

## KARL HEINZEN'S GERMAN-AMERICAN WRITINGS: SOME LITERARY ASPECTS

by

KATHERINE AND GERHARD FRIESEN

The Johns Hopkins University

...setzt mir einen Leichenstein mit folgender Grabschrift, die meinen Verbrechen bei den kommenden Geschlechtern zur Entschuldigung dienen wird: "Hier ruht ein Teutscher, der das Unglück hatte, im 19ten Jahrhundert ein freier Mann zu sein."<sup>1</sup>

In the eyes of his contemporaries Karl Heinzen stood prejudged as "der Lange,"<sup>2</sup> "der grosse radikale Streiter,"<sup>3</sup> "der gefürchtete Redacteur des 'Pioniers,'"<sup>4</sup> and "das Krokodil."<sup>5</sup> Today he is remembered, if at all, primarily for his lectures, journalistic pursuits, and for his consistently radical and outspoken nature. This study intends to focus on a few lesser known literary aspects of Heinzen's work. In an attempt to rectify some errors made by previous Heinzen scholars, it will concentrate on his role as a German-American author, with particular emphasis on the literary and documentary value of the only one of his satirical comedies set in America, *Die teutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika* (1859).

Heinzen was born in Grevenbroich near Düsseldorf on February 22, 1809 as the son of a forester. He attended the Gymnasium in Cleve and later the University in Bonn. Relegated from the university for allegedly bad conduct, he joined the Dutch military service and spent 1829 to 1831 in the Dutch East Indies. This experience later inspired his imaginative travelogue *Reise nach Batavia* (1841). Upon his return he worked for many years in the Prussian civil service, but his bitter criticism of bureaucracy and militarism in *Die*

*preussische Bureaukratie* (1844) caused such a furor that Heinzen was forced to flee, first to Belgium and then to Switzerland.

During his Swiss exile he became acquainted with, among others, Gottfried Keller, Conrad Ferdinand Meyer, August Adolf Ludwig Follen, Wilhelm Schulz, Ferdinand Freiligrath, Karl Grün, and Arnold Ruge. An indication of Heinzen's notoriety as a radical at the time is found in an 1847 letter of Meyer to Keller, in which he states: "Bei diesem Feste [a meeting of the Rosenbund in 1847] haben wir *in effigie* verbrannt: Feuerbachs Werke, Ruges Werke, Heinzens Schriften, Viktor Hugos 'Le roi s'amuse', Heines Schöpfungslieder und G. Sands sämtliche Romane. Das gab einen Rauch, Satanas fuhr aus!"<sup>6</sup> Faced with expulsion from Switzerland as a *persona non grata* for his reputed leadership in the subversive activities of a Zürich *Flugschriftenfabrik*,<sup>7</sup> Heinzen used his connection with Wilhelm von Eichthal of the New York *Deutsche Schnellpost* to aid him in his emigration to the United States. Upon Eichthal's death in January of 1848, Heinzen became editor of his paper. In March of 1848, however, Heinzen felt compelled to return to Europe in order to take part in the imminent German revolution. When the second Baden revolt collapsed, Heinzen, after a short stay in London, returned to New York in 1850. From 1850 to 1853 he was the editor of five newspapers in succession, all of which failed because of his relentlessly radical outlook. The business offices of the last of these five papers, the *Herold des Westens*, were burned down in Louisville by opponents of Heinzen's steadfast pro-abolitionist position. Heinzen's next paper, the *Pionier*, was founded in Louisville in 1853, moved to Cincinnati, then to New York, and finally in 1859 to Boston, where it continued to be published until 1879, when it merged with the Milwaukee *Freidenker*. This paper remained the main forum for Heinzen's uncompromising social and political journalism until his death on November 12, 1880. If there is any consistency in Heinzen's eventful and colorful life, it is his outspoken and unrelenting tenacity throughout his literary



*Rudolf Grunyan*

career in advocating truth, liberty and justice, showing a total disregard for personal advantage and practical gain.

The neglect of Karl Heinzen as an author in his own right, apart from his role as a political and polemical *bête noire* in Europe and North America, is inherent in the few past investigations, which have also generated a number of errors regarding his literary output. In his article "Karl Heinzen: Reformer, Poet and Literary Critic,"<sup>8</sup> Otto P. Schinnerer grants only cursory attention to the prose works, the many pamphlets and newspapers, and makes no mention of Heinzen's autobiography, novel, and *Lustspiele*.<sup>9</sup> Although Schinnerer includes all three editions of Heinzen's collected verse (Köln, 1841; New York, 1858;<sup>10</sup> Boston, 1867) in an appended list of Heinzen's publications, he confines his rather uninspired consideration of Heinzen's verse to the first edition. On the basis of one early poem, "Ermannung eines jungen Poeten" (1827), he concludes that "we might almost regard Heinzen as one of the forerunners of Young Germany."<sup>11</sup> Notwithstanding any possible association of Heinzen with his Young German contemporaries, however, it should be pointed out that their self-styled prosecutor Wolfgang Menzel did not hesitate to laud the earthy appeal of Heinzen's poems in a review of 1842:

So findet sich hier denn manches Gedicht, bei dem wir Freude haben, zu fühlen, dass es in schweren und leichten Stunden frei entstanden und nicht gemacht sey. Es weht darin ein Hauch des Lebens, bald ein rauher und kalter, bald aber ein zarter, von fremdartigen Düften trunkner Hauch, der uns überzeugt, der Dichter hat Wirkliches erlebt, er hat nicht bloss hinter seinem Fenster Phantasieblumen aufgekränkt.<sup>12</sup>

Schinnerer mentions in passing that Heinzen was the "author of a great number of epigrams,"<sup>13</sup> and that "he selected the satire and polemic form of poetry as more congenial to his nature,"<sup>14</sup> but no specific attention is granted to Heinzen's *Amerikanische Epigramme* in Schinnerer's article. These epigrams were added to the second edition of Heinzen's

poems<sup>15</sup> and were especially important in shaping his literary reputation among German-American contemporaries. After the second edition of 1858, Heinzen featured a column in his *Pionier*, entitled "Die Gedichte von K. Heinzen und die Teutsche Kritik in Amerika,"<sup>16</sup> in which he reprinted recent reviews of his poetry. The longest critique came from the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens*, whose editor at the time was Heinrich Börnstein. While recommending the purchase of the volume, this review concludes, "Heinzen ist ein trefflicher Prosaiker mit einem markigen, klaren Styl, aber Heinzen ist kein Dichter."<sup>17</sup> Most other reviewers, however, voiced their preference for Heinzen's epigrams to the rest of his poetry, which some criticized for occasional formal flaws. Characteristic in its appreciation is the review of the New York *Familienblätter*:

Das Epigramm ist denn auch überhaupt die dem scharfen dialektischen Geist unseres Autors am meisten zusagende Form der Dichtung. Wir betrachten den 5. Abschnitt, welcher ausschliesslich kleine Gedichte und Epigramme enthält, als den interessantesten und gelungensten der ganzen Sammlung.... Etwas bitter, doch desshalb oft nicht minder treffend sind die beigefügten "Amerikanischen Epigramme." Der Autor geisselt unbarmherzig die Schwächen des amerikanischen sozialen und politischen Lebens; nachdem er inzwischen seinem ganzen Grimme Luft gemacht und der modernen Musterrepublik ihr Sündenregister vorgehalten, kann er doch schliesslich nicht umhin, ihr auch Gerechtigkeit widerfahren zu lassen.<sup>18</sup>

Carl Wittke's biography of Heinzen, *Against the Current*, delineates his career from a historical rather than literary point of view and thus contains neither a systematic nor a critical evaluation of Heinzen as a literary figure. Wittke recognizes, however, that "Heinzen's literary ambitions were great... he was not satisfied to be known only as a journalist; he wanted recognition as a poet and a playwright and as an author of books..."<sup>19</sup> Although Wittke further informs us that

"Heinzen regarded the *Editoren-Kongress* as the best book he had produced in America," Wittke held that "its plot was insignificant and stupid."<sup>20</sup>

The complete title of this book is *Der teutsche Editoren-Kongress zu Cincinnati, oder Das gebrochene Herz*, and its preface explains that it is in fact a fictitious work, a satirical novel.<sup>21</sup> Although the preface also indicates that the novel had been printed earlier in one of Heinzen's newspapers, Wittke and others would have us believe that it did not appear until 1872 in Boston. The *Editoren-Kongress* had, however, been serialized as early as 1857 and 1858 in Heinzen's *Pionier*.<sup>22</sup> Even a cursory reading of this novel reveals the striking similarity between its content and that of Heinzen's comedy *Die teutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika*. The reason for this is readily apparent when one considers that both works originated at the same time, i.e., the late 1850's. The novel depicts the experiences of Editor Längst at a congress which meets in various American cities for the purpose of improving the state of journalism and culture among German-Americans. The preface to the 1872 book edition confirms the obvious: Editor Längst really represents "der Lange," i.e., Karl Heinzen, who is taking this fictitious trip with the high hopes of an "Organist der Bildung." The subtitle, "das gebrochene Herz," foreshadows the sad outcome of the story, while the ultimate disgust of Editor Längst is reflected in the epigram "Teutsche Tonangeber in Amerika":

Teuschlands Vertreter wollt ihr sein?  
O lasst euch diesen Irrthum nehmen!  
Teuschlands Vertreter sind allein  
Die Wen'gen, die sich eurer schämen.<sup>23</sup>

A good example of Heinzen's imaginative talent and prophetic intuition, as well as of his concern about slavery and racial prejudice is offered by the conclusion of his *Editoren-Kongress*. As in the *Pionier* serialization, one of Heinzen's favorite fictitious characters, Julie von Berg, is called upon to com-

plete the narration of Längst's story, because he has been suffering from heart trouble since his return from the itinerant congress. As his cardiac condition worsens, she reports, a team of doctors decide to perform open-heart surgery. Upon seeing the condition of his heart, they agree, however, that the only remaining solution is to attempt a heart transplant, using the hearts of several slaughtered men—Negroes of course—to create a perfect donor-heart. There is just one complication: "...der Patient wollte kein fremdes Herz im Leibe haben,"<sup>24</sup> and thus the novel concludes with the patient's prejudice resulting in his death. It would seem difficult to agree with Wittke that his novel has an "insignificant and stupid plot."

The same complex of critical ideas expressed in the novel—the questionable quality of the language and content in German-American newspapers, the venality of many German-American intellectuals, the problems of American slavery, and women's rights—was also taking dramatic form in Heinzen's mind during 1858. Evidence of this can be found in the *Pionier* of this year. However, before we approach Heinzen's dramatic treatment of these ideas in his play *Die deutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika*, a brief glance at Heinzen's previous *Lustspiele* might here be indicated.

Whenever Heinzen's dramas are mentioned at all, there seems to be some confusion as to their number, correct titles, places of publication, and present availability. As far as can be determined, Heinzen's first play was *Doktor Nebel, oder: Gelehrsamkeit und Leben* (Köln, 1841). According to Eitel Wolf Dobert, this play has been lost.<sup>25</sup> Unknown to Dobert, at least one copy of it still exists.<sup>26</sup> In the past, critical reaction to *Doktor Nebel* has generally been short and negative. Thus August Lewald in 1842 concluded: "Das Theater ist nicht sein [Heinzens] Bereich und dieser Versuch ein gänzlich verfehlter zu nennen."<sup>27</sup> Similarly, Heinrich Kurz, while showing some appreciation for Heinzen's poems, commented, "Der bekannte K. Heinzen bewies in 'Dokor Nebel' . . . , wie weit man

es in Geschmacklosigkeit und Unsinn bringen könne."<sup>28</sup> At least one critic has felt this play to be of value; Michael Singer, editor of the *Jahrbuch der Deutschamerikaner*, wrote in 1918, "Das Volkstück fand in dem radikalen aber vielseitigen Achtundvierziger Karl Heinzen einen erfolgreichen Vertreter. Sein 'Dr. Nebel, oder Gelehrsamkeit und Leben' verdiente . . . dem Moder entrissen zu werden . . ."<sup>29</sup>

Possibly another of Heinzen's early plays is *Die Kölnische Komödie* (Köln, 1842). Wittke repeatedly notes that Heinzen wrote "some satirical comedies"<sup>30</sup> during the early 1840's, but he does not name this work by its title. Several sources simply attribute it to Heinzen.<sup>31</sup> Although a copy of this work could not be located, its full title can be identified as *Die Kölnische Komödie, von Tante Alhier, oder getreue Beschreibung der Höllenfahrt des Hanswurst und des Höllenzuges aus dem Kölnischen Karneval im Jahr 1842*.<sup>32</sup>

On August 15, 1858, Heinzen offered for subscription the second volume of his collected works, which was to contain his *Lustspiele*.<sup>33</sup> This volume did not appear until a year later, and although it was published in New York, Heinzen had already moved with his *Pionier* to Boston.<sup>34</sup> A second edition appeared (1872) in Boston and included only two plays, *Professor Irrwisch* and *Die teutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika*.<sup>35</sup> The first and longer of these satirical comedies, *Professor Irrwisch*, is interesting in a number of respects. One thing which Heinzen does not mention, but which immediately becomes evident upon comparing this play with *Doktor Nebel*, is that *Professor Irrwisch* is merely a reworking of the earlier drama.<sup>36</sup> The text has been altered to some degree, but of the twelve characters, only the names of Dr. Nebel and Dr. Feger have been changed to Dr. Irrwisch and Dr. Gift, respectively. A "Vorbemerkung" has also been added, in which Heinzen explains that this *Lustspiel* was originally conceived as the introduction to a planned comic novel called "Irrfahrten des Professors Irrwisch." Perhaps this explanation came in response to negative criticism of



*Doktor Nebel*, or in anticipation of the major objection future critics might have to the play, namely its reliance on monologues and dialogues rather than on action.<sup>37</sup> Heinzen notes in his autobiography that *Professor Irrwisch* is based on his experiences at the University of Bonn during the year 1827.<sup>38</sup> This separates it in time and space from the second *Lustspiel* in the volume, which grew out of Heinzen's career as a journalist in the United States during the 1850's.<sup>39</sup>

Let us now turn to a fuller discussion of this latter play, *Die deutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika* and its background. On September 5, 1858, a column appeared in Karl Heinzen's *Pionier* which was written in dialogue form and bore the heading "Ein Beitrag zur deutsch-amerikanischen Originalliteratur."<sup>40</sup> An obvious continuation of this column appeared in the September 19 issue with the title "Lesefrüchte aus dem Garten der N.Y. Staatszeitung." Six further articles<sup>41</sup> with this heading followed in the *Pionier*, but the initial dialogue form eventually gave way to prose letters. The issue of November 7, 1858, brought the "Fortsetzung und einstweiliger Schluss" of the series.

The material in these columns, as well as the manner in which it is presented, very closely resembles in form and content the second act of Heinzen's play, "*Organisten der Bildung*," which appeared as the second *Lustspiel* in the 1859 edition of Heinzen's collected works. Some of the newspaper columns begin with a stage direction: "Szene: Sanktum der 'N.Y. Staatszeitung'," "Sanktissimum der 'N.Y. Staatszeitung'," and finally, "Im eisenbeschlagenen Rhomboide der 'Staatszeitung'."<sup>42</sup> In one instance the column also closes with "Der Vorhang fällt."<sup>43</sup> Each of these columns contains a long conversation between a female editor, identified at first only as "die Patronin," and her assistants, variously referred to as "der dienende National-Geist," "der Lokal-Kopf," and "der Lokal-Verbrecher." The subjects discussed range from slander (mostly of Karl Heinzen) and slavery, to German-American literature and foreign literary critics. The author of these

columns—obviously the editor of the *Pionier*, Karl Heinzen himself—only thinly disguises his purpose here, which is to present a dramatization of his disagreements over a wide range of subjects with the *New Yorker Staatszeitung*. In the columns “die Patronin” is eventually identified as “Jakob Uhl’s Wittwe.” This is the historical figure Anna Uhl, who became publisher and editor of the *Staatszeitung* upon her husband’s death in 1852 and served as such until 1859.<sup>44</sup>

Heinzen’s feud with this newspaper was also responsible for the somewhat unusual title of his comedy *Die deutschen “Organisten der Bildung” in Amerika*. In the preface to the *Editoren-Kongress*,<sup>45</sup> (which, as explained above, had likewise been serialized in the *Pionier* during 1858), Heinzen informs us that it was the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* which had nicknamed him the “Organist der Bildung.” It intended to imply by this cognomen that Heinzen, as the typical Forty-Eighter, was over-anxious to organize and educate all German-Americans socially, politically, and culturally, especially those who had come to the United States during the 1830’s. In order to understand the reasons for this personal literary feud, one must see it in the context of a general rift in contemporaneous German-American circles. The editors of the *Staatszeitung*, like the editors of many other German-American papers, belonged to this latter group who felt confident that there was nothing wrong with the quality of their papers (even if every other word in them was an Americanism), nor with their social attitudes (even though they opposed abolition), nor with their right to speak as representatives of German culture in America (even though their papers did not show any interest in German literature, let alone its German-American branch).

This conflict was thus by no means limited to a personal feud between Karl Heinzen and the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* during the 1850’s and early 1860’s. The split was so wide-spread among German-American newspapers of the day that the editors who had established themselves before 1848 came to be

known as the "Grays," and those who had come after, as the "Greens."<sup>46</sup> The term "Greens" arose because the older editors, those who had been in America for at least twenty years in the 1850's, liked to refer to a Forty-Eighter as a "Grünhorn." Besides their demand for higher standards in journalism and their concern about German culture in America, the Forty-Eighters also advocated such radical plans as the establishment of a separate German state in the western United States and the abolishment of the U.S. Presidency. Karl Heinzen, however, wisely confined himself in his three-act *"Organisten der Bildung"* to an exposure of two undesirable types of German-American editors.

In the single lengthy scene constituting the first act, these two editors are indirectly introduced through the conversation of two men, Geissel and Streichling, at the former's inn. Geissel is a Forty-Eighter, a writer-editor who has chosen to become an innkeeper because of the corrupt state of American journalism. His enemies have labelled him the "Organist" or "Organisator der Bildung," and, true to his name, he is anxious to "whip into shape" at least two of them. Streichling is a violinist, who has recently fled from Germany (even his musical interpretations of Louis XVI's death at the guillotine, he relates, could not elude the censors) and wants to establish a reputation as a true artist in America. With his somewhat hesitant help Geissel devises a plan which will force the despicable editors of two rival papers to reveal publically their true natures.

Act Two is divided into two scenes. The first scene is set in the "'Sanktum' des 'National-Hickory'" (176),<sup>47</sup> while the second scene takes place in the "'Sanktum' des 'Staats-Hickory'" (185). The editor we meet first is Beutel. He can be described perfectly by one of Heinzen's American epigrams, entitled "Der 'Graue'":

Ich bin schon zwanzig Jahr' im Land,  
Verlernte Sprache und Verstand,  
Drum soll kein Grüner sich erfrechen,  
Mir gegen die Sklaverei zu sprechen.<sup>48</sup>

The quality of his "Päper" becomes apparent when his assistant Bengel informs him that the next edition will contain "... wie gewöhnlich: ein Leitartikel über eine verbrannte Frau, ein Mann zu Brei zermalmt, ein durchgegangenes Pferd, das 6 Menschen gekillt hat, und ein Artikel gegen die Whigs ..." (176). When Bengel asks whether they should print a refugee's poem gratis, Beutel reveals in his answer at once his ignorant attitude toward literature and his bastardized German:

Well, das wär' ein Büsiness, Gedichte umsonst aufzunehmen! Das heisst, ich bin nicht ganz gegen die Gedichtkunst: sogar Göthe und Schiller können ein Gedicht in mein Blatt setzen, wenn sie dafür bezahlen wollen, aber Käschen daun, das ist american fashion. Der "National-Hickory" ist ein demokratisches Blatt, das soll so ein Grünhorn von einem Verseemacher sich merken, und wir Demokraten sind praktisch. Was sagst Du, Tschali? (177)

The monetary significance of Beutel's name is demonstrated when Draht, a tailor and father of six children, tries to collect the long overdue payment for his work. Rather than part with any of his ill-gained "honorariums" (most of which, we learn, he promptly spends in nightly carousals), Beutel prefers to intimidate and threaten the tailor. First he asks questions like "Wie können Sie Grünhorn mir solche Dinge in meinem Sanktum sagen? Sind Sie ein Demokrat?" (181) When this evasive technique fails, Beutel begins to preach: "... ich sage Ihnen, dass ein Grüner an unsern gastlichen Gestaden erst etwas lernen muss, ehe er mitsprechen darf. Ich bin schon zwanzig Jahre im Lande—" (182). Finally he threatens to slander the tailor: "God däm! Jetzt ist es genug. Herr Grünhorn, in meinem nächsten Blatt werden Sie einen Artikel finden, dass kein Mensch von der national-demokratischen Partei Ihnen mehr einen Cent zu verdienen geben soll." (182)

There is also some attention given to politics, particularly to an impending "Elekschen." Beutel's paper is supporting "Der Fox" because he is a "Schentlemän" and his election will benefit the paper. But this election is by no means a central

theme in Heinzen's play, as it is, for instance, in Gustav Freytag's earlier *Lustspiel, Die Journalisten* (1853).

After Beutel's assistant becomes so disgusted with him that he hurls him out the door, we meet the second editor, Schneider. He has been in America only ten years (188) and in comparison with Beutel is considered a "'Soft', ein Weichschaaliger, ein Barnburner, ein Jungamerikaner, ein Sozialist." (187)<sup>49</sup> His manner of speech resembles that of a student of Hegel, and he boasts of his ability to conceal his shrewd opportunism from his readers. On the ever present issue of slavery, Schneider reveals his shifty editorial stance as follows:

Wir müssen immer eine Zeitfrage, z.B. die Sklavenfrage, benützen, um vor den Hunkern den Schein als Fortschrittsmänner voraus zu haben, wir dürfen solche Fragen aber niemals bis auf das praktische Gebiet verfolgen, denn das verstösst gegen unsre Partei, untergräbt unser Buisness und gleichzeitig die Kuppel dieser grossen Union. (187)

This editor is also inclined to publish "popular" articles rather than literary or cultural ones, whatever promises to attract more subscribers (188). As in the previous scene, an assistant, this one named "Typus," is so revolted by his editor's lack of ethical principles that he throws him out the door.

Act Three again takes place in Geissel's inn. The two editors, who have fallen for Geissel's trap and simultaneously exposed each other in their newspapers, come to the inn demanding "Satisfäkschen." Geissel, whom they pretend to have never met before, introduces himself: "Ich bin nämlich ein Philosoph und heisse Hagel." (199) He then succeeds in so confusing the editors with his dialectical discussion of positives and negatives that they allow themselves to be whipped as just punishment for their corruption of the German language (204). To add insult to injury, the whipping is performed by a Negro, who has escaped from the South by the Underground Railway and is heading for Canada. Geissel feels this is particularly appropriate because Beutel and Schneider

are two of the anti-abolitionist German-American editors, "welche über Tyrannei in Europa schimpfen und ihr in Amerika die Schleppe tragen." (205) Geissel's position could best be described by these lines from Heinzen's "Deutsch-amerikanisches 'Volkslied'":

Nur Der ist Mensch, nur Der ist frei,  
Der jede fremde Sklaverei  
Hilft wie die eig'ne niederstreiten.<sup>50</sup>

The ultimate humiliation comes when the editors learn that the Negro speaks "Dötsch" (207), which he learned from his German plantation master, and when Beutel finally finds out that his own sister is going to marry the Negro (208). This situation thus recalls the problems caused in the *Editoren-Kongress* when a Negro's heart was to be transplanted into a white man's body. As a last punishment, Geissel forces the editors to promise that they will give up their editorships and never begin another paper. When they ask whether they could not simply reform, Geissel replies, "Wissen Sie denn nicht, dass Sie die deutsche Literatur und die Sache der Freiheit noch mehr schänden durch Ihre Gunst als durch Ihre Anfeindung?" (210) The play ends as the editors circumvent their pledge to Geissel and exchange their papers together with their political positions. When Schneider mildly protests about doing this, Beutel laconically declares, "Nevermeind, es ist ja doch Alles eins." (213) This sameness in the endeavors of two apparently hostile rivals is actually implied throughout the play by Heinzen's choice of names for both editors. As they have been active in the same selfish pursuit of material gain by all sorts of underhanded trickery, they are no better than swindlers, *Beutelschneider*.

In considering the critical reception of this play by various German-American editors, many of whom were authors in their own rights, one can begin to form an idea about the state of German-American drama during the 1850's. Writing for the *Anzeiger des Westens*, Otto Ruppius was the first German-American to review the play.<sup>51</sup> His little-known interest

in drama is apparent from his collaboration (1859-61) with another author and critic, Heinrich Börnstein, who had founded the St. Louis German stage in 1859. Ruppius' review is extremely negative; he supports his arguments by selectively reprinting only the derogatory comments made about the play by the Leipzig critic Hermann Marggraff.<sup>52</sup> A partial explanation for Ruppius' malevolence is that he had been assistant editor of the *N.Y. Staatszeitung* during the period of Heinzen's feud with the paper,<sup>53</sup> and there can be no doubt that Ruppius considered slavery an economic necessity for the South.<sup>54</sup> Another appraisal of the play appeared early in 1860 in the *N.Y. Demokrat*<sup>55</sup> and came from Adolf Douai. A German-American author, who had formerly been assistant editor of the *Pionier* and had later broken with Heinzen, Douai recognizes that Heinzen had made a noble effort to fill a gap in German-American literature. He laments what he found most *Lustspiele* of the day to be lacking in, "an Ideen, an edler zeitgemässer Tendenz, an Wahrheit der Charaktere, die in der Regel viel zu stark karrikirt [sic] sind, und an Neuheit der Fabel," and concludes somewhat tepidly, "Es ist offenbar, dass Heinzen diese Mängel gefühlt und ihnen abzuhelpfen gesucht hat."

In Germany, the first review of Heinzen's play was Hermann Marggraff's three-page critique in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, announcing: "In unserer lustspiellosen Zeit wird uns plötzlich zu unserer Ueberraschung ein Lustspielgericht von Nordamerika aus servirt, und zwar durch keinen andern als durch Karl Heinzen, den gefürchteten Redacteur des 'Pionier' . . . ."<sup>56</sup> Marggraff lauds Heinzen's honesty, admires his defense of America's "schwarze Brüder," and agrees with him about the generally deplorable state of the German-American press and its readership, insofar as Marggraff is convinced that "Journalismus ist Ausdruck und Produkt des Bildungszustandes eines Volks."<sup>57</sup> His distress over Heinzen's uninhibited use of profanities as well as Heinzen's brutal treatment of his "weisse Brüder" in the play is temper-

ed by the conclusion, "er meint es mit seinen Bestrebungen zur Besserung der Lage des menschlichen Geschlechts ganz ernst und ehrlich."<sup>58</sup>

Whether the "*Organisten der Bildung*" had any significant practical effects at the time is difficult to ascertain. In 1860 Karl Weller, editor of the Leipzig *Jahrbuch deutscher Dichtung*, viewed Heinzen not only as "der erste Pionier in der Geisteswildniss deutsch-amerikanischer Cultur," but in many respects comparable and even superior to Ludwig Börne:

Heinzen ist seinem Charakter, seiner Anschauungsweise und selbst seinem Style nach ein auferstandener Börne — nur ist sein Gesichtskreis ein weiterer, ein viel mehr kosmopolitischer und radikaler, weil er eine viel grössere Fülle von Ideen und Verhältnissen an sich herantreten liess.

Weller attributed to him a marked improvement in German-American journalism:

[Heinzen] hat es erreicht, dass nachgerade jedes einigermaßen verbreitete deutsch-amerikanische Blatt sich eines erträglichen Styles befleißigt, nachdem er mit beissendem Spotte die yankeesirenden Verhöhnung unserer edlen Muttersprache in den dortigen Journalen zehn Jahre lang gegeißelt . . .<sup>59</sup>

Undeniably, Heinzen's *Lustspiel* is of considerable socio-historical interest today because it is basically the translation into a dramatic art form of his active role in American affairs of the 1850's. But, as the preceding analysis has attempted to demonstrate, it is also possible today to take issue with the 19th-century critic who felt that Heinzen's *Lustspiel* was "in culturhistorischer Hinsicht interessant, aber keineswegs erfreulich."<sup>60</sup> This play contains a good deal of genuine humor which the modern reader can still appreciate. It merits rank and recognition as an original contribution to a select number of memorable satirical German comedies. Over the last hundred years, far too many German playwrights have with a good deal of repetition and anachronism made Johannes



Gutenberg and Ulrich von Hutten exponents of modern journalism and its problems. Heinzen's *Lustspiel* is comparable to the few imaginative German comedies on the subject of journalism, like Eduard Bauernfeld's *Der literarische Salon* (1836), Gustav Freytag's *Die Journalisten* (1853), and Arthur Schnitzler's *Fink und Fliederbusch* (1917).

Stimulated by his American comedy, German critical interest in Heinzen was, however, short lived. When Marggraff, in his article "Characterstudien über die Deutschen in Deutschland und Amerika,"<sup>61</sup> condemned Heinzen as a compulsive detractor of German *Literatenthum*, the editor of the influential *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, Joseph Lehmann in Berlin, came to Heinzen's defense.<sup>62</sup> Heinzen's *Pionier* recorded this dispute in a column "Teutsche 'Kritik' hier und drüben"<sup>63</sup> and expressly invited further exchange of views between German *literati* on both sides of the Atlantic. "Wir sind ja doch alle 'teutsche Brüder'," he wrote, "bloss getrennt durch ein wenig Wasser und ein wenig Polizei."<sup>64</sup>

Unfortunately, Heinzen's invitation met with no substantial response until twelve years later. When in 1872 the *Pionier* printed the anonymous epic *Ein neues Wintermärchen. Besuch im neuen deutschen Reich der Gottesfurcht und der frommen Sitte von Heinrich Heine*, a caustic satire on the hollowness of the newly founded Prusso-German Empire, readers immediately attributed it to Heinzen. Paul Lindau's indignant review of it,<sup>65</sup> charging that Heinzen had outdone *Götz von Berlichingen* in pugnaciousness and vulgarity, prompted a repartee from Heinzen.<sup>66</sup> After emphatically denying authorship of the epic and thus refuting Lindau's personal invective against him, Heinzen broached a larger issue: the frequently lacking or prejudiced reception of German-American works by 19th-century Germany. Heinzen linked this problem to an even larger perspective. If German critics were to continue in their habit of ignoring as irrelevant, or even misinterpreting as unaesthetic, the only truthful works in their language, those written by freedom-loving authors in

forced or self-imposed exile, Germans would be enlightened only too late. Heinzen postulated that the future of a free Germany would lie in its close association with America, and prophesied destruction for a smug and illiberal Germany, if not in the first major war, then in the second. In an arrogant rejoinder reflecting the optimistic conceit of the *Gründerjahre*, Lindau dismissed Heinzen's warning as "wiederum eine schwarze Ausgeburt Ihrer Phantasie."<sup>67</sup>

### NOTES

1. From Heinzen's manuscript describing his expulsion from Bern in the winter of 1847. **Nachlass Seidensticker**, No. 25.6835, No. 90, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen.

2. "Am Empfindlichsten trafen mich die vernichtenden Beinamen, durch welche ich als öffentlicher Verbrecher gekennzeichnet wurde, und unter diesen zahlreichen, mit dem äussersten Aufwand von Geist ersonnenen Beinamen war keiner mehr geeignet, mich unter allgemeine Polizeiaufsicht zu bringen, als jener, den Inbegriff aller geistigen Unfähigkeit wie moralischen Verworfenheit bezeichnende: 'Der Lange.'" From the preface to Heinzen's **Der deutsche Editoren-Kongress** (Boston, 1872), p. 3.

Heinzen's American biographer, Carl Wittke, records that one of Heinzen's uncles was six feet five inches tall, and that Karl Heinzen was no exception to this family trait. **Against the Current** (Chicago, 1945), pp. 2-3.

Although the above-mentioned preface seems to suggest that Heinzen was only known as "der Lange" in America during the years 1847-48 and 1850-1880, Gottfried Keller also refers to him thus in a line of his epigram "An Karl Heinzen," which was written as early as 1846:

Du mit dem Kopfe voll Erbsen, o langer und redlicher Heinzen!  
**Sämtliche Werke**, ed. Jonas Fränkel (Bern und Leipzig, 1926-49), XIII, 357.

Later, in these lines of his satire "Der Apotheker von Chamounix" (*Ibid.*, XV, 287), Keller again speaks of Heinzen as:

Jener lange Karl, der Heinzen,  
Der seit vielen langen Jahren  
Theoretisch Köpfe schneidet,

Aber friedevollen Herzens  
Noch kein Tröpflein Bluts vergossen,  
Während schweigend die Tyrannen  
Morden, dass die Erde raucht!

3. Gustav Adolf Zimmermann, **Deutsch in Amerika** (Chicago, 1892), p. xxx.

4. Hermann Marggraff, "Karl Heinzen als Lustspiieldichter," **Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung**, vol. 6 (February 9, 1860), III.

5. **Der Pionier** (September 19, 1858), p. 3. Heinzen satirizes this appellation by the **Staatszeitung** when he puts the following words into the mouth of its female editor: "Das was man Schimpfwort nennt, wirkt nur dann, wenn es die verstärkte Bezeichnung einer Wahrheit ist; wenn Sie aber ein Pferd eine Wanze schimpfen, wird es dadurch eine Wanze? Der Bösewicht vom 'Pionier' hört Sie mit lächelnder Miene alle Namen der Naturgeschichte ablesen und wenn Sie zu Ende sind, sagt er bloss: der Mensch scheint im Reich der Bestien gut zu Hause zu sein."

6. Emil Ermatinger, **Gottfried Kellers Leben, Briefe und Tagebücher**, I (Stuttgart und Berlin, 1924), 163.

A clash over atheism in 1845 generated a number of literary works from these writers. Cf. Wittke, pp. 148-151; Ermatinger, I, 157-163; the Fränkel edition of Keller's works, XIII, 357; XIV, 341 ff., and II (II. Abteilung), 287 also adds to the available knowledge about this religious conflict which took literary form.

Of primary importance for this study is the realization that, as early as the 1840's, Karl Heinzen was already giving literary form to his strong feelings on religion, politics and the general social state of the society around him. Heinzen's **Gedichte** (3rd. edition 1867, p. 228) include his sonnet "(An den Zürcher Dichter G. Keller, Zögling und Schildknappen Follens.)", which in turn provoked Keller's epigram quoted above, his inclusion of Karl Heinzen in his literary satire, and possibly also Keller's use of Heinzen as a model for the atheist Peter Gilgus in this novel **Der grüne Heinrich**, as Ermatinger suggests (I. 577). Keller continues to refer to Heinzen in his letters until at least 1880 (Ermatinger, II, 252).

Reprinted also in Heinzen's volume of poetry is Follen's sonnet entitled "Einem Kaiserkandidaten (1846) 'An Karl Heinzen'" (p. 223). Several of Heinzen's sonnets to Follen, dated 1846 (pp. 223-228), with a note about their significance, as well as a number of epigrams directed at Follen (pp. 182, 192, 193) are included as well.

7. Karl Glossy, "Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz," **Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft**, vol. 21 (1912), 95.

8. **Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Gesellschaft von Illinois**, vol. 15 (1915), 84-144.

9. Heinzen's non-poetic works are dismissed with the remark: "Space will not permit a more comprehensive account of Heinzen's literary activities, but in order to convey a vivid idea of the variety of his labors, a list of his publications is added at the end of this

paper." (p. 120) On p. 143 Schinnerer merely lists the **Lustspiele** as item No. 49. He fails, however, to indicate the date of publication, giving only Boston as the place. In fact, they first appeared in New York (1859) and only later in Boston (1872).

10. Not 1856, as Schinnerer (p. 143) claims. Heinzen's **Pionier** contains the "Einladung zur Subskription" for this volume of poetry on February 28, 1858 (p. 7), and the volume was not available until June 27 of that year.

Several other dates Schinnerer offers are inaccurate, e.g., 1843 for **Reise eines deutschen Romantikers nach Batavia**. According to the **Literaturblatt** of February 7, 1842 (No. 14, p. 15), Wolfgang Menzel had reviewed this work prior to this date. But conclusive proof that the **Reise** appeared in 1841 rather than in 1843 is found in C. G. Kayser's **Neues Bücher-Lexikon**, Erster Theil (Leipzig, 1841), p. 413, where "Reise nach Batavia. Köln, 1841. Boisserée" is listed. The **British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books**, Cl (London, 1961), 141, also dates it 1841.

11. Schinnerer, p. 110.

12. "Gedichte von Karl Heinzen," **Literaturblatt**, No. 14 (February 7, 1842), 55. An interesting sidelight here is given by Heinzen in **Erlebtes I**, 331, where he states: "...bald vergiftete man aus Bosheit meinen treuen Begleiter, meinen Hund, der den glorreichen Namen Menzel trug...."

Heinrich Kurz gives a similar positive judgment in **Geschichte der neuesten deutschen Literatur von 1830**, 3rd. ed. (Leipzig, 1874), IV, 46: "**Lyrische Poesie**. Von dem bekannten Agitator Karl Heinzen... erschienen 'Gedichte' (Köln, 1841), die nur zum Theil hierher gehören. aber unter diesen zeichnen sich mehrere durch Tiefe des Gefühls und Kraft des Ausdrucks aus...."

13. Schinnerer, p. 117.

14. Schinnerer, p. 114. Heinrich Rattermann in "Karl Heinzen," **Der deutsche Pionier**, vol. 13 (1881), 5, expresses a similar opinion.

15. Usually only the third edition (Boston, 1867) is listed as "enlarged." The review of the New York **Familienblätter** (see fn. 18) reveals they were also included in the New York, 1858 edition.

16. **Pionier**, vol. 5, No. 29 (July 18, 1858), p. 5 begins the column. It was continued in the issues of: July 25; August 1, 8, 22, 29; and September 5, 1858. The review from the **Anzeiger** appeared in the July 25 issue, p. 6, and continued into the August 1 issue.

17. **Ibid.**, (July 25, 1858), p. 6.

18. **Ibid.**, (August 22, 1858), pp. 5-6.

19. Wittke, p. 142.

20. **Ibid.**, p. 143.

21. (Boston, 1872), p. 4.

22. The January 3, 1858 issue of the **Pionier** contains this column, which begins: "Ich heisse Krüger und mein Name kommt von Krug, und es gäbe keinen Krug, wenn es kein Bier gäbe...." (p. 2). This corresponds exactly to page 281 of the Boston, 1872 edition of the novel. The initial date of the column could not be determined at this time because the 1857 volume of the **Pionier** is presently missing from the Library of Congress. The column ends, however, on April 18, 1858 with the line "Gross bist du, Herr Jesus!" which is identical to the conclusion of the 1872 edition (p. 372).

23. **Editoren-Kongress**, p. 303. This also appears as an American epigram in the 1867 edition of Heinzen's poetry (p. 204).

24. **Ibid.**, p. 346.

25. **Deutsche Demokraten in Amerika** (Göttingen, 1958), p. 109.

26. In the private collection of Professor Harold Jantz in Baltimore. The publishers were J. & W. Boisserée.

27. **Europa. Chronik der gebildeten Welt**, vol. 4 (1842), 585.

28. **Op. cit.**, IV, 522.

29. "Deutsches Bühnenleben in Amerika," **Jahrbuch der Deutsch-amerikaner**, vol. 4 (1918), 227.

30. Pp. 23, 25, 143.

31. Dobert includes this work among Heinzen's "Andere Schriften", p. 115; Schinnerer lists it as item No. 5, p. 142.

32. C. G. Kayser, **Vollständiges Bücher-Lexikon**, IX (Leipzig, 1848), 520; also Wilhelm Heinsius, **Allgemeines Bücher-Lexikon**, X (Leipzig, 1848), 454, which gives the volume as 2 "**Bogen**," i.e. 32 pages, and informs us that Ritzefeld was the publisher.

The **Kölnische Komödie** is not listed in the National Union Catalogue at the Library of Congress, and no review of it during 1841, 1842 or 1843 could be found. As far as could be determined there is no mention of the work in Heinzen's autobiography. Perhaps it is still available in a private collection, or reference to it can be found in the German magazines to which Heinzen was contributing at the time it was written.

33. **Pionier**, No. 33 (New York), p. 6.

34. **Ibid.**, No. 33 (August 20, 1859), p. 6. The long delay in publication is attributed to the length of the volume and its printing costs.

35. Dobert (p. 113) mentions only the first edition and distorts the title. In addition, the plot summary and one-sentence criticism offered by Dobert apply only to **Professor Irrwisch**.

36. Wittke mistakenly informs us that "Heinzen also wrote **Lustspiele**, like **Professor Irrwisch**, **Dr. Nebel**, and several others, and published them in 1870." (p. 143) The date 1870 is correct neither for **Doktor Nebel** (1841), nor for **Professor Irrwisch** (1859; 1872), and Wittke seems to think that these are two different plays.

37. The "Vorbemerkung" reads: "Dieses Lustspiel hatte ursprünglich bloss die Bestimmung, als Einleitung zu einem (wegen Ungunst der Verhältnisse unbeendet gebliebenen) komischen Roman, 'Irrfahrten des Professors Irrwisch' zu dienen. Auf Bühnengerechtigkeit wurde daher wenig Rücksicht genommen. Es bedarf wo[h]l keiner Bemerkung, dass die Häufung von Monologen im ersten Akt ein absichtlich angewandtes Mittel der Introdution ist." (New York, 1859), p. 4.

In light of the above, Wittke's criticism of Heinzen's comedies, of which he mentions only **Dr. Nebel** and **Professor Irrwisch**, seems unjustified: "The comedies could not possibly have been performed on the stage with success. They were practically all dialogue and no action... utterly lacking in taste, dramatic form, and understanding of the demands of the theater." (pp. 143-144)

Dobert makes a similar mistake when he states that "**Professor Irrwisch** verrät einiges über Heinzens Technik als Bühnendichter." (p. 113)

38. **Erlebtes**, 1. Theil (Boston, 1864), p. 40.

39. Wittke (p. 143) generalizes about Heinzen's **Lustspiele** thus: "They were attempts to write satire for the theater and attacked such favorite abuses as censorship, police, and bureaucracy and extolled the virtues of the revolutionary spirit." This description seems to relate only to **Dr. Nebel** and **Professor Irrwisch** as these abuses are not at issue in **Die teutschen "Organisten der Bildung" in Amerika**.

40. No. 36, p. 2.

41. **Ibid.**, September 26; October 10, 17, 24 and 31; November 7.

42. **Ibid.**, September 5; September 19 and 26; October 10.

43. **Ibid.**, September 19, p. 3.

44. Karl Arndt and M. Olson, eds., **German-American Newspapers and Periodicals, 1732-1955** (New York and London, 1965), pp. 399-400.

45. (Boston, 1872), p. 4.

46. Cf. Carl Wittke, **We Who Built America** (Ann Arbor, 1939), pp. 193-195.

Franz Löher, **Geschichte und Zustände der Deutschen in Amerika** (Cincinnati und Leipzig, 1847), p. 456, gives an excellent description of the reputation of the **Schnellpost**, the **Anzeiger des Westens** and the **New Yorker Staatszeitung** during the late 1840's. The picture is anything but flattering for the **Staatszeitung**, which is referred to as the "Chorführer der Gemeinheit." Arndt-Olson (p. 399) confirm that this paper did not reach its highest standard of excellence until the editorship of Oswald Ottendorfer (1858-1900).

47. All further references to this play will be given in parentheses and apply to the 1859 New York edition.

48. **Gedichte** (Boston, 1867), p. 198.

49. For Heinzen's own dislike for "Junghegelianer" and their cowardly "Jungamerikaner" counterparts, cf. **Erlebtes**, I, 47.
50. **Gedichte**, p. 244.
51. See reprint in **Pionier** (April 12, 1860), pp. 1-2. For a discussion of Ruppius by Heinzen cf. **Pionier** (September 20, 1860), pp. 2-3.
52. This falsification is revealed in **Pionier** (September 20, 1860), pp. 2-3.
53. Arndt-Olson, p. 399, state that Ruppius was editor from 1856-57.
54. Cf., e.g., Otto Ruppius, "Amerikanische Zustände Nr. 2," **Die Gartenlaube** (1861), p. 622.
55. Reprinted in **Pionier** (April 12, 1860), p. 2.
56. Cf. fn. 4 above.
57. Marggraff, p. 111.
58. **Ibid.**, p. 112.
59. Reprinted in **Pionier** (September 27, 1860), pp. 2-3.
60. Kurz, IV, 522.
61. First published in Marggraff's own Leipzig **Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung**, and reprinted in **Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes**, No. 35 (August 29, 1860), p. 420.
62. "In der That sind Goltz und Heinzen selbst die besten Widerlegungen ihrer eigenen Behauptungen von der Engherzigkeit, Kurzsichtigkeit, Gemeinheit und Lüderlichkeit der Deutschen und des deutschen Literatenthums insbesondere, denn in Beiden ist, bei aller Einseitigkeit und Verrantheit—der Eine in konservativ-religiöse und der Andere in destructiv-atheistische Ideen—ja, bei aller scheinbaren Lüderlichkeit, ein universeller Geist und die vollste Theilnahme für alles Menschliche und Edle nicht zu verkennen." **Ibid.** and reprinted in **Pionier** (September 27, 1860), pp. 2-3.
63. **Pionier** (April 12, 1860), pp. 1-2; (September 20, 1860), p. 2; (September 27, 1860), pp. 2-3: "Mehr Kritik"; (October 4, 1860), pp. 2-3: "Noch Mehr Kritik."
64. "Mehr Kritik," **Pionier** (September 27, 1860), pp. 2-3.
65. "Deutsche Poesie in den Vereinigten Staaten," **Die Gegenwart**, No. 15 May 4, 1872), pp. 235-237.
66. "Ueber Grobheit," **Die Gegenwart**, No. 22 (June 22, 1872), pp. 350-351.
67. "An den Redacteur des 'Pionier', Karl Heinzen in Boston," **Die Gegenwart**, No. 30 (August 17, 1872), p. 109.

# ***Polish American Studies***

—a journal of ethnic studies focusing on Americans of Polish origin, published twice each year since 1944 by the Polish American Historical Association.

---

*Polish American Studies* is devoted to scholarship—articles, criticism, edited documents, bibliographies, reviews—dealing with all aspects of the history and culture of Poles in the United States. It attempts to place the Polish American experience in historical and comparative perspective by examining its roots in Europe and its relationship to other ethnic groups.

---

Recent articles include:

“‘The Test is Poland’: Polish Americans and the Origins of the Cold War” by Peter H. Irons

“Dimensions of Ethnicity: A Preliminary Report on the Poles of Milwaukee” by Donald Pienkos

“Ethnic versus Black Metropolis: The Origins of Polish-Black Housing Tensions in Chicago” by Joseph Parot

“The Republican Party and Yalta: Partisan Exploitation of the Polish American Concern over the Conference, 1945-1960” by Athan Theoharis

“Post-World War II Polish Immigrants in the United States” by Danuta Mostwin

---

Subscriptions are \$5.00 for one year and may be obtained by writing to the Executive Secretary of the Polish American Historical Association in care of the Polish Museum of America, 984 N. Milwaukee Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60622. Complete files are also available. Regular membership in the Association is \$10.00 for one year.