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There has been a German presence in Philadelphia almost as long as there has been a Philadelphia. In 1683, thirteen families from Krefeld under the leadership of Daniel Francis Pastorius arrived in the city, which had been founded only the year before. Philadelphia soon became the primary port of entry for German emigrants to Pennsylvania and the British colonies in North America generally.

The German Society of Pennsylvania was founded in Philadelphia in 1764. Initially dedicated to helping newly arrived immigrants from Germany, the German Society came to play an important role in fostering the German cultural tradition and, with time, in preserving memory of the German contributions to the making of the United States. It is the oldest and most prominent organization of its kind in the country.

Like all ethnic organizations in the United States, the German Society of Pennsylvania has been subject to the vagaries of demographic, social, and cultural change. The society has adapted its programs and redefined its mission over the centuries in response to shifting patterns of immigration and to the transformation of the German-American community. Declining German immigration and waning interest in the German cultural tradition in the mid-twentieth century posed a major challenge to the German Society—a challenge greatly exacerbated by the hostilities and suspicions engendered by two wars that pitted Germany and the United States against one another. Thanks, though, to the dedication of its members and leaders, the German Society survived several difficult decades and has experienced a revival since the 1960s as it has reached out to local young people and to all with an interest in the German-American experience.

The German Society of Pennsylvania is home to an unparalleled scholarly resource, the Joseph P. Horner Memorial Library. The library was begun in the early nineteenth century to serve the needs and interests of the German Society’s members and their families. As a Volksbibliothek, it offered all manner of both recreational and serious reading materials—from popular novels and cookbooks to German literary classics and works of scholarship. The collection now contains over 70,000 volumes, including many rare titles that, in some instances, are not to be found anywhere else. The Horner Library also houses the German Society’s collections of manuscripts, pamphlets, and newspapers. These holdings offer rich source material on topics ranging from the social problems facing newly arrived immigrants to the transformations of American communal life over the past two and a half centuries.
Ethnicity Matters: A History of the German Society of Pennsylvania and its companion publication, The German Society of Pennsylvania: A Guide to Its Book and Manuscript Collections by Kevin Ostoyich, aim to bring attention to the German Society of Pennsylvania and to the wealth of research material contained in its Horner Library. The library’s catalog is accessible on the German Society’s website (www.germansociety.org), which also includes information on the society’s current programs.

Ethnicity Matters: A History of the German Society of Pennsylvania is a joint project of the German Historical Institute, Washington, DC, and the German Society of Pennsylvania. The two organizations want to voice their deep appreciation to Birte Pfleger for the fine job she did in setting the history of the German Society in its broader social and cultural context. We hope this publication will awaken interest in a scholarly resource that deserves to be better known.

Christof Mauch                      Hardy von Auenmüller
Director                           President
German Historical Institute        German Society of Pennsylvania

Dirk Schumann                      Frank Trommler
Deputy Director                    Professor of German and
German Historical Institute        Comparative Literature
                                               University of Pennsylvania
INTRODUCTION

Today the differentiation between those who simply call themselves Americans and those who claim a hyphenated identity has profound political implications and produces interesting nuances in American nationalism. People who describe themselves as Americans without reference to African, European, Asian, Hispanic, or other immigrant ancestry silently point to their families’ longtime residence in this country. Some of them, especially members of colonial heritage societies such as the Sons of Colonial Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the Mayflower Society, stake out a kind of guardianship over how American history should be taught and ultimately attempt to limit the definition of who gets to be American.

Expressly hyphenated Americans, on the other hand, define themselves in terms of their immigrant past, even if that experience is actually two or more generations removed. This does not prevent them, however, from also claiming participation in the nation’s past. Almost every ethnic group in the country today proudly points to ethnic brethren who were important actors in American history. Many Americans of German descent, while sometimes reluctant to admit to their German ancestry, are no exception. They, too, will tell anyone who listens that the Revolutionary War was saved by Baron von Steuben, that American Christmas traditions came from Germany, and that Grace Kelly’s mother was German.

But German Americans are also different from many other hyphenated Americans. Despite the fact that up to 28 percent of Americans have some German ancestry, many Americans of German descent are reluctant to acknowledge their German heritage and prefer to emphasize their non-German background. The two World Wars of the past century are probably responsible for this development. With the Second World War more than sixty years in the past, there are still, or perhaps again, German Americans in this country whose ethnic background shapes their identity and influences the way they lead their lives—their choice of friends and leisure activities, sometimes even their choice of a mate and how they raise their children. Members of the German Society of Pennsylvania (hereafter GSP) fall into this category of people for whom ancestry is important. Or simply put, for many members ethnicity matters.

The society had its origins in the eighteenth century, before the American Revolution, when the meanings of ethnicity, nationhood, citizenship and immigration were vastly different from those of today. The GSP has survived into the twenty-first century to become the oldest German ethnic organization in the Western hemisphere. This work attempts to tell the story of how the GSP endured, who its members and leaders
were, and how the past fits into the larger context of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and American history.

Chapter One explains how and why the GSP was founded in Pennsylvania, a colony with the most heterogeneous population in British North America. The stories of a few individuals whom the society assisted in their quest to succeed in the New World illustrate some of the hardships and challenges eighteenth-century German-speakers encountered. After a period of decline in the early nineteenth century as a result of decreasing German immigration to the U.S., the GSP expanded its immigrant aid efforts in the mid-nineteenth century. Its library, established in 1817, became an important factor in the society’s emergence as a cultural broker.

Chapter Two illustrates the heterogeneity of late nineteenth-century Germans in Philadelphia and examines how the GSP and other German-American organizations met the challenges posed by the First World War and the accompanying anti-German hysteria. Although investigated by the government, threatened by some overzealous American patriots, and suffering reduced membership numbers, the society emerged from the war not as badly injured as some have suggested. In part, the society’s survival might be attributed to the fact that the organization had the support of its Women’s Auxiliary, which had been founded in 1900.

Chapter Three discusses the role of women in the society and tells the story of the Women’s Auxiliary’s charitable work. Especially during the Great Depression, Auxiliary members took over much of the poor relief the society had traditionally engaged in. The surviving records tell the stories of forgotten people whose lives were often made a little easier because of the assistance they received from the Women’s Auxiliary.

Chapter Four addresses the period from the 1930s through the 1960s and the political context in which the GSP pursued its activities. Largely forgotten Nazi literature tucked away in a third-floor closet of the GSP building tells the story of some society members and leaders who were Nazi sympathizers. Although the GSP officially opposed Hitler’s regime by early 1938 and engaged in carefully staged American patriotism during the Second World War, the organization still came under government scrutiny and lost its tax exempt status in 1944. Only when the GSP combined its charitable contributions with those of the Women’s Auxiliary did the society regain its tax-exempt status in 1948. By then, German war refugees were arriving in Philadelphia, constituting new members and clients for the society. Because these newly arrived immigrants had to cope with their own experiences of hardship, they were reluctant to address Germany’s atrocities or to investigate the GSP’s fascist sympathies during the early 1930s. This failure on the part of the society and its
members to engage in any sort of Vergangenheitsbewältigung shaped the organization for years to come.

The impact of the Second World War and its aftermath for the GSP was as important as the changing landscape of Philadelphia—the topic of Chapter Five. The society’s Spring Garden location became a central problem as Philadelphia experienced profound economic and social change in the postwar decades. When Philadelphia began its long recovery in the 1970s, the society was stigmatized by being situated next to a federal housing project. Starting in the late 1980s under the leadership of a few dedicated academics, the society managed to gain the financial support of several foundations and generous individuals and was able to embark on an ambitious $3 million library and building renovation project. Between 1995 and 2000, the library’s collection was partially restored, cataloged, and made internet accessible. Funding difficulties, however, compelled the GSP to severely limit the library’s operations in 2001, in effect closing it to readers and researchers. It is to be hoped that the reopening of the library in 2006 will help spur much-needed financial support for its operations.

***

Researching and writing the 240-year history of the German Society of Pennsylvania in ten months proved to be an enormous challenge. Oswald Seidensticker and Max Heinrici’s nearly 90-year-old history of the society was a great starting point and provided much useful biographical information about early GSP members. Still, the following pages do not claim to come even close to telling the entire story. Much has been left out for a variety of reasons—space and time being the most pressing. Some areas, such as society members’ involvement in the American Revolution and the extent to which eighteenth-century members owned slaves, need further research. Many sources available at the GSP archive are also still untapped. Among the most intriguing ones are the extensive records of the society’s employment agency, its poor relief books, and the nineteenth-century membership records of other Philadelphia organizations. Jewish members and involvement in the society from the colonial period until today are briefly touched upon in Chapter Four but require further research and analysis. German-American organizations in the Delaware Valley and the country at large deserve more attention. A thorough comparative study of ethnic organizations in Philadelphia and perhaps the nation would also add to our understanding of how ethnicity functioned in the past and what role it plays today.

***
Although researching and writing are largely solitary endeavors, the completion of this project is the result of help from many people and institutions. First and foremost, I would like to thank the German Historical Institute for the opportunity to write this book. Dirk Schumann, David Lazar, and Patricia Casey Sutcliffe were patient editors and their expertise has improved this project tremendously. The California State University, Los Angeles, allowed me to take a year off from my teaching responsibilities in the Department of History. Members and leaders of the GSP welcomed me with open arms, and many took time to share their recollections of the society with me. The current administration also gave me the opportunity to present some of my findings to GSP members on two separate occasions. Andrew Gatti, an undergraduate student of history at Widener University, volunteered to track down newspaper articles and to look up hard-to-find facts. The community of scholars at the McNeil Center for Early American Studies at the University of Pennsylvania served as a sounding board for my thoughts about the society’s history.

Several friends and colleagues read drafts of various chapters and were kind with their comments and suggestions. I would like to thank Kevin Ostoyich, whose friendship as well as his amazing expertise in the German language, German history, and the society’s sources were so helpful. Frank Trommler at the German Department of the University of Pennsylvania and A.G. Roeber at the History Department at Pennsylvania State University generously shared their knowledge of German-American history, literature, and culture. Frank also read nearly the entire manuscript and provided invaluable comments. My dissertation advisor, Dickson D. Bruce, former GSP executive director Mark McGuigan, Union League Librarian and former GSP president James Mundy, and McNeil Center Director Daniel Richter took the time to read drafts of different chapters. Abigail Bruhlmann, who completed her thesis on the German-American community of the Delaware Valley at Bryn Mawr College in spring 2006, also shared her thoughts and insights. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to thank my husband Robert Cullinan for listening to my seemingly endless stories about the society, for his work on the charts and tables, and for reading every chapter.

Notes

1 For Native Americans, the politics of hyphenation are beyond the scope of this project.
The journey of the *Charming Molly* from Rotterdam to Philadelphia in the fall of 1773 ended catastrophically for the family of Jacob Uleckinger. After a stopover in Portsmouth, England, the *Charming Molly* took ten weeks to cross the Atlantic. Jacob and three of his five children died en route before reaching the New World. His wife succumbed just as the ship arrived in Philadelphia. Jacob’s brother-in-law, George Seess, survived but had to be brought to the sick house, where he reported that money his late sister had given to a fellow passenger to exchange for local currency had disappeared. It was not clear whether Jacob and his family had paid their fare or if they had planned to sell their labor to the highest bidder upon arrival to pay for the voyage. Regardless, the two surviving children, Peter, age 13 and handicapped by a malformed hand, and Andrew, age 9, would have to enter some kind of servitude to earn their keep now that both of their parents were gone. An unnamed weaver offered to pay twelve pounds for Andrew, and Nathaniel Witmore was reportedly “willing to take the eldest lame Boy without paying any thing for him.” Negotiating the boys’ indentures as well as recovering the missing money and Jacob’s chest, which was still aboard the *Charming Molly*, required inquiry and supervision. Leaders of the German Society of Pennsylvania looked into the matter.

The Uleckinger family tragedy was exactly the kind of case the society had been established to handle almost a decade earlier. According to the first rules, the GSP founders, “moved by the sorry condition of many of our countrymen who have arrived lately on ships from Europe,” gathered to “provide relief for these strangers.” The German Society quickly became the voice for German-speakers in the Delaware Valley and beyond. In addition to paying for medical care and providing legal counsel, it offered job referrals as well as monetary gifts and loans to Germans in the area. The mostly well-established Pennsylvania Germans who joined together to create the German Society ensured not only that children like Peter and Andrew would receive their inheritance but that ship captains, masters, and others in positions of authority did not abuse their power over newly arrived German immigrants.

Pennsylvanians of German descent have a long history in the Mid-Atlantic region. Starting with the arrival in 1683 of the first thirteen Krefelder families led by Daniel Francis Pastorius upon William Penn’s invitation, over 100,000 German speakers came to British North America before the American Revolution. Germans made up 10 percent of all...
colonists, constituting the largest group of immigrants to the colonies in this period second only to Africans. Tens of thousands of these newcomers made Pennsylvania their home where they composed one-third of the population by the 1750s. The steadily growing influx reached its peak between 1737 and 1754 when more than 55,000 German speakers arrived in Philadelphia. During the same period a mere 16,000 people emigrated to the Mid-Atlantic colony from England. By 1790, German speakers made up 33 percent of Pennsylvania’s population, while 35 percent was of English descent. 11 percent were Scotch-Irish, 9 percent were Scottish. The remainder were of various other European ethnic backgrounds, some Native Americans and African Americans.

With its incorporation in 1781, the GSP expanded its mission beyond aiding immigrants and became a cultural broker. No longer subjects of the British crown, Germans quickly embraced their new status as citizens of the United States. They were the first group of non-British European immigrants to assert their ethnicity within the context of their identity as Americans. The GSP briefly supported German literacy and classical education by paying the expenses for several promising boys to study at the University of Pennsylvania. Trying to preserve the German language in the United States and to bring elite German culture to Pennsylvania proved difficult, however. Even when the society began in earnest in 1817 to create a library of German literature, which it had planned to do since 1781, works of popular fiction (Trivialliteratur) quickly came to outnumber serious literary works. Within a few years, GSP readers demanded that the library also make available books in English; for much of the nineteenth century, works in English accounted for more than half of the library’s holdings and loans. The GSP itself switched to English as its official language in 1818. Promoting German language and culture in the new nation was difficult, not least because most German immigrants were simple artisans and farmers with little interest in highbrow literature.

German immigration dwindled to a trickle between 1790 and 1830, and the German Society’s activities diminished accordingly. The renewed influx of Germans after 1840, especially in the years after 1846, brought the GSP back to life. More than 100,000 Germans entered the United States annually during the 1850s, reaching more than 200,000 annual newcomers during the 1880s. Altogether, an estimated 5.5 million Germans emigrated to the United States in the century before World War I. Based on these demographic realities, German speakers needed a public voice, and the GSP tried hard to constitute that voice and to overcome long-standing regional, religious, and social distinctions among German immigrants.
An effort to “re-Germanize” the GSP began in the late 1850s when several middle-class “Forty-Eighters” joined the society. Oswald Seidensticker, a professor of German at the University of Pennsylvania, played an especially important part. He became involved in the society during the Civil War, and it was on his initiative that the GSP added an archive to its library. It was also under Seidensticker’s leadership that the society instituted a lecture series in 1867. Most of the speakers were local ministers and academics, and they usually either lectured on German culture or gave accounts of their travels or GSP benevolent activities.

The library, the archive, the scholarships, and lectures sponsored and organized by the GSP gave the society an elite air. Most of the organization’s members and leaders were, however, mostly of middling social status. This dichotomy between elite aspirations and middle-class foundations would characterize the GSP throughout its 240-year history. During the colonial era, Philadelphia families of German descent who were well-connected with the Anglo-American elite—the Shoemaker and Rittenhouse clans, for instance—generally had little to do with the society. Philadelphia’s important German-American Revolutionary War heroes such as Peter Muhlenberg and his brother Frederick led the society more in name than deed due to their frequent absences. The GSP attracted members of the up-and-coming middle class, a group eager to distinguish itself through its commitment to education, its connections to social elites, and its money. Money was an important source of power because the GSP’s board members kept tight control over the financial assistance offered to those who turned to the society for help.

The GSP’s membership was also characterized early on by a lack of continuity across generations. Two decades after the society’s founding, most of its leaders were older men, and few of their sons and grandsons had become members. This pattern was not unique to the Germans of Pennsylvania. In his study of ethnic historical societies in the U.S., John Higham notes that “it is almost inevitable that successive generations will feel less and less new to the place they inhabit.” Comparatively few members of generations beyond the first are moved to active participation by the “memory of common descent” that ethnic societies preserve and cultivate.

Providing Relief to Strangers

The story of the German Society of Pennsylvania’s founding on December 26, 1764, at Philadelphia’s Lutheran Schoolhouse on Cherry Street has been told many times by society members and historians of the German-American experience (Figure 1). The November 19, 1764, edition of Heinrich Miller’s *Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote* (The Weekly...
Philadelphia State Courier) carried a letter describing the miserable circumstances of a group of recently arrived German immigrants who were hovering near death. In response, Philadelphia German speakers quickly donated money and supplies to help. Prominent Germans in the city decided soon thereafter to found an association to engage in more con-

Lutheran Schoolhouse, 325 Cherry St., site of the GSP meeting place from 1764 to 1807 (2006).
certed efforts on behalf of their newly arriving brethren. The result was the founding of the German Society of Pennsylvania. The first action taken by the 65 members of the new society was to elect Heinrich Keppele its president. They also elected a vice-president, two secretaries, a treasurer, a lawyer, and six overseers, each of whom would be responsible for supervising the society’s poor relief efforts for two months every year.\textsuperscript{16}

Heinrich (Henry) Keppele was not a surprising choice to lead an association dedicated to assisting newly arrived German immigrants. A native of the village of Treschklingen in Baden, Keppele left Germany at the age of 22 in 1738. He sailed for Philadelphia from Rotterdam aboard the \textit{Charming Nancy}, and the experience marked him for life.\textsuperscript{17} Of the \textit{Charming Nancy}'s 312 passengers, only 62 survived a deadly on-board fever epidemic. Despite the traumatic beginning of his New World venture, Keppele established himself quickly in Philadelphia. Within three years of his arrival, he had become an elder at St. Michael’s Lutheran Church and well-enough situated to marry. His bride, Anna Catharina Barbara Bauer, was 16 at the time of their wedding; during the thirty-three years of their marriage, Anna Keppele gave birth to fifteen children, nine of whom survived to adulthood. Keppele had started out as an innkeeper and butcher, and before long he had established himself as a prominent merchant dealing in most everything from linseed oil and rum to writing paper and nails. He also invested in real estate; he was to buy and sell dozens of properties in the Philadelphia area and Lancaster County over the course of a half century. During the French and Indian War, Keppele was chosen as the lieutenant for the North Ward. He did not, however, see any actual fighting. By the end of the war, Keppele was an established leader of German-speaking Lutherans in the city. He was in charge of purchasing real estate for the growing congregation, and he donated a substantial sum toward the construction costs of the Lutheran Schoolhouse on Cherry Street. It was not by coincidence that the Lutheran Schoolhouse served as the newly founded Germany Society’s temporary headquarters.

Having been elected to a one-year term in Pennsylvania’s Assembly in 1764, Keppele was in a position to support the German Society’s first legislative initiative, a law aimed at protecting immigrants from the worst of the abuses they commonly had to endure.\textsuperscript{18} The new law added a height requirement for the minimum space allotted to each passenger; an earlier act of the assembly had specified only the length and width.\textsuperscript{19} Moreover, it required ship captains to furnish medical assistance to sick passengers, prohibited them from making more than 50 percent profit from the sale of wine, spirits, and other provisions, required the regular cleaning of passenger quarters, and mandated the presence of a translator upon arrival to read and explain passengers’ rights.\textsuperscript{20} The 1765 law also
regulated the sale of labor to pay for passage. Up until that time, any relative of a passenger who died at sea could be held liable for the dead person’s passage; the 1765 law limited liability to the children of the deceased. The law also stipulated that husbands and wives who had to sell their labor could not be separated without their consent.

The new legislation protecting German immigrants was not without benefits to ship owners. Health and provisioning regulations promised fewer onboard deaths and thus higher profits. Regulating the fares for Atlantic crossings and ensuring the orderly sale of indentures was also advantageous for ship owners and merchants—among them Henry Keppele. Keppele and his son-in-law John Steinmetz owned twelve ships, 5 percent of the vessels involved in bringing immigrants to Philadelphia between 1752 and 1775. The estimated 2,258 immigrants transported on ships Keppele and Steinmetz owned must have brought them considerable profit.21

Conditions on board immigrant ships had been notoriously bad for decades. Gottlieb Mittelberger, whose account of his experiences in the New World was published to discourage German speakers from emigrating, did not exaggerate when he described the journey as long, expensive, and dangerous. His words vividly capture most Germans’ experiences:

[D]uring the voyage there is on board of these ships terrible misery, stench, fumes, horror, vomiting, many kinds of seasickness, fever, dysentery, headache, heat, constipation, boils, scurvy, cancer, mouth-rot, and the like all of which come from old and sharply salted food and meat, also from very bad and foul water, so that many die miserably.22

To maximize their profits, ruthless captains frequently crammed as many passengers onto their vessels as possible and did not supply their charges with even the bare minimum for subsistence. Arriving immigrants often seemed more dead than alive.

The situation deteriorated further after about 1750 as the demographic profile of the German immigrants changed. In the early decades of the century, it was primarily families who headed to Pennsylvania. From mid-century on, by contrast, unmarried young men made up an increasing share of the colony’s German immigrants. Generally poor, about half of these German newcomers arrived as “redemptioners” who had to sell their labor to the highest bidder to pay for their passage.23 Many entered into their indentures without completely understanding the terms, leaving them vulnerable to all sorts of abuse.24 The GSP would deal with many such cases in the years to come.

Providing money, food, lodging, medical care, and legal counsel to “poor, sick and otherwise needy” newly arrived Germans was among the
most important activities of the GSP in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The society’s officers carefully evaluated each application for help, noting when the petitioner had arrived in Pennsylvania. Generally, anyone who had been in the New World for more than a year was no longer considered a newcomer and was thus ineligible for GSP assistance. While the society acted quickly to help those in immediate need, there was also a limit to how long the officers were willing to lend their support. On September 13, 1770, for example, they agreed to house and feed the passengers of a ship owned by James Pemberton that had just arrived from London. At their next meeting nine days later, they resolved that “it must be made known to these people that they should settle in this land so that they are no longer a burden” on the GSP.25 The society wanted to protect newly arriving Germans from abuse but did not intend to serve as a permanent almshouse. GSP members were convinced that hardworking, pious Germans would succeed in Pennsylvania. After all, they themselves had been able to attain considerable wealth and prestige in their new homeland.26

This confidence was expressed in the seal the GSP chose in 1766. It bore the simple Latin slogan Religione, Industria et Fortitudine Germana Proles Florebit – By religion, industry, and courage will the German progeny flourish.27 The image on the seal depicted an eagle over a Bible, a plow, and a sword—items of everyday life for German-born men of modest circumstances. GSP charter members such as Henry Keppele expected that, armed with these simple tools, German speakers would follow the example they had set and establish themselves as respectable Pennsylvania Germans.

German immigrants who suffered misfortunes during the transatlantic voyage or immediately upon arrival were usually eligible for GSP assistance. Simply being of German birth or descent and in need of help did not necessarily make a person eligible for GSP support. This became quite clear to John Andrews, who asked the GSP to assist a German-born doctor in Yorktown. The doctor, Andrews had reported, suffered from “a great and universal Tremor of his nerves” and was unable to work. In describing the doctor’s worthiness, Andrews highlighted his intellectual accomplishments, which had included an appearance at the Philosophical Society. But despite Andrews’s lengthy explanation of his needy friend’s medical condition, the GSP denied the request for financial assistance. Henry Kammerer, the society’s vice-president, noted that “according to our fundamental Articles, the German Newcomers only come under [our] Notice,” and thus his hands were tied.28

When it came to offering help in legal matters, the GSP was more generous in its definition of who qualified as a “newcomer.”29 Judging by the large number of cases it took on, the society clearly had a particular
interest in immigrants who were unable to pay for their passage. Any German-born redemptioner who had been wronged, physically abused, or persuaded to sign an indenture that was not in accordance with customary practice in Pennsylvania could apply to the GSP for help and be assured that it would do everything in its power to secure him or her redress. Depending on circumstances, the society might try to resolve such conflicts informally or would pursue action in the courts.

It was through arbitration that the GSP helped resolve the first dispute over an indenture in which it was asked to intervene. Johann Zimmermann and his wife sought the society’s assistance after Matthias Kopplin denied Mrs. Zimmermann’s customary freedom suit, i.e. a set of new clothing. Sometime between January 6, 1770, when the complaint was first discussed within the society, and February 17, 1770, when the GSP’s officers formally accepted the arbitration results, Kopplin was persuaded to pay his former servant five pounds Pennsylvania currency and to free the couple’s child. Since indentured servitude could last anywhere from one to seven years, it is obvious that Zimmermann’s wife was no longer a newcomer when she and her husband petitioned the GSP. Their vulnerability as servants, however, made them eligible for society assistance. The society’s action on behalf of the Zimmermann family indicates that it did not regard periods of servitude as the start of immigrants’ road to success. Only upon gaining freedom and being in possession of the basic necessities such as clothing and some money did immigrants begin the process of becoming Pennsylvania Germans.

Some ship captains tried to raise the price of passage from Europe upon arrival in Pennsylvania. Women, especially women whose husbands had died during the transatlantic voyage, were particularly vulnerable to this form of abuse. The GSP must have seemed like a godsend to the widow Mary Christina Martin, who arrived in Philadelphia with her six children on the Minerva in the fall of 1772. Martin reported to the society’s officers that her husband had agreed to pay “Nine Guineas a Freight” and had paid “40 Guilders Hollandish” up front. Martin’s husband died en route. The captain subsequently sold the services of three of her sons for 30 pounds Pennsylvania currency each, and Martin’s brother-in-law paid 10 pounds Pennsylvania currency to cover the passage of the two youngest children. Despite having received 100 pounds (Pennsylvania), the captain also sold the 46-year-old widow’s service for a term of five years for 22 pounds (Pennsylvania). Although it is now difficult to calculate a meaningful conversion rate between the Dutch guilder and the British and Pennsylvania pound, the GSP’s officers recognized that Mary Christina Martin had been overcharged. They sent Christoph Ludwig to the ship’s owners “to desire to know of them whether the Facts alledged by the said Woman are true, And whether the
Gentlemen would be pleased to favour us with a Copy of the Amount of that Woman as it stands in their Books.” Ludwig was an ideal candidate for this mission; he had the necessary language skills and the worldly know-how to talk to just about anyone. Working variously as a soldier, sailor, and baker, Ludwig had traveled the world and lived in London before settling in Philadelphia and establishing himself as a successful baker there. Ludwig and the lawyer Ludwig Weiβ met several times with the Minerva’s owners and were eventually able to resolve the dispute. That Mary Christina Martin, a poor widow only newly arrived in Philadelphia, sought the GSP’s help suggests that the society had become very well known within the city.

The GSP stepped in again in the fall of 1785 when immigrants who had just arrived upon the Lydia found themselves at odds with its captain. The captain had pledged to charge only half the usual fare if the voyage from Holland to Philadelphia lasted less than five weeks. Apparently, several passengers counted on the prospect and sought the assistance of the society when the captain insisted on the full fare for what turned out to be an eleven-week journey. Although the captain may have been within his rights in insisting upon the full fare, the GSP’s officers promised to help the now desperate immigrants “with advice and deed.”

German immigrants working as indentured servants who suffered violence at the hands of their masters could turn to the GSP for assistance. In August 1785, for example, Johannes Öttinger complained that his master Friedrich Kistelman (or Kesselmann) had “treated him barbarically [by] hitting him with the thick end of a whip, smashing a shovel on his head resulting in blood flowing from his ears” and had also threatened further physical abuse. Öttinger suffered from “lameness in the hip,” but he did not know if that was the result of the beatings he had endured or from having fallen. Three GSP officers formed a committee to ask Chief Justice McKean what might be done. The committee was also authorized to hire an attorney if necessary. A fourth GSP board member was in charge of taking care of the injured man and advancing money to cover whatever costs necessary. Three weeks after receiving Öttinger’s petition, the board approved an agreement whereby Öttinger would be transferred from a local inn to a hospital at his master’s expense. He was to be discharged from the hospital only after GSP president Christoph Wengman had been notified. The minutes of a meeting three weeks later indicate that the board expected that Öttinger would soon be released from the hospital; if his master did not voluntarily pay his hospital fees, the board would take the master to court. Since there is no further mention of the case in the society’s records, Kistelman (Kesselmann) most likely paid.
Ottinger’s experience was not typical, but nor was it unique. Barbara Ham arrived in Philadelphia in the fall of 1792 and entered into an indenture with Nathan Eyre. Seven months into her term of service, Ham sought refuge with her local alderman on the grounds that her master had treated her “inhumanly.” The alderman took Ham to a physician and may well have helped her when she filed charges against Eyre. The court, ruling in Ham’s favor, imposed fines that came to nearly 4 pounds Pennsylvania currency and ordered him to post 10 pounds security for his good behavior. But it also ordered Ham to return to Eyre’s service. It was at this point, in March 1793, that the GSP stepped in and resolved to help get Ham released from her indenture. Shortly after first taking up the case, the GSP board decided to extend Ham a loan of 5 pounds so that she could pay off her obligation to her master and get free of him. Eyre, however, apparently wanted much more than 5 pounds; only after another man, John Barkley, paid Eyre 20 pounds for Ham’s indenture was she finally free of her violent master. The records suggest that the GSP might have played a role in bringing Ham into contact with Barkley. They also note that Henry Kammerer, the society’s lawyer, submitted a sworn statement that he would not pursue any further legal action on behalf of Barbara Ham, either acting on his own or for the society.

The GSP did not necessarily side with indentured servants as a matter of course. In 1795, GSP lawyer Michael Kepple, the grandson of Henry Kepple, looked into the complaint of an unnamed German servant girl. The young woman had entered into an indenture with a Mr. Billmeyer upon her arrival in Philadelphia from Europe. Soon thereafter, she fled her master and was subsequently imprisoned. She thereupon complained that “a fraud was exercised upon her” and that “her Master made her work unnecessarily Service.” At the heart of the dispute was the question of her term of service. Although her indenture specified that she was to work for Billmeyer for two years and nine months, she claimed that her term of servitude should be only eighteen months. Investigating the matter, Kepple found that the bilingual city registrar who had recorded the indenture—and who was an active leader of the GSP—had taken pains to explain the terms of the indenture to the girl. He thus concluded that “the Interference of the Society” in the case would be “unnecessary and improper.”

Indentured servitude was on the decline by the 1790s. As Aaron Fogleman has shown, the proportion of European immigrants who sold their labor to the highest bidder upon arrival in the New World decreased dramatically after 1776. In the years 1700–1775, more than 40 percent of the estimated 255,000 European immigrants to British North America came as indentured servants. The combination of wartime social disruptions and the Revolutionary ideology of freedom and equality helped
bring about a rapid change: between 1776 and 1809, only 8 percent of voluntary immigrants from Europe, 18,300 out of 253,900, entered into indentured servitude. The percentage was cut in half again between 1810 and 1819, after which the practice of indentured servitude essentially ended for white Europeans. In Philadelphia, 255 indentures were registered in 1819. The number fell to 35 the next year, and the total for the years 1821–31 was 34. Although the demise of unfree white labor in Pennsylvania can be attributed in part to economic change, historians also emphasize that the erosion of established hierarchies after the Revolution made the idea of whites in bondage “anomalous and anachronistic.”

The GSP and the American Revolution

The American Revolution also affected the GSP as an organization. The war and the British occupation of Philadelphia disrupted the society’s meetings, charitable activities, and construction plans. Intending from the outset to build a home of its own, the GSP had purchased a lot on Seventh and Market Streets in 1765 for 125 pounds Pennsylvania currency. Fundraising difficulties and indecision delayed further action until 1776, when a property adjacent to the GSP’s lot was acquired for 200 pounds. By June of that year, lumber and stones had been purchased and workmen hired. The Revolutionary War changed everything. Due to “the dangerousness of the time,” the GSP decided to postpone the building project. During the occupation of Philadelphia from September 1777 until the fall of 1778, British authorities used the GSP’s building materials to erect a stable. But even after the British withdrawal from the city and the American victory five years later, the GSP did not immediately resume its building plans. It rented its lot until 1806 when, after much discussion, it finally began constructing a two-story building that was completed in April 1807 at a cost of nearly $7,000.

Not much is known about the GSP during the eight years of the Revolutionary War except that its members did not meet between the summer of 1776 and September 1778. Like many civilians, GSP president Keppele followed the Pennsylvania Assembly and the Continental Congress in moving to Lancaster during the British occupation of Philadelphia. He lived there with his daughter Barbara and her husband Henry Helmuth, a local Lutheran pastor. Given his age and loss of hearing, Keppele’s revolutionary activities were limited to investing in the newly chartered Bank of Pennsylvania. This institution was “less a bank than a patriotic fund-raiser with its primary goal to provide funds to supply American troops.”

Many of Keppele’s ethnic brethren were not quite as enthusiastic as he was about the American cause, at least initially. While the GSP today
points out proudly that the first printed version of the Declaration of Independence came from the press of German printer Henry Miller on July 5, 1776, scholars have shown that German speakers in Pennsylvania were rather reluctant supporters of the Revolution. The Pennsylvania Germans understood liberty primarily as negative freedom, namely, freedom from oppression. Many Germans were not familiar with English conceptions of liberty and did not see British imperial policies as reason to revolt. To Lutherans in particular, “the possibility that liberty and property could justify rebellion against legitimate authority seemed utterly preposterous.”

Philadelphia’s Germans did not on the whole play prominent parts as either Patriots or Loyalists. Some did, of course, take sides. The Pietist Germantown printer Christopher Sower (Saur), for instance, was arrested as a Loyalist and his press confiscated.

The leaders of the GSP, by contrast, supported the Revolution. Perhaps as a result of their long residence in Philadelphia and participation in the city’s commercial life, they understood the Patriots’ conception of liberty and aided the American cause. GSP founding member Christoph Ludwig, whom George Washington described as his “honest friend,” supplied the Continental Army with bread. Ludwig Weiß, the GSP’s second president, regularly wrote newspaper articles in support of independence for the German printer Henry Miller. Ludwig Farmer, the society’s third president, gave up innkeeping for soldiering and endured the terrible winter of 1777 at Valley Forge. He later oversaw the army’s provisions. Heinrich Kämmerer, who briefly held the GSP presidency several years after the war, served as a captain during the Revolution.

The most dramatic show of support for the Revolutionary cause came from Peter Muhlenberg. The son of Lutheran leader Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, the younger Muhlenberg had followed in his father’s footsteps and become a minister. When the war began, he gave a farewell sermon that was to become famous. There was, Muhlenberg told his congregation, a time to pray and a time to fight, and as he declared that the time to fight had arrived, he took off his robe, revealing his military uniform. Together with his brother Frederick, who became the first Speaker of the House of Representatives, Peter Muhlenberg led the society in 1788 and again from 1790 to 1797. Both men’s involvement in the everyday affairs of the organization was limited, however, especially on account of Frederick’s responsibilities in Congress during the early 1790s.

The GSP had its work cut out for itself in trying to resume its activities during the war. After the British left in the fall of 1778, GSP leaders scrambled to assemble their members, collect dues, and launch a citywide relief drive for poor Germans. Within a few weeks, the society had raised over 670 pounds Pennsylvania currency. The ministers at Philadelphia’s three German churches, who had been instrumental in collecting dona-
tions, were requested to announce to the poor that the GSP would distribute money to needy Germans at the Lutheran church. This initiative could not have been more timely. Prices had risen by more than 150 percent over the course of the preceding year. Philadelphians had taken to the street to protest the all-time high prices being charged for flour and other staples, and Pennsylvania’s Executive Council had tried to curb profiteering. In January 1779, the GSP decided to give poor German families cash handouts of 4 to 8 dollars, depending on their size. Generous as these gifts were, they did not go very far at a time of high inflation when the cost of a week of lodging at a comfortable inn had risen temporarily from 4 dollars in 1776 to 100 dollars five years later.

This one-time relief measure was financed by the GSP’s members and Philadelphia’s German community as a whole. All of the society’s other activities, by contrast, were paid for by membership dues. Even before the currency crisis touched off by the Revolution, belonging to the GSP was not inexpensive. The initial membership fee of twenty shillings and quarterly dues of five shillings the GSP originally imposed were beyond the means of most of Philadelphia’s German speakers. Moreover, members had to pay fines of up to ten shillings for missing meetings. Before 1776, a day laborer earned about two shillings a day, and an annual newspaper subscription to Der Wöchentliche Philadelphische Staatsbote cost three shillings. In 1781, the GSP’s membership fee stood at 200 Continental Dollars. In the early nineteenth century, after the country’s currency had stabilized, the membership fee was $5 and quarterly dues $1. That was, however, still too much for working-class Germans.

Money, Honor, and Culture

The members of the GSP were financially astute and kept careful track of membership dues and expenses. As the society slowly resumed its activities after 1779, questions arose about the way Henry Keppele, Jr., GSP treasurer since 1766, had been handling the society’s money. Keppele had acted as a bank for the GSP, and he was expected to pay interest on the funds entrusted to him. When the newly elected treasurer Georg Reinhold asked him to turn over the society’s funds and financial records, Keppele could produce neither. During the war, Keppele had handed over the GSP’s records to his father, who, like many Philadelphians, had moved to the interior of Pennsylvania during the British occupation of the city. An embarrassed delegation from the GSP approached the senior Keppele, who was able to turn over the documents but not the funds. It is not clear whether the younger Keppele, a merchant who supported the Patriot cause, had embezzled the GSP’s money or simply lost track of it. In the end, Keppele’s brother-in-law John Steinmetz vouched for him and
paid the GSP 390 pounds, 8 shillings and 3 pence. Three months later, Henry Kepple, Jr., died, but his death was not mentioned in the society’s minutes. That was unusual, as the deaths of board members were usually noted. The potential scandal of the younger Kepple’s mismanagement or possible embezzlement was ultimately defused by his father’s prominence in the GSP and Steinmetz’s generosity. Steinmetz’s intervention was prompted not only by family obligation but also by late eighteenth-century notions of honor. Honor was an important concept that middle-class men who aspired to climb the social ladder took very seriously.

It was not only individuals who adhered to notions of honor: the GSP was sensitive to affronts to its standing in society. During the 1790s, the GSP worked hard to demonstrate its own importance and the prominence of Philadelphia’s German community. Member’s funerals were an important opportunity for public display on the part of the society, and it barred no expense or effort to seek redress when it felt its honor insulted during a funeral. In 1795, for example, a coach drove through the funeral procession along Arch Street for George Biegler, who had joined the GSP only two years earlier. The society’s president convened a special meeting of the officers, and the incident was denounced as “a most egregious [sic] and daring Insult which had [sic] offered to the Society.” GSP lawyer Michael Kepple was authorized to seek advice from the best legal minds of the city “to persue [sic] all legal Means to bring the person who was guilty of this Outrage to Punishment such as the Laws prescribe.” After consulting city Attorney General Jared Ingersoll, Kepple reported that “as to the Indignity which had been offered to the Society in particular and to the Citizens of Philadelphia in general was such, as not only to justify but to require a legal Prosecution.” Kepple promised that the “Prosecution Will be entered as soon as the Name of the Offender is known.” Six weeks later, the case was resolved when the coachman Nathaniel Sweet offered a written apology. Ingersoll received $20 from the GSP for his advice. It is likely that Kepple had approached Ingersoll — who had served in the Constitutional Convention a few years earlier and was the legal advisor to many of Philadelphia’s most affluent and influential — more for the prestige he could lend to the German Society’s pursuit of satisfaction for the insult it had suffered than for the substance of his legal advice.

As part of its ongoing effort to secure its standing as the voice of Germans in the Mid-Atlantic region and to preserve the German language in Pennsylvania, the GSP began sponsoring deserving male students at the University of Pennsylvania in 1781. The university had earlier created a professorship for instruction in the classical languages “through the medium of the German tongue.” The first two holders of the position — Johann Christoph Kunze and Justus Heinrich Christian Helmuth —
were both Lutheran clergymen and GSP members. They were also the driving forces behind the GSP’s decision to sponsor students at the university. Lamenting that “only crafts and commerce find fertile grounds” in the United States, Kunze argued “we must begin to turn the poor into scholars.” Under the plan adopted by the GSP, the fathers of the young men sponsored by the society had to promise to keep their sons in school “for as long as it is deemed necessary and good.” In 1786, the committee appointed to keep track of students’ progress reported proudly that the seven young men receiving financial assistance from the society were all making good progress. Not all of the GSP-sponsored students, however, ended up completing their studies. Jacob Hoffman, for example, was expelled from the university in his third year because of bad behavior and laziness. Johannes Bausch, who seemed to be doing well during his first year, eventually asked to be released from his studies so that he could pursue a trade. The GSP’s officers made sure that Bausch’s father reimbursed the society for the tuition already paid.

Little ultimately came of the GSP’s attempt to create an educated German-American elite. By 1810, the GSP was sponsoring only one or two students at a time, and some years it had none. Stipend recipients in the early nineteenth century were exclusively students of theology, which suggests the GSP and leading German ministers were eager to ensure the supply of German-speaking clergymen. The GSP stopped sponsoring students after 1833. At that point, the so-called German department at the university was essentially defunct, and the GSP itself was experiencing a decline in membership as a result of the fall in German immigration. Likewise, nothing came of plans to conduct an annual essay contest on the theme “how best to preserve and expand the German language in Pennsylvania.”

The GSP’s faltering support of German-language education in the early nineteenth century perhaps reflected its members increasing preference for English over German. In 1818, the society made English its official language. That decision was partially reversed in 1842, when members voted that “all the records and proceedings of this society shall be kept and conducted in the english [sic] Language excepting the minutes of the society which may be kept in the english [sic] and German Languages.” The GSP thereupon recorded its minutes in German for the next three years; both English and German were used between 1845 and 1848, and after that English predominated. It was not until the 1860s, after recent immigrants had come to play a leading role in the GSP, that German was again used consistently for record-keeping.

Ironically, as the GSP was wavering in its attachment to the German language and in its efforts to foster a German-American elite, it finally
decided to take action on a long-standing pledge to create a German library. A special committee reported in 1817 that

the high standing which German literature has justly acquired in modern times and which is very little known here, rendered in the opinion of your committee highly eligible to make the beginning of such a library as contemplated in the charter without loss of time. Your committee beg leave to suggest that no good Books in any language should be excluded but, as the investments must be to a limited amount that particular attention should be paid in the first place to forming a collection of works in the German language this city being unprovided with them, whereas of English and even books in the dead languages there are so many public and private collections that hardly any individual can fail to have access to them if he wishes.\textsuperscript{71}

Three months later, the library committee proudly announced that it had purchased $200 worth of books in Hamburg and that the library would be open to members on Saturdays from 3 to 5 p.m.\textsuperscript{72} In 1819, the library committee, “understanding it to be the wish of a large number of the members of the Society that a part of the Library should consist of works written in the English language,” began to purchase books in English as well.\textsuperscript{73} According to the minutes of a March 1823 meeting, “members of this society have observed with regret the comparative smallness of the English part of the library.”\textsuperscript{74} An effort was therefore made to expand the library’s English-language holdings. Before long, there were more titles in English than German: in 1826, the library contained 853 English and 798 German books.\textsuperscript{75} By 1842, the collection had grown to 2,355 books in German and 3,369 in English.\textsuperscript{76} The GSP would continue to add more books in English than in German to its collection—and its members would continue to borrow English works more often than German—until recently arrived immigrants came to dominate the GSP in the 1860s.\textsuperscript{77} Works in German then began to account for an ever larger share of the more than 10,000 loans the GSP’s library recorded annually in the decades after the Civil War.\textsuperscript{78} The decline in the number of English books GSP members borrowed was especially marked after 1894, when the Free Library of Philadelphia opened its doors to the general public. Given the expansion of the city’s public library system at end of the nineteenth century, which broadened access to works in English, the change in members’ use of the GSP library should not be seen as a sign of increased ethnic identification but merely as a shift in where they went to read books in the two languages.\textsuperscript{79}
Nineteenth-Century Revival

The recent immigrants who began to assume leadership positions in the GSP in the 1850s and 1860s were exasperated by the society’s lack of “Germanness,” and they largely failed to recognize the distinctly German-American culture that had emerged in Philadelphia by then. The newcomers reinstated German as the GSP’s official language and tried to revive the organization as a promoter of German culture. The centenary of Schiller’s birth in 1859, for instance, provided occasion to celebrate a German literature hero. The so-called Pennsylvania Dutch traditions that had developed by the mid-nineteenth century were, by contrast, generally looked upon with disdain by the Forty-Eighters. They saw the dialect of the Pennsylvania Dutch and their adherence to traditional ways of life and farming as perhaps quaint but refused to recognize them as authentically “German.” The two groups by and large stayed far apart. When the Pennsylvania German Society was founded in 1891, it limited its membership to those of Pennsylvania German ancestry and denied admission to anyone born in Germany. While the organization shared a few members with the GSP, most notably Pennsylvania Governor Samuel Pennypacker, the two groups remained distinct from and politely distant toward one another.

The nineteenth century saw a steady increase in the number of Germans immigrating to the United States. Although only a small percentage arrived in Philadelphia and fewer still chose to settle in the city, the demand for the GSP’s services grew. In response to the establishment of the Deutsche Einwanderungs-Gesellschaft (German Immigration Society), which employed a manager who took care of needy German immigrants, in 1843, the GSP hired an agent of its own in 1846. It actually hired away Lorentz Herbert from the rival organization. Besides administering poor relief, Herbert was in charge of providing information and advice to newly arrived immigrants, ensuring that the ill received medical care, and referring those with legal problems to the society’s attorneys. The influx of German immigrants continued to grow in the decades following the Civil War. Anywhere from 20 to 71 steamships brought as many as 10,000 immigrants to Philadelphia every year, and between 17 to 50 percent of them were German speakers. After the Red Star Line steamship company began to offer service between Antwerp and Philadelphia in 1873, German immigrant traffic increased so much that the GSP appointed an immigration committee.

The most interesting innovation in the GSP’s efforts to aid immigrants was the employment agency it created in response to the mid-century revival of German immigration. Ever since the disappearance of indentured servitude, newly arrived immigrants often required assis-
tance in finding ways to make a living. The number of job referrals the GSP’s employment agency made fluctuated widely over the years, ranging from 1,302 in 1847 to 117 in 1855. On average, it placed about 450 immigrants in jobs each year through the end of the century. Despite the success of this initiative, the GSP’s agents often had a rather cynical view of job-seekers. Joseph Bernt, for instance, explained in an 1897 report that there were three sorts of people who sought assistance from the GSP’s employment agency. The first were “people who can work but do not want to work”; the second consisted of those “who want to work but cannot work”; and the third group was made up of “people who want to and can work” but who were hindered by their inability to speak English and their lack of job skills.

Society members often used the employment agency. Bernt noted, for example, that, due to the chronically short supply of female domestic servants in the city, society members had first choice of maid referrals. Considering that most GSP members were successful businessmen, it is perhaps not surprising that the society’s employment agency displayed little sympathy for organized labor or strikers, the prominence of German workmen in the labor movement notwithstanding. The Verein Deutscher Gewerkschaften (Association of German Unions) complained to the GSP in 1887 that the agency had “sent people to businesses whose workers were on strike.” The board of directors simply ignored the complaint. At the same time, though, the GSP was not insensitive to the situation of working-class immigrants. From the late nineteenth century well into the 1920s, workers’ compensation claims for on-the-job injuries figured prominently among the cases taken on by GSP-hired lawyers. GSP leaders were moved to help workers who fell victim to the all too frequent industrial accidents of the Gilded era, but they apparently could not bring themselves to support workers’ efforts to change dangerous conditions and other grievances through collective bargaining or strikes.

The GSP not only expanded its immigrant aid efforts but it also stepped up its charitable work in the course of the nineteenth century. In 1854, it revised its policy and began offering assistance to needy individuals and families who had been in the United States for over a year. With this change, the number of people seeking the GSP’s help rose. In 1871, the society doubled the number of directors engaged in overseeing poor relief from six to twelve. Each director served for one month. During his month of service, the director, assisted by the GSP’s agent, would spend weekday afternoons listening to requests for help. To ensure that aid reached the most needy, preference was generally given to requests from married men with children. Thirteen large leather-bound volumes survive today that record the names and circumstances of every person who turned to the GSP for assistance between 1869 and 1914. These
registers also record the society’s responses. Typically, the society preferred to hand out goods (clothing and shoes) or vouchers (for meals, accommodation, or train tickets) rather than cash. In the rare cases where the GSP gave money, the sums were usually quite modest, ranging from 25 cents to a few dollars.\textsuperscript{93} The agent also kept an elaborate registry of names that directors used to cross-reference applications for assistance and to weed out fraudulent requests. The agent also went to great lengths to protect the GSP from tricksters and professional beggars. For example, he kept a list of all passenger ships arriving in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York. If an applicant for assistance could not name the ship he or she had sailed upon and its arrival, his/her request would usually be denied.

As the number of German immigrants increased, so, too, did the number of those seeking the GSP’s assistance. The records of the society’s poor relief efforts make clear that the dream of America as the land of opportunity often turned into a nightmare.\textsuperscript{94} New and recent immigrants were vulnerable to shifts in Philadelphia’s economy. During the economic crisis of 1873, for example, 1,380 men and women turned to the GSP for help; the year before, the figure had been 838.\textsuperscript{95} In the absence of government welfare programs, private charitable initiatives like the GSP’s were the only source of aid to America’s poor. Many immigrants must have found it embarrassing to ask the GSP’s help and to undergo its scrutiny.

The growing number of newly arrived German speakers in Philadelphia also stood behind a program that contributed substantially to a change in the character of the GSP. In 1867, the society began operating a night school that offered courses in English. Thousands of immigrants, mostly but not exclusively men, took advantage of the school. This renewed involvement in education was notably different from the GSP’s earlier support of a few talented students at the University of Pennsylvania. Instead of trying to foster a homegrown German-American elite, the society now concentrated on uplifting the huddled German masses. Its school committee noted with satisfaction that the students would “give honor to the German name” as they overcame not only their lack of English-language skills but their more general educational deficiencies as well.\textsuperscript{96}

Although the GSP’s English classes usually had a few adult students who had been living in Pennsylvania for a decade or longer, newcomers who had been in the country less than a year typically accounted for as much as half of each class. In 1871, for example, 192 students enrolled in the GSP’s classes, of whom 91 had been in the U.S. for less than one year, 51 for less than 2 years, and 31 for less than 3 years.\textsuperscript{97} That same year, the city of Philadelphia began to fund the GSP’s school, which allowed the
society to begin offering German language courses. The enrollment in the German courses was low, however, and the program did not survive long. Demand for instruction in English remained strong, and total enrollment reached over 1,000 students annually. Most were skilled workmen ranging in age from 13 to 30. Women generally made up less than 10 percent of the students. As German immigration declined in the late nineteenth century, enrollment decreased accordingly. In 1915, the GSP converted its English language courses into naturalization classes for German immigrants.

The revival of German immigration in the mid- and late nineteenth century transformed not only the GSP’s activities but also Philadelphia’s German-American communities. The new arrivals founded a variety of social clubs and associations that reinforced German regional identities. In contrast to the GSP, organizations like the Cannstatter Volksfest Verein (founded 1873) and the Bayerischer Volksfest Verein (1875) made no attempt to reach beyond the popular interests of their middle-class constituencies. Concentrating on socializing, singing, dancing, and, of course, beer-drinking, some Vereine soon surpassed the GSP in membership. It is ironic that just when their German fatherland was being united as a nation-state, Germans abroad deliberately cultivated the regional and religious distinctions that had divided them in the Old World.

The original charter of the German Society promised to help “those arriving who stood in danger of being oppressed due to lack of knowledge of language and laws.” People such as the Uleckinger boys benefited from the society’s founders’ commitment to their newly arriving brethren and received much-needed assistance in the eighteenth century. When the organization briefly became involved in efforts to preserve the German language and to raise a German-American educated elite after the American Revolution, the attempt soon failed. Due to decreasing German immigration in the early nineteenth century, the society’s immigrant aid activities declined. With the influx of more Germans after 1850, the GSP was revived, both through new members and needy ethnic brethren.

Since 1817, the organization has put much time, money, and effort into creating a library that today has become the largest privately owned collection of German-American history and literature in the country and perhaps the world. In large part built and utilized by post-1850 German immigrants, the library became the centerpiece of GSP leaders’ commitment to their German heritage. The same generation of leaders and members also revitalized the organization’s dedication to helping newly arriving Germans. By hiring a paid agent for its poor relief program,
instituting an employment agency, an immigration committee, as well as an English language evening school, the GSP became an important benevolent association for Philadelphia’s German Americans in the second half of the nineteenth century. Waning German immigration, regional, religious, and class differences among German Americans, and the emergence of other German-American organizations, however, created a less unified ethnic community than the GSP would have liked. The First World War of the next century would test the resilience of the society and German Americans in general.
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The members of the GSP responded to the outbreak of the First World War in very different ways. In 1915, thirteen members resigned from the society; well over one hundred members had left by the end of the war. According to the GSP’s annual report for 1915, one longtime associate had explained bluntly that “as a loyal citizen of the United States it was impossible for him to continue his membership.”

This position stood in stark contrast to that of Charles Hexamer, who was then serving as the president of both the GSP and the National German-American Alliance. Writing in the Alliance’s Mitteilungen, Hexamer condemned those who repudiated their German heritage:

> We have before us a bitter struggle, and we can wage it successfully only if we are united. . . . Whoever casts aside his Germanism from him like an old glove is not worthy to be spat upon. Such a rascal is a deserter. . . . We have long suffered the preaching that ‘you Germans must allow yourselves to be assimilated. You must merge into the American people’: but no one will ever find us prepared to consent to an inferior culture.

GSP leaders embarked upon a vigorous defense of Germany, German culture and German-American institutions at the outset of the war. But once the United States entered on the side of Entente powers and all things German came under increasing criticism, the GSP became a bastion of American patriotism. This shift saved the organization, and the toned-down version of German ethnic pride that accompanied it was emblematic of the changing outlook of Philadelphia’s German-American community. To understand the differing reactions to the war, we must examine Philadelphia’s German-American community during the three decades prior to World War I.

**Philadelphia’s German Communities**

The establishment of a German nation-state in 1871 did not suddenly create ethnic unity among Philadelphia’s German speakers. The city’s Germans may have briefly united to celebrate Prussia’s victory against France (Figure 2), but they did not constitute a single community. Philadelphia was home, rather, to a number of German-speaking communities based upon regional, religious, and class affiliations.

Contemporary observers divided Germans in America into “soul Germans” and “stomach Germans.” “Soul Germans” asserted the supe-
priority of German *Kultur* and the German language; German cultural influence, they insisted, could help make America the greatest civilization on earth. “Stomach Germans,” on the other hand, limited their ethnic identification to partaking of certain culinary delights, engaging in social activities, and perhaps reading a German-language newspaper.  

While this contemporary assessment may be rather simplistic, it does highlight the diversity among ethnic Germans in America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. As many as one-third of German-speakers in America were not active in any sort of German institution or organization. The principal institutions that attracted German Americans were churches (above all Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic) and *Vereine* (associations). Particularly in the Midwest, *Kirchenvereine*—church-affiliated charitable associations—were sometimes established even before parishes or congregations were organized. *Vereine* that were not church-affiliated attracted secularly oriented, mainly urban Germans who were “possessed by an almost missionary eagerness to propagate and spread their particular *Weltanschauung,*” which rested in large measure on the belief that Germans were culturally superior to native-born Yankees.  

The GSP was associated with a vocal and visible minority group within the German community. In 1892, the society was just one of 642 German organizations, including nearly 300 mutual-aid institutions and over two dozen singing associations, in the Philadelphia area. The city was home to approximately 160,000 first- and second-generation Germans, who made up 15 percent of the population. The GSP attracted middle-class Germans who aspired to be the elite of their ethnic group.
Although the GSP was officially unaffiliated with any religious denomination, its members were more often than not Protestants. A number of Lutheran and Reformed ministers held leadership positions within the GSP over the years; Catholic priests, by contrast, appear not to have been active in the society. Even if German Americans were not directly affected by the confessional tensions aroused by Bismarck’s anti-Catholic Kulturnkampf, Catholic Germans in the U.S. tended to avoid German organizations that were not church-affiliated.\textsuperscript{10} Joseph Bernt, the GSP’s agent from 1893 to 1916, was a rare example of a German Catholic who held an important position in a predominantly Protestant secular organization and also played a leading part in a Catholic institution at the same time: in addition to his job with the GSP, Bernt edited a Catholic newspaper, the \textit{Nord Amerika}.\textsuperscript{11}

Philadelphia’s German Protestants, especially Lutherans, were often loyal supporters of the GSP. German- and English-speaking Lutherans in Pennsylvania were long at odds over which language to use for church services and synod meetings. Neighborhood German Lutheran churches thus often became ethnic strongholds where German-language services were anxiously preserved. The German language was closely tied up with Lutherans’ religious identity because they saw Martin Luther as the father of modern German. This view was compatible with some of the GSP’s positions. Indeed, there was a long history of cooperation between the society and Philadelphia’s Lutheran congregations, and it comes as no surprise that all the ministers of the city’s Lutheran churches became GSP members. That holds true to this day.

The GSP aimed to be a neutral ground where the different German ethnic communities within Philadelphia could come together to express, create, defend, and celebrate their \textit{Deutschtum}. But due to the GSP’s middle-class character and values, working-class Germans rarely set foot within its hall except to apply for assistance or to take advantage of its evening English courses. Working-class Germans appear to have looked beyond ethnicity and were bound to their counterparts of other ethnic backgrounds by their shared class interests. During Philadelphia’s general strike in March 1910, for example, thousands of German workers joined their Irish and Anglo-American colleagues on the picket line.\textsuperscript{12} For middle-class Germans, ethnic identity generally remained more important than class consciousness in the decades before World War I. Ironically, the outbreak of war in Europe did more than any of the efforts of organizations like the GSP or the National German-American Alliance to unite Germans in America across class lines.\textsuperscript{13}

The GSP was in competition with at least half a dozen other associations engaged in highlighting German contributions to American history, organizing social events, and offering charity to poor Germans. The
Cannstatter Volksverein, for example, was founded in 1873 with the express purpose of providing traditional German entertainment. For most of its history, it could boast a larger membership than the GSP’s.\textsuperscript{14} A few prominent German speakers, such as John File and Pennsylvania Governor Samuel Pennypacker, were members of both the GSP and the Cannstatter Volksverein. The family names of nineteenth-century Cannstatter members suggest the great majority came from southwestern Germany and were probably drawn to the organization on account of its regional origins.\textsuperscript{15} Part of the Cannstatters’ appeal no doubt stemmed from their three-day festival every September. All Philadelphians were invited to have a good time eating, drinking, and dancing in the city’s parks during the festival. But Cannstatter members were concerned with more than just having a good time. Within seven years of its founding, the organization was contributing more money to charity annually than the GSP.\textsuperscript{16}

German associations of all varieties increasingly had to compete with other forms of entertainment and leisure activity in the decades around 1900. Recent scholarship on German-American institutions dates the beginning of their decline to the 1890s rather than the First World War, as had long been assumed.\textsuperscript{17} With the proliferation of inexpensive mass entertainment—ranging from sporting events to vaudeville and amusement parks—and the emergence of a new consumer culture, Americans had increasingly less time and money for participation in social or charitable groups. This shift in habits was reflected in the membership figures of organizations like the GSP. In 1911, for example, the GSP lamented a 30-percent decline in its membership since 1902.\textsuperscript{18}

Another factor in the decline of ethnic associations was a change in the conception of “race.” By 1900, the once-derided Irish could at last claim to be “white,” for example, but Eastern and Southern Europeans, who were entering the United States in large numbers, could not. In Philadelphia, the percentage of Italians, Russians, and Poles in the city’s total foreign-born population rose from 16 to 33 percent between 1900 and 1910.\textsuperscript{19} This period also saw a large migration of African Americans from the South to the Mid-Atlantic region; in the first two decades of the twentieth century, more than 50,000 blacks settled in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{20}

In response to the country’s changing ethnic profile, as Russell Kazal has shown, German Americans adopted a variety of nativism that cast them as “old stock” Americans who were superior because of their “race” and because members of their ethnic group had arrived in North America before the American Revolution. This outlook was reflected in the GSP’s stance on immigration and in its activities. Its 1903 annual report portrayed German Americans as good citizens and Germans as desirable immigrants, and it made clear the GSP’s eagerness to assist in formulat-
ing policies that would ensure “the restriction of undesirable immigration.” Two years later, the annual report argued that a congressional proposal to limit immigration from any given country to 80,000 people per year “was problematic and dangerously liberal” as it applied to “undesirable immigrants.” There is no question that the GSP’s leaders had recent arrivals from Eastern and Southern Europe in mind when they complained of “undesirable immigrants.” The GSP also began at this time to place ever greater emphasis on German contributions to American history. Society leaders highlighted Germans as among the founders of America to instill recent German immigrants with pride in both their ethnic heritage and their adopted homeland. This expression of German cultural chauvinism was not solely a response to the growing numbers of African Americans and immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe in the Philadelphia region, however. It was also a reaction to Anglo-American efforts to exclude “others” from the nation. The GSP’s characterization of Germans as champions of freedom and preservers of the Union stands as evidence of a growing desire among German Americans in the decades before World War I to lay claim to a share in their nation’s history and to celebrate their American patriotism.

The GSP, it should be added, was not alone in praising the virtues of German immigrants. A government-sponsored study undertaken in 1911 seemed to give scientific credence to claims of German superiority. The study looked at rates of crime and literacy, along with much else, among different immigrant groups. Germans came out better than any of the groups of more recent immigrants. This study was widely cited as evidence by those who saw the country created by “old stock” Americans threatened by the “new immigrants” who had played no part in building the nation.

The Monument Movement

It was no accident that a movement to pay tribute to German cultural icons and German American heroes arose in this climate of scientific racism and German chauvinism. The GSP and other German-American organizations eagerly took up the call for monuments to honor figures such as Francis Pastorius and Peter Muhlenberg to reinforce German Americans’ claims to full membership as Americans.

As the leader of three German organizations, Charles Hexamer was instrumental in the movement to erect monuments to notable German Americans in Philadelphia. Since famed Germans like Friedrich Schiller and Alexander von Humboldt had been honored with monuments in the nineteenth century, Hexamer and other German-American leaders argued the time had come to recognize a German-American historical fig-
ure. Monuments, as Hexamer explained, would provide “public visual instruction” in the role of German Americans in the nation’s history. In 1905, Hexamer spurred the GSP to action by pointing out that “the Puritans” had erected a monument in front of Philadelphia’s city hall.  “Muhlenberg, who was [GSP] president for many years and who played such an important role in the United States, does not deserve to receive less recognition,” he reminded the society’s board members. They quickly approved a motion to create an organizing committee for a Muhlenberg monument. When it was reported nine months later that Philadelphia’s Germans had not yet donated enough money to build the monument, Hexamer complained “it was regrettable that the local Deutschtum did not show any more interest . . . to honor such a deserving German-American.” The fund-raising effort would take another four years. The GSP’s Muhlenberg committee was finally able to report in April 1910 that $7,252 had been collected, enough to cover the cost of the monument. Six months later, the monument was dedicated during the celebration of German Day.

The GSP also became involved in the effort to erect a monument to Francis Pastorius, the founder of Germantown, the first German settlement in the New World. As a committee formed in 1907 to organize the celebration of the 225th anniversary of Germantown’s founding noted, “what Plymouth Rock . . . means to Anglo-Americans, that is Germantown for Americans of German descent: a place consecrated by historical memories.” A Pastorius memorial, in other words, would symbolize German emigration to America and reinforce German Americans’ claims to count their forebears among the founders of the nation.

The National German-American Alliance led the fund-raising effort for the Pastorius monument, but the GSP was closely involved in the design-selection process because Hexamer was president of both organizations. In July 1910, Congress voted to allocate $25,000 for the Pastorius monument under the condition that the Alliance raise the same amount. The final decision on the design of the monument rested with the U.S. Secretary of War, the governor of Pennsylvania, and the National German-American Alliance. By 1912, an advisory jury had narrowed the field to two artists, Otto Schweizer, who had designed the Muhlenberg monument and was a prominent GSP member, and Albert Jaeger, a noted German-born artist based in New York. In January 1913, the jury decided in favor of Jaeger’s design because it gave “by far the best promise of success.” Perhaps to placate the aggrieved Schweizer, the National German-American Alliance agreed to purchase three bronze versions of his design, one of which is still on display in the GSP’s Horner Library today. Schweizer’s design was also in effect a memorial to Hexamer, whom the artist had used as a model for one of the figures.
Although the Pastorius monument was scheduled to be dedicated on October 6, 1914, it was not completed until the spring of 1917, whereupon it was promptly covered over with a wooden enclosure on account of the American declaration of war upon Germany. The monument was finally unveiled in a brief ceremony on November 10, 1920. The modest event, Russell Kazal notes, marked the “virtual erasure of the German-American ethnic presence” that had been so prominent a decade earlier.32

Charles Hexamer and the National German-American Alliance

Charles Hexamer was the son of a Forty-Eighter. Having grown up surrounded by German immigrants of his father’s generation, he became a champion of German Kultur. He joined the GSP in 1883 at the age of 21 and was chosen to serve on its board eight years later. In 1900, Hexamer was elected president of the GSP; 38-years-old at the time of his election, he was one of the youngest men ever to hold that office.33 He was also one of the GSP’s longest-serving presidents, remaining in office until 1916. For decades, Hexamer worked tirelessly on behalf of his German heritage and demanded the same of those around him.34 In 1899, he founded the National German-American Alliance to combat the decline of the Vereinswesen, dwindling membership in German ethnic organizations, and competition from new pastimes.

When Hexamer founded the National German-American Alliance in 1899, GSP board members were initially hesitant to join. The Alliance, which lobbied for expanded German-language instruction in public schools, could not avoid political activity, and for that reason, GSP leaders feared possible violations of the society’s charter.35 Soon, however, the two organizations were inextricably linked as GSP board members took on positions within the Alliance.36 The close connection between the two organizations was reinforced in 1911 when the women’s branch of the Pennsylvania Central Alliance merged with the Women’s Auxiliary of the GSP.37

The Alliance never attracted large numbers of nationally prominent German Americans from the worlds of industry, finance, or academia. The psychologist Hugo Münsterberg of Harvard was a notable exception. At the outset of World War I, Münsterberg had grand plans to draw large numbers of the German-American upper class into the Alliance and thereby create a political force that could work “in Washington politics in the interest of a really neutral policy.”38 Nothing came of his efforts, however.

The Alliance was more successful in its efforts to promote German Americans’ identity as “old stock” Americans. In countless speeches and essays, Hexamer highlighted Germans’ contributions to American his-
tory. He was firmly convinced that German Americans had achieved recognition as respected hyphenated Americans. In 1911, for example, he declared that German Day celebrations were “becoming more and more American commemorations, recognized by our population and enjoying more than ever general participation.” The Alliance summed up its understanding of the German-American position in its motto, “Germania our Mother, Columbia our Bride.” When war broke out in Europe in 1914, this motto aptly captured the dilemma German Americans faced: they could not deny their parentage, but nor were they willing to forsake their spouse.

**World War I**

In response to the situation in Europe, Hexamer led the GSP and the Alliance in the effort to “preserve the prestige of the German name . . . against malice and ignorance.” He called for the creation of press offices in all major American cities that could “react immediately in the English language against spiteful attacks . . . by irresponsible reporters in English newspapers.” He also urged German Americans to organize local aid societies to collect donations for wounded German soldiers and the widows and children of soldiers who died, thereby demonstrating to the American public at large that “blood is thicker than water.”

“[E]very German Verein, every German association, German societies and churches of all denominations everywhere” were exhorted to collect donations on behalf of the National Relief Fund Committee for the Wounded and Destitute in Germany and Austria-Hungary. The appeal was extremely successful: within weeks, well over $100,000 had been collected.

By its own reckoning, the GSP played an instrumental role in organizing aid for Germany. Its 1914 annual report claimed the society had become “the central location for all efforts in the interest of the German cause and the alleviation of suffering in Germany and Austria-Hungary due to the war.” In 1915, the GSP turned the ground floor of its building over to the German and Austro-Hungarian Red Cross for use in coordinating its relief efforts.

The fund-raising and relief efforts undertaken by the GSP and other German-American organizations were seen by many Anglo-Americans as evidence of “extravagant partisanship for Germany” even though they “were not necessarily representative of the masses of German Americans.” Not all German-American organizations followed the GSP and the Alliance in the drive to support the fatherland. The German Society of New York, for example, did not engage in any fund-raising efforts on behalf of German war victims and continued to do “only what it was
founded for.” This stance did not, however, prevent the New York organization from losing members. Indeed, in percentage terms its membership loss over the course of the war—22 percent—was nearly double the GSP’s (12 percent).46

Although the GSP supported the war relief effort on behalf of the Central Powers and its Women’s Auxiliary was active in collecting money and supplies for the effort, the society officially refrained from making explicitly political statements. Ever careful to avoid political entanglements, the GSP was nevertheless a silent partner in the public relations campaign undertaken by other German organizations in Philadelphia. John Mayer, a GSP board member (and later president), was the president of the United Singers of Pennsylvania, which represented over three dozen German singing societies. In October 1914, he wrote a letter to the editor of an English-language newspaper to protest the calumnies and unwarranted attacks made upon Germany by a part of the American press. In the development of our nation, the educational and cultural mission of the German race has been of vast influence and has been favorably commented upon by the American public and press. The American people therefore owe Germany a debt of gratitude and certainly a favorable remembrance. The studied antagonism, misleading statements and deliberate perversion of truth as shown by certain newspapers can be construed as having only the object of influencing public sentiment against the German government, its army and people. In the maintenance of this struggle no sympathy is asked for or needed by the Germans in Europe or their friends here. An emphatic objection is made, however, to the manner in which the notoriously unreliable news from abroad is presented and prominently featured, and in particular, to the biased and unjust editorials, which appear in our newspapers and are contrary to the American sense of justice and Fair Play.47

Three months later, Mayer, speaking in his capacity as president of the United Singers, called England “a loathsome, damnable country of liars” that had brought this terrible war onto “our old fatherland.”48 In denouncing England, Mayer was echoing the views held by many German Americans during the early years of the war.

Mayer rarely missed an opportunity to rally German Americans to the cause of the Fatherland. In addition to writing letters to newspapers, he organized several mass meetings in Philadelphia and one in Chicago. In January 1915, Mayer reminded GSP members of a meeting of the American Neutrality League at the Academy of Music and asked those present to attend. The meeting was intended, he explained, as “a mass
protest to pressure the U.S. Congress to prohibit weapons exports to the warring European nations.”

Germany came under heavy attack in America’s English-language press for the alleged brutality and savagery of its invasion of Belgium. Although German-American leaders came to the Reich’s defense, and even though some even touted its early victories in the war as proof of German superiority, the criticism of Germany in the English-language press did not extend to German Americans in the early stages of the war. But when a German submarine sank the British ocean liner *Lusitania* in May 1915, killing more than a thousand people, including 128 Americans, many American newspapers accused German Americans of disloyalty and sabotage. The “ethnocentrism” displayed by the leaders of the National German-American Alliance, as one historian has noted, “contributed mightily to a polarization of popular opinion.”

By the autumn of 1915, the concept of hyphenated identity was under attack, and the drive to Americanize immigrants intensified.

In a message to Congress in December 1915, President Woodrow Wilson insinuated that German Americans’ support of Germany was disloyal to the United States. There were, Wilson said, “citizens born under a different flag and admitted and welcomed to the privileges of citizenship and opportunities of this country who have infused into the veins of this country the poison of disloyalty.”

Vehemently denying Wilson’s veiled accusations against German Americans, John Mayer challenged the widespread sympathy for Britain in the U.S.:

> What do we as Americans have to do with England? We are no longer an English colony! Anti-English certainly does not mean anti-American. . . . We German-Americans are and remain good American citizens and always anti-English because England has never been a friend of this country.

In the spring of 1916, Mayer, Hexamer, and other German-American leaders from Pennsylvania organized a meeting of German-American societies, Vereine, and newspapers in Chicago ostensibly to voice their opposition to the U.S. government’s position on the war in Europe. The aim of the gathering was, however, to organize German Americans to help defeat Woodrow Wilson in the upcoming presidential election. The participants adopted a resolution proclaiming that “any candidate for the presidency who is not in accord with the views expressed herein is unworthy of the support of a free and independent electorate.”

John Mayer and Sigmund von Bosse, a Lutheran pastor and GSP member, led the effort to rally German-American support for the Republican candidate, Charles Evans Hughes. Hexamer, too, endorsed Hughes, but did so as an individual rather than in his capacity as president of the
GSP and the Alliance. He even paid out of his own pocket for a flyer that proclaimed that “no self-respecting American of German birth or extraction can vote for President Wilson.”

Despite the efforts of Mayer, von Bosse, and Hexamer, German Americans did not line up unanimously behind Hughes. For example, the writer Hermann Hagedorn, a superpatriot outspoken in his support of the Allies, dismissed the Alliance’s defenses of Germany as “pompous drivel” and backed his friend Theodore Roosevelt. German-American newspapers did not uniformly endorse Hughes, and Hughes himself was not expressly pro-German. He actually rebuked German-American support of Germany, but the mildness of his criticism prompted Wilson and Roosevelt to paint him as the German-American candidate. On election day, more German Americans cast their votes for Hughes than for Wilson or Roosevelt and thereby came closer to voting as an ethnic bloc than they had in any previous election. Nonetheless, it would be misleading to speak of a solid German-American vote.

Wilson’s re-election did not slow down the efforts of the GSP and other German-American groups to collect donations for the widows and children of fallen German soldiers. Just before Christmas 1916, for example, the GSP made its hall available for rehearsals for a large benefit concert. GSP officers and members were prominent among the organizers and attendees of a charity event a month later sponsored by the Zentralverband der Veteranen und Krieger der Deutschen Armee, one of many German veteran organizations in Philadelphia.

In its annual report for 1916, the GSP lamented that “more German blood was flowing” in Germany’s “fight for its existence against a world of predatory enemies.” The report expressed the hope that 1917 would “grant the righteous cause victory and with that a lasting peace.” A German victory became steadily less likely, however, as relations between Germany and the United States deteriorated in early 1917. In February, Wilson broke off diplomatic relations with Germany in response to its resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. On April 2, at the president’s request, Congress declared war on Germany.

The National German-American Alliance, meeting in the GSP’s hall, decided in February 1917 that it would hand over donations collected for the survivors of German war dead to the American Red Cross in the event of war between Germany and the United States. Charles Hexamer announced at the meeting that the Alliance’s three million members would “fight loyally under the command of President Wilson, just as German-Americans had fought in the American Civil War under Lincoln.” Pledging to organize German-American regiments, Hexamer promised, “should there be a call for volunteers, we will prove to the
American people that we are willing to defend the flag and the country.”

Not all German Americans agreed with Hexamer’s stance. The Illinois branch of the National German-American Alliance, dismissing even the possibility of war between Germany and the U.S., denounced Hexamer’s plan to turn the money collected for Germany over to the American Red Cross as “without value and validity” even for legal reasons. Others attacked Hexamer for promising German-American troops to the U.S. military.

Taking account of the changing political situation, the GSP decided in March to limit the use of its hall by other organizations. Mayer, who had recently succeeded Hexamer as president of the GSP, also reported to the board that he had been invited to participate in a meeting of the “Home Defense League” called by the mayor of Philadelphia. The League had issued a unanimous resolution in full support of the American president. When some delegates proposed that special mention be made of German organizations’ support for the resolution, Mayer objected. As he told the GSP board, he had argued against regarding “citizens of German descent as a special class of citizens” since Germans in case of war “were only Americans, Americans first, last and always.”

It had become clear, however, that German Americans were widely seen as a special class, as a threatening postcard the GSP received demonstrates. The postcard had been sent by the Patriotic Sons of America, an anti-Catholic and antiradical organization.

If the sympathy of your Society is with the United States, place the stars and stripes outside of your building, as you did of the German colors. This is a friendly tip. The Society of the Patriotic Sons of America is only one short square from your building on 6th and Spring Garden Streets. So get the flag out at once. If you do not do so and anything happens you know you have been warned.

The head of the GSP House Committee reported that the society had followed this menacing advice. At the same time, the GSP’s board requested that Mayer show the postcard to the mayor and other members of the Home Defense League and ask what protection they would offer the GSP. Two days after the board meeting, Mayer invited the leaders of all the German organizations in the city to meet to discuss strategies for German institutions and to form an advisory committee.

Following Congress’s declaration of war, Mayer issued a statement that was carried in several Philadelphia newspapers. Mayer renounced German Americans’ identity as hyphenated Americans, insisting that “we do not want to be put in a special class and called German-
Americans.” “We protest most emphatically such a term in a crisis like this,” he declared. “We are Americans, nothing but Americans, loyal through and through.” Americans of German descent, he emphasized, “will do their duty.” Rudolph Blankenburg, who had earlier served both as mayor of Philadelphia and president of the GSP, went a step further and exhorted “all citizens of German birth or descent to declare their unflinching allegiance to the country of their adoption and to show by word and deed that they are true and unaltering Americans”

Our acts will show how we condemn and scorn the ‘hyphen’ so unjustly bestowed upon us as a class. We are not German-Americans, but Americans of German birth or descent, and as Americans we shall live and, if need be, die.

Hexamer, on the other hand, chose to remain silent.

During the early months of America’s direct involvement in the war, the GSP adopted a two-pronged strategy for survival. First, it continued to function as an aid organization for German immigrants. The war in Europe had initially provided a boost to the American economy, and German Americans and German immigrants shared in the benefits of expanded employment opportunities. Following the country’s entry into the war, some employers dismissed workers of German descent. More Germans lost their jobs when Wilson issued an executive order prohibiting German residents who were not American citizens from holding jobs in certain sectors and in certain places. Some of those who lost their jobs turned to the GSP for assistance.

Second, the GSP made gestures demonstrating its patriotism. It went so far, for instance, as to offer the mayor the use of its hall for any event he wanted. The offer was not entirely disinterested: as a board member pointed out, making the hall available to the city would secure “special protection” for the GSP.

Anti-German Hysteria

Before long, everything associated with Germany came under attack in the U.S. In the fall of 1917, for example, the Philadelphia orchestra banned German music from its repertoire. Sauerkraut became liberty cabbage, and the public burning of German books was considered a demonstration of American patriotism in some communities. German Americans in Philadelphia and nationwide became the targets of suspicion and wild accusations. Some were victims of anti-German violence; one German immigrant in Illinois was hanged by an angry mob.

In August 1917, President Wilson signed an executive order requiring the registration of all aliens over the age of 14. They were also barred from transportation hubs and other strategic locations considered vital for the
war effort. Some commercial properties belonging to aliens were confiscated, and thousands of German aliens were interned.\textsuperscript{76} The German-language press came under close government scrutiny, and several socialist German-language newspapers were charged with criminal offenses under the Espionage Act of 1917.\textsuperscript{77}

The GSP endeavored both to aid Germans caught up in the anti-German hysteria and to demonstrate its patriotism. It supplied those in need with job referrals or relief aid, and it did what it could to provide German aliens with legal advice.\textsuperscript{78} The GSP initially also tried to continue its efforts to teach the public about the role of German Americans in the country’s history. With that end in mind, a publicity committee was created in 1917. It was supposed to supply newspapers with articles on German heroes of the American Revolution, such as Christoph Ludwig, Washington’s “honest friend.” But the committee itself realized that “under the current circumstances, the irritability of the American spirit and the mood against everything German, it made little sense to publish such stories,” and the GSP’s board thought it unlikely that English-language papers would be willing to publish the articles.\textsuperscript{79} Although the GSP opted not to call attention to itself—deciding, for example, to cancel its annual German Day celebration in 1917 and forgoing the commemoration of the 400\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of Martin Luther’s posting of his Ninety-Five Theses—it also tried to demonstrate its patriotism. It invested $1,000 in Liberty Bonds; paying 4 percent interest, the bonds were not the best investment, but the purchase was intended to send a signal.\textsuperscript{80} In similar spirit, the GSP’s board suspended its usual Monday evening meetings when the Wilson administration introduced “heatless Mondays” to conserve coal. Noting that it “wished to avoid all possible conflicts with the authorities,” the board decided in early 1918 to turn down almost all requests from other organizations to use its hall. More importantly, the GSP became an intermediary between government officials and Philadelphia’s non-citizen Germans by assisting police officials in cities and postmasters in rural areas to register non-citizen Germans as enemy aliens.\textsuperscript{81}

The GSP’s efforts to adapt to the new situation did not prevent it from coming under suspicion. In April 1918, the Philadelphia \textit{Evening Bulletin} reported that the GSP’s library held “many books carrying the most bitter form of German propaganda.” When the board met to discuss the allegations, a member of the library committee dismissed the attack, explaining these pro-German books . . . undoubtedly came to us merely through ordinary commercial channels. They were not specifically ordered. . . . If there is the slightest objection to the circulation of some of the books named in the report, I am sure the
objection would be honored. The members of this society are loyal to America, . . . We have added during the year a large number of books that might be styled intensely anti-German. There has not been the slightest thought of propaganda, and there will not be, in connection with the library.

The board decided to limit library access to GSP members only. Previously, non-members had been allowed to use library materials during business hours. 82

Shortly before the GSP’s run-in with the Evening Bulletin, the National German-American Alliance disbanded. The decision came in response to a Senate investigation launched by Senator William King of Utah. The congressional hearings determined that the Alliance had “fostered racial separatism and foreign allegiance among German-Americans” but had done nothing illegal. 83 Although cleared of actual wrongdoing, the Alliance could not withstand the animosity bred by anti-German hysteria. On April 11, the leaders of the Alliance voted to dissolve the organization.

The GSP inadvertently became entangled in the investigation of the National German-American Alliance. Some of the Alliance’s records were stored at the GSP, and a reporter told federal investigators that the Alliance’s files contained “a list of German sympathizers within draft age . . . and statistics of value to the German cause.” When a federal agent and the reporter went to the GSP and demanded to see the Alliance’s records, Herman Heyl, the GSP’s longtime treasurer who was serving temporarily as its business agent, denied all knowledge of the matter. A subsequent search of the premises turned up documents belonging to the Alliance in the furnace room. Some allegedly connected the Alliance to Philadelphia liquor interests and Sinn Fein, the radical Irish party. 84 Within hours of the search, Heyl and GSP vice-president Franz Ehrlich made their way to the federal investigators’ office on Ninth and Market Streets, just a few blocks from the GSP’s building. In the presence of federal agents, Ehrlich telephoned Adolph Timm, the secretary of the Alliance (and a GSP member). To his embarrassment, Ehrlich learned that Timm and Mayer had indeed stored some Alliance records in the GSP’s basement after destroying others. In a subsequent interview, GSP president John Mayer told a federal agent “that everything had been destroyed and that he had sold the filing cabinets, and that nothing was in the records that would in any way be harmful to the United States.” The agent reported that Mayer “admitted being favorable to Germany before the entrance of the United States into the war, and was active in the affairs of the ‘American Neutrality Society.’” 85 This interview appears to have brought the government’s investigation of the GSP to a close.
The investigations of the Alliance and the GSP testify to the prevailing climate of suspicion. The neighborhood around the GSP’s building was swarming with federal agents searching for German spies. One agent, for instance, responded to reports about a German man who lived “alone, with a helmet, some army clothes and various documents” at 728 Green Street, literally around the corner from the GSP. The man’s neighbors had reported that he came and went at all hours and carried a cane that some thought might be a weapon. When the agent found that no one was officially registered as residing at the address and learned that the house had recently been offered, unsuccessfully, at a sheriff’s sale, he decided to turn the matter over to the U.S. Attorney. Although it is not clear who the mysterious man living in the abandoned house might have been, he was certainly not a dangerous German spy.

Anyone of German descent could easily come under suspicion. Long-time GSP board member Frank Sima was accused by his neighbors of celebrating German victories “with beer, wine and German patriotic songs.” Similarly, Harry J. Smith, the Pennsylvania Dutch manager of the Allentown branch of the State Employment Bureau, came under official scrutiny after he sang a German song during a social gathering at the posh Adelphia Hotel. The agent investigating Smith brought the case to a close only after receiving ample evidence of Smith’s patriotism—evidence that ranged from his father’s military service during the Civil War to his own purchase of $800 worth of Liberty Bonds. Even then, the agent cautioned Smith against “engaging in singing any more songs of a German character.”

Some investigations came in response to accusations prompted by personal motives that had nothing to do with politics or the war. An investigation of a woman named Mary Stotz was initiated, for example, after two of her neighbors accused her of having made disloyal remarks. Stotz was cleared only after a young woman acquainted with all three women told investigators that she had “never heard her [Mrs. Stotz] talk one way or another about the war, but that she knew that Mrs. Haines and Mrs. Stotz have had continually . . . personal difficulties and that Mrs. Haines is a woman who would have words with people very quickly and often.” It was not animosity but rather affection that landed one young man in trouble. In the presence of other people, he bragged to a woman that he was a German sailor and had escaped from an internment camp in Gloucester. He had the good luck, though, that the investigating agent quickly saw through his tale and recognized it as “simply a romance originated to impress a girl with German sympathies.”

No accusation, no matter how unlikely or trivial, went unchecked. Investigators were sent out to the Hillside Cemetery just outside of Philadelphia in response to a report that it housed “a life statue of a German
soldier carrying a German flag.” The offending statue turned out to be a monument honoring the veterans of Germany’s war against France in 1870. The investigators learned that the memorial had been erected at the turn of century by the German Veterans Association and decided that it could stay where it was, since most members of the association were “good loyal citizens with sons with the colors overseas.”

Germans were not, however, the only ethnic group who found themselves under scrutiny. In the fall of 1918, a federal agent attended the meetings of several ethnic organizations in Philadelphia to determine their attitude toward the war. He reported that the Ukrainian Club’s public proclamation of loyalty to the U.S. was insincere because many of those in attendance were “against this country” and had said “Germany must win this war.” At the Polish Club, located only a stone’s throw away from the GSP, the agent found the members divided: some were “loyal to this country” but “others still collect money for Germany.” The situation was much the same, he reported, at the Lithuanian Independent Club.

The best way for both individuals and organizations to combat allegations of disloyalty was to buy war bonds. Failure or refusal to do so raised serious suspicion. As the U.S. Attorney in Philadelphia explained,

Of course it is a man’s right to refuse to subscribe to either Liberty bonds or the War Chest, and there is no legal obligation to subscribe to either. Of course, a refusal to subscribe to the Loan, coupled with disloyal remarks, might be evidence to be considered with other matters in determining a man’s loyalty.

As this outlook was tantamount to official policy, it is not surprising that the GSP purchased $3,500 worth of Liberty and Victory Bonds even though they did not yield as much as its other investments. GSP vice president Franz Ehrlich proudly wrote to Philadelphia U.S. Attorney Francis Fisher Kane in the spring of 1918 to report how much money Americans of German descent had contributed to the annual war bond drive. Perhaps tired of the pointless investigations and futile hunts for German spies, Kane took the time to reply and praised a “splendid showing” that “ought to make German Americans of this city proud of what they have done.”

Intolerance of everything German in the wake of the American declaration of war on Germany was perhaps an inevitable result of the constant defense of Germany in the German-language press across the nation up until the U.S. became directly involved in war. That ethnicity was a matter of emotion rather than politics for most German Americans—an attachment to certain facets of culture rather than an ideological adherence to the Reich—did not matter to other Americans. The war, as Fred-
erick Luebke has noted, “was the occasion that converted latent tensions into manifest hostility.”96 The GSP recognized the historic significance of the mounting anti-German sentiment evident even before the American entry into the war. In March 1917, the board decided that the GSP should collect copies of war-related materials—government decrees, newspaper articles, propaganda materials—for its archives.97 Unfortunately, the assembled documents were never cataloged, some have been lost or destroyed over the years, and the surviving collection is in disarray.

**Picking up the Pieces after the War**

The war and anti-German sentiment took a toll on German-American associations. Some suspended their activities for the duration of the war.98 Struggling to survive, some changed their names or merged with others. Many were forced by circumstances to close their doors for good. The GSP was among those that tried to ride out the wave of anti-German hysteria by publicizing their patriotic efforts.

The GSP continued to tread a careful path following the armistice of November 1918, tentatively trying to reestablish itself as a visible German presence in Philadelphia while still underscoring its American patriotism. In June 1919, it began to discuss the possibility of organizing relief for Germany; it decided three months later that it would work with the Society of Friends rather than establish a German aid organization under its own leadership.99 Nothing could be done, however, until the board and members had determined whether a relief effort for Germany was permissible under the GSP’s charter. Taking a narrow reading of the charter, the board was not certain the GSP was permitted to engage in activities outside of Pennsylvania.100 At a special meeting in early November, the membership voted to authorize the board to undertake a relief action for Germany. Within the next two months, the GSP’s Committee for Famine Stricken People in Central Europe collected more than $7,000.101

The GSP was careful in the public image it presented in the early postwar period. At Philadelphia’s Fourth of July parade in 1919, the representatives of all non-German ethnic organizations marched in traditional outfits and carried national symbols; the GSP contingent, by contrast, wore everyday street clothing and waved American flags. Later that year, the all-male social Verein Schlaraffia asked to use the GSP’s building for its weekly meetings; the board turned down the request on the grounds that Schlaraffia opened its meetings by singing the German national anthem.102 In 1920, the GSP’s school committee decided to offer free classes to prepare German-speaking aliens for naturalization.103 The GSP’s efforts to Americanize newly arrived German immigrants stand as
evidence of its goal to be 100-percent American. They also reflect the self-perception of the GSP’s leaders; as “old stock” Americans, they saw themselves as fully qualified instructors in what it meant to be American.

By mid-1920, the GSP board apparently thought hostility toward all things German had abated sufficiently for it to back away from one of its more demonstrative wartime displays of patriotism. It decided to trade some of its Liberty Bonds in order to invest in mortgages that paid one and a half percentage points more than the government securities. Clearly, the GSP no longer considered it necessary to hold war bonds as proof of its patriotism.

Having survived wartime anti-German hysteria, the GSP found itself confronted with a different sort of challenge in the postwar period. The neighborhood around its headquarters at Spring Garden and Marshall Streets had changed considerably since the GSP had moved there in 1888. German immigrants and German Americans were moving to northern sections of the city. Large numbers of Eastern European and Russian immigrants, above all Russian Jews, had moved into the neighborhood, establishing businesses and religious institutions of their own. Whereas about half the residences and businesses in the area had been German-owned at the turn of the century, only about a quarter were still in German hands by the mid-1920s. Some German organizations and institutions, recognizing the demographic shift early on, had already relocated to other parts of the city. In 1919, the Slovenic National Society approached the GSP and offered to buy its building; in response, the GSP board formed a special committee to explore the feasibility of a move to “a better area.” When the Slovenic National Society withdrew its offer, the GSP decided to stay put.

It was not only the GSP’s immediate neighborhood that was changing. The number of German-born Philadelphians was declining and would fall from approximately 40,000 in 1920 to fewer than 28,000 by the end of the decade. The interwar years would also see an increasing divide between new and recent arrivals from Germany and long-settled German-Americans. During the 1920s, some 400,000 German immigrants entered the U.S., and they felt largely alienated from the majority of Germans who had arrived before 1895. More recent immigrants had little interest in preserving the Deutschum and did not like what they saw as an outdated version of German culture cultivated in German ethnic organizations. Those organizations, many already struggling for survival during the war, were dealt a serious blow by the enactment of the Eighteenth Amendment in January 1920: Prohibition not only put an end to the beer-fueled sociability that was a central to many Vereine but also put a core constituency of club life out of work, namely brewery owners and
Many of the German Americans who had identified themselves as hyphenated Americans before 1914 ceased to do so after the war, opting instead to call themselves “Americans of German descent” or simply “Americans.” Steadily fewer German Americans could speak German or were interested in German culture. The generation of German Americans who came of age between the two world wars was characterized, in the words of Frederick Luebke, by “a sort of cultural amnesia.”

The GSP had 520 members on its rolls in 1914, a figure that hardly supported Hexamer’s and the GSP’s public pronouncements about the strength of Deutschtum in the United States. Indeed, the GSP’s membership had declined by about a third between 1900 and the beginning of the war. There were other indications of change as well. The once vigorous German-language press was shrinking. Many German newspapers folded or merged, and those that survived had to cope with an ever smaller readership. Schools were cutting back on German courses, and the German language was on the decline in German parishes and congregations, in Vereine and German organizations, and in German-American homes. It was a sign of times that the GSP decided in 1911 to publish its annual reports both in English (in abbreviated form) and German.

The war brought hardship to individual German immigrants and German Americans and to ethnic German institutions and organizations. The National German-American Alliance dissolved under the pressure of public hostility and official suspicion. The already suffering German press was especially hard hit: fully three-quarters of the German-language newspapers published in the U.S. in 1914 did not survive the war. The GSP outlasted the wave of anti-German hysteria. Some of its members were outspoken German cultural chauvinists during the early years of the war; some became American superpatriots after the United States declared war upon the Reich. A few GSP members participated in public political debate. Former GSP president Ralph Blankenburg, for instance, was a leader of the Friends of German Democracy, which advocated the abolition of the imperial crown and the creation of a German republic. Most GSP members, however, seemed to have tried to steer clear of politics, and it appears likely that many of those who quit the society during the war were quietly waiting for the wartime hostility toward all things German to blow over before rejoining. The surviving documents do not clearly indicate how many members left or rejoined the GSP in the years from 1917 to 1922. According to its financial records, the GSP collected only $471 in dues in 1918, which could mean that it had as
few as 115 active members. By 1923, membership had rebounded to 554.\textsuperscript{115}

Not all German-American organizations were as cautious as the GSP in the early postwar years. In 1919, George Sylvester Viereck, a militantly pro-German writer, and a group of like-minded German Americans founded the Steuben Society. Their ambition was to create an umbrella organization that would unite local German societies and clubs, and they hoped ultimately to forge a German-American voting block.\textsuperscript{116} The Steuben Society never managed, however, to enroll more than 20,000 members nationwide.\textsuperscript{117}

Charles Hexamer, the ardent defender of American Deutschtum, died as the GSP and the German-American community were grappling with the new realities of postwar America. Broken by the war between the two countries he loved, shunned by his friends and neighbors, Hexamer died in October 1921 at the age of 59. His successor as GSP president, John Mayer was also dead when the society honored both men at a special ceremony in May 1922. All the speeches at the event honoring two men who had dedicated their lives to everything German were held in English.\textsuperscript{118}

The society’s new leaders would face the challenges of the roaring twenties, the Great Depression, and another World War started by Germany. They would not be alone in their efforts to cope. Since 1900, the Women’s Auxiliary of the German Society had taken over most of the poor relief work. Together the men and women of the GSP shouldered the burden of being German in a world that seemed to have turned upside down.
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This anecdote was recorded by GSP member and historian Max Heinrici. See Max Heinrici, “Die ereignisreichen zwanzig Jahre, 1915–1935 der Geschichte der Deutschen Gesellschaft von Pennsylvanien,” unpublished manuscript, page 6, GAC, uncataloged.

R. L. Hagele, Conshohocken, PA, May 31, 1918, Record Group 118, box 39, file 3432 Restricted.


W.S. Carman, Philadelphia, May 21, 1918, and May 27, 1918, Record Group 118, box 39, file 3432 Restricted.

W.S. Carman, Philadelphia, October 31, 1918, Record Group 118, box 39, file 3432 Restricted.

Anthony Amber, Philadelphia, September 18, 1918, Record Group 118, Box 38, folder 7.

U.S. Attorney to Mr. William Clark, October 1, 1918, Record Group 118, box 38, folder 6.

GSP Annual Report 1919.

Ehrlich to Kane, May 21, 1918, and Kane to Ehrlich, May 23, 1918, Record Group 118, box 38, folder 6.

Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty, xiii.

The special membership meeting resulted in unanimous approval of assistance for Germany. It is interesting to note that only twenty-four members attended the meeting.

GSP Annual Report 1919. Between 1919 and 1921, individual German Americans donated more than $120 million to war-ravaged Germany. See Rippley, *The German Americans*, 193.

Schlaraffia was originally founded in Prague in 1859 as an all-male social club that made fun of the aristocracy. The Philadelphia chapter was organized in the 1890s and finally had its Burg at the GSP from the early 1960s until 2002. Since then it has moved to the Verein Erzgebirge in Philadelphia’s suburbs. For the GSP board meeting discussion about Schlaraffia, see GSP Minutes, October 27, 1919.


St. Paul’s Independent Lutheran Church decided to move to Olney after more than fifty years at its Northern Liberties location, for example. Kazal, 217.

For a more detailed discussion of the effects of Prohibition on German brewers in Philadelphia, see Kazal, 202–204. Even George Beichl, GSP president from 1974–1993, whose newsletters are full of almost militant Germanness, did not consider himself German-American during the 1920s and 1930s. See Kazal, 234.

See membership statistics in chapter 3 and Kazal, 82.

See GSP Annual Reports for 1918–1923. Annual membership dues were $4.


von Bosse, *Dr. C. J. Hexamer*, 13.
The day after Christmas 1849, the German Society of Pennsylvania convened its anniversary meeting as usual and with little debate decided to exclude women from membership in the organization. The minutes of the meeting make no mention of the discussion of the topic that had taken place at its previous meeting in September, nor do they offer any details of the vote to deny membership to women. The secretary noted merely, “It was moved and seconded that Ladies descendants of Germans be admitted as members of the Society, which was negated.”

Almost exactly a century later, in February 1949, GSP president Ernst Jockers reported that the charitable contributions made by the society’s Women’s Auxiliary would henceforth be recorded in the GSP’s financial accounts. In exchange, one member of the Women’s Auxiliary would be given a seat on the GSP’s board. The accounting change allowed the GSP to reclaim the tax-exempt status it had lost four years earlier shortly before the end of the Second World War. This chapter explains how women, who had been deliberately excluded from the GSP in the mid-nineteenth century, came to found an organization of their own that ended up literally saving the GSP in the mid-twentieth century.

Nineteenth-Century Women and Charity

It is not surprising that women would have sought to become members of the GSP in the late 1840s. Involvement in charitable organizations and reform movements had by then become a badge of middle-class identity for white women. Moreover, there were precedents of women of German descent in Philadelphia and elsewhere in the nation organizing for good causes. The Ladies Aid Society had been founded in 1804; the widow Anna Cruse established the first German Sunday school in 1809; the women of Philadelphia’s German St. Michael’s and Zion Evangelical Church had formed a charitable organization of their own in late 1834. And it was not only German-American women who were engaged in philanthropic work in Philadelphia at mid-century. In 1847, for example, a group of women founded the Rosine Association, which sought to alleviate the poverty and degradation suffered by so many women in the city. The widespread support for such engagement by middle-class women rested on the assumption of women’s superior moral character; the popular Ledger was just one of many newspapers and magazines published in Philadelphia that espoused this view of women during the 1840s. That women wanted to become active in the GSP was thus by no
means unusual. That the proposal to admit them was rejected was, given the conservatism of most members, hardly surprising. \(^5\)

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the GSP dealt with women primarily as recipients of relief or as beneficiaries of its social services. Most of the women who entered its hall were indigent widows who, accompanied by their children, benefited from the annual Christmas *Bescherung* (gift-giving). Some women and girls took advantage of the GSP’s language classes, but they accounted for less than 10 percent of the 21,000 students who had enrolled by 1903. \(^6\) Working-class women sometimes made use of the GSP’s employment agency. In the late 1880s, as many as a third of the individuals who found jobs through the agency were women. \(^7\)

To the wives and daughters of members, the GSP was of interest above all for its library. Indirect evidence suggests many female readers made use of the library. In 1851, the board passed a resolution to grant library privileges “to adult unmarried daughters of deceased members who leave no widows.” \(^8\) Eight years later, the library rules stipulated that “widows of deceased members or unmarried daughters who are of adult age, can if they continue to pay the regular quarterly contributions, make use of the Library in the usual manner.” \(^9\) One indication that women may have constituted the majority of the library’s users was the fact that more than 80 percent of the books loaned were novels, novellas, and poetry—the standard reading fare of Victorian middle-class women. After the Women’s Auxiliary of the German Society was founded in 1900, one of its first acts was to ensure that its members would have access to the GSP library. \(^10\)

Middle-class women were not entirely excluded from participation in the charitable activities of the GSP and other German associations in the years before the founding of the Women’s Auxiliary. The GSP granted the women’s branch of the Cannstatter Volksverein and the Ladies’ Aid Society of the German Hospital use of its hall for their meetings in 1889. \(^11\) A year later, it offered members’ wives the use of two rooms on the second floor of its building to encourage them “to participate in the humanitarian efforts of the Society.” \(^12\) Members’ wives had by then already been long active in the society’s annual Christmas *Bescherung*. Yet they rarely received any recognition beyond the occasional mention in the minutes of GSP meetings and thus had to rest content with the satisfaction of knowing that they had made the holidays a little brighter for some poor Germans.

**German Gender Norms and the Women’s Auxiliary**

Philadelphia’s middle-class women of German descent found themselves in an awkward position in the late nineteenth century. Their ethnic iden-
tity carried one set of expectations and their class status another. Much like their colonial-era forebears, German-American women of the Gilded Age were expected to live by gender rules that differed from those applied to their Anglo-American counterparts. During the eighteenth century, German-speaking women on New World farms were expected to work in the fields side by side with their husbands, a custom their English neighbors found appalling. A variety of contemporary observers contrasted the frugality of hard-working rural and urban German women with the penchant for luxury typical of the beautiful but lazy English women in the New World.\textsuperscript{13} Even if few middle-class Philadelphians still spoke in those terms a century later, gender expectations and behavior were still differentiated by ethnicity. Middle-class Anglo-American women who participated in Philadelphia charitable organizations would, for instance, more likely than not be supporters of the temperance movement; for obvious cultural reasons, middle-class German-American women with ties to the GSP and other German groups were usually opposed. As many GSP women were Lutherans, who were known for their general conservatism, they may have also been reluctant to become involved in the politics of Progressivism.

A comment by Georg von Bosse, a Lutheran pastor and prominent GSP member, illustrates the differing perceptions of German-American and Anglo-American women. Married to an American-born woman of German descent, von Bosse insisted that “in my house, I am Herr, and there does not rule some ‘New Woman’ or the will of the child.”\textsuperscript{14} While this statement seems to limit German women’s role in Philadelphia severely, Germans also surprised and perhaps shocked their Anglo neighbors by bringing their wives and children to beer gardens, Verein picnics, and other public celebrations. This kind of public family togetherness stood in contrast to Anglo organizations, which regularly excluded wives from social occasions. Moreover, not all German husbands had the time, energy, and inclination that von Bosse seems to have spent on supervising the proper Germanness of his household.

It was widely recognized that in all ethnic groups women had an important role to play in preserving ethnic identity. German women seem to have used this responsibility as an opportunity to range beyond their domestic duties. They founded their own secular charitable associations and auxiliaries to their husbands’ Vereine. There was also a long tradition of church-affiliated organizations for German women, which usually had twice or even three times as many members as their counterparts for men. Focusing on turn-of-the-century nineteenth-century Philadelphia, Russell Kazal has set the success of German women’s organizations in contrast to what he describes as a crisis in the male Vereinswesen.\textsuperscript{15}

Charity before Government Welfare
Kazal’s assertion that female-led German Vereine thrived is certainly valid for the Women’s Auxiliary of the GSP. It was established in May 1900 with 100 members; within a year, its membership stood at 400 and at 610 by the end of the decade.\(^\text{16}\) [Chart 1] The middle-class women who belonged to the Women’s Auxiliary tread cautiously as they sought to fulfill their responsibility in cultivating German ethnic identity. They eagerly took up the appeal from the all-male GSP for assistance in matters “more suitable [to women] in their character and essence than to men,” but they could not and would not follow their working-class ethnic sisters or their middle-class Anglo-American counterparts in calling for women’s suffrage. For one, the suffrage movement was closely associated with the temperance movement.\(^\text{17}\) But middle-class German-American women also had a different understanding of the special maternal qualities women were purported to possess. Whereas the suffragettes argued that women’s inherent maternalism would make the world a better place once they were fully enfranchised, middle-class German Americans opposed the vote for women because they feared it would degrade women by threatening “to take wife and mother from her proper place and make her a contestant in the political arena.”\(^\text{18}\)

It was in their capacity as family caretakers and nurturers that members of the Women’s Auxiliary, in one of the group’s first initiatives, purchased 38 tables and tablecloths for the German Society in the hope that they would be used for gemütlich gatherings. The same evening that their donation was announced, the women introduced a new style of sociability when they served cake and beverages to GSP members on the new tables.\(^\text{19}\) This was an unprecedented innovation: early GSP rules had insisted that eating and drinking had no place in the serious business of
helping newly arrived immigrants. Since 1901—and to this day—the Women’s Auxiliary has been visible within the GSP above all by providing food and drink at society events and tending to the clean-up afterward. In other words, a century’s worth of change in the position of women in American society notwithstanding, the members of the Women’s Auxiliary have still not left the kitchen. Indeed, it has long been the Auxiliary members’ domestic skills, manifested in homemade goods that are offered for sale, that have underwritten the group’s charitable activities.

The existence of the Women’s Auxiliary changed the way the GSP conducted its poor relief. With the Auxiliary’s assistance, the society created a sewing room in its headquarters in 1905: rather than handing out cash, which it had always done reluctantly, it now gave indigent women the chance to earn money by producing garments for the society’s Christmas Bescherung. Each week, Auxiliary leaders noted carefully how many skeins of yarn and how many yards of cloth each worker received and how many pieces of clothing she produced. Ironically, the women who were paid pennies to sew clothes were also the women who would receive gifts of clothing from the GSP at Christmastime.\(^{20}\)

Important as the sewing room was, the major focus of the Auxiliary’s charitable work was providing assistance to the needy on a case-by-case basis. At each of its meetings, the situations of several individuals or families were discussed in detail, and the board would then assign members responsibility for individual cases. The members were expected to provide progress reports on their cases at subsequent meetings. Because many Auxiliary members were also involved in the Ladies’ Aid Society of the German Hospital or other charitable organizations, they could often turn cases over to other organizations or arrange for joint assistance with them.

**Women’s Auxiliary Charitable Work**

The Women’s Auxiliary, as noted in the previous chapter, was instrumental in organizing the relief effort for the widows and children of fallen German soldiers during World War I. This work continued in much the same fashion after the U.S. declared war on Germany as it had before, but now donations were collected for the American Red Cross. The war relief effort expanded the role of women in German institutions on account of their fund-raising know-how. Perhaps more importantly, caring for widows and children was also seen as being compatible with their maternal duties. Tellingly, the Auxiliary did not experience the decline in membership the GSP did during the war. Although at least half of Auxiliary members were the wives, daughters, or sisters of GSP members, the
Auxiliary’s membership, in marked contrast to the GSP’s, grew during the early years of the war and declined only slightly during the years of direct U.S. involvement. (See chart 1).

Women’s work on behalf of Germans might not have been considered as threatening as men’s. During periods of harassment, as historians have suggested in other contexts, women sometimes become “ambassadors” of their ethnic groups.21 Unlike the GSP, the Women’s Auxiliary also steered clear of politics during the war years and concentrated entirely on charitable work. Since women in the U.S. would not be enfranchised until 1920, Women’s Auxiliary members may also not have seemed to constitute a serious threat to the nation during the war.

When the GSP decided in the summer of 1919 to organize relief for Central Europe, the Women’s Auxiliary again played a major role. The men of the GSP raised nearly $3,000 in cash; the Women’s Auxiliary contributed clothing, shoes, blankets, and wool worth $10,000.22 Even before the relief effort was formally launched, the GSP’s sewing room was being used to help supply garments for those in need in Germany. Members of the Women’s Auxiliary gathered there once a week to knit and prepare packages of donated clothing. They continued to collect contributions for Germany’s poor up through 1924.

Although the Auxiliary’s relief efforts and the GSP’s complemented one another, relations between the two groups were not always smooth. The husbands of Auxiliary members, for instance, enjoyed library privileges at the GSP, which prompted some disgruntled GSP officials to suggest that those men be urged to join the GSP. No doubt that suggestion was spurred by the fact that the GSP’s membership was very slow to recover from the steep decline the organization experienced during World War I. The women also had reason to complain. In 1921, Women’s Auxiliary president Antonie Ehrlich protested that the society’s agent treated the women with disrespect and denied them the services of the janitor, which had led the Auxiliary members to conclude that “they are no longer wanted here, that the Directors take no interest in their affairs.”23 The dispute was not resolved until after the agent was replaced two years later. The relationship between the GSP and the Women’s Auxiliary also improved when Louis H. Schmidt became president in 1923. Schmidt, who led the organization until 1943, seems to have been able to please everyone at least for a while.

The so-called Roaring Twenties were not necessarily a decade of prosperity for working-class Philadelphians. As the records of the Women’s Auxiliary indicate, expenditures for poor relief increased even before the stock market crash of 1929. A comparison of the GSP’s gifts to the needy and those of the Women’s Auxiliary shows that the women took over much of the poor relief work [Chart 2]. Just as in the nineteenth
century, the GSP limited itself to giving small amounts of cash and vouchers for meals, transportation, and/or accommodations mainly to men. Business agent Henry Hoffmann, a meticulous man hired in 1923, also kept record of those seeking legal and medical advice. Looking at Hoffmann in his office, which is now the former Schlaraffia room in the basement, one can only imagine how this stern-looking man must have intimidated poor Germans seeking assistance. His careful records show that he noted each and every literal penny he gave out. [Figure 3]

The Great Depression

Philadelphia’s public and private resources to assist those in need were stretched thin in the wake of the crash of 1929. By the end of the year, more than 10 percent of the city’s wage earners were without jobs. The unemployment rate rose to 15 percent during the first five months of 1930, and by the end of that year it was clear the Depression had come to Philadelphia. Over a nineteenth-month period stretching from late 1930 through the summer of 1932, Philadelphia’s wealthy elite contributed $14 million toward alleviating the hardship many of their fellow citizens were suffering, but the funds were quickly exhausted. Tens of thousands of destitute people relied on family, friends, and neighbors to survive. Local merchants and landlords extended credit even when it became evident the debts would likely never be paid. In 1933, unemployment skyrocketed when 11.5 percent of white, 16.2 percent of black and 19.2 percent of foreign-born Philadelphians were out of work. Mayor J. Hampton Moore, refusing to acknowledge the scale of the crisis, exacerbated the city’s
economic troubles by firing thousands of workers during his term of office (1932–35) and rejecting federal funds for public works projects because it would have required spending city money. His Republican successor Davis Wilson also did little toward relieving poverty among his constituents. It was only because of Pennsylvania Governor Gifford Pinchot that Philadelphians could turn to the County Relief Board for food, fuel, and other necessities.

The Women’s Auxiliary concentrated its poor relief efforts on widows with children and elderly couples unable to work. It tried to provide them with financial assistance on a monthly basis. The directors who decided how much each family was to receive learned the details of their particular stories of hardship, thereby gaining special insight into who should be invited to the GSP’s annual Christmas Bescherung. Initially dozens and later hundreds of women, children, and elderly people received baskets of food, clothing, shoes, and toys, along with money to cover their streetcar fare home, at the Bescherung, which usually took place a few days before or after Christmas. In 1933, with no end in sight to working-class Philadelphians hardship, the Women’s Auxiliary doubled its expenditures for poor relief and expanded the Christmas Bescherung.

Fortuitously, the Women’s Auxiliary had taken steps during the boom years before the crash to professionalize its work in poor relief. In 1927, it joined the Philadelphia Social Service Exchange, which described itself as “a private coordinating and registration center for social service
organizations.” For an annual fee of $5, the Exchange kept records of referrals and services provided to the poor by social workers as well as private charity organizations. The Women’s Auxiliary submitted the names and, in many cases, the addresses of individuals who were seeking its assistance to the Exchange, which would in turn send brief reports summarizing the dealings they had had with other charitable and relief organizations. The Exchange provided a means for monitoring and coordinating poor relief efforts in the period before organized public welfare assistance.

Some of the surviving Exchange reports tell stories of families who had been in trouble long before the onset of the Great Depression. Rose and Joe C. and their eight children are a revealing example. Between 1894 and 1930, the family came into contact with no fewer than 23 social service providers, including the Jewish Welfare Society, the Home Missionary Society, the Family Society, the Juvenile Aid Society, the Big Sister Association, and the Mother’s Assistance Fund. They also received medical assistance from the University Hospital and the Pennsylvania Hospital. Domestic troubles and perhaps even violence might have been part of the family’s story: there are entries in the Exchange’s report of dealings with the Society to Protect Children from Cruelty and the Domestic Relations Division of the Municipal Court. In 1930, the Jewish Welfare Society attempted to transfer the C.’s case to the Women’s Auxiliary on the grounds that Joe C. had been born in Germany. The family’s long history of receiving charitable assistance and the allegation that the couple had refused a job offer prompted the Women’s Auxiliary to refer the family back to the Jewish Welfare Society.

Before the introduction of Social Security numbers in the mid-1930s, it was often difficult to verify an individual’s identity. The Women’s Auxiliary submitted the names, for example, of Helen and Alexander H. to the Exchange. The referral sheet the Women’s Auxiliary received in response to its inquiry listed three families with the same or a similar last name, but it made no mention of Helen and Alexander.

The Exchange offered well over 350 charity organizations in Philadelphia the opportunity to refer cases to one another according to their particular mission or target group. Thus, the Women’s Auxiliary received letters from other organizations concerning German-born applicants for assistance. Many needed only temporary help. Just days before the “Black Friday” crash of 1929, for instance, the case of Catherine and Nicholas M. was referred to the Women’s Auxiliary. Catherine had been born in Germany, and Nicholas was the son of German immigrants. They had seven children, and another was on the way. At the time of their application, Nicholas had been hospitalized with a heart problem for over a month and the family had to make do on the oldest son’s weekly paycheck of $7.
The M.’s said they would need help only until Nicholas was able to work again; the surviving records do not indicate whether Nicholas recovered or was able to find a job after the crash.  

Others clearly needed long-term financial assistance. Elderly widows in particular stood at risk of homelessness and starvation. In 1930, 70-year-old Carolina S. was referred to the Women’s Auxiliary. An immigrant from Germany, Carolina had twice been widowed and was dependent upon a former neighbor for food and shelter. Her age and poor health prevented her from earning a living, and her four adult stepchildren refused to contribute toward her support. Even married couples could end up needing help. Franz and Marie J. had emigrated from Berlin to the U.S. as a young married couple. They had both long been employed, he as a gardener, she as a cook, and for many years they had been able to send money to relatives in Germany. In 1930, they were compelled to seek assistance. Franz’s heart problems and Marie’s varicose veins had forced them to stop working, and they had exhausted their savings. To avoid having to move to a home for the indigent, they sought financial assistance. The County Relief Board apparently provided assistance until Marie began to receive a state pension, which was not enough, however, to cover the couple’s expenses. The Women’s Auxiliary stepped in and helped the couple pay for food and rent until Franz began to receive a government pension in July 1937. The Women’s Auxiliary’s records suggest that the couple also participated in the annual Christmas Bescherung. A letter written by a social worker in 1936 relayed Mr. J.’s concern that he and his wife might not receive an invitation to the event since their former landlady refused to forward their mail.  

Some people were too embarrassed to ask for assistance themselves. The Women’s Auxiliary was sometimes approached by friends of those in need or even by public officials. In April 1933, for example, Margarete O. wrote the Women’s Auxiliary pleading for help for her sister’s good friend, a Miss H. According to O.’s letter, Miss H. lived with her elderly mother and, despite exerting great effort, was not able to find employment, leaving her in a “very distressed situation.” The writer repeatedly emphasized that Miss H. was a very decent and deserving person who was ready to do any kind of work, except sewing. Perhaps Miss H. had heard about the Women’s Auxiliary’s previous practice of employing poor women as seamstresses and wanted to avoid that.  

Equally deserving and probably even more mortified by the prospect of needing charity was the family of Kathryn K. Her case came to the attention of the Women’s Auxiliary via the Director of Teacher Training of Philadelphia’s public school district. Young Kathryn was eight months short of graduating, but her family was in dire straights because her father’s employer had all but gone out of business. Bill collectors had
taken most of the family’s furnishings and the rent was long overdue. The school was giving Kathryn a little money, and the family received $2 a week from a city welfare program, but these forms of assistance did not come close to covering the K. family’s basic needs. The concerned school official cautioned that Kathryn’s father was “not sympathetic” to his daughter’s ambition to finish school and was likely to blame her for drawing attention to the family’s plight.\textsuperscript{34} It is not clear how the Women’s Auxiliary reacted to the letter. About a week after the initial request, the caring teacher wrote again with the happy news that, as a result of the improved employment status of the father and the generous contributions of the school, the assistance of the Women’s Auxiliary would not be necessary after all.\textsuperscript{35}

Private charitable initiatives like the Women’s Auxiliary’s were by no means rendered superfluous by the myriad relief programs launched under the aegis of President Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal. Through a referral via the Social Service Exchange, the Women’s Auxiliary learned about John and Theresa S., both of German descent and their three young children. John S. was lucky to be one of about 40,000 Philadelphians employed as a Works Progress Administration (WPA) laborer, but his wages were too meager to provide his family with anything more than the bare necessities of life. The S. family was thus deemed eligible for the annual Christmas \textit{Bescherung}.\textsuperscript{36} For such families, private charity was an invaluable supplement to governmental assistance.

Some people, perhaps encouraged by the glowing accounts of the \textit{Bescherung} published in Philadelphia newspapers, asked directly to be included in the GSP’s Christmas season charity effort.\textsuperscript{37} Louis S.’s handwritten letter in faulty German offers a good example. Louis introduced himself as the father of four children, all under age 14, and described the chronic illness that prevented him from obtaining work. Deeply embarrassed, he appealed to the good hearts of the members of the Women’s Auxiliary and asked their help for his children, who were “living with pain and hopelessness” as the “holy days” approached. Mr. S. concluded his letter by listing the names and ages of all family members, which suggests the distraught father had some idea of the information the Women’s Auxiliary usually requested.\textsuperscript{38}

The hardship created by the Depression put great strain on many families. It was not uncommon for hard-pressed parents to move in with their adult children or, conversely, for adults to move back in with their parents. Three generations of the S. family had been living under the same roof for seven years when Family Services contacted the Women’s Auxiliary to ask for a contribution of basic household goods so that Mr. and Mrs. S. could move out of the home of their oldest daughter,
Margaret. The S.’s had five children between the ages of 9 and 22 in addition to Margaret, who had three children of her own.

The S. family’s story reveals some interesting facts about reproductive realities before reliable methods of birth control became easily available and about notions of individual space and sexual privacy before the Second World War. Mr. S., who was 69 at the time the Women’s Auxiliary was informed of his family’s circumstances, was 16 years his wife’s senior. Mrs. S. had given birth to their youngest child at age 44, only three years before her oldest daughter Margaret had her first child. All three of Margaret’s children were conceived while her parents and siblings were living with her and her husband. With twelve people under one roof, the quarters must have been quite cramped by the time Family Services turned to the Women’s Auxiliary for assistance in helping the family.\(^{39}\)

The birth of a child could create great financial difficulties for working-class families during the Depression. In 1936, the Social Service Exchange informed the Women’s Auxiliary of the plight of the M. family. Mr. M. was away when his wife gave birth to their second child. Mrs. M., the Exchange reported, could barely take care of her five-year-old daughter and was “rather upset and discouraged about her situation.” The Exchange hoped that Mrs. M., a past beneficiary of GSP assistance, would once again be invited to the Women’s Auxiliary Christmas Bescherung.\(^{40}\) The case of Madeline B., which was also referred to the Women’s Auxiliary in 1936, was similar. Over a period of eight years, she and her husband Charles had had four children. For the previous three years, the family had been surviving on public relief because illness had left Charles unable to walk.\(^{41}\)

These stories gleaned from write-ups of the Social Service Exchange share two characteristics: the German birth or descent of the applicant and the deserving nature of the case. Auxiliary member Miss Weidemann wrote a memo to the Exchange in October 1931 to outline the types of people eligible for the annual Christmas Bescherung. She indicated that people’s ethnic background and problems needed to “appeal to volunteers and members of the Club.”\(^{42}\) The cases detailed here show that only people of German descent or birth, and only those who had distinguished themselves through honesty, hard work, and efforts to cope on their own were considered worthy. Sometimes applicants had to provide very detailed information to move the Auxiliary to give them aid. There are stories of families sending teenaged children to work, disabled adults peddling homemade toys at street corners, and older, sick women renting rooms to boarders and cooking and cleaning for them. In general, professional social workers were opposed to the benevolent work of private charities. In their judgment, such work was “more beneficial to the egos of the givers than responsive to the real needs of the recipients.”\(^{43}\)
case of charitable assistance provided by the Women’s Auxiliary, the help was real and in direct response to applicants’ needs. The women who contributed to this work of benevolence did single out members of their own ethnic group as beneficiaries and did favor those with verifiable tales of hardship, which indeed may have made Auxiliary members feel good about themselves. Nevertheless, judging from the few surviving thank-you letters written by the recipients of Auxiliary charity, the actual aid they received was more important than having to present themselves as deserving poor and in the process perhaps gratifying some donors’ sense of self-worth.

In almost all cases of the Women’s Auxiliary, the records do not tell the complete story. It is not clear how long a particular family received assistance or whether the goods and money offered by the Auxiliary helped them regain self-sufficiency. I have found only one case that tells the story from beginning to end. Five letters from Clara U. to Bertha Schweizer dated between May 1933 and December 1936 recount the tale of one German immigrant family’s path toward moderate success.

The story began in 1933 when a severe but undiagnosed illness incapacitated Clara. She spent three weeks at home and then six weeks at a hospital. When she complained of difficulty walking and pain in the entire left side of her body, doctors inexplicably extracted five of her teeth and planned to take out her appendix to alleviate the pain. In a woeful letter to Schweizer in May 1933, Clara expressed her understandable dissatisfaction with her treatment. Although Clara had primarily written to thank the Women’s Auxiliary for its financial support, she also pointed out that her husband Josef was still looking for work and that she had not been able to be a caring mother for her daughter Hilde. This additional information might have been intended to remind Auxiliary members that they could help with these problems as well.

A little over a year later, in July 1934, Schweizer tried to visit the family but found no one at home. In response, Clara sent a typed letter in which she explained that her family’s fortunes had changed for the better. Her husband was working as an electrician’s assistant earning $18 per week. Although the job was beneath Josef’s qualifications, he felt lucky to have it. Moreover, the family was now merely two months behind in their rent payments and had just splurged on a one-day excursion with neighbors to River View Beach, New Jersey. This was the first time they had left the city since they had arrived in the United States five years earlier. Perhaps a day at the beach had whetted her appetite for more because Clara asked in her letter whether the Women’s Auxiliary might finance a vacation for her and her daughter. Surprisingly, Clara’s dream came true. In a subsequent letter from August of that year, Clara thanked Schweizer and her husband for making two trips possible for her family; Hilde had
gone on a trip to a children’s camp, and Clara had spent a week in Cape May. Both Hilde and her mother seem to have thrived as a result of the vacation.

Schweizer and the family continued to be in touch. In December 1935, Clara wrote that her family’s situation had not changed. Her husband was still only earning $18 per week, and so it continued to be difficult for them to make ends meet. Yet Clara realized that they had endured worse times and that others had less than her family. Perhaps she was aware that many women in Philadelphia’s garment industry worked for less than $7 a week. For that reason, Clara asked Schweizer to take her family off the list for the Christmas Bescherung. However, Schweizer apparently did not comply with the request because Clara restated more emphatically in a letter the following year that her family should no longer be included. By 1936, due to a $6 increase in Josef’s weekly wages and some additional income from weekend work, the family had managed to obtain a mortgage for the home on Reese Street that they had rented for years. Located in a narrow alley in south Philadelphia close to the Italian Market and Front Street, their house on Reese Street was probably very modest. But home ownership ended their worries over increasing rent. In good health, the family was, in Clara’s own words, “happy and content, that we can see the path before us again.”

This moderate success story, however, does not belie the fact that the Great Depression brought hardship to countless Philadelphians. Even members of the Women’s Auxiliary and the GSP seem to have been affected. Women’s Auxiliary membership declined steadily after 1929: at least 285 members gave up their GSP membership between 1929 and 1938, not counting those who died. In 1935, the Auxiliary had to remind its members for the first time to pay their $2 annual dues in its annual report. While some members may have simply forgotten, those who were wives of local shopkeepers and craftsmen perhaps could not afford to pay. By 1936, the Women’s Auxiliary had to make an appeal for new members for the first time; the GSP had a long history of such appeals. Of course, declining Auxiliary and GSP membership may have been caused by other factors as well. As discussed in the next chapter, the GSP had some outspoken Nazi sympathizers, who might have led some other members to distance themselves from the organization. In 1937, the Women’s Auxiliary felt compelled to point out that it offered assistance to those in need regardless of religious affiliation or “political views.”

In the early years of the Great Depression, Auxiliary members had already grown concerned that the Christmas bazaar would suffer from the economic crisis. Expenses were rising due to the increasing numbers of needy applicants, so Auxiliary members were worried about their biggest fund-raising event. However, the women were able to report
record level proceeds in 1930 and 1931 of about $2,300 each year. Yet after 1932, Auxiliary income from the Christmas bazaar declined steadily. By 1940, when records ceased to be published regularly, proceeds had declined by over 30 percent. During these lean years other German women’s organizations contributed to the poor relief fund. In 1933, for example, the women of the Turngemeinde and the singing society Harmonie organized entertainment events to benefit the Auxiliary. In the fall of the following year, Bertha Schweizer, head of the poor relief effort, was a little more optimistic about sufficient funding when a few Auxiliary support recipients reportedly found work and no longer required assistance. Yet this optimism did not last long. In 1938, the Women’s Auxiliary complained of losing members (and therefore funds) because return emigration to Germany had begun “due to the pressure of world events and unemployment in the U.S.” The Poor Relief Committee’s meeting records stop abruptly in late 1939.

World War II and Beyond

When war broke out in Europe, the women of the Auxiliary tried hard to continue their charitable efforts in the face of a catastrophe beyond their control. Not much is known about the work of the Auxiliary during the war years, however, since the GSP decided not to publish its annual reports after 1941, and Auxiliary meeting minutes for the 1940s seem to be lost. Yet in the fall of 1943, the GSP began publishing a newsletter under the name Postilion, from which some information can be gleaned. The Auxiliary’s and the GSP’s expenditures for charity showed that the Auxiliary again had spent two and a half times as much as the GSP, and that the women had donated a flag with a large number 120 embossed to symbolize the number of GSP relatives fighting in the war abroad. The newsletter also made clear that membership was a problem for both organizations. German Americans’ were reluctant to become involved in any German ethnic organizations during the war, but especially in the GSP because it had gained the reputation that it “lacked life and energy and that the very conservative Board of Directors was opposed to letting young and more active members with new ideas enter its ranks.”

This dire situation did not change until after the war ended. By then, the GSP had lost its tax-exempt status, in part because investigators of the Internal Revenue Service determined that the German Society was not spending enough money on poor relief to qualify as a charitable organization. To alleviate the situation, the GSP and the Women’s Auxiliary held an unprecedented combined meeting in September 1945. The boards of both organizations agreed to “unite in order to make a better showing in our Charity work, [and] also to be in a better working shape to face the
ever changing future.” They expected the increased cooperation between men and women to help in the planned assistance for Central Europe to be organized by the Quaker Relief Fund as well. Although each organization intended to continue its work as before, some Auxiliary members apparently were not too happy about the situation. In its annual report, the Auxiliary leadership reminded its members that they “must overcome any animosity or pettiness that may have crept unwittingly into [the] organization.”

Nevertheless, the GSP came to rely even more on the Auxiliary for charitable contributions. By the spring of 1946, more than sixty Auxiliary members met weekly at the GSP to sew clothing and to mend donated items. [Figure 4] Then in February 1948, Auxiliary charitable contributions were officially recorded as part of the GSP’s benevolent work. In exchange, Marion Linke became the Auxiliary representative to sit on the GSP board. Finally, in 1949 the GSP amended its bylaws and appointed a special women’s committee. For the first time in the society’s history, German birth or descent were no longer prerequisites for membership. U.S. citizenship, however, was required for all board members.

In addition to the war relief sent to Germany, the charitable work of the Women’s Auxiliary continued with newly arrived Germans. Some were German war brides who were isolated from their family networks in Philadelphia. For example, a twenty-year-old German woman married to an American sailor found herself in “dire need” when her husband was

**Women’s Auxiliary Members at Work in the Sewing Room, May 1946**
hospitalized for mental problems. She had nine-month-old twins and no one to turn to. The Auxiliary approved an immediate payment of $25 and regular monthly contributions of $15. During the 1950s, the Women’s Auxiliary regularly supported around a dozen individuals or families with cash and in-kind donations. Yet toward the end of the decade, the bulk of welfare contributions were made to organizations rather than to individuals.

Although women were now officially allowed to be GSP members, the minutes of the Women’s Auxiliary meetings through the 1950s clearly show that they continued to view the GSP as a male organization. Again and again, the Auxiliary referred to “the men” when dealing with the German Society. Both organizations, however, shared one tremendous problem: drastically reduced membership. The GSP only had an estimated 350 members in 1946, while the Women’s Auxiliary membership had shrunk to 150 by the mid-1950s. Although a few members resigned, the death of old members and few newcomers were primarily to blame.

In the GSP, women generally continued to be relegated to the kitchen for decades after the war ended. For example, it took the organization until late 1972 to rename its decades-old Herrenabend tradition with the more gender-neutral term, Gesellschaftsabend, and also to at last allow women to take part in the occasional political or literary lectures. The snide comment “women’s Lib strikes again” was added to the otherwise quite unremarkable board minutes. Ironically, women continued to serve food and beverages at both all-male gatherings and the new mixed events.

Two decades later in 1991, the GSP’s charitable work was limited to handing four needy families from the Spring Garden apartments checks for $75 right before Christmas and the end of the tax year 1991. The following year, the total charitable contribution was reduced to $225 and distributed to three families living in the federal housing project next to the German Society. Thereafter, charitable contributions of this and all other kinds essentially ceased.

The Women’s Auxiliary’s record of charitable work for the past thirty years is more impressive. Traditionally, it has given one third of its donations to German-language scholarships, one third to a local German-affiliated charitable institution, and one third to the GSP. Individual charity work essentially ended after a few extraordinary cases in the 1980s and early ’90s taxed the patience, management abilities, and financial resources of Auxiliary members. Perhaps since Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty of the 1960s instituted Medicare and Medicaid, poor relief by small private charity organizations is no longer considered necessary.

By the late 1990s, the GSP and the Women’s Auxiliary had also drifted apart as partner organizations. A new executive director hired in
June 1999 claimed the two rooms that had been used by the women for over a century as her office space. Intent on raising much-needed funds and ignoring the close relationship between the two organizations, this executive director also demanded rent payment from the Women’s Auxiliary for the use of the GSP hall during the traditional Christmas bazaar. In another attempt to generate money for the GSP, the board of directors decided to sell a first edition of Walt Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass*, which was opposed by members of the Women’s Auxiliary and resulted in a lawsuit between the two entities. While the GSP prevailed in selling the book at auction, the unfortunate dispute only widened the rift between the Women’s Auxiliary and the German Society. As the purpose of both organizations—helping Germans in need with money and advice and offering a lending library to its members and the German-American community at large—has essentially ceased to exist, it is perhaps not surprising that the men and women who had worked together toward particular charitable goals are less likely to find common ground. It remains up to the current membership to find ways to continue both organizations in a changed and changing world.

Conclusion

The Women’s Auxiliary was founded rather late in comparison to other benevolent organizations for women in the German-American community and, generally, in Philadelphia’s middle class. Women of German descent faced different gender norms than their Anglo-American sisters, and so they opposed both Prohibition and women’s suffrage. The Women’s Auxiliary quickly took over much of the poor relief work of the German Society and has led the GSP in assistance to Germany during and after the First and Second World Wars as well as during the Great Depression. When the GSP lost its tax-exempt status in 1944, the charitable contributions of the Women’s Auxiliary were temporarily recorded jointly with the society’s donations. Despite this substantial assistance to the GSP, the women of the Auxiliary were only grudgingly admitted to all of the society’s events in the early 1970s. Personality clashes and perhaps conflicting perceptions of the Auxiliary’s continued charitable work led to a rift between the two organizations that is slowly healing. While this chapter has shown how extensive the work of benevolence of the Women’s Auxiliary was during the Great Depression, the next chapter places the history of the German Society from the 1930s to ’60s in a larger, geo-political context.
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Hitler’s Shadow in Philadelphia:
The GSP from the 1930s through the 1960s

On October 6, 1933, 15,000 German Americans gathered at the Pastorius Monument at Vernon Park in Germantown to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the first German settlement in America. This elaborate, three-day commemoration of German Day was among the few occasions since the Great War that had brought Americans of German descent together in such large numbers. [Figure 5] Anti-German hysteria during and immediately after World War I had limited public demonstrations of German-American ethnic pride. But now, eight months after Hitler had taken control of the Reich, Germans in America celebrated their ancestry publicly, proud of Germany for its reemergence from the ravages of war and because it seemed to be weathering the storm of the worldwide economic depression better than the U.S. Sponsored by well-established cultural organizations such as the United Singers of Philadelphia and the Philadelphia Turngemeinde, as well as the German Society of Pennsylvania, the event was also supported by a new, right-wing Nazi organization, the Friends of the New Germany.¹ Adolf Hitler and President Hindenburg sent telegrams.² The German Ambassador Hans Luther, however, canceled his appearance because organizers had refused to raise the swastika flag. In response to the absence of the highest-ranking diplomat from the German Reich, GSP board members resolved to send him a letter expressing their “sentiment.” In it, they objected to the organizers’ lack of

---

1. The Friends of the New Germany was a right-wing Nazi organization.
2. Adolf Hitler and President Hindenburg sent telegrams expressing their support and encouragement to the organizers.

German Day Celebration at Vernon Park, Germantown, October 6, 1933
“decency and tact” that had prevented the ambassador from speaking at the event.³

While the GSP continued its dedication to German literary and musical culture during the 1930s, some leaders and members became key figures in the American Nazi movement. One board member was even convicted of conspiring to spy on behalf of Hitler’s regime. It is difficult to know exactly what most GSP members thought about the Nazis, yet some outspoken Nazi sympathizers seem to have set the tone at public events. At the annual charity ball, for example, the swastika flag was raised. GSP President Louis Schmidt, who led the society from 1923 to 1942, was well-liked; he had united members during the 1920s after the crisis of World War I. Yet in the last ten years of his presidency, he did not exert much power.⁴

Through action and inaction, the GSP found itself on a treacherous path in this decade, and it alienated many of its members. Jewish members were put off by anti-Semitic reading material in the library, for example, as well as by more covert hostility. In 1938, the society did publicly condemn Hitler for his military aggression, but the GSP still had lost a substantial number of its members by the time the U.S. entered World War II in late 1941. The GSP also heeded the government’s call to purchase war bonds as a patriotic duty, and so its investments yielded much lower returns. With reduced membership contributions and low investment returns, the GSP was more or less ruined financially at the end of the war.

Although German Americans overall did not experience the kind of anti-German hysteria they had suffered during the previous war, the GSP emerged from the Second World War severely weakened. Had it not been for the renewed influx of German immigrants after the war and a large monetary bequest to benefit the library, the organization might have collapsed. New German immigrants who joined the GSP after 1945 allowed the organization to focus on the plight of German refugees rather than the German war atrocities or the society’s own fascist sympathies before the war. The continued problem of declining membership after the war and through the 1960s can, in part, be explained by the society’s failure to address this past both among its membership, as well as in German history generally.

The GSP during the 1930s

As discussed in chapter three, the 1930s began under the shadow of the Great Depression. Large numbers of Philadelphians were unemployed, and many people had difficulty meeting basic needs. Philadelphia was the third largest city in the country with a population of almost 2 million:
1.36 million were native born, 370,000 were foreign born, and 220,000 were African Americans. German-born inhabitants made up a little more than 10 percent of the city’s foreign-born population (about 37,000), and 94,000 people had at least one German parent. 50 percent of the city’s residents were Catholic and 15 percent were Jewish. Philadelphia was also one of the largest Jewish cities in the U.S.; it had 82,000 Yiddish speakers.5

When the Great Depression began, the GSP had finally reached pre-World War I membership levels again, with around 640 members. Despite Prohibition, which was opposed by virtually all Germans, “associational life was in relatively good condition.”6 The library enjoyed record readership. Although lectures and other GSP events were not as well attended as the board might have liked, the explanation apparently lay not in a general decline of interest in the GSP by German Americans, but rather in “the rich calendar of events of the local Deutschtum, distractions through radio and movie theaters and the increasingly unfortunate location” of the GSP.7 In 1930, after a fifteen-year interruption, the society revived its traditional annual charity ball held at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, which came to be heralded as the “highlight of German-American social life” in Philadelphia by 1934.8 The ball was held annually through 1941.

Despite this successful annual event, GSP membership declined over the course of the decade, decreasing steadily from 520 in 1932 to 411 in 1940.9 The membership records of GSP agent Henry Hoffmann indicate that at least 300 members resigned or simply stopped paying their dues between 1929 and 1940. In addition, more than 100 members died during this period.10

While it is difficult to determine why individual members withdrew from the society, five major reasons for the general decline are apparent. First, participation in ethnic organizations lessened in general during the 1930s due to the expansion of alternatives for inexpensive, ethnic amusements.11 Radio shows and movies offered in German, for example, gave German Americans opportunities to use their language without joining a Verein. Second, the economic hardships of the Great Depression might have made it difficult for some GSP members, especially those who were small business owners, to pay the annual dues. Third, some German Americans, remembering the anti-German hysteria of World War I, left the society by the late 1930s out of fear that their affiliation with the GSP, or anything German for that matter, would become a liability once again. This fear became especially pronounced when Hitler’s aggression led to war.12 Fourth, the Treaty of Versailles had raised hope among Jews that they would have their own state in Palestine. This Zionist hope caused a
split between German Gentiles and Jews everywhere. Increasing anti-Semitism in Germany and in Philadelphia, as displayed in Philadelphia’s German-language daily, the Herold, led some German Jews to distance themselves from anything German and from the GSP, where Nazi propaganda was readily available in the library. Lastly, some non-Jewish GSP members may not have been comfortable associating with pro-Nazi members.

The fact that a few GSP leaders and members were among the most prominent Nazi sympathizers in Philadelphia no doubt deterred new Jewish immigrants from becoming members. Nearly half a million Jews entered the U.S. from Austria, Germany, and Czechoslovakia between 1933 and 1945, some of whom stayed in Philadelphia. This number could have been larger had not both the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations implemented tighter immigration restrictions, motivated by notions of alleged “Nordic” superiority, growing isolationism, and xenophobia in general. Acculturation for the Jewish refugees fortunate enough to make it to the U.S. was quick: almost all of them conducted their religious, social, and cultural activities in English soon after arrival. In short, as historian Herbert Strauss puts it, “these immigrants had few, if any, organized connections with the German-American community during the Third Reich and for a considerable time thereafter.”

Strauss’s assertion also held true for the GSP, as confirmed by anecdotal evidence from interviews with members. Some Jewish members were allegedly told around 1933 that they were no longer desirable members. On the other hand, former longtime GSP President George Beichl, who did not join the society until 1964, recalls rumors of Jews using the GSP library during the 1930s and ’40s. Considering the amount of Nazi propaganda on display at the library, it is doubtful the Jewish readership was large. The surviving records unfortunately fail to shed any light on Jewish membership.

Throughout the 1930s, many German Americans celebrated the newly emerging, stronger Germany. Pride in the new Germany continued into the late 1930s among Philadelphia’s German Americans. As many as 1,500 German Americans gathered there to celebrate the Anschluss, Hitler’s annexation of Austria, on March 13, 1938. They sang not only the Deutschland Lied, but also the Horst Wessel Lied, the Nazi Party anthem. Sigmund von Bosse, a Lutheran pastor and prominent GSP leader, gave a rousing speech, and almost everyone in the audience gave him the Hitler salute at its conclusion.

Demonstrators increasingly protested these celebrations with anti-German rallies in Philadelphia and elsewhere. Protestors feared a newly aggressive Germany, but German Americans rejected such fears as remi-
niscent of World War I anti-German hysteria. Most of the celebrations ceased once Hitler invaded Poland, but Pennsylvania’s extreme right did not disappear completely.

The GSP reacted to the rise of anti-German sentiment in the 30s first with stoicism and later with a kind of siege mentality. As early as 1933, after Hitler had come to power, the Women’s Auxiliary and the German Society complained about the “increasing distress for people of German descent,” in part due to “anti-German tendencies” in Philadelphia. The men and women of the GSP vowed to be steadfast and to “preserve the respect of their fellow citizens through model behavior.” By 1936, newspaper headlines about Germany’s territorial aggression, militarism, and national chauvinism increased Americans’ hostility toward Germans in Philadelphia. Harry Pfund, head of the events committee, voiced his fervent hope that the community would “remain faithful to itself” at a time when the Deutschtum needed to “draw closer together” for self-preservation. When war broke out in September 1939, Pfund remarked that he was reminded “of the gray days of 1914, except that this time the slow burning fire of hatred by the press and certain circles against everything German burst into flames already much earlier.”

Although largely only a bystander in world events, the German Society may have contributed to the anti-German sentiment Pfund perceived. As we have seen, GSP board members sided with the German ambassador in his desire to have a swastika flag flying at the German Day celebration in 1933. They also unanimously voted to send a congratulatory telegram to the German Führer in 1935 when the Saarland plebiscite returned the area from French to German rule. They believed this indicated “the victory of German faithfulness in spite of all insidious attacks.” Notwithstanding this public outburst of German patriotism, board members were cautious when they merely acknowledged an invitation to a joint Hitler-Bismarck birthday celebration extended by the Friends of the New Germany in the spring of that year and did not attend as a group.

Sigmund von Bosse, however, may have persuaded some of his fellow GSP board members to join in this revival of Pan-Germanism. Although von Bosse never officially joined the Friends of the New Germany or its successor, the German-American Bund, he was widely known as “an open sympathizer” and “a leading figure in later Bund activism.” He was also the last President of the National German-American Alliance. Right-wing German groups had already emerged in the 1920s and gained momentum after 1933 when the Association of Friends of the New Germany was founded in Chicago. When some of its members voiced concern in 1936 that the organization was too German and thus could be
deterring potential supporters from joining, the name was changed to German-American Bund. Hitler’s rise to power in Germany, one scholar argues, permitted “some Americans of German descent to feel their homeland was being restored to its proper dignity.”

Von Bosse was merely one among several GSP members who felt this way.

Overall, the German-American Bund never had more than a few thousand members in the entire United States, and these were concentrated in the Mid-Atlantic region. The Philadelphia chapter of the Friends of the New Germany thrived quickly: it had over 220 members by the end of its first year in 1933. The organization had strong ties to New York Nazis such as Heinz Spanknoebel and sang the Horst Wessel Lied at the end of its meetings. New members were also required to pledge that they were Aryans without Jewish or black blood. Like the Nazis in Germany, Bund members joined forces with members of other associations to form uniformed paramilitary groups that even conducted regular drills. In Philadelphia, for example, the hall of the Liedertafel Sängerbund on Sixth Street, not far from the society’s building, served as the drill room.

As an American-born man, von Bosse was in the minority among Bund sympathizers, as well as members, who consisted mostly of post-World War I German immigrants. Nevertheless, his involvement was not limited to attending the organization’s gatherings. He also gave passionate speeches at several meetings. The most famous was the Bund rally at Madison Square Garden in February 1939, where 22,000 Hitler supporters cheered him and other speakers on. Ostensibly held in honor of George Washington’s birthday, the rally was, in reality, a glorification of Hitler. In his speech, von Bosse explicitly linked the two men: “if Washington were alive today, he would be a friend of Adolf Hitler, just as he was of Frederick the Great.” Within days of war breaking out in Europe, von Bosse used Aryan racial ideology to call “upon all our racial fellows to stand behind the neutrality proclamation of the President 100 percent,” although he knew it would be difficult “due to the vicious propaganda” that was being circulated in the press. Less than a month later, the pastor chaired the German Day celebration, which still drew a crowd of 2,300. Although overt symbols of Nazism such as the swastika flag were not on prominent display, highlights of the speech were greeted with an enthusiastic “Heil” cheer from the audience. Later that year, von Bosse became the head of the Pennsylvania Zentralbund. In this capacity he became part of the isolationist movement after Germany invaded Poland. Like other leaders of the movement, von Bosse called for American neutrality, framing his argument in anti-Communist, or rather, anti-Jewish, terms: Jews were generally considered to be radical Communists. He said, for example, “the main lineup is not democracy versus fascism, but fascism versus Communism and here our choice is clear.”

Hitler’s Shadow in Philadelphia
To be sure, Sigmund von Bosse was not representative of GSP members, although he seems to have found sympathy in the organization. In 1935, within a year of his election to the board, GSP leaders commended von Bosse for his work as the society’s secretary and for his accomplishments on behalf of “the Deutschum in general.” A number of GSP members were associated with the conservative Pan-German movement. R.T. Kessemeier, who joined the GSP in 1930, was a “leading figure in the Association of the Friends of the New Germany” and later also a Bund member. As manager of two German steamship lines in Philadelphia, Kessemeier offered free passage to German Americans, especially to sympathetic academics, so that they might see German progress first hand. Quite a few German-American college professors from Philadelphia-area schools traveled to Germany through this offer. Theodore Martin, head of the Philadelphia Bund, was also a GSP member for at least part of the 1930s. Another prominent Bund sympathizer, Fred C. Gartner, had joined the GSP in 1923. The largely German population of Northeast Philadelphia elected him to the Pennsylvania State Legislature in 1933 as a Republican representative and then to the U.S. Congress for one term in 1938. Reverend Erich Saul, pastor of the German Seamen’s Home in Philadelphia from 1912 to 1942 and GSP member from at least 1923 to 1937, was also a Nazi sympathizer. In addition, in the late 1930s the German Society lost several members who returned to Germany. These so-called Rückwanderer had followed Hitler’s call for all Volksdeutsche to come home to the German Reich. Many of these same members had been active in the Bund.

By the early 1930s, the 19-member GSP board was dominated by German-born men and included some recent immigrants, at least one of whom had served on the German side during World War I. But regardless of their place of birth or length of time in the United States, all board members viewed Germany as the victim of the Versailles Treaty. The provisions of the treaty had been very hard on Germany, not least because Germany was held to be solely responsible for the war, as dictated in its war guilt clause. Under its provisions, Germany was forced to pay reparations, it permanently lost possession of its colonies, the French occupied the Saarland for fifteen years, and the Ruhr/Rhine River area was demilitarized. Like most Germans in Germany, GSP board members believed in the so-called Dolchstoßlegende, or the “stab in the back” theory, according to which Germany had lost the war because of internal strife, primarily brought about by Communist agitators and Jews.

There were two indicators of this mindset. First, in early 1931, the board unanimously resolved to purchase five copies of a Thomas St. John Gaffney’s recently published book, Breaking the Silence. Discussion about the book itself was unusual: typically reading material acquisitions
were not discussed in detail at board meetings. The librarian merely submitted a written report including the number of visitors and books loaned. Written by the former American consul to Munich and based on his personal experiences, the book is an indictment of the Wilson administration for not preventing the war and for getting the U.S. involved in it. Moreover, Gaffney condemns the Treaty of Versailles for a long list of atrocities. Among them were “the annexation of German provinces and colonies to the territory of racially heterogeneous and inimical peoples . . . [and] the occupation of German territory by tens of thousands of vicious African blacks.” Secondly, Conrad Linke, a prominent GSP member and artist, left the society several folders of newspaper clippings and his own writings, which show that he was a leading proponent of the Germany-as-victim view among GSP members.

Periodically, the library sent new book lists to local newspapers or enclosed them in the GSP annual report. These records reflect the conservative, middle-class character of the society. They also illustrate a slant toward a Heimatliteratur that idealized Imperial Germany in much the same way that “Lost Cause” writings glorified the antebellum American South after the Civil War. Moreover, the lists reveal that the GSP library contained more pro-Nazi literature than works by exiled writers by the 1930s. In 1930, the GSP acquired Adolf Hitler’s Mein Kampf. The library had already purchased a collection of Hitler’s speeches in 1924 within months of its publication. Over the course of the 1930s, the GSP library made a variety of Nazi literature available to its readers, ranging from Julius Streicher’s notoriously anti-Semitic weekly Der Stürmer and the SS publication Das Schwarze Korps to the more serious, less overtly anti-Semitic periodical Volk im Werden, published by the pedagogue Ernst Kriick.

At least some Nazi propaganda came to the GSP through the Volksbund für das Deutschutm im Ausland (League for Germandom Abroad), which is listed among the donors of reading material in library reports of the 1930s. Apparently these were “very welcome” additions to the library. When the Nazis acceded to power in Germany, they increased their effort to reach all Volksdeutsche, that is, Germans outside of the Reich. They created the League to send propaganda abroad as part of this effort. Collections for Volksdeutsche in Germany’s public schools partially financed this propaganda campaign. At the same time, it is clear that the GSP ordered books by Joseph Goebbels or Alfred Rosenberg, who had helped to create Nazi ideology, and subscribed to American pro-Nazi periodicals like the Herold. The Herold was published by the same company that printed the anti-Semitic, Nazi paper, Deutscher Weekruf, whose front-page slogan called for a unified Deutschutm everywhere.
The GSP also established close connections to the German Reich in the 1930s. The Volksbund für das Deutschtum im Ausland contacted the GSP to request material for an exhibit on Germans outside of Germany to be held in Bremen in 1936. The GSP responded by appropriating funds and selecting and sending photographs.\(^{54}\) In the wake of the 1936 Olympic games in Germany, a representative of the German Olympic press committee brought a German film about the games for GSP members to enjoy.\(^{55}\) The GSP also aimed to update members on the latest views in Germany by hosting lectures mostly by pro-Nazi speakers. One was a lecture in 1936 by Colin Ross, who offered a self-professed National-Socialist view of Germans’ role in American history in his book *Unser Amerika*, published in Germany. German Americans, Ross explained, had “experienced their own Versailles and the heavy weight and humiliation of defeat.” But just as in Germany, Germans in America had emerged, he argued, “with enormous pride and undefeatable strength.”\(^{56}\) Harry Pfund, head of the events committee, later approvingly remembered Ross’s lecture as a “brilliant speech defending today’s Germany” and as “an attack against all powers whose aim it is to prevent an understanding of the true situation in the Third Reich through false and distorted reports.”\(^{57}\)

By January 1938, however, the GSP publicly disavowed its Nazi sympathies.\(^{58}\) Twenty-two German-American associations in Philadelphia including the GSP joined the German-American league of Culture at this time, whose purpose was to “expose the dangerous roles the Nazis [were] playing in numerous organizations throughout Pennsylvania.”\(^{59}\) Within a year, the number of German Vereine in the league had increased to nearly 100. Led by Raymond Ruff, who had begun to publicly denounce Hitler and his policies as early as 1936, the league clearly opposed the “theory of militarism and racial hatred” of the Nazis without relinquishing their “pro-German” ideals. Ruff called on the member organizations to advertise “the dominant role Germans have played in the development of this country,” which was, of course, something the society had already been engaged in for at least fifty years. Yet it was hard for pro-Nazi members to break old habits. At the GSP annual charity ball in February 1938, only a month after the society had joined the league, Ruff personally tore down a swastika flag.\(^{60}\) This awkward situation was not mentioned, of course, in the glowing account of the event in the society’s annual report.

Nazi sympathizers now came under attack in Philadelphia. Protestors marched in large demonstrations by the thousands, picketed German-American Bund meetings, and some even beat up Bund members.\(^{61}\) Two Nazi sympathizers in the GSP also came under attack. The home of Dr. Richard Gerlach, GSP director and physician for the German Consul-
ate, was bombed in September 1938. No one was injured in the blast, but damage to the front of the house was severe. Anti-Nazi protestors had recently demonstrated outside the German Consulate against Hitler’s plan to annex the Sudetenland. Yet Gerlach refused to acknowledge that there could be any connection between the two occurrences. Another GSP member, William Graf, the publisher of the Herold and the Bund’s Deutscher Weckruf, reported that his print shop on Germantown Avenue had been bombed.

In this climate of anti-Nazi violence, the German-American Bund basically became defunct and then officially dissolved after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The Bund’s disappearance was more a strategic move than a real indication that it had lost all support. New organizations, such as the America First Committee, which led the neutrality campaign in which some GSP members were involved, were much more effective at a time when overt Nazism and its symbols had become untenable. While most German Philadelphians appear to have rejected Hitler by 1939, some continued to work covertly for the German cause. For example, the Kyffhäuserbund, a German veterans’ association with Nazi connections, called for charitable contributions to assist German POWs held in Canada. Instead of going to German soldiers imprisoned in Canada, however, the money collected was diverted through a German steamship company and went to Germany in support of the Nazi regime.

Although there is no evidence that there was a united “Fifth Column” as Roosevelt and others warned, there were some suspicious explosions at various defense plants in the Mid-Atlantic region that suggest that some German Americans sought to undermine American forces in the war. The most sensational sabotage story was a plot that was never carried out. In the summer of 1942, eight German agents who had landed by submarine in Florida and on Long Island were arrested for conspiring to destroy several military installations and strategic logistical support stations. The plan was named “Operation Pastorius” in honor of the founder of the first German settlement in America—an honor the GSP as well as other German-American Vereine could have done without.

After 1938, the GSP avoided overt connections with Nazis abroad. This does not mean, however, that it repudiated Nazi sympathizers within its ranks. Prominent society members who were also Philadelphia Bund supporters, such as Sigmund von Bosse, Fred Gartner, and Kurt Molzahn, remained very popular among members even as late as 1939. Von Bosse was approvingly characterized as “an undaunted man,” Gartner was the guest of honor at the society’s 175th anniversary celebration, and Molzahn continued to be a valued director of the poor relief program. At the same time, the society invited an exiled German writer for
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a lecture in 1940. Although not overtly political, Hamburg novelist Joachim Maass left Germany in 1939 and found employment as a lecturer through the Carl Schurz Foundation. His brother Edgar Maass, author of the World War I novel *Verdun*, also lectured at the GSP that same year.\(^6\)

In the political arena, however, the GSP did not get involved in any way during the summer of 1940 when German aliens were required to register under the Alien Registration Act.\(^6\) After the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and Germany declared war on the U.S. a few days later, the fear of subversive aliens suddenly became so great that thousands of them across the country were arrested overnight. Few Americans noticed at the time that 10,905 German legal resident aliens were interned during World War II, and since then, the government, the general public, and most scholars have forgotten.\(^6\) Some GSP members had their homes searched, and a few were arrested and interned.\(^6\) INS facilities at Ellis Island housed hundreds of detainees, and the immigration center closest to Philadelphia, Gloucester, New Jersey, became the temporary home of dozens of Germans suspected of subversion. FBI officers interrogated suspected Nazi sympathizers. They often asked detainees whether they would be willing to shoot their brothers or other close relatives fighting for Germany and used photographs of Hitler and other Nazi paraphernalia as evidence of their un-American activities.\(^7\) The GSP did not officially receive any pleas for legal assistance from Germans affected by FBI investigations in the 1940s, as it had during World War I. GSP board member Kurt Molzahn, however, did visit some internees in Gloucester in his capacity as a clergyman.\(^7\)

**A Nazi Spy?**

Pastor Kurt Molzahn was a man whose German nationalism turned into fascism in part because of his experiences during World War I. After four years of fighting on the Russian front in the German cavalry, Molzahn attended the Kroop Seminary to pursue his lifelong dream of becoming a minister. He then emigrated to the U.S. in 1923. Soon he was able to send for his fiancée, and by 1929, he was appointed as the minister at St. Michael’s and Old Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church, the oldest German Lutheran congregation in the country.\(^7\) Within weeks of arriving in the city of brotherly love, Molzahn joined the GSP, and his wife became a member of the Women’s Auxiliary.\(^7\) He also quickly became involved in other German organizations and preached in his capacity as a clergyman and German war veteran to a gathering in commemoration of the armistice of World War I veterans from both the American and the German sides.\(^7\) Although the speech had nothing to do with his GSP member-
ship, the GSP annual report for 1930 favorably noted Molzahn’s involvement. A year later, he was elected to the GSP board of directors and served until his arrest for conspiracy to commit espionage in 1942.

By 1937, Molzahn had become an indispensable leader not only for the GSP but also as an overt propagandist of the Nazi regime. He had reportedly “done everything in his power to win over the people in his congregation for the Third Reich.” The Volksbund für das Deutsche im Ausland sent materials to Molzahn, and he was in close contact with officials in Berlin through the German Consul in Philadelphia, Arno Mowitz. According to numerous scholars, the pastor had become a German secret agent. He allegedly “had recruited several V-men for the Abwehr [German intelligence service], and, after the outbreak of the war in September 1939, he worked as a producing spy under registry No. 2320.” Molzahn was allegedly “one of the most energetic and productive agents in the United States.” Supposedly, he became involved with Gerhard Kunze, a Philadelphia Bund member and Abwehr agent, in an effort to raise money and to devise a way to communicate secretly with Berlin, so that German officials could find ways to pay known Bund members indirectly.

By 1938, Molzahn allegedly had found a reliable source of funds in Count Andreyevich Vonsiatsky, the leader of a Ukrainian anti-Communist exile group. In December 1940, Kunze supposedly arranged for Molzahn and the Ukrainian Count to meet in Chicago, where they agreed on “an operations plan for sabotage of war installations.” Although it is not clear whether the plan ever resulted in any real damage, the group did collect sensitive information about US military fortifications on both coasts, which Molzahn allegedly delivered to a man at the German embassy. The spy ring was discovered when Vonsiatsky confided in a supposedly reliable fascist priest, Alexei Pelypenko, who turned out to be an FBI agent. On June 10, 1942, a federal grand jury indicted Molzahn, and he was arrested the next day. While three of his co-defendants pleaded guilty “to conspiracy to transmit to Germany and Japan information relating to the national defense,” and the Ukrainian count was declared mentally ill, Molzahn did not. A three-week trial, however, resulted in a guilty verdict and a ten-year prison sentence. The pastor was released after three years due to heart disease.

In a church trial after his release, Molzahn was deemed fit for the ministry despite his criminal conviction. He became an associate pastor at a Philadelphia church and headed his own congregation at German-town’s St. Thomas Lutheran Church by early 1949. In 1956, President Eisenhower pardoned Molzahn fully and unconditionally. The legal effect of a pardon is to eliminate both the punishment and the guilt asso-
ciated with the crime. Although it might be a little surprising to people in the twenty-first century that the president of the United States would thus remove the stigma from a felony conviction for spying, it was a strategic move in 1956: the U.S. needed all the allies it could get in the Cold War against the Soviet Union and Communism at home. Perhaps granting a pardon to a former Nazi spy seemed harmless and ultimately meaningless in a world that was faced with a new foe. Pastor Molzahn was, of course, relieved.

In his biography published in 1962, Molzahn denied all charges. Refusing to acknowledge his public propaganda activities on behalf of Germany’s Nazis, Molzahn claimed that he “tried to maintain a neutral position” during the 1930s. Molzahn devoted most of the book to the story of how he survived prison, but he did address his arrest and conviction as well. His version of events suggests that an overly paranoid FBI concocted a fantastic tale. Molzahn claimed that he had never heard of the Ukrainian Count Vonsiatsky, although he acknowledged that he met Wilhelm Kunze several times. Still, he “had not seen or talked to him since 1938—before he became headline material as national leader of the Bund.” Molzahn did admit to a visit by the Ukrainian priest Pelypenko but placed the encounter in a harmless, albeit convoluted, context. Molzahn also differentiated between knowing about a conspiracy and actually participating in it. Molzahn’s son suggests that his father was aware of Kunze’s and others’ activities and plans but did not participate in the plot.

Upon his arrest, the Lutheran minister and his wife disappeared overnight from the records of the German Society without any explanation or comment. Most people in his congregation, which included some GSP members, did support Molzahn for a while and raised $25,000 for his bail. They only hired a new pastor when Molzahn’s last appeal was denied in June 1943. His wife Nina and their three children stayed in the parsonage until December 1942. They relied on the $30 a week Nina earned working for the American Friends Society, as well as the proceeds of a Friday night poker game friends donated every Saturday morning. However, most German-American friends and acquaintances, among them many GSP members and leaders, stayed away from the Molzahn family. Associating with the relatives of a convicted spy could only bring suspicion upon them. Once the pastor was released from prison and transported by ambulance to Lankenau Hospital, the staff initially refused to treat the man who had once been a member of its board of directors.

But life for the Molzahns improved quickly thereafter. Within months of Molzahn’s release the family bought a house “with the help of generous friends.” He did not appear again in official GSP records until 1954,
when he gave the benediction at the Pastorius Day celebration at Vernon Park in Germantown. It must have been quite strange for Molzahn and other society members to be at the monument again twenty-one years after the jubilant celebration of 1933.\(^8\) In 1957, Molzahn’s name appeared in GSP records listed among the guests at its *Herrenabend* (Gentlemen’s Evening).\(^9\) His wife Nina frequented the GSP library and was a member of the Women’s Auxiliary for at least part of the 1950s. Although longtime society members recall seeing Molzahn at various other Society events, he never rejoined the GSP officially before he died in 1979.

The GSP Beyond World War II

By the time Molzahn was arrested for espionage, the GSP had already drastically reduced its cultural programming. To save money, the GSP decided to publish its annual report in 1941 in abbreviated form. Then it did not send out an annual report again until 1950. By the spring of 1942, President Louis Schmidt announced that the war prevented the society from planning “many events.” But he hoped that if members continued to work “in the same patriotic ways as in the previous 177 years,” they would be able to preserve what they had inherited from their predecessors.\(^9\)

At the same time, the GSP attempted to publicize its patriotism. In January 1943, the board ordered agent Henry Hoffmann to buy a “Service flag” to demonstrate GSP patriotism. Intended to have 150 stars (in the end the flag only had 120 stars, one for each service member associated with the society), the flag was to be installed “on the stage or at the window of the hall.”\(^9\) Eugene Stopper, the new president, urged society members to remain active and to work hard to ensure that the society would survive the war. He warned that “any organization that closes its doors now will never open again.” Stopper spurred members on to attract new members and to publicize members’ and the society’s involvement in the war bond drive. As part of this demonstration of patriotism, the GSP also invited a former member’s daughter to give a lecture on Thomas Jefferson from her recently published book.\(^9\) Beyond the issue of American loyalty, however, the society recognized that members wanted to help loved ones in Germany. Thus, members were reminded that donations to the Red Cross would also benefit German POWs.\(^\) The GSP donated $1,000 to the Red Cross, an amount unmatched by any other German-American organization in Philadelphia.\(^\)

But the society had problems beyond the war. In 1943, the board acknowledged that a real divide existed between the leadership and the general membership, evident in dwindling enrollment and the small number of people attending quarterly meetings. In an attempt to solve
the problem, the board decided to publish a newsletter every two months. To dispel any suspicion, the newsletter was written in English. In the first issue, the GSP announced that most lectures and other activities would also be held in English, ostensibly to attract younger people.96 In the next Postilion, longtime board member Ferdinand Mostertz took up the language issue again. He noted that all the worries about using German could be solved by using “tact and common sense.” While acknowledging that it would be “unwise during these wartimes to speak German in public places,” Mostertz advised that people simply had to “use discretion as to where to use it and where not to use it.”97 A stern reminder not to anglicize German names followed in the next issue. Although Mostertz was ready to refrain from speaking his native language in public, he had no sympathy for those who changed their names.98 The limited use of the German language in the GSP did not end with the war.

The newsletter served to inform members about GSP history and internal issues. It tried to instill pride in the past accomplishments of Germans in the U.S. by including short biographical sketches of eighteenth-century GSP heroes such as society founder Heinrich Keppele, founder and printer Henrich Miller, and Revolutionary War hero von Steuben. The Postilion, however, never addressed fascism, the Holocaust, or any other events in Europe. Perhaps because of this omission, it did little to bring people into the society. President Stoppers recognized this and asked members to suggest other ways to improve sociability in the organization at the annual membership meeting in 1944.99

Attendance at meetings did not improve until the society came under official attack. In 1944, federal officials told the GSP that it was not contributing enough to charitable causes to qualify for tax-exempt status, even though members had contributed to five war bond drives in less than three years and had broken all records as an ethnic group and organization for effort.100 The society also came under investigation for un-American activities.101 Thirty-five members were present at a meeting to hear updates on the situation instead of the usual twenty or sometimes fewer than fifteen. The struggle to regain tax-exempt status took over three years and required the society to submit financial records from 1933 to 1945. In the end, the society temporarily merged its charitable contributions with those of the Women’s Auxiliary. In addition, the GSP was required to sell its real estate mortgages and to invest the money in federal treasury notes at much lower returns.102

Picking up the Pieces

The financial losses were felt immediately. By the spring of 1945, the German Society had invested half of its cash assets in $25,000 of war
bonds. The sharp decline in investment returns by early 1946 caused the society to operate at a deficit. The fiscal situation did not improve until 1950, when the GSP finance committee sold the last of the war bonds and invested in the booming stock market instead, resulting in a balanced budget for the year.

A bequest by Joseph P. Horner in 1946 could not have come at a better time. It was not immediately clear how much money the society would receive, or when it would receive it, but it was apparent that the sum would be substantial. In 1962, the GSP at last received an endowment of $388,000. Horner, a member of the Philadelphia orchestra and a longtime GSP member, had requested that the interest income be used for general expenses and the library. The $3,600 annual income from the Horner estate saved the GSP from running a substantial deficit. Apart from the endowment the value of the society’s cash assets had dropped to less than $21,000 in 1965 and continued to decline. At the annual membership meeting in January 1967, outgoing President Hermann Witte rightly reminded everyone that Horner’s bequest was “the ‘life-safer’ of the Society.”

In 1946, the society also participated in the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Peter Muhlenberg, the German-American Revolutionary War hero. In a remarkable display of revived German-American pride, members began a campaign to have Mühlenberg’s statue moved from City Hall to Independence Square, where they felt it “belonged.” Although the effort failed, it is significant that the GSP felt strong enough as an organization in 1946 to attempt the transfer. By then, the GSP had begun efforts to help war-torn Germany. In the summer of that year, the Women’s Auxiliary began to meet regularly to mend donated clothing, a warehouse had been rented for storing collected items, and good progress had been made in obtaining governmental permission to collect money towards the cause.

Society members’ engagement with aid for Germany helped them to distance themselves from the recent past by allowing them to focus on Germans and German Americans as victims rather than perpetrators. Harry Pfund had shaped this focus in 1944 when the board of directors asked him to write a short history of the society in celebration of the tercentenary of William Penn’s birth. In twenty-one pages, Pfund painted a glowing picture of the society’s history but characterized the last three decades as “the most tragic” period. Concentrating on cultural highlights such as a Goethe celebration at the Academy of Music in 1932, the chair of the library committee left out any reference to the Third Reich and Nazis in the U.S. or abroad. Pfund instead focused on Germans as the victims of events in both the New World and the Old. Germans everywhere, he wrote, were “distressed by the sufferings of one’s kith and kin,
of those of the same blood, the same language and the same cultural heritage,” and members of the German Society had borne “this grief in silence.”\textsuperscript{112} Pfund’s essay set the stage for the society’s silence about the Third Reich.

After the 1940s, the GSP became more American. The society no longer insisted that most events be conducted in the German language. Initially due to the war, the society made English its official language, to the chagrin of some, although there were some exceptions.\textsuperscript{113} Later this policy was continued because fewer people spoke German. The society also focused on offering more social events to restore a sense of German Gemütlichkeit to its members, as well as prospective ones, and therefore sought permission to serve alcoholic beverages. In early 1954, the GSP acquired a liquor license, which it carefully guards to this day, especially because serving alcohol is an important part of almost all events.\textsuperscript{114} Lastly, a special committee urged the society to move to the northeastern section of Philadelphia, “where the bulk of our present and future members live.”\textsuperscript{115} Lacking money and decisiveness, the board failed to act on this recommendation and three years later decided to stay put. The idea of moving recurred periodically over the next twenty-five years.\textsuperscript{116}

In the meantime, after a twenty-year interruption, GSP services for immigrants, ranging from employment referrals to English and citizenship classes, were once again in demand.\textsuperscript{117} Increasing numbers of German refugees were entering the United States. Conrad and Marion Linke, two longtime GSP members, were instrumental in effecting a change of status for incoming Germans. They had moved Congress to revise the Displaced Persons Act so that new Germans, who were classified as Expellees and were ineligible for emigration, became refugees. Of the nearly 600,000 Germans entering the United States between 1946 and the late 1950s, thousands came to the Delaware Valley.\textsuperscript{118} Although many refugees established their own organizations, a sizable number of the most active and dedicated GSP members today are former refugees and their children.\textsuperscript{119} These expatriate families had endured terrible hardships and had little interest in dealing with German atrocities or questions of culpability. Instead they focused on their own ordeals, which helped to shape the society for the next sixty years.\textsuperscript{120}

It was around the time that German war refugees came to the U.S. in increasing numbers that the German Society decided to keep all Nazi periodicals and books in a dark and dirty storage room on the third floor of the building.\textsuperscript{121} By the late 1970s, this closet became known as the Giftschrank.\textsuperscript{122} This mysterious space is not a closet full of presents, as the English word “gift” would suggest, but a poison cabinet, because “gift” means “poison” in German. It is not clear how this forbidden closet came into being, who named it, or who filled it with “undesirable” materials
from the 1930s: bundled stacks of Nazi periodicals, envelopes containing small fascist pamphlets, and books written by Hitler, Goebbels, and Alfred Rosenberg, for example. What is clear is that the “gift” is a poison that the society decided to keep apart from the rest of its library collection. By literally and figuratively putting their recent past in a closet, society members bestowed a general amnesia on the organization.

Instead of addressing their own recent past, longtime GSP leaders of the 1950s, together with the new postwar refugee members, carefully resumed their programs celebrating German-American contributions to American history. Without any reference to the war or the Holocaust, about 1,000 German Americans gathered in 1951 at the Pastorius Monument on October 6, 1951, to celebrate “Pastorius Day” instead of the usual “German Day”. Perhaps organizers intended to acknowledge the recent war or to distance themselves from the German nationalism that had led the world to disaster by renaming the celebration. The speeches for the occasion, however, seamlessly picked up where prewar celebrations had left off – with the society’s perpetual lament that German-American contributions to American history were being ignored.123

Conclusion

The GSP did not turn into a quasi-Nazi organization during the 1930s. However, some leading American Nazi sympathizers were influential society members and might have contributed to the decline in membership. While the GSP tried its best to demonstrate its American patriotism during the war, it was put on the defensive when the U.S. government investigated it. With a declining and aging membership, financial problems, and a divide between leadership and rank-and-file members, the GSP emerged from World War II with less resolve and support than after World War I. Only the influx of German refugees, a fortuitous monetary bequest, and the challenge of sending aid to Germany made it possible for the society to survive this crisis. New and old members alike, however, cast themselves as victims of Soviet brutality in World War II and Cold War politics in the 1950s rather than perpetrators, and this framing of recent history shaped the society for years to come. Some Americans of German descent may have been put off from joining the organization because of its failure to address Germany’s and its own recent past. Perhaps this partially explains low membership numbers through the early 1970s. Yet the GSP’s troubles now extended far beyond the membership in its walls: postwar economic and social changes radically altered the landscape and politics of Philadelphia and other urban centers, transforming the neighborhood in which the GSP was located and, therefore, the GSP itself.
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CONFRONTING THE CHALLENGES OF CHANGE:
THE GSP IN PHILADELPHIA’S URBAN LANDSCAPE

In October 1967, the GSP board of directors decided that the society should “remain at its present location.” At the same time, the board urged all members to do what they could “to overcome the . . . disadvantages” of its location. They planned to improve facilities so that the society would “become a point of attraction not only for the membership but for the community at large as well.”¹ Three months later, at the 203rd anniversary celebration, the German Society unveiled a $350,000 four-year redevelopment model for a “cultural center” that was to include “a 450 seat auditorium, . . . dinner club facilities [with] luncheon and dinner memberships available to the businessmen and residents of the neighborhood, a multi-tiered landscaped garden, a basketball court and parking areas.”² In addition, “a children’s library of American books, to serve the children of our neighbors irrespective of color or national origin” was planned.³ By the fall of 1971, only the basement conversion into a German-style Ratskeller, an expanded, unpaved parking lot, and a small garden were completed. Moreover, the librarian complained that fewer people used the library, “which she attribut[ed] to a fear of the neighborhood.”⁴

The continuing deterioration of the Spring Garden area, as well as changing GSP membership and leadership, turned the society into an ethnic social club with limited appeal. Federal and local urban policies from the 1940s to the ‘80s only made things worse. Under the auspices of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the one and two-bedroom Fairmont Manor Apartments were built literally right next to the GSP almost overnight in 1969. In the late 1980s, a new group of professionals trained in fund-raising for non-profit organizations and some very dedicated academics became involved in the ambitious building project, helping the GSP overcome a chronic shortage of funds, and the building was finally renovated. Starting in 1995, a five-year library cataloging, restoration, and microfilming project constituted the foundation of what promised to become a valuable scholarly resource. Financial setbacks, internal disagreements over what the society should be, and personality clashes, however, have prevented this promise from being fulfilled.

Housing the Society

The German Society has always been intertwined with the changing landscape of Philadelphia. The waxing and waning of German immigration, along with changes in the neighborhood, have influenced the society’s
effectiveness in helping newly arrived German immigrants and local German Americans, and in providing a gathering place for the middle-class Deutschtum. The GSP was originally founded at the German Lutheran Schoolhouse at Cherry and Fourth Streets located two doors down from Philadelphia’s first Jewish place of worship. The schoolhouse was close to the center of the city’s heterogeneous business and residential life.\textsuperscript{5} Members continued to meet there until the society finally succeeded in financing its own building on Seventh and Market Streets in 1807.

Right from the start, the GSP rented out some of the Seventh Street building. Some of the tenants paid for enlarging and remodeling the hall over the next few decades. In November 1856, a fire in an adjacent building spread to the GSP, damaging the library and the hall, and completely destroying the agent’s office.\textsuperscript{6} That same year, the Gas Company became the society’s sole tenant. In 1866, it paid to replace the building with a larger one in exchange for relatively inexpensive rent and fees.\textsuperscript{7} The remodeling project benefited the library since floor-to-ceiling walnut bookcases were purchased and a gallery was installed.\textsuperscript{8}

Until the 1840s, the Seventh Street building was an ideal central location. Philadelphia was then still a walking city with no clear ethnic settlement patterns nor a strict separation between residential and commercial areas. In the mid-nineteenth century, German immigration to Philadelphia increased dramatically, and in 1854, the municipality was enlarged. The northern section became at least 50 percent German, and the GSP decided to relocate to the Spring Garden location bordering the Northern Liberties neighborhood in 1888.

The move to the Spring Garden location came rather late, however, since German immigrants had been settling in the Northern Liberties area for about three decades by then. In 1882, Lutheran pastor and GSP member Wilhelm Julius Mann had warned the society that it could “scarcely hope to gain many more new members” as long as it remained in its old location since the center of German activity and commerce in the city had moved too far from there.\textsuperscript{9} Mann was very familiar with the local Deutschtum and its general movement toward the north of the city. A minister at St. Michaels and Zion Lutheran Church, and after 1867 professor of the Lutheran seminary, Mann had witnessed the sale of the old cemetery at Fifth and Cherry Streets and the emergence of St. Paulus Church in the Northern Liberties as an independent congregation in those years.\textsuperscript{10}

This move was expected to offer more space for the library, the agent’s office, and the housekeeper’s quarters, as well as provide a hall with good acoustics to attract new members and improve the society’s ability to serve poor German immigrants. Financially, the relocation was advantageous: the old building was sold for $75,000, and the existing
townhouse at Spring Garden Street cost a mere $28,000. After much haggling, the GSP agreed to spend an additional $32,600 for some necessary renovations and a new building adjacent to the townhouse.\textsuperscript{11}

Soon after the groundbreaking ceremony [Figure 6] and the subsequent grand opening celebration in December 1888, however, problems became apparent.\textsuperscript{12} The visually beautiful glass cupola at the center of the library ceiling leaked when it rained, and its flimsy construction made heating the room nearly impossible. Moreover, the support columns in the auditorium were unattractive. For more than a decade, GSP members and leaders complained. Following its traditional frugality, the society did not begin renovations until after the newly formed Women’s Auxiliary organized a successful fund-raising bazaar in November 1901, which generated the required funds.

Over the next century, the building continued to pose challenges for the society. In 1941, the glass dome was finally removed,\textsuperscript{13} and eventually the decorative balconies on the west and south sides of the building were demolished. The heating system continues to be problematic even now, despite a recent, extensive three-million-dollar renovation. Additional restrooms and an elevator to the third-floor library remain desiderata.\textsuperscript{14}

An even more important challenge than the condition of the building, however, has been its location for the past century. As early as 1919, the
society realized that the Spring Garden Street location had become out-of-date, just as the Seventh Street location had. The economic success of those who had arrived earlier, together with improved public transportation and the increasing use of the automobile, had facilitated the move of many Germans to the northeastern part of the city. Declining German immigration in general, and rising Eastern and Southern European immigration into the Northern Liberties neighborhood, also augmented this trend. Thus, potential GSP members, as well as some of those the society was supposed to help, began to live miles away. GSP director John Fahrenwald, who was also a successful businessman, raised the matter at a board meeting, and a committee was formed to “sell the present building . . . [and] to look for a hall in a better area.” In the end, no suitable buyer was found, so the issue was dropped.

Another reason the GSP had hoped to move was that the neighborhood in general was changing. Since the 1870s, the area around Spring Garden Street had witnessed the rise of heavy industry in its midst, the declining real estate value of residential properties, and the disappearance of the market stalls between Twelfth and Seventh Streets, which had been the center of shopping and community activity in the neighborhood. Spring Garden Street was not initially intended to be a thoroughfare to the Delaware River: it ended at Fifth Street until 1925, when it was finally connected to the commercially important riverfront. [Figure 7] A banner at a parade on October 16, 1925, advertised: “Spring Garden
Street: The MAIN Street EAST and WEST: WATCH IT DEVELOP.” Local business owners and perhaps those cheering at the parade hoped that the straight run to the port area would bring commercial benefits to the neighborhood. The advent of the Great Depression and post-World War II deindustrialization dashed these hopes, and many white Philadelphians fled the city.17

From at least 1919, the GSP was well aware of the negative repercussions its address had on membership numbers, attendance at its cultural events, and its ability to serve its constituents. Germans were moving progressively to outlying areas.18 In 1936, board members blamed the “increasingly detrimental location of our building” for the “small if attentive audience” at many of its events.19 A decade later, after the devastating war, a special nine-member committee urged the society to move to Olney,

where the bulk of our present and future members live. . . . [O]nly there could social expansion and increased membership be successfully procured. . . . [S]uch a move [is] not only essential, but directly beneficial to our library and related activities, because it would make it more valuable to a greater number of those most interested.20

This forceful appeal to move was not heeded. In 1950, the society resolved to paint all the building’s rooms instead.21 Two years later, however, the annual Pastorius celebration took place in Olney.22

Other German clubs in Philadelphia were similarly confronted with the issue of changing location. Of the twenty-seven German clubs, singing Vereine, and societies (including the GSP) that advertised regularly in Philadelphia’s only remaining German-language newspaper in the post-World War II period, most were located in sections of Philadelphia that were transforming rapidly.23 The Cannstatter Volksverein, for example, moved from its Center City building to a seven-acre Northeast Philadelphia location in 1947.24

The GSP raised the question of moving to a different neighborhood again in 1953. Board members were concerned not only that Germans had left the Spring Garden area, but also that “Buddhists” had settled in the neighborhood. Apparently, the proximity to Philadelphia’s Chinatown, which had become a recognized neighborhood by the mid-1920s, caused some members to wonder “how the Society could protect itself” from “such a group” dominating them and possibly taking control of the building.25 Although these fears were unfounded, the subsequent relocation discussion lasted for over a year. It was again set aside without any solution when finding a new home for the library appeared to be impossible.26
Federal Housing Projects and the GSP

Apprehensions about the neighborhood were not alleviated, however. In 1954, GSP treasurer Herman Witte inquired about the city’s plans to build “several large, low cost apartment projects” in the vicinity. By then, the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, created in 1945 as a result of a federal mandate, had issued a plan for the East Poplar area that envisioned a mixed-use neighborhood with heterogeneous residents. As opposed to the Philadelphia Housing Authority, also federally funded, the Redevelopment Authority did not only concentrate on creating low-income housing. In addition, it tried to rehabilitate decaying neighborhoods by purchasing properties and then reselling them to private companies at a reduced cost under the condition that they redevelop the area.

The GSP decided in 1954 to become part of the redevelopment plan. It also intended to build a small park on land it hoped to purchase from the Redevelopment Authority, with room for monuments to honor “outstanding German Americans.” Thirteen years later, the redevelopment project still had not come to fruition. Frequent and often cantankerous correspondence between the GSP and city authorities reveals that both were to blame. Indeed, the slow pace was not unusual: experts in the field of redevelopment find that despite “the accomplishments of the various housing agencies . . . deterioration proceeded faster than rehabilitation.”

In August 1967, recently elected GSP President C.R. Walther Thomas posed the issue of moving one last time to the GSP membership. The visionary president described the Spring Garden neighborhood as “neither congenial, attractive, nor hospitable.” He also noted that few members made regular use of the library and that the facilities on Spring Garden Street were also seldom used, “except for regularly programmed events.” Thomas was not exaggerating. The neighborhood had been designated as one of the blighted areas of the city in need of rehabilitation, and the townhouse adjacent to the GSP building and many other structures in the area had long been abandoned; many were boarded up. Some, like the townhouse next door, had been broken into and were “used for nocturnal pleasantries” by neighborhood youths.

At the same time, Thomas outlined an alternative redevelopment plan but was concerned about the future of the organization at the Spring Garden location and whether better facilities would engender more support from present and new members. Acknowledging the broader contemporary problem of race riots, Thomas wondered whether “American cities like Philadelphia [would] continue to experience such ordeals as Newark, Detroit and Milwaukee.” Thomas himself seemed willing to
remain at the Spring Garden location and change the role of the society within its community: he anticipated that the society would “sooner or later have to become an active participant in solving local communal problems.” But he left it up to the membership to decide.

Many GSP leaders and members, especially older ones, did not like what Thomas suggested. Otto Woltersdorf, a former GSP lawyer and longtime member, and Herman Witte, a recent GSP president, were among them. Witte quipped to Woltersdorf that he “never knew that one man [Thomas] could so quickly create so many problems, and incur so much enmity in so doing.” Only few outspoken and relative newcomers to the GSP had the courage to face Witte, including Ludwig Honold, a successful and wealthy businessman. Reminding Witte that the question before the board was whether to move or stay, Honold chastised the older man as “unable or unwilling to comprehend . . . some rather momentous problems.” In response to Witte’s detail-oriented concerns about how best to remodel the existing building, Honold squarely told Witte that, “what really ails the Society cannot be cured by any architect.”

The ultimate question was whether the society should move to an area where it would not have to confront the urban crisis or stay and become part of the solution, and the outcome was less than decisive. Of the approximately 145 members who replied to the questionnaire sent out by the GSP, 74 voted to stay, thus outnumbering members who favored a move by merely 3 votes. However, members did commit to this choice by pledging over $25,000 to support the redevelopment project. While the arguments for relocating were explained quite clearly by Thomas and others, the arguments for staying in the Spring Garden building were never spelled out. Many members who had arrived as refugees after World War II seemed reluctant to let go of the German home they had found and created at Spring Garden Street. Still, this decision would have profound consequences as the neighborhood continued to change.

The redevelopment of the East Poplar area where the GSP is located never became the socially and racially heterogeneous neighborhood with plenty of green spaces and playgrounds amidst low-rise structures that planners had envisioned. Instead, as elsewhere, planned low-income housing became low-cost construction. The new residents thoroughly transformed the neighborhood around the GSP in the three decades following World War II. Eastern European and German immigrants, who had made up around 60 percent of the area’s residents in 1940, left and were replaced by African Americans, who made up 93.3 percent of the residents in the Spring Garden section by 1970. Poverty was rampant. But these problems were not unique to the East Poplar area, or even to Philadelphia.
Urban problems were so widespread that urban planning became an academic field in the 1940s. Government officials and scholars agreed that federally funded public housing was necessary for rebuilding the nation’s cities: slum clearance could only become a reality if “short-term, low-income housing” could be provided to the nation’s poorest segment. The Housing Act of 1949 codified this vision and appropriated federal money so that local redevelopment offices could buy properties in blighted areas, clear the land, and make it available to private developers. The law also required cities to construct housing for the poor who would be displaced. Thus, public housing and redevelopment were to go hand in hand.38

The Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority included federally funded housing projects in the central city in their general redevelopment plan. Like all redevelopment projects, this one emphasized the creation of housing through “code enforcement, housing rehabilitation, and citizen involvement.”39 Each target area consisted of about fifty-block squares that were believed to be manageable. Philadelphia’s Redevelopment Authority was officially committed to providing racially integrated housing. Planners hoped to accomplish this by mixing low-income housing with middle-class homes. They decided on building sites and architectural features and also considered the character of the people to be relocated. Studies and experience had identified so-called problem families—troublemakers, alcoholics, families with too many or unruly children, criminals, and prostitutes—who needed to be kept out because of their potential to ruin the entire low-income project. But in the end, tenants so identified were also placed in projects. As a result, the trend to regard low-income housing as a permanent dead end for undesirable elements of society increased, even though the projects had been intended as a temporary solution for upwardly mobile, hard-working people.

Increasing racial tensions nationwide only made matters worse. In the 1950s, African Americans were largely excluded from owning private, single-family homes. In 1960, more than three-quarters of all Philadelphia blacks lacked the minimum annual income of $4,000 necessary to become homeowners.40 Clashes between blacks and whites turned transitional neighborhoods into war zones as blacks demanded inclusion and whites resisted. White neighborhoods selected as sites for public housing projects fiercely objected that property values would decline if “undesirables,” meaning African Americans, were admitted. In the protests, home-ownership was portrayed as a virtue that would be endangered if low-income renters entered the community. By the mid-1960s, blacks constituted 95 percent of most Philadelphia housing projects, and public housing projects had become part of the problem instead of part of the solution to urban renewal. In areas where public housing projects had been built, private investment had not followed as had been originally
hoped. In the 1970s, grass-roots efforts and government encouragement raised tenant participation in public housing management. Nevertheless, housing projects had become “warehouses for the poor” whose residents were mostly black and, more often than not, single mothers with children.

Philadelphia’s mayor Frank Rizzo, elected in 1971, reinforced the racial segregation in public housing. Rizzo was firmly committed to retaining black ghettos and keeping public housing, now synonymous with poor blacks, out of white neighborhoods. His five-year fight to prevent a public housing project from being built in the predominantly Italian South Philadelphia neighborhood that constituted his main political support only ended with a U.S. Supreme Court decision requiring the project to be built. 42

Again, federal housing policies directly affected the GSP when a federal housing project, the Fairmont Manor Apartments, was constructed directly adjacent to the GSP building in the spring of 1969. GSP President Thomas protested that “the erection of low rental, federally subsidized housing” constituted a breach of the agreement with the Redevelopment Authority, which had intended to build or rehabilitate “88 houses which were to become privately owned.” [Figure 8] Homeownership, according to Thomas, would “stabilize, maintain and improve a fully integrated neighborhood.” A low-income housing project, on the other hand, might result in “a serious weakening of our position when we seek funds to finance our own plans.” Thomas claimed that the GSP had “the best of neighborly relationship with the Black families who live in modest, comfortable housing directly adjoining the property,” but that the introduction of a housing project would bring “people who have no roots in the community” and who “are economically insecure, dependent on public support, and culturally disadvantaged.” In other words, residents of the Fairmont Manor Apartments would be the antithesis of desirable neighbors. 43 Thus, Thomas echoed the common rhetoric of white homeowners opposed to low-income developments.

In January 1969, the GSP, as part of the East Poplar Neighborhood Committee and in conjunction with the Quaker Lawyers Committee, had filed a lawsuit against HUD to stop construction. 44 Ten months later, however, the buildings had been completed, and the judge ruled that it was “‘too late’ to effect any change in this particular development.” The Neighborhood Committee’s worst fears quickly came true. It was reported in October 1969 that “the East Poplar area [had] become the scene of an intensive narcotics traffic,” to which “the local or federal authorities . . . ha[d] not adequately responded.” 45

In the fall of 1969, the GSP’s troubles got worse when the decrepit townhouse next door, which it had purchased as part of the redevelopment plan, was torn down. Soon neighborhood children were playing on
the property. The GSP discussed turning the space into an enlarged parking lot with a garage for the business manager’s son-in-law since his car had “been repeatedly vandalized by neighborhood denizens.” In 1973, the GSP board reported that the Philadelphia Police Department “consider[ed] the East Poplar Area to be dangerous because of the high con-

“East Poplar is a good place to live!” Brochure of the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Pennsylvania, March 1964.
centration of residents who are drug addicts.” When one was found in the GSP building, the board decided to lock the front door on Spring Garden Street during business hours and to install an intercom system that would enable the librarian to let in visitors.47

Break-ins, car burglaries, and robberies occurred repeatedly just outside the building over the next two decades, increasing rather than alleviating members’ fear of the neighborhood.48 Starting in the 1970s, the GSP began to hire security guards for the parking lot during events. By 1990 the hourly rate of $11.50 for these guards was more than the wages earned by the librarian.49 With the addition of a wrought-iron fence, electric gate, surveillance cameras, and a twelve-foot concrete wall built in the early 1990s “providing protection from the housing project,” the GSP turned into a secure compound rather than a place open to neighbors, visually solidifying its reputation as unapproachable.50

Beyond Finding a Home: Internal GSP Issues to the Present

Even before the GSP finally decided to stay at its Spring Garden location in August 1967, it faced a number of problems aside from its address, including generational and philosophical ones. Already in March 1967, then newly elected President Thomas had come up with a list of issues confronting the GSP. Membership numbers had declined below 300, in part because there was little interest among “second and third generation families of German descent in the library, lectures and other endeavors.” Moreover, the original mission of the society, helping “needy or distressed Germans,” had become obsolete, “hence the benevolent aspect of the Society’s existence [was] of very limited appeal to potential supporters of the Society.” Moreover, GSP activities were “confined to an age group beyond forty and even fifty.”51 The new president also recognized that the society’s financial resources would probably enable it to carry on for quite some time without any real change. However, in order to turn the GSP into a growing, relevant, and vital institution once again, members had to find “new directions . . . with the expressed courage to disregard some traditions” that had become as meaningless as “‘holy cows’ in India.” Thomas proposed to start by “un-cluttering” the library, and “render[ing] some services to the immediate community.”52

Shortly after the final decision to remain at the Spring Garden location was made, President Thomas offered a remarkably realistic analysis of the society’s condition and a far-reaching vision for its future. Reminding everyone that “the Society could not escape the unalterable facts of its geographical location and the legacy of an anti-German feeling engendered by two World Wars . . . ,” he suggested that “the Society could serve the immediate neighborhood by maintaining a library of English
language books for the local children, or possibly by providing a counseling service employing senior students from local universities.” As Dean of Instruction at Philadelphia’s Community College only ten blocks from the German Society, Thomas seems to have had a unique understanding of Philadelphia’s urban challenges, but he ended up alone within the GSP in his willingness to address those problems. His case for transforming the society from a purely ethnic organization to a social and cultural benevolent institution open to neighborhood residents fell on deaf ears. Instead, members grumbled about the younger generation’s “excessive materialism,” alleged badmouthing of the society by members of the German-American community for its “supercilious[ness],” and the lack of awareness of the society’s existence among Americans of German descent.53

Thomas stepped down as GSP president in 1970 when he accepted a job as provost at a college in Pennsylvania’s interior.54 The next two presidents, John Huberti and Ludwig Honold, also tried to change the German Society. Huberti’s goals for the society, for example, were to “heal any schisms between cliques,” “gain back worthwhile members” who had left out of “apathy or discontent,” and improve the society’s “standing in the community as a whole.”55 But like Thomas, Huberti and Honold met with little success. It was not until the election of American-born George Beichl that the GSP found a leader who was able to unite most members for nearly twenty years.

Under the leadership of George Beichl, as well as Elfriede Sonnenberg, the heart and soul of the GSP during her thirty-year tenure as business manager and housekeeper from 1967 to 1997, the GSP attracted a tight-knit group of mostly elderly members. These men and women were especially attracted to the GSP for its annual New Year’s Eve parties, German-style Carnival celebrations, and other amusements. Luncheons for newly sworn-in citizens hosted by the GSP were controversial, however. The luncheons were inaugurated in 1967 and occurred annually until 1976, and then again in the 1980s through 1989. Because there were few Germans among the new citizens present, members were divided over the usefulness of the event. In 1968 already, only ten of the seventy new citizens were German or Austrian. At the time, GSP leaders believed that favorable press coverage would benefit the society in general.56 By 1974, GSP treasurer Anton Meidhof, concerned about the growing deficit, reminded fellow board members that the event cost more than $100 and doubted whether it benefited “the German cause.”57 Beichl argued in 1982 that the event “was related to the original immigrant-related aim of the Society” and offered the GSP “a chance to shine as a public spirited organization, which does not restrict its interest to Germans,” but after
1989, the membership was no longer convinced and the luncheons stopped.\textsuperscript{58}

Beichl inaugurated a newsletter during his presidency that he wrote and edited almost single-handedly. It became a good forum for the requests for assistance that now occasionally came to the society. About a dozen young women and men in Germany wrote each year searching for temporary employment, such as au-pair positions, or short-term lodgings free of charge for vacations or study abroad plans, and many found accommodations or jobs.\textsuperscript{59} The newsletter also allowed Beichl and other society members to reproach the media for emphasizing Nazi atrocities rather than anti-Nazi resistance when dealing with Germany’s recent past.\textsuperscript{60} Beichl used every opportunity to highlight the resistance movement and to admonish the media for failing to acknowledge the atrocities committed in the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{61} His refusal to address the Holocaust was agreeable to many members who were German World War II refugees still coping with their own ordeals.

As a second-generation German American, Beichl’s pride in his ethnic heritage led him to emphasize German contributions to American history adamantly. He was also intent on making the GSP the center of Philadelphia’s upcoming bicentennial celebration of the U.S. in 1976 and the tricentennial of the founding of Germantown in 1983.\textsuperscript{62} The city of Philadelphia was not particularly successful in staging the bicentennial of the nation, but the German Society was quite successful in staging the tricentennial of Germantown.\textsuperscript{63} Under Beichl’s leadership and in the absence of German diplomatic representation in Philadelphia, the GSP became the central address for German and American dignitaries coordinating events. In June 1983, Vice-President George Bush, Philadelphia Mayor Green, Beichl, and others visited Krefeld to commemorate the departure of the thirteen Krefeld families who became the first German settlers in America. On October 6, Germany’s President Carstens, Krefeld’s Mayor Pützhofen, and a delegation from the German Bundestag met Vice-President Bush and other U.S. representatives at Philadelphia’s Franklin Plaza Hotel for an elegant dinner with 1,500 invited guests to mark the 300th anniversary of the Krefeld families’ arrival. Frank Trommler, head of the German Department at the University of Pennsylvania and member of the GSP library committee, organized a four-day “Tricentennial Conference of German-American History, Politics and Culture” at the University of Pennsylvania, which underscored Philadelphia’s significance for the history of the German Americans.\textsuperscript{64}

Although the society contributed only a few thousand dollars for these events, it topped the list of sponsors and made German government officials aware of its existence.\textsuperscript{65} Beichl had envisioned early on that the tricentennial would provide “a golden opportunity for the Germans to do
something—in striking an image, raising visibility.” And Beichl was determined “to maximize on it.”66 After the festivities, Beichl and others merely lamented that “the echo in the German press” had been distorted by German reporters’ “inability to appreciate the nature of our Tricentennial celebration.” An editorial in Die Zeit, for example, saw the festivities as a missed opportunity to talk about current problems in U.S.-German relations and deemed the congratulatory sentiments “slightly embarrassing, slightly untruthful.”67 For Beichl, this criticism detracted from the historic commemoration. Nevertheless, Beichl and the GSP continued to nurture contacts with German officials carefully in the years to come that would result in substantial financial support for the library and building renovation projects a decade later.

After a decade as GSP president, Beichl in 1984 accepted his re-election on the condition that the board agree to hire a “part-time executive director” to “answer the mail and handle the details that are involved in all the activities of the society.”68 Barbara Lang, a recent Ph.D. graduate from Germany, was finally found to fill this position in the fall of 1986. She would be instrumental in raising the society’s awareness of its potential as a research center for German-American history. Lang had arrived as an intern sponsored by the Center for North American Research in Frankfurt a year earlier and was quickly appalled by the conditions in the library. She lamented “the sad physical state of many of [the] important books and newspapers,” the lack of a sprinkler system, humidity control, and vermin control, and predicted that without proper measures “to conserve [the society’s] German-American treasures, a large number of [the] 18th and 19th century books will simply turn to dust, and will join the other vanished thoughts of the past.”69

Smart, educated, and full of enthusiasm, Lang threw herself into creating well-thought-out exhibits for the GSP with topics ranging from the German roots of Christmas celebrations in the U.S. to the history of brewing. The dynamic woman also attracted new, younger members to the society with the institution of the young associates program. Moreover, Lang taught the board about modern fund-raising requirements, emphasizing the society’s need to clarify its identity and goals. After a year of hard work, Lang “requested that her duties, salary and title be reevaluated.”70 Following an embarrassing disagreement over travel expenses Lang had incurred while traveling to Germany, in part to secure funds for GSP projects, her pay was grudgingly adjusted to $19,800 per year, which was about 10 to 20 percent less than the starting salary of an assistant professor in the humanities at the time.71 A few months later, Lang left but not before participating in an ambitious fund-raising effort that ultimately resulted in the three-million-dollar library and building project.
The Library Project, 1994–1999

Begun in earnest in 1994, the project was initially assessed in 1987 by people from the Max Kade Institute. Frank Trommler and Dr. Elliot Shore, the librarian at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, had established contacts there. In preparation for the renovations, the English-language collection and many recently donated books were packed up in more than 1,000 boxes and sent to a warehouse in New Jersey in the fall of 1989. Trommler and Shore were instrumental in securing the funds necessary for cataloging and restoring the library mainly with monies from German foundations and the German Foreign Ministry. A separate fund drive, directed chiefly at American foundations, was initiated for the restoration of the library hall and roof of the 1888 building. Together both men wrote countless grant applications, ultimately garnering the support of the Fritz Thyssen Foundation in Cologne, the Robert Bosch Foundation in Stuttgart, the German Foreign Office in Bonn, and the University of Pennsylvania, among others.

The entire project lasted five years and did not commence without having to overcome some major challenges. For example, funds promised by the Kulturstiftung of North Rhine-Westphalia ended up being diverted to the states of former East Germany upon Germany’s reunification. In addition to the obvious problem of raising enough money from various organizations, GSP members themselves had to come up with $300,000 over the course of five years to fund both the library and building renovation. It was only through the tireless efforts of the fund-raising committee involving personal phone calls to potential donors and the generous support of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Barthelmes, a philanthropically inclined couple from Oklahoma, as well as some charitable local GSP members, that this substantial sum was raised. Another hurdle was the discovery that the renovation of the building roof would be much costlier than first assumed, due to severe cost-cutting measures in the original construction of 1888. After the drop-ceiling of the 1950s was removed, the cupola of the library ceiling was restored to its original shape. [Figure 9]

Internal society politics only complicated the project. President George Beichl and his board fought hard to stay in charge of the entire project for fear of losing control over the library, especially because Beichl deeply distrusted academics. In 1993, Bernard Freitag was elected GSP president. A high school German teacher, Freitag brought the society into the modern era of non-profit cultural organizations and taught members to approach challenges systematically as well-defined projects for which funds can be raised.

The library project resulted in some significant accomplishments. Catalogers made the holdings public by entering them into the RLIN
(Research Libraries Information Network) database and discovered that “fully 57% of the books cataloged are new to the database, and close to 20% represent unique titles in U.S. libraries.” The library building was renovated, and most “books and pamphlets that are at the heart of the understanding of German American culture” were physically restored. In celebration of the completed project, Frank Trommler organized another scholarly conference under the appropriate and provocative heading “The Future of German-American History,” sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania and the GSP. This conference, too, resulted in a book publication.

This successful endeavor, however, constituted the last serious effort the GSP has made to put its library at the center of German-American studies in this country. After 1999, no one raised additional funds to make the library accessible to the general public or scholars. One reason for this is members’ failure to acknowledge a change in the library’s status. It is no longer the Volksbibliothek it once was, but now essentially houses a research collection for scholars of German-American studies. To this day, many society members think of the library as an ordinary lending library without fully appreciating the scholarly value of the collection, which has
been reflected in society decisions. In 1987, the board decided to purchase audiotapes in “music, contemporary German culture and biography” and to begin offering videotapes as well, a policy pursued into the 1990s.80

In some ways, the library project accelerated and finalized the shift from a Volksbibliothek to a research library, albeit one that has been closed for over three years as of this writing. The library closed its doors to all users between February 1998 and the fall of 1999, following decades of decline in the number of visitors. Since then, very few people have attempted to borrow books, and those who might have wanted to could not because the society has not employed a trained librarian since 2002. In part, this was due to a lack of funds but also board members’ unwillingness to commit resources to an aspect of the society that by its very nature cannot be self-sustainable. Some board members, unaware of the climate control precautions necessary to preserve the collection, have also shut off the sophisticated but complicated air-conditioning system in the library to save money at times.

Substantial financial support and serious dedication are needed to make the collection available to scholars. Rare book collections by their very nature generate limited readerships but are extremely costly to maintain, and they are experiencing increasing financial pressure nowadays. Even an organization as old and prominent as the College of Physicians in Philadelphia, home to the third-largest medical library in the country, has had to lay off librarians and other staff members due to a $500,000 budget deficit.81 Although the college is not considering selling its collection at this time, commentators fear that it will eventually do so, just as the Franklin Institute had to sell its rare books in the 1970s and ‘80s for financial reasons. With these organizations unable to maintain their historical treasures, the GSP library becomes even more precious but also more endangered.

Outside of its library, the society has managed to survive over the past two decades by offering German language courses, music concerts, film evenings, and other cultural and social programs. With the exception of the language program, which generates profits of perhaps $40,000 annually, most of these events merely break even. Attracting new members continues to be a problem. A group of nearly one hundred young German professionals has formed its own organization outside of the society because the GSP does not currently offer much for that demographic group. Ranging in age mostly from their twenties to their forties, this younger generation includes women and men of all backgrounds. Among them are students, teachers, physicians, academics, artists, housewives, and accountants who meet in three different locations throughout the city to socialize and to discuss current events.82 The society is not quite so vibrant. Assuming the GSP continues its pace of the past few
years, the organization can probably stay alive until the dedication of its volunteers wanes or until the last descendants of Germans interested in the kind of German culture produced at the society die. At least, that was the prediction of the eighty-three-year-old president and executive director of the German Society of New York, the second oldest-German organization in the U.S.\textsuperscript{83}

\textbf{Conclusion}

In many ways, the history of the German Society of Pennsylvania is tied to the history of Philadelphia: in the colonial period, Philadelphia was the nation’s largest city; it remained preeminent as the country’s industrial center until the early twentieth century; it declined steadily from the 1940s through the 1970s; and in the past two decades, it has experienced an uneven renaissance. When the society had the chance to move to the northern suburbs where most Germans lived after World War II or to take up residence at Washington Square in the prestigious Society Hill area of Center City, leaders and members hesitated. Aside from the usual financial problems, the refugee mentality of many GSP members at the time may have contributed to their recalcitrance to move. Having lost their homes in the Old World due to the war, many seemed determined to hold on to the new German home and community they had found in the German Society at Spring Garden Street.

Considering previous generations’ willingness to change location, this sentimental attachment to the physical structure of the society is a recent phenomenon of the past five decades that has put the GSP in the unique position of being the only ethnic organization in the city to have been at the same location for nearly 120 years. On the other hand, the GSP’s decision to stay has added a substantial financial burden to the society and continues to cause concern about safety in a neighborhood that seems to defy the gentrification visible elsewhere in the city.

In addition to the challenges posed by its location and building, the German Society became entangled in Philadelphia’s redevelopment politics. In many ways it ended up as a victim of misguided and inconsistent local and federal-housing planning. Moreover, the substantial accomplishments of the building and library projects have been overshadowed by internal conflicts during the past five years. Hiring a professional staff at market costs led to personnel budgets of nearly $200,000 per year, an unsustainable expense for an organization without a real endowment and with fewer than 900 members paying $50 annual dues.\textsuperscript{84} As Sally Griffith has said about the history of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, “it is crucial to appreciate that it is essentially a voluntary association that has survived into a very different age from the one in which it began.”\textsuperscript{85}
While the spirit of volunteerism seems alive and well among many GSP members, more than time, painting, and scrubbing are needed to save the organization and to give it a chance to reinvent itself.

The GSP’s public appeal will remain limited, but there is a real need for a center for German-American studies that would ideally be housed at the historic Spring Garden location. The organization can reinvent itself in a way that would honor its long tradition of assisting newly arrived German immigrants in the best possible fashion: by making its unique historical sources available to a growing number of scholars who tell the story of German speakers in American history.
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A donation to the committee was discussed at a GSP board meeting. See GSP Minutes, April 28, 1969.
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GSP Minutes, September 15, 1969.


In October 1973, beer steins worth $3,000 were stolen from the basement. A board member became a designated escort for the elderly librarian’s walk to the train station. See GSP Minutes, October 15, 1973. By 1980, President Beichl announced that during all major activities a hired guard watched over parked cars and the society contacted the local police district to actively patrol the area. Beichl newsletter, March 27, 1980. By 1990, the hourly rate of $11.50 for these guards was more than the wages earned by the librarian. Beichl newsletter, December 1990. In 1986, Mrs. Sonnenberg was robbed on her return from Provident Bank across the street from the GSP. GSP Minutes, May 19, 1986. That same year, rangers to be stationed at the newly opened Edgar Allen Poe House behind the GSP were supposed to “keep an eye on the building.” GSP Minutes, March 24, 1986.

Beichl newsletter, December 1990.
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Board members’ ages confirmed Thomas’s assessment. In 1969, the youngest board member was 40 and the oldest 79. The average age of the 18-member board was over 56. “List of all officers and directors for 1969/70,” uncataloged.

Handwritten notes by President Thomas, “Statement of Objectives for the German Society of Pennsylvania,” March 27, 1967, GSP various box #3.


By this time, the conversion of the basement into a Ratskeller had gone $10,000 beyond the original budget of $30,000 by 1970. GSP Minutes, September 12, 1970. In 1973, the society had to approve $12,000 for much needed renovations although some board members grumbled about taking such a large sum from the investment portfolio, which was shrinking due to the stock market crisis of the early 1970s. GSP Minutes, May 21, 1973. Within ten months, the society’s portfolio had declined by over 35 percent from $456,000 to $278,600. GSP Minutes, March 25, 1974. Membership numbers had also only improved slowly from around 300 in 1969 to 375 in 1974. GSP Minutes, January 14, 1974.
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The first citizen reception at the GSP was held on August 30, 1967. GSP Minutes, September 18, 1967. On January 13, 1968, a second one was held where nine Germans and one Austrian were among the seventy immigrants. At the subsequent board meeting, the benefits of local press coverage were discussed. GSP Minutes, January 15, 1968.


GSP Minutes, March 22, 1982. The last citizen luncheon seems to have been held in 1989. Beichl newsletter, October 11, 1989.

Two German girls were looking for au-pair positions. See Beichl newsletter, June 9, 1983. By 1992, when the newsletter had taken on a more professional appearance, it had become a virtual clearinghouse for job announcements and those seeking employment. See, for example, Der Neue Pennsylvanische Staatsbote, January 1992.

As early as 1976, one GSP member argued “that the primary objective of the Society should be to counteract [the] lingering distrust [of Germans] by highlighting the contribution of earlier generations of Germans to the making of modern America.” GSP Minutes, April 22, 1976.

For one of many examples, see Beichl’s letter to the editor, Philadelphia Inquirer, November 30, 1980. Beichl also invited speakers to the GSP who could lecture on the resistance move-
ment. For an announcement of one such talk, see GSP Minutes, December 6, 1981. Dr. Carl Schweitzer, “The German Resistance to Hitler,” December 6, 1981.

The city had begun its preparations for the bicentennial in 1964 with various planning groups that seem to have spent a lot of money on nothing. Although important historic sites such as the Independence Mall were coincidentally completed in time with federal funds, the city’s strategy of emphasizing entertainment backfired when only half of the hoped-for 20 million tourists came and most of the public exhibits, such as a video about the city, produced at a cost of $2 million, attracted few viewers. The only aspect most Philadelphians remembered decades later was the fire hydrants painted red, white, and blue. The GSP was initially inspired by the city’s effort to plan early for the 1976 event and even established a “200 fund” to save money for the celebration but in the end was disillusioned by Philadelphia’s inability to organize a dignified result.

The city had begun its preparations for the bicentennial in 1964 with various planning groups that seem to have spent a lot of money on nothing. Although important historic sites such as the Independence Mall were coincidentally completed in time with federal funds, the city’s strategy of emphasizing entertainment backfired when only half of the hoped-for 20 million tourists came and most of the public exhibits, such as a video about the city, produced at a cost of $2 million, attracted few viewers. The only aspect most Philadelphians remembered decades later was the fire hydrants painted red, white, and blue. The GSP was initially inspired by the city’s effort to plan early for the 1976 event and even established a “200 fund” to save money for the celebration but in the end was disillusioned by Philadelphia’s inability to organize a dignified result.


For the $1,000 support, see GSP Minutes, May 24, 1982. For the list of sponsors, see “German-American Tricentennial, 1683–1983 Banquet Program, October 6, 1983.” Courtesy of Frank Trommler’s records.

GSP Minutes, December 12, 1982.

Theo Sommer, “Falsches Pathos beim Familienfest,” Die Zeit, October 21. Sommer had criticized German officials, in particular, for failing to mention the current tensions between the U.S. and Germany arising from Reagan’s nuclear weapons proliferation program within the context of the Cold War. German officials did not even address the fact that 5,000 peace demonstrators, both American and German, were staging a candle-light vigil on the steps of Philadelphia’s art museum as the politicians held their banquet inside.

GSP Minutes, June 27, 1985.


GSP Minutes, January 27, 1988, and February 22, 1988. Lang’s relationship with the male-dominated GSP board was difficult, at best.

Shore was later Director of Libraries and Professor of History at Bryn Mawr College.

GSP Minutes, December 21, 1987. I am grateful to Frank Trommler for providing me with his personal notes and documents pertaining to the library and building project.

The Freitag administration became controversial. Struggles between member volunteer workers and paid professionals over who was in charge and who was accountable to whom raised tensions all around and often resulted in ugly outbursts. Freitag’s successor, James Mundy, library director at the Union League of Philadelphia, inherited the tension-riddled climate, making it impossible for him to unite members.


Accurate membership numbers are impossible to ascertain since the society counts everyone admitted to membership instead of only those who are current on their dues payments. At times, merely 50 percent of those who were listed as members had actually paid their dues.
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