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Defending Deutschtum: The Germania’s Bennett Law Coverage

Introduction

The Bennett Law, passed without debate by the Republican-led Wisconsin Legislature in April 1889, was a compulsory education law that laid Wisconsin’s religious and ethnic fault lines bare and shook the state’s political balance of power. Officially named “An Act Concerning the Education and Employment of Children,” the Bennett Law was named for its sponsor, Representative Michael Bennett. Most Wisconsinites had no problem with compulsory education per se, but supporters of private schools believed that the Bennett Law overreached. These included German Lutherans, Scandinavian Lutherans, and German Catholics. They saw the law as an attack on their parochial schools, especially the clause that required the core subjects of reading, writing, math, and U.S. history be taught in English. If the state could determine the language of instruction in parochial schools, they reasoned, what would prevent the state from regulating other parts of the curriculum based on that precedent? The law also declared that schools that did not comply with the English requirement would not be recognized and that local school boards would decide which schools were in compliance. Moreover, since children would be required to attend a school in their own district, many rural parochial schools would lose out-of-district students.

The issue proved disastrous for Wisconsin Republicans. First, the Democratic ticket nearly swept the April 1890 municipal elections in Milwaukee. Then, after months of impassioned campaigning in favor of the Bennett Law, William Dempster Hoard, the former dairyman and incumbent Republican governor, lost the November 1890 gubernatorial election to the Democratic newspaperman and Milwaukee mayor George Wilbur Peck. The Wisconsin
Democratic Party saw its greatest victory since the 1850s. The 1890 Democratic wave included the governorship, majorities in the state Senate and Assembly, and all but one congressional seat. While their stance on tariffs sank the Republicans nationally, German-American Catholics and Lutherans were decisive in bringing the Democrats to power in Wisconsin in 1890. German-language newspapers, particularly the Protestant *Germania*, were instrumental in convincing Lutherans that voting for Democrats was a defense of their religious freedom and German-American culture, *Deutschtum*.

**Wisconsin’s German Americans**

German Catholic and Lutheran cooperation in 1890 was exceptional; Wisconsin’s German Americans formed neither a cohesive cultural whole nor a consistent voting bloc. In the 19th century, German-speaking lands were divided religiously, culturally, and linguistically, and throughout the century, emigrants came from all regions of Germany to Wisconsin. The three peaks of German immigration to the United States were characterized by their differing regions of origin. Before the Civil War, many Germans emigrated from southwestern Germany, a largely Catholic region; between 1865 and 1875, another wave came largely from northwestern Germany; and from 1880 until 1890 most immigrants arrived from northeastern Germany. Immigrants from the northeastern and northwestern German provinces tended to be Lutheran. By 1890, about a third of Wisconsin’s population was either first- or second-generation German-American. Because so many Germans immigrated to Wisconsin, they were able to form communities and to maintain their distinct religious, cultural, and linguistic boundaries longer than immigrant groups that came in lesser numbers.

Among German Americans, Catholics, Lutherans, and revolutionary liberals formed the most influential cultural sub-groups, each with distinctive political leanings. Throughout the 19th century, Catholics of all stripes tended to vote for the Democratic Party. Lutherans came to Wisconsin in the early years as well, including conservative groups fleeing the forced union of Lutheran and Reformed churches in Saxon and Prussian territories. In those early years, they voted with Catholics for Democrats. After the failed 1848 revolution in Germany, liberal political refugees, the so-called 48ers, came to Wisconsin. Often educated, anticlerical, and politically engaged, these men and women frequently clashed with their more traditional countrymen. While German immigrants originally supported the Democratic party, 48ers generally switched to the Republican Party in the 1850s. In the years following the Civil War, Lutherans, particularly those living near Catholics, increasingly tended to vote Republican. When Lutherans lived apart from Catholics,
though, they still voted for Democrats. Thus, at the time of the Bennett controversy, Republican Lutherans had to be convinced to switch their party allegiance. One of the most important vehicles for bringing about this change was the German-language press.

The German-American Press and the Germania

German Americans across the religious and political spectrum subscribed to newspapers that aligned with their views. The press had long been influential among German Americans. As Kathleen Conzen notes in her account of antebellum Milwaukee, “The press played a crucial role in German community formation, helping to arouse a sense of united Deutschtum and reflecting and fomenting its divisions.” Because so many 48ers were educated and politically engaged, they had an outsized influence on the German-American press soon after their arrival. First Catholics, then later Lutherans founded newspapers to provide platforms for their religious and political views. Bolstered by the massive influx of German immigrants in prior decades, Wisconsin’s diverse German press flourished at the start of the 1890s as the Bennett Law issue came to the fore. At that time, newspapers catering to Catholics and Lutherans had higher circulations than liberal-leaning ones. Republican and Democratic newspapers written in the German language were also well-established in Wisconsin by then, and even Socialists found an audience for their newspapers.

The German-language press voiced a variety of opinions about the Bennett Law. Some newspapers favored the law, including the Amerikanische Turnzeitung, a Freethinker outlet, and the Republican-leaning Herold. However, most German papers in Wisconsin were opposed to the law. Catholic papers like Columbia and Excelsior explicitly encouraged their readers to vote down those who supported the law. The same is true for Democratic newspapers like Madison’s Wisconsin Botschafter. The most important paper representing the German Protestant perspective, the Germania, was a vehement critic of the Bennett Law.

Published in Milwaukee with both national and Wisconsin editions, the Germania was founded in 1873 by German-American Protestants who did not see their views represented by the Catholic Seebote or the various 48er papers. The Germania had a strong, if not the strongest anti-Bennett influence among Wisconsin’s German-language newspapers. On its header, it boasted the widest circulation of any German weekly. The American Newspaper Directory puts the Germania’s circulation between 75,000 and 100,000 weekly subscribers, head and shoulders above both its German- and English-language rivals in the state. By October 1889, the Germania had become
popular enough to warrant two weekly national editions. The owner, George Brumder, added a daily edition during the Bennett controversy.9

The *Germania* was influential in the Bennett debate not only on account of its substantial circulation, but also because of its relentless anti-Bennett articles. It actively campaigned against the law and its backers in nearly every weekly edition between April 1889 and November 1890. By means of editorials, guest articles, headlines, poetry, and special pamphlets, it made the case to the public that the Bennett Law was an unjust attack on German-language parochial schools.

The *Germania* staff itself played an influential role in the anti-Bennett movement. Owner George Brumder loaned money to the Anti-Bennett City Executive Committee for the spring campaign, but later told them that he did not need to be reimbursed.10 The legal editor of the *Germania*, Christian Koerner, headed the Anti-Bennett Executive Committee for both the Milwaukee municipal election and the state general election in November. Koerner was a Lutheran and the author of the most important pamphlet of the anti-Bennett campaign. The *Germania* published the pamphlet in both German and English. Its editor-in-chief, George Koeppen, supported the anti-Bennett cause by shaping the editorial policy and authoring articles himself. Finally, the *Germania*’s business manager, August Roß, supported the Bennett Law in a very public way, addressing anti-Bennett forces at their June 1890 convention.11 With so many employees invested in the controversy, it is no surprise that so much about the Bennett Law appears on the *Germania*’s pages.

Some recurring themes stand out from the sheer mass of information in the *Germania*’s Bennett coverage between April 1889 and November 1890. For instance, the *Germania* did not portray the fight for German parochial schools in Wisconsin as something that started with the Bennett Law, but rather as part of a larger struggle for schools in the state. The *Germania* argued that the controversy began with an address that Governor Hoard made to the Wisconsin legislature in January 1889, continued with the contentious Pond Bill that spring, and reached its culmination with the Bennett Law.12 The *Germania* situated the Bennett Law against a national backdrop of German Americans advocating for their rights and freedoms against oppressive nativist forces. The newspaper rallied German Americans nationwide to defend *Deutschtum*. Again and again, the *Germania* made the case that German parochial schools needed to be defended against state interference lest *Deutschtum* itself fail. More particularly, the *Germania* felt the need to counter the arguments spread by pro-Bennett newspapers, especially the *Milwaukee Sentinel*. In article after article, it defended German Protestants from what it saw as half-truths, lies, and misrepresentations in the *Sentinel* and other papers. According to the *Germania*, the deception and attacks of pa-
pers like the *Sentinel* were a major reason that Protestant German Americans were reluctantly driven away from the Republican Party into the arms of the Democrats during the campaign. Christian Koerner’s influential pamphlet gave German Protestants an intellectual weapon to defend their schools and culture from *Sentinel* articles and Republican sophistry.

**Scholarly Treatment of the Bennett Law Controversy**

Many scholarly accounts of the Bennett Law controversy emphasize its religious dimension. One of the first of these appears at the turn of the century in a chapter of Brunken and Hense-Jensen’s history of Wisconsin Germans, *Wisconsin’s Deutsch Amerikaner*. They argue that Lutherans found their voice in the heat of the Bennett controversy, taking the mantle of German-American leadership from the Turners and Freethinkers. In an influential article about the Bennett Law, Louise Kellogg emphasizes the role the German-American leadership, particularly pastors, played in leading their followers to the polls. William Whyte, a friend of Governor Hoard in the state Republican party, penned a 1927 essay recounting the campaign from an insider’s perspective. Like Kellogg, he suggests that German Americans were submissive to their religious leaders, but he also emphasizes that Governor Hoard’s intransigence was largely to blame for alienating religious German Americans and leading the Republicans to electoral disaster.

Richard Jensen devoted a chapter to the 1890 election in his 1967 dissertation, *The Winning of The Midwest*. Religion is a decisive factor in Jensen’s account, in which he broadly categorizes Wisconsinites into three religious types: pietistic (mostly Protestants with roots in New England), liturgical (Catholic and Lutheran), and “anticlerical freethinker.” One of the best treatments of various religious perspectives on the Bennett Law, particularly the Catholic view, comes from Thomas Hunt. His 1981 article reappeared as a book chapter in 2007 with a co-author, James Carper. The chapter emphasizes the deeply held beliefs of all involved, both individuals and groups, and supports those claims with ample quotes and citations. Like most Bennett Law scholars, Carper and Hunt rely overwhelmingly on English-language source material.

Some scholars place more emphasis on the ethnic and linguistic question when writing about the Bennett Law. For instance, in his “Wisconsin Ethnic Groups and the Election of 1890,” Roger Wyman does not take at face value the Catholic and Protestant arguments that their religious freedom was at stake. “Again and again, regardless of the official protests against the Bennett Law on the basis of state paternalism, the central concern of Germans involved the language provision.” In making this argument about the
primacy of the language question, Wyman draws on a master thesis by Janet Johnston which was originally written in 1966 and published in 2011. Neither Wyman nor Johnston, however, make much use of German-language source material.

While most accounts of the Bennett Law controversy draw exclusively on English sources or translated German ones, some scholars have cited German sources. Narrating the Bennett controversy from the perspective of various American Lutheran synods who generally opposed the law, Walter Beck refers to official church documents written in German and supplements these with English-language source material. August Stellhorn’s 1963 book on the history of parochial schools was focused solely on the Missouri-Synod Lutheran school system. In his chapter on the Bennett Law, Stellhorn quotes German-language synodical documents at length to show the Missouri Synod’s anti-Bennett Law position in the controversy. When Wayne Schmidt discusses the Wisconsin Synod’s Bennett Law opposition in the second volume of his dissertation, he cites German-language synodical documents, including the Wisconsin Synod’s official school journal. However, neither Beck, nor Stellhorn, nor Schmidt make use of German-American newspapers. The two-volume dissertation by Robert Ulrich from 1965 does, however, and is far and away the lengthiest treatment of the Bennett Law. Notably, Ulbrich discusses at length the importance to many German Americans of Deutschtum, German culture in America. While Ulbrich cites more German-language sources than most and does sometimes reference German newspapers like the Germania, he primarily relies upon the English press and other English-language material. His chapters about the Bennett campaign itself rarely include references to German sources.

German-language sources have been underutilized to the detriment of Bennett scholarship. In Bennett Law histories, German-language newspapers have to date not been given nearly as much attention as English media. While German-American newspapers have tended to remain unread, English-language texts produced by German Americans have been consulted by historians. There is, for example, an oft-cited English version of Christian Koerner’s pamphlet that outlines the prevailing German Protestant views on the Bennett Law. Even though such documents exist, German-language newspapers can teach us things about German Americans that English-language sources cannot. The satirical parodies, the heartfelt poetry, the elegant prose, and the sharp rhetoric that pervades German coverage of the Bennett campaign is lost when we only look at English source material. We should also read the German press simply because it was influential; in 1890, tens of thousands more German newspapers were sold in Milwaukee than English ones.
better understand the Bennett controversy, we need to see which narratives Wisconsin Germans told.

Considering the *Germania*’s wide circulation and influence among anti-Bennett forces, a thorough study of its Bennett Law campaign coverage is a suitable starting point to learn more about what German Americans said about the Bennett Law in their first language. By drawing out some of the most important themes from the *Germania*’s coverage, the present article hopes to shed light on this oft-forgotten corner of American history and add to the body of Bennett scholarship.

### The Wider School Controversy in Wisconsin

Before the Bennett Law became a topic of discussion, German Protestants were already wary of state interference in their schools. In the spring of 1889, the *Germania* editors were primarily concerned about the Pond Bill, a measure that would have required the collection of attendance statistics from both private and public schools throughout Wisconsin. The *Germania* and its German parochial school allies saw the bill as an attack on their parochial schools. The *Germania* interpreted the Pond Bill as a wedge that would allow the state to meddle in the affairs of parochial schools. 

The very next week, the celebration ended when the *Germania* learned of the Bennett Law. It caught Pond Bill opponents like the *Germania* off-guard, passing as it did without debate at the end of the legislative session. The *Germania* acknowledged that in many respects the law was reasonable: it prevented child labor and required children to go to school. Already in April 1889, however, the *Germania* took issue with section five of the law, which required that reading, writing, arithmetic, and American history be taught in English if schools were to be formally recognized by the state. In this section, the *Germania* editors saw the stamp of anti-German sentiment more clearly than in the Pond Bill. They noted that the law might not have much of an effect on schools’ day-to-day operations, but that it could be too
broadly interpreted. The *Germania* editors believed that, like the Pond Bill and Hoard’s 1889 speech to the legislature, the Bennett Law was really meant “to suppress German parochial schools.”

While the *Germania*’s editors were invested in the defense of parochial schools, they were probably at least tempted by potential profits. Such a controversial issue as the Bennett Law would have provided an opportunity to sell more newspapers and special publications like Koerner’s pamphlet. A business capitalized on the issue by taking out Bennett-related advertisements in the *Germania*. Additionally, the *Germania*’s editors could have calculated that their readership would decrease if the law stayed in effect and the next generation could not read German. Still, their response to Governor Hoard’s speech and their Pond Bill stance indicates that the *Germania*’s editors’ concern for the religious liberty of parochial schools was sincere. The editors wanted *Deutschtum* to flourish, and they considered parochial schools essential to that flourishing. They continued to prove their sincerity as they defended *Deutschtum* over the next 18 months of the Bennett controversy.

**Defending Deutschtum**

The concept of *Deutschtum* was important to the writers of the *Germania*. Throughout the Bennett Law campaign, they told their readers that *Deutschtum* was under attack, and that German Americans needed to defend it. The term *Deutschtum* had strong emotional connotations. It represented German culture in America, an intergenerational bond based on a shared history and on particularly German virtues. Many of the poems and songs that the *Germania* printed during the campaign draw on the concept.

One such poem by Konrad Krez from January 1890 is particularly helpful in describing *Deutschtum*. The poem, “Seid einig,” can be translated as “Be United!” It begins with a call to action for German Americans to fight the Bennett Law. Krez retells pioneer history, emphasizing the hard work and dedication shown by German immigrants as they cleared the virgin forest. He discusses the importance of the German-language church and school to immigrant life. Next, Krez shares his hope that the grandchildren of German immigrants will not have to seek a translator to read the inscriptions on their parents’ graves. The final three verses summarize the argument and reiterate the call to action. According to Krez, German pioneers asked nothing of the state government apart from the freedom to form and cultivate their own communities. With the Bennett Law, however, the state was trying to rob them of their children by stealing their mother tongue. Krez challenges his readers to prove that they are not serfs, nor mindless animals voting the party...
line, but that they are free men who support parental rights. Three middle verses are particularly illustrative of the concept of *Deutschtum*:

Soon enough, out of his hard work comes  
A contribution to the house of God,  
Wherein the pastor or teacher  
Builds up his listeners’ spirits in German

From such a church stands not far removed  
The school, where the little flaxen-head learns  
What he needs in life, and they teach him:  
“You shall honor your father and your mother.”

Healthy and strong, even if not learned,  
He grows up. Unfooled by ambition,  
He will satisfy himself with the simplest joys,  
To plow his father’s farm in German.\(^{36}\)

These verses indicate the key virtues and institutions of *Deutschtum*. German *Fleiß*, industry, allows them to earn all that they need and more. Once daily needs were met, churches were built where German-speaking pastors tended to their congregations. For German immigrants, both Catholic and Protestant, schools were built soon after their arrival.\(^{37}\) The speed with which schools were built shows that education was important to Germans, but not just any education would do for many German immigrants. The calls to honor one’s father and mother and to stay humble, avoiding deceptive worldly ambition, show how important an education in religious and moral principles was to many parents. The traditional, agrarian, German-speaking life is the idealized *Deutschtum* in this poem. The *Germania* editors thought that measures like the Bennett Law threatened *Deutschtum*’s survival.

For the duration of the controversy, *Germania* coverage emphasized that Wisconsin German voters were part of a much wider battle for the fate of *Deutschtum* throughout the country and, to a lesser extent, around the world. Illinois, for instance, had similar compulsory education legislation to Wisconsin’s, the Edwards Law. Thus, the *Germania’s* editors followed the Illinois school controversy closely throughout 1889 and 1890. In both the Wisconsin and Illinois cases, they deemed the laws to be attacks on *Deutschtum*. They also linked the temperance movement, another perceived infringement of their personal liberties, to the battle for the parochial schools. In the last issue before the November 1890 election, the *Germania’s* articles issued a call to arms to their German readers across the country, exhorting them to vote
ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE BENNETT LAW

The *Germania* printed a wide variety of arguments over the course of its coverage of the Bennett Law. Some columns, like a guest article by F. Scheer, situated the Bennett Law within a wide geographical and historical context. Most writers tended to focus on defending the quality of parochial schools, their teachers, and curriculum. Other coverage, like that of the Anti-Bennett Convention in 1890, detailed arguments from several speakers and summarized what the anti-Bennett delegates considered to be the most important legal and political arguments.

A guest writer, F. Scheer, wrote one of the more erudite articles against the Bennett Law in November 1889. His piece began with common complaints against the law. Scheer argued that, by forcing German-American children out of the parochial schools, the Bennett Law would deliver *Deutschtum* a *Todesstoß*, a deadly dagger thrust. To him, the fact that Bennett Law proponents had pushed a measure more offensive to German Americans than the Pond Bill through the legislature was further evidence that the law was directed against *Deutschtum*. He believed such an attack was particularly unjust considering the contributions that loyal German-American citizens had made throughout U.S. history. While the *Germania* had often argued that German could coexist with English as a common language, Scheer went further when he looked to Switzerland as an example of a flourishing, multilingual polity. His final line of argumentation echoed the pride that many German Americans felt in the recently-founded German Empire. Scheer thought that German was an increasingly important language for children to learn in light of Imperial Germany's increasing economic and military might. Furthermore, he believed that an age of enlightenment was replacing one of power and that German would be important in this coming epoch. In this vein, he concluded the article, "Therefore, our motto should not be regress, which would mean suppressing German, but progress. With progress as our motto, we can..."
cultivate both German and English, and so give our children a double armor in the unavoidable battles for their daily bread." Such world-historical pronouncements were rare in the *Germania’s* Bennett coverage. More typically, articles and editorials appeared that defended the German parochial school on its own merits.

On numerous occasions, the *Germania* made the case for the importance and quality of German parochial schools. It further argued that Deutschtum would stand or fall with the German schools. On September 11, 1889, the *Germania* published an editorial defending the quality of these schools, especially of their teachers, against Bennett-friendly newspapers. The author noted the hypocrisy of newspapers that had once held up the German educational method as exemplary and had criticized the Yankee method, but which were now saying that the “soul-deadening memorization” in “American schoolmarm-led schools” was better than the German system. The author noted that many public school instructors were not teachers for the long term, but instead started in the schoolhouse and moved on to advance their careers. German parochial schoolteachers, on the other hand, considered teaching to be a life’s calling. Stepping back a little from the harsh rhetoric, the author asserted that he did not want to bash the public schools, but thought that parochial schools and their teachers were not getting the credit they deserved for their contributions to American education. In addition to such defenses of German-American schools, the *Germania* also made appeals using the language of rights, duties, and freedom.

The *Germania’s* coverage of the June 4, 1890, anti-Bennett convention provided a wealth of ammunition for their fight against the law. Typically, the *Germania* devoted only a few columns to the Bennett controversy, but on June 6th, it produced almost two entire pages. While the *Germania’s* convention coverage was almost entirely in German, the convention itself was held mainly in English. The *Germania* hoped that this would open Bennett supporters’ eyes to the high level of English proficiency among German Americans. At the assembly of over 700 anti-Bennett pastors, professors, and members of German cultural associations, two speakers were *Germania* employees: Christian Koerner and August Roß. Like the Republican and Democratic conventions, this, too, was a political convention. Thus, the delegates heard speeches, named committees, and adopted resolutions. The resolution committee’s report, which was unanimously accepted by the convention, was also printed in the *Germania*. The resolutions summarized arguments that the *Germania* had been making throughout the campaign.

The committee’s first few resolutions sought to clear the air of any misconceptions about the anti-Bennett position. They acknowledged the necessity of public schools and pledged to continue supporting and funding them.
Moreover, they declared that they would not seek public money for the parochial schools. The delegates also reiterated that they were not enemies of the English language and that they wanted their children to learn English in addition to German. Finally, they made clear that they opposed neither compulsory education nor laws that prohibited child labor in factories.\textsuperscript{49}

Then the committee enumerated the reasons for their opposition to the law. They saw the district clause as depriving them of their rights as parents, citizens, and Christians to send their children to the school of their choice. Also, they argued that section one of the law was unjust because, by allowing public school boards to fix when the consecutive school term would begin, the law robbed private schools and churches of flexibility in setting their children’s educational schedules.\textsuperscript{50} They further objected to the portion of the law requiring schools to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, and U.S. history in English, arguing that it was unjust to set the language of instruction and curriculum for private schools.\textsuperscript{51} They feared that the law was written in such a way that public school boards would feel empowered to interfere in the affairs of private schools. Therefore, the delegates resolved only to support candidates who would vote to repeal the Bennett Law, regardless of their party.\textsuperscript{52} An addendum expressed the delegates’ disappointment with Governor Hoard, who had suggested that pastors and congregations were conspiring to hold their children in ignorance. They also felt insulted by the \textit{Sentinel} and its editor, Horace Rublee, who had suggested that the German-American laity was blindly following the clergy.\textsuperscript{53}

**Feud with the Milwaukee Sentinel**

Between the summer of 1889 and the November 1890 general election, the \textit{Germania} feuded almost weekly with the \textit{Milwaukee Sentinel}. This is understandable because Horace Rublee, a Republican and the editor of the \textit{Sentinel}, had been one of the earliest and most vocal backers of Governor Hoard. Rublee had done so despite objections from party bosses and, thus, had a personal interest in seeing Hoard succeed. This put him on a collision course with George Koeppen and his colleagues at the \textit{Germania}.

In a July 1889 article, the \textit{Germania}’s editors sarcastically questioned the \textit{Sentinel}’s concern for German schoolchildren.\textsuperscript{54} The \textit{Sentinel} had reported on reforms in German parochial education in Milwaukee, but lamented the state of affairs in rural parochial schools. \textit{Sentinel} editors also wondered why supporters of parochial schools were so agitated about the Pond Bill and Bennett Law. The \textit{Germania} editors thought that such questioning was late-coming because they and the various Lutheran synods had been opposing both measures for months. The \textit{Germania} reiterated the synods’ arguments
that German Protestants were not against the public schools but wanted to maintain their right to educate their children according to the dictates of conscience. In what would become a frequent dispute, the Germania’s editors then took issue with the characterization of German as a “foreign language” in the United States, noting that German had been spoken in America for 200 years. Additionally, they refuted a Sentinel charge that the Germania was the mouthpiece of a church, arguing that it was a political newspaper that sought readers among German Protestant Christians. For their part, the staff of the Germania believed that the Sentinel was not motivated by religious bigotry, rather by an enmity toward the German language that was revealed in their coverage of Governor Hoard’s January address to the legislature.

The Germania’s editors provoked the Sentinel when they compared the events in Wisconsin to the suppression of ethnic minorities under German and Russian rule. In those countries, minority groups were often forced by law to use the majority language. The Germania’s editors said that the Sentinel would likely characterize such foreign laws as unjust. They argued that the Sentinel writers ought to be able to recognize that what was tyrannical in European monarchies was no less tyrannical in the United States. The Sentinel disagreed with that comparison, and the next week, the Germania pressed its point. The Germania argued that the difference between what was going on in Europe versus America was practically nonexistent, a difference between “verbieten und nicht erlauben,” forbidden and not allowed. In Prussia, the Germania argued, Poles were forbidden from using their language apart from in religious instruction, while in Wisconsin, Germans were not allowed to teach in German for most subjects apart from religion. The newspapers continued to take issue with each other’s coverage.

One tactic of the Sentinel during the Bennett controversy was to find Germans who could not speak English well to illustrate why the Bennett Law was necessary. The Germania, with the help of its readers, debunked as many of these mischaracterizations as possible, often chastising the Sentinel for lazy journalism. In February 1890, the Sentinel reported that two Germans had needed a court translator in Wausau, bringing the total number of Germans with poor English that they had found to eight, according to the Germania’s reckoning. The Germania’s writers were suspicious of the report, recalling the Sentinel’s debunked claim about a Jefferson County man who had attended German parochial schools and allegedly could not speak English well. It turned out that the man had had a disability, but nonetheless spoke English even better than German. Just below this article, the Germania editors printed a report from the Green Bay Landsmann about a German family with four children who could not speak English. The Landsmann editors expressed their frustration that the Sentinel was overlooking the thousands
of Germans who never attended public schools and yet still spoke excellent English. They also critique the public schools whose students speak “slang” instead of proper English but somehow get a pass from the *Sentinel*.58

The 1890 spring municipal elections brought more disagreement with the *Sentinel*. The Milwaukee mayoral election had turned into an early referendum on the Bennett Law. In the heated days prior, *Germania* editors accused the *Sentinel* of misrepresenting the law by claiming that it was merely meant to help the “poor German boy.”59 Moreover, they were frustrated that German Protestants kept being depicted as fools who were against the public schools, against the public order, and against the English language. If German Protestants were bitter now, it was largely the *Sentinel*’s fault that they had become so. Just as the French were provoking the Germans in Europe, the Yankees were provoking Germans in America. The Yankees were attacking *Deutschbum* at its center, the parochial schools. On election day, the Yankees would see the *furor teutonicus* they had conjured up with their provocations and tricks.60 The *furor teutonicus* was loosed indeed; George Peck, the anti-Bennett Democratic candidate, was elected mayor of Milwaukee. After the election, *Germania* editors commented on the amazing amount of exaggeration, lies, and nonsense that had been said by defenders of the Bennett Law in the days following the election.61 They further complained that the English-language press, despite all argumentation and evidence to the contrary, still believed that German Protestants wanted ignorant children and were against compulsory education and the English language.

Though the *Germania* editors took a hard line and sometimes used inflammatory language, they sought to avoid personal attacks. They explained their position thus: “*der Sache Feind, dem Manne Freund.*” (An enemy to the cause, a friend to the man).62 They tried to stick with this credo even when the *Sentinel* editors did not, such as when the *Sentinel* spread false rumors about a feud between *Germania* editors Koerner and Koeppen.63 The *Germania* editors proved their intent to follow their maxim by their editorial policy. They often gave people with opposing viewpoints the chance to express their arguments in the *Germania*. For example, in January 1890, the *Germania*’s editors published a long letter from Horace Rublee, the editor of the *Sentinel*.64 Late in the Bennett campaign, they also printed a sizeable editorial from Republican U.S. Senator John Spooner, who sought to defend the Bennett Law and the Republican platform.65

The Reluctant Shift from the Republican Party

As a Republican-leaning newspaper, the editors of the *Germania* often expressed the hope that repeal of the Bennett Law would receive bipartisan
support. For instance, in January 1890, they emphasized that although the Bennett Law might be an issue in the upcoming elections, it need not be so since neither party had yet taken an official position. The editors had more reason to expect a bipartisan solution in March, when the prominent Republican, Henry Clay Payne, agreed that the law needed amending. Before the summer conventions, they continued in their hope that both parties would agree to oppose the Bennett Law, particularly after hearing that both parties had opposed the Edwards Law in Illinois. They also encouraged their readers to make their voices heard at the Democratic and Republican state conventions so that both parties might be pushed to call for the repeal of the law.

The Germania’s reaction to the 1890 political platforms adopted by the Democrats and Republicans showed their reluctance to support the Democrats. Once the Republican platform came out with a pro-Bennett plank, the Germania expressed mixed feelings about their preferred party. At first, the Germania commented that many in the Republican party did not want to support the Bennett Law, but were doing so only reluctantly because Hoard and the English-language press had tied the Republicans’ fortunes to it. The Germania editors believed that the Republican platform could be interpreted too broadly, but they decided to withhold final judgment until they heard what the Republican leadership and press made of it. Despite its questions about the state platform, the Germania expressed approval of Senator Spooner and the national platform. When the Democratic platform came out a week later, the Germania was pleased with the anti-Bennett plank but thought the rest of the platform was weak. A few weeks later, the editors argued that, while the Republican platform could be interpreted positively, Governor Hoard’s statements made the law’s true intent clear. Starting with his January address to the legislature, Hoard had shown his desire for state control over parochial schools, leading to the eventual “annihilation of the German school and thus of Germandom” (Vernichtung der deutschen Schule und damit des Deutschthums). Nonetheless, Germania editors argued that Republicans running for national office need not lose votes on account of state-level issues like the Bennett Law.

As the November election neared, however, the Germania changed its attitude towards Senator Spooner. Despite the great amount of column space Spooner had been given, the Germania printed articles that called for his ouster. C. F. W. Huth of the Anti-Bennett State Central Committee made the case against Republicans on October 14th, shortly before voter registration closed. He said that German voters especially needed to beat Governor Hoard, “that closed-hearted, German-hater and enemy of religion,” (Dieser engherzige Deutschenhässer und Religionsfeind). Huth also exhorted his read-
ers to beat Hoard’s supporters, including Senator Spooner. He brought up how Spooner had defended Hoard and was actively working toward the German Protestant defeat. *Germania* readers were urged to see through Spooner’s rhetoric. “It is precisely (Spooner) whom we need to show that we are men, and that a true and just man does not let himself get distracted by any flattering or sweet-sounding rhetoric when the time comes to stand up for freedom and justice.” Huth concluded his essay with a call to action to first register, then go out and vote opponents of the Bennett Law into office.

**The Koerner Pamphlet**

To counter sophisticated Republicans like Spooner, to make their anti-Bennett reasoning widely known, and to motivate German-American voters, *Germania* editors published a polemical pamphlet written by their legal editor, Christian Koerner. It is titled *Das Bennett Gesetz und die deutschen protestantischen Gemeindeschulen in Wisconsin* (The Bennett Law and the German Protestant Parochial Schools in Wisconsin). The pamphlet first appeared in English but was later expanded and translated into German. Though often referenced in historical works on the Bennett Law, little is said about the pamphlet aside from the fact that it was written by the *Germania*’s legal editor. It includes a copy of the text of the Bennett Law, analysis of each section, statistical tables for German parochial schools throughout the state, and strongly-worded objections to the law.

The story of the Koerner pamphlet begins in Watertown in August 1889 with the joint meeting of representatives from the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod and the Wisconsin District of the Missouri Synod. These two Lutheran church bodies had already formed their own committees tasked with providing an appropriate response to the Bennett Law. The pastors and teachers present decided to merge these individual Bennett committees into a single executive committee. Among the new committee’s tasks were the defense of congregations that might be affected by the law, composition of articles to be released to the press, and compilation of parochial school statistics. Eventually, Christian Koerner would lead the executive committee, but at that juncture, he was on the statistics committee. The tables in Koerner’s pamphlet probably came from his committee work. At some point in the next few months, Koerner also began work on the essay that would become the body of his pamphlet. On December 27, 1889, representatives from nearly every denomination with a German congregation in Wisconsin met in Milwaukee and approved the first draft of Koerner’s essay. Politicians of both parties as well as lawyers scrutinized the draft before recommending its publication along with the Lutheran parochial school statistical tables.
On January 4, 1890, a version of Koerner’s work appeared in the *Milwaukee Daily Journal*. Three days later, the *Germania* announced that it had copies of Koerner’s *Journal* article for sale that readers could share with their English-speaking neighbors.

The Koerner pamphlet was completed in the period leading up to the 1890 Milwaukee mayoral election. On February 4th, the *Germania* announced that it was printing the English edition. The pamphlet included the statistical tables and expanded, refined, and reorganized arguments from Koerner’s *Journal* article. Additions included ample quotes indicating Lutheran approval of public schools, analysis of statistics showing English use in parochial schools, and a lengthier conclusion. The goal of the pamphlet was to show English speakers what German speakers did in their schools and help people see how papers like the *Sentinel* had been distorting the truth. The *Germania* hoped that even the most ardent enemies of German parochial schools would see that the Bennett Law was unnecessary, that the statistics provided irrefutable proof that parochial schools already taught English. The pamphlet was sent to all the newspapers in the state, state officials, members of the legislature, school superintendents, German pastors, teachers, and more.

Soon, a German edition was completed. First, a text of the German edition without statistical tables appeared in the *Germania* on February 18. Then the *Germania* announced a completed edition on February 25. The *Germania* said that its German translation was much more precise than the ones made by other German newspapers. It claimed that it was the most important anti-Bennett document, suggesting that even opponents would want a copy. Framing the sale of the pamphlet as a public service, the *Germania* declared that the pamphlet’s price was just high enough to cover the cost of its printing. The editors also announced that the second English edition was ready less than a month after the first one had appeared. The *Germania*’s editors concluded with a request for readers to send in any missing information about parochial schools in their area.

During the next month, thousands of pamphlets were bought and distributed. Many pastors circulated pamphlets to their congregations in the weeks before the spring election. The *Germania* reported which congregations were getting pamphlets and the number of pamphlets each congregation received. By March 11, the *Germania* editors were boasting that, because of the pamphlet’s thorough argumentation and wide distribution, no one could act on the Bennett Law without taking German Protestant views into account.

Koerner’s objections to the Bennett Law on behalf of German Protestants tend to have either a constitutional or practical basis. Most objections rest on
constitutional grounds. Koerner argues that granting public school boards authority over parochial schools is a violation of religious freedom. He also alleges that parents’ right to trial by jury would be usurped by school boards because school boards would have the discretion to levy fines. Koerner further argues that if no parochial schools were in the child’s district, the law would implicitly violate constitutionally protected freedoms of conscience by forcing students to attend public schools. Finally, Koerner reasons that schools would lose their right to observe weekday religious holidays because the law required that students attend school for a consecutive period. Koerner’s other objections rest on practical grounds. He argues that forcing students to attend in-district schools would deprive rural schools of students. Koerner also notes that clergy, who often taught classes in addition to fulfilling their pastoral duties, would have difficulty teaching more than four days per week, which the law requires. According to Koerner, the law would be detrimental to German-American students’ education because students from German-speaking homes learn better when German is the language of instruction. His final argument appeals to his American readership’s patriotic sensibilities. Koerner clearly hopes that the reader will conclude that supporters of the Bennett Law are supporting tyranny and that German Americans are fighting for freedom:

Men who have not breathed the fresh and free air of our country long enough to cleanse their blood of monarchical ideas, who still consider the servants of the commonwealth as authorities to whom absolute submissiveness and blind obedience is due, who believe our great republic should follow in the paths treaden (sic) by European monarchies, are praised as enlightened and broad-minded patriots, worthy of imitation by men whose first breath was freedom and whose whole life is patriotism. Such is a truthful pen-picture of the leaders in this bitter and unjustifiable warfare against our parochial schools. Does the reader long for such company? Will he entrust himself to such leadership?

Notably absent from this conclusion is any appeal to Deutschtum. As noted above, this document was a polemic first written in English. That is, the core arguments are more for outsiders than for German-Americans. Thus, while the pamphlet itself does a service in defense of Deutschtum, it makes this defense without appeals to German industriousness, the beauty of the German language, or the piety of the German people. Instead, it appeals to outsiders with arguments based on the constitution and common sense.
Conclusion

The theme tying together the Germania’s coverage of the Bennett Law controversy was its defense of Deutschtum. From the beginning, the Germania consistently made the case that the language, traditions, and institutions of German Americans were under attack. The Germania saw the parochial school as the bulwark of German culture in the state. Without the parochial school, the Germania believed that Deutschtum would fade away and that German-American children would be bereft of their heritage. By means of poetry, impassioned argument, and sober analysis, it made the case that the Bennett Law was an attack on their parochial schools and, thus, the heart of German-American culture.

Many opportunities for future research on Wisconsin newspapers and their Bennett coverage remain. The German-language newspapers are a largely untapped primary resource. As indicated above, no single newspaper spoke for all of Wisconsin’s German Americans during the controversy. German Catholics, Freethinkers, Turners, Republicans, Democrats, and Socialists from all over the state of Wisconsin printed their own newspapers. Scholars have also yet to examine how German-American newspapers like the Germania made different appeals depending on their audience. Krez appealed to his German readers’ cultural heritage, while Koerner appealed to his English readers’ American ideals. Additionally, no one has written a comprehensive comparison of the German reporting and the English coverage of the controversy. The feud between the Germania and the Sentinel is also relatively unexplored. While the Bennett Law controversy has been analyzed by some historians over the years, by no means has every interpretive lens been used.98

This study is a reminder that the English-language take on American history is far from the only one. Millions of Americans descend from ancestors who did not speak English when they first arrived. Though the task of understanding these early immigrant views can be difficult for English monolinguals, it is certainly rewarding. The perspective of the foreign language press is, on the one hand, the perspective of insiders, inasmuch as the press was writing in America for Americans. On the other hand, the linguistic and cultural norms of the immigrant press gave them something of an outsider perspective in American culture. Such dual perspectives can enrich our understanding of the American story. Though the Germania editors fought for Deutschtum, they did so as true Americans, and whether they wrote in German or in English, they used the same language of liberty.
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