James R. Maxeiner

J. L. Tellkampf: German Legal Scientist in the U.S. (1838-47) in an Age of Reform

In October 1841 and January 1842 J. Louis Tellkampf, then a professor in Union College, published in The American Jurist and Law Magazine a remarkable two-part article: “On Codifying or the Systematizing of the Law.” It was one of the first analyses of systematizing law to appear in the United States. It remains one of the best. It was among the first proposals anywhere for establishing a standing body to be responsible for quality of legislation. Flaws in systematizing and controlling the quality of laws account for much of the dysfunctionality of contemporary American law. Here—already in 1841/1842—is a diagnosis and prescription for what ails the American legal system today. It’s not too late to listen to Tellkampf.

When I first read Tellkampf’s article I did so as a student of contemporary legal methods. I am a professor of law, not a professor of history. I wasn’t thinking about the author’s origin, but about what the author had to say and about what publication of his article by The American Jurist, then the leading American law journal and one of the most thoughtful American law journals ever, suggests about American law. Publication by The American Jurist counsels against accepting the myth of near total common law dominance of American law. When I learned of Tellkampf’s German origin, I thought a presentation about him might interest Society members including those who have no particular interest in law. Hence the unassuming title: “J. L. Tellkampf: Transnational Jurist.” Writing the presentation up, I thought, should be a snap: “College Teacher Calls for Codes.” Only it wasn’t.

Tellkampf was more than a college teacher who wrote an interesting article on codification. He was a German legal scientist. He sided with
the Göttingen Seven against English tyranny in Hannover and, as a result, left for America. He had the support of Alexander von Humboldt in coming to America and from the illustrious Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story and literary icon Henry Wordsworth Longfellow in finding a place. Here he got to know an earlier generation of American codifiers and may have inspired the leader of the later one, David Dudley Field, Jr., America’s “Justinian”. In his writings he addressed goals of the Young America movement for legal, commercial and penal reform. He and his brother Theodore helped found one of America’s most respected penological institutions, the present-day Correctional Society of New York. As an observer of America, his observations are correctives to those of Alexis de Tocqueville. As a college teacher, he experienced ante-bellum false starts of a transition from American college to European-style university. To Francis Lieber, an earlier German scholar in America, he is said to have been “an eternal rival” to be discredited. Faced with limited opportunities in the United States, and greater opportunities in Germany, for legal science and for reform, in 1847 he chose to return to Germany to a position at the University of Breslau (present day Wroclaw), again with the support of Alexander von Humboldt. In Germany he was an important participant in the events of, before and after the March Revolution of 1848, contributed an American perspective to German constitutional issues and continued as professor in Breslau and as parliamentary delegate in Berlin to the end of his life in 1876.

That was too much for the short article that I had in mind, especially when there is no biography of this remarkable man to rest my remarks on. So, I have split my article in two, one is biographical (this one) and another is legal. This article is narrowed to his first forty years, is largely limited to his life in the United States, and even here, is without the benefit of archival research.
Tellkampf’s Family and Upbringing in Germany 1808-38

Johann Ludwig (sometimes Louis) Tellkampf was born January 28, 1808, in the small town of Bückeburg, then capital of the principality of Schaumburg-Lippe about thirty miles west of the city of Hanover. Tellkampf’s upbringing in splintered Kleinstaat Germany contributed to the acuity of his observations of ante-bellum federal America.

Tellkampf’s father, Johann Georg Dietrich Tellkampf (1771-1846), was secretary to Johann Ludwig von Wallmoden (1736-1811), one time commander-in-chief of the army of Hanover and regent of Schaumburg-Lippe until just before Tellkampf’s birth. Wallmoden himself was an illegitimate son of King George II of England.

In 1809 Tellkampf’s family moved to Heinde, about twenty-five miles south-southwest of Hanover. There his father administered a Wallmoden estate. In 1818 Tellkampf began Gymnasium (academic high school) in Braunschweig; he graduated in Hanover. In 1819 his father was chancery advisor (Kanzleirat) in Braunschweig. In 1835 his father was supervisor (Oberrevisor) of the accounting department of the State Church in Hanover.

Tellkampf’s older half-brother, Adolf Tellkampf (1798-1869), did not go to America. Adolf as a boy joined in the wars of liberation against Napoleon 1813-15. In 1822 he completed a doctorate in mathematics and began university teaching. Owing to financial necessity, in 1824 he gave up university and began secondary school teaching where he achieved recognition.

Although Adolf did not go to America, his daughter did. In Germany she married into the Sedgwick family of law reformers, one of whose offspring had come to study law in Heidelberg, Göttingen and Breslau, the last likely with his uncle’s colleague, J. L. Tellkampf.

Two of Tellkampf’s younger brothers, Theodore, a physician, and Herman, a businessman, did follow him and made their lives in the United States settling eventually in New York City. Theodore had a career as noted physician involved in the public life of the city. Hermann was a stock-broker.

Law Student and Legal Scientist at Göttingen

Spring 1828 Tellkampf matriculated at the University of Göttingen. He was twenty years old. Three years later, May 14, 1831, he completed a doctorate. The University was at the peak of its fame. It had the largest library in Germany. By American standards of the day, it was huge. It had about fifteen hundred students; Harvard, the largest of American institutions, that fall had only 401 students.
No American college or university, as some colleges called themselves, bore any resemblance to Göttingen. The best American college was rather more a German Gymnasium. Students in American colleges might be as young as thirteen or fourteen; the better schools aimed for sixteen as a minimum. “Teaching” meant superintending student reciting. The standard curriculum was a program of classical and mathematical studies. There was no system of advanced work and no reward for scholarship. There was little library support for such work. College management was in the hands of often distant trustees or was delegated to discretionary control of the president. There could be no talk from a German perspective of “scientific study.” Teaching meant drilling, quizzesing and recitation. Colleges, or at least Columbia College, was less about learning or libraries and more about sport.

The disparities between the law faculties of Harvard and Göttingen were greater still: Harvard Law School had one professor and six students. Göttingen’s law faculty had eleven or more faculty members and about six hundred students. Göttingen’s faculty of law alone was larger than all American law schools put together.

Göttingen drew students from all over Europe and from across the seas in America. In 1829 Göttingen had as many students from the United States as Harvard Law School had students from anywhere (six). Among the six was Harvard student and later Harvard professor, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, whom Tellkampf would get to know in New England in 1838. Longfellow gives an American’s admiring view of the University of Göttingen then. He wrote his father that he found “everything I imagined . . . the advantages for a student in my particular pursuits are certainly not over-rated.” He wrote his sister: “With Göttingen I am much delighted, though I have no other society than my books.” He wrote a friend: “I never saw so great advantages for a student.”

In Germany, then and now, law is a science. It is not a natural science, but a normative science. Legal scholars are legal scientists. Legal scholars add to knowledge. They are not teachers of a trade. In the United States, even today, law professors are likely to regard themselves as teachers of lawyers rather than as scholars of law. They lack dissertation doctorates in law.

After completing his doctorate in law, Tellkampf took an education tour of Germany, and then returned to Göttingen to pursue studies to qualify as professor. For this he had to write a second dissertation. In 1835 Tellkampf published both dissertations, one in Latin and one in German.

Both dissertations demonstrate Tellkampf’s devotion to legal methods and legislation. The Latin dissertation, De longa consuetudine, is about
custom in law. Tellkampf prefaced his Latin text with a quotation from Friedrich Schiller about legislation: “Only lawmakers labor on a self-acting, obstinate material—human freedom. Only imperfectly can they realize the ideals that they have so clearly in mind. But here the mere attempt deserves all praise, if undertaken with disinterested benevolence and presented with consistent moderation.”

Tellkampf’s habilitation, his “second dissertation,” is *Ueber Verbesserung des Rechtszustandes in den deutschen Staaten* (1835) (*About Improving the Condition of Law in the German States*). In his habilitation Tellkampf made the audacious proposal of creating in every German state separate authorities, subject to the executive, that would be concerned exclusively with law reform, including civil law legislation, court procedures in civil matters, and finally criminal law and procedure. The authorities were to clean up defects and controversies in the law and develop it. The habilitation is the basis of the *American Jurist* article on systematizing law.

While lecturing at Göttingen Tellkampf wrote a substantial article on a technical issue of civil procedure and, before leaving for the United States, submitted it for publication in what was then and today still is the leading German journal for civil procedure, *Archiv für die civilistische Praxis*. Its editor, C. F. A. Mittermaier, was among Germany’s leading jurists and the one most focused on comparative and foreign law. Mittermaier also edited the only comparative law journal, *Kritische Zeitschrift für Rechtswissenschaft und Gesetzgebung des Auslandes* and the leading criminal law journal, *Archiv des Criminalrechts*. Mittermaier’s journals took note of Tellkampf’s work. After J. L. Tellkampf’s return to Germany, Mittermaier published a lengthy report by Tellkampf’s brother Theodore, who was still in New York, about prison conditions in the United States. Whether Mittermaier corresponded with either Tellkampf is not known to me, but he is known to have corresponded extensively and much of his correspondence survives.

Mittermaier was intensely interested in developments in the United States and reported on them frequently. He was particularly interested in prison discipline. Before he had heard of Tellkampf, Mittermaier was in contact with a German who had gone to America ten years earlier, Francis (Franz) Lieber. Lieber and Mittermaier were in frequent letter correspondence to exchange publications. Lieber was Mittermaier’s intermediary to United States Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story, not only to obtain publications, but to publish Story’s work in Mittermaier’s journal. Then Lieber was better known in the United States than Tellkampf, but not necessarily in Germany. Today, on both sides of the Atlantic, Lieber is remembered while Tellkampf is forgotten.
The Göttingen Seven and Tellkampf’s Departure for America

**Vormärz** is the time before the March beginning of the 1848 Revolution in Germany when there was agitation for democracy and national unity.\(^{28}\) Among the most famous incidents of the **Vormärz** was that of the “Göttingen Seven.” It is still remembered today.\(^{29}\) The incident began when Victoria become queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland as George III’s granddaughter. Dynastic law precluded her from ruling her grandfather’s Kingdom of Hanover. So her uncle became Hanover’s King Ernest Augustus I. The new English king, son of America’s own tyrant, King George III, quickly overturned the liberal Hanover Constitution of 1834 and demanded that all state servants—including university faculty—take oaths of allegiance to him. Seven professors at the University of Göttingen, including the noted constitutional scholar Hugo and the brothers Grimm—refused. English King Ernest Augustus I dismissed the German renegades and expelled the non-Hanoverians from Hanover. Tellkampf, as *Privatdozent*, i.e., someone authorized to teach but not formally a faculty member, was not included among the Göttingen Seven, but he too refused to sign the loyalty oath and resigned from the University.

At this point, if not sooner, Alexander von Humboldt befriended Tellkampf. It appears that Humboldt arranged for authorization of Tellkampf to teach in the Prussian universities. When Tellkampf decided to go to the United States, it appears that Humboldt provided letters of introduction. How this friendship came to be—whether as a result of the Göttingen Seven’s defense against English tyranny in Hanover or in some other way—is not known to me. Humboldt was known to be “the protector of many unfortunate scholars.”\(^{30}\) He was a prolific letter writer; archival research might answer these questions.

Tellkampf did not have the urgent reason to depart Germany that Lieber did: imminent imprisonment. Tellkampf could have stayed in Hanover. Some sources suggest that to go to America he left behind an offer of professorship in Prussia.\(^{31}\) This seems unlikely. More likely he was offered the possibility of following the long and difficult course from *Privatdozent* to *Professor*.\(^{32}\) That he did go suggests that whatever offer he had in Germany was not more attractive than going to the United States.

The financial support, if any, that Tellkampf had for his trip is not known to me. By one account, Alexander von Humboldt himself made the trip possible. The *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* of 1908 attributes the trip to Humboldt: “He found in Alexander von Humboldt a protector who brought about his going to the United States for scientific studies.”\(^{33}\) Did that mean money?
If it was Humboldt, one wonders what Humboldt encouraged Tellkampf to study. It certainly was not the natural phenomenon that Humboldt had researched. Was it the legal system and its methods, i.e., a continuation of Tellkampf’s university studies? Rattermann, a German-American editor who knew Tellkampf’s brother Theodore, suggested that Tellkampf had decided “to make a scientific trip to England, France and North America to study the administration of justice from his own perspective.”34 Or did Tellkampf plan, with or without Humboldt’s counsel, to study something that he had yet to publish on, but would later, i.e., prison discipline reform, banking or constitutional law? Humboldt, as confidant of Prussian King Frederick William IV, would later discuss with Tellkampf and the King, prison reform. Or did Humboldt have another topic in mind? Currency was a current theme in the world. Humboldt just then had published a study of availability of metals for backing currency.35 Or might Humboldt have had yet another subject? Might it have been the United States of America as a model for a future United States of Germany? Bismarck, when a student at Göttingen in 1832/1833, wagered an American student, Amory Coffin, that German unity would occur within twenty years.36

Tellkampf apparently did have a governmental approval for his mission. Which ministry is uncertain. Tellkampf’s undated but necessarily post-1847 biography in Breslau stated that “The Royal Prussian Minister for Foreign Affairs supplied him with letters of introduction for this purpose.”37 In 1843 a German language newspaper in New York, reported that it was “das preußische Ministerium für die öffentlichen Unterricht mit Empfehlungen an den preußischen Gesandten in den Vereinigten Staaten, Hrn. V. Rönne.”38 Perhaps it was both.

Ministerial backing suggests that Tellkampf left Germany intending to study prison discipline. That was a topic already in discussion in Prussia and certainly safer than constitutional reform. Only a few years before, not only had the Frenchman Tocqueville made his famous study of American prisons, a Prussian penologist, Nikolaus Heinrich Julius made one too. Later in 1843 and in 1846, Humboldt and Tellkampf would discuss with the king prison reform. Whether a ministry provided money is not known to me. Tellkampf did not have the independent means that his French aristocrat counterpart Tocqueville did.

Many sources say he planned a scientific trip and none that I have seen speak of a planned permanent emigration. Still he may not have been certain in his own mind. He was unmarried. Two of his brothers, Theodore and Herman, did follow him and were immigrants who spent their adult lives here (although both returned to Germany to die). Theodore originally planned only a study trip of his own to hospitals and asylums.39
The American Legal Scene in 1838

When Tellkampf arrived in the United States in 1838 nascent efforts to develop a modern American system of law and legal education were at a zenith notwithstanding the Panic of 1837 and the Six Year Depression that followed.

Codification, that is, the stating the law in systematized legislation instead of in cases of judge-made common law, was center stage. In 1829, New York, under the leadership of three young, well-regarded lawyers, Benjamin F. Butler, John Duer and John C. Spencer, had revised its statutes. Foreign legal publications in England and in Germany took positive note and regarded the work as practically a code. In the 1830s Massachusetts and Pennsylvania followed suit. In Massachusetts agitation for a further-reaching codification that would incorporate and largely eliminate common law led to the appointment and a report of a five-member study committee led by America’s most illustrious active jurist of the day, Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story.\textsuperscript{40}

In 1838 professional legal education seemed to be about to turn a page from an older, practice-based English-style apprenticeship models to more science-oriented Continental European university style law faculties. The most successful proprietary law school, that is, a law school run by practitioners independent of a college, Litchfield had closed in 1835. The first law school of the new model, Harvard Law School, which had been near death in 1828 with only one faculty member and one graduate, had been resurrected with the appointment of Justice Story as lead faculty member. In 1838 it had three faculty and thirty graduates. Two of the three New York Revisers, Butler and Spencer seemed on their way toward creating new law faculties at New York University in New York City and Hamilton College in Clinton, New York. Butler, by then Attorney General of the United States, had made the most progress. With a view toward learning from the Prussian model, New York University held inaugural lectures in April 1838.\textsuperscript{41} Out west, in Cincinnati, Timothy Walker, a student of Story’s first class, had himself begun a law school. In the South, David Hoffman was still struggling with legal education in Maryland, published the second edition of his \textit{Course of Legal Studies}, which Story had favorably reviewed in its first edition.\textsuperscript{42}

Everywhere in the United States, it seems, there was talk of creating a science of law. Harvard law school at its formal re-founding in 1833 was looking to a science of law.\textsuperscript{43} That idea is in the title of Butler’s proposal in New York in 1835.\textsuperscript{44}
A science of law needs scientific publications. Again, Justice Story took the lead. Instead of publishing a general, Blackstone-like all-encompassing commentary such as his friend and rival, Chancellor James Kent had done, beginning in 1833 he published a series of subject-oriented commentaries that drew upon European law, were noted in Europe, and dominated legal publishing in America for decades after his death in 1845.

A critical literature was forming: works for systematizing jurists, reforming politicians, and future-thinking traders. *The American Jurist and Law Magazine* under the editorship of Georg Hillard in 1838 was in its tenth year of publication. As Tellkampf arrived, John O’Sullivan brought out the first issues of *the United States Magazine and Democratic Review*. Just after Tellkampf arrived, Freeman Hunt brought out the first issues of *the Merchants’ Magazine and Commercial Review*. Tellkampf got to know all three men and was represented in all three of their journals, each of which led the country in its respective field.

**Tellkampf in Cambridge (Summer 1838)**

Tellkampf arrived in New York City July 4, 1838. He soon went to Cambridge. There he met with Justice Story. Story was keenly interested in foreign law. Francis Lieber was Story’s source for German law and intermediary to Germany’s leading comparative scholar, C. F. A. Mittermaier. But by 1838, Lieber had left Cambridge for a position at South Carolina College. I am aware of no record of the meeting.

Whatever was the nature of the meeting, Story gave Tellkampf a letter of introduction to Henry Wordsworth Longfellow, then Smith Professor of Modern Languages at Harvard College. As Smith Professor of Modern Languages Longfellow was responsible for modern language instruction at Harvard and that summer had been seeking a replacement teacher for German and French. Tellkampf did not wait for Longfellow to return to Cambridge but tracked him down to his boyhood home in Portland Maine where he was summering. By the time Tellkampf reached Portland, however, Longfellow had filled the position.

August 16, 1838, Longfellow wrote his friend George Hillard that Tellkampf and he had had a pleasant visit: “Another out-lander walked in yesterday morning without knocking. He proved to be an exiled Professor from Göttingen by name Tellkampf, with a letter from Judge Story. He passed the day with me. A very social, pleasant person—somewhat tinged with the green vanity, which every German *Privat-Docent* is clothed with.” Longfellow wrote Hillard as editor of the *American Jurist* that Tellkampf was “desirous of inflicting an Article” upon that journal; “pensively adum-
Some three years later the American Jurist did publish a Tellkampf article—surely the one discussed with Longfellow.

A little more than three weeks later, Tellkampf saw Longfellow again, this time in Cambridge while visiting Charles Beck, a German teaching at Harvard. September 2, Longfellow wrote his father, who also had met Tellkampf in Maine: “He speaks of his day with us in Portland as one of the pleasantest he has passed in America. The coffee and cigars in the back yard he looks upon as the most delicate attention he has received anywhere.” Tellkampf’s plans for America must have still been up in the air. Longfellow continued in his letter to his father: “He proposes to pass the Winter in Boston; and deliver a course of Lectures on the Various Schools of German Philosophy. I think the plan very good.” But Tellkampf’s plans soon changed. By month’s end, he was lecturing at Union College in Schenectady New York.

Tellkampf kept up his relationship with Longfellow, at least for a while. They got together again in Cambridge the next year for an evening of frivolity. December 5, 1839, Longfellow wrote his father of the visit, poking a little fun at Tellkampf for his English pronunciation, but reminding his father of Tellkampf’s visit to Portland and reasons for coming to America: “Do you remember Dr. Tellkampf, the German, who visited me last summer in Portland—no, the Summer before—and smoked under the trees after dinner? The same who was banished from Göttingen, because, as he said, the “King of Hanover wanted him to swallow his oats’ (oaths) and he would not.”

Longfellow followed up with news of Tellkampf’s appointment at Union: “He is professor in Union College, Schenectady; and teaches there Civil Polity, French, Italian and German. I never see him, that he does not allude to the cigar and coffee after dinner, under the trees. It took him captive entirely. It was he says, so German!”

Tellkampf based in Schenectady NY
(Union College, Fall 1838 to Spring 1843)

September 26, 1838, Tellkampf was in Schenectady in upstate New York at Union College lecturing on Roman law and political economy. Less than a year later, in July 1839 at the College’s annual commencement,
the Board of Trustees recommended the appointment of “Louis Tellkampf, of Göttingen, teacher of Latin, Modern languages and civil polity, as professor to be paid up to $1000 a year.”

This was no ordinary commencement. Tellkampf had landed in the right place at the right time—at least, the best landing possible in America in 1839. The ambitions of Union College’s flamboyant President Dr. Eliphalet Nott were at their apogee. His biographer writes of July 1839: “By Commencement of 1839 Union College . . . was in a unique position. It was potentially the wealthiest college in America. Waiting for the end of what appeared to be only a temporary faltering of the economy, [Nott] could turn his mind again to university planning, for it was a Union College transforming itself into a University which more and more took hold of his imagination. Much had been done.” He towered over Union College’s Board of Trustees.

Tellkampf’s hiring was one thing that Nott had done. Nott’s biographer observes that the Board “had only to attend the graduating exercises to sense a changing land. . . . the addresses given by the graduating seniors, many of them no more than seventeen or eighteen, boys who now spoke gravely to their elders on [adult topics]. . . . And there were literary criticisms of Goethe and Schiller . . . inspired no doubt by Professor Louis Tellkampff [sic], of Goettingen, teacher of Latin, Modern Languages, and Civil Polity’. . . .” The Board of Trustees received a finance committee proposal to apply to the State in order to establish “New Schools . . . new professorships . . . new scholarships . . . and an observatory” to be associated with Union College. The College seemed on the verge of a great expansion.

Commencement in July 1839 brought to Union College as trustees the newly elected governor of New York State, William Seward, and the newly elected Secretary of State, John C. Spencer, who was also Superintendent of Schools. Both would have roles in Tellkampf’s professional future. Spencer had been one of the three drafters of the New York Revised Statutes of 1929. He recently had given tangible expression to his interest in a science of law and legal education: in 1835 he edited the first American edition of Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America*. In 1835 Spencer had proposed establishing a law school at Union’s upstate New York competitor Hamilton College. When in the 1850s Nott was wrapped up in charges of financial misconduct, Spencer would prove Nott’s best friend.

Also at the meeting was Union College’s new Vice President and Nott’s son-in-law, Alonzo Potter. Potter and Nott shared ambitions for Union College, but Potter’s was less “Messianic” and more “academically conventional.” Potter was himself an early American academic. As an or-
dained minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church and later Bishop of Philadelphia, he was one of five ministers counted as the “clerical school of political economy.” Later, at Columbia Tellkampf got to know another, Reverend John McVickar. One of the Board’s actions that day was to add Potter to the Library Committee to do something about the library that four years before it had found wanting.

Tellkampf the Legal Scientist at Union College

Tellkampf seems not to have disappointed either Nott or Potter, notwithstanding their different orientations. Criticism from the former we have none; praise from the latter we have in quantity. Tellkampf played for them both. He seems to have done what he might have at a German university.

Tellkampf supported Potter in the latter’s tasks from the mundane to the ambitious. When Potter wrote texts, Tellkampf helped. For a second volume of Potter’s 1841 textbook *Political Economy*, Tellkampf wrote chapters on currency and banking. Potter in the foreword to volume 1, the only volume to appear, thanked Tellkampf. Of Potter’s 1842 *Manual for Schools* Tellkampf is reported to have helped Potter. In Potter’s 1843 *Handbook for Readers*, Potter thanks for legal work a “professional friend” who likely was Tellkampf. So Tellkampf (apparently) brought to the attention of their junior colleague and later college librarian, Pearson, the German practice of libraries exchanging duplicate books to help strengthen the library Potter had charge of.

It was through Potter’s work in book publishing, it seems, that Tellkampf met Francis Lieber, who came to Schenectady in 1841 to discuss publishing Lieber’s book, *Property and Labour*. Potter arranged for its publication with Harper & Brothers and wrote an 18-page introduction. Harper’s initial print run in 1841 in the first of what would be seven printings was 15,000 copies, 10,000 for school libraries and the remaining 5,000 as No. 146 in its Family Library series.

Nott must have been proud of the scientific work that Tellkampf was doing in legislation, banking and prison discipline and glad for the luster it was bringing Union College. The article that Tellkampf brought to Longfellow in 1838 appeared in the *American Jurist* beginning in October 1841. Tellkampf himself reported that Spencer’s father, then Chief Justice of New York’s highest court, wrote him to signal his appreciation. Its auspicious appearance in October 1841 means that David Dudley Field, Jr., might have relied on it in his first substantial publication on codification: open letters to New York Assembly (Young American) John
O’Sullivan, dated January 1, 1842, and written just after Field’s defeat in the 1841 election.

In 1842 Tellkampf published two articles in Freeman Hunt’s Merchants’ Magazine and Commercial Review. Hunt’s newly founded magazine is in the spirit of Nott’s views of education. Tellkampf’s articles were probably based on, or may have been, the chapters that he prepared for Potter’s Political Economy.\textsuperscript{72}

In 1843, Tellkampf gave tangible form—and showed courage—when he took on Charles Dickens’ critique of American prison discipline.\textsuperscript{73} By 1843 Tellkampf had visited—and revisited—many American prisons. The topic then called “prison discipline” was a leading one for comparison. It was the ground for not only Tocqueville’s nine-month visit to the United States in 1831 to 1832, but also that of the Prussian Nikolaus Heinrich Julius. It was a topic of keen interest to Mittermaier.

Prison discipline was one area where Europe looked to America for new ideas to replace capital punishment, transportation to prison colonies and inhumane prisons. The United States presented two competing models, both intended to prevent prisoners from contaminating each other. The one was the “silent model,” so-called because it allowed prisoners to work together, but required that they maintain silence. Associated with the New York prison at Auburn in upstate New York, prisons maintained silence with physical punishment (the lash). The other model was known as the “separate model” to those who approved of it, or “solitary confinement,” to those who did not. The idea was that prisoners would be completely separated from each other, but would receive constant attention and instruction from caretakers. Proponents of one or the other system, or modifications thereof, fought bitterly for their positions.

From Union College Tellkampf carried out research on American prisons. During the three vacation periods of each year, he visited prisons in the northeast that could be reached by rail or boat.\textsuperscript{74} Fortunately, the principal prisons for his visit could be so reached. Auburn Prison in New York is about 150 miles west then reachable not far from the Erie Canal, Sing Sing Prison is on the Hudson River about 135 miles south reachable by Hudson River Steamer, and the Pennsylvania State Prison was in Philadelphia. Tellkampf inspected and re-inspected many different prisons and similar institutions.\textsuperscript{75}

The furthest west that Tellkampf went was to Columbus. Either in the course of that trip or another, in January 1842, he visited Cincinnati. There his brother Theodore, who collaborated with him on the study, was practicing medicine. Theodore visited many of the same prisons, although I do not know how often they visited together.\textsuperscript{76} How he financed these trips I
do not know. He was not independently wealthy and his salary from Union College was not munificent.

Tellkampf in presenting his scholarship, notwithstanding the “greenish vanity” seen by Longfellow, or the “flippancy” noted by Pearson, respected the sensitivities of his audiences to foreign criticism. He appended to his 1842 article this note: “The writer of this article, Professor Tellkampf, is entirely disinterested in his views, and has no wish to come with the sphere of political contention; he is simply desirous of contributing towards the full discussion of a few of the most important questions regarding the currency, now agitated in this country.” He prefaced his remarks at the first meeting of the Prison Association of New York in 1842: “I may be permitted to contribute a small share of information upon the subject in question, and expect to be indulged in a candid criticism on the creditable experiments in this country in prison reform; for impartial criticism is the best service that can be rendered where the end aimed at is still greater reform.” Tellkampf tried to distance himself from politics and to adopt the mantle of scientific neutrality.

Tellkampf the Teacher at Union College

Tellkampf joined the Union College faculty in 1838 to lecture on Political Economy and Roman Law. With Tellkampf there Union College for the first time divided its course offerings into eight “departments,” including “Moral and Political Economy under the care of Professors Alonzo Potter, Reed and Tellkampf.” Texts included Kent’s Commentaries on American Law and Guizot’s History of Civilization. Tellkampf taught a variety of courses in law, history and political economy. He was the first faculty member to have history in his title. He sometimes also taught German. With his departure, for a time history at Union College fell into the “doldrums.”

One remarkable source for the history of Union College, including of Tellkampf there, is the private diary kept over 47 years by Jonathan Pearson, a colleague junior to Tellkampf. The diary—long known—was first published in this century. Pearson, a frequent critic of President Nott in his diary, is consistently complimentary of Tellkampf. His wry comments are reminiscent of those of Longfellow. On first meeting Pearson described Tellkampf as “A very smart, flippant little fellow and of considerable talents and acquirements. In the recent difficulties at the University [of Göttingen] with Prince Ernst he was among those Pro[ffessors] who were sent away.” He recorded that a student with whom Tellkampf de-
veloped a mentor type relationship had learned German and had translated for publication Tellkampf’s brother’s book on mathematics. 

In his March 4, 1842, entry, Pearson reported that Tellkampf had suddenly left Schenectady to follow a job prospect in New York City: an appointment at Columbia College. Pearson wrote that Tellkampf “hopes to get the appointment, although I think it doubtful.” More likely, thought Pearson, was that Lieber or another German, “both somewhat distinguished,” would. Still, Pearson described Tellkampf as worthy competitor for the post: “a right clever fellow in the Yankee sense, gentlemanly, kind-hearted, a ripe scholar and persevering . . .”

It is in this entry that one finds the only negative comment from Pearson about Tellkampf. Pearson thought that it “would be well for Un. Coll. if he would leave that his salary might be applied to some better use.” Pearson had in mind where that salary might go: to himself. Less than seven weeks before, his plea to Potter for promotion to professor and for a full salary had been brushed off. By way of justification Pearson noted in his diary of Tellkampf that he: “knows little of our Am[erican] way of teaching. Don’t succeed as a teacher or lecturer. [sic].” No other entries suggest animosity of any kind; other entries are sympathetic.

Half a year later Pearson recorded an autumn outing with Tellkampf much like the one that Longfellow reported: “Glorious day—one of those soft balmy fall days so delightful to enjoy. With Dr. Tellkampf walked to the Aqueduct. A pleasant companion like him, with a cigar and apple, a beautiful day, and gorgeous autumn foliage, wide prospects of the Mohawk, and distant murmurs of the rips at the Aqueduct. These are enough to make a pleasant foot jaunt. This we had; and an appetite for supper.”

Tellkampf did his share of service to school and community. Notwithstanding his research travels, he faithfully attended all of the semiannual faculty meetings held while he was at Union from 1838 to 1843. He helped out Secretary of State Spencer in common school education. He contributed to ex-Governor William Dix’s Northern Light journal. He gave instructions on setting up the first Christmas trees in Troy New York.

Tellkampf did get the post at Columbia. In April 1843 Columbia College Trustees created the Professorship of the German Language and Literature. In June they appointed Tellkampf Gebhard Professor. The American press, both English-language and German language, noted the appointment; the latter added that the Columbia Trustees had chosen Tellkampf nearly unanimously out of many candidates. The German-language press in Europe reported the appointment following the New York German-language report.
Tellkampf and Union College parted on good terms. William H. Seward, who counted himself a faithful “Pupil of Nott,” Union College alumnus, and formerly as Governor of New York a trustee of Union College, had himself recommended Tellkampf to Columbia.\textsuperscript{94} When two years later Union College celebrated its semi-centennial, with Spencer presiding, Tellkampf was among the invited honored celebrants. Among eleven toasters he alone delivered a laudation in Latin.\textsuperscript{95}

Tellkampf is reported to have told a German-American publisher of his positive memories of Union College, its students and faculty. The publisher wrote: “He was active there until 1843 and with great success. Many professors and students had him teach them German language and literature, and he declared his complete satisfaction with the enthusiasm with which they studied the language and literature of the German people.”\textsuperscript{96}

**Tellkampf’s Research and Job Trip Home (Summer/Fall 1843)**

By summer 1843, when appointed to the Gebhard Chair, Tellkampf had made substantial progress in his research work on prison reform. In January he had published in the United States in English an extended rebuttal to Charles Dickens criticism of the Pennsylvania “separate” system of prison discipline.\textsuperscript{97} Still in the first half of the year while at Union College, Tellkampf published in Germany a preliminary report of aspects of his American visits.\textsuperscript{98} The German journal’s co-editor, who himself only a few years before had visited American prisons, thanked Tellkampf for permitting publication of “fundamental as well as meritorious unpublished work” and noted both Tellkampf’s extensive visits to American prisons and his “penetrating” observations. Later that year Mittermaier reported on Tellkampf’s observations and on his efforts independently to verify them through his U.S. contacts.\textsuperscript{99}

Tellkampf sought and received from Columbia College permission to defer taking up the position in New York until New Year 1844.

With the time made available, Tellkampf returned to the Continent and stopped off in England to visit two prisons with a letter of introduction from the German Ambassador Bunsen. Back in Germany he rekindled his contacts in a way one might call a big blaze. He discussed prison reform with the King of Prussia himself, Friedrich Wilhelm IV. After the meeting, his sponsor Alexander von Humboldt, who met daily with the King and probably sat in on the meeting, wrote him on November 14, 1843:

> To the most favorable impression which you have made through talent, knowledge and modesty upon the King and all his Secretar-
ies and the Counsellor of the Cabinet Mr. Müller, I have nothing to add. They find you valuable for the University and almost indispensable for the projects of the penitentiaries.\textsuperscript{100}

Tellkampf was exploring an appointment in Prussia, but as Humboldt predicted in his letter, the matter was not resolved before Tellkampf left Germany November 23. Humboldt wrote "Knowing as I do the affairs from close observation I must advise and counsel caution," nonetheless wrote "I consider it certain that we shall gain you for the Fatherland in an honorable manner rewarded,—now or after a year."\textsuperscript{101} Tellkampf returned to New York City in time to commence teaching at Columbia College Winter 1844. By then Young America was in full flower in New York City.

\textbf{Columbian Competition and Tellkampf’s Choice}

Tellkampf’s decision to accept the chair at Columbia College was not the simple choice that one might imagine today. In choosing Columbia College, he chose New York City over Schenectady. He did not choose Columbia College over Union College. Tellkampf’s choice of cities worked out; his choice of colleges did not.

\textit{Young America in New York City}

American historians call the 1830s to the early 1850s an age of reform. Within that age they place “Young America.” They use Young America both to identify a movement and as a label for the times. They see it both as a literary and as a political phenomenon.\textsuperscript{102} In politics they associate it with “New Democrats” and with John Louis O’Sullivan’s journal \textit{The United States Magazine and Democratic Review}. They note Young America’s affinity with similarly named phenomena abroad, e.g., Young Europe, Young Germany, Young France, and Young Italy, that culminated in Revolutions in 1848.\textsuperscript{103} They remind us that of Young America Lincoln said: “Is he not the inventor and the owner of the present and the sole hope of the future?”\textsuperscript{104}

Historians see the political issues of Young America in codification, law reform,\textsuperscript{105} banking, free trade, infrastructure improvement and a new international consciousness extending to support for the revolutions of 1848 in Europe. Slavery is largely absent. Historians see the principal players of Young America in New York as David Dudley Field, Jr., John L. O’Sullivan, the Sedgwick family, and Benjamin F. Butler.
Historians associate Young America geographically with New York: an intended shift from Boston and its Brahmins and Philadelphia and its patriots to New York and its merchants. This “new American culture,” one historian writes, naturally emanated from New York City, already undergoing a stunning metamorphosis.” New York was outstripping all rivals. “As it became the great emporium of American commerce, it inevitably emerged as the nation’s cultural marketplace as well, attracted a swarm of intellectuals . . . .”

Tellkampf was one of those intellectuals. Schenectady was almost in “the larger cultural region” of ante-bellum New York City: the rough triangle between New York, Albany and Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

Even before the advent of literary Young America, New York had set the direction for legal reform: the New York Revised Statutes of 1829. Begun as a simple compilation of statutes in force, it ended as a true revision intended to make laws simpler and better. Three young lawyers carried it out: Benjamin F. Butler, John Duer and Tellkampf’s collaborator, John C. Spencer.

For Tellkampf, the legal scholar, the allure of New York over Schenectady was likely more important than Columbia College over Union College. Political and commercial capitals draw legal scientists: where else can one better impact the law than where it is made and plays out? Capitals have better libraries. They have more to do. For a bachelor German in America, New York City offered a vibrant German community.

Francis Lieber: Tellkampf’s Stealth Competitor

If junior colleague Pearson knew that Francis Lieber was a competitor for the Columbia post, Tellkampf surely did too. What Tellkampf might not have known is that Lieber was out to discredit him. Tellkampf was Lieber’s “eternal competitor” in America and in Europe.

Lieber is often seen as founder of political science in the United States, but in 1843 an appointment at Columbia was still fifteen years’ in the future. In 1843, Lieber was stuck at South Carolina College in Columbia, South Carolina and desperate to leave.

Lieber’s training in Germany was in mathematics and not in law. About ten years older than Tellkampf, he came to the United States about ten years sooner under similar political circumstances and with similar high-level encouragement. But Lieber had no choice but to flee: he had been imprisoned and was under sentence of imprisonment. Not until he was pardoned in 1843 could he safely return to Prussia.
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Lieber in the United States got to know Justice Story, whom he enlisted to provide the American law entries for America’s first encyclopedia, the *Encyclopedia Americana*, based on Germany’s popular *Conversation’s Lexikon*. Lieber befriended Tocqueville and translated (and transformed) Tocqueville’s report on American prisons. Unable to obtain a position at Harvard or elsewhere in the Northeast, he accepted one at the College of South Carolina.

As a lover of liberty, Lieber was desperate to escape the South and slavery and to get to the North. In 1842 his own position was tenuous: he was too well known as an opponent of slavery. As Pearson expected, Lieber did apply for the Columbia position. May 19, 1842, he wrote privately to Columbia Trustee Samuel B. Ruggles of his interest in the “German professorship.” The two had met previously, but were not yet friends. Lieber wrote of his present salary, $2500, and of his family’s need to at least match that. He hoped that Professor Reverend John McVickar, who taught political economy might be chosen as new president so that part of his salary could be used to fund a chair for Lieber. That summer Lieber went to New York and visited Ruggles and William Kent, Chancellor Kent’s son and himself a Columbia trustee. Lieber went home encouraged.

In January of 1843 Ruggles updated Lieber on progress of the process: applications were “measured by the cubic yard.” The chair was not yet established as Columbia had not yet received the bequest. Ruggles told Lieber that the College’s finances precluded paying more than the interest on the $20,000 bequest, which would have been less than half the $2500 Lieber was seeking. Ruggles added, however, that the Trustees would consent that the “German Professor” devote a considerable portion of his time to classes other than those in the College or to any other literary pursuit.

Although Lieber’s salary requirements precluded his getting the post, Lieber is reported to have been “disgusted” by Tellkampf’s appointment and “galled” by it. Lieber’s 20th century biographer put the appointment down without dignifying Tellkampf with a name: the trustees “appointed an impecunious young immigrant who would accept it for far less than would Professor Lieber.”

In summer 1843, when Tellkampf was off to Germany to restore ties there, Lieber traveled North, this time to Cambridge, to mend fences with Longfellow, with whom he had been a continuing friend, and to discuss with Justice Story possibilities for endowing a chair for Lieber at Harvard Law School. Lieber had no law degree, so his possibilities at a law school were remote.

When Lieber was finally, after nearly two decades in exile, able to return to Prussia in summer 1844 King Frederick William IV himself spoke
to Lieber of Tellkampf’s visit. He counted Tellkampf as an American not fully convinced of the separate system of prison discipline.\textsuperscript{116} The King suggested that Lieber speak with Humboldt. Lieber had already met Humboldt decades before. Lieber sought Humboldt’s help in getting a Prussian position similar to that Tellkampf might have had in mind, professor of penology and general inspector of prisons.\textsuperscript{117}

Lieber did not keep his dislike for his competitor Tellkampf to himself. As his 21st century biographer reports, it’s remarkable how personal interest can color subjective descriptions.\textsuperscript{118} She relates criticisms that are personal. To his wife, in 1843, Lieber described Tellkampf as “that disagreeable fellow . . . a Hanoverian, ein fader, ekelhafter Laffe (a stale, disgusting popinjay).”

In November, after the visit with the king, Lieber warned Tocqueville against this “fool [who] has done a great deal of mischief. He has written a book, in which he proposes the silliest things. . . .”\textsuperscript{119} In 1844 Lieber would gladly have stayed in Germany. Unfortunately, Heidelberg did not offer him a position and the administrative position the King offered paid too little. Lieber’s work against Tellkampf still did not stop. Lieber held out that he might be named as representative of the 1848 National Assembly to the United States. He warned the scholar and politician von Mohl of his fears that Tellkampf might get the job.\textsuperscript{120}

Tellkampf based in New York City  
(Columbia College Appointment Summer 1843 to Spring 1847)

Tellkampf’s actual time in New York City turned out to be short: not even three full years. Appointed in early summer 1843, he spent summer and fall 1843 abroad. At last in New York City in winter 1843/1844, he may not have started teaching until April 1844. He then did teach two full academic years: 1844-45 and 1845-46. He was again abroad for fall 1846 to follow through on a study requested by Prussia. It appears that he returned for winter 1846/1847, only to be gone for good to Germany in spring 1847, when he sent in from Berlin his letter of resignation to Columbia College. His brother Theodore, who himself had moved to New York City, covered for him teaching commitments in 1847 and possibly earlier.

Columbia College allowed Tellkampf to defer the start of teaching and accepted his proposal that his salary fund a German collection in the library to create a German collection. As part of his trip he acquired books for the collection.\textsuperscript{121} Although not reputed to be divisive point, as well
as the trip fit into to Tellkampf’s development as a legal scientist, it can hardly have helped him get off to a good start as a teacher.

**International Legal Scientist in New York City**

In real time Tellkampf was in New York City for about 2½ years, more-or-less from January 1844 to June 1846.

Those years should not have disappointed him. He seems to have used them well to develop his professional career as legal scientist. He put his work in prison discipline front-and-center, but had ample opportunities in international commercial law, and good prospects for future work in law reform. His work blended the scholarly and the practical.\(^\text{122}\) In his work and opportunities in all three areas, the overlap among the people involved in each is remarkable. Young Americans were involved in all three areas. He even got to know the literary side of Young America, i.e., he befriended Edgar Allan Poe in his journal and public life. He may have influenced Poe’s views on monetary issues.\(^\text{123}\)

“Prison discipline reform” was the main theme for Tellkampf on his return in early 1844. Just as he was getting to New York City, his book reporting his findings in America was being published back home. It found much interest in Germany because of interest in how the United States was handling the issue. The first sentence of one review explained that some Germans saw prison reform as the one truly new scientific idea to come out of the new world.\(^\text{124}\) Reviews were not all positive\(^\text{125}\)—for the topic was controversial—but there was interest in prison reform throughout the western world\(^\text{126}\) and Tellkampf was at the heart of it.

A Democratic election victory in 1842 resulted in John W. Edmonds becoming the president of the new board of inspections at Sing Sing prison. Edmonds began to follow through on promised prison reform. When the legislature failed to deliver Edmonds took his case to the public. He enlisted prominent Democrats as well as both Tellkampf brothers to found the Prison Association of New York, today’s Correctional Association of New York.\(^\text{127}\)

Edmonds assigned a central role to the two Tellkampf brothers—the German experts in prison discipline reform. They were two of the eight signers of a circular distributed November 25, 1844, calling for a meeting December 6 to form a “Prison Association” whose objects were to be “amelioration of the condition of prisoners,” “improvement of Prison Discipline generally,” and “relief of discharged convicts, by affording them the means of obtaining an honest livelihood.” The notice that accompanied
the circular, signed by 62 leading citizens, was published in the New York newspapers December 3.

When the organizing meeting came Tellkampf, (i.e., the elder brother J. Louis) had a starring role. He was one of only four people to offer resolutions to the founding body. He came right after Theodore Sedgwick, Jr. The Report of that first meeting prints only three addresses: the one by Tellkampf takes up a quarter of the 64-page report.\textsuperscript{128} One sees reflected in Tellkampf’s call for prison discipline reform his abiding interest in rational legislation that went back to Göttingen: “The true end design of government is legal security, which can not be preserved without the controlling force of criminal law. The power of the criminal law depends upon the approval of public opinion. The law must, therefore, necessarily be so reasonable that enlightened public opinion can approve of it.”\textsuperscript{129}

Among the Association’s most substantial accomplishments in its first eighteen months (in May 1846) was to win from the legislature legal authority for the Association itself to inspect prisons.\textsuperscript{130} Tellkampf soon made use of that authority.\textsuperscript{131}

Tellkampf remained with the Association through its first years until he returned to Germany. When he returned to Germany, he became one of its foreign corresponding members. For years after the Association and others remembered him for his role in its founding.\textsuperscript{132} His younger brother Theodore continued as an active member for many years.\textsuperscript{133}

Earlier in 1844 before establishment of the Prison Association, Field’s old ally, editor of the \textit{United States Magazine and Democratic Review}, and quintessential Young American, John L. O’Sullivan, founded a national organization for abolition of the death penalty\textsuperscript{134} At the second annual meeting of that association in February 1845 Tellkampf became a member of its “Committee of Five” led by Horace Greeley.\textsuperscript{135}

Even while in New York City Tellkampf’s work in prison discipline reform remained international. Access to American prisons helped him report abroad as well. His German visit and publications paid off back home. In March 1846 Tellkampf reported to Columbia’s Board of Trustees that he had received a call to “to a full Professorship of Civil Polity, Political Economy and Law (‘Staatwissenschaften’)” and as “counselor of State.” Tellkampf had already been in touch with members of Columbia’s Board and with the President about the possibility. Then he was not yet prepared to give up his position at Columbia. He asked the full Board for a leave of absence and wrote of his conflict between his adopted country and his native country as well as of his wish to facilitate reform in both places:
Though this call in a pecuniary point is very advantageous and holds out the prospect of a prominent position in the government of my native country, still I must say that I do not wish to resign my present situation. I have become strongly attached to this country, I have resided here for seven years and have acquired a large circle of friends, to whom I am under the greatest obligations for innumerable acts of kindness and to whom I am attached by my many associations. Still there is that in the call of the Prussian government to which I cannot be insensible. I owe in common with every man something to the country of my birth, and if an opportunity is presented of being in any degree useful to it, I feel a very natural desire to contribute my share. In the call I have received that opportunity is presented. The Prussian government are about engaging in a most thorough and extensive reform upon a subject to which I have paid close attention for many years and upon which I have had the opportunity of attaining minute information viz: the penitentiary system and prison discipline generally. Were I permitted to visit Prussia, I might say, without egotism, that it would be in my power to make myself useful to the government in this respect; and it would be also not unlikely that I should be enabled from the experience I have had in this country to offer many valuable suggestions upon matters equally important. In this view I venture to ask leave of absence for the coming Collegiate year.¹³⁶

Law Systematization. Tellkampf was one of the fifteen original members of the Prison Association’s Committee on Prison Discipline. That committee included the leaders in New York City of law systematization in New York. It included two of the three authors of the 1829 Revised Statutes of the recent past: Benjamin F. Butler and John Duer. From the present-day it included John O’Sullivan and Theodore Sedgwick, Jr., who were David Dudley Field’s closest allies and still, as of then, not yet eclipsed by him. Sullivan, as already noted, had sponsored Field’s first legislation in the State Assembly. Sedgwick was Field’s law office partner. The Committee included two future judges who would espouse law systematization, Charles P. Daly¹³⁷ and the Association’s founder, John W. Edmonds.¹³⁸ Field himself was not a member of the Association nor was John C. Spencer.

In 1845 proponents of constitutional amendments that would address debt and internal improvements, succeeded in getting the legislature to authorize a constitutional convention. The Constitution of 1846 that resulted
included two separate codification mandates: one to codify rules of practice and procedure, the other to codify substantive law. For more than forty years following these two constitutional mandates would be the basis for codification in New York. David Dudley Field, Jr. would eventually be in charge of each. For the moment, however, in 1845 and 1846, he was in the background as others brought the mandates into being. May 13, 1845, the legislature approved the law authorizing a constitutional convention; November 4, 1845, the voters overwhelmingly approving holding a convention. June 1, 1846, the constitutional convention convened in Albany, where on October 9, 1846, it concluded its deliberations and proposed a constitution. November 3, 1846, the voters overwhelmingly approved the Constitution of 1846; it went into effect on January 1, 1847.

I have found no evidence that Tellkampf participated in these efforts although they surely must have excited his interest. By the time the constitution convention was underway he was occupied with renewing his prison investigation. He was abroad when it carried through its work. The commissions that resulted from its mandates did not come into being until 1847. The practice commission almost immediately bore fruit in new code of civil procedure in 1848, but the second commission went moribund and did not accomplish much until reinvigorated under Field in the latter years of the following decade. In 1875 Tellkampf reported that Field sent him copies of the draft codes and stated that he believed that his original articles in the *American Jurist* had helped bring about the two code commissions that Field came to chair.

**Commercial Policy (Political Economy):** Freeman Hunt’s newly established *Merchants’ Magazine and Commercial Register* was the focus of Tellkampf’s work in commercial policy in New York City. Freeman Hunt is not identified by the histories of Young America as among the group, but perhaps he should be. Along with the two Tellkampf brothers, Hunt was one of the eight signatories of the circular of November 1844 calling for foundation of the Prison Association. *Hunt’s Merchant’s Magazine*—as it was most commonly known—reported on the commercial issues important to Young America and sometimes supported their positions.

*Hunt’s Merchant Magazine* was progressive in its use of and reporting of statistics. It combined the practical and the theoretical. Biographical sketches of Tellkampf note his involvement with it. Besides possibly contributing news and intelligence for the journal, Tellkampf published six articles under his own name and most likely wrote a seventh of unidentified authorship. The first two appeared in 1842 when he was still at Union College and probably followed from his work with Professor Potter. They
were directed to monetary policy, which was a hot topic. Later articles focused on international commercial policy. Tellkampf was among the first authors to call to break the British transatlantic mail shipping monopoly. Later, in 1852 a proposal for federal involvement became a Young American issue before Congress.\textsuperscript{143} Tellkampf’s work on the mail monopoly may have helped him to develop contacts with German shipping and diplomatic leaders in America. In December 1844 Hunt published an article that most likely Tellkampf wrote: “Germany and the Commercial Treaty of Berlin.”\textsuperscript{144}

Twenty years later, the successor to Hunt recalled Tellkampf’s contributions to the \textit{Merchants’ Magazine} in the 1840s and printed a later work of Tellkampf, “Money and Banks.” The editor prefaced it with a lengthy biographical footnote: “Professor J. L. Tellkampf is an economist of high standing, both in Europe and America. Some of our readers are, undoubtedly, acquainted with him personally. It will be remembered that he was in the country about eight years, and at that period contributed many valuable articles to the pages of the \textit{Merchants’ Magazine}, occupying at that same time important positions, first in the faculty in Union College, and subsequently filling the Gibbard [sic] German Professorship in Columbia College, New York city.”\textsuperscript{145}

\textit{Tellkampf’s Teaching Troubles at Columbia}

As successful as was Tellkampf’s professional sojourn in New York City, was disappointing his time teaching at Columbia College.

Columbia College was no Göttingen. It was no university. It was no Harvard Law School. It was no Union College. To Tellkampf it may have appeared to be a finishing school for the children of the privileged. That is pretty much how Columbia’s 250th anniversary history describes the place in the years that Tellkampf was there.\textsuperscript{146}

In 1848, the year after Tellkampf resigned, Columbia College had 223 “pupils” in the grammar school and 130 “students” in the college.\textsuperscript{147} The college students were divided in four classes from freshmen to seniors of thirty-five to thirty-one each. They were nearly all young boys, much younger than the twenty years of Tellkampf when he matriculated at Göttingen.

The 250th anniversary history reports that “Early Columbia College students operated in a buyer’s market. . . . Only a studious few actively sought the approbation of their teachers. . . . Most students were more intent on winning the approbation of their classmates, which came quickest through defying their teachers.” Things changed little at Columbia
from the 1780s to the Civil War. Students lived at home. Each student’s schedule was the same: four assigned classes one immediately after the other. All students in a given year took the same subjects at the same times with the same teachers. At school they recited. Only in the junior and senior classes were they likely to be expected to take notes of their teachers’ lectures. Not until the so-called “Gibbs Affair” 1852 did Columbia begin to take steps toward breaking out of the historic college mode. It seems to have been among the last of the colonial colleges to do so. The old mode meant that Columbia was controlled by its Board of Trustees. Finally, Columbia was poor.

Tellkampf was doomed at Columbia from the start. Columbia had no place for a legal scientist. The view that “faculty should be encouraged, even expected, as part of their job to pursue scientific or literary studies beyond the levels that could expect to teach their undergraduates,” would not come to Columbia until the 1850s. Such aspirations as there were, must have served only to mislead Tellkampf.

Tellkampf’s standing at Columbia College could not have been more different than at Union College. Where Dr. Nott at Union was a strong president of decades’ long standing, President Moore at Columbia was himself newly appointed and destined to last only a few years. Where President Nott had a board of trustees firmly in hand, President Moore had a board nearly as large as the entering class that was determined itself to run the school. Where on the Board of Trustees at Union, had Tellkampf needed help, he had his colleague John C. Spencer, Secretary of State, at Columbia he had the irascible Samuel B. Ruggles, one of Columbia’s most active trustees and, by 1844, Lieber’s advocate. Where at Union College Tellkampf had in Reverend Potter an ally and supporter in political economy, at Columbia College he had no such ally; Potter’s counterpart at Columbia, Reverend McVickar, another of the five “clerical political economists,” had just been passed over for president and was showing his age in teaching.

Tellkampf might have gotten along well enough at Columbia College as teacher but unrecognized legal scientist, had the trustees not sentenced him to teach nothing but language courses (not even literature courses, it seems) in the rigid curriculum. Coincident with his appointment, the Board made German language instruction a mandatory subject for all four college years.

At Union College Tellkampf had taught a variety of courses in political science and history. Occasionally he taught a course in German literature or maybe even in German language. When he came to Columbia College he expected a similar package. Although the chair was formally in
“German Language and Literature,” it was commonly counted the “German Chair.” At Columbia and other colleges of the day there were no strict departmental lines and teaching could be across lines that today would not be crossed. Foreigners were, however, expected to teach their language, and even national customs. Danton, Tellkampf’s 1946 critic, quipped a Frenchman might be expected to teach dancing. The German language was, according to Danton, a sort of a “mythical entity.”

Some of Columbia’s trustees may have misled Tellkampf on what he was to teach. When Tellkampf learned in February 1844 what he was to teach he told the board that that some of them had encouraged him to think he could give “courses in ‘Greek or Roman Antiquities or in Civil Policy for some compensation.’” Ruggles privately had given candidate Lieber similar assurances. Only on arrival did Tellkampf learn that “the Department of Antiquities had been disposed of.” He then offered to teach courses he had given at Göttingen and Union: “On the Philosophy and History of Law; on Roman Law and Antiquities and on the History and Philosophy of Government and Legislation.” The Board of Trustees had none of it. According to the 250th anniversary history, “An elective system at Columbia made no headway because it made no financial sense to the trustees as long as enrollment remained low. It made no sense to the Columbia faculty either, or at least until years later when they saw themselves as “something more than teachers of undergraduates who happened to have been assigned to a particular subject area. . . .”

There was still worse news for Tellkampf on the teaching front. Columbia students in general are reported in the day to have had little place for studies and much for “boyish mischief.” Some were as young as fourteen or fifteen. December 2, 1844, the Board noted that: “He has trials to endure which a new Professor always meets with and to which a foreigner who speaks somewhat imperfectly our language is peculiarly exposed.” Little did Tellkampf know what awaited him the following fall: William Backhouse Astor, Jr., class of 1849 and presumably freshman in fall 1845.

One term of Astor’s freshman class was enough to lead Tellkampf to seek relief from the Board. In January 1846 he proposed a solution: “making the study of the German language a voluntary one in the Freshman Class . . . and to extend [the voluntary principle] to the other classes if further experience and convenience permit it.” This, Tellkampf, reported, had worked well at Union College, where it was usual, and at Columbia College, where he “yielded to the desire of a large number of students and at their request gave extra-recitations to voluntary classes of the Juniors and Seniors without charge. They were very attentive and diligent. . . .” By then, however, it was too late.
William G. Astor, Jr., grandson of the richest man in America, Jacob B. Astor, would have none of it. When Tellkampf returned to teach in early 1847, the seventeen-year Astor brought daddy into the mix. William B. Astor, to be first or second richest man in America upon his father’s death the following year, asked to have Junior excused from “further attendance on the German professor.” While wealth does not exclude the possibility that sixteen-year junior might have been in all respects a fine student, junior’s subsequent life does not suggest that. When Junior died in 1892 he was remembered for spending most of his time on the world’s largest yacht. In any case, who should be the Astor family lawyer, but Samuel B. Ruggles! Although Columbia did not technically excuse Astor from attendance, it changed its curriculum so that in his junior and senior years German would be elective. It was not the first time that Columbia College changed its curriculum to suit students.

April 18, 1847, Ruggles wrote his friend Lieber that Tellkampf had gone off to Prussia leaving his brother Theodore in charge of teaching the classes. A month later Tellkampf, having met with the King of Prussia and having been assured of an appointment at the University of Breslau, wrote to the Board of Trustees of Columbia College tendering his resignation. Tellkampf wrote that his reception at Berlin had answered his “most sanguine expectations.” The King of Prussia had met with him and was involving him “in the deliberations of some departments of the cabinet.” Tellkampf expected there to “participate in the affairs of the central government” and thus permit him to fulfill “a very natural desire on my part to render myself useful to the country of my birth.” Thus he accepted the situation offered him by his native country and with “much reluctance” and “deep gratitude” decided to sever ties with Columbia and give up “the advantages and pleasures of a residence in America.”

Through all his troubles at Columbia, Tellkampf never complained in public. Not everything at Columbia was bad for him. He may even have had a romantic interest. Marian Campbell Gouverneur, daughter of Columbia trustee John Campbell, remembered Tellkampf fondly. She told the story of a valentine sent to her by another Columbia professor that teased her about Tellkampf’s interest: “Oh, list to me, my loved one, list! Thy Tellkampfs suit no more resist, But give to him, to call his own, A heart where Kings might make their throne.” John Louis Tellkampf, to whom Anthon so facetiously alludes in the second valentine, was a young German who frequently came to our house, and who, through my father’s aid and influence, in subsequent years became professor of German in Columbia College. When we first knew him he spoke English with much
difficulty, and it was a standing joke in our household that once when he
desired to say that a certain person had been born he expressed the fact as
‘getting alive.’”

**Epilogue and Conclusion**

In 1847 Tellkampf decided to stay in Prussia rather than return to Co-
lumbia College in New York. German-Americans later regretted the loss
to America, but shared his conclusion that his talents were better appreci-
ated in Germany than in the United States.\(^{173}\)

In Germany Tellkampf enjoyed a nearly thirty-year long career as both
Professor of Government (*Staatsrecht*) at the University of Breslau and as
representative to a series of German parliaments: the national Frankfurt
Parliament of 1848/1849, the lower House of Prussia, the upper House of
Prussia, and then the first two sessions of the national German *Reichstag*
in the 1870s. When he died in 1876 he had recently taken Emeritus status
at the University, but was still an active parliamentarian. His widow in-
formed friends at Union College that both the celebration of his retirement
and his funeral were well attended by luminaries of the day.\(^{174}\)

Tellkampf’s subsequent career in Germany was that of a German legal
scientist: he combined the academic with political counseling. Already in
the months just before March 1848, Tellkampf worked on a new constitu-
tion for Prussia for Frederick William IV. When the king did not take up his
suggestions, he publicized them in a revolutionary pamphlet.\(^{175}\) Tellkampf
was elected to the Frankfurt Parliament and there served on the famous
constitution committee that drafted a constitution for all of Germany. He
constantly brought to his colleagues’ attention American approaches to the
constitutional issues that faced Germany. Not all of his colleagues appreci-
ated hearing about how the United States dealt with German issues. When
the Frankfurt Parliament is criticized for having had too many idealistic
academics, Tellkampf is among their numbers.\(^{176}\)

As a legal scientist, Tellkampf published much in Germany. The lion’s
share of his work was in political economy, principally banking and inter-
national trade. He translated a leading English treatise on banking and was
a leading representative of full metal backing of currency. Although he
did not write specifically on the United States or on prison discipline, his
earlier work in America finds reflection in many of his subsequent works,
especially in works dealing with government organization. It is in those
works, too, that one finds his prior work in systemization followed.

Tellkampf’s time in America informs us about development of aca-
demic disciplines in the United States. Tellkampf was a legal scientist.
He came from a faculty of law in Göttingen and went back to a faculty of law in Breslau. He devoted his life to developing better legal systems and rules. His better remembered contemporaries, Tocqueville and Lieber, on the other hand, are considered among the first political scientists.

Tocqueville was a tourist in America. He was here only nine months. He did not have to worry about an academic position. Lieber and Tellkampf, on the other hand, were permanent residents. They competed with each other in a market where there were no positions such as they would have liked. There were no universities; there was one law school, but it only had two or three professors, and was unsure of a commitment to legal science. In such a world, there was no place for either a legal or a political scientist. Tellkampf was able to return to a German university. Lieber would have liked to, but never had the opportunity. That Lieber was able to make for political science a place—in his time, however, small—is why he is remembered. Tellkampf, with no family in the United States, was not prepared to spend the thirty years wandering in the wilderness that Lieber had to spend.

Tellkampf, had he stayed in the United States, would have been as frustrated Lieber. Even before Tellkampf left, the college law school idea that seemed promising when he arrived in 1838, was again in doubt. Justice Story died in 1845 and Harvard fell into turmoil leaving no model law school. Not until the late 1850s did law schools finally begin to take hold. Only then, too, did Columbia College, and other American colleges, move in the direction of universities. Both developments, however, were still underway and not completed when Tellkampf died in 1876.

Even that world at the end of Tellkampf’s life would not have had a place for him. In 1876 Harvard Law School was again preeminent in teaching law. But its model in 1876, more than in 1838, was of a law school that taught aspiring private practitioners skills for litigation and not of a law faculty that systematized law. By century’s end, over the objection of the first American Bar Association study of legal education, American law schools led by Harvard Law School had banished from their premises a normative science of law and government in the European sense. In 1914 the Carnegie Foundation, in its first study of legal education, pled for law schools to follow the European model, much as it had with great success in its first study of medical education. Law schools did not.

Would there have been a place for Tellkampf in the colleges of arts and sciences? Depending upon the university today one finds either a department of political science or of government. Presumably, Tellkampf would fit better in the latter rather than the former. But both lacked the practical connection to prescribing solutions that a European law faculty had.
Finally, one field of exploration that I see as promising, is a comparison of Tocqueville’s description of America, on the one hand, with that of Tellkampf (and Lieber), on the other. Tocqueville is celebrated and even worshiped. Tocqueville’s book, *Democracy in America*, is practically gospel. Tocqueville told a narrative that many today like to hear: lawyer supremacy and dispersal of authority. Tocqueville, with his background in the centralized French state, praised centrifugal forces. Tellkampf, with his background in centrifugal Germany, had a more critical view of the difficulties of guiding centrifugal interests. He was in the United States longer and was more invested in the country than Tocqueville. His work could provide a corrective to the popular views of Tocqueville.

*University of Baltimore School of Law*
*Baltimore, Maryland*

**Notes**

1. Expanded version of a presentation, “J. L. Tellkampf: Transnational Jurist,” given at the 39th Annual Symposium of the Society for German–American Studies at St. Louis, MO, April 10-12, 2015. A second paper also flowing from that presentation is “J. L. Tellkampf: Hazards of an Early Huboldtianer,” forthcoming in *Festschrift für Keiichi Yamanaka zum 70. Geburtstag*, Jan C. Joerden & Kurt Schmoller, eds. (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2017). (Printed materials that predate 1926 have been digitized and are as such available.)

I thank Philip K. Howard and The Common Good Institute without whose support this article would not have been written. I also thank Marlaine DesChamps, Archives Specialist of Union College.


5. The principal biographic encyclopedia entry is: Herman von Petersdorff, “Tellkampf, Johann Louis,” *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (1908) [Onlinefassung]; URL: http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd115501142.html. It is the principal basis for information here on Tellkampf after his return to Germany in 1847.

6. Wallmoden unsuccessfully led the Hanoverian Army in the War of the First Coalition (1792-95) against revolutionary France. In 1799 he was made regent of Schaumburg-Lippe. When Napoleon’s troops occupied Hanover in 1803, Wallmoden signed the Hanoverian capitulation. He ruled the little county until 1807 when the count, later prince, Georg Wilhelm (1784-1860), came of age. Bernhard von Poten, Wallmoden-Gimborn, Ludwig Graf von in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (1896)
One might surmise that Johann Ludwig was named after his father’s employer. The English connection may explain Tellkampf’s knowledge of English.


Adolf wrote works in mathematics. In the last decade of his life, however, he produced a political work that proved a bestseller: Die Franzosen in Deutschland (1st ed., 1860) (The French in Germany). It went through three editions. It is a collection of materials on French absorption of Germany west of the Rhine River and of later French conquests to the east, including of Hanover.
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Letter of May 25, 1847, from a copy in the Union College Archives. The first two paragraphs read in full (the third and final substantive paragraph deals with appointment of his brother as replacement):
Relying upon your kindest indulgence I take the liberty of addressing you these lines, on a subject of considerable importance to me. Allow me, in the first place, to say a few words in regard to my present position and future prospects. My reception at Berlin has answered my most sanguine expectations. His Majesty the King of Prussia has been graciously pleased to grant me several interviews and to treat me with his peculiar kindness; and the members of the Cabinet have honored me with their confidence. I am at present employed in partaking in the deliberations of some departments of the Cabinet; and consequently enjoy a fair opportunity of rendering myself useful to the government of this country. The Prussian government has also offered to me the appointment of Professor ordinarius of political economy and civil polity, in the University of Breslau (the capital of Silesia,) and in this situation I should occasionally participate in the affairs of the central government, until called to a professorship in Berlin. These are the advantages which are offered to me by the Prussian government: and joined to the flattering [sic] nature of the proposals themselves is a very natural desire on my part to render myself useful to the country of my birth. [Page 2.]

Your honorable body will please to consider that a question is presented to me which is in every respect the most important of my life, and which I have not wished to decide in haste – but after mature deliberation I have decided to accept the situation offered to me by the authorities of my native country. – It has been with much reluctance that this determination has been formed; for I had of course always in view the advantages and pleasures of a residence in America; a residence made delightful by the confidence and kindness with which the members of your honorable body, worth individually, and collectively, uniformly treated me; nor was a desire wanting on my part to repay as far as my powers would permit, some portion of the debt of gratitude, which I owe in return for the numerous favors that I have received at your hands. Allow me then with the warmest thanks for your many acts of kindness towards me, which have rendered the duties of my professorship in your institution as pleasant and which now make the severing of these ties which have so long connected me doubly painful, to resign into your hands, the trust with which you honored me.
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172 Marian Campbell Gouverneur, As I Remember: Recollections of American Society during the Nineteenth Century 17 (1911).
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174 Danton, 472.
175 Die künftige deutsche Bundesversammlung zu Frankfurt, Broadside (Berlin: April 1848), reprinted in J. L. Tellkampf, Der norddeutsche Bund und die Verfassung des deutschen Reiches (Berlin: Verlag von Julius Springer, 1866), 17.
176 Later, Bismarck in the Prussian Upper House delivered to Tellkampf one of the most famous put-downs of academics of all times (one year of practical training, would be of greater value to me than if he had been active, even more years than he says, as a professor on the lecture platform.” Otto von Bismarck, “Professorial Politics,” Speech of December 21, 1863, in The German Classics, Masterpieces of German Literature, Translated into English (German Publications Society, 1914), 10:175.