

Walter D. Kamphoefner

Liberal Catholicism and Its Limits:
The Social and Political Outlook of
the Louisville *Katholischer Glaubensbote*, 1866-86

The Catholic Church through most of the nineteenth century has often been regarded as a bulwark of conservatism and an inveterate foe of liberalism. But particularly in America, its outlook on the labor question was highly ambivalent. On the one hand, the church was largely comprised of poor immigrant workers, so sympathy toward their plight might be expected from the Church and particularly its ethnic parishes and institutions. But on the other hand, the hierarchy strongly believed in civil order and abhorred the violence which often ensued in labor conflicts. Still, it is doubtful whether the laity was always so unquestionably obedient to the clergy as enemies of the church often feared.

A narrowly focused study of one German Catholic newspaper, the St. Louis *Amerika*, revealed a surprisingly sympathetic stance toward the labor movement during the great railroad strike of 1877, but an almost diametrical reversal of opinion in reaction to the Haymarket affair of 1886. It remains unclear, however, to what extent this shift was attributable simply to a change in editorship of the paper in early 1878, and whether the *Amerika* was at all typical of the German Catholic press generally.¹ An opportunity for a broader examination of Catholic views in another heavily German river city is presented by a complete run of the Louisville *Katholischer Glaubensbote*. While labor continues to be one of the main focuses of this study, it also examines the general political world view reflected in the *Glaubensbote* (the name means "messenger of faith"), a lay-run and financed paper with clerical blessing.² Particular attention is focused on issues that placed Catholicism in conflict with other principles such as democracy and republicanism, egalitarianism, racial and ethnic pluralism, and not least a German national pride, that were present or prevalent in other elements of German-American society. The religious press, although certainly not reflecting without distortion the views of the Catholic rank and file, at least provides a midlevel perspective, thus supplying an important

corrective to the old institutional religious history largely focused on and identifying with the church hierarchy. The outlook of the *Glaubensbote* manifests a more liberal outlook and a broader degree of German-American consensus than most scholars have realized.³

Though best known for the radical "Louisville Platform" of 1855, this city's Germans included a substantial Catholic element which by the end of the Civil War had founded four ethnic parishes and was capable of supporting a weekly paper. But Catholics, too, partook of the spirit of the age.⁴ The pages of the *Glaubensbote* from its founding in 1866, reflect the existence, as well as the limits, of German Catholic liberalism. Officially independent in politics but with clear Democratic leanings, the paper nevertheless showed some striking contrasts to its southern Anglo counterparts. It unequivocally supported union and emancipation, stating in its first issue in April 1866: "We endorse the emancipation of the blacks with all our heart; freedom and self determination are necessary for every human being to reach his destination; but what we do not support is that the Negro be pushed into the foreground at the expense of the white population. . . . It is impossible with the stroke of a pen to transport a race out of slavery's shackles into the House of Representatives. That is not the right way to make out of the Negro that to which he as a human being is every bit as entitled as the white."⁵

Although the *Glaubensbote* opposed immediate suffrage for freedmen, it blamed their shortcomings entirely on environment, stressed their full human equality, and strongly supported educational and religious efforts among blacks. For example, an article of June 1866 remarked upon black criminality, but then went on to say: "One can't expect much else of the Negro, when one considers that he was born and raised in slavery, had no schools or churches, was treated and traded like a head of livestock." In August of the same year, the paper endorsed plans for building a black Catholic church in St. Louis and, two months later, related the bishop of Savannah's support for improving the spiritual education of blacks.⁶ As late as 1886, the paper stressed that there was "no more inviting field" for the church than work among black Catholics. It carried under the bold headline, "The First Colored Catholic Priest in the U.S." an extensive report on an ordination in Quincy, Illinois. And it still celebrated the total elimination of slavery in Britain and the U.S. as one of the moments which earned a gleaming crown of fame, taking first place in the nineteenth century.⁷

Occasionally the paper showed more strongly racist undertones, particularly where politics was involved. While the German population of Louisville grew by only one thousand during the 1860s to reach 14,380, the number of black inhabitants more than doubled, slightly surpassing the Germans and replacing them as the city's largest minority.⁸ Against this background, the *Glaubensbote* related under "Humor" an attempt to teach apes to pick cotton, which failed because it required ten men for each ape instead of vice versa, and concluded: "If the experiment had succeeded, the radicals [i.e., Republicans]

would have surely given the apes the right to vote." Still, it reported without further comment an incident which had raised quite a spectacle in Bloomington, Illinois: With the passage of the 15th Amendment in 1870, a German Republican paraded arm in arm with a young black woman, preceded by a brass band, the whole affair resulting from a bet.⁹

Although not without traces of antisemitism, the *Glaubensbote* in its first years spoke out against the oppression of Eastern European Jews in tones more reminiscent of liberal forty-eighters than of Catholics. For example, an 1866 article on Jewish persecution in Rumania characterized it as a staged rabble-rousing, as vandalistic and despicable as any experienced in the century. Later the same year, a report on the harassment of Jews in Poland spoke of an outrageous attempt to give them the choice of conversion or deportation. Four years later, President Grant was decried as a "fanatical Methodist and a obdurate hater of Catholics and Jews."¹⁰ Even during this era there were occasionally less benevolent overtones and frequent emphasis on Jewish wealth and power. In 1866 Prussia's foreign policy was decried as a "regular Jew-deal, and Austria as usual played the fall guy"; though several months later a headline featured "Patriotic Prussian Israelites" among soldiers and civilians in the war.¹¹

But the "ingratitude" of Rome's Jews toward the beleaguered Papacy in 1870 appears to have brought the latent antipathies toward Jews out into the open, precipitating charges that "modern Jewry shifts its loyalties with the change of political conditions as swiftly as quicksilver in a barometer varies with a change of weather." Admittedly, the Jews were not the only ones to come under fire for their treatment of the Vatican: "A bunch of riff-raff [*Lumpenpack*] is the right word for the Italian people," was the verdict of the *Glaubensbote*. But two weeks later it was running headlines like "The Jews Rule the World" and stating that it would be no wonder if persecution should break out. The next year, commenting on Russia, it asked: "Isn't it . . . a disgrace to the government when it 'intervenes' in favor of this lousy Jewish riff-raff?"¹²

Although one might expect a policy of "first Catholic, then German" on the part of the *Glaubensbote*, German interests in America or Europe were strongly defended on its pages, even where they would appear to conflict with Catholic interests. It is not surprising that the paper objected to the Protestant tone in public schools and agitated for the division of school funds among all confessions on a pro rata basis. Since this article complained about paying double for both parochial and public schools, one would think its author would especially object to German language instruction in public schools, a measure that not only drove up costs but also tended to undermine parochial education. But not so; the *Glaubensbote* found it "gratifying, that German language instruction has already been introduced into the public schools of most of the large cities of the Union," adding that not only German children benefitted from this. A few months later an article combatted the impression that German instruction in public schools would hinder the Americanization of the German element, and continued its arguments under the headline, "The Advantages of

the Knowledge of the German Language."¹³ In 1886 the paper was proud to report that thirty-eight teachers were providing German instruction to nearly six thousand children in Louisville public schools. An article the next week argued that young men and women who could speak English and German received better jobs and higher pay than those who spoke English alone.¹⁴

Political and religious historians have often argued that freethinking forty-eighters were anathema for German Catholic voters and had no influence with them.¹⁵ Yet more than once one sees the *Glaubensbote* citing Carl Schurz when he happened to agree with their cause. For example, as the Liberal Republican movement was getting under way in 1870, it reported on the uneasiness of Germans such as Schurz with their Republican allies, and a month later headlined the news that "President Grant [of whom the paper was certainly no admirer] declares war on Karl Schurz." Similarly, the paper in 1886 reported Schurz's impressions of the popularity of the Democratic President Cleveland.¹⁶

On the European side as well, the causes of democracy and German unity took precedence over purely Catholic interests. Within its first month the *Glaubensbote* was complaining about European royalty in radically egalitarian terms: "Upon bleached bones the emperors, kings, princes and dukes have built up their thrones, and from there with the title 'by divine right' they crack the whip upon their slaves." This, it argued, was what often drove people to emigration out of "the desire for freedom and self determination." The religious question was not in the foreground when war broke out between Protestant Prussia and Catholic Austria. The *Glaubensbote* argued that not Catholicism, but the parasitic nobility and its "cancerous damage" to the Habsburg throne was at the root of Austria's backwardness. Above all it was "this vermin" which fettered the process of development. "Since the bishops' seats . . . are no longer in the hands of the nobility, the Catholic religion has blossomed anew." The article went on to denounce the nobility as dumb, lazy, and immoral.¹⁷

The Protestantism of the Prussian state did not cause the *Glaubensbote* to throw its support to Catholic Austria in 1866, much less to France in 1870. In 1866 it tendered the pious hope "that the blood of the German *Volk* will not have been shed in vain, that from this bloody seed the tree of freedom will sprout up and the German nation can pluck the golden fruit of *freedom* over the graves of its fallen sons." The war was over by the next month, but the results remained unsatisfactory because "Germany is not unified. Germany is not free."¹⁸ The European war of 1870 presented the *Glaubensbote* with fewer problems of loyalties. Although respecting the [local] patriotism of those from Hannover, Hesse, Nassau, and South Germany, when it came to "defending the German Fatherland from a foreign conqueror, we despise every German who does not step into the fray." In fact, the war was portrayed not as Franco-Prussian, but as Franco-German; directed not against the Catholic French people, but against a Napoleonic dictatorship.¹⁹

A common Catholic faith was not enough to bridge the gap between Irish and German immigrants. The *Glaubensbote* presented a stern rebuttal to a New

York Irish paper's opposition to German unity and its identification of Germany with Protestantism, calling it an insult to the Germanic race and Catholic Germany. For good measure, it added that the Irish exaggerated the worth of the Catholicism and the independence of Ireland. Irish Catholics in general met with little sympathy. Their illiteracy and mortality rates (attributed to poor sanitation), were duly noted by the paper. Even an 1871 riot against a Protestant Orangemen's parade in New York brought the *Glaubensbote's* firm condemnation of the Irish "rabble" who were by no means "our people."²⁰

The German Catholic press in Louisville showed a lively interest and a surprisingly friendly face towards labor in the great railroad strike of 1877, noting on 25 July that other topics had been dropped to provide more room for coverage. Although the headlines screamed "Revolution, Robbery, Murder and Arson in Pittsburgh," the text, while condemning violence, showed considerable empathy with the workers' plight. "It goes without saying that we are not on the side of the revolutionaries and arsonists, but we must say this: the demands of the railroad workers are not unjust."²¹

The next week a lead article devoted itself to an exposition on "Who Was Right?" It listed a number of facts for consideration: The railroad workers had started the strike; however they had done so not out of insolence but out of privation. "The railroad companies, through their *unjustified* [*ungebührliche*, emphasis in original]—to put it mildly—reductions in wages, precipitated the strike and forced laborers to take matters into their own hands." The federal and state governments as well as city mayors and militias "placed themselves *prematurely* and *overzealously* [emphasis in original] on the side of capital." This in turn aroused the workers by undermining their belief in equality before the law. It was only here, under its sixth point, that the *Glaubensbote* came around to condemning labor's resort to "the law of the jungle [*Faustrecht*], not a legitimate means for obtaining a just end." But it soon returned to its original point of departure, "that man not be used or rather misused as a machine, a machine which the companies and rich capitalists need supply nothing more than the necessary oil."²²

More than once the paper stressed the need for government neutrality in disputes such as these: "The man of capital dare not have greater rights before civil authorities than the laboring man; if this is not the case, then our freedom is lost." At times the *Glaubensbote* argued in terms almost reminiscent of its Marxist antagonists: "The people are being robbed, lied to, skinned and deceived; it's no wonder that workers hope for improvement only through self-help." In promoting the solution of "justice for all and no privileged theft," the paper in one swipe implicated both heartless capital and the government which protected it.²³

Occasionally more conservative tones showed through in the Catholic press. The *Glaubensbote* distinguished between legitimate and illegitimate means of redressing grievances. It stressed a return to "true Christianity" as the solution to the social question, and lectured employers, and to a lesser extent laborers, on

their social responsibilities in a paternalistic "family." But while reminding workers that social distinctions were ordained by God, it also took the opportunity to castigate the purely materialistic view of life promoted equally by anticlerical radicals and conservative capitalists. "The reigning liberalism has robbed the working classes of their highest good, their religion; materialism has withheld from them the temporal goods. Thus it is no wonder that the oppressed turn to violence to obtain their rights."²⁴

In all of these points, there was a close congruence in 1877 between the views of the *Glaubensbote* and the St. Louis *Amerika*. The latter bandied about terms such as "proletariat" and "plutocrats" [*Geldprotzen*, spelled with "b" instead of "p"], holding up as an example for the latter the elder Vanderbilt, "who regarded labor as just a commodity, and gave his workers no greater attention than the horses who pulled his wagons."²⁵ The *Amerika's* analysis of the strike's origins resembled that of the *Glaubensbote*; it did not subscribe to any conspiracy theories of labor violence. Rather, it argued that "socialistic, or if you will, socio-political reform movements" were the best way to restrict the influence of the Communist International.²⁶ The need for action was evident, and the simplistic and moralistic advice offered by the "experts" of the day had proven inadequate. Workers were already economizing to the limits of their ability. Repression was no real answer to the crisis either; the *Amerika* obviously had no stomach for "Prussian standing armies and Bismarckian spiked helmets." Instead, the paper supported a program of federal public works, and though normally leaning toward the Democrats, argued that narrow partisan orthodoxy opposing "the subsidy theory of the old Whig party" should not stand in the way of needed reforms.²⁷

By the year 1886, little had changed in the *Glaubensbote's* positions or its empathy towards the plight of workers, except perhaps a heightened degree of awareness. In both 1877 and 1886, the paper used the terms "capital" and "monopoly" almost as interchangeably as any writer in the former East Germany. There was now a regular column headlined "Capital and Labor," reporting on disputes around the country and occasionally in Europe.

The serialization of a preposterously stereotyped novella set in Germany, "The Social Democrat," might be seen as a sign of conservatism. The plot involved an agitator named Schwarz (black) inciting the workers against a factory owner named Engel (angel), who was willing to give a 25 percent raise but balked at the workers demand for 50 percent, along with eight-hour day and 6-hour night shifts. In the ensuing strike and violence, troops are called out and fire on the mob; the protagonist Hartmann takes a bullet in the breast but is saved (temporally and eternally) by his mother's prayer book which he had stuck in his pocket to light his pipe with.²⁸ But a melodrama of this kind was probably run mostly out of convenience, for it contrasts strongly with the paper's dominant tone.

For the most part the *Glaubensbote* followed the line of the Knights of Labor. It reported extensively on the debate within the Catholic church on the

legitimacy of the Knights and their compatibility with the Catholic faith. While both sides of the question were covered, the paper's sympathy was clearly with the Knights. It gave much favorable attention to their proceedings and to the pronouncements of their leader Terence Powderly on various subjects.²⁹ This did not, however, translate into any sympathy for the Haymarket anarchists on the part of the *Glaubensbote*. Its first reaction to the affair on 9 May 1886 led off with the headline, "Knights of Labor Against Anarchists," citing Powderly's statement branding the anarchist idea as un-American and pointing out that none of anarchist leaders were Knights. During the next months, there were repeated references to Powderly and the Knights in opposition to anarchism.³⁰

One of the big concerns of the *Glaubensbote* was that "the shameless demeanor of the German anarchist gang . . . would give new and increased nourishment for nativism," directed particularly against Germans.³¹ In May the paper had repeated Powderly's denials that immigrants were the ones primarily responsible for violent strikes. Another article cited the *New Yorker Staatszeitung* to the effect that the leader of the conspiracy had been "the full-blooded Yankee Parsons," and that most of his correspondents were "by no means Slovaks, Pollocks, Germans and other 'Foreigners'" but people of English mother tongue, Parsons's fellow citizens.³²

Reports during the first week or two after Haymarket did include some wild rumors, but thereafter the paper's sober, unemotional coverage stood in strong contrast to the bloodthirsty hysteria of much of the English-language press. In fact, the *Glaubensbote* did not expect the anarchists to be convicted for murder, only to be imprisoned for inciting a riot. In July 1886 the paper devoted most of a column to "'Wise' Sayings from the Koran of Monopoly." The *Glaubensbote* opined that the *New York Herald* and railroad magnate Tom Scott should be on trial alongside the anarchist bombers for their statements to the effect that strikers deserved to be shot. The fashionable Protestant preacher Henry Ward Beecher's admonition that workers should be satisfied with bread and water was countered with the negative German version of the Golden Rule: "don't do unto others what you wouldn't like done to you." The *Glaubensbote*'s strongest ire was reserved for the *Chicago Tribune*'s recommendation that handouts for tramps be laced with strychnine: "Assassination was never preached more meanly and cynically even in the '*Arbeiter-Zeitung*,'" the organ of the condemned anarchists.³³

Right at the peak of antilabor agitation on 23 May the *Glaubensbote* spoke out for the recognition of labor organizations as bargaining agents, calling this an absolute requirement for the common good. "Workers have drawn the lesson from bitter experience that their sole guarantee against exploitation lies precisely in organization. . . . The idea of regarding a firmly united association of thousands of people as simply non-existent, is on its face absurd and laughable." The paper even announced a planned speech by the German socialist Karl Liebknecht in Louisville, noting that here he could say what he wanted: here

Bismarck, (the old nemesis of German Catholics as well as socialists), had no say.³⁴

In its analysis of the root causes of anarchism and labor violence, the *Glaubensbote* reiterated many of the same themes it had advanced in 1877. A 23 May piece, "On the Recent Disorders," began with the observation that America's free institutions did not preserve it from conflicts similar to those in Europe. First on its list of causes was the "ruthless exploitation of laborers by egoistic, unscrupulous, and unmerciful monopolies and giant industrialists, who regard their people simply as machines from whom the greatest possible output must be extracted for the least possible wages, and who thereby trample upon all the commandments of Christian brotherly love." Next in line came the "press, which denies God and all Christian principles." Only then did the paper get to the culpability of the "constant agitation and incitements of so-called labor leaders."³⁵

As in 1877, the *Glaubensbote* enunciated a "plague on both your houses" against the materialist world view shared by labor radicals and conservative capitalists. An article adopted from the St. Louis *Amerika* argued:

if the most vehement opponents [of anarchism] would take a few moments to reflect, they would find that they themselves are its fathers. When they through word and print try to sell the people on the systems of Darwin and Haeckel or of Büchner as indisputable truth, when they scorn the belief in the divine origins of the human soul or a future reward, when they promote with all their might the view that only sensual things are worth striving for and that man is a beast, then the coming generation of young people cannot help being transformed into a horde of nihilists.³⁶

This was one of the few points of correspondence between the *Glaubensbote* and the *Amerika* in 1886, though they also shared the well-founded fear that the anarchists would provoke a revival of nativism.³⁷ But for the most part, the *Amerika* could offer the laborer nothing but pious platitudes, "pie in the sky by and by," in the derisive words of a labor ditty from the turn of the century. In articles that sounded more like sermons than editorials, it contrasted the patience of European Catholics under the *Kulturkampf* with the impatience of American anarchists.³⁸ Countering the views of a priest who had pointed out the extenuating circumstances leading laborers to sabotage or violence, the *Amerika* dogmatically argued that "Divine Providence lets the virtuous enjoy the fruits of their toil and good works, but subjects the evil-minded to the fruitless pains of severe divine and human punishment."³⁹ The *Amerika* did admonish the "millionaires' churches, the Episcopalians and Presbyterians," who "instead of bringing humanity together in equality before God, separate the poor from the rich." But it had little besides abstractions to offer instead: "The great hope, the single hope of the poor is real, observed Christianity. When the world follows

the teaching of Jesus Christ and not sooner, the wounds of society will be healed and the brotherhood of mankind established."⁴⁰

A comparison with the Louisville *Glaubensbote* makes the shifting attitudes toward labor of the *Amerika* stand out all the more. There is little doubt that the change in editorship of the St. Louis paper in early 1878 was crucial. And although there are no smoking guns, it seems probable that the initial editor was forced out.⁴¹ Anton Hellmich, a schoolteacher from Mud Creek, Illinois, was replaced by Dr. Edward Preuss, who had been raised a devout Lutheran, earned doctorates at both his native Königsberg and at Berlin, taught for ten years, numbering among his students Prussian royalty, but ultimately converted to Catholicism and emigrated because he found Lutheranism to be an insufficient bulwark against liberal Protestantism. An ecclesiastical history argues that Hellmich was merely a figurehead and that Preuss, his assistant, had been "the real editor from the start."⁴² But it is as inconceivable to have Preuss railing against plutocrats (*Geldprotzen*) as it is for the man from Mud Creek to offer his beleaguered and downtrodden readers nothing but the cold comfort of theological abstractions. And it is obvious that Hellmich could be a thorn in the flesh of the wealthy lumber merchant who headed up the "Catholic Literary Society" which financed the *Amerika*.⁴³

These findings also have broader implications. Of the two journals, the Louisville paper appears more typical of the German Catholic press generally. The waning nineteenth century saw increasing, not decreasing sympathy for labor in the Catholic church and its publications.⁴⁴ It is also important to realize that the German Catholic press and its editors did not operate in isolation from the larger social forces around them. The principle of a democratic and egalitarian society—even if it manifested certain shortcomings in practice—colored their political views on America and Germany. American liberties contrasted starkly with German censorship, standing armies, and parasitic royalty. On the other hand, pride in being German, the reflected glory of a united Germany and the heightened respect it brought German-Americans in their adopted country, led Catholics as well as other Germans who otherwise had little sympathy for Bismarck or Prussia to join in the jubilation of 1870-71.⁴⁵ Not even the German Catholic press was always Catholic first and German second; there is even less reason to expect the rank and file to have been so.

Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas

Notes

¹ Walter D. Kamphoefner, "The St. Louis *Amerika* from 1877 to 1886: The Immigrant Catholic Press and the Labor Question," unpublished paper, History 356, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1974.

² The Louisville *Katholischer Glaubensbote* [hereinafter cited as LKG] in its initial number of 14 April 1866, p. 4, contained letters of approbation from the bishops of Louisville and Covington. William J. Weber, Jr. served as editor from 1866 to 1871, followed by Edward Neuhaus, 1866-75, and F.W.A. Riedel, 1876-78, with Jakob Kooper & Co. as publisher from 1871-77 and George D. Denser as editor and publisher from 1878-85. There were no noticeable shifts in editorial policy with changes in editors, and it is not known whether Weber was the son of liberal St. Louis journalist Wilhelm Weber. Karl J. R. Arndt and Mary E. Olson, *German-American Newspapers and Periodicals, 1732-1955: History and Bibliography*, 2d ed. (New York: Johnston Reprint Corp., 1965), 169-73, 250. Some general background on the ethnic community is provided by Thomas P. Baldwin, "The Public Image of Germans in Louisville and in Jefferson County, Kentucky, 1840-72," *Yearbook of German-American Studies* 29 (1994): 83-90. However, he does not mention the existence of the *Glaubensbote*.

³ The definition of liberalism employed here is a specifically German-American one based on the heritage of the 1848 revolution and its sympathizers in America. In its support of ethnic pluralism, it differs from the so-called liberalism of the Catholic "Americanizers" described in works such as Robert D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Cambridge, MA, 1958), esp. chapters 5 and 7, though both types of liberals were in broad agreement on the labor question.

⁴ Jay Dolan, *The American Catholic Parish*, vol. 1 (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1987), 245-48, 254, 281. A conservative Catholic daily, the *Louisville Adler*, founded in 1852 specifically to combat the "destructive tendencies" of the forty-eighters, folded within a couple of months. Arndt and Olson, 169.

⁵ LKG, 14 April 1866, p. 6. The *Glaubensbote*, had the highest circulation of any German paper in Louisville in 1870, ca. 5,300, but it also catered to Catholics in surrounding rural areas including southern Indiana. Of the two competing dailies, the Republican *Volksblatt* had less than half the circulation of the Democratic *Anzeiger*. Arndt and Olson 169-73. Louisville Germans had been strongly unionist according to Baldwin, "Germans in Louisville," 87.

⁶ LKG, 16 June 1866, p. 6; 18 Aug. 1866, p. 6; 6 Oct. 1866, p. 6; cf. 24 Nov. 1866, p. 4. Louisville's first black Catholic parish was established in 1869. Dolan, *American Catholic Parish*, 260.

⁷ LKG, 3 Oct. 1886, p. 3; 25 July 1886, p. 4; 17 Oct. 1886, p. 3.

⁸ George C. Wright, *Life Behind a Veil: Blacks in Louisville, Kentucky, 1865-1930* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1985), 16, 32; *Population of the U.S. in 1860: Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census* (Washington, D.C., 1864), xxxii; *Ninth Census, Volume I: The Statistics of Population of the U.S., 1870* (Washington, D.C., 1872), 389.

⁹ LKG, 23 Nov. 1870, p. 8; 6 Apr. 1870, p. 6.

¹⁰ LKG, 11 Aug. 1866, p. 3; 1 Dec. 1866, p. 2; 6 Apr. 1870, p. 4.

¹¹ LKG, 12 May 1866, p. 2; 13 Oct. 1866, p. 4; cf. 3 Nov. 1866 on the Rothschild family.

¹² LKG, 7 Dec. 1870, p. 4; 4 Jan. 1871, p. 4; 18 Jan. 1871, p. 4; 19 June 1872, p. 1.

¹³ LKG, 6 Apr. 1870, p. 4; 27 July 1870, p. 4; 18 Jan. 1871, p. 4.

¹⁴ LKG, 9 May 1886, p. 5; 16 May 1886, p. 4. In all, 5,979 children were taking German; only two of the instructors were male.

¹⁵ A good example is Sister Audrey Olson, "The Nature of an Immigrant Community: St. Louis Germans, 1850-1920," *Missouri Historical Review* 66 (1972): 342-59, here esp. p. 348.

¹⁶ LKG, 14 Sept. 1870, p. 5; 5 Oct. 1870, p. 6; 1 Aug. 1886, p. 4. It should be remembered that Schurz himself was a lapsed Catholic, and that there was some liberal Catholic support for the 1848 revolution in the Palatinate and Rhineland Prussia. Jonathan Sperber, *Rhineland Radicals: The Democratic Movement and the Revolution of 1848-1849* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 47-48, 281-83, 451-54.

¹⁷ LKG, 28 Apr. 1866, p. 2; 25 Aug. 1866, p. 2.

¹⁸ LKG, 4 Aug. 1866, p. 2; 8 Sept. 1866, p. 2.

¹⁹ LKG, 17 Aug. 1870, p. 1; p. 2.

²⁰ LKG, 24 Aug. 1870, p. 4; 26 May 1866, p. 3; 19 July 1871, p. 4-5.

²¹ LKG, 25 July 1877, p. 3.

²² LKG, 1 Aug. 1877, p. 4.

²³ LKG, 1 Aug. 1877, p. 4.

²⁴ LKG, 15 Aug. 1877, p. 3.

²⁵ St. Louis *Amerika* [hereinafter cited as SLA], 8 Aug. 1877, p. 6.

²⁶ SLA, 8 Aug. 1877, p. 6.

²⁷ SLA, 1 Aug. 1877, p. 4; cf. 15 Aug. 1877, p. 4, "More Military?"

²⁸ LKG, 15 Aug. through 12 Sept. 1886, usually on p. 6.

²⁹ LKG, 23 May 1886, p. 4; 12 Dec. 1886, p. 3. Support for Powderly and the Knights is the more remarkable because it required Germans to overcome serious anti-Irish prejudices. At the 1887 Central Verein convention, one opponent of the Knights reportedly stated that "Germans ought to consider it a disgrace to be ruled by Irish ignoramuses," but his resolution identifying the organization with "anarchists, socialists, and prohibitionists" ended up being tabled. Henry J. Browne, *The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1949), 291.

³⁰ LKG, 9 May 1886, p. 1; 17 Oct. 1886, p. 4; 24 Oct. 1886, p. 1; 2 Jan. 1887, p. 1.

³¹ LKG, 3 Oct. 1886, p. 3; cf. 29 Aug 1886, p. 4.

³² LKG, 16 May 1886, p. 3; 30 May 1886, p. 4.

³³ LKG, 15 Aug. 1886, p. 4; 25 July 1886, p. 5.

³⁴ LKG, 23 May 1886, p. 4; 22 Aug. 1886, p. 8.

³⁵ LKG, 23 May 1886, p. 7.

³⁶ LKG, 23 May 1886, p. 4; original in SLA, 19 May 1886, p. 4.

³⁷ "Results of the Anarchist Putsch," SLA, 19 May 1886, p. 4, reflected fears that a prohibitive \$800 head tax would be levied on immigrants. Cf. "Anarchists and Germans," LKG, 29 Aug. 1886, p. 4.

³⁸ SLA, 26 May 1886, p. 4.

³⁹ SLA, 19 May 1886, p. 6.

⁴⁰ SLA, 16 June 1886, p. 7.

⁴¹ Archbishop Kendrick of St. Louis was one of two members of the Bishops' Conference who voted for condemnation of the Knights of Labor. Browne, *Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor*, 211, 244-46.

⁴² Rory T. Conley, "Arthur Preuss, German Catholic Exile in America," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 12,3 (1994): 41-50; John E. Rothensteiner, "A Sketch of Catholic Journalism in St. Louis," *Pastoral Blatt* 58 (1924): 90.

⁴³ Like the *Glaubensbote*, the *Amerika* was not strictly speaking an ecclesiastical organ, but was published by the German Literary Society of St. Louis, a Catholic lay organization that appears to have been organized specifically for that purpose. Its president throughout this period, William Druhe, appears in 1878 as a lumber merchant and by 1885 as president of the Druhe-Eastman Hardwood Lumber Company at the same address, according to Gould's *St. Louis City Directory*.

⁴⁴ Browne, *Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor*, 134-6, 182-83, 212-13; Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience* (New York: Macmillan, 1985), 334-37; David O'Brien, *Public Catholicism* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 83-87.

⁴⁵ In Louisville all schools and city offices were closed for the victory parade; Arndt and Olson, 168. For statements by two immigrant Catholics of South German origins of a willingness to accept Prussian preeminence as a price of German unity, see the letters of John Dieden, 31 May 1862, and Edward Treutlein, 21 May 1869, both in the Bochumer Auswandererbrief-Sammlung, Ruhr University Bochum. For reactions to 1870-71 from otherwise apolitical immigrants see Walter D. Kamphoefner, Wolfgang Helbich, and Ulrike Sommer, eds., *News From the Land of Freedom: German Immigrants Write Home* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), 141-42, 162, 430, 585-86.

