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From the Editor

With this thirtieth volume of the *Yearbook of German-American Studies*, we return to the practice of publishing a selection of ten scholarly essays by our membership. From time to time, we will also publish historical materials—as in the previous volume which presented the German original and an English translation of a nineteenth-century publication by Gottfried Duden with an introduction by Steven Rowan. The essays in the current issue focus largely on the nineteenth century including contributions on Friedrich Münch by Petra DeWitt, Charles Sealsfied by Alexander Ritter, Abraham Reeser Horne by Achim Kopp, Moravians and Cherokees by Rowena McClinton, Socialist Turners of New York by Charles Reitz, among others. Other contributors engage issues of the twentieth century such as Bix Beiderbecke as a German-American jazz musician by William Roba or the dilemma of a Texas German community during the First World War by Jared Donnelly. Finally, Randall Donaldson explores the synergy unleashed by combining genealogical and historical studies. A five-year index of the *Yearbook* concludes this issue covering volumes 41 (2006) to 45 (2010) as well as supplemental issue number three (2010).

With this volume, we also extend a warm welcome to Susan Schürer of Susquehanna University in Pennsylvania as our new book review editor. Susan enthusiastically answered our call for a book review editor at the symposium last April at the University of Delaware. She has done an outstanding job in her first round of reviews and we look forward to many years of collaboration with her in future volumes of the *Yearbook*. For the time being, Susan will also be responsible for literary reviews as well as those of scholarly studies.

On a sad note, we have finally decided to discontinue publication of the Annual German-American Bibliography in the *Yearbook*. When Dolores and Giles Hoyt agreed in 1989 to continue the bibliography begun by Steven Benjamin, they knowingly took on a task of Herculean proportions. That they
have persevered for some twenty years in this effort is an achievement worthy
of high praise and a tribute to their fortitude and that of their bibliographic
committee. It is very understandable that they have decided at this point to
consider other ways of making such a bibliography available to our members
and the public. SGAS will explore other avenues for the bibliography at a
future meeting of the executive committee. We extend our heartfelt thanks to
the Hoyts and those who collaborated with them in their bibliographic work
for the Society.

We would like call the attention of our readers to the back matter of
the Yearbook. The SGAS Bylaws were revised at the recent meeting of the
executive committee in New Orleans in mid-October 2011. The Bylaws in
this volume are the most up-to-date version and are the basis for the overall
operation of the Society. The executive committee is currently revising the
policies governing our research and publication awards. These have been
removed from this issue pending those changes. However, we are including
the policy governing the SGAS Outstanding Achievement Award for your
information.

Digital Media Services of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the
University of Kansas continues to offer its generous support in the preparation
of the Yearbook as well as our supplemental issues for publication. We are
most grateful for the assistance provided by Paula Courtney of that office
for the 2010 Yearbook. We look forward to working with Paula on our next
supplemental issue to appear in early 2012, which will be a monograph by
Frank Baron (University of Kansas) entitled The German Factor in Lincoln's
Nomination and Election: Turners and Forty-Eighters.

With this issue we must bid farewell to Editorial Board member Helmut
Schmeller, who has recently decided to step down from the board after over
twenty-five years of service. Helmut has been a critical yet fair evaluator of
manuscripts for the Yearbook since 1984. Needless to say, the editor is indebted
to editorial board members such as Helmut, in maintaining the fine scholarly
reputation that our Yearbook enjoys. As editor I can truly say that Helmut’s
participation in the review process—and his at times humorous remarks in
Bavarian dialect aimed at me—will be very much missed. In addition to his
service with our Yearbook, Helmut also served as first vice-president of the
Society from 1981 until 1987 and organized the 1982 SGAS Symposium
in Hays, Kansas, featuring a tour of the Volga German settlements in that
area. Helmut has recently been named the 2012 recipient of the SGAS
Outstanding Achievement Award for his lifelong contributions to the field
of German-American Studies. We look forward to honoring Helmut and
expressing our appreciation to him at our next Symposium.

That Symposium will be held April 12-15, 2012, at the University of
Kansas and feature the dedication of the renovated historic “James Lane Stable” adjacent to the Max Kade Center for German-American Studies. The historic stone building, built by the infamous abolitionist about 1861, will house the archives of the Turner organizations of Milwaukee, New York and Lawrence in the Center’s collection. We encourage our members not only to participate in the symposium next April but also to contribute their essays for consideration in the *Yearbook* as well as their reviews of recent books in our field. As we continue with the sesquicentennial of the American Civil War, we especially invite scholarly studies on the contributions and impact of German-Americans during that critical period of American history.

*Max Kade Center for German-American Studies*

*The University of Kansas*

Lawrence, Kansas

November 2011
Die Erfindung des Amerikaners: Zu Charles Sealsfields strategischer Inszenierung seiner Identität und Repräsentation als US-Bürger

I.

Es ist der 23. August 1858. Der 65jährige Charles Sealsfield hat sich für den offiziellen Auftritt im City & County Court (New York) in der 32 Chambers Street entsprechend gekleidet. Er ist durchgeschwitzt, aber zufrieden. Mit Erfüllung der gesetzlichen Bedingungen eines fünfjährigen Aufenthaltes sieht er seiner Einbürgerung entgegen. Der Verwaltungsangestellte “Nathaniel Javis Jr.” füllt die vorgedruckte Urkunde aus, unterschreibt und siegelt sie: “. . . on the Twenty Third day of August in the year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifty eight Charles Sealsfield . . . was accordingly admitted to be a CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . . . .”


Im Hinblick auf die amerikanische Immigrationsgeschichte als einer
machinery of national identification and integration sowie das Inszenieren einer Identität als amerikanischer Bürger und amerikanischer Schriftsteller ist Charles Sealsfield ein instruktives Paradigma für das Immigrantenverhalten eines europäischen Intellektuellen. Die Begründung dafür leitet sich her aus privaten Verfehlungen und politischer Motivation, die als Ursache der zielgerichteten Generierung einer neuen Namensidentität, seiner inszenierten Auftritte als Amerikaner und deren zusätzlicher Verifizierung durch literarische Selbstdarstellung anzunehmen sind. Das damit verbundene Persönlichkeitsprofil bedingen seine biographischen Voraussetzungen.


Die Metamorphose vom österreichischen Priester Carolus Magnus Postl zum amerikanisierten Schriftsteller und amerikanischen Staatsbürger Charles Sealsfield dokumentiert die Manipulation seines Namens und äußerer Biographie. Weil dem Theologen die Funktion der anthroponymen Referenzleistung von Identifizieren und Repräsentieren, aber auch die Einhaltung eines Rollenauftrags als Ordensanghöriger geläufig ist, nutzt er diese Kenntnis für seine Identitätsveränderungen.

Grundlage der folgenden Ausführungen sind biographische Informationen, die vom Verfasser in mehreren Dokumentationen zwischen 1999 und 2011 vorgelegt worden sind. Mit ihnen wird zum einen danach gefragt, welche Mittel Sealsfield funktionalisiert, seine Biographie neu zu ordnen und diese auf die Karriere als politischer Schriftsteller auszurichten. Zum anderen geht es um die Erkundigung, inwieweit er seine biographische Selbstinszenierung lediglich als pragmatische Kostümierung für sein
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Geltungsbedürfnis und politische Aufklärungsmission versteht oder aber auch als Selbstüberprüfung der inneren Biographie und Katharsis seiner konfliktgeladenen psychischen Befindlichkeit.


II.


Postls existentielles Ziel, gedanklich vorbereitet in der Prager Zeit, ist definiert: als spätaufklärerischer, liberal-konservativer amerikanischer Republikaner und Literat die demokratische Staatsordnung der USA für Europa vorleben und verkünden zu können. Mit einer Doppelstrategie organisiert er die Voraussetzungen für dessen Realisierung, zurecht darauf
vertrauend, dass unzulängliche Kommunikationsverbindungen in den USA und von dort nach Europa ihn nicht entlarven können: 1. als der lutherische Reverend Carl Moritz Zeilfels in Kittanning, seelsorgerisch tätig im Wohnort und dessen Umgebung; 2. als der Reisende und Publizist C. Sidons/Charles Sealsfield, Personenkontakte pflegend außerhalb der engeren Region (Pittsburgh und Philadelphia/Pennsylvania, Ohio/Indiana, Europa). Wie geht er praktisch vor?

Der erste Wirkungskreis ist das Provinznest Kittanning im Pennsylvania back country. Hier lässt er sich die ihn identifizierende Funktion des lutherischen pioneer preacher übertragen, die ihn als ehrenvollen Mitbürger öffentlich glaubwürdig repräsentiert und vor unliebsamen Nachfragen schützt. Postl gibt sich sein erstes Pseudonym Zeilfels, namengeschichtlich unbekannt, also vermutlich ein Konstrukt. Mit den Vornamen Carl Moritz garantiert sich Postl namentlich einen Teil seiner hier unbekannten Herkunftssidentität als Carolus Magnus, den ersten eingedeutscht wiederholend, für den zweiten die Initiale übernehmend. Mit dem Namenwechsel und der Berufsnahme verändert er die Selbstidentifizierung vom Katholiken zum Protestanten, vom Priester zum Pastor und verdrängt seine sicherlich ganz reale Furcht vor Gott und der Welt.

Die Authentizität seines neuen Status garantieren Kirche, Synode und das Predigertun. Postl stellt für sich Öffentlichkeit her, indem er Trauungen in Kittanning vollzieht, mehrere Kleingemeinden betreut, für 1824 70 Taufen, 24 Konfirmationen, 156 "Communicirungen"[?], sieben Beerdigungen und vier betreute Schulen nachweist. Diese schlecht entgolten seelsorgerischen Aktivitäten unter zumeist ungebildeten Kleinbürgern sucht der Junggeselle durch Kontakte zu ihm sozial genehmnen Honoratioren im Kirchenmilieu der Nachbardörfer Butler und Zelienople/Harmony zu kompensieren. Neben dem Kirchenführer und Pastor Johann Christian Gottlob Schweizerbarth (1796-1852) ist es vor allem Zélie Passavant, geb. Basse, (1786-1871), aus den Industriellen- und Kaufmannsfamilien Basse und Passavant in Zelienople. Die bemerkenswert gebildete Frau durchschaut Postls alias Zeilfels’ konfliktgeladene Situation und entwirft ein entlarvendes Psychogramm von ihm: “He has lived very much in the world, . . . got a very liberal education though very little calculated for his present situation . . . he is well acquainted with all matters but I . . . do not think he has the necessary fervour or the devotion to find the happiness in his present profession.”

Für den intellektuellen Postl ist das provisorische Predigeramt ein provisorische Existenz, mit der er die ihm wichtigen Unternehmungen tarnt, die er gleichzeitig mit seiner zweiten Rolle als Intellektueller unter dem zweiten Pseudonym C. Sidons ausübt, einem angloamerikanischen Namen.

Verborgen vor der lokalen Öffentlichkeit trifft er zielstrebig
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Für die Durchsetzung seiner Pläne scheut Postl es nicht, wie vor drei Jahren erneut Kirchengelder für die Reise zu unterschlagen: “... it was afterwards ascertained that he had collected a considerable amount of money and put it in his own purse.” Wie damals in Prag, als er von der Inspektionsreise der Klosterlatifundien nicht in den Orden zurückkehrt, meidet er Kittanning, holt seine postlagernden Briefe nicht ab und lässt sein Pferd bei John Philipp Shæffer zurück.

den hinderlichen privaten wie pastoralen Verpflichtungen befreit, seine provisorische Zeilfels-Identität annulliert. Mit dem safe conduct pass des Staates Louisiana, signiert vom Gouverneur Henry Johnson, vollzieht Postl die angestrebte öffentliche Wandlung vom österreichischen Flüchtling zum angeblich amerikanischen Bürger CM Sealsfield, dafür die phonetische und orthographische Anglisierung der Schreibvariante Zeilsfield vollziehend, die neben anderen orthographisch varierten Fassungen kursiert:

Zeilfelz — Protokoll der Ohio-Synode 1824;  
Carl Moriz Zeilfels — Prokolll der Ohio Synode 1824;  
Mr. Zeilfels — Zelie Basse vom 12. Juni 1824;  
Candidat Zeilfels — Prokolll der Ohio Synode 1825;  
Mr. Zailsfield — Reverend, Kittanning Gazette vom 17. August 1825;  
Zailsfield — Reverend, Kittanning Gazette vom 24. August 1825;  
Zailfield — Reverend, Kittanning Gazette vom 31. August 1825;  
C.M. Zeilfeld — Reverend, Kittanning Gazette vom 31. August 1825;  
C. Zailsfield — Reverend, Kittanning Gazette vom 11. Oktober 1826;  

Spätere kirchengeschichtliche Berichte über Posts Tätigkeit als reverend übernehmen den Namen Zeilfels und fügen eine weitere Schreibfassungen hinzu:

C.M. Zielfels — Rev., 1904;  
Karl Moritz (Karl M./K.M.) Zeilfels — Burgess 1925;  
Charles Zeilfels — Preacher, King, 1938;  
Carl Moritz Zeilfels — Reverend, 1974;  
M.C. Ziefels — 2005.


III.


Symptomatisch für diese Unsicherheit, die ihn nach Europa begleitet, ist eine Episode in dem Manuskript seines Amerika-Berichtes, an dem er an Bord des Seglers arbeitet. Wahrscheinlich gespeist vom schlechten Gewissen des sündig gewordenen Priesters, verstärkt durch ein gesundes Misstrauen, begreift er, dass Ausweispapiere mit ihrer begrenzten, an das jeweils situative Auftreten ihres Inhabers gebundenen Öffentlichkeitswirkung einen darauf begrenzten Effekt haben. Der Effekt ist jedoch unbegrenzt, wenn er Informationen über sich selbst in ein Buch aufnimmt. Daher legt er eine Dialogpassage in seinem autobiographischen Amerika-Bericht, den er 1827 sicherheitshalber unter der Verfasserschaft von C. Sidons, Bürger der Vereinigten Staaten bei Cotta in Stuttgart publiziert, so anonymisiert an, indem er einen Ich-Erzähler einsetzt, der die Fremdinszenierung seiner selbst als Autor und Protagonist durch das Vermeiden von Klarnamen und Decknamen vollzieht.\(^{17}\)

In dem fiktionalisierten Dialog des Reisenden mit einem Farmer bekennt er auf die Rückfrage nach seinem Wohnort, er "wohne in Kittanning, 21 Meilen von Butler." Um aber den Leser daran zu hindern, mit der identifizierbaren Ortsangabe ihn, den flüchtigen Pastor Zeilfels, möglicherweise in Verbindung bringen zu können, lässt er seinen Reisenden auf die Rückfragen nach den Personalien zwar antworten, jedoch nur mit allgemeinen Hinweisen indirekt durch den Erzählerbericht, für den Leser die Details aber unterschlagend: "Ich nannte ihn"—den Namen—und "Ich nannte sie"—die Profession.

Zwecken verbunden. Es geht ihm—in der Rolle des politisch informierten Amerikakenners und amerikanischen Schriftstellers—um die öffentliche Belastbarkeit seiner Identität, die Sanktionierung der Repräsentation als Amerikaner, um Geschäftskontakte zu bedeutenden Persönlichkeiten der politischen wie kulturellen Szene und damit um die Stabilisierung seiner desolaten Finanzlage.


Das finanzielle Interesse, das der österreichische Diplomat als einzige Motivation bei Postl diagnostiziert, treibt ihn ebenfalls an, wenn er das Geschäftsgespräch mit den beiden Großverlegern Johann Friedrich Cotta (1764-1832) und John Murray II (1778-1843) sucht. Aber es ist darüber hinaus auch mit der Absicht verbunden, für seine beiden politischen Berichte Verlage zu gewinnen, die zuverlässig arbeiten und auf dem Literaturmarkt einen möglichst großen Einfluss haben.
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was wiederum seiner Informationsabsicht entspricht. Auch wenn dieses Unternehmen eher desaströs endet, so dokumentiert das Buch durch den Hinweis auf den Autor “C. Sidons, Bürger der Vereinigten Staaten” seine Identität in der deutschen Öffentlichkeit, unterstützt durch den Vorabdruck in Andrés Zeitschrift Hesperus, der ausdrücklich darauf verweist, “der Verfasser selbst ist nordamerikanischer Bürger.”


Murray geht dennoch auf Postl ein, übernimmt aber vorsichtshalber lediglich den ersten Band in englischer Sprache und kleiner Auflage, ohne Autorangabe. Auch wenn sich Murray durch Weitergabe eines Auflagenteils an den Verlag Simpkin & Marshall abzusichern versucht, der Verkauf ist eine Katastrophe. Das gilt auch für Postls Geschäft mit dem bedeutungslosen Verlag Hurst, Chance & Co., dem er den zweiten Band seines Amerikaberichtes andient und sein Österreichbuch Austria as it is: or, sketches of continental courts.


Nun auch in Europa respektiert und eingeführt als amerikanischer Autor, sucht er seinen Status durch den Auftritt auf dem amerikanischen Buchmarkt zu komplementieren. Pragmatisch wechselt er ins andere Genre und stellt—beeindruckt und beeinflusst von Scott, Irving und Cooper—seinen ersten Roman Canondah fertig, thematisch orientiert an der jüngeren englisch—

Erneut gewinnt er mit dem Verlagshaus *Carey, Lea & Carey* ein bedeutendes, den Literaturmarkt beherrschendes Unternehmen, den Hausverlag seiner drei Vorbilder. Trotz dieser günstigen Umstände und des getroffenen Zeitgeschmacks wird der Roman, publiziert 1829 unter dem Titel *Tokeah, or the white rose*, kein Erfolg, auch nicht mit der zweiten Auflage 1845.²⁹

Aber drei biographische Umstände hat Postl definitiv eingerichtet: seine Identität als Amerikaner ist gesichert, ebenfalls sein Auftreten als amerikanischer Literat, und er hat prinzipiell dasjenige Schreibkonzept gefunden, was langfristig seinen literarischen Erfolg ausmacht: den engagierten Gesellschaftsroman, der die politische Botschaft eines *Jacksonian* Demokratieverständnisses dem liberal gesonnenen deutschen Leser vermitteln soll, exemplifiziert an den exotischen Stoffen inneramerikanischer Gesellschaftsverhältnisse, die in Europa interessieren.

IV.

Am 4. Juni 1844 mockt sich Edgar Allan Poe im *Columbian Spy* über “the uproar which is made about Seatsfield—‘the great Seatsfield’—,” denn dies sei “merely one other laughable, or disgusting instance of our subserviency to foreign opinion. . . . Seatsfield might have written and printed here, *ad infinitum*, without getting his head above the mob of authors . . . . A German critic, however, of no very great merit or eminence, in a big book of no very particular importance, informs us that we have a great author among us without knowing it.”³⁰


Das öffentliche Nachdenken unter den Intellektuellen über den Schriftsteller und seiner erfolgreichen Romane ist die Folge scheinbar widersprüchlicher Umstände: Postls Amerikakenntnis, Deutschsprachigkeit
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Mit dieser wohl berechneten Maßnahme nützt er sowohl dem kommerziell denkenden Verleger als auch sich selbst als demjenigen, der sorgfältig über seine Pseudonymität wacht und die damit referentiell verbundene Existenz als amerikanischer Schriftsteller, eindeutig identifizierbar durch diesen einen Namen. Er korrigiert damit die inkorrekte Orthographie von Theodor Mundts Information, bestätigt seine amerikanische Identität und bekennt sich zu den Romanen als Urheber. Die passamtlich und öffentlich repräsentierten Identitäten stimmen überein. Missverständnisse sind von nun an, entstanden aus den zahlreichen Varianten seiner Namensschreibung, weitgehend ausgeschlossen.

Die Übersicht zu diesen Varianten des Namens Sealsfield ist ein namengeschichtlich instruktive Dokumentation dafür, wie zu Postls Zeit Rezeptions- und Weiterleitungsprobleme mit Eigennamen entstehen. Gängige Ursachen dafür sind begrenzte Alphabetisierung und Englischkenntnisse,
vorrangig mündliche Namenweitergabe und diese bei häufig fehlerhafter Aussprache, phonetisch bestimmte Schreibweise und Kopierfehler, was insgesamt zu orthographischen Verfälschungen bei der schriftlichen Erfassung durch Passagierlisten, Presse, Behörden usw. führt:

Saalsfield—Joel Roberts Poinsett vom 8.10.1837;
Chas. Searlsfield—New York Evening Post / New York Journal of Commerce vom 10.10.1837;
Seatsfield—Theodor Mundt, 1842 (folgenreiche Falschschreibung in der deutschen und amerikanischen Presse 1842ff.); Boston Daily Advertiser, 1844; Life in the New World or Sketches of American Society, 1844; Johannes Scherr, 1844; (usw.);
Sietsfield—Graham's Lady's and Gentlemen's Magazine, 1844;
Charles Sielsfield, New York—Bank Passavant & Co, Basel, 1853;
Scalsfield—Paris, 1853;
Sealsfeld—Kölnische Zeitung vom 01.06.1864.
Cha Seafield—16.[18.?] 08.1827: Passagierliste der “Stephania”;

Erst das Testament von 1864 entlarvt seine hermetische organisierte Existenz des Charles Sealsfield als grandiosen namengeschichtlichen Bluff.

V.

gebohren, in den Ver. St. eingebürgert."³⁴

Mit lediglich zwei von ihm autorisierten Sätzen über seine Identität und den ihn repräsentierenden Namen legt er seine biographische Wirklichkeit fest. Alles das, was von ihm öffentlich zu Recht als rufschädigend eingeschätzt wird, unterschlägt er: die österreichische Herkunft, Theologiestudium, Klosterzugehörigkeit und Priesterweihe, den Freund André und die illegale Flucht, die Kittanningzeit als angemässter lutherischer Geistlicher und natürlich die anderen rechtlichen Verfehlungen.

Die Beschäftigung mit der schillernden Persönlichkeit Postl alias Sealsfield ist ein dreierlei Hinsicht eine ergiebige Angelegenheit, weil man erkennen kann, wie private Lebensumstände und öffentliche Bedingungen der Anpassung die Identitätsfindung und Repräsentationssteuerung beeinflussen.

- Zweitens: Die changierende Mischung, die Postls Motivation der identitätsnachweisenden Selbstinszenierung bestimmt, blendet die rechtswidrigen Aktionen, die notorische Geschäftstüchtigkeit und fehlende Glaubensbindung als unbewältigte Konflikte des Lebens eines intellektuellen und begabten Schriftstellers als störend aus.
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*Der Staat Missouri: Friedrich Münch’s German-American Perception of and Guides to Missouri, 1859-1875*

During the nineteenth century, the height of European migrations to North America, German speakers who wished to find out more about the United States before they began their travels across the Atlantic could rely on letters from acquaintances already there, emigration societies, advertisements as well as a wide range of advice literature for information regarding their journey, destination and opportunities.¹ Friedrich Münch, the well-known German rationalist who settled in Missouri with the hopes of creating a better life for himself, his family, and his friends, was one among several authors of guidebooks, including Gottfried Duden, who aimed to attract Germans to the state. He published his first book, *Der Staat Missouri: geschildert mit besonderer Rücksicht auf teutsche Einwanderung* (The State of Missouri: Portrayed with Particular Consideration for German Immigration)² in New York and Bremen in 1859; his second updated and abridged edition *Der Staat Missouri: Ein Handbuch für deutsche Auswanderer* (The State of Missouri: A Handbook for German Emigrants)³ in Bremen in 1866; and his third “entirely revised” and enlarged edition *Der Staat Missouri: Ein Handbuch für deutsche Auswanderer* (The State of Missouri: A Handbook for German Emigrants)⁴ in Bremen in 1875. Comparing and contrasting these three works and placing them into their historical context reveal that Missouri despite its problems during and after the Civil War was according to Münch still one of the best places for German immigrants to settle. This comparison also reveals one of the many paradoxes about the author; Münch, a passionate opponent of slavery and advocate for legal equality, did not perceive African Americans as socially equal.

Frederick “Friedrich” Münch⁵ was born on 25 June 1799 in Niedergemünden, the Grand Duchy of Hessen. After graduating from the gymnasium in Darmstadt, Münch studied theology at the university in
Gießen. Following in his father’s footsteps, the young Münch became an ordained minister, served as his father’s assistant pastor for five years, and upon the elder’s death, took over as the town’s pastor. In 1833, he co-founded the “zu Gießen gegründete Auswanderer Gesellschaft” (Emigrants’ Society founded in Gießen) with Paul Follenius to establish a utopian German colony in America because the social and political circumstances in the German states no longer satisfied the present and future needs of Menschen, citizens and their children. In 1834 Münch and Follenius led hundreds of German speakers to Missouri. Deaths through cholera, squabbles over money, and diminished expectations created major rifts in the group by the time it arrived in St. Louis and the society disbanded. Münch settled on a farm near Marthasville, Warren County, in 1835, adjacent to where Gottfried Duden had lived a decade earlier.

By the time Münch published his first guidebook for future emigrants from the German states in 1859, he had already created a reputation as a teacher, prosperous farmer, wine grower, prolific writer and leading rationalist thinker. Among numerous publications, he penned several short novels, articles for newspapers usually under the nom de plume “Far West,” and pamphlets on theological rationalism such as “A Treatise on Religion and Christianity, Orthodoxy and Rationalism.”

In 1858 New York publisher C. L. Brai suggested that Münch write a book to promote further German immigration to Missouri and therefore stimulate the state’s economy and possibly “affect a solution to the slave question.” Münch agreed. He explains in the introduction to his first Der Staat Missouri that he did not wish to evaluate the reasons for emigration, nor negate the opportunities available in such states as Ohio, Iowa and Wisconsin, as many had already written about these areas and Germans had settled there in great numbers. Germans, in his opinion, were just discovering Missouri, and he thought it appropriate to describe the state in greater detail, especially the current political circumstances and future prospects for immigrants.

Münch distinguishes his book from previously published advice literature about Missouri, asserting that Duden’s Bericht, Johann Wappäus’ Handbuch der Geography and Statistik von Nordamerika, and Theodor Olshausen’s Der Staat Missouri, geographisch and statistisch geschrieben were not necessarily wrong but dated. His work, by contrast, included contemporary developments and lessons learned through twenty-four years of personal experience and observation. He did not intend for the book to serve as a travel guide; instead he aimed to help his country men who contemplated emigration but were not yet certain about their destination.

Münch immediately alerts the ”künftigen teutschen Auswanderer” (future German emigrants) that the decision to move to the United States
was not for the faint-hearted because the excitement about going to America would quickly give way to the reality of living in a strange country, hearing a foreign language, and confronting an unknown culture, including nativists who did not hesitate to express their discontent for immigrants. As Münch explains, a republican government that guaranteed many freedoms to its citizens including the right to make their own laws also allowed them to be rude, indifferent, and arrogant.14

Münch also warns that success required hard work and additional effort. He had learned personally that Duden’s assertion about farmers working for only a few hours each day to prosper and dedicating the remaining time to “cultural things” was wrong.15 He thus suggests to readers who wished to settle in towns or cities as craftsmen, even master craftsmen, that they plan for several weeks or months of additional learning because materials, tools, and practices were different in the New World. These efforts, combined with traditional German accuracy and thoroughness would pay off greatly as everyone appreciated German workers.16 Although Münch did not aim to discourage young clerks, mechanics, teachers, apothecaries and doctors from migrating to the United States, he believed that they were at a competitive disadvantage with natives and earlier immigrants who dominated these professions. Artisans, craftsmen, and farmers on the other hand had, in his opinion, the highest success rate in finding gainful employment and achieving prosperity.17

Success for farmers required persistence, hard work, and willingness to utilize the experience of Germans already living in the area or to establish good acquaintances with non-Germans to learn about climate, soils, plants and agricultural practices.18 For example, according to Münch, it would take nearly a Menschenalter (lifetime) to remove trees and stumps from land before it all could produce crops. Furthermore, Americans took the majority of the fertile bottomlands leaving less productive hills for the hard-working Germans who through diligence and adaptation, nevertheless, produced more than the former on his hundreds of acres.19

The remaining chapters in the first edition of Der Staat Missouri describe the state’s history, size, geography, rivers, forests, minerals, climate, animals, population, infrastructure, commerce, agriculture, constitution, churches, schools, publications, and a survey of counties and major cities. Of particular interest are the chapter on slavery, as he discusses the subject and its aftermath in each of the three books, and the chapter on nativism as they also provide further insight into Münch’s Weltanschaung.

Münch traces the history of slavery from when cotton production became viable to the controversial Dred Scott v. Sanford Supreme Court decision in 1857. He recognizes that this labor system was extremely cost beneficial for
the North, the South, as well as the “civilized world.” Although Münch along with his brother Georg owned or rented a female slave according to the 1850 census, he was also very concerned how the debate over slavery had divided the nation and threatened the survival of truth, law and order. He wondered when Vernunft or reason would finally prevail before the nation fell apart; but he remained positive. The “mighty reaction” to the Supreme Court decision was now unstoppable and would not give up until the Übel or evil institution had ended and the Constitution guaranteed freedom as a general rule. Indeed, Münch did not stand by idly. He had already entered politics in 1856 by campaigning for Republican candidates in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Indiana and he continued to advocate the abolition of slavery and preservation of American liberty for an entire decade.

Münch also wonders in this chapter what would become of former slaves once they were set free. He feared that most would not be able to take care of themselves as a result of their debasement through slavery and thus become a burden to society. Even if the emancipated could exist as compensated workers racial equality could not yet exist even through lawful force. Would the stereotypes associated with blacks always include carelessness, pleasure-seeking, and lack of drive? He thought that these traits were not unlike Caucasian traits, such as of the Irish, and that they did not inherently hinder progress and advancement. Münch cites examples of African Americans who had achieved greatness, including Frederick Douglass, a former slave now one of the best orators in the land, blacks who have become judges, doctors and ministers, as well as the few blacks in his settlement who learned to speak and sing German. He, however, believed that their “undeniable foreign characteristics” would hinder advancement and whites would continue to consider them as inferior.

As a practical free-soil Republican Münch supported gradual emancipation, agreed that under the present circumstances the visibly different races should live separately without one owning the other, and advocated resettlement of former slaves to places such as Liberia. He also assured readers that Missouri among the agricultural slave states would stand at the forefront of change because the state was surrounded by free states, slavery was not as entrenched there as in other southern states, and its industrial endeavors had developed better through and thus required free labor. Furthermore, immigrants could do their part to end slavery sooner.

Indeed, the “Schlußwort an die Leser” (Concluding Words to the Readers) reveals the primary reason why Münch wrote the book. This final chapter provides necessary travel advice and suggestions such as one should not take too much luggage because one could purchase most everything in Missouri, a person should carry money in a belt on the body and wait to
exchange currency until arrival in New York and St. Louis, one should always use caution with all strangers, families and their friends should travel together for mutual support and possible co-settlement, one should begin everything small and in moderation, a trade or plough would secure most a living even as hired hands, knowledge of English was essential to success, and the assistance of the German Immigrant Society in New York City and in St. Louis was crucial to finding information regarding travel into the countryside, property prices, and work. At this point Münch also explains that while he aimed to assist his countrymen and to save them from “making the same bitter experiences we had to undergo,” he could not deny that “we Germans in the most beautiful and greatest state in the west need brave supporters in the fight against slavery.”

In his opinion, “Slavery has survived only because there was not enough free labor.” Therefore, every German immigrant could support the cause, even if he did no more than succeed through his own exertion in contrast to the poor success through slave labor, compared his “civilized and happy family life” with what Münch called the *wüste Negerwirtschaft* (wild Negro economy), and “contrasted his diligent and well-mannered children with the spoiled and conceited children of slave owners.” Thus, Germans could change the state “quietly and peacefully” and be part of “one of the most important and meaningful humane steps” in the history of mankind. Missouri, conquered peacefully through German immigrants to create a homeland for free and happy millions, was for Münch a thought which human beings even during trying times could support. He hoped that his readers recognized the important consequences attached to freeing Missouri from slavery, as, in his opinion, one slave state after another necessarily had to follow the example of Missouri and finally create the republic of free citizens.26

In chapter twenty-one Münch addresses *Nativismus* (nativism) which, in his opinion, paralleled slavery as a “damnable outgrowth” of social life and that no work about Missouri should ignore the subject.27 He traces the political background for nativism, including the role that the Whig Party and especially the American Party, also known as the Know-nothings, played after 1852 in creating hatred toward foreigners in order to siphon votes from both pro and anti-slavery supporters. Münch, however, recognized that other circumstances also contributed to the sudden outbreak of nativist mindset. The sudden arrival of large numbers of Catholic Irish after the potato famine, their willingness yet unpreparedness and ignorance to effectively participate in politics under the influence of church leaders contributed to suspicions. Even German immigration must have created reason for annoyance as new immigrants arriving after the failed 1848 Revolutions were more assertive and, in contrast to the older generation, no longer willingly integrated into
American society. Although Münch appreciated the fresh spirit of the newly arrived “greens,” the resulting increased demand for newspaper literature, the re-connection with German scientific thought, Turner activities, singing, and a stronger nationalistic feeling, he disliked their unwillingness to defer to their elders and experienced “greys.” In Münch’s opinion, this different German spirit that brazenly demanded recognition, and the desire to create an independent Germanness certainly did play a role in the strong rise of nativist feelings. He was overly optimistic in his projections of Germans coming to Missouri and predicted that future immigrants would have to deal with tougher conditions, worse than what he had experienced. These newcomers, however, could also rely for assistance upon a larger number of countrymen than when he arrived.28

Münch believed that nativism in Missouri had been no worse than elsewhere, had not resulted in violence, and had disappeared like distant thunder by 1859. He thought, however, that the nativist movement had a ruinous impact on American society as native born and immigrants had become more alienated – the latter holding closer together and maintaining national traits. Yet, Münch remained optimistic. He suggests to his readers that German immigrants could gain nativists’ respect through civilized behavior and decency because the native born had not only learned the negative stereotypes applied to German speakers but also knew their positive attributes. Furthermore, Germanness had become a matter of fact that they (the nativists) had to accept. Reflecting the original purpose of the Gießen Emigrants Society, Münch implies that it would not be hard to turn Missouri into a German state, a state for hard working German hands and for the reign of freedom and humanity; “Was kann Missouri sein schon nach dem Verlaufe eines Menschenalters!” (What Missouri could be in just one generation!) 29

The chapters on slavery and nativism thus clearly indicate that the first edition of Der Staat Missouri was not just an advice book but also reflected Münch’s conviction that migration was more than just the desire for economic improvement. As a theologian and advocate of rational thought he was convinced that all people, including immigrants, could overcome adversity as well as shape history, including the noble task of ending slavery in a state blessed with the “nicest, greatest and … most inexhaustible natural resources.” 30

Münch published his second edition of Der Staat Missouri in 1866 after the Civil War had ended to update German readers about the changed situation in Missouri. Münch had experienced much during the past seven years. In 1858 he became the editor-in-chief of the Farmers Zeitung, an agricultural paper in St. Louis.31 Between April and November 1859 he undertook a promotional tour for the first guidebook through Germany
and Switzerland. During the war he experienced the hatred of confederate sympathizers who had “resolved to kill me, burn my house and violently expel my whole family.” He had also remained politically active for the purpose of ending slavery. Voters in Montgomery, St. Charles and Warren counties elected him in November 1861 to the Missouri State Senate where he served for four years. He represented the “charcoal” Republican ideology which demanded an immediate end to slavery, as compared to the “clayback” Republicans who supported gradual emancipation with compensation. During heated debates in the state senate on how emancipation should proceed in Missouri, Münch spoke up on behalf of African Americans who as slaves had not just lost independence and freedom but humanity itself. He took on what he considered “the responsibility” to represent the marginalized African Americans as human beings in the Missouri legislature because he feared that otherwise laws would continue to treat them as less than human even after emancipation.

Münch continued this task while serving as a delegate to the 1865 Missouri constitutional convention and debating the rights of African Americans. As for many German Americans at the time it did not make sense to him to deny a human being born in America or naturalized citizenship rights based on ancestry or color. As an immigrant he was acutely aware of the prejudices Anglo-Americans, especially nativists, applied to those whom they considered as outsiders or undesirables. Like other German Radicals, however, he also believed that education was necessary for effective citizenship. The Westliche Post, for example, argued that the majority of African Americans were “totally incapable of exercising the franchise.” German Missourians thus supported literacy tests, not to exclude them, but to encourage education, uplift and progress for African Americans in general. Indeed, Friedrich Münch introduced a bill entitled “For the Education of Negro Children” to the Missouri Senate that same spring and the legislature subsequently passed a law that instructed boards of education to establish separate schools for African American students.

While busy changing Missouri society Münch also found the time to update his guidebook. The obvious and immediate change between the first and second edition of Der Staat Missouri is the title as it contains the word “Handbuch” or handbook. In this abridged edition chapters dealing with topography, climate, and agriculture are indeed very concise. Münch, however, expanded the introduction to express his persistent belief and overly optimistic hope that only the United States among all the countries in the world can “deutschartig werden” (become Germanized) because the six to seven million Germans already living there represented the core for future millions to come. He also provides insight to the acculturation and identity
construction process when he explains that German Americans, living in new circumstances and under a new mindset, were no longer the same Germans as those in the Heimat, but they continued to nurture a strong bond to the homeland despite their new identity and attempts by nativists in the 1850s to stop them from maintaining German characteristics.  

Although abridged, the second edition nevertheless contains important modifications that help the reader understand the author and his world view. For example, in the population chapter, and in contrast to the first edition, Münch addresses the presence of African Americans and notes that the 1860 census counted 120,000 blacks and mulattos. At publication time, most of them were free and had citizenship rights with the exception of the vote. Although many had feared retribution after emancipation, Münch informs his readers that these fears had not come true. Most “learned rapidly and eagerly” and had found a place to live and worked for wages or worked the fields of former owners for shares in the harvest. Münch assures the reader that whatever one might think of “these people from Africa” and whatever their future would bring, they represented no competition to German immigrants in Missouri; indeed many Germans had benefited through their assistance, and many African Americans had searched for and found refuge among the Germans in their time of distress.

In his condensed “Schlußwort” an die Leser Münch provides the same yet abbreviated travel advice as in the first edition. The reader, however, also learns about the changes in transportation, such as steamships, which provided cheaper and faster travel. Although Münch still preferred New Orleans as the best port of entry because of its direct connection to St. Louis through the Mississippi River, he also suggests that travelers should not overlook Baltimore as a destination as it offered better and faster connections for those traveling to the west. Münch furthermore no longer argues that Germans should come to Missouri to eliminate slavery. Instead, he asserts that friends and enemies alike acknowledged that the German element played an important role in saving the state from the control of “fanatic pro-slavery traitors.” It should therefore be no surprise that Germans wished to increase their numbers as no other state in the union offered the same advantages as Missouri.

The publisher H. M. Hauschield, upon the suggestion of the author, also added a fifteen-page appendix entitled “Kurzgefaßte Rathschläge und Notizen für Auswanderer” (Summarized Advice and Notations for Emigrants). These included suggestions on how to prepare for the voyage, how to use only licensed agents, what the emigrant should or should not take along, which ports German emigrants should use or avoid, what they ought to do upon arrival in America, how they could contact German Immigrant Associations in several major cities, how to convert German into American measures, and
finally, how the Homestead Act could benefit them. Consequently, the second edition of *Der Staat Missouri* was certainly more of a guidebook for potential German emigrants than the first edition.

Münch published his third and much expanded edition of *Der Staat Missouri* in 1875 to again reflect important changes, such as Reconstruction and the 1873 Panic. He also brought new insight to the publication because Governor Thomas C. Fletcher had appointed him as a member of the Missouri State Board of Immigration on which he served for several years as subsequent governors re-appointed him to this voluntary and honorary position. The duties of the board included the publication of articles and pamphlets “describing the resources and advantages of the state; to appoint agents to travel in the eastern states and Europe to direct and aid immigration to Missouri; and to solicit funds from merchants and manufacturers.” Indeed, Münch notes in his “Foreword to the Third Edition” that he revised and updated the earlier editions upon the suggestion of the State Board of Immigration and that the board contributed financially to the publication of this third edition. Münch thus reflects the efforts by enthusiastic state promoters to attract not just more farmers to work unclaimed land but to also increase the number of laborers in the state as it industrialized. Lack of funding, poor organization, overemphasis on agriculture, and growing opposition to outsiders, however, did not result in the desired outcome.

Münch places the third edition of *Der Staat Missouri* in the context of its time and recognizes that many immigrants had become disappointed with the corruption in the Grant administration, the centralization of big business into ever fewer corporations, the 1873 Panic, and had returned to Europe. Münch, nevertheless, remained optimistic and asserted that the United States continued to offer the best answers to the needs of immigrants. Indeed, he suggested that emigrants take him as an example on how to deal with the “disappointing situation” in America. The corruption in Grant’s administration had convinced Münch, a life-long Republican, to support the Liberal Republicans in 1871 and as the 1874 election results indicated to him the people in Missouri also no longer tolerated corruption. In other words, Münch tells his readers that the United States not only offered economic opportunity but its political system also offered opportunity for individuals to affect real change.

The third edition also includes a chapter “Gedanken über Auswanderung im Allgemeinen und Winke für Auswanderer nach Amerika” (General thoughts about Emigration and Tips for Emigrants to America) which reflects Münch’s philosophy regarding emigration. He continued to believe that emigration was a natural reaction to prejudices, overpopulation and insecurity and predicted migrations would result in eventual equilibrium of
populations. Like so many intellectuals in his time, he believed that those who applied hard work to the soil to benefit mankind had more right to that land than those who happened to be there before but did not use land to the best potential for civilization. As in nature where the stronger survived, Münch believed that in the human world those with higher education led and those less educated followed. Consequently, in his opinion, the more developed countries, such as Germany, had to supply the emigrants who would turn the wilderness of the New World into a civilized world.46

Münch argues that opportunities remained plentiful in America for anyone willing to learn, able to speak English, and eager to embrace chance. While craftsmen prospered, factory workers generally remained stagnant as they spent too much money in taverns, but plenty of opportunities existed for servants, domestics, brewers, barbers, seamstresses and cooks. Farmers could still expect prosperity as well but only through diligent hard work and adjustment to local crops and practices. Even poorer families could find good situations on the land by renting unused properties or working as laborers.47

Münch reminds the reader again, as he had done in the previous editions, that America was of course different from the Old World, that Germans had to adjust to a new way of life, invest more time, effort, and means into work than they might have done in the homeland, and that they definitely had to learn English to prosper. He also warns that Americans looked down on aristocratic ways and viewed snobby behavior as undesirable. Honor, merit, and proper manners were therefore important to fit into society.48

The third edition also provides the reader with a glimpse into the acculturation process. Münch recognizes that while the use of Plattdeutsch and Pennsylvania Deutsch was declining, proper use of High German was flourishing as was evident to him in numerous German newspapers, churches, schools, Turnvereine and singing societies. He suggests to the potential immigrant that he had to give up his provincial identity such as the different wedding traditions because in the United States there were few regional or urban-rural distinctions in dress, mannerism, and language. At the same time he noticed that several German habits were becoming American habits including singing and gymnastic societies, which reflected, in his opinion, the unique Gemisch (mixture) of societal elements in the United States.49

Chapters regarding geography, climate, crops, public institutions, and finances are virtual copies from the first or second edition of Der Staat Missouri. Chapter seven, “Population: Americans, Germans, Irish, Negroes” however has changed. Münch, as noted above, had dedicated many years of his life to the ending of slavery and in his capacity as a state senator and delegate to the 1865 state constitutional convention had advocated protection of civic rights for African Americans after emancipation. In chapter seven Münch
reveals that he too held racial stereotypes. He recognized that although the government had established citizenship rights for African Americans including the vote the result was not social equality. While he was aware that many Americans resisted racial equality with “all their strength” and thus limited the effectiveness of the recent changes, he also blamed African Americans for the lack of true equality. In his opinion, they preferred to roam around (treiben sich herum) in cities where they worked at odd-jobs, as servants, barbers, ferry operators, steamboat sailors, and at the same time represented the majority of people on the lists of criminals. In the countryside they worked or planted parts of fields of their previous owners for a share in the harvest, or lived on leased property, and several “make themselves useful” as tradesmen. In his opinion, “the majority are unreliable, demanding, greedy, and wasteful” and did not achieve the same standard of living that the poorest German day laborer right off the ship would achieve. Consequently, Münch believed that “these human beings in general are not a desirable addition to our population,” even though they were the least obstacle to Germans who often benefitted from their assistance.

This perspective appears contrary to Münch’s previous thoughts regarding the irrationality of prejudices based on race or nationality that had contributed to limitation of rights. He believed that legal protection of civil rights and access to education were essential to effective citizenship, but it was up to the individual to take advantage of these institutions and to work hard to improve one’s situation. By 1875 the federal and state governments had established the legal framework for the protection of civil rights and improved education for African Americans. The above expressions thus reflect that Münch did not perceive African Americans as equals to Germans and that he did not recognize the connection between sharecropping and southern resistance to reconstruction and widespread poverty among the former slaves. At the same time, he was also disappointed that despite all his efforts on behalf of African Americans they, unlike German immigrants, did not use the recent improvements to their advantage. Münch, thus, fits well into the group of German Republican Radicals who aimed to establish protection of civil rights for not just African Americans but all Americans, including naturalized German immigrants. Once these protections were established, German Americans, who as whites quickly became acceptable members of society, did not invest much effort into assuring that these protections also existed for the undesirable element.

This comparison of Münch’s three guidebooks has provided new insight into the study of migration advice literature for Missouri by taking into account context of publication date and ideology of author. While the initial purpose of Der Staat Missouri included the invitation of German immigrants...
to Missouri to help in the battle against slavery, the second and third editions clearly aimed to appeal more to migrants who wished to resettle for purely economic reasons. The end of the Civil War, the subsequent social changes in the United States and Missouri, and Münch’s position on the State Immigration Board influenced this transformation in focus. This work also helps the reader to better understand the role German immigrants played during the tumultuous years just prior to, during, and immediately after the Civil War. Münch, as he describes the political and social changes in Missouri, reveals that he, like many German immigrants, ardently opposed slavery and passionately advocated protection of civil rights for all American citizens regardless of ancestry. That dedication to civic equality, however, did not automatically mean that he, like many abolitionists and Radical Republicans, viewed African Americans as social equals. Future German immigrants, who read his descriptions of freedmen as less than equal to them, then brought these constructed and preconceived notions with them to the United States and consequently contributed to the perpetuation of racial stereotypes.
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Ulrike Wagner

The Aesthetics of bildende Nachahmung: A Transatlantic Dialogue between Ralph Waldo Emerson and Karl Philipp Moritz

"[I]t is verbose rubbish and sounds like a parody of ‘deep’ German prose.” With these words W.H. Auden justifies why he omitted Karl Philipp Moritz’s “whole article Concerning the Pictorial Imitation of the Beautiful” from his translation of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s Italian Journey.1 Auden’s dismissal would have surprised the German poet, for he found in this Berlin intellectual an ideal partner with whom to discuss his works. Even more significantly, he decided to insert Moritz’s treatise on the process of artistic production at the very end of his Italian travel book so as to sum up his own philosophical and scientific thoughts about nature and the world of art. Goethe notes in the introduction that these “few pages from … [Moritz’s] presentation” have to be regarded as an outcome of their conversations which his friend Moritz had “used and developed” in his own fashion. Furthermore, Goethe remarks that the outcome of their conversations in Italy as formulated by Moritz “happily coincide with the mode of thought of the age.”2 Not only was Moritz an appreciated “model reader,” a sounding-board for Goethe’s ideas and writing, but, more importantly, the respected man from Weimar chose to conclude his Roman reflections with another’s text, for he felt that “Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen”3 portended the spirit of the coming age.

Over fifty years later, in a context Goethe could not possibly have envisioned, the aesthetic reflections of the two German writers would become intellectual touchstones for a young intellectual from New England. Feeling trapped in his job as a Unitarian minister, Ralph Waldo Emerson left Boston and his native New England for the European continent in search of a new vocation—and in his luggage he carried a German edition of Goethe’s Italienische Reise which included “Der zweite römische Aufenthalt,” the last volume of Goethe’s travel book which included Moritz’s “verbose
rubbish.” Emerson found in Goethe’s travelogue a very useful and inspiring companion. The reading helped to improve his German language skills, and the wide-ranging observations of his German precursors on politics, history, art, literature, and science stirred his imagination, sharpening not only his perception of Italian history and culture, but also, crucially, his own nascent sense of the deep interconnections between natural history, art, and aesthetics. He copied long passages of Goethe’s works into his notebook, complementing and specifying his own thoughts. As testimony to the deep impact not only of the German poet but also of his protégée and Roman companion, Emerson would meticulously transcribe much of “Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen” three years after his return from Europe.

The American poet’s indebtedness to Goethe’s works has received an overwhelming amount of critical attention both from contemporaries and modern scholars, and I have no intention of disputing the significance of Goethe’s thought for the development of Emerson’s writing. A careful rereading of Emerson’s early lectures, however, reveals a striking presence of Moritz’s aesthetic ideas which has not been sufficiently recognized in the vast body of Emerson criticism. Moritz’s philosophical investigations of the relationship of nature, art, and mimesis resonate deeply with the New England thinker’s early formulations of these issues. In order to clearly comprehend this resonance, we must first critically reconsider the relationship of the two German thinkers in Italy, for it was in this crucible that Moritz’s ideas took shape in conversation with Goethe. Why was Moritz’s text accorded such a prominent position in the *Italienische Reise*, and what were the ideas contained therein that made this short aesthetic tract so important not only to Goethe but to a whole generation of German writers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries? And in what context did Emerson encounter these ideas?

The essay’s opening part draws out biographical parallels between Goethe’s, Moritz’s and Emerson’s self-invention as artists on their respective Italian journeys and highlights the centrality of Moritz’s treatise on artistic production for the three poets. The second section puts Emerson’s explications on criteria of original artistic creation in his lectures on “Michel Angelo Bounaroti” and “The Eye and Ear” in dialogue with Moritz’s expositions of the same theme. A close reading of selected passages from the two lectures sheds light on the long-neglected relevance of Moritz’s aesthetics for Emerson. I argue that in conversation with Moritz’s work, Emerson puts forward a strikingly similar notion of artistic autonomy that would later resurface prominently in *Nature*. Finally, I suggest that the concept of “bildende Nachahmung” as it figures in Emerson’s early works turns out to provide a useful model to account for his own poetic practices.
“All Roads lead to Weimar…”: Moritz, Goethe and Emerson in Italy

The meeting of Moritz and Goethe in Rome in 1786, and the powerful intellectual encounter with both which Emerson would experience when he traveled through Italy in 1832 with the *Italienische Reise* as his constant companion, was anything but fortuitous. Italy—and specifically the Italy of classical antiquity whose image had been created and diffused during the Renaissance—had long been a destination for aristocratic travelers, and since the sixteenth century had been the subject of a veritable flood of personal travel narratives. Though there were many travelers from the German territories in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, interest in and travel to Italy as part of an aesthetic education grounded in the appreciation of classical antiquity received an enormous boost with the publication in 1755 of Winckelmann’s *Gedanken über die Nachahmung der Griechischen Werke in der Malbrey und Bilderkunst* which was published shortly after the author arrived in Rome. Winckelmann—both the man and his work—quickly became the touchstone for debates about the role of classical models, and his remaining in Rome until his death made that city a magnet for German artists and intellectuals.

Classical art was considered harmonious, serious and authentic. Winckelmann believed “the only way for us to be great, and if at all possible, immortal, is by imitating the ancients.” Schiller and a whole host of German intellectuals also looked to the ancient world as a model. Here, Schiller believed, art and thought, aesthetics and philosophy flowed from a common source and nourished an integrated culture. One reason classical culture was so appealing to these German writers was the connection between the arts and public culture which created a sense of unity among members of the society, a unity lacking in both the political, cultural, and artistic life of Germany. Within the circles of Germany’s leading contemporary thinkers, Greek culture occupied a model function. For many German thinkers, ancient Greece and Rome had what the fragmented German nation so desperately needed: a rich cultural tradition expressing and celebrating the nation’s aspirations, functioning as the product and protector of its shared identity.

This larger historical context accounts for why Germany’s intellectual community felt so strongly drawn to Italy, the cradle of civilization they were striving to unearth and appropriate for the creation of a national cultural consciousness. Although the story of German travelers to Italy hardly began with Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, it was he who, after Winckelmann, gained the status of the German traveler par excellence. He departed for Italy in September 1786, leaving behind a prestigious but taxing position as a long-
standing member of the Privy Council at the pleasure of Carl August, duke of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach. So as to remain unrecognized and to completely free himself from the personal and professional entanglements which would ensue if his artistic and diplomatic identity were known, the already famous author of *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* traveled incognito and successfully escaped making the diplomatic rounds in his whirlwind trip to Rome. He disguised himself as a painter from Leipzig named Jean Philipp Möller and traveled without servants in a simple postal coach, the common public transportation of that time. In Rome, the city of the world and the ultimate goal of his sojourn, Goethe joined the circle of prominent members of German society who gathered around Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein (today mostly known to us as the painter of the famous portrait *Goethe in der Campagna di Roma*) who himself was a part of the Winckelmann circle, which included Tischbein’s teacher, Anton Raffael Mengs.

Goethe had traveled to Italy in part to hone his own artistic capabilities, and he spent many hours with Tischbein, who drew sketches of Goethe on their long walks through Roman gardens and the Italian countryside. On the return from one of their longer excursions the two artists, coming back to Rome, saw a horse slipping on the paved surface in front of the Pantheon, causing the poor traveler to break his arm. It was Karl Philipp Moritz, the author of an unusual travel book about England and of an unmistakably autobiographical *Bildungsroman, Anton Reiser*, who had only recently met Goethe before his accident. It was the unhappy incident of Moritz’s fall which proved to be a felicitous moment in the intellectual development of both men. Moritz became Goethe’s patient for many weeks; the accident brought the two writers into almost continual contact, out of which would develop a long-lasting friendship. The poet never came closer to any of his friends, not even to Herder, than to this small, ugly man with his monk-like features and expressive eyes. In a letter to Charlotte von Stein, Goethe wrote that Moritz was like a younger brother, cut from the same cloth but someone to whom fate had been less kind.

Moritz advanced as Goethe’s student and became a “model reader” with whom Goethe could discuss his writings and test the plausibility of his plant system and the metamorphosis of the plant: “Wie faßlich aber das Abstrakteste von dieser Vorstellungsart wird, wenn es mit der rechten Methode vorgetragen wird und eine vorbereitete Seele findet, seh’ ich an meinem neuen Schüler [Moritz]. Er hat eine große Freude daran und rückt immer selbst mit Schlüssen vorwärts.” Moritz proved to be a receptive and eager “Schüler.” Not only was he enthusiastic about Goethe’s ideas, but he also helped to further develop and define the ideas emerging from their conversations. Moritz’s treatise “Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen” was the product of the two
men’s nightly musings over natural phenomena and artistic production, their two favorite topics, and topics which they felt were closely related. Goethe later inserted an excerpt of this piece in “Der zweite römische Aufenthalt” of the Italienische Reise. This middle part of Moritz’s text on the creative imitation of nature, in which he problematizes artistic production, would become the most popular and most interpreted text of his aesthetic works. Modern scholars have conceived of Moritz’s theoretical treatise as principally a realization of Goethe’s aesthetic ideas.¹⁹ Goethe himself, however, justified the reprint of Moritz’s treatise in his text by arguing that this essay is an outcome of their conversations, which Moritz then appropriated, modified and shaped: “Gedachtes Heft aber [Moritz’s text] darf ich nicht unerwähnt lassen; es war aus unsern Unterhaltungen hervorgegangen, welche Moritz nach seiner Art benutzt und ausgebildet.”²⁰

Goethe clearly had a high opinion of Moritz’s thinking, both while they were in Rome, and much later in his life, when the Italienische Reise was printed. Introducing and accounting for the reprint of Moritz’s treatise in his travelogue, Goethe remarks that his friend’s article is of historical interest as a window into his own and his friend’s thinking at the time. Interestingly enough, it is specifically Moritz’s appropriation and modification of the ideas which according to Goethe “happily coincided with the Zeitgeist of the age”:

Es kann [Moritz’s “Heft“] geschichtlich einiges Interesse haben, um daraus zu ersehen, was für Gedanken sich in jener Zeit vor uns auftaten, welche, späterhin entwickelt, geprüft, angewendet und verbreitet, mit der Denkweise des Jahrhunderts glücklich zusammentrafen.²¹

Goethe was aware that his and Moritz’s pioneering ideas had been those which were most valued by their Romantic successors. It was, however, really through Moritz that these ideas spread widely. But what was so innovative and new about Moritz’s aesthetic? Why was this theory so widely discussed in Weimar’s circles and what exactly in Moritz’s particular appropriation of the spirit of the time gave way to new impulses among his contemporaries? Obviously these are questions that go far beyond the scope of this essay; what is crucial to note is that Moritz’s representation of the “creating artist” as an independent, autonomous designer, different from any other professional, had not been formulated before in such a determined and pointed way.²² For him the artist occupies a status higher than others for he alone has the privilege of creating—he possesses the same characteristics inherent in the continuously productive and changing forces of nature:
Wem also von der Natur selbst, der Sinn für ihre Schöpfungskraft in sein ganzes Wesen, und das Maß des Schönen in Aug' und Seele gedrückt ward, der begnügt sich nicht, sie anzuschauen; er muß ihr nachahmen, ihr nachstreben, in ihrer geheimen Werkstatt sie belauschen, und mit der lodernden Flamm' im Busen bilden und schaffen, so wie sie.  

Hence, “jedes schöne Ganze aus der Hand des bildenden Künstlers, ist daher im Kleinen ein Abdruck des höchsten Schönen im grossen Ganzen der Natur.” For Moritz, the beautiful miniature whole, originating from the hand of the artist, is an imitation of the greater whole of nature in that it is the outcome of a productive process. What he creates, however, is not a blunt reformulation of patterns observed in nature, but an autonomous work of art with individual structures and laws. It can be called authentic because it comes about in a process of creation; its status as an authentic and original entity, however, can only be achieved at the expense of claiming to represent reality as such. For what the creative artistic power does is to transform reality into appearance: “die Realität muß unter der Hand des bildenden Künstlers zur Erscheinung werden.” The artist turns reality into an autonomous new entity, as we shall see. Moritz’s claim of a fundamental difference between the real whole of nature and the imaginary whole of the artistic object was both widely discussed and intensely disputed among writers and philosophers in the Weimar circle.

It is the role of the artist as an autonomous producer which distinguishes Moritz’s work and which helped Weimar’s artists to see themselves in a new light. As Nicholas Boyle points out, the modern reader takes the proximity of such nouns as “art” and “creative” for granted and can barely imagine how recent our contemporary notion of these terms actually is. The term “creative” did not cease to be a purely theological term until the mid-eighteenth century. At the same time, the word “art” took on its “modern, more general, and high-flown meaning (‘…but is it Art?’).” Most rulers did not view the writers, composers, set designers, architects and actors who provided them with drama and music as being fundamentally different from the other craftsmen who supplied luxury goods for the court’s consumption— they were seen as mere servants of the court. The idea that literature, the performing arts and music could have something in common which distinguishes them from technical crafts was new.

Moritz smartly captured the zeitgeist of the century in his brief treatise on the predicament of imitating the beautiful. The artist is an independent producer who creates works of art which have to be appreciated “for their own
sake”; consequently, the producer of such works also has to be acknowledged and recognized “for his own sake” and not for any other tasks and duties which might accompany his position in society. So when Goethe suddenly departs incognito in a simply postal coach without servants to Italy it is more than a fulfillment of a nearly life-long yearning for the South; it is an act of artistic self-fashioning. The distinguished poet, who stood for so long in the service of Carl August, Duke of Saxony-Weimar, wants to establish himself as an artist. He writes to Carl August that in Italy he had rediscovered himself “as an artist!” and adds, “anything else I may be is for you to assess and to utilize.”

Boyle points out that when Goethe uses the word “artist” with a quotation mark, the term is not applicable to a lowly craftsman but to a man of letters, implying a court function dignified in itself, and not just by virtue of the fact that he also happens to be an acting President of the Chamber at the duke’s court. As a self-sufficient creator, he wants to be supported by his patron but not be subservient to the duke’s purposes.

Moritz’s sudden departure from Berlin also reveals an impetuous impulse of artistic self-discovery. Shortly before his disappearance in June 1786, he wrote to his friend Karl Friedrich Klischnig: “Es ist beschlossen! Ich muß fort, wenn ich nicht zu Grunde gehen will. Ich erliege im ewigen Kampf mit einer Leidenschaft, die doch nie befriedigt werden kann.” The dramatic tone of this theatrical statement inevitably echoes Goethe’s Werther. While in Moritz’s autobiographical novel Anton Reiser the author fashions himself after Goethe’s sensitive romantic young artist at odds with society and ill-equipped to cope with life on a textual level, Moritz stages his escape to Italy as the flight of a Werther figure from Berlin. His stay in Italy was the crucial turning point in his life, establishing his career as a scholar of the arts.

When Ralph Waldo Emerson impetuously fled from his native New England for Italy, he carried with him Goethe’s Italian Journey and Wilhelm Meister. His own expectations were conditioned by the Bildungsreise and the Bildungsroman, exemplified by the texts of a poet and scholar whose works had found a wide audience in America. The New England poet was troubled by similar feelings of an unfulfilled vocation and a broken heart, and decided that he had to leave his hometown. Like the beleaguered Goethe fleeing from the Weimar court circle, Emerson’s ministerial career was broken off. His desolate situation echoes the circumstances in which Moritz or the protagonists in Wilhelm Meister or Anton Reiser found themselves: Emerson felt uncertain of himself and his aims in life, and his wife, Ellen Tucker Emerson, had just died from tuberculosis. For a while he felt that his own life had ended, too. He began to think of going south again for the climate and took out books on the West Indies. Then, dramatically, on 10 December 1832, on the spur of the moment, he boarded a small merchant brigantine which was about to set sail
for the Mediterranean, and the frail former Unitarian minister found himself heading back to the world of Cicero and Virgil, a world he knew through his vast knowledge of classical literature—and one which he would view through the lens of Goethe. After leaving theology and his prestigious pastoral office behind, Emerson set off down a path which he knew would involve both literature and natural history, as it had for the poet from Weimar. After an arduous voyage on which the already physically weakened poet found himself in constant battle with the stormy Atlantic in midwinter, causing him terrible seasickness and diarrhea, Emerson went ashore at Malta and then traveled north to Sicily and on to the Italian peninsula, tracing Goethe’s steps in reverse, from south to north. While touring through Italy, France and England, he transcribed long passages from Goethe’s works into his notebooks, which would later become the basis for his lectures and essays. Besides Carlyle and Coleridge, Goethe was the thinker whom Emerson took most seriously: “It is to me very plain that no recent genius can work with equal effect upon mankind as Goethe.”

After his return to America, Emerson transformed his European experiences into writings which founded the New World’s cultural independence from the old continent. In the winter of 1836, three years after his return, Emerson focused with renewed attention on Goethe after having acquired the complete, authoritative edition of Goethe’s writings published by J.G. Cotta in Stuttgart, Germany, which consisted of the forty volumes of the Ausgabe Letzter Hand and fifteen additional volumes of Nachgelassene Werke that appeared between 1832 and 1833. By this time Emerson was working intensively on his German language skills so as to be able to read all of Goethe’s works in the original version, a daunting project but one that he was able to complete in the following years. This obvious fascination—one might say obsession—with Goethe has obscured the deep debt Emerson owes to Moritz, one which can be traced textually in Emerson’s own journal and in his early essays. His transcript of the Moritz text in the Italienische Reise was published as part of Journal B in Volume IV of The Journals and Miscellaneous Notebooks. Interestingly, Emerson’s transcription ends with the statement: “[t]he rest is translated in my Goethe Transcript”; the text, however, to which the reader is referred by the editor, namely Journal T, in Journals VI, bears no relation to the remainder of Moritz’s text. Since various echoes of Moritz’s treatise can be found not only in the essay Nature but also in Emerson’s early lectures “The Eye and Ear” and “Michel Angelo Buonaroti,” Mueller-Vollmer concludes that it is plausible to assume that there once was (or still is) a continuation of the Moritz transcript in existence. Further corroboration of Mueller-Vollmer’s hypothesis and more importantly of the centrality of Moritz to Emerson’s developing ideas about the relationship of art, nature,
and mimesis is found in the presence of Moritz’s ideas in two early lectures. As I demonstrate below, these early lectures contain not only direct allusions to the transcript we have, but also to the missing journal entry, and amply demonstrate how Emerson absorbed the German thinker’s key concepts and molded them to fit his own Transcendental project.

**Emerson Meets Moritz or the Aesthetics of bildende Nachahmung**

Emerson’s interest in Michel Angelo dates back to his time in Italy and accompanied him for his whole life. At the sight of the head of the Justice which sits on the monument of Paulus III, he exclaimed: “There is a heaven.”45 While visiting the Santa Croce in Florence, he notes: “when I came to Michel Angelo Buonaroti my flesh crept as I read the inscription. I had strange emotions, I suppose because Italy is so full of his fame. . . . I see his face in every shop window, and now I stood over his dust.”46 Emerson’s fascination with the Italian artist is often talked about in connection with his reception of Goethe, for whom the works of Michel Angelo played an equally crucial role, as we can see in his travel account.47 This focus on Goethe has obscured the debt Emerson owes to Moritz in “Michel Angelo Buonaroti.” Even the significant quote at the beginning of Emerson’s lecture on the relation of all beautiful objects in nature to the entire universe which is a direct translation from Moritz has been wrongly ascribed to Goethe.48 And, more importantly, critics have ignored the fact that Emerson himself literally mentions Moritz at the beginning of the passages in which he engages with the key idea from Moritz’s text: “Beauty cannot be defined . . . says Moritz, a German critic.”49 Even scholars who have carefully examined Emerson’s German precursors have downplayed Moritz and misrepresented the precise nature of the relationship between “Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen” and Emerson’s early aesthetic philosophy.50

In order to better understand precisely what Emerson was borrowing from Moritz, we need to get an idea of what the central concepts in the German thinker’s theory of “creative imitation” consist of. The problem of artistic production as a way of mediating between art and nature is at the heart of Moritz’s discussion in the middle part of his essay which Goethe published in the *Italienische Reise*. As the contradictory title “Über die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen” already suggests, at the core of any artistic working process lies an aesthetic paradox: the independent, creatively forming production of art on the one hand, and the regulated imitation of nature on the other. For Moritz, this paradoxical relation is the core assumption from which he develops his aesthetic theory of the autonomy of art.
The limitations of our rational understanding mark the point of departure for Moritz’s discussion, leading to a rehabilitation of aesthetic insight. In response to the enlightenment notion of “Denkkraft”—of man’s ability to comprehend causal relations in nature rationally—as bearing the most promising potential to arrive at some kind of higher insight, Moritz suggests a model in which irrational and dark human faculties move to the forefront. Radically turning idealist theories upside down, Moritz comes up with his idea of “dunkelahnende Thatkraft,” of a dark, irrational and highly dynamic artistic power that is both superior and inferior to all other human senses. Being placed at the top and, simultaneously, at the very bottom of the idealistic value chain of human faculties, the paradoxical composition of “Thatkraft” reiterates the equally contradictory notion of artistic production as both imitative and creative on a structural level. Precisely because of its incomplete and dynamic structure, the artistic “Thatkraft” demonstrates a certain resemblance to nature. The artist imitates nature in that he creates, but what he creates is an autonomous work of art with individual structures and artistic laws. It can be called authentic because it came about in a process of creation; its status as authentic and original, however, can only be achieved at the expense of claiming to represent reality as such. For what the artistic “Thatkraft” does is to transform reality into appearance [Erscheinung], into an independent piece of art.

Emerson’s indebtedness to Moritz in the talk he gave on “Michel Angelo” in February 1835 resonates on the opening pages. Introducing Michelangelo to his audience, he maps out what he takes to be most remarkable about this widely accomplished Italian artist, namely, his continuous and laborious striving to express the idea of beauty in all fields of artistic activities: “This was his nature and vocation. This Idea possessed his soul and determined all his activity. Beauty in the largest sense.” To someone so entirely devoted to the study of beauty, the question “What is Beauty?” occurs naturally, remarks Emerson, and he provides an answer for his audience which derives from Moritz’s text: “Beauty cannot be defined.”

Only two years later, in the period leading up to the publication of Nature, Moritz was again on Emerson’s mind. Even more forcefully than in “Michel Angelo,” the German poet’s thoughts reappear in Emerson’s lecture “The Eye and Ear,” serving as a supportive and illuminating backup for Emerson’s own ideas. This presentation is the fourth in the series at the Masonic Temple in Boston; in it Emerson discusses what man can actually see and hear in nature if he sharpens and develops the respective senses. The text centers around sensuous energies, namely seeing and hearing, which are potentially capable of receiving an impression of what Emerson terms the beautiful in the natural world: “these organs furnish us with the external elements of our
idea of Beauty. They have the highest interest for us; I shall confine to that subject the present discourse.” Emerson assumes that the artist whose sensual organs are susceptible to the energies of beauty permeating the entire natural space feels in himself the energy to produce a replica of what he beholds. He thereby does not create a mere imitation of nature, but his work reveals “the mind of nature.”

It is at this point in his lecture that Emerson turns to the “Italian and German masters” so as to see what they have to say about the practice of original artistic creation. Unlike in “Michel Angelo,” Moritz is not mentioned in particular; the textual evidence in the following passages, however, leaves no doubt about the provenance of these ideas. In order to see how Emerson absorbed and reformed them, we need to delve more fully into Moritz’s explications themselves.

In the first section of the excerpt Emerson read in Goethe’s publication, Moritz states that so as to produce a true image of highest beauty, all these relations of that great whole that are only dimly sensed by the active power [tätige Kraft] must necessarily in some way become either visible, audible, or, at any rate, comprehensible to the imagination. By the same token, the artist’s primary task in Emerson’s text is to render these harmonious correspondences between the disparate entities he experiences in nature accessible; he “never rests but toils with enthusiasm to express that which he beholds, to transfer to some visible or audible [my emphasis] object the perfection he contemplates.” The creative energies of the artist have to render the beautiful harmonies which govern all levels of the world and universe visible and/or audible in a piece of art. But how precisely are we to envision this very process itself? Moritz explains that the active artistic power “muß alle jene Verhältnisse des großen Ganzen und in ihnen das höchste Schöne wie an den Spitzen seiner Strahlen in einem Brennpunkt fassen” In the context of Emerson’s lecture that same principle which Moritz describes as governing the process of artistic production, namely the act of taking all the relations of the great whole and bringing them into focus, echoes in Emerson’s portrayal of the finished artwork: “But that single work must stand as it were in relation to all nature, as if all influences streamed in upon it as a focal point.” And it is from this focal point, this “Brennpunkt” that, in Moritz’s words, within the precise range of the eye, a fragile yet faithful image of the highest beauty must be rounded out and include in its small compass the most complete relations of the great whole of nature. Emerson concludes likewise: “As in nature abides everywhere quiet proportion and all relations enter without crowding into every particular product so must the work of art represent all nature within its little circuit.” Both poets stress the necessity of rendering the proportions residing in nature (and making nature appear beautiful to the human eye) visible in a piece of art. And both claim that the finished
artwork can only be called truly beautiful if it reiterates nature’s principle where each entity somehow refers back to a greater whole. This theory of mimesis, however, is only one side of what qualifies an artwork to be called authentic.

On the one hand, both poets lay emphasis on the aspect of correspondence between the produced artifact and the phenomenal world which initiated the artist’s urge to work on a reproduction of the beautiful relations he beholds. “It is a maxim of Art,” argues Emerson, “that every true and perfect masterpiece is a whole; does take up into itself all beauty, and reminds the beholder of the entire beauty of nature.” On the other hand, however, Emerson and Moritz stress the autonomous status of original art: “Hence follows the severe demand that the work of art should concentrate the look, the thought, the interest of the beholder so that he shall think of nothing out of it, nothing near, nothing else. A masterpiece of art should...annihilate everything else.”

How can an artwork represent the beautiful of the whole of nature in its little circuit and, at the same time, be an entirely autonomous entity that ideally succeeds in bracketing off all other associations? It is Moritz who provides an explanation as to why art derives its original status precisely by hovering between imitation and autonomy. The artwork as a whole in and for itself can only exist as such because the artist has transformed the inner essence of nature into an appearance, into a non-representational piece of art. The beauty of nature itself, as we know from Moritz’s “Über die bildende Nachahmung” and Emerson’s lectures, cannot be represented. The beautiful is beautiful precisely because of its incommensurable status. Moritz’s recapitulation of this artistic predicament at the particular point in his discussion which I have been comparing with Emerson’s rendering of the same ideas reads as follows:

Und weil dieser Gegenstand wiederaum, wenn er wirklich [emphasis is only in Moritz, SAP, 76/38, not in Goethe], was er darstellt, wäre [s.a.], mit dem Zusammenhang der Natur, die außer sich selber kein wirklich eigenmächtiges Ganzes duldet, nicht ferner bestehen könnte, so führet uns dies auf den Punkt, wo wir schon einmal waren: daß jedesmal das innre Wesen erst in die Erscheinung sich verwandeln müsse, ehe es durch die Kunst zu einem für sich bestehenden Ganzen gebildet werden und ungehindert die Verhältnisse des großen Ganzen der Natur in ihrem völligen Umfange spiegeln kann.

So what the artist in both texts ideally does is to uncover what Emerson calls “the mind of nature” and what Moritz introduces as nature’s unique features: permanently in motion, it has the faculty to continuously reform
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itself and to produce. It is an autonomous entity, a totality in itself that cannot be represented. It is governed by its own laws which we will never be able to fathom entirely.

The artwork resembles nature the moment it succeeds in also appearing as a totality in and for itself. This specific design of the artwork does not have to bear any resemblance to the structures the artist beholds in nature. On the contrary, the “masterpiece of art should exclude and for the time annihilate everything else.” In other words, the resemblance to the great whole of nature does not consist in a content-related fashion but in the very fact that the artwork, like nature, is being produced and that all its parts are somehow related to its entirety. Emerson talks about a certain feeling that is “excited by the masterworks of art, and by the works of nature” in the beholder; both are joined together and yet autonomous. There is a particular bond, for in both entities a productive energy is at work, “a certain link joins what is beautiful in productions [art] that speak to the eye and ear, with what is beautiful in action [nature].” The artwork, however, is at the same time independent from nature’s beauty, for it is not beautiful in proportion to anything that lies outside of the scope of vision of the beholder: “The object is beautiful in proportion to the skill of the eye. All cultivation of the man decks the things he beholds.” The harmonious structure of nature lies entirely within the experience of each person. Hence, whatever we experience, whatever we see, not see or how we see it is in proportion to our individual horizon. The observing artist transforms nature the way it appears to him into an artistic object which echoes the part/whole structure that both Moritz and Emerson understand to be the governing principle in the natural world. The artwork deserves to be called original and autonomous because the artist does not even pretend to reflect something which can be measured by any objective criteria of artistic production. Art is the transformation of one particular experience of reality into a newly constructed and thus authentic entity. These core ideas of “Über die bildende Nachahmung” and of Emerson’s appropriation in his early lectures are the ones that provide important building blocks for Emerson’s far more complex and elaborate discussions in *Nature*.

If we try to locate any of these thoughts, obviously recalling Moritz work, in Emerson’s long transcript of Moritz’s text in his journal from 1833, the effort is in vain. The first part of “The Eye and Ear” demonstrates that Moritz’s footprints can be seen even in sections of Emerson’s text which are not drawn directly from the extant transcript, a fact which strongly supports Mueller-Vollmer’s argument for the existence of another transcript, one mentioned by Emerson himself.

The subsequent part of “The Eye and Ear” which follows up on Moritz’s discussion of dilettantism can once again be tracked back to Emerson’s journal transcriptions. Emerson distinguishes between those who merely
perceive and those who actually produce beauty, picking up on the last paragraphs concluding Moritz’s excerpt in the *Italienische Reise*: “It is not to be denied meantime that the greatest difference exists between the capacity of different individuals to create and to judge of what is beautiful.” This debate about the two forms of artistic skills had already occupied Emerson in his “Michel Angelo” lecture; the respective part in “The Eye and Ear,” however, moves beyond the corresponding paragraphs in the earlier version. Like Moritz, Emerson specifies the difference between those who have such highly developed sensual organs that they are susceptible to the beauty of nature and the elite group of people who moreover have artistic energies to transform what they perceive into a new, autonomous object:

The doctrine of Art explains the different susceptibility of men to Beauty by supposing that where the organization of the individual is not perfect, so that his power of reception does not correspond point for point with the relations of surrounding Nature but here and there a point is missing, then he is not an artist; all his attempts to represent the beauty of the world will miscarry.

No matter how capable someone is of producing art, if his aptitude is incomplete, if “his power of perception does not correspond point for point with the relations of surrounding Nature,” he is simply not a real artist. Emerson inserted in his lecture an abbreviated version of his comprehensive transcript of Moritz’s ideas from his journal. Moritz’s original text reads:

It is revealing to scrutinize the way Emerson transfers Moritz’s key expressions into his native language. Moritz’s “abspiegeln,” for instance, is rendered as “re-image” in the transcript in his journal; whereas “reflect,” the closest English translation of “abspiegeln,” would suggest a purely mimetic connotation of the word, the semantic “re-image” is closer to Moritz’s artistic
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aesthetic as both imitative and individual. Furthermore, he capitalizes not only some of the crucial German nouns such as “the Beautiful” or “the Creative,” but also pivotal adjectives for the argument Moritz is making, namely the distinction between “Bildungskraft” and “Empfindungskraft” as two essentially distinctive yet interwoven faculties allowing man to correspond with nature. The artist who finds himself “in lieu of the Creative,” echoes Emerson, can still be endowed with “the Perceiving [my emphasis] faculty for the Beautiful.”

But why, we may ask, does the organic structure of the artist’s senses, not woven finely enough to offer the inflowing whole of nature as many points of contact as needed to mirror, or re-image completely, all its relations in miniature, force him to give up on his creative power altogether? Emerson argues that “the want of one relation destroys the harmony as much as the want of a thousand.” Like many philosophical observations in these early essays, this remark cannot be traced back to any previous journal transcripts but nevertheless resonates powerfully with a similar statement by Moritz: “Weil nämlich das Wesen des Schönen eben in seiner Vollendung in sich selbst besteht, so schadet ihm der letzte fehlende Punkt so viel als tausend, denn er verrückt alle übrigen Punkte aus der Stelle, in welche sie gehören.”

Since it is rare to find oneself among the select few who do not lack one point or another indispensable for the essence of beauty to consist in its being complete within itself, it seems more reasonable to part with one’s amateurish energy to create altogether, especially given the fact that one’s giving up something one won’t ever successfully master anyway is rewarded with an increased susceptibility to nature’s splendor: “[das] Empfindungsvermögen eröffnet sich zum Lohne für sein bescheidnes Zurücktreten in seine Grenzen dem reinsten Genuß des Schönen, der mit der Natur seines Wesens bestehen kann.” Emerson provides equally encouraging advice for the amateur who cannot represent true beauty in his art, for he lacks a couple or maybe even only one of these significant points which together form something that is worth labeling authentic art: “yet to that man is still left the perception of the beautiful. He has no art. He has Taste.” Nature only rarely allows the indwelling creative power so many people believe they feel to fully develop, and the reason is simple: genuine beauty must remain rare otherwise it loses its preeminent status.

Imitation and Autonomy: “The most indebted man”

In both early lectures Moritz’s aesthetic ideas on principles of artistic production figure prominently. It is in Nature, however, where this concept of art as an independent entity, taking shape in a creative process, moves like
a red thread through the fabric of this dauntingly multifaceted text. There, in Emerson’s key chapter on beauty, the resonance of his discussions of Moritz is most conspicuous. However, it would be presumptuous to argue that Emerson’s continuous reformulations and renegotiations of ways to make nature accessible to the human eye all point back to Moritz’s aesthetics as they resonate in Emerson’s journal and his early lectures. On the contrary, as Barbara Packer demonstrates convincingly, “Nature is a case study in the pleasures of eclecticism.” Numerous Emerson scholars have meticulously hunted down the sources the poet read or even glanced at, providing evidence that he tapped into an immensely large pool of global thought to support and enhance his intellectual probing into the issues he addresses. It would not serve the purpose of this study to further engage in identifying and discerning Emerson’s sources of inspiration, demarcating traces of Moritz’s aesthetics from other intellectual influences. Instead, I suggest that Emerson’s appropriation of Moritz’s idea of “bildende Nachahmung” provides a model of thought useful not only for discussing of perspectives on artistic production in *Nature*, but also for accessing the author’s own artistic method. In other words, the method of reforming and reorganizing structures inherent in different contexts in nature in a creative new way can also be seen as a key to Emerson’s own reworking of his source material.

How have critics assessed this dazzling deployment of texts and traditions in *Nature* and the rest of Emerson’s essays? We can broadly distinguish between three different yet intertwined approaches. Often, the foreign influence is acknowledged as important but regarded as a confirmation of already existing tendencies in a nascent American canon, a welcome mental import that helped to authorize, reinforce and specify native impulses. Other critics disregard the presence of non-native thought by highlighting the amateurish preoccupation of the transcendentalists with German metaphysics and concluding that foreign influences were not significant. Instead, they emphasize that this fledgling American literature is a unique homegrown product—even when (or especially when) it is a creative misreading of continental precursors. More recent approaches, however, attempt to introduce a new vocabulary and methodology for discussing the evolution of nineteenth century American culture.

The work of Kurt Mueller-Vollmer both critically reviews this history and takes it in new directions that are especially interesting in light of the connections traced above between Moritz and Emerson. He demonstrates convincingly that understanding American intellectual culture during the decades from the 1820s through the 1840s is impossible without taking into account the pivotal role German philosophy and literature played in the shaping of a specifically American national literature. Mueller-Vollmer is,
however, not alone in making broad claims about the transatlantic impulses behind much writing in early and mid nineteenth century New England. In the most recent critical biography of Emerson, Lawrence Buell introduces the most prominent representative of the Transcendentalist movement in New England as someone we cannot think of in terms of “a single cultural context.”

Emerson, he writes, has to be regarded as anticipating a “postnational form of consciousness,” as a thinker who had a “surprisingly limited patience for nationalism as such and would probably have been far more supportive than critical of the increasing interest being taken today by historians of U.S. culture in how it has been shaped in interaction with transatlantic … influences.”

This study follows the critical tradition of Mueller-Vollmer and Buell, which attempts to dislodge the Emerson who stands at the origin of a distinctly American literary tradition and recuperate an Emerson more attuned to and receptive of transatlantic literary and philosophic currents. And it proposes that the double structure of “bildende Nachahmung,” of creation and imitation that Emerson develops in conversation with Moritz’s work provides a framework to approach the issue of Emerson’s eclecticism. In Nature and his lectures he talks about moments of original creation as always going had in hand with actualizing universal laws of interrelation between individual human experience and nature. By the same token, his texts, that we admire for their refreshing independence and inventiveness, turn out to be both deeply indebted and yet unique. They are mimetic in that they emerge from a large webs of foreign thinking, but to what extent then can these texts also be called original?

Regardless of the subject matter, questions of influence occupy him in basically all of his essays. “No man,” he says in “Art,”

\[
\text{can quite emancipate himself from his age and country, or produce a model in which the education, the religion, the politics, usages, and arts, of his times shall have no share. Though he were never so original, never so willful and fantastic, he cannot wipe out of his work every trace of the thoughts amidst which it grew.}\]

Nature’s chapter on “Discipline” notes in the first paragraph that “this use of the world includes preceding uses, as parts of itself.” In “Experience” he writes: “The history of literature—take the net result of Tiraboschi, Warton, or Schlegel—is a sum of very few ideas, and of very few original tales, all the rest being variations of these.” Consequently, since no true originality can exist, the best authors are the best borrowers; “the greatest genius,” he
proclaims in *Representative Men*, “is the most indebted man.”

Emerson unravels the matrix of the matter of intellectual influence comprehensively in his essay, announcing the crux of the debate already in its heading: “Quotation and Originality.” Quotation for Emerson is not limited to actual verbal citation; rather, it expands to take in all areas of human action and interaction, anything that is somehow historically connected: “All minds quote. Old and new make the warp and woof of every moment. There is no thread that is not a twist of these two strands….We quote not only books and proverbs, but arts, sciences, religion, customs and laws; nay, we quote temples and houses, tables and chairs by imitation.” If we “confine ourselves to literature,” we can discover innumerable degrees of influence, ranging from concrete citation to merely remote resemblances of thought.

The various ways and degrees of influence Emerson addresses enclose all genres of intellectual history and lead him to a notion of collective authorship: “Read Tasso, and you think of Virgil; read Virgil, and you think of Homer; and Milton forces you to reflect how narrow are the limits of human invention. The Paradise Lost had never existed but for these precursors.” He continues by pointing out the common ancestors of Eastern and Western Bible traditions:

What divines had assumed as the distinctive revelations of Christianity, theologic criticism has matched by exact parallelisms from the Stoics and poets of Greece and Rome. Later, when Confucius and the Indian scriptures were made known, no claim to monopoly of ethical wisdom could be thought of; and the surprising results of the new researchers into the history of Egypt have opened to us the deep debt of the churches of Rome and England to the Egyptian hierology.

Emerson thereby “puts an end to the Christian ‘monopoly’ of ‘ethical wisdom’ by showing its ‘deep debt’ to other tradition,” notes Julie Ellison in *Emerson’s Romantic Style*. By the same token, mythology is introduced as an aggregation of fragmented musings of the folk; being “no man’s work… the legend is tossed from believer to poet, from poet to believer, everybody adding a grace or dropping a fault, until it gets an ideal truth.”

Albeit Emerson incessantly emphasizes our indebtedness to the past, he does not hold back his uneasiness about tracing any philosophical idea or modern invention back to prior forms, admitting that “there is something mortifying in this perpetual circle…[leaving] a very small capital of invention… how few thoughts!” The disassembling of complex philosophical arguments laid out by the world’s intellectual elite demystifies Emerson’s idea of the possibilities of original citation, and he concludes that the term “original” is
altogether inappropriate and deceptive; suggesting that it is a fatal illusion to think of any “original thought” as an unprecedented entity, he writes: “Swedenborg, Behmen, Spinoza, will appear original to uninstructed and to thoughtless persons: their originality will disappear to such as are either well read or thoughtful; for scholars will recognize their dogmas as reappearing in men of a similar intellectual elevation throughout history.” Thorough scrutiny allows us to place basically every book in a long genealogy of similar thought: “Renard the Fox, a German poem of the thirteenth century, was long supposed to be the original work, until Grimm found another original a century older. M. Le Grand showed that in the old Fabliaux were the originals of the tales of Molière, La Fontaine, Boccaccio, and of Voltaire.”

Imitation is a vexed issue for Emerson; the difference between original and unoriginal quotation is a slippery slope. From reading Emerson’s early discussion of the subject’s possibilities to appropriate nature in an original way along with Moritz’s idea of creative imitation, we are familiar with the theoretical premises of what he takes to be authentic mimesis. In a similar way, Emerson suggests that literary indebtedness only registers as legitimate if the quoting author has also established a relationship to nature that is not mimetic in the sense of a one-to-one representation but imitative in a creative way. “As [people] do by books, so they quote the sunset and the star, and do not make them theirs...[they] quote thoughts and thus disown them.” The reason for man’s failure is not located in the very act of not being able not to quote but in their lack of quoting creatively, of not “mak[ing] them [sunset and stars] theirs.” Hence, Emerson concludes his essay by saying that “only an inventor knows how to borrow, and every man is or should be an inventor. We must not tamper with the organic motion of the soul.”

The similar patterns determining both the reception of a text and of what Emerson describes as the poet’s struggles in his attempts to account for nature’s beauty are obvious. A crucial difference, however, lies in the fact that in reading or quoting from a text, the reader/author is faced with something that is an outcome, a product of the practice Emerson determines as imperative for all original artistic creation. Consequently, an artist who has the ability to turn his perception of nature into production, in this case text production, always finds himself indebted in a twofold way. He is indebted to nature as a source of inspiration and in adopting certain laws of relation and incommensurability. At the same time, he finds himself as part of a web of textual discourses in which these phenomena have been expressed prior to his contemporary formulations. It is therefore logical to declare that only people who know how to “quote the sunset and the star” may succeed in citing another book in an original manner. The crisis of belatedness burdening the reception of a text can only be mastered if the reader extends beyond
the past utterance and becomes a genius himself. Since the product of his desire, the text of the other, is a result of creative nature quotation—besides being of course also another item within the discursive web of prior texts—he can only grow up to the challenge of producing original work himself if his appropriation of the thoughts in the other text coincides with the skill to experience nature: “And what is Originality? It is being, being one’s self, and reporting accurately what we see and are. Genius is in the first instance, sensibility, the capacity of receiving just impressions from the external world, and the power of coordinating these after the laws of thought.” If the author has internalized these principles, he is likely to succeed in producing something equal to the quality of the text he finds worth quoting—the “most indebted man” becomes the independent creative genius.

The preceding investigations of Emerson’s adoption and reworking of Moritz’s concept of “bildende Nachahmung” and Emerson’s multifaceted explications of the role of the texts of others for the generation of modern works suggest a notion of originality evolving from indebtedness. Emerson was intricately enfolded in the intellectual discourses of his times and highly receptive of transatlantic literary and philosophical currents. This Emerson needs to be carefully excavated, and I hope the close readings of two short texts performed here demonstrate the ways in which these currents entered into his prose. This labor needs, however, to be performed not just from the perspective of Boston, Cambridge or Concord; we need a criticism that is also attuned to the transmission of texts and ideas in Europe. Thus I also endeavor here not just to recover the textual traces of Moritz in two early essays, but also to follow the genealogy of Moritz’s ideas as they evolved out of the particularly charged atmosphere of late-eighteenth century Weimar and Rome. Emerson’s encounter with both men was culturally over-determined; his encounter with Goethe—with the Bildungsroman, with the Bildungsreise—repeated in a new context the encounter of Moritz and Goethe in Rome in 1786. I attempt here to carefully follow these encounters, retracing the steps—physical and textual—of all three men, attempting to do justice both to the cultural and historical context and to their writing. My efforts also take their cue from these writings themselves, for they are all deeply concerned with issues of imitation and autonomy, of mimesis and artistic production. I hope that these efforts demonstrate the complex ways in which “the most indebted man” turns out also to be the greatest genius.

Columbia University
New York, New York
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Converging Spiritualities:
Observations of Anna Rosina Gambold,
Moravian Missionary to the Cherokees, 1805 to 1821

In the early nineteenth century, two disparate groups came together on the American South landscape and fostered long-lasting relationships. One was German-American, the Unity of the Brethren or Brüdergemeine (later Moravian).\(^1\) These dissident Brethren had a rich history as descendants of religious reformer John Hus called Hussites, some of whom settled in Moravia (located in present day the southeast Czech Republic), and adherers of mid seventeenth century Pietism, a movement within the Lutheran Orthodox Church known for heart-felt caring, a contrite heart, personal conversion, and most of all, an unconditional devotion to the Crucified Christ.\(^2\) The other, the Cherokees, a Southeast tribe located in parts of present day states of Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, emerged from centuries’ old Mississippian traditions that imbued the physical world with spiritual meaning and preserved a highly defined system of balance and order. Their very rocks and streams held life that transcended the secular Anglo-American world that would displace them in the infamous Trail of Tears, the 1838-1839 forced removal.\(^3\)

Against this backdrop of heightened tensions over United States’ dispossession of Cherokees from ancestral domains, one particular Moravian missionary, Anna Rosina Kliest Gambold, wife of Moravian minister John Gambold, took her pedagogical and people’s skills and Moravian Christianity to the Cherokee Nation and lived from 1805 to 1821 among the Cherokees,\(^4\) who had already had lost over two-thirds of their ancestral land base located in the American South. The pervasiveness of disputed lands and indiscriminate white settlement prompted Cherokees to seek out persons like the Moravians who could possibly provide them with tools to co-exist peacefully with their Anglo-American counterparts. Moravians appeared the very persons to live among the Cherokees because they were widely known, though heavily
criticized by other Americans, for their eighteenth century missionary activity and non violent stances among tribes of New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and the Old Northwest territories; Moravians held the belief that Indians did have souls allowing Moravians to seem more tolerant than other evangelical societies; other religious societies held hierarchical opinions of European superiority with the view that Indians had no more of a soul than a buffalo.\(^5\)

The Brethren’s commitment to proselytizing among the “heathen” resulted from a sense of their unique place in history that germinated from their common past of oppression.\(^6\) They shared a history of persecution for objections to armed violence, the swearing of oaths, and the machinery of church and state had also caused firestorms in eighteenth century Central Europe as Lutheran Orthodoxists questioned founder of the Renewed Moravian Church (1727) Count Nicholas Ludwig von Zinzendorf’s worship services as appearing to foster a “fourth species of religion” banned by the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, which had allowed Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists freedom of worship though dictated by imperial rulers of some three hundred principalities throughout the Holy Roman Empire.\(^7\)

Unwanted in Europe, they formed a close-knit society leading to undaunted courage and confidence to establish distant colonies. Known as non-combatants, Moravians created an intensive personal society, where every person was a “Brother’s Keeper.”\(^8\) The Brethren carefully selected members whose occupations met community needs, and those chosen for the missionary field enjoyed the greatest prestige.\(^9\)

The meaning of that shared experience also prompted them to record their spiritual journeys in cursive, the writing convention called German script. So with quill in hand, Moravian missionaries, far from their home congregations, corresponded with their co-religionists and with their far flung missionary counterparts in Greenland, Labrador, and Caribbean, and Africa by carefully recording their observations of non-European cultures in diaries. In addition to this sense of uniformity that epitomized Moravian coherence, their world-wide correspondence, and general penchant for producing copious documents sustained their distinctiveness for long periods of time.\(^10\)

In the early nineteenth century, Moravian documents from Springplace, a site in present day northwest Georgia, in particular, the Gambold Springplace Diary, serve as examples of Moravian uniqueness. The two volume edition, *The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokees, 2 volumes, 1805–1813, and 1814–1821* is evidence of just how intense times were for the Cherokees and their sojourners, the Moravians, who recorded those encounters almost daily for seventeen years.\(^11\) The first volume extends from 1805 to the beginning of the Creek War (1813); the second volume encompasses the following years,
These documents illuminate why Cherokees welcomed Moravian missionaries; they had educational values they could pass on to their offspring. While multiple Moravian missionaries ministered to the Cherokees before their infamous forced removal, it was Anna Rosina’s spectacular life that had origins in her teaching career at the Moravian Female Seminary for Young Ladies in Bethlehem beginning in 1785 and ending in May of 1805, when she married John to become his co-worker among the Cherokees. Anna Rosina’s success as a botany teacher at the Female Seminary caught the attention of the newly elected Bishop and President of Helpers Conference at Bethlehem, the Reverend George Henry Loskiel, and he decided in 1803 to take his wife, Maria Magdalena, and Sister Anna Rosina Kliest on a journey to Goshen, in Tuscarawas County, Ohio, to observe Moravian Indian missions first hand and hold a mission conference. Indians, once feared by her, became her all consuming goal. At the Goshen Mission, Indians and Moravians greeted one another with kisses; Indians prepared fine lodging and food. Anna Rosina met Delaware Indian convert, William Henry or Gelelemend, and other Indians from the “brown flock.” She described her complete joy among those “brown ones, whom she loved,” that such joy “could not be moved.”

With bold and boundless confidence, she brought the “arts of civilization,” reading, writing, arithmetic, and Christianity, to the Cherokees—the very activities that governmental agents deemed worthy for ones seeking the so-called “civilized” life. In the intimacy of the Springplace Mission, along the Federal Road connecting Augusta, Georgia, to Nashville, Tennessee, as chief diarist of the Springplace Diary, Anna Rosina recorded what she heard from her students, their relatives. Frequently, visits of curious Cherokees testify to Moravian willingness to listen to them. Visiting Cherokees sometimes received a spiritual education whether they requested one or not. Cherokees encountered paintings of the Crucifixion depicting the mutilations and agonies of Jesus and heard Biblical accounts of blood and wounds cleansing Moravians of sin. One Cherokee guest, The Bird, at the Moravian’s Springplace mission queried Anna Rosina about the mystical properties of blood, thereby setting the stage for mutual doubts about each other’s spiritual soundness and intensifying their mutual incomprehension. Divergent beliefs about blood provide a good example, and The Bird is the centerpiece of this discussion.

On December 15, 1808, The Bird had attended the Passion Liturgy, a common service held throughout the Moravian calendar year, though, it actually implied the days between Palm Sunday and Good Friday. As it was the case many times when the two cultures converged, Anna Rosina depended on her youthful translators studying at Springplace Mission to explain Passion
Week. Through Cherokee students, *The Bird* told her that he had “already learned a great deal about the birth, life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of the dear Lord, and he wanted to hear more.” Consequently, the Cherokee pupils told him the “Old Testament story of the creation of the world, the first man and his fall, the unhappiness that came to all humans as a result of this, and the necessity of the Redeemer.” The Cherokee students at Springplace concluded by emphasizing the “love of God for His poor fallen humans.” Pupils explained, “We humans have to prevail on Him *alone* to have mercy on us, to suffer in our place, to atone for our sins, and to pay with His blood.” Following this Bible lesson, “*The Bird* sat in deep thought.” Finally, the old chief asked “if Jesus shed *all* of His blood.” Then he raised the crucial question: “Did His blood fall onto all the earth?”

To the Moravians, blood represented Christ’s mystical substance that could pardon sins and make the human heart pure and divine. The Savior’s blood alone was powerful enough to atone for the sinfulness of human beings; it erased former and present wrongs. Therefore, a person who exhibited a contrite heart was not ultimately accountable for his or her behavior. The Savior had completed what no earthly being could do: Grant mercy and forgiveness for all human beings throughout the world. To the Moravians, His blood provided the means.

While attempting to adhere to Lutheran orthodoxy under the terms of the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, Moravians became obsessed with “Blood Theology,” a set of beliefs that made them unacceptable to Lutherans. So in addition to their unpopular stances on nonviolence, the established church, and political participation, Moravians brought to North America distinctive ways of worshipping that already had caused a furor in Europe.

Called the “Sifting Period” in the 1740s, when Zinzendorf cultivated in his followers an obsession with blood, this became a time of notorious practices that caught British North America’s attention to observe Moravians also suspiciously of promoting religious fanaticism. Later Moravian scholars began to use the words “sifting,” or sometimes “winnowing,” to describe a time when Moravians became devout extremists. Moravians derived the term from the Bible verse in Luke in which Jesus told Simon Peter that he would be tempted by Satan: “And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat,” Luke 22:31. Though they came through this period intact as a community, it was a time of trial or testing for the Moravians. Due to obsession with Jesus’ crucified body, Moravians accentuated the imagery of blood during the sifting period.

As result, members sought to keep Christ’s death and suffering on the cross always before them; His wounds and blood signified the total sacrifice God had made for human kind. Members were to feel joy for His oblation by
uniting with Christ in a child-like way. This Lebensgefühl or “joyful feeling for life” appealed to the sensual and emotional nature of the communicants. So during the time when Europe and British North America experienced the Age of Reason or Enlightenment, Moravians embraced the opposite: anti-rationalism. Zinzendorf discouraged members from using their own brains, their reason. Communicants did not need reason because they were only children in the arms of Christ Who banished all their cares and doubts. Self-named groups of little fools, little worms, baby chicks, “who could feel at home in the Sidehole and crawl in deep” formed throughout the “sifting” period. Some of the believers addressed Zinzendorf as Herzens Papa or “Daddy’s Heart” or “Darling Daddy.” Additionally, Moravian customs pertaining to the wounds of Jesus epitomized extreme and heightened lustful longings for His body. Christian Renatus, the son of Zinzendorf, built a “Side Wound” on the wall of the church at Herrnhut, Saxony, whereby the congregation experienced the Savior’s blood by marching through it. Therefore, the side hole became symbolic of their wound theology. 

In the early nineteenth century, Moravians had not completely abandoned their obsession with blood and the wounds and suffering of Jesus, especially the stab wound in His side. Paramount to believers was the Savior, and His wounds kept that connection to Him intimate and personal, perhaps even erotic. His blood and wounds cleansed Moravians of sin and made them pure like wheat when the chaff was blown away. Transparent pictures and living tableaus were part of worship services that depicted the mutilations and agonies of Jesus. Blood theology permeated everyday life of the Bethlehem and Salem congregations and even at the Springplace Mission. Central in the thoughts of each member was the shedding of the Savior’s blood and why lowly humans could never be grateful enough for His ultimate bloody sacrifice on the cross. However, Cherokees did not believe human martyrdom could absolve sin and guilt; as noted, these are alien concepts. When the Moravian missionaries arrived in the Cherokee Nation, they encountered a people who valued order and believed things should stay in their place. Cherokees attached special meanings to anomalies because these occurred along the interstices of their categorical system. Substances that belonged inside the body but were expelled received particular attention, and thus blood, breath, and saliva possessed spiritual properties, which created, healed, or induced death.

But when The Bird questioned the premise that did He shed all of His blood and did it fall over the whole world, the Moravians naively thought that the old chief honestly understood the Savior’s force. In one sense, he did understand. Cherokees also ascribed mystical qualities to blood. To The Bird,
the sacred and secular were one. Historian of Religion and Cherokee scholar William Gerald McLoughlin has argued that Cherokees were monistic; spirituality was a sacred circle not dividing body and soul but serving as a continuum. The Bird was probably astonished that any people, including the Moravians, could possibly conclude that a human being’s body held enough blood to fall over the whole world much less be able to assuage guilt and sin. Yet that substance, blood, to Moravians, had those extraordinary capabilities.

The Bird’s question, however, “Did He shed all of His blood?” held particular import for the Cherokees. For healing purposes, the blowing or spraying of a specially prepared concoction over a feverish body by post-menopausal women was common. Since these women no longer possessed hidden forces brought about by their menses, they lacked the power to harm or cause death. But their long experience with blood had imbued them with extraordinary spiritual power. Therefore, post-menopausal women took care of warriors’ wounds and attended to younger women while they secluded themselves in menstrual huts during menstruation and following childbirth. Menstrual periods for Cherokees represented a time of exquisite bodily awareness and heightened spiritual power. Likewise, substantial ancestral meanings emanated from menstrual blood. The ancient myth of Stoneclad, the wicked stone-skinned monster, portrays how his advances terrified a Cherokee village. A Cherokee shaman could stop him only when Stoneclad came in contact with the seventh woman, whose menstrual cycle had “just begun.”

Women’s blood also signified creation. Women embodied the very essence of birth and it was their blood that held the future of the human race. In “Windigo goes South: Stoneclad among the Cherokees,” Anthropologist Raymond Fogelson proposes that Stoneclad represented the masculine world in antithesis to the feminine realm and when he passed the female whose menstrual cycle had just begun, her blood stopped him immediately from going any further into the village. Historian Gregory Dowd suggests that women, as “keepers of the village, as cultivators, stood in greater opposition to the monster than did men, who operated as hunters in ‘nature.” When men shed blood, it meant death; female bleeding connoted life. According to Cherokee historical origins, Selu, the first woman, had given her sons instructions on how to grow corn. Believing her a witch, they killed her and dragged her body around the circle. Wherever her blood spilled, corn grew. They took her around only twice; consequently, Cherokees work their corn twice. Her boys had only cleared seven spots and that was why corn is grown just in a few places. Perhaps, when The Bird asked if Jesus’ blood covered the earth, was he actually challenging the Moravians’ concept
of blood’s power? Was that power limited merely to assuaging guilt? If Christ’s blood flowed over the entire world, why did the Moravians have so little to show for it in terms of converts? Obviously, to the Cherokees, Selu’s female genius resided in the far more tangible results of her blood: reproduction and production, the ability to produce foodstuffs, the practical aspects of living.

Cherokees found little sensible value in blood as a means to absolve them of the sins that they had not committed. Because Indians did not believe in sin or guilt, any Moravian explanation of Christianity as the panacea to addressing guilt and sin failed to resonate with most adult Cherokees. Equally, Cherokees were probably appalled that Moravians could not accept the notion of the universality of religious belief. Christianity probably seemed so mysterious to many Cherokees that they remained uncertain whether religion and western medicine even applied to them. Perhaps, Gott had created two distinct peoples and cultures. McLoughlin has suggested that Cherokees believed that what was good for one group was not necessarily applicable to the other.

After The Bird heard all the exclamations about Jesus’ brutal sufferings and he asked, “Did He shed His blood over all the earth?” the missionaries could only assure him that was the case. But the spirituality of an early nineteenth-century Cherokee dictated otherwise. The Bird could only say he would not forget what the missionaries had told him about Christ’s sufferings, bodily mutilations, and the importance of conversion; these beliefs were so alien. The Bird could just remark that he could ponder about these things. As he was unconvinced that Moravian concept of original sin had to be absolved by Christ’s blood, he was equally resolute in the notion that assuaging guilt was achieved through a bodily sacrifice. Adding to his skepticism were Moravian stances that denounced all spiritualities except their own. Yet Cherokees considered all their beliefs appropriate for all. Yet both cultures believed blood held magical properties.

As far as the Moravians were concerned, the Crucifixion was the focus of expelled, sacred blood. A case in point was Cherokee student, Dawzizi, son of The Tiger and Oodeisaski of Big Spring, near the Springplace Mission, who was asked to explain to his father and other Cherokees, The Little Broom and his wife, who all ate a noonday meal at the Mission; Anna Rosina imparted important and necessary truths of the crucifixion:

“The Tiger, The Little Broom, and his wife ate the noon meal with us. They meditated on the picture of the Crucifixion of our Savior. Dawzizi explained to them the important event and added several necessary truths. His father listened thoughtfully; but The Little Broom laughed really loud in an Indian manner, as if it signified something new and strange.”

In the missionary houses and on the walls of the Mission school were...
paintings of the crucifixion. These represented not just the death of a person, but the death of God. Again the side hole was the focal point. Perhaps, those representations evoked a sense of blasphemy for visiting Cherokees. The Moravians lamented the fact that the centerpiece of Christianity, the crucifixion, held little awe for the Cherokees. Some Cherokees politely listened to these stories but showed little genuine interest. Native American scholar Gregory Dowd notes that Indians, probably, found the Europeans’ treatment of their God rather appalling: “Here were a people who admitted to having killed their God.”42 The Moravians also consumed the body and blood of their God, which to the Cherokees was taboo. The Cherokees placed blood and flesh in opposite categories, and they considered animals that ate flesh to be abominations.43

Perhaps as intriguing as the profound differences between Cherokee and Moravian beliefs, is the respect both Cherokees and Moravians exhibited for each other. Ever aware of possible expulsion of Christian missionaries from the Cherokee Native world, Anna Rosina Gambold unveils how dissimilar peoples created vitality in an uncommon world where each struggled to bring meaning to their lives. Perhaps, Moravians and Cherokees viewed their interaction as one of “contest,” describing what colonialist and Indian scholar James Axtell calls primarily a conflict “between two concepts of spiritual power and the quality of life each offered.”44

Although the Cherokees had little interest in adopting Moravian Christianity and expressed mostly skepticism about the Moravians’ most profound truths, Moravian missionaries and the community at Salem consistently extended hospitality to Cherokees, treated them with respect, educated their children, and performed any number of services for them.

Similarly, the Cherokees were remarkably trusting of Moravians, who must have seemed incredibly bizarre to them. The Cherokees sent their children to be educated by the Moravians, they consulted them on important issues, and they visited them regularly. Cognizant of the missionaries’ commitment to their fellow human beings, the Cherokees looked to the Moravians for ways to adapt peacefully to an ever-changing world that was far more intolerant of diversity than were the Moravians.

In a period of hardening racial attitudes, demands for Indian removal, a fraudulent treaty, and ultimately dispossession, a conscientious religious group, the Moravians, applied principles of peace and exemplified human understanding. Moravians constantly sought acceptance from the outside world. When negotiating with the Cherokees about Springplace Mission, Colonel Return Jonathan Meigs,45 United States Indian agent to the Cherokees from 1801 to 1823, implored the Cherokees to trust the Brethren: “They are not speculators, nor merchants; they do not want your land, nor your money;
they wish to give that to you which is worth more than lands or money.”

Meigs’s assessment was accurate. The Moravians believed in a theocratic Gemeinschaft, or a close-knit community, where all people strove toward the realization of God’s will on earth, but simultaneously, they sought to impart their values of brotherhood and forgiveness to the surrounding society or Gesellschaft.

The Gambolds constantly referred to the surrounding area as their neighborhood, and the missionaries epitomized neighborliness throughout their sojourn. A truly integrated community, the missionaries invited Cherokees, slaves of African descent from nearby Cherokee slave-holding plantations, and traveling free persons of African and European descent, to come in and eat at unser Tisch, or “our table.”

According to Moravian historian Jon Sensbach, “peoples of color” from all over the world have historically reached out to Moravians, and they have helped form the modern Moravian Church. While some Moravian beliefs and the words that express them may seem to have little place in the modern world, the Moravian experience in the Cherokee Nation has great relevance. Sensbach contends that the Moravian Church worldwide embodies the notion that “there is no such thing as race.” The Gambolds, Moravian missionaries at Springplace, practiced a sense of acceptance for Cherokees as human beings, though they did not tolerant Cherokee spirituality or tried to understand it. Thus, the Springplace Diary provides an important link to the past even though Moravian beliefs seem medieval and their piousness appalling. Although the Cherokees had little interest in adopting Moravian Christianity and expressed mostly skepticism about the Moravians’ most profound truths, Moravian missionaries and the congregation back in Salem, North Carolina, consistently extended hospitality to Cherokees, treated them with respect, educated their children, and performed any number of services for them.

In a period of hardening racial attitudes, the country’s demands for Indian removal and somewhat later, a fraudulent 1835 treaty that forced Cherokees on the 1838-1839 Trail of Tears, a conscientious religious group, the Moravians, applied principles of peace and exemplified human understanding, but not agreement. Therefore, Moravians remained more concerned about Cherokees accepting Christianity than ways to alleviate their human suffering. In this sense, Moravians displayed little regard for human frailty. They believed in the humanity of mankind, but not every man’s innate ability to determine his own life course. Thus Moravian missionaries thought of Cherokees as human objects worthy of assistance but not persons to be completely accepted.

Yet, the Cherokees were remarkably trusting of Moravians, who must have seemed strange to them. Perhaps, their stances on non-violence, their
humility, and simplicity incorporated the force of transnationalism and therefore access to the Cherokee people.50
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1 I am using Craig Atwood's historical understanding and application of the term Brüdergemeine from his Community of the Cross: Moravian Piety in Colonial Bethlehem [Max Kade German American Research Institute Series] (University Park: Penn State University, 2004).


Moravian Bishop August G. Spangenberg wrote the treatise on Moravian perception of “heathen” that these particular peoples had not entered into a covenant relationship with God and His Son Christ. He conceptualized the bond as resembling the way “God called the people of Israel to be his people and to bless and protect them as his people.” Thus God consented to enter into a covenant with “a certain race of men,” a people who recognized God’s calling as a reciprocal agreement binding one to the other. It was no fault of their own that they lacked knowledge of God’s contract and historic perception to share “in this peculiar covenant of grace.” August Gottlieb Spangenberg, An Account of the Manner in which the Protestant Church of the Unitas Fratrum, Or United Brethren, Preach the Gospel and Carry on their Missions among the Heathen (Barby, Germany, 12 December 1780), 1, 2; 45-46. See also Adelaide L. Fries, ed. and trans., Records of the Moravians in North Carolina, 11 vols, (Raleigh, North Carolina: The North Carolina Historical Commission, 1922 - 1968), 1: 13.

In America church adherents became known as Moravians, a name signifying the Moravia region in present-day southeast Czech Republic. But in Germany, the society, the Unity of the Brethren, managed to survive under the auspices of the recognized state Lutheran Church and by 1748, it assumed a legal status and in 1924, the state recognized the church as a separate entity. Peter de Beauvoir Brock, Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 196.

During the German War of Liberation, many Moravians became imbued with nationalism and congregations in Saxony and Prussia officially abandoned their position on non-combat. In 1815, Prussia, now controlling all Saxon congregations, withdrew the grant of exemption and the Brethren registered no objection to the state. In 1818, the Pennsylvanian Moravian stand on armed participation ended when that synod “officially withdrew the ban on members performing military service.” Whether to bear arms or take a conscientious objector’s position was left up to the individual. Somewhat later, the more conservative North Carolina Brethren adopted the position that allowed their young men to bear arms, Independence Day, July 4, 1831. Brock, Pacifism in the United States: From the Colonial Era to the First World War, 327-29.

For a discussion of Quaker and Moravian stances on personal military service, refer to: Adelaide L. Fries, “Parallel Lines in Piedmont North Carolina Quaker and Moravian History,” The Third Lecture delivered at the Two Hundred and Fifty-second Session of North Carolina Yearly Meeting Eighth Month, the Third, 1949, North Carolina Friends Society, 11-12.

For a discussion of Quaker and Moravian stances on personal military service, refer to: Adelaide L. Fries, “Parallel Lines in Piedmont North Carolina Quaker and Moravian History,” The Third Lecture delivered at the Two Hundred and Fifty-second Session of North Carolina Yearly Meeting Eighth Month, the Third, 1949, North Carolina Friends Society, 11-12.


For a discussion of Quaker and Moravian stances on personal military service, refer to: Adelaide L. Fries, “Parallel Lines in Piedmont North Carolina Quaker and Moravian History,” The Third Lecture delivered at the Two Hundred and Fifty-second Session of North Carolina Yearly Meeting Eighth Month, the Third, 1949, North Carolina Friends Society, 11-12.


The contents of this essay are derived from the Editorial Policy of McClinton's The Moravian Springplace Mission to the Cherokees, 2 vols. 1805-1813 and 1814 -1821 (Lincoln

12 The Springsplace Diary was partly transcribed by McClinton; however, all 1490 pages were translated from the original document located at the Moravian Archives Salem; hereafter cited as MAS.

13 In addition to his position as minister, her husband, Brother John Gambold, was a cooper, mason, carpenter, and tailor. Anna Rosina was the principal teacher in the mission school and was in charge of the kitchen as well as the gardens. Kenneth G. Hamilton, ed. and trans. “Minutes of the Mission Conference Held at Springplace,” The Atlanta Historical Bulletin, 15(Winter 1970): 85-87; Hamilton, “Minutes of the Mission Conference Held at Springplace,” The Atlanta Historical Bulletin, 16(Spring): 49; and Schwarze, History of Moravian Missions Among the Southern Indian Tribes of the United States, 82 83.

14 George Heinrich Loskiel, Extremepore on a Wagon; a metrical narrative of a journey from Bethlehem, Pa., to the Indian town of Goshen, Ohio, in the autumn of 1803 (Lancaster, Pa.: S. H. Zahm, 1887), iii, iv, 1; 41.

15 Early Republic leaders reasoned that continuing Indian wars would be costly to the Early Republic. Washington’s Indian policy, under the Department of War, fostered the concept of beneficent imperialism toward Indians. The president and Secretary of War Henry Knox wanted the new government to replace the Confederation Indian policy of conquest, the one that denied treaty rights and rightful Indian ownership of land, with a “civilization” program that would promote Indian rights to lands, peaceful acculturation, and quiet white expansion. So they introduced the “clean hands policy”; the Washington administration believed posterity would judge it benign toward Indians, if it displayed such imperial beneficence. Through the passage of various Trade and Intercourse laws between 1790 and 1823, philanthropic measures included paying missionaries to live among the Native Peoples to Christianize Indians and educating them in the European sense. This plan supposedly would make Indians not only predictable but less reticent to preserve ancestral land holdings. Policy makers encouraged male Indians, hunters and meat producers, to vacate the hunt and become agriculturalists, traditionally belonging to the female realm, and substitute digging sticks for the plow and oxen; they demanded that women should abandon fields as vegetable producers to one of republican womanhood: tend to the hearth. Reginald Horsman, Expansion and American Indian Policy, 1783-1812 (Norman: University of Oklahoma, 1967; reprint, 1992), 53-83. For discussions of early U.S. philanthropic gestures toward Indians and their questionable benefits, see Bernard Sheehan, Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1973).


19 The Springsplace Diary in German script had its own nuances. Anna Rosina wrote English words such as Chief in the Roman script and those words as well as words underlined in the script are italicized.


21 “In the afternoon a chief, named The Bird, arrived here and attended our Passion Liturgy in the evening. The children told us that they had already told him much about the
Anna Rosina Gambold, Moravian Missionary to the Cherokees

birth, life, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of our dear Lord; he wants to hear more about this. Then we then told him the story of the creation of the world, the first man and his fall, the unholiness which came to all humans as a result of this, and the necessity of the Redeemer. With warm hearts we told him about the love of God for his poor fallen humans, who prevailed upon Him alone to have mercy on us, to suffer in our place, to atone for our sins, and to pay with His blood. He sat there deep in thought. Finally, he asked if He shed all of His blood. And did it fall onto the earth? We answered affirmatively and spoke further about this great matter. Then he asked, “Who had made God?” We answered that God had always been here, that He tells us this in His book, which He left behind; it tells us about His love and His whole existence and will. It is not our place as His creations to brood about His Divine Being, since we are not in a position to investigate this or to grasp it. The work of our hands could not make judgments about our existence. Rather, the Son of God became human to comfort us and save us and in Him we can imagine the dearest Brother and Friend of humans. We can call to Him for help in all distress, spiritual and physical, and through Him to His dear heavenly Father, Who sees us as also as His children for His Son’s sake. If we learn to know and love the Son of God here on earth and pray to Him diligently, He will take us to Himself in heaven when we depart from this world. At that time we will also see His dear Father with our eyes and have grace, etc. He seemed to be very taken in by these matters, and at his request, the children talked with him about the love of our Lord until late in the night. In the morning on the 17th, the admirable old chief very cordially left and added that he would often think about what he had heard from us, so that he would not forget it.”

Transcription below is that of the author’s. Boldface indicates Roman script.


Schöpfung der Welt, der ersten Menschen, deren Fall, u das Unglück so durch denselben auf alle Menschen gekommen; die Nothwendigkeit eines Erlösers - u priesen ihm die Liebe Gottes zu Seinen armen gefallenen Menschen, mit warmen Herzen an, welche allein Ihn bewogen, sich unserer zu erbarmen, an unserer Statt zu leiden, unsre Schuld zu büßen, u mit Seinem Blute zu bezahlen. Er saß in tiefen Gedanken da - Endlich frug er: Und hat Er alle Sein Blut vergoßen? Und ist es auf die Erde gefallen? Als wir ihm dies bejahet, u weiter von der großen Sache geredet hatten, frug er: Wer hat denn Gott erschaffen? Wir antworteten, Gott sey immerdar gewesen, dies sage aus Sein Buch, welches Er uns hinter laßen; u welches uns Seine Liebe u Seinen ganzen Sein u Willen kund thun: Uns, als Seinen Geschöpfen, gebührte nicht über Sein Göttliches Wesen zu grübeln, da wir auch nicht im Stande daßelbe auszuborschen, oder zu begreifen, weil weniger noch, als das Werk unserer Hände über unsre Wesen urtheilen könne. Uns zum Trost u Heil sey der Sohn Gottes ein Mensch geworden; u an Ihm dürften wir uns den liebsten Bruder u Menschenfreund vorstellen Ihn in aller Noth, Geist u leiblich, um Hülfen anrufen, u durch Ihn, Seinen l. Vater im Himmel, der uns um Seines Sohnes willen auch als Seine Kinder ansiehet - Wenn wir nun hier auf Erden den Sohn Gottes kennen u lieben lernten, u fleißig zu Ihm beteten, so würde Er uns bey unserm Scheiden aus dieser Welt zu sich in dem Himmel nehmen; als dann würden wir auch Seinen l. Vater mit unsern Augen zu sehen, die Gnade haben, u.s.w. Er schien von der Sache ganz hingenommen zu seyn; u die Kinder unterhielten ihn, auf sein Verlangen, bis spät in die Nacht, mit Gesprächen von der Liebe unsers Herrn. Am 17ten Morgens nahm dieser würdige alte Chief sehr freundschaftl. Abschied von uns, u sagte noch, er wolle dem, so er bey uns gehört, öfters nachdenken, damit ers nicht vergeße.
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Anna Rosina Gambold, Moravian Missionary to the Cherokees

*Note: The page number 75 is not visible, so I will continue from the text provided.*


38 The German term meaning God (Gott), not Great Spirit, was used extensively in the Moravian Springplace to the Cherokees.


40 Or The Tyger, father of Moravian student Dawzizi.

41 Moravian Springplace Mission Diary, vol. 2: 86. Yet, each believed blood held magical properties.

The Tiger, the little Broom u deßen Frau speißten mit uns zu Mittag. Sie betrachteten sich das Bild von der Kreuzigung unsers Heilandes. Dawzizi erklärte ihnen den wichtigen Vorgang, u fügte mehrere nützliche Wahrheiten bey; sein Vater hörte andächtig zu, - the little Broom aber lachte, nach Indianerweise, wenn ihm etwas neu u fremde deuthet, ganz laut.


43 Hudson, *The Southeastern Indians*, 147,148, 318, 324.


46 Schwarze, *History of Moravian Missions Among the Southern Indian Tribes*, 77-79; Meigs’ quote is on page 77.

47 See footnote 47.


50 This idea was expressed at a University of Chicago graduate seminar, November of 2001. Parts of this entire essay was presented at American Society of Ethnohistory,. “Native and European Divergent Worldviews: How Early Nineteenth Century Cherokees and Moravian Missionaries Responded to Each Other’s Concepts Pertaining to the Mystical Properties of Blood”; American Society for Ethnohistory, London, Ontario, October 14, 2000.
Thomas Otto Massnick

Marauding Tribesmen for Unity and Equality: 
The Forty-Eighters’ Creation of a 
German-American Genius Loci

The refugees who left or escaped the German lands following the failure of the revolutions of 1848 and 1849 have long stood as examples of transference of political will. The leaders of the so-called Forty-eighters worked, in America, to build the society that they failed to bring about at home. This task required of its leaders rhetorical acumen, political savvy, and an ability to connect with a large and disparate community. In this paper I will analyze the political and intellectual climate of the German-American community before and during the United States Civil War, I will then read closely the poetry of Caspar Butz, and to a lesser degree Konrad Krez, for the purpose of answering the following question: how did German-Americans go about transferring the leftover fury from the revolutions into the American political arena? I will argue that Krez’s and Butz’s poetry operates primarily in the discursive fields of gender, the body, and national origin myth to make a connection with a wide variety of German-American readers. The poetry of the Forty-eighters demonstrates the importance of Heimat (homeland) to the entire German-American community, not just the recent immigrants. Ultimately, the poetry of Butz and Krez reflects an effort to create a new genius loci in America.1

The Forty-eighters in America covered a very wide range on the ideological spectrum. As Carl Wittke puts it, “Among them were irrepressible radicals like Heinzen who never became completely adjusted to their new home; and extreme social reformers like Weitling, Sorge, and Weydemeyer who advocated a thoroughgoing social revolution according to their own plan for utopia or the gospel of Karl Marx.”2 As such, the group never established a clear narrative. Ottilie Assing, a contemporary of the revolutions and mistress of Frederick Douglass, provides an interesting reading of the rhetoric of the Forty-eighters. In the following passage Britta Behmer paraphrases Assing’s
categorization of the German-Americans of the nineteenth century, Assing claimed that they “. . . made it their business to uphold their Germanic ways as a counterbalance to the pragmatic, ordinary American manners. From sentimental poetry, full of homesickness, to ethnocentric slogans, the faith in their ethnic inheritance resulted in a self-styled mission to polish up their uncultured fellow men and to civilize philistine America.” Certainly these characteristics do jump out at the reader of the works of Butz and his contemporaries. This “sentimental poetry, full of homesickness,” and poetry containing “ethnocentric slogans” or at least ethnocentric metaphorical conceptions, filled the front pages of the many German-language newspapers of the antebellum period. These trends, though looked down upon by Assing, provide at least interesting possibilities for rhetorical analysis of the German-American community, and at most, examples of poetry that we should take more seriously.

In order to understand the context of the poetry of the Forty-eighters, it is important to understand both the climate of print culture and the politics in German-America following the revolutions of 1848/49. The eventual failure of these revolutions created a mobile group of radicals who had been exiled or had escaped the punishment by the government against which they had fought. Many of these refugees, the so-called Forty-eighters, moved to the United States. Early estimates suggest that about four thousand of these political refugees fled to America, though subsequent scholars have determined that this estimate is quite low. Since the publication of the monumental studies by A. E. Zucker and Carl Wittke, a fair amount of work has been done to explore the historical impact that this group had on the political climate of the mid-nineteenth century. In addition, some attention has been paid to the literature of the Forty-eighters, though often in the larger context of “German-American literature.”

Recently, particular attention has been paid by historians to the effect the Forty-eighters had on the politics of slavery and on the U.S. Civil War, some have demonstrated that the German-American population, led in a significant way by the Forty-eighters, played a role in the abolitionist movement. Wittke points out “it was self-evident that radical reformers among the refugees of the 1850s would not compromise with human slavery, which they regarded as the blackest stain on the banners of the new land which claimed their political allegiance.” Wittke continues, “As the hope of the exiles for a new revolution in Germany faded, their idealism and talents for agitation and reform found an outlet in the rapidly mounting controversy over slavery.” These “talents for agitation” exist primarily in the realm of political protest, journalism, and poetry. Lorie Vanchena argues that political poetry in periodicals within Germany “proved central to the evolution of
German nationalism in the nineteenth century.” Less attention has been paid to the role of German-language poetry in America; however, it is clear that poetry in periodicals played a significant role in the development of the German-American community, particularly as the immigrants lamented their separation from the homeland. This Heimweh (homesickness) played a significant role in the unification of the German-American community.

To understand the totality of Heimweh in America, we must first understand the nature of the German-American community before the arrival of the Forty-eighters. Many earlier German immigrants reacted very strongly to the ultimately doomed revolutions. A number of factors played into this; first, many German-Americans were supporters of a unified German state. Charles Wallman explains, “On the night of May 10, 1848, the village of Watertown in the Wisconsin Territory buzzed with excitement. Four hundred people – townspeople and farmers, Americans and Germans alike – crowded into or around the English Methodist Church to celebrate a very special occasion, the Revolution in Germany.” The village of Watertown was, and remained to be until well into the twentieth century, a heavily German-speaking city. Soon after the triumphant night described by Wallman, many of those involved in the struggle against the Prussian regime escaped to live all over the United States.

German immigration to the United States spiked in numbers even before the arrival of the Forty-eighters. Between 1830 and 1848 the immigration from Germany was driven primarily by economic opportunity. Wittke adds the caveat that the earlier immigrants were successful, often educated, and did not differ entirely from the Forty-eighters in their desire to remain German. Indeed German identity in the United States “did not originate with the Forty-eighters and most of the institutions which were typical of German-American life already existed before they came.” Essentially, the earlier immigrants laid the fiscal and cultural groundwork for the so-called Forty-eighter renaissance. The years preceding the revolutions saw a spike in German-language newspapers in the United States even before the population boom caused by political refugees. Twenty different German-language newspapers were printed in the United States before the revolution even took place; the burgeoning resistance to the German absolutist governments had inspired support from Germans already living in America, and the medium of the newspaper provided a means to espouse this rekindled love of homeland. It also gave a forum for fund-raising, discussion, and advertisement. Wittke explains, “The German-language press not only reported the revolution in detail, but appealed to its readers to support it in every possible way, and particularly by collecting funds for its victims.” German-Americans contributed considerable amounts of money toward the revolutionary effort
despite their physical removal from it.

The coming revolution in Germany served as the greatest catalyst to reverse the trend of assimilation in America; in addition, the harshening trend toward nativist sentiment played a role in the unification of the German-American community, and its increased separation from Anglo-America. For instance, the Wisconsin Banner, established in Milwaukee in 1844, served as a German-language reaction to the Whig-run Milwaukee Sentinel. The Volksfreund, established in 1847, was essentially a German version of the Sentinel at its inception, but evolved into a more liberal mouthpiece for the revolution and eventually merged with the Wisconsin Banner. An example of this slow move toward liberalism occurred on March 9, 1848, just before the revolutions, the Volksfreund added its first recurring phrase in English: “Devoted to Equal Rights” was printed near the top of the front page of each subsequent paper for several months. This one line represented solidarity with the cause of the German revolutionaries as well as, by way of being in English, a call for fair treatment of Germans in America.

The arrival of the Forty-eighters added a great deal to the concept of German-American identity and to the journalistic marketplace. The fact that more Forty-eighters went into journalism than any other profession (as A. E. Zucker counted) speaks to the scope of the impact they had on German-American thought and the modification of a young community. Even by 1850, New York had more German-language dailies than Leipzig or Berlin. Twelve years after the failed revolutions, Milwaukee had as many dailies in German as in English, not to mention the many weekly and monthly periodicals. Perhaps most astoundingly, the number of German-language papers in America nearly doubled between 1848 and 1852, from 70 to 133. Many of these political refugees held strong resentments of German immigrants already living in America at the time of the revolutions. The founder of the California Staatszeitung described the earlier immigrants as people who would “rather pay for lager-beer, wine, sausage, Swiss cheese and bread with caraway seeds than for newspapers.” Though this sentiment fails to account for the considerable political and journalistic achievements of the earlier immigrants, it succeeds in reflecting the stereotypes that many Forty-eighters had of their predecessors.

The Forty-eighters’ influence on the creation of Deutschtum (Germanom) in America was so great largely because of their success in journalism. The Forty-eighters extended and capitalized on the public forum of the nineteenth century—the newspaper. They reconstituted “German-America” by telling its stories and voicing its concerns in the German language, thus separating this imagined community from that of mainstream America. Ultimately, the basis for a united German-American community is tied to experience in
America, but also to descent.

The self-identity of Germans abroad turned from exuberance about the possibility of a German nation-state to a dreary ennui. This appeared in form of the notion of *Heimweh*. What Cora Lee Kluge terms “Poetry of Heimat” (poetry of homeland) was hard to miss in American German-language periodicals throughout the 1850s.\footnote{Corina Lee Kluge, *Germany on the American Mind: The Poetry of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 24} This concept was most visible in the writings of the Forty-eighters, but even the *Wisconsin Banner*, a Milwaukee press run by relatively assimilated American citizens, frequently published poems on the topic of homesickness.\footnote{See especially Corina Lee Kluge, *Germany on the American Mind: The Poetry of Heimat*.} Caspar Butz, who left Germany after being persecuted for his revolutionary speeches and writings, and eventually settled in Chicago, wrote a provocative poem in 1853 called “Heimwehtod” (Death by Homesickness). This poem begins with an epigraph, in English, from an American newspaper:

> A German woman committed suicide  
> in Syracuse a few days since.  
> *Home sickness* was assigned as the cause.  
> Rather a queer reason. (1-4)\footnote{John W. Duyckinck, *German-American Literature: The Nineteenth Century* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1911), 26.}

By quoting this short passage, Butz highlights the lack of understanding between the American and German conceptions of homesickness, or *Heimweh*. To the much of Anglo-American audience, the German conception of *Heimweh* is absurd; to kill oneself because of homesickness soars beyond melodrama. Kluge argues “the American idea of home is both larger and more abstract than the German notion of *Heimat*; . . . the German *Heimat* is a place one can perceive with one’s senses, while the American “home” may just as easily be something in the mind.”\footnote{Corina Lee Kluge, *Germany on the American Mind: The Poetry of Heimat*, 27} This follows logically when one considers that the German communities in America could have re-created something like a mental “home,” but could never have re-created the physical attributes of the German *Heimat*. Because of the physical focus of *Heimat*, *Heimweh* is logically more akin to a physical illness than a mental one. *Heimweh* could feasibly lead to the extreme act of suicide in two ways: first, death could be a form of euthanasia; the woman in the poem is irrevocably plagued by her inability to return to her homeland, thus she has a terminal physical illness. Butz describes this woman as sick, rather than in pain, contrary to what the direct translation of *Heimweh*, “home pain” would suggest. He describes her pain in terms of physical ailment, “Auf hartem Lager, wie im Fiebertraum” (Upon a hard bed, as if in a fever dream).\footnote{Corina Lee Kluge, *Germany on the American Mind: The Poetry of Heimat*, 28} The symptoms of this ailment that the American-born citizen would consider mental, in this case manifest in an extremely physical way, just as Kluge’s analysis would suggest. This explanation makes up only part of the equation; the second
part lies in the German conception of Vaterland, which cannot be captured in the English language. Kluge argues that “fatherland,” which most closely matches Vaterland, is “essentially not English; an American does not refer to the United States as his or her fatherland.”29 To consider a land to be a father to its people reflects a very different conception of a nation than that of the United States. America did not give its people life; the people gave America life. This functions at least as the dominant metaphorical conception. On the other hand, Germany fathered its population. Butz’s “Heimwehtod” reflects this idea:

Die Lind’, an der so oft als Kind gespielt,
Wo Er die Jungfrau Abends schüchtern grüßte,
Wo Er zuerst sie heiß umfangen hielt,
Das Wort der Liebe von der Lipp’ ihr küßte. (29-32)30

The linden, so oft played upon as a child,
Where in the evening he shyly greeted the maiden.
Where he first hotly held her,
Kissed the word of love from her lips.31

The Vaterland, for this persona, relates strongly to fertility. Thoughts of the Vaterland immediately turn to images of first loves in lush woods. The woman in the poem simultaneously represents child and mother; this contrasts strongly to the poem’s vision of America, the image of a sterile deathbed:

Das ist ihr Sterbezimmer, öd’ und leer
Wie all’ ihr Hoffen, einst im vollen Blühen, (17-18)32

That is the room of her death, barren and empty
Like all of her hopes, once in full bloom,

For this woman, the United States represents an end of fertility. Her body is left alone and barren. Butz presumably did not know this woman, yet he laments her death and provides a plausible reason for her despair. Butz’s poetry seeks to unite; his demonstration of solidarity creates an alliance between himself and the poem’s subject, and also between his readers and the poem’s subject. Ultimately, this collective sympathy engenders a community of sufferers, joined together by their ailment. True to his nature as a politician, Butz operates as a rhetorical poet whose concern is a connection with the audience, and the potential to move that audience to action, as his later works
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The poetry of *Heimat* is so significant because it exemplifies the method by which Butz and other German-American poets depicted and created a cohesive German immigrant narrative by using origin myth and corporeality. These poems, nearly ubiquitous in German-American publications, helped to bridge the major gaps separating Germans of different ages, classes, genders, and political affiliations. Essentially, poetry of *Heimat*, created, or at least documented, an imagined community of metaphorical orphans, children separated from their father. Ottilia Assing looked down on these attempts to make the emotional appear physical, lived, maybe even essentialist. The question arises, though, whether the readers and writers of the poetry of *Heimweh* considered this feeling to be something constructed; that is, did they know that they were creating this idea, or were they simply feeling it? This is a very difficult question to answer, but it seems unlikely that the woman in Syracuse would have killed herself merely as a rhetorical statement. *Heimweh* is engrained deeply in these writers and readers; it is so deep that it differs from a rhetorical trope, or a piece of propaganda to stir the masses into action. Though it served specific political purposes, namely galvanizing the German-American population to fund and work toward various political projects, the poetry of *Heimweh* should be considered an achievement in nineteenth-century American literature.

Even after the U.S. Civil War was over, and the unification of German-Americans for particular gain was no longer as necessary, the poetry of *Heimweh* lived on. Probably the most celebrated poem by any Forty-eighter is a poem of *Heimweh* from 1870, long after one might assume that some assimilation could have taken place. Konrad Kreiz’s “An Mein Vaterland” (To My Fatherland) considers his separation from his homeland with continued melancholic tone:

O würden jene, die zu Hause blieben 
Wie deine Fortgewanderten dich lieben, 
Bald würdest du zu Einem Reiche werden, 
Und deine Kinder gingen Hand in Hand 
Und machten dich zum größten Land auf Erden, 
Wie du das beste bist, o Vaterland! (25-30)

O, if thy children all, who stayed at home, 
Did love thee like the ones thou badest roam, 
A Union soon, an empire would have birth, 
And thou wouldst see thy children hand in hand 
Make thee the mightiest land on earth,
As thou art the best, my Fatherland!34

Krez, whose collected poems has the title “Aus Wiskonsin,” (from Wisconsin) often wrestled with the concept of the physical land of his adopted country. Some of his poems contain visions of landscapes, a typical trope in poetry of Heimat, but many of these landscapes are American, not German. Krez wrote poetry to make Wisconsin more like Germany in his own mind; the title of his collected works declares Wisconsin as his home; yet, over twenty years after leaving Germany, he still laments his separation from what could have been a great nation. Krez’s consistency shows that metaphors of identity are anything but fleeting. They change with age and overlap with other metaphors, but they rarely disappear.

It is not accurate to consider Heimweh to be a notion completely unique to the German-Americans of the nineteenth century. Indeed, it is not even accurate to apply this particular tendency to focus on the physical as a way of representing the lost homeland only to those who have left Germany. The physical nature of homesickness is a common to many cultures in many epochs. My narrow focus on select German-Americans is not an attempt to claim this notion for a particular group; rather, it is an attempt to provide a framework for the analysis of discourse in a particular place and time. The Krez’s and Butz’s use of this concept gives a glimpse of the first step toward the transference of the spirit of the Forty-eighers.

With the coming of the U.S. Civil War, the German-American community’s unity through German nationalism and Heimweh began to lessen in degree. Other political, economic, and religious forces caused something of a division in the German-American community over the slavery issue. There were few German immigrants of any generation who openly supported the institution of slavery, but there was quite a range in willingness to fight it.35 This range did not always form in predictable ways. For instance, Missouri Synod Lutheran leadership “quoted scripture to prove that slaveholding was not a sin.”36 Wisconsin synod Lutherans took exactly the opposite approach. Strangely, the German population in Missouri voted overwhelmingly for Lincoln in 1860, while the German wards in Milwaukee voted overwhelmingly against him. Some of the most extreme anti-war riots in the country were started by German-Americans in Port Washington, WI. Many of the so-called “Old Lutheran” types were against slavery, but were far more adamantly against fighting a war with the Confederacy. The multiplicity of political, economic, regional, and religious forces surrounding the reality of the Civil War, and the confusion of political association amongst the German-Americans, made for a diverse and divided community.

This variety of opinions, in part, is what made the poetry of the Forty-
eighters so politically important. The poems aimed at particularly German feelings, the trajectory of German history and ideology in the context of America. It is important to remember that many of the Forty-eighers do not share in the romanticized narrative of immigration to the New World which many European immigrants either felt or had put upon them. It is safe to say that most would rather have remained in a free Germany, in contrast to Ottilie Assing, who would not have returned to Germany even after a revolution. America, at least to begin with, was not a city on the hill, but a stepfather whose home the exiles had been forced to move into under threat of violence.

The slavery question allowed for a recapitulation of prior Forty-eighter ideals. Many radicals considered the fight against slavery to be an opportunity to put in place the ideals of the failed revolutions, and indeed hoped that they would have some effect in Europe. Radical Forty-eighter Karl Heinzen wrote, “This republic cannot and will not be able to do anything for European freedom until it has shaken the yoke of slavery from its own.” Caspar Butz was as outspoken for the cause of abolition as any of his prominent colleagues. He advocated for abolition in his Chicago journal Deutsch-Amerikanische Monatshefte für Politik, Wissenschaft und Literatur (German-American Monthly Journal of Politics, Science, and Literature). First published in 1864, this journal resembled The Atlantic Monthly. Butz voted for Lincoln in 1860, but later came to despise him for his relatively moderate stances. Later, Butz claimed that he could produce 400,000 German votes for John Fremont if the Democrats would have given him the nomination in 1864. As a legitimate leader of the German-American community in Chicago and nationwide, and as what Wittke calls a “capable poet,” Butz provides an excellent case study for analysis of radical discourse in a relatively broad context. Furthermore, Butz represents something of a gatekeeper in the German-American literary realm; he managed the literary department in the journal Um die Welt, the so-called “Pioneer high class paper in the German language.” Indeed, his poetry served simultaneously as high art and as propaganda; it was often initially published in politically charged newspapers, but it ended up in stately volumes of collected poetry. I found it in a book taken from Carl Schurz’s personal library, though recently Kesslinger publishing has done a reprint of Butz’s 1879 collected works entitled Gedichte eines Deutsch-Amerikaners. Butz wrote of Heimweh as well as German origin myth; his poetry may be precisely what Ottilia Assing spoke against in her scalding reviews of German-American culture.

In his 1865 lyric “Das Siegesfest,” (The Victory Festival) Butz transposes the images of German nationalism onto American soil. To do this, he changes the national gender metaphor of America as barren and incapable of
reproduction into a site of newfound fertility, available for the conquest by the masculine:

Dann schwör’ bei deinem Schwerte, o! greif’s mit fester Hand:  
Dies Blut für immer taufe das freie Vaterland!  
Hau’ nieder jeden Oelbaum, Zeit ist nicht jetzt noch hier,  
Für künft’ge Friedenszweige bewahr’ den Samen dir;  
Und wenn die Zeit gekommen, dann säe’ ihn wieder aus,  
Dann mög’ er blüh’n und wachsen im Land um jedes Haus! (54-59)

Then swear by your sword, O grasp it with a firm hand:  
May this blood forever baptize the free fatherland.  
Chop down every olive tree, the time has not yet come,  
Stow away the seeds for future olive branches;  
And when the time has come, then sow them once again,  
Then may they bloom and grow around every house in the land.

This description of a violent clear-cutting of a nation, followed by the planting of seeds, or “Samen,” which means both ‘seeds’ and ‘semen’ in German, serves to alter the prior image of the United States as a whole. No longer is the image of America one of barrenness; now it is a place where there exists the possibility of reproduction and fertility. Butz imagines a takeover, by the sword, followed by planting of the seed and a creation of a new, blooming and growing nation. This “Victory Celebration” is, in fact a celebration not of emancipation, or even of victory over the Confederacy; in a very important sense, it is a celebration of an imagined conquest of a nation. Significantly, Butz uses the term *Vaterland* to describe the United States; a move which, coupled with the images of fecundity, serves to bring up the possibility of a new *Vaterland* which only a few years earlier might have been unthinkable for many Forty-eighters and other German-Americans. Essentially, Butz, like Krez, works to transfer the unique physical qualities of the *Vaterland* to a new context, thus transferring the German *genius loci*. Unlike Krez, Butz does not conform his tastes to include the landscape and other physical attributes of the United States, but he imagines using force to create the landscape anew. This requires violent imagery as well as the use of Germanic origin myth.

Elsewhere in the same poem, Butz uses German literary history:

Da sprach zu seinen Freunden manch’ narbenvoller Held:  
Ob auch die Wunde brannte, sie hat mich nicht entstellt;  
Vergessen sind die Schmerzen in dieses Morgens Roth,
Sieg hallt’s, nun ist vorüber der Nibelungen Noth! (13-16)  

So speaks to his friends many a scarred hero:  
Though the wounds burned, they left me not deformed;  
Forgotten are the pains in the red of this morning,  
Victory keeps it, now is past the Nibelungen Noth!

Butz compares the U.S. Civil War to the medieval epic poem “Das Nibelungenlied.” Again, this demonstrates Butz’s desire to use a collective ideology to speak to a very deep place in his readers. The reader is encouraged to play around with this comparison and plug herself or himself into the equation as is desirable.

Butz employs both physical elements and origin myth with even greater intensity in his satirical poem “Heil dem Gewinn” (Hail Profit), which was probably written in 1862 or 1863. In an acerbic tone, Butz satirizes the American South; he implicitly compares the Confederacy to Rome, the slaves to the Roman slaves, and adopts as the poem’s persona a profit driven slave-owner who forces his slaves, and perhaps hired hands, to create a house for him that stands as a monument to money and excess:

Nehmt das Gerüst hinweg! Ihr Sklaven laßt mich sehen  
Was ihr gebaut, mein Haus, wie es fortan soll stehen,  
Pompeji’s schönste Zier, mit hohem Säulengang.  
Nicht für die flücht’ge nur, die Stunde, wollt’ ich bauen,  
Nicht Lohn hab’ ich gespart, noch Peitsche, laßt mich schauen  
Wie es gelang! (1-6)

Take away the scaffold! You slaves let me see  
What you have built, my house, as it will henceforth be,  
Pompeii’s most beautiful adornment, with a high colonnade.  
Not only for the fleeting hour did I wish to build,  
I have spared neither expense nor whip; let me look at  
How it succeeded!

The persona demonstrates his love of excess and use of cruelty. This house does not reflect his particular design, nor his taste or hard work. Rather, it is a product only of his power and competitive desire. Slave owners in the Confederacy, by way of Butz’s comparison, represent extravagant and cruel tyrants who care only for money.

The poem’s setting, in the shadows of Mount Vesuvius, is significant on its own terms, as it is the site of the famously destructive volcano which will
destroy the persona’s prized house. It is also significant thematically in two ways: first, it allows the poem to approach the large issue of pride and the necessary fall which follows. More importantly, the setting and the poem’s extended metaphor invites German-American readers to place themselves within this equation both as Americans and as Germans. The poem’s first eight stanzas are voiced by the wealthy Roman; during this part of the poem, the German-American reader imagines herself or himself not as a Roman, but as one of the tribal groups to which the persona alludes: “Die stets mir Gold gebracht auf meines Handels Bahnen, / Ich kaufe sie für Rom, den Gallier, den Germanen” (29-30, They always brought me gold on my trade routes, / I buy them for Rome, the Gaul, the Teuton). In one aspect this is a favorable and unifying comparison for the German-American reader. In the world of this poem, Germans are the ones who will ultimately destroy this decadent and brutal empire. When one applies this to the United States’ Civil War, as Butz does in the second part of the poem, the message remains encouraging, but asks more of the reader than a simple denunciation of the Confederacy. By bringing up the economic ties between the northern tribes and Rome, Butz asks the reader to consider a possible equivalent in the United States. Naturally one does not have to look far to discover economic ties between the northern and southern states; perhaps Butz is asking the reader to take seriously the role she or he is playing in the economics of slavery, as many abolitionists did. Also significantly, the setting is not just the Roman Empire, it is a place and time destined to be destroyed by a natural disaster. The imminent destruction of this particular citizen of the Roman Empire is the impending volcano, not the tribesmen at the gate. This again complicates the metaphor; the question emerges: is the destruction an act of God or of man? Perhaps Butz’s reader would understand this as a declaration that the Confederacy will receive retribution one way or another—that the German-Americans and the citizens of the Union will work together with the forces of nature and God.

As the poem transitions from its first to its second part, Butz develops a theme which is remarkably similar to that of Percy Shelley’s poem “Ozymandias.” Like Shelley’s poem, a persona from the modern world comes across ancient ruins which display a carved prideful phrase, made pathetic by time and circumstance. The following two stanzas contain the poem’s transition from an ancient to a modern persona:

Vollendet ist der Bau; in des Vesuvius Schatten
Das schönste Denkmal auf Campanien’s üpp’gen Matten.
Noch zeugen wird’s von mir, nahm längst die Nacht mich hin;
Nur Eines fehlet noch: der Inschrift Weiheworte!
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Komm her du Sklave, schnell, und meißle auf die Pforte:
“Heil dem Gewinn!”

* * *
Wer war der stolze Mann? – Sein Name ist verschollen;
Man grub die Inschrift aus in jenem Bergwerkestollen,
Aus dem aus alter Zeit der Mensch die Schätze bricht.
Pompeji’s Trümmerwelt, empor an’s Licht gehoben,
Das übermüt’ge Wort sie sendet es nach oben.
—Den Namen nicht! (48-59)

Finished is the construction; in the shadows of Vesuvius
The loveliest monument in Campania’s lush meadow.
It still will testify of me, even once the night has long since taken me;
Just one thing yet is wanting: the inscription of consecrated words!
Come here you slave, quick, and carve upon the portal:
“Hail profit!”

* * *

Who was this proud man? – His name is forgotten;
Someone dug the inscription out in that cave’s tunnel
From which the person broke loose the ancient treasures.
Pompeii’s world of ruins, lifted up to the light,
The careless phrase is sent upward.
—Not the name!

One major difference between this poem and Shelley’s is that the name of the once powerful ancient person never appears. This fact is significant to the persona in the second part of the poem, and perhaps to the readers. Perhaps it is better for the cruel and greedy Roman to have lost his name to history; a modern archeologist or traveler might have made his name more infamous than famous. But the question remains, what significance does anonymity have for Butz’s audience? In the next stanza Butz sharpens this question, and then takes an abrupt turn by using a grotesque image:

Willst du für immer auch auf deine Bauten graben,
Amerika, den Spruch der Zeit, die, längst begraben,
Als warnend’ ernstes Bild durch die Geschichte geht?
Ihr häßlich Leichentuch, wir seh’n es mit Entsetzen,
Mit jeder Schaufel Staub fliegt auf ein blut’ger Fetzen,
Moderumweht. (60-66)

Do you forever wish also to engrave your buildings,
America, with the saying of the time, which, long buried,
Goes through history as a cautionary tale?
We look upon your hideous shroud with horror,
With every shovelful of dust flies away a bloody rag,
Enveloped in mildew.

This juxtaposition of stone remnants with bodily remnants is immediately jarring to the reader. Again, Butz connects with the reader both by way of historical narrative and corporeality. Both images function as threats to a country which must re-evaluate its current mode of operation or else die in infamy. The image of the mildew-covered bloody rags thrown to the air with every shovelful outweighs the threat of shame which stands as the poem’s major concept. Butz undercuts the poem’s own narrative by this return to physicality. “Heil dem Gewinn,” in addition to demonstrating Butz’s ability to use biting satire, shows once again that his connection to his audience cannot be divorced from physicality and historical narrative.

In addition to the narrative of German nationalism, Butz makes use of another trope—the apocalypse. In is poem “Die schwarze Schaar,” (The Black Flock) Butz continues the metaphor of African-American slaves as gladiators or Roman slaves, but he adds another vision of them as sheep in an apocalyptic slaughter. In the following stanza, Butz draws a vision of the Civil War as a righteous event:

Die Salve prasselt, o! der Tod macht frei,
Und dunkel wird die Erde von den Leichen.
Sie wanken, ihre Reihe schwankt und bricht;
Wer hat im ersten Kampfe nicht gezittert!
Doch einen Blick nur, wie der Feind dort sicht,
Und sie, sie fechten bis zum Tod erbittert. (66-71)

The Fusillade patters, o! Death brings freedom,
And the earth will be dark with corpses.
They waver, their rank fluctuates and breaks;
Who in the first battle did not tremble!
Indeed, just one glance at how the enemy there appears,
And they, sword-fight to grim death.

This scene describes the glory of death in combat. The line “death brings freedom” works both to romanticize military conquest, and to connect to the Christian narrative. “Death brings freedom,” in this context, has two distinct but related meanings. First, it highlights the cost of war: human life must be lost when seeking a higher cause. This is echoed in the final line of the poem:
“Der Baum der Freiheit sei mit Blut begossen!” (112). Butz’s prior fertility metaphor seems all the more violent in this light. Not only is the Civil War a razing and fertilizing of the soil, but the tree which grows from that soil must be nourished, not with rainwater, but with blood. Even the natural elements must be controlled by human violence. The second implication of “Death brings freedom” relates to an afterlife, in this case, due to the imagery of mass destruction, the reader might also consider the apocalypse. The image goes far beyond an individual death for the country, “the earth will be dark with corpses.” The Civil War, for Butz, is Apocalypse; it is marked by extreme suffering, but it is necessary to bring about a new heaven and a new earth. This intertwining of Christian with military discourse serves further to unite and militarize the German-American community through common narrative and self-conception.

The identity metaphors lived and created by the German-American community were made more widespread by poetry in newspapers, but perhaps more importantly, they were common feelings among people of shared cultural experience. Ottilie Assing’s critiques of nineteenth-century German-American literature still hold up today, though a closer look shows the “sentimental poetry” to contain real emotion, and the “ethnocentric slogans” to reveal a complex use of metaphor which goes well beyond what most would call a slogan. The examples in both cases remain problematic, but at very least, continued close reading of non-English American literature will reveal more about the creation of American culture, and it may lead us to discover “some mute inglorious Milton.”
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Socialist Turners of New York City, 1853:
Archival Materials Warrant Further Research

A vivid political episode in the history of the German-American Turner Movement has come to my attention since the acquisition of the archive of the Sozialistischer Turnerbund of New York City by the Max Kade German-American Studies Center of the University of Kansas in October 2009. This affair offers a clear indication of the German-American solidarity displayed by the New York City Turners toward the multidimensional European socialist/communist movement in a significant 1853 event. Greater familiarity with this matter will also suggest continuities with radical German-American leadership in U.S. labor history and further topics for research.¹

Political liberalism and radicalism have long been recognized as important elements in history of the German-American Turner movement, though much of this radical heritage tends to be played down in our contemporary historical understanding of the Turners.² According to the classic treatment of Carl Wittke, however, the Turners became a significant political influence in this country only after émigrés from the armed struggles for democratic freedoms in 1848 came to the U.S. from Germany and across Europe.³ Liberal and radical activists and fighters there had been intensely persecuted by forces of reaction after they were defeated by the Prussian military. Waves of German political refugees thus fled to England, and also to the U.S., in which places they generally continued their struggles for greater equality and human rights. In the U.S. many of these German immigrants became leaders within the abolitionist movement, fighters for a slavery-free Kansas, and officers in the Union army.⁴

New York City’s first German-American athletic association, the Turngemeinde, founded in November 1848⁵ underwent a split in 1849 between its liberal and radical members giving rise to the more militant formation that concerns us here: the Sozialistischer Turnerbund – New York City’s Socialist Turner Organization. Most prominent among the members of
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the new Socialist Turners of New York City was Franz Sigel, who (along with Friedrich Hecker) had led the armed revolution in Baden. Both Sigel and Hecker were subsequently highly visible as German-American commanders during the U.S. Civil War. Sigismund Kaufmann, a German-Jewish Forty-eighter, was the first “speaker” of the New York Socialist Turners. He also edited their *Turnzeitung*, and nearly a decade later, in 1860, served as a Republican Party elector for Abraham Lincoln.

In January 1853 New York City’s Socialist Turners took a stand in support of seven jailed communist revolutionaries in Germany who had been tried for sedition by the Prussian courts at Cologne. The Turner leadership in New York City issued the following *Aufruf!* [Call to Action!] in bold type in its nationally-circulated New York *Turnzeitung*, a twice-monthly socialist organ:

Because of the trial in the Cologne Court of Assizes, which took place a few months ago against the citizens Becker, Bürgers, and others that resulted in convictions, we must once again assist families that have been catapulted into catastrophe. Each one of these who was sentenced was a defender of the rights of workers! In order to more easily gain convictions, the Prussian police doctored the evidence against these brave men. Even from our distance we can hear these families, having been robbed of their breadwinners, cry for help. Given the justice of supporting these fighters for the proletariat, who can hesitate? The Central Administration requests that all of our affiliated organizations respond by actively and strenuously collecting funds to alleviate the suffering of the destitute without delay. These funds are to be conveyed to the Central Administration which will publish a timely account of their use.

Immediately after the publication of this *Call*, in February 1853, Eugen Lievre, a prominent German-American Forty-eighter and owner of New York’s Shakespeare Hotel, wrote a letter that encouraged the Socialist Turners of New York City to act expressly in solidarity with the Central Committee of the Communist League in London, of whom the Forty-eighter German émigrés, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, were the most high-profile members. Lievre suggested that the Turners coordinate this solidarity effort through Ferdinand Freiligrath, the radical poet and close associate of Marx and Engels, who at the time was similarly situated as a political refugee in England. Below in translation is the letter Lievre submitted to the Socialist Turner Organization of New York suggesting a Ball at his hotel to raise funds for the London Committee in order to express solidarity with those convicted.
in the Cologne communist trials:

New York [City], February 17, 1853
To the Socialist Turner Organization,
Fellow Turners!

You have resolved in your membership meeting to do everything in your power to support to the champions of the revolutionary workers’ party recently condemned by the bourgeois jury in Cologne. I know that I can therefore certainly rely on you for a favorable response to my proposal to raise a considerable sum for this purpose by holding a Ball at my Hotel. The Ball will take place on Monday the 28th of February; members of worker’s organizations shall pay an entrance fee of 50 cents, all others $1.00. I shall underwrite all of the costs myself. Nonetheless, I would find it congenial if the Turner Organization would deputize some members of its body to constitute a finance committee, along with deputies of other organizations, to oversee the receipt of funds until these are sent to the treasurer of the central committee in London, Ferd. Freiligrath.

With warmest regards,
Eugen Lievre

The Lievre letter clearly indicates his belief that many of New York City’s Socialist Turners would be ready and willing to act in international solidarity with Freiligrath, Marx, and Engels as leaders of the increasingly suppressed Communist League. To understand the significance of this letter in response to the Call by New York City’s Socialist Turners, it is important that we become more familiar with the political context of the “monster” show trials of the arrested members of the Communist League at Cologne (1851-52). According to Karl Obermann, the ultimate impact of the trials was quite the opposite of their intended repressive function. Instead of intimidating the international communist movement, the trials ushered in its resurgence. German Forty-eighter exiles in the U.S. who had fled reaction in Europe certainly followed these trials with much interest.

In March and April of 1853 Karl Marx addressed the affair in his “Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne.” Published in the Neue-England-Zeitung of Boston, he begins by explaining –

On May 10, 1851 Nothjung was arrested in Leipzig and Bürgers, Röser, Daniels, Beckers and the others were arrested shortly after. The arrested men appeared before the Court of Assizes in Cologne on October 4, 1852 on a charge of ‘conspiracy for treason’ against
the Prussian state. . . . When Nothjung and Bürgers were arrested police discovered copies of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. . . .14

Franz Mehring later summed up the consequences of the trial in which seven members of the Communist League were sentenced from three to six years:

The cigar-maker Röser, the author Bürgers, and the journeyman-tailor Nothjung were sentenced to six years’ imprisonment in a fortress each, the worker Reiff, the chemist Otto and the former barrister Becker received five years each, whilst the journeyman-tailor Lessner received three years. The clerk Ehrhardt and the three physicians Daniels, Jacoby and Klein were all acquitted.15

While the members of New York City’s *Sozialistischer Turnerbund* were, as a whole, explicit advocates of revolution and socialism, Lievre, and the group of Socialist Turners to whom he turned in this appeal, represented what they considered to be a middle ground in their turn to Ferdinand Freiligrath, Karl Marx, and Friedrich Engels. These figures were critical of the traditional liberalism of some exile Forty-eighers on the one hand, and what they saw as incendiary displays of nationalist rhetoric by those who longed to return to Germany for a new opportunity at revolution. The latter position was frequently advocated in the pages of the *Turnzeitung*.16

The stance in the socialist middle was developed in London exile by leading Forty-eighter communists, Freiligrath, Marx, and Engels – and also in New York City by Joseph Weydemeyer,17 a prominent Forty-eighter émigré who was also among the closest political confidants of Marx and Engels, both in Europe and throughout his U.S. exile.

Weydemeyer functioned as a kind of literary agent18 for Marx and Engels in New York City, and succeeded in having certain of their writings – and his own – published in the Socialist Turners’ newspaper beginning in 1852.19 Weydemeyer had a special regard for Freiligrath, who had not been publishing any new work since he evaded arrest with the other Cologne defendants20 by fleeing from Germany to London in the summer of 1851.21 Weydemeyer succeeded in having Marx encourage Freiligrath to resume his writing, and Freiligrath’s “Poetic Epistles” were published in New York City, in German, by Weydemeyer (January 1852) in his short-lived political journal, *Die Revolution*.22 Freiligrath’s work is described as combining his radical political values with his literary art, and functioning as a kind of editorial commentary on contemporary events and circumstances. One of the key themes of Freiligrath’s “Poetic Epistles” was a satire of certain Forty-
eighter exiles whom he dismissed as sectarian and theatrical egoists only playing at revolution. In this regard, Freiligrath was articulating in poetry a political criticism also being made in prose by Weydemeyer, Engels, and Marx against what Wittke calls “German Fenianism” \(^{23}\) – that ardent desire of some Forty-eighter émigrés who wished to return to Europe to carry out another uprising against its kings and princes. Such persons Weydemeyer considered to be petty-bourgeois, conspiratorial, adventurist, fringe elements. His commentary was incorporated by Marx and Engels in their critical exposé of “The Great Men of the Exile,” \(^{24}\) a tract which they had hoped to publish in 1852 in New York in Weydemeyer’s *Die Revolution*, but which was not actually published anywhere until 1930. \(^{25}\) Marx did publish his closely related pamphlet, *Enthüllungen über den Kommunisten-Prozess zu Köln* [Revelations Concerning the Communist Trial in Cologne] as mentioned above in Boston in German in 1853. This circulated widely among German-American immigrants. In it he condemned not only the “infamies perpetrated by the Prussian police,” \(^{26}\) but also those of August Willich, Gottfried Kinkel, and others, for their “beer-house bluster” \(^{27}\) and for being “entrepreneurs in the business of the German-American revolutionary loan.” \(^{28}\) Marx stressed that the “sole function” of the European emissary of the German National Loan organization “was to promote antagonism among the workers towards the party of the accused in Cologne.” \(^{29}\)

The *New York Turnzeitung* of February 1, 1852, noted that Kinkel had been a welcome guest in January and raised “almost 100 dollars” for the German National Fund. The March 1, 1852, issue included an article by Joseph Weydemeyer criticizing “Herr Kinkel and his Friends.”

Marx and Engels had a definite *intellectual* presence in New York City at this time (though conventional historical scholarship has little appreciated it) given their publications, at first in German in the *New York Turnzeitung*, \(^ {30}\) and then also via a steady stream of journalistic and political statements, in English, in Horace Greeley’s *New York Tribune*. \(^{31}\) It is insufficiently recognized that Greeley was a major proponent of socialism in the United States, generally that of French utopian Fourier and Fourier’s main spokesperson in the U.S. Albert Brisbane, but his partnership with Marx endured for more than ten years, from 1851-62. This gave Marx and Engels a voice across the entire country since the *New York Tribune* was the first nation-wide newspaper in the U.S. Their first *New York Tribune* contributions, actually penned by Engels but published under Marx’s byline, were nineteen installments over the course of a year from October 1851 to October 1852 precisely on the details of the 1848 revolution and the counter-revolution in Europe. \(^ {32}\)

In November 1852 Engels wrote a separate focus piece, “The Late Trial at Cologne,” \(^{33}\) which was published as a letter to the *Tribune* (again
under Marx’s name) that December. This summarized two earlier accounts of the Cologne communist trials published in London newspapers under four signatures: “F. Engels, F. Freiligrath, K. Marx, W[ilhelm]. Wolff.” As these men viewed the matter, the Cologne trials were primarily intended to suppress and ultimately to destroy the Communist League (to which they all belonged) as a legal political formation. Marx and Engels publicly protested what they considered the cruel and unusual circumstances of the arrest of their “friends at Cologne,” and the illegitimacy of the convictions. As “F. Engels, F. Freiligrath, K. Marx, and W. Wolff” described the situation, the accused had all been held in solitary confinement for eighteen months: time simply wasted during which they were prohibited from conferring with lawyers and were refused proper medical treatment. When their case came to trial, their jury was composed of six reactionary aristocrats, four representatives of high finance, and two functionaries of the Prussian government. According to Engels, Freiligrath, Marx, and Wolff, the trials generated convictions only upon forged evidence and resulted in a circumstance in which all of Europe was being now held in bondage by the German secret police that was placing its agents in foreign embassies (in this case London) where they worked as spies and organized paid informants to infiltrate German communist refugee associations.

Engels’s letter on the Cologne Trial to the New York Tribune was published December 22, 1852, just a few weeks before the January 1853 Call for funds published in the New York Turnzeitung for the defense of the accused as well as Lievre’s February letter. Engels made the case that the Communist League and its members, including those on trial in Cologne, were not advocates of immediate revolution in Germany; that the organization had studied the 1848 uprisings and understood that they failed because times were not yet ripe in terms of society’s class structure. Thus, the program of this organization as Marx and Engels saw it was the “preparation of such a movement” for a workforce revolution in the future, and—not against today’s “mere ‘tyrants,’ ‘despots,’ and ‘usurpers,’” but . . . [against] . . . a power far superior, and more formidable, than theirs: that of capital over labor.” Engels wrote furthermore, “In accordance with the principles of its ‘Manifesto’ (published in 1848) and with those in the series of articles on “Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany” published in the New York Daily Tribune, this party never imagined itself capable of producing at any time and at its pleasure, that revolution which was to carry its ideas into practice.” These facts about the publicly stated goals and aspirations of members of the Communist League, in Engels’s estimation, fully undercut all allegations against its members in Cologne. Within this organization Marx and Engels had criticized, as premature, the insurrectionist proposals of “a
few ambitious imbeciles.” These individuals then split from the League and formed an actual conspiracy in Paris. Certain of these former members were subsequently convicted of undertaking a Parisian coup d’état. Efforts by the Prussian police failed to implicate the Communist League led by Marx and Engels.

For its part the leadership of New York City’s Socialist Turners declined to send any of the funds it raised to Freiligrath in London. In several statements in the *Turnzeitung* immediately after Lievre submitted his letter, the Central Administration made its opposition to the Lievre proposal clear, yet at first in quite an understated fashion:

> We wish to share the following gratifying announcement with all of our member associations. For the support of those convicted in Cologne: the Louisville Turner Organization has sent in $50 and the Social Democratic Turners of Baltimore, $35. When all donations have been collected, we will send these *directly* to Cologne (emphasis in original). New York, March 1, 1853. The Central Administration.

Bold print and a single word reminded the readers of the *Turnzeitung* that the Central Administration had initially proposed that it, itself, would coordinate the collection and distribution of funds to assist the families who had lost their breadwinners through the Cologne trials. Apparently however, a fuller explanation for the New York City leadership’s desire to maintain its political distance from the exile London communists was needed, and its position was directly challenged by the Washington, D.C., Turnverein in an open letter (in support of working with Freiligrath and the London committee) published, with a rebuttal, by the New York City Central Administration in the next issue of the *Turnzeitung*:

> Washington, D.C. March 7, 1853
> Re: Issues with regard to the support of those sentenced in Cologne and their families.

We wish to report that we have today conveyed a sum from our own organization in the amount of $97.12, together with other monies that have been transferred to us, *directly* to Ferd. Freiligrath. We hope this step will inspire other fraternal organizations and that it will not be interpreted as a separatist action. The [New York City] Central Administration has shown itself to be unworthy of our trust . . . inasmuch as it is trying to take the funds out of the hands of Ferd. Freiligrath, whose name stands without blemish before the German nation and high *above* the reputation of the New York [City] Central
Administration, and turn them over to some functionaries or other whom we do not know. As revolutionary socialists we protest . . . .

The Washington, D.C., Turners argued that the New York City Central Administration was transforming a radical act of political solidarity with the Cologne prisoners into the more conservative kind of conduct better suited to a churchly collection of alms. The Baltimore Turners published a letter in the same issue stating rather diplomatically that they also preferred linkage through Freiligrath, but that they did not want to insist on this approach. The New York City Central Administration responded that it had announced from the start that it wanted to send assistance to families. In addition, it had no qualms about Freiligrath's integrity, but it had to consider not only the Washington, D.C. group's desires but those of the majority of the of other fraternal organizations as well, which like Cincinnati in particular, had expressed negative experiences working through such European committees.

The historical and political significance of this debate may be pursued in the future through deepened consideration of the strategic controversies that appeared among the several factions of Turners. For example, the enduring issue in radical politics of resolute direct action as compared to the patient recognition of the material necessity for conditions to ripen. There is also the organizational and philosophical matter of thinking in terms of autonomous and heroic individuals or thinking in terms of structured social systems. The controversies in reaction to Lievre's letter did lead to increased differences rather than unity in the movement. Yet the robust discourse testifies to the vibrant state of radical politics within German-American Turner circles. Widespread radically democratic German-American activism stands out in U.S. social and labor history during the following century. According to Obermann, the solidarity of radicals in the U.S., like Lievre and Weydemeyer—with Freiligrath, Marx, Engels, and the Cologne communists—resulted in a "Revival of the Labor Movement" in America. The spirit of 1848 lived on with the [1853] formation of the "American Workers' League."

Karl Marx emphasized the linkages among German Forth-eighters, abolitionists, Republicans, Lincoln, and labor radicals, as preparing the way for the post-Civil War American workingmen's pursuit of the shorter working day. In Das Kapital he writes:

In the United States of North America every independent movement of the workers was paralysed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labour cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight
hours’ agitation.45

Of course German-American socialists were central to the culmination of this eight hours’ movement during the May 1 through May 4 general strike and demonstrations at the Haymarket in Chicago in 1886.46 German-American labor leaders, August Spies, Adolf Fischer, Georg Engel, Louis Lingg and Michael Schwab, were executed for their revolutionary agitation for the shorter work week. As a result, and in honor of the American eight hours’ movement, Marx and Engels advocated that this May 1, 1886, date be taken up by European workers and become the international day of labor solidarity – May Day. American socialism’s strength in the 1880s and 1890s was of such magnitude that it had to be massively suppressed by U.S. Attorney General Palmer in 1919. Furthermore, labor strength, strife, and success reached its apex in the 1930s, as exemplified by such radical tactics as the 1936 sit-down strike at General Motors in Flint, Michigan. This strike did in fact shorten the work day to eight hours and secure the recognition of the United Auto Workers (under Walter Reuther, son of a German socialist, and early-on a member of the American Socialist Party). Radical labor activism opened the door to the industrial unionism of late twentieth-century America and its sense of workforce solidarity led to more: the spirit of 1848 has lived on in twentieth-century civil rights agitation, women’s rights struggles, even the New Left peace and free speech movements.47 It is easy to see how and why the legacy of nineteenth-century German-American socialism is suppressed in today’s establishment historiography. Under the spell of what I call the “American Pageant View of History,” writing of this conventional sort has played down immigrant, indigenous, women’s, and ethnic minority voices, and the resistance of these subaltern groups to class, race, and gender-based exertions of power. The militancy and the sense of social justice among the German-American socialist Turners should serve in the U.S. history and civics curriculum as a model of the pursuit of a fuller political and economic commonwealth for us all today and for the generations of the future.

Kansas City Kansas Community College
Kansas City, Kansas
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11 Eugen Lievre, letter 17 February 1853 (emphasis in original; my translation) from General Membership Correspondence, 1850-53, File No. 3.18, Archive of the Socialist Turners of New York, Max Kade German-American Studies Center, Sudler House, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Special thanks to Frank Baron, Director of the KU Max Kade Center, for bringing this letter by Lievre to my attention. We know from Wittke, 166, that Lievre’s Ball did in fact take place, yet Wittke furnishes no specific documentation of the event. Original text: “New York, 17. Febr. 1853. Dem Sozialistischen Turnverein! Turner! Ihr habt in Eurer Versammlung beschlossen für die Unterstützung der, von Bourgeois-Geschworenen Kölner, verurtheilten Vorkämpfer der revolutionären Arbeiterparthei Alles aufzubieten, was in Euren Kräften steht. Ich darf daher mit Sicherheit darauf rechnen bei Euch eine günstige Aufnahme meines Projectes zu finden, durch die Veranstaltung eines Balles in meinem Hotel eine Summe für den gleichen Zweck aufzubringen. Der Ball soll am Montag den 28. Februar stattfinden; den Eintrittspreis habe ich für Mitglieder der Arbeiter Vereine mit 50 Cents für andere mit $1.00 festgesetzt. Für alle Kosten werde ich selbst aufkommen. Doch wäre mir es angenehm, wenn der Turnverein einige Mitglieder ausserer Mitte deputieren wollte, die mit den Deputierten der anderen Vereine zu einer Finanz-Comitée zusammentreten, um die Controlle über die Einnahme des Geldes bis zu seiner Versendung an den Cassirer des Londoner Central-Comitees, Ferd. Freiligrath zu übernehmen. Gruß und Handschlag, Eugen Lievre.”
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Abraham Reeser Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual

Together with Edward H. Rauch’s 1879 Pennsylvania Dutch Hand-Book, Abraham Reeser Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual stood for many decades as the most influential source book for Pennsylvania German language, literature, and culture. First published in 1875, the work went through three further editions in 1896, 1905, and 1910, all of which enlarged the scope of the book in one way or another. Horne’s Manual presented not only the most extended Pennsylvania German wordlists of its time, but also an abundance of materials on Pennsylvania German heritage and literature. The following paper will explore the story and significance of Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual and put the work into the context of the author’s life and the changing attitude of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Pennsylvania educators with regard to the teaching of Pennsylvania German and English in the public schools.

According to an obituary published in the January 1903 edition of the National Educator, Abraham Reeser Horne was born on 24 March 1834 in Springfield township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. His maternal grandfather, Abraham Reasor, was an early settler in the area and both his parents, David L. and Mary Horne, were originally Pennsylvania German Mennonites. He attended nearby Mt. Airy School and, starting in 1848, the boarding school at Line Lexington, both in his home county. According to legend, at the age of eight the avid reader would eagerly await the post rider’s arrival on Wednesday night, delivering the Doylestown papers for a basket of apples. At sixteen Horne was teaching school and at twenty, in 1854, he became principal of the Bethlehem public schools. In the same year, he entered Pennsylvania College, from which he graduated in 1858. Immediately following, he founded Bucks County Normal and Classical School at Quakertown, Pennsylvania, starting with only three students and extending it to 142 pupils at the end of the first year. In 1867 Horne became the first superintendent of the schools of the city of Williamsport,
Pennsylvania, while also serving as pastor of St. Mark’s Lutheran Church. He held the superintendent position until 1872, when he became principal of the Keystone State Normal School in Kutztown, Pennsylvania. Under his leadership, the school became one of the most flourishing normal schools in the state. According to the *National Educator* obituary, Horne’s tireless energy, hard work, and contagious enthusiasm served as a model to his students, who, as rural Pennsylvania Germans, were contending with a great number of educational challenges. In 1877 Horne established the Normal Department of Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pennsylvania, which prepared young men to become teachers and enter college. He remained at Muhlenberg until 1882. His passion for teaching and knowledge of the theoretical aspects of public school education gave Horne an important voice among school principals, superintendents, and other educators at the state and national level. He gave numerous lectures on the subject in schools and churches, not only...
in Pennsylvania, but also during lecture tours through New Jersey, Louisiana, and Texas between 1881 and 1884. As a result of his extraordinary reputation as a leading educator, he was offered the presidency at Texas University, which he declined. In 1860, during his time in Quakertown, Horne had founded the National Educator under the original title Educator and Teachers’ Journal. The monthly journal became a resource to thousands of teachers throughout the United States, not only in the areas of education and pedagogy, but also in literature, religion, history, health, and manners. As Donner points out, the journal also included articles of interest to Pennsylvania Germans, in particular during a very short period in the 1870s. However, the main focus was always on educational topics. After 1890, A. R. Horne’s son, Thomas K. B. Horne, took over the business management of the journal. The place of publication changed as its editor relocated within the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the journal originating alternately in Quakertown, Turbotsville, Williamsport, Kutztown, and Allentown. Horne’s first book publication, a small volume entitled Hand-Book of Botany and published in 1875, grew out of his love of flowers. It was followed in 1885 by Easy Experiments for Schools and Families, which provided teachers with a resource for physical and chemical experiments and the construction of inexpensive apparatuses. The popularity of this work caused a second, enlarged and improved, edition in 1886. Horne’s next work was Common Sense Health Notes, published in 1893. It included useful advice on health preservation, hygiene, disease prevention, and proper ventilation of schools and homes. Horne’s final book publication, entitled Memoirs of Rev. Joshua Yeager, 1802-1882 / Das Leben und Wirken von Pater Josua Jager, Evangelische-Lutherischdem Prediger, appeared in 1889 and was written in both English and Standard German. Yeager was a well-known Lutheran minister in Lehigh and Northampton Counties and predecessor of Horne. In addition to these book publications, Horne published numerous newspaper, magazine, and journal articles, for the most part pertaining to education, but also to local history, most notably that of the Pennsylvania Germans. A. R. Horne married Jemima E. Yerkes in 1858; the couple had seven children. He died on 23 December 1902 a few hours after having delivered a Christmas sermon to a group of children. He is buried in Fairview Cemetery in Allentown, Pennsylvania.

The following brief description of the linguistic situation in southeastern Pennsylvania before the 1870s will provide some context for the discussion of Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual. The first German-speaking immigrants to the province of Pennsylvania founded Germantown (now a part of Philadelphia) in 1683. In the colonial period, almost 100,000 immigrants from German-speaking areas settled in southeastern and central Pennsylvania. They included sectarian Mennonites and Amish as well as
non-sectarian Lutherans and Reformed from the Palatinate, Alsace, Baden, Hesse, the Lower Rhine, and Switzerland. In 1783, exactly a hundred years after the arrival of the first German-speaking immigrants, Johann David Schöpf describes the language of these immigrants and their descendants as a confusing mixture of various German dialects and English. It can be assumed that up until the Revolutionary War the various German dialects had undergone a leveling process, which, in conjunction with linguistic contact with English, resulted in the rise of Pennsylvania German. Although immigration resumed after the Revolutionary War, later immigrants from German-speaking areas increasingly bypassed Pennsylvania. For more than a century, many Pennsylvania Germans preserved their German dialect in the home domain, while also learning English for interaction with the
surrounding mainstream society.\textsuperscript{15} The establishment of an English-speaking public school system and the later switch to English in external domains like church and press eventually led to English becoming the dominant language.

The shift to English among Pennsylvania Germans was by far less widespread when Horne conceived his \textit{Pennsylvania German Manual} in the 1870s. Two important books on the market at the time deserve special mentioning, each for a different reason. In 1870 Henry Harbaugh had published \textit{Harbaugh's Harfe}, a collection of fifteen of his poems in Pennsylvania German, which included the well-known “Das alt Schulhaus an der Krick” ("The old schoolhouse at the creek").\textsuperscript{16} This collection stands at the beginning of Pennsylvania German dialect literature, which has been flourishing to the present day, both in poetry and in prose. The second important publication is S. S. Haldeman’s 1872 volume entitled \textit{Pennsylvania Dutch: A Dialect of South German with an Infusion of English}.\textsuperscript{17} This book marks the beginning of scholarly interest in Pennsylvania German and has been followed by numerous studies of aspects of dialectology, historical linguistics, and sociolinguistics over the last thirteen decades. The two works by Harbaugh and Haldeman are symptomatic for the emerging interest of scholars and educated laypeople in Pennsylvania German language and culture at the time when A. R. Horne was getting ready to publish the first edition of his \textit{Pennsylvania German Manual}.

Horne’s \textit{Manual} altogether went through four editions, the first appearing in 1875, the second in 1896, the third in 1905, and the fourth in 1910. The 1910 edition is made out to be a reprint of the 1905 edition but is in fact slightly enlarged and also differs in pagination. With each new edition except the fourth, slight adjustments were made to the title to account for the enlargements that had taken place. In addition, the work was published by three different publishing houses, namely Urick and Gering in Kutztown (\textsuperscript{1}1875), National Educator Print in Allentown (\textsuperscript{2}1896), and T. K. Horne (\textsuperscript{3}1905 and \textsuperscript{4}1910), also in Allentown. The last three editions are self-publications in that they are connected to the National Educator (\textsuperscript{2}1896) and A. R. Horne’s son Thomas K. B. Horne (\textsuperscript{3}1905 and \textsuperscript{4}1910). The bibliographic citations of the four editions are as follows:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

Title page of the second (1896) edition of A. R. Horne's *Pennsylvania German Manual.*

The following gives an overview of the contents of the first edition of Horne’s *Pennsylvania German Manual* from 1875. In the preface (pp. 3f), Horne contends that the education system serving the Pennsylvania Germans, who generally lack proficiency in English, is in need of improvement. At the same time, however, he stresses that “Pennsylvania Germans can reason and study as well as others,” as is proven by their equality and even superiority in mathematics to native speakers of English or High German. Since, according to Horne, Pennsylvania German itself is merely a spoken language, all that its native speakers need to express themselves appropriately is an adequate tool to help them become proficient in English. Horne’s *Manual* is designed to provide this assistance. It is important to note that Horne, although himself a native speaker of Pennsylvania German and a life-long advocate for Pennsylvania German culture, does not call for Pennsylvania German as the language of the school or the exclusive language of its people. Instead, he readily acknowledges English and High German as somewhat superior because of their widespread use as written languages.

The first part of Horne’s *Manual* is entitled “English Pronunciation” (pp. 5-24). It is designed to help native speakers of Pennsylvania German correct some common errors when pronouncing English words. After some general remarks (pp. 5f), Horne presents twelve lessons, each one providing tips and rules for pronouncing certain vowels or consonants, along with a large number of examples and exercises. Lesson XI, for instance, teaches that <x> “represents a compound sound, which is either a combination of ks or gz” (p. 17). One of the practice sentences reads: “The executrix examined the excellent exotics” (p. 18). Lesson XII “comprises a list of words which are frequently mispronounced, not only by Germans, but also by the English part of the community” (p. 18).

Part II, entitled “Pennsylvania German Literature,” offers “exercises for translation into English” (pp. 25-84). The exercises consist “of selected original Proverbs, Ballads, Anecdotes, and Compositions, on various subjects, in Prose and Poetry, by writers in Pennsylvania German” (p. 25). The assumption is that by translating into English, native speakers of Pennsylvania German are led “from the known to the unknown,” thus learning to express themselves in
their second language (p. 25). The introductory notes conclude with a trilingual admonition in English, Pennsylvania German, and Latin to work hard and persevere: “Do not be afraid of hard work. Persevere, persevere, persevere. Wår ‘aw-hólt, g’wint [“He who holds on, wins”]. Perseverantia omnia vincet [“Perseverence will conquer everything”]” (p. 26). A phonetic key for the English sounds (p. 27) is followed by illustrations designed to familiarize the reader with the spelling systems used in the book for Pennsylvania German, English, and High German (pp. 28-30). The actual translation exercises start with a collection of 102 Pennsylvania German proverbs (pp. 31-36), followed by riddles (pp. 36-38) and nursery rhymes (pp. 39-42). A collection of anecdotes (42-44) and descriptions of Pennsylvania German customs (pp. 44-46) offer longer prose texts for translation. The rest of the chapter (pp. 47-84) includes a variety of poems and short prose texts in Pennsylvania German, all designed to afford the reader plenty of opportunity to practice translating into English.
The third part (pp. 81-169) consists of a trilingual dictionary, Pennsylvania German – English – High German. It is prefaced by some general remarks (pp. 81-83) and a brief overview of Pennsylvania German grammar (pp. 83-94). The latter provides the targeted audience of native speakers of Pennsylvania German with a theoretical account of the syntax of their own language. The dictionary part (pp. 95-169) includes approximately 5500 entries, with the Pennsylvania German lexemes in alphabetical order, each followed by English and High German translations. The appendix (pp. 170f) consists of a short list of entries that did not appear in the main body of the dictionary, with an appeal to readers to supply the author with further omitted words. The final part of the book includes a number of advertisements (pp. 171-74).

As Pennsylvania German was originally almost exclusively used as a spoken language, there was no standardized orthography in the 1870s, when Horne published the first edition of his Manual. As Horne explains at the beginning of the second part, he decided to use an English-based orthographical system for practical reasons: “The exercises are printed in English type, since those who use this book have learned to read English mechanically, and are, therefore, familiar with its pronunciation” (p. 25). In choosing to use an English-based orthographical system, Horne followed common nineteenth-century practice, as most Pennsylvania German texts published in that period appeared in newspaper columns and targeted a readership literate almost exclusively in English (as opposed to High German). A look at a few examples from the pictures and words printed in the first exercise (pp. 28f) illustrates the use of a phonetic, English-based orthography: Koo ‘cow’, Fős ‘barrel’, Sha Madĕl ‘pretty girl’, Fawnă ‘flags’. Horne uses short marks over all vowels except <i> (<ă, ē, ŏ, ŭ>) to mark shortness. He also uses ’ to indicate omission of a vowel (such as in ‘N G’bis ‘a bit’) and ‘ to mark nasalization (such as in ‘ans ‘one’). As Donner explains, Horne’s English-based orthographical system relying heavily on diacritical marks never gained popularity among writers of Pennsylvania German. In fact, as will be seen below, Horne’s son Thomas felt compelled to use the preface of the third edition (published in 1905 after A. R. Horne’s death) to defend his father’s phonetic orthography against critics as a deliberate choice to help readers learn “to read and pronounce the dialect correctly.”

In the preface to the second (1896) edition of the Pennsylvania German Manual, Horne reports that the first edition was in such high demand that it has been out of print for over ten years. According to the author, the necessity for more and better instruction in English is unchanged after twenty years, which leads him to repeat verbatim the reasoning for his work expounded in the first edition in the preface to the second. The only notable change, as pointed out by Donner, is the omission of the acquisition of High German
(in addition to English) as one of the goals for the readers of the Manual. This change is symptomatic for Horne’s decreasing emphasis on German as a language taught and used in school.

While Part I, consisting of the rules for English pronunciation, remains completely unchanged, Horne considerably expanded the list of pictures and trilingual captions preceding the translation exercises (twenty-eight pages in the second edition versus three in the first). The second edition even includes a trilingual diagram of the meat cuts in a cow (p. 44). Horne added English translations to the Pennsylvania German proverbs, riddles, nursery rhymes, anecdotes, description of customs, and poems in the second edition. This change, along with the inclusion of some new pieces and more pictures, considerably extended the second part (from 60 to 111 pages). One example of a new piece, only available to Horne after the printing of the first edition, is an excerpt from Shakespeare’s Hamlet in Pennsylvania German (pp. 97-100; from E. H. Rauch’s 1879 Pennsylvania Dutch Hand-Book). The second edition
also features Henry Harbaugh’s popular poem “Das alt Schulhaus an der Krick” (‘The old schoolhouse at the creek’) from the 1870 collection entitled *Harbaugh’s Harfe* (pp. 102-109, including an English translation) and Henry Lee Fisher’s “Die alte Zeite” (‘The olden times’) from the 1878 collection *S alt Marik-Haus mittes in d’r Schtadt, un Die alte Zeite*22 (pp. 110-16, including an English translation). Horne also updated the list of biographical sketches of well-known Pennsylvania Germans (pp. 121-29), adding some names and dropping others, while updating existing biographies.

Horne appended a new preface (pp. 130-33) to the trilingual wordlist presented in Part III. In it, Horne traces the origin of Pennsylvania German to dialects spoken in the southwestern parts of Germany and presents a sample of (assumed) Palatinate dialect for comparison. The preface also includes etymological explanations of various Pennsylvania German words in an attempt to prove the authenticity and expressiveness of Pennsylvania German. The preface concludes with a list of five available Pennsylvania German dictionaries, of which Horne’s, with its alleged 5522 entries, is the largest, followed by a wordlist included in Rauch’s *Pennsylvania German Hand-Book* (5000 entries) and shorter wordlists appended to poetry collections (including Fisher and Harbaugh). The Pennsylvania German grammar found in the first edition was dropped. The Pennsylvania German-English dictionary itself (pp. 134-202) remains largely unchanged. It is, however, followed by an English-Pennsylvania German wordlist, which constitutes the fourth part of the second edition (pp. 204-79). Unlike its Pennsylvania German–English counterpart, it does not include High German equivalents.

Between the third and fourth parts Horne promises to send a free copy of the *Manual* to any reader supplying him with ten words not yet listed in the Pennsylvania German–English dictionary (p. 203). No fewer than 135 pages of various advertisements are appended to the second edition (pp. 281-415), which helped to defray the printing cost (p. 281).

The third (1905) edition, posthumously published by A. R. Horne’s son Thomas Horne, includes a frontispiece including a picture of A. R. Horne and a brief text praising his advocacy for the Pennsylvania German culture. The preface of the third edition defends A. R. Horne’s Pennsylvania German orthographic system against criticism. It also announces the inclusion of new selections from Pennsylvania German literature and additional illustrations. It reminds the Pennsylvania German reader of the strict necessity of practicing one’s English pronunciation with the help of the exercises given in the first part. The preface of the second edition is reprinted.

The first part, giving rules and exercises for English translation, remains once again unchanged (pp. 5-17). However, the section containing pictures with captions in Pennsylvania German, English, and High German was
further enlarged, now comprising fifty pages (pp. 20-69). One new feature is a section on Christmas (pp. 65-67).

With the exception of some new illustrations, the section on proverbs, riddles, nursery rhymes, anecdotes, and the description of Pennsylvania German customs remains the same as in the second edition. However, the latter part of the poetry and prose section includes a number of new texts, among them an excerpt from the “Boonastiel” letters by T. H. Harter (1893). Part II (pp. 18-183) shows numerous irregularities in pagination, some pages being out of order and others repeated. The section from page 180 to 183, which concludes the second part, oddly resumes the illustrations with trilingual captions.

The third part reprints the section on Pennsylvania German grammar
found in the first edition but eliminated from the second (pp. 184-92). It is followed by the Pennsylvania German–English–High German wordlist, beginning with page 1 and ending at page 69. The wordlist is identical with that of the second edition. Likewise, Part IV, including an English–Pennsylvania German dictionary, remains unchanged from the second edition (pp. 71-146). The remainder of the book (pp. 147-82) includes business directories of various Pennsylvania communities, such as Allentown, Catasauqua, and Kutztown, interspersed with further pictures with Pennsylvania German and English captions.

The fourth (1910) edition reprints the prefaces of both the third (p. 6) and the second editions (pp. 7-8). The twelve lessons on English pronunciation, once again reprinted unaltered (pp. 11-21), are now introduced by the following potential pitfalls: “PARENTS, TEACHERS, can the children give the English Pronunciation? – It is a job to chop Jane’s chain. He fell on the ice and hurt his eyes. I thought I sought the thick sick man in the South. He wets his whetstone with wine, and whines when he cuts the vines” (p. 11).

The second part includes a further expanded section on illustrations and trilingual captions as compared to the third edition (pp. 22-95). Further additions in the second part (pp. 22-216) were made in particular to the nursery rhymes. While the section on poetry and prose remained largely the same, the pagination errors found in the third edition were corrected in the fourth. The few additions that were made include materials highlighting the value and pride of Pennsylvania German culture (pp. 215f.).

Both Part III (preface, Pennsylvania German grammar, and Pennsylvania German–English–High German dictionary; pp. 217-95) and Part IV (English–Pennsylvania German dictionary; pp. 296-371) are exactly identical with the third edition, with the exception that the pagination has been integrated. There are no advertisements in the fourth edition. Instead, pages 372f. present a brief text honoring the achievements of the Pennsylvania Germans, while predicting the loss of the German dialect, and a map of the Palatinate.

Today, a century after the publication of the fourth edition, Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual remains a treasure trove for linguists, literary scholars, and historical sociologists interested in Pennsylvania German language, literature, and culture. The work not only offers the largest Pennsylvania German dictionaries of its time, but also an anthology of the most important Pennsylvania German proverbs, nursery rhymes, and early literary texts.

The concept was so successful that in 1879, four years after the publication of the first edition, Horne’s Manual faced a sudden competitor in Edward H. Rauch’s Pennsylvania Dutch Hand-Book. Interestingly enough,
Rauch’s *Hand-Book* includes not only a Pennsylvania German–English wordlist, but also an English–Pennsylvania German one. It may therefore not be completely coincidental that Horne added his version of an English–Pennsylvania German wordlist as Part IV to the second (1896) edition. It is also interesting to note that unlike Rauch, who includes a fair number of English words among his Pennsylvania German lexemes (for instance *able*, *ability*, *abuse*), Horne renders all these words as native Pennsylvania German words (*fäich*, *färmagafäichkad*, *shimpā/misbrouchā*), thereby showing himself more as a purist than the more descriptive Rauch.

As a lifelong educator,\(^{25}\) Horne saw a necessity for his fellow Pennsylvania Germans to educate themselves. Although he considered the Pennsylvania Germans intellectually as capable as the members of the surrounding English-
speaking mainstream society and although he held the Pennsylvania German language and culture in high esteem, he recognized that future socio-economic success of the native speakers of German depended on their proficiency in English. Over his professional career, therefore, Horne exhibited a gradual shift from an insistence on the importance of instruction in Pennsylvania German and High German to increasing support of English as the language of instruction in schools throughout the Pennsylvania German area.26

According to Donner,27 Horne actually started out as an advocate for the use of English in schools during the 1850s and through the Civil War. In the early 1870s, however, “[c]ompared with his contemporaries, Horne took some very strong stands in support of using Pennsylvania German as a language of instruction, and occasionally even supported teaching students to read and write High German rather than English.”28 By 1873, his position began to shift again. In his 1873 article in the Pennsylvania German Dutchman, Horne pointed out that children who came to school with native proficiency in Pennsylvania German but none in English did not profit from English-only instruction.29 He therefore called, among other things, for teachers in German districts to be proficient in German and teach their students “[t]o read, write and translate German. . . . The Pennsylvania German,” he stated, “can be made introductory to the high German.”30 At the same time, however, he suggested that “[t]he ordinary branches of an English education, such as arithmetic, geography, etc. of course should be taught in English.”31

Horne’s shift to becoming an outspoken supporter of multilingual education in the mid-1870s is reflected in the pedagogical approach he employs in the 1875 Manual, which offers exercises in English pronunciation and translation from Pennsylvania German to English. Changes and additions in subsequent editions of the Manual (as, for instance, the omission of acquiring High German as an objective in the preface of the second edition) reflect Horne’s ever growing belief in the primacy of English as language of instruction. Even though, as Waldenrath points out,32 Horne’s Manual was never widely used in the schools, it was a book found in the homes of many Pennsylvania German-speaking families. The fact that the work went through four editions over three and a half decades shows that it had a lasting impact on the education of an important part of the Pennsylvanian population. Perhaps the Manual’s popularity in the home domain reflects the emergence of a Pennsylvania German dialect literature, which began with newspaper columns, letters, and poems in the 1860s and was fully developed by 1900.33 Nevertheless, as Horne grew older, his stance in the language dispute leaned even more increasingly toward the teaching of English and the use of English as the language of instruction.34 At the end of his life he sided with those of his educator colleagues who considered English-only instruction as the
best method to educate young Pennsylvania Germans and who advocated a complete ban of Pennsylvania German in the classroom.\textsuperscript{35} As Donner points out,\textsuperscript{36} Horne himself embraced English as his own primary language by publishing almost all his writings in English, using English for his personal notes, and apparently using English as the first language in his household and with his children.

Despite this change of view with regard to language instruction, however, Horne never ceased to advocate Pennsylvania German heritage and ethnicity, as his editorials in the \textit{National Educator} and his articles elsewhere, as well as his active involvement with the Pennsylvania German Society (founded in 1891 with Horne as one of thirty-one founding members)\textsuperscript{37} and with the Bucks County Historical Society,\textsuperscript{38} show. In fact, he is considered one
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of the most vocal advocates of his own culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. As Donner explains,39 Horne’s Manual can be seen as “an example of a rising consciousness and pride in ethnic identity, and in this sense is a very modern book.” In addition, the bilingual pedagogical strategy employed in the work of using a child’s native language to acquire a national language was a century ahead of its time. Today, A. R. Horne’s Pennsylvania German Manual stands as a testimony to a changing attitude among leading Pennsylvania German educators of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which, continuing a development that had begun in the 1830s, firmly established English as the language of instruction in Pennsylvania public schools.
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During World War I many “hyphenated” Americans faced complex questions of loyalty. German-Americans undoubtedly had the most difficulty during this time. While many German-Americans had been part of their communities for generations, others had only been in the United States for the past few decades and others still were newly arrived in America. Some felt that their loyalty lay with the land of their heritage, and many still had family in Germany. However, a large portion no longer had activities with Germany and were thoroughly integrated into their communities. Regardless of how long they had been in America or where their loyalties lay, almost all German-Americans, at some time or another, faced questions about their loyalty and patriotism. This study seeks to determine what kinds of issues German-Americans in the predominantly German communities of Klein, Spring, and Cypress about 25 miles Northwest of Houston in Harris County, Texas, faced during World War I. It also attempts to establish to what extent these communities faced loyalty questions and, more important, how did they deal with them? To determine how the experiences of these communities differed from other German-American communities in Texas this study compares the Big Cypress to a previously studied German-American community in Fayette County.

The literature on German-Americans in the United States is substantial. German immigration to America has a long and multifaceted history that has been the subject of a number of books and articles. On the issue of German-American loyalty in the United States during World War I, Frederick Luebke’s *Bonds of Loyalty: German Americans and World War I* provides a useful start. Luebke focused on German-American communities in larger cities such as Cincinnati and Philadelphia and presented an overview of German-American patriotism during the war as well as how the American population treated them. In addition Mark Sonntag’s MA thesis “Hyphenated Texans:
World War I and the German-Americans in Texas” contributes to our understanding German-Texans during World War I. Sonntag’s focus is on German-Americans in Texas during World War I with special emphasis on the German-American communities of the Hill Country of Texas. The most recent study of German-Americans during this period is Matthew Tippens Turning Germans Into Texans. Tippens looked at the assimilation of German culture in Texas from 1900-1930 and traced the effect of World War I had on the survival of German culture. Tippens’ work focused primarily on 10 counties in and around Central Texas where he found that the German-American communities faced considerable hostility and questions about their loyalty. These studies, however, do not consider or account for the unique experiences of the large number of German-Americans in Harris County during World War I.

The United States in 1910 had a significant population of German descent. In fact, more than 2.5 million people listed Germany as their birthplace, with more than 45,000 living in Texas. Including their offspring, often first and second generation Americans, German-Americans in Texas numbered more than 170,000 in 1910 and over 8 million nationwide. Harris County in 1910 was home to the second highest population of German-born residents of Texas at nearly 3,000 along with more than 4,000 first generation German-
Big Cypress German-Americans during World War I

Americans. Many other Texas communities were home to hundreds of German Americans; in some cases the communities were exclusively German. These communities often maintained their heritage on a number of levels by conducting church services in German, celebrating German festivals such as Maifest and Oktoberfest, and often printing German language newspapers. Thus, these communities attracted a significant amount of attention from neighboring Anglos when the United States entered World War I against Germany and the Central Powers.

German settlement in Texas has a rich history from 1831 to the early twentieth-century. A number of Germans who settled in Texas before the state gained independence fought in the revolution. But it was not until 1844 that the first major effort of Germans to settle Texas came when the Society for the Protection of German Immigrants in Texas (Verein zum Schutze deutscher Einwanderer in Texas), also known as the Adelsverein or simply the Verein, began promoting the settlement of Texas. The Verein obtained the rights to settle a large tract of land in west central Texas near present day Austin. The Verein then sought to attract German settlers by offering transportation, land, a house, and other benefits for the cost of $120 for a single man and $320 for a family. The Verein would keep one-half of the land in the colony for future sales in the hope that land values would increase as demand soared once the area was sufficiently settled. As many as 7,380 Germans accepted the Verein’s seemingly generous offer between the years 1844-1846 and moved from Germany to Texas.

Poor organization and inadequate funding resulted in the bankruptcy of the Verein in 1847. However, during its short existence thousands of Germans immigrated to Texas to settle the land. Most of the German settlers who had been brought to Texas by the Verein settled in west central Texas to the north of present day San Antonio. Once settled the Germans wrote to their friends and families in Germany of the plentiful land and encouraged them to join them. In fact, it was said that in parts of Germany during the 1840s one often heard “Geh mit ins Texas” (“go with us to Texas”). Through the mid 1840s to the 1850s, German immigration increased and more Texan areas were settled as Germans spread out to the south along the Brazos and Colorado Rivers and west along the Guadalupe River. During this period the port of Galveston and the nearby city of Houston saw an influx of German settlers on an impressive scale. In the early 1850s it was estimated that nearly two-fifths of the Houston population and nearly one-third of the population in Galveston was German. Austin and San Antonio also saw a significant rise in their German populations during this period as well as many other smaller communities throughout southeast Texas and the Hill Country.

German immigration to Texas continued at a steady rate until the outbreak
of the Civil War in 1861. With Confederate ports blockaded by Federal ships, immigration to Texas by sea was effectively brought to a standstill for the duration of the war. Following the Civil War, immigrants from Germany once again flowed into Texas. The second generation (first generation Americans) of German-Americans expanded the predominately German areas and, along with new immigrants, expanded along new railroads that were being built in Texas. By the turn to the twentieth-century, German-Americans could be found throughout Texas and while some completely integrated themselves with the local Anglo populations, many settled with their own kind in nearly exclusively German communities.12

Harris County was home to German-Americans. The communities of Spring, Klein, and Cypress are located in north Harris County. Situated in an area known as “Big Cypress” which stretched from the town of Spring, today located about twenty-five miles north of Houston on Interstate-45, west to the community of Cypress, located today on Highway 290 about twenty miles northwest of Houston. In the 1840s the area was very remote, as the city of Houston, which had been founded in 1836, was still relatively small. German immigrants were drawn to the area by the fertile soil and abundant water sources, which were ideal for immigrant farmers and many chose to raise their families in the area.13

After the Civil War the population boomed in the Big Cypress. Railroads were built and new economic opportunities developed in agriculture and in the lumber industry. The railroads, cotton gins, and sawmills attracted workers to the predominantly farming communities and as the population grew towns were founded in the area. The International and Great Northern Railroad Company established the town of Spring in 1873 when the railroad line connecting Houston to St. Louis was built through the area.14 The communities of Klein and Cypress also grew as more farmers came to the area. In 1884, due to the growth in population over the preceding decades a U.S. Post Office was established in Klein as well as a gristmill and a cotton gin.15 In Cypress, further to the west, a corn cracking mill, cotton gin, and sawmill were opened to support the local farmers and lumber industry.16

In 1904, oil was struck in nearby Humble, just to the east of Big Cypress. This attracted even more people to the area as the Gulf Coast oil boom created a flurry of activity. This economic windfall allowed many of the local farmers to sell off portions of their land for substantial profits. When World War I broke out in Europe the German-Americans of Big Cypress were adjusting to the recent and rapid growth in their communities.17

The families that settled the Big Cypress had immigrated from Prussian provinces such as Posen, and Pomerania as well as the German principalities of Württemberg, Saxony, and Mecklenburg in the 1840s and 1850s. The
Alvin Klein family, like many families in the area, primarily farmed cotton but they also grew subsistence crops such as corn and potatoes and raised hogs, cattle, and chickens. Some families harvested timber and processed it at Jacob Strack’s sawmill just south of Klein. A number of the families in the Big Cypress also worked a trade. The Mittelstädt family farmed and ran a blacksmith shop in Klein while Henry Kaiser farmed and raised cattle but was also a carpenter who helped build the Trinity Lutheran Church. Many families also sent their sons to work as laborers at the rail yards and in the oil fields to earn extra money.18

The center of social life in the Big Cypress was Trinity Lutheran Church. The leading families of the Big Cypress: the Kleins, Kaisers, Klencks, Lemms, Wunderlichs, Stracks, and Theisses all joined together to organize the church.19 Trinity Lutheran Church was not just the religious center for the community; it was also the center for education. The church educated the area children in German and provided religious as well as secular instruction.20

The German-American communities of Fayette County provide good examples of typical Central Texas German-Americans. The area was settled by Germans in the 1830s, even more were brought by the Verein during the 1840s and over the next fifty years the German-American population steadily increased. Much like the Big Cypress, the primary occupation of German-Americans in Fayette County centered on agriculture. The main crops were cotton and corn but they also grew cabbages, beans, and potatoes. Many families also raised livestock to supplement their diet and income.21 In 1910 the size of the German-American population in Fayette County was also similar to that of the Big Cypress; 5,428 were born in Germany or were first generation.22 The majority lived in the country but some lived in the County Seat, La Grange, and in the towns of Schulenburg and Fayetteville.

The United States declared war on Germany on 6 April 1917. This event changed the lives of German-Americans throughout the nation. Many German-Americans were torn over how to react to the news that America was at war with the land of their forefathers. Many were upset and some were outspoken in their anger, but once war was declared, the evidence suggests that the German-American population in Big Cypress supported their new homeland unflinchingly.

As preparations for war got underway state Councils of Defense were created in May 1917. Their primary purpose was mobilizing the economic resources of the state; a secondary purpose was to promote patriotism within the state. Then County Councils of Defense were created as the state council delegated the tasks prescribed by the national council.23

On 11 August 1917 the Harris County Council of Defense organized in Houston with Otis Hamblen as council secretary.24 It apparently was not very
active, as the State council was required to send state organizers to reorganize the Harris County Council of Defense in 1918 almost exactly one year from the date that it was established.\(^\text{25}\) For the most part, the Harris County Council of Defense only concerned itself with community organization and industrial mobilization.\(^\text{26}\) The majority of its actions dealt with Red Cross donations, Liberty Bond drives, and Victory Gardens. In fact Harris County led the State in Victory Garden enrollments in the spring of 1918.\(^\text{27}\) Other county councils of defense in Texas were much more active in rooting out disloyalty in their communities.

In a letter from the Texas Council of Defense in San Antonio to the County Councils of Defense on 11 August 1917, each County Council was asked a series of questions about their status. The questions focused primarily on Liberty Bond Drives, food production, and general war contributions. However, one of the questions dealt with loyalty: “Do you see any evidence of disloyalty in your community?” Each council was asked to deal with disloyalty issues within their county and report back to the state council if the issue could not be resolved. Often the most a county council could do was ask disloyal citizens to be more patriotic, unless they broke the law as prescribed in the Sedition Act of 1918. In some cases no actual crime had been committed but the actions of the “disloyal” citizen drew the attention of the council, such as speaking German in public or not portraying sufficient patriotic spirit.\(^\text{28}\)

Unpatriotic or disloyal citizens were encouraged by other, more patriotic citizens to increase their support for the country in a number of ways. One of the most common methods was a patriotic essay published in the local newspaper. For example, in the \textit{Denton Record-Chronicle}, an article was titled “Ask Yourself The Question ‘Am I a Patriot or Traitor?’ Loyal ‘German-Americans,’” in which the author presented various ways for the “Loyal German-American” to be more patriotic by helping the Y.M.C.A. or contributing to the Red Cross.\(^\text{29}\) The State Council of Defense sent many of these essays to Texas newspapers for publication throughout the state. Some of the essays were general appeals to patriotism such as an April 1918 essay titled “Are you for America or for Germany?”\(^\text{30}\) Others were aimed at specific areas of Texas; for example in April 1918, a Mr. Hoopes wrote a letter to the Hill Country region about the attitudes of the German-Americans he had encountered. He wrote that they had been very patriotic, participating in Liberty Bond drives, Red Cross activities, and Y.M.C.A. functions. However, Hoopes pointed out some counties with significant German-American populations that fell short in meeting their Liberty Bond quotas and that these unpatriotic German-Americans should take notice and emulate their honorable brethren who had gladly participated.\(^\text{31}\)
At times people resorted to violence or the threat of violence when attempting to curb unpatriotic, pro-German sentiment. In Brenham, Texas, just fifty miles from the Big Cypress area, rioters attacked and flogged six German-American farmers for not joining the Red Cross. Such violent intimidation could even have deadly consequences: the *Austin Wochenblatt* reported that a German-American farmer in Fayette County committed suicide when he could not buy the prescribed amount of Liberty Bonds because of the poor harvest. In Fayette County some people were quite willing to root out disloyal German-Americans; one man wrote the Governor asking, “Give me the right to help our country run down the disloyalty among the German speaking people of Fayette County.”

In regard to Harris County, the Houston newspapers are some of the best sources for evidence of anti-German or pro-German sentiment in the area. The *Houston Post* on 4 January 1918 printed a story about a man who was attacked in Illinois for being a “Kaiser Lover.” The headline of the article read “Kaiser Lover Beaten and Painted Yellow.” In a story a little closer to home, the *Houston Post* printed a story about a German-American in Brazoria County, Texas, who was beaten for unpatriotic statements; the title read “Black Eye Result of Unpatriotic Remarks.” In a letter to the Editor of the *Houston Chronicle* a man wrote that to ensure “democratic” voting in the upcoming primary Pro-Germans should not be allowed to vote. To enforce this he suggested that at each polling place a patriotic man should be stationed to question voters who were unsure about their loyalties.

The *Houston Post* and the *Houston Chronicle* also reported arrests made for violations of the Sedition Act of 1918. In Fayetteville Mayor W. C. Langoltz and ten citizens were arrested by Federal officials for flying a German flag at the Germania Club and charged with committing espionage. They pled not guilty and said that the flag was flown by mistake. The news article noted that “with one exception, all are American-born citizens.” On 6 January 1918 O. M. Michaelis, a German citizen who was living and working in Houston, was accused of “Having Collected Data of Value to German Government.” On 19 January 1918, Louis Ruffel, also a German citizen living in Houston, was held on a Federal charge, the *Houston Post* reported that he had been “Arrested Twice Within 3 Months for Unpatriotic Remarks.” The *Houston Chronicle* ran a story on 9 August 1918 about two men from Corrigan, Texas, who were charged with making “Disloyal Remarks” about the United States government. The men in the two previous cases were German Aliens rather than German-American citizens. However, it is important to note that the Houston newspapers reported on these kinds of issues as this is evidence of their willingness to print stories about unpatriotic actions by people of German descent. Therefore, based on a close reading of the sources, there is
little evidence that any significant issue occurred with the German-American communities in Big Cypress. If there were issues, they do not seem to have been reported in the local newspapers.

Perhaps the most controversial element of testing German-American loyalties during World War I was the suppression of the German language. Like other immigrant communities the German-born settlers in Texas actively retained the use of their mother tongue. While many of the older German-born generation never mastered English their children often learned English as well as German. Thus, German was often heard in the streets in German communities throughout Texas. Advertisments of businesses were in German, too, and local children learned the German language in the parochial schools. German was also the language in the Lutheran churches in the communities. Many churches in the larger communities held German language services as well as services in English while smaller communities only offered services in German. This prevalence of the German language in Texas communities was an obvious target of “Americanization” efforts.41

In an undated letter to the County Councils of Defense the Texas State Council outlined its primary objectives. Number three on the list, following industrial mobilization and community organization, was “To curtail the use of the German language.”42 Many counties took steps to curb the use of the German language; some even went as far as to ban the public use of German.43 Generally, the State Council of Defense advised the local councils simply to ask the German-Americans not to use German in public and specifically advised that violent enforcement was not an option.

In a letter to Judge J. F. Carl, the secretary of the Texas Council of Defense, the Castro County Council of Defense asked what could be done about German-Americans in the community speaking German in public. Their concern was that “Germans . . . are speaking German in [the town of] Dimmitt. Americans cannot understand what they are saying. What can be done?”44 J. F. Carl responded to the Castro County council writing “The council may ask the Germans to stop speaking German in Dimmitt but cannot enforce it.”45 In Fayette County the County Council of Defense thought it would be best if the use of German were discontinued saying that it would “prove a boon to the children of the community . . . and lead to the thorough Americanization of our people.”46

German language newspapers protested the removal of the German language from American society. The Neu-Braunfelser Zeitung argued that the knowledge of foreign languages helped to diversify a culture.47 In Fayette County, the LaGrange newspaper Lutherbote für Texas argued against the banning of teaching German in schools saying that the result of such action would be damaging to education of the nation’s youth.48 The La Grange
deutsche Zeitung took exception to the assumption that everything spoken or written in German was disloyal. 49

Use of the German language was also targeted in churches. While most members of churches that held services in German were German-American, the local Anglo communities frequently took offense and deemed the practice “unpatriotic” in a time of war with Germany. Many churches could not understand how a church service could be considered unpatriotic regardless of the language it was conducted in. The Austin German language newspaper the Austin Das Wochenblatt articulated its resentment of the attempt to Americanize the German church services in order to eradicate disloyalty within the German-American population. The paper pointed out that the United States military included “thousands of German Lutherans, Catholics, and Methodists, and thus far no traitor has been found among their number.” 50 The Fayette County Council of Defense disagreed. In denying a request by the Bethlehem Lutheran Church in Round Top to hold German language services it stated “To permit the German language as a means of communication is opening the door wide for German propaganda, friction, disorder and disloyalty.” It seemed that the Fayette County Council of Defense could not understand why the German-Americans wished to speak German, “Have they ever thought how it grates upon the ears of these neighbors when they hear this language, which they cannot understand, in these critical times?” 51

In a letter from the State Council of Defense concerning an earlier letter from the pastor of St. Mark’s Lutheran Church in Waco about the elimination of German language services, the State council was fairly diplomatic in tone. The letter recognized the church’s obvious good intentions and merely asked that it comply with the request to ban German for reasons of patriotism and public safety. Secretary Carl was careful to point out that the State council could not enforce such a ban and the “. . . request is not a command.” 52 Remarkably, the letter reflected the State Council’s concern of for the German-American worshippers, in fear of violence against them by the Anglo population due to the use of German in public.

The German-Americans of the Big Cypress were aware of the general feelings towards the German language. Due to such concerns, the Trinity Lutheran Church and School in Klein discontinued the use of the German language in 1918. The local parochial schools also terminated their German language instruction. There does not, however, seem to be any evidence suggesting that the local Anglo populations took steps to encourage this. Rather the sources appear to suggest that the German-Americans of Big Cypress took these steps on their own, owing to their judgment of the local and national sentiment. 53
The reaction of the German-American community was varied. While some people were willing to stop using German in public and only speak German in private, others ardently opposed such measures. In response to the Americanization of his language the editor of Das Wochenblatt declared, “The demand that I shall not speak the language of my dear mother, thus honoring her, is persecution pure and simple.” The LaGrange Zeitung criticized school boards across the nation for eliminating German language classes, maintaining that their elimination would be detrimental to the United States.

In many cases the German-Americans made efforts to support the nation by taking part in various patriotic activities. The actions of The Houston Sängerbund provide a good example of such German-American activity in Harris County during World War I. The Houston Sängerbund is a German singing society that has been in existence since the 1870s. The Sängerbund owned a building in Houston where members held dances and singing nights, which were regularly attended by a wide range of Houstonians. The group's records are detailed and informative as they describe the difficulties that they faced during World War I. In the annual report for 1919, the society secretary detailed the effects of the war on the Sängerbund,

My report for the outgoing year will mark the most trying experiences of “The Houston Sängerbund” since its 35 years of existence . . . Not only the world war, but also the various State Legislations, especially Prohibition have added to our discomforts. On account of the latter issue, many of our Members withdrew, however, the Sängerbund remains firm in all its endeavors and such Members resigning on “Beer Principles” alone, were especially noted.

He then went on to describe the actions of the Sängerbund during the war and their patriotic support,

The Sängerbund also lent very active service in all National undertakings, especially Liberty Loan Issues, War Savings Stamps and Red Cross Contributions, not forgetting a full quota of enlistments both U.S. Army and Navy. President Hellberg especially, was very active with all National calls and his efforts deserve all compliment.

The Sängerbund is an excellent example of how some German-Americans attempted to preserve their heritage while at the same time wholeheartedly supporting the war effort with donations and military service. The Sängerbund records indicate that their membership included German-Americans residing beyond the city of Houston in Harris County. This suggests that the actions
of the Sängerbund can be used as a gauge of German-American sentiment throughout Harris County.\textsuperscript{57}

Many German-Americans served in the U.S. military during World War I either “over there” in France or in the States at (military) installations scattered throughout the nation. Congress passed the Selective Service Law on 18 May 1917, which required all males ages twenty-one to thirty to register for the draft, including aliens residing in the United States.\textsuperscript{58} It is interesting to see whom the U.S. military classified as “enemy aliens,” namely a non-U.S. citizen from Germany or any of the Central Power countries allied with Germany. The \textit{Second Report of the Provost Marshal General} detailed the number of German citizens in the U.S. who registered for the draft as 158,809 in a total of nearly twenty-four million men that registered nation-wide.\textsuperscript{59} It is not possible to discern how many of the total number of registrants were German-American, because the paperwork did not require information about one’s heritage, but it can be assumed that they registered just as the rest of the population as there was no report stating otherwise.

The \textit{Second Report of the Provost Marshal General} also discussed the naturalization process to allow the enlistment of enemy aliens who wished to serve in the U.S. military, writing “The amendment to the naturalization law . . . [would permit] alien enemy subjects enrolled in the military or naval service to obtain speedy naturalization.”\textsuperscript{60} The report spoke well of German aliens and German-Americans who served in the military, commenting that “The great and inspiring revelation here has been that men of foreign and of native origin alike responded to the call to arms with a patriotic devotion . . .” The report also related a portion from a captured diary of a German officer,

\begin{quote}
Only a few of the troops are of pure American origin; the majority are of German, Dutch and Italian parentage. But these semi-Americans—almost all of whom were born in America and never have been in Europe—fully feel themselves to be true-born sons of their country.\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

German-Americans from the Big Cypress also answered the call to arms. The Kaiser family, who had settled in Klein in the 1860s, sent their sons to war. Gustav Henry Kaiser of Klein was a World War I veteran who served in France.\textsuperscript{62} His brother Paul Kaiser also served in France and was killed in action on 9 November 1918, two days before the Armistice. Gustav and Paul’s Uncle Fred and younger brother John also did their duty and registered for the draft. Alvin Klein, whose grandfather first settled Klein in the 1850s, served with the 36th Division Headquarters in France where his fluency in German proved valuable to the unit.\textsuperscript{63} William Wunsche, whose family was
one of the first to settle Spring, served with the 117th Headquarters supply train in France. Both of his brothers served as well. His brother James was stationed in San Antonio, Texas, for the duration of the war where he was classified as a chauffeur. The only combat that James Wunsche saw was with the hand cranks of the Model T’s that he worked with; one broke his arm and another broke his nose. The third Wunsche brother, Earl, also served in France. Nearly all of the men from the prominent families of the Big Cypress registered for the draft and at least six served in the Army during the war.

In general the German-American populations of Big Cypress did not face the same level of anti-German sentiment from their neighboring communities as the German-Americans in Fayette County did. This is probably because of the composition of their respective counties. Fayette County was almost totally rural and the few towns were not very big. Harris County was both rural and urban, and the city of Houston was emerging as one of the largest cities in the state. To illustrate the difference, the total population of Fayette County was 29,796 in 1910 compared to 115,693 in Harris County. In Fayette County there was a larger population of German-American: 5,428 made up 18.2% of the total population. In Harris County the German-American population was 7,676 in 1910, just 6.63% of the total population. These data lead us to the conclusion that while the socio-economic status of the German-Americans living in the Big Cypress and Fayette County was similar, the fact that the Big Cypress communities were in close proximity to the city of Houston and a much smaller portion of the population, allowed them to escape the hostility that the German-American communities in Fayette County experienced.

Matthew Tippens argued in his book *Turning Germans into Texans* that the large urban areas of Dallas, San Antonio, and Houston were anti-German but did not entail mob action. The urban areas took measures to increase nationalism though enforcing the law or in the public discourse of urban newspapers. He argues that most violence and organized intimidation occurred in the small towns and rural areas of Texas where the German-Americans were numerous. This might explain the absence of hostility towards the German-Americans in the Big Cypress. They were a highly concentrated, mostly rural, population seemingly a perfect target for hostility and intimidation. However, since the German-Americans of the Big Cypress were only a small proportion of the very large population of Harris County, they did not warrant the concern of their neighbors. Another factor that probably contributed to this disparity between the two counties with significant numbers of German-Americans was the high numbers of new residents in Houston at this time. Over a twenty-year period from 1900 to 1920, the population of Harris County tripled from 63,788 to 186,677 residents. The population of Fayette
County, however, shrunk over the same time period from 36,542 to 29,965; further increasing the visibility of the German-American population.\textsuperscript{68} As the German-Americans in the Big Cypress became an increasingly smaller proportion of the Harris County population, and consequently less visible, the German-Americans of Fayette County became more visible, and thus easier targets for anti-German hostility during World War I.

Furthermore, because of the age of the Big Cypress communities (Spring, Klein, and Cypress had been settled by Germans since at least the 1840s), by 1917 most of the German-Americans living there were second and third generation Americans.\textsuperscript{69} Therefore, many felt they had closer ties to America than to Germany. Consequently, many German-Americans from the Big Cypress reported to their draft boards and some served in the military during World War I. Clearly they saw themselves as Americans first and therefore considered it their duty to answer America’s call to arms. Thornwell Kelb, a descendant of German settlers in the area, put it best when he related a story from his youth:

There was this family [in the area] who had in their attic a picture of Kaiser Wilhelm . . . they had this picture in their living room until World War I came along, they took it and put it in the attic, way back in the attic because, after all we came to America to be Americans. Why try to keep alive somebody’s heritage? Oh we think about it, and may be proud of it, but we’re here to be Americans and so that picture was put back in the attic.\textsuperscript{70}

Unlike other German-American communities in Texas and the United States, the loyalty of the German-Americans of Big Cypress does not seem to have been called into question. Given their proximity to the rapidly growing city of Houston, and the fact that their communities were tight-knit and nearly as old as Houston, they were able to escape the intimidation, hostility, and outright violence that many other German-Americans in Texas experienced.
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Bix Beiderbecke as a German-American

Bix Beiderbecke symbolized the “Jazz Age” in America. His life and legend, based upon anecdotal evidence, oral history and memory, emphasizes his short life (1903–31), his great musical inventiveness, and his substance abuse. However, the influence of ethnicity has never been examined in-depth as a major source of his American musical importance. Fifty years ago, James Burnett, argued that “without his background and upbringing his talent would probably have matured along different lines.”¹ This essay analyzes his background as a way of understanding how he became a jazzer, and how German-Americans played an important role in American musical history.

Bix was the first influential white jazzman in popular American culture. What made Bix stand out among so many jazz musicians in the 1920s was “the curious elusive quality of wistfulness one finds so constantly in Bix’s jazz.”² In the midst of a “hot” jazz band, with its members playing their lungs out, the musical clouds parted and his own lyrical melancholy shines through.”³ With an obvious German-American surname, his musical reputation in the aftermath of World War I, and the anti-German hysteria of 1917–18, may have been diminished at times; today his global reputation remains secure. The European context for Bix’s international jazz reputation is connected to jazz music as a symbol of America. Support for this appears in the memories of Jacques Bureau, famous French co-founder of the Hot Club in Paris in 1932. While languishing in the Fresnes prison, near Paris, imprisoned as an enemy of the Reich during World War II, he retained “his sanity and dreamt of better times while surrounded by brick wall and barbed wire,” by singing to himself “the solos from his favorite Bix Beiderbecke recordings. He knew Bix’s cornet improvisations by heart, . . . , allowing him to create a fantasy world that he could travel to in his own mind, far from the Nazi jail cell.”⁴ Since Bix’s death in 1931, the unique aspects of Bix’s music have been overly emphasized, with historical antecedents overlooked, obscuring the powerful cultural and social forces which influenced the development of Bix Beiderbecke’s music.
His early musical experiences in the Midwest depended upon the larger development of a German-American cultural region within the Midwest. The area where Bix spent the first twenty-three years of his life has been called the German Triangle: the core area defined by a triangle starting in Cincinnati, extending west to St. Louis and northwards to Milwaukee. This is the region where 42% of the eight million Germans who migrated to America settled, and its German-American inhabitants bore the brunt of anti-German hysteria during World War I. The result for Bix’s generation was a feeling of defiance, the rejection of traditional norms, and the belief in individual expression. Of particular interest is how these German-American attitudes resembled the dominant cultural norms of the 1920s for Americans in general. The decade involved not only a Middle Western regional revolt, but also contained assimilation and rejection of one’s ethnic identity. The case study of Bix Beiderbecke, jazz musician, contains elements of both responses.

Bix’s musical genius blossomed in an emerging Midwestern regional culture which matured and received national attention after World War I. The major emphasis in portraying this regional culture has been literary analysis with writers such as Carl Sandburg and Theodore Dreiser placed in a Chicago context, and isolated from any appreciation of their ethnicity and its influence on their writing. Simultaneously, in the area of art history, the regional work of Tom Benton and Grant Wood, became part of a regional movement, similar to Midwestern writers. This essay argues that in this same period of time, the music of Midwestern jazz stands as an analogue: in this respect, Bix was a Midwestern regional musician who reinterpreted popular music into 1920s jazz. By close examination of the diversity of ethnic talent emerging in the early 1920s, a new historical portal can be examined, and the roots of German-American influence upon popular culture clearly established.

There was a confluence of new versions of American music after 1900. Besides traditional marches and waltzes, syncopated music was appearing in many local areas, without an agreed upon label. Both the “cakewalk” and ragtime were originally music invented by black musicians, which was slowly appropriated by white musicians. At the St. Louis World’s Fair of 1904, the musically unique “cakewalk” which originated in a black sub-culture, became something which white musicians performed as their own invention. Simultaneously, ragtime first appeared in American popular culture, but was quickly accepted by English popular culture. Standardized ragtime arrangements were played by the ship’s orchestra of HMS Titanic until the early morning hours of 15 April 1912 when the ship finally sunk into the North Atlantic waters. Scott Joplin, the greatest exponent of ragtime, using the race vernacular of the period, said that “ragtime rhythm is a syncopation original with the colored people, . . . ” Both were overtaken by a third form of
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syncopated music, which fundamentally refers to rhythmic surprise; instead of predictable musical accents, the jazz musician uses an irregular pattern of placing accents between the beats.

One of the agreed upon sources of this new form of syncopation was in the city of New Orleans, where popular music was being called “jass” by 1917; this was applied to dance music which was played with more energy. The term may have begun on the West Coast, according to the vaudevillian, William Demarest (better known as Uncle Charlie on the television show My Three Sons). He recalled that he first heard it in 1908 when directors wanted more energetic playing or “peppy music.” But it was also used a decade later by the Original Dixieland Jazz Band in their first recordings in 1917.

As the wording of “jass” became “jazz,” a type of syncopated music originating from the regional setting of New Orleans began to be transformed into a popular type of music for white consumers, throughout the country. The Original Dixieland Jazz Band (ODJB) was advertised as “Untuneful Harmonists Playing Peppery Melodies,” which on their first recordings sounded like as “odd shrieks and squawks emitted at furious tempos from horns held in tangled formations by grimacing musicians.” When Bix heard their recorded music in his Midwestern home at age fourteen, he began to use his musical experience with traditions of German-American classical and popular music in interacting with the new. Thus two key ingredients were involved: what mattered for Bix was “his German ancestry, and the other is that he didn’t come from New Orleans.”

Careful evaluation makes it clear that by 1923 “there was a whole separate style of Midwest jazz playing, which flourished in and around Indiana and Illinois and Ohio long before the so-called ‘Chicago Style’ became well known.” It was Bix Beiderbecke who led in this regional innovation, developing a Midwestern version of jazz, which in turn became a nationally recorded “sound” as part of the 1920s American popular culture. It was a cultural transmission of New Orleans popular culture, ultimately derived from its infamous red light district of Storyville, but transformed into a new “sound” which was played on radio and finally appeared in Hollywood movies. It became a national version of Dixieland jazz music. Bix, along with other early jazz musicians wrote syncopated dance music which could encompass the “hot” variety. Bix’s first successful band, the “Wolverines,” played a style of jazz that “was in demand only where dancers wanted strong rhythmic stimulants and the excitement of fine improvising, . . . .” It was at this point that the new sound in music, became nationally and internationally defined. Besides these changes in national forms of popular culture, the 1920s was a decade of unrestrained capitalism, and monetary success was also a powerful force upon Bix. His own wealth reflected the success notions of the 1920s.
When Bix played at the Rendezvous and the Derby Café on the north side of Chicago in 1923, he made $25 a week.\textsuperscript{14} By the time he moved to St. Louis in 1925, he earned a weekly salary of $100 and was able two years later to regularly send home a large portion of his $200 weekly salary from Paul Whiteman’s Orchestra. Richard M. Sudhalter has estimated that Bix made approximately $25,000 from his playing during the period 1927–29, which would be equal to about $600,000 in 1990.\textsuperscript{15} From January to April 1928, Bix was at the peak of his earnings, making $300 a week.\textsuperscript{16} But all of this changed because of the Stock Market crash of October, 1929. By 1930 “Bix was broke. The considerable amount of money he had sent home to his sister through the years was lost in the crash; Bix had invested it all in bank stock, and the stockholder’s double liability of those days wiped out his savings.”\textsuperscript{17}

The Beiderbecke family members who watched Bix use his musical gifts, realized the unsavory connotations with jazz music in the 1920s. It seemed to flourish in metropolitan areas where nightclubs or “speakeasies” flourished, and illegal liquor flowed freely. Then again it had originally been sponsored by illegal bordello money in Storyville, the Red-Light district of New Orleans. In New York City, the Cotton Club had Duke Ellington but also mob influence; in Kansas City a neighborhood of joints and jazz clubs provided sponsorship for a young Charlie “Bird” Parker but was controlled by the mobster Tom Pendergast. It was most noticeably a type of music where many of the musicians appeared to be black. The emerging stereotype was one of illegality and immorality, even though the music was played on Mississippi river boats, summer amusement parks, and dance halls. The technology of the record player made the music widely available, leading to the inevitable phrase of describing the 1920s as the Jazz Age.

The German-American background of Bix can be understood not only in the Midwestern cultural assumptions of the early twentieth century, but also by focusing on the Iowa city where he grew up. Davenport was part of an interstate metropolitan area which was unofficially called the Tri-Cities. This urban area of nearly 100,000 in 1910 included Davenport, Iowa plus a large cluster of cities on the Illinois shore, across the Mississippi River in Illinois: Rock Island and Moline. Numerous German-American social institutions, musical organizations, clubs and fraternal groups flourished.

It was within this urban area that a highly structured, German-American cultural network provided musical support to the young Leon Bix Beiderbecke, who was born 10 March 1903 into a musically proficient extended family.\textsuperscript{18} His uncle had belonged to a regionally based zither club and played the cornet professionally; his grandfather was a member of the Germania Männerchor, and his grandmother supported the Tri-City Orchestra, which held its rehearsals in German. Bix’s family consciously used
an “Americanized” approach to their community, and tried to pass this on to Bix and his two siblings. The changing patterns of collective identity meant using a “nonthreatening, low-key public stance” with reticence about any German ancestry. This may have influenced their decision to not name him “Bismarck” after both his father, and the Iron Chancellor of the German Empire. But the last name still presented an obvious ethnic connection, which was not a problem in Davenport or the Midwest when he was born in 1903. His father, Bismarck Herman Beiderbecke (1868–1940), was a businessman who was a partner in a lumber company, and owned many rental properties; his mother was Agatha Jane Hilton (1870–1952), who had attended a local Episcopalian school, St. Katherine’s College Preparatory school for girls, before marrying Bismarck on 7 June 1893. They bought a middle-class house in the eastern half of the city in 1900, far removed from the traditional German neighborhood of his parents. Bismarck and Agatha had many American and German-Americans friends, belonged to the nearby First Presbyterian church and the socially prestigious Outing Club.

From one perspective, Bix was a third-generation German-Iowan: it was Bix’s grandparents who had originally migrated from the Germanic Confederation. His grandfather, Carl Beiderbecke, was born on 20 July 1835 and baptized in the Catholic church, at Benninghausen, Westphalia. As a young man, he migrated first to Indianapolis, Indiana, in 1853 and worked in a grocery, before moving to Dubuque, Iowa, in 1856. He soon moved to Davenport and successfully went into business for himself, marrying Louise Pieper (who was born near Hamburg) on 21 April 1860. As his partnership flourished, and their wholesale grocery company succeeded, he became accepted into the upper-class German-American segment of Davenport society. That acceptance appeared in an invitation to join the Davenport Schützenverein, and expanded when he was elected to the presidency of the First National Bank. His German-American success can be found not only in his position of co-organizer of the Männerchor, but also co-organizer of Davenport’s first public library. He died on 20 October 1901, and the funeral ceremonies symbolized the bi-cultural aspect of Davenport society: Gustave Donald, regionally recognized Speaker of the city’s Central Turnverein, gave an impressive eulogy at home; while the Swiss-American minister of the Unitarian Church, Arthur M. Judy, presided at the graveside ceremonies.

In Davenport, the Freidenker (“free thinker”) contingent carefully coexisted with the New England associations of the Unitarian church and its minister. Although Bix never knew his grandfather, his grandmother, Louise Pieper Beiderbecke quietly influenced him before her death on 27 October 1922, when he was nineteen. She had been born on 18 June 1840 in the Duchy of Holstein, and migrated to America in 1859. Her father August
Pieper joined the 37th Iowa Infantry Regiment on 15 December 1862 at the age of forty-four. This became known as Iowa’s famous Greybeard Regiment, composed of men past draft age who were willing to go to war. After the Civil War, he started a local business, which became successful before his death on 16 December 1889.\(^{23}\) She was known to family members as “Lutie,” and became a major supporter of community musical projects, especially the Tri-City Symphony.

Bix was eight years old when his Grandma traveled with her son, forty-four-year old Carl to the German Empire in 1911.\(^{24}\) After much planning, he and his mother, who was seventy-one, departed from New York City 4 May 1911 on the *George Washington*; this was the third largest ship in the world, and famous for its luxurious appointments.\(^{25}\) They traveled in the safer season after the icebergs of April retreated, arriving in Bremen. They returned on the *Großer Kurfürst* steamship on 19 September 1911.\(^{26}\)

Although part of the American dream of immigrant success, the trans-Atlantic return to Germany was also an opportunity to renew family connections, often decades after the original embarkation. Two comparable trips help to define the aspirational social goals. One example was Hans Hansen (1846–1907) who retired and took his family to Denmark in 1892. He had migrated to Davenport, Iowa, in 1866, and became successful in the wagon-making business, before retiring in 1890. He had been a member in many of the same German-Iowan organizations that Carl and Louise Beiderbecke participated in such as the *Männerchor*, Central Turners, and the *Schützenverein* which contained both a private shooting club and a hugely popular proprietary park with its own trolleycar stop.\(^{27}\) Another example can be found in the experience of Emil Geisler (1828–1910), a teacher and successful land developer who retired in 1885, moving west to Coronado, California. In 1909 he returned to the places of his youth in the northernmost German province of Schleswig-Holstein.\(^{28}\) In both cases, there were elements of social prestige in attaining retirement status as part of the formula for success.

Bix’s early musical education started at home. There were early signs of precocious musical ability: at the age of two, he could pick out “Yankee Doodle” perfectly on the piano, and the next year he could play Liszt’s *Hungarian Rhapsody Number 2* after listening to his sister play it!\(^{29}\) His home offered initial support for his musical talents, and “Little Bickie,” as he was first called by family members, soon added the neighborhood to his audience when he entered public school. This was an easy transition for him because Tyler Grade School was across the street from his family’s house. For fourteen years, Bix gained immensely from the infrastructure of professionally trained, German-American, musical educators in the public schools of Davenport, and one year at Lake Forest Academy, a private, college preparatory school
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near Chicago.

At the age of six he entered first grade on 30 August 1909, and his teacher, Alice Robinson, later recalled that “Bix loved to stand by the piano and play with the class pianist, imitating on the high notes whenever she was playing. He was a dreamy little fellow and was happy finding his own niche rather than joining the larger group.”30 In the summer of 1910, Davenport’s readers learned about Bix when a newspaper feature appeared on the 4th of July. The seven-year-old was called a musical boy wonder, “the most unusual and the most remarkably talented child in music that there is in this city.”31

He was recognized as talented and gifted by Prof. Ernst Otto, director of music for the school system, 1895–1922. This first professionally trained musical educator in Davenport was born in Schönwalde, Duchy of Holstein, in 1865, graduated from the Leipzig and Copenhagen conservatories, and migrated to America in 1879, moving to Davenport in 1885. He had organized Otto’s Orchestra and Military Band the previous year in Chicago, and it quickly became the most popular German-American Band in Davenport. Building upon his credentials for professional educational training, he became the chosen director of a very popular series of Sängerfeste. He had more than fifty songs published, and in 1895 he “was appointed by the board of education as superintendent of music instruction.”32 One of his duties was to go to all grade schools, and monitor the musical instruction. It was said that “whenever Prof. Otto comes to the school he plays the violin and calls upon Bix to play the accompaniment on the piano.”33

He returned to school as a second-grader in Corrie Brown’s class. One of his childhood friends, Mae Steffen, remembered Bix many years later “as a little boy, so small that he sat on a big dictionary to play the piano. He was a cute, dark-haired little kid and very talented. I am sure that even then Bix must have been considered a prodigy.”34 From many accounts he was also a normal boy, who got into scuffles and fights on occasion. One time he had a fight with Phil Adler, who was in the same class as he was. This was the son of E. P. Adler, powerful owner and editor of the Davenport Times newspaper. According to family stories, Phil’s father “received a call from the principal one day requesting that he come to school and take Phil home. When he got to school, he found Phil with two sprained ankles, the result of a fight with a schoolmate, B[ix] B[iederbecke].”35

He had finished second grade and by the late summer of 1911 he contracted scarlet fever and his mother took him out of school for the 1911–12 year. As compensation, his parents engaged Charles Grande, a forty-one-year-old German-Iowan music teacher who lived in Muscatine, a small city about twenty miles south of Davenport, connected by a daily interurban schedule. Grande had graduated from Muscatine High School,
and studied in Berlin for three years before returning to Muscatine, where he taught music for fifty years, well-known and respected enough, to open an additional Davenport office. One illuminating story about this professionally trained, German educator happened during Bix’s weekly lessons. After a few lessons, Bix asked Prof. Grande to play the “next week’s lesson” so he could see how it should be played. Prof. Grande was astonished the next week, when he heard Bix play the lesson in a much improved manner. But after carefully observing his star pupil, he realized that Bix had memorized his performance, because Bix had included the professor’s minor mistakes! This was the second German-American music educator to influence Bix, and his musical abilities continued to develop. By May, 1913 he completed third grade and the first semester of fourth grade. By the fall of 1915, Mildred Colby, his sixth grade teacher “observed that young Beiderbecke participated in classroom singing in a rather special way, adding second or third parts by ear, even when no written parts were furnished.”

As a member of the Beiderbecke family, Bix learned at an early age what the social expectations were for socially prominent German-Americans who were attempting to blend into the more Americanized section of Davenport’s upper middle class status. His parents retained some aspects of their German heritage, but lived on the American side of the city, the East Side, and spent their leisure time in mainstream church or club activities, not the traditional German-American organizations. Bix and his sister were baptized on 20 April 1916, at the Presbyterian Church, only three blocks away. One of Bix’s lifelong friends, Karl K. Vollmer, lived in a higher profile neighborhood of McClelland Heights, further east. Much of the family’s social life centered around the Outing Club, a family-centered organization different from the emerging cachet of country clubs. Instead of golf, the sports consisted of a shooting gallery, bowling alleys, and tennis courts (where Bix later won the tri-city cup in 1923). The club house building offered dining rooms and an upstairs dance floor. The Outing Club was the most prestigious social organization for a family. Its members eschewed golf, and instead insisted upon formal dining, family sports and “coming-out” parties for its daughters who were then introduced to Davenport upper class society. The adolescent Bix took dancing lessons in preparation for future debutante balls and parties. For the Beiderbecke family, outward conformity and compliance with American culture, was always important, and their younger son was remembered by Marie Le Claire Anderson, a descendent of the founder of the city, Antoine LeClaire. Her aunt was principal of Tyler Grade School, and her parents were friends with Bix’s parents. She remembered Bix “in short pants, patent leather shoes and gloves. His hair looked like patent leather, and as she recalled, “he would
come up to me wearing his white gloves, and in those days [when] the young man put his hand over his heart and bowed, the girl got up and curtsied. This meant he was asking you to dance and that you were accepting. Then during intermission, he'd gravitate to the piano and he'd improvise.\textsuperscript{41} The Outing Club remained a social reference point for the Beiderbecks.

Bix's older sibling furthered the family's goal of acceptance by the American world of Davenport. Charles Burnette Beiderbecke (1895-1972), nicknamed “Burnie,” excelled in Davenport High School. He played varsity football, went out for track, was elected class president, and joined one of the secret high school fraternities, Kappa Delta. Later, after graduating from Davenport High School, he entered Iowa State University, in Ames, Iowa. In conformity with the rest of his class, he dropped out his Sophomore year to enter the U. S. Army in April 1917.

Meanwhile, Bix graduated from Tyler Grade School at mid-year, enrolling at Davenport High School in January 1918. In retrospect, one can understand why his teachers expected great things from him: he was a publicly proclaimed “a boy musical wonder,” his brother had been very “successful,” and the family's social position remained unscathed by anti-German hysteria. This was an especially tumultuous time in the Midwest, affecting the important German-American cities of the heartland: St. Louis, Milwaukee, and Cincinnati. For the past four years the German-American organizations of Davenport had taken a leading role in supporting the German Imperial war effort by raising money and sponsoring the sale of government bonds. Public aspects of German culture and traditions were attacked. The teaching of German in Davenport schools was dropped when the State Superintendent of Instruction announced a state-wide ban, and the Davenport Board of Education complied. The immediate suspension of classes “was greeted with applause and enthusiasm, especially by those taking German. However, when the matter of credits was mentioned, most of the eager ones came to life again.”\textsuperscript{42} It turned out that if a student was passing, then credit was given; but there was an expectation of patriotic work in lieu of classes.

An anonymous article in the student edited newspaper, closed by mentioning that the German teachers were fired except for Miss Behnke because she could teach French! Another article explained that all German books had been publicly burned on school grounds, with the tacit approval of the faculty and administration. On a beautiful spring afternoon, about fifty of the lower classmen who had been studying German gathered on the track field north of the building, and piling their books in a heap, saw them go up in a blaze; “the books that had given them so much pain at last vanish forever from their sight.”\textsuperscript{43} Apparently the rest of the students used this as an opportunity for a break from classes. The bonfire also included geography
books which contained photographs of “Kaiser Bill” (the emperor, Kaiser Wilhelm II). Local newspapers described it as a celebration, endorsed by the faculty, who stood by and smoked cigarettes. Not only did more than 500 books get burned, but the students turned it into a patriotic rally with the singing of “America,” the yelling of their class cheer, and general expressions of contempt for all things German.44

While this anti-German hysteria ran its course in Iowa and in the Midwest, Bix lived in a city which received repressive treatment from the national government, with the leaders of its large German-American population openly defying the United States Government from 1917 to 1918.45 While Bix may have remained apart from the popular kids, he continued to live as an ordinary adolescent in high school, even though he had publicly been proclaimed the “boy wonder” in the local newspaper in 1910. The shifting perception of ethnicity changed public opinion, thus following the non-threatening public perception which Russell A. Kazal found to be true in eastern cities such as Philadelphia.46 Warren Postel was two years younger than Bix, and remembered him as “sort of shy, rather quiet, nice looking and a good sand lot ball player.”47 Another classmate was Virginia Gansworth Stange, three years younger, who clearly “remembers ice skating at Vander Veer Park with Bix Beiderbecke who could jump over several park benches.”48 An older girl who graduated with the class of 1920, explained that the general student body knew very little about Bix, and before his junior year, even his jazz music remained unknown.49

Privately, high school marked the first turning point in his life, when his brother returned home from the army, and bought a Christmas present for the entire family, a Columbia gramophone in December 1918 and some popular records, including the Original Dixieland Jazz Band recording of “Tiger Rag.” According to local legend, Bix set the turntable next to the piano and played along with the records and soon bought a second-hand coronet and taught himself how to play. He quickly organized his own jazz band. Warren Postel recalled that “he played the piano at parties, . . .” and now and then he played with a small combo for the Friday dances in the Davenport High School gym.”50 The group stayed together for the summer, playing on the Julia Belle Swain, an excursion boat on the Illinois river near Peoria, Illinois. The combo’s composition became a template for his future musical groups: it had four members, three of whom were German-Americans (Fritz “Putsie” Putzier, Bob Struve, and Bix); this split of ethnicity in his musical groups was a pattern for Bix’s jazz bands, and continued for the next decade. In many ways this was an accurate predictor for his successful period of playing. “So long as Bix found himself in congenial surroundings, with abundant opportunities to indulge his musical appetites, his confidence knew no bounds and his
happiness was complete.”

During the next two years, he concentrated more on music than on his studies. Bix and his musical buddies were able to get paid for a variety of social “gigs” to play as a musical group for various dances. Another musician friend, Esten Spurrier, explained how Davenport was a “very predominant German town, whose music was over legitimate . . . a dotted eighth was a dotted eighth, and a vibrato was verboten, only excusable in a solo, and then used sparingly. . . . we punks who played jazz were frowned on and ridiculed as ‘chassers,’ German accent for ‘jazzers.’” At the same time he followed his older brother in pursuing the family’s Americanization policy. He belonged to a secret high school fraternity at Davenport High School, Delta Theta Sigma, and played at some of their dances. Frederick Potter who had been student at Rock Island High School, across the river in Illinois, was quoted as saying that “while in high school, he [Potter] was social director of the fraternity and frequently arranged for co-fraternity member Bix Beiderbecke to provide the entertainment for social gatherings.”

It was during the spring of 1921, that an adolescent event happened which became the second turning point in Bix’s career. On April 21 Bix and two buddies, “Fritz” Putzier and Bob Struve, the two other German-American members of his school jazz band, were out of school for the day, at loose ends in the afternoon, and may have drunk some “hootch”: bootleg liquor. Since January they had been “hanging around” Davenport’s entertainment district, centered around the newly opened Coliseum, which was a large dance hall, with live entertainment and movies. It was here that Bix heard for the first time, and actually met jazz musicians whom he would befriend later on in his short career. As a kid he met New Orleans cornet players such as Wingy Manone and Emmet Hardy; accompanying them was Leon Rappolo, a clarinetist. This may also have been the first time that Bix smoked marijuana, which was not legally prohibited in Iowa until 1923, but was clearly associated with crime and black musicians. Santo Pecora, trombone player, later said that the musicians smoked “weed” at a vaudeville rooming house. They were the band which supported the exciting Bee Palmer (1898-1967), the risqué “Shimmy Queen” who performed in late March at a nearby Davenport vaudeville house, the Colombia Theatre.

On the afternoon of 21 April 1921, Bix and his friends walked a mile north of Bix’s house, laughing and rough-housing, eventually reaching the alley behind 3030 Grand. The trio saw a young girl playing in the back yard of a small house. They laughed at the little girl, and Bix said something which scared her, before leaving. This five-year-old girl told her parents (Preston Ivens (1892–1957) and Mary (1892–?) who had arrived in Iowa from Chester, Maryland, so Ivens could attend the Palmer School of Chiropractic. The
next day, Ivens confronted the two boys who mysteriously returned to the alley without Bix, and when asked, they said their friend’s name was Leon Beiderbecke. Ivens went to the police station and swore out a complaint; soon after, Lt. Frank J. Lew arrested Bix for “Lewd and Lascivious Act[s] with a Child.” Bix returned home after a bond of $1,500 was posted. The Chief of Police, Charles Boettcher, a German-American veteran of the police force, realized the social prominence of Beiderbecke’s family, and conferred with the County Attorney. All of this is important to understand its impact upon Bix Beiderbecke. From the perspective of the complainant, there was a fusion of conflicting forces. Preston Ivens was a student who would soon be graduating in less than a year. He had registered for the draft in 1917 when he and his wife lived in Pennsylvania; his older brother had been killed in World War I. The tide of anti-German sentiment was receding, but Ivens apparently became incensed when he learned the teenager’s last name was German. The same day, he met with Dr. B. J. Palmer, president of the Palmer School of Chiropractic, who understood first hand, the pain and sorrow of the war: his best friend Elbert Hubbard, and his wife Alice, were drowned on 7 May 1915 in the sinking of the Cunard liner Lusitania by a German submarine. B. J. Palmer had previously stated, “the Lusitania lies at the bottom of the sea, and the soul of Elbert Hubbard went out with her sinking.” However, it seems probable that Palmer’s considerations were complex. He was no stranger to hatred and vilification. His family and the new health care system of Chiropractic had been intensely rejected by medical doctors who regarded B. J. Palmer as a charlatan. The result seems to be caution by Palmer. The Beiderbecke family had lofty social connections in Davenport, and they belonged to the Outing Club, a stronghold of anti-chiropractic belief; an untold number of his patients in the Palmer Clinic were German-American, so his course of action was probably tempered by diplomacy. B. J. Palmer needed positive public relations in Davenport, and was not interested in another court case, since the Palmer School of Chiropractic’s enrollment was growing with a huge class of new students. Finally, he was planning for a year-long journey around the world for his family, which required stability in Davenport. He conferred with Dr. John H. Craven, an instructor at the school, and Cornelius H. Murphy, Ivens’s lawyer. Afterwards, Ivens signed a letter describing the events, and closed by agreeing that it would be “best to drop the case for the betterment of the child.”

This judicial process was certainly hidden for many years and any possible financial settlement was never revealed; in the end, the trial which had been scheduled for September 1921, was dismissed. In Davenport it was viewed as a youthful indiscretion because Bix publicly played in Buckley’s Novelty Orchestra from 23 March until 19 June 1921 when he joined the band on
the excursion steamboat, the Majestic from 21 June to 4 July. Two days later he was in the band on the excursion boat Capitol from 6–16 July. This meant ten days of playing the four beat rhythm of five standard songs: “Dixieland One Step,” “High Society,” “Panama,” “At the Jazz Band Ball,” and “Musk Rat Ramble.” However, his playing ended because he had failed to join the musicians’ union.

A further complication arose which may have been the actual reason for the firing. The owner, Captain Streckfus “insisted on regular rehearsals, and strove for perfection. . . . He would attend rehearsals . . . and if the band failed to keep the proper tempo (70 beats a minute for fox trots and 90 for one steps), somebody got hell.” This insistence on practice and predictability never fitted Bix’s style, and underscored one of his major characteristics: stubbornness. At the same time, this same approach was used by Fate Marable, the Black band leader who discovered Louis Armstrong. He held “his orchestras together with an iron hand. The musicians had to play music strictly for dancing. Marable actually set the tempos with a stopwatch, and that music included popular waltzes and other styles not dear to the hearts of jazzmen—but they always managed, of course, to get their jazz licks in when ever, so to speak, the boss wasn’t looking.”

At age eighteen, with only fourteen credits from Davenport High School, about half the number required for graduation, Bix remained uncertain of his parents’s plans for him in the summer of 1921. In July, he formed the Bix Beiderbecke Five, and played a number of “casual” or one night musical dates until he learned that his parents had gotten him accepted as a Sophomore at Lake Forest Academy, thirty-five miles north of Chicago, and near Ferry Hall, a girl’s college preparatory school. During the 1921–22 school year, there were only 129 students enrolled, but there was football and other sports. Bix’s letters reveal Bix to sound like a very typical prep school student who however was almost nineteen years-old, but still taking freshmen courses. In one letter to his father on 12 October 1921, he asks “how is Oma dad? I have a letter written and mean to send it to her as soon as I can bum a stamp.” He also wrote to his older sister who was engaged to be married; “I’m glad ‘mam’ has a cook, tell her to take it easy and let Bridget do it all.” Apparently the family finances were in good shape, and many of the letters include a request for money. Much of the letters in the fall semester portray Bix as successful as a student, and socially involved with a number of friends. He was an active member of the orchestra, but an old pattern began to appear. Bix had his third experience with a professionally trained German-American musical educator, Prof. Richard Paul Koepke (1867–?) who may have been born in Prussia, lived in Strasburg, and had studied in Paris and Berlin; he was married in 1891 and naturalized in 1922. One of his American friends
at the academy, Julian S. Merigold described how “Mr. R. P. Koepke, head of the music department at Lake Forest Academy, frequently grimaced in pain and agony when Bix would let some of his jazz creep into the playing. His style of playing was so infectious that the others would pick up the beat. Poor Mr. Koepke ended the session for the day.”

A change can be noted during the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays, a year before his grandmother’s death. Bix received permission to go home with his friends for the holidays, friends who lived much closer to Chicago. In January 1922, he organized a “secret band” which began playing in Chicago places where the liquor flowed: the popular night club in the Edgewater Beach Hotel, the Blackstone Hotel in the Loop and at dances hosted by Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois. Other students remember Koepke the same way. Here then is the pattern: the three professionally trained German-American musical educators were initially sources of support for Bix, but eventually for him they represented an old-fashioned approach to music, which was strict and lacked any opportunity for improvisation; they became targets of rebellion for Bix, as had Captain Joseph Streckfus. The end of Bix’s formal education occurred in May when Bix’s group accepted an invitation to provide incidental music at a school assembly. The Headmaster was suitably impressed when Bix’s band played “Rock of Ages,” however, Bix surprised everyone with a Dixieland version of the traditional hymn in syncopated or “cut time.” He was promptly expelled the next day after a formal vote by the faculty.

How did the “musical boy wonder” become a jazz genius? Martin Williams explained that “he looked wherever he could for whatever would help him. Growing up an American of German descent in Davenport, Iowa, he heard all the jazz he could hear—Ragtime was widespread but it had already been sifted of its meaning for jazz by the early twenties.” So Bix used this exposure, and for the next three years he established himself as a jazz cornetist in the Midwest, playing in three different bands which toured the region, appearing at college dances, working with two “house bands,” and taking dance assignments on excursion steamers, country clubs, and summer resorts. In the fall of 1923, his family pressured three board members of the Davenport musician’s union: Ben Ebeling, Prof. Ernst Otto (his former teacher!) and Frank Fich. They finally passed Bix, based upon his musical ability playing the piano, thereby assuring him a local union card. He was awarded a card in the American Federation of Musicians, Tri-Cities (Davenport) Local 67 on 1 October 1923. He continued to find short-term jobs in Cincinnati, Chicago, and St. Louis. Finally, he joined a new group, the Wolverine Orchestra, which was in the vanguard of a new phenomenon—jazz and dance bands which toured by automobile and train to supplement
Bix Beiderbecke as a German-American

The Wolverines played at universities, and like other college bands, they played both dance music and “hot” jazz for their audience. “Most important to the rise of jazz, the element that put it over, was, of course, the dancers. Dance and the music are inseparable.” In 1924 and 1925 he played for periods of time in Chicago, and worked at summer resorts along the Great Lakes. Of major importance was how Bix learned to understand his audience’s taste in emerging popular music; they in turn interacted with Bix and his emerging style. He appeared in formal attire, as an upper-class preppie, with publicly perceived immaculate manners; but at the same time he delivered the forcefulness of an improvisational style of music, transforming black jazz into a Midwestern version. By returning to Chicago “speakeasies,” he maintained a friendship with Black musicians, such as Louis Armstrong. Their two approaches to jazz were fundamentally different, with Bix always wanting to fit into the band, and Armstrong always dominating; Bix played the cornet, Armstrong switched to the trumpet. As an indication of that interesting friendship, Armstrong’s agent had him dedicate the first volume of his autobiography *Swing That Music* to Bix, Eddie Lang and King Oliver (1936); in his second volume, *Satchmo: My Life in New Orleans* (1954), he stated that “every musician in the world knew and admired Bix. . . . We all respected him as though he had been a god.” It seems clear that Black musicians respected Bix as unusual in the segregated world of 1920s jazz. One of Bix’s New York acquaintances, a Black jazz musician, Louis Metcalf, recalled that Bix “would come uptown and blow with us, eat with us, sleep with us. He was one of us.”

Bix’s creativity extended into transforming what he viewed as Classical Jazz. Very quietly Bix improved upon the basic repertoire of the Original Dixieland Jazz Band by mixing their “raucous jocularity with his poised, declarative, and harmonically advanced improvisations,. . . . [He] brought a new, more contemplative artistic sensibility to an older, more slapstick repertoire.” Bix modified the first of eleven key songs in the Original Dixieland Jazz Band repertoire, including “Clarinet Marmalade” which Bix later recorded with the Whiteman Orchestra in 1927. Bix’s genius was to use “a greatly expanded melodic and harmonic vocabulary.” The Wolverines, gained a reputation for a more controlled and disciplined syncopation, after Bix joined the group. After their first great recording session, Bix said “softly, ‘I am not a swan,” which was his way of saying ‘I love it.” This session was held at the Gennett Studios in Richmond, Indiana and resulted on 20 June 1924 in a recording of “Royal Garden Blues.” Years later, Charles Edward Smith selected this event as a major turning point in jazz. “Bix took an ad. lib. chorus in this piece, a tradition of uncertain origin in jazz bands, and this...
innovation which permits of a number of bars at the pleasure of the soloist is one of the most important features of blues and jazz.”

The third turning point in his career was a combination of “lucky breaks” which led to Bix spending a successful, productive and happy year in St. Louis. He originally had met Frankie Trumbauer, a C-melody saxophonist, in Davenport after hearing the Benson Orchestra on 24 April 1923. More than a year later they became better friends in Detroit when Bix was briefly part of the Goldkette Band, and then mid–June 1926 Bix agreed to work in his band in St. Louis, starting in mid-August. This marked the most stable period in his adult life, and one of the most creative: he lived in three upscale hotels (miraculously the Majestic, the Art Deco styled Coronado and the Chase are still in use as hotels); had the friendship and support of Trumbauer while perfecting his musical craft; had a steady girl friend to stabilize his social life; and he was still able to continue drinking, albeit in a more hidden fashion. This was the only time that Bix he had what outsiders would have considered a “normal” life.

Bix joined with the Trumbauer (“Tram”) band in early September where they played at the Arcadia Ballroom (the name conjured up a famous New York ballroom), strategically placed near the campus of St. Louis University. There were two musical units; the house band, the “Arcadian Serenaders” (with Bix’s friend from Chicago, Wingy Manone, a one-armed musical comedian whom Bix had heard in Davenport in 1921) alternated with Trumbauer’s band. This was the better band which also played at the exclusive Racquet Club after hours, proms at the Statler Hotel, and weekend trips by train to Indiana University and Carbondale, Illinois.

Frank Trumbauer’s background was rooted in the German-American towns in the St. Louis metropolitan area. His father, Fred Trumbauer (1873–1943), was born in Germany, and with his family, moved to Iowa’s Linn County. After marriage, he moved his family to southwestern Illinois, but a decade later divorced his wife, so his son lived with his grandparents. His wife remarried and worked as a saxophone teacher and movie house pianist in St. Louis, while their son eventually entered the navy in 1917. In many ways Trumbauer became a “Dutch uncle” for Bix, although only a few years older, as their careers became entwined and their national reputations grew. Although he stayed with the Paul Whiteman Band for a few years after Bix died, he eventually retired from music. “Frank Trumbauer is unique in jazz history, for he is the only musician known to have suffered artistic death at second hand.” His musical success and influence was primarily contingent upon working with Beiderbecke, and their later success can be dated from that one year in St. Louis. On the surface, Bix seemed to be happy when the holiday season rolled around in St. Louis. Trumbauer explained that Bix “was
saving his money, had plenty of clothes, and was playing golf and looked wonderful.” But “Tram” lived with his family in south St. Louis, far away from the hotels where Bix lived a very carefree and alcoholic life.

Another perspective on this period of time comes from the memoirs of Pee Wee Russell (1906–69), who was born in the middle-class neighborhood of Maplewood, in suburban St. Louis, but had become a teenage alcoholic. He was only fourteen when he played for various society bands to support his habit including the St. Louis Club, and the Coronado Hotel Orchestra.

Russell had attended the Western Military School in Alton for one year, and then dropped out in 1921 (as did the regionalist artist Thomas Hart Benton), much as Bix had done at the Lake Forest Academy. Also like Bix, Russell had heard great Black bands playing on the Streckfus Line excursion boats St. Paul and J. S. … “I worked afternoons, … . The ‘name’ bands worked nights. We’d go up to Keokuk and Davenport on the Streckfus Line boats. … we hit it right off. We were never apart for a couple of years—day, night, good, bad, sick, well, broke, drunk.” From this perspective, Bix’s time in St. Louis was a continuation of his Chicago experience. They would usually hang out at Joe Harway’s speakeasy near the Arcadia Ball Room. He also found black night clubs in the Mill Creek Valley like John Estes’s Chauffeur’s Club on West Pine, the Westlake, or the Tremps Bar on Delmar. The two of them eventually rented an apartment in Granite City, Illinois, across the Mississippi river from St. Louis where it was much easier to get booze. Pops Foster, Black New Orleans bassist, recalled that “The colored and white musicians were just one. … We used to all pile in Bix’s car and go over to Katie Red’s in St. Louis and drink a lot of bad whisky.”

But Bix also enjoyed a surface life of greater normality. He started dating soon after meeting another young German-American, Ruth Shaeffner until the band broke up in late May 1926. It became even more “cozy” for the band members when her sister, Estelle, started dating Pee Wee Russell, while her other sister Bessie, started dating “Bud” Hassler. Bix was able to enjoy a comfortable life style with his salary of $100 a week and by mid-November he moved to Room 608 at the Coronado Hotel on Lindell, which was much closer to the Arcadia Ballroom. The hotel had been built in 1925 at the cost of $4 million and was an outstanding example of Art Deco style. An attending physician in the 1920s usually meant a safe and discreet source of liquor; an additional bright spot was an exclusive club in the basement which featured local bands on the weekends. This was the location for one of the society bands that Pee Wee Russell had played with earlier. Bix thrived and after his birthday in March 1925 moved into the Chase Hotel, even more upscale, with 500 rooms and nine stories tall. At the 29 September 1922 opening,
Paul Whiteman’s Pavillion Royale Orchestra played for the festivities, which added a certain jazzy Prunk, or aura of panache to his new hotel apartment.94

The most important musical development for Bix was that he learned to read music. Trumbauer recalled that when he hired him for the band, “Bix had a screwy way of pecking out notes from a violin part, playing them in the key of ‘C’ on a ‘B Flat’ coronet. It was confusing to everyone, even Bix! We fixed up a book of regular trumpet parts and for hours on end, I would work with Bix.”95 The process worked and Bix eventually could do a workman-like job of reading music. Tram had been able to teach Bix basic note reading which he incorporated into his improvisational music. He now had a standard sound to play “against,” in a way the rest of the band could follow. For Bix’s music to work, there had to be a steady, driving rhythm, which resulted in the audience hearing his leaps of fancy in opposition to the basic rhythm. In his early experience with German-American march music, and the formally timed dance music of his Davenport days, Bix now created more permanently, his own personal musical language, or “rhetoric of music.”

James Burnett explained that “when we listen to a typical Bix solo, in whatever mood—vigorously thrusting or romantically reflective—we are conscious of a unique and sharply personal voice expressing significant contents on its own terms. . . . we are aware of something which is autonomous, which exists in and for itself and is not simply a derivative of another style or a different technique.”96 During the ten months in St. Louis, Bix and Tram created a special style of jazz music, the format of the “chase” chorus. George Avakian explained it by saying the “Bix plays two bars, Tram plays two. Bix answers and so on, for the whole chorus. They keep the melodic line going in one continuous improvisation, . . . .”97 This brought out the very best in Bix’s experimentation, which created repeat customers who wanted to come back to dance and listen to “hot jazz” variations from the last time. With greater confidence in reading music, Bix created a following of customers who loved listening to the typical “chase chorus” of the jazz band by creating an improvised “dialogue” with Tram with musical statements and response.

Besides the qualitative improvement from playing with “Tram,” Bix and Russell developed in another direction. Pee Wee Russell explained this way: “The thing about Bix’s music is that he drove a band. He more or less made you play whether you wanted to or not. If you had any talent at all he made you play better. It had to do for one thing with the way he played lead. It had to do with his whole feeling for ensemble playing.”98 Russell had talent and interacted with Bix’s experimental musical language. He recalled that “we built nifty little things into our arrangements that were so risky, or better music of that time that more than one of the managers . . . came to us and said, ‘For God’s Sake! What are you doing? . . . Of course we could not
Almost ninety years ago, Bix created modern concepts of jazz, and certainly fulfilled a typical version of this: “to sustain and destabilize—that’s as good a definition of . . . jazz,. . . .” By the holiday season, the band was in “full swing.” Bix wrote Hoagy Carmichael a letter on 15 December 1925: “We have absolutely the hottest band in the country. We’re playing at the Arcadian here nightly and are panicking the town.”

At the same time, Bix still continued his family’s idea of Americanization by attending performances of the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra with his friends Bud Hasler and Pee Wee Russell. Of the ten programs that trio attended on Friday afternoons between 6 November 1925 and 12 March 1926, Bix heard classical, romantic and modern composers. The orchestra played many standard selections with excerpts from Beethoven, Schumann, Brahms, Bach, Beethoven, Hayden, Schubert, Brahms, Mendelsohn and Handel. These were certainly familiar to Bix from his musical childhood, but he now heard them as a professional musician, and for the first time he considered them as possibly being incorporated them into jazz. There were also performances of the Russian romantic musicians: Rachamaninoff, Borodin, Tschalkowsky and Rimsky-Korsakoff; Strauss symphonic music; and the all Wagnerian program of 5 March 1926. This was a compelling line-up of both romantic and modern music which influenced Bix for the remainder of his short career.

The nine months in St. Louis were productive for Bix and the result was the end of his regional apprenticeship. He would never again have the time and the friendship of two equally talented musicians. Tram and Pee Wee Russell “were often compelled towards a more advanced musical idiom than was the current in jazz. Only Bix and Pee Wee were gifted enough to realize the implications. . . . But Bix died before his personal development had gone far enough. . . . But the trends were there—and Trumbauer was deeply involved in them.” By May 1926, Bix intuitively made decisions which influenced the rest of his life. Probably the most profound was fitting his Chicago experiences into his brief St. Louis period: “he found that the stalest cliché at the Chauffeur’s Club [a Black night club] could bring down the house at the Arcadia. Beiderbecke gained an enthusiastic following among White jazz fans for playing music that they could have heard everywhere if segregation had not limited Black artists to mostly Black audiences.” But he continued to modify and experiment with the jazz he heard, and translated it into an acceptable sound for customers wanting to dance.

At age twenty-three, the public perception of Bix became fixed as a jazz musician’s musician, and his “curious individuality as a jazz musician, and his rare ability to evoke in the listener a range of emotions not so common in jazz as one thinks.” Richard Sudhalter has remarked that the legends and
stories about Bix developed out of a post-adolescent Sehnsucht or yearning for what was lost.\textsuperscript{106} For his friends and admiring colleagues, he remained an enigma. “Introverted, sensitive, generous, shy, fatalistic, humorous and above all, scattered—these character descriptions of Bix Beiderbecke were known by the people ‘who knew him well’”; but even they “have admitted that they never quite made sense out of it, except as a musician.”\textsuperscript{107} Duncan Schiedt has expressed this view of Bix as a flawed hero of the Roaring Twenties. “It was as if he were the embodiment of young idealism, the innocence that still lay deep in their own makeup, layered over as it might be with veneers of commercialism.”\textsuperscript{108} The opposite view by Benny Green, has stressed the sameness of the story: “a natural musician . . . becomes déclassé thorough his inability to ignore his own powers. He drifts into an artistic cul-de-sac, drinks too much and dies.”\textsuperscript{109}

There is also the continuing story about Bix's difficulties in being part of a traveling band such as Paul Whiteman’s Orchestra. In the 1940 film, \textit{Second Chorus}, Fred Astaire plays the character Dannie O’Neill, “a minor-league jazz trumpeter [who] dismisses the idea of joining Whiteman with the comment, ‘Too big a band for me. If I’d’ve stayed with him, I’d’ve lost my individuality. Same thing happened to Bix.’”\textsuperscript{110} Knowing his Davenport background, and educational experiences provides an important perspective on the last years of his life because “Bix remained intellectually unaware of the process that had taken hold of him, unable to rationalize its effects, unable to help the process along, unable to opt out for the simple reason he was hardly aware he had ever opted in.”\textsuperscript{111}

On 20 May 1926, Bix and Pee Wee left St. Louis in order to join one of Goldkette’s summer dance bands, and the fourteen weeks in Hudson Lake, Indiana was the last time Bix followed the pattern of a season from September through May, following the college calendar, with a very different summer time experience. During that summer of 1926, Bix worked to incorporate modern masters into the emerging canon of jazz. In some ways this was a compromise with the Beiderbecke family’s position of Americanization. The result was the Modern Piano Suite: “In a Mist” was the first of four impressionistic and lyrical pieces: “Candle-Lights,” “Flashes,” and “In the Dark.” For the remaining five years of his life, he continued to work daily on his music. “Numerous colleagues recalled him at the piano, ‘fooling around with modern stuff,’ in the words of trombonist Newell ‘Spiegel’ Willcox, seemingly at every opportunity.”\textsuperscript{112}

After 1926, Bix’s music, which had been a regionally defined form of popular music, called by some Midwestern jazz, intersected with a nationalized audience, and became the popular culture version of “Dixieland Jazz.” It was this Upper Midwest area which “had its own identifiable style, a band sound
and rhythmic outlook [where] . . . the Midwesterners bounced; ardent fans, defined the way they played as ‘sock-time,’ giving the impression of being at once tight and relaxed.”

Bix had his first experience with radio when the Goldkette summer band did several broadcasts on WSBT, a South Bend radio station. It was during this last “lake summer” engagement, that Bix and Tram visited Jean Goldkette in Detroit, who had several orchestras ready for regional tours. He named Trumbauer the head of one of the orchestras; soon thereafter, Bix returned to Detroit, where he joined the combined Goldkette Orchestra.

By joining a jazz band which also recorded on a regular basis, Bix gained a potential source of permanence to present to a national audience the sound that Bix, Tram and Pee Wee had invented in St. Louis. Eventually the Goldkette Orchestra traveled to St. Louis for the Independence Day weekend. After a month’s hiatus, they returned to New York City for a few weeks, and it was during this period that Bix sat down and played his first composition for a recording of “In a Mist.” Hoagy Carmichael later described the sound as having “a grayish-white sound, a Germanic sound that colors his best work.”

Soon after he joined Paul Whiteman and his national touring orchestra. During the next year of his life, Bix experienced the apogee of his career. After some preliminary contact, an agreement was made with Paul Whiteman, and both Tram and Bix joined his band in Indianapolis on 28 October 1927. Whiteman billed himself as “The King of Jazz,” and his success in the latter half of the 1920s came from his popular combination of dance music and the latest jazz numbers. A few days later, the band was in St. Louis, where Bix and Tram had many friends; the band stayed for November, before a recording session at the end of the month in New York City. When Bix became a member of the group, he successfully challenged Whiteman’s long-time lead cornetist, Henry Busse. In a later recording session of 25 November 1927, Whiteman’s arranger assigned solo spaces to both Busse and Bix for recording “Mary.” Busse’s preference for a muted trumpet initially stated the theme, and from a contemporary account, Bix took “over the brasses for the verse, delivering them and the entire ensemble into the sunshine of swing. Toward the end of the performance, Bix begins his flaming eight-bar improvisation with an important rip and, leading the brasses in contrapuntal figures, [and] all but drowns out Busse’s reprise of the theme.”

Matty Malneck, violinist and arranger, recalled that when Bix came into the Whiteman orchestra, “Busse didn’t dig that kind of music. There was a disagreement in principle, a disagreement in thought. The diehards in the band never wanted Bix and Trumbauer.”

Underneath the myth of musical differences of opinion, there was
tension which becomes more understandable by realizing the ethnic context. Karl Gert zur Heide has made the connection that Bix’s paternal grandfather came from Benninghausen in Westphalia, while Busse was born in nearby Magdeburg. He understood enough German to face Busse’s criticism. Heinrich Busse (1894–1955) arrived in America in 1910, and moved to San Francisco by 1917; he played the trumpet with Whiteman’s Orchestra from 1918–28, specializing in mutes, fast vibrati, and playing upon a facial resemblance to Whiteman. He had accompanied the orchestra when it went to England in 1923, the two extended American tours of 1924–25, and the tour to Germany in June 1926. When Whiteman gave the members a break from 5–19 June, Henry Busse took Paul Whiteman’s sister Vanda Whiteman, to tour the area around Magdeburg where his father still lived. A year later, Busse was the highest paid member of the band at $350 per week.

The recording session was followed by performances in Chicago and Cleveland by early December 1927. For the first four months of 1928, Whiteman’s Band stayed on the East Coast, centered in New York City. It was on Tuesday night, 24 April 1928, that the NBC national radio network featured Whiteman’s band at midnight. This was the show where Bix played his composition “In a Mist,” which was carried live on WOC-AM radio in Davenport, Iowa. His mother’s public comment was that “we can always tell when Bix’s horn comes in. . . . The air is carried out by the other cornetist, but the sudden perky blare and the unexpected trills—those are the jazz parts, and they are Leon’s.” This was followed six months later when Bix played “In a Mist” in Carnegie Hall on 7 October 1928, as part of Whiteman’s the centerpiece solo for his “Third Experiment in Modern Music.” Two weeks later the band was touring the southern states, appearing in New Orleans on 28 October 1928. There were two concerts at the St. Charles Theater, and at the start of the second one, Whiteman gave Bix twenty minutes to play “Dinah” and other solos; later that evening Bix met with Nick La Rocca, his childhood jazz idol from the Original Dixieland Jazz Band who was now retired, at a big party.

In the space of six months, Bix had reached his intuitionally defined life goals, which coincided with his family’s view of successful Americanization. This was emphasized by Whiteman’s occasional tutorials for the young Bix, which paralleled the St. Louis experience. “Bix Beiderbecke, bless his soul, was crazy about the modern composers . . . but he had no time for the classics. One evening I took him to the opera. It happened to be Siegfried. When he heard the bird calls in the third act, with those intervals, that are modern today, when he began to realize the leitmotifs of the opera were dressed, undressed, disguised, broken down, and built again in every conceivable fashion, he decided that old man Wagner wasn’t so corny after all.
and that swing musicians didn’t know such a helluva lot.”

By the end of Bix’s career, Paul Whiteman remained a strong supporter of Bix and his music. The “King of Jazz” was unique in his role as an impresario who combined classical music, the semi-classical music of Victor Herbert, the latest popular music, and jazz. “Far from being the stodgy and complacent money-maker . . . [.] Whiteman was in fact a restless experimental musician always open to new ideas.” When he began to be recognized, an early New Yorker profile captured him in print as a thirty-six-year-old man who was “flabby, virile, quick, coarse, untidy, and sleek, with a hard core of shrewdness in an envelope of sentimentalism, striped ties, perspiration and fine musical instincts.” His success with the Aeolian Hall concert of Gershwin’s “Rhapsody in Blue,” on 12 February 1924, was based not only on the idea of “an experiment in music,” but establishing himself as the leading proponent of new types of jazz and featuring a parody of the Original Dixieland Jazz Band, which had been Bix’s inspiration since 1918.

It was at this high point in his career, when drinking caught up with Bix and destroyed his life. He had been a heavy drinker since 1921, and in the fall of 1922, the first independent report of his alcoholism appeared. Bix was part of a six-piece jazz band that played briefly in Syracuse, New York; Eddie Condon recalled the reaction of an old friend of Bix’s from Davenport, Wayne Hostetter. Hostetter, who knew German-Iowan cultural values, accepted liquor availability in cities such as Davenport, although it had been illegal in the state of Iowa since the 1880s. Although the generally acknowledged support for Personal Freedom had been legally abridged by the Prohibition amendment to the U. S. Constitution, Hostetter was surprised at Bix’s tolerance for hard liquor. The band members liked the cheap “booze” available in Syracuse, New York, where they were playing. The cost was ten beers for one dollar, but Condon explained that Bix had a fondness for the more expensive alcohol mixed with cherry pop and fake gin. He started to become dependent upon the gin before performing. And with the exception of the “double life” he had led in St. Louis, he did little to follow a sober version of his family’s career views; he became entrenched in the musical culture of alcoholism; it was certainly not a uniquely German-American behavior, but his character trait of stubbornness remained. “There was a single-minded dedication to perfecting his own concept of jazz but, working against him, a defiance of authority and accepted behavior that finally prevented Bix from attaining the artistic satisfaction that should have been his.”

The beginning of the end was not inevitable, but it cast a long shadow on the last three years of his life. The recurring pattern was one of breakdown, rehabilitation, and brief recovery. There were still flashes of brilliance left in Bix’s playing. When Bix and Tram returned to St. Lois again with the
Whiteman Band, they played spectacularly well again at the Washington University Field House on 31 May 1929. “The shock of being no longer able to hold his place in Whiteman’s band” was immense; “the golden door was being slammed in his face, and for the rest of his life Bix seems not to have cared very much what else happened to him.”

During 1929, Bix’s career began to recede. Otis Ferguson, the gifted reviewer of the New Republic, who first recognized Bix’s importance to jazz in the late 1930s, commented that the drinking took a while, but eventually destroyed him. “He lacked a natural brake in that; and his constitution was so good to start with that he wasn’t retarded physically until he’d blown the fuse on the whole works.”

The end of his real hopes and dreams may have occurred in the summer of 1930. He had continued to correspond with his former girl friend, Ruth Schaffner, from St. Louis. In one of his last letters, he explained that “I’m joining Paul [Whiteman] again in two weeks in Chicago from where we go to New York and then possibly London, Eng. for a few weeks to be present at the premier of the picture ‘King of the Jazz Revue.’” This was mere speculation and he never went to Europe, although his parents did. It seems hard to believe that in the first year of what was known as a “business depression,” Bix’s parents and his aunt and uncle went on a trip to Europe, on the Hamburg-American Line SS Cleveland. It had been two decades since Charles had traveled with his mother “Lutie”; for his wife Adele, and his brother Bismarck and sister-in-law Agatha, it was a first-time event. In late 1929 the rate for North German Lloyd’s Bremen was $325 for a first class ticket. By the next summer eastbound travel was off 18% by the end of June, when round trip tourist cabin tickets were selling for $200–$250. At this time a gallon of gas cost $.10; an approved master recording of a jazz group was about $100. They planned on leaving Davenport on 15 April to visit their daughter, before leaving on a tour to England, France and Switzerland arranged by a Chicago travel agency, and returned on 11 August 1930. During the summer of 1930, Bix was in New York City, trying to find any kind of work. In the midst of this, he briefly met his family when they returned from Europe in early August. He also tried to gain some publicity with a “trial balloon.” In the weekly column this news item appeared: “Bix Beiderbecke starting his own band. Formerly with Whiteman Orchestra and wants Whiteman to manage him.”

A year later Bix was dead at the age of thirty-one, and the process of editing and myth-making began to hide the importance of German-American ethnicity in his career. The trajectory of his musical development was greatly aided by the German-Iowan infrastructure which he encountered throughout his short life. The intersection of his regionally based early jazz
with the popular culture of the late 1920s suggests the continuing influence of his year in St. Louis. The result was a musical greatness which came from German-American influences.

Scott Community College
Bettendorf, Iowa
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Genealogy versus History: Generating Synergy

Anyone studying the history and culture of the German element in North America or, indeed, any branch of immigration studies has likely experienced the phenomenon. A researcher walks into the library of a local historical society or a state archive and finds him- or herself working alongside a genealogist. In fact, the historical researcher may well have reason to envy the genealogist. While the historian seeks a pattern in the life stories of a thousand, often nameless, individuals, the genealogist pursues the minute details of the life of a single individual. Generally, the genealogist has the name of an ancestor to work from. He or she is intimately familiar with census records, ship lists, city directories, and the papers and diaries of this or that family, religious congregation, or organization. Yet, one could argue that the genealogist approaches the task of assembling historical data with a distinct bias. The focus on a single individual or family necessarily narrows the researcher’s perspective on the material.

There is a certain natural tension between history and genealogy. That tension is often heightened when one is dealing with the history of a specific immigrant group. Perhaps more than in many other intellectual endeavors, the need to generalize is at odds with the need to discern the highly individualized influences behind the decision to relocate. Scholars who seek to understand the forces which drive immigration must of course try to identify trends and commonalities amidst a variety of competing factors. Most will attempt to reduce myriad individual motives and decisions and hundreds of contributing influences to a single narrative.

The resultant narrative can vary widely in emphasis, however. In the field of German-American studies there are examples as different as Rudolf Cronau’s *Drei Jahrhunderte deutschen Lebens in Amerika*¹ or his *German achievements in America*² on the one hand and Robert Frizzell’s *Independent Immigrants*³ or Kathleen Conzen’s *Germans in Minnesota*⁴ on the other.

Cronau celebrates the degree to which the traditions and values ostensibly
inculcated in certain individuals from birth influence their accomplishments in their adopted homeland. He seems to have extrapolated the genealogist’s interest in the history of a single family to an examination of all those of German heritage taken as a group, attributing to all those of German heritage a certain “family resemblance.”

Conzen and Frizzell use records of the everyday experience of German-speaking immigrants as a framework within which to better understand the settlement of the American heartland. Both document the lives of individual immigrants. In fact, Frizzell is investigating the migration of a disproportionately large number of inhabitants from a single tiny village in the area of Hanover to a very circumscribed area of northwestern Missouri. Yet the focus is finally on the historical forces which play themselves out in the immigrant experience of certain individuals from German-speaking lands.

The present discussion seeks a middle ground between a narrow family chronicle and a broader study of German-speaking immigrants to North America. The focus here is on three different individuals, unrelated to one another, who are connected only by the fact that they left a German-speaking area of Europe and emigrated to a relatively similar geographical area. They enter the United States or the American colonies, as the case may be, in three different centuries and follow very different paths as they settle in. None might be considered a man of extraordinary achievement, although each made his mark within his limited sphere of influence. Each, of course, had a family as well. In fact, in all three cases a descendent supplied the basic biographical facts which provide the framework for the larger narrative.

There are differences among the stories, but each details the forces at play on both sides of the Atlantic in motivating an individual to emigrate and in shaping his experience in the New World. The goal is to allow the lives of three individuals to illuminate the narrow historical and geographical circumstances of the period in which they lived and to let those circumstances in turn deepen our understanding of the life of each of the three German immigrants. In his recent article with the tantalizing title, “Elvis and Other Germans,” Walter Kamphoefner urges scholars in German-American Studies to provide as much context as possible for each observation or assertion made. It is in that spirit that the three vignettes which follow here are offered.

The story to be told here then is of three immigrants from German-speaking territories in Europe who ultimately settled in the colony established by Cecil Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, on the shore of the Chesapeake Bay or its successor American state, Maryland, which honors Queen Henrietta Maria, the wife of England’s King Charles I, by taking her name. The first, Moritz Wörschler, left the Palatinate in 1752 and arrived in Baltimore around 1758, having spent his first years in southern Pennsylvania. Vincent Potthast
sailed from Bremerhaven directly to Baltimore in 1891, and Kurt Möller was born in Pomerania in present-day Poland and arrived in Annapolis in 1948.

**Moritz Wörschler (1719–ca. 1795)**

Moritz Wörschler was born on 4 December 1719 in Herxheim am Berg in the Palatinate. Moritz was the sixth of the ten children of the shoemaker Johannes Wörschler and his wife Anna Catharina, née Lutz. Moritz married Anna Elisabeth Stuffus in Trippstadt, his bride’s hometown, on 31 October 1741. By the time of his marriage he had established himself as a school teacher in nearby Stelzenberg, where the couple subsequently lived and worshiped. On 27 May 1749, after almost precisely eight years and eight months of marriage, Elisabeth gave birth to a baby boy, Johann Friedrich. The child died just short of ten months later on 21 March 1750, and there is no evidence that the couple ever had any more children. Given both the number of years it seems to have required Elisabeth to conceive the first time and the general tendency toward numerous children at the time, it seems likely that Moritz and Elisabeth had no other children even after they settled in America.

Moritz and Elisabeth must have remained in Stelzenberg until at least early 1751 as Moritz is listed as a sponsor at the baptism of Anna Elisabetha, daughter of Johann Nickel Lüttig and his wife Maria Magdalena on 9 November 1750. After that, there is no record of either Moritz or Elisabeth in church records, although Moritz is listed as a baptismal sponsor in a couple of earlier instances. Presumably the two of them emigrated to America in the late spring or summer of 1751. Information is sketchy, but it is very likely that Moritz and his wife traveled a route similar to that taken by many from the Palatinate, including two of Moritz’s brothers and one of his sisters. That voyage would have taken Elisabeth and Moritz down the Rhine to Rotterdam and from there to Philadelphia with likely a stop in Portsmouth, England.

Although there is no documentary evidence of the Wörschlers in the colonies until 1758 when Moritz and Elisabeth served once again as baptismal sponsors, it is likely that the two settled almost immediately upon arrival in what is now Adams County, Pennsylvania, in the area known as Bermuda Springs between Gettysburg and Carlisle. Moritz’s older brother, Johannes, had been in the area since 1741. His sister, Anna, and her husband arrived in the area in fall 1752, and the youngest brother, Heinrich, and his wife and daughter left Trippstadt for south-central Pennsylvania around 1753. Moritz and Elisabeth likely moved to Baltimore in late 1758 or early 1759. By 1760, Wörschler is definitely living in Baltimore, where he leads an active and somewhat colorful life for at least twenty years.

As Moritz becomes active in Baltimore, the family history of the
Wörschlers in America intersects in a significant way with the growth and development of what would become Maryland’s major city. It is worth noting here that the history of German settlement in Maryland differs markedly from that of other states along the eastern seaboard. Although there were early settlements of individuals from German-speaking territories in the tidewater area around the present border with Delaware, Germans settled primarily in the western section of the colony initially, in many cases entering from Pennsylvania many miles inland.

Sherry Olson estimates that by the middle of the eighteenth century Baltimore was “a mere village of twenty-five houses.” When Moritz arrived almost a decade later it would not have been much larger, although growth accelerated during the 1760s. The town of Baltimore was originally laid out in 1730 in sixty lots of approximately one acre each rising from the riverbank in the south to high bluffs in the north and to the marshes adjacent to the Jones Falls in the east. On the eve of the Revolutionary War there were almost six hundred houses built on approximately two-hundred acres.

Maurice Wersler, as Moritz was often listed on legal documents, seems to have quickly become an active member of the community. His name appears frequently as a witness in real estate transactions, of which there were many in the burgeoning town. When his occupation is mentioned, it is as a school teacher, which seems logical in view of the fact that he had held a similar position in Stelzenberg. Documents in the archives of Zion Lutheran Church in the City of Baltimore attest to the fact that Moritz was, indeed, the first schoolmaster at Zion, a significant fact in itself, made even more notable by the fact that Moritz’s tenure preceded the well-known Scheib School by seventy-five years.

But Moritz was much more than schoolmaster to the congregation. Following a practice replicated in other Lutheran and Reformed churches in the seventeenth and in the eighteenth century, schoolmaster Wörschler served as chief clerk and administrator in the early years when the number of congregants was small and good advice and assistance at a premium. He was deputized in a number of instances to speak for the young, struggling congregation, the first and, for many years, the only German Lutheran congregation in Baltimore. He also participated financially in the purchase of a package of land parcels bounded by Holliday, Saratoga, Gay, and Lexington Streets on which the present church building sits and on which the first wood frame church was built. Indeed, Moritz’s ability to support the purchase of the church property as well as a number of additional land purchases seem to indicate a source of income beyond that of schoolmaster. In addition, Moritz was a signatory on both the first and the second Zion constitutions (1769 and 1773 respectively) and served with the first group of elders.
Moritz was also an outspoken opponent of what he considered the anglicization of Zion. Although the question of whether or not to conduct services exclusively in German with appropriate liturgical texts was one which lasted well into the nineteenth century, the issue was at the heart of discussions concerning the survival of the struggling congregation. Although Moritz’s point of view had its adherents, it had powerful opponents, particularly in the person of Dr. Charles Frederick Wiesenthal, a well-known Maryland physician and stalwart supporter of Zion. As Klaus Wust expresses it:

The conflict was of a fundamental nature. On the one hand stood Moritz Wörschler, the eager, stubborn teacher of the old school, who had devoted his life to the language of the fathers, to whom German was everything. . . . On the other hand stood Charles F. Wiesenthal, the enlightened, well-educated physician who looked forward and was well aware that, unless something unforeseeable should happen, the days that the church would remain purely German could be counted.

Wiesenthal not only prevailed, but his insistence on the use of English in church dealings as well as his inclination not to define the congregation in strong confessional terms likely guaranteed the survival of the young congregation, which was always in competition with a much more robust Reformed Church in those early days.

Although Moritz Wörschler was instrumental in the organization of the congregation at Zion and despite the fact that his open feud with Wiesenthal was ostensibly settled amicably, Moritz fades from the historical record of Baltimore and Zion around 1780. The meticulous record of income and expenses established by the first resident pastor, Kirchner, shows frequent small reimbursements to Moritz, presumably for purchases made on behalf of the congregation. That activity ends relatively abruptly in April 1776. Of course, the Revolutionary War may well have caused certain disruptions in the general course of life, but in any event, by 1780 the ledger documents payments of £300 annually, a modest but seemingly just amount, to a “Henry Simon, schoolmaster.” Moritz himself was definitely still living in 1790 as an inventory of the estate of his older brother Jonathan in Pennsylvania lists interest due on a bond from “Morice Wershler.” However there is no direct evidence of an economic or professional life. Although Wiesenthal was buried from Zion upon his death in 1789, Wörschler’s name does not appear in the burial register. It would seem that by 1780 Moritz had moved on, perhaps returning to Pennsylvania where one of his two brothers and his sister were living.
Vincent Potthast (1866–1911)

According to family legend, in June 1891 twenty-five-year-old Vincent Potthast, the second-oldest of four brothers, was attending a party in the family village of Borgholz in eastern Westphalia not far from the Weser River when the festivities got a bit out of hand. Vincent found himself in a fight and knocked his opponent down. When his adversary failed to get up again immediately, Vincent assumed that he had accidentally killed the man. He fled the scene immediately, traveling the three-hundred kilometers up the Weser to Bremerhaven, where he boarded the first available ship, the SS München of the North German Lloyd Line, which happened to be sailing for Baltimore.

It should be said that Vincent did not, in fact, kill his adversary. His opponent had merely been knocked out. The man said that he bore Vincent no ill will, and a messenger was dispatched to Bremerhaven to convince Vincent to return to Borgholz. However, by the time the messenger arrived in Bremerhaven, Vincent’s ship had already departed.

Vincent arrived in Baltimore on 2 July 1891 and immediately found employment at the Knabe Piano Factory as a cabinet maker. Encouraged by the relative ease with which he found employment, Vincent wrote to his brothers in Germany and urged them to come to Baltimore, where he was certain they would find good jobs. The prospects for financial security seemed much rosier in Baltimore than on the other side of the Atlantic. Vincent’s three brothers heeded his words and ultimately joined him in Baltimore, although it was almost a decade before all four were reunited. William arrived in June 1892, John in November 1894 (on his twenty-fourth birthday), and Theodore came finally in August 1900.

The Potthasts were all cabinet-makers in Europe, and the four brothers decided to save their money and start their own furniture company in Baltimore. For a time they made furniture in the basement of their homes, but eventually they went into business making new furniture and repairing antiques. The firm, which became known as Potthast Bros., Inc., was officially founded in 1892, after William arrived in Baltimore. It flourished for eighty-two years, becoming a Baltimore institution known well beyond the borders of Maryland. Numerous Potthast pieces are now treasured antiques; many are still in use. In fact, the mahogany desk in the private office of the Governor in the Maryland State House was made by Potthast. The firm also made a desk for Governor Theodore McKeldin (1900–74) from a large branch which fell from the Wye Oak, then the state tree. McKeldin took the desk when he left the governorship and went back to City Hall as mayor of Baltimore for the second time.

But this story is about Vincent. Vincent married Lena, also an immi-
grant, in 1892. They settled at 124 W. Saratoga, near Park Avenue and St. Alphonsus Church. Between 1894 and 1909, they had seven children at approximately two-year intervals, three sons and four daughters. None of Vincent’s sons appears to have joined the family firm, perhaps because Vincent himself died in 1911, when the boys were relatively young.

All the other males in the second generation—six in all—were, however, involved in the business. Together they brought the company successfully through good times and bad, from the prosperity of the early twentieth century to the anti-German hysteria of the First World War, the Great Depression, yet another world war, and the post-war period. When Theodore, John’s son, retired in 1975, the company closed. Its factory in the 1300 block of Wicomico Street, as well as its retail store at 924 N. Charles Street, was sold. The Charles Street store became the Brass Elephant restaurant, which became known not only for its food but also for its beautifully carved wood paneling which for decades had served as the showcase for the handcrafted mahogany furniture of the Potthast Bros. The restaurant itself closed in August 2009.

Kurt Möller (1896–1980)

Kurt Gustav Friedrich Möller was born in Stettin (now Szczecin, Poland), then the provincial capital of Prussian Pomerania, on 27 February 1896. He was the second child, and only son, of senior government clerk Julius Möller and his wife Amalie, née Schmelzeisen. When Kurt was two years old, the family moved to Berlin, where he attended the humanistic Gymnasium in Friedenau, the then-fashionable and growing section of south-central Berlin. He received his Abiturium in February 1914.

By April of that year, Kurt Möller had enrolled at the University of Berlin, known universally today as the Humboldt University, where he studied physics with a number of professors who would later gain world renown, including Max Planck. Möller remained at the Humboldt until October 1919, when he apparently finished his studies. He received his highest academic degree, a doctorate in science (Dr. Rer. Nat.), many years later at the end of 1938.

In reviewing his employment history years later, Möller lists his first job as “Chief of Laboratory for Telecommunications” for the Bureau of Ordnance of the German Army (Heereswaffenamt), a position he held until 1933, when he was appointed Professor for Telecommunications at the Technical University in Berlin. He must have felt that the position was secure despite the financial and political turmoil of the time because in 1921 he married Johanna Koschorek, ending a seven-year courtship which had spanned World War I. One year later, their only son, Gerhard, was born, followed in 1928
by a daughter, Ilse.

In 1939, Möller was appointed acting Vice-President and Department Director of the German Bureau of Standards. For all practical purposes he functioned as the director of the Bureau, but he could not hold the position officially because he was not a member of the NSDAP, the Nazi Party. In fact, he continued to hold his university position and was paid through the university.

In 1943, after American saturation bombing of Berlin had begun, Dr. Möller relocated part of the Bureau to an empty shoe factory in Weida, a small town in Thuringia near Gera. Meanwhile, his wife remained in their apartment in Berlin, and daughter Ilse stayed with friends in what is now Poland because the schools in Berlin had been closed. Gerhard had been killed in September 1941, at the age of nineteen, in the Battle of Leningrad. In November 1943, the Möllers’ apartment house in Berlin was bombed out, and Mrs. Möller joined her husband in Weida. Daughter Ilse was reunited with her parents in Weida as well.

In April 1945, allied forces moved into Weida, and all local men were required to register. As a trained scientist with an important post in the Bureau of Standards as well as a university position, Dr. Möller was considered both a valuable asset and a political question mark by the Americans. Indeed, as the war in Europe came to an end in the late spring and early summer of 1945, the personal and professional life of Kurt Möller, the after effects of World War II, the history of the state of Maryland, and the politics of an inchoate cold war converged. Kurt Möller came under scrutiny by those charged with recruiting German scientists to work in the United States.

As Linda Hunt tells the story, “. . . as American troops coped with the chaos and ruin of what once had been Hitler’s Third Reich, the scientific teams held thousands of German scientists captive in detention camps across Germany.” The goal was to “exploit” the expertise and technical knowledge of German and Austrian scientists for the good of the war effort. Men like Air Force Colonel Donald Putt believed that the “Germans were years ahead . . . in aircraft design.” Initially many hoped that German expertise could be used to develop techniques and equipment to shorten the war in the Pacific, but the focus quickly changed. Almost from the beginning, great effort was expended to recruit German scientific talent and import it to the United States before the Russians could do the same on their own behalf.

In 1945, the Joint Intelligence Committee, the intelligence arm of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, responsible for advising the Joint Chiefs on the intelligence problems and policies and furnishing intelligence information, established a subcommittee known as the Joint Intelligence Objectives Agency. That subcommittee was given direct responsibility for operating the foreign
scientist program, initially code-named Overcast and subsequently code-named Paperclip. Among the Agency’s duties were administering the program’s policies and procedures, compiling dossiers, and serving as liaison to British intelligence officers operating a similar project. It was also responsible for collecting, declassifying, and distributing technical intelligence reports on German science and industry.

Operation Paperclip in particular has entered the public consciousness because of controversy surrounding the National Socialist sympathies of certain celebrated German scientists, especially those involved in the American space program. Despite a determination to forbid enemies of the United States, including those who fought for or sympathized with Hitler’s Germany, entrance into the country, there was considerable debate in military, government, and intelligence circles about the relative value of scientific information and political sentiments. Amidst and despite considerable controversy, over 1,500 German and other foreign scientists, technicians, and engineers, including Kurt Möller, were brought to the United States under Project Paperclip and similar programs.

Initially Dr. Möller resisted efforts to entice him to work with and for the occupation forces. Ultimately, however, the Americans made Möller an offer which he accepted rather than sacrifice the safety of his wife and daughter by having to leave them while he sought work elsewhere. Thus began a journey of almost five years which led from a small village in Thuringia to a home in Maryland.

Almost immediately the whole family was loaded onto an open three-ton truck with a few possessions and driven through Germany to a destination unknown even to the soldier-drivers, who received directions from checkpoint to checkpoint. Ultimately, the truck arrived at a former police academy in Heidenheim an der Brenz in Württemberg. By daylight it became evident that the place was filling up with German scientists of all stripes. The Möller family was assigned a barracks room with four bunk beds, one of which was occupied by a cancer researcher, a total stranger who had arrived alone literally sitting on his desk chair!

Gradually, all the scientists were interviewed individually by U.S. Army officers. Ilse Möller and one other young woman served as volunteer interpreters because many of the scientists had no background in English despite their training in Greek, Latin, and French. Dr. Möller was confined with several other scientists in a building guarded by American soldiers. No reason was given for Dr. Möller’s incarceration, but it became clear that the Americans believed he could not have held the position he occupied without having been a member of the Nazi Party. Finally, after seventeen months of confinement, Möller was released because his assertion that he was not a member of
the party had been confirmed “in Berlin.”

As a certified non-Nazi, Dr. Möller was a highly desirable commodity. Eventually it became clear that “the Americans” wanted him to come to America. With that bit of insight, Dr. Möller began accepting job interviews with the occupation forces which he had previously declined. On 10 February 1947, Möller signed a contract with the U.S. Navy. Once Möller was under contract, the Military Government allowed him to accept a job as Technical Deputy Director for the Department of Weights and Measures in the province of Württemberg with a guaranteed annual salary of 23,000 *Reichsmark* for a minimum of six months. However, Möller was almost immediately put on a temporary leave of absence without pay while plans to bring him to the United States were put into place. As Möller understood the situation, he was to spend up to a year in the United States under the supervision of the U.S. Navy looking for a suitable position. At the end of the term he could decide to return to Germany or to stay in the States and have his wife and daughter join him there. However, the documents in his Operation Paperclip dossier present a somewhat more complex scenario.

“German Specialist, Dr. Kurt Moeller” arrived in New York on 24 June 1947 aboard the *Edmund B. Alexander*. Immediately upon arrival he was sent to the Naval Research Facility at Sands Point on Long Island for rest and recuperation while the Navy sought a position for him. The building itself, known as Hempstead House, was once the home of Daniel Guggenheim and is currently part of Sands Point Preserve in the hamlet of Fort Washington on the north shore of Long Island. From 1946 to 1967, however, the estate was leased to or owned by the U.S. Navy which used the property for the design and testing of electronic systems.

On 14 October 1947, specialist Moeller was released by the navy, and his services were offered to other interested military agencies. Those in charge of “Civil Exploitation of German Scientists” at the Joint Intelligence Objectives Agency began shopping Moeller for civil employment as well. At the same time, Moeller was relocated to the U.S. Naval Barracks “K” in Arlington, Virginia, outside Washington D.C., from where naval personnel accompanied him to a number of locations in search of a job.

It would appear that a number of processes were underway simultaneously. The record indicates that both the Department of Commerce and the Carnegie Institute of Technology were unable to find a suitable position for Dr. Moeller. Daughter Ilse recalls that her father was escorted to several Navy research facilities to experience the range of possible postings, but there is no archival evidence of such trips.

In early 1948, Moeller moved again, this time to Annapolis, Maryland, where he had accepted a job as a consultant at the Naval Engineering Experimen-
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ment Station (EES) across the Severn River from the U.S. Naval Academy, bringing the job search to an end. Just before his wife and daughter arrived in June, he found housing for the three of them in nearby Arnold. He was reunited with his family on 5 June 1948, when his wife and daughter arrived in the United States. A little more than a year later, on the first of July 1949, Kurt Moeller signed a personal services contract as a civilian with the EES. For his services he was paid twenty-five dollars a day, or approximately $6,500 a year.

Once Dr. Möller left for America, Mrs. Möller and Ilse were moved from Heidenheim to Landshut an der Isar in Bavaria, where they lived in a dependents’ village under the auspices of the U.S. Military Government. Once Dr. Möller could provide for his family and had a place to live, arrangements were made for his wife and daughter to come to the States as well. The ocean transit from Bremerhaven to New York City took fourteen days in a small Army transport ship with ninety women and children in one big dormitory in the bow of the ship. On arrival in New York, the passengers were transported to the Brooklyn Navy Yard in busses with locked doors and armed guards stationed at the doors. Dr. Möller, escorted by a Navy officer, came to pick up his wife and daughter for the trip to Maryland by train. Not quite a year from the time that Kurt Möller arrived in America, he and his family began a new life in Maryland.

Moeller was fifty-one years old when he started to work at the EES as an “enemy alien.” At first, when he wrote a scientific paper, it would be stamped “SECRET” and he would never be able to see it again! Eventually, he became a U.S. citizen, complete with secret and top-secret clearance. He received over twenty patents and numerous awards for his work and achieved the position of Associate Director for Research at the institute, which underwent multiple name-changes during his tenure. When he reached retirement age at sixty-five, the Navy asked him to stay on. This became an annual ritual until his seventy-second birthday, the mandatory retirement age. He continued to serve as a consultant for several more years until his health forced him to finally retire. Kurt G. F. Möller died on 17 February 1980, ten days before his eighty-fourth birthday; his wife died a year later, on 25 May 1981.

Conclusion

Definitions of “synergy” vary modestly among themselves although all emphasize a whole which is greater than the sum of its parts. The most appropriate and appealing phrasing for the current discussion, however, appears in Merriam Webster on-line: “A mutually advantageous compatibility . . . of resources or efforts.” Each of the three original informants had a vested
interest in the life story of his or her relative, whether father, great uncle, or distant cousin. Yet each had a somewhat restricted perspective on the details.

At the one extreme, Leo Wastler was frustrated by the lack of specifics on his relative who lived almost three centuries ago. At the other extreme, Ilse Moeller Harrop experienced the events which eventually led to her family’s emigration herself although she could not have known the specifics of the plans to exploit German scientists and technicians nor have anticipated the controversy which would ultimately surround some of the more well-known recruits to Operation Paperclip. Ted Potthast finds himself between the two extremes. He grew up in a family of successful furniture makers and was there at the end to attend to the legal details of dissolving the company for his father, but he was born after Vincent’s death and knows the story of the arrival of his grandfather and his great uncles secondhand at best.

Yet, when one brings the biographies of three unrelated immigrants to Maryland together in the context of German immigration to the mid-Atlantic region, both the genealogist and the historian benefit. The family of each of the subjects gains factual information as well as perspective. The historian, too, gains new perspective on known facts. Although Dieter Cunz makes it clear in *The Maryland Germans*, his definitive history of the German element in Maryland, that in the early years Germans settled in the western part of the territory, Moritz Wörschler’s story illustrates the degree to which Baltimore was a small, relatively insignificant and overwhelmingly English village in the eighteenth century. The story of Vincent Potthast and Potthast Bros. furniture highlights a remarkable immigrant success story. Despite two world wars and a worldwide depression, four brothers from Westphalia were able to build and maintain a business founded on their skill as craftsmen and their pride in a solid product. Finally, Kurt Moeller is an example of a scientist who was brought to the United States under Operation Paperclip through a process which seems thorough yet rational, even if it was somewhat opaque to Moeller and his family.

Of course, each person’s story deserves further scrutiny. The current discussion can only be a beginning, laying the groundwork for more work, both broadly across time and deeply into the historical moment. It is always difficult to discern the issues and thoughts which motivate a person or a group to leave the relative comfort and security of home, no matter how meager, and to take up a new life in a foreign country. Genealogists looking at a family tree many years later will be inclined to applaud the bravery and accomplishments of an ancestor, perhaps attributing success to strong character traits in the family lineage or, more broadly, to certain ethnic characteristics. The scholar presumes him- or herself to be more objective, generating the tension alluded to in the title and early paragraphs of this essay. Yet the academic researcher
likely approaches a topic with a certain theoretical bias which affects both the evaluation and the weighting of the documentary evidence. Combining the genealogist’s biographical data with the historian’s broader perspective generates a synergy which can resolve any tension between the two approaches. To paraphrase Walter Kampfoehfner, the more context one can provide, the better and more reliable the result.36

Loyola University Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland
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Eldon Knuth

Mecklenburger Gotteskasten, Dubuque, Iowa, 1904

As Carl Wiedow (a.k.a. Jürnjakob Swehn) documented so vividly in his letters to his former schoolteacher (Gottlieb Gillhoff) in Mecklenburg, the church played an important role in the adaptation of the immigrant to his new home.¹ Recognitions of the importance of this role led to the establishment of a seminary for training pastors in Dubuque, Iowa, in 1854 — by two pastors from Bavaria, with support from Bavaria. This seminary blossomed and matured, becoming the present-day Wartburg Theological Seminary.² At the 1904 celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the seminary, the accompanying photo was made of a group of attendees identified as the “Mecklenburger Gotteskasten.”³ Of the twenty-nine men depicted in this photo, twenty-six are believed to be pastors. Of the twenty-six pastors, twenty-three are identified in a photo caption found in the seminary archives. But only their names and graduation year are given. The recent renovation of the museum in the Gillhoff-Stuv in Glaisin, Germany, motivated a search for additional information. Mrs. Jean E. Peterson of the Iowa Synod Archives, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa, provided invaluable help in researching the archives. The author searched public records such as the census lists from Mecklenburg, the U.S. and Iowa; passenger lists; death indexes and cemetery records.

In the following summary of data collected for those twenty-three identified pastors, the information from the photo caption is displayed in bold type. The date enclosed in parentheses is the year the student completed his studies at the seminary; the location of the pastor in the photo is given by row and seat number counting from the left. Then the collected data is summarized with references enclosed in parentheses. The acronym WTS indicates the Iowa Synod Archives located at the Wartburg Theological Seminary in Dubuque, Iowa. References identified only by date are census tables from Mecklenburg (1867 and 1890), U.S. (1870, 1880, 1900, 1910,
1920, and 1930) and Iowa (1895, 1905, 1915 and 1925). The referenced obituaries are on file at the Iowa Synod Archives.

**Henry Berestaedt (1886) Row 1, No. 1**


**Carl Baetke (1897) Row 1, No. 2**

W. C. F. Adix (1875) Row 2. No. 1

Wilhelm Carl Franz Adix, born 1849 in Ziegendorf (obituary). Emigrated in 1872 (1900). He founded congregations in Buck Creek, Sumner, Westgate and Maynard, 1875-97, and served in Andrew, 1897-1908, all in Iowa. Died in 1908 in Jubilee, Iowa (obituary).

L. Seehase (1880) Row 2. No. 2


W. Proehl (1886) Row 2. No. 3

Wilhelm Pröhl, born 1859 in Lübtheen (1867). Emigrated in 1875 (New York passenger list). Served in Peoria, Illinois, 1879-80, then as assistant instructor at the WTS, 1880-84. Returned to Germany to study at the universities in Rostock, Leipzig and Erlangen, 1884-86. Served then in Chicago, Illinois, 1886-89. Was Professor from 1889 to 1900 and Director from 1900 until 1905 at the WTS; died in 1905 in Dubuque, Iowa (obituary).

J. C. K. Graening (1868) Row 2. No. 5


C. Proehl (1878) Row 2, No. 7


U. F. Groth, Sr. (1885) Row 3. No. 2

Ulrich Friedrich Groth, born 1861 in Kittendorf. Ancestors on his mother’s side included the important Lutheran theologians Paul and Johann Tarnow. Emigrated in 1883. Served in Yorktown, Royal, Harker’s Corners and Paines
Point, all in Illinois, 1885-89, and in State Center and Palmer, both in Iowa, 1889-1932. Interrupted these services with two one-year tours as a traveling preacher, in Kansas and in Oklahoma. Died in 1932 in Palmer, Iowa (obituary).

**R. Bunge (1899) Row 3, No. 3**

Richard Heinrich Julius Bunge, born 1877 in Garwitz bei Klinken (1890, obituary, WWI draft registration and Bergmann Family Tree.) Emigrated in 1890 (1900). Served first in Fond Du Lac, Wisconsin, 1906-12. Then became headmaster of the college in Eureka, South Dakota, 1912-16; Served next as pastor in Aberdeen, South Dakota; Archbold, Ohio, and Watertown, Wisconsin. Died in San Antonio, Texas in 1920 (obituary). Is a twin brother of Walter Bunge, also a brother of Paul Bunge and John Bunge.

**G. F. H. J. Romberg (1890) Row 3, No. 4**

Johannes Romberg, born 1856 in Perlin. Attended universities in Leipzig, Tübingen and Rostock. Emigrated in 1890. Served in Earlville, 1890-95, and Sheffield, both in Iowa; then as headmaster of the Evangelical Lutheran College in Brenham, Texas, ten years; next as pastor in Austin, Texas, twelve years, and finally as professor at Wartburg College in Waverly, Iowa, 1916-18. Died in Waverly, Iowa in 1918 (obituary). The Iowa Cemetery Records give his name as Gotthard Frederick Henry John Romberg.

**Wilhelm Baetke (1885) Row 3, No. 5**


**Paul J. Bunge (1893) Row 3, No. 6**

Paul John Bunge, born 1872 (1900, WWI draft registration, obituary) in Warin (Bergmann Family Tree and Anderson/Borel Family Tree). Emigrated in 1890 (1900). Served in Hartley and Davenport, Iowa; Sugar Creek, Colorado; Hull, Iowa; Delmont and Menno, South Dakota. Died in 1947 in Sheldon, Iowa (obituary).
Hermann Wunderlich (1896) Row 3, No. 7


August F. L. Augustin (1885) Row 3, No. 9


Gustav A. G. Bischoff (1879) Row 3, No. 10


John G. Bunge (1895) Row 4, No. 2

Johannes Gustav Bunge, born 1874 in Ribnitz. Emigrated in 1890. Served initially in the Oklahoma Territory, where he gathered scattered settlers into congregations. Served subsequently in Hawkeye, Iowa; Garnavillo, Iowa; Rich Hill, Missouri; Linton, North Dakota; Wauzeka, Wisconsin; Sheboygan Falls, Wisconsin; Ellis, Kansas; March and Jordan, Montana, and Goodrich and Fredonia, North Dakota. Died in Sheboygan, Wisconsin in 1951 (obituary).

A. Hein (1900) Row 4, No. 3

August J. Hein, born 1875 in Dömitz (New York passenger list). Emigrated in 1892. Lived in Waterloo, Iowa (1895) and Dubuque, Iowa (1900). Served in Tripp, South Dakota (1910); Clinton, Iowa (1920, 1925); Boyden, Iowa and Wilber, Nebraska. Died in 1965 at Tripp, South Dakota (obituary).

A. F. C. Karsten (1901) Row 4, No. 4

Albert Fred Karsten, born 1877 in Sumner, Iowa (1885, WWI and WWII
draft registrations). The only pastor in the photo born in the U.S. But his parents were both born in Mecklenburg (1880). Lived in Dubuque, Iowa (1900). Served in Tripoli, Renwick, Mason City, Correctionville and Alta Vista, all in Iowa. Died in Waverly, Iowa in 1958 (obituary).

**C. W. R. Streich (1890) Row 4, No. 5**


**Carl G. Ziehe (1891) Row 4, No. 6**

Carl Ziehe, born 1865 in Rühlow (obituary). Emigrated in 1887 (1910). After graduating from the WTS, he returned to Mecklenburg for one year to study at the University of Rostock. Served in Davenport, Iowa, 1891-97; Mason, Maxwell, Charlottenburg, and Greenvine, all in Texas, forty-four years. Died in Brenham, Texas in 1946 (obituary).

**Walter H. Bunge (f1899) Row 4, No. 7**


**Albert R. Boer (1902) Row 4. No. 8**


**Alvin W. Biedermann (1889) Row 4. No. 9**

Alwin Wilhelm Biedermann, born 1862 in Moxa, Thüringen. Studied two years at the University of Berlin. Emigrated in 1887 (1910). Served in Otis, Kansas, 1890-95; Tinley Park, Illinois, 1885-99; Toluca, Illinois, 1899-

Of the twenty-three pastors in the photo which have been identified, twenty were born in Mecklenburg. Many were sons of pastors. They emigrated in the fifty-year time period from 1846 to 1896. Obituaries have been found for twenty-two of the twenty-three pastors; the lack of an obituary for Carl Baetke is due perhaps to his withdrawal from the Iowa Synod. They served in at least fifteen states, all in the Midwest, where many of the immigrants from Mecklenburg settled. Seventeen of the twenty-three served during at least a portion of their careers in Iowa; two served in Garnavillo, Clayton County, where Carl Wiedow (a.k.a. Jünjakob Swehn) first went to church when he settled in Iowa. The pastors served as missionaries, founded congregations and responded to calls for pastors. The twenty-two obituaries document that this was a well-educated, extremely dedicated group which persevered in spite of frequent relocations and the challenges typical of frontier living. Nearly all served as long as health allowed. Without question, the role of this group in the settlement of the Midwest was immense relative to the size of the group.

University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Notes


3 The author was provided with a copy of this photo in 1989 by Dr. Robert C. Wiederaenders, Archivist at that time at the Iowa Synod Archives, Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa.

Paint, Pattern and People, with its alliterative title, is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the decorative arts of what cultural geographers call the “culture hearth” of Southeastern Pennsylvania. With its relatively short text and its gallery of magnificent illustrations, the book covers the subject of early Pennsylvania furniture with the éclat and flair that we have come to expect of Winterthur Books. The two curators of furniture at Winterthur, Wendy A. Cooper and Lisa Minardi, deserve long rounds of academic applause for their accomplishment.

The book essentially presents a Pennsylvania furniture culture assembled from the three ethno-cultural components of the colonial population—the English and Welsh (Quakers and others); the Ulster Scots or more commonly the Scotch-Irish, and the Pennsylvania Dutch or Pennsylvania Germans. Each of these elements is taken up in detail, with individual pieces pictured and discussed. The Pennsylvania German section in a sense patterns itself after Donald Shelley’s trail-breaking Fraktur book of 1961, which broke up Fraktur into “schools” of production. The authors here discuss the denominational “schools” of furniture production under the headings: Ephrata, Schwenkfelder, Mennonite, Moravian, and Lutheran and Reformed. In each case they deal
with individual pieces and their provenance. And along the way we learn that Mennonite “plainness” did not cover everything in Mennonite culture, and the “dower chests” were not necessarily “dower chests,” since they were given to boys as well as girls, for the storage of personal belongings.

The book is a pictorial treasure house—exciting iconographic evidence is presented not only on furniture, the book’s focus, but also on architecture, Fraktur, folk paintings of farmsteads and landscapes, Mäntell genre sketches, rare photographs (Fegley, Cope, et al.), portraits of some of the leading players in the culture, and lots of Lewis Miller! As a text for courses in Pennsylvania history and culture, this book with its illustrations is superb.

The introduction includes a brief research survey of how the furniture of Southeastern Pennsylvania was discovered by such collectors as the DuPonts and Dr. Barnes, and some of the pioneering exhibits, monographs, and catalogues produced in the twentieth century are commented upon. Chapter one, “People: A Great Multitude,” makes sense out of the ethno-cultural confusion that was Southeastern Pennsylvania in the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries, dealing competently with the three major population elements. Chapter two, “Places: Regional Forms and Local Expressions,” among others, focuses on distinctive Pennsylvania items such as slat-back chairs, attached benches from the Stube or stove room, kitchen cupboards, Chester county settees, and Quaker spice boxes. Localisms in ornament are also featured here—particularly the sulfur inlay on Lancaster County furniture, a discovery made by the late Monroe Fabian, with as yet no European origins discovered. Of course, localisms in ornament also include the painted decoration on (1) the Jonestown chests, (2) the Wythe County, Virginia, possible spinoffs of No. 1, and (3) the Mahantongo-Schwaben Creek painted desks, bureaus, and other pieces from Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties.

Chapter three, “Families: Owners and Inheritors,” focuses on such stellar sites as the Millbach House (1751) and the Hottenstein Mansion near Kutztown (1783), both spotlighted by installations at the Philadelphia Museum of Art and Winterthur. Chapter four, “Makers: From Cradle to Coffin,” features, among other items, a whole range of Moravian funerary apparatus, including the bier from the Central Moravian Church at Bethlehem, the “Corpse House” (1786) at Lititz, and a “Corpse Tray” from Bethlehem (1775-1800). The chapter takes a good look also at the craftsman’s tools and manuscript plans, and for good measure, a photograph of Daniel Bertolet’s Up-and-Down Sawmill (1810) from the Oley Valley, now on display at the Daniel Boone Homestead—and finally, bringing the reader to 1850, some delightful glimpses of those sets of painted kitchen chairs from the mid-nineteenth century, that many of us remember from farmhouse childhoods.

Social class is brought into the picture also. The strong influence of
Philadelphia’s elegant furniture is demonstrated in the outlying counties, where wealthy patrons welcomed the Philadelphia high style, or good copies of it, into their halls and parlors. Lancaster, founded in 1730, which by the time of the Revolution was the largest inland town in America, became the major clearing house and transfer point for Philadelphia goods destined for the back country. Some of those Conestoga wagons indeed hauled Philadelphia—made furniture to the up country.

All in all, this is a superior volume. However, while the book can certainly stand on its own, even with its self-imposed limitation to cabinetmaker’s furniture, with some exceptions like those delightful winged cherubs that once adorned the exterior of St. Luke’s Lutheran Church at Schaefferstown in Lebanon County, a few “tough-love” criticisms and clarifications are in order here. Since professors are notorious for suggesting further research, let me do my professorial duty by suggesting a few areas that deserve fuller treatment, perhaps in a supplemental volume or sequel.

First of all, the book would decidedly profit by fuller details on European backgrounds. Eighteenth-century Pennsylvania was an emigrant society. Every valley community had a mixture of emigrants from Europe. Many of the craftsmen who produced the pieces pictured in this book were emigrants. The big question is—what did they bring here from the old world in their minds and memories and in the skills of their hands? How did their European craft training, apprenticeships, and guild memberships affect their Pennsylvania production? And how were their skills transplanted into the new world setting?

The vast literature on furniture from the Germanic areas of Central Europe and the British Isles needs to be analyzed meticulously for models of our Pennsylvania furniture. Alas, this volume yielded in text, endnotes, and bibliography only a single work on German furniture, two on Welsh and one on Irish furniture. For a cogent example, the whole background of our Pennsylvania paint-decorated furniture traces back to Europe. When the European middle-class or peasant craftsman copied the massive, elaborately carved wooden chests and wardrobes of the Renaissance period, he chose cheaper woods and transmuted the carving into painted decoration which imitated the architectural features of the originals with painted arches and columns. The copious literature on European painted furniture, particularly that of Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Alsace, needs urgently to be collated with our paint-decorated Pennsylvania furniture.

Another area that deserves attention is the context of the furniture. Where were these individual pieces placed in townhouse or farmhouse? Here we need more interior views, which are relatively scarce, but available. The Krimmel Sketchbooks at Winterthur reveal not only Pennsylvania interiors
(like his much reproduced “Christmas Morning” scenes), but also offer views of everyday German interiors—the artist’s parents’ house in Württemberg that he revisited after the War of 1812. The house drawings of Susanna Brinton (1833-1927) in Pennsylvania Folklife (July 1964) show a room sketched in 1848 in a Lancaster County Quaker farmhouse that could pass for a Pennsylvania Dutch interior. And for the record, several of the fifty Folklife Questionnaires that were published in Pennsylvania Folklife, 1967-77, could be useful since they deal with house orientation, room divisions, and the furniture found in them. But most useful of all is the source volume by Margaret Berwind Schiffer, Chester County Pennsylvania Inventories, 1684-1850 (1974). These complete estate inventories in some cases list a decedent’s household furnishings room by room, giving us detailed glimpses into colonial farmhouses and every stick of furniture that the appraisers found in the rooms. Pennsylvania deserves additional inventory surveys, but this one is basic. Thank you, Margaret Schiffer!

The book could also profit from more details on prior research. For example, the lifelong work of John Joseph Stoudt, one of the leading discoverers of the Pennsylvania Folk arts in the 1930s, is, however, given short shrift in text, endnotes, and bibliography, except for a just criticism of his over-symbolistic interpretation of our folk art decoration. But one of his major books, Early Pennsylvania Arts and Crafts (1964), could have been cited, since in a sense it attempted to accomplish what the present volume did—a synoptic view of the arts and crafts of Pennsylvania’s colonial “mixed multitudes.” Stoudt’s pioneer treatment is also more inclusive, covering pottery, glassware, silver, pewter, iron work, textiles (from samplers to quilts and coverlets), and other aspects of early Pennsylvania’s everyday culture that are household furnishings if not furniture. The question is, where do the decorative arts scholars draw the line?

Yes, why, for example, were stoves omitted? They are furniture in a very real sense, and Pennsylvania’s stove culture brought comfort, rare in the days of open fireplaces, into the colonial Pennsylvania Dutch farmhouse, where the stove room (Stube) was comfortably heated, smoke-free (unlike the adjoining kitchen), and provided basic dining space, work space, and living room space in general. Pennsylvania’s many iron works, whether run by Quakers, Scotch-Irishmen, or Pennsylvania Dutchmen, made stoves that warmed Pennsylvania houses all through the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth, when urban stove factories took over the process.

And since the book was accompanied by an important exhibit in the Winterthur Galleries, it could profit by extended analysis of other exhibits of the past decades, which in a sense broke ground for this one. Particularly relevant are the 1983 Traveling Exhibit sponsored by the Philadelphia Museum

One other possible addition should be mentioned, and that is a complete English and German glossary of furniture terminology. This could follow the pattern set up by the European journal *Wörter und Sachen* in 1900, which listed and discussed the technical vocabularies associated with various aspects of material culture that were then being studied in Germany.

With these subjects dealt with in a sequel, which I hope the authors are contemplating, the Pennsylvania furniture story will be more completely covered. But the book, as I have both implied and stated, can of course stand alone as a major contribution to the arts and crafts of the colony and state that more than any other, foreshadowed the multicultural America that we have today. Only in Pennsylvania could this unique synthesis have taken place. Yes, only in Pennsylvania!

*The University of Pennsylvania*  
*Don Yoder*

---

**Wartesaal-Jahre: Deutsche Schriftsteller im Exil nach 1933.**  
*By Wulf Köpke. Erkelenz, Germany: Altius Verlag, 2008. 480 pages. €36.90.*

It is no mean challenge for a writer or scholar to write about catastrophe in our catastrophe-ridden age without succumbing to platitudes or martyrization. Wulf Köpke has taken upon himself the task of presenting a convincing and evocative tableau of those unfortunate German writers who lived through that inordinately destructive and lugubrious period 1933–45. The pitfalls of writing about this period, especially for a German literary historian, are great. Most obviously, one can allow oneself to write a victim narrative, in which all of these gifted writers are compressed into one suffering group of persecuted and disenfranchised outcasts, brutally and shamefully expelled from their fatherland to begin their existence anew in some far-off country that could neither rightfully appreciate them nor offer them a secure haven. This approach is more than understandable. Who can forget Kurt Tucholsky’s desolation in Sweden, where he finally took his own life! Who can fully reconstruct Ernst Toller’s last days in Washington Heights in New York, where he chose Freitod when all seemed lost! Who can imagine Walter Benjamin’s despair when, after a dangerous trek through the Pyrenees,
was told by the Spanish authorities that he would not be allowed to enter Spain and would have to return to France to be at the mercy of the Vichy government and the Gestapo!

The second danger in such a study is to treat Germany’s literary refugees as the morally superior Germans. This is the obverse of the victim narrative. After all, one can reason that it was these Germans who made the ultimate sacrifice by leaving their country, their language, their culture to begin a new life in extreme uncertainty, replete with poverty, alienation, and the loss of one’s profession and readership. Moreover, according to this reasoning, those writers who went into exile recognized the inherent evil of National Socialism, refusing to believe in its promises and blandishments and resisting the general intoxication and the pull of the zeitgeist, where so many compromised themselves and ended up in moral bankruptcy.

The principal challenge of such a study is to find the proper vantage point for such a troubling theme, and it is here where Köpke’s work succeeds brilliantly. Köpke does not merely present a single point of view of the victims, but shows the manifold positions and strategies and ideologies of those writers in exile. Through a careful perusal of original sources, e.g. diaries, memoirs, and letters, Köpke is able to enter into the inner lives of the exiled writers, revealing an essential facet of this mass exodus—its enormous ambivalence. Köpke not only shows the feuds and disagreements of these writers, but also evokes their deracination, their struggle to make sense of themselves and their literary work. Hence the three sections of his work all have existential dimensions: “Der Schock der Vertreibung” (Section 1); “Um uns die Fremde” (Section 2); “Deutschland aus der Sicht des Exils” (Section 3).

In addition to delving into the inner lives of these writers, Köpke also employs a historical schema to differentiate the various stages of exile, beginning with the so-called Machtergreifung in 1933 and then describing with great insight the fall of France in 1940 and the escape to the Americas, and then delineating the final stage—the defeat of Nazi Germany with all the various aspects and dimensions of the Rückkehrproblematik. These historical stages also are linked to geographical centers, with Paris being the capital of the first exodus and New York and Los Angeles the main focal point of the second Diaspora, with the final migration—the return of the exiled writers and intellectuals to Germany—conspicuously bereft of any ultimate destination.

Since Köpke’s work is a collection of previously published essays extending over a period of many decades, it comprises a mosaic-like structure encompassing a vast panoply of different themes and authors. This is advantageous because Köpke can devote attention to both canonical and non-canonical authors, thus expanding considerably the entire spectrum of
exile literature. For example, Köpke can discuss the work of Thomas and Heinrich Mann and Alfred Döblin and then in the next chapter invoke the struggle of Jochen Klepper (1903–42) and the entire problem of the so-called “innere Emigration.” Or his purview can turn to Latin America, where not only the work of Stefan Zweig is discussed, but also such forgotten German writers as Paul Zech (1881–1946), Max Aub (1903–72), and Hans Gustav Elsas, aka Helmut Gaupp, (1894–86), among others.

Köpke remarks that his book is not a general survey of exile literature, but instead concentrates on what he calls “exemplary cases” (exemplarische Fälle) and “single aspects” (einzelne Aspekte). His intention is to provoke and to stimulate the reader usually by positing an array of challenging theses. For example, Köpke avers that very few writers, with occasional exceptions, acclimated themselves to their adopted countries either culturally or linguistically, as evinced by the paucity of works dealing with life in exile or the number of works written in the language of the host country. However, not only did these writers experience a feeling of estrangement from their host countries, but the longer the period of exile lasted, the more pronounced were their feelings of alienation towards their native country. As a result, most of the literary production gravitated to the historical novel or the exotic novel, the most notable examples cited by Köpke being Lion Feuchtwanger’s Josephus-Trilogie (1932–45) and Heinrich Mann’s Henri Quatre (1935–38). Of course, these works are disguised confrontations with the so-called “German catastrophe,” the advent of National Socialism, and its impending demise. In other words, the loss of what Köpke calls “die Idee ‘Deutschland,’” the dream of an ideal Germany fusing the twin concepts of Kultur and Zivilisation, never ceased to exercise a spell over these authors, despite their persecution and homelessness.

Part of the provocative nature of the book is its willingness to depart from conventional wisdom. For example, Köpke examines the cultural discourse of the “Jewish question” before the accession of the National Socialists. Interestingly enough, Köpke discovers among the Jewish intellectuals in the Weimar Republic that such nefarious concepts as Deutschtum, Rasse, jüdischer Geist, and Volkstum, inter alia, were all widely discussed and polemicized by Germans and Jews alike. In this connection, Köpke cites none other than Arnold Zweig, who argued that the large influx of Eastern European Jews into Germany in the 1920s could lead to what some German intellectuals still refer to today as Überfremdung, i.e., the loss of one’s cultural integrity.

Coupled with its provocative arguments and theses, Köpke’s work overtly pursues a heuristic strategy. Nearly every essay asserts its provisionality. Nearly every chapter reminds the reader of its open-endedness and incompleteness. The author functions as a guide and instructor, telling the reader which
lines of inquiry to follow, which research areas to explore. Frequently Köpke concludes a chapter with a remark about an author that a fair assessment is still waiting to be written, e. g. when he refers to the now forgotten author Franz Carl Weiskopf (1900–55) that subsequent research has to consider the complexity of his work (Vielfältigkeit) and “the three main dimensions of his life and work” (405). Or when Köpke considers a larger, more generalized theme, as in his essay on the reception of German exile literature after 1933, upon which he has written a long, comprehensive essay, Köpke still concludes by writing that his essay should serve as a “pre-study” (Vorstudie) (123).

What ties all the strands of this multifaceted work together is the principle of empathy. Köpke writes about exile not merely as a scholar, but also as someone with a profound emotional involvement. As he mentions in the epigraph to the work, his wife’s family was murdered in Auschwitz, which, he writes, has left its traces on his children as well. Despite its critical expertise, despite its elaborate documentation and erudition, Köpke’s book is enormously moving, for the reader begins to fully grasp the magnitude of the disaster that befell an entire society and culture. Köpke’s gnomic presentation of his theses and arguments makes his treatment even more poignant. For example, “Das Exil gehörte nicht zu den Siegern, sondern zu den Verlierern” (“Exile did not belong to the victors, but to the defeated”) (16) or “Die Begegnung mit dem Gastland wurde verweigert” (The encounter with the host country was rejected) (14). These and other theses disperse all the myths and convenient fictions about the exile of an multifarious group of intellectuals, showing how such a catastrophe can never find closure, but must be left to future generations to explore its unending tragedy.

University of Turku
Jerry Schuchalter

Westward: Encounters with Swiss-American Women.

A compilation of portraits detailing the lives of Swiss-American women from the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Bosshard-Kälin’s work examines immigrant history in a unique context. She presents the largely overlooked and undocumented history of Swiss female immigrants to the United States from the perspective of the everyday, as it was lived and experienced. This English translation of Bosshard-Kälin’s Westwärts: Begegnungen mit Amerika Schweizerinnen (Bern: eFeF Verlag, 2009) published
by the Swiss-American Historical Society, represents Bosshard-Kälin’s most recent contribution to the study of modern Swiss women. A journalist and communications specialist, Bosshard-Kälin served as project initiator, co-author and editor of the 2006 publication of *spruchreif – Zeitzeuginnen aus dem Kanton Schwyz erzählen* (ready to be told – Personal Accounts of Women from Canton Schwyz), as well as co-author of *Leben im Kloster Fahr* (Life in Fahr Abbey), published in 2008.

Divided into three sections, the book begins with fifteen portraits of twentieth-century Swiss-American women. Four portraits of Swiss immigrants from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries follow, and the book concludes with an essay outlining the social status and history of American women in the twentieth century. The first and longest section documents the lives of Swiss-American women, most of whom were born during the second quarter of the twentieth century. Despite the relative similarity in their geographical and temporal origins, each of the women traveled a distinct path that led to a life in the United States. In selecting these fifteen “time witnesses,” Bosshard-Kälin chose women with varying familial and occupational backgrounds who haled from different Swiss cantons and settled in various regions of the United States. In the portraits, Bosshard-Kälin describes her encounters with each of the women, imbuing her accounts with photographs and numerous quotations. At an average of twelve pages each, the portraits do not offer comprehensive biographies, but rather snapshots of memories that create an impressionistic collage of the women’s individual pasts. The texts highlight their memories, aspirations and everyday lives, with twentieth-century history serving as a secondary yet common thread weaving through each portrait.

Artist and “time witness” Margrit Mondavi Biever Kellenberger married an officer of the US army, saw firsthand the devastating aftermath of World War II in Germany and later lived a nomadic life as she followed her husband across the world. Eventually settling in the Napa Valley, Margrit Mondavi worked as a tour guide and public relations director at the Mondavi vineyards, and ultimately fell in love with world famous vintner Robert Mondavi, whom she married. Despite her life abroad, Margrit Mondavi, like the other “time witnesses,” is still affected by her Swiss roots. She explains, “Switzerland: I have lived there but a quarter of my life. And yet something from that time remains in my heart . . . but I feel American through and through” (195). The process of cultural mediation, of establishing an identity relative to two worlds, is a subtle yet common element of the twentieth-century portraits. Composing the portraits with a mixture of narrative and direct quotation, Bosshard-Kälin successfully captures the spirit of each “time witness” and thereby creates a compelling sense of intimacy between the reader and these contemporary subjects.
The second section features four portraits of Swiss women, who journeyed across the Atlantic during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Leo Schelbert, professor emeritus of Swiss-American Immigration at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Included are brief yet informative summaries of relevant eighteenth- and nineteenth-century historical developments that contextualize the women’s emigration. Reconstructed through letters and photographs, the portraits highlight the struggles and joys of the Swiss women as they carved out new lives in a new world. This section provides an interesting juxtaposition to the encounters with twentieth-century Swiss-American women presented in the previous section.

The book concludes with the essay “Women in Twentieth-Century America” by Leo Schelbert. His essay sketches the social status and history of American women in the twentieth century. Divided into five sections covering the topics of politics, society, economy, education, and ideology, the essay outlines how the status of women developed in the United States over the course of the twentieth century. Schelbert’s comprehensive summary provides insight into the society that shaped the personal histories of the fifteen twentieth-century “time-witnesses.”

The inclusion of this essay, however, leaves the reader to question why a similar history on the status of women in Switzerland was not also incorporated in the book. An account of women in twentieth-century Swiss society would provide a historical comparison between the United States and Switzerland, befitting a book that captures the lives of women “standing between [the] two worlds, two cultures, and two languages” that these countries represent. Furthermore, the fact that two of the twentieth-century Swiss-American women ultimately returned to Switzerland underscores the relevance of modern Swiss history to the work.

A compilation of personal histories that emphasizes the value of individual experience in life, Bosshard-Kälin’s work succeeds in preserving the essence and voice of women as diverse as the two worlds that their lives straddle.

The University of Kansas

Gabrielle Frawley

Turning Germans into Texans: World War I and the Assimilation and Survival of German Culture in Texas, 1900-1930.


German immigrants and their culture have been present in Texas since the 1820s and like Germans elsewhere in the United States, they suffered
under the prevalent anti-German sentiment of the World War I period. In this monograph, historian Matthew Tippens attempts to examine how the war and related anti-German backlash influenced German culture in Texas. Tippens “examines the plight of German-Texans during World War I, the role the war played in speeding their assimilation,” and the survival of a “substantial portion of German-Texan culture” after the war (12).

*Turning Germans into Texans* offers a good, easily accessible narrative of German-Texans in the early twentieth century. Tippens begins the work by showing how many white Texans, beginning in the 1800s, formed a distrust of Germans because Germans typically opposed secession, temperance, and women’s suffrage. This in spite of the fact that Texans generally considered German immigrants thrifty and hardworking. Their distrust caused many Anglos to be wary of Germans and, as temperance and women’s suffrage came to the fore during and after World War I, heightened white Americans’ suspicion of those who continued to maintain ties to the Fatherland and to German culture. Using records from the Texas State Council of Defense, newspapers, and a few personal and religious records, *Turning Germans into Texans* illustrates how anti-German sentiment arose, targeted German language, religion, and culture, and at times sparked physical force in an attempt to ensure loyalty to the United States. This onslaught, Tippens claims, caused a redefinition of German heritage in Texas as German-Texans dealt with the nativism of the 1920s.

*Turning Germans into Texans* focuses mainly on the Anglo-Texan perspective as viewed through official records. The monograph emphasizes the political issues of prohibition, suffrage, and the manner in which Anglo-Texan politicians used the German vote for their own advancement or to attack opponents during wartime and in the 1920s. In only a few examples does a German voice appear in the book and most of these instances derive from the German-language newspapers, though in chapter six Tippens does include some letters and records documenting the reaction of the Lutheran church to the Americanization process. Still, most of those records are from the Texas War Records collection. In addition, the work’s tone often supports the view that white Texans orchestrated German acceptance of American culture entirely, failing to give credit to the efforts of Germans themselves. The monograph emphasizes the way in which anti-war hysteria “resulted in a rapid retreat from public displays of German ethnicity” while the nativists of the 1910s and 1920s “suppressed the more visible cultural attributes of German-Texans” (212), and the way in which “German-Texan culture would be driven into submission” by the Second World War (192). Yet, without including the Germans’ own responses and reactions, Tippen’s gives the impression that the dominant culture was forced upon a minority group.
Additionally, though Turning Germans into Texans includes many telling examples of anti-German sentiment, it could benefit from a clearer definition of timeframe and argument. The conclusion touches on developments impacting German-Texan communities into the twentieth century but the book's scope ends in 1930 without an explanation for this stopping point. Tippens claims that German culture did survive the war, although much changed, and that it eventually tapered off in the next few decades particularly around World War II. He points to growth in German-language newspaper readership in the 1920s and the organization of new Vereine and German church services after the war hysteria died down. However, the argument seems contradictory at times as the author claims Americanization efforts “to eliminate German culture [were] quite successful” while at other times he emphasizes the continuation of German culture (11). For example, the author affirms that Germans in Texas were unique because they “faced such sustained pressure to forgo [their] ethnic identity for an ‘American’ one; and none appeared to mute [their] ethnic identity to so great an extent” (13).

Finally, as Tippens covers the sensitive and complex relations between Germans and white Texans, his work presents many new questions worth addressing more fully. For instance, how does the triple ethnic dimension of Anglo-Texans, Germans, and Mexicans make Texas a unique example of anti-German sentiment compared to the American Midwest, which lacked a large Mexican population in the period under study? Likewise, what is the impact of rural and urban settlements as well as that of class issues? In the conclusion, Tippens alludes to the importance of these issues and points out that rural settlements maintained their Deutschtum longer, that rural areas with higher German population witnessed much less violence during the war, and that Germans tended to see themselves as more cultured and respectable than the poor white farmers around them. Furthermore, how did the anti-German backlash of 1917-1918 grow into the isolationist nativism of the 1920s, and how did German-Texans succeed in becoming old stock by the end of that decade? Investigating the transformation in nativist arguments in the 1920s, especially when such arguments focused on new immigrants, urban labor problems, and specifically anti-Mexican protests overtaking German targets, would have strengthened this work.

Yet overall, the work offers a solid description of the reaction of white Texans to German-Texans during World War I by offering details on the violence and tensions. One should note, though, that with all of the interesting vignettes and examples, much of the German voice is left out.

Concordia University, Nebraska

Mary Knarr
Yankee Warhorse: A Biography of Major General Peter Osterhaus.


This book is an account of the American Civil War experiences of Major General Peter Osterhaus whose meteoric rise to high rank in the Union Army rested to an astonishing degree on his extremely brief military training in Prussia as well as his own steady character. Born and raised in Koblenz in the Prussian Rhineland, Osterhaus had received only one year of training to be an officer in the Prussian Reserve when, in 1845, he resigned his commission to become a businessman in Mannheim in Baden. When revolts broke out in Baden in May, 1849 after the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament, Osterhaus nevertheless stepped up to become the commander of the Citizens’ Army of Mannheim. After the revolution was put down in late June, Osterhaus fled, first to France to await his family and then on to Belleville, Illinois, also the new American home of Friedrich Hecker, one of the most popular speakers and agitators of the 1848 Revolution.

When the American Civil War began twelve years later, Osterhaus was already well established as a businessman in St. Louis, Missouri. Yet, on April 15, 1861, he joined a German-American Union Army volunteer unit as a mere private, and owing to his Prussian military training was elected to the post of major of his battalion only a few days later. Then in July he was promoted to colonel. He served in campaigns in Missouri and Arkansas in 1861 and 1862. At the beginning of 1863, he joined Ulysses Grant’s campaign against the Confederate fortress at Vicksburg, Mississippi, having been made a brigadier general six months earlier. From private to brigadier general in roughly eighteen months! After Vicksburg, Osterhaus continued to serve as a major general in southeast Tennessee, in the Atlanta Campaign, and as a part of Sherman’s March to the sea across Georgia. He ended the war back in the Trans-Mississippi West and then served six months as the military governor of the state of Mississippi.

Osterhaus served diligently and with a high degree of competence throughout the entire conflict. His brother officers respected him and he was popular with his troops, German-American or Yankee. But he was not well-known because he concentrated on doing his job and was not skilled in self-promotion. Instead of attempting a political career after the war, with health damaged by malaria and dysentery, he returned to Europe with his family in 1866. He served for over a decade as U. S. Consul in Lyon, France, including during the Franco-Prussian War. Then he returned to Germany to spend
twenty-five years as a businessman back in Mannheim. He left descendants in both Germany and in America.

The author of *Yankee Warhorse* is one of his direct descendants who lives in California, and she has told his story, for the most part, at the level of the units he commanded rather than from the perspective of the wider campaigns in which he participated. Just ten pages of the book are devoted to the general’s life before immigration. His life in Europe from 1866 through his death in early 1917 is squeezed into a thirteen page epilogue, much of which is taken up with his return visit to America in 1904. The author writes readable and competent military history, although many readers will want more battle and campaign maps. She displays considerable energy in finding relevant published English-language source material. Christian B. Keller’s *Chancellorsville and the Germans* could have helped Townsend on the matter of ethnic tensions within the Army especially from the points of view of Generals Joe Hooker and O. O. Howard, both of whom Osterhaus served under just months after Chancellorsville. But Townsend must have been largely finished with her research when Keller’s book appeared. Overall, it seems a shame that the author did not find partners trained in European history and continental languages so that a broader and more complete biography of this important German-American immigrant could have been produced.

Maryville, Missouri

Robert W. Frizzell

---

**Learning Democracy: Education Reform in West Germany, 1945-1965.**


Dagegen ist durchaus zu behaupten, dass internationale Referenzhorizonte für die Bildungs- und Gesellschaftsreform der Bundesrepublik Deutschland eine weitaus größere Rolle als gemeinhin angenommen spielten. Der kultur- und bildungspolitisch motivierte Austausch zwischen den USA und Westdeutschland wirkte intentional und funktional als Medium der Reformen vor allem unter dem Prämisse der Professionalisierung sozialwissenschaftlicher Berufsfelder, des Aufbaus neuer Institutionen, der Modernisierung im Sinne der Erweiterung sozialer und bildungsbezogener Leistungen sowie individueller Emanzipationsstrategien, die ein neues Selbstverständnis in Gesellschaft und Kultur durchsetzen. Auch der hier nicht behandelte Aufbau von Amerikastudien und des Studiums der Politikwissenschaft weisen bereits in die Richtung demokratischer Lernprozesse, welche die Typenbildung westlicher Leitkultur in den Prozessbegriffen der machtpolitischen
Setzung, verinnerlichten Bewuβtseinsbildung, der Wunschbilder, Phantasievorstellungen und Trotz-Abwehrreaktionen einleitete. Leider stellt die Studie nicht das methodische Instrumentarium einer Prosopographie zur Verfügung, das zusätzlichen empirischen Aufschluβ über konzise Zusammenhänge zwischen Kulturaustausch, Innovation und Reform geben und gerade dabei auch theoriegeleitete Aussagen zum Verhältnis zwischen Adaption, Transformation, Kopie und Prozessen kultureller Aneignung gewinnbringend ausarbeiten könnte. Im Ergebnis bleibt deshalb festzuhalten, dass trotz der aufgezeigten Defizite die Studie eine kompakte Zusammenfassung vorhandener Erkenntnisse darstellt und durchaus für weiterführende Analysen anzuregen vermag.

Technical University of Berlin, Germany 
Karl-H. Füssl

Studies on German-Language Islands.  

This volume is a collection of sixteen articles, of which nine specifically deal with German immigrant dialects in the United States, including Pennsylvania German/Dutch; Wisconsin German; Amana (Iowa) German; Mennonite Low German/Plautdietsch (Henderson, Nebraska) and Texas German. This collection also includes an article that deals with Mennonite Low German in the Americas with a focus on two communities in Paraguay and one in Brazil. Two closely-related German dialect enclaves in Northern Italy receive some attention: Mòcheno and Cimbrian German. Finally, an article is included concerning Siebenbürger Sächsisch, spoken in Romania.

The editor’s stated goal with this volume is to present research on German speech islands from a generative or structural perspective as opposed to a sociolinguistic perspective. The six section titles and the articles included in each section help clarify his new organizational approach:

Section 1 - Phonetics & Phonology  
Section 2 - Morphology & Lexical studies  
Section 3 - Syntax I - Verb clusters  
Section 4 - Syntax II - The syntax of Cimbrian German  
Section 5 - Syntax III - The syntax of Pennsylvania German  
Section 6 - Pragmatics & Conversational analysis.
As the section titles suggest, this book is not for those who are uninitiated in linguistics, especially current trends in theoretical linguistics. Readers will encounter terms such as final laryngeal neutralization, synchronic phonological patterning, Optimality-Theoretic framework, ‘other-directed’ verbs vs. typically ‘self-directed’ verbs, syntagmatic constraints, structural convergence and divergence, themata and remata, V2 language, allative preposition, turn constructional unit, etc. The authors of most articles expect readers to have the appropriate linguistic knowledge to make sense of the research results. Some of these theoretical articles are not easy reading. Nevertheless, this book breaks new ground and is worth a look by those who are interested in the application of newer linguistic methodologies to German dialect research. The editor provides a listing of contributors with contact information.

This volume is available from the publisher in print and e-book format: http://www.benjamins.com/cgi-bin/t_bookview.cgi?bookid=SLCS%20123. A complete table of contents is posted by the publisher and a Google preview is also available at this website.

University of Kansas
D. Christopher Johnson

The East Franconian Dialect of Haysville, Indiana: A Study in Language Death.

Structural decay is often a distinct phenomenon of languages facing their linguistic demise. Daniel Nützel’s study in language death on the East Franconian dialect of Haysville, Indiana, a German dialect, however, exhibits a different prototype. Although it is a dying language, Nützel’s very comprehensive linguistic study written in English, documents that the morphological and syntactic structures of this dialect remain mostly intact when compared to its base dialect spoken in Upper Franconia, Germany. Selected examples of this dialect’s morphology and syntax illustrate and underscore this deviation from linguistic developments evolving in many other moribund languages. In the introduction to his work, Nützel highlights some linguistic studies of endangered languages, which showcase significant structural reductions in their final stages of language death. He asserts that a close-knit communal structure of the immigrant speakers of the Haysville
East Franconian dialect on the other hand, contributed immensely to the fact that morphological and syntactical reductions in this dialect are virtually non-existent and remain similar to the base dialect in Upper Franconia. This thesis is the focus of his comprehensive study on this unique dialect of Haysville, Indiana. The author gives a concise overview of each chapter and includes detailed maps that conveniently illustrate not only the geographical area of Haysville East Franconian in Indiana, but also informs the reader about the geographic origin of the emigrants to Haysville from the Upper Franconia area in present-day Germany.

In chapter one Nützel provides an extensive overview of German immigration to the United States and examines in particular, the settlement history of Dubois County, Indiana, where Haysville is located. In addition, he provides reasons for emigration from Upper Franconia. Chapter two covers the topic of data collection for this dialect study. Here Nützel details his fieldwork methodology and discusses sociolinguistic variables such as religion. Chapter three is devoted to language death in its various forms. Nützel then goes on to explore the correlation of language decay and the semi-speaker and its relevance to the East Franconian dialect of Haysville. In chapter four the reader is informed about the linguistic location of this East Franconian dialect among German dialects and learns about its different varieties. A map depicting the major isoglosses within European East Franconian is included for the reader's convenience. Chapters five through nine concentrate on a very detailed grammatical analysis of Haysville East Franconian. While chapter five discusses the verbal system, chapter six addresses conjunctions and modal particles. The nominal system is the focus of chapter seven discussing cases and pronouns. One of the main points the author makes here is that case reduction does indeed take place in the Haysville East Franconian dialect, and he argues that it is a result of borrowing rather than language decay. Chapter eight centers on syntax. Nützel maintains that American English does not influence word order in Haysville East Franconian despite close language contact, and it stays in close relation to its base dialect in Upper Franconia. Directional adverbs and their prepositional use in the Haysville East Franconian dialect are the focal point of chapter nine. The author concludes his work by summarizing the findings put forth in his study by pointing out the unique exception of the Haysville dialect among languages facing gradual extinction, namely, that it deviates from the seemingly common pattern of morphological and syntactical reduction. A brief summary in German about his work and a notable and extensive bibliography complete Nützel's publication.

The East Franconian Dialect of Haysville, Indiana: A Study in Language Death is a valuable contribution to the study of dying languages because
it shows an atypical case in language death. It will interest dialectologists, sociologists, and historians alike, and will surely draw the attention of someone in German-American Studies and related fields.

Washburn University


Die beiden Herausgeber waren bescheiden genug, jeden Anspruch auf enzyklopädische Vollständigkeit ihres touristisch-historischen Traktats weit von sich zu weisen. Trotzdem möchte man diesem Bändchen eine bessere Zukunft bzw. Neuaufgabe wünschen, denn die jetzt vorliegende Fassung ist ausbaufähig, nicht nur in Hinsicht auf den Inhalt, sondern auch auf die drucktechnische Gestaltung. Beispielsweise wären viele Fotos in vergrößerter Form besser zur Geltung gelangt. Zahlreiche Aufnahmen sind außerdem


Point Pleasant, New Jersey

Gert Niers

Sounds of Ethnicity: Listening to German North America 1850-1914.


The third volume in the Studies in Immigration and Culture series published by the University of Manitoba Press, Barbara Lorenzkowski’s Sounds of Ethnicity explores verbal and musical expressions of ethnicity and intercultural exchanges from the mid-nineteenth century to World War I in the “heard worlds” (5) of German immigrant communities in rural Waterloo County, Ontario and urban Buffalo, New York. Engaging her readers in “historical eavesdropping” (8), Lorenzkowski pieces together discussions of language use from written documents and examines musical performance and identity in these communities. In doing so, she also reveals “public conversations on ethnicity and modernity, community and nation, public culture and transnationalism” (17).

The book is divided in two sections. Part I, “Language Matters,” consists of three chapters focusing on German in the press and in the schools. Chapter 1 is devoted to the Berliner Journal, the leading German-language newspaper of its time in Ontario and “translator” for its readership, connecting them to news from the homeland, English-language newspapers, as well as the German-language press in the United States (22, 24, 42). Lorenzkowski also follows the Berliner Journal’s running commentary on language use over the course of its publishing history. A staunch supporter of maintaining German in the new homeland, especially in the family home, the Berliner Journal also recognized the benefits of being bilingual (41), as long as there remained separate domains for German and English (25, 38). Criticizing what it viewed
as indifference towards language loss and observing increasing use of English and language mixing, the *Berliner Journal* cautioned that an inability to speak German would result in future generations losing “their right to membership in the ethnic community” (30).

In Chapter 2 Lorenzkowski traces the teaching of German in the Waterloo County schools. Comments from the *Berliner Journal* about immigrants being indifferent about passing German on to the next generation, were echoed in a lack of support for German language education. For immigrant parents, German was a conversational tool and practice at home was sufficient, while English instruction in the schools was seen as necessary for their children to integrate in the hybrid German-English environment (74-75). Whereas the community elites argued that German was essential to identity, immigrant parents didn’t make the same connection between language and identity: their identity was multilingual and crossed cultural boundaries (74).

Lorenzkowski then looks at Buffalo schools in Chapter 3, where the push for German language education carried with it modern teaching techniques that would influence teaching in the public school system (77). While German had often been taught like the classics where the focus was on grammar and translation, those who advocated German language maintenance promoted natural teaching styles which prioritized conversational use. Although the limitations of the classroom and teaching training did not always make these suggested reforms possible, it still left a mark on the educational system and created stronger connections between the German and Anglo instructors who shared pedagogical goals (97-98).

In Part II, “Sound Matters,” Lorenzkowski turns her attention to the domain of musical performances and traditions. Chapter 4 looks at the “transformative power of performance” in the Buffalo Singers’ Festival of 1860, which not only brought German singers together in a spirit of community, and brought them closer to their German heritage, but also opened the musical experience up to a more broader American audience who, despite being unable to understand the language of the songs, shared in the festival experience which served as a forum of communication for all involved (103, 116, 127).

German unification of 1871 had special meaning for German settlers abroad and their German ethnic identity, expressed in the German Peace Jubilees covered in Chapter 5. The jubilees were symbolic of the “cultural pluralism and dual loyalties” (131) felt by German North Americans. They were politically tied to their new homelands, but still felt a cultural connection to the land of their birth. Whereas in Canada the festivals were perceived in a positive light, the American festivals drew some negative attention, calling into question the loyalty of German-Americans to their new homeland, illustrating the difference of national contexts and identity (146-48).
Lorenzkowski highlights in Chapter 6 the cultural interactions in the Great Lake regions, as German-Canadians and German-Americans attended each other’s musical festivals, fostering a North American German community identity in which “bonds across the border strengthened and the festivals assumed the air of reunion” (184). While the smaller venues allowed leaders a chance to try to introduce more classical music and art in the celebrations, the emphasis was still on creating a social environment for fun and communication. But at the turn of the century, the process of modernization changed the nature of the music festivals, as demonstrated by Lorenzkowski in Chapter 7. The divide between high culture and popular culture widened (191-92), splitting the musical public between those who prioritized artistic performance and those who preferred the social aspects of festivals. Lorenzkowski also describes the impact of the creation of a music hall in Buffalo (194), the developing local identity of festivals (199), and changing expectations of audience etiquette (206).

The language and sound matters discussed by Lorenzkowski make a valuable contribution to the scholarship on North German American immigrant communities and ethnic identity by tuning in to the aural history of these communities and documenting their interconnected worlds of sounds. The connection with musical social spaces is a particular strength of her work, as musical performance played a significant role in these communities, and as shown by Lorenzkowski, created a domain for intercultural exchanges. As Lorenzkowski herself states, the fleeting and transient nature of sound is a challenge to aural history (21), but the available conversational fragments she gleans from newsprint and other documentation provide valuable information about the changing ideas on language and identity that prevailed in these communities from the time of immigration through the early years of the twentieth century. These conversations tend to be somewhat one-sided, biased towards the viewpoints of the society elites, but Lorenzkowski also points out, whenever possible, how these elite viewpoints may reflect responses to what is occurring in these communities on a more general level.

Coming from the perspective of a linguist, Lorenzkowski’s work, while not strictly a linguistic study, is highly relevant to those interested in North American German language varieties and domains in which they were used. It should be noted that Lorenzkowski uses the term “language change” in a general sense to describe what was happening in the varieties of these communities and the shift from German to English, whereas linguists would not. Overall, Sounds of Ethnicity is a valuable read for historians, sociolinguists, musicologists, and anyone interested in “hearing” how ethnicity was practiced in language use and in musical performance. This is one of Lorenzkowski’s stated goals (8), which she achieves.

Wayne State University

Felecia A. Lucht
Siedlungen und Leistungen der Deutschen in Brasilien.

It is but a very thin booklet–only 92 pages written in German–that claims to enlighten the reader about the German settlements and achievements in Brazil. This volume is number twelve in a series dedicated to German colonial history published by the International Study Group for Research in Colonial Studies (Internationaler Arbeitskreis für Kolonialwissenschaftliche Forschung). The series is published in Windhoek, Namibia, and previous volumes included mainly studies on the German presence in Africa. The present little volume now traces the German immigration to Brazil. In six chapters the editor Hartmut Fröschle tries to give an overview of the long history of the German presence. The main piece by Hartmut Fröschle himself (comprising nearly 50% of the pages) is a classical account of the German settlements in Brazil. Fröschle describes the few first German arrivals on Brazilian soil beginning in the sixteenth century with the Portuguese invasion before German immigration on a larger scale began in the nineteenth century. The most prominent of them is probably Heinrich Staden whose travel accounts published in 1557 achieved a wide readership in Germany and are still read by scholars of early modern travel literature.

The first attempts for an organized German settlement began in 1818 and were fostered by Georg Anton Schäffer who recruited more than 10,000 families (6) to settle on Brazilian soil. Many who came served as Söldner or mercenaries before settling in Brazil for good. The strategically organized German settlements in the southwest of Brazil helped to create farms and infrastructure for the country. Another wave of immigrants entered after 1918 and also settled mainly in the Sao Paulo region. Several settlement companies created in the 1930s continued to bring German-speaking settlers mainly to the southeastern states of Brazil. The last major phase of German immigration to Brazil began after World War II. The last estimate of the 1970s calculated that approximately 1.8 million German speakers had settled in Brazil. A figure given in 2007 speaks of five million German descendants.

Fröschle continues his general introduction with structured accounts of the German accomplishments in the areas of architecture, craftsmanship and industry, trade and transportation, science and research, military, politics, and government administration. The article concludes with a chronology of German migration from 1494 to 2007.

In a subsequent article Bodo Borst researches “The role of German-speaking Jesuits in Brazil from 1660 to 1760.” Borst claims that, although
German missionaries were much fewer in numbers and came at a later time than their Iberian colleagues, the Germans had a considerable impact. While a few individuals can be traced before 1660, the majority of German-speaking Jesuits came later. A prominent figure was Father Johann Phillip Bettendorff who not only founded several missionary stations but also worked as a linguist, farmer and entrepreneur. Due to his considerable influence on the Portuguese court he was instrumental in the passage of the Missionary Laws of 1686 that granted the native *Indios* some rights to protect them from slavery and exploitation. At the end of his life Bettendorff had not only established a large number of new missionary stations but he left a detailed historical and geographical account of the Tapajos river region of the Amazon. Borst’s account continues with a brief summary of further Jesuits active in that region until 1760, their expulsion in 1750, the dissolution of the Order by Pope Clemens XIV in 1777, and the resumption of Jesuit activities in 1924 that continues today.

In Eckhard Kupfer’s article “The German immigration to the State of Sao Paulo in the Nineteenth Century” the author traces the history of the first settlement, the foundation of the first German societies, and the creation of communal life. The first German “Hilfsverein” was founded in 1863; Dr. Wilhelm Delius published the first German paper in 1875; and in 1878 came the newspaper “Germania” that continued until 1921. By 1879 the “Hilfsverein” had collected enough money to open the first German school in Sao Paulo to 52 children. Although the developments of World War I seem to have lesser consequences for the school than similar histories shown for in the USA, it suffered considerably during World War II when in 1942 the government prohibited the employment of German nationals. The school then changed its name and the German language was banned from the classrooms. Not until 1966 was German language training offered again along with classes for children with German as their mother tongue. The most prominent alumni of the Calegio Visconde de Porto Seguro is probably Queen Silvia of Sweden who attended it from 1949 to 1956 when her father, a German business man, had moved the family to Brazil. The school still offers primary and secondary schooling for children with native German language skills as well as for German as a second language. Today the Martius-Staden-Institute is probably the most interesting place for researchers on the German history of Brazil. Founded in 1925 it had a rocky history but has managed to emerge as a prominent research library offering more than 150,000 documents and thousands of books and newspapers. The institute welcomes research visitors and still publishes a yearbook and awards the Martius-Staden-Award annually.

In her short article Ursula Dormien describes the recent history of the
"Brasil-Post," a German weekly published since 1950 and that is still read by German-Brazilians today. The final article is a brief history of German societies in Porto Alegre with an emphasis on their umbrella organization that continues today. Although just founded in 1914 the first German-Brazilian umbrella organization had to close its doors again when Brazil entered World War I in 1917 and the use of the German language was prohibited. The story repeated itself during World War II. In the 1950s German-Brazilian life began to recreate itself and is still active today. In the meantime the Brazilian “Verband der Deutsch-Brasilianischen Kulturvereinigungen” has connected itself to other national organizations throughout Latin America.

The title of this publication, Settlements and Achievements of the Germans in Brazil, promises more than it can deliver. It is simply too short. The modern reader may also be a little alienated by the Fraktur-Schrift on the title page and in headings. That has no place in a modern, scholarly publication, however romantic it may be. But maybe this work is not intended to be scholarly at all? Apart from Fröschle’s article most others are classical institutional histories with little distance between their authors and the subjects themselves. Eckhard Kupfer is the director of the Institute Martius-Staden; Ursula Dormien is the owner and publisher of the “Brasil-Post,” and Jorge Wolfgang Globig is the president of the umbrella organization for German-Brazilian societies. So this is more a “Festschrift” than anything else. There is nothing wrong with a “Festschrift” but for those readers who want to read an informative and interesting one I recommend Nina Tubino’s Das Deutschtum in Brasilien: A Germanidade no Brasil (Porto Alegre: Sociedade Germania, 2007).

Berlin, Germany

Katja Hartmann

Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire and the Globalization of the New South.


There can be no question that in the twentieth century American culture came to dominate the world. Surprising, however, is both how early in the twentieth century the process of American dominance began (it is not 1945 or even 1918, but 1902) and how thoroughly it constitutes the present day geo-political and economic structures of planet Earth. More shocking still are the origins (the ‘Scramble for Africa’), the social-political model (the Jim Crow South), and the major players (the Kaiserrreich, Tuskegee Institute) that
contributed to the implementation of what became virtual global policy. Bringing all of these elements together at the crossroads of the German colony of Togo, Andrew Zimmerman has produced nothing short of a masterpiece of historical research and analysis that demonstrates the transnational, interconnected, and tragic nature of global capitalism as it began to emerge in the early twentieth century.

To be sure, the Togo colony was intended to serve Germany’s industrial needs as a cotton producer at a time of voracious demand and dwindling worldwide supply. Nevertheless, when the German colonialists arrived in Togo they found a social and economic order replete with economically independent women, polygamy and a lackadaisical workforce that absolutely personified their worst assumptions about Africans and confirmed their darkest prejudices against workers in general. To overcome the problems of producing industrial grade cotton in west Africa, the Germans looked to the source of most such cotton, the American South. More importantly, to help them teach the Togolese to grow the cotton, German officials turned to Booker T. Washington’s Tuskegee Institute, which had just settled on a curriculum of industrial education to create a “new Negro” for the “New South.” In righting the upside-down world of Togolese gender and sex relations, the Germans drew upon their own experience in dealing with the migrant Polish workers of East Prussian estates.

Shared American and German attitudes about race, sex and labor fueled the relentless drive of both Germans and Tuskegee graduates to transform the free, prosperous Togolese into American New South-style sharecroppers of cotton. German and American experiences with and fears of single, unmarried workers, whom they regarded as either as lazy, as potential victims of socialism, or as sexually profligate, functioned to impose on the Togolese a harsh regimen of disciplined labor. Operating under a policy of ‘education to work,’ the Togolese were systematically transformed into small homesteaders whose agricultural practices, however inappropriate for African conditions, satisfied Western eyes and, in response, many Togolese simply fled. The remainder could only be kept in place through the careful use of terror, occasional torture and prison. In the end, German and American efforts to create a viable cotton agri-industry in the Togo were so successful that the League of Nations adopted the scheme wholesale for use throughout the rest of the European colonial empires. The American New South thus became the model for the rest of the colonial world’s economic development.

Although Zimmerman’s thesis uses gender, sex and race to investigate the common history of the South, Togo and the German Reich, it is at its heart a labor history. Famously Karl Marx noted that capitalism exists in a fundamental contradiction in the creation of its own gravediggers. Much less
famously, perhaps, but equally paradoxical, capitalism requires untrammeled labor in order to grow, and much of the nineteenth century political accomplishment achieved across Europe and North America was in fact to dismantle regimes of forced labor, such as those suffered by the East Prussian serf and the American black slave. But emancipated labor threatened the foundations of bourgeois society and propriety. The advantage of emancipated labor is that it works much harder and with greater diligence than coerced labor, but it is also free to avoid areas of low wages and seek areas with higher wages, upon which labor regimes frown.

Furthermore, liberated labor has a nasty proclivity of frightening the employing classes with its sexual profligacy. Polish seasonal workers and American blacks were the bugbears of their masters/former masters, who feared for a sexual based breakdown of the social order, whether because workers would have sex and enjoy themselves rather than work, or might fall in love with German/white women (who might also fall in love with them), or worse still they could go on raping rampages. Free labor worked harder, but its incipient threat was its freedom, to travel, to love, to do whatever it might. It was a threat to the entire moral order of 19th century society to such a degree that that such labor was not sustainable. This, in spite of the fact that in the Togo all the practices of binding nominally liberated labor to the labor exacting regimes perfected in Germany and the American South were brought to bear: the chicanery of ruinous credit practices, legal restrictions on labor’s movement, bourgeois paternalism, destruction of native self-identity for that of the colonizer’s choosing, traditional agricultural replaced with monoculture and the entire economy, once independent and thriving, converted into a true colonial economy, yoked totally to the European colonizer for both markets and supplies.

In this work any number of hoary historiographical shibboleths (like American exceptionalism, the German Sonderweg and any kind of lingering reputation Germans possess as being benign colonial masters) are so thoroughly demolished as to leave historians scratching their heads for analytic frameworks with which to replace them. Zimmerman’s argument places at its center assumptions common to American and German capitalists, intellectuals and political elites about workers, blacks and Africans. He also shows the appalling results their common attitudes about race, sex, gender and culture generated. Finally, Zimmerman makes his own contribution to a much larger and older historical debate regarding the European ‘Scramble for Africa’ (a debate that itself dates from the time of the Germans’ project in the Togo). Europeans were not in search of markets or investment opportunities per Hobson and Lenin, rather they were looking for laboratories in which to create docile, disciplined workers whose labor could be fully exploited for
European economies. They were devastatingly successful.

Zimmerman’s brilliant analysis effectively demonstrates that the web of capitalist economic structures interweave and interconnect states in ways individual participants themselves might not have fully grasped. Indeed, understanding these economic forces and their effects busied some of the mightiest intellects of their day, including Max Weber, Gustav Schmoller and W.E.B. Du Bois, and stretched from the sandy fields of East Prussia, Alabama and Togo to the rarified atmospheres of the Ivory Towers at the universities of Chicago and Berlin, where they continue to inform influential schools of social thought. More devastatingly, as the tendrils of capitalism unfurled across the world and across the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, they ensnared peoples like those of the Togo, totally unprepared and incapable of defending themselves, whose lives and societies were most thoroughly upended by European and American industrial needs and social thought, transforming them into global sharecroppers in all but name. This is an important work, and will set the standard for transnational history for years to come.

East Carolina University

Chad Ross

A Girl from Alt Jabel.

This is the autobiography of a girl born in 1926 who grew up in the village of Alt Jabel in southern Mecklenburg—written in a very simple forthright style. In her first volume, Journey to Freedom, the author describes in fascinating detail her life from her earliest memories until she boarded the boat for America in 1951. Highlights include the death of her mother when the author was eight, life with a very stern father, the war years, her engagement to a German military pilot, and her dramatic crossing of the Elbe River to West Germany at the end of the war in May 1945. Several months after her “flight to the West,” she fell deeply in love with an American soldier. In the spring of 1946 she discovered that she was pregnant. The soldier returned with his unit to the USA—promising that he would return for her soon. But he didn’t. In due time, she gave birth to his son. In January 1949 she received a postcard from her military-pilot fiancé, recently released from a POW prison in Siberia. She did not reply, feeling that, as an unwed mother of a child fathered by an American soldier, she had become second class in
the eyes of many German people. Later that year, she married a Polish cook for the local American air base. Convinced that it would be easiest to start a new life in America, they (including now also a daughter) boarded a ship in Bremerhaven in December 1951 and headed for New York. This volume is excellent first-hand documentation of the impact of World War II on the personal lives of German citizens.

In her second volume, America the Beautiful, the author tells how the family arrived in New York, penniless but sponsored by the National Catholic Conference. She relates how, via hard work and frugal spending, they were able to buy their own home in 1955. Her four children have done well. Since the reunification, the author has made several trips back to Germany, reconnecting with her past. During one of these trips, she attempted to locate her wartime fiancé, but learned that he had passed away in 1987. In 2008, she contacted the soldier father of her first child via telephone. He was on his deathbed. A poignant conversation followed -- just a few days before he passed away. Hence the author achieved significant closure on both of her early loves. The second volume documents not only the challenges facing emigrants from Germany to America after WWII but also the opportunities available for those willing to work hard.

This autobiography is the story of one of over 60,000 unwed mothers with children left behind by the Allied troops after World War II. Journey to Freedom was published in serial form in the California Staats-Zeitung, with the last installment appearing 28 May 2011. America the Beautiful is being published currently, also in serial form, with the first installment appearing 4 June 2011.

University of California, Los Angeles

Eldon Knuth

The Journey Takers.

It takes an especially dedicated individual to do serious genealogical research. It requires a higher level of dedication to undertake placing that research in a historical context and to put it before the public. Leslie Albrecht Huber is, without doubt, a thorough and competent genealogical researcher and author of over one hundred articles on the subject. Having worked as a professional researcher at the family history library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS), she developed the skills and tenacity to
undertake a ten year journey of her own, not only to find, but also to try to understand her own ancestors. In the introductory notes to her self-published book, *The Journey Takers*, her stated purpose was “... not to write a scholarly account or even a thorough family history. I wanted to write a story—a narrative.” To write that narrative, she got out of the library and made her ancestors’ journeys in reverse, when she could.

As a nation mostly descended from immigrants, many of us are fascinated with the stories of our immigrant forebears, and seek to find a sense of continuity in our family stories, to help us provide a more grounded sense of who we are, as individuals, or as a people. A cursory online search of books relating to genealogy and family history yields several thousand items, in large part self-help books showing you how to find your elusive ancestors. There are also numerous genealogical databases, containing billions of documents, to help you in your search. One problem encountered by many is that of finding a starting point to their search.

As a member of the LDS church, Huber had a tailor-made starting point. Her immigrant ancestors came to the United States after having converted to Mormonism in the nineteenth century. These are the journey takers of her title, and their stories begin in three separate places: the German state of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Sweden, and England. As she travels to these locations to see if anything remains of the places her ancestors knew, Huber relates her own unfolding life experiences to those of her ancestors – her impending marriage, subsequent childbearing and childbirths balanced against the records of births, infant deaths and multiple marriages of her ancestors. In telling their stories, Huber interweaves documented research with fictionalized scenes from her ancestors’ lives. To her credit, she is quite forthcoming in her purpose for this: “I ... create scenes that could have taken place. I feel these are an important element of the story. Although I don’t know exactly what emotions my ancestors had, I certainly know they had emotions. Telling their story without these doesn’t do them justice.”

On this point, I disagree with her. I am no stranger to the sense of history one can feel when walking streets your ancestors may have walked, or learning how extraordinary it was that they left behind most of what they knew for an uncertain future. It is not the visualizing of her ancestors that gives me pause, but rather how far afield she seems to go. I think the *Journey Takers* would have been a stronger book if she had relied a bit less on her imagination. With her gifts for research, and her ability to visualize the stories of her immigrant ancestors, I believe Leslie Huber has the makings of a historical novelist. Telling her family story as a historical novel would allow her to use historical research to frame her family’s journey, while using her informed imagination to tell the story of their lives in an engaging manner, which would not do
them an injustice. My objections aside, *The Journey Takers* is an informative and instructive book, with an extensive bibliography, as well as some useful maps. It also contains useful insights into the art of genealogical research.

William Woods University


Edda Ziegler hat mit ihrer jetzt vorliegenden engagierten Studie ein Panorama der weiblichen Exilliteratur entworfen, bei der biografische Angaben und Textkritik einander auf anschauliche Weise ergänzen. Sehr informativ sind auch die Analyse des Buchmarkts und die Einordnung der Autorinnen in die literarische Szene vor 1933. Der Band mag sich in seiner Ein- und Übersicht durchaus als Lehrbuch eignen.


Der Hinweis im Impressum, dass es sich beim vorliegenden Band um eine „revidierte und erweiterte Neuauflage“ handelt, ermutigt zu der Hoffnung, dass solche Vorschläge bei einer künftigen Auflage berücksichtigt werden könnten. Die Rezeption von Exilliteratur ist offenbar ein sich wandelnder, für Korrekturen zugänglicher (um nicht zu sagen anfälliger) Prozess.

Point Pleasant, New Jersey  Gert Niers

Those of us who live on the periphery of Anabaptist life, often regard it as an endless struggle. This is most palpably obvious in the case of Amish and Old Order Mennonite groups, the plain people, who grapple with so much: maintaining their growing communities, negotiating the lives of their youth in a modern culture, competing for business in an open market, and, heroically, saving money for farms and businesses for their children. But it is not only the plain Anabaptist groups who struggle and, in fact, my impression is that the Anabaptist groups that do not remain plain wrestle with their decisions and identity even more.

This makes sense, of course. Without the visible and auditory markers that separate the plain groups from the rest of us, non-visible markers must be found that will hold them together as a community and also separate them from the larger society. Those markers are lifestyle and philosophy. To this end Brethren, Mennonite, and non-plain Anabaptist groups devote an entirely admirable amount of time and energy to the discussion and debate of their values and policies. Each accommodation to modernity and technology is born from years of painful soul-searching and debate. Significantly, as the author of From Nonresistance to Justice, Ervin R. Stutzman, argues, this discussion and debate tends to be limited largely to the written text. In this case, the explanation is the Mennonite tendency to avoid public conflict and controversy, and this is the justification for Stutzman’s approach: a painstaking analysis of the documents that trace the development of the pacifistic views of the Mennonite Church USA and Mennonite Church Canada over one hundred years, which, he feels, offer a deeper and fuller view into the process than that of theology, sociology, or history alone.

Ervin R. Stutzman’s life and career have familiarized him with realities of Anabaptist communities and the written discourse of the church. He is currently the Executive Director of Mennonite Church USA and served for nearly 12 years as Dean and Professor of Church Ministries at Eastern Mennonite Seminary, Harrisonburg, Virginia. He has also served as pastor, district overseer, missions administrator, conference moderator and, from 2001 to 2003, as moderator for Mennonite Church USA. Though he was born Amish in Kalona, Iowa, he found his way into the Mennonite Church and into higher education, and holds master’s degrees from the University of Cincinnati and Eastern Mennonite Seminary and a doctorate from Temple University. His doctoral dissertation covered the same subject as this book.
As the title implies, the pacifistic discourse of the Mennonite Church over the last hundred years shifted focus from nonresistance to justice, and in so doing it responded to forces within and outside of the church. The process was exceedingly complex. Among other fascinating sources in his analysis, Stutzman traces “New Terms” in the peace-related Index Headings in the Gospel Herald and The Mennonite from 1908-2008. These illuminate the scope of Mennonite concerns: Civilian Public Service, Draft Registration, Cold War, Israel-Arab Border Conflict, Guantanamo, Iraqi Refugees, and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. Throughout his analysis, Stutzman’s conviction is always that rhetoric, which he defines simply as “public discourse,” is the soul of the Church and its mission to spread the Gospel, but also of human integrity and our efforts to live together in peaceful communities. Along the way, he explores rhetoric as persuasion, as symbolic action, as identification, as structure, and as movement. This book is a sophisticated scholarly analysis of one hundred years of discourse on peace and is recommended for scholars and serious readers of Anabaptist history, of peace rhetoric, and of rhetoric, in general, also for anyone interested in the rigorously “examined life” and values guided by deep faith.

Susquehanna University

Susan M. Schürer


By Heinrich Lienhard. Edited by Christa Landert; foreword by Leo Schelbert. Zürich: Limmat Verlag, 2010. 761 pp. €52.00.

As Leo Schelbert says in his foreword, this volume is truly “ein grosses Buch” (7). Not only is it a monumental tome at over 760 pages, but it is also a grand accomplishment of transcription and editing by Christa Landert. The memoirs of Swiss immigrant and pioneer, Heinrich Lienhard (1822-1903), detailing his three-years in the American West during the late 1840s contain a wealth of details about the critical years surrounding the War with Mexico (1846-47) and the California Gold Rush at Sutter’s Fort (1848), a fascinating period in the history of the American Republic. After several earlier partial publications of his narrative, some in English translation, others in the
original German, that were not always faithful to the original manuscript, Landert has produced a critically edited version of the original German text.

Landert prefaces her edition of Lienhard’s lengthy memoirs of the years 1846-49 with a biographical sketch of Lienhard’s childhood in Switzerland, travel to the U.S. in 1843 and his first years in the New World living in the Swiss settlement of Highland, Illinois (1843-46). Following Lienhard’s narrative, Landert then continues the biographical sketch with Lienhard’s first departure from California in 1849 and brief return to Switzerland (1849-50), his second sojourn in California in the first half of 1850, and his last return to Switzerland (1851-54), where he marries Elsbeth Blumer and their first two children are born. Landert completes the biographical sketch with Lienhard’s eventual return to the U.S. in 1854, where he initially settles in Madison, Wisconsin (birth of his third child), and his ultimate establishment as a farmer in Nauvoo, Illinois, in 1856, where his last six children are born. Lienhard dies in Nauvoo in 1903 after completing the memoirs of his early years in California during the 1870s and participating in their first partial publication in 1898.

Certainly one of the highpoints of Lienhard’s narrative is his description of that February day in 1848 when his fellow Swiss immigrant Jacob Wittmer returned to Sutter’s Fort and reported that gold had been found. Apparently until that point Sutter and the operator of the sawmill John Marshall had managed to keep the secret since their initial discovery in mid-January of that year. According to Lienhard, he confronted Wittmer saying: “Wenn du [sic] Gold entdeckt hast, wirst Du doch gewiss welches mit Dir gebracht haben” (529). After Wittmer produces some small yellowish nuggets, the group of men with Lienhard melts one down on an anvil and determines it is indeed gold. As Lienhard describes it:

Die eben noch so ruhig sich verhaltenden Männer tanzten wie plötzlich wahnsinninger gewordene Männer über altes Eisen, Hämmer und Zangen, um den Ambos herum, lachten, jauchzten, schrieen, pfiffen, sangen und jodelten, dass, wenn jemand sie hätte sehen können, ohne den Grund zu diesem Lärm zu kennen, [er] gewiss geglaubt haben müsste, sie hätten durch irgend ein Zufall den Verstand verloren. . . . “Gold!—Gold!—Gold! Bei chimney—Gold, boys, Gold! We will all be rich, all of us—hurrah for the Gold!” und dergleichen waren unsere Rufe. (530)

Whether Lienhard is describing his overland journey to California across the Rocky Mountains in 1846, his first encounter with Johann Sutter, his several encounters with grizzly bears, the life of Indians in various locales, and
the like, his narrative is itself filled with dozens of such nuggets of information that fascinate and enlighten. His Erinnerungen are an incredible treasure trove for anyone interested in this period of American history. We can be thankful that Lienhard’s father eventually relented and permitted his son to travel to the New World saying in exasperation: “Wenn Du absolut nach Amerika willst, so gehe in Gottesnamen!”

We can also be truly thankful that Christa Landert devoted over two decades working with Lienhard’s original manuscript at the Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, to produce this edition. Her detailed description of the manuscript and critical apparatus accompanying the narrative and her biographical sketch of Lienhard’s life before and after his 1846-49 memoirs are enhanced with numerous maps and illustrations. Landert’s edition also includes a replica four-part “Map of the Emigrant Road from Independence Mo. to St. Francisco California” published in 1849 in a slip-pocket on the inside back cover. This reviewer notes with some personal satisfaction that Lienhard’s route from Independence to the West Coast passes across the Kansas prairie at one point where the future town of Lawrence would arise in 1854, now the home of the University of Kansas. Lienhard passed through that area some eight years before Kansas Territory was opened for settlement.

The University of Kansas

William D. Keel

Sweet Sister Moon.

Norbert Krapf, Indiana Poet Laureate 2008-10, has made a name for himself with a series of poetry volumes that focus on his geographic and personal background, such as Somewhere in Southern Indiana: Poems of Midwestern Origins (1993), The Country I Come From (2002), Looking for God’s Country (2005), Invisible Presence: A Walk through Indiana in Photographs and Poems (photos by Darryl D. Jones, 2006), and Bloodroot: Indiana Poems (with photos by David Pierini, 2008). In addition to these collections, two more poetry volumes highlight other places of relevance for the author’s biography: Blue-Eyed Grass: Poems of Germany (1997) and Bittersweet Along the Expressway: Poems of Long Island (2000). A prose volume is dedicated to the author’s early years in the Hoosier State, The Ripest Moments: A Southern Indiana Childhood (2008). As indicated by the titles of these collections, the identity of Krapf’s poetic voice is closely connected with his essentially
American geographic background.

Krapf was born in 1943 in the rural community of Jasper in Southern Indiana. His ancestors immigrated to this country from Franconia (Germany) during the first half of the nineteenth century. Occasionally, German words come up in his poetry like quaint greetings from a distant past. Still, his poetic essence is clearly American – not just because of the language and the subjects but mainly because of his compositional approach which operates almost exclusively with free verses guided by enjambement and bundled into various strophe patterns, a distinct feature of contemporary American poetry. This genre is often referred to as a narrative poem. As if he wanted to take a step forward from the geographical backdrop of his previous collections, Krapf has brought a new dominant theme into his latest publication, *Sweet Sister Moon*, a poetic tribute to the universal woman and, at the same time, an artistically relevant attempt at overcoming gender polarization and other sins of the past.

It is probably not a coincidence that this seven-part collection is presented without a subtitle. The volume covers a wide range of relations, affiliations, and perceptions, too diversified to be subsumed under one umbrella. Krapf, who also translated seminal poems by Rainer Maria Rilke, offers a *Stundenbuch*, a poetic prayer book in celebration of the eternally feminine. Of course, the result of his efforts is not a form of *écriture feminine*. How could it possibly be? But the author is aware of literature written by women and refers to it, e.g., in a homage to Emily Dickinson (36-37). He also offers extensive commentary on another art form, music, as presented by female performers such as Ma Rainey (113-14), Bessie Smith (115), Billie Holiday (116-17), the Hampton Sisters (Virtue and Aletra, 118-19), Monika Herzig (120-22), Cassandra Wilson (123), Diana Krall (124), Lucinda Williams (125-26), and Carrie Newcomer (127-28). The title of the entire book is taken from a song called “Sweet Sister Moon” as rendered by Kriss Luckett-Ziesemer and Greg Ziesemer. Krapf describes the duet in “Full Moon over Central Indiana” (131).

There is no further reference made to the lyrics of this song, but by then it is already clear who is meant by the epithet “sweet sister” in this poetry collection and in the real life of the author. The third part of the book, altogether nine poems under the collective title “The Sister in the Circle” (57-73), is an explicit and very sensitive homage to the poet’s stillborn sister Marilyn. The attitude taken by the poetic voice is that of adoration reminiscent of medieval altar paintings. The reader may make the association with well-known moon mythology which often identifies the moon as feminine (e.g. in Latin and Romance languages). In as much as the moon is of the same origin as the earth and is able to lighten the earth at night, the *Sweet Sister Moon* is
of existential significance for the poetic ego, i.e., the feminine functions as the alter ego.

Within the seven parts of this collection, Krapf has proven himself not just as a virtuoso of different styles, but foremost as an author who is genuinely dedicated to an understanding of the female being and the female existence. The range of this poetic voice is applied to themes of family and parenthood as well as to love poems and spiritual explorations of other cultures. In the last section of this volume, Krapf offers a selection of lyrical comments on various paintings from the famous Helga series by Andrew Wyeth (151-69). However, this is not the first time the author has raised his interpretation of an art object to the level of a poem. His early collection *Lines Drawn from Dürer* (1981), later incorporated into the volume *Blue-Eyed Grass* (cf. above), qualifies as the natural counterpart to the “Songs of Helga.” The two selections make up a parallel approach to an ekphrastic genre known in Germany as the Bildgedicht (“picture poem”), meaning a poem that embarks on a dialog with a work of art, but not in the sense that it merely describes what can be seen in the picture, but rather develops its own response or commentary to the subject presented in the other art form. Thereby the poem gains its independence from the object that originally inspired it. In the final analysis the Bildgedicht stands on its own. It does not need the work of art as a visual support or illustration. Consequently, it was not necessary to add reproductions of the paintings to the book.

*Sweet Sister Moon* is not a poetry collection built on dichotomy, neither in a lunar nor in a human sense. It does not lay claim to any ideological or political territory. In an almost spiritual and post-feminist sense the term sister is used to identify family bonds, another form of the self, a reconciliation of the genders without renunciation of the male counterpart. Poetry may not change society immediately, but it might have a long-term effect. This collection is a small book that encourages great hope.

*Point Pleasant, New Jersey*  
*Gert Niers*

---

**Das Bild vom Krieg: Zu den Romanen Lothar Günther Buchheims.**  

Das Fach Germanistik ist heute ein breites Feld: Film- und Musikkurse, Seminare über die sozialen Nebeneffekte der Grimm’schen Märchen oder sogar Pop-Kultur. Themen, die einst am Rande des Studiums lagen, sind jetzt nicht mehr wegzudenken. Freilich haben sie unsere Aufmerksamkeit


Wittwars Untersuchung ist tiefgründig und für Leser, die keine apologetische, sondern eine tatsächliche Beschreibung des literarischen Stils und des quantitativen linguistischen Wertes des Verfassers Buchheim sucht, lässt sich *Das Bild vom Krieg* wie ein Begleitheft lesen.


Hofstra University       Dean Guarnaschelli

New York Amish: Life in the Plain Communities of the Empire State.

Some time ago, Merlin, a Old Order Stauffer Mennonite living close to our home in Snyder County, PA, told us about his plans to move to upstate New York. He had recently married, and we met his wife and first child in a small house which he had built with the help of his parents and his large family. He was earning his living working in a machine shop and intermittently in a woodworking shop making pallets. Both shops are owned by fellow Mennonites, and there is no electricity for light or the heavy machines which are pneumatically powered. Merlin related that several members of his community, his brother among them had relocated to New York because farmland was available and affordable there. He intended to join them and had gone there on several occasions to help his brother, but so far he has not moved his family. It is a hard decision for him and his wife to leave their families and the beautiful valley of the Susquehanna River and become modern pioneers.
The Stauffer Mennonites are Anabaptists, plain people just like the Old Order Amish, so when I saw the study by Johnson-Weiner, I looked forward to reading it. I was not disappointed! A professor at SUNY, Potsdam, New York, the author lives close to several Amish settlements and has studied the Amish migration to and from the Empire State closely for over twenty-five years. She visits the Amish regularly and defines her research method as “participant observation.” As the extensive bibliography of her study shows, she is also very familiar with the research literature on the Amish and other plain sects. The result is that she always places her findings into the wider historical, cultural, and sociological context. This is of great importance for the reader who is not a specialist on the topic, especially in regard to the doctrinal disputes based on the “Schrift,” the Holy Bible, and disagreements concerning the discipline, or “Ordnung” which regulates the daily life of the Old Order sects and has led to so many schisms.

I might mention at this point that the informative appendices (A-D), the index and the illustrations add to the appeal of the book. It is also helpful for readers to keep at hand a road map of New York, such as the one provided by AAA to located the new settlements and see their location in a wider geographical overview.

While the heartlands of Amish settlements are Pennsylvania and Ohio, with Indiana, Illinois, Iowa and Canada also mentioned fairly often, New York used to be a blank spot. Except for one community in the nineteenth century there were no settlements there until after World War II, and as Johnson-Weiner points out in her preface, the Amish have come in larger numbers only since 1975. But now there are twenty-five settlements across the state mostly in the northern parts, often fairly close to the Canadian border (see Appendix A).

Just like the first wave of Amish settlers who came to the New World during the first half of the eighteenth century, and the second wave which followed in 1817 after the end of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe until the beginning of the Civil War in the United States in 1861, the immigrants were not a homogeneous group. The Anabaptists had tried to carry the Protestant Reformation under Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and others from the religious into the social sphere. Rejecting the hierarchy of the Catholic Church as well as of the secular world, they formed congregations based on their understanding of the Bible in regard to equality, pacifism, and separation from the world. However, the Bible can be read and interpreted in many different ways, which led to the formation of many different sects, even among the Mennonites. The Amish were the first splinter group, and they in turn underwent the process of division (see Appendix C). The secular powers—allied with the mainstream churches—saw these dissidents as a threat to their rule and
persecuted them ruthlessly. If caught and unwilling to renounce their faith, they were executed by hanging, beheading, burning, drowning and other imaginative ways, and their supporters were threatened with heavy penalties. Fortunately, some territorial rulers and states such as Holland and Prussia allowed them to follow their religion and conscience as long as they paid their taxes and kept a low profile. An attempt to form their own kingdom of Zion in the Westphalian town of Muenster in the 1530s was bloodily suppressed, the leaders executed, and their bodies hung in iron cages over the entrance to the cathedral where for 300 years they reminded the church goers what was going to happen to heretics.

But back to the Amish in New York: Johnson-Weiner discusses the founding and lifestyle of the new settlements in chronological order, examining first the reasons families give for leaving their parent community, and then the slow process of establishing their new congregations. The old warning about making a home and living in a strange land: “Dem Ersten Tod, dem Zweiten Not, dem Dritten Brot,” however, does not fit these modern settlers. This does not mean that all settlements are a success. Some fail due to a number of factors, as is shown by several extinct settlements in New York (see Appendix B). The reasons for their failure are examined: they are caused by internal and external conflicts which might be similar to the ones that induced the families to move in the first place from places such as Lancaster. There the scarcity of farmland, often exacerbated by rising land prices and higher assessments resulting in higher taxes, make it impossible for most Amish families to buy the necessary land to establish new farms for their sons. They are forced to earn their money exclusively as craftsmen, often in non-Amish businesses. They can no longer follow the agrarian lifestyle of their forefathers, working together as a family and raising their children at home and in a congregation separated from the modern world and its cultural, economic, and technological forces. These forces seem bent on subverting the way of life of the Amish, especially that of the children to whom parents want to teach the skills necessary for successful farming and a craft, as Menno Simons admonished his followers to do, and to impart the spiritual values to live as good Christians.

Johnson-Weiner explains that in the North Country of New York good farmland is available at a fraction of the price the Amish would have to pay in their traditional areas. These they could afford! Strangely, considering the move of mainstream society to Florida and other southern and southwestern states during the last decades, the prospect of cold and harsh winters does not seem to intimidate them. The first families settling in a new location hope that a chain reaction will start and other families will follow them so that they can form a new congregation. In doing so they hope to avoid community
strife and internal conflicts concerning the *Ordnung* that have often led to frictions and schisms. They also want to get along amiably with their “English” neighbors and the local, regional and federal government. Although they are “in” but not “of” this world they are good citizens and contrary to often voiced but incorrect complaints that they are exempt from paying taxes, they not only pay all taxes, they even pay the local school taxes, although they pay for and build their old schools to make sure that their children are taught by Amish teachers in an Amish environment. Parents are very concerned and saddened when they hear about improper behavior of their adolescent children although these have not been baptized and are not yet members of the congregation. They see close-knit families and congregations as the means to keep the world at bay and have their children follow in their footsteps. However, they cannot achieve a strict separation from the world since the viability of their congregations also depends on their economic success in finding markets for their agricultural products, their handicraft, and their work skills. They need money—not much—but still enough to pay their taxes and buy products that they cannot manufacture themselves.

Johnson-Weiner’s study tells us that New York State is in the process of creating a rich Amish heritage and that the Old Order Amish contribute to the diversity and vitality of the Empire State. However, her study is not restricted to New York, but is an important contribution to the study of the history of the plain people in general and the Old Order Amish congregations in particular. It is highly recommended and belongs into the library of all those interested in the history of religion, especially that of the Anabaptists since the days of the Reformation.

_The Pennsylvania State University_  

*Ernst Schürer*
Yearbook of German-American Studies
Five-Year Index:
Articles, Book Reviews, Authors of Reviews, Topical Index

This five-year index follows the format of the indexes published in 2000 and 2005 beginning with an alphabetical listing by author of all articles published in the past five years. The second listing contains all books reviewed arranged by last name of the book’s author. An alphabetical index of all authors of book reviews is followed by a general topical index of all articles and reviews. In addition to the five regular issues of the Yearbook indexed, we have also included the supplemental issue published during this five-year period, The Language and Culture of the Pennsylvania Germans: A Festschrift for Earl C. Haag, edited by William D. Keel and C. Richard Beam (2010).

William D. Keel, Editor
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</table>
SOCIETY FOR GERMAN-AMERICAN STUDIES

BYLAWS

Article I. Name and Purpose

1. The name of the organization shall be the Society for German-American Studies.

2. The purpose of this Society shall be:

   2.1. To promote the scholarly study of the German element in the context of culture and society in the Americas.

   2.2. To produce, present, and publish research findings and educational materials.

   2.3. To assist researchers, teachers and students in pursuing their interests in German-American Studies.

Article II. Membership

1. Membership in the Society shall be open to all persons and organizations interested in German-American Studies.

2. Application for membership shall be made in a manner approved by the Executive Committee.

3. The Society affirms the tradition of academic freedom and will not interpret the exercise of free expression to constitute an act prejudicial to the Society. However, if the Executive Committee deems that any member of the Society is at any time guilty of an act which is prejudicial to the Society or to the purposes for which it was formed, such person shall be asked to submit a written explanation of such act within thirty
days. If the clarification is not acceptable to the Executive Committee, then at its discretion the membership may be terminated.

**Article III. Officers**

1. The officers of the Society shall be president, vice president, secretary, and treasurer, all of whom are members of the Society and are elected at the annual meeting of the members.

2. The term of office for members elected secretary or treasurer shall be for two years. A secretary or treasurer may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

3. The member elected as vice president will serve one two-year term and automatically assume the presidency for a single two-year term following the next regular election.

4. The duties of the officers are as follows:

   4.1. The president serves as the official spokesperson of the Society, chairs the Executive Committee, and presides over annual meetings.

   4.2. The vice president maintains the procedures of and coordinates the schedule for the annual symposia. The vice president presides when the president is not available.

   4.3. The secretary keeps a written record of the annual business meetings of the membership and all meetings of the Executive Committee. The secretary maintains the handbook of procedures and policies established by the Executive Committee and deposits all written records in the official repository of the Society as provided for in Article XIV.

   4.4. The treasurer keeps the financial records of the Society and prepares an annual budget.

5. The resignation of any officer shall be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee

6. If any vacancy should occur, the Executive Committee shall elect a member of the Society to fill such vacancy for the unexpired term.

7. No officer shall receive directly or indirectly any salary, compensation, or emolument from the Society. The Society may, however, pay compensation to employees or agents who are not members of the Society.
Article IV. Meetings

1. The Society shall hold an annual symposium which shall include the annual business meeting of the membership.

2. The Executive Committee shall meet at the symposium and any other time as may be required to conduct business.

3. A quorum at the annual business meeting of the Society shall consist of a majority of the members present.

Article V. Order of Business and Parliamentary Procedures

1. Robert’s Rules of Order shall be the authority followed for parliamentary procedures at all meetings of the Society.

2. The order of business at any meeting of the members of the Society shall be as follows:
   2.1. Call to order
   2.2. Reading and approval of minutes of the last meeting
   2.3. Reports of officers
   2.4. Reports of committees
   2.5. Election of officers [in alternate years]
   2.6. Communications
   2.7. Old business
   2.8. New business
   2.9. Adjournment

3. The order of business at any meeting may be changed by a vote of a majority of the members present. A motion to change the order of business is not debatable.

Article VI. Dues and Finances

1. The annual dues of members are on a calendar-year basis, normally payable in advance by 31 January. Non-payment of dues will result in the cancellation of membership.
2. The amount of dues and assessments shall be set by the Executive Committee.

3. The fiscal year shall be from July through June.

4. The operating funds of the Society shall be deposited in a federally-insured financial institution.

   4.1. Operating expenses shall be disbursed according to the budget approved by the Executive Committee.

   4.2. Unbudgeted expenses shall be disbursed upon order of the president subject to review by the Executive Committee.

5. The investment funds of the Society shall be invested with one or more financial institutions by an investment advisor approved by the Executive Committee.

   5.1. Such funds may be disbursed only upon order of the Executive Committee.

**Article VII. Nominations and Elections**

1. Election of officers will be at a general business meeting of the membership.

2. All officers shall take office on 1 July of the year in which they are elected.

**Article VIII. Committees**

1. Standing Committees

   1.1. Executive Committee

      1.1.1. The Executive Committee consists of the four elected officers of the Society, the editor(s) of the Newsletter, the editor(s) of the Yearbook, the website manager, and the Membership Committee co-chairs.

      1.1.2. Except as otherwise required by law or provided for by these Bylaws, the entire control of the Society and its affairs and property shall be vested in its Executive Committee as trustees.

      1.1.3. The Executive Committee shall supervise the affairs of the Society and regulate its internal economy, approve expenditures and commitments, act for and carry out the established
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policies of the Society, and report to the membership through the president at its annual meeting.

1.1.3.1. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

1.1.4. No organization shall serve as a member of the Executive Committee.

1.2. Membership Committee

1.2.1. The Membership Committee shall be co-chaired by an American and a European representative appointed by the Executive Committee.

1.2.2. The Membership Committee shall be responsible for maintaining the membership list, and working to maintain and increase membership in the Society.

1.3. Publications Committee

1.3.1. The Publications Committee shall be co-chaired by the principal editors of the Society and shall consist of all associate editors and the website manager.

1.3.2. The Publications Committee shall oversee the various publishing activities of the Society.

1.4. Nominations Committee

1.4.1. The Nominations Committee shall consist of the immediate past president of the Society, who will serve as chair, and two additional members appointed by the president.

1.4.2. The Nominations Committee shall solicit nominations and prepare a slate of candidates for officers and conduct the election of officers at the annual meeting.

1.4.2.1. Members of the Nominations Committee cannot be nominated for an office.

1.4.3. The Nominations Committee shall also solicit nominations for the annual Outstanding Achievement Award and report the results to the Executive Committee for consideration.

1.5. Publication Fund Committee
1.5.1. The Karl J. R. Arndt Publication Fund Committee consists of a chair and two additional members. The chair will normally be the editor of the Society’s Yearbook. The two additional members, at least one of whom shall not be a current member of the Society’s Executive Committee, are appointed by the president for a renewable two-year term.

1.6. Research Fund Committee

1.6.1. The Albert Bernard Faust Research Fund Committee consists of three members, one selected from the Society’s Executive Committee and two selected from the membership at large. The president appoints all members for a renewable two-year term and designates the chair.

2. Ad Hoc Committees

2.1. Except as otherwise provided by these Bylaws, the president shall annually designate ad hoc committees and at the time of the appointment shall designate their membership and their chairpersons.

Article IX. Publications

1. The official publications of the Society are the SGAS Newsletter and the Yearbook of German-American Studies.

2. The principal editors of official SGAS publications as well as the website manager shall be appointed from the membership by the Executive Committee and serve at its discretion.

2.1. The editor of the Yearbook will appoint members of the Society to serve as associate editors subject to review by the Executive Committee.

2.2. The editor of the Yearbook will appoint members of the Society to serve on the Editorial Board of the Yearbook subject to review by the Executive Committee.

3. Contributors to SGAS publications/symposia shall be members of the Society.

4. Copyright in all publications of the Society is held by the Society for German-American Studies.
Article X. Indemnification

The Society as a Corporation shall indemnify any director or officer of the Society, or any former officer of the Society, to the extent indemnification is required or permitted by law. The expenses of any officer of the Society incurred in defending any action, suit or proceeding, civil or criminal, may be paid by the Society in advance of the final disposition of such action, suit or proceeding, at the discretion of the Executive Committee but only following compliance with all procedures set forth and subject to all limitations as provided by law.

Article XI. Conflict of Interest

A disclosure by the Executive Committee and officers is required if there is any conflict of interest so that an analysis can be undertaken to handle any identified conflict, examples of which include, but are not limited to existing or potential financial interests; any interest that might impair a member’s independent, unbiased judgment; membership in any other organization where interests conflict.

Article XII. Executive Contracts and Other Documents

The Executive Committee shall establish policies and procedures with respect to the execution of instruments, deposits to and withdrawals from checking and other bank accounts, loans or borrowing by the Society. The Treasurer can sign all checks for budgeted items and for unbudgeted items as provided for in Article VI.

Article XIII. Amendment of Bylaws/Periodic Review

Subject to law and the Articles of Incorporation, the power to make, alter, amend or repeal all or any part of these Bylaws is vested in the Executive Committee.

Article XIV. Repository

The Archives and Rare Books Department, University Library, the University of Cincinnati is the official repository for all records of the Society.

Article XV. Dissolution

Upon dissolution of the Society, the Executive Committee shall, after paying or making provision for the payment of all of the liabilities of the Society, dispose of all of the assets of the Society exclusively for the purposes
of the Society in such manner, or to such organization or organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable, educational, religious or scientific purposes as shall at the time qualify as an exempt organization or organizations under section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (or the corresponding provision of any future United States Revenue Law), as the Executive Committee shall determine.

**Article XVI. Nondiscrimination**

The services and activities of this Society shall at all times be administered and operated on a nondiscriminatory basis without regard to color, national origin, gender, religious preference, creed, age or physical impairment.

Approved: October 15, 2011
New Orleans, LA

Karyl Rommelfanger
Secretary, Society for German-American Studies
**SGAS Outstanding Achievement Award**

The Society for German-American Studies has established an award which is given each year to an individual who has distinguished him- or herself in the field of German-American Studies. Achievement in the context of the award is broadly defined. The honoree may have published significant research in the field, may have served the Society and the field of German-American Studies in an outstanding fashion, or may otherwise have made an outstanding contribution to the field.

The membership of the Society for German-American Studies is invited to nominate individuals of merit. Nominations should be directed to the chair of the Nominations Committee no later than September of the year prior to the one for which the individual is nominated. The Nominations Committee will forward all nominations to the president for review at the fall meeting of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will select the awardee.

Awardees will be encouraged to attend the annual symposium to receive the award. All awardees will be awarded a Life Membership in the Society for German-American Studies. The Society will cover the housing and registration expenses of those who participate in the annual symposium.

Nominations for the Outstanding Achievement Award should be forwarded to the chair of the Nominations Committee no later than September 1 of a given year for consideration for the following year. All nominations should include a letter which specifies the reasons why the nominator feels the award is justified as well as a short précis of the nominee’s accomplishments.