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AN INVITATION

What we are today, we owe in part to our ancestors. Pride of ancestry is commendable in people wherever found. It is this feeling of pride that holds people together, that causes them to cherish and record the deeds of the valor and the achievements of their kin. Indeed, it was a desire to share the glory and the past greatness of one’s own people which led to the formation of the Society for the History of Germans in Maryland in 1886, a society which has distinguished itself in becoming the only group of its kind to reach the hundred-year milestone.

The Society’s purpose is to collect and preserve material which documents the history of the influence of the German element in the growth and development of the United States of America, with particular reference to the State of Maryland. In pursuance of these purposes, the Society has published, over the years, forty-one (41) volumes of its journal entitled, The Report: A Journal of German-American History. Plans now call for the yearly publication of the Society’s journal.

In the belief that those who receive and read this volume are interested in preserving and perpetuating the knowledge of the meritorious role that those of German heritage have played in the making of our nation and of the State of Maryland, we take the liberty of inviting your cooperation by becoming a member of the Society and/or by making a contribution to it.

Once a year, the members of the Society gather for a dinner meeting. At this meeting, various activities of the Society are reported, and an outstanding historian presents a lecture on an aspect of the history of German-Americans. The annual dues are a modest fifteen ($15.00) dollars per year (for either an individual or a couple) which entitles each member to a copy of the journal when it is published (a single issue is mailed to each address). The Society is exempt from both federal and state taxes because of its purposes, and contributions made to the Society are tax deductible. So please remember the Society in your will. The following bequest form is suggested, “I bequest to the Society of the History of the Germans in Maryland, the sum of $_______________ to be used by said corporation for the purpose for which it is incorporated.”

Trusting that we may have the pleasure of a favorable response to our invitation, we are,

Very respectfully,

The Executive Committee
FROM THE EDITOR

In 1986, the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland celebrated its centennial with the publication of Report No. 40. Now, four years later, Report No. 41 is the first publication of the new century. And there is much to mark the beginning of a new era. In 1986, Carrie-May Zintl, who was then president of the Society, collected material for a volume on German-American families and businesses in Maryland. The response to Dr. Zintl's request for information was so overwhelming that the Executive Committee has decided to make a column on German-American enterprise a standard part of each Report. Bill McClain, long-time member and former vice-president of the Society, has graciously volunteered to write that column, the first installment of which appears in these pages. Thanks are due to the many individuals who answered the original call for information.

The new century also brings a new look to the Report itself. Beginning with this volume we will attempt to make each edition more readable and to provide the opportunity for graphics to accompany our articles. Thanks largely to computer technology and the tenacity and inspiration of Klaus Wust, the readers of the Report will get a glimpse of the fascinating source documents which inspire the articles we publish.

With the new look comes a new editor. After more than thirty years as editor of the Report, Klaus Wust has expressed his desire to retire from active involvement in the editing of each volume. The Society extends its heartfelt thanks to Klaus for all his efforts over the years, and I add a personal note of gratitude for his assistance and sage advice in producing the current issue.

Finally, the best news of all. Under the active leadership of Jerry Wittstadt, the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland is flourishing. As a result of some generous contributions from several sources, including the German Society of Maryland, we are building a modest publication fund which, if it continues to grow, should provide sufficient income to fund the annual publication of this Report. Thus, as the Society inaugurates its second century with the publication of its forty-first Report there exists the very real possibility that we may soon be able to realize the first goal of this organization, the yearly publication of its Report.

Rpd
A SALUTE TO THE GERMAN-AMERICAN BUSINESS ENTERPRISES OF BALTIMORE

by William H. McClain

Among the plans for the centennial of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland in 1986 was to accord special recognition to German-American business enterprises of Baltimore City by publishing brief accounts of their role in the economic and cultural life of Baltimore and the State of Maryland in the Report. Letters were addressed to several firms of German-American origin, and quite a few responded by sending brief histories. In this issue we offer accounts of two of the oldest and most highly esteemed of Baltimore's German-American business enterprises: Glauber's Fine Candies, Inc., which enjoys the distinction of being the oldest retail candy manufacturer in the United States, and the Kirk Stieff Company, America's oldest silversmiths.

GLAUBER'S CANDIES

In 1876, the year in which Alexander Graham Bell invented the telephone and the Johns Hopkins University opened its doors for the first time, John H. Glauber established a small candy factory and retail candy shop at 1037 South Hanover Street which prospered and grew. By 1912 two of his sons, Howard A. and J. Milton, had become partners, and the firm name had been changed to John H. Glauber & Sons. With the help of his two
partners John Glauber was able to open stalls in the Cross Street and Hollins markets and to supply candy to department stores and to several groceries and bakeries.

By 1935 the Hanover Street quarters had become too small, and Howard Glauber, then president, accordingly purchased a property at 1020 Regester Avenue in North Baltimore where he could both live and work. Space for the factory and also for a small retail shop was provided by adding on to the house.

When Howard Glauber died in 1939, the responsibility for running the business fell to his widow, Miriam, and his eldest son, Howard A. Glauber, Jr. Howard's younger brother, Kenneth, also became a partner after he had finished college. Under the competent management of the third generation the company continued to thrive. In the early 1950's a candy stall was opened in the newly rebuilt Lexington Market; and in 1963 a shop featuring both cards and candies was established in the Yorkridge Shopping Center. In 1965 another retail outlet was added in the Perring Plaza Shopping Center. Six years later still another store was started in the Eastpoint Mall. 1983 saw the opening of an additional outlet in the Towsontown Centre. The family ultimately decided to close the Lexington Market stall, but the four outlet stores are still flourishing.

Because of technological advances, as Kenneth Glauber notes in his account of his firm's history, candy-making operations today bear little resemblance to those employed by the firm's founder. On the other hand, as he points out, time has not changed "the family tradition of excellence and personal service." In manufacturing candies basic recipes are still used, and several traditional procedures are still followed. In making caramel, fudge, and nougat products, for example, Kenneth Glauber still employs a traditional open-kettle cooking process, and Howard Glauber, Jr. "still roasts fresh nuts and crushes them with a rolling pin." The old metal molds for Chris Kringle, Easter bunnies, and toy shapes have of course been replaced by modern fiberglass molds, but the products, Kenneth Glauber affirms, "are as tasty and pretty as they were 100 years ago."

**THE KIRK STIEFF COMPANY**

The first member of the Stieff family to arrive from Germany was Karl Maximilian Stieff, who emigrated in the early 1830's. A professional musician, he first earned his living by giving piano lessons. Later, reports Charles C. Stieff II, he also imported pianos from Germany for his pupils. In 1850, his son, John Louis Stieff, went to the gold fields at age sixteen and discovered gold. With his gold he was able to help his father begin the manufacturing of pianos and thus to launch what soon became known throughout the United States as the Stieff Piano Company.

The founder of the firm now known as the Kirk Stieff Company was John Louis Stieff's youngest son, Charles Clinton, who left his father's piano company at an early age and became a wholesale silver distributor. Later he acquired a small silver manufacturing enterprise which assumed as its firm name the Baltimore Silver Company. In 1892 the firm was incorporated as the Stieff Silver Company.2

Under the able direction of Gideon Numsen Stieff the Stieff Silver Company developed into a national organization which was represented in every major American city. In the late 1930's the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation further enhanced the prestige of the firm by extending to it a license to make all Williamsburg silver reproductions. During World War II the firm contributed to the war effort by manufacturing radar parts, surgical instruments, and other items of strategic importance.

After leaving the service in 1946 Rodney G. Stieff joined the company. Charles C. Stieff, II followed in 1948, and in 1954 Gideon N. Stieff, Jr. came into the firm. From 1956 on, thanks to the development of Williamsburg reproductions, pewter also became an important product. Soon other restorations — Monticello, Old Sturbridge, the Newport Preservation Society, Mystic Seaport, Historic Charleston, The Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and the Smithsonian Institution — were also commissioning silver and pewter reproductions.

In 1974, James W. Stieff, a representative of
the fourth generation of the Stieff family, entered the firm. Four years later, in 1979, a merger was announced between the Stieff Silver Company and the eminent Samuel Kirk Silver Company, America’s Oldest Silversmiths. Today the firm produces and markets sterling silver flatware and hollowware, silver plated flatware and hollowware, pewter, 14k.-gold designer jewelry, and stainless steel flatware.

A new chapter in the history of the Kirk Stieff Company began on March 9, 1990, with the finalization of a merger agreement between the firm and Lenox, Inc., which is widely renowned for its fine china. One of the terms of the agreement, as reported in the Baltimore Messenger of March 28, 1990, is a guarantee of a five-year lease of the Hampden plant “so that the company’s 200 employees would not be immediately displaced.” It was also agreed that Rodney G. Stieff, the present Chairman of the Kirk Stieff Company, would continue to be a member of the Board of Directors of the new firm, and that Pierce Dunn would also remain in his position as President.

Some of the early machinery used by John H. Glauber was donated by the Glauber family to the Maryland Academy of Science and Industrial Museum, where it is now on display.

Among the holdings of the Peabody Library of Baltimore is a short history of the early years of the company: The Stieff Company. Planned and Produced by the Barton-Gillet Company. Baltimore, 1930.
MAJOR GENERAL THE BARON JOHANNES DE KALB: A FORGOTTEN MARYLAND PATRIOT

Following the bloodshed at Lexington and Concord, the Continental Congress created the Committee of Secret Correspondence\(^1\) and commissioned Silas Deane, Arthur Lee and Benjamin Franklin as its first Ministers.\(^2\) Deane was ordered to France on March 3, 1776, to plead for help in the form of arms and financial assistance. He was also to seek an alliance with France. His arrival in France was to be discreet, and his welcome was therefore informal.\(^3\) Nevertheless, the responses in France to his requests were overwhelming. On March 13, 1777, just six days before Baron Johannes de Kalb left France for America, the Continental Congress, overrun with applicants from France for military appointments, directed the Committee of Secret Correspondence by resolution to discourage all "gentlemen of France" from coming to America with expectation of employment in the military service, unless they were masters of the English language and had the best recommendations.

On November 7, 1776, Deane was introduced to Baron de Kalb by Comte de Broglie, a close friend of King Louis XIV and a relative of the Marquis de Lafayette.\(^4\) On December 1, 1776, Deane contracted with the Baron and granted him the military grade of Major General in the Continental Army. On December 7, 1776, through the efforts of Baron de Kalb, Lafayette was granted the military grade of Major General in the Continental Army. Deane executed that contract as well. It should be emphasized that these contracts were executed prior to March 13, 1777, and were therefore not in violation of the resolution of the Continental Congress. Following the execution of the contracts, Deane wrote to Congress and stated that he had engaged the Baron and Lafayette even though he recognized that he was not specifically empowered by Congress to appoint officers. Deane described the Baron as one of the bravest and most skillful officers in France.\(^5\) On March 19, 1777, on the strength of their contract with Deane, the Baron, Lafayette, and a dozen other French military gentlemen of noble rank, all with contracts for ranks of colonel or less, left France on the *Victoria*, a vessel owned by Lafayette. They arrived in North America on June 15, 1777, weighing anchor in the South Inlet, near Charleston, South Carolina.

The Baron's party journeyed to Philadelphia and arrived there on July 27, 1777. It was Sunday and the Continental Congress was not in session. Nevertheless, they were able to deliver their letters of recommendations and copies of their contracts to John Hancock, then the President of the Continental Congress. The following morning, the party was met in the streets in front of Independence Hall by Robert Morris and James Lovell, members of Congress. They were informed by Lovell that Deane had exceeded his authority and that although there was a need in 1776 for foreign military leaders, that was not the situation in 1777. He stated that it seemed that French officers had a great fancy to enter the Continental service without being invited. Morris and Lovell left the Baron's party in the street with the further advisement that they would in due course, hear from Congress regarding their "offers" to serve as officers in the Continental Army. The Baron at a later date described this reception as more of a dismissal than a welcome. Lafayette described the reception as being "received like dogs at a game of ninepins".\(^6\)

By a resolution, dated September 8, 1777, the Continental Congress awarded Lafayette the rank of Major General. Lafayette's high noble rank and his influence at the Court of Louis XVI had indeed impressed the Congress. Lafayette did, however, have to agree to serve without pay and without the promise of a command.\(^7\) By that same resolution, the "offers" of the Baron and the other French gentlemen were rescinded. The Baron was selected by the other French gentlemen to negotiate a settlement of their claims for
damages. They insisted that the Continental Congress had a legal obligation to honor Deane's contracts. The Baron also decided to express his own position separately to the Congress. He wrote a letter in English in which he insisted that Congress fulfill its part of the contract written by Deane. He emphasized his thirty-four years of military service in the French Army, serving lastly as a General. He stated that salary was not important but that the rank was essential. He indicated no jealousy whatsoever of Lafayette, but made it clear that he could not serve under his young friend's command, since the two of them came with the same promises and the same purposes. He mentioned two instances which offended him, the alleged incompetence of Deane by exceeding his authority and the rude treatment accorded him and his party by Lovell. He further stated that if Congress did not want his services, he was ready to return to France — naturally upon reimbursement of his expenses. He indicated that a law suit against Deane would have merit and that it would prove to be an embarrassment to America.

Congress reconsidered its rejection of the Baron and by a resolution, dated September 15, 1777, offered him a Major Generalship in its army. The Congress' reversal of its previous action was due in large part to the favorable impression the Baron had made on various members of Congress with whom he had been negotiating in regard to his own claims and those of the other French gentlemen. His ability to speak English, French, and German as well as his brilliant military career in the French army set him substantially apart from the other French gentlemen. Even Lovell was impressed. In a letter to another member of Congress, he praised the Baron and described him as resembling General Washington in looks and manners. Lovell even expressed concern that it would be America's loss if the Baron now refused the Major Generalship. In another letter from a member of Congress, the Baron learned that the Congress intended to date his commission back to November 7, 1776, the date Deane first met the Baron, so as to give him seniority over Lafayette. The Baron accepted the appointment on September 18, 1777. He insisted that his aide de camp, Chevalier Dubuysson, be commissioned a Lieutenant Colonel and that his own appointment be dated the same as Lafayette's. He also insisted on a pension for his wife in the event of his death.

On October 13, 1777, the Baron was inducted in the American army and was cordially received by General Washington. He was eventually placed in command of a division that consisted in part of the Maryland Line.

The Nobility of the Baron

De Kalb was born on June 29, 1721, in Hüttdorf, a village a few miles northwest of Nuremberg in central Bavaria, Germany. His parents were Johann Leonard Kalb and Margaretha, née Seitz.

It is believed that the Baron left Hüttdorf in his mid-teens to join the French Army. Records reflect that in 1743 he was serving as a Lieutenant in a German-staffed infantry regiment of France named Löwendel in the area of Nuremberg. For many years it was common belief in America that the Baron had been born into a noble family which had settled centuries earlier in the Franconia section of Germany, but that belief can now be discarded. His parents were freeholders, not aristocrats. That is not to say, however, that the Baron was not later a member of the nobility or that he merely assumed the title of "Baron" to facilitate his advancement in the French Army or his appointment to the Continental Army. He did acquire the title "Chevalier" and the right to the use of "de" in front of his last name when, in 1763, King Louis XVI bestowed on him the Order of Military Merit. This award came in recognition of his outstanding bravery in the Battle of Wilhelmstal during the course of the Seven Year War. Thus, for more than a decade before the Baron was appointed a Major General in the American Army, he was a
member of the French nobility. The Baron married Anne Elizabeth Emile van Robais on April 10, 1764. She was the daughter of Peter van Robais, an aristocrat and a wealthy cloth manufacturer in Paris, who in turn was the son of a prominent citizen of Holland, who had settled in France and established a large cloth factory. The factory prospered and proved to be so successful that King Louis XIV awarded the family with a patent of nobility. In fact, the Baron's eldest son, Frederic de Kalb, died a victim of the guillotine during the French Revolution partly because of his nobility. Even later, descendants of the Baron enjoyed the privileges of nobility. The baron's grand-daughter, Leonore de Kalb married Vicomte d'Abzac and her grandniece, Kunigunda Egelseer of Hüttendorf, married Johann Andreas Wirtstadt, a direct descendant of one of the oldest aristocratic families of Franconia. Although no documentation can be found, it is generally believed by descendants of the Baron that the baronage was an award for his acts of gallantry in the French army. In fact, no contemporary of the Baron, including the Comte de Broglie, the Marquis de Lafayette, and the French gentlemen who served with him, ever challenged the Baron's right to the tide. Many of these gentlemen had noble titles of their own and knew of the various levels of nobility. Many historical works on the French army give examples of individuals who enlisted in the French army, rose to high ranks, and were subsequently awarded with patents of nobility. Some historians believe that France had accorded de Kalb the tide of "Baron". These facts suggest a valid right to the tide. Those who speak of the Baron as the "so-called Baron" or the "self-styled Baron" and otherwise allude to the tide as a suggestion of dishonesty must bear the burden of proving that the tide was not properly received.

Fighting with the Maryland Line

Although Baron de Kalb longed for a chance to gain glory, he was in the service of the Continental Army for nearly three years before he even so much as heard a gun go off. In the spring of 1780, when the British forces were moving from New York south to Charleston, South Carolina, and it was obvious that the theatre of war was moving south, General Washington ordered Baron de Kalb to make preparation to move his division of Maryland and Delaware troops south to aid the Army of the South under the command of General Benjamin Lincoln. De Kalb's division, which was considered one of the best trained, was to be strengthened by the infantry and cavalry of the French "Armand Legion", commanded by Marcuis de la Rouere, as well as by the militias from various southern colonies. When De Kalb arrived in Petersburg, Virginia, he was informed of the surrender of General Lincoln on May 12, 1780. General Washington had designated De Kalb the new Commander of the Army of the South. The surrender of General Lincoln's forces was judged by Congress to be one of the worst disasters of the war. On July 25th, Congress, in haste and without consulting with General Washington, designated General Horatio Gates to replace General de Kalb as Commander of the Army of the South. This was done with full knowledge that General Gates did not enjoy the complete confidence of General Washington. Baron de Kalb moved his division to Hillsboro, North Carolina. His immediate subordinate officers were General William Smallwood and General Mordecai Gist.

Disregarding the advice of de Kalb and others who knew local conditions, General Gates ordered the American Army to meet the British Army. Gates insisted on taking a route which could not supply the men or their horses with sufficient and proper food. The route led through desolate country, and the diet of the troops during their inarch to the enemy consisted of green fruit and unripened corn. This, as it turned out, had an ill effect. When the American Army met the British forces under the command of Lord Charles Cornwallis on August 16, 1780, a large number of the men and their horses were unfit for battle. The First Maryland Brigade was under the immediate command of General Gist and the Second Maryland Brigade was under the immediate command of General Smallwood.
Baron de Kalb, well seconded by General Gist, remained in the front lines of the First Maryland Brigade.

When the two forces met, the British, after firing only one volley, rushed forward in a bayonet attack. The militiamen that joined De Kalb’s forces from the South had never been under fire and had not been trained in the use of the bayonets. Weak and terrified as they were, they cast away their muskets and ran for their lives. This action caused the French Legion also to retreat. General Gates was swept away in the rout of the militiamen and he did not stop his retreat until he reached Charlotte, some 60 miles from the battlefield. The Maryland Line, supported by the Delaware troops, was thrown into battle against the overwhelming British forces. De Kalb’s troops engaged the British hotly. Not only did his troops hold the British off, but on several occasions, they broke through the British line and captured prisoners. De Kalb’s troops were winning the fight initially and thought that the entire battle was going as well. De Kalb did not know of Gates’ retreat or of the retreat of the rest of the Southern Army. He never received orders from General Gates to retreat, so his troops fought on. Indeed, it has been said that never had troops shown greater courage than those men from Maryland and Delaware. With the same unflinching resistance that the Maryland Line had shown at the Battle of Long Island in 1776, the Maryland Line and the Delaware troops contended with the superior force of the enemy in the summer of 1780.

De Kalb’s horse was shot from under him and while he was directing the movement of his troops on foot, his head was laid open by a sabre stroke. Cornwallis, with a force nearly four times greater than De Kalb’s surrounded De Kalb’s forces, but De Kalb led his troops through the enemy’s ranks. Finally, bleeding from eleven wounds, General de Kalb fell. His troops broke up and scattered for the woodlands and swamps; the battle came to an end. Chevalier Dubuysson threw himself on top of his General’s battered body. Some of the enemy immediately pick up De Kalb, propped him against a wagon, and started to strip the dying Baron of his uniform. There he stood, bleeding to death, when Cornwallis came by and rescued him from the despoilers. Cornwallis caused him to be cared for by the British surgeons. De Kalb died three days later. He was buried with military honors by his victorious adversaries. Before his death, he told the British officers who were consoling him in his misfortune, “I thank you for your generous sympathy, but I die the death I always prayed for — the death of a soldier fighting for the rights of man.” Many years later, General Washington visited the grave of the Baron in Camden. After gazing sadly, he exclaimed, “So here lies the brave de Kalb, the generous stranger who came from a distant land to fight our battles and water with his blood the tree of liberty.”

A Forgotten Maryland Patriot

Notwithstanding the fact that Baron de Kalb has been described as one of the most skillful and bravest soldiers in the American Revolutionary War and that he was the Commanding General of the Maryland Line, he seems to have been largely neglected by historians and has thus become a forgotten American hero. Perhaps as well as an unsung Maryland patriot The Baron de Kalb has been assigned a relatively insignificant place in the history of our country. Very few places have been named in his honor and even fewer monuments have been erected in his memory. It seems that he has always stood in the shadows of those generals who survived the Revolutionary War. Few Americans today recognize his name. Even fewer are familiar with any significant facts relating to his contributions to the American cause. Some historians will argue that his obscurity is undoubtedly the result of the anti-German feelings that existed in this country for many years flowing from Germany’s position in the first and second world wars and, as a consequence, from the inability of German ethnic groups to have their voices heard for those many years. Even if this argument is valid, his obscurity must be based also on other reasons because the neglect existed even before World War I.
Only twice have historians been induced to write a serious treatise of his life. It was more than eighty years after his death before his first biography was written. This first work was written not in America but in Germany. In 1862, in Stuttgart, Friedrich Kapp authored Das Leben des amerikanischen Generals Johann von Kalb. This work was later translated into English and published first privately (1870) and then publicly (1884) in New York, under the title The Life of John Kalb. A more comprehensive study entitled General de Kalb, Lafayette's Mentor was written many years later by A. E. Zucker (see note 6).

In Camden, South Carolina, where the Baron is buried, his grave was marked for nearly half a century by nothing more than a tree. It was not until 1825, through the efforts of the citizens of Camden, that a monument was erected over his grave. General Lafayette laid the cornerstone for this monument on a journal through the United States. The inscription on this monument reads in part, "Here lie the remains of Baron de Kalb, a German by birth, but in principle a citizen of the world."

On October 14, 1780, the Continental Congress passed a resolution that decreed that a federal monument was to be erected to the memory of the Baron in the City of Annapolis. It is painful to know that this resolution was not carried into effect for well over one-hundred years. In 1886, on the anniversary of the Battle of Camden, an impressive larger-than-life-size bronze statue was unveiled and dedicated on the grounds of the State House in Annapolis.

At the time of the death of the Baron, there were certain arrears of pay due him. The family of the Baron petitioned the Congress for years for liquidation of their claims. Although these claims proved to be just even when subjected to the severest scrutiny, they were passed over from session to session. Finally, in 1855, seventy-five years after his death, an Act of Congress was passed authorizing the payment of $66,090.67 to the descendants of the Baron de Kalb for his services and his ultimate sacrifice.

It was not until 1960 that any consideration was given to memorializing the birthplace of the Baron. On May 22, 1960, in the City of New York, the Federation of American Citizens of German Descent gave tribute on "Deutschen Tag" to the Baron. Later, on July 9, 1960, in Huettendorf, the Federation dedicated a plaque to the memory of the Baron on the house that is now located on the site where he was born.

Portraits of the Baron can be found in Independence Hall in Philadelphia and in the museum of the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore. The Philadelphia portrait was painted by Charles Wilson Peale; the Baltimore portrait is by James Lambin.

There are nine towns and villages in the United States named De Kalb. None are in Maryland. There are also six counties that bear his name. They are located in Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri and Tennessee. De Kalb, Illinois, is the only city named after him. In some major cities in the United States, there are streets named in memory of the Baron. Unfortunately none can be found in Maryland.

While it is incumbent upon every American to preserve the memory of those eminent Europeans who, like De Kalb, left their families and their homes to fight the battle for American liberty, it is particularly desirable that we of German descent here in Maryland should know and duly honor the memory of Baron De Kalb, who gave his life while leading the Maryland Line during our war of independence.

I am pleased to say that the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland is one organization which has not neglected nor forgotten the Baron de Kalb. On the occasion of the dedication of the De Kalb statue in Annapolis in 1886, the newly-founded Society made it first public appearance and took part in the festivities.

In addition, the Society has published more articles relating to the Baron than any other publication.

—Gerard Wm. Wittstadt, Sr.
Baltimore, MD
The foreign affairs of the United States during the period of the Continental Congress were under the direction of Congress. In November 1775, seven months before the Declaration of Independence, a secret committee was appointed to maintain foreign contacts.

The highest ranking officer in the American diplomatic service up to 1893 was a Minister. In 1893, Congress created the higher rank of Ambassador.

Official reception of diplomatic representatives is regarded as formal recognition of the country which they represent. France, which was at peace with England, did not want to incur the wrath of England’s might by formally receiving Dean. France had lost the Seven Years War (French and Indian War) and lost many of its holdings in North America to England. France was thirsting for revenge and was therefore eager to inflame the quarrel between England and its American colonies.

Lafayette was a recently-married youth of nineteen years, a young man of high noble rank and enormous wealth. His military experience consisted of a summer of maneuvers without actually being in combat. He could not obtain his family’s consent to go to America unless he went as a general officer.

Lord Stormond, the English Minister to France, was informed by his spies that a prominent and experienced officer was being sent to America. In a letter to Lord Weymouth, Stormond describes the Baron as an officer of distinction and a man of ability.


Lafayette contributed over two hundred thousand ($200,000.00) dollars of his own wealth to the Continental Army, but never requested repayment.

The Baron was serving as an officer in the French Army as early as 1743. He attained the rank of Brigadier in the French Colonial Army. It has been suggested by historians that the Baron’s further advancement in the French Army was blocked because of his Protestant faith and his German birth.

The Baron’s wealth was considered to be substantial.

The value of his properties and those of his wife amounted to approximately half a million francs. He owned the Chateau Milon-la-Chapelle, situated on spacious grounds outside of Versailles. It is still today owned by his descendants. He also owned a substantial mansion in Courbevoie, a suburb of Paris.


In the summer of 1980, many descendants of Baron de Kalb commemorated the anniversary of his death by attending a family reunion at Milon-la-Chapelle in France and later at his place of birth in Hünendorf, Germany. These and other descendants living in France, Germany and the United States strongly feel that American history has neglected their ancestor.

German-Americans and abolitionism — if one believes the history books — are synonymous. Motivated by their own experiences in Europe, German immigrants reportedly were repulsed by the proliferation of slavery in the new homeland and both actively and passively opposed what they considered an inhumane system. One measure of their passive anti-slavery activity was a refusal to exploit the labor of Africans in any form. The popular histories, that is, the textbooks utilized to teach American history in our schools, state unequivocally that Germans as a group did not own slaves. Increasingly, the Germantown Protest is used to explain the origins of this humanitarian struggle against popular opinion and convention.

One need not be a professional historian to discover how deeply slavery was rooted in the American system both before and after the creation of the Bill of Rights. Slavery and the issue of equal rights for Blacks were and are the political controversy that threatened the Constitutional Convention, engendered the Fugitive Slave Acts of 1797 and 1850, necessitated the Missouri Compromise and the Compromise of 1850, contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War, and precipitated the Civil Rights Movement which in recent years has floundered because it has collided with the bedrock problem of economic justice. Within that context, the Germantown Protest would seem to have been the most important document for Black Americans before the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself. So it would seem.

In the following I propose to re-examine the Germantown Protest from the perspective of its impact on Afro-German relations in Pennsylvania and Maryland during the succeeding two centuries, up to the Civil War. Specifically, I am interested in testing a hypothesis formulated forty years ago by Dieter Cunz in his book on the German element in Maryland and most recently by LaVerne J. Rippley. Both authors differentiate the anti-slavery attitudes of the older German migration (pre-1800's) from that of the group which arrived as refugees from the political turmoil of the 1840's. If the Germantown Protest has value as a source document for German anti-slavery sentiment then one might expect some sort of casual relationship between the Protest and German-Black interactions between 1700-1860.

When the Germanic settlers arrived in Pennsylvania in 1683 Africans and African slavery had already been present in the Delaware Valley for at least four decades. In Maryland it had been tolerated since at least 1642. In both areas African laborers had been obtained, presumably from the flourishing seventeenth century slave trade that continued the process begun in the sixteenth century of depopulating Western Africa to meet the labor needs of Spanish and Portuguese New World colonies. The establishment of English colonies in North America did nothing to impede or reduce the spread and growth of this trade in human beings.

Quaker Pennsylvania also required laborers and embraced slavery as a convenient solution. In 1684 a consignment of one hundred-fifty slaves was sold to the highest bidders in Philadelphia and slavery began its slow but steady infiltration of all levels of colonial society. From a prerequisite for survival of the colony, slavery soon evolved into a status symbol, an outward sign of wealth and position. At that point it had become so intertwined with Pennsylvania's social fabric that its removal was unthinkable and fraught with the danger of extensive social disruption.

The Germantowners arrived early in this process and thus witnessed the rapid proliferation of Africans and slavery. Their reaction was the Germantown Protest. It is misleading, however, to read a special empathy for Afri-
cans into that document. The German-
towners' condemnation of slavery was moti-
vated in part by self-interest. Slaves were
unpaid laborers and as members of a
working-class settlement the Germantowners
were understandably apprehensive at the
prospect of a large pool of cheap labor with
which they would have to compete.
Furthermore, although the protesters use
the Golden Rule to argue cogently against the
inhumanity of involuntary servitude, their
underlying perception of Africans is not
entirely free of ego-and ethnocentrism. The
core of their argument is contained in the
following passage:4
You surpass Holland and Germany in this
thing. This makes an ill report in all those
Countries of Europe, where they hear off that
ye Quakers doe here handle men lice they
handle there ye Cattel. And for that reason
some have no mind or inclination to come
hither, and who shall maintaine this your
cause or plaid for it?
The oblique reference to Holland and Ger-
many was intended as a comparison. Dutch
and German traders had been engaged in the
slave trade for some time but to the
Germantowners Quaker involvement far
exceeded that of the other groups.5 Appar-
etly, it was not only the intensity of Quaker
involvement in the trade that was disturbing
but also its proximity to Germantown that
prompted the protest.
The Germantowners would have us believe
that Quaker involvement in the slave trade
was turning public opinion against Pennsyl-
vania in some parts of Europe. As a conse-
quence, potential colonists were reconsider-
ing whether or not they should emigrate
there. A reduction in the flow of colonists to
Pennsylvania was certainly not a prospect
which the colonial government would wel-
come. The Germantowners had an even direr
prediction should the slave trade not cease:6
If once these slaves (wch they say are so
wicked and stubborn men) should joint him-
theselves, fight for their freedom and handel
their masters & mastrisses as they did handel
them before; will these masters & mastrisses
tacke the sword at hand & warr against these
poor slaves, licke wee are able to believe, some
will not refuse to doe? Or have these negroes
not as much right to fight for their freedom,
as you have to keep them slaves?
These protesters argue here very pragmat-
ically.
The spectre of slave revolt — a not un-
common phenomenon in the Spanish and
Portuguese colonies — was an intimidating
prospect. But potentially even more threaten-
ing to Quakers was the likelihood that such
revolts could test Quaker commitment to paci-

dism as a way of life. In effect the German-
towners were saying that slavery was not only
morally wrong but its presence created a situa-
tion which would ultimately challenge a basic
tenet of the Society of Friends, possibly de-
stroying in the process the source of that
group's moral authority. Self-interest was an
important motivation for the protest because
some of the Germantowners were beginning
to identify themselves with the Society of
Friends as is manifest in the audience chosen
for the protest. A second motive — concern
for the plight of the African — is not as
uncomplicated or unambiguous as historians
would have us believe.
The text of the protest provides brief
glimpses of the Germantowners' attitude
towards Africans. A central concept is the
notion of servitude. Coming from Central
Europe the Germantowners were well ac-
quainted with servitude. Seldom still existed
there as well as the ever present danger of
enslavement from marauding Turks. This
experiential background lent added fervor to
the protest's denunciation of involuntary
servitude:7
There is a saying that we shall do to all men,
licke we will be done our selves; making no
difference of what generation, descent or
Colour they are. And those who steal or robb
men, and those buy or purchase them,
are they not all alicke? Here is liberty of con-
since, whch is right & reasonable/likewise
liberty of ye body./ But to bring men hither,
or to robb and sell them against their will, we
stand against.
These are strong sentiments indeed.
But what sort of men were these enslaved
Africans? As noted above, the German-
towners believed many of them to be
"wicked" and "stubborn." This mildly nega-
tive characterization is strengthened by a telling reference to the Africans: "Now tho' they are black, we cannot conceive there is more liberty to have them slaves, as it is to have other white ones." Color is a critical issue for the Germantowners. Their demand is for fair treatment despite the Africans' skin color — at least a tacit recognition that skin color can negatively affect social status. Equally interesting is the term used to identify the Africans.

African identity has been a controversial subject for centuries. Racism decreed an inferior role for all people of color and therefore as recently as 1941 in his *The Myth of the Negro Past* Melville J. Herskovits felt compelled to defend the notion that Egyptians were Africans and that dark-skinned races were capable of creating great civilizations such as the Egyptian. The Germantowners were obviously aware of the danger of using race to stigmatize individuals but nevertheless referred to Africans as "negers."

The word "neger" uses, of course, color as the sole designation of racial group. Other racial groups are identified by a region where they allegedly originated. The etymology of "neger" is also very instructive. A quick glance in Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* confirms that the word used most frequently to refer to Africans by Germans before 1800 was "Mohr." There was, however, some confusion in the use of the term since it was applied indiscriminately to refer to Ethiopians, Turks, North Africans, and to a lesser extent to dark-skinned Sub-Saharan peoples — the latter groups were relatively unknown in Europe before 1600. It is worth noting that according to Grimm the term "Neger" first came into common German usage near the end of the eighteenth century when it found its way into Johann Christoph Adelung's dictionary.

The Germantowners' use of the word "neger" could indicate either English or Dutch influence. The Oxford English Dictionary documents the use of the word "negro" as early as 1555 when it was used as a synonym for "Ethiopian." Whatever the source of their term, the Germantowners' usage clearly indicates at least tacit acceptance of the ethnocentrism then current in contacts between Europeans and dark-skinned races. More significantly, it signals an ambivalence in the perception of Africans that would influence future contacts between the two groups.

The Protest's latent ambivalence stems in part from the fact that it was intended for internal rather than public discussion. The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting's minutes show clearly that for almost three generations the question of slavery was discussed in the Monthly Meetings without any resolution until the two decades before the Revolutionary War when the Quaker leadership in Pennsylvania successfully curtailed Quaker involvement in the slave trade by disowning all offenders against this self-imposed ban. A similar development among Maryland's Friends was not completed until 1780, the year in which Pennsylvania began the process of phasing out its slave population by enacting the Gradual Abolition Act.

German involvement in this early anti-slavery activity was minimal. Indeed in 1844 when the existence of the Protest was "discovered," Quakers presented it as a Quaker document and as early evidence of their anti-slavery activity. That action ignored, of course, the fact that the protest was directed against Quaker merchants who bought, sold, and used slaves. With the exception of an editorial in Christopher Sauer II's Germantown newspaper "Pennsylvania Berichte" from 1761, evidence of German-Black relations can be extrapolated only by an analysis of diverse information sources such as church records, newspapers, court records, census returns, and — in the case of Frederick County, Maryland — Jacob Engelbrecht's marvelously detailed record of daily life in Frederick during the Antebellum Period.

Let us then extract some information from these sources. Surveying the entire period under discussion, one is struck not just by the coexistence of Blacks and Germans but also by the variety of their interactions. Moravian, Lutheran, and Reformed Church records
from both Pennsylvania and Maryland document a significant Black presence. It is not always clear whether the Blacks listed in those records were accepted as members of the various congregations, but they were unquestionably baptized, married, and buried by the clergymen of those churches. A few brief citations from several churches in both states can perhaps illustrate the range and depth of Black involvement in German churches during the period.

The Moravian settlement at Bethelhem, Pennsylvania, exemplifies one aspect of Afro-German interaction that was transatlantic in nature. Among the residents there in the 1740's was:13


This terse notice is complemented by a reference to another Andrew.14 The second Andrew apparently played an important role in the history of the Moravians. A slave on St. Thomas in the Danish West Indies, Andrew came to Denmark as the possession of a Court Laurwig around 1730. There Count Zinzendorf, spiritual leader of the Moravians, reportedly made his acquaintance and had him brought to his estate at Herrnhut.

In Herrnhut Andrew so eloquently represented the plight of his people on St. Thomas that the Moravians reportedly were moved to begin missionary and philanthropic work that would take them to Greenland, Lapland, Africa, and the Americas. In the New World, especially in North America, settlements such as Bethelhem, Nazareth, and Winston Salem were established as operational bases from which the Moravians launched their frequently perilous missions to christianize and educate Indians and Africans. Thus a triangle exchange came into being. Through their missions Moravians and their Africans converted moved from the West Indies to Pennsylvania, to Germany, and back. Andrew from St. Thomas, for example, lived for a time in Bethelhem and then accompanied Zinzendorf on his return to Germany in 1743 and died the next year in Marienborn.15

Even Moravian philanthropy had overtones of ambivalence. In volume one of "The Bethelhem Diary," the minutes of the meetings of the congregation council between 1742-44, the protocol for October 31/November 11, 1742, contains a very revealing passage:16

It was further proposed to get rid of our white hired hands, because to present they have behaved so arrogantly and insolently. And should we be compelled to keep hired hands, it would be preferable to buy Negroes from St. Thomas and employ them as regular servants who would receive wages, to show Pennsylvania and a conscientious author, who in his writing has opposed slavekeeping, how one can treat even Negroes.

We would always simply deceive ourselves should we have dealings with such people with the laudable intention of converting them.

No one becomes converted in a state of servitude; such folk seek their own advantage and harbor false designs.

If one should wish to help people pay off their debts one should do so out of pity and as an act of mercy, and then let them go their way again.

This homespun pragmatism is perhaps a humane way of not exploiting the misfortunes of others, but it gives an unsympathetic view of Blacks. This Moravian brother, and perhaps the entire council, obviously considered Blacks to be a depraved and thus depraved species. Such an attitude, steeped as it is in an ambivalent sense of charity, might easily be transformed into hostility should the objects of that charity and pity not adhere to the giver's expected behavioral norms.

Even more importantly, the Moravian experience in Bethelhem leads us to a most complex problem: German involvement in slavery. Were Germans slaveholders? If so then to what extent? If one considers the early German settlement areas in Pennsylvania and Maryland, namely, Lancaster, York, Frederick, and Washington Counties, then we must affirm that Germans were indeed slaveholders but not major slaveholders. Admittedly, the existing data for those areas during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is
too sketchy to render a definitive answer but even a cursory glance at the 1790 Census reveals an interesting contradiction of traditional assumptions about Germans and slaveholding.

In Pennsylvania in 1790, York and Lancaster Counties had the largest and third largest slave populations. In fact, 22% of all the slaves held in the Commonwealth were housed in the two counties considered today to be the heart of the Pennsylvania Dutch country. In Maryland, whose slave population in 1790 of 103,036 ranked third among the sixteen states, only 4.8% of that population was found in those counties with a significant German population as a result of eighteenth century migrations. However, the total of 4,927 slaves in Frederick and Washington Counties contrasts markedly with York and Lancaster's total of 847. Of course, not all of the slaveowners in the four counties were German, but a survey of the census comparing slave ownership and German surname shows that in Lancaster and York Boroughs 24 of 59 and 15 of 30 slaves, that is, 41% and 50% respectively of the slaves in those boroughs were owned by individuals with German surnames.

Census returns for Frederick County, Maryland's earliest German settlement area, unfortunately do not reflect governmental subdivisions but 115 slaveholders with German surnames owned 282 slaves of 7.8% of the total slave population in the County. In Washington County 63 slaveholders with German surnames owned 248 slaves or 19% of the County total of 1,286. Slavery was an aspect of Afro-German relations in Pennsylvania and Maryland but what was its origin and what conclusions can be drawn about the nature of the relationship between master and slave?

Perhaps the earliest reference to German slaveholding in Pennsylvania is a letter written by Cornelius Bom, a former resident of Philadelphia who joined the Germantown settlement. Writing to Rotterdam in 1684 Bom commented on his living arrangements in Germantown by noting: "I have no regular servants except one Negro whom I had bought." Bom's purchase was not an isolated event From 1684 to the appearance of Sauer's editorial in 1761 there are numerous documented references to Germans and Africans in a master-slave relationship. For example, the German Lutheran pioneer John Caspar Stoever recorded his baptism of "Johannes Jung's Negro children" on July 23, 1733 in Schifenthill (Montgomery County?). Their names were Sybilla, Daniel, Margaretha, Ludwig, Jacob, and Johannes and their ages 10, 8, 6, 4, 2, and 5 months.

One of the more unusual cases of German slaveholding is that of Gideon Moor, the slave of Rev. George Michael Weiss, who pastored at — among others — the New Goshohoppen Reformed Church in Montgomery County. His master died in 1761 and was followed a few years later by his mistress. From the late 1760s up to the eve of the Revolutionary War, Gideon and the Goshohoppen congregation were embroiled in one law suit after another. Gideon claimed that his mistress had willed her house to him which the congregation refuted. There followed a series of nuisance actions filed by Gideon such as trespass, malicious mischief, etc. Finally in 1776 Gideon's lawyers tried a new tactic: they proposed to prove his right to the property by questioning the validity of the church's title to the land. Unfortunately, there seems to be no record of how the dispute was settled.

A similar set of circumstances can be found in Maryland. Frederick County's Monocracy Lutheran Church records contain a reference to a baptism on May 31, 1749 of Jacob, son of "Richard Wosle, Negro," but potentially more sensational are two references to a certain James who was "of Ethiopian nationality in service with Johannes Hoffman." This James has two sons baptized on April 13, 1743: one named Samuel and one who was the illegitimate offspring of a liaison with "the white servant girl, Eva Margaretha (surname not given), member of the so-called Reformed church standing in service with him at Johannes Hoffman." In Colonial America fornication and bastardy were punishable offenses; miscegenation was also.

The above entries can be multiplied several times over and found replicated in the
German congregations at Graceham (Maryland), Lancaster, York, Hagerstown, etc. It is not surprising therefore that in his February 13, 1761, editorial Christopher Sauer commented.

It has been noted with dismay that Germans [in the area] have gotten involved in the inhumane practice of buying negroes because they can no longer have German servants.²² Sauer's consternation was engendered in part by German involvement in the slave trade. Equally lamentable to his mind was the expansion of the trade itself, Quaker merchants seemed on the verge of establishing a direct link to Africa that might guarantee a veritable flood of slaves. Three ships had been sent directly to Africa perhaps in the hope of reducing the time and expense involved in having Africans "seasoned" in the West Indies. Should this scheme be successful, Sauer feared conditions similar to those in the Carolinas would soon obtain in Pennsylvania. According to Sauer's report White Carolinians were so outnumbered by Africans that they could not sleep at night for fear of slave insurrections. It is interesting to note the parallels between Sauer's warning and the premonition of the Germantown protesters about the dangers of the slave trade.

Clearly, Black and Germans experienced each other at close quarters. Such contacts much have had some impact on attitudes and perceptions. Here again the dearth of in-depth documentation and an overabundance of minutiae hinder generalization. Obviously nothing definitive can be said about Afro-German relations until more research is conducted on individual responses to such contacts. Increasing the sample can perhaps establish patterns which in turn can lead to hypotheses about group behavior. Three final sources of information provide at least initial movement in that direction.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century newspapers from Maryland and Pennsylvania provide useful insights into everyday interactions of Germans and Blacks. Some, but unfortunately not all historians have long since discarded the myth of slavery's essential benevolence. Apologists for slavery betray their own ethnocentrism when they attempt to portray forceful abduction, sale, and involuntary servitude as Christian benevolence vis-à-vis a primitive race. Such logic flies in the face of all we know about the level of culture and civilization in West Africa before and during the period of European colonial expansion. Also the number of runaway slave advertisements demonstrate the willingness of many Blacks to escape bondage whenever the opportunity presented itself.

Maryland newspapers for the Post-Revolutionary War period are a gold mine of information for local history enthusiasts, genealogists, and researchers interested in Black history. A typical example of the sort of information to be found is contained in this advertisement from the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser of December 1, 1789:²³

**Eight Dollars Reward**

RAN AWAY, from the subscriber on the Night of the 18th Inst. a NEGRO WENCH called ELEANOR, alias NELL, but supposed will change her Name, and, probably, call herself LINDY: She is about 20 years of Age, about 5 Feet 3 Inches high, stout made, bold Look, swallow Complexion, short wooly Hair, which is very knotty, has a scar on one of her Cheeks, near the Temple, walks very brisk, understands and can speak German; has a soft Voice, and speaks fast, fond of Dress, and has a great Variety of Clothes with her [....]

George P. Keesport

Baltimore, November 29, 1789

The important bit of information in this notice is something that researchers have largely ignored. In some cases a significant part of the acculturation process for Afro-Americans has been the contact with ethnic groups and a resultant need to acquire proficiency in languages other than English.

Where is the research on the Black enclaves that were proficient in Pennsylvania German?

Newspaper advertisements can also shed light on the nature of the master-slave relationship. An appropriate example is the following notice from the October 1, 1788, edition of the Neue Unpartheyische Lancaster Zeitung:

**For Sale at a good price with favorable terms**

A negress and two beautiful children,

A boy and a girl (both duly registered accord-
ing to the law). The woman is a slave for life, the children are indentured to serve until the age of 28. The woman is herself only 25 years old, able to serve in either the city or the country, she can speak both English and German. Several types of grain, flour, whiskey, or other produce will be accepted at the prevailing market price as payment and the terms made easy for the buyer. Interested parties can inquire as to price and terms. Ask for the undersigned at the Lancaster Courthouse.

Salomon Etting
N.B. The negress would prefer to be sold to a German farmer who lives reasonably close to Lancaster.24

Generalizations are not feasible on the basis of this one advertisement but here is proof that the slavery experience was not uniform. The slave's opinion was not only solicited but also considered in the plans to sell her and her family. Furthermore, her preference of a German farmer as a future master is significant and indicates a positive attitude at least of this slave towards Germans. Obviously, more material must be gathered before a valid hypothesis can be formulated.

Our third and final source of information is The Diary of Jacob Engelbrecht (1818-1878). The three volume edition of the diary edited by Prof. William R. Quynn provides a plethora of everyday events in Frederick during six decades. Many of the events which Engelbrecht noticed or participated in also had relevance for Black history. For example in December 5, 1820, he wrote in his diary a list of various Blacks who lived in Frederick Town.

Schley\(^5\) Jacob Livers Steiner Moses Graham & Philip Mercer
Bradley Tyler\(^5\) Daniel Anderson Shivers
Abraham Brightwell
Helfenstein\(^5\) William Brown Bealls Robert Magruder Taney\(^5\)
Romico Price & Cyrus Jenkins Murdock\(^5\) Wm. Warfield Ross\(^5\)
Frederick Hillman Potts\(^5\) Cornelius Thompson

Here as elsewhere in his diary Engelbrecht's comments are objective and devoid of editorializing. Occasionally, however, his true feelings do rise to the surface.

On October 19, 1822, at 9:00 AM he wrote the following remarkable entry in his diary:\(^{26}\)

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are born FREE, that they have been endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights among which are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness" Declara. of Independence, I was forcefully struck by the above Sentence, this morning, at Seeing a drove of fellow beings whose chance of birth hath put them in perpetual Slavery — I mean a set of "Soul-drivers" who in two instances, two & two hand-cuffed together — Shame, Shame for this land of Liberty— "Remember God the revenger reigns"

Engelbrecht's anti-slavery sentiment which surfaces so forcefully here led him to support the Union cause forty years later. Throughout his long life he maintained many friendships among Frederick's Black community as is evident in the last entry in the diary made by Engelbrecht's son on the occasion of his father's death and funeral. It was noted that: "a large number of Colored persons came to pay their last respect, a class among whom he had many friends."27

Despite his obvious empathy for Blacks there are still unexplained lapses, ambiguities which seem to suggest an ambivalence towards Blacks in certain circumstances. On several occasions Engelbrecht came forward as a witness to corroborate that this or that Black individual was indeed a free person. Yet, though he frequently refers to Blacks as "Negroes" or "Colored friends" later in the diary — and here the editor is perhaps at fault — one finds references to "Darky."28 Also in 1823 after observing the public whipping of a black man convicted of theft Engelbrecht's almost gleeful remark on the punishment: "His dose consisted of 25 pills which were administered by Dr. Jacob Myers Constable 'Honesty is the best policy'"29 contrasts strangely with the empathy displayed elsewhere.

Equally anomalous is Engelbrecht's lack of comment on an event that occurred in February 1826. Jacob C. Nicholson, a resident of Frederick, punished one of his Black indentured servants, a certain James Toogood age seven, by incarcerating him overnight in a cold closet. Because he was naked, except for a shirt, Toogood's legs and feet froze and he
died eight days later. An inquest was held in Frederick Court and after almost ten hours of deliberation Nicolson and his wife, who had been tried as an accessory, were both found not guilty of manslaughter. Other than recording the facts, Engelbrecht voiced no opinions.

Similarly, throughout his diary there are many references to events among Frederick's free Black community: church events, activities of various Black organizations such as the masons and beneficial societies, and marriages or deaths in the community. Yet, two events that had the greatest impact on free Blacks during the Antebellum period receive only cursory attention from Engelbrecht. Those events were the urban riots and the activities of the American Colonization Society. On August 14, 1835, for example, it was reported:

They had a kind of mob in Baltimore last week — about the "Poultny Bank" business — it happened between 7. & 10. of this month. & on Monday or tuesday night, they had a small Spree in Washington, about the "Nigg" business Torn down Several black school houses & burnt a black Church & c.

The "Nigg' business" is a reference in this case to the infamous "Snowhill Riot" of 1835 which sough to destroy the advances made by free Blacks in Washington, D.C. through wanton destruction of property and random violence directed at individuals. Engelbrecht's comments are remarkably casual. Just as casual are his references to the organization of a branch of the Colonization Society of Frederick. Although an auxiliary was organized there in 1831, as early as August 13, 1825 Engelbrecht reported being present at a lecture given in Frederick's German Reformed Church by Rev. Ralph R. Gurley, agent of the American Colonization Society. Lectures given ten days later by Gurley and Francis Scott Key at the church presumably also dealt with the program for returning free Blacks to Africa but Engelbrecht was more concerned with Key's excessively long speech than with its content.

The only interesting note which is offered on the entire colonization scheme is found in the September 21, 1838 entry in which Engelbrecht describes how a free Black named Thomas Jackson, formerly owned by Ritchie of Frederick, spoke at the Lutheran church on his experiences in Maryland's African colony since 1831. Still the objective observer, Engelbrecht remarked on Jackson: "he will find it difficult, to get those of his own Color, to believe his Statements, too many of them have no faith in the Colonization Scheme." But where does our diarist stand? The answer is silence until April 18, 1853 where we find the note that "Cornelius Campbell (of Robt) & wife Mary Thomas, Ford & wife Rebecca Tho" Smith all colored" were leaving that afternoon to sail for Liberia.

The ambivalence and contradictions which we have found in the diary of Jacob Engelbrecht are typical of the entire development of Afro-German relations since the Germantown Protest. During the almost two centuries between the formulation of the protest and the outbreak of the Civil War it is not possible to refer to Germans as an ethnic group united by commonalities of language, religion, and custom. Similarly, it is impossible to comment on Afro-German relations as group interactions; instead we find a myriad of individual responses in which numerous discrepancies and contradiction are present. The response of German-speaking individuals of the first migration to the African presence varied from group to group.

Wealth and standing were an important factor in so far as only wealthy and socially prominent members of the Lutheran and Reformed churches could afford to own slaves. Moravians, however, bought slaves and made them indentured servants with results such as we have seen. The pietistic groups such as Dunkards, Amish, and Brethren have no documentable evidence of a stand on slavery and their preference to shun worldly matters removes them from consideration on this issue. Given our current information we can only conclude that Afro-German relations before the Civil War in the older German settlement areas can only be fully understood if we divorce ourselves from the ideology imposed by an incorrect interpretation of the Germantown Protest. The
Protest was the laudable result of a few conscientious individuals who were able to wed self-interest and a humanitarian concern for a subjugated race. In the process they were able to overcome an ethnocentrism which affected not only their time but themselves as well. Their descendants and successors have not always been able to measure up to their achievement.

— Leroy T. Hopkins
Millersville State University

NOTES
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In reviewing the second edition of his epoch-making book, *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that Made the American People*, Oscar Handlin adds a chapter which reviews his initial difficulties in assessing the impact of immigration on the average individual as well as the critical reception of his ideas since their first articulation. As he notes, it is problematic at best to attempt a divination of the reactions of a non-literary class of people. Moreover, the scholarly community resists any tendency to generalize — to approximate an average experience out of a broad spectrum of specific instances. Yet any understanding of persons with little time or inclination to chronicle their lives must be drawn from indirect reports.

Handlin’s observations certainly hold for the German-American experience. German immigration into the United States — especially during the nineteenth century — is difficult to define. Many of its distinguishing characteristics are necessarily defined by the reactions of the individuals involved, and any attempt to delineate accurately the nature of the phenomenon must gauge and equitably distill thousands of uniquely personal experiences into an adequate representation of what the German-American immigration "was." Such an undertaking is continually frustrated by the elusiveness of the evidence, by its unwillingness to conform to a well-defined pattern.

Immigration to the United States from Germany during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries shows little consistency of character. It was by nature emphatically complex. Large numbers of people came, and as a whole, they were a motley throng — considerably more heterogenous than their predecessors. Although members of a family frequently traveled together, at least early in the period, the individual family was not likely to be a part of a larger, group movement. The thirties and forties were rife with plans for mass immigration and colonization, but despite the publicity surrounding such ventures, they generally elicited little favorable popular response and had almost no practical effect on the nature of immigration. The move to American during this era of greatest influx was for its entire duration largely a personal act. The individual, joined at times by members of his immediate family, reached his conclusion to emigrate privately and set off on his journey alone.

Naturally many external forces occasioned such a decision. Economic exigencies were almost inevitably a factor in the desire to relocate, and whether or not one elected to depart for America was doubtless determined in part by his attitude toward that distant land. Although there seems to be no solid evidence to point up one specific image of America and its possible relationship to an individual’s decision to emigrate, the European conception of the distant American continent seems to have played a definite role in influencing many a potential emigrant. Which one of the several available concepts of America might have proven most attractive to an individual emigrant is often impossible to determine. As the decision to emigrate was largely a personal one, it is likely that separate elements of the popular image may well have appealed to different individuals in varying degrees. Other causes contributed as well to the migratory urge. But in the end, emigration was a profoundly personal reaction to a specific set of outside influences, and for the majority of the individuals and families involved, it was a lonely undertaking. Many times travelers had friends in America whom they hoped to contact and from whom they thought to receive some aid in adjusting to the strange situation. Yet increasingly Germans were settling in the West, and the journey from a port of entry to an acquaintance and potential assistance was
itself a lengthy and toilsome, cross-country or upriver trek. In all, the difficult, and often frightening, task of relocation had to be accomplished alone.

A more sanguine view of the American continent, improved physical conditions, reduced hardships, and cheaper, more efficient intra-European and transatlantic transportation combined to increase the flow of travelers westward across the ocean. In the course of the century millions entered as immigrants. Eighteen fifty-four and 1882 were the peak years of German immigration, and in each of those years alone about a quarter of a million emigrants from German-speaking countries entered the United States. They were more numerous, they arrived with greater frequency, and they traveled more independently than their predecessors. Moreover, increasingly throughout the period, immigrants were drawn from a broader geographical area. In a politically atomized region such as the Germany of the time, this necessarily meant an intensification of the diversified character of German immigration which was already apparent in the growing tendency to emigrate as individuals or in very intimate and discreet family units. And precisely because Germans leaving home for America in the nineteenth century were no longer inclined toward group endeavor as their counterparts in previous centuries had been, they encountered in immigration psychological adversity despite an improving material situation.

Because he traveled essentially alone, the nineteenth-century immigrant did not bring with him an effective sense of group identity. Consequently deprived of a familiar social and cultural context in which to function, he usually experienced feelings of isolation and alienation. He had no fellows with whom to commiserate, few colleagues in his efforts to adjust, and little real sense of personal or communal identity.

In his book, Germany and the Emigration, 1816-1885? Mack Walker has determined that those who left home came largely from the middle class, an extremely vulnerable class economically and a group keenly sensitive to the feelings of inevitable change in the air in nineteenth-century Europe. Although an individual’s conscious motives were invariably dependent upon many only vaguely scrollable factors, those who emigrated in general did so in the hope of maintaining their customary way of life. The act may have been extreme—certainly not an option chosen by everyone in similar circumstances—but the motivation behind it was decidedly conservative. Emigrants were an anxious group, disturbed by the uncertainty and insecurity of the age. They felt threatened by new land policies and the movement toward a money economy, both public and private. For the peasant these developments meant more taxes, less acreage, and the loss of his sons’ labor through conscription; the artisan saw the forbidding omens of change in a shrinking clientele. Both sought in emigration a means of escaping an uncertain future and ensuring the continued integrity of life as they knew it.

It remained for the nineteenth-century immigrant to realize his vision of a secure future, and America seemed to offer the immigrant a haven from abrupt and unwelcome fluctuations in the normal pattern of life. Yet in working toward that end he was suddenly confronted with the fact of his solitude. His mental and physical welfare demanded a sense of identity and a sense of purpose in a community of his fellows. Thus the nineteenth-century German immigrant, having most likely made the transatlantic crossing by himself or with his immediate family, actively sought companionship and association with others upon disembarkation in order to achieve the community of interests essential to the preservation of his personal and psychological well-being and to recreate the familiar institutions that had constituted the context within which he had formerly functioned from day to day.

The broad geographical base and individualistic character of emigration during the period did not, however, produce the religious affinities and natural compatibility which had been such distinct features of the previous era of emigration. A common language and vaguely similar national origins, as
well as the need for group identity, often provided the only basis for the cultivation of a potential relationship among German immigrants during the nineteenth century. Rowland Berthoff depicts the situation in many localities: "The strongest bond among the members of a local ethnic group was the consciousness of what they were not. Surrounded by other kinds of people, the Irishman, Norwegian, or Yankee began to turn what had been a neutral circumstance, the customary common culture which everyone in his own community had taken for granted, into an exclusive principle of self-identification." Thus it happened that German-Americans living in loose-knit, rather random enclaves quickly gained a heightened awareness of their common ethnic and cultural heritage. The atomization of nineteenth-century American life, which frequently disturbed even the native-born, ran very much counter to the expectations of most immigrants. Although he desired the freedom to pursue his livelihood as he saw fit, the individual emigrant continued to define his social identity and moral worth in terms of his membership in a group. In his adopted country he sought the right to sustain his association with a group which would provide the framework within which he might realize his first goal in emigration — the preservation of a former way of life. As it developed, then, German-American society was a product of the interaction between the physical and emotional requirements of the immigrant and prevailing social conditions in the United States.

In Europe the life of an individual had been whole and integrated, and the church had often been the nucleus about which most community life had revolved. Soon after arrival most immigrants, regardless of faith, routinely acted to restore the traditional nature of their denomination in the hope that it might remain a compelling force for personal discipline and doctrinal conviction among the faithful. The majority saw in the perpetuation of familiar religious forms a very attractive and highly serviceable vehicle for the re-establishment of group life and, subsequently, a sense of group identity. Conservatism, the maintenance of the status quo and the perpetuation of standing institutions with no precipitous innovations, was a guiding principle for almost every immigrant, and its essence ruled each of his communal endeavors.

A number of investigators have remarked upon the conservatism of most German-Americans as well as the provincial nature of the society they built. Yet very few have taken sufficient notice of this. Rather distinctive characteristic of German-American society and fewer still have undertaken to explain its existence. The following quotations are two examples of the incomplete attempts to find an adequate explanation of German-American conservatism:

Because the Germans were unable to respect or, sometimes, to understand the social habits and standards of culture of their American neighbors, particularly in the newly developed regions, they sought to preserve as much as possible their old world habits and culture (Hawgood, p.41).

Considerations of language, the physical concentration of the urban community, and a natural submission to their political and religious leaders led these Europeans to reproduce the domestic, religious, and educational practices of the Fatherland in the New World (Still, p. 80).

In a short time the church again became the center of community life. In fact, it ultimately played a vital part in supplying many of the non-religious needs of its members, for there grew up about each German-American congregation a considerable number of lay organization which provided the population with a wide variety of services. From mutual aid societies, volunteer fire companies, and cooperative insurance agencies to glee clubs, Turnvereine [gymnastic unions], and secret lodges, the broad range of immigrant associations always drew attention to the clannishness of the newcomer, particularly the German-American. To the immigrant, however, membership in such groups provided fellowship in a time of stress. Emigration interrupted the regularity of life, and the strange American environment seemed to militate against the full restoration of the conventional order. Union with one's comrades
— be it serious and practical or frivolous and fraternal — was an attempt to duplicate the sense of community the immigrant had known at home. In the midst of the apparent chaos of American life, the ethic group provided a person with standards of behavior and moral sanctions imported from the homeland as it simultaneously established a well-defined position for him in his adopted society.

Inspection shows that there was not, in fact, an irreconcilable disparity between the more moderate views of the majority of the German-American public and the liberal tendencies of a decidedly smaller segment of the population. Undeniably, a very vocal and highly visible radical or lunatic fringe did exist. Indeed the actions of a few short-sighted, potential world reformers at the Chicago Haymarket bombing and subsequent riot in 1886 did much to politicize and finally discredit the activities of progressive thinkers of all persuasions, but the predominant majority of those German-Americans who called themselves free-thinkers or even socialists rarely espoused principles more radical than the three-part motto of the French Revolution: liberty; equality; and brotherhood. Organizations, such as the North American Turner Union which were founded directly after the abortive revolutions of 1848 by expatriates who were anxious to realize the aims of those European uprisings on American soil, did profess ideals which might be considered vaguely socialist even today. William Kamman, says simply: "Many of the principles advocated by the North American Gymnastic Union are now generally considered socialist. They oppose, for example, the extreme concentration of wealth, and political power in the hands of a few, the exploitation of labor by capital, and they defend the rights of the individual" (Socialism in German-American Literature, 63, c.f. note 3). Of course, many of the ideas considered progressive or even radical at the time are today all but self-understood. G. A. Hoehn lists a number of the changes demanded by the North American Turner Union. Among them are: an eight-hour day; governmental inspection of factories; children under fourteen cannot work, no more sales of public lands to individuals or corporations, except under very special conditions for improvement of the land; and mandatory and free public education.

Some organizations, however, did call for changes which might be considered suspiciously socialist by many even today. The "Platform of the Radicals," which was drawn up at a meeting of radical thinkers in Philadelphia in 1876, included many of the demands listed by Hoehn, but it incorporated as well calls for the elimination of all indirect taxes, the dismantling of all monopolies, and the introduction of progressive income and inheritance taxes with no taxes on income at or below a level necessary for adequate support of a family. But even in the first flush of enthusiasm prior to 1860 the goals of many groups which styled themselves socialist, communist, or atheistic frequently revealed nothing more dangerous or radical than a deep belief and trust in man and nature and the characteristic freedom inherent in both. Amidst the many specific demands incorporated into the platforms and constitutions of the various liberal organizations there seems always to be an undertone which betrays a general striving towards a type of Humanitätsideal. Heinrich Metzner records the goals of the Gymnastic Union formulated more or less specifically with the statement: "social, political, and religious reform are the watchwords of our organization." Yet the group eschews any specific recommendations and seeks to be a clearinghouse for all liberal ideas. The guiding philosophy behind all its actions is then revealed a few paragraphs later (p. 203):

We have learned to separate the natural laws in their purity from those artificial laws so offensive to reason through which hypocritical priests and blind fanatics defame the good name of morality.... We believe in that profoundly beautiful, truly human philosophy of life, according to which body and spirit contribute equally to the quest for perfection in human endeavor and true humanity consists in the harmony of body and spirit, in the complementary interaction of a spirituality which seeks the sublime and a healthy but
restrained sensuality governed by moderation.22

Socialism seems in any case to have meant different things to different people. In practice, the various groups frequently stood for whatever ideas were thought to be progressive at a given time, and there was confusion in the minds of many as to the principles for which each faction stood. Indeed, the ideals espoused by one organization usually overlapped with those defended by yet another, resulting in a confusing array of goals and aims, the majority of which were shared by all. The confusion was exacerbated by the constant attempts of the leaders of many factions to vie for the support of the members of other factions. Wilhelm Weitling, whose own brand of Handwerkerkommunismus [communism for the laborer] never held much appeal for men like Karl Heinzen who were more aristocratically and theoretically inclined, gives a most incisive and memorable description of the situation as it existed in 1850:

Everyone wants to publish a newspaper, everyone wants to preside over a club or found a mutual aid society, everyone wants to set off on his own to be a spokesperson for some faction or another. This one mixes decentralization with socialism, this one atheism with rationalism, yet a third is a socialistic gymnast, the fourth is active in progressive affairs. One of them wants to form an organization for the development of the spirit, the next one for humanity, the third for the people, the fourth for the working class, one wants to bring singers into a group, another wants tailors, another refugees, etc. And hundreds of others want the same thing, but with a slight variation.23

After the Civil War much of the ardor which had been born of the dream of actualizing freedom from oppression in Europe was channelled into more directly American concerns, such as homesteading and naturalization, and socialistic rhetoric receded into the background. Many of the members of organizations which called themselves liberal were small businessmen, more concerned about making productive business contacts than refashioning the political system. The groups would meet, usually on a weekly basis, to listen to a lecturer whose purpose it was to educate the assembly spiritually and intellectually with an edifying talk on the latest scientific discoveries, taxing the rich, the moral character of a life patterned after nature rather than religion, or perhaps the beauty of literature and the arts. The primary concern of any speaker's audience was, however, more likely to be the liquid and solid refreshments which were scheduled to conclude the evening's festivities rather than the speech itself. Many of the buildings in which such meetings took place were mortgaged to brewery owners who extracted the privilege of maintaining a public house of the premises. Indeed the frequent complaints of the really serious adherents of liberal philosophies lead one to conclude that for many the appeal of an evening at the Turnverein or Free Thought Society was more of a social than of a scholarly nature.

A 1908 article in a Detroit newspaper illustrates the popularity of beer in many German-American endeavors. In reviewing the first years of a German theater group which had prospered in the city in the third quarter of the previous century. This the article informs its readers that:

At first it was a small affair, the stage being located at the end of the bar room. This proximity of mental and physical refreshment proved a happy combination. The refreshment privilege constituted an important item in these early German theaters, John Deville, who owned the ground on which the Thalia society erected the theater, retaining the right to supply the wants of the inner man and profiting materially thereby.

That similar arrangements were common in other German-American cultural endeavors seems confirmed by the fact that Karl Knortz finds it necessary to include in his very accurate summary of the decline of the Turnvereine toward the end of the last century the complaint that:

... In addition there was the unfortunate circumstance that most of the organizations had established permanent taverns on their premises and, as the tavern business constituted the major source of income, the leadership tended to devote its attention primarily to that activity. Consequently, the bonds which had been issued to build the organization's hall soon came into the possession of rich beer brewers, who naturally insisted that the gymnastic unions do things their way.
Knortz' complaint indicates the seriousness of the problem, and the scattered comments of various speakers, reviewers, and historians dealing with freethought and other liberally-oriented groups indicate that the membership was not always made up of persons whose primary interest was the serious pursuit of the ideas professed at such meetings. In fact, the lack of seriousness on the part of some supporters is frequently cited as the reason for the limited success of such groups.

Thus even organizations which bore the word "socialistic" in their name, as well as many other German-American groups dubbed liberal by the public at large, probably served a much more broadly cultural function than has usually been assumed. The measure of cohesiveness which such a union of individuals provided was probably more than anything else responsible for the popularity and variety of German-American societies, for like the church, the middle-class lay organizations became a sort of German-American cultural phenomenon, providing a sense of identity and a source of companionship amidst the rather unsettling struggle every immigrant endured in his attempt to preserve a semblance of the life he had left behind as he established himself in his adopted homeland.

— Randall Donaldson
Loyola College in Maryland

NOTES


2. Marcus Hansen [The Atlantic Migration 1607-1860 (Cambridge, MS: Harvard Univ. Press, 1940)] continually stresses the individualistic nature of nineteenth-century immigration. Yet he seems unwilling to dismiss completely arguments which credit group attempts at colonization with some degree of success. However, Hansen's, and particularly John Hawgood's, [The Tragedy of German-America: The Germans in the United States of America during the Nineteenth Century — and After (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1940)] efforts to ascribe a measure of success to group attempts at colonization seem largely overdrawn.


4. Statistics on the subject of emigration or immigration are difficult to determine. Frequently records are incomplete, at times the method of reporting changes, distorting the statistical basis for all previous estimates, and German and American figures often differ substantially. Moreover, statistics of this kind were at times biased because it was politically expedient to either over- or underestimate the number of persons entering or leaving a specific country at a specific time. Most researchers feel, however, that 1854 and 1882 are the peak years of German immigration. Walker, as usual the most cautious and very likely the most reliable investigator, estimates about a quarter of a million German immigrants in each of those years. Albert Faust, The German Element in the United States (New York: Steuben Society of America, 1927), 1,588, puts the number at 215,009 for 1854 and marks 1882 as a banner year with 250,630 (p. 586). William Kamman, Socialism in German-American Literature (Philadelphia: Americana Germanica Press, 1917), p. 10, also finds 1882 the high water mark with a figure of 250,630, but his figure might well have been taken from Faust, who cites no source for his information.


6. Walker describes a scene on the roads in southern Germany in 1832 where "travelers to Hambach mingled with growing numbers of Auswanderer [emigrants] going beyond, to America. They differed in one important way: the Auswanderer had no faith in Germany's future, or at least no faith in their places in it. Those who journeyed to Hambach did have plans or hopes for Germany's future and saw themselves as part of it. But taxes and princes, dislocation and frustration lay behind both; very often they were the same taxes and the same princes" (Germany and the Emigration, p. 65).

7. In seeking the external factors which influenced emigration, Walker examines vital statistics and finds: "Once more it is insecurity, instability, and violence of statistical ups and downs, rather than constant low or high position, that accompany the Auswanderung [emigration]. Vital statistics reflect basic parts of the patterns of human lives, and their violent fluctuation reflects disruptions of the patterns" (Germany and the Emigration, p. 57).

8. Walker (Germany and the Emigration, p. 157) lists the "long term stimuli to Auswanderung [emigration]" as: "land fragmentation, the decline of the handicrafts, and the movement to a money economy, public and private."

9. The present study cannot offer an appropriate forum for detailed discussion of the social structure of nineteenth-century German-America. Historians have only in recent decades begun a reassessment of the sig-
Significance of social history as a key to the deeper understanding of past events, and the implications of this new perspective have yet to be fully explored. Recognition of the pertinence of social history to a consideration of immigrant communities can, however, help sweep away some of the more antiquated and unsatisfactory explanations of the substance of German-American society and establish the importance of the solitary nature of nineteenth-century German immigration as a formative influence upon that phenomenon. Rowland Berthoff has done much to elucidate the relevance of the progressively unsettled structure of American social institutions to growing feelings of anxiety and uncertainty which lay at the base of many political movements after 1820. His book, *An Unsettled People: Social Order and Disorder in American History* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), attempts to authenticate the social interpretation of history as a necessary complement to political and economic expositions of the subject. However, a great deal of preliminary work would have to be done before an adequate analysis of the social institutions of the Germans in the United States could be undertaken. Perhaps an investigation of various German immigrant communities similar to Mack Walker’s *German Home Towns: Community, State, and General Estate, 1648-1871* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1971) would yield significant results. Certainly there are many questions still to be answered by such a study. For instance, Marcus Hansen undertook *The Emigrant* (pp. 23-4) an examination of three relatively similar German settlements in Rio de Janeiro, New South Wales, and Missouri which seemed to show that the German immigrants in Missouri were more readily assimilated into the native society than their compatriots elsewhere. Hansen could find no apparent reason for the difference, and even today there is no satisfactory explanation of the situation. As the field is already in the process of relocation and state that if the individual immigrant is unable to adopt new habits and standards to meet the situation, he will become depressed (p. 61). They treat at length the potential for demoralization inherent in the process of relocation and state that if the individual immigrant was the most consequential element in the situation and the notorious, the task is considerably more involved than it might be were a competent political success. What determined the nature of immigrant groupings was not national feeling, for in Europe immigrants had been hardly aware of their nationality. To most, local and regional affiliation were more important.” In practice, an immigrant would most likely seek out friends or relatives already in the country. Letters home from successful settlers frequently urged others to follow; perhaps the new arrival could prevail upon the hospitality of an old acquaintance until he was acclimated to the new land. Failing that, most immigrants were usually informed as to the location of settlements of their compatriots, where they could solicit the aid of those already established in making the initial adjustments.

11*An Unsettled People*, p. 225.

12Rowland Berthoff notes (*An Unsettled People*, p. 372) that despite the fact that most Americans had an inbred sense of respect for the much-vaunted principle of self-reliance, many nonetheless felt “caught in a modern web of rapid economic growth, social individualism and instability, and anxious reaction” (x) and that it would seem that “the anxieties which historians have recently detected at the root of various political movements after 1820 evidently had something to do with the uncertainty of a society which lacked an accepted pattern of reciprocal rights and duties among well-founded classes. They also had something to do with the dissolution of other old social patterns — the functionally integrated family, community, and parish church of an earlier day—which Americans had not specifically intended to discard along with the old class distinctions” (xii).

13The community life an individual had known in Europe had been characterized by a fixed configuration of reciprocal privileges and obligations. As Oscar Handlin describes the situation on page 221 of "Historical Perspectives on the American Ethnic Group," *Daedalus* 90 (Spring 1961), 220-32: "The communities the emigrants left had been whole and integrated, and had comprehended the total life of their members . . ., and the individual was therefore located in a precise place that defined the whole range of his associations." Many times, in fact, it was true that the immigrant to the United States had left his homeland precisely because established patterns of behavior were being altered by changing social and economic conditions. Yet America in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was a country where, as Handlin sees it (p. 222), "uninterrupted territorial expansion was the most consequential element in the situation" and "...almost everywhere the concomitant was a spatial and social mobility that exerted a continued strain upon existing organizations and habitual modes of behavior." The newly-arrived immigrant was often confused and disheartened, for, as Rowland Berthoff explains (*An Unsettled People*, p. 371), "whatever he had heard of American freedom and opportunity, he (the immigrant) had not anticipated that so many familiar elements of old-country society would be missing. In an American city he
could preserve only fragments of the sort of parish, village, or family life that he was used to. . . . His ethnic neighborhood had little more cohesion or tradition than could be mustered by fraternal lodges and other voluntary associations on the American plan. . . . But these struggling versions of old-country social institutions could at least do what they had been doing ever since the 1820's: reassure the individual of his social identity and moral worth as a member of some collective entity more coherent and less confusing than the atomistic society at large."

In addition to the "spatial and social mobility" (see note 14 above) which Oscar Handlin finds so characteristic of nineteenth-century America, he also lists ("Historical Perspectives," p. 222 ff.) a number of further reasons forthe inability of most European immigrants to reestablish the type of integrated community life they had known at home. Among these are the looseness of American institutional forms and the heterogeneity of the American population. In an attempt to locate himself in his new situation, an immigrant of any nationality customarily engaged in some form of associationism. For a more detailed discussion of this topic see Arthur M. Schlesinger, "Biography of a Nation of Joiners," American Historical Review 50, No. 1 (October 1944), 1-25. As the need for association with a group usually had physical as well as psychological aspects, one must ultimately look to the entire complex of associations in which the immigrant was involved, but chief among the affiliations which continued to determine one's social context was the church. Frequently community and congregation were synonymous, and the church was a decisive influence in many facets of existence extending far beyond the realm of basic religious beliefs. In most cases it provided a focal point for almost all community activity.


Of course, immigrant associations were a phenomenon in every ethnic group, for such organizations were often an important part of an individual's adjustment to his adopted country. However, the Germans seem many times to have been at least more conspicuous in their clandestiness. Forster, Zion on the Mississippi, p. 258, documents at least one situation, in St. Louis, where the Germans were thought to be making "improper attempts" at cultural isolation. Forster blames the Vereinsmeierei [clannishness] of the group for much of its trouble: "The Germans were joiners and everywhere displayed a tendency to band into societies, preferably with bombastic or lurid names or with a military flair."

In 1876 Roben Reitzel delivered the keynote speech to an assemblage of free thinkers gathered in Philadelphia to celebrate the anniversary of the Independent Congregation of Philadelphia. In his remarks, he himself uses the words quoted to express the goals of the organization (Geschichtliche Mittheilungen über die deutschen Freien Gemeinden von Nordamerika p. 71.): "Die Befreiung von der Religion... ist allerdings die Grundlage und der wichtige Factor alles Fortschritts, unser Endziel aber ist der Culturstaat, d.h., die wahre Republik, in der sich endlich einmal das goldene Motto der französischen Revolution: 'Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit' verwirklichen soll."

"Der Nordamerikanische Turnerbund und seine Stellung zur Arbeiter-Bewegung" (St. Louis, Missouri: 1892), 4.


Karl Knortz in a pamphlet on the necessity for organizing liberal-minded men entitled Die Notwendigkeit einer Organization der Freidenker (Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Verlag des Bundes-Vororts, 1910), p. 5, continues in a similar vein on the duty of every free thinker: "In diesem Sinne [Ciceros] ist nun ein religiöser jeder Freidenker ein Mensch: seine Gottheit ist, wie Feuerbach sagt, Menschenliebe, und er hält daher die Morallehre für die erhabeneste und edelste, welche die übelwollenden, egoistischen Neigungen beschränke und das Wohl der Allgemeinheit beförder." Finally, Carl Friedrich Huch sums up the deliberations and activities of a convention of freethinkers in 1876 with the words ("Die Konventionen der Freigesinnten im Jahre 1876," p. 4): "Das Buch der Natur und Geschichte ist die alleinige Quelle, aus welcher die Vernunft alles notwendige und nützliche und das Menschenleben vereinende und verschönernde Wissen und Können, alle Sitten- und Staatsgesetze und gesellschaftlichen Einrichtungen schöpfet... Das allseitige liebliche, geistliche und gemütliche Wohlbefinden, die irdische Glückseligkeit ist unser höchstes Gut."

23"Republik der Arbeiter," 1850, p. 180 ff., as quoted by Kamman, Socialism in German-American Literature, p. 20. [translation my own]

24The fundamental principles of the Arbeiterkongreß [workers' union] formulated in convention in 1850 included even then: "Freiegebung der öffentlichen Ländereien in bestimmten Quantitäten an wirkliche Bebauer; Sicherung der Heimstätte gegen erzwungenen Verkauf; die Erlangung des Bürgerrechtes für Einwanderer von keiner Zeitbestimmung abhängig gemacht werden; Beschränkung des Bodenbesitzes; hohe Besteuerung aller verkaufen, jedoch unbefall liegenden Ländereien; Schutz der Einwanderer gegen Prellereien durch Spekulanten und Makler" [as quoted in: C. F. Huch, "Die Anfange der Arbeiterbewegung unter den Deutschen in Amerika," Mitteilungen des Deutschen Pionier-
The majority of immigrants tended to emphasize these and other specifically American concerns even more during the period following the Civil War.

In his keynote address at the Philadelphia convention of free congregation (Geschichtliche Mittheilungen über die deutschen Freien Gemeinden von Nordamerika, p. 97) Reitzel himself warns: "Natürlich, wer zu uns kommt, um einen Tummelplatz seiner persönlichen Eitelkeit zu finden, wer zu uns kommt, um materielle Vortheile für sein Geschäft dabei zu finden, wer zu uns kommt um des gesellschaftlichen Vergnügens willen, der wird auch bald wieder gehen. Although expressed negatively, as that which is undesirable, the sentiments make it obvious that there were at least sufficient numbers drawn to free religion for precisely such reasons that Reitzel found it necessary to mention the problem. One's suspicions are confirmed upon reading Heinrich Hoehn's remarks in Der Nordamerikanische Turnerbund und seine Stellung zur Arbeiter-Bewegung, p. 1, about those who "erblicken im Turnverein einen gewöhnlichen Vergnügungs-Club" and those members who are "Produkte unseres kapitalistischen Wirtschafts-Systems." He explains: "Ich meine jene Leute, welche sich nur einem Dutzend Vereinen oder Vereinchen ansschließen, in der Hoffnung, sich dabei Kunden zu erwerben resp. einen Vor-
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FROM CAROLINA TO CONNECTICUT: GERMANS AND SWISS IN SEARCH OF GOLD AND SILVER, 1704-1740

This is not meant to be a treatise on early mining in the colonies involving people from German-speaking lands. It is rather a by-product of a comprehensive study of 18th-century immigration, pointing to some figures of fact and fiction who might deserve a closer look by students of colonial history. The frequent references to mineral wealth, to the gold and silver the New Land was expected to yield, and with it the hope for quick riches did not pass unnoticed among adventurers, debt-ridden patricians, and mere tricksters in various parts of the Empire and Switzerland.

Among those whose names appear in the records of the colonies were remarkable men who fit at least one of these characterizations. Frantz Ludwig Michel was an educated adventurer, untrained for prospecting, and might have believed that the minerals he had found were indicative of considerable lodes. Christopher von Graffenried was desperate enough to grab any chance to reverse his bad fortune. Friedrick Redegelt, whoever he really was, emerges as an outright fraud. Johann Heinrich Sprögel was a transatlantic whizzer, free of traditional scruples when business seemed to require it, whose luck tended to run out when he most needed it.

Dreams of silver and gold flowing from the mining projects of Michel and Graffenried in the Carolinas and along the Potomac and Shenandoah remained unfulfilled. There was only one tangible result, albeit unexpected and unplanned: the beginnings of Spotswood's iron works in Virginia. The copper mine at Simsbury, Connecticut, was started as a solid business venture by merchants in Amsterdam and New York. Germans were involved only as contracted experts and mine workers. The discovery of the Perkiomen copper deposits in Pennsylvania has been credited to J. H. Sprögel's efforts to exploit and settle the Frankfurt Company lands which he had acquired through a much criticized legal maneuver in 1708.

The vignettes which follow here might also serve to illustrate the diversity of Swiss and Germans who were drawn to the New Land in the early part of the 18th century. They seem a far cry from the still prevalent image of "Paltines and Switzers" as droves of ill-used peasants and persecuted sectarians. That some of them were flawed in one way or another should not come as a surprise in schemes which involved dreams of instant riches.

The Situation in Virginia and Maryland

... it is for Certain, there would be in a Short time very rich mines discovered, to the benefit of Great Britain as well as America, and the Spaniards might hang themselves for their Money for the future.

J. H. Sprögel to the Board of Trade

The common knowledge of the gold and silver the Spaniards had found in their colonies had raised hopes for similar discoveries in the English colonies in America. Indeed, the young Jamestown settlement briefly came under the spell of quick riches when William Hendrick Faldoe, the "Helvetian" who had come to Virginia with German and Polish craftsmen in October 1609, announced the discovery of a "silver-myne". He returned to England and was awarded an eighteen-month contract to develop the mine. When he came back to Virginia with Lord De la Warr, precious time and labor were wasted in the precarious infant colony in a futile search for the deposits. Faldoe was, however, spared the burden of proving his claim, for it "hath pleased god since that time, that the said Helvetian hath died of a burning-Fever, and with him the knowledge of that myne [he] would not reveale unto any one ells of the Colony." As late as 1630 an expedition tried again to find the silver deposits "discovered by a Dutchman," because not all Virginians shared Captain John Smith's reasonable assessment that the Swiss was "a meere Imposer whose real name and background have never been uncovered."
Almost a century went by before other adventurers from German-speaking lands made waves again with their promises and assurances of finding the long-sought mineral wealth. The beleaguered proprietor of Pennsylvania, William Penn, was singularly receptive. On March 16th, 1703/4 he issued a commission to "Colonel Friedrich Redegelt":

Reposing special Confidence in Thy Conduct & Integrity, & being well satisfied of Thy Great Skill & Experience in the Discovering & Working of Mines & Minerals, as well as in other Useful Inventions; I do hereby Constitute & Appoint Thee, Friedrich Redegelt, to be Sey-Master General of the aforesaid Province....

This "colonel," who also claimed to have purchased 10,000 acres of land in Pennsylvania, approached in London the scouts that had been sent out by an emigration society of Langensalza, the High-German Company of Thuringia, to look for a suitable place of settlement in America. On August 5, 1704, Johann Heinrich Kürsten, a woolen draper from Langensalza bought sight unseen 750 acres and Lorenz Christopher Nohren 200 acres from "Colonel Frederick de Redegoldt" in London. Later, in Pennsylvania, both men found out that their deeds, written in German, did "not appear Good." It is possible that Redegeld tried to recruit people in Saxony because on July 7, 1706, Prince Elector August expressly stated in an order that "also miners were to be lured away." Three years later, in July 1709, the British envoy in The Hague passed on to London a petition of "chief mine master" Joh. Joseph Kramer from "Vreybergern in Meissen" (Freiberg, the center of Saxon silver mining) who asked for travel assistance to the New Land for himself and 40 to 50 mine foremen and workers.

The first "Essay Master General of the Province of Pensilv'a and Terr's annexed, in America," as Redegelt signed his tide on the deeds, remains shrouded in mystery. As William Penn’s troubles in England increased, Redegelt felt obviously free to commit various frauds and lastly claimed to have found the tincture to make gold. By the time the authorities began investigating his activities he had left for Holland and Germany. When he appeared at the home of the pietist pastor Johann Wilhelm Petersen and his wife Eleonora von Merlau near Magdeburg, who were shareholders of the Frankfurt Company, he was sent on his way. Petersen called him an "arch-trickster." Despite attempts by the Prussian civil and church authorities in Berlin and Magdeburg to have him apprehended, Redegelt succeeded in selling more of his pretended estates in Pennsylvania. A schoolmaster in Sudenburg near Magdeburg quit his job after paying the "colonel" dollars in cash, only to find out in Holland that he had been duped. Hermann Groethausen, who purchased 9,000 acres and went to England with his family, was clever enough to see Penn before embarking. When he checked with the proprietor in December 1709, the hoax was exposed and he accepted Penn’s offer of 500 acres instead. "Thereupon the scoundrel vanished from sight," Petersen noted in his memoirs, and with him William Penn’s first mining projects.

Meanwhile there was some real exploration underway along the Maryland and Pennsylvania frontiers. In February 1707 the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania received a message that an expedition led by Frantz Ludwig Michel was building cabins on the "forks of the Potomac pretending they were in search of ore. Thirty-two-year-old Michel was the adventurous son of a former member of the Great Council of Bern. He had already made a first exploratory trip to Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania in 1701/2. In 1703 he embarked again for America. This time he visited the Carolinas where he became friends with John Lawson, an indefatigable explorer and future surveyor general of North Carolina. Lawson encouraged Michel’s mineral search. In his book A New Voyage to Carolina, Lawson wrote:

As good if not better Mines than those of the Spaniards in America, lie full West from us; and I am certain, we have Mountainous Land, and as great Probability of having rich Minerals in Carolina, as any of those Parts that are already found to be so rich therein. He also mentioned Michel’s investigation of ore deposits and welcomed the proposed settlement of Swiss by the Ritter Company of Bern, for which Michel served as scout."

[ 44 ]
After his extended visit of the Carolinas, Michel moved north and explored the northern part of the Shenandoah Valley and other areas along the Potomac. The decision was finally made in Bern to locate the Swiss colony "on the Hed of Potomack River and its branches." In May 1707 George Ritter himself sent a letter to the contact man in the English government in which he expressed the hope "... if we find some minerals, iron, lead, tin, copper, etc., they shall belong to the discoverers," blissfully unaware of the concept of Royal Mines which governed English policy at home as well as in the overseas plantations.10

The first reaction at Court and at the Board of Trade was less than promising but the mention of "frontier" and "minerals" created enough of an interest to keep the project alive. Although the Board of Trade had only a vague conception of the unexplored western regions, the representatives of the proprietors, notably of Lady Fairfax and Lord Baltimore, but even the embattled William Penn, monitored western settlement schemes closely. Granting the land that Michel described clearly would have infringed on the Fairfax proprietary, if not also on those conflicting claims of the Maryland and Pennsylvania proprietors.

Frantz Ludwig Michel returned to Europe late in 1708. His enthusiastic reports spurred the Bernese on to renewed activity. In London Michel was joined by Christopher von Graffenried who had left Bern "in all quiet" on May 13, 1709, to escape serious pecuniary difficulties. Graffenried himself wrote enthusiastically of Michel's reports, "what fine rich silver mines he had discovered and found," and "when I considered that I was burdened with rather heavy debts;" the Bernese projects must have looked attractive to him.11 In the London of 1709 Michel and Graffenried were caught up in the whirlpool of the largest mass migration from the German Rhine-lands. Only their repeated emphasis on mineral discoveries and on strengthening the frontier with orderly, small groups of "war-like Switzers" opened for them the doors to the administration, the Board of Trade, and the proprietors. As to the plans in Virginia, the Queen's approval was expressed in an Order of Council on August 22, 1709: "that the Governor of Virginia doe upon the said Petitioners Arrival there, forthwith Allot unto them certain Lands on the South-west Branch of Potomac."12

At the same time they accepted 650 of the thousands of Germans stranded in London for a settlement scheme in North Carolina where Graffenried was also to take the first contingent from Bern after Lawson and the Carolina proprietors had succeeded in diverting their intentions from the Virginia-Maryland border area. After the numerous contracts and agreements dealing with these settlers were concluded, Michel and Graffenried concentrated on their mining proposals. The proprietors of Carolina were the first to grant them certain privileges. The contract was signed at Craven House on April 6, 1710:

Agreed that the Baron de Graffenried and Mr Lewis Michel shall have a lease of all royal mines and minerals in the Province of Carolina that they shall discover and work for the term of 30 years, they being at the entire charge. The produce of it to be divided into eight parts whereof four eights are to be paid to the Lord Proprietors the other four eights to the said Baron de Graffenried and Mr Lewis Michel for the term of 5 years after any such Mines shall be found and opened. But after the aforesaid term of five years then the Lords to have five eights, the said Baron de Graffenried and Mr Lewis Michel three eights the Lords being to pay the Crown the fourth part according to the Words to the Charter.13

The negotiations with William Penn turned out to be more involved. It was no secret that the proprietor of Pennsylvania was desperately looking for a way out of his financial straits. In March 1709, he wrote to James Logan in Philadelphia that Michel had visited him: "Pray Scruteny this matter well & let me hear from thee with all the Speed thou canst; for the assurance Michell gives me, makes me sollicitous to pry into that affair, whence help & reward may arrive to deliver me."14 He had obviously not yet received the letter Logan had addressed to him a few weeks earlier: "There is nothing yet certainly to discover about the mines," and he added a warning
about Michel, "... for I fear Mitchell has tricked us all." Penn's earlier dealings with the notorious Redegelt should also have made him more cautious. Graffenried later recalled: "But if I had not been present at the first negotiation, nothing would have come of it, and Mr. Penn would do and conclude nothing, unless it were signed by me." On June 14, 1710, Penn informed Lieutenant Governor Charles Gookin:

Haveing made a Contract wth my friends Lewis Mitchel & Baron Graffenried for the Discovering Opening & working certain Mines within the Bounds of that Province for which I have Granted to the said Mitchel my Commission w' Such full & ample Powers as may be Necessary to Carry on the said Work: I Doe therefore desire thee to give the said L Mitchel & all persons Concerned for or under him all reasonable Encouragemt in the Sd Design....

The Swiss nobleman's charm had evidently worked for William Penn continued:

Haveing mencioned the Baron Graffenried I must Particularly recommend him to thy favour and Notice, as a Gentleman of Worth that haveing made a very good figure, & born very Considerable Offices in his own Countray, is now willing to retire, & Plant himself in a Land of more freedom & Ease.

Despite these negotiations with the proprietors of Carolina and Pennsylvania, Michel returned to prospecting in the back country of Virginia while Graffenried accompanied the Swiss colonists to North Carolina though he had also taken care to select two miners from the large crowd of Germans in London to go with him to America.

The ensuing events proved that the mining contracts for the Carolinas and Pennsylvania were to remain nothing more than pieces of paper.

The Shareholders' Book [Gewercken-Buch]

Before returning to his prospecting camp on the Potomac, Michel had gone over to the Netherlands where he met with a German head miner, Johann Justus Albrecht, in order to work out a contract for the personnel to be recruited in German mining areas. Albrecht was hired as Berghauptmann (inspector of mines) and charged with the procurement of the necessary tools. As it turned out, he was not an ordinary chief miner but a crafty, first-class public-relations man. He traveled to Siegen where the mining industry was in a depressed state and workers were looking for jobs. He spent a considerable time to have mining implements made to order. He also contacted prospective workmen. His credentials seemed impressive. Siegeners were awed by this self-assured man who claimed to have been appointed to develop mines and smelters for gold, silver and other metals on behalf of Her Majesty of Great Britain in the colonies of Carolina, Virginia and Pennsylvania. In order to create local good-will, Albrecht grandly signed a donation contract for the benefit of the three Reformed ministers in Siegen in which he promised them an annuity of 350 rix dollars in perpetuity from the proceeds of the American mines. This "document" was duly sealed by the imperial notary and signed by leading Siegen citizens as witnesses in the presence of the overwhelmed main beneficiary, the Rev. Johannes Daniel Eberhardi, inspector of the Reformed Church in Nassau-Siegen. If we may believe Graffenried's apology, written several years after the events, Albrecht did arouse some suspicion and by order of the imperial administrators who were then in charge of the Siegen territory he was detained and all his belongings and utensils were impounded. Upon intervention of the English envoy he was released.

In May 1712 Albrecht was in London and busy designing a fancy shareholders' book (Gewercken-Buch) of the mines with the intention of selling shares. By this time he had promoted himself to General Berg-Hauptmann [chief inspector of mines] of the gold and silver mines in the province of South Carolina. But he was also growing impatient. No orders to proceed to America were forthcoming from Graffenried. The latter had no sooner somewhat consolidated his German and Swiss settlement at New Bern, North Carolina, than an Indian attack practically wiped out the colony. Graffenried himself barely escaped with his life. He did ask Michel by letter to inform Albrecht not to come with
Cover page of Johann Justus Albrechts "Gewerchen Buch" of 1712.
(Virginia State Library)
his company without express orders. Michel, however, eager to get some more work started, advised the head miner instead to come over with one or two others to have a look for himself.²¹

Albrecht returned to Siegen immediately. Twelve skilled miners and their families, complete with a Reformed minister and a schoolmaster, responded to his call. Thanks more likely to the earlier clarification of his activities by the English envoy than to Albrecht's public relations efforts, the emigrants were granted leave without trouble from the authorities.²² The retired pastor, seventy-year-old Joh. Heinrich Häger, was particularly eager to join the group because his son, Joh. Friedrick Häger, had left Siegen in 1709 and was installed with the blessings of Anglican Church as minister to the Palatines in the Hudson Valley. Little did he realize the distances in America. There is no record of any meeting of father and son. The Siegen area had provided a number of emigrants in 1709. There must have been an awareness of available land in America because the Hägers, father and son, had close and friendly relations with the Behagel family who were the heirs to the late Daniel Behagel's share in the Frankfurt Company lands in Pennsylvania.²³ The fact that the Siegeners came with their families was unusual for contract labor.

By the end of September 1713, the miners were in London. Albrecht was unable to find a passage for them. Graffenried, a virtual refugee from the disaster that had befallen his colony in North Carolina and, as no more funds from his associates in Bern had reached him, also a fugitive from creditors, arrived just about the same time in London. He had spent some time in Virginia and had learned discouraging things about Michel activities. On the other, hand Governor Alexander Spotswood had shown keen interest in the mining prospects. Graffenried had not expected to find Albrecht and his miners in London. Despite his own predicament, his sense of responsibility came briefly back to him and he tried to help them. The personal savings of the miners were running low. Graffenried tried in vain to persuade them to return to Siegen for the winter but they feared rightly that the authorities would not re-admit them. After much vexation Graffenried found temporary work and shelter for some of them and got their agreement to serve four years in exchange for their passage. The agent for Virginia, Nathaniel Blakiston, whose aid Graffenried had enlisted, found space on a ship leaving for Virginia early in 1714. While the Swiss entrepreneur was still hoping that the miners would eventually be engaged in the purported silver mines, Blakiston was confident that Governor Spotswood would welcome them for his own purposes.²⁴

The Siegeners arrived in Virginia on April 28, 1714. Spotswood paid the captain the balance of 150 pounds still owed on their transportation, allegedly from his own pocket. Thus they were his personal indentured servants. Informing the Board of Trade of their arrival, the governor disguised their real purpose by reporting that they were placed on the frontier and equipped with cannons and rifles. The palisades in which he fenced in the entire group was given the name Germanna in honor of both their homeland, Germany, and Queen Anne. The beginnings at Germanna were extremely hard for the Siegeners, and their life was a far cry from Albrecht's golden promises.²⁵ In November 1715, when the young Huguenot John Fontaine visited Germanna, he confided to his diary: "The Germans live very miserably." Although Spotswood used public funds for their support as frontier rangers, the miners and their families suffered considerably. It was not until March, 1716, that anything resembling the work for which these men had chosen to go to America was begun. At that time, as Albrecht testified later in Essex County Court, Spotswood "did put under my command eleven laboring men to work in mines or quarries at or near Germanna." Fontaine, who was again in the area on August 25, 1716, recorded "after dinner we went to the mines, but I could not observe that there was any good mine. The Germans pretend that 'tis a silver mine." According to Albrecht, who signed as "Holtman John Justice Albright" and Hans Jacob Holtzklaub, the schoolmaster, the work con-
tinued only until December 1718. The miners, well aware of their four-year contract, began to grow restless in 1718. Spotswood, in one of his moves that five years later brought about his removal from office, had personally acquired the Germanna tract in 1716, thus making the Siegeners technically his tenants even after their indenture expired in April 1718. Three of the Germans, John Fischbach, Johann Hoffmann and Jacob Holtzklaau, obtained their naturalization in order to be able to acquire and hold land on behalf of the group. In 1718, a warrant was issued to these three men for more than 1,800 acres on Licking Run to which they removed themselves in the following year and founded Germantown. The erstwhile miners turned into versatile farmers, soon adding cash-producing tobacco to their crops. Head miner Albrecht was not among those who settled on Licking Run. The last record found of him in Virginia is his affidavit of May 1720 describing the actual work done by the miners.

The Situation in Connecticut

In the Simsbury area of Connecticut, northwest of Hartford, copper deposits were discovered as early as 1705. Mining operations began about 1713 but they were hindered both by lack of investments and the disadvantage of having to be carried out secretly, since English regulations prohibited the smelting and refining of copper in the colonies. Two New York merchants, Andrew Fresneau and Charles Crommelin, and several Amsterdam investors headed by Abraham Sydervelt acquired part of the Simsbury copper mines and works. They began to recruit miners in Germany.

In July 1718, three men from Altenau near Clausthal in the Harz, George Henckel, Heinrich Henckel and Christopher Michael, were contracted by the firm Benelle & Company for seven years to work in developing the Crommelin mine. In Amsterdam they boarded the ship Henry and Margaret, Capt. Nicolas Tinmoth, for New York. Benelle & Co. paid the captain 225 guilders for their ocean fare.

On October 17, 1720, master miner Johann Jacob Luttroth signed a contract in Amsterdam for five years with Andrew Fresneau. In April 1721, more Germans received contracts from Fresneau, namely the master refiner Christian Müller and smelter workers Hans Vogt, Sr. and Jr., and George Wilhelm Morick. In July 1721, a six-year contract was signed for work in Fresneau's enterprise by Elias Hoffmann, overseer of the workmen and by the following individuals:

- Anones Grasteyn
- Hans Heinrich Keller
- Johann George Fricke
- Heinrich Godücke
- Matthias Otto
- Michael Hoffmann
- Zacharias Auwenhof
- Hans Peter Holthan
- Daniel Ziechelsen

Of all the contract workers named only four were unable to write their names and made their marks (the two Vogts, Grasteyn and Keller).

There were no doubt others from Germany at Simsbury whose contracts have not been preserved. The Lutheran pietist lay preacher, Johann Berndt van Dieren, who had been entrusted by the court chaplain, Anton Wilhelm Böhme, in London with a large barrel of books to be distributed among the German settlers on the Schoharie in New York, reported to Böhme on May 26, 1721: "Still another volume of sermons by Mr. Spener I gave to New England to the silver mine, where there are many Germans who have neither books nor a preacher. They promised me to encourage one another diligently to listen to the word of God." It is strange that van Dieren also came away with the impression that was a silver mine although it was widely known that the deposits yielded only copper.

Before the men hired in 1721 arrived, Andrew Fresneau had separated from his Amsterdam partners and on May 11, 1721, the General Assembly revived an extended for seven more years the mining privileges of the now divided partners. Abraham Sydervelt appeared before the legislature on behalf of the Dutch proprietors and Jacob Luttroth
represented Fresneau. The latter works for smelting and refining on Hopmeadow Brook. The place where the crushing mill and furnace stood was named Hanover by the workmen.

When the Hanover works failed and together with Fresneau's other property at Simsbury were attached in 1725, 1,700 pounds of "black copper," i.e. unrefined, were among the assets listed. Little is known of what happened to the workmen whose contracts had not yet expired. A local history lists Caspar Hoofman who remained in Simsbury and died there in 1732. The master refiner, J. Christian Müller, married a local woman and also stayed behind. His name and that of Luttroth appear among the signatures of a letter written on April 27, 1725, by leading Lutherans in New York to the Amsterdam Lutheran consistory in support of appointing Job. Berndt van Dieren as their pastor. This is the last record found so far of members of the short-lived German mining community in Connecticut.

The Situation in Pennsylvania

Johann Heinrich Sprögel came to Philadelphia in August 1700 with the transport of immigrants from Saxony and Holstein gathered by Daniel and Justus Falckner. Like the Falckners, he was the son of a Lutheran clergyman who was much respected in pietist circles. From the beginning Sprögel showed a definite inclination toward business. He obtained his naturalization in 1705 so that he could trade without hindrance." That he was not only interested in trading in merchandise is evident from the intelligence reports of the Saxon resident in London, Carl Christian Kirchner. In 1706, Kirchner stated that Sprögel had returned from Pennsylvania with the Lic. Mentze, the scout for the High German Society of Langensalza, "with the secret intention of bringing peasants and artisans from Saxony." When that scheme came to naught, Sprögel turned to Rotterdam where he had no trouble obtaining credit on account of his father's reputation. In October 1707, he acquired his ship, a small one at that, but it was an auspicious beginning. Back in Pennsylvania he had hedged a larger project. With the connivance of David Lloyd he prepared the takeover of the 25,000 acres of land belonging to the Frankfurt Company. This huge tract had remained unoccupied for more than two decades since its acquisition by a number of pietist investors. Several of the absentee shareholders had died and the remaining ones and the heirs, several of them known personally to Sprögel, showed little interest. The acting administrator, Daniel Falckner, was beset by personal problems. It was now or never. There were potential emigrants with some means in the Palatinate and adjacent areas getting ready to leave. Sprögel also prepared the move politically. In his 1708 petition "on behalf of the German Nation: in support of a general naturalization bill before the House of Parliament," he stressed the need for a naturalization free of charge and cited the cost of emigration, particular of moving household goods overland and down the Rhine.

The takeover of the Frankfurt Company lands was delayed by one of the mishaps for which Sprögel's unsavory business career became known. He was captured by the French with his ship Prince George. Although he soon made his escape from Dunkerque to Rotterdam and was back in Philadelphia late in 1708, valuable time was lost. The transfer of the Frankfurt Company lands was pushed through the court in December 1708. William Penn referred to it as the "notorious case of the Frankford Company, the Abhorrence here of all men of Law that have heard of it..." and Franz Daniel Pastorius called Sprögel "worse than the worst Land-Pirate in the world." He had won the land but lost respect and friends. Moreover, the emigration of 1709 turned out to be a feverish, almost hysterical mass movement which was diverted from Penn's colony by the British authorities.

But there were other benefits to be reaped besides the piecemeal sale of tracts when emigration from Germany intensified again in 1717 and 1719. Mineral deposits were discovered in the Stone Hill on Sprögel's land. He sent samples of the ore to England and Germany for testing. By 1723, he had found inves-
tors willing to back the opening of a copper mine. A company of sixteen partners was formed. Sprögel went to Clausthal in the Harz Mountains to procure miners but he was also still looking for prospective settlers. A number of reports praising the land and extolling the wealth of ores at the Perkiomen mine are said to have appeared in Breslau in the journal of the Society of Arts and Natural Sciences between 1720 and 1727, but so far the reports have not been located. In the absence of reliable records, it can be said that the development of the mine stalled because it did not really go into production until 1740.43 Sprögel was again in Germany in 1739 where he might have contacted the expert ore miner Christopher Geist, but when Geist and his mine workers arrived on the ship Lydia in September 1740, they found that Sprögel had died a few months earlier.44

Sprögel's interest in mines is attested to by a memorial on trade between the colonies, Great Britain, and the king's German dominions which he submitted to the Board of Trade in October, 1731, while he was in London:

They say that the Royall Mines belongs to the King, which is the reason, that the People in America do not care to discover any, neither will the Indians do it, they Say, it will kindle a War, if they are discovered, and it is Known by experience, that if any body agrees with one particular Indian, to discover Such a place they presently threathen to Kill him. Now that there is a great deal of Oar in America, whe not onely See by the Spaniards to their greatest Advantage, but is likewise Known by experience that in the Northern part of America all Manner of Oar is found, especially Copper Oar very rich and which Some upon Tryall yielded 19 Gran of Gold out of ½ Ountz of Copper, and the more Soutward, the richer the Oar is.

In these lengthy observations Sprögel also urged the British government to ease the restrictions placed on colonial manufacturing. With respect to craftsmen who came to the colonies, Sprögel found "that the People who transport themselves, generally take more delight to live upon a Plantation rather then to follow their Usual Trade," because farming enabled them to work for their own livelihood whereas crafts and manufacture were difficult on account of the general lack of cash in the colonies. The Crown's insistence on "Royall Mines" prompted him to remark that "if this reservation must extend itself to the American Plantations, where there are actually Royall Mines, and that his Ma[45] do not improve them, nor give the Subjects Encouragement to improve, then the Nation will reap no more benefitt of that which they have, as of that which they have not, which is against that good Intent the Crown reserved for, and therefore deserves a Serious Consideration."45
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Like the inhabitants of Germantown, who protested against slavery in 1683, the Georgia Salzburgers have long been praised as opponents of that peculiar institution. In 1984, two historians questioned whether or not the Salzburgers were as opposed to slavery as had been popularly believed. In fact, my Salzburger Saga, which also appeared in 1984, showed that the view of the Georgia Salzburgers as stalwart opponents of slavery was not entirely tenable. Actually, the two historians were more or less beating a dead horse, one adequately killed in 1938 by Hildegard Binder-Johnson, whose concise and factual contribution, being in German, has not come to the attention of scholars of Georgia history. Because the two historians used no German sources and my own study was brief and undocumented, a further study of the attitude of the Georgia Salzburgers toward slavery is justified, especially since the present study examines the experience which many of the Germans in Georgia, both Salzburgers and others, had with slavery.¹

The Georgia Salzburgers were a small part of the many Lutherans expelled from Roman Catholic Archbishopric of Salzburg in the year 1731. They were recruited from those exiles who had found temporary refuge in Swabian cities. The first Salzburger transport,
or traveling group, arrived in Georgia in March of 1734 under the conduct of Baron Philip George Friedrich von Reck and was settled at an infertile and inaccessible spot on Ebenezer Creek some twenty-five miles northwest of Savannah. By the time a second and third transport arrived, von Reck’s group had determined that the spot chosen initially was infertile, and the settlement was moved to the bank of the Savannah River a few miles away.2

Although the Trustees who founded Georgia had outlawed slavery, Paul Jenys, the Speaker of the House in South Carolina, lent the Salzburgers fourteen slaves to help them fell trees and saw boards. Despite the usefulness of these involuntary workers, the Salzburgers saw the evils of the system and developed not only a disgust for the evils of a system which could engender such violence, but also a fear of the slaves because of their violence toward each other.3 In fact, they had already seen the evils of slavery in their short sojourn in Charleston, as their pastor, Johann Martin Boltzius, had recorded in his journal.4 Christian Israel Gronau, Boltzius assistant pastor, was somewhat inconsistent in his attitude toward Blacks. He often referred to their treachery and thieving; yet he attributed such behavior to the bad treatment they received. He as also lenient when obliged to have an unruly slave punished.5

While the Trustees wished to keep Georgia free of slavery, their stand owned less to a moral repugnance against slavery than to a desire to further their goal of developing Georgia into a land of yeoman farmers able to defend their homes. Besides, the Trustees saw the danger of having discontented slaves, whom the Spaniards might tempt to run away to Florida or even to rebel. In addition, slave labor would degrade honest work and corrupt the masterclass, and even those Trustees who personally abhorred slavery probably did not wish to offend their many friends who profited from slavery in the West Indies and South Carolina. The evangelist George Whitefield saw no incongruity in maintaining a slave-operated plantation in South Carolina to support his orphanage in Georgia.

It did not take the Georgians long to discover the difficulty of competing against slave labor. Already on December 14, 1734, Thomas Christie, the recorder in Savannah, wrote that the Carolinians with their slaves could undersell the Georgian’s rice and corn; and a man named Robert Parker, who built a sawmill, found that he could not compete against the Carolinians with their slave labor.7 Baron von Reck, the leader of the first Salzburger transport, explained how, in the slave colonies, the slave owners let their more clever slaves learn a profession, while the remainder cultivated the fields. He continues, "Then, because everything is occupied by Negroes who have to work hard and with miserable sustenance day and night and even on Sunday, which is a terrible thing, a white man in these lands, if he cannot buy a slave, must work himself like a slave."8

While slavery was still illegal in Georgia, the Salzburgers had observed the fourteen Negroes lent them by Jenys. These had been rather primitive people, apparently newly arrived from Africa. One of them stabbed another, one ran away, and a third committed suicide in order that he might return to Africa in spirit.9 After that, the Salzburgers often saw black rowers on the river, including those of Theobald Kieffer, a good friend in Purysburg, a Swiss settlement downstream from Ebenezer. One of Kieffer’s slaves attended church on April 11, 1742, and Boltzius was impressed by his good behavior.10

Boltzius considered slavery not only unproductive, but also dangerous, having been alarmed by the bloody uprising at Stono Ferry in South Carolina, which he mentioned on March 13, 1739, and by an attempted rebellion at Santee, which he mentioned on July 14, 1740. He also considered slavery immoral, since the slaves are snatched away from their own country, as he explained on July 19, 1740. Boltzius consistently upheld the Trustees’ stand against slavery. In 1741, he would not allow the Kieffers to employ their three slaves in making tar on the Georgia side of the river, as he reported on August 27th of that year; and on December 28th of the following year he remarked that white people could not find
employment in South Carolina where there were enough Negroes. He also thought there could be no blessing in the un-Christian life of slave-holders, as he wrote on February 8, 1743. On December 24, 1745, he wrote Whitefield a long letter refuting, one by one, the latter's arguments in favor of slavery; and this letter brought him favorable comments from the Trustees.

On January 2, 1746, Boltzius sent Urlsperger a similar letter of seventeen pages in German brilliantly summarizing all the economic, social, moral, and military arguments against slavery. This letter may well have been the stimulus for Urlsperger's spirited letter of August first of that year to the Trustees urging them to introduce slavery into Georgia; and, according to Ziegenhagen, it was the reason that several wavering Trustees were won back to their stand against slavery.

When the land around Parker's Mill was given to the Salzburgers on July 18, 1746, this appeared to be a reward for their opposition to slavery, for Parker had tried to operate the mill with slave labor despite the Trustees' prohibition.

As late as May 6, 1747, Boltzius was still writing persuasively against slavery, which would drive out free labor and present a danger to life and property; and on August 29, 1747, he wrote to the Trustees' secretary, Benjamin Martyn, that many hated him for upholding the Trustees' stand on slavery. In this very long letter, in which he well summarized the Salzburgers' previous hardships, Boltzius assured Martyn that, lest people believe he forced his own will on his parishioners, he had let Ludwig Mayer, the surgeon and justiciary, question them privately, with the result that they expressed unanimous opposition to it.

Nevertheless, Boltzius wrote on September 7, 1747, to Gotthilf August Francke, the head of the Francke Foundation in Halle, that he had resolved to say nothing more against slavery, since the Trustees could not settle the colony with industrious white settlers.

However, on May 20, 1748, Boltzius wrote an eloquent letter against slavery to his friend and admirer John Dobell, who had fled to Charleston to escape the wrath of the "Malcontents," a pro-slavery faction in Savannah which had branded both Boltzius and Dobell "mercenary slaves" of the Trustees. In his letter, Boltzius renewed his arguments against slavery and informed Dobell that he was resolved to suffer "heinous reflectance, reviling, and reproaches" rather than "lend the least finger to promote the Introduction of Black Slaves to the apparent destruction of our well situated and fertile Province as an intended Asylum for many poor laboring Protestants." He assures Dobell that he will not waver in his views although he might be in mortal danger from those who look upon him as a stone in their way. He gives no credence at all to certain proposed restrictions on slavery promised, since such restrictions were already being ignored in South Carolina.

By 1749 the "Malcontents" in Savannah had so greatly intimidated Boltzius that he thought his life in danger and ceased opposing them. His views, however, were still maintained by many of his fellow Salzburgers. On April 28, 1749, Christian Leimberger, Ruprecht Steiner, Matthias Brandner, Simon Reiter, and Thomas Gschwandl petitioned against slavery and declared they would not have come to Georgia had they known that it would be permitted. They would have preferred to go to Prussia to be among whites and safe from thieving people who would take away their livelihood, and now they were ready to go to any of the King's territories where no slaves were allowed. Agreeing with the petitioners and seeing no other remedy, Boltzius saw their complaint as grounds to petition for the Salzburgers all the land from Abercorn to Mount Pleasant and from Ebenezer to the Ogeechee so that they would have no slave owners as neighbors. On August 24th of the same year he prayed that God would help him to remain steadfast in his opposition to slavery.

Nevertheless, during the same year the people of Savannah heaped "so much heinous reflectance" on Boltzius for his fight against slavery that he began to question his stance and actually besought the Trustees to disregard his previous petitions against slav-
ery and to allow the introduction of black slaves, but only "under such wise restrictions that it be not a discouragement but rather an encouragement to poor white Industrious people to settle and live in this happy Climate." In October of that year Boltzius attended the Assembly in Savannah that designed the new slave code and was able to affect the development of the law to provide for the slaves' welfare. Boltzius' change of heart may help explain why the Trustees, who still opposed slavery, arranged to have one Palatine and three Swabian transports recruited for Ebenezer during the next five years.

Boltzius' anti-slavery stance was also weakened by his dear friend James Habersham, who had come to Georgia with Whitefield to serve as a teacher but was soon manager of Whitefield's orphanage, Bethesda. There he learned the skills necessary to become a successful merchant; and as such he wished the Salzburgers to develop staple exports such as lumber, which would be advanced by slave labor. In 1750, when Habersham offered to supply the Salzburgers with slaves on credit, Boltzius decided not to stand in the way. Indeed, it is ironic that Christian Leimberger, who had argued so ardently against slavery, was the first to acquire a slave. Boltzius was, however, always sympathetic toward the slaves; and he preached against cruel treatment. On May 17, 1742, Boltzius reports his shock at hearing that a slave was tortured with a thumbscrew, although conceivably the incident occurred across the river, in the area beyond his control.

Boltzius' change of heart was further facilitated by a letter of July 11, 1750, from Samuel Urlsperger, the Salzburgers' "Reverend Father" in Augsburg, which stated:

If need is such that one can do nothing else, then one may take slaves in faith and for the purposes of leading them to Christ. Then such a deed will not be a sin, but rather it may lead to a blessing.

When, on April 19, 1751, at the Council in Savannah, Boltzius revealed his scruples against buying and selling slaves, he was assured that the slaves had already been slaves in Africa under tyrannical conditions and had been sold and bought legally. Therefore Christians should feel no more scruples than the patriarchs, or even Philemon, to whom St. Paul returned the slave Onesimus. Moreover, the slaves would now have a chance to become Christians. Despite these assurances, Boltzius expressed his scruples on August 23rd and still again on September 18th.

Once slavery was legalized, Boltzius resigned himself to it. Backed up by Urlsperger's letter, he told his flock that it was permissible to keep slaves if one looked out for both their bodies and their souls, as he wrote in his journal on April 3, 1751. By October 1752, Boltzius admitted that one could accomplish more with black slaves than with white indentured servants; and only a few years later, on January 3, 1753, he justified slavery again when he needed labor for his uncultivated lands. However, Boltzius always insisted on good treatment, which would not spoil the slaves but would make them loyal, since they would not run away from kind masters. Whatever maliciousness they had was due to brutal treatment. On the other hand, on November 12th and August 3, 1752, Boltzius complained that his parishioners were giving their slaves too much freedom on Sundays.

No sooner had Boltzius withdrawn his objections to slavery than the Salzburgers began to buy slaves. However, as Muhlenberg observed on his journey through South Carolina, many Germans considered it unprofitable to keep slaves. As seen in the comparison of free and bonded white servants, those work best who work for themselves. We may assume that many small German farmers in Georgia would have agreed with Philip Eisenmann of Old Indian Swamp fifty miles from Charleston. According to Muhlenberg, Eisenmann and his wife worked their plantation by the sweat of their brows, and this proved that one could live and find food without slaves, provided, as Muhlenberg added, "one is godly and contented and does not desire to take out of this world more than he brought into it."

For years Theobald Kieffer of Purysburg
insisted that he was just about to move to Ebenezer to be nearer Jerusalem Church; yet something held him back. It is easy to suppose that he remained in South Carolina in order to profit from the use of slaves, even though he was constantly complaining of their uselessness. On March 30, 1747, Boltzius recorded that one of Kieffer's slaves committed suicide, one of them died, and one tried to run away but was caught. His feet must have been bound too tightly, for both of them had to be amputated, thus greatly lessening his value so that he was sold for a cow, which died. Surely the wretch suffered a "Negro-cure" at the hands of Jean Bourquin, the Puryburg surgeon.

By January 27, 1750, Habersham was arguing persuasively that the Salzburgers should buy slaves and that Boltzius should use some at the mill, for otherwise the poor Salzburgers would be unable to live long without them. By July 17, 1750, not only Christian Leimberger but other Salzburgers as well had earned enough money through lumbering to buy black labor to help them with their work. Some time before January 14,1751, the shoemaker Matthias Zettler bought a black woman to help his wife in her silk business, and they christened her child Sulamith and reared it in a Christian way along with their own. However, in March 1751, when they wished to get rid of its surely mother yet keep the child, Boltzius read them the law that parents and children were not to be separated. On May 12th of that year Zetler was still complaining of his uncontrollable slave women. Boltzius said that slaves on the block in Charleston often warned would-be purchasers that they would run away.

On September 27, 1750, Jacob Caspar Wal- thour requested a grant for 400 acres "setting forth that his Father had enabled Him to cultivate and improve the same" by giving him £30 for a slave. The grant system greatly stimulated the purchase of slaves. First, the grantee had land, but no slaves. Then he bought a slave on credit, giving his improved land as collateral. Having a slave, he could request more land; and then, having more land, he could get credit for another slave. One thinks of the child who needs more jam because it has some bread left and then needs more bread because it has some jam left. It was probably by this method that Peter Sal- termann (Schlechtermann), a poor little orphan at Fort Argyle, later acquired six hundred acres and two Negroes by August 1771.

Habersham remained the chief source of slaves for the Salzburgers, in part because he let them buy on credit, a failing they had learned from the other colonists despite Boltz- ius' warning. The number of slaves owned by the Georgia Germans in 1767 to 1769 is revealed in their petitions for land, in which they had to state how much labor they could command. In April of 1753, when Haber- sham brought a shipload of twenty-six Blacks from St. Kitts and St. Christopher and fattened them for sale, Boltzius attended the auction and bought five slaves for £145. One of these bondsmen, a Catholic man named Thomas, could speak excellent English; but Boltzius saw little hope of converting the others. He was especially pleased with their performance when they rowed him back to Ebenezer. Six years later he and Rabenhorst, the fourth minister to serve at Ebenezer, bought a youth for £35, who would have brought £40 if he had not been so emaciated. The following year a group of Salzburgers went down to Savannah and bought nine or ten more slaves.

One of the first large German slave owners in Georgia was Johann Hamm, an immigrant from the West Indies, who brought slaves from St. Christopher and proceeded to the slave colony of South Carolina. Hamm bought five more slaves in Savannah on October 18, 1755 and sold fourteen four days later. Subsequently, having become a "Gentleman," Hamm requested 500 acres of land with the Germans at Black Creek near Pater Lemke, Gronau's successor. He also requested a lot in Savannah, which was granted on August 6, 1755; yet two years later his 500 acres had not yet been run out. In 1755 Hamm served as collector and assessor for Abercorn and Goshen, two German settlements near Ebenezer, and also as surveyor of the high- ways. Some of the indentured Palatines in
Savannah also rose to the rank of "planter," which term was gradually restricted to those farmers whose work was done by slaves. For example, Jacob Ihle had twelve slaves by 1771 and the tavern-keeper Solomon Schad left a legacy including "1 Negerow thom" valued at £15.5 and "1 Negerow wench Selvey with a boy 3 years old" valued at £35.0.0.

Among the slave-owners, one might be surprised to find the Swiss physician, Jean Francois Regnier, who had been with the Moravians in Georgia. After returning to Europe in 1738, when most of the Moravians left Georgia, he had gone to Surinam in South America and then to Pennsylvania, where he feuded with the Moravians. On June 6, 1769, he returned to Georgia with a wife and child and three Negroes and received a grant for two hundred acres. By now Regnier seemed to have recovered from his religious zeal and insanity, for which his host, Conrad Beissel of Ephrata, had had to confine him soon after his first arrival in America. During the Revolution, slaves were a major form of booty, as mentioned by Col. Friedrich von Porbeck, the Hessian commander at Savannah. The Hessian, who felt little prejudice against the blacks, recruited many of them into his service, mostly as drummers but also as packmen and grenadiers. The labor of four hundred slaves was crucial in the successful defense of Savannah by the British in 1779. Like other slave owners, the Salzburgers had to furnish slave labor for whichever government was in power during the Revolution. Because Johann Joachim Zubly was a clergyman, his slaves were exempted from work on the roads; but Matthias Ash (Aschbergh, Eichberger) had to give over his slaves for public works in 1782.

It has been mentioned that the Kieffers, as residents of South Carolina, owned slaves before slavery was permitted in Georgia. To their credit, it should be said that they truly tried to convert their slaves, as shown when one of the sons borrowed a primer from Boltzious on May 14, 1739, to try to teach his slave enough German to understand the catechism. On April 11, 1742, the young Kieffer came to church with his slave, who paid close attention even though he did not understand the language well. Surely it was asking too much of a heathen to learn Swiss German just to get to heaven.

In his journal entry for October 17, 1742, Boltzious repeated a discussion he had had with a blasphemous slave owner in which he gave reasons why it was the man's Christian duty to convert his slaves. The slave owner could merely repeat the standard arguments: the slaves could not comprehend Christianity, it would corrupt them, etc. Boltzious never doubted the Negro's basic intelligence. In his often quoted Questionnaire of 1751 he wrote:

To be sure, people have often told me that you cannot teach the Negroes anything, that they are stupid and disinclined to learn and that they take advantage of Christian and gentle treatment. But I consider all this a fiction of those people who take no trouble with the souls of these black people and do not wish to keep them in a Christian way with regard to food, clothing, and work. They are intelligent enough and can learn arts and crafts and even writing and mathematics, as is known of some in Carolina. It is also known that many Negro men and women of Christian and righteous masters have achieved the Christian religion and a righteous behavior in Christ.

In his journal entry for December 3, 1752, Boltzious still contended that blacks are just as intelligent as whites; and on November 3rd of that year he advocated teaching the slaves German for their proper religious instruction. Seven years later, he repeated his conviction that blacks are just as intelligent as whites and he regretted that they could speak neither English nor German. The English they acquired, which we now call "Gullah," made it hard to convert them. The Salzburgers fulfilled their duty to convert their slaves and provide them with Christian nurture, for Negro baptisms are recorded right along with those of white children, as Lothar Tresp has shown and as it evident in the Ebenzer Church Records.

It would appear that the first Negro child baptized in Georgia was baptized by Boltzious, not by Bartholomais Zouberbuhler, the Anglican minister, as is usually believed. It was a child belonging to Theobald Kieffer, Jr.,
which was baptized on March 30, 1747. This was probably the same child who later took catechism instruction from Boltzius along with his master's children. When Muhlenberg visited Rabenhorst in 1774, he noted that the old minister's slave children came to his house every evening to pray with him. According to Boltzius, the Rabenhorsts, who were childless, loved their slave twins as if they were their own children. In 1760, Boltzius baptized two black girls and three black boys; and by 1764 the number had risen to four girls and four boys. When Boltzius baptized the child of a slave woman at the mill on August 21, 1760, he reminded the congregation that by nature black children were just as good as white children, and it was his policy that slave owners had to stand as Godparents to their slave children and give them a Christian education. As a result, the Kieffers' black child attended Sunday School along with their white children. Just as the Blacks received the same baptism as the whites, they also merited identical funeral rites, as we see when Lemke held the funeral ceremony for Capt. Kieffer's slave child on June 10, 1760.

Some of the Germans who could not afford slaves profited from slavery by serving as overseers or slave-drivers. On September 18, 1737, Boltzius mentioned a German overseer from South Carolina who came to Ebenezer to attend Holy Communion; and on February 10, 1738 he reported that a Salzburger named Hans Michael Muggitzer had engaged himself as a slave driver and that his crony Stephan Riedelsperger probably had too. The renegade Ruprecht Zittrauer also became a slave driver, as Boltzius wrote on May 24, 1748. On December 15, 1751, Boltzius reported that Ebenezer had just received a soap boiler from Stuttgart who had served as a slave drive in South Carolina; and on August 15, 1759, the widow of Carpenter Hirsch married a slave driver from South Carolina named Johann Christoph Heinz. Conrad Fabre (no doubt Faber) and Matthias Zophi, who served Henry Laurens as overseers in 1769, were clearly German or Swiss; and the slave driver Joseph Weatherly, who is mentioned by Betty Wood, may well have been a member of the Vetterli family that came over on the Europa. On February 10, 1739, while still supporting the Trustees in their stand against slavery, Boltzius expressed his view that overseeing slaves is a very evil profession. Ordinarily, "only such people are used for this task as can be quite merciless with these poor slaves."

Even though German slave-drivers were available, the widow Rabenhorst preferred to do without one. This seems amazing in view of the allegation that a slave woman had tried to poison her and her husband. Perhaps the threat of employing a slave-driver was sufficient to persuade her slaves to serve faithfully. On September 26, 1777, she wrote to Muhlenberg that:

My Negroes have behaved very well, and have been orderly and diligent. I have a good harvest of all fruit, also a great deal of cotton for Negro clothing. That also was done by the Lord. I was a little afraid on account of them, but he has guided their hearts. I often wondered about it quietly; I will not be forced to hire a white man if they continue this way.

She ends her letter saying that she had told her slaves that she has written Muhlenberg that they loved her and that they promised to behave well and be diligent in the future and that they sent him their love. After her death two years later the slaves were sold, we hope as a group and to a good master. However, even if they remained on the plantation for a while, they were probably scattered during the Revolution, when strong young slaves were taken as booty while the old and helpless were left behind.

To judge from surviving documents, it is evident that the Salzburgers, through their spokesman Boltzius, resisted the introduction of slavery as long as possible. When resistance proved useless, they resigned themselves to it reluctantly, and participated through necessity. Except for the strong stance taken initially by Boltzius, the Georgia Germans acted much as their compatriots did in Pennsylvania and Maryland, as related by Leroy Hopkins.

Only a few Salzburgers acquired slaves, and then in small numbers, usually just enough to replace the labor of their lost children. As a result, Effingham County, where the Salz-
beggars dwelled, remained largely a land of white yeoman farmers, who were not driven out by slave labor as was the case in most surrounding areas such as Bryan County. To

the Salzburgers' credit it can be said they did not doubt the Negroes' native intelligence or their right to share in the Kingdom of God.
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IN MEMORIAM

HAROLD JANTZ  
(1907 -1987)

Those of us who remember Harold Jantz stimulating and elegantly formulated centennial address in April 1986 received with disbelief the sad news of his death on February 27, 1987, in Durham, North Carolina, where he had been Emeritus Professor of German since his retirement from the Johns Hopkins University in 1972.

Harold Jantz was a native of Ohio. From his hometown, Elyria, he went to nearby Oberlin College and received his B. A. degree in 1929. A year later he began graduate work at the University of Wisconsin and wrote his doctoral dissertation on problems in literary historiography under the direction of the celebrated Germanist, Alexander Hohlfeld.

Antioch College in Yellow Springs, Ohio, offered Harold Jantz his first teaching post in 1933. Not long after he had met his first classes he fell in love with one of his students, Eleanore Whitmore, and married her in 1935. Meanwhile, he had been appointed Assistant Professor of German at Clark University and wrote while there his first major book. In the New England historical societies in which he worked during his years at Clark he discovered numerous unknown poems by early New England poets. His anthology and critical survey of the work of these poets, The First Century of New England Verse, in 1944, revolutionized the field of American literary studies by offering copious evidence that poetry of high quality had been written in America long before the date given in standard histories of American literature.

Shortly before the appearance of The First Century of New England Verse, Harold Jantz had joined the faculty of Princeton University. At Princeton he was promoted to the rank of Associate Professor of German. In 1947, Northwestern University called him to Evanston as Professor of German, and he taught there until appointed Professor of German and Chairman of the Department of German at the Johns Hopkins University in 1956. Prior to the call to Hopkins he had served at both the University of Hamburg and the University of Vienna as guest professor of American Studies. Eleanore and he were particularly fond of Vienna, and their apartment in the Hörigasse often served as a home abroad for American colleagues on sabbatical.

The anthology of American verse was followed by a number of studies on aspects of German-American literary relations which gained for Harold Jantz widespread recognition as an authority. A frequently cited publication in this field is his comprehensive survey, Amerika im deutschen Dichten und Denken, in 1962.

Because of his publications on German Renaissance and Baroque literature and his Goethe-studies he had by then already been recognized as one of the foremost American Germanists of his day. His first major Goethe-book, Goethe’s Faust as a Renaissance Man: Parallels and Prototypes, in 1951, presents a new reading based on the drama’s Graeco-Roman and Renaissance backgrounds. Outstanding among his later Goethe-studies are his original translations and explication of Goethe’s enigmatic Soothsayings of Bakis and his monograph on The Form of Faust which reflects a lifetime of thought about structures and patterns that operate in the drama and help to inform it.

For bibliophiles, the name of Harold Jantz is associated with one of the finest Baroque collections in the nation. For many years the collection, to which he gave his students free access, was housed in his study in the house on Highfield Road which so many of us remember. It is now part of the collections of Duke University Library.

Among the many honors that came to him over the years Harold Jantz was especially proud of his election to membership in the American Antiquarian Society and in the Massachusetts Historical Society in recognition of his American and American-German studies. He also treasured, of course, the
Goethe-medal in Gold awarded him by the Goethe Institute in 1969.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and of working with Harold Jantz as colleagues, fellow editors, students, and as members of the Executive Council while he was President of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland remember him not only as a nationally and internationally renowned scholar, but also as a good friend who was always willing to listen, and with whom it was always a delight to converse because he knew so much about so many things. He enjoyed nothing more than sharing information and ideas, and happily he was able to do so almost to the last, for only a few weeks before his death he delivered what no one at the time realized was to be his last public lecture. His work lives on, as he always hoped it would, in the publications of his students. The qualities that endeared him to us live on in our warm memories of our association with him.

William H. McClain

BERNARD G. PETER
(1909 -1989)

Bernard G. Peter was a native of Omaha, Nebraska. He graduated from Creighton Preparatory School and, in 1932, from the Creighton University Law School. He moved to Baltimore upon graduation from law school to manage the publication of the Baltimore Correspondent and an associated printing business.

In 1939, Bernard was honored by being appointed Assistant State's Attorney for Baltimore City. He continued in that capacity until 1947, when he resigned to take a more active role in the family publishing business and engage in the private practice of law. During the late 1940's, he was a partner in an early FM radio station, WMCP-FM, which began broadcasting on March 17, 1948.

Upon the resignation of his brother Theodore in November 1967, Bernard proceeded with the liquidation of the printing corporation which had been founded by his father. He also assumed the management of the Correspondent, although the paper itself was printed in Omaha from 1967 to 1971, at which time the Correspondent was sold to the New York Staatszeitung, which continued to print it until December 28, 1975, when the two papers were merged into one. In 1968, Bernard retired from the news business.

Bernard G. Peter was a member of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Judges, and a member for 55 years of the Baltimore City Bar Association. He also belonged to the Maryland State Bar Association, the District of Columbia Bar Association and the American Bar Association. On June 21, 1971, he was appointed a Master in Chancery, Juvenile Court for Baltimore City. He retired under the Judiciary Mandatory Retirement Laws on August 28, 1979, his 70th birthday.

Randall Donaldson

FREDERICK J. SINGLEY, JR.
(1913-1988)

Frederick J. Singley, Jr. died on April 24, 1988, at the age of 75. Judge Singley served as a member of the Court of Appeals of Maryland from October 25, 1967, through October 31, 1977, the last several years as Senior Judge. He was author of 333 reported opinions of the Court of Appeals as well as five opinions while assigned to the Court of Special Appeals.

A 1930 graduate of Baltimore City College, Frederick Singley, Jr. matriculated at The Johns Hopkins University where he majored in history. Due to his completion of City's renowned Advanced Academic Course, Hopkins conferred its degree upon him three years later. Young Mr. Singley continued on to the University of Maryland School of Law, where he was admitted to the Order of the Coif, a distinction which neatly complemented the Phi Beta Kappa key he had earned at Hopkins. Upon graduation from law school, he passed the bar examination and was admitted to practice by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, all in 1936.

That same year he began work as an asso-
date lawyer with a firm which, by the close of 1936, was known as Hinkley, Burger & Singley, later to become Hinkley & Singley. The firm traced its unbroken roots back to 1817, and the "Singley" in Hinkley & Singley was Frederick J. Singley, Sr., who admonished his son that a lawyer should always wear a hat, never have a drink before lunch, and never be seen at a racetrack. The junior Singley was to spend his entire career as a practitioner with that office until his appointment to the Court of Appeals.

He did take the time, however, to receive his commission from the United States Navy in 1939, from which he retired six years later with the rank of Commander. He also displayed his characteristic good sense by marrying Margaret G. Kaestner in 1942. Ever the scholar, Judge Singley was a long-standing member of different law clubs and a lifetime member of the American Law Institute, whose annual meetings he looked forward to as sessions of a super law school. His diverse interests encompassed art, music, travel and landscaping.

In his private life, as in his professional and public life, Judge Singley gave freely and selflessly without expectation of return and most often with complete anonymity. His was indeed a remarkable life and he is remembered by his family and friends with loving devotion and abiding affection.

Glenn E. Bushel, Esq.

GEORGE J. WITTSTADT, JR.
(1906-1990)


Born in Baltimore on October 18, 1906, George Wittstadt was a son of the late George John Wittstadt, Sr. and Hannah Bozman Wittstadt. Raised and educated in Baltimore, Mr. Wittstadt moved to Cambridge where he established Wittstadt and Son Inc. Auctions in 1946. He married Thelma Estelle Warfield on December 1, 1940.

Mr. Wittstadt was a member of St. Paul's United Methodist Church of Cambridge, Masonic Lodge 66 AF & AM, Chesapeake Forest 115 Tall Cedars of Lebanon, Hayward Chapter 29, Zabud Council 9, Cambridge Commandery 14 Knights Templar, York Rite and 32nd degree Scottish Rite, AONMS Boumi Temple of Baltimore, the Eastern Shore Shrine Club, the Eastern Shore Scottish Rite, the Cambridge Moose Lodge 1211, A. Lee Poole Legion of the Moose, American Legion Post 91 of Cambridge, a life member of the Cambridge VFW Post 7460, a life member of the DeMolay, a life member of the National Auctioneers Association and a member of the Rescue Fire Company.

Mr. Wittstadt is survived by a son, Thelman G. Wittstadt of Cambridge, his sister, Helen Schultz, a brother, Glenn L. Wittstadt, both of Baltimore, a granddaughter and numerous nieces and nephews.

Randall Donaldson

(excerpted with permission from Memorial Minute, presented before the Court of Appeals of Maryland, Thursday, October 20, 1988)
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