States clamored to obtain Crockett-themed T-shirts, knives, toy rifles, books, jackets, bandanas and other items inspired by the television show. Within the first six months of the Crockett broadcast, seven million records of the show’s theme song, “The Ballad of Davy Crockett,” were purchased nationwide. The company also produced and sold over ten million coonskin caps, which donned the heads of children all over America who were caught up in the Crockett craze. Given the enormous popularity of the television shows, which had drawn around ninety million American viewers,
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Disney repackaged the episodes into a feature film that, upon its release, brought in revenue of $25 million dollars in ticket sales in theaters around the country.\footnote{Stein, Why We Love Disney, 96.}

Why did Crockett, who Disney utilized as Frontierland’s centerpiece at Disneyland, become so wildly popular? The answer lies in the Cold War’s pervasive influence on the United States. Gabler relates how the Crockett craze owed its success to Disney “reviving the idea of a plainspoken, fearless, idealistic…hero, at a time when Americans were harking back to values that they believed distinguished them from the conformity and cold-bloodedness [sic] of their global antagonist, the Soviet Union.”\footnote{Gabler, Walt Disney, 516.} Whether on purpose or by blissful accident, the promotion of Davy Crockett on Disneyland contributed to the growing national longing for a return to a simpler, more controlled America. In the words of Steven Watts, “Walt Disney, with his instinctive feel for cultural pressure points, half-consciously shaped an ideal, reassuring representative of the American life as it faced a daunting challenge from without.”\footnote{Steven Watts, The Magic Kingdom: Walt Disney and the American Way of Life (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2013), 317.} This emphasis on simplicity and order appealed to the massive crowds which would eventually flock to Frontierland, which at the time of Disneyland’s opening, “resembled nothing more than the 1950s TV western set for Davy Crockett.”\footnote{Rabinovitz, Electric Dreamland, 165.}

Tomorrowland, the second themed land, also demonstrates how the Cold War climate impacted the development of Walt’s theme park. In the middle part of the 1950s, Americans became enthralled with the concept of space exploration and interstellar travel.\footnote{Barczewski, Magic Kingdoms, 68.} This infatuation with surveying the cosmos found its source in America’s ongoing arms race with the Soviet Union, which, by the late-1950s, included the Space Race as well.\footnote{Gabler, Walt Disney, 517.} While Walt wished to capitalize on the public’s interest in space exploration in the Tomorrowland section of the park, the Studio’s lack of a background in dealing with the evolving field of planetary discovery meant that the company would have to develop new content.\footnote{Ibid.} Marvin Davis, one of Walt’s right hand men at WED Enterprises, later recalled, “Tomorrowland was a mystery. I mean, who knows what tomorrow will be like? So our early planning was just brainstorming…That area was the most difficult because everything in it had to be created.”\footnote{“Planning the First Disney Parks: A Talk with Marvin Davis,” The E Ticket 28 (Winter 1997), 14.}

To create the content necessary to bring Tomorrowland to life, Walt had to accomplish two separate objectives. First, he needed the Studios to develop content which could be used in the Disneyland show to promote Tomorrowland.\footnote{Gabler, Walt Disney, 517.} Second, he needed the creative team at WED to develop attractions which would harness the public’s obsession with space exploration.\footnote{Barczewski, Magic Kingdoms, 68.} Walt accomplished both of these goals by recruiting some of the foremost American aerospace experts of the era, Werner Von Braun, Willy Ley, and Heinz Habler, to serve as consultants for the Tomorrowland episodes of Disneyland.\footnote{Gabler, Walt Disney, 517.} The first of the three episodes, entitled Man in Space,
debuted on March 9, 1955, and proved to be a smashing success amongst the national viewing audience.\textsuperscript{56}

One individual who watched the program, President Dwight Eisenhower, found the educational programming on the prospects of space travel to be so fascinating that he required all of his rocket experts to study its contents.\textsuperscript{57} Ward Kimball, one of Walt’s top animators who worked on the cartoon segments of \textit{Man In Space}, recalled, “Eisenhower, when he happened to see our \textit{Man In Space} program, was absorbed by it. He realized that he had generals in the Pentagon who didn’t understand or accept these ideas…He flew them all in, and for two weeks he screened our program for his top generals.”\textsuperscript{58} Kimball went on to explain how the Soviet Union also attempted to utilize the \textit{Man In Space} footage for its own space program: “Walt told me later that the Russian government had also requested a copy of the \textit{Man In Space} film, and he flatly turned them down.”\textsuperscript{59}

The development of \textit{Man In Space} contributed to the creation of Walt’s centerpiece for Tomorrowland, an attraction the Imagineers called “Rocket to the Moon.”\textsuperscript{60} Although not involved in the actual creation of the ride at WED, Kimball remembered, “I think a lot of the animated footage of the take-off may be the same as ours in the moon picture…and Willy Ley [one of the same scientists] helped them define some of the concepts.”\textsuperscript{61} This attraction proved overwhelmingly popular with guests at Disneyland due to its pertinence to Cold War events, since the attraction debuted around the time of the Sputnik launch.\textsuperscript{62} Writing on the potency of the Rocket to the Moon ride, Rabinovitz observes, “Rocket to the Moon…[was] central to Tomorrowland because it played out fantasies and fears regarding the U.S. Cold War space race in the 1950s.”\textsuperscript{63} By tapping into the national fears regarding the potential for space exploration, at a time when the country raced against the Soviets to obtain interstellar supremacy, Tomorrowland’s appeal stemmed from the Cold War’s influence on its design.

A third themed land, Main Street USA, constitutes further evidence regarding the significance of the Cold War’s influence on the creation of Disneyland. While suburbanization had begun to take place in droves around the country in the postwar era, Walt looked back on his childhood in Marceline, Missouri with an idyllic romanticized fondness.\textsuperscript{64} Along with Harper Goff, an Imagineer tasked with designing larger portions of Main Street USA, the pair oversaw the creation of the park’s entrance as an embodiment of a bygone era of idealized Americana.\textsuperscript{65} In an interview describing Walt’s vision for Main Street, Goff relayed how Walt told him, “You know, I was a country kid, and things astonished me that don’t astonish people now…but I want something here at Disneyland that would have astonished me as a kid.”\textsuperscript{66} To accomplish this task, Walt and Goff went about designing Main Street USA as a romanticized version of a turn-of-the-century American small town.\textsuperscript{67}
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The Cold War’s influence on this decision, while less obvious than in the Frontierland and Tomorrowland segments of the park, is still apparent when one considers Walt’s motives in designing Disneyland. Biographer Gabler claims, “What was uncanny [about the creation of Disneyland], as always, was how much Walt Disney’s persona experience converged with the national experience.” Gabler further explains how, “Early in the planning stages Walt had described the park as providing a lesson in American heritage…and he wanted visitors to appreciate the kind of bedrock values that were especially salient with the onset of the Cold War.” As guests entered Disneyland, this emphasis on bedrock American values, being promoted against the communist positions of the Soviet Union, could be seen throughout the Main Street USA section of the park, and set the stage for the fantastical version of American idealism which guests would encounter in other sections of the park.

After Disneyland’s debut, expansions made to the park show how the Cold War continued to factor into the company’s creation of content. The catalyst for the park’s first large scale expansion consisted of Disney’s involvement in the planning and execution of the 1964 New York World’s Fair. In the period leading up to the worldwide exhibition, one of the Fair’s chief planners, Robert Moses, contacted Walt for help designing Disneyland-style attractions to draw crowds to the showcase. Walt agreed to produce attractions, which received corporate sponsorships, with the understanding that the technologies, rides, and shows would be transferred to Disneyland after the conclusion of the 1964 New York World’s Fair.

Going into the 1964 New York World’s Fair, Disney saw the exhibition as a venue where he could test out novel technology which he longed to install at Disneyland. To that end, Disney tasked his Imagineers with developing a novel form of entertainment technology called Audio-Animatronics. This newly produced magical machinery fulfilled Walt’s desire to create three-dimensional animated objects capable of bringing his silver screen masterpieces to life. Combining robotic wizardry with impeccable Disney animation, the Audio-Animatronic figures first debuted in the Enchanted Tiki Room, a show at Disneyland where Audio-Animatronic birds, tikis, and flowers sang to the park’s guests in the audience. For the World’s Fair, Walt wanted to improve the Audio-Animatronic technology to the point that the robots could imitate human beings. After several months in the planning stages at WED, the Imagineers succeeded in adopting the technology to include humanoid robots.

While the company developed several attractions for the 1964 New York World’s Fair, no attraction demonstrates how the company utilized the Audio Animatronic technology to promote American values during the Cold War like “It’s a Small World.” The famed attraction consisted of a boat ride through sets representing every region of the world with a chorus of dolls representing dozens of nations singing an infectious song titled the same as the attraction itself. The song, written by Disney lyrical legends Robert and Richard Sherman, begins when the dolls...
sing, “It’s a world of laughter/a world of tears./It’s a world of hope/And a world of fears./There’s so much that we share/That its time we’re aware/It’s a small world after all.” After the chorus, where the choir of dolls repeat the last line over and over again, the harmonious group of dolls continue, “There is just one moon/and one golden sun./And a smile means friendship to every one [sic]./Though the mountains divide/and the oceans are wide/it’s a small world after all.”

This attraction, with its emphasis on harmony amongst members of the global community, represents one of Disney’s most overt attempts to strike back against American fears in the Cold War era. The ride’s conceptualization originated when the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) agreed to sponsor one of Disney’s attractions at the Fair. Richard Sherman remembered how, in the planning stages for the attraction, he told Walt how excited he was to develop the song for the ride, since “The attraction is sponsored by UNICEF [and it]’s a good cause.” However, when Sherman, not believing the song would be the huge success it eventually became, suggested that he would donate all of his royalties from the song to UNICEF, Walt, realizing how the song related to the climate of the times, replied: “Don’t you ever do that! This song is gonna [sic] see your kids through college...You want to make a donation? Do that! But don’t give away your royalties.” Ever in touch with the national temperature, Walt’s prediction regarding “It’s a Small World” came to pass as the song became one of the most popular ever developed by Disney, due in no small part to the manner in which the song soothed the fears of its listeners during the Cold War.

At the dedication ceremony when Disneyland opened on July 17, 1955, Walt Disney famously remarked,

To all who come to this happy place; welcome. Disneyland is your land. Here age relives fond memories of the past. And here youth may savor the...promise of the future. Disneyland is dedicated to the ideals, the dreams and the hard facts that have created America with the hope that it will be a source of joy and inspiration to all the world.

These words embody the principles and values which Walt Disney hoped to promote to the American people with his creation of Disneyland. Walt succeeded in his promotion of these idealistic principles through the making of themed lands like Frontierland, Tomorrowland, and Main Street USA, as well as through the expansion of the entertainment complex through the invention of Audio-Animatronic attractions like “It’s a Small World.” In making these magical productions, Walt Disney successfully fought the battle for the advancement of American values during the Cold War. In his creation of the so called “Happiest Place on Earth,” Walt Disney managed to embody Americana in a way which appealed to families across the United States. Ultimately, the primary role Disney fulfilled in the Cold War consisted of his contributions to the boosting national morale through his efforts in these magical battlegrounds.
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Introduction
From 1960 to 1980, the United States of America witnessed a surge in immigration as populations across the globe sought to reap the benefits of America’s labor market, educational opportunities, and expanding social networks. Immigrants from Spanish speaking regions including Mexico, Central America, and South America constituted the largest share of new arrivals. However, these new entrants found themselves subject to disadvantages at the hands of American institutional structures, notably its medical care system, effectively marginalizing them. Latina women were particularly restricted by structural boundaries in the public healthcare system in Los Angeles as they unwittingly became victimized by a modern-day eugenics movement that sought to limit the number of newborn Latin American citizens.

Eugenics, a term coined by sociologist and statistician Francis Galton in 1883, is defined as the science of artificially producing a better, more improved human race. The field of eugenics continued to rise in popularity and peaked by the 1920s. Although eugenics as a study was rarely referenced after the early twentieth century, its focus on controlling birth rates of specific groups of people endured. Guided by an evolved notion of eugenics, health professionals sterilized many pregnant Latina mothers without their explicit permission in a Los Angeles public hospital. This demonstrates a type of impaired intersectional experience of Latina women, as they were not only women in a patriarchal society but were also of an ethnic minority in a white majority.

These women, despite the great challenges they faced, used their limited power to reclaim their bodies via two interrelated approaches: grassroot organization and a reliance on the American legal system to encourage reforms on sterilization practices. Latina immigrant women were able to exert historical agency, as they aligned themselves with the Committee to Stop Forced Sterilization in LA, organized local protests in 1973, and filed a lawsuit under the Madrigal v. Quilligan case in 1975.

Eugenics, Sterilization, and Immigration: A Historiographical Assessment
Francis Galton’s eugenics program aimed to regulate marriages between mentally and physically superior individuals in order to increase the procreation of individuals with desirable traits. Eugenics as an idea became increasingly popular starting from the 1880s and was found
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across numerous cultures and states in varying forms.\textsuperscript{5} The widespread emergence of nationalism by the onset of the twentieth century created an environment that sought to exercise a type of population control.\textsuperscript{6} Several authors have taken stances on certain eugenics movements in the United States that effectively marginalized and oppressed groups of people.

In Molly Ladd-Taylor’s \textit{Fixing the Poor: Eugenic Sterilization and Child Welfare in the Twentieth Century}, readers are introduced to an era of legalized sterilization in the U.S. from 1907 to 1937.\textsuperscript{7} In her text, Taylor discusses how state-run eugenic programs in the state of Minnesota effectively targeted welfare-dependent and disabled citizens. Her work reflects an effort by the state to reduce and control any benefits given to the poor, who were often labeled as “undeserving.”

In \textit{Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America}, author Mae M. Ngai touches on the nuances of what became known as the “illegal alien” in the context of U.S. immigration policies and American society.\textsuperscript{8} Ngai closely examines the different treatment of European and non-European migrants and nation-specific immigration restrictions during the 1920s. The text touches on the use of eugenics-based assumptions by those who advocated against immigration. Some government officials claimed that by allowing immigrants of certain backgrounds, like those of Hispanic origin, would degrade the American population through race-mixing, which would create “mongrel,” unstable races.\textsuperscript{9}

Author Nancy L. Gallagher, in her work \textit{Breeding Better Vermonters: The Eugenics Project in the Green Mountain State}, exposes eugenics programs in the state of Vermont. Gallagher demonstrates how eugenic based policies in Vermont targeted the rural poor in the 1920s and continued to pursue ethnic minorities well into the 1930s. Gallagher introduces readers to the “new” eugenics of the 1930s, one that focused on population and birth control as opposed to the old eugenics-based goal of shaping intellect and behavior.\textsuperscript{10}

Paul A. Lombardo’s \textit{Three Generations, No Imbeciles: Eugenics, the Supreme Court, and Buck v. Bell} assesses the 1927 case of \textit{Buck v. Bell} which allowed states to forcibly sterilize residents.\textsuperscript{11} The sterilization laws were meant to suppress the spreading of “defective” traits seen through the offspring of inadequate individuals.\textsuperscript{12} Lombardo effectively demonstrates how Carrie Buck, an impregnated rape victim, failed to challenge Virginia’s sterilization laws in an era in which sympathy for the eugenics movement was widespread.

There have been numerous works on American cases of discrimination and sterilization of minority groups in the context of the eugenics movement. Each contributes valuable insight to the social and political circumstances of eugenics-based ideologies in the marginalization of
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lower socioeconomic individuals. However, each of these works stop the debate on sterilization as a mode of eugenicist ideology too early. After the 1930s, Americans began to speak about eugenics in more subtle ways as the field itself became increasingly controversial. However, this did not mean that eugenics as a theory was completely eradicated. As highlighted through the 1975 *Madrigal v. Quilligan* sterilization case in the L.A. county hospital, several Americans continued to abide by the logic of Francis Galton’s original eugenics study.

**The Path to Latina Sterilization: The Mexican and Puerto Rican Immigrant Experience**

The arrival of new Spanish-speaking individuals into the United States was one of the most contentious aspects of U.S. immigration and foreign policies. Latinx populations began to rapidly increase with the onset of the 1960s, climbing from a concentrated population of 3.24 percent in the US to 16 percent within only a few decades. Mexican and Puerto Rican newcomers comprised most of these immigrants – with reason. Several American programs and policies were implemented in the mid-1900s and after which presented certain opportunities to Mexican and Puerto Rican immigrants.

The Bracero Program, founded in 1942, was a guest worker program that allowed Mexican laborers to perform agricultural work for US farms and encouraged many Mexicans to enter the US, drastically increasing the number of Mexican immigrants both legal and illegal. The program stimulated a sharp rise in undocumented Mexican migration as many Mexican men, eager for better wages in the US, circumvented the program’s contract and visa system and crossed the border without any paperwork. American employers also contributed to the steady rise in undocumented immigrants as they wished to avoid the higher costs that came with being involved with the Bracero Program. The steady influx of Mexican immigrants, provoked by this government-mediated project, continued well after Bracero’s termination in 1964.

The Jones-Shafroth Act of 1917 was another American legal policy that added to the increased immigration of Latinx people. After the end of the Spanish-American War of 1898, Puerto Rico was appointed as an unincorporated possession of the United States, causing aggressive independence movements by Puerto Rican nationalists who felt they had no freedom to exercise their rights. The Jones-Shafroth Act was then established to grant United States citizenship to Puerto Ricans. But the writers of the Jones Act did not anticipate that this new citizenship would stimulate a rapid increase in Puerto Rican migration to continental US. By 1960, the population of mainland Puerto Ricans jumped to a staggering 887,000, a steep rise from a population of 70,000 in the 1940s.

In 1965, the Immigration and Nationality Act was passed, which pursued a change in what it meant to be American; it sought to introduce policies that abolished the notion of a “second class citizen” and promote greater equality by eliminating quotas that favored northern European immigrants over other nationalities. Vice President Hubert Humphrey, working under the Johnson Administration, stated that “We [the U.S.] must in 1965, remove all elements in our
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immigration laws which suggest there are second-class people.”18 This act allowed for single, naturalized immigrants to open the doors of America for their family members and effectively created a flow of Latina women into the United States. These women came to reunite with their brothers, husbands, and fathers who had already been working in the US. These new immigrant women significantly contributed to the steep increase of the Latinx population in the United States from the 1960s to the 1970s.

The Rise of Sterilization Programs in American Healthcare Systems

Vice President Hubert Humphrey called for a time of equality in 1965, but the reality was far more precarious for Latina women. As Latinx populations within the United States increased significantly, the US also entered a state of economic crisis, leaving the poverty rate at an all-time high of nineteen percent.19 In response, President Lyndon B. Johnson initiated his War on Poverty, a political move to improve Americans’ economic standing. Johnson’s War on Poverty ultimately led to the passing of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which mobilized several government funding initiatives that aimed at decreasing poverty.20 One of the most significant aspects of this legislation was increased federal funding towards family planning. These funds were meant to support families by ensuring that children had necessary resources to survive to adulthood, while also providing increased access to birth control. However, some hospital executives directed a portion of these funds towards tubal ligations, the irreversible cutting or tying of the fallopian tubes, ultimately rendering several Latina women sterile without their knowledge.21

In the early twentieth century, American culture became motivated by the eugenic family studies of what were known as “defective” lineages, such as the study on the Kallikak family. Psychologist and eugenicist Henry H. Goddard, director of the Training School for Feebleminded Children in New Jersey, published his study on the “underperforming” family lineage of one of his students.22 His work concluded that many mental traits, such as intellectual and learning disabilities were hereditary. He proposed that society should therefore limit the reproduction of individuals who met criteria he developed for mental deficiency to prevent them from having unintelligent children.23 Although Goddard’s claims were not backed by a concrete scientific method of hypothesis and supporting evidence, several Americans grew fascinated with the idea of relying on prevailing “scientific” norms to regulate societal development.

For example, in the state of California, several bills were passed that allowed medical officials in asylums and hospitals to sterilize patients and inmates to improve their psychological or moral conditions.24 In addition to such bills, clauses were added by the 1920s that shielded
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physicians from legal retaliation by providing an effective rationale for such procedures. In a leaflet circulated from the 1920s to 1940s, the Human Betterment Foundation, based in California, listed several justifications for sterilization. The pamphlet claimed, “[Sterilization] in no way unsexes the patient, it in no way impairs the health of the patient, it is a protection, not a punishment and therefore carries no stigma or humiliation, it prevents the birth of children who would probably have a bad heredity, who could not be cared for properly.”

With new state laws and clauses that rationalized sterilization, California became home to an extensive eugenics movement. In a California medical report table from 1941, the number of sterilization procedures surpassed 14,955, putting California at the forefront of the sterilization movement in all of America. Many academic figures actively attempted to promote even more legislation on sterilization. For example, philanthropist Ezra S. Gosney, wrote Sterilization for Human Betterment: A Summary of Results of 6000 Operations in California, 1909-1929, in which he discusses the benefits and successes of a range of sterilization procedures. Such public advocacy for sterilization was an attempt to create more laws that widely permitted procedures like tubal ligation and procure more sterilization supporters. California law defined sterilization as an act of public health and preservation, ultimately allowing sterilization procedures to continue without disruption for decades. Such procedures continued in California well into the 1970s on the basis of preventing bad parenthood and alleviating population burdens – a response to high rates of immigration to the U.S.

Sterilization of Latina Women in Los Angeles County General Hospital

As the federal government continued to endorse immigrant restrictions and family planning, sterilization procedures became widespread in several clinics and hospitals, including the Los Angeles General Hospital. This hospital, which oversaw service to many Latina women, was funded largely in part by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). This department made efforts to cover the costs of medical treatment for women who did not possess sufficient funds for private healthcare. However, under the guise of providing caesarean sections, the Los Angeles County Hospital became well known for simultaneously sterilizing women after they had given birth.

Beginning in the 1960s, many white, middle-class women advocated for greater reproductive agency as part of the second-wave feminist movement that sought to expand women’s identities beyond those of mothers and wives. White feminists were able to achieve much success as they gained greater access to birth control and abortion. However, Latina women did not achieve much victory in their fight for greater birth control, as they were deemed “destructive over breeders whose procreative tendencies needed to be managed,” by the white majority. Such notions were fostered in the Los Angeles County Hospital through sterilization
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procedures. Physicians and residents were required to meet certain quotas for tubal ligations, and ultimately met such demands by performing these procedures on Spanish-speaking immigrants.

Sterilization practices continued in the hospital, unknown to its victims, at alarmingly high rates. In the year 1973, Dr. Bernard Rosenfield, a medical resident at the county hospital, found he could no longer contain the horror he felt while witnessing the unethical sterilization practices. He decided to publish a piece that publicly reported on sterilization statistics at the County General Hospital, including records that indicated “a 742% increase in elective hysterectomies, a 470% increase in tubal ligations, and a 151% increase in postdelivery tubal ligations” between 1968 and 1970. Rosenfield further spoke about pressures that medical residents, or doctors in training, received from obstetricians in supervisory roles. Many residents were told to coerce vulnerable patients into agreeing to tubal ligation procedures, so that the residents themselves could get the proper surgical training they needed. A combination of government pressures, resident doctor exploitation, and racial bias led to several Latina women losing their right to have children.

The Response to Forced Sterilization at the L.A. County Hospital: Latina Residents Organize to Cease Unethical Medical Practices

In light of Rosenfield’s public exposé on forced sterilization, many Mexican-American women, who were the primary Spanish-speaking patients at the Los Angeles County Hospital, began to organize themselves. Over 140 women came together, at home and at street rallies, and spoke about their similar experiences at the hospital, all claiming to have been sterilized without their explicit knowledge. Many of these women decided to mobilize their frustrations by demonstrating against the County Hospital through the formation of the Committee to Stop Forced Sterilization (CSFS). The CSFS played an integral role in Latina women’s ability to exert agency in their fight against the unprincipled practices of the hospitals and its workers. This committee placed the onset of sterilization within the context of the federal antipoverty programs that they believed, targeted poor people of color. Not only did the CSFS conduct peaceful protests outside the hospital, but it also produced many pamphlets that called for individuals to join the fight by providing statistical information on coerced sterilization.

In a 1973 leaflet published by the Committee to Stop Forced Sterilization, the text implores its readers to join the cause by providing “speakers that will come to your house and additional leaflets to pass out,” as well as contact information for those who “have information to give us [CSFS] about sterilization.” This pamphlet sought to uncover the reality of what occurred behind the closed doors of the Los Angeles County Hospital through cartoons and written pieces on what it means to have a lack of agency over one’s reproductive choices. In one cartoon included in the pamphlet, a man labeled as “HEW,” representing the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, stands behind a doctor stating “She [the patient] should be grateful. After all the operation is free. They have too many kids anyway.” In response, the doctor tells his patients to “Sign, or we’ll cut off your welfare” or “You have to sign this before I deliver” while forcing consent papers into the hands of women who do not speak English and are in intense labor. The cartoons tersely emphasize not only key players in forced sterilization, but also the manipulation of women in labor.
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The text further identifies corporations and a racially motivated US government as reasons for the lack of communication and cooperation amongst victimized women in the fight against sterilization. The leaflet expressed that, “White workers are told that the reason taxes take so much out of their salaries is because they are supporting all those non-white people and their kids on welfare. Minority people are told that the reason they are poor is not because of job and education discrimination but because they have too many children.” The leaflet in effect works to suggest that the blame should neither be placed on groups of lower socioeconomic statuses, nor on oneself, and rather it should be targeted against those in government and business who exercise the greatest amount of power. The CSFS, through information pamphlets such as “Stop Forced Sterilization Now,” effectively prompted more women to speak out about their experiences in the County hospital.

**The Case of Madrigal v. Quilligan**

To further expand organization efforts, the Committee to Stop Forced Sterilization cooperated with other Latina and Hispanic organizations such as Comisión Feminil and filed a lawsuit against the Los Angeles County Hospital under the case Madrigal v. Quilligan in 1975. The case involved ten sterilized women who gave their testimonies against obstetricians in the hospital. The plaintiffs claimed that they had all been sterilized between the years 1971 and 1974, arguing that their basic constitutional and human rights had been violated. Attorneys Antonia Hernandez and Charles Nabarette, who worked for the Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice, represented these women. All ten of the women were working-class Mexican women who knew little English. Although each of the women were of different ages and had a different number of children, they had all immigrated to the US as teenagers to either reunite with their families or find work. Furthermore, they all shared strikingly similar experiences within the Los Angeles County Hospital.

Jovita Rivera, one of the plaintiffs in the case, gave the following testimony in court: “While I was in advanced labor and under anesthesia with complications in childbirth and in great pain, the doctor told me I had too many children, that I was poor, and a burden to the government … the doctors told me that my tubes could be untied at a later time.” Another plaintiff, Maria Hurtado, provided her own experiences at the hospital, describing what staff members told her about tubal ligation:

I was told that the State of California did not permit a woman to undergo more than three caesarean section operations and that since this was to be my third caesarean section, the doctor would have to do something to me to prevent my having another caesarean section operation. No explanation nor description of the tubal ligation, which was later performed on me … was given to me.

Rivera and Hurtado’s testaments reveal an unethical trend within the Los Angeles County Hospital. Women in labor who were in no condition to make informed decisions were forced to sign consent papers that, at that moment, appeared to be contingent on their receipt of medical
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care. Even if doctors mentioned the procedure of tubal ligations, women did not know it could irreversibly prevent pregnancy. Many women still believed that they would be able to continue to have children.

Judge Jesse Curtis, who was appointed to the Madrigal v. Quilligan case, ultimately ruled in favor of the defendants, who he pronounced as innocent physicians working in the genuine good interest of the patient. Although Curtis did acknowledge the emotional trauma each of the women had faced due to sterilization procedures, he determined that the issue boiled down to “a breakdown in communication between the patients and the doctors.” It was a harrowing loss for many victims of forced sterilization who demanded justice. However, despite the loss of the plaintiffs, a clause was secured, that required all consent forms to be bilingual. Furthermore, the Los Angeles County Hospital became further scrutinized by government officials, forcing it to closely adhere to the guidelines of waiting 72 hours between consent and operation, and banning any sterilization procedures on patients at or below 21 years of age.

**An Interdisciplinary Approach to Understanding Forced Sterilization**

The sterilization programs that targeted Spanish-speaking immigrant women in California arguably stemmed from inherent notions and fixations on female gender norms and sexuality. In Michel Foucault’s *The History of Sexuality*, Foucault discusses the concept of gender and sexuality, claiming that it derives from power and knowledge relations. He specifically discusses “bio-power” and its two dimensions: anatomo-politics of the body and biopolitics of the population. Anatomo-politics refers to the knowledge of the body to discipline it and ensure its maximum efficiency. This form of bio-power focuses on treating the body almost like a well-oiled machine, making sure it is well organized and optimized in its capabilities. Biopolitics of the population centers on the regulation of species population through fertility and mortality, to control reproduction. This type of bio-power focuses on the biological mechanics of propagation, health levels, life expectancy, and the conditions that can cause such processes to vary. Anatomo-politics and biopolitics combined create techniques of power found in all levels of social body and institutions, allowing for segregation and social hierarchization. Such stratification is seen through the control and isolation of Latina women’s bodies via sterilization within hospitals and clinics, conducted by mostly white male physicians, governed by white lawmakers.

During waves of immigration throughout the 1960s and 1970s, many mainstream Americans felt that immigrants were taking away their opportunities for work and income. Several of them began to think of immigrants as reasons for increased taxes because of their numerous children, straining society by taking resources away from the middle-class white American. Immigrant women who had “too many children” were targeted for not conforming to American societal standards by being women of color who had more than the socially accepted one to two children. In effect, the American government sought to control Latinas’ bodies through sterilization programs; American society primed the Latina body by its own standards, rendering it unfertile. Latina women became an easy target, as they were barred from proper education and means of higher income due to institutionalized discrimination. Their lower
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socioeconomic status, combined with their perceived inferior femininity, placed them at the bottom of the social hierarchy, leaving them with little to no power within society. In effect, these women lost control of their bodies, as well as their basic rights.

Conclusions

After the Madrigal v. Quilligan case, forced sterilization continued in several other hospitals across the U.S. The continued loss of Spanish-speaking women’s rights to their own bodies suggested a comprehensive lack of influence and power on the part of Latina women. Despite the loss of the Madrigal v. Quilligan case, many victims of sterilization were able to publicize the ongoing practices of what was supposedly a mid-to late twentieth century eugenics movement. As the public gained greater knowledge, the government was forced to investigate and supervise medical operations more than ever before. For example, in the year 1977, a total of 50 organizations convened in Washington D.C. to push for stricter enforcement and oversight by the HEW to decrease continued hospital violations in terms of tubal ligations.\textsuperscript{41}

Several mainstream Americans considered sterilization programs to be policies that would better the nation for all, whether for Mexican immigrant women, or for white American men. Although sterilization procedures started as a mode of family planning to conserve resources, the course and objective of this project changed once Latina women comprised the majority of sterilized individuals across the US, even beyond California. The rising number of sterilized women was no coincidence; it rather indicated a type of social marginalization these women faced due to their immigrant, female, and Latina identity. What is extraordinary is that these same women were able to exert agency by uniting and taking part in protests while making political moves within the American judicial system. Their determination to prevent further unsolicited sterilization of other women demonstrated a salvation of the Latina body. More importantly, these women’s civic perseverance effectively cemented a Latina identity of unapologetic strength within the American social and political atmosphere.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid. 1138.
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Switzerland was granted status as a confederation in a perpetual state of neutrality by the final act of the Congress of Vienna in 1815. This was undoubtedly seen as a blessing in its time, finally ending the period of Mediation set in place by Napoleon Bonaparte. Just a few days later, Napoleon would be defeated at the Battle of Waterloo, and the relative homeostasis of the European powers would re-establish itself for the next hundred years. At the end of this period of industrial advancement, colonial expansion, and military armament beyond compare, Europe plunged into a hellacious period of war and famine whose buildup can only be likened to a Greek tragedy. Still there amidst the chaos stood Switzerland. Many fall into the easy trap of believing that while Europe was burning, Switzerland sat like Nero in his palace, watching and fiddling as it burned. This is not the truth at all, as Switzerland underwent its own painful war at home. Had the Communist Revolution not broken out in the Soviet Union in 1917, the Swiss people and culture could have experienced a revolution in its image.

From 24-25 November 1912, Basel was host to the Ninth Conference of the Second International. The conference was called in order to direct the whole community of European Socialists against the impending war. This would be the last conference of the Second International before the eruption of the war. Notably, all of the conferences held after the war were also held in Switzerland despite having only had one previous conference there before 1912, indicating that sometime between 1912 and 1919 a growth was experienced in the comfort of Socialists in Switzerland. One possible explanation for this is that during the First World War, Switzerland became a haven for political activists avoiding involvement in the war, such as Leon Trotsky, who boarded a train bound for Zurich the very day that Germany declared war on Russia. Trotsky was drawn to Switzerland from the outset, commenting in his personal memoir that it was a “temporary political watchtower from which several Russian Marxists reviewed the development of those unprecedented events.” Trotsky had not to this point established himself as the revolutionary leader that he would soon become, but he was already a man of action. Less than two weeks after arriving in Zurich, a paper he was affiliated with called “Volksrecht” published an article suggesting that the Swiss government should begin the requisition of all grain and potatoes in order to oversee distribution levels appropriate for a war-time nation dependent upon imports for more than 75% of its food. These sort of Socialistic propositions to the Federal Council would continue, and public activism in support thereof, although initially reserved, would escalate as the war waged on.

The Swiss population at the outbreak of the war was unique in their unity despite their vast diversity of national backgrounds, economic standings, and language barriers. Having an almost evenly distributed population with one-third speaking German, one-third speaking French, and one-third speaking Italian, such representation in the Federal Council was not the case. Of the seven members of the council, six were Germanophones, with one lone Francophone in company. This curiosity was magnified when the Federal Council was given unlimited plenary powers in order to uphold Switzerland’s “security, integrity, and neutrality” during the war. With such power, the Council mobilized the Swiss Army on 1 August. Within a week, the Council promoted Colonel Ulrich Wille to General, and named him commander of their forces, of which there stood 220,000 men and 200,000 reserves. Wille decided to focus his forces on two primary locations: A small contingency was staged in Engadin to the Southeast near the Austro-Italian border, while six divisions were staged at Ajoie to the Northwest near the Franco-German border. Around the same time, the International Committee of the Red Cross worked in conjunction with the Swiss Federal Council to formulate an agreement between Germany, France, Britain, Russia, and Belgium that stated that “captured military and naval personnel who were too seriously wounded or sick to be able to continue in military service could be repatriated through Switzerland.” It appeared at first that the Swiss would make their contributions to the European community by housing those homeless, caring for those wounded, and defending their own citizens thus uninvolved in the conflict. After all, the Swiss had endured throughout previous periods of war and acknowledged its punitive nature. The Federal Council even took the time to reassert the ideal that the Swiss people were, “First and above all… Swiss, then only Latins and Germans.” This perspective may be best stated by Swiss historian Jean-Rodolph de Salis, who was thirteen and living in Bern when the World War began, as he says, “As seen from the political observation post of Switzerland, it was clear over the centuries that any given country that was victorious in one war was defeated in another.” Salis would go on to argue that though the Swiss population may have been bound by language to their ethnic homeland, if either France or Germany had attacked Switzerland, all of the cantons together would have rushed to her defense.

Salis may have overestimated the universality of his experience, however, as many held a view of their respective home-nation in which they were not willing to let go of the aspirations of a continental empire. Hans Kohn, an historian who spent most of World War I as a POW in Russia, writes in his book, Nationalism and Liberty, “The war of 1914, with its split between pro-German and pro-French Swiss, aroused passions in neutral Switzerland which threatened to destroy the moral unity of the country.” One passionate Germanophile was the new Swiss commander, General Ulrich Wille, who was married to a member of the Bismarck family. His bias towards Germany quickly revealed itself when he suggested on 20 July 1915 that
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Switzerland join Germany in the war. This pro-Central sentiment found home in Northeast Switzerland where most of the citizens were Germanophones and Germanophiles. Following the invasion of Belgium, many refugees fled to Switzerland and were met by Swiss-German newspaper articles telling them to return home where “under sensible German administration, they could work on getting the situation back to normal.” Another historian that happened to be living in London when World War I began, states that from his perspective, “The Great War of 1914–1918 was… a civil war within the European community of nations.” Having been shaken by the explosion of the Balkan “Powder Keg”, the whole of Europe began moving about during this “civil war,” and the Swiss policy of asylum attracted agitators from across the continent. Trotsky crossed into France on 19 November 1914, but his absence was hardly noticed as the public was consumed with another high-profile immigrant.

Having been recently released from prison in Galicia, Vladimir Lenin arrived in Bern on 5 September 1914. Lenin wasted no time, as he spent the two days following his arrival delivering his theses of “The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War” to the Bolsheviks living in Bern. Later that month, on 27 September, Lenin spoke at the Italo-Swiss Social Democrat Conference in Lugano. Noteworthily, Robert Grimm, the future Swiss leader of the Socialist-center, and Benito Mussolini were both in attendance to this first of the major Socialist conferences in Switzerland during the war. Conferences of this nature were commonplace in Switzerland from the time of Lenin’s arrival until the Russian Revolution. The popularity that Lenin accrued was due in no small part to his near omnipresence throughout Switzerland. He came to Lausanne to debate Georgi Plekhanov on the issue of “The Attitude of Socialists Towards the War” at a meeting of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (RSDLP) on 11 October. Later that week, he was reported in a French Socialist newspaper called “Golos” as having given a public lecture to a “large audience.”

He continued to speak in West Switzerland by giving a speech on “European War and Socialism” in Geneva on 15 October. Due to the liberal status of the Swiss legal system, censorship was not an option as it was in the belligerent countries, and this allowed men like Lenin to rouse support in even the most conservative sections of Switzerland, such as Geneva, where it was said that identifying as a Socialist was equivalent to self-imposed social ostracism.

Lenin also likely found acceptance due to the fact that the Swiss social climate was ripe for revolution. The Swiss found themselves in a particularly poor position in the worldwide community, being completely landlocked, and as Trotsky had warned, dependent on imports to feed the population. Some have described Switzerland as being a “windowless antechamber,
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which in order to get air, must keep its doors open at all times.”\textsuperscript{24} The main communication route by which the Swiss operated was the Rhine River, which was controlled at this point by the Germans. They also received many imports through the port at Cette on the South coast of France. Thus, much to its displeasure, the Federal Council was forced to submit to external control of its imports. The Allies began imposing restrictions on quantities of material and food being imported to ensure that the Swiss were not re-exporting it to the Central Powers, which they had previously been doing, as Germany was their largest purchaser of machinery. In early 1915, the Swiss managed to secure a trade agreement with the Germans and Austro-Hungarians for coal, iron, and sugar, but just months later the Allies threatened to greatly reduce the amount of food being given to the Swiss if they continued to trade with the Central Powers. With 80% of their war-time food coming from the Allies and the United States, a future Allied Power, the Swiss were forced to comply.\textsuperscript{25} The lack of raw materials previously received from the Central Powers put many workplaces out of business, including the previously flourishing watch industry. Suddenly, “thousands of the most highly skilled workers became unemployed, and were obliged to take up coarse work, which spoiled their hands and blunted their skill. From artisans they became proletarians.”\textsuperscript{26} This new proletariat class, hearing the speeches of Lenin and company, began to harbor hatred for the bourgeoisie. It was such that “the worker felt that he had to suffer, not to pay his share of the general debt, but so that others might enjoy themselves.”\textsuperscript{27}

In order to turn the attitude towards the government from such a negative light, the Federal Assembly began imposing uncharacteristic restrictions on publications published within the Confederation. It began with the banishment of a satirical magazine called “Guguss,” and soon after, the Swiss Foreign Minister banned all publications with “prophetic angles.”\textsuperscript{28} This type of effort did little to hush the Socialists, who were practiced in readily erecting new publications within days of the suppression of another. For example, in France, Leon Trotsky was working for a Socialist newspaper titled “Mysl”, when on 3 March 1915 it was banned by the French Minister of the Interior. By 31 March, Trotsky and company published the first issue of their new paper, titled “Zhizn.”\textsuperscript{29} The efforts of the Foreign Minister to put down anti-government sentiment had an inverse effect. From February to September 1915, the RSDLP-led Socialists held no fewer than six conferences in Switzerland alone. These conferences were attended by a host of Socialists that found their way into Switzerland. Even Julius Martov, the leader of the Mensheviks and mentor to both Trotsky and Lenin, was known to lecture occasionally in Bern after being “squeezed out” of France.\textsuperscript{30} Martov’s entrance into Switzerland shows an interesting reason why neither the Central Powers nor the Allies invaded the Swiss. Switzerland had become the last refuge for leaders of nations that had lost their thrones by revolution or war. To invade would destroy any hope of a convenient safe-haven in the post-war world.\textsuperscript{31}
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The influx of immigrants with revolutionary ideas led many native Swiss to react in one of two ways: some who agreed with those that had come to Switzerland as conscientious objectors or deserters began to flock to the Socialists in support of their anti-militaristic stances, while others who were discontent with neutrality left Switzerland in order to enlist in the armies of belligerent nations, many believing that the only result of neutrality was an indifference to good and evil. By the war’s end, seven thousand Swiss men had died in the service of France alone. For those that remained in Switzerland, however, disdain for the government continued to grow, for “since the government, in virtue of its emergency powers, decided everything that was to be done, the whole responsibility was laid at its door, and an extremely left-wing Socialist group with a Communist bias had been steadily taking shape.”

While the Swiss Government was busy throughout 1915 with the internment and repatriation of over 67,000 soldiers from France, Germany, England, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, the Socialists were busy organizing a revolution. From 14-19 February, Bern was host to the Conference of the Foreign RSDLP. Later that month, from 27 February – 4 March, Bern was again host to the Conference of Foreign Sections of the Bolsheviks, the far-left section of the RSDLP. Lenin wrote that this conference was of “great historic importance, as it worked out a platform on which all genuinely internationalist elements in the international labour movement could unite.” Bern, notably the city in which Lenin lived until December 1915, also hosted the International Socialist Women’s Conference, the International Conference of Socialist Youth, and the “Vorkonferenz” where the first Zimmerwald Conference was organized, and those to be invited were settled upon.

The first Zimmerwald Conference was held from 5-8 September 1915. With 30 delegates from at least 11 different nations, it was one of the most valuable and diverse conferences to take place during the war. Lenin, Trotsky, Martov, Grimm, and other well-known Socialists were in attendance, though the British delegates were refused passports and thus were unable to attend. Lenin proposed a slogan for the conference, “Civil War, not Civil Peace,” which received 5 votes, one of which from a Swiss delegate, but was ultimately voted down. The two most important results of the conference were the establishment of the Zimmerwald Left, which Lenin would go on to champion, and the establishment of the Commission of the Centre of International Socialism in Bern, headed by Robert Grimm, who had taken on the position of editor at Berner Tagwacht, a Swiss Social-Democratic newspaper. The commission put Grimm’s talents to use and published bulletins announcing upcoming events. In their third bulletin, they announced a conference to be held in Kienthal. From 24-30 April 1916, 40 delegates were in attendance representing at least 11 nations. After deciding to push the end of

---

32 Bonjour, et al., *A Short History of Switzerland*, 345-351.
34 Bonjour, et al., *A Short History of Switzerland*, 351.
35 Ibid., 353.
36 Thatcher, *Leon Trotsky and World War One*, 45.
38 Ibid., 426-433.
the conference to Labour Day at sunrise on 1 May, many saw this conference as a symbol of working class unity. The conclusion of this conference was concise:

To the people driven to ruin and death, there is but one effective means to preventing future wars; The seizure of political power and the abolition of capitalist property by the working class.

This conference is believed to have marked both the high point and the beginning of the disintegration of the Socialist movement in Switzerland. Lenin and his wife had run out of money and were forced to leave Bern and move to Zurich for the remainder of his time in Switzerland. He was still living in poverty in Zurich when the Communist Revolution in Russia occurred in 1917. However, when word of the revolution reached Lenin, he contacted Gregory Zinoviev in Bern, Mikha Tskhakaya in Geneva, and Inessa Armand in Clarens, showing that despite the fact that he was impoverished, he still had connections throughout Switzerland. On 3 April, Lenin began his German-funded trip back to Russia, which Winston Churchill described saying, “They transported Lenin in a sealed train like a plague bacillus from Switzerland to Russia.” After arriving in Petrograd, Lenin and the provisional government (including Zinoviev and Stalin) met for the Petrograd City Conference in which they published a resolution that was based largely off of Lenin’s writings from his time in Switzerland.

Absent of Lenin, the Swiss Social Democratic Party fell into the hands of Robert Grimm, who had been recently disgraced in the public eye during the Grimm-Hoffman affair. The victory of the Bolsheviks in Russia inspired the Swiss proletarians who had been so enthusiastic in their support of Lenin. Lenin’s rapid ascension into a position of power was a cause for celebration and hope to his friends in Switzerland. Yet, while Lenin took power of 160 million citizens in Russia, his followers in Switzerland still waited for an end to the wretched war. Switzerland had experienced inflation, which, combined with low wages due to raised unemployment rates, set the stage for revolution in Switzerland in the likeness of that in the Soviet Union. When the Federal Assembly became aware that Swiss Bolsheviks were planning to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution with a massive demonstration in Zurich, they ordered a military occupation of the city. In response to the occupation, the Socialist Action Committee declared a general strike across Switzerland beginning on 11 November 1918, which also turned out to be Armistice Day. While the rest of Europe finally erupted into celebration and the church bells rang, 250,000 Swiss workers went on strike. In Zurich, 7,000 workers were fired upon by 95,000 soldiers, leaving four dead and many injured. The Social Democratic Action Committee, headed by Robert Grimm, gave five simple demands:
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1. Immediately withdraw all troops
2. Immediate reelection of the Federal Assembly on the proportional system
3. Labour Conscription
4. 48 Hour work weeks
5. Government agreement to pay off the national debt by capital levy.

On 12 November, the public service workers joined the strike and the railways practically ceased to run. The Federal Assembly held an extraordinary session in which they declined all demands of the Action Committee, declaring their readiness to enact social and political reforms only by constitutional action. The Federal Council demanded the strike end at midnight, and that the Action Committee be arrested and conducted to the frontier country under military escort. That day, the Council accepted the unconditional surrender of other leaders from the Social Democratic Party, some of whom were arrested and sentenced to anywhere from four weeks to six months imprisonment. Work re-commenced on the morning of 13 November.

Later that month, the Swiss Consultative Commission presented a project for the League of Nations that would give neutrals permission to have an active role in the machinery of conciliation and mediation of war. Having overcome the uprising, despite the fact that there was much division throughout the process, it appears that Trotsky was correct when he stated that “Switzerland… has successfully solved the problem of nationality in a multi-national state.”
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During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, America was a burgeoning nation coming of age in a global community. Immigrants arrived from all around the world, transforming America into a “melting pot” of international influences. In the wake of this immigration, many European authors and scholars traveled to America to appraise the progress of the developing country. In fact, observations about America became a minor genre of European literature. As the period was marked by the highest population increase in the United States due to such an especially large influx of immigrants, it is important to pay attention to the travelogues written during this time.\(^\text{1}\) After all, these are the narratives which informed the European populace what life in America looked like and encouraged the largest generation of immigrant Americans to move abroad. Just as importantly, these past impressions of European travelers present the current opportunity for Americans to view the nation from a foreign perspective, or in other words, “to see ourselves as others [saw] us.”\(^\text{2}\)

The focus of most European travel writers was on America’s populous urban centers where new immigrants were arriving in droves and where their hopes for making a better life in the New World were most salient. Each immigrant came with their own hopes and expectations for the new life they would find in America. Many were motivated by the belief that America was a land of opportunity, where they could pull themselves up by their bootstraps to financial success so long as they had the determination and initiative to try.\(^\text{3}\) This was the so-called American Dream, which appeared tantalizingly attainable as the names of self-made men such as Andrew Carnegie, a Scottish immigrant, and John D. Rockefeller, American-born, circulated among newspaper headlines and decorated public landmarks. However, the Europeans who came to observe but not necessarily to stay found many examples of disenchantment with the American experience for both immigrants and the native-born. The late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries were indeed marked by social unrest and demands for reform of business practices and workers’ rights. The wealth disparity between the rich owners of production and the poor laborers was as evident in America to these visitors as it had been in Europe. Despite this, most of these European observers of the United States were able to rationalize the nation’s social inequalities and maintain their trust in the promises made by the American Dream. Their faith in this dream remained resilient due to their underlying belief that America was fundamentally a meritocracy, and thus a land where people retained the ultimate ability to determine their own fate.

This essay will examine European perceptions of the American Dream from the perspective of observers who traveled to America during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. It
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will begin by defining the American Dream, and then will analyze the ways European travelers positively appraised the American Dream, particularly their belief in the ability of immigrants to determine their own fate in America, regardless of their origins. It will then move into a critical evaluation of their observations using the contradictory evidence that these same observers offered. It will conclude with a discussion on how European authors resolved their cognitive dissonance and reaffirmed their belief in the American Dream.

While the phrase “American Dream” was not coined until 1931, its ideals were evident in American ideology during both the Industrial and Progressive Eras. James Truslow Adams, the American scholar who coined the phrase, defined the American Dream as:

that dream of a land in which life should be better and richer and fuller for every man, with opportunity for each according to his ability or achievement… a dream of a social order in which each man and woman shall be able to attain to the fullest stature for which they are innately capable, and be recognized by others for what they are, regardless of the fortuitous circumstances of birth or condition.4

In this definition, Adams articulated one of the founding ideals of the nation which held that all individuals should be judged equally and achieve social status according to their individual merit rather than the class into which they were born. The desire to live in a society that was structured according to merit rather than one’s family background was one of the motivating factors that drove the original English settlers to Atlantic shores, and was later formally articulated and preserved in the Declaration of Independence.5 The preamble begins with, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.”6 This statement would later serve as the basis for Adams’ understanding of the American Dream, but clearly the idea of America as a land of equality and social mobility had been around since at least 1776. In fact, throughout the “long-nineteenth century,”7 Europeans were enchanted with the idea of America as the land of opportunity, where one might not only find freedom from social, religious, and economic controls, but the opportunity for a new life with equality under the law.8 Those Europeans with faith in the American Dream implicitly believed that Americans, more than any other people, could determine their own fate.

This belief was clearly articulated in the writing of Europeans who came to observe the place to which so many of their compatriots had emigrated. European travel writers were impressed by two aspects of the American Dream in particular. The first was a reflection on American customs and public institutions, in which European observers recognized and validated the underlying belief in American equality as asserted in the Declaration of Independence. The second aspect that so impressed European observers were American business practices and opportunities. As
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American businesses entered the twentieth century, there existed an unprecedented amount of factory positions open to unskilled laborers that vastly outnumbered those available in Europe. European perceptions of access to work and resources served as an extension of their beliefs on equality, and whether they held that the apparent mental and material equality among Americans truly represented equal opportunity within the nation.

In his travel narrative, Giuseppe Giacosa included commentary on how equality between men physically manifested itself in American culture. Giacosa was an Italian dramatist born in Piedmont in 1847 and the son of a distinguished magistrate. He visited the United States in 1898, and later published his impressions in the novel Impressioni d’America in 1908. He wrote that the Americans all maintained an appearance of equality in their manners and dress:

The first product of the prodigies of mechanization that impressed me in the United States was the appearance of universal prosperity, and consequently the visible equality of social conditions… No European would be able to pick out by eye who there represents the infinite variety of professions, trades, states, fortune, culture, education that may be encountered among the whole people.\(^9\)

Likewise, Sir Morton Peto, an English railway developer, noted in 1865 that, “Nothing is more striking to a European than the universal respectability of appearance in all classes in America.”\(^11\)

Giacosa and Peto found the distribution of material wealth to be less apparent in the attire of the American populace than that of Europe. Although Peto did not elaborate in his writings, it is evident that Giacosa believed this cultural practice served as both a manifestation of America’s egalitarian ideas and a perpetuating factor. The nation as a whole appeared to encourage prosperity and social mobility as there were fewer distinctions between classes and thus fewer barriers to overcome. In his travelogue, Giacosa continued to write, “… the shape and texture of the clothing all shows the same care, the same cut, and almost the same easy circumstances; and in all manners and speech all display the same vigorous sentiments of an egalitarian society and of personal dignity.”\(^12\) Personal dignity was an integral aspect of American national ideology, as the country was highly individualistic. It was apparent to Giacosa that, for the population to be perceived as equals and treated with equal respect, they must both act and appear alike. In this manner, they may also be judged without thought to their class or background so that the person is valued for their merit rather than their circumstance.

Peter A. Demens, a Russian traveler who wrote under the name Tverskoy, was particularly impressed by the opportunities the nation provided for its younger generation as they came of age and entered the working class; his narrative emphasized the benefits he observed on America’s practice of providing universal education to create equal opportunity. Demens was born in Russia in 1849, and moved to America in exile after quarreling with a member of the Royal Family in his position on the Imperial Guard. He found success as a businessman in a
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variety of trades, and recorded his impressions on the working-class world in his novel *Sketches of the North American United States* in 1895. Although Demens rejected the presence of the material equality that Giacosa endorsed, he was impressed by the mental equality America had achieved through the public school system. Demens noted that:

The great mass of people in the United States, despite difference in material conditions, is relatively on the same level of mental development… in the great majority of cases, their moral and mental life will be formed under the influence of the public school; and the spirit of equality and mutual respect which they there assimilate will remain inviolable to death.14

As agents of cultural transmission, public schools, originally promoted by the Jefferson administration, were often used in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century to assimilate young immigrants into American culture and to create “the conditions needed for people to believe in and pursue the ideology of the American Dream.”15 By offering universal public education, the nation demonstrated its intentions to offer students equal standing and opportunity when entering the workforce, so that no individual would have an advantage over another. W.A. Harris and Alex Rivington, two Englishmen who visited in 1869, also attributed America’s success to its public education. The pair wrote, “the public school system of the United States is the foundation of their political edifice, and is the real cause, as well, of the general intelligence, as of the industry and commercial prosperity of its people, and of its political safety as a nation.”16 The idea of equal standing due to education reinforced European perceptions of America as a meritocracy by promoting their belief in the individual’s ability to determine one’s own future success.

From Demens’ excerpt it was also apparent that he believed that the shared background and ideology of public education would remain a binding and equalizing factor throughout citizens’ lives, so that Americans would maintain their feelings of equality with their fellow man no matter the social class they may end up belonging to. He also recognized the contributing role of other social institutions Americans would encounter later in life in maintaining these egalitarian beliefs. Demens wrote that, despite the different livelihoods and successes American students may achieve, “they will constantly meet each other; they will read the same newspapers and magazines; they will attend and take part in the same public meeting; they will belong to the same Masonic lodge; they will go to the same church; in a word, they will live an identical mental life.”17 He believed that all individuals experienced equal access to cultural opportunities and social institutions, and thus were granted equal opportunity for personal and interpersonal development. From his perspective – one which many European visitors shared – no man was given access to greater resources in life that would indicate an unfair advantage over another man, thus maintaining a basic level of social equality from which one may only distinguish
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oneself according to individual merit. Thus, between Demens and Giacosa, both mental and physical equality serve as integral tenets for the realization of the American Dream.

The Austrian diplomat and traveler Baron von Hübn er focused his attention on American industry and social mobility in his two-volume work, A Walk Around the World, 1871. Von Hübn er had served as an ambassador to Paris and Rome before taking a “leisurely trip around the world” during which he briefly remained in America. During his stay, he was impressed by the drive and self-determination present in the American working class. He found that the new immigrants were an “entirely new class of men” that were more industrial minded than their preceding generation. Von Hübn er continued, “These men were above all distinguished by intuition and courage. They seemed to divine their business, saw profits as in a vision, and pursued their ideal with a vigor that converted it into a reality.” Stephen Graham, a British journalist whose work now resides in the US Library of Congress, summarized the difference as, “The American man has a true passion for work, for his country, for everything; the British man does his duty.” Following urbanization and the influx of European immigrants, industry was continually on the increase where, as von Hübn er wrote, “neither capital nor hands [were] wanting.” So long as there appeared to be a viable product or business venture, there seemed to be an investor willing to support it and a market willing to absorb it. From von Hübn er’s rosy perspective, it appeared that industrial opportunities and access to the American Dream would continue to grow for successive generations of immigrants.

For a large portion of European travelers in the Progressive Era (1880-1920), this impression of perpetual improvement seemed true. The narrative of Charles Boissevain, a newspaper correspondent for the Amsterdam Algemeen Handelsblad, provided evidence that von Hübn er was not alone in his thinking. Following his own visit to America in 1880, Boissevain wrote that “free competition and the incentive to labor were the goads that produced progress.” Free competition allowed the businessman to excel and achieve upwards social mobility, while incentive to labor produced the necessary hands to support industrial growth. While Boissevain was more critical of the ideals of the American Dream than some other European observers, this may be due in part to the “hands” he observed in the early years of the Jim Crow South that shook his foundational beliefs in American equality. However, he still believed in the social advancement of “industrious merchants” and visualized a more egalitarian future in which racial animosity would ease. In short, despite the bigotry against black Americans, he still believed that the American Dream was real.

As with Boissevain, Demens offered a positive perspective on the availability of industrial opportunity for economic advancement and social mobility in America. Indeed, his personal success in business stood as an example of the achievement of the American Dream. Demens was born into an upper-class Russian family but increased his fortune through entrepreneurial ventures once he came to America. “I must note here that companies and partnerships are formed
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amazingly swiftly in America…No one bothers about your past, who you are, whence you come, why you need help… A stranger is considered an honest citizen until he proves himself the opposite.”

Under an ideology of equality, businessmen relied on trust and personal respect to take each other at their word which allowed for many entrepreneurial opportunities to arise. However, the market remained extremely competitive. Contrary to Hübner’s account that “neither capital nor hands are wanting,” Demens found that increased resources bred increased competition. He wrote, “In America a mass of free capital constantly seeks investment, and therefore competition is great in all manufactured articles.”

Although there was a great amount of wealth seeking investment in the United States, capital remained wanting due to oversaturation of entrepreneurs seeking investment.

Paul Charles Joseph Bourget, a poet born in France in 1852, also noted the competitive nature of business relationships in his 1895 volume on the United States, Outre-Mer: American Impressions. Bourget observed that, “So far as regards the affairs of everyday life they are good fellows—amiable, open, easy; but as soon as it comes to business, they are as keen and energetic in defense of their interests and in conquest of yours as they were easy and generous before.” While Americans were usually perceived as easy-going, their manner in the affairs of business were completely different. Competing in business was viewed as “fighting” for one’s place in society, so one had to be opportunistic and unwilling to make concessions.

In other words, some traveling European writers acknowledged how difficult, and thus how impressive, it was for a self-determined immigrant to become recognized in industry and achieve the American Dream.

The previous point highlights the fact that although European travel writers maintained an overall positive tenor in their narratives, they were not naive to America’s shortcomings. The emergence of large-scale industrial capitalism and the rise of wage labor in America during the Industrial Revolution represented a direct challenge to the vision of America as the land of opportunity and equality. Demands for social reform during the Progressive Era brought critical attention to social and economic inequality which privileged one group over another for social mobility. English legal scholar Sir Henry Maine asserted that America had produced a society of staggering inequality in a series of essays he published in 1885. He contended that the concept of America as the land of opportunity that could be seized by those with strength and determination was simply a veiled justification for the disadvantages of the poor, working classes. “There has hardly ever before been a community,” observed Maine, “in which the weak have been pushed so pitilessly to the wall, in which those who have succeeded have so uniformly been the strong, and in which in so short a time there has arisen so great an inequality a private fortune and domestic luxury.”

Public national statistics supported his assertions. According to the United States census of 1890, the top 8 percent of the population controlled 71 percent of the
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wealth while the bottom 52 percent only controlled 4.5 percent of the wealth.35 Forty years before the term was even coined, it seemed that reality had already diverged from the rhetoric of the American Dream.

In the urban centers that European travelers visited, the majority of the lower-class population worked in industrial factories. Workers were viewed as replaceable as they participated in one small step of the manufacturing process, rather than making an entire product from start to finish. Count Vay de Vaya und Luskod was a Catholic cleric from Hungary who visited the United States several times between 1903 and 1906.36 He was born into a noble family and served as the privy chamberlain to Pope Leo XVIII, and he pitied the lives of the working class people he observed in America’s iron and steel industries. He likened the urban centers to Hell, in which “the thud of the steam hammers and the hissing of escaping steam smite aggressively on the ears” and “soot, ashes, and glowing embers rain in a steady shower, as through from some volcanic crater.”37 In his narrative, he focused on the false hope put forth by the American Dream which allowed immigrants to be exploited by the oppressive owners of industry. In factories where immigrants sought “the realization of their cherished hopes,” they instead toiled and suffered “till they [were] swallowed up in the inferno.”38 Vay de Vaya rejected the American Dream as unreal, as he thought it was impossible for immigrants to advance themselves in a system that actively exploited them and failed to do them any benefit. He found the working conditions of the lower-class within industrial factories to be appalling and inescapable, as “only immigrants, rendered desperate by circumstances, take up this degrading means of earning their daily bread.”39 Vay de Vaya believed that immigrants were exploited to create the wealth of others, yet denied the pay and opportunity necessary to excel themselves. There appeared to be an “absolute indifference and contempt of the rich toward the poor,” where the factory owners felt no responsibility to provide their workers access to the social mobility that they achieved.40

Giacosa also recorded his observations on the conditions endured by the working-class during his visits to the Chicago slaughterhouses, which he asks the reader to visualize as “the nastiest pits the human mind could imagine.”41 The physical conditions of the slaughterhouses were unhygienic and claustrophobic, which appeared more suited to cattle than the humans that worked there. There was a physical toll that arose from the work, as workers had to operate in cramped conditions and constantly strained their eyes in the dark light of the building.42 Giacosa goes so far as to say that the poor conditions had a dehumanizing effect on the workers, writing that “the greasy matter, reddish and shiny, that stains their foreheads and cheeks, the encrusted blood hardened on beards and hair, the abrupt and rapid movements by which they throw severed pieces to neighboring workers… gives them an appearance altogether inhuman, and rather like the savage animals they destroy with so much dispatch.”43
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Von Hübner also noted the tremendous toll that the industrial system took on its workers. Although he was impressed by the progress America was achieving in its industrial sector, he found its results to be “at the cost of excessive labor, of a permanent tension of mind, and a permanent drain of physical strength.”

In his narrative, he wrote that the excessive toil demanded by American businesses “produces exhaustion, lassitude, and premature old age; it deprives those who give themselves up to it first of time, and then of the power of enjoying the results of their labor.”

Writing some twenty-five years apart, von Hübner and Vay de Vaya both believed that the labor of the working class was exploited to benefit the upper class, and deny benefit to the laborers. However, unlike Vay de Vaya, von Hübner did not reject the American Dream as false. Instead, von Hübner concluded:

You [America] offer liberty and equality to everyone. It is to the magic charm of these two words, more than to your gold fields, that you owe the influx of your immigrants, and the enormous and ever-growing increase of your population…

The emigrants go to you for bread, individual liberty, and social equality, and they find space; that is liberty to work and equality of success if they bring with them the necessary qualifications.

Despite his earlier assertions, von Hübner rationalized and retained his belief in the American Dream by introducing contingencies and qualifications that excused – or at least explained – evidence of social inequality.

Indeed, it was von Hübner and not Vay de Vaya whose positive attitude about America was typical of European observers. Most of them maintained their faith in the American Dream despite the inequality and hardships that they witnessed. They justified the moral contradictions they noticed in order to ease their cognitive dissonance without changing their beliefs about the American Dream. But how could they do this? In analyzing firsthand accounts of America by European observers in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, it is apparent that European travelers relied on three primary explanations to justify their belief in the American Dream. First, they did this by recognizing the contradiction within the American Dream itself. As Seymour Lipset, a sociologist who assisted in the compilation and interpretation of early European travel narratives in the 1960’s, wrote, “Achievement is a function of equality of opportunity… achievement must lead to new inequality of status and to the use of corrupt means to secure and maintain high position is the ever recreated and renewed American dilemma.”

In other words, it is inherent in the belief of the American Dream that in order for one person to excel in society, they must outcompete and thus confine others to their lower social class. One’s hard work and determination to rise to the top are in direct competition with others who desire the same positions and social mobility. The acceptance of the American dilemma as a necessary counterpart of the American Dream was completed by the prevailing perception of America as a meritocracy. Europeans who believed that America was a meritocracy did not only believe that Americans had the ability to determine their own fate, but also held personal responsibility for their destiny. European observers justified social and economic inequality by placing the blame

---

44 Von Hübner, Promenade, 324.
46 Ibid, 321.
47 Seymour M. Lipset, The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective in Rapson, ed., Britons View America, 186.
for whether one excelled in life on the individual’s ability to navigate society rather than on the society itself.

Second, European observers maintained their belief in the American Dream because, relative to what they knew in Europe, America seemed to allow for greater economic and social mobility. While America was not a full meritocracy, Europe was still largely aristocratic. After his travels in 1846-1847, British newspaper correspondent Alexander Mackay wrote, “The United States constituted themselves, not amid the circumstances of a feudal age, but in a modern age; not under the condition of an epoch favorable to subordination, but under those of an epoch of expansion.”\(^{48}\) Mackay believed that, due to America’s historical equality and absence from feudal inheritances, Americans began their society from a more modern and egalitarian standpoint that Europe only started to approach at the turn of the twentieth century. Mackay furthered this point by saying, “The absence of arbitrary inequalities banishes restraint from their [Americans’] mutual intercourse, whilst their mutual appreciation of each other’s sentiments imparts a kindness and cordiality to that intercourse, which in Europe are only to be found, and not always there, with the circle of class.”\(^{49}\) As most Americans saw each other as equals, they treated each other with mutual respect, a privilege many Europeans desired. In a similar vein, Von Hübner noted the consequences of returning to Europe after being exposed to the egalitarian culture of the United States. “You see, in Europe we can’t associate with the gentry and we can’t live with our equals above whom we have unconsciously raised ourselves.”\(^{50}\) European immigrants who lived in America, even if they only found small success or hardship, became used to a standard of equality that persisted even in interactions between social classes. Those who returned to Europe were then more cognizant of their place in society and felt “therefore like fish out of water” because the potential for social mobility had been taken away from them.\(^{51}\) So, despite American inequality, European travelers reaffirmed their beliefs in the American Dream because America was relatively more equal and Americans had relatively more opportunity to determine their own fate.

The third reason that European observers maintained their belief in the American Dream arose from the belief that for many immigrants, the Dream itself was enough. Whether true or not, believing in the American Dream was a form of having hope for the future. Although one may not achieve a higher social status, to be treated with equality and personal dignity was one thing that immigrants wanted. As Giacosa phrased it, “Born of a nation which knows no ease, the Americans accept the inequality of labor in order to attain a relative equality of goods.”\(^{52}\) The materialism of goods was tangible and made the American Dream feel more concrete for a majority of immigrants. While one might never make it to the upper class, people saw their increased standards of living caused by their own labor as evidence of their upward climb. Thus, European observers maintained their belief in the American Dream despite the clear evidence of American poverty.

To many European observers in the late-nineteenth to early-twentieth centuries, America embodied the promises of the American Dream according to their perception of America as the land of equality and opportunity. In order to achieve upward social mobility, it appeared one only needed a strong work ethic and the initiative to try. While European travelers believed in
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self-determination of one’s fate and the ideals espoused by the American Dream, they also remained mindful of the inequalities of labor and the distribution of material wealth. They openly criticized the fierce economic competition and dehumanizing conditions present in urban industries. Nevertheless, their belief in the American Dream remained resilient. European observers resolved their cognitive dissonance by accepting the “American Dilemma,” in which they recognized the comparative advantage of American opportunity and retained that believing in the dream was better than having no hope at all. In sum, because satisfaction among immigrants was often derived from the belief that they could advance socially even if they had not yet done so, the dream itself was what mattered, even if it did not always come true.
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