News From the Land of Freedom: German Immigrants Write Home

REVIEWED BY DOROTHEE SCHNEIDER, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

Amid the large number of monographs, biographical writings, and other publications on immigrants to the United States that have been issued in recent years, this book deserves special attention. More than a decade ago researchers at the University of Bochum, Germany, began collecting and preserving letters German emigrants to the United States had written home to their relatives and friends. From this large-scale effort grew a collection of more than five thousand letters, a fraction of which have now been translated and edited for publication in the United States. The result of these efforts is a treasure trove not just for the immigrant historian but also for anyone interested in the immigrant experience of Germans in general and the social history of the midwestern states. What makes the collection so interesting for a wide audience is the great variety of viewpoints represented by the letter writers and the directness of their style. From the pious farmer in Michigan to the urban factory worker, from the enterprising servant girl in New York to the failed entrepreneur in the far West, the nearly infinite variety of experiences within this largest of nineteenth-century immigrant groups can be well understood.

To provide some continuity and cohesion, the letters consist of twenty family series, grouped into three categories: farmers, workers, and domestic servants. In a rough sense, these are an accurate reflection of the three largest occupational groupings of German immigrants, but to this reader the differences were more apparent than the similarities among the men and women in each group. Among the workers we find a successful Milwaukee hardware merchant but also, more typically, a miner, a number of laborers, and artisans. Many of the farmers started out as laborers, but in the American context became rural entrepreneurs. Most interesting in many ways are the letters by domestic servants, rare among historical documents. They often give a close-up view of the lives of the working class (servants) and the middle class (masters) at the same time.

Although none of the letter writers were immigrants to Iowa, many letters reflect experiences of Germans in the surrounding
midwestern states, and therefore the volume should be of consider-
able interest to readers who want to learn about the lives of rural
and urban Germans in the midwestern states. In addition, this vol-
ume is invaluable for its meticulously researched and clearly writ-
ten editorial texts. The extensive introductions to the book in gen-
eral and to the three subcultures reflect the latest research on
German-American migration and immigration to the United States,
and the reader will gain a vast array of information and survey
knowledge from them.

Altogether this book should be a very valuable addition to any
reading list concerned with the firsthand experiences of immigrants
as well as a rich source of information on German immigration to
the United States.
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In Watchdog of Loyalty, Professor Carl H. Chrislock draws a compre-
hensive picture of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety
(MCPS). He chose not to compare the Minnesota commission with
other state councils of defense because the Minnesota legislature
established the MCPS by a statute that predated the call from the
National Council of Defense, the impetus for the organization of
most other state councils. In addition, with few exceptions, other
state councils had limited powers and basically carried out the poli-
cies formulated in Washington, D.C.; the Minnesota legislature, by
contrast, gave its commission “almost dictatorial powers.”

With those powers, the Minnesota commission defended the
socioeconomic status quo “against a rising tide of radicalism” in
farm areas and “a growing labor union militance in the mines, for-
est and working-class wards” (x) instead of working with Wash-
ington to mobilize Minnesotans for the war effort. The commission
refused to implement federal policy when labor-management dis-
putes erupted in 1918, and it disagreed with federal policy toward
the Nonpartisan League. Washington sought to co-opt the League,
while the Minnesota commission tried to exclude it by encouraging
fearful “local officials to ban league activity” in their areas (x).
Although the commission led an “intolerant loyalty crusade” against