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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

New Ulm, Minnesota is home to one of the most ethnically German communities outside of Germany. New Ulm’s tourism pitch to “See Germany in America” holds true to that image as New Ulm residents proudly stress their German ethnicity.¹ Berlin, Ontario was no different at the beginning of the twentieth century. It boasted a population that never fell below seventy percent German up through 1911.²

Both of these towns celebrate Oktoberfest and their German heritage. However, for more than fifty years all aspects of German heritage vanished in Berlin. What Berlin now celebrates as their “Germanness” is nothing more than a token of their former glory. Only two German celebrations, Oktoberfest and Christkindl Market, which emerged in 1969 and 1995, respectively, as well as a modest showing at the local farmers market reflect the once proud and genuinely German town. The German language once could be heard, but faded away as the German population assimilated into the British-Canadian majority. New Ulm, on the other hand, still proudly portrays their German origins. German monuments and language are seen today in the town that maintained a significant German majority in the population.

Primarily due to the fact that each of these towns suffered significantly dramatic anti-German events during the First World War, New Ulm and Berlin came out of the war in different lights. The war served as a catalyst that substantially accelerated pre-war tendencies in Canada, which led to the dramatic change. By establishing and examining the typical anti-German activities that occurred on both sides of the United States-Canada border, this study attempts to discover why New Ulm and Berlin took such different paths after the First World War.

New Ulm is located in rural southern Minnesota, nestled next to the Minnesota River. After its founding, the village quickly grew into a thriving midwestern town. Industry blossomed and the town became known for its breweries. The town also had a successful flourmill. Early businesses included “five breweries, notably Augustus Schell’s, potteries, cigar and soda water factories, elevators, brickyards, a vinegar factory, a United States land office, a pipe organ factory, five creameries, two stone quarries” and several stores.

Berlin began as a small, rural town positioned alongside the Grand River. Nearly a thousand miles from New Ulm, Berlin rests in the southernmost portion of Canada just north of New York state. It too was an industrial town, which soon

---

became proclaimed the furniture capital of Canada. After overcoming initial struggles, the town surpassed 15,000 residents by the start of the First World War. 5

Why were these towns chosen for the study? The selection of New Ulm and Berlin as the towns to examine derived from three pieces of criteria. Both towns contained a significant amount of residents of German origins. Coupled with this fact was the key issue that New Ulm and Berlin were both victims of substantial anti-German incidents. Lastly, both of these towns gained national attention for their anti-German activities, which justifies their inclusion in this study.

The single most important aspect of this analysis is the examination of the actual anti-German events. Examining these incidents establishes how the towns took separate paths by the conclusion of the war. In order to better comprehend how the towns arrived on different paths, this study distinguishes how these events developed as well as the relevance of the actions of the residents of each town. Each difference found between the towns helps explain how the very similar pre-war towns transitioned into two very different post-war towns.

This study is important to the scholarly community for many reasons. In opposition to previous studies that examine German-Americans and German-Canadians separately, this analysis makes connections between the two social groups and views them together as Germans (in the broad sense of the term) in a unique light by exploring them through the common theme of anti-German hysteria. This essay also establishes a foundation for future studies comparing the treatment

5 Edna Staebler, The Story of Kitchener, (Kitchener-Waterloo Record, June 1962), 10; Census of Canada, MacNaughton.
of citizens of German ethnicity between the United States and Canada during the First World War. No scholarly work prior to this compared these two towns. Furthermore, scholars thus far have not compared anti-German hysteria on both sides of the United States-Canada border. More importantly, the goal of this study is to find out why this change in the town’s trajectories occurred during the war as opposed to an earlier or later time period.

In order to properly examine the anti-German hysteria of these two towns, one must first understand the history of such ethnic agitation. Anti-German hysteria did not develop with the emergence of the First World War; it existed in the United States throughout the nineteenth century. Canada's sparse overall population and limited German population contributed to the lack of anti-German activities in Canada until imperial concerns, such as the aftermath of the Boer War, developed at the start of the twentieth century.6 Throughout the nineteenth century in the United States many issues involving elements of the German population materialized. The earliest attacks towards the German population began with anti-Catholicism. Anti-Catholicism resulted from the Protestant fear that the pope would control the nation through the Catholic masses residing in the United States. This fear emerged prior to the end of the American Revolution. Much of this anxiety derived from the northern European settlers as non-Catholics received harsh treatment in England as well as

---

the wars fought against Catholic France. Therefore, as many Germans remained Catholics, they too faced this anti-Catholic attitude of many Americans.

By the 1840s, anti-Catholicism diminished and anti-immigrant concerns developed. Between the 1830s and 1840s immigrants began to flood the United States. However, nativists claimed, these immigrants were the undesirable sort. Many of the immigrants immediately required public charity. Moreover, nativists argued that many of the immigrants were criminals. This anti-immigrant push coincided with the first temperance movement. The Irish immigrants with their “devotion to whiskey” and the German immigrants’ affinity for beer drew temperance advocates’ focus onto each immigrant group. The Germans, more so than the Irish, became the focal point due to their beer gardens and ignorance of Sabbath. Temperance movements continued off and on through the prohibition era.

Anti-immigration tensions did not reflect solely the issue of temperance. Nativists feared that destitute immigrants weakened the moral fiber of American society. They worried that the criminals, in addition to the poor, corrupted society. Moreover, many of these immigrants did not respect the popular Puritan belief of the Sabbath. The early 1850s gave birth to a political party that captured the fears of many nativists and used them to unite Americans behind their cause. The Know-Nothing party began simply as an anti-Catholic, anti-foreign political party, but in

---

the years to come they went to the polls with clubs enforcing their will upon hardworking immigrants.⁹

Yet another prevalent nativist fear was anti-radicalism. The liberal revolutions of 1848 drove many Germans to the United States. Some radical Germans even began organizations with the goal of completely changing the United States government by removing the president and senate, abolishing slavery, and ending formal Christianity and the Puritan Sabbath. One such organization was the Central Union of Free Germans, which formed in 1854. It ran on a “platform opposed to slavery, despotism, and the Bible.” Understandably, many ardently religious Americans and Southerners rose in opposition to this. Labor fears also persisted as nativists claimed the higher standards of American labor encouraged immigration at a time when the United States had no immigration restrictions. Americans felt betrayed as radical immigrants who found sanctuary in the United States sought to change the nation into what they desired. More importantly, Americans realized these radical immigrants were “willing to sacrifice the United States in the interest of their home lands.”¹⁰

With the exception of the reemergence of the temperance movement in the 1870s, German-Americans fared well in the last forty years of the nineteenth century. German-Americans continued to enjoy their card-playing, beer gardens, and Sunday amusements. As the largest immigrant group during this period, Germans had their own ethnic enclaves within most major cities. Cincinnati,

---

⁹ Ibid., 195, 323, 380-389.
¹⁰ Ibid., 328-331, 334.
Columbus, New York, Chicago, and Milwaukee all had substantial German populations. Each German quarter had its saloons, German advertisements, and German-language schools. Cincinnati even had a special name for its German district, the “Over-the-Rhine” district. Praised as law-abiding and industrious citizens that were strongly patriotic and easily assimilated, Germans became an acceptable immigrant group as they folded into American society nicely in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Though life went well for most German-Americans towards the end of the nineteenth century, the twentieth century reintroduced anti-German sentiments. The outbreak of the First World War reignited the anti-German flame with a passion. Historian John Higham described the outbreak of anti-German hysteria well, arguing “The fury that broke upon the German-Americans in 1915 represented the most spectacular reversal of judgment in the history of American Nativism.” As German agents operating out of the German Embassy in the United States botched attempts at sabotage, the German-American community became suspected accomplices (see Appendix 1.1). German agents attempted, yet failed to smuggle bombs on board ships bound for England. They also failed in their pursuit to “wreck American factories”. Both of these efforts were solely designed to discourage further relations with England. Though each endeavor officially credited German agents as

---

the saboteurs, the German-American public could not escape insinuations as aiding the saboteurs. The issue of the hyphenated American took center stage. An underlying meaning attributed to the hyphenation during the war was the assumed divided loyalty of hyphenated Americans.

Moreover, as tensions grew, German-Americans steadily became portrayed in political cartoons, editorials, and quoted statements from political officials as traitors and spies who should be put to death (see Appendix 1.2). For example, Howard Heinz, a Federal Food Administrator for Pennsylvania proclaimed, “We will not be strictly free people until 10,000 German propagandists in this state have been hanged to telegraph poles and shot full of holes.”

The American Defense Society, in a widely publicized note, stated, "that a German-American, 'unless known by years of association to be absolutely loyal, should be treated as a potential spy.'" Even Wisconsin Senator Robert M. La Follette could not escape the harsh treatment. His strong opposition to the declaration of war and his part in the defeat of President Wilson’s Armed Ship Bill landed a political cartoon image of him in a special Life magazine issue entitled “Traitors Number” (see Appendix 1.3).

Nativists saw evidence of conspiracy everywhere as anti-radicalism fears emerged alongside the existing fear of German-American spies and traitors even

though German agents fled to Mexico upon the United States declaring war. Nativists reverted to old tactics as they desired to further isolate the German-American population from the rest of American society. The radical Germans who fled Germany after failed rebellions again threatened Americans. Nativists popularized rumors that German-Americans secretly desired and planned to revolt and overthrow the government replacing it with a socialist government (see Appendix 1.4).  

Anti-German hysteria culminated in the Prager lynching of 1918. Robert Prager, a forty-five year old German-American of Collinsville, Illinois, which is about ten miles northeast of St. Louis, Missouri, died at the hands of a mob of three hundred men and boys. Prager spoke “disloyal utterances against the United States and President Wilson” in a neighboring town. A mob formed and grabbed him at his home. The mob then brought him to the main street, removed his shoes, wrapped an American flag around him, forced him to kiss the flag many times, and made him march up and down the street holding two small flags. The police, fearing violence, escorted Prager to a jail cell for his safety. The mayor convinced the mob to disperse, but it reassembled later. The reassembled mob stormed the jail, overpowered the guards, broke open Prager’s door, and dragged him to a tree

---

17 Higham, 201-210, 218-220.
outside of town. After allowing him first to pray (in German), members of the mob placed a noose around Prager’s neck and hung him from the tree.18

As the First World War developed, German-Americans and German-Canadians were in a difficult situation. After the Unification of Germany in 1871 most German-Americans and German-Canadians remained extremely proud of their homeland even though they lived in another country. Eventually, both German-Americans and German-Canadians lived in nations that fought against their homeland, which led to much of the anti-German violence. To better understand the German view during this war, it is necessary to comprehend the origins of the First World War. Scholars still debate the fault of the origins of the war. In general, the war began as a result of a series of negotiations and treaties among various European nations under which each European world power complied with obligations to other nations and entered into war. The result some of the treaties formed two opposing alliances. The Triple Alliance consisted of mutual aide among the nations of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. The opposing Triple Entente combined the might of France, Russia, and Britain. The initial flame to the fire of war began when a Serbian nationalist, Gavrilo Princip, shot and killed Archduke Franz Ferdinand. Archduke Ferdinand was an heir to Austrian throne visiting Sarajevo at the time of his assassination.

---

The Austrian government, which relied on German support, believed the Serbian government was behind the assassination attempt. Austria proceeded to issue an ultimatum to Serbia. Serbia met nearly all demands, but Austria still sought war. Russia, as the self-proclaimed protector of Slav nations, mobilized for war. Germany, possibly desiring to avoid a significant conflict, demanded promises of peace from Russia and France. Resting between these two powerful nations, Germany previously devised a plan called the Schlieffen Plan, which required Germany to quickly win a war against France if a war with Russia ensued in order to avoid a war on two fronts. The necessity of this plan derived from a treaty between France and Russia with each nation promising aid if the other went to war. As France and Russia refused to answer Germany’s call for peace, Germany declared war on Russia on the first of August in 1914 and Germany also declared war on France two days later. On August 4, 1914 Germany begins its offensive by invading France by way of neutral Belgium. Belgium was a protectorate of Britain. Thus, when Germany invaded Belgium, Britain came to Belgium’s aid. Britain issued an ultimatum demanding that Germany withdrawal from Belgium. As a result of the unanswered ultimatum, Britain declares war on Germany on the fourth of August of 1914. Therefore, all of the powers of Europe became entangled in the mess of the First World War.\(^1\)

The powers of Europe also insisted on support from their colonies. As a colony of Britain, Canada joined the war. Also, the United States struggled to remain

neutral during the first couple of years of the war, but as neutral relations with Germany could no longer exist, the United States also joined the war. With both Canada and the United States fighting against Germany by the war’s end, German-Americans and German-Canadians naturally became caught in the middle as the nations sought to vilify the enemy. Therefore, the anti-German hysteria of the First World War intensified during the war and led the anti-German events of New Ulm and Berlin to gain national attention.
CHAPTER TWO

“14 MILES EAST TO BERLIN”

New Ulm has a special place in American history. Since the Chicago Land Company, comprised of German-Americans searching for a home of their own, found New Ulm in 1854, the town has maintained a distinct German nature. Today the unique German atmosphere is evident throughout the year as it has been for nearly one hundred and sixty years. The August Schell Brewing Company still creates the wholesome German lager it that began one hundred and fifty years ago. New Ulm puts on one of the best Oktoberfest celebrations outside of Germany. As a tribute to all German-Americans, New Ulm maintains a statue of Hermann the Cherusci, the warrior known for liberating Germany from Roman rule in 9 A.D. New Ulm also honors the German-Bohemians who settled in the area around 1870 with a German-Bohemian Immigrant monument. Lastly, New Ulm maintains an authentic Glockenspiel that operates daily. The residents of New Ulm have long put to rest any doubts of their German heritage.

The Hermann Monument, above all else, is the symbol of New Ulm. It represents the continuation of the German heritage as it was erected about forty years after the town was founded and when the population had reached nearly

---

20 Hoisington, 7.
21 Ibid., 17.
3,800 residents. The monument, which the Sons of Hermann national organization financed, symbolizes the strength and cohesiveness of the national German-American population. Hermann the Cherusci was a German warrior who fought for individual rights against the immense power of the Roman Empire. It is significant that the community constructed the monument during progressive-era calls for prohibition. In 1887, the Minnesota legislature passed a saloon-licensing bill, which restricted operation hours on Sundays. German-Americans saw the bill as an attack on German social customs, for only a few short weeks after the saloon-licensing bill passed, Julius Berndt, creator of the monument, addressed his local Sons of Hermann lodge. When pitched, Berndt said, “New Ulm was a little German community struggling to do something for their nationality and to elevate the race.” He later wrote the president of the Minnesota State Sons of Hermann lodge calling for and mentioned his desire for this monument to be a national symbol to promote all Germans. This monument is still proudly displayed on a hill overlooking New Ulm for all to see.

The preservation of German heritage by the residents of New Ulm was not an unseen outcome, as its founder originally desired the creation of a German society. Frederick Beinhorn founded the Chicago Land Company to establish a German colony in the American West. The goal was not without a sense of urgency as anti-immigrant violence flowing rampant from the popular Know-Nothing Party filled

---

23 Hoisington, 91; “U.S. Census data” file, Brown County Historical Society.
24 Ibid., 94–95.
25 Ibid., 67.
26 Ibid., 3.
the mid-nineteenth century. As historian Ray Allen Billington argued, “there is little doubt that the [Know-Nothing] party encouraged violent methods. Violence was certain on election day as Know-Nothing members pledged to keep foreign-born citizens from voting by any means necessary. On August 5, 1855, a riot engulfed the German sector of Louisville, Kentucky after a group of Know-Nothing members marched through campaigning. The event, known as “Bloody Monday,” resulted in twenty deaths and several hundred wounded.²⁷

Upon arriving at their plot of land in Minnesota, one of the settlers, Jacob Haeberle, named the town New Ulm after the German town of Ulm, from which a majority of the settlers emigrated. After beginning to build houses and buildings for the settlers, the initial settlement became financially strained, but luck would be on their side.²⁸ Just two years after New Ulm’s founding, a second land settlement company, the German Land Company, arrived. After realizing that both companies had the same goal, establishing a German colony, the companies agreed to merge into the German Land Company of Minnesota.²⁹

While the Chicago Land Company reflected Lutheran and Catholic immigrants of the working class, Turners formed the German Land Company. Turners, originally founded in 1811 in Berlin, Germany by Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, began as gymnastics clubs called Turnverein. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries numerous social clubs emerged in both Europe and the United

²⁷ Billington, 420-421.
²⁹ Hoisington, 13.
States. These clubs, called *verein* in German, provided men with a place to go to socialize outside of the home. Initially, the *Turnverein* was designed to “combine physical fitness with a love of education.” Jahn’s goal was to produce young healthy men who had a strong knowledge of German "folkdom," which Jahn thought would reform the social and political establishment of the German states that were then dominated by the Napoleonic Empire.\(^{30}\)

By the 1840s, the German Turners had spiraled into something different. No longer were the initial and simple goals of the founder upheld. Now non-gymnastic members filled the ranks. These individuals were skilled craftsmen, factory workers, and shopkeepers seeking intellectual and social stimulation by sponsoring lectures or establishing libraries. After taking part in the 1848 revolutions, the Turner clubs were disbanded with many of the leaders exiled or jailed by the various princes of Germany who sought to maintain their power and authority.\(^{31}\) One of the exiles was Friedrich Hecker. He arrived in Cincinnati in 1848 and formed the second American Turner Society. It was there in Cincinnati where the connection to New Ulm derives. One of the founders of the American Turner Society in Cincinnati was William Pfaender, a future resident of New Ulm and leader of the German Land Company. The Turner Society in Cincinnati quickly established a reputation as a radical

---


society. The American Turners opposed temperance, condemned slavery, and also opposed Sunday-closing laws.\textsuperscript{32}

Deemed radical by American society, Turners remained outside the norm due to their opposition to temperance, slavery, and Sunday-closing laws. They did not assimilate into or accept these established mainstream American beliefs. Thus emerged one of the primary factors for the origins of anti-German/anti-immigrant hysteria beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. Though representing only a minority within the greater German-American population (with highest membership level reaching 39,870 members in 1895), Turners clung ferociously to their customs. Nativists’ anti-German movement focused their efforts directly upon the Turners as well as other German-Americans who proudly expressed their German heritage. Turners as well as other German-Americans maintained their cherished customs as Carl Wittke illustrates, “Good beer and good food and good music went together, and Sundays were especially popular for Ausflüge, picnics, and entertainment of every sort... and turnen sought to cultivate the joys of life along with other more immediate objectives.”\textsuperscript{33} Nativists worried that these immigrant intellectual societies sought to transform America into the center of a “world revolutionary movement,” as was indeed the goal of an actual German radical organization, the Volksbund für die alte und neue Welt (People’s Alliance for the Old and New World) in 1852. If these actions were to occur, the United States would

\textsuperscript{32} Hoisington, 8-9.

become deeply involved with European politics and would have to abandon its policy of neutrality that prevailed throughout the nineteenth century. American reaction to this movement, largely seen as a German intellectual movement, was significant. Americans were unwilling to incorporate Turnverein because they feared that it "might be a disguised anarchistic society." Though the German-American Turners were not physically singled out within the larger anti-German hysteria, the Turner Halls, which were buildings where Turners met and socialized within their communities, were targeted with violence. However, Carl Wittke confirmed that accusations against the Turners were rampant, yet inaccurate. One such accusation claimed that the Turnverein was conducting military drills to prepare for their invasion of Canada. These wild claims against all German-Americans became so absurd that mocking counter-accusations arose as evidenced in one German-language newspaper, the Gross-Daytoner Zeitung that stated, "Whenever a lamp explodes in America, there must have been a German spy on it."

To escape the anti-German hysteria violence William Pfaender envisioned a dramatic shift in Turner thought. Instead of living within a diverse American society that seen all Germans as a threat, Pfaender proposed moving west and creating a society in which the Turners could live in peace. He stated that the Turners should find "a separate settlement, which in addition to material well-being also presents

---

34 Billington, 330.
35 Hoisington, 10.
36 Carl Wittke, German-Americans and the World War (with Special Emphasis on Ohio’s German-language Press), (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society, 1936), 40.
the advantage that the mad, unworthy attempts at killing by our Anglo-American disciplinarians cannot limit us.” Shortly thereafter the Cincinnati Turners founded the German Land Company as a shareholder company to work towards Pfaender’s proposed society.\textsuperscript{37}

Eventually, the settlement began to grow. Settlers of the German Land Company joined the original thirty-two settlers and, by 1870; there were more than 1,300 residents in the town. The population continued to increase steadily through the turn of the century. By 1910, the total population for New Ulm was 5,648 residents.\textsuperscript{38} Throughout the years New Ulm maintained its German population. In a state that joined the Union in 1858, the foreign-born population of Minnesota was understandably high as most settlers were immigrants. Of the total population of the state, 71.5 percent were foreign-born and, of that, nearly twenty-five percent were of German origin.\textsuperscript{39}

Religiously, New Ulm was diverse. The original settlers of the Chicago Land Company were mainly Lutheran, Catholic, and Methodist, but, as mentioned previously, the settlers of the German Land Company were Turners. In 1870, the German-Bohemians arrived and they increased the number of Catholics.\textsuperscript{40} Lutheranism, Catholicism, and Turnerism came to dominate New Ulm. Though Turnerism faded over the years, Turner Hall remained a historically significant

\textsuperscript{37} Hoisington, 11.
\textsuperscript{38} “U.S. Census data” file, Brown County Historical Society.
\textsuperscript{39} “U.S. Census data” file, Brown County Historical Society; “1910 Population” file, Brown County Historical Society, 56, 836, 919.
\textsuperscript{40} La Vern J. Rippley and Robert J. Paulson, \textit{German-Bohemians: the Quiet Immigrants}, (Northfield, MN: St. Olaf College Press, 1995), 5.
place in the town. Turnerism played a key role in the happenings in New Ulm during the First World War. Lutheran influence also was felt throughout the town over the years. Martin Luther College, a derivative of the original Dr. Martin Luther College founded in 1884, is operating today providing formal and religious education to future ministers of the Lutheran faith. Catholicism has also maintained an influence in New Ulm since the first Catholic settlers arrived. New Ulm is home to the Holy Trinity Cathedral. The cathedral blossomed out of a simple church for the New Ulm community, which began servicing the population in 1903. It became a cathedral when Pope Pius XII created a new diocese in New Ulm in November of 1957 and the church was transformed into a cathedral to house the new diocese.

This diversity did not come without its complications. Agnostic views and a lack of harmony with religious institutions persisted among Turners. The town, including the Lutherans, Catholics, and Methodists, developed a reputation in Minnesota as a community of freethinkers and atheists, yet none were atheists. Harriet Bishop McConkey published a popular story revealing outside opinions of New Ulm in her account as a Baptist missionary visiting the town. She told the Saint Paul Pioneer Press that “they proposed to let in the saloon but keep out the church.” She also stated that the original proprietors stipulated that no church should ever be built in the town. These statements were untrue exaggerations of the town reflecting a misunderstanding of the perceived beliefs the Turners. Daniel

---

Hoisington stated the true beliefs of the Turners well. He wrote that “the underlying message was that the Turners wanted a community open to all beliefs—but that if people really thought about it, they would jettison the supernatural aspects of religious belief.”\(^\text{43}\) The Turners did not desire to be suppressed and wanted a community that would accept them with their beliefs.

Though New Ulm played a role in two previous major conflicts, the Civil War and the Dakota Uprising, it was, unsurprisingly, the First World War that affected New Ulm the most.\(^\text{44}\) Although the war began in 1914, the United States remained neutral until 1917. Americans were divided. Though propaganda from both sides reached the United States, British propaganda was more influential largely due to the use of English and having better lines of communication. A minority of Americans were pro-German and a larger group of Americans were pro-Ally. Irish-Americans had little love for the British government, and those Americans who had fled the Russian empire—Poles, Jews, Balts, and others—disliked the Tsar. A majority of Americans were neutrally-oriented and desired to avoid the war.\(^\text{45}\) The diversity and varying opinions of the American population demanded that the government stay out of the war.

The German decision in January 1917 to resume unrestricted submarine warfare, which was part of a broader strategic plan to win the war in 1918 before

\(^{43}\) Hoisington, 21-23.
\(^{44}\) The Dakota Uprising was a violent conflict instigated by the Dakota Native Americans after wrongdoings by the United States government led to starvation and hardships for the Dakota people.
Germany and its allies collapsed, led to United States intervention. Both Germany and Britain followed the military practice of attrition in which the military forces of a nation attempt to prevent commerce from reaching an opposing nation. Previously, efforts at naval blockade avoided damage to neutral ships; but submarines had little room, and could not take on passengers and crews from ships whose cargo they wished to destroy. As trench warfare overtook the Western Front and distances on the Eastern Front meant no quick end to war, on February 4, 1915, Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany declared that the German navy would engage in submarine warfare around the British Isles and might damage neutral ships even though they were not the intended targets. This put the United States in a tough spot. The United States either had to direct its own merchant marine away from the British Isles or risk American lives.\footnote{Ibid., 52.} The introduction of submarine warfare required revisiting the legality of actions at sea as submarines depended greatly on maintaining their stealth and, therefore, could not conform to established practices without serious risk.

As fate would have it, the debate took a dramatic turn when a German submarine torpedoed and sunk the passenger liner \textit{Lusitania} on May 7 of 1915. The incident resulted in the death of nearly 1,200 people including 124 Americans. Though the submarine commander did not know, 4,200 cases of cartridges were also on board, which would have justified the attack. Another arguing point for the German commander was that Britain had pressed into service the \textit{Mauretania},
which was the larger sister ship of the *Lusitania*. Regardless of the justification of the attack, Americans united as they felt immense hostility towards the nation responsible for the killing of defenseless human beings.\textsuperscript{47}

Much diplomacy followed this event and Britain, believing the incident allowed them some leeway, began to blockade all of continental Europe. Germany sought to avoid sinking neutral shipping and warned Americans of the risk of traveling on ships of British Commonwealth nations; it also retreated from unrestricted submarine warfare to avoid inflaming American opinion. After another incident on March 24 of 1916, Germany agreed to the *Sussex* pledge in which Germany promised to discontinue unrestricted submarine warfare and abide by conventional sea warfare laws.\textsuperscript{48} However, by early 1917 Germany realized it needed to win the war within eighteen months and thus it returned to unrestricted warfare. Later, the Zimmerman telegram, a telegram between Germany and its ambassador in Mexico seeking an ally against the United States, was intercepted and President Wilson revealed it to the country. The return to unrestricted warfare and the fallout of the Zimmerman telegram culminated into Congress declaring war on Germany on April 6, 1917.\textsuperscript{49}

The United States had only a small army that had not adjusted to the realities of warfare in Europe. Roughly a month after declaring war on Germany the Selective

\textsuperscript{47} *Ibid.*, 57-58.
\textsuperscript{48} *Ibid.*, 91, 95.
\textsuperscript{49} *Ibid.*, 120, 129.
Service Act was passed allowing the induction of young men into the army.\textsuperscript{50} German-Americans had serious concerns about fighting against their homeland. Though loyal and patriotic, German-Americans insisted that draftees of German origins perform duties that excluded them from being forced to “fire upon one’s kinsmen.” This was the true concern out of which German-American protests emerged. They petitioned Congress pleading for an amendment to the conscription act that was more favorable to German-Americans, yet no strong united force accompanied these petitions. Only in New Ulm was there a united body of German-Americans meeting to petition.\textsuperscript{51}

Upon the declaration of war actions were set in motion across the nation. In Minnesota only four days after the declaration of war on April 10, 1917, the state legislature passed a bill creating the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety. This agency was “designed to take swift and decisive action toward ‘suppressing disloyal outbreaks and possible disturbances of order in communities where the German element was predominant’ during World War I.” There were seven members on this commission and Minnesota governor, Joseph Alfred Arner Burnquist, headed it.\textsuperscript{52}

Though the purpose of the agency was to weed out and suppress disloyal people and actions, the commission did much more. Fearful of pro-German


sympathizers the commission created the Home Guard, which was a military body to maintain order while National Guard was actively involved in the war. Initially, there were only seven battalions created to protect Minnesota, but, by 1918, twenty-one battalions were organized. In addition to the Home Guard and the seven-man commission, agents did field work by surveilling suspects.53 These agents acted not unlike the secret police of Nazi Germany. For example, one agent reported to the Public Safety Commission his findings in New Ulm concerning the town’s stance on the war while the agent was also attempting to surveil a Mr. Ackerman. The agent interviewed several residents of the town as he attempted to deduce the town’s loyalty. He furthered his quest of determining New Ulm’s loyalty by visiting the pool halls and saloons and trying to lead conversations toward a discussion of the war. The agent felt it necessary to include in his report that the Post Office did not have a United States flag. Lastly, he questioned residents on Mr. Ackerman’s “pro-Germanism”.54

Since the end of the war and the disbanding of the commission, critics and scholars have condemned the organization as overbearing and unconstitutional. The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety sought to force all residents of Minnesota to speak English, which was beyond the parameters of the agency’s purpose. The commission desired to eliminate not only German, but also all languages of allied and neutral countries throughout the state with the obvious exception of English.

They acted through Carl Gustav Schulz who was the Minnesota superintendent of education. He formed a committee to produce a “white list” of approvable textbooks for school boards to select their books from. A strong counter to the criticism of the actions of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety was that they never went so far as to issue a prohibitive order against the use of German as other midwestern states did. Iowa, South Dakota, and Missouri all took “stringent measures against the use of the German language.”

The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety played a significant role in New Ulm throughout the war. New Ulm was a town proud of its German heritage. This view was noticeable outside of New Ulm just as it was by the residents of New Ulm. Therefore, it was not surprising that the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety highlighted New Ulm. Three events occurred in New Ulm that told the story of how the town changed over the course of the war.

The first event in New Ulm was the Peace Meeting on the fourth of April in 1917. This meeting occurred only two days before Congress declared war. The meeting was held in the armory within New Ulm. Major Pfaender, descendent of William Pfaender, organized the meeting. He felt that entry into the war was “unadvisable.” His opinion on the war carried weight within the community as he was a member of the National Guard. The town mayor, Dr. L. A. Fritsche presided and opened with a statement claiming that the meeting was “purely from a patriotic standpoint.” Major Pfaender then stated, “war is justifiable only when waged in

---

55 Rippley, “Conflict in the Classroom,” 172, 175-6, 179.
defense of our country against invasion, or of its citizens against active oppression, conditions which do not exist.”

Pfaender wanted to inform the community of its rights as well as portray the opinions of prominent individuals of the community.

The third speaker was Professor Adolf Ackerman. He was a professor and the head of the Dr. Martin Luther College. Professor Ackerman educated the audience on the constitutional rights regarding peaceful protests. Reverend Robert Schlinkert followed and addressed the audience in German. He called for peace and stated that, unlike the Civil War and American Revolution, America could not adequately justify entry into the First World War.

The next speaker at the event was an interesting character. Albert Steinhauser served in the United States army during the Spanish-American War as a captain. He also commanded a National Guard company in the Philippine Islands. He was admitted to the Minnesota bar in 1899 after studying law. Upon returning to New Ulm, Steinhauser served as the city attorney for New Ulm as well as the county attorney for Brown County. In addition, he served as the superintendent of Brown County schools. Most importantly, however, Steinhauser was the editor of four publications, which provided him with a sizable regional and national audience. As for the Peace Meeting, Albert Steinhauser spoke as a man with military experience. Thus, his military experience allowed him to speak as a man who proved his

57 Ibid.
willingness to fight for his nation. Steinhauser opened by saying that he saw men before him who fought in the Civil War, Spanish American War, and men who recently returned from duty on the Mexican border, claiming “You don’t have to tell these men what war is for they know.” Instead of discussing the conditions of war, he argued that munitions makers and other capitalists, desirous of large profits, pushed most stridently for war.

One of the last speakers, F. H. Retzlaff, contributed little to the overall discussion. However, Mr. Retzlaff did make one important contribution. He illustrated how most New Ulm residents felt about their loyalty to the United States. Retzlaff said, “I am neither German-American nor an American-German, but a loyal American, with no hyphen about it.”

The meeting remained peaceful and at its conclusion a committee was appointed to travel to Washington to join others in protesting entry into the war. The committee, Mayor L.A. Fritsche, F. H. Retzlaff, Captain Albert Steinhauser, and Professor A. Ackerman, were unsuccessful in deterring the nation from war. Though the committee was unsuccessful at the national level, they did demonstrate to the region their opposition to the war. Joined by roughly 2,000 peace envoys from across the nation, the committee arrived on the sixth of April. As they failed to acquire the proper permit, the peace delegation was not allowed to perform their speeches on the steps of the Capitol. The delegates finally spoke after receiving permission from Vice President Thomas Marshall. Ironically, as the delegates

60 Ibid.
assembled for speeches, President Wilson advocated entry into the war to the
senate.61

Though unknown at the time, the second event in New Ulm during the war
caused a great stir in Minnesota and it gained some national attention as well.
Residents held an Anti-Draft Meeting on the 25th of July in 1917. Many of the
speakers of the Anti-Draft Meeting also participated in the earlier Peace Meeting.
However, there was a much greater turnout for the Anti-Draft Meeting. Between
6,000 and 8,000 people attended the meeting from nearly every town and city in the
south central part of Minnesota according to the Brown County Journal. For a town
of 6,405 people, the anti-draft meeting was a big event.62

Once again Dr. Fritsche, the city mayor, acted as the chairman of the event.
He opened the meeting, which was held in Turner Park, with this statement: “This is
a peaceful gathering of American citizens. We have no desire to cause and
disaffection of the draft law...we do ask, though, that congress and the government
do not force those drafted to fight in Europe against their will...”63 Albert Pfaender,
now a former major of the National Guard, followed Dr. Fritsche’s opening speech.
He spoke of the Constitutional rights of the people. Yet another familiar speaker of
both meetings was Albert Steinhauser. He spoke after Mr. Pfaender. Steinhauser
discussed Constitutional rights and censorship of the press. Four other speakers

62 U.S. Census data reported in Brown County Journal, Aug. 7, 1920, Brown
County Historical Society; “Don’t Want Draft Men Forced to go to Europe.” Brown
County Journal, July 28, 1917, vol. XIX.
63 “Don’t Want Draft Men Forced to go to Europe,” Brown County Journal, July
28, 1917, vol. XIX
lected on their specific agendas. The final four speakers were Professor Wagner, Professor A. Ackerman, F. H. Retzlaff, and Paul Dohnel. It was not until F. H. Retzlaff spoke that the purpose of the meeting was discussed. He explained that many of the local drafted men “appelled [appealed] to them to see what could be done in the way of keeping the boys from being sent to France.”

Only a few months after the Peace Meeting, views had changed somewhat. Residents now fully accepted the United States’ entry into the war. A local judge, I. M. Olson, stated that New Ulm draftees and residents insisted that they were proud to support their country at war if only they could serve without fighting. New Ulm residents, just as many German-Americans, quite possibly still maintained close ties with their German brethren. In Sleepy Eye, a mere fourteen miles from New Ulm, Michael Meidl received a letter from his relative, Michael Wellner, who resided in Neumark, Germany, discussing the war and the health of their relations. Mr. Wellner stated that three of Mr. Meidl’s nephews were in the war and one was injured. Although this is only one letter, it is representative of the very real concern regarding fighting against one’s brethren.

The reaction to this meeting was severe. Critics claimed the anti-draft speeches were “un-American,” “undemocratic,” and “autocratic.” The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety sent agents to the meeting to gain a “cognizance of the

---

64 “Mass Meeting Draws Crowd,” New Ulm Orogram, July 1917, Found in “Anti-draft Meeting” file at the Brown County Historical Society.  
gathering and the speeches”. Governor Burnquist claimed the meeting was “disloyal to America and pro-German.” Subsequently, through powers vested in him as governor, Burnquist removed Dr. Fritsche and Albert Pfaender from their government positions as mayor and city attorney, respectively, on the charge of disloyalty. After further investigation, the agents of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety concluded that the meeting’s true purpose was to hinder government activities. They claimed that Dr. Fritsche as the chairman organized the event and handled the advertising. They also claimed that Albert Pfaender’s speech was “designed and calculated to discourage the success of the United States in its war with its enemy.”

The prosecution of the supposed organizers and speakers of the Anti-Draft Meeting did not subside with the actions of the governor. Possibly through the influence of Governor Burnquist, the Minnesota State Medical Association ordered the Brown-Redwood Medical Association (county member of the state association) to place Dr. Fritsche on trial with the charge of disloyalty. According to the prevailing rules, a medical doctor who became a member of the county medical association by association became a member of the state and national medical association. However, the county medical association had exclusive jurisdiction. Thus, the Brown-Redwood Medical Association had jurisdiction over Dr. Fritsche’s

---

67 Brown County Journal, Dec. 8, 1917.
case. The Brown-Redwood Medical Association tried Dr. Fritsche and found him not guilty due to a lack of evidence.68

The situation worsened, however, as the Minnesota State Medical Association revoked the Brown-Redwood Medical Association's charter as a result of their finding Dr. Fritsche not guilty.69 Following revocation of the charter, Dr. O. J. Seifert and Dr. D. V. Gleysteen sued Minnesota State Medical Association and demanded reinstatement. In 1920, a new charter was granted. The new association, the Redwood-Brown Medical Association, was granted the charter on the condition that Dr. Fritsche, Dr. O. J. Seifert, and Dr. D. V. Gleysteen, along with any other physician associated with them, were permanently excluded from the association.70

Albert Pfaender, too, faced further punishment. Ivan Bowen, an attorney practicing in Mankato, Minnesota, charged Albert Pfaender with gross misconduct and recommended an investigation into Pfaender’s conduct by the ethics committee of the Minnesota State Bar association.71 The committee found Albert Pfaender guilty of disloyalty and conduct unbecoming of a member of the association and of a citizen of the state. The ethics committee stated that Pfaender had “openly defied constituted authorities of the State; delivered speeches tending to create hatred and antagonism to the American government; made remarks that were seditious and

68 Brown-Redwood Medical Association requested transcript of the testimony of the hearing that resulted in Dr. Fritsche’s removal from office. The state failed to provide the transcript. New Ulm Review, Oct. 16, 1918.
69 Brown County Journal, Oct. 4, 1919.
70 New Ulm Review, Nov. 29, 1922.
71 Brown County Journal, Aug. 11, 1917.
disloyal; violated his oath as an attorney and gave aid and comfort to the enemy.”

The findings of the committee resulted in Albert Pfaender being disbarred.\footnote{Brown County Journal, Apr. 27, 1918; Brown County Journal, Aug. 17, 1918.}

Following an investigation by the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety, Professor A. Ackerman, too, faced the repercussions of the Anti-Draft Meeting. The commission concluded that Professor Ackerman should be removed as the director of the Dr. Martin Luther College, but the commission had no authority to make that decision. Instead, the commission presented its findings and its recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the college. The Board of Trustees concluded that it should ask for Professor Ackerman’s resignation. Professor Ackerman complied with its wishes.\footnote{New Ulm Review, Feb. 6, 1918.}

The last speaker suffering harsh punishment for his contributions to the Anti-Draft Meeting was Albert Steinhauser. He was the only participant to be arrested. Steinhauser, the editor of four publications, was arrested for publishing articles deemed to be in violation of the Espionage Act.\footnote{Steinhauser edited and published the English-language \textit{New Ulm Review} as well as three German-language papers: \textit{New Ulm Post}, \textit{Der Freidenker}, and \textit{Die Turner-Zietung}. He also edited numerous other publications. Don Heinrich Tolzmann, “The Captain” p. 5-6; The Espionage Act of 1917 prohibited attempts to interfere with military operations, to support enemies of the United States during war, to promote insubordination in the military, or interfere with military recruitment.} He was also charged with publishing words “intended to bring the army and also the navy into contempt, scorn, contumely, and disrepute.”\footnote{Brown County Journal, Sept. 3, 1918.} Though the government eventually dismissed the second charge and abandoned the first charge, the damage was already done.
His actions, though not criminal, warranted the discontinuation of his military pension awarded for the injuries he received during his service with the United States Army in the Spanish-American War due to his “un-American and un-patriotic actions.” 76 Steinhauser was also expelled from the Minnesota State Editorial Association for his disloyal actions.77

In addition to the punitive actions taken against the participants of the Anti-Draft Meeting, the neighboring communities polarized themselves against New Ulm. In nearby Sleepy Eye, Minnesota the town posted a large banner across their main street stating “14 Miles East to Berlin.” 78 New Ulm gained national attention with their Anti-Draft Meeting, even drawing attention from the War Department. A memo on July 30, 1917 asked, “Is it not time to do something with those New Ulm Dutch?.” It continued, “That is the name they are known by here! They have been against the U.S. ever since the war broke out in Europe. I would suggest putting a machine gun on an automobile to patrol in and around this town...” 79

Though New Ulm residents only sought to protect their drafted men from fighting against close relations, they residents changed their mindset dramatically after the harsh reaction to their last meeting. Albert Pfaender traveled to Gaylord, Minnesota and, at a Fourth of July address, urged a ban on the German language. The same man who spoke of constitutional rights of the people to a large group a year

76 Brown County Journal, Mar. 6, 1920.
77 Brown County Journal, Mar. 23, 1918.
78 Martin Steffel, (Sixth of a series on “New Ulm in World War I”), no date, “World War I” file, Brown County Historical Society.
earlier now stated “Make your Americanism so positive that there can be no doubt of it. Banish the German speech from your home. Put your shoulder to the wheel and help see the war through to a successful conclusion.”80

The final event occurring in New Ulm regarding the First World War demonstrates just how greatly the backlash of the Anti-Draft Meeting affected the residents of New Ulm. The familiar voices of the previous meetings were silent for the Patriotism Meeting. This meeting took place in September of 1917 and had a much greater showing than the previous meetings. It was estimated that approximately 15,140 people were in the audience. The intent of this meeting was to provide a banquet for the drafted men of Brown County and give them a friendly sendoff. The event included a substantial parade. Two local military companies in addition to a Home Guard company were also present to show their support and patriotism. Lastly, unlike the previous meetings, Governor Burnquist attended the function at noon.81 As this meeting exemplified acceptable actions of an American society, this meeting faced no negative actions.

This dramatic transition in New Ulm did not occur overnight. It was a complex and multifaceted change with events taking place at different and sometimes overlapping times. The patriotic events of New Ulm surpassed skepticism, though they were perhaps reactionary in nature. Fellow Minnesotans saw the patriotism of New Ulm as genuine. The first patriotic incident representing

80 Brown County Journal, July 13, 1918.
81 Brown County Journal, Sept. 12, 1917.
this change occurred with the actions of Sherburn Treadwell Beecher. According to the local lore, upon registering for the draft, Mr. Beecher listed his physical address as Liberty Street opposed to German Street, which it was officially called. Apparently, residents of German Street, thereafter, unofficially changed the name of the street to Liberty Street. Though officially the street remained German Street, this action exemplifies the patriotic and loyal elements of New Ulm life happening while the so-called “un-patriotic” activities took place.\(^82\) One final example of the patriotic transition of New Ulm was the Citizens Loyalty League. Residents of New Ulm formed this organization on the fifteenth of July in 1918. The reactionary nature of the organization was evident through their stated purpose. The Citizens Loyalty League desired to promote loyalty in New Ulm as well as punish and eradicate disloyalty in the area. These two goals illustrate the importance of New Ulm attempting to fit in once again. The organization pledged to support the organization until the end of the war. As the end of the war was only a couple months away, there is no evidence of any deeds performed by the Citizens Loyalty League.\(^83\)

Upon the conclusion of the war, New Ulm resumed its promotion and pride for its German heritage. Though the punishment of Dr. Fritsche persisted until 1920, the rest of New Ulm embraced its heritage once again and did not face scrutiny or discrimination. This can be illustrated best through the ethnic diversity statistics

\(^{82}\) “List of names of persons whose Registration Cards are in the possession of this Local Board”, Local board for the County of Brown, State of Minnesota, New Ulm, Minn., Form no. 102, prepared by Provost Marshal General, 1918.

\(^{83}\) Citizens Loyalty League 1918, Declaration of Principles, Signatures of subsidiaries, Original Document, 1918.
and German-language publications. As recent as 2000, the German element of New Ulm could still be seen easily by simply examining the United States Census. In 2000, sixty-six percent of New Ulm’s 13,553 residents claimed German ancestry.\textsuperscript{84} Moreover, twenty years earlier in 1980, an article based on the United States Census data published that New Ulm was the least ethnically diverse city in America. With a population of 13,755 residents, 7,355 residents listed exclusively German ancestry and 3,019 residents listed German ancestry along with other roots.\textsuperscript{85}

More conclusive and relevant to the time period was the persistence of German-language papers. Though German-language newspapers faced a natural decline, the efforts of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety did not eradicate the German language. Upon their dissolution shortly after the conclusion of the war, there was no longer a barrier to freedom of speech. In New Ulm there were a total of six newspapers published in 1915. The \textit{New Ulm Review} and the \textit{Brown County Journal} were English-language publications. The \textit{New Ulm Post} published a paper in English as well as German. The final two newspapers, \textit{Fortschritt} and \textit{Volksblatt}, were both German-language publications.

Of these papers, the \textit{Fortschritt} was the first to end. In 1916, the \textit{Fortschritt} merged with the \textit{New Ulm Post} and it proceeded to publish papers in both English and German. The \textit{Volksblatt} was terminated when it merged with the \textit{Brown County Journal} in 1921. Lastly, the only remaining German-language newspaper, the \textit{New Ulm Post}, faded away when it merged with the \textit{New Ulm Review} on the 12\textsuperscript{th} of May in

\textsuperscript{84} Larsen, “Census Bureau: New Ulm loaded with Germans.”
\textsuperscript{85} Weber, “New Ulm at bottom of Diversity Scale?”
1933. Thus, only the *Brown County Journal* and the *New Ulm Review* remained and both were English-language only papers.\(^8^6\) The persistence of the German-language publications well after the war came to an end illustrates the determination of the New Ulm residents to maintain their German heritage just as the founders intended. Yet the end of German-language publications also reflects the lasting effects of the restrictions on education put forth by the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety as fewer and fewer residents of New Ulm knew how to read German.

\(^{86}\) “New Ulm Newspapers” file, Brown County Historical Society.
CHAPTER THREE

ARE YOU IN FAVOR OF CHANGING THE NAME OF THIS CITY? NO!!

The city of Berlin, Ontario began as a simple and reclusive farming area. The settlement, which has been called either Grand River or Sand Hills after its only distinguishing features, was nothing more than a hodge-podge of Mennonite farmers from Pennsylvania. Although Mennonites were the sole residents in the beginning, later immigrations introduced many others of German ethnicity to the Berlin area. Native Germans accompanied the German-American Mennonites.87

Much like the New Ulm residents, among the combined, yet still predominantly German population of Berlin was a strong sense of pride for the Fatherland. After the Unification of Germany in 1871 residents of Berlin threw a large celebratory party called the Friedensfest (the Peace Festival) to show pride in their former or ancestral home. Their level of pride cannot be overstated. Germans everywhere were intensely proud of the progress Germany had made. With a centralized government and a consolidated nation, Germany found its place in the world. The residents of Berlin, Ontario, in commemorating their pride in Germany and their Friedensfest, planted an oak tree in Victoria Park.88

87 Native German and German-American immigrants will be referred to as German-Canadians from this point on since both groups were treated the same.
88 The oak tree is a common symbol of strength and endurance. Also, in the nineteenth century, it commonly symbolized Germany after its unification. Werner Bausenhart, German Immigration and Assimilation in Ontario, 1783-1918, (LEGAS: Ottawa, 1989), 83-4.
Years later this symbol of German pride in Berlin mysteriously disappeared. Twenty-five years after the *Friedensfest*, in 1896, Karl Muller who was president of the local German Club suggested the town raise funds to replace the tree. The response was so great that Berlin decided to erect a bust of Emperor William I on a stone pedestal in place of the oak tree. Affixed to the pedestal were two bronze plaques of Bismarck and Moltke. The monument promoted the pride German-Canadians had in these three men who were responsible for consolidating Germany. Ironically, with the exception of the name of the town park (Victoria Park), nothing in Berlin, Ontario, a British colonial town, visually promoted Great Britain.

Immigration from the United States to Canada was nothing new. The Great Migration of 1783 occurred when loyalists and neutrals left the independent United States for the closest British colony. In fact, “virtually all ‘Germans’ who settled in Upper Canada until the eighteenth century were German-Americans.” From this first migration, Canadian officials learned that the German immigrants were a desired immigrant group because they were hard workers and blended in nicely with the other settlers. The only negative attribute, according to the commonwealth, was the immigrants’ language.

The next major migration of which Germans participated was the migration occurring shortly after the Proclamation of February 7, 1792. John Graves Simcoe became governor of Upper Canada after the Constitutional Act of 1791, which

---

89 Otto von Bismarck was the first Chancellor of the German Empire and is credited with constructing the empire. Helmuth von Moltke (the Elder) was the Chief of Staff of the Prussian Army throughout the German unification efforts of the second half of the nineteenth century. *Ibid.,* 83-4.
separated Quebec and Upper Canada, and made the proclamation shortly after becoming governor. Upper Canada was sparsely settled and Simcoe desired to populate his realm with individuals who could easily be assimilated into the British Empire. With his previous knowledge of the German-American population in Pennsylvania, Simcoe took it upon himself to write a letter to the British Consul in Philadelphia offering a personal invitation to the German-Americans residing in the area. This personal invitation is important because in it Simcoe promised exemption from military service for conscientious objectors.90

Land ownership in the United States in the nineteenth century was problematic. By 1800, most of the fertile farming land was scarce or expensive. Primogeniture, or other types of inheritance, hindered economic survival as multiple generations of Americans began to saturate regions of the States. American expansionists, as well as those looking for a better life, had two options as of 1803. Settlers could move north to Upper Canada or move west into the recently purchased Louisiana Purchase territories. Any migration of the period had its difficulties, but the westward expansion presented an additional threat in the form of potentially encountering hostile Native Americans.

Of this second migration, roughly from the 1790s to the 1820s, many were German-Americans venturing from nearly every state. Furthermore, a substantial number of these immigrants were relatives of the first wave immigrants. Significant portions of the second wave immigrants were Mennonites or Tunkers as well. As

90 Ibid., 15-18, 40.
Upper Canada was still sparsely populated, it appealed to the Mennonite and Tunker immigrants due to their desire to maintain a limited interaction with the world. By settling in a compact, cohesive group, they would be able to further limit interaction.

Berlin’s founding dates to 1800 when Joseph Schoerg and Samuel Betzner, two German-speaking Mennonites from Franklin County, Pennsylvania, purchased a plot of land on the Grand River from Richard Beasley. Twenty Mennonite families from Franklin, Lancaster, and Montgomery counties of Pennsylvania populated the settlement known as Grand River by 1803.

Interestingly, the Grand River settlement had to form a joint-stock company after already settling in the area as some startling facts came to their attention. While on business in York, Samuel Betzner overheard a conversation discussing how Richard Beasley sold land that maintained a substantial mortgage to some unsuspecting Mennonites. The land sold to the Mennonites had been purchased jointly by Richard Beasley, James Wilson, and St. Jean Baptiste Rousseau from the Six Nations Native Americans. The Six Nations Native Americans sold the land with a mortgage that was to last 1,000 years, which was to provide the Six Nations with an income. Beasley, however, failed to mention this fact to the Mennonites. After overcoming the initial shock, the Mennonites secured an agreement to receive full ownership of the 60,000 acres if they could pay off the mortgage, which totaled 10,000 Sterling.

The small settlement could obtain nowhere near enough to pay off the mortgage and decided to plead to their Pennsylvania brethren for aid.
Mennonites of Lancaster County formed a joint-stock company, the German Land Company, acquired the funds, and purchased the 60,000 acres. A mass emigration ensued with Mennonites purchasing land not only for themselves, but also for their children and grandchildren. The emigration was so extensive that soon there was no land left to sell. The company then purchased 45,195 acres of land from the neighboring Woolwich Township. The once small Mennonite community of only twenty families grew into a large community that was still a cohesive Mennonite community.

Grand River’s group settlement was unique. Before and after, Governor Simcoe refused to allow group settlement. His desire to populate Upper Canada did not outweigh his greater goal of creating a British Canada. He felt that individual non-British settlers could easily be assimilated. Thus, the Grand River settlement was able to avoid mainstream assimilation efforts, as they were a cohesive, secluded group.91 This unique case slipped by Governor Simcoe because the initial land purchase occurred at the hands of individual Mennonites. Benjamin Eby, one of the original founders, renamed the settlement, which already changed from Grand River to Ebytown, to accommodate the significant German population. As the story goes, Ben Eby changed the name in 1824 to Berlin in order to make the German emigrants “feel at home.”92

The third wave of immigration to Canada by Germans consisted of mainly native Germans traveling across the ocean. A few factors led to this wave of

91 Ibid., 41-47.
92 Staebler, np.
immigration. First, the end of the Napoleonic Wars left many soldiers without work or food. Secondly, the cottage industries of Europe could no longer compete with the manufactured goods of England. Thirdly, the poor harvests across Europe in 1816 led to much starvation. Fourthly, the potato famine of the 1840s led to starvation on a grand scale. Lastly, many lesser Germans took advantage of the “relatively high” land prices in Germany to sell their land and pay for their passage as well as provide them with a little bit of money to begin their lives in America.\textsuperscript{93}

Due to the cohesiveness of the Mennonites of the Grand River settlement, it became the “hub of the German presence.” Many of the immigrants found a home in Berlin as some of the Mennonites sold these immigrants small plots of land to entice them into staying. The Mennonites maintained their beliefs, but they also saw the necessity of retaining the immigrants who offered skills that the residents did not have. This allowed the town to remain secluded to a higher degree. However, after 1850 land and employment opportunities became scarce and Berlin became merely a stepping-stone for German immigrants.\textsuperscript{94}

Though German immigration continued steadily throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, three events greatly affected the immigration of German citizens. The British North America Act of 1867 united the provinces of Canada under a single identity. This produced a strong, united front to any opposition. Scholars have long claimed that this act simply answered the threat of the long-feared United States’ invasion. The Unification of Germany in 1871 also affected

\textsuperscript{93} Bausenhart, 64, 67. 
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 69-71.
immigration. Unification created centralized authority over colonization and emigration. New policies and colonization goals arose. However, emigration continued unabated for the most part.95

Although Canada welcomed large populations of foreigners, the country remained strongly assimilationist. As a British colony, Upper Canada, which divided into the provinces of Ontario and Quebec after the British North America Act of 1867, desired the Anglicization of all residents. Church services, education in the schools, and later newspaper language censorship reflected this mindset. Governor Simcoe’s prohibition of group immigration was the first evidence of this attitude. The church services, although not a forced action from a legal standpoint, provided the first physical evidence of Anglicization within the society. The British Colonial Office began a policy of establishing the Church of England as the sole religious institution in Canada in 1763. They saw that the original thirteen colonies of the United States had various religious beliefs. They felt that these differing beliefs led to differences in thought, which they later attributed to a partial cause of the American Revolution. This policy and the later Canada Act of 1791 gave preferential treatment to Anglican ministers. Though Canada never outright excluded other religious institutions from forming, it was the economic incentive of fifty pounds per year paid to Anglican ministers that encouraged religious officials of other religions to convert to the Church of England.

95 Ibid., 75-76.
For example, in Williamsburg and Matilda, Ontario one Lutheran minister served both towns. The presiding ministers struggled to resolve the financial issues troubling the two churches. The method they developed to obtain the money their congregation needed was to have the minister become reordained as Anglican ministers, which allowed them to continue servicing the congregation while receiving the fifty pounds per year. However, what resulted from this practice was that by 1833 all Lutheran services of these two towns performed services only in English.\textsuperscript{96} The example of the Williamsburg and Matilda churches reflects the Anglicization efforts occurring across Ontario to all church services struggling financially.

Though, by 1890, many of Berlin’s church services were held in English, which reflected the policy as well as changing demographics, German services remained prevalent in Berlin. However, by the onset of the First World War, all religious officials performed services nearly exclusively in English.\textsuperscript{97} The British Colonial Office’s main goal of establishing the Church of England as the sole religious institution of Canada failed. This is evidenced by the religious composition of Berlin in 1911. The Anglican population of Berlin totaled only 907 members. Berlin remained dominated by Lutherans and Catholics, totaling 5,100 and 3,560

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid., 31-37.
\textsuperscript{97} Thomas Adam, ed., \textit{Germany and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History}, (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, Inc., 2005), vol. 1, 140.
respectively. Additionally, Berlin housed populations of Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and, of course, Mennonites.\footnote{Census of Canada, MacNaughton.}

By the end of nineteenth century Canada took steps to anglicize public education. In 1851, the Council of Public Instruction passed Section 8, which allowed teachers to substitute knowledge of French or German for that of English.\footnote{Bausenhart, 86-88.} This concession was short-lived however. The School Act of 1890 instituted English as the primary language of instruction and placed French and German as academic disciplines. Also, instruction was in English at all times unless pupils could not understand English. Unlike French-Canadian parents, the German-Canadian parents encouraged a stronger knowledge of English for their children as they envisioned a better future for bilingual children.\footnote{Hienz Lehmann, \textit{The German-Canadians, 1750-1937: Immigration, Settlement, and Culture}, trans. and ed. Gerhard P. Bassler, (St. Johns, Newfoundland: Jesperson Press, 1986), 74-75.}

Later, in April of 1890, an amendment to the Education Act allowed trustees and inspectors to use their discretion to determine if French or German was to be taught to the pupils whose parents requested it.

By 1900, outrage overwhelmed the residents of Berlin and they began the \textit{Deutscher Schulverein}, which was a German Language School Alliance. Led by Karl Müller, president of the German Club in Berlin, the organization stressed the importance of maintaining German in schools for instruction, which “would render German as a ‘real’ communicable language as opposed to an academic discipline.” This greatly improved German language instruction in the Berlin-Waterloo school.
system until the outbreak of the First World War. However, in 1913, the Ontario Department of Education passed Regulation 17, which limited instruction in French and German to a maximum of one hour a day.\textsuperscript{101}

Despite the significant concerns over the educational restrictions on the German language, the Boer War created the greatest problem for German-Canadians, changing forever the public opinion of German immigrants.\textsuperscript{102} What seemingly arose from the Kruger Telegram, concluded in a chain of events that progressively put Germany and Britain at odds with each other.\textsuperscript{103} The Boer War forced Canada to face issues of its diversity for the first time. Significant tensions arose between the French-Canadians and British-Canadians as French-Canadians opposed entry into the war and British-Canadians felt obligated to support England. Though, “the only sustained and widespread opposition to the war came from French-speaking Canadians,” a rift grew between British-Canadians and German-Canadians too. This clash between British-Canadians and German-Canadians developed out of Germany’s pro-Boer stance and British-Canadians assumed German-Canadians took a similar stance. Along with the German-Canadians, Canada needed to appease the interests of its French-Canadians. Aware of such divided loyalties, Canada asked for volunteers, only, to participate in the Boer War.

\textsuperscript{101} Bausenhart, 88-89.
\textsuperscript{102} The Boer War was a lengthy conflict pitting native South Africans against British Imperial soldiers. The conflict arose out of Britain’s ambition to conquer and claim South Africa for its Empire.
\textsuperscript{103} The Kruger Telegram was a congratulatory note on the repelling of British forces by the Boers during the botched Jameson Raid. It was from Germany’s Kaiser Wilhelm II to the Transvaal Republic’s President Stephanus Johannes Paulus Kruger and it signified a pro-Boer outlook by the German government.
Voluntary enlistment allowed obviously pro-British British-Canadians to fight and potentially pro-Boer or neutral Canadian elements to avoid the conflict.

Though the only serious opposition to the war in Canada came from French-Canadians, it was the German-Canadians who suffered after the war.\textsuperscript{104} In addition to other events, but beginning with the Kruger telegram and continuing with the British seizure of German merchantmen off the coast of South Africa as well as the tariff war between Germany and Canada, anti-German sentiment continually increased throughout the British Empire. The tariff war between Germany and Canada in 1897 resulted in the proposal of Tariff Reform by the British Empire. Most importantly, however, British politicians, eager to attract support for the reform, began publicly promoting anti-German sentiment, which further separated Anglo-German relations.\textsuperscript{105} The steady increase of Anglo-German antagonism within the British Empire greatly affected German immigrants and German-Canadians alike. At war’s end, many Canadians questioned the loyalty of German-Canadians. Germans were no longer seen as the preferred immigrant. This antagonism climaxed after the onset of the First World War.

On the verge of the outbreak of the First World War Berlin, Ontario was a unique region within Canada. It was a bustling town of 15,196 residents. The German ethnic makeup of Berlin was nearly three times higher than the British with 10,633 residents claiming German ethnicity compared to only 3,416 residents

\textsuperscript{104} Buckner, 233-237.
claiming British ancestry. Moreover, the strong Mennonite population remained under the impression that they remained pardoned from military service as was promised by Governor Simcoe at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Despite mixed loyalties among German and Mennonite populations in particular, Canada entered the war on August 4, 1914 as a colony of the British Commonwealth.

Canada was poorly prepared for a conflict of such magnitude. Canada maintained a “fledgling navy” and only 3,110 soldiers. Through voluntary enlistment Canada mustered 619,636 men and women. More troops were needed, however, and conscription eventually became necessary. The Military Service Act of 1917 ordered the drafting of men to fill the military ranks. Following this act was the Conscription Crisis of 1917. Spurred by French-Canadian protests, concerns also arose among the significant Mennonite community of the Berlin area. The fears of the Mennonite community were put to rest on the tenth of January in 1917 when Robert Rogers, a judge presiding on the National Service Board, told five bishops of the Mennonite Church of Canada that Mennonites continued to be exempt from military service, but the requirement of completion and signing of registration cards by all residents of Canada remained regardless of exemptions.

---

106 Census of Canada data, MacNaughton.
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The rising dislike towards people of German ethnicity climaxed with the onset of the First World War marking an end to the Germans’ status as the favored immigrants of Canada. As historian, K. M. McLaughlin, argues, “This was a war not just against Germany, but against ‘Germanness’, and it was no longer possible to be both a German and a Canadian.”\textsuperscript{111} The anti-German sentiment was so strong that many German-Canadians and even some Mennonites sought to prove their loyalty to Canada by enlisting for military service.\textsuperscript{112} German antagonism continued in many other ways as well. By the conclusion of the war it was no longer socially acceptable to proclaim “we are Germans and proud of it” W. H. Breithaupt did in 1916 in Berlin.\textsuperscript{113}

Anti-German protests in Berlin took a variety of forms. However, unlike events in New Ulm, the German population did not initiate the protests of Berlin. Instead, many of the anti-German activities stemmed from British-Canadian patriotic fervor. Moreover, the protests did not face strong opposition from the residents of Berlin. Lastly, the events occurring in Berlin, for the most part, remained internal to the city and did not include outside interference, as was the case in New Ulm.

The bust of Emperor William I suffered greatly as anti-German protests grew in Berlin. The vandalism of the Bust of Emperor William I was the first anti-German
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act to occur in Berlin. Less than one month after Canada went to war, vandals broke
the bust of William I off its stone pedestal, carried it to the nearby wooden bridge in
Victoria Park, and hurled it into the stream that ran beneath the bridge. The
patriotic fervor of the individuals responsible for the act did not sit well with the
Berlin public. Most of the residents of Berlin felt that this act was an “unjustifiable
act...[done to] vent spite” on the current Emperor of Germany. The police actively
sought to persecute the guilty miscreants as the act remained unforgiven.114

After recovering the bust from the stream, the German Club of Berlin
subsequently housed it in Concordia Hall. Anti-German protests remained minimal
throughout the next year and a half, but on the fifteenth of February in 1916
violence once again erupted. On that evening ten to twelve soldiers of the local 118th
Battalion stormed the German Club rooms of Concordia Hall. They proceeded to
take the bust of William I out to the street. Once on the street, the soldiers formed a
procession, began marching while singing patriotic songs, stopping occasionally to
pound the helmet of the bust with sticks and canes. The soldiers marched from King
Street to Queen Street and stopped at the skating rink to deliver a recruiting speech.
Their march concluded at the barracks where the soldiers conducted another
speech and “locked their prize in the ‘Clink’ for safe keeping.” Later, a portrait of his
grandson, the current Kaiser, accompanied the bust of William I. As the mob of
soldiers frightened the guards on duty, the shameless soldiers were able to do as
they pleased.

This was not the end of their anti-German escapades. Joined by many more soldiers, the group marched back to the Concordia Hall where they found a number of pictures of German royalty as well as German flags. They stole these paintings from the club and brought to the recruiting office. There the “pictures were smashed to splinters and the German flags torn to ribbons.” Emboldened bystanders snatched up the broken pieces to retain as souvenirs.

The mob returned to the Concordia Hall one final time that night. On this visit, the mob grabbed anything left that was German and tossed it into the street in front of the club. The mob did not stop there as they broke windows and doors. They continued by tossing every broken piece outside. Other soldiers and even some civilians gathered the tossed debris and placed it into a pile in the middle of the street. The mob soaked the pile of debris in gasoline and set it on fire. By this time a large crowd formed.

Colonel W. M. O. Lochead arrived shortly after the bonfire was set and restored order. He commanded his men to fall in. He promptly proceeded to march the men back to the barracks. Though many heated arguments broke out, no further violence ensued. A substantial number of soldiers were not present for the criminal activities, but arrived after hearing the commotion. Colonel Martin, also a late arrival, assembled the remaining soldiers and marched them back to headquarters. The night concluded with anti-German speeches on a neighboring street by excited
citizens of the event.\textsuperscript{115} The bust of Emperor William I was never recovered and many claimed it was melted down.\textsuperscript{116} Moreover, Colonel Lochead also downplayed the significance of this violent action by stating the event was merely “unfortunate.”\textsuperscript{117}

The bust was not the only violent outburst within Berlin. Individual German-Canadians suffered as well. One such event was the Tappert incident. The Tappert incident illustrates the typical anti-German violence occurring throughout Canada. It was not the only violent action taken by patriotic Canadians, but this incident establishes the degree to which the German population faced a fierce reaction. Carl Reinhold Tappert was an ordained Lutheran pastor residing in Berlin where he attended to his congregation. Born in Germany and performing services in German, led residents of Berlin to suspect Tappert of disloyalty. As a man of faith, he was a conscientious objector to the war. His first troubles emerged during a meeting of the Ministers’ Association of which he was a member. The discussion in September of 1914, shortly after war had been declared, centered on war. Tappert expressed his concern about the accuracy of anti-German propaganda circulating in Canada. Furthermore, he stated that he would not contribute to the Patriotic fund as “a matter of conscience.” Rumors throughout Canada followed and the police chief of

\textsuperscript{115} “Soldiers Break Loose and Wreck German Club Rooms in Concordia Hall,” \textit{The Berlin News Record}, Feb. 16, 1916.
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Berlin decided to bring Tappert in to resolve these rumors. The issue eventually concluded with Tappert receiving a public apology for these false rumors.

Though Tappert was innocent of any wrongdoings, he was a conflicted man. As W. R. Chadwick explains, “[Tappert] likened Germany to the mother that bore him, and America to the bride that he chose, and suggested that this was the situation for thousands of other Canadians.” Tappert could not stand “slurs against ‘the mother that gave birth to me.’” He publicly countered such claims and this brought him much of his troubles.

Canadians increasingly directed their frustrations at Mr. Tappert. In February of 1916 Tappert submitted his resignation as his family began to suffer. Johanna Tappert, Carl Tappert’s daughter, withstood physical assaults. Another daughter forcibly quit her job as a city clerk and two of his sons faced false accusations in the newspapers. The community assumed Tappert’s final day to be March 1 of 1916, but there was a confirmation service on the fifth of March that Pastor Tappert deemed too important to miss. On the night of March 4, 1916 fifty rowdy and impatient soldiers of the local 118th Battalion met Pastor Tappert at his house. The soldiers beat and dragged Tappert from his home. The assembled mob then paraded Tappert’s beaten body around the city center in order to humiliate him. The mob paused outside of the Concordia Club, which was still badly damaged from the earlier mob involving the bust of William I. Still dragging Tappert along, the crowd concluded its journey at the barracks where they intended to put Tappert

into the detention room for the night. Captain Fraser, a senior officer of the 118th Battalion finally arrived and convinced the mob to surrender Tappert. Mayor Hett, who accompanied Captain Fraser, rushed Tappert to the town surgeon. Beaten and bruised, Tappert and his family quietly left Berlin on the eighth of May. The culprits of the incident suffered little more than a stern lecture from the judge.\(^{119}\)

At roughly the same time as Mr. Tappert left Berlin, the most famous anti-German protest began to gain momentum in Berlin. This was the protest of the name change. The initial thought of changing the name of the town remains unknown. Some residents claim manufacturers first sought the name change while other residents cite the first call for the name change deriving from patriotic citizens. What is known is that by the beginning of 1916 residents of Berlin seriously began to consider changing the name of their town, which resulted in the city council agreeing to put the issue to a vote by the end of January. In February of 1916 the editor of the *Berlin News Record* challenged the question of changing the name of Berlin as a rash move enveloped in emotion. By the eleventh of May in 1916 the front page of the *Berlin News Record* had a response to the editor by an individual identifying himself or herself only as New Zealander. He or she countered the earlier claim by stating that the town council, the board of trade, and general citizens have all had opportunities to ponder the name change.\(^{120}\)

---

\(^{119}\) Chadwick, 78-85; “The Tappert Case Aired in Court This Morning,” *The Berlin News Record*, Mar. 6, 1916.

The question of the name change breached all aspects of the town. Lifelong residents could not comprehend the necessity of changing the name. Residents implored fellow countrymen to recognize that residents of Berlin were proud Canadians. These lifelong residents were not associated with Berlin, Germany. The residents concluded that anyone who sought to change the name was disloyal to the town. On the contrary, manufacturers, which originally brought forth the proposal, did not understand why changing the name was such a big deal. Neighboring towns agreed with the manufacturers, claiming that the town would only lose standing and commerce by retaining a name with a current negative connotation.\textsuperscript{121}

The manufacturers of Berlin had no choice but to suggest the name change. By 1916, manufacturers received many letters from across Canada from their customers stating that they were unable to sell the manufacturers’ goods. No customer would buy goods with a “Made-in-Berlin” label, as they assumed it came from Germany. After the proclamation of Berlin as the furniture capital of Canada in 1912, Berlin manufacturers saw their demise in sight after only recently gaining national prestige for their industrious efforts.\textsuperscript{122}

Of course there were many reasons provided in support of the name change as well. One businessman stated that while travelling he faced allegations of the “pro-Germanism” of the town and, for the sake of commerce, endeavored to correct this misconception. Others claimed that the industries have done well for the town

\textsuperscript{121} “Executive Committee Favoring Name-Changing By-Law Held Meeting,” \textit{The Berlin News Record}, May 10, 1916.  
\textsuperscript{122} Staebler, 10.
in the past by bringing “the gas, electric, and waterworks and street railway plants” to the town and the industries would do right by the town yet again. The argument for showing loyalty for Canada was also put forth. Still other residents declared that the name Berlin would have a negative connotation at the conclusion of the war and Berlin, Canada would suffer along with Berlin, Germany. Mr. C. K. Hagedorn stated that although the town has stood for quality for thirty years, the war had changed the perception of Berlin, Canada. The residents of Berlin were deeply troubled over this issue and it was not taken lightly by anyone.123

The residents of the town were split on the issue. Those opposed to the name change argued that this was not Canada’s war and thus a show of loyalty was not necessary. Secondly, some residents argued that the manufacturers’ complaints were unfounded. Even if business suffered, some argued, profit loss was not valid justification for changing the name of the town. Other residents declared that the name change should wait until after the war. Yet another reason for maintaining the name was that many agreed that changing the name was a “slap at the German people.” The last counter voted to keep the name of the town in order to promote their patriotism through the “From Berlin to Berlin” statement.

In addition to the general schism of the residents of Berlin, many took actions to promote or condemn the name change. A legal injunction claiming the name

---
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change as illegal briefly halted the vote.\textsuperscript{124} Two opposing organizations formed to publicly contest the name change. The Citizens League, which sought to keep the name as it was, and the British League, which promoted changing the name, both performed public speeches and advertised their views in the newspapers.\textsuperscript{125} On the verge of the vote, manufacturers such as the Dominion Rubber System, which already dropped Berlin from its name, wrote a letter to its employees pleading them to vote for the change.\textsuperscript{126}

Interestingly, the committee heading the name change previously put the vote to the students of the Berlin schools. In this ballot, which published its results two days prior to the actual vote, the outcome was drastically different. The students voted for a name change by a vote of 1,560 supporting a name change and only 207 students opposing the change.\textsuperscript{127} Critically, the discrepancy between the students and the older voters rested with the wording of the proposed question. Unlike the voters, students voted whether or not they were in favor of changing the city’s name for patriotic reasons, which, of course, left out the manufacturer’s argument. When the day of the vote came on the nineteenth of May in 1916, tensions were high as many awaited the results of the vote. Though only 3,057 residents voted, it was the highest recorded voting turnout in Berlin’s history.
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vote was very close. The motion to change the name of Berlin passed by only 81 votes with 1,569 voters supporting the change and 1,488 voters against the name change.\textsuperscript{128}

The next step in the process of changing the name of Berlin was to determine which name should replace Berlin. Another committee emerged to create a list of names that would be put to a vote. The committee reduced a list of more than two hundred names down to five or six that would be put to the vote. Early on, there was a motion to join the town of Berlin with the neighboring city of Waterloo. After deliberating over this option, however, the idea failed to gain favor. The potential name of Kitchener was not originally among the suggested names. It was not until the patriotic fervor surrounding Lord Horatio Herbert Kitchener’s death on the fifth of June did his name find its way onto the list of potential names, which was after initial reductions of the list of suggested names began. Gaining his fame by conducting military campaigns in Africa on behalf of the British Empire, Lord Kitchener was a military man of great significance. After securing Sudan in the Battle of Omdurman he received the title of Lord Kitchener of Khartoum. He also increased his standing with his successful campaigns as commander-in-chief during the Boer Wars and the British army in India. Kitchener became the Secretary of State for War by the start of the First World War. Among other responsibilities, Kitchener headed recruiting efforts. His recruiting propaganda further improved his image among the British Empire. Lord Kitchener died on board the HMS Hampshire, 

\textsuperscript{128} “Electors by Majority of Eighty One Votes Decide to Change Name,” \textit{The Berlin News Record}, May 20, 1916.
which was a British warship transporting Kitchener to Russia for a diplomatic
meeting, when the warship struck a German mine. His immense popularity and
sudden death gave rise to a substantial patriotic fervor that swept the Empire.  

By the end of June in 1916, the list of potential names included only
Kitchener, Broce, Adanac, Benton, Corona, and Keowana. These names were on the
ballot and Kitchener won with only 346 votes. Coming in second was Broce with
335 votes. Of the 892 total votes, 163 voters invalidated their ballots as they wrote
in their votes for either Waterloo or Berlin. This was the lowest vote ever polled in
Berlin. Of the 4,897 people eligible to vote, less than twenty percent voted. This
illustrates the ambivalence of the voting population towards the new name,
especially when the numbers are compared to the vote to change the name.

The last example of anti-German protests within Berlin came from the
governor through the Executive Council. Commands issued from the Executive
Council, called an Order-in-Council, created legislation. One such Order-in-Council
given on the second of October in 1918 banned German-language publications. At
the turn of the twentieth century there were six German-language newspapers in
the Berlin area. German-language newspapers steadily declined thereafter. In 1902,
the Deutsche Post, Berliner Journal, Ontario Glocke, Canadischer Kolonist, Canadisches
Volksblatt, and the Canadischer Bauernfreund all published their papers in the
German language. However, the father and son Christiansen team who owned the
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*Deutsche Post* closed up shop in 1916. Also, the Rittinger and Motz families who owned and operated the *Berliner Journal* began monopolizing the Berlin German-language newspaper industry. While retaining the mastheads of the previous companies, the owners of the *Berliner Journal* bought out the *Ontario Glocke* in 1904 and the *Canadischer Kolonist* in 1906. Though the outside appearance of the newspapers did not change, the *Ontario Glocke* and the *Canadischer Kolonist* contained the exact same substance as the *Berliner Journal*. Moreover, the *Canadisches Volksblatt* merged with the *Canadischer Bauernfreund* in 1908. A year later the *Berliner Journal* bought out the *Canadischer Bauernfreund.*

Up through 1916, German-language newspapers declined solely through natural business practices. The *Deutsche Post* closed in 1916 leaving only the *Berliner Journal* and its affiliates, which printed the same material the *Berliner Journal* did. As a result of the town’s name change the *Berliner Journal* changed its name to the *Ontario Journal* on the tenth of January of 1917. However, the issuance of the Order-in-Council on October 2, 1918 forced the *Ontario Journal*, along with around thirty other German-language newspapers in the province, to begin publishing in English.\(^{131}\)

Another Order-in-Council on June 9, 1919 resulted in immigration restrictions. First, any conscientious objectors, such as the Mennonites, were prohibited from immigrating to Canada. This was in response to the surge of German-speaking conscientious objectors arriving in Canada in 1918. Another

\(^{131}\) Bausenhart, 95-98; Adam, vol. 3, 855.
Order-in-Council prohibited entry of citizens of the former Central Powers, which included German citizens. Though these Orders-in-Council were rescinded in 1923, for five years much of the German-speaking immigration was halted.\textsuperscript{132}

Though residents of Berlin attempted to demonstrate their loyalty in numerous ways, they still suffered because of their “Germanness”. They displayed their allegiance by providing a parade and reception for the soldiers of the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion on the evening following the Tappert incident.\textsuperscript{133} The German-speaking church congregations hosted dinners for the 118\textsuperscript{th} Battalion as well. So desperate was the desire of the residents of Berlin to show their loyalty that Berlin and neighboring Waterloo became the “two communities in Canada with the highest per capita contributions to the Canadian Patriotic Fund.”\textsuperscript{134}

By the end of the First World War the “Germanness” of Berlin was barely visible. The name of the town no longer reflected the ethnicity of its residents. The German language was not spoken in schools or churches. Newspapers no longer published in German. All evidence of German heritage disappeared from the town. Though the war did not cause this ethnic divesting, it did catalyze simmering anti-German sentiment. What began in the late eighteenth century, the Canadian policy of Anglicization, finally bore fruit. The war, if anything, simply accelerated the process. German-Canadian youths by the early twentieth century already spoke English in public, read English papers, and claimed themselves as Canadians of
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German heritage unlike older German-Canadians who claimed to be Germans living in Canada.\textsuperscript{135}

The proof of the loss of “Germanness” in Berlin can be seen in the census data as well. Prior to the war, the percentage of the population claiming German origins never fell below seventy percent. However, immediately following the war the percentage fell to approximately only half of the population claiming German ethnicity. Despite a modest resurgence of German-speaking immigrants from Eastern Europe after the Second World War, the percentage of Berlin residents claiming German ethnicity steadily declined since the First World War.\textsuperscript{136} Many factors including the fact that German immigrants no longer remained preferred immigrants contributed to the decline in Kitchener.

Kitchener’s German population largely faded into the mosaic of cultures now represented in Kitchener. Although diminished, the German element of Kitchener still persists. Boasting the largest Ocktoberfest outside of Munich, Germany, Kitchener pays tribute to its German origins every year. The Christkindl Market, a festival of German Christmas unique to Canada, opens the holiday season each year.\textsuperscript{137} Additionally, the Mennonites now join the multicultural atmosphere of the Kitchener Market. The Mennonite farmers arrive “with their neatly bonneted wives to sell schmier kase, shoo-fly pie, schwadamahga sausage, garden flowers and goose
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wings that are extra good for cleaning out the corners.”\textsuperscript{138} Although Kitchener’s German element has significantly dwindled, the pride in their German origins allows residents of Kitchener to maintain certain aspects of their German heritage.

\textsuperscript{138} Staebler, 15.
CHAPTER FOUR

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE EVENTS OCCURRING IN NEW ULM AND BERLIN DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR

The two German towns of New Ulm, Minnesota and Berlin, Ontario were similar towns in a variety of ways prior to the First World War. Both towns had German populations exceeding seventy percent of the total population. In 1911, Berlin maintained a German population of seventy percent exactly. Also, New Ulm continued to surpass seventy percent German population up through the 1980s. In fact, in the 1980 United States census, New Ulm still claimed a 75.4 percent German population. The towns were complementary in other ways as well. They both proudly displayed their German roots. Residents of both towns spoke German regularly in public. The two towns also had monuments dedicated to popular Germans. Moreover, the goals of both sets of founders were similar. The founders of the two towns desired land where they could practice their beliefs without outside interference. Lastly, both towns serviced a variety of religious followers. Each town had a moderate Methodist following, but Lutheranism and Catholicism prevailed in both New Ulm and Berlin, as one would expect given the religious affiliation of residents of Germany.

The different dates for the onset of the First World War is a crucial distinction between New Ulm and Berlin and their respective nations that must be discussed. As part of the commonwealth of Great Britain, Canada went to war when
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Great Britain declared it on August 4, 1914.\textsuperscript{142} This encouraged Berliners to “tote the line” as the province of Ontario prepared for war and government pressure to support the commonwealth would naturally follow. New Ulm, as a town of the United States, did not enter the war until the United States declared war on April 6, 1917.\textsuperscript{143} With this in mind, the stark difference in attitudes reflects the fact that Berliners resided in a state of war whereas New Ulm residents lived in a state of relative peace and the incomparable events mirror the state of mind of the residents of the towns. Furthermore, the affair of the Boer War already set in motion the anti-German sentiments that materialized during the First World War.

Although both towns appeared to be on comparable paths leading up to the war, by the conclusion of the war, New Ulm and Berlin diverged along different trajectories. Though New Ulm faced suspicion and harassment by both neighboring towns and the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety, the town managed to emerge from the First World War with its German traditions relatively intact. Although Berliners made comparable choices to those that residents of New Ulm made, in the end, much of Berlin’s German identity was lost. No longer did Berlin proudly display its German heritage. Its residents no longer spoke German in public. Its newspapers discontinued publishing in the German language. Monuments celebrating the local German population seemingly disappeared in Berlin. Even the town’s name changed from the German name Berlin to the British name of Kitchener named for Lord Horatio Herbert Kitchener, who gained fame as a British commander in the Boer
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War and as Secretary of State for War early in the First World War, in essence, an overly exuberant sign of “Britishness.”

So, what caused the towns to diverge from the same proudly German path during the war? Multiple causal factors led to the significant shift Berlin took between 1914 and 1918. One of the primary factors attributing to the ethnic divesting of Berlin was the longstanding Canadian governmental policy of Anglicization, given the long-standing challenge of Quebec, the remnant of French Canada. The pre-war tendency of Berlin towards Anglicization only accelerated during the war. This led to residents of Berlin receiving religious instruction as well as educational instruction in English by the outbreak of war. In fact, Berlin truly began to lose its capability of retaining the German elements of its society shortly after the town officially became Berlin. Once the small Mennonite community no longer remained a secluded or cohesive group, Anglicization efforts began to effectively influence the town.

The instances of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety and the governor of Minnesota were the only two governmental interferences that residents of New Ulm experienced, yet they did not change the makeup of New Ulm. Negatives actions occurred against the mayor, city attorney, dean of the college, and others, but the town stood firm and preserved its German characteristic. Also, the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety was not as persistent in its desire to purge the German language from the state as other states were, which perhaps reflects the significant foreign-born population in Minnesota, as three-fourths of the state’s
residents derived from at least one foreign-born parent in 1900. Furthermore, due largely to the leniency of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety, German-language publications faded to a natural death in the 1930s.

Though both towns faced numerous wartime changes, Berlin suffered greater losses. The Anglicization efforts, which began well before the war, had a dramatic impact on religious services by war’s beginning. By 1914, nearly all religious officials spoke English in their services and by war’s end the Anglicization of religious services was complete, save for the Catholic Mass which priests continued to lead in Latin.  

New Ulm and Berlin faced government pressure to add a certain anti-German attitude in their school instruction as well. New Ulm schools, as with all public schools within the state, began acquiring approved “white list” books during the war. The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety through the efforts of Carl Schulz sought to purge the German language from school curriculum by approving only books promoting and using the English language. Likewise, the Council of Public Education in Ontario passed a series of legislation culminating with Regulation 17, which restricted German and French instruction to a maximum of one hour per day. The restrictive education in both towns is an example of
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145 Adam, vol.1, 140.
146 Rippley, “Conflict in the Classroom,” 171-172.
147 Bausenhart, 88-89.
governmental influence. It is important to realize that only Berlin endured a prohibitive action as New Ulm students could still receive instruction in German.

Government influence reached further yet by restricting German-language publications. Illustrating the effect of this restriction is the decline of German-language newspapers in each town. New Ulm German-language papers experienced a natural death. As more and more New Ulm residents spoke and read only English, demand for German-language newspapers diminished. However, the final German-language print did not occur until 1933. The spread of school lunch programs, championed by famed educator John Dewey, kept students in school, away from home, and the speaking of the families’ native tongue during the day, helping to create new “Americans.” Contrarily, Berlin German-language papers faced their end at the hands of an Order-in-Council. A month before the war ended, in October of 1918, an Order-in-Council banned German-language publications.148

Indeed, the situation in Canada, in Ontario, and in Berlin contrasted greatly with that of the United States, Minnesota, and New Ulm. The governmental policy of Anglicization beginning in the eighteenth century after Britain’s victory in 1763 in the fourth and final of the so-called French and Indian Wars finally bore fruit by the end of the war. The polarization of ethnic communities during the war accelerated Anglicization ventures by allowing the British-Canadian majority to justify assimilationist policies for the benefit of the war effort. Orders-in-Council effectively ended German-language publications. The British Colonial Office successfully

148 “New Ulm Newspapers” file, Brown County Historical Society; Bausenhart, 95-98; Adam, vol. 3, 855
Anglicized all church services by 1918. The Council of Public Instruction opportually purged the German language from schools. Through these acts, every available conduit for the persistence of the German language disappeared. Without the capabilities to educate future generations in German, provide German-language reading material, or frequent a sanctuary of the German language, residents of Berlin had no alternative to assimilation into the British-Canadian majority as the Canadian government effectively stripped the German language from the residents of Berlin. New Ulm, however, retained its German-language publications, German religious services, and German school instruction due to the leniency of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety.

Another causal factor explaining Berlin's divergence rests with military presence. Though New Ulm faced the rumors of military intervention, no rumor ever became reality. Conversely, the 118th Battalion stationed in Berlin received credit for much of the anti-German attacks. The Tappert incident and the destruction of the bust of Emperor William I as well as the carnage of the German Club began as a result of the soldiers of the 118th Battalion. Comprised mainly of British-Canadians desiring to demonstrate their loyalty and stationed in Berlin, a town known for its German majority, the 118th Battalion was obviously a hotbed of anti-German sentiment. Though the anti-German violence did not occur frequently, largely thanks to the disciplinary efforts of Colonel W. M. O. Lochead, each crucial anti-German event began with members of the 118th Battalion lashing out on the town and its members.
Another aspect contributing to the departure was the difference in the nature of the anti-German events that occurred. The Peace Meeting and the Anti-draft Meeting of New Ulm, which resulted in strong reactions, arose from genuine concern about being forced to fight against one’s relatives. The resulting removal of the city attorney and mayor as well as the forced resignation of Professor Ackermann from the local college all stemmed from fears of the draft causing men to fight their kin.

Anti-German events in Berlin during the war differed. Reverend Tappert and his family faced violence and harassment due to the patriotic fervor that swept over Berlin. The German Club and the larger German community of Berlin lost their German monuments and mementos as the violence, vandalism, and theft occurred, which derived from individuals demonstrating their loyalty and, perhaps, attempting to avoid suspicion of sympathizing with Germany as all German-Canadians were.

New Ulm and Berlin faced different types of persecution as well and this component cannot be ignored. The entire German population of Berlin withstood anti-German attacks. The attackers destroyed their monuments, portraits, and other symbols of their heritage. Though individuals suffered, as in the case of Mr. Tappert, the anti-German violence occurring in Berlin largely focused on group persecution. The changing of the town’s name influenced all residents of the town. The attacks on the German monument affected every German-Canadian and the vandalism and destruction at Concordia Hall upset every German-Canadian.
New Ulm, on the other hand, faced individual persecution. Only individuals deemed responsible for instigating the community faced punishment. The mayor, perhaps suffering to the greatest extent, acted as chairman of the two events and, as such, he suffered multiple punishments. The governor stripped him of his position as mayor. The mayor also lost his rights as a physician when the state medical board forced his removal from the local chapter. Yet, during all of Dr. Fritsche’s punishments, the town continued seemingly unaffected. Though other individuals braved their punishments too, New Ulm residents maintained their beliefs and continued to celebrate their German heritage. As the divergence illustrates, Berlin did not sustain its German heritage.

New Ulm and Berlin had a significant difference in their populations. New Ulm’s population was only 5,648 residents in 1910 whereas Berlin had 15,196 residents a year later in 1911. However, this fact alone is not as important as the fact that both towns maintained substantial majorities of their populations who claimed German ancestry. As a result, the dominant German populations of the towns catered to their own way of life. Nevertheless, a key factor that developed during the war related to the population. Though both towns maintained a German majority, residents of New Ulm remained mostly united against attacks whereas the German element of the Berlin population progressively became singled out within their own community. Though such individuals as Professor Ackermann and Dr. Fritsche suffered greatly in New Ulm, the town remained a cohesive and supportive
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group throughout the war. Neither Dr. Fritsche nor Professor Ackermann faced violence from New Ulm residents. They only faced actions from individuals and organizations beyond the supportive New Ulm community. The case of Reverend Tappert exemplified a different situation for Berlin residents. The patriotic mob that attacked Mr. Tappert singled him and his family out from the greater German population. The German community did not support him or attempt to prevent the violence just as they stood by while a mob destroyed the German Club. Moreover, the cohesive and supportive population of New Ulm meant that outside interference was a prerequisite of any anti-German protest. The banner in Sleepy Eye, Minnesota and the persecution of New Ulm’s mayor and city attorney were examples of this outside interference. Though both towns’ founders sought to create a German community to curb outside cultural influences, only New Ulm succeeded in remaining a German community. In opposition, Berlin’s displaced German population endured little outside interference, which led to the soldiers of the 118th Battalion instigating much of the anti-German activities.

Examining the anti-German events in a different manner allows one to distinguish the level of violence between these two towns quite easily. New Ulm avoided violence in all of the meetings and the aftermath of those meetings. Possibly encouraged by the prevalent Turners, New Ulm sought to protest only through intellectual means. Ironically, Berlin, the town pacifists founded, suffered violent attacks. Criminal actions, such as vandalism, burglary, and battery led to the destruction and harassment of the German elements of Berlin.
The last element of comparison between New Ulm and Berlin focuses on the post-war demographics of the towns. Both towns continued to grow from their prewar populations, but the ethnic composition of the towns differed greatly as Kitchener’s ethnic composition changed drastically. Though Kitchener reached population heights that New Ulm could not dream of, the percentage of residents claiming German ethnicity did not increase at the same rate as the population in Kitchener. New Ulm continued to increase its population just as it had prior to the war. In 1910, New Ulm’s population was 5,468 residents, by 1940, the population increased to 8,640, and by 2000, the population of New Ulm was 13,553 residents. Kitchener steadily increased its population as well. In 1911, Kitchener had a population of 15,196, by 1941, Kitchener’s population rose to 35,657, and by 2001, the population of Kitchener was 190,399. In Kitchener, the residents of German origin between 1911 and 1961 dropped from seventy percent to approximately forty-three percent while New Ulm continued to maintain seventy-five percent of the population claiming German origins as late as 1980.

The dramatic effects of the First World War can be seen in both towns. However, the post-war German heritage of the two towns provides the best evidence of just how striking the changes were. Berlin retained only a token of its former heritage. There are no German monuments left in the town. Even the
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reclusive Mennonites assimilated to a degree in their interactions with the public. They did, however, retain their German language within their communities.\textsuperscript{153}

Moreover, the German celebrations and festivals within Kitchener are recent additions to the culture of the town. The Ocktoberfest festival began in 1969 and the Christkindl Market began in 1996.\textsuperscript{154} The only German element to remain consistently throughout the twentieth century in Kitchener was the Berlin/Kitchener Market, which began with the Mennonite farmers prior to 1869. Yet, the market too changed to an extent. What began as a simple farmers’ market consisting primarily of British-Canadians, German-Canadians, and possibly some French-Canadians, has now grown into a multicultural setting that provides goods representing all of the cultures of Kitchener today.\textsuperscript{155} Therefore, from roughly 1918 to 1969, the only visible aspect of German heritage persisting in Kitchener was the farmers’ market.

New Ulm demonstrates a very different story as residents maintained a rich German heritage before, during, and after the war and they still retain their German heritage today. Representing its proud German heritage, New Ulm supported the numerous monuments over the years, which includes the statue of Hermann, the German-Bohemian Immigrant monument, and the Glockenspiel. Additionally, the

\textsuperscript{153} Adam, vol. 1, 202, 210-211.
August Schell Brewing Company maintained its traditional German lager production. The company even continued to brew “‘near’ beer with an alcohol content limited to one-half of one percent by regulation” with special permits granted to the company during the Prohibition Era.\(^{156}\) Like Berlin, many of the festivals of New Ulm have a more recent history. For example, Ocktoberfest had only been celebrated for the last thirty years. However, “Christmas in New Ulm,” a celebration occurring at the same time of year as the Christkindl Market and designed to welcome in the Christmas spirit in a traditional German manner, began in 1925.\(^{157}\) Though no festivals carried on from before the war on through until today, festivals of the German heritage in New Ulm in general have a much longer history than those of Kitchener.

In conclusion, though Berlin and New Ulm differed greatly in a number of ways, both began as German towns with proud ethnically German residents. Both towns progressed along similar lines, however a dramatic shift occurred between 1914 and 1918, which resulted in one town losing its German heritage. The purpose of this paper has been to establish the definitive reason why Berlin, a substantially German town prior to the First World War, faced significant change during the First World War while New Ulm, which was also a considerably German town, resisted the change. The substance of the argument rested on the examination of the anti-German incidents occurring during the war as these events exemplified the

\(^{156}\) Hoisington, 143.
characteristics of catalysts for the transition from a community proudly portraying its German heritage to one that ethnically divested any German aspects.

The two towns remained comparable as the differences failed to carry any weight under scrutiny. Berlin had more than twice the population prior to the First World War and it continued to outpace New Ulm in the years following the war, yet during the war these towns maintained similar ethnic homogeneity as both towns consisted of significant German majorities. Moreover, though the religious diversity of the two towns differed, both towns furnished dominant Lutheran and Catholic majorities. Each difference between New Ulm and Berlin failed to deter accurate conclusions as the two towns were similar in all important aspects.

The examination of the anti-German events illustrated certain attributes specific to the respective towns. All of the incidents in New Ulm reflected individual persecution, yet the town remained united against anti-German harassment. The events of Berlin demonstrated both individual persecution, as in the case of Pastor Tappert, and group persecution evidenced by the name change and vandalism of the bust of Emperor William I. The residents of Berlin, unlike those of New Ulm, split into opposing factions.

Moreover, the analysis of government influence deduced that each town withstood different pressures. The Minnesota Commission of Public Safety and the governor of Minnesota pressured New Ulm into compliance and attempted to purge New Ulm of its German language. However, efforts failed as the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety did not prohibit German-language publications or
instruction. Instead, the organization made suggestions and encouraged the removal of the German language. Additionally, the governor only removed city officials he deemed disloyal. The governor’s powers could do nothing more to influence New Ulm. On the other hand, the combined efforts of Governor Simcoe, the Council of Public Instruction, the British Colonial Office, and various Orders-in-Council brought an end to German heritage in Berlin as it severed the conduits of German language.

Lastly, military intervention only occurred in Berlin. The informal actions of small groups of the 118th Battalion instigated much of the anti-German violence. Evidenced in the case of the destruction of the German Club, these soldiers emboldened average citizens to act out, which only further polarized residents of Berlin.

Of the military intervention, government influence, and individual versus group persecution, the most significant and lasting effect came from the government influence. The government policy of Anglicization began in the eighteenth century and by the twentieth century legislation catered greatly to the Anglicized population as evidenced by school instruction. One hundred and thirty years of Anglicization efforts gained force with the other two conclusions. Military intervention and group persecution simply divided the society and allowed swift change to occur. The German population, as a whole, withstood the anti-German attacks instigated by the soldiers and only one alternative could be seen. Realizing that the soldiers faced little punishment for their actions, German-Canadians deduced that assimilation was their only recourse.
The findings of this research are significant in a multitude of ways. This essay bridges a gap in historical research between the studies of German-Americans and German-Canadians. This essay also establishes a foundation for further research on comparisons of ethnically homogenous towns in the United States and Canada. This essay has found multiple factors explaining why Berlin, Ontario dramatically changed its trajectory during the First World War. As it is beyond the scope of this essay, perhaps future studies will explore the anti-German hysteria relationships of other states and provinces. One can only venture to guess that other Midwestern towns suffered similar situations to those of New Ulm and came out differently just as other provincial towns in Canada possibly faced comparable events to those of Berlin yet came out unscathed.
APPENDIX 1.1

WHEN A FELLER NEEDS A FRIEND

I AM FOOLING UNCLE SAM.
APPENDIX 1.2

WE WOULD HAVE LESS OF THIS

IF WE HAD MORE OF THIS

This cartoon appeared in an influential periodical on the same day that Robert Prager was lynched in Collinsville, Illinois.
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