

“UNSWERVING HONESTY, INDUSTRY, AND FRUGALITY”: LOCAL DEBT LITIGATION AND GERMAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY, 1859-1877

Alison Efford

When I first drove out to western Ohio to investigate the German-American communities founded there in the 1830s, local historians cheerfully told me that they did not much like strangers there. I was taken aback. But I quickly realized that these local historians were not trying to say something about me; they were trying to communicate something about themselves and their communities. Even today, the inhabitants of German Township in Auglaize County, the area I chose to study, not only remember their German heritage, they see themselves as clannish and insular.¹ Festivals, monuments, and a small museum (open two hours a week during the summer) memorialize the area's German past for the public, and the continued prevalence of the surnames of nineteenth-century settlers suggests that there is some truth to the statement that they do not much like strangers.

In many ways, the six square miles of German Township and the village of New Bremen within it exemplify the archetypal rural German community in the Midwest as described by historians. Historians have shown that many such settlements were formed in the nineteenth century by the chain migration of individuals from a particular part of Germany. When they arrived, immigrants often formed enclaves that coalesced around shared religious values and shared state of birth. Many historians argue that even after the formal creation of the German Empire in 1870, German Americans identified themselves first as Bavarians, Westfalians, or Hanoverians, not Germans.² German Americans, they also argue, built tight-knit communities based on the traditional hierarchical values surrounding church, farm, and family, while Anglo-Americans saw community as commercial and contractual.³

This paper re-examines the nature of community in rural German-American enclaves in the nineteenth-century Midwest. I approach community structure through the lens of the civil docket book of William Finke, one of German Township's justices of the peace from 1859 to 1877. How this German-born JP helped the people of German Township resolve civil disputes over money illuminates how they conceived of contract and com-

munity. It tells us how they felt about neighbors and strangers, about what divided them and what united them. Finke's docket suggests that in German Township localism and enduring European ties were important, but that they interacted differently than historians have recognized. Local civil dispute resolution demonstrates that a contractual approach to community united the people of German Township in a way that regional background did not. Despite the legal latitude accorded justices of the peace, Finke did not mediate disputes in a traditional way; he enforced contracts in a formalistic manner. He was widely supported by his community, perhaps because he overcame differences between people from different German states. In sustaining local control of disputes, Finke contributed to a sense of community solidarity based on a common German-American identity constructed around the ideals of industry, probity, and frugality.

* * *

The community Finke helped govern had been founded in 1832 when a group of immigrants living in Cincinnati formed the City of Bremen Society to establish a town for German settlers.⁴ The society bought government land and resold it to its members, who settled there in the following years. The Miami and Erie Canal reached German Township in 1838, and when it was completed from Cincinnati to Toledo in 1845, it opened the area to regular commerce.⁵ By the late 1860s the nucleus of the township, the village of New Bremen, boasted several grain storage warehouses, an important trade in pork, and a plow factory. The original society members had mostly come from Hanover, but immigrants from various German states quickly joined them in the growing farming settlement and canal town. In 1860 only about half of the township's 335 households were nominally led by people from Hanover. Most of the remaining heads of household were from twelve other German states, with Mecklenburg, Bavaria, and Prussia well-represented. Only about 7 percent of households were led by people born in the United States.⁶ The township supported a German-language newspaper and German-speaking churches until after the First World War.

On the first Monday in April 1859 this township elected William Finke to the first of six consecutive terms as justice of the peace. Before another justice in the county he "made oath that he would support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Ohio, and that, as Justice of the Peace in and for said Township and County he would administer justice without respect to person."⁷ Finke had been born in Hanover in 1813,

where he had trained as a flour miller before he emigrated to America in the 1830s.⁸ By the early 1840s he lived on a farm just outside New Bremen, where he became engaged in the flour and woolen milling business.⁹ For nearly two decades this man judged the minor disputes that arose in his township. He had concurrent jurisdiction with the county's Court of Common Pleas over most civil cases that involved less than one hundred dollars.¹⁰ Civil debt cases dominated his docket. During the same period that he saw 308 civil cases he saw only twenty-eight criminal charges. Of the civil cases, over 95 percent involved debt.¹¹

Finke ensured that debtors paid their creditors. The comity he supported was contractual and commercial, not conciliatory or traditional. Historians of law in early colonial America have found that jurists were willing to take into account the circumstances surrounding a contract, that they assumed that those in positions of power in the community had responsibilities to their subordinates, and that they thought the goal of community harmony justified compromise.¹² Many historians have assumed that these values lived on in the nineteenth century in the lowest of American courts, the justice of the peace court.¹³ But there is no sign from Finke's docket book that he acted as a father figure whose unique local knowledge allowed him to establish harmony by reconciling the demands of plaintiffs and defendants. Finke's rulings do not reflect the idea that fairness in any particular case was determined by the different roles people played in the community or by other mitigating factors. Catherine Rüdénbach had borrowed \$22.50 from John Steinbrei over several years for necessities ("nessesy"). She was named as John Laut's guardian in the 1874 suit against her, suggesting the loan was related to the care of her ward. When Finke ruled against her, she still did not have the means to pay. She resorted to Herman Laut, who served as a "surety," securing a stay of execution by effectively backing the loan. She did not receive any special treatment because she was a single woman raising an orphan.¹⁴

Creditors, who tended to be men employed as merchants or craftsmen, came before Finke to sue their debtors, who included farmers, professionals, and women like Rüdénbach (see Table 1). The men who sued, the plaintiffs in Finke's cases, won. Only about 8 percent of all the cases seen by Finke were either found in the defendant's favor or dismissed.¹⁵ Finke pursued delinquent debtors until they either paid, found friends who would secure their debt, or even relinquished property. He did not protect community insiders from outsiders. Finke had a reaper and horse confiscated from farmer Henry Hirshfeld in 1865 when he could not pay Pritch & Sons the cost

of the reaper.¹⁶ However just the case, Finke provided the means for an out-of-town farm implement dealer to take property from a local farmer.

Finke's administration of justice was a consistently rigid and contractual process. One case that was appealed to the Court of Common Pleas demonstrates how inflexible he could be. Farmer William Meyer had sold merchant Henry Schmidt a bay gelding for \$108 in April of 1860.¹⁷ Schmidt never paid him, but he felt that he was quite justified; Meyer had "agreed and warranted that the said bay gelding was sound." In fact, the horse "was sick and infected on the lung and died from this decease [sic] a few days after said contract."¹⁸ Finke decided that Meyer was right to require Schmidt's payment, and Schmidt promptly filed a notice that he would appeal. Although he did not explain his decision, Finke adhered to the logic of "buyer beware" and minimized the importance of a verbal guarantee. The county court was more convinced by Schmidt's argument regarding both the guarantee and a history of problems with Meyer's horses, and Schmidt eventually succeeded in getting it to dismiss the suit in 1862. The justice of the peace was less responsive to mitigating circumstances than the county court. He believed that contracts should be judged at face value rather than according to a broader norm of community fairness.

Somewhat surprisingly, the voters of German Township appreciated Finke's hard-nosed approach. He won resounding reelection every three years until he decided to retire in 1877. In 1862, for example, he won 199 of the 201 votes cast.¹⁹ After his 1871 reelection the *Auglaize County Democrat* observed, "He has made an excellent officer, and it seems that the people have willed that he shall have the office 'for life.'"²⁰

To understand why Finke won the loyalty of German Township voters, we must examine the nature of the township's internal divisions and the other ways people sought to overcome them. German Township residents, it turns out, were divided by their place of birth. Finke overwhelmingly solved disputes between people who came from different states within German Europe. I analyzed Finke's first and last fifty cases, using the decennial censuses of 1860, 1870, and 1880 to identify the place of birth for the litigants. I excluded cases that involved corporate entities, usually canal boats. Of the fifty remaining cases between individuals, only four were between *Landsleute* (people who shared the same state of birth). Three of these cases involved the same plaintiff and defendant from Hanover. Henry Backhaus, a 55-year-old day laborer, repeatedly had difficulty getting fellow day laborer Gerhard Lubgemann to repay debts, but this did not

seem to have stopped him extending loans based on promissory notes.²¹ Had the two men had a better relationship, they could have achieved the same results without Finke's mediation. It is quite plausible that many other *Landsleute*, who had common experiences and friends, were either more conscientious borrowers or more forbearing lenders.

Backhaus and Lubgemann were exceptions. Usually *Landsleute* avoided suing each other. Settlers' state of origin was indeed important in German Township. It influenced economic interactions.²² Finke's main litigants, Hanoverians and Prussians, disproportionately sued people with whom they did not share a common regional background (see Table 2). Hanoverians were numerically dominant and well-established in the community, while many Prussians were prominently involved in business. Despite sharing the role of creditors in German Township, Hanoverian and Prussian plaintiffs were affected by their state of origin. Finke promoted commercial exchange by allowing German Township to bridge such internal divisions locally without recourse to the county court, which used the English language and was dominated by Anglo-American judges and jurors.

The community's divisions were also bridged culturally. The German language slowly became a unifying force. It is possible that initially the settlers could not understand each other's dialects, but *Hochdeutsch* was the language of church, school, and later the newspaper.²³ People who claimed to represent German Americans but spoke or wrote *Hochdeutsch* poorly left themselves open to attack. The local German-language newspaper, *Der Stern des westlichen Ohio* recommended that a critic of New Bremen's Concordia Gesangsverein (singing society) learn his "Muttersprache und die Grammatik" before he styled himself as the literary luminary of the community.²⁴ *Der Stern's* state and national stories also recommended, celebrated, and defended teaching German in American schools. They were referring to a standardized *Hochdeutsch* that would unite German Americans. The people in German Township also declined publicly to display their regional identities as their counterparts in other locations did. In large American cities Germans organized mutual aid societies, singing groups, and shooting clubs along state lines.²⁵ In New Bremen the Young Men's Literary Society, the Concordia Gesangsverein, and numerous smaller musical groups were not tied to a particular state identity. The New Bremen Bau- und Spar-Verein (building and loan society) took the village's name, not a German one.

As Finke and other community leaders sought to obscure transplanted regional identities, they created an idealized image of a diverse

German-American community united by the ethnic characteristics of thrift, honesty, and hard work. In 1869 local booster and politician Karl Bösel proclaimed, "Yes, it certainly would not be too much to claim that there is scarcely a town of the same population in the state of Ohio that can be compared with New Bremen in respect of its business."²⁶ His piece in the German-language Cincinnati monthly *Der Deutsche Pionier* maintained that New Bremen was a model town exemplified by the industry and zeal of its citizens. He told the story of the rise of New Bremen as a celebration of German ingenuity and tenacity. Herr Greber had carried a plow and a sack of potatoes from Piqua (about twenty-three miles away) on foot to save himself ten cents to hire a driver. One settler made a grater to grind flour by poking holes in a piece of metal.²⁷ Such stories fill the pages of many histories of pioneer communities, but in New Bremen they were connected to specifically German ideals. Bösel explained that the early settlers had been swindled several times "von den smarten Yankees" in business transactions before they could establish businesses on their own terms.²⁸ He was proud that New Bremen succeeded while remaining German.

Nineteenth-century German commentators on American life often contrasted the German's admirable qualities to the American businessman's desire to get rich quick. The politician Bösel only implicitly made this comparison, but it was one that pervaded immigrant letters, autobiographies, and newspapers. Nineteenth-century chroniclers of Auglaize County's development also explicitly linked Germans' hard work to their heritage. One man was "one of those honest, sturdy old Germans to whom Auglaize county is so much indebted for the prosperity she enjoys."²⁹ One inherited "the perseverance, honesty and industry of his German ancestors, and also the sterling qualities of that nationality that fit them for almost any occupation in life."³⁰ A farmer had achieved success "by the same industry and frugality which characterizes so many of his people." Many men overcame language difficulties, lack of education, and the death of parents to achieve material success. They achieved this archetypal American feat with a certain German style: "unswerving honesty, industry and frugality."³¹

Despite their remarkable ability to retain an exceptional image, these German Americans resembled their Anglo-American counterparts. Like many other people living in America's rural heartland, they aspired to conduct economic interactions within an ordered community. German Township's residents valued community *and* commerce. New Bremen and German Township preserved a localized German identity through local control of civil disputes, while they also promoted the same rural entre-

preneurship that characterized the model American small town. German Township successfully participated in what historians Andrew Cayton and Susan Gray have called the “Midwestern doctrine of materialism and morality,” and it sold its fusion of these qualities as specifically German-American as it fashioned a new sort of enclave.³²

Method and Tables

I used ACTUS, a computer program designed by George Estabrook and Carl Estabrook, to analyze the distribution of relationships between lenders and borrowers and plaintiffs and defendants.³³ Classical statistics are not effective for analyzing the distribution of small sets of data. ACTUS overcomes the problem of small data sets by using random number generation in place of Gaussian or normal distributions. First it determines the “expected” distribution based on the proportion of the data each group represents (or the “marginal” totals). For example, in Table 2 Prussians were 37.1% of plaintiffs and Hanoverians were 34.3% of defendants, so we would expect them to be paired in 4.5 (12.7%) cases (37.1% of 34.3%). The number of “observed” cases of Prussians suing Hanoverians is eight. That is higher than we would expect. ACTUS then helps us understand just how much higher. It creates simulations of the table by randomly pairing the plaintiffs and defendants. (My tables are all based on 10,000 simulations.) ACTUS indicates how unusual the table is as a whole by reporting the number of times the chi-squared (X^2) values of the simulated tables were equal to or exceeded the chi-squared value of the original table. This significance value (P) is expressed as a proportion. Statisticians generally agree that a significance value less than 0.05 means it is unlikely enough that the pattern in the table arose by chance.

ACTUS also records how frequently the simulated values are below or equal to the observed value within individual cells. The “small significances” show the number of times out of 1,000 that the randomly generated results did not exceed the observed values. For example, Prussians plaintiffs and Hanoverians defendants were randomly paired eight or less times in 972 of 1000 random combinations. This confirms what we already noticed: the observed value is considerably higher than the expected value. It is unlikely that the observed value arose by chance. The small significances become meaningful when they are less than fifty or more than 950, because that is the point at which statisticians accept that it is significantly unlikely that such results would be random.

Table 1: Occupations of parties in Finke's cases May 1859 – July 1860 and December 1874 – April 1877³⁴

| Occupation | Plaintiffs | | | | Defendants | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| | Counted once | | By case | | Counted once | | By case | |
| | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) | N | (%) |
| Professional | 1 | (1.6) | 4 | (4.0) | 4 | (6.5) | 6 | (6.0) |
| Merchant, retailer, or proprietor | 17 | (27.0) | 41 | (41.0) | 9 | (14.5) | 9 | (9.0) |
| Canal Boat | 0 | (0.0) | 0 | (0.0) | 3 | (4.8) | 24 | (24.0) |
| Craftsman or skilled worker | 14 | (22.2) | 16 | (16.0) | 18 | (29.0) | 23 | (23.0) |
| Farmer | 5 | (7.9) | 8 | (8.0) | 14 | (22.6) | 16 | (16.0) |
| Unskilled laborer | 6 | (9.5) | 8 | (8.0) | 3 | (4.8) | 8 | (8.0) |
| None (retired or married woman) | 1 | (1.6) | 1 | (1.0) | 1 | (1.6) | 3 | (3.0) |
| Unknown | 19 | (30.2) | 22 | (22.0) | 10 | (16.1) | 11 | (11.0) |
| Total | 63 | (100.0) | 100 | (100.0) | 62 | (100.0) | 100 | (100) |

Table 2: Cross-tabulation of Finke's cases 1859-60 and 1874-77 brought by Hanoverians and Prussians with small significances³⁵

| | Defendant Hanover | Defendant Prussia | Defendant other | Row totals |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Plaintiff Hanover (%) | 4 (11.4) | 3 (8.6) | 15 (42.9) | 22 (62.9) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 7.5 (98) | 1.9 (879) | 12.6 (849) | |
| Plaintiff Prussia (%) | 8 (22.9) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (14.3) | 13 (37.1) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 4.5 (972) | 1.1 (324) | 7.4 (216) | |
| Column totals (%) | 12 (34.3) | 3 (8.6) | 20 (57.1) | 35 (100) |

$P = 0.016 \quad X^2 = 7.516$

Table 3: Cross-tabulation of German Township mortgages 1860 and 1876 according to state of birth with small significances³⁶

| | Borrower Ohio | Borrower Hanover | Borrower Prussia | Borrower Bavaria | Borrower other | Row totals |
|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|
| Lender Ohio (%) | 3 (5.8) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (3.8) | 1 (1.9) | 6 (11.5) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 1.0 (979) | 2.4 (83) | 0.7 (487) | 0.6 (979) | 1.3 (633) | |
| Lender Hanover (%) | 1 (1.9) | 8 (15.4) | 2 (3.8) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (9.6) | 16 (30.8) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 2.8 (234) | 6.5 (808) | 1.8 (726) | 1.5 (212) | 3.4 (877) | |
| Lender Prussia (%) | 2 (3.8) | 5 (9.6) | 3 (5.8) | 0 (0.0) | 3 (5.8) | 13 (25.0) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 2.3 (606) | 5.3 (569) | 1.5 (939) | 1.3 (281) | 2.8 (706) | |
| Lender Bavaria (%) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (3.8) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (3.8) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 0.3 (699) | 0.8 (446) | 0.2 (789) | 0.2 (1000) | 0.4 (655) | |
| Lender other (%) | 3 (5.8) | 8 (15.4) | 1 (1.9) | 1 (1.9) | 2 (3.8) | 15 (28.8) |
| Expected (small sig.) | 2.6 (738) | 6.1 (861) | 1.7 (477) | 1.4 (571) | 3.2 (374) | |
| Column totals (%) | 9 (17.3) | 21 (40.4) | 6 (11.5) | 5 (9.6) | 11 (21.2) | 52 (100) |

$P = 0.002 \quad X^2 = 37.383$

NOTES

1. For a journalistic interpretation of these values, see John Baskin, "God's Country," *Ohio Magazine*, 15 August 1992, 114-19, 121, 137.
2. For work on chain migration and the idea of ethnic enclaves, see Walter Kamphoefner, "The German Agricultural Frontier: Crucible or Cocoon?" *Ethnic Forum* 4 no. 2 (1984): 21-35; and Kamphoefner, *Westfalians: From Germany to Missouri* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987). For an urban example of the perpetuation of regional identity, see Stanley Nadel, *Little Germany: Ethnicity, Religion, and Class in New York City, 1845-50* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990). A German scholar has also described regional transplantation in a demographic study of German migration to Auglaize County: Anne Aengenvoort, *Migration, Siedlungsbildung, Akkulturation: Die Auswanderung Nordwestdeutscher nach Ohio, 1830-1914* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1999).
3. For descriptions of German Americans' traditional and hierarchical approach to community, see Philip Gleason, *Conservative Reformers: German-American Catholics and the Social Order* (Notre Dame and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968); Kathleen Neils Conzen, *Making Their Own America: Assimilation Theory and the German Peasant Pioneer* (New York: Berg Publishers, 1990); Jon Gjerde, *Minds of the West: Ethnocultural Evolution in the Rural Middle West, 1830-1917* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997); and Stephen J. Gross, "The Battle over Cold Spring Dam," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 21 (2001): 83-117.
4. City of Bremen Society, "Actum Cincinnati," trans. George Chochoms, in *New Bremen Sesquicentennial Reflections: New Bremen, Ohio, 1833-1983* (Defiance, Ohio: Sesquicentennial Committee of New Bremen, 1983), 8.
5. Historians differ on the exact date that the canal came through German Township. Karl Bösel, "Ansiedlung von New-Bremen," *Der Deutsche Pionier* 1 (1869): 120 provided the 1838 date.
6. One hundred and fifty-five (46.3%) heads of household were from Hanover, and 22 (6.5%) were from the United States. U.S. Census Bureau, Population Schedule of the Eighth Census of the United States 1860, manuscript returns for Auglaize County, Ohio.
7. Auglaize County Clerk of Courts, *Justice of the Peace Oaths & Bonds 1849-1867*, Special Collections and Archives, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, 116.
8. William J. McMurray, ed., *History of Auglaize County, Ohio* (Indianapolis: Historical Publishing Company, 1923), 2: 252.
9. There are references to Finke's occupation in Bösel, "Ansiedlung von New-Bremen," 121; McMurray, *History of Auglaize County*, 2: 252; and *New Bremen Centennial, 1833-1933* (New Bremen, Ohio: privately printed, 1933), 9.
10. Ohio, *Act to Extend the Jurisdiction of Justices of the Peace in Civil Cases, Statutes* (1854).
11. Of his 308 civil cases, 95.8 % (295) involved debt. Finke's criminal records are included in *German Township Justice of the Peace Criminal Docket, 1859-1899*, Special Collections and Archives, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio, 21-75. All descriptions of the content of Finke's civil cases refer to *German Township Justice of the Peace Civil Docket, 1859-1877*, Special Collections and Archives, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.
12. Historians have approached the issue differently, but they share the assessment that law became less community-centered and more formal during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. See William Nelson, *Dispute and Conflict Resolution in Plymouth County, Massachusetts, 1725-1825* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); Morton Horwitz, *Transformation of American Law, 1780-1860* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977); Deborah Rosen, *Courts and Commerce: Gender, Law, and the Market*

Economy in Colonial New York (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1997); and Bruce Mann, *Neighbors and Strangers: Law and Community in Early Connecticut* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987).

13. There are few studies of the role of justices of the peace in nineteenth-century America. Those historians who do address them suggest that even native-born JPs approached justice in a traditional and paternal way unlike William Finke. See John Mack Faragher, *Sugar Creek: Life on the Illinois Prairie* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 142; Paul Douglass, *Justice of the Peace Courts of Hamilton County, Ohio* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1932), 51-52; Carrington Marshall, *History of the Courts and Lawyers of Ohio* (New York: American Historical Society, 1934), 2:497; and John Wunder, *Inferior Courts, Superior Justice: A History of the Justices of the Peace on the Northwest Frontier, 1853-1889* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1979).

14. Steinbrei v. Rūdenbach, *Justice of the Peace Civil Docket*, 456-57.

15. Twenty-five (8.1%) cases were dismissed or found in favor of the defendant.

16. A. Pritch & Sons v. Hirshfeld, *Justice of the Peace Civil Docket*, 202-203.

17. Meyer v. Schmidt, *Justice of the Peace Civil Docket*, 57-58.

18. Meyer v. Schmidt, case 574, Auglaize County Court of Common Pleas (1860), Auglaize County Court House, Wapakoneta, Ohio.

19. Auglaize County Clerk of Courts, *Poll Books / Tally Sheet, German Township 1848-1892*, Special Collections and Archives, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio.

20. *The Wapakoneta Auglaize County Democrat*, 6 April 1871, 3.

21. U.S. Census Bureau, manuscript returns for Auglaize County, 1860, 124; and Backhaus v. Lubgemann, *Justice of the Peace Civil Docket*, 8-9, 28, 60-61.

22. Although *Landsleute* rarely sued each other, they did borrow from each other. See Table 3 for an analysis of German Township mortgage records.

23. As late as the 1960s a German language scholar was able to record the *Plattdeutsch* dialect spoken in Auglaize County by immigrants from the low-lying parts of Germany. Aengenvoort cites sound recordings made by Wolfgang Fleischhauer and held by the Ohio Historical Society, but they can no longer be located. Aengenvoort, *Migration, Siedlungsbildung, Akkulturation*, 341.

24. *Der Minster (Ohio) Stern des westlichen Ohio*, 7 February 1879, 4. Later that year *Der Stern* was bought and moved to New Bremen from a neighboring township.

25. For example, on New York City, see Nadel, *Little Germany*, 37-58, 110.

26. Bösel, "Ansiedlung von New-Bremen," 121.

27. *Ibid.*, 119.

28. *Ibid.*, 119-20.

29. John Walsh, *Atlas of Auglaize County with Historical and Biographical Sketches* (Wapakoneta, Ohio: Atlas Publishing, 1898), 49.

30. Chapman Bros., *Portrait and Biographical Record of Auglaize, Logan and Shelby Counties, Ohio* (Chicago: Chapman Bros, 1892), 574.

31. *Ibid.*, 432.

32. Andrew Cayton and Susan Gray, "The Story of the Midwest: An Introduction," in *The American Midwest: Essays on Regional History*, ed. Andrew Cayton and Susan Gray (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 11.

33. Carl Estabrook and George Estabrook, "ACTUS: A Solution to the Problem of Small Samples in the Analysis of Two-Way Contingency Table," *Historical Methods* 22 (1989): 5-8.

34. I used the decennial censuses to determine occupation. I categorized occupations according to my sense of New Bremen from newspapers. The most difficult distinction was that between craftsmen and retailers. I relegated blacksmiths and shoemakers in the

“craftsman” category even when they might have owned their own shop. A hotel proprietor, brewer, and the partnerships (none appeared to be professional) became “merchants, re-tailers, or proprietors.” Farm laborers were grouped with unskilled laborers.

35. Despite census attempts to be precise, the shape of Europe changed over the nineteenth century. Prussia expanded then created the German Empire, so people who had grown up in Hanover could be enumerated as such in 1860, become Prussians in 1870, and return to being Hanoverians according the preference of the enumerating marshal in 1880. In such cases I identified them as Hanoverians. Thirty-four of the fifty cases between individuals are represented in this table. Percentages may not add to one hundred because of rounding.

36. Auglaize County Recorder’s Office, *New Bremen and German Township Deed and Mortgage Abstracts*, Auglaize County Court House, Wapakoneta, Ohio. “Other” includes both people whose state of birth could not be determined from the manuscript census and people from under-represented states.

Alison Efford is a Ph.D. candidate at The Ohio State University. She is currently working on a dissertation exploring the influence of German immigrants on American citizenship during Reconstruction. She is the recipient of Ohio State’s Dean’s Distinguished University Fellowship.

Email efford.1@osu.edu