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Abstract
The immigration of Germans to Victoria commenced in 1849-50 and resulted in the formation of a number of settlements in and around Melbourne, Geelong and the Western District of Victoria. This thesis investigates the factors which helped or hindered the emergence of a cohesive German community, with particular reference to its East-Elbian origins; the role played by the Lutheran church and the various associations formed by the community; the character of its leadership; and the attitude of the Anglo host community towards their German fellow settlers.1 The different development paths of rural and urban settlements receive special attention.

Using a chronological approach, the thesis examines a number of major events that impacted significantly on both communities and changed their relationship with one another. In the 1850s these included the discovery of gold, while in the 1870s German unification, and in the 1880s and ‘90s the emergence of colonial rivalries between Great Britain and the German Reich, became dominant themes. In the 1850s and ‘60s the impact of these events was confined to German settlement and community formation that resulted in establishing wide acceptance by the Anglo majority. From the 1870s onwards external developments began to increase the complexity of the relations between German-Australians and their Anglo-Australian hosts, gradually eroding mutual acceptance.

A detailed analysis of German-language papers and the English-language mainstream press provides clear evidence of the tentative status of the German community. Its temporary unity, resulting from the unification of Germany after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, rapidly dissipated. Subsequently the community failed to re-group and to accept a new generation of leaders to carry it forward, give it direction, foster its assertiveness, and secure its entitlements as a distinct group. Its passive attitude was in stark contrast to the emerging nationalist fervour informing the Anglo-Australian majority. The community’s weakness ultimately climaxed in World War I when war-induced tensions led to its virtual destruction.

The outcome of this investigation, contrasting the urban and rural sections of the community, provides clear evidence that small rural communities were more successful in overcoming serious challenges, based on religious faith and internal cohesion, while their urban counterparts, lacking these characteristics, succumbed under the pressure of war-time suppression.
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The German-speaking community of Victoria between 1850 and 1930: origin, progress and decline

Introduction

I.1 Prologue

In 1915, two academic members of the University of Melbourne were dismissed following a vicious and xenophobic campaign by a university council member, Dr Alexander Leeper. Both of the victims were German-born. Walter von Dechend had taught German at the university for the past nineteen years; he was married to a New Zealand-born woman, had several children and had been a popular teacher. Eduard Scharf, a distinguished composer and pianist amongst whose pupils had been the noted musical entrepreneur Louise Dyer-Hanson, was a piano teacher at the university’s conservatorium. Neither of the two men had been naturalized, yet their wide circle of friends and, more importantly, their considerable achievements showed their deep commitment to the country in which they had lived and worked a large part of their formative years.

The dismissal ruined the careers of both men and profoundly affected their families. It also left them to spend the remainder of their lives in straitened circumstances. Their story is not merely a metaphor for the trajectory of Victoria’s German community from its rise sixty-five years earlier to its virtual destruction, but it is the story of German-Australia. It encapsulates the rise and decline of a community that this thesis aims to explore, assess, measure, and contextualize within the dominant Anglo-Irish majority.2

I.2 Aims, objectives and methodology

In the nineteenth century, millions of German-speaking people found conditions in their various homelands difficult to live with. Bad harvests and starvation (especially in the middle of the century), unemployment as the result of dramatic changes in agricultural


NB: Bibliographic style adopted for footnotes: This thesis conforms with The Chicago Manual of Style Online [electronic resource] (Chicago: University of Chicago, c2010). All citations in the footnotes are given in a shortened form while the full form is given in the bibliography. In cases where footnote references are to several pages of a source document, they are listed, separated by a comma without extra spaces.
practices, lack of access to land, repression in various forms affecting choice of trade, marriage, religion, freedom of movement and of expression—all contributed to a pervasive feeling of discontent. The two forms of resistance chosen by the majority were either emigration or revolution. Millions chose the former. Thus, in the course of the three-quarter century preceding World War I over six million Germans emigrated. Of these, approximately 70,000 came to Australia where, until the war, they constituted the largest non-Anglo minority.

I.2.1 Research questions and scope of investigation

The compass of this thesis is extensive, ranging from an overview of conditions in the homeland, internal and external migration, settlement in the new host lands, and subsequent formation of a German immigrant community. The four principal research questions this investigation hopes to address vary in their complexity. Applied progressively, the first of these research questions appears to be fairly straightforward. It explores how and why Germans came to emigrate to Australia and establish themselves in Victoria, which regions they came from, and the *modus operandi* of their arrival and settlement. The second research question, to determine how the community formed and consolidated and how successfully it projected itself into the larger host community, is considerably more complex, as the following brief overview attests. It commences with an investigation of how it endured, with particular regard to urban and rural settlement, and it encapsulates the core of what this thesis aims to document, hypothesize, and, ultimately, to prove by identifying an outcome. This is followed by exploring two possibilities, first, whether this small ethnic immigrant community was content in accepting a secondary role, uncertain about its aims—and to some extent even of its identity—while evolving side-by-side with a more powerful, dominant and well-established, yet also essentially immigrant society that was also still seeking to define its boundaries. Or, second, was there any evidence that it had developed a clear and assertive idea about how it saw itself? Were the two communities competing with one another, with the stronger seeking to dominate, or were they collaborating? On a superficial level, it appears that their relationship may have been based on positions of power, primacy, and the claim for political and moral superiority. The thesis will seek to prove or disprove such perceptions.

The third research question aims to provide a clearer understanding of the German community’s modes and meanings of self-representation as revealed, for
example, in its own memorials, letters, and through views expressed in the German-language press.

The final research question seeks to determine the attitudes of the host community by drawing heavily (but not solely) on the views of the English-language press. This will be the most complex research question, in that it projects the German community against the background of the Anglo majority to determine, first and specifically, the German vis-à-vis Anglo-Australian relationship, and then extrapolating any findings into a more general paradigm that includes a broad range of relationships such as identity, power, entitlement, and transnational influences.

The topic of this thesis is considerably more complex than what is implied in its title. For example, “the German-speaking community” was not a simple, easily definable, cohesive group, nor was it a static body, rather, it was a multifaceted aggregation of persons from various German-speaking areas of central Europe, choosing to migrate to Victoria and settle there for a variety of reasons. Their identity as a group (and within the group, as individuals) was, and continued to be, subject to continuous change in response to conditions and circumstances around them.

I.2.2 Literature review, sources and methodology

A review of the available literature reveals that this investigation has no precedent and covers new ground on several levels. The evidence of this becomes immediately obvious, namely that the German history of Victoria has attracted an inadequate amount of primary research. This thesis will endeavour to redress this elision. Even recent writings cover Victoria only selectively, often just marginally, by focusing on the larger communities in South Australia and Queensland. At a superficial level this may be explained, in South Australia’s case, by the fact of its earlier establishment, the greater gender balance of its immigrant population, and its greater share (ca. 7 per cent) of the colony’s total population vis-à-vis Victoria’s less than 2 per cent. In Queensland’s case, immigration was later, more rapid, and almost entirely of more homogenous peasant farming families. For Victoria, goldrush immigration created more exceptional,

---
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complex and unpredictable circumstances for examining and assessing the emerging German community.

A second theme, quite inadequately covered in past research, is the degree of German involvement in the politics of the colony and the function of various Victorian institutions. The published literature merely deals with the contributions of a few notable Germans to Victoria’s scientific, artistic and cultural life. Charles Meyer’s research into German and Lutheran schools and education, Thomas Darragh’s on Vereine (Associations), Rod Home’s work on the life and multi-faceted networking of Ferdinand von Mueller, Stephanie Buchanan’s insights on German identity, and Heidler’s and Henderson’s investigations into various aspects of assimilation are among the few notable exceptions. Most of these important works appeared several decades ago. Although more recent, even Michael Clyne’s research on German-Australian speech and Gerhard Fischer’s on German experiences in World War I cover Victoria only selectively. Further, with the exception of Irmline Veit-Brause’s work on the complex relationship of the German community with the colonial aspirations of the British and German empires and Australia’s own imperialist ambitions in the South Pacific prior to World War I, and Andrew Bonnell’s various investigations of German-Australian political engagement, little interest has been shown in similar, potentially fascinating fields of research.4

A third, almost totally neglected area of research is that of international migration, multiculturalism, refugee studies, studies on memory, belonging, race, gender and power as applying to Victoria’s German community. The literature in these fields has grown significantly, but internationalized subjects and themes that rightfully belong in any investigation of the migration and settlement process of German-Australians are still much neglected. They will occupy their rightful place in the present investigation. In consequence, this thesis takes account of these new approaches and thus will be able to draw on a much wider canvas of research, such as Manz’s work on the German diaspora, Panayi’s study of German immigrants in Britain and the Empire, and others. It should be added that the rich output of the extensive transnational research, collaboration and joint publishing (especially between German and American scholars, and to a lesser extent also British) has introduced numerous new angles in the

investigation of diasporas and transnational groups. Kamphoefner, Bade, Hoerder, Manz and Panayi are especially notable researchers whose work on German-American immigration and cultural and political inter-relations provides numerous methodological platforms utilized in my own research.\(^5\) Regrettably, such innovative transnational approaches are still relatively rare in German-Australian scholarship, and Andrew Bonnell’s work on the influence of German social democracy is one of few exceptions.\(^6\)

The timespan covered by this thesis is eighty years, during which period some fundamental political and strategic changes occurred that implicated Australia as well as Great Britain and Germany. In turn these changes affected Victoria’s German community profoundly. It seems therefore logical to adopt a chronological framework for my investigations. Within that format I will engage with the observations of some leading writers on German immigrant communities in various countries, and in some cases argue against their propositions. This will offer me the opportunity to test my hypothesis about the failure of Victoria’s German community to survive. Among the reasons the following will receive particular attention:

1. why the community failed to develop a plan to establish itself as a cohesive and independent diasporic community
2. why it never intended to establish independence
3. why separate cultural/ethnic communities are inevitably absorbed by the majority, either by force or over time, by the natural progress of assimilation
4. why the chance of cultural, but not political survival, is more likely in rural environments while having little chance in urban environments.

Several of the writers I will respond to have already been named. They include Dirk Hoerder, Klaus Bade, Panikos Panayi, Walter Kamphoefner and Stefan Manz, but there are others, including James Bergquist, Kathleen Conzen, Jurgen Tampke, Thomas Sowell and John Hawgood. All of these scholars have greatly enriched my understanding of the complexities of immigrant communities.

As appropriate, in each chapter except the first I intend to relate my own findings to those of the above-named researchers by use of a number of research concepts, viz. community, ethnicity, loyalty, affinity, assimilation, milieu, and nationalism.

---


\(^6\) Bonnell, “Transnational Socialists?.”
I.2.3 Chapter outline

Apart from this Introduction and a separate Conclusion, the thesis is organized into five chapters. Each chapter represents a period defined by significant events or developments. The first chapter briefly examines the political and economic situation in Germany in the early to mid-nineteenth century, giving a background to the emigration of Germans to America, Australia and other overseas destinations. This is followed by an overview of how and why several groups of Germans came to choose Victoria as their new home, including an examination of the events and persons involved. The second part of the chapter deals with early settlement, the emergence of small German villages, and the impact of the goldrushes on the early development of a German community in Victoria.

The central theme of the second chapter focuses on the community as it evolved, examining in detail, first, the various rural, and then the urban sections of the community and their interrelationships. The objective of this chapter is to identify their respective strengths with regard to their ultimate ability to survive. This involves analyzing their origin, membership, local characteristics and in some cases, individuals who played significant roles. The history, purpose, nature and function of various institutions established by these communities or connected with them is part of the second half of this chapter, as well as an investigation of how links with the dominant Anglo community developed. Compared with later chapters, the initial Chapters One and Two are considerably longer than those following. The justification for this is that they establish most of the basic facts and conditions on which later chapters build and to which regular reference will be made.

The timeframe of Chapter Two (1850-70) leads to a significant signpost in the history of the German community: the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, dealt with in Chapter Three. That chapter explores the relationship between the unification of Germany in 1871 and the response of Victoria’s German community to this event. There are two main themes, the first dealing with the short and long-term impact of German unification on the by then well-established German community, resulting in its own unification; the second focuses on how the community’s subsequent relationship with the host community changed as a consequence of these developments.

Chapter Four views the German community’s attitudes and reactions at a time when international imperialist rivalries between the German Reich, the British Empire, and Australia’s own imperialist aspirations, became more overt. The challenges facing
the German community were enormous and complex, and much of this chapter investigates the unwillingness of the community to deal with them effectively.

The fifth and final chapter covers the period of World War I and its aftermath. This investigation will examine how and why a popular fellow-settler group and partner, without just cause, came to be turned into a hated enemy and why it was unable to defend itself. The second part of the chapter will juxtapose the war-time events and attitudes to post-war attempts at rehabilitation and reconciliation. It will also examine the ongoing viability of the German community and its place in Australian society with particular regard to rural and urban settlers.

The concluding section will summarize the main findings and demonstrate the greater resilience of small and isolated rural communities as compared with the urban part of the community. It will also identify matters that were either excluded or will need further investigation at a future date.

This is a transcultural and transnational investigation: hence, the approach will at various stages veer between a transnational and a national-historical position, dictated by the range of subjects dealt with but also because social and political attitudes and relationships are continuously imbricated. To illustrate without elaboration at this stage, examples of national topics are the land question, i.e. how German farmers fitted into the opening up of lands for small farmers in Western Victoria; or the governance of schools, the denominational system, and education in general. In contrast, questions of kinship and loyalty are clearly connected with transnational history. While Anglo-Australians saw themselves as British, linked by loyalty to their Queen, for Germans it was a more complex, dual relationship, linking love of their old homeland with that of their new home, which included loyalty to the Queen but not Britain, nor, for that matter, to the German Kaiser.

Further to earlier comments about important researches, the general literature about the principal subject of this thesis—especially secondary sources—is extensive and, in the main, of quite recent date. Stefan Manz’s *Constructing a German Diaspora* (2014) is a good example. International in scope and innovative in much of its historiographical methodology, I owe this discourse a great debt for opening up a variety of questions concerning nation and nationalism, migration and assimilation.

Among the important serial publications consulted are the *Australian Journal of Politics and History*; the *Journal* of the Royal Australian Historical Society, the *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* and a range of others, with
contributions by distinguished Australian scholars such as Irmline Veit Brause, John Moses, Peter Overlack and others. Likewise, databases like APAFT; Historical Abstracts; Historical Census and Colonial Data Archive and the invaluable Trove and others have been essential tools, though regrettably the latter’s coverage of German colonial newspapers is still inadequate. The printed source material is a mix of primary and secondary publications, both monographic and serial. Standard works include classics like Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien (1932), Lyng, Non-Britishers in Australia: Influence on Population and Progress (1927), and Borrie, Italians and Germans in Australia; a Study in Assimilation (1954). Lodewyckx, though old-fashioned in his approach, dated (published in 1932) and lacking any bibliographic documentation, gives by far the best overview of German-Australian history. His discussion of the complex role of the Lutheran church, which played a major role in the evolution of the German community, remains very useful. Borrie’s work, with its extensive use of census material and German newspaper analyses, is remarkably modern despite its age. All forementioned works have been extensively though critically used. Charles Meyer’s modest A History of Germans in Australia, 1838-1945 (1990), including his large chapter on Victoria, comes closest to a consideration of Victoria, and contains a number of important historical insights, for example on the Anglo press, while Harmstorf and Cigler’s The Germans in Australia (1985) has a South Australian focus. Unfortunately, no full and authoritative recent history of the German community in Australia, let alone in Victoria, has appeared. Although a number of very useful articles have appeared in a variety of general and scholarly journals, including the Australian Journal of Politics and History mentioned above, the subject of German-Australian history remains perplexingly under-represented.

Above, I noted the expanding nature of the field of migration studies and studies on multiculturalism, which this thesis will attempt to utilize. The relatively limited documentation of some aspects of the German-Australian community demanded reference to a wider body of related information, to give my findings greater depth and broaden the methodology. The extensive literature on the German-American as well as on the Teuto-Brazilian communities proved to be very useful. The number of innovative and challenging works by such authors as Bergquist, Conzen and Luebke on Germans
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in America; Luebke on Germans in Brazil; and Kamphoefner, Hoerder, Manz and Bade on migration, transnationalism and inter-cultural relations invite the researcher to identify a more extensive range of issues and to make comparisons with the much larger German-American and German-Brazilian communities.  

I.2.4 Objectives

I noted earlier that this thesis aims to demonstrate that its subject, treatment and methodology are original and innovative. Apart from a few well-documented themes, like the treatment of Germans in World War I, in narrating and defining events my general approach is to interpret (rather than re-interpret) events on the basis of the latest evidence ascertained rather than relying on prior research. It will become apparent that in recent years very little transnational research, with an ethno-cultural focus and dedicated to the period covered by this thesis, has been published regarding the German-Australian community for the purpose of comparing the two immigrant groups endeavouring to establish themselves side-by-side. The same can be said for several other immigrant groups, for example Scandinavians, Afghans or Italians. The sole exception are the Irish in Australia. Apart from a brief revival of interest at the time of Australia’s Bi-centenary, Walker’s view is largely validated, namely that German-Australian history has been largely written-out of broad-based Australian history, with the possible exception of inanities like German beer-fests. The need to replace such trivialities with more rigorous intellectual enquiry lies at the heart of this thesis.

---

8 Bergquist, “German America in the 1890s”; Bergquist, “German Communities in American Cities”; Bergquist, “Germans and German-speaking Immigrants”; Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty; Luebke, Germans in Brazil. Manz, Constructing a German Diaspora; Panayi, “Germans as Minorities”; Kamphoefner, German-American Immigration; Bade, Deutsche im Ausland; Hoerder, People in Transit.

9 Under the heading of “Religion,” this topic will be briefly explored in Chapter Two, section 2.2.4.

10 See Walker, “Social and Political Aspects,” 26.; see also Fischer, “Debating the ‘German Presence’ in Australia.” Fischer’s iconoclastic but well-informed chapter identifies a number of reasons, hurdles, and ways to overcome these shortcomings.
Chapter One
Emigration, immigration and settlement, 1848-55

1.1 Migration, a “human condition” serving political and economic necessity

1.1.1 Introduction

On August 23, 2015, the German daily Die Welt carried an article headed “Is this the new migration of peoples?” (“Ist das die neue Voelkerwanderung?”), referring to the mass emigration of refugees from the Middle East to Europe. In its second sentence the article then asked the rhetorical question, “Is there a single European nation more strongly moulded by migrations than Germany has been over many centuries?”

The theme of the article is not only highly evocative, but the allusion to mass migration (Voelkerwanderung) is both pertinent to the present discussion while also familiar even to German schoolchildren’s ears. It conjures up the idea of the mass migrations of Germanic tribes at the beginning and again at the end of the first millennium that resulted in the emergence of what eventually became Germany. The more recent forced migration of millions of Germans at the end of World War II, expelled from their homes in the east, still remains in living memory. In the nineteenth century, mass migration took millions of Germans to new destinations, for reasons quite similar as almost 2,000 years earlier, namely to find new land, security, and to counter poverty caused by war and overpopulation. It profoundly affected both the home as well as the host countries. This thesis is concerned with a minute fraction of those millions. An estimated 70,000 out of well over six million emigrants came to Australia, and a smaller fraction of these, not much more than 10,000, settled in Victoria. Thus, the ideas in the article in Die Welt serve as a metaphor for this thesis as well as a convenient start for its various investigations.

This chapter will examine the history of emigration against the background of nineteenth-century German history, in a land then existing only in literature and lore rather than as a political entity. It will document the numerous factors contributing to the sense of desperation and discontent that ultimately led to mass emigration. It will demonstrate that, beside poverty, famine, bad harvests, Landhunger (longing to own land), political and religious restrictions and repression, what drove Germans to leave the familiar surroundings of their home was also the hope for a better and more
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1 “Gibt es eine europaeische Nation, die staerker von Wanderungen gepraegt wurde als diese [Deutschland], und zwar seit vielen Jahrhunderten…?”
fulfilling life. The chapter will also examine why German immigrants came to choose Australia, which (compared with the far more popular and less distant North America) was scarcely known and involved a much longer and riskier journey of almost four months. The role played by leading Port Phillip businessmen William Westgarth and Alexander Thomson and the immigration agent Eduard Delius, who initiated the immigration of Germans to Victoria from eastern Germany, is put under review, followed by a description of the first wave of German immigrant arrivals and their subsequent settlement.

The almost simultaneous immigration waves of overlanders from South Australia who settled in Western Victoria, and of immigrants lured to Victoria by the gold discoveries, leads to a brief overview of an emerging German community. What will become clear is that by the mid-1850s noticeable differences between the urban and rural sections of the still embryonic settler community were already emerging, and that the assertiveness of Germans that can be observed on the goldfields contrasted with the more subservient attitude of the German community elsewhere in Victoria. Both themes will receive continuous attention throughout the following chapters.

1.1.2 Migration: an overview

Discussions on migration usually attempt to address the two principal questions, why people want to leave, and what attracted them to a new place. These two opposites are conventionally summarized as the push-pull factors.\(^2\) Especially for rural persons, well-established in communities with family and friends nearby, and often characterized by a natural conservatism and unwillingness to change, it required a powerful impulse to decide to leave their familiar surroundings. Poverty and overwhelming despair often provided the push. A vague hope for improving their condition and to better themselves, to acquire some land and to gain greater freedom, provided the pull. But beyond that, an overriding consideration is encapsulated by Alexander Murdoch’s assertion of inevitability, namely that “Migration was part of the human condition throughout history.” This also confirms the sentiments expressed in the article in *Die Welt*.\(^3\)

Migration was a universal phenomenon; it became “the signal event of the [19th] century.”
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\(^3\) Murdoch, *British Emigration*, 1.
century,” as a Prussian memorial (Denkschrift) noted in 1867.\textsuperscript{4} It affected people in every corner of Europe, the Western Hemisphere and Australia, though Moenckmeier, the classic early writer on German emigration, claims it is impossible to pinpoint any single cause.\textsuperscript{5}

Some of the key concerns of this thesis might be usefully illustrated by comparing two different ethno-cultural groups and their responses to migration. The aim is a simple one: can we devise a paradigm that singly and comprehensively applies to nineteenth-century migration across the board, and thus identify commonalities between two different sets of immigrants to Australia: Anglo-Celtic immigrants on the one hand, and Germans on the other? Although both groups differed in size, cultural background, institutional support, and importantly, the former’s advantage of preceding the latter by half a century, can we expect comparable outcomes?

A useful start can be made by a consideration of what both groups had in common, namely poverty, population pressure, inadequacy of support services, and widespread discontent with local conditions. Murdoch points out what was seen as the British solution to these problems, where

the dark forces of radical revolution that threatened to destroy the basis of society could be channelled to new destinations overseas that would not only allow the…poor to escape the dismal destiny that awaited them in the impoverished rural slums of Britain or the teeming urban slums of the British cities, but create societies that would provide an inexhaustible destination for those unable to respond to…economic and social changes necessary for the continued prosperity and greatness of Britain.\textsuperscript{6}

Thus Britain perceived emigration as a solution to a plethora of problems, including the impact of the policy of enclosures, the industrialization of agriculture, and the endemic poverty in Ireland. It was encouraged not only for those reasons, but also because it would simultaneously provide a support structure for Britain’s growing empire by peopling—and thus consolidating—distant colonies with British immigrants, and by creating markets for British goods. All these ideas were enshrined in the proposals

\textsuperscript{4} Quoted Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 9 & note 1.
\textsuperscript{5} Moenckmeier, Deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung, 25; see also Muehle, “Zum historischen Hintergrund,” 29-61, passim.
\textsuperscript{6} Murdoch, British Emigration, 4.
advocated by Edward Gibbon Wakefield. For Germany the situation was vastly
different. Klaus Bade observes that “The Euro-colonial concept of migration, which to
some degree became historical reality in the case of Britain [remained] largely an
illusion with respect to Germany.” It remained so even when, several decades later, its
colonial policy unsuccessfully attempted to create conditions similar to Britain. In the
1840s and ‘50s colonial migration was merely a catchphrase, espoused by spokesmen of
an awakening German nationalism. Though never realized, quite unrealistic pre-
colonialist ideas briefly surfaced in the wake of the nationalist upsurge brought about by
the 1848-49 revolutions, somehow linked with fears of the “spectre of communism”
(Marx) and debates such as appeared in the journal Der Auswanderer, “insisting that
Germany must rid itself of its dangerous proletariat by emigration.”

What other characteristics might British and German emigrants have in
common? It is not unreasonable to assume that migration for English (free) emigrants
setting out for the Port Phillip District of New South Wales in 1850 would have
generated little fear and anxiety. Very likely they would have had a rudimentary idea
about the social structure of their destination, following in the tracks of a well-
established emigration practice that was often assisted by free passage provided by the
home government through bounty schemes, or else by various emigration support
societies. On arrival they would expect to meet fellow English-speakers and conditions
that would aid in a fairly easy transition to the new place. They would soon merge into,
and be part of, the Anglo-Australian colonial community. For German emigrants that
would not be the case. Language, culture, and the nature and structure of institutions
would be unfamiliar and present major obstacles to assimilation, setting them apart from
the beginning. While they might share experiences like “separation from known
surroundings” with immigrants from Britain, but “becoming a foreigner” or “ceasing to
belong”—all named by Oscar Handlin in his influential book The Uprooted (1951)—
were experiences only suffered by German and other non-Anglo immigrants.

7 Wakefield, Letter from Sydney, passim.
8 Bade, Migration in European History, 117. The idea of colonial emigration was actively promoted by propagandists
like Karl Sieveking, Friedrich Fabri and others well before Germany acquired its own colonies.
9 Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 135-6.
10 Murdoch observes that “British emigrants were different from other European Emigrants...because of their access
to the dominant language and culture [at the destination];” he speaks of their “privileged status” by virtue of their
“familiarity with more aspects” of the society they joined.” Murdoch, British Emigration, 11,126. Borrie notes that
“British settlers found in Australia an institutional framework which was not alien to them.” Borrie, Italians and
Germans, 14. Joynson—admittedly in a post-World War II context—disagrees by arguing that they experienced
emotional problems that “were not dissimilar to [those] of other immigrants.” Joynson, “British Emigration to
Australia,” 7.
11 Handlin, The Uprooted, 4.
overseas travel be a deterrent or cause of fear for persons from Britain, where a long-
standing maritime culture and oversea travel had been the norm for centuries? Would
their attitudes differ from those of Silesians or Saxons from landlocked rural homes
with no experience of the sea? It is a reasonable assumption that the latter would face
the unexpected of a long and dangerous ocean journey to an unknown destination with
far greater uncertainty.

Mobility in search of work was nothing new for Germans. As Hoerder observes,
by 1880, 50 per cent of the population lived at locations different from where they were
born.12 Muehle concurs: “[M]obility] was an elementary part of the existence of rural
lower classes [in Germany] in the 19th century.”13 More familiar and traditional
migration modes had been in practice since the seventeenth century, when overland
(rather than oversea) migration to areas such as Prussian or Russian Poland, Russia
proper, or the Balkans was not uncommon.14 Such places would have seemed less
frightening: often German was spoken in established destination communities,
conditions would be far more familiar than in overseas locations like America or
Australia, and return to the homeland would be easier.15 But these options were rapidly
disappearing as Prussia outlawed such emigration in 1859, after settlement in domain
lands in Posen was shown to be unsuccessful. And as Danube Valley emigration
actually benefited Austria, Prussia opposed it for political reasons.16 Temporary
(circular) migration to inland areas offering better work prospects was becoming more
common, especially when early industrial developments in the western parts of Prussia
began after 1830.17 To summarize, though some similarities existed between Britain and
Germany, the factors outlined are far too divergent to allow formulating a single
paradigm combining British and German immigration.

There was, however, a potential pull factor for German emigration that could
parallel British migration. Bade suggests that the Wakefieldian idea of “a profitable
system of exporting labour, capital and goods that would be largely self-financing
through the labour of exported settlers” invites the idea that German immigration could

12 Bade, Migration in European History, 1.
14 Ibid., 40-1; Bade, “Conclusion: Migration Past and Present,” 400-1; Bade and Weiner, eds., Migration Past,
Migration Future, 3-4.
15 Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 140-48, passim.
16 Walker, ibid., 148.
17 Herbert, Geschichte der Ausländerpolitik, 31-2, passim.
be easily fitted into the British scheme. When labour supply was inadequate, Germans might not only be willing but inexpensive and industrious substitutes.18

Overall, by mid-century, Germany was socially and industrially backward, when compared with Britain. Its rural population was impoverished and discontented. Unhindered emigration allowed some German governments to rid themselves of unemployed, landless, discontented and/or rebellious persons, and thus by default to counter an escalating population surplus. But they cared little where they went and what fate they would meet, quite unlike British practice. Although some of the causes for emigration may appear to be familiar and common to both source regions, most differ sharply from Britain, as will be shown in the following brief outline.

1.2 Germany in the mid-nineteenth century

1.2.1 The background

Until 1871 Germany did not yet exist as a nation state.19 The post-Napoleonic settlement at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 created (or recreated) thirty-nine sovereign states that were loosely joined into a Deutscher Bund (German Confederation), successor to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation that had fallen victim to Napoleon’s invasion in 1806. Under Prussian leadership, a number of states gradually joined a customs union known as Zollverein (1834) which eventually morphed to become the Norddeutscher Bund, after Prussia eliminated Austro-Hungarian leadership aspirations in 1866. Until then, there had been no common political denominator, and few of the states had foreign policies other than to deal with immediate neighbourhood matters. The exceptions were the maritime city states of Hamburg and Bremen, and Prussia, the largest of the German states.

In the eighteenth century, emigration had been illegal in most states, and residual restrictions remained in place almost to the end of the nineteenth. In 1815, the Deutscher Bund had guaranteed freedom of movement (including emigration) in its Article 18, which Prussia endorsed in 1842,20 but it remained to the member states to interpret the legislation and impose obstacles if they so chose.21 Usually certain
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18 Bade, Migration in European History, 124.
19 Throughout this thesis the term Germany is used generically as a descriptor for the lands occupied by persons whose language and culture was German, notwithstanding whether Germany existed as a political entity.
20 Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 95 and Note 70.
21 Deutsche Bundesakte, paragraph 18b, quoted Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 34.
conditions had to be met, like completion of military service, settling tax dues, and securing appropriate release permits. But many arbitrary restrictions remained.

At mid-century, almost feudal conditions still prevailed in some of the smaller states. Even more advanced Prussia did not de-feudalize land regulations until 1850, which resulted in an increase of landless farmers unable to reimburse their former feudal masters for releasing land to them (“Grundentlastung”). As a result, large holdings grew in size, and the number of landless former tenant farmers grew.22 Except for the most advanced German state, Saxony, agriculture was the dominant employer; even by 1871, 49.1 per cent of the population of the future German Reich found their livelihood in it, compared with England’s 22 per cent (but only 20 per cent in Saxony), while an industrial revolution was still largely on the horizon.23 Small cottage industries (e.g. weaving in Silesia) were being mechanized, and small industries and workshops were emerging in urban centres, while railway construction was expanding.24

Especially in East-Elbia—notably in the Prussian provinces of Silesia, Pomerania, Brandenburg and Mecklenburg, the “foodbowl” of Prussia—from 1850 onwards agriculture was undergoing a transformation to large-scale production and introduction of new techniques of crop rotation, fertilizer usage and machinery. Ulrich Herbert observes that although “[T]he agriculture of the Prussian eastern region was economically, politically and socially the spine of the rising Prussia in the 19th century,”25 the inefficiency of agricultural management and strong international competition against much cheaper grain imports from Russia and the U.S. had forced the introduction of structural changes that had a direct impact on (un)employment that often prompted migration. As in the case of Britain almost a century earlier, though for different reasons, many small-acreage farmers and share-croppers were left without adequate land holdings and in increasingly desperate straits, drifting into overcrowded towns and cities, moving away in search of work, or considering alternatives like emigration.26

An insensitive attempt by Prussia’s King Friedrich Wilhelm III to enforce unification of the Lutheran state church had started a protest movement in 1836 that led
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22 Ruerup, Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert, 42,50.
23 Ibid., 33.
25 Herbert, Geschichte der Auslaenderpolitik, 14.
26 Lodewyckx gives useful background information on the situation in Silesia, especially the reasons that led to the emigration of Old Lutherans. Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 34-40 and 249-52. For political and economic information see also Schmidt, Die schlesische Demokratie, passim.
to the first major group emigration of so-called Old Lutherans from Prussia’s eastern provinces to America and South Australia in 1838-40. Although the persecution of believers and their pastors declined under the king’s successor, the protest movement it had triggered simmered for decades afterwards. Much publicized and generating an enormous impact, “it helped implant the idea of Auswanderung [sic] in the East,”27 even though in overall terms the total of 7,000 estimated by Walker pales into insignificance compared with the millions of purely economic emigrants that followed.28 A reluctant Prussian government had allowed 600 of its citizens to emigrate to South Australia under the auspices of George Fife Angas’ South Australian Company, more to keep on good terms with Britain than for more altruistic sentiments. The reverberations of the compulsory church union continued to rumble, leaving feelings of resentment and distrust. Emil Jung, long-time resident in South Australia, could still claim in 1902 that “the hatred of an intolerant [Prussian] government…[and its injustice] was never forgotten.”29 Throughout Germany general discontent remained near boiling point, and the 1848-49 revolution that swept through the various states found large-scale support not only amongst students and intellectuals but also among the lower middle-class, artisans and the displaced rural population. The social and economic landscape in the German states was beginning to change significantly.30

1.2.2 Origins and causes of emigration from German states in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries

In 1816, the Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung observed that “In the richest…parts of Europe there rules such discontent that whole families resolve to quit their fatherland.”31 The paper’s observation aptly described a situation that applied throughout Germany almost to the end of the century. Initially the exodus was small. Based on the seminal work by Wilhelm Moenckmeier, Peter Marschalck shows that emigration in eighteenth-century Germany, both over land and overseas, was small but not uncommon. Even in
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27 Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 78.
28 Ibid., 79. Iwan’s worldwide total of 4,828 seems more reliable. The Australian share can only be guessed at approx. 1,000. See Iwan, Alllutherische Auswanderung, vol.1, 302, Table viii.
30 Walker, op.cit., 239.
31 Augsburger Allgemeine Zeitung, September 12, 1816, quoted in Walker, op.cit., xii.
the early nineteenth century, it did not increase until the famine of the 1840s and the bad harvests following in the early 1850s.32

While reasons for early migration were manifold, economic and (to a lesser extent) religious reasons stand out. According to Bade, an “imbalance between population growth and employment opportunities” that would eventually cause the breakdown of a purely agriculture-focused economy was already evident at an early stage.33 But little evidence exists that a Malthusian fear of overpopulation encouraged emigration. Emigration was almost self-regulating; in south-western regions, especially Baden and the Palatinate, it was driven by the shrinkage of individual agricultural holdings to uneconomic levels; in the east and north by accumulation of land into large estates. Contradictory restrictions on marriage and emigration, imposed by large landowners and reactionary governments, merely served to keep their subjects in check. They discouraged but did not suppress emigration.34 Religious reasons for emigration other than the Prussian church unionization were uncommon but must be considered, because religious minorities “had stronger propensity for emigration than the rest of society.”35 Ruerup notes the rise from the 1820s of what he terms “Massenfroemmigkeit” (“mass piety”), religious fervour that challenged and to a degree resisted authority in a similar way to the Old Lutheran resistance.36

The south-west (Baden, the Palatinate, the Moselle district) was the earliest area where emigration became significant. Here, the lack of primogeniture had led to the fractioning of holdings to uneconomic levels and acute land hunger. An outlet for landless peasants and agricultural labourers at the turn from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century had offered itself in present-day Rumania, Hungary, and the Black Sea and lower Volga regions in Russia. With progressive restrictions by receiving countries after the late 1830s, these destinations were replaced by North and South America.37 Ruerup notes that until about 1850 “[T]he largest part of immigrants [sic, i.e. emigrants] to overseas destinations came from south-west Germany, where emigration was often financially supported by local communities who thus solved their social

32 Moenckmeier, Deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung, passim; Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, passim; see also Ruerup, Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert, 26.
33 Bade, “Conclusion: Migration Past and Present,” 400.
34 See for example the situation in Mecklenburg-Strelitz: Marschalck, op.cit., 50, table 3.1. Marriage restrictions here were only lifted in 1867; ibid., 71.
36 Ruerup, op.cit., 142. Examples of other religious groups were the Mennonites, Pietists and Stephanists. None of these groups came to Australia, but the influence of the Stephanists on the Missouri Synod also extended to the ELSA synod in South Australia and western Victoria. For more detail see Chapter Two.
37 Bade, op.cit., 400.
service support problems” by sending their unwanted populace beyond the seas.\footnote{Ruerup, \textit{Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert}, 30,142. Other states used similar methods to get rid of the poor, but disallowing returns.} For reasons that will become clear, the economic situation in the western regions of Germany is of only marginal concern in this thesis, because the majority of early immigrants to Victoria came from eastern and north-eastern districts.

Eastern Prussia in the latter part of the eighteenth century had witnessed a small but steady stream of migration to its recently acquired eastern territories in Posen and Polish Silesia, where “colonist villages” were established. But this turned out to be only short-term, as these settlements rarely endured for long.\footnote{Reich, “Emigration from Regierungsbezirk Frankfurt/Oder,” 83,90; see also Muehle, “Colonist Traditions,” 40-1.} After the turn of the century, better employment opportunities in urban and emerging industrial centres, especially the Ruhr district in the west, started to encourage internal migration, while in parallel, overseas migration also steadily increased.\footnote{Herbert, \textit{Geschichte der Auslaenderpolitik}, 15; also Ruerup, op.cit., 31,32,205.}

Though East-Elbian emigration had started well before the mid-century, prior to the early 1860s it was far slower than in the west. That is surprising because property ownership here was far more concentrated than elsewhere in Germany, and it was almost impossible to access land via the open market, as noted earlier.\footnote{Kampfoefer, “German Emigration Research,” 22.} Accompanied by an annual population growth of 1.04 per cent almost from the beginning of the century, the stress on available resources of food and land was enormous.\footnote{Ibid., 25. The figure applies to the future Reich territory. See also Appendix 1.} The resulting rise of emigration in the mid-1860s, sudden and dramatic, ultimately led to what became known as mass emigration.\footnote{Ruerup, op.cit., 30,31.}

To summarize, mass emigration started in south-west Germany in the 1820s and gradually moved north-east towards the East-Elbian provinces of Prussia where it peaked in the mid-1860s, continuing at very high levels in Brandenburg, Silesia, Pomerania and Mecklenburg until 1910.\footnote{Moenckmeier, \textit{Die deutsche ueberseesichere Auswanderung}, 71,73,83-5, passim; Marschalck, \textit{Deutsche Ueberseewanderung}, 35,38,39,45 (Table 8), 64; see also Bade, “Die deutsche Massenauswanderung,” in Bade, ed., \textit{Auswanderer, Wanderarbeiter, Gastarbeiter}, 275.} Immigration statistics will show, however, that in the later years of the century (after 1890) it scarcely touched Australia as it was almost totally directed to the U.S.\footnote{See Appendix 2, Table 2.}

It was noted earlier that Moenckmeier (1912) resisted assigning specific reasons that triggered emigration. He claimed that decisions to emigrate were made by
individuals for often quite personal reasons. Later writers, including Marschalck, Muehle and Reich, are less coy. Reich (1995) names structural changes in agriculture resulting from reforms; population growth; labour competition; land hunger; rising land prices and demand; inflexibility of the real estate market not giving access to land on the open market; capitalist transformation of agricultural production to seasonal employment only; technology; and competition of cereal prices from Russia and the U.S. Muehle (1995) summarizes the main reason as “hard times.” Rosenthal (1931), noting the significant share of artisans rather than peasants among emigrants from Saxony between 1853 and 1870, notes that many feared to be condemned to factory work in consequence of growing industrialization. Walker’s evocative observation (1964)—he speaks of America—identifies a fundamentally conservative element by noting that “[T]he Auswanderer [sic, i.e. emigrants] went to America less to build something new than to regain and conserve something old…which the new Europe seemed determined to destroy.” This means that ideological factors complemented economic considerations. Ruerup (1984) and Bickelmann (1991) point out that many emigrants blamed the emerging capitalism and its legal and social norms for the poverty that encouraged emigration, rather than the continuing reliance on agriculture.

Ruerup rejects political reasons as of importance. Marschalck accepts them merely as contributory rather than causal factors to economic hardship. The small number of 1848 revolutionary emigrants (3-4,000) seems to confirm this. Marschalck sees economic factors and the potato blight as far more significant. As the German Confederation had—under pressure—introduced press freedom in 1848, a major cause for political unrest had in any case been removed. Though this liberating action was doubtlessly welcomed by some intellectuals and revolutionaries, some so-called 1848ers nevertheless left their home country for the New World, including a small
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46 Moenckmeier, Die deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung, 25. See also Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 16.
47 Marschalck, op.cit., 52-71, passim; Muehle, “Colonist Traditions in Nineteenth Century Emigration,” 38; Reich, “Emigration from Regierungsbezirk Frankfurt/Oder,” 83,84,87-88.
48 Reich, op.cit., 83-88, passim.
49 Muehle, op.cit., 38.
50 Rosenthal, Auswanderung aus Sachsen, 27 (Table), 30. Bickelmann notes that in Saxony the rural sector fared much better than elsewhere in Germany, while small artisans in southern Saxony were acutely pauperized.
51 Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 69.
52 Ruerup, Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert, 142; Bickelmann, op.cit.
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54 Marschalck, op.cit., 39.
number who settled in Australia. Lodewyckx rather uncharitably speaks of a few “hotheads [Brausekoepe]...who were enthusiastic about the prevailing revolutionary ideas.”55 Other writers are more positive about the 1848ers and name Carl Schurz in the U.S. and Carl Muecke in Australia as contributors to a new society. Rather than as a practising revolutionary, Fischer interprets the contribution of former revolutionary Ludwig Becker to the German community as defining and affirming their “identity within and as part of Australian society.”56

Press freedom, however, played virtually no role in the attitudes of the largely non-political peasantry, who neither took notice nor cared. Apart from poverty, their principal worry was that the upheavals caused by the revolutionary events in 1848-49 made their lives even more insecure.57

1.2.3 East-Elbian emigration

American scholars on German immigration have largely focussed on emigration from south-west Germany because that was the earliest and, overall, most prolific source of immigrants to the Western Hemisphere. This thesis will show that Victoria’s earliest, albeit modest, immigration was sourced primarily from the opposite parts of Germany, namely its south-eastern and north-eastern regions, collectively referred to as East-Elbia, i.e. east of the river Elbe. Though immigrants eventually arrived from other German-speaking parts, East-Elbian immigrants were the most numerous and most conservative, while also the most religious. All these factors made them the most influential in determining the character of Victoria’s German community.

East-Elbia included a large part of the Kingdom of Prussia with a large population but relatively low population density. Apart from the provinces of Brandenburg, Pomerania, Silesia, East and West Prussia and Posen—all of them part of Prussia—it also comprised the two Mecklenburg Grand-Duchies of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and the densely populated eastern part of the Kingdom of Saxony (the Lusatia region). East-Elbia’s population growth after 1850 was the highest in Germany.58 A characteristic of East-Elbia—especially its eastern and

55 Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 50.
56 Fischer, “The Forty-Eighters,” 434. See also letters by Carl Traugott Hoehne (“Hoehne’s Letters”) in Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 170-217, passim, especially 176; Bade, Migration in European History, 176; Lodewyckx, op.cit., 50.
58 See also Ruerup, Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert, 26,29; Herbert, Geschichte der Auslaenderpolitik, 14 and Note 2. Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, gives details on the religious problems in Silesia in Chapter 3, pages 34-40, passim.
northern (Mecklenburg) regions—was its narrow, stratified social structure, essentially comprising of only two groups, land owners and peasants. The almost total absence of a broader spectrum of the lower and middle-class, and of the intelligentsia, would profoundly affect the social and political attitudes of these immigrants in Victoria.\(^{59}\)

Apart from some limited districts—mainly Saxony and a few regions of Silesia—East-Elbia was almost entirely agricultural, and living standards fell progressively between 1816 and 1840.\(^ {60}\) Its economic situation was characterized by almost endemic food shortages, rising food prices and famine, especially resulting from the potato blight of 1846-47 and several bad harvests in the early 1850s, land-hunger and general discontent.\(^ {61}\) These conditions prepared the ground for social change that accelerated emigration. Yet Muehle comments that “hardships alone were insufficient to trigger migration.”\(^ {62}\) He implies that migration could be construed as an act of defiance. To him it was not merely an economic but also a political response, an expression of passive resistance to prevailing conditions, whether religious, economic or political, by escape as “peasant politics” and as voting with one’s feet.\(^ {63}\) Hoerder puts it thus: “Migration was part of a process of bargaining over the allocation of resources and the resistance to unacceptable conditions imposed either by demographic and economic developments or by political and social systems.”\(^ {64}\)

In Victoria, East-Elbian immigrants dominated the German community from the beginning, and their attitudes to religion and land ownership shaped the character of the emerging community. It was not until the gold discoveries that the balance of new arrivals diversified. After the mid-1860s, the mix of immigrant origins became more blurred, though even then, arrivals from the Prussian south-east still appeared to be the most numerous. This is not surprising, as heavy emigration from East-Elbia, although mainly directed to North America, continued almost to the end of the century.

In regional terms, the East-Elbian mass exodus started in Silesia and Mecklenburg. It then spread rapidly to Posen, Pomerania and subsequently to West and East Prussia. Not surprisingly, it was more pronounced in areas where property ownership was (or became) most concentrated, and where peasants were unable to acquire land despite the fact that the remaining feudal ties to large estates had been

\(^{59}\) Walker observed “In ... East-Elbia... a middle class hardly existed.” Walker, *Germany and the Emigration*, 167.

\(^{60}\) Kamphoefner, “German Emigration Research,” 25,28.


\(^{63}\) Muehle, op.cit., 39.

\(^{64}\) Hoerder, “Introduction,” 5.
severed in 1850, as already noted. By far the worst areas were Mecklenburg and Brandenburg, which is reflected in their emigration statistics (see Appendix 2, Table 3). A perusal of early immigration lists and other local Victorian records suggests that, other than gold-seeking immigrants, Mecklenburg, Posen, Silesia and Saxony continued to top the list of Victorian arrivals.

In the present context, Marschalck’s observations about the East-Elbian mass exodus from the mid-1860s have only limited relevance for Victoria. This is because the initial wave of immigrants to Victoria commenced ten years earlier, just before 1850. Two main sequences of events explain the reasons for this. First, between 1849 and the mid-1850s three separate and largely unconnected waves brought immigrants to Victoria: an 1849-50 indentured immigration scheme initiated by several Victorian businessmen; the overland movement of farmers from South Australia to Victoria’s Western District; and immigration by gold seekers after 1851. The first two of these immigration waves were predominantly of East-Elbian origin, as already noted. Thus the trigger for German immigration to Victoria was a quite specific precedent, namely the successful immigration of East-Elbian Old Lutherans to South Australia under the auspices of the South Australian Company between 1838 and the early 1840s. The promoters of the Victorian scheme, notably businessmen William Westgarth, William Dutton, Dr Alexander Thomson and others, much impressed by the South Australian scheme of the 1830s, wanted to replicate it in Port Phillip by indenturing what they called Moravian (a misnomer; for Silesian) settlers, whose reputation they rated highly and whom Westgarth would eventually visit and personally negotiate with. The Victorian businessmen reasoned that a German immigration scheme to Port Phillip could be easily “piggybacked” onto the continuing South Australian scheme, using the same agent and the same transport arrangements and thus avoiding unforeseen mishaps. This was purpose-focused emigration rather than the general emigration implied by Marschalck. The second explanation for the unique character of Victorian immigration,
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65 Kamphoefner, “German Emigration Research,” 22-4,28. Various writers identify the two main reasons for this inability: first, lack of funds, and second, the landowners’ reluctance to yield land because that represented both power and status.


67 Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 38,39. When the East-Elbian emigration stream started to accelerate, largely directed towards America, immigration from that region to Victoria already showed a decline. Compare Kamphoefner, “German Emigration Research,” 28, and Borrie, Italians and Germans in Australia, 163.
apart from occurring ten years earlier, is that the emigration climate in other areas of
Germany, especially in the south-west, was quite different to East-Elbia.\(^{68}\) It is quite
clear that without the South Australian precedent, at least one third of Victoria’s
German immigration would very likely never have taken place.

Hoerder notes that until about 1878, most emigration stemmed from
predominantly agricultural areas, while Germany’s own industrial revolution was able
to accommodate much of the rural population surplus thereafter.\(^{69}\) The statistics of the
Reich confirm this: between 1870 and 1913 employment in agriculture declined from
38 to 23 per cent, while in industry it rose from 30 to 45 per cent.\(^{70}\) Despite this,
overseas migration continued unabated until the early nineties, but it largely bypassed
Australia.

Rainer Muehle shows that East-Elbian emigration, despite its large scale, was
not uniform. It was based on “a relatively small number of rural communities and small
towns.”\(^{71}\) Often groups of fellow villagers emigrated together, as the evidence shows for
South Australia, where settlement patterns reveal that where persons from the same
village had emigrated together they also stayed together and settled in the same
“village” in their new home. In Victoria immigration was less regional in origin, and
this lack of homogeneity influenced how communities developed here, affecting their
stability and cohesiveness. Borrie’s observation that “Germans in Victoria formed a
number of concentrated settlements [but] these never developed into enclaves [as in]
South Australia” needs qualifying. He referred to a relatively small number of
settlements in Western Victoria.\(^{72}\)

The unevenness of East-Elbian emigration can also be observed in the
destinations chosen by emigrants. Zubinsky shows that in Mecklenburg-Strelitz
between 1846-1914 only twenty-six emigrants of a total of 15,953 headed for Australia,
while all others went to America.\(^{73}\) This contrasts with Reich’s findings that in the
southern county of Cottbus in Regierungsbezirk (major district) Frankfurt/Oder between
1840 and 1893, of a total of 11,000 emigrants, more than 50 per cent came to Australia

\(^{68}\) The result was that around 92 per cent of the ensuing mass emigration was directed to the U.S. Herbert, *Geschichte
der Auslaenderpolitik*, 14, Note 3.

\(^{69}\) Hoerder, *People in Transit*, 2; see also Kamphofner, “German Emigration Research,” 22-28, *passim.*

\(^{70}\) Bade, “Deutsche uberseeische Massenauswanderung,” 259, Table 1.

\(^{71}\) Muehle, “Colonist Traditions in Nineteenth Century Emigration,” 38.

\(^{72}\) Borrie, *Italians and Germans*, 163.

while those emigrating from the northern county of Arnswalde all headed for America.\textsuperscript{74}

Before proceeding, it should be remembered that religious beliefs were important factors determining emigration and subsequent community formation. In the nineteenth century religion was a significant aspect of the attitudes and life philosophy of the rural population in particular. I already noted Ruerup’s claim that piety and religious fervour, accompanied by a degree of resistance to authority, had markedly risen since the Napoleonic era.\textsuperscript{75}

Apart from East Prussia (whence few immigrants came to Victoria), most of East-Elbia adhered to the evangelical (reformed) church, often referred to as “unionist,” which was the religion of the ruling Hohenzollern family. However, there was a significant minority of orthodox Old Lutherans. The latter exerted an inordinately major influence on the rest which continued after their emigration, especially in America and Australia. The deliberations in this thesis will be primarily based on the premise that most of the immigrants investigated here were Lutherans of either persuasion. Other faiths, including Roman Catholicism, Judaism, Baptism and others, played virtually no role in attitudes and settlement patterns.

1.2.4 Numbers and Statistics

When the Zollverein was formed (1834), the population of the member states of the Bund (what one may consider \textit{proto-Germany}) was around 23,759,000. With various territorial additions, by 1852 it had risen to 34,366,000; in 1871 to 40,997,000; in 1890 to 49,241,000; in 1900 to 56,046,000; and in 1910 to 64,568,000.\textsuperscript{76} Despite the rise of large-scale emigration after 1840, the total population growth was never offset by emigration, and the overall growth rate rarely fell below 0.75 per cent per annum.\textsuperscript{77} In East-Elbia it was consistently above that level, despite the mass migration from these provinces.\textsuperscript{78}

Emigration rates show some significant fluctuations, influenced by conditions already named earlier, including food prices, the availability of labour and/or land, and the nature of government suppression. Marschalck stresses that the latter, surprisingly,
made the least impact. He notes that it made itself felt indirectly by flow-on effects such as fear and anxieties triggered by uprisings and especially the 1848-49 revolutions. Often such responses showed up after time-delays of one to several years. Bade notes that variations can also be attributed to good conditions at home or conversely, economic problems in destination countries. The American Civil War, for example, made a dent into emigration to the U.S., benefitting other destinations like Brazil, especially as the latter encouraged German immigration. Because of the small numbers involved, no spike can be discerned in the Australian figures.

Emigration totals for the various territories of the North German Confederation showed a massive increase between 1846-47 and 1857-58, rising to 1.3 million; between 1852-54 alone 566,000 persons emigrated. In 1857 and 1866-70 the annual total exceeded 100,000. Thereafter the annual average rarely dropped below 100,000 until the end of the century. More than 90 per cent of all emigrants were heading for the U.S., where by 1910 the number of German-born stood at 5.1 million (see Appendix 2, Table 2).

German emigration figures are unreliable for a variety of reasons, as Moenckmeier, Grothe, Marschalck and several other writers point out. It was only from 1871 that reliable emigration statistics were collected. As German emigrants departed not only from Hamburg or Bremen but also from Dutch and French ports for which no statistics are available, the researcher has to rely on mix-and-match figures based on available departure and arrival port statistics. On the evidence most East-Elbian emigrants left from German ports, and thus figures are fairly reliable. While their numbers appear to be relatively small, the explanation is that with the exception of the Kingdom of Saxony, the eastern provinces of Prussia were considerably less populous than most other German districts, especially those in the north and west (see Appendix 2, Table 3).
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79 Marschalck, *Deutsche Ueberseewanderung*, 11, notes significant timelags between economic events and its reflection in emigration figures.
80 Bade, “Conclusion; Migration Past and Present,” 401; Walker, *Germany and the Emigration*, 97 and following; see also Luebke, *Germans in Brazil*, 33; Grothe, *Die Deutschen in Uebersee*, 34, Table 1.
81 Bade notes in particular the *Gruenderkrise* (economic downturn) of 1873-9 which followed unification of Germany in 1871. Bade, “Conclusion; Migration Past and Present,” 399-401, *passim*: Marschalck, op.cit., 28,68.
82 Herbert, *Geschichte der Auslaenderpolitik*, 14; Ruerup, *Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert*, 30-31. Various writers cite figures of German emigrants to the U.S. ranging between 5 and 8 million.
Compared with the U.S., or even Brazil’s 400,000, the figures of German immigration to colonial Australia look small and show great variations. Voigt estimates a total up to World War I of 60,000. Moenckmeier’s estimate is fractionally lower at 55,322, while Beuke’s estimate lies a little higher, at 70-80,000. Grothe’s figures are 54,026 until 1901 (German departure statistics), plus an additional 2,226 up to 1913. For 1902-13 the latter figure compares with 22,829 according to Australian arrival statistics. After identifying a number of variations, Grothe determines a “true” figure for 1838-1902 of 70,000. Figures calculated by Borrie (of German-born Australian residents), using census data, are much lower. They are 26,872 (1861); a peak of 44,961 (1891); thereafter they decline—32,990 (1911), 16,842 (1933).

The figures for Victoria—treated as population rather than immigration figures—will be discussed in a later chapter, but briefly here, according to the Victorian census the figure in 1861 was 10,418, which included a significant spike resulting from gold discovery immigration. This number remained the highest for three decades, increasing briefly to an all-time peak of 11,353 in 1891 before declining.

1.2.5 Propaganda and information: Travel books, emigration papers, songs and emigrants’ letters

Information about the Great South Land reached German readers almost three-quarters of a century prior to the age of mass migration that began in the mid-nineteenth century. Captain Cook’s accounts of his various voyages were translated and published by Reinhold Forster, who had accompanied Cook on his second voyage. These and other publications had created an awareness and interest, even among relatively uneducated Germans, about these mysterious and distant lands. “Armchair travel” books, largely fictitious, especially by women novelists like the remarkable Therese Huber and Amalie Schoppe, generated popular interest. Less fictitious accounts followed, dealing

83 Figures given by Schueler in Brasilien, ein Land der Zukunft, quoted in Josephy, “Die deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung,” 106. See also Grothe, Die Deutschen in Uebersee, 276,280. Grothe, despite some misgivings, accepts the widely accepted figure of 400,000, pages 30-31.
84 Voigt, Australia-Germany, 30.
85 Moenckmeier, Die deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung, 221. In a footnote Moenckmeier stresses that the departures via British ports—for which no statistics exist—would raise this figure considerably.
86 Beuke, Werbung und Warnung, 21.
87 Grothe, Die Deutschen in Uebersee, 276-7.
88 Ibid., 278.
89 Borrie, Italians and Germans, 158; see also Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 56,64-5; Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 225-29.
90 Marschalck, op.cit.,163.
91 Widow of Georg Forster, who with his father Reinhold had accompanied Cook on his second voyage.
with the discovery and early settlement at Botany Bay. Koplin claims that almost forty works appeared in Germany between 1781 and 1795. After the turn of the century, as migration progressively became “the signal event of the [nineteenth] century,” the German lands became flooded with books and pamphlets dispensing information, propaganda, advice, warnings, lies, truths and myths about emigration, distant lands, and riches to be found. The most immediate, direct, and often best-informed observations came from letters by former emigrants, as Hoerder notes: “Personal letters played an extremely important role in promoting [emigration].” They possibly constituted one of the main pull factors, though Marschalck doubts that their impact was significant on decisions to emigrate. He does admit, however, that letters were passed around and read by neighbours and fellow villagers, and often were even published in local newspapers. Collections of letters from German immigrants in America, published in book form or assembled at various libraries, show the wide variety of emigration experiences. For very good reasons they have been extensively used in immigration research by German and American scholars like Walter Kamphoefner, who co-edited a collection of letters. Letters by Victorian immigrants Heyne and Hoehne also appeared in book form but, regrettably, few other letters relating to Victoria survive. Koplin identifies one of a variety of problems, noting that the special collection programme for letters at Ruhr-Universitaet Bochum excludes Australia because of the dearth of material. We must therefore be grateful to Darragh and Wuchatsch for unearthing several examples, especially of Wendish emigrants. The immediacy of letters generated much greater interest than travel books, of which a number also appeared from the 1820s onwards. Letters from emigrants to friends and family were often also published in special emigration newspapers that were published between 1846 and 1884. Eight of these papers are named by Marschalck. Most of them were short-lived. An exception, the Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung: ein Bote zwischen der alten und neuen Welt, appeared for almost a quarter-century. Issued from 1846 until 1871 at Rudolstadt in Thuringia, despite its small edition of only 500-1,000

92 Koplin, “Wussten sie was sie tun?,” 52.
93 Prussian government memorial (Denkschrift), quoted Marschalck, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung, 9 & note 1.
94 Hoerder, “Introduction,” 2.
95 Marschalck, op.cit., 17.
97 Koplin, op.cit., 5.
98 Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 163-248, passim.
copies, it was widely distributed and read. Koplin refers to the tradition of *Lesen-Hoeren* (literally reading and listening), where newspaper articles were read by one to a group of listeners. To some extent, newspapers as well as letters had a quality of authenticity and objectivity that was lacking in other potential sources of information that emigrants could draw on. However, as Walker points out, even the proprietor of the successful *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung*, G. Froebel, pursued interests at variance with objectivity and altruism by running a land sales agency in Texas, a travel agency of dubious reputation, as well as the Rudolstadt Emigration Bureau.

Quite early, there was an awareness that emigration also represented a loss to the *Volk*. Some writers drew attention to the dangers of assimilation and recommended that retention of national characteristics be safeguarded. One journalist in 1850 put it thus: “[It must be] ensure[d] to settle Germans in foreign countries in ways that guarantee their original national and community associations and independence.”

Emigration agents played the most proactive role, as promoters, information providers, fare brokers, facilitators and negotiators with customs and consular agencies, and a good deal more. Edward Delius had collaborated with George Fife Angas and his South Australian Company to organize and oversee the indenture of over one thousand Germans, including some 600 Old Lutheran immigrants to South Australia between 1844 and ca.1850. He later coordinated the emigration of several hundred East-Elbian peasants and rural labourers to Port Phillip, to be discussed elsewhere in this chapter. He is the most well-known of agents for German immigration, and was perhaps also a better example of a class of immigration professionals who attracted a great deal of scorn and criticism at the time, though his failings are also well-documented. Although the involvement of agents in the emigration process was extensive, Kamphoefner assigns them a role as “mediators and facilitators” rather than as
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100 Koplin, “Wussten sie was sie tun?”, 28.
101 Walker, *Germany and the Emigration*, 137.
103 Walker, op.cit., 237.
104 Though not deliberately dishonest, the extensive though usually qualified references to Delius indicate he was first and foremost a wheeler-dealer interested in personal advantage. See Delius Papers at University of South Carolina at Columbia. Edward Delius papers, 1835 Apr. 3-[1851?], accessed via https://beta.worldcat.org/archivegrid/collection/data/34763895; Tampke, “Pre-War German Settlement in Eastern Australia,” 366-7; and especially South Australian journalist Rudolf Reimer’s critique in his 1851 book *Australien* (1851).
immigration promoters and initiators. Often retained by shipping companies and occasionally by overseas immigration societies or individuals (like William Westgarth and Alexander Thomson at Port Phillip), their dependability and integrity varied considerably, as will be observed in the case of the Hessian stonemasons in a later chapter. Often agents, motivated by greed for fees or bonuses rather than to proffer genuine advice, visited areas with emigration potential and often described conditions in destination countries in glowing terms, frequently exaggerating or outright lying.

Darragh and Wuchatsch made a comprehensive study of the contribution to German immigration by William Westgarth, a prominent member of infant Melbourne’s business community, who became the de facto “father” of German immigration to Port Phillip. Westgarth himself writes in his memoirs,

> When I made my first Home trip, in 1847 [to his native Edinburgh], I resolved to open, if I possibly could, German emigration to Port Phillip. Quite a number had already been settled, some from the earliest years, in South Australia, where their industry, frugality, sobriety, and general good conduct had made them excellent colonists. This favourable testimony was confirmed to me by correspondence on the subject with my late much-lamented friend, Alexander L. Elder, one of South Australia’s earliest, most esteemed, and most successful colonists.

What Westgarth omits to mention is that a number of letters in the *Port Phillip Gazette* by William Dutton, another Melbourne merchant, and the *Gazette’s* editor, Thomas McCombie, followed by discussions between the Hamburg merchant R.V. Swaine and Dutton about the possibility of indenturing Germans to Port Phillip, had preceded Westgarth’s interest and involvement by several years. Dutton had expressed a particular interest in German handcraftsmen, labourers, shepherds and “decent women and girls.” An editorial in the *Gazette* in December 1846 had concluded with the comment that “Port Phillip possesses many agricultural Districts which would be

---

107 See Letters by Heyne and Hoehne, in Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 150 and 177, respectively.
109 Geelong *Advertiser an quatters’ Advocate*, January 8, 1847, 1.
eminently fitted to receive these hard-working [German] emigrants.”\textsuperscript{110} Swaine and Dutton were acquainted since their youth, and Dutton had been a schoolmate of Edward Delius when both attended school at Bremen. This also explains Delius’ significant involvement in the subsequent arrangements to bring out several shiploads of Silesians to the colony.

At the same time the \textit{Sydney Morning Herald} also featured articles about the desirability of German immigration. A report noting the colonial government’s “proclamation for the encouragement of immigration from the continent of Europe to this colony” was followed by a fulsome account by F. Dutton on the thriftiness and sobriety of the South Australian Germans.\textsuperscript{111} South Australian community leaders themselves seemed slightly miffed that “our Port Phillip neighbours are endeavouring to divert to their shores some of the German immigration.”\textsuperscript{112}

In various states of Germany, a number of philanthropic emigration societies sprang up in the 1840s and ‘50s, with the objective of providing advice, liaising with local government, and raising funds. The two societies with an Australian focus identified by Marschalck—Zentralverein für Auswanderung nach Australien (Dresden 1849) and the Auswanderungs- gesellschaft für Südaustralien (Berlin 1850)\textsuperscript{113}—are not documented in the literature, and their effectiveness can only be surmised. Bretting and Bickelmann’s study of emigration societies is disappointing in that it provides virtually no useful information about Australia.\textsuperscript{114} Throughout Lusatia, several emigration advice bureaux (Auskanderungsvereine) sprang into life, possibly only briefly, in towns like Bautzen, Kamenz and Zittau, whence a number of early immigrants came to Victoria.\textsuperscript{115} The Saxon government’s decree in 1848 merged all under the umbrella of the Dresden association which appeared to fizzle out around 1851.\textsuperscript{116} In Silesia, the very active Breslau Verein lapsed in 1858.\textsuperscript{117} Walker points out that most of these associations eventually established business connections with shipping lines, and as a result, became more commercial and less objective in the information they provided.\textsuperscript{118}

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Port Phillip Gazette}, December 9, 1846, 2; Darragh and Wuchatsch, \textit{From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay}, 1-5, passim.
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Sydney Morning Herald}, April 13, 1847, 2.
\textsuperscript{112} \textit{South Australian}, February 5, 1847, 2.
\textsuperscript{113} Marschalck, \textit{Deutsche Ueberseewanderung}, 21.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., 21-22.
\textsuperscript{116} Rosenthal, \textit{Auswanderung aus Sachsen}, 56-7; Bickelmann, “Auskanderungsvereine,” 144.
\textsuperscript{117} Bickelmann, op.cit., 154-5.
\textsuperscript{118} Walker, \textit{Germany and the Emigration}, 137.
As early as the first half of the nineteenth century, books by travellers and former emigrants appeared in increasing numbers, though Marschalck claims they had little or no impact in inducing emigration.\textsuperscript{119} His view is not shared by several other writers. Walker notes, for example, that the Leipzig Fair in 1847 in its book catalogue listed twenty-seven books on *Auswanderung* (emigration) which quite clearly indicated interest in the subject.\textsuperscript{120} Corkhill lists a number of writers and their works, including the prominent novelist and travel writer Friedrich Gerstaecker. Gerstaecker’s *Auswanderung* (emigration) (1849), was based on information he had gathered from various sources. Two years after its publication he came to visit, publishing several very successful novels following his year-long adventure in 1851, including *Die beiden Straeflinge* (*The Two Convicts*, 1857). Highly readable, his works contributed to an increased awareness about Australia, especially among the relatively few book and newspaper readers. Many Germans would have heard or read about Ludwig Leichhardt’s travels and his mysterious disappearance. His *Tagebuch einer Landreise* (Diary), published in Halle in 1851, and his tragic fate generated considerable interest.\textsuperscript{121} The wide range of books, travel reports and published letters is sampled in a selective annotated list in Appendix 3.

As noted above, Darragh and Wuchatsch reproduce a number of letters by immigrants to Port Phillip/Victoria. Letters by Heyne and Hoehne have already been referred to. Others include Eduard Klingauf, arriving in Victoria via South Australia in 1849 and whose letters were published in the *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung* in June 1851;\textsuperscript{122} Johann Graf, a foundation member of the village of Westgarthtown, author of an unpublished letter from 1850;\textsuperscript{123} Michael Zwar, a Wend and committed Old Lutheran from Saxony, whose accounts appeared in the Wendish newspaper *Tydzenske Nowiny* in January 1852;\textsuperscript{124} a letter by Johann Pannach, published in *Tydzenske Nowiny*, March 6, 1852;\textsuperscript{125} unpublished letters by Dr Gustav Schmidt\textsuperscript{126} and Andreas Kaiser, the latter subsequently a stalwart of Melbourne’s German community and Lutheran Church;\textsuperscript{127} and a letter by the only female correspondent, Agneta Stephan, published in *Serbske*.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{119} Marschalck, *Deutsche Ueberseewanderung*, 17-18.
\item \textsuperscript{120} Walker, *Germany and the Emigration*, 123 and note 49.
\item \textsuperscript{121} Corkhill, *Antipodean Encounters*, viii, 23-46, passim; see also Friederich, *Australia in Western Imaginative Prose Writings*, 143-55, passim.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 163-6.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 218-23,253.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Ibid., 224-9.
\item \textsuperscript{125} Ibid., 230-33.
\item \textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 234-42.
\item \textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 243-5.
\end{itemize}
Nowiny, formerly Tydzenske Nowiny.\textsuperscript{128} One of the most interesting letters, published in Der Pilger in Victoria, comes from Adolph Haller, who had come to Melbourne independently. Although he did not maintain close links with the German community, he had business connections as a land agent at various times in the 1850s with several German community leaders including Otto Neuhaus.\textsuperscript{129}

There is little doubt that letters increased a general awareness about Australia, its land and opportunities, and the lives of compatriots who had settled there. Australia, however, could not compete with America. Around the middle of the century songs and jingles about America abounded, indicating why North America was the emigrant’s dream destination. One sample song has to suffice; its poignancy is clearly self-evident:

Ade, du theures Vaterland,                      Farewell beloved Fatherland,
Es winkt zum Abschied unsere Hand;              We wave a final farewell;
Zwar träubt sich nun unser Blick,              Though misty-eyed we may be,
Doch lächelt uns der Zukunft Glück;              Future happiness already smiles;
Im Vaterland nur Angst und Noth,              The fatherland offers only fear and want,
Typhus, Jammer, Hungerstod;                    Typhoid, misery, death by starvation.
Drum suchen neue Heimat wir                  Now we seek a new Heimat
Amerika, bei dir, bei dir ...\textsuperscript{130}               With thee, America, with thee...

Not surprisingly, Australia boasted no such songs; it had little allure, it was distant, and travel there was expensive as well as dangerous—a ninety-day journey versus forty to America prior to the advent of steam. Its name had none of the familiar ring of “America.” Even after the emigration propagandists (including Westgarth) had picked up explorer Major Mitchell’s propitious name of Australia Felix (Latin for Fortunate or Happy Australia) as a prop for promotion, a good deal of persuasion was needed to induce emigrants to come to this unknown and distant land.

\textsuperscript{128} Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 246-7.
\textsuperscript{129} In a letter in Der Pilger in Victoria, 1 (1853), 4, Adolph Haller offered to make regular contributions on politics and public affairs. In the end this did not eventuate.
\textsuperscript{130} From Volksliederarchiv http://www.volksliederarchiv.de/text6.html
1.2.6 Shopping for German immigrants: Westgarth, Delius and the Colonial Office

As noted earlier, Westgarth left for Europe in January 1847, briefed with information from Dutton, McCombie and others, and with the full authority of the so-called Delegate Committee, an informal lobby group pressing for proceeds of local land sales to be spent at Port Phillip rather than elsewhere in the (pre-separation) colony. Armed with introductions to Delius, Swaine, and the Emigration Commissioners at the Colonial Office, he was confident he could persuade the latter to support German immigration to Port Phillip. On the voyage he wrote much of *Australia Felix; or, a Historical and Descriptive Account of the Settlement of Port Phillip*, later to be published as a book (Edinburgh, 1848) but also to be selectively featured in the *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung*.\(^{131}\)

In the belief he would obtain the approval of the emigration commissioners to subsidize the emigration of German “vine dressers, agricultural labourers and shepherds,” he corresponded with and then met with Delius in Germany. After this, matters become very muddled. Continuing to believe firmly he would receive approval for bounty payments to cover the passage of a first party of some 200 Silesians from Liegnitz, promised to him by Delius (which he believed, wrongly, to be Moravians\(^{132}\)), he failed to comply with the commissioners’ demand to provide lists of emigrants that proved their trades qualified them for the bounty.\(^{133}\) Delius meanwhile, assuming he had the all-clear, assembled a motley crowd of agricultural and other workers and their families, of whom only a small percentage were later found to conform with bounty regulations. With these serious misunderstandings, the first party was almost ready to travel to Hamburg when the Danish-Schleswig-Holstein war over succession broke out (1848-51), resulting in a Danish blockade of Hamburg. The result was that the Silesian party at Liegnitz was broken up as all young men were called up for home-guard service. Not until October 10, 1848, was a re-constituted emigrant group ready to sail for Melbourne. They eventually set off, travelling largely on credit of the Hamburg shippers, J.C. Godeffroy & Sohn on the *Godeffroy*, which berthed at Sandridge on February 11, 1849.\(^{134}\)

\(^{131}\) *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung* 41 (October 9, 1848), 645-9. See Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 37,69 (note 3).

\(^{132}\) Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., 138; Lodewyckx, *Das Deutschum in Victoria*, 3.

\(^{133}\) Especially in the case of foreigners, bounty payments would only be available for immigrants with special skills in high demand in the colony, such as specialists in the production of wine, silk and oil.

\(^{134}\) This subsequently became a matter of anger and contention. Many immigrants either believed, or had been told—perhaps by Delius himself—that their passage would be paid by Westgarth or the Port Phillip authorities.
While these arrangements were proceeding, Westgarth, still in Edinburgh, both directly and through Delius, engaged in extensive correspondence with the Moravian Bruegergemeine (“Brotherhood” or “Brethren”) at Herrnhut in Upper Lusatia, eastern Saxony. The reasons are not entirely clear, other than that he knew that this non-denominational Christian community was interested in missionary work and had supported immigrant groups abroad.135 It turned out they were not able to help, nor even to provide a pastor, which the emigrants were keen to have travel with them. Meanwhile, both Westgarth and Delius continued their efforts to assemble additional parties for emigration. In spring 1848 Westgarth travelled to the two port cities of Hamburg and Bremen; he also visited Liegnitz in Silesia and Herrnhut in Lusatia, to address potential immigrants and drum up support.136

In relatively rapid succession, several ships belonging to the Godeffroy shipping firm left Hamburg, laden with emigrants rounded up by Delius, destined for Port Phillip and South Australia. The Godeffroy berthed at Sandridge on February 11, 1849, the Wappaus (actually Wappaeus) on March 6, 1849, the Dockenhuden on April 21, 1849, the Emmy on December 19, 1849, the Pribislaw in February, 1850, the Alfred on February 24, 1850, the Sophie on August 23, 1850, the Antonie on October 31, 1850, and the Dockenhuden (second time), on March 6, 1851. By that time over 600 Germans had arrived at Port Phillip,137 though the majority still alighted at Adelaide, attracted by their knowledge of its already well-established and thriving German community. This brought to an end the first stream of German settlers to Port Phillip. There was a pause before another flood would arrive, this time lured by gold fever.

When the authorities checked out the new arrivals, only a fraction turned out to be eligible for the bounty payment. Altogether two vinedressers and fifty-six other qualified agricultural workers complied; the majority, over five hundred, did not. Westgarth, while commended for his initiative, was attacked from many quarters, including some of the immigrants who claimed to have been misled.138 Those who had

135 It seems Westgarth was unaware they were not colonizers themselves. He may also have acted in deference to the Port Phillip Superintendent Charles La Trobe’s Moravian background, and he also knew that the Herrnhuters were of the highest character and thus the most desirable immigrants. See also Jensz, German Moravian Missionaries in the British Colony of Victoria, Australia, 1848-1908. The work of the Moravian missionaries at Ebenezer and Ramahyuck Mission Stations in Victoria, though only marginally affecting the development of the German community, will be briefly discussed in Chapter Two.
136 Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 17-20, passim.
137 Tampke’s estimate of “about 900” by 1849 is somewhat exaggerated. Tampke, The Germans in Australia, 77.
138 “German Immigration,” Argus, March 3, 1850, 2 and May 11, 1850, 2; “Mr Westgarth and the Germans,” Argus, August 29, 1851, 2; “Merit to Whom Merit Is Due,” Argus, September 1, 1851, 4; “Mr Westgarth and the Germans,” Argus, September 1, 1851, 4.
travelled “on account,” i.e. on the basis of credit given by Godeffroys the shippers, subsequently received demands to pay up. One of the arrivals, Otto Neuhauss, was retained to act as a debt collector and enforcer. In the end, however, Godeffroys were left with many hundreds of pounds in unpaid fares, and they subsequently withdrew entirely from servicing Victoria.\textsuperscript{139} But did Westgarth show contrition for failing to impress on Delius the need to explain the conditions of bounty payments? His defence against accusations in the press at the time admitted no culpability, and he blamed the mishap on others: “The chief cause [for failing to secure the bounty payments] arises, not from a neglect on my part, as is very ungenerously alleged, but from a mistake committed, though unintentionally, by the Germans themselves.”\textsuperscript{140} He repeated the same claim in his memoirs, published forty years later, blaming the Germans for this serious misunderstanding. As he recalled the events:

A rather motley crew was this first German party landed at Melbourne. I fear they were not all vinedressers. But the difficulty was to get them to describe themselves as such, even when they were so. This was almost as hard upon them as for an Indian Brahmin to write himself down a low-caste Hindoo. Upon any pretence they would class themselves as of some trade…[E]ventually a substantial sum was handed to the shippers, sufficient to encourage them to continue the business…

He had forgotten; they had not. However, it would be unfair to diminish Westgarth’s good intentions. He was genuinely sympathetic towards his German clients, and his concern with their welfare continued until his final departure from the colony in 1857. In his memoirs, published after his final visit to Victoria in 1888, he recalled with fondness his various German friends.

In 1847-48 Westgarth’s gung-ho attitude to the unequivocal rulings of the Emigration Commissioners, and the fact that his travels in Britain often kept him out of reach of Delius, encouraged the latter to use his imagination to assemble immigrants, mostly of a quite unsuitable trade background and character.\textsuperscript{141} Wilhelm Iwan, who

\textsuperscript{139} Darragh and Wuchatsch, \textit{From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay}, 75-9, passim. Few Godeffroy ships called at Melbourne in the following years. One exception was the \textit{Peter Godeffroy}; she brought some German immigrants on December 14, 1855, after having called at Adelaide.

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Argus}, August 29, 1851, 2.

\textsuperscript{141} Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., 74-5.
analyzed shipping lists and made person-by-person comments about some of the Silesian emigrants, reveals that a number of undesirables jumped on the emigration bandwagon. For drunkards, recalcitrant debtors and thieves, Iwan claims, a free trip to Australia Felix seemed a most desirable way out. A Victorian immigrant, C.T. Hoehne, stated much the same, based on personal observation. Darragh and Wuchatsch show that while Earl Grey, Secretary at the Colonial Office, eventually gave the green light—subject to conditions being adhered to—the Emigration and Land Commissioners were never very happy to subsidize non-British immigrants.

1.3 Settling into a new Heimat

After the arrival of the last immigrant ship flying the Godeffroy flag, Melbourne by 1851 had a German community, or rather a motley crowd of German speakers, mostly rural workers and some artisans from the eastern rural provinces of Silesia, Pomerania and Mecklenburg, with a sprinkling of Wends from Lusatia in eastern Saxony. They joined a small group of prior arrivals—tradesmen, artisans, and a few farmers. The number of those resulting from Westgarth’s efforts is estimated at 630, all arriving on ships chartered by Delius from J.C. Godeffroy & Sohn. No doubt some other Germans had arrived independently of Westgarth.

Borrie gives the number of “foreign-born” in Victoria in 1851 at 1,494, based on census figures. Naturally this included the 630, plus those who had immigrated on their own, as well as some other nationalities—which I estimate to be no more than about 2-300. Westgarth’s own estimate in 1850 was “nearly one thousand Germans,” which is also the figure assumed by Lodewyckx. A local tobacconist, Gumbinner, claimed there were only 700 Germans at Port Phillip in 1850. If we assume a total of German-born persons in Victoria of approximately 1,100-1,200, this suggests that a small number of Germans must have been here before Westgarth’s immigrants arrived. This poses the question of who these early pioneers were and where they lived. Neither Lodewyckx, Darragh and Wuchatsch, nor Mees provide any clues.

142 Iwan, Um des Glaubens willen nach Australien, 146-47. The list on page 147 mentions several thieves and drunkards.
143 “Hoehne Letters” (“Emigration to Australia”), in Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 194.
144 Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., 13-14,19,37-39, passim.
146 Borrie, Italians and Germans, 157.
147 “German immigration,” Argus, January 18, 1851, Supplement, 1; Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 56.
148 Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., 83; Argus, September 10, 1850, 2.
149 Mees, A German Church in the Garden of God, passim.
and Charles Meyer cite a figure of eight Germans at Port Phillip in 1842, based on a report in the *Port Phillip Gazette*.\textsuperscript{150} A remark attributed to community leader Alexander Brahe that upon his arrival in 1846 Melbourne’s German population rose “by 25 per cent, from 4 to 5” is quite fanciful, especially as he only arrived in 1849.\textsuperscript{151}

An unverified reference by J.F. Curran in *Early Days of Berwick* names two early settlers at Harkaway near Berwick in around 1845, namely the Silesian Gottlob Scholtz and a former sea captain, Wilhelm Fritzlauff. Both men and their families were said to have arrived via Adelaide. This information, however, seems doubtful.\textsuperscript{152} Darragh and Wuchatsch mention another German, a Portland farmer, Gottlob Neander, who had been there since 1842/3.\textsuperscript{153} The *quatters’ Directory* of 1849 gives a few other German-sounding names of individuals also living in the Portland district, like Henry Lemann (Lehmann?) at Woodlands, Portland Bay, a squatter.\textsuperscript{154} But who were the others? Unfortunately, lack of appropriate documentation leaves this question unanswered for the time being.

At the time of the arrival of the Godeffroy ships, the only prominent German names in the Melbourne area were the later solicitor and consul W.A. (Alexander) Brahe, in Melbourne since 1849; the hotel owner Georg Nissen; journalist Gustav Droege (all having arrived in Adelaide between 1847 and 1848, and in Melbourne very likely in 1849), the cabinet maker Lewis Kalz, who arrived before 1844,\textsuperscript{155} and W.F.A. Ruecker, a financier, hotelier and merchant, in Melbourne since about 1838. Though well placed, Ruecker took almost no interest in the welfare of his compatriots. It was mainly Brahe who supported his fellow Germans. Extensive help was given to the new arrivals by Scottish and English community leaders who launched appeals for funds to provide accommodation for the newcomers.

There was obviously a dire need for urgent action. While artist and naturalist Ludwig Becker saw the funny side of early Melbourne life in his humorous *Ein Australisch Lied*, by claiming that “Life is upside-down, and all the houses are jam-packed” (“Das Leben ist verkehrt und toll/ die Menschen und die Haeuser voll”);\textsuperscript{156}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[150] Tampke, *Germans in Australia*, 76. Meyer writes that the *Port Phillip Gazette* in 1842 claimed there were eight Germans at Port Phillip (Meyer, *History of Germans in Australia*, 23). The appropriate issue of the *Gazette* could not be located at State Library of Victoria.
\item[151] Tampke, op.cit., 76.
\item[153] Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 115,123.
\item[154] *Squatters Directory for Port Phillip 1849 Revisited*, transcribed by Ian Itter.
\item[155] Geelong Advertiser, December 16, 1844, 3; Argus, September 10, 1847,1.
\item[156] For text, see *Melbourne Deutsche Zeitung*, 45, July 13, 1860; for comment see Wehner, *Heimat Melbourne*, 27.
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others, including Ernst Heyne, Moritz Michaelis, and Emma Brendel’s family, found Melbourne perplexing. Beside accommodation, the Germans urgently needed food and employment. Few spoke English. Apart from limited self-help (those with a little English could look for work and helpful contacts), it was Brahe, assisted by some educated and better-placed recent arrivals, like Dr Ferdinand Schroetteringk, Eduard Schlobach, Gustav Schmidt, as well as several activists and natural leaders from among the new rural arrivals like Wanke, Thiele and Heyne, who set up support bodies as well as engaging in joint operations with local Anglo community leaders. The latter had formed a German Immigration Association, whose lobbying resulted in a government building being made available with the assistance of Superintendent Charles La Trobe. It became known as the Immigration Barracks. The immigrants themselves established a Deutscher Verein (German Association) and a Krankenkasse (sickness benefit association), and even organized fundraisers like an agricultural show. The German Immigration Association undertook to welcome new arrivals, as well as planning and providing funding, accommodation, and work. It also interceded on their behalf by giving financial support to immigrants receiving demands to pay back their passage fees. There were many of these, and few that were able or willing to comply.

Reports of the meetings and activities of the German Immigration Committee appeared regularly in the press. Prominent members included the Lord Mayor, Alderman Kerr, the Reverend Irving Heatherington, community leader Dr Thomas Black, and others. Westgarth contributed his “after care” by buying land at Kilbundoora in 1850 in trust for a group of settlers, and in many other ways also showed his support by taking a very active role on the German Immigration Committee and enlisting the help and wide contacts of Captain Stanley Carr, a recent visitor from Germany. Both men were also instrumental in generating support in the Geelong area by landholder Dr Alexander Thomson and other leading Geelong citizens, by
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facilitating German settlement in that district. The Immigration Committee functioned until 1854, if perhaps not as actively as in 1850-51.165

It is tempting to compare the early five years (1850-55) with the German immigration situation in the U.S. or Brazil. However, the small numbers in Victoria, and the tenuousness of Melbourne as a true frontier settlement, makes this rather pointless. In America and Brazil, the arrival port cities very rapidly drained newcomers into new ethnic settlements. In contrast, in Melbourne many newly arrived Germans were stuck until the gold discoveries lured them away to the goldfields two or three years later.166 It is therefore almost impossible to reconstruct a workable paradigm of how an early community and identifiable settlements were formed.

The discovery of gold in mid-1851 started a huge population move. Within a short time most of the new arrivals, together with Germans from the other colonies and thousands of Anglo fellow-settlers, made their way to the goldfields. By 1854, 38 per cent, by 1857 61 per cent, and by 1861 59 per cent of Victoria’s Germans had moved to the diggings.167 It was only after the initial attraction of gold declined, and after many of the early workings had been exhausted or turned to industrial mining methods, that many returned to Melbourne, while others settled in the Western District of the colony, joining the Germans immigrating from South Australia; still others went to Queensland, which was then emerging as a new magnet for German immigrants, or the recently discovered goldfields in New Zealand. A good number returned to Germany.168 A simplistic view suggests that the dispersal of a large part of the entire Victorian population, including most of the newly-arrived Germans attracted by the gold discoveries, not only put off community formation but also resolved some of the early accommodation and employment problems in the metropolis for at least one or two years. However, the corollary of this is that the rapid move of recent German arrivals to the goldfields—the above statistics indicate well over half of them—in turn led to the formation of new German communities and even Lutheran congregations in a number of goldfield towns beside Ballarat, Bendigo and Castlemaine. Some of these endured, mainly in the larger towns.169

165 Argus, December 15, 1854, 6.
166 Ripley’s comments, and especially his reference to Frederick Jackson Turner’s 1893 essay “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” establish a valid contrast between Victoria and the U.S. See Ripley, “The Ethnic Frontier: Rural Germans and the Settlement of America,” 197-214, passim. Turner later re-worked his earlier essay, and its title was revised to The Frontier in American History.
167 Borrie, Italians and Germans, 163.
168 Ibid.; Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 56.
169 Lodewyckx, op.cit., 55; see also Paech, Twelve Decades of Grace, passim.
One may postulate that by about 1853 a good number of the 1849-51 arrivals were sufficiently acclimatized to Australian conditions, spoke some English, had prospects of finding permanent work, or had been sufficiently disappointed on the goldfields to settle down more permanently as artisans or small businessmen in Melbourne or (for the majority) to become farmers or rural workers. Thus they were able to realize their dream which had brought them to Victoria: to acquire and work the land.

In and close to the metropolis, several small settlements had rudimentary beginnings prior to the gold discoveries: Dry Creek (also known as Westgarthtown, Kilbundoora, Thomastown; 1850-51), Germantown (Grovedale; 1849), Merri Creek (Northcote, 1851), Hawthorn (1850), Plauen (1850-51)—in the case of Dry Creek with the help of Westgarth’s land purchase at Kilbundoora, and in the case of Germantown, indirectly through Dr Thomson’s counsel and advice. The chaos resulting from the gold discoveries had stunted most further developments, but by 1853-54 several new though small communities began to form. Compared with South Australia, where the presence of family groups and even whole village communities had helped the establishment of strong and permanent village-style communities, that was not the case in Victoria. As an illustration, the ratio of females to males in South Australia between 1851 and 1855 had been 76.5:100, indicating a relatively high prevalence of families. In Victoria it was only 26.1:100.

New settlements, however, were formed on the fringes of the metropolis, at Waldau (Doncaster; 1853), Harkaway (“Berwick”; 1853), Bayswater (late 1850s), and as already noted, near Geelong: in 1849-50 at Germantown (Grovedale) and around 1855 at Waldkirch (Freshwater Creek). A few other very small communities—in some cases of only one, two or three families—also emerged at Plauen (Mill Park), Greensborough and Brunswick. Few of the latter eventually survived.

Among the arrivals between 1849 and 1851, some individuals quite early showed leadership qualities. After their sojourn on the goldfields, some with, others without success, they now came to show their communal spirit in a different form: Gottlieb Thiele as the founder of the village of Waldau and Ernst Wanke of Harkaway, Bernhard Heyne as a newspaper publisher and horticulturalist, and Andreas Kaiser and Anton Markert as leaders instrumental in the eventual formation of a Melbourne

172 Based on the 1856 Census: Borrie, op.cit., 158.
community. For the purposes of studying how settlements evolved, and in some cases eventually lapsed, I will provide brief sketches of some of these. In Chapter Five, I will be able to use some of them as case studies to illustrate their stability, longevity and/or decline.

Before proceeding, it is important to recognize that, unlike most British immigrants who blended seamlessly into the majority population, their ethnic differences—language, religion, social, economic and political attitudes and practices—dictated that Germans remained apart, forming separate groups. Secondly, at this early stage, i.e. until the 1860s, it is quite premature to speak of a true German community. Rather, one may visualize their various settlements as largely isolated islands. Juxtaposing the two terms of settlement and community, the former conveys the idea of randomness, of accident or even convenience. Settlements have no corporate agency, and they rarely convey the idea of purpose or influence. The term community, in contrast, conveys the idea of a collective will, a purpose and even aspirations to gain power. My view is that, at this time, Germans were still engaged in forming settlements whose main function was to give mutual assurance. It was still too early for them to aspire to power or influence, nor were they seeking them. As immigrants, that was the fundamental difference with British immigrants. Germans at this stage existed merely as separate and unconnected social groups.173

Westgarthtown, the first permanent and most successful of the German settlements close to Melbourne, was almost entirely a creation of William Westgarth, who jointly with businessman Captain Stanley Carr had in 1850 purchased a 640-acre block of land on the Dry Creek in the parish of Kilbundoora and subsequently subdivided it and sold it at £1 per acre to a number of settlers who had taken up his invitation to Victoria.174 Sixteen families moved there from the Immigration Barracks in early 1850, and more joined later.175 Many of its leading settlers were Wends, a Slavic tribe long resident in Saxony and neighbouring Brandenburg and Silesia.176 Already survivors in their native Lusatia and Silesia as a minority among Germanic Germans, it was their tenacity and group cohesiveness to which Thomastown owed its long-term survival, although not all of the settlers had Wendish origins. An additional factor was

173 Compare this with British immigrants who found it easy to integrate on account of “the British nature of ... Australia and New Zealand,” Murdoch, British Immigration, 127.
174 “German Immigration Committee,” Geelong Advertiser, March 30, 1850, 2; Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 116.
175 Argus, March 23, 1850.
176 A table indicating origin is given in Chapter 2, Appendix 3.
the strong agricultural performance of Westgarthtown as a leading dairying district, supplying the growing metropolis, in one case even with a specialist city outlet. Lodewyckx observes that its early settlers were a mixture of Mecklenburgers, Saxons and Silesians.

The leading role in the formation of Waldau was taken by Gottlieb Thiele. Already known as a spokesman for his compatriots, and with excellent personal connections with Lieutenant Governor La Trobe, Thiele (later joined by his brother Gottlob) bought a small block of land at Ruffey Creek in 1853, after some success on the goldfields. Though rocky and densely timbered, the land seemed suitable for vegetable and fruit tree culture. The Lutheran broadsheet *Der Pilger in Victoria* in September 1853 noted that a group of German settlers had cooperatively purchased 750 acres and intended to subdivide the land. It was to be called Breslau. Eventually with a Lutheran church, school, and a succession of capable teachers, this community thrived and even survived a partial split of the congregation in 1860. Waldau/Breslau’s survival owed as much to its strong and innovative horticultural tradition as to a particularly amiable relationship with its Anglo-Australian fellow orchardists.

The *Argus* in 1851 refers to a German settlement at Plauen, in the present Mill Park area. However, Darragh and Wuchatsch note that this small settlement of Silesian immigrants faded away by 1860. The same writers also mention small settlements at Greensborough (1852-60), Collingwood, and Richmond where a number of new arrivals lived briefly soon after their arrival. Collingwood and Richmond in particular were convenient places for artisans and tradesmen to access the promising Melbourne markets and building sites, but none of these communities survived beyond the 1860s.

More enduring were settlements at Merri Creek (Northcote) and Hawthorn. Merri Creek/Northcote attracted new arrivals from 1850 onwards, and a number of them over time bought small blocks along and around the present Separation Street, once
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known as German Lane. Unlike Westgarthtown and Waldau, Merri Creek had the advantage of close proximity to the metropolis without the bad road and river obstacles hampering the former. Lodewyckx notes that a number of the settlers at both Merri Creek and Hawthorn were of Wendish or Silesian origin. Though never large enough to allow building a Lutheran church, being so close to the metropolis, Merri Creek served as a transit location for immigrants who would later play a leading role in Melbourne’s life—architect Friedrich Kawerau and brickmaker Andreas Fritsch among them. Although Northcote was already a brickmaking centre, Fritsch (with his partner Holzer) started his illustrious brickmaking career elsewhere before moving to Hawthorn.

Parts of Hawthorn, despite becoming suburbanized relatively early, and soon with a large Anglo majority, also started as a distinctly German settlement in 1850, becoming known as German Paddock, strung along a rural lane known as Weinberg Street that was re-named in World War I. One of its most distinguished early settlers, Christian Finger, became one of the founders of Melbourne’s Lutheran congregation. Harkaway—early records usually refer to it as Berwick (not to be confused with present Berwick)—owed its origin in large part to another community leader, Ernst Gottlob Wanke (1823-97), a former medical student from Berlin. In 1853 he bought a 640 acre block that was subsequently subdivided among a group of former fellow ship mates, and eventually a variety of latecomers of various German backgrounds. Despite the proximity of the nearby rural centre of Dandenong, Harkaway’s relative isolation protected its German character for several decades, helped by its own church, cemetery and school.

At Grovedale, Alexander Thomson, Geelong mayor and major landholder, had indentured ten families of viticulturalists who arrived in 1849 on the Emmy. All of them were successful bounty applicants, unlike most of Westgarth’s—and their success in the Geelong region very likely lured a number of other immigrants to the district. The families soon purchased land—piecemeal but closely adjacent—that soon led to a new village known as Germantown. Lodewyckx points out that most came from Zuellichau, a small town in Brandenburg on the border with Silesia. He claims that here “German language and customs survived much longer than at most other German settlements in
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Victoria.” Nearby, at Waldkirch (Freshwater Creek), another small community formed as the result of a religious rift in the Germantown Lutheran congregation in 1860. The endurance of this small German community, much as that of the larger Germantown, owed a good deal to their relative isolation, but also the strong conservative influence of Old Lutheran religious practices that ruled most of western Victoria.

1.4 The rural invasion from South Australia

Quite separately from the immigrants arriving and settling in and around Melbourne, an overland migration of Germans from South Australia commenced in 1850-51. Portland was already well-known, and several immigrants had started farming in the district prior to 1850. The early immigrants in the neighbouring colony, who arrived between 1838 and about 1841-42 under the auspices of the South Australian Company, were by 1850 well established in a number of distinct villages in the Adelaide Hills, Mt Lofty Ranges and the Barossa Valley. After 1844 Delius re-commenced sending more immigrants to that colony, and by 1850 land suitable for the new arrivals had become scarce. Explorer Major Mitchell had described what eventually became Victoria’s Western District as Australia Felix, and a quite substantial overland movement of South Australian Germans in search of land began soon after 1850, continuing for most of the remainder of the century. It was encouraged by Victoria’s various Lands Acts (of 1862 and especially of 1869) that made available more land that had previously been monopolized by squatters. Initial small settlements near Portland were followed by a larger settlement at the Grange (Hamilton) that soon spread to the Hochkirch (Tarrington) and Gnadenthal (Penshurst) districts. It gradually expanded further north, first into the Wimmera and eventually the Mallee, but Hochkirch became a cultural, religious and commercial centre for several decades. Beside becoming the seat of one of the most influential Lutheran pastors—Pastor Clamor Schuermann—it also contained a bookshop, printing works for the Lutheran journal Der Lutherische Kirchenbote fuer Australien, and various German-owned shops, hotels and businesses.

The local Portland Guardian and Normanby Advertiser regularly reported the arrival of new groups of German settlers. In 1855 it noted “the arrival of a long line of
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about a dozen covered wagons [belonging] to a company of German emigrants arriving overland from Adelaide on their way up to the Grange [i.e. Hamilton].” It welcomed this as “a hopeful sign of the progress in that township when this class of well conducted and industrious emigrants are occupied in farming pursuits in that neighbourhood.” The local bureaucracy was less supportive. When a long-time resident, Gottlob Neander, applied for a hotel licence to provide accommodation “to so many Germans who are now in the district…many of whom cannot speak English…[hoping to be] able to put up at a house…kept by one of their own countrymen,” his application was rejected.

Largely of East-Elbian origins like most of their Melbourne compatriots, many of the South Australian arrivals adhered to a rigid Old Lutheran religious outlook which would separate them from most of the other Germans in the colony. Indeed, religious differences would become and remain the chief divisive force that would ultimately prevent the German community from becoming a united political force.

1.5 Goldminers and adventurers

In 1851 the German population in Victoria, as noted above, was approximately 1,200. After gold was discovered in June that year the rush started. After a delay of one to two years for overseas arrivals, by 1854 the number of Germans had more than trebled to 3,955; by 1857 to 7,814; and by the time of the 1861 census to 10,418. In 1854 37.5 per cent of Victoria’s Germans had moved to the goldfields; by 1857 this number had risen to 60.8 per cent, and by 1861 it was still 59.1. This meant that many of the fledgling German settlements in and around Melbourne had all but been depleted, while Victoria’s German population had been significantly boosted, not only by arrivals from overseas but also by a rush from South Australia and New South Wales. Accommodation and service delivery in Melbourne was in near-chaos.

A German visitor, Dr Georg Bruhn, a medical practitioner and amateur geologist, was partly responsible for the hubbub. In May 1851 at The Clunes station near Buninyong, he had found traces of alluvial gold that ultimately led to his sharing a
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reward with the station owner and an Irish prospector as joint discoverers of payable gold. Today, Bruhn’s claim is still debated by several counter claims.192

The thousands of Germans at the diggings over time included artists like Eugene von Guerard, scientists like Georg Neumayer, photographers like Wilhelm Blandowski and future pioneer settlers like Wanke, Thiele, Kaiser and Heyne. The flood of arrivals posed major problems which La Trobe’s administration did not handle well. The imposition of monthly diggers’ permits caused hardship and many protests. The reputation of docility German immigrants acquired over time was not in evidence on the goldfields. During the miners’ protests in 1853 and 1854 over licence fees, Germans were prominent at the protest meetings. The Herald reported from Bendigo on August 13, 1853 that, while diggers of all nationalities showed their militancy, “the Germans, in particular, seemed determined to come out strong, having ordered some splendid new banners for [the] occasion” (a big protest meeting) at which “German Committee” spokesmen addressed a protest crowd of 10-12,000.193 A year later, at Ballarat, Hanoverian Friedrich Wern was one of the protest leaders. Eventually hunted down and sentenced to imprisonment, he was the only protester thus punished. A hothead, and maligned even by more recent historians including, surprisingly, Geoffrey Serle, who calls him a “German mountebank [who] spouted red republicanism,” he gave Germans a largely undeserved reputation for rebelliousness.194 La Trobe was not the only leading official who over-reacted. He feared that it was the Europeans who were intent on spreading the 1848 revolutionary spirit on the goldfields.195 Serle rightly observes that “Some of the Germans who took part [at the Eureka rebellion at Ballarat the following year] may conceivably have been political refugees.”196 Some former participants of the 1848-49 revolution, including artist Ludwig Becker, scientist Georg Neumayer, writers Robert Oberlaender and Theodor Mueller, and many others, were also on the goldfields at the time and no doubt shared the sympathies of the diggers. But their names are not mentioned among the protest leaders.197 The stockadists at Ballarat—Serle describes
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them as one third French, one third Swedish and one third German—according to gold commissioner Robert Red were “determined men and the greatest scoundrels in the Colony.”

In 1853, captioned “Grievances of the Gold-Diggers; Public Meeting,” Melbourne’s Argus reported on one of the diggers’ protests, providing much detail, especially about La Trobe’s animosity towards the German protesters at the diggings.

When shown a diggers’ petition with 7,000 signatures, he exclaimed “[If] I find the petition is signed by Germans and aliens, it will militate against its force with me.” The Argus reporter was taken aback. Puzzled, he reflected that the Lieutenant-Governor “seemed to have no idea of comprehending, much less of carrying into execution, the enlightened spirit of government and legislation of which he had such an illustrious example in Great Britain.”

Three German miners who participated and were killed at the Eureka rebellion in November 1854 (under the much tougher new Lieutenant Governor Sir Charles Hotham) were former teacher Edward Thonen of Elberfeld, Johann Hafele, a blacksmith from Wuerttemberg, and the youngest of them all, Wilhelm Emmermann, a German from St Petersburg, allegedly decapitated by police lieutenant Richards’ sabre. What is significant is that their activism contrasted with the political inertia which would later characterize Victoria’s German community.

More important still is that it was miners from western Germany who became protest leaders at the diggings. Their numeric share in Victoria’s German community was relatively low, but a good number might have been involved with the 1848-49 revolutions in the western and central parts of Germany, far more so than the East-Elbians. With the exception of Saxony, which had been a centre of fierce revolutionary activity where the rebels were put down with the help of the Prussian army, the revolution in East-Elbia had been muted and lacking in militancy. Apart from that, the revolutionary hotbeds in 1848-49 had mostly been in the west. Goodman makes two important points, first, that the Eureka rebellion had
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strong nationalist overtones, emphasizing citizenship, but that it was also characterized by its internationalist and democratic nature, both in terms of participants and objectives. As already noted above, the strong German participation quite clearly differentiated the “Eureka Germans”—the “revolutionary hotheads,” as Lodewyckx called them—from the majority of their politically passive fellow Germans.203

After the Eureka disaster, Victoria’s Germans were now on the defensive. To counter any possible anti-German backlash and to quash the “rumour that foreigners are or have been the cause of the present riots at Ballarat,” community activist Otto Neuhauss called together a well-attended German community meeting on December 7, 1854, “for the German residents in this colony to make a demonstration showing their zeal and anxiety to assist in any way in the preservation of order and peace in this their adopted country.” The Argus reported the following day that this was fully endorsed, that the press and government insinuations of German support for the riots were unjustified, and furthermore that Germans did not consider themselves as foreigners but “as Australians.”204

The meeting may have appeased the conservative government party, but it was not an impressive demonstration of German solidarity with their wounded and killed compatriots, nor with the miners’ genuine grievances. Almost prescient in how it assessed its compatriots, Australische Monatzeitung in its first issue in 1859 railed against such behaviour, describing it as verknechtet and anschmiegsam (slave-like; ingratiating) and of being indifferent to political reality. It, and another early paper, Kosmopolit, would regularly accuse their compatriots of such reprehensible attitudes.205

Apart from their militancy on the goldfields, the social and educational profile of German diggers differed markedly from that of East-Elbian immigrants elsewhere in Victoria. Serle notes that “the number of well-educated men and skilled artisans who migrated in the fifties was extraordinarily high,” and that the literacy level in Victoria rose markedly above the Australian average and vastly above that in Britain.206 There is strong circumstantial evidence that Germans contributed to this rise, considering their backgrounds. Many of them were young, well-educated, of urban background, and
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mostly from the more advanced north-west and west. In addition to elevating the intellectual level of the colony, their presence threw Victoria’s gender balance further out of sync. While the gold years of 1851-55 caused a dip even in South Australia’s (German) gender balance, declining from its previous 83.0 or higher to 76.5 (i.e. females per 100 males), it was significantly worse in Victoria, where it fell to an all-time low in 1857 of 25.8.207 After returning from the goldfields, many miners with technical trade or agricultural skills either turned to farming, largely in Victoria’s west, or set up shop in Melbourne or some of the gold towns. A number of the well-educated joined Melbourne’s German leadership clique.

1.6 Urban communities

Let us imagine urban Melbourne between 1850 and 1855, seen through German eyes. What would be the obvious and significant signs and sights for them? Thanks to the diligence and meticulous archival researches of Darragh and Wuchatsch, we have access to letters from a number of early arrivals who not only recorded their impressions of their long journey but, more importantly, commented on the life of the emerging German community. Curiously, though most letters date from the early to mid-1850s, their impression of Melbourne was more that of an established town than a frontier town and transit settlement.208

The consensus of almost all letter writers was that learning to speak English seemed to be their highest priority. “He who knows English will be successful,” wrote Michael Zwar.209 Were these the first serious signs of creeping assimilation or of a bi-culturalism demanding rapid adjustments? Not knowing the local language was not only embarrassing, it could be humiliating. Several letters complained that on occasions Germans were underpaid or cheated simply because they didn’t understand.210 Other letters stressed the desirability of acquiring land for the security this provided.211 Andreas Kaiser contrasted the freedom he had found in Australia with the “slave-like existence” in the old country. But as will be found later in this thesis, few of his compatriots would see it his way and seek to participate in the political affairs of their

207 Borrie, Italians and Germans, 159,163,164.
208 The impressions of other contemporary or later visitors to Melbourne may be gleaned from Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, Chapter 3, especially pages 29-38.
209 Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 228.
210 Ibid., 165.
211 See for example Tampke, The Germans in Australia, 89.
new home. All letters referred to the importance of the (Lutheran) church and their desire to establish a community underpinned by spiritual support, helping to overcome the shock of the new and to get on their feet with a pastor for guidance. Most letters accepted that immigrants had to work hard and that Victoria was not a land of milk and honey. They stressed that those possessing good practical skills or trades, or willing to take on jobs that might be demeaning to their expectations—even if only temporarily—would do well. This sums up letters by Ernst Heyne and Andreas Kaiser. Less willing to adapt was Carl Hoehne, whose expectations were greater than the effort he was prepared to make. He regretted coming here, hoping to leave what he called “the English Siberia,” and to return to his native Lusatia as early as possible. He described Melbourne as “a desolate, parched, burnt-up plain” while his former ship-mate Johann Graf called it “a beautiful town.” The reviewer of the book in which Hoehne’s letters were eventually published after his return to his homeland calls him “a man who is not suitable for emigration.” That seems an understatement.

Far more positive and constructive, Adolph Haller, congratulating Lutheran pastor Matthias Goethe on commencing his new journal *Der Pilger in Victoria*, hoped that the journal would be “educating committed citizens of this their new fatherland but avoiding a narrow nationalist attitude.” An almost euphoric endorsement of the boundless freedoms enjoyed by settlers in Victoria comes from the pen of an astute and well-qualified observer, the later undeservedly much maligned Dr Hermann Beckler. Several letter writers praised the hands-on welcome from the Anglo community, its constructive spirit in setting up the German Immigration Society, leasing the Immigration Barracks that accommodated them until they found work and/or bought land, or made their way to the goldfields. But there is another side to the welcome. “The uneducated…see in every German a competitor and blame them for bringing down the workers’ wage,” wrote Eduard Klingauf in 1850. Other letters give a more positive spin on William Westgarth’s role and concern for the welfare of the German
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community than is suggested in some of the contemporary newspaper articles.220 Letters also describe the purposes of the newly formed Deutscher Verein (German association) and its role as a community support structure, a very early Liedertafel (in later years significantly influencing Melbourne’s music scene); and the surprising observation that local Anglo newspapers lacked in political comment.221

The English-language press, while focussing on news from the Diggings, occasionally commented on their German fellow settlers. The arrival of Matthias Goethe, the first permanent Lutheran minister, is noted with approval.222 Over time, Goethe would get fairly frequent mentions, usually positive ones. His ecumenical outlook made him popular beyond his own community, while some of the hardliners in his own church criticized him for this. A successful bridge builder between the two communities and well-known outside his community, he frequently appeared as a guest speaker at non-Lutheran religious or even secular events, as for example in 1855, when he gave a talk to the Collingwood YMCA on “the necessity of the cultivation of the arts in a new country.”223 In later years similar outreach programmes were successfully conducted by other prominent Germans as public speakers or advocates of popular causes like the Burke and Wills Expedition, among them the botanist von Mueller, the Observatory director Neumayer, the scientist and photographer Blandowski, and on several occasions consul Brahe and businessman Julius Pokorny on the importance of engaging in the political affairs of the colony.224

The Age commended the Germans for raising £400 for their own church,225 and their piety was much admired by the Presbyterian Church’s Moderator, Dr Mackay.226 A new German paper was welcomed with the comment that “[T]he numerous and respectable body of Germans resident in this city have started an organ in their own language.”227 Significantly, the larger, more established Anglo-Irish immigrant society had embraced the Germans as a welcome and legitimate junior partner, perhaps, as Dr Gustav Schmidt surmised, because “we Germans by affinity [are] allied to the Saxon
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The widely reported outburst by La Trobe against German diggers had met with strong criticism in the *Argus* which condemned his contemptuous attitude for making dismissive comments like “they had very much to be thankful for being in Victoria.”

As noted earlier, almost half of the colony’s Germans were found at the diggings, and by the late 1850s this had risen to around sixty per cent. This did not mean that still-growing small German settlements became entirely depleted, but rather that the stream of immigrants from overseas, South Australia and New South Wales bypassed them and headed for the diggings. The growth of Melbourne’s German community, and the development of the smaller German settlements, slowed down but was not halted. The demand for labour in Melbourne was huge and qualified artisans as well as smart traders did well. Thus, the 1851 *Victoria Directory* lists a number of the recent arrivals who had resisted the lure of gold. Here we find the names of Julius Gumbinner, tobacco merchant, Moritz Hahn, architect, Carl Hoehne, labourer, Ernst Ziesche, shoe maker—all passengers of Westgarth’s Godeffroy ships. Moritz Michaelis, who arrived in 1853, found a town in chaos: all of Emerald Hill (South Melbourne) was a canvas town. Ernst Beer, an 1854 arrival, confirms Michaelis’ account. What is surprising is that no visible German urban community emerged, either then or later, that mirrored the small rural settlements on the periphery of the metropolis, let alone the dense urban settlements that became almost typical in the U.S. and Brazil. The closest to what might be called urban centres, albeit only briefly and not very large, showed up in the larger goldmining centres of Ballarat and Sandhurst. For Melbourne’s Germans, their communal spirit and neighbourliness would be expressed by their involvement with their Lutheran churches and the various clubs and associations they formed—which scarcely differed from those in America and Brazil—rather than by living cheek by jowl with their compatriots.

1.7 The mid-1850s: community, diaspora, or merely a scattering of German-speakers?
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By the mid-1850s, with a population of 70-80,000, Melbourne was a big city by international standards, though Germans made up only a tiny fraction of approximately 1.6% per cent.\(^{233}\) Their number would have been below 1,500. Even a few years later, in 1859, *Melbourner Deutsche Zeitung* estimated their number in the metropolis at only 1,742.\(^{234}\) There was no German quarter as one could find in many Mid-West and East Coast locations in the U.S., or in the southern states of Brazil. In the capital, Germans lived dispersed—only in the German villages on Melbourne’s periphery was settlement more compact. Elsewhere, perhaps one thousand or more were scattered across the rest of the colony, including a few hundred in the villages near Melbourne, a few more in the villages and rural hamlets in the west, and the rest in the gold districts. According to Manz’s definition, Victoria’s Germans did not constitute a diaspora, not solely because of their small number. Were they inclined to ever become one?\(^{235}\) This will be one of the themes in the following chapter.

The three or four scattered groups—those in and near Melbourne, the goldfields, and the Western District villages—formed little more than an *imagined community*.\(^{236}\) But there were clear indicators of a growing connectedness. At this early stage, it was the Lutheran church that would strive to hold them together and act as the agent of unity. Its monthly newsheet, *Der Australische Christenbote*, would connect the various German groups and settlements. As early as 1853, Lutheran pastor Matthias Goethe (in *Der Pilger in Victoria*) had promised that he intended “to promote German-Australian citizenship.”\(^{237}\) Later in the decade, a small but vibrant German press would make its appearance to widen the scope of information and debate. However, at this stage it was only the church that served as a focus, a unifier, and a cultural anchor. Until 1852, Lutheran services had been read by several lay readers in a borrowed church, the Independent Church in Melbourne’s Collins Street, made available through the generosity of its Scottish minister, the Reverend Alexander Morison. Ernst Wanke, the future founder of Harkaway, was the first of several lay readers, followed by several temporary pastors. It was Goethe’s appointment in late 1852 that consolidated the church for the longer term, and I will argue, with it the German community.

\(^{233}\) *Kosmopolit* 22 (January 30, 1857); Funk, *Die ersten hundert Jahre*, 114 and Note 108.

\(^{234}\) Funk, op.cit., 26 and Note 7.

\(^{235}\) Manz’s ideas will receive closer examination in Chapter 2.

\(^{236}\) Benedict Anderson’s theory about imagined communities will be discussed in Chapter 2.

\(^{237}\) *Der Pilger in Victoria* 1 (1853), 1.
Goethe’s was in every respect a fortuitious appointment. Tall, articulate and personable, he spoke English fluently. A native of the *enlightened* Rhineland, and until recently a teacher at Sydney’s Australian College—to which the Reverend J.D. Lang had headhunted him—in outlook he was ecumenical and able to network across ethnic lines. His persuasiveness secured a site for his church on Eastern Hill, and he applied successfully for government aid to inaugurate several Congregational schools. He also brought his large congregation into closer contact with all the other majority congregations. Unfortunately, in the long run, he was unable to hold together his own. The centrifugal force of Old Lutheranism that held sway in the West would disunite his congregation along doctrinal lines for almost a century.

### 1.8 Conclusion

The scope of this chapter is extensive. It ranges from an overview of the complex political and economic situation in various German territories during the first half of the nineteenth century, to the massive exodus of emigrants to overseas destinations that occurred from mid-century onwards. Since a significant proportion of immigrants to Victoria came from East-Elbia, the economic and political situation in that district has received special attention, followed by an examination of their emigration to, and settlement in, the Colony of Victoria. The chapter examined and analyzed the complexities of emigration, and the psychological, economic and political factors accompanying the trauma of leaving their homelands and emigrating to a distant overseas destination. It explored the vast range of factors involved in the emigration process and the transition from home to host, like the role of shipping companies, of emigration agents, of books, newssheets and letters advising for or against emigration, of welcoming parties at the destination like Melbourne’s German Immigration Committee. Upon arrival, the equally complex situation encountered in settling, in hoping for success on the goldfields, and in acquiring land was explored. Parallel to the direct immigration prior to the gold discoveries, the chapter also considered German immigration from South Australia to Western Victoria, and the arrival of gold-seekers after 1851. These two immigration waves added to the complexity of my investigation of how the German community evolved by the mid-1850s.

In reaching this point in my investigation, it is tempting to rush ahead and find a unifier that moves fast-forward to combine, indeed summarize, all aspects of this immigrant community’s further progress, including foreshadowing the eventual
outcome/s. However, that would be misguided and premature. The present chapter is merely an introduction to the chronology of a long and complex process, during which immigrants are gradually turned into settlers, and eventually into German-Australians and citizens. The chapter ends when German immigrants were still struggling as individuals, aiming to establish themselves. Forming a viable community was still a thing of the future. However, there were already some early signs drawing attention to the investigation to follow in later chapters. Pastor Goethe’s promise to the effect of maintaining the German nationality while also encouraging Australian citizenship (1853), Wendish immigrant Andreas Kaiser’s hope that Germans “might be freed from [the] slavery” they experienced in their homeland and to “live as a free man under the English [i.e. Australian] government” (1853), 238 Dr Gustav Schmidt’s “endeavours… aimed at promoting feelings of fraternity among our German settlers as well as towards our noble-minded English colonists” (ca.1853), 239 and Hermann Beckler’s celebration of the spirit of freedom all point at future directions. 240 However, even by the mid 1850s it became clear that beside their industriousness, their many gifts, their willingness to face uncertainty and hardships, and their ethnic uniqueness they also brought with them ignorance and prejudices, which would divide them and weaken their status.

A number of questions asked in this chapter are not given immediate answers. It is up to the following chapters to provide acceptable explanations. Important among these questions are whether German immigrants came to Australia to change the world as they had previously known it. Did they perhaps merely dream of re-creating a problem-free, idealized historical past? Were they prepared to abandon their old prejudices, calling their old values in question or at least re-assessing them, by adapting to new sets of traditions and values? 241 Did their emerging communities aim at preserving a separate cultural identity, or were they happy to succumb to the norms of the host country? And how did their own German-language press see their situation? Did its perception differ from that of the Anglo press? It will be the task of later chapters to provide answers. 242

238 Darragh and Wuchatsch, From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay, 243.
239 Ibid., 234-5.
240 Voigt, “The Australian Experience of a German Doctor,” 76-81, passim.
241 See Kamphoefner, News from the Land of the Free, vii.
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Chapter Two
The early German community and its institutions, 1855-70

2.1 Introduction: focus and definitions

Following an overview of German history in the nineteenth century and the reasons for the large-scale emigration to overseas destinations including Australia, the first chapter briefly summarized how Germans settled in Victoria following three different immigration waves. Each wave was followed by the formation of small German settlements.

The present chapter will focus on these settlements, their origins, operation, and structure, how they projected themselves to the broader Anglo-Australian community, but also whether they endured and why. Based on a variety of sources, including local and church histories, personal accounts, English and German language newspaper reports, and local and overseas studies of community formation, the observations in this chapter on the relative strength and resilience of rural versus urban communities will ultimately constitute the basis of my findings in the final chapter.

After defining various key concepts, this chapter will explore whether the diversity, and especially the physical and ideological separation of German settlement groups, constituted a “true” community. A number of historians have attempted to elucidate the complexities of social structures that are variously described as community, enclave, diaspora, ethnic group, expatriate minority, and similar. The interpretations of all of these writers show significant differences. Stefan Manz for example views a diaspora—he chooses not to use the term community—as a dynamic structure involving internal and transnational links.\(^1\) The ideas of another writer, Benedict Anderson, can be interpreted as suggesting communities are more static bodies, distinguishable more “by the style in which they are recognized.”\(^2\) Other writers contribute different views again, all of them drawing attention to the social and anthropological complexities and differences that may be represented by a group of immigrants.

In *The Construction of Cultural Identity: Germans in Melbourne* (2007), Buchanan defines a community simply as a group with significant distinguishing characteristics that separate it from other putative groups.\(^3\) She notes significant
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\(^1\) Manz, *Constructing a German Diaspora*, 50-1.
\(^3\) Buchanan, *The Construction of Cultural Identity*, 16.
differences between individual members, but also the importance of symbols common
to all, such as mode of speech, body language, general demeanour and dress. Henderson
(1983), also focussed on German-Australia, examines the distinction between
assimilation and integration and how their respective outcomes are perceived in
government practice. He concludes that a community exists solely in relation to others,
a contrastive distinguishing quality, acquired rather than inherent, indicating how others
see one and contrasting this with how one sees oneself.4 O’Donnell (2005) and others,
more global in their views, note the “tenacious and separate group ethnic identity” that
was maintained by German immigrants in certain host countries in Latin America and
Russia, contrasting them with similar groups in North America.5 This thesis will
compare this with the Victorian scene. Kuehlmann (2007), exploring the term “in der
Fremde” (in a strange/ unknown place), notes the tendency of German emigrant groups
to retain identity by regional concentration.6

Walker Connor (1986) introduces the term diaspora. He views members of any
diaspora as outsiders despite their multi-generational presence. Though they may be
treated well, they are always at the mercy of the host country should it exercise its
“primary or exclusive proprietary right.”7 Robin Cohen (1999) claims an almost
exclusivist right to the term diaspora for Jews and Africans, on the grounds of having
been driven from their homelands. Other writers do not always accept such a restrictive
use. Cohen names the commonness of language, religion, cultural heritage and
achievements, idealization of the ancestral home, strong group consciousness and the
self-perception of victimhood, a troubled relationship with the host country and a
common fate (both past and present) as principal characteristics. To this he adds an
empathy with other disadvantaged groups, and the longing for a return to the
homeland.8 Clifford (1999) notes that the concept of diaspora over time has
significantly broadened. He defines it as “a larger semantic domain that includes words
like immigrant, expatriate, refugee, guest-worker, exile-community, overseas
community, ethnic community.”9 In addition to Cohen’s core factors, he notes the

4 Henderson, “Die Deutschsprachigen in Melbourne,” Chapter 1, Einleitung (introduction) and 3-30, passim, especially 4,7,14-16,22. In Chapter Five, Henderson’s deliberations help in making a connection with a specific Australian attitude during World War I.
6 Kuehlmann, Deutsche in der Fremde, 9. Other writers, e.g. Luebke, Germans in Brazil, and Rippley, “The Ethnic Frontier,” make similar comments.
tenuousness of the group’s existence, i.e. its being merely tolerated by the host country, but also its resistance to some of the host country’s norms. Walker Connor’s and Clifford’s findings take a global view, while Cohen is principally concerned with communities of forcibly displaced Jewish and African persons. Manz (2014), investigating the German diaspora world-wide, while endorsing most of Cohen’s concepts, insists that only a formal trans-national connection between the ethnic community and the home country warrants the ascription of diaspora. By this he means a regular two-way interchange between the migrant community and a defined nation, in the case of Germany, the Reich after 1870 but not the Confederation or the particular states prior to unification. Thus, he implies that the status of the German community prior to 1870 was merely that of an emigrant group. He also makes a major distinction between Germans abroad (Auslandsdeutsche), whom he sees as agents of the homeland, and German-Australians, German-Americans, etc., viewed as de facto “lost” members, whom the Reich may attempt to re-incorporate as “co-nationals.” Finally, Stoljar, in an essay on the German-language press in Australia, holds that as their leaders had gone over to the English language “the sense of a coherent German community diminished.”

Summarizing, despite being diffuse in its meaning, my use of the term community will define an almost natural concept of how displaced persons ultimately normalized their lives, coalesced, and evolved a new identity. This not only applies to Germans, but any group of displaced persons. In attempting to accommodate Benedict Anderson’s influential though controversial views that “all communities…are imagined,” my view is that despite physical separation, sometimes extreme diversity and contradictory perceptions of some of its agents and members, the German community always saw, felt and perceived itself as “real” despite its fragmented appearance.

What the opinions by these experts acknowledge is the diversity of characteristics and functions that applies to all, even small, communities which, like larger organizations, are complex social structures because of the variety of their concerns. These include the act of sharing—of land and neighbourhood; of activities and interests like involvement with church, schools, clubs or associations after creating
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11 Manz, Constructing a German Diaspora, 50-1.
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or maintaining some of these; or simply a common desire to come together, socialize, speak in the native language, make or share music. All these activities engender interrelationships, and they emphasize common concerns that unite persons and generate group or community feelings and actions.¹⁴

However, my argument is that these scholarly views pose a dilemma. My perception is that communities appear to be presented as more static than they are. Too little consideration seems to be given how and why communities were formed, including the process of formation, nor what their principal aims were, how they adjusted to needs, dealt with conflict, or even how they functioned in unifying groups that were separated by geography, ideology or religion. Even more importantly, they do not clarify how and whether communities sought access to power, and if so, how it was attained and exercised. The purpose of this thesis is to address these important questions.

The greater part of this chapter will briefly describe and analyze various German communities—first rural, then urban—with brief histories of all but examining some in greater detail, particularly those with special characteristics and those impacting more significantly on the wider community. The structure, role and resilience of rural and urban communities, respectively, is one of the principal themes of this thesis. This theme, to be progressively explored here and in the following chapters, starts with definitions and investigations of the social and political relationship between rural and urban communities, their differences and respective roles, the institutions and structures created by or serving them, such as societies, clubs, and religious organizations, especially those linked to the Lutheran church. This will include a discussion of the role of the church and certain religious ideas and dogmas, without which an understanding of its seminal role is not possible. An introductory study of the German press in this chapter will be re-visited and concluded in Chapter Five.

In this chapter, a hypothesis about the durability of rural and urban communities is introduced. Detailed discussion and tests, however, will be reserved to later chapters. That discussion will be guided inter alia by Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis.
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¹⁴ In German the closest equivalent to the English word community is Gemeinschaft, and it is uncanny that the etymology of the root word ein = one, to be one, to be unique, to be united, forms the stem of a range of related concepts like Gemeinde=community, village; Kirchgemeinde=congregation, members of a church community; Gemeinschaft=community, company; Einheit=union, unity; unification; Verein=club, association, interest group. My study of the literature suggests that the etymological nexus is culturally significant. To Germans all these concepts are closely linked and it seems, more so than the English equivalents village, congregation, community, union, association, etc., would be to English speakers.
and Rippley’s interpretation, but will also consider ideas more closely related to Australia by reference to articles by Rushbrook, Spennemann, Bodi and others. A small survey aimed at determining the stability of one particular rural community will be included.\textsuperscript{15} By their very nature, communities connect, protect, inform, engage and hold together their members. This occurs largely through subsidiary structures as well as church and press. The discussion of their history, function, and connections within and without the community will occupy most of the second part of this chapter.

\subsection{Rural communities}

The rationale of commencing with an investigation of rural communities is not to prove that rural communities are less complex than their urban equivalents, but rather that they appear to be more visible, more cohesive, more permanent and focused on self-preservation, and more alike when comparing them to each other, or even to rural communities in Germany. Numerically they dominated. Borrie’s figure of 36.9 per cent for urban communities in Victoria (1861) may appear rather too high, but it indicates that roughly two-thirds of the community were rural dwellers.\textsuperscript{16} In a wider sense, statistics almost propel German settlers into the foreground. They document that German immigrants, more than any other ethnic group, had a unique preference for settling in the countryside. Even in 1921, when 39 per cent of the Australian-born population lived in rural areas, 54.1 per cent of German-born, but only 22.2 per cent of British-born and 30 per cent of all other European-born did likewise.\textsuperscript{17} Buhle and Georgakas observe that while urban communities often overextended by forming a multiplicity of associations and thus weakening their effectiveness, rural communities adopted a far simpler paradigm. “Form[ing] their new institutions around their churches” ensured strength and endurance, they note.\textsuperscript{18} Despite their seemingly lesser diversity, I will seek to prove that rural communities were more enduring, and that their long-term impact may have been greater. It may be tempting to succumb to Tampke’s glib assertion that rural communities were “bastions of political conservatism,” and


\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{16} Borrie, \textit{Italians and Germans}, 164-5. Incidentally, this proportion also applied in Brazil while the reverse applied in America. Luebke, “Images of German Immigrants,” 208.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{17} McPhee, “Australia: its Immigrant Population,” 177.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{18} Buhle, \textit{The Immigrant Left}, 46.}
Despite appearances, such assertions can and will be challenged later in this thesis. 19 Even if coming from different regions of German-speaking lands, as was the case in Victoria, immigrants often formed links on shipboard. That subsequently led them to settle in close proximity, form villages, associations, share in practising their religion, socialize more closely with each other, inter-marry, and conduct their lives that often relied on support from one another. 20 Such relations were quite distinct from the roles played by regular friends or neighbours; they often established more permanent bonds. Friendships formed on board often resulted in joint settlement after disembarking, or alternatively, of coming together again after one or several years after becoming more familiar with the lie of the land, or as was often the case at that time, after seeking their fortunes on the goldfields. Unlike South Australia or Queensland, chain migration played only a minor role.

Charles Price, historian and demographer, writing about German rural communities in South Australia (1945), observed that “it might have seemed [as if] a little piece of Silesia had suddenly taken wings and flown complete and undisturbed to a new land many thousands of miles away.” 21 American historian Nielsen (1977) speaks of “transplanting,” implying continuity of a traditional lifestyle. 22 This suggests that German immigrants, having fulfilled their desire to acquire their own plot of land, did not wish to change the world as they had previously known it. They merely hoped to re-create their former lives with little change, except for the freedom and greater security they had found.

How may we describe a typical German rural community in an Australian context? An 1853 letter by Pastor Clamor Schuermann, addressed to the Colonial Secretary, gives a clue:

It is their [i.e. the German settlers at the Grange 23] wish to settle, if not in a body, at least within such distance of each other as to be able to form a religious community, that is to say to be within reach of Church and School. The religious well-being of the applicants depends entirely on their ability to settle so near to
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19 Tampke, The Germans, 90.
20 See also Spennemann, “Keeping it in the Family,” passim.
21 Price, German Settlers, 13-14.
22 Nielsen, In Search of a Home, 22.
23 The Grange, now Hamilton, was the centre of the earliest major settlement in Western Victoria (1852-3).
each other so as to be able to have a common place of worship as they are precluded from profiting by English Churches or Chapels as much by diversity of principle as of language.24

Apart from the desire for exclusivity and physical and spiritual separateness conveyed in the words “precluded from profiting...by diversity of principle as of language,” Schuermann’s letter is loaded with other meanings: the immigrants’ need to be physically close to each other (reassurance, security); adjacent land by implication suggests cooperation (economics); unhindered exercise of their common religion (spiritual comfort); the importance of education (schools). One may dispute Schuermann’s motive: was this the genuine wish of the community, or was it the pastor’s concealed desire to keep his flock close together so as to ensure his control? Several instances document that Schuermann, despite his limited income, purchased strategically located blocks of land adjacent to land already occupied by Germans which he later resold, at cost, to newcomers, always with a view of tying-together and strengthening his congregation.25 His letter also suggests other benefits including cohesion and stability—tantamount to a desire for survival. Lodewyxckx speaks of a natural inclination of rural Germans to stay together.26

Before examining the emergence of various settlements, we must establish how they came about, and whether accident or deliberate design played a role. In the latter case, what reasons, persons, or issues were instrumental in these processes? The first chapter examined the roles of William Westgarth, the German Immigration Committee he headed for some time, and some natural leaders from among the recent German arrivals. The names of steerage class immigrants Gottlieb Thiele and Gottlob Wanke, and cabin class arrivals Schroetteringk and Brahe, were mentioned. Leadership (by participants rather than outsiders) was an important ingredient for the successful formation of settlements. It required human relations skills and tact but also a certain empathy (“insider knowledge”), because the East-Elbian tradition of blind obedience to authority was gradually disintegrating within the group.

24 Quoted Huf, Courage, Patience and Persistence, 23 and Note 23.
26 Lodewyxckx speaks of the “Neigung der deutsch-australischen Kolonisten, meistens von Haus aus Kleinbauern, nicht allzu weit voneinander entfernt zu wohnen.” Lodewyxckx, op.cit., 71; see also Sowell, Migration and Culture, 72-8, passim.
In close proximity to Melbourne, German rural communities came into existence at Kilbundoora, Waldau, Berwick, Merri Creek, Hawthorn, Richmond, and several other locations, as outlined in Chapter One. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the population of Kilbundoora/Westgarthtown and Waldau had become fairly stable by the late 1850s. Their homogeneity, indicating a common regional origin of the inhabitants (a mix of neighbouring Upper Lusatia, Lower Silesia and south-east Brandenburg), doubtlessly added to this stability. For Westgarthtown, local directories reveal few names of newcomers after 1854, when the number of resident Germans had grown from the original sixteen families to just over 150 souls.\(^\text{27}\) Surrounding farmland had been taken up, and a community had formed around a newly built church and Lutheran school. Whether by consensus or firm leadership, their ongoing governance seemed settled. At the start, the German Immigration Committee would have given support and advice, and after the arrival of Pastor Goethe in 1853, so would the Lutheran church. The informal German community of Melbourne, still fairly unstructured, also gave support through two (short-lived) institutions, a Deutscher Verein (German Association, 1850) and a sickness benefit association, the Krankenkasse. After the re-constitution of the Deutscher Verein in 1856, it would also be supportive.\(^\text{28}\)

Merri Creek showed both general growth and unusual fluctuations of its German population.\(^\text{29}\) That seemed to confirm its role as a transit settlement, and unlike Westgarthtown and Waldau, it never developed the character and appearance of a distinct German village, despite the at times relatively large number of German residents, its popularity for the annual picnics held by Melbourne’s Turnverein (Gymnastics Club), its proximity to the metropolis, and having its own “German Cemetery.”\(^\text{30}\) Even more fluid German populations characterized Richmond and Hawthorn, where the proportion of Anglo settlers was steadily encroaching on their district, eventually outnumbering the small German population.\(^\text{31}\)

---

\(^\text{27}\) Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 117-8.
\(^\text{28}\) In general, the name of German institutions as well as frequently used German words will only be italicized on first mention, with translations given in brackets.
\(^\text{29}\) As Northcote was only gazetted as a town in 1890, useful census information is not available before that time. Sands & McDougall’s Directory shows a small growth of the number of Germans between 1870 and 1900, but their numbers are dwarfed by those for Angles. Lemon in *The Northcote Side of the River* indicates a total population of 597 in the 1850s, over 1,000 in the ‘60s, and 3,000 in the ‘80s (all males) (Lemon, pages 50,55,98, respectively). According to the 1901 census the number of German-born was 77 (Lemon, 178), but the number of burials at the “German Cemetery” in Separation Street (formerly German Lane) in the preceding half-century suggests a somewhat larger number.
\(^\text{30}\) Lemon, op.cit., 63.
\(^\text{31}\) Lodewyckx, *Das Deutschtum*, 4; Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., 129-33, *passim.*
Berwick’s (Harkaway’s) new arrival patterns display different features. A survey of surnames that are distinctly different from those of the Westgarth-sponsored group suggests that many later arrivals had not come from East-Elbia, thus giving its population profile a more trans-regional character compared with Westgarthtown or Waldau (see Appendix 7). Despite its own church and Lutheran school, it showed signs of “ethnic decline” relatively early, regardless of its economic viability.32

The strength of most of these settlements was based on small-acreage animal husbandry, mixed farming and horticulture, as at Westgarthtown and Berwick, both of which developed a quite lucrative cottage dairy trade. Waldau struggled until its fruit trees came into production. For some years it had to rely on horticultural produce from the settlers’ gardens, and supplying firewood to the metropolis, the result of clearing their blocks.33 Westgarthtown, Waldau and for a time Berwick appeared to remain isolated from their Anglo neighbourhoods, as shown by names and numbers of the residents—contrasting with some of the settlements closer to the centre of the metropolis. Anglo holdings eventually grew on the periphery of core German settlements without intruding.

As from 1853, all the German settlements were served by a single Lutheran pastor (Matthias Goethe), this helped to retain a sense of connectedness with each other as well as with the city congregation. When, later in the 1850s, more Germans arrived, often on the rebound from the gold districts, or late goldseekers arriving from overseas, we can observe developments similar to South Australia. Thus, when land for farming became scarce, rural expansion led to the formation of a new settlement at Scoresby (Bayswater) and, from the late 1860s, a small migration to Gippsland. The latter, however, did not result in new German settlements but merely a series of small family clusters.34

The relative stability of the “Melbourne villages” can be attributed to the stabilizing role of the Lutheran church, the common regional origin of settlers (except Berwick), and the opportunity to provide essential goods and services meeting the needs

32 The church was dedicated on August 12, 1860; the school in the mid-1850s. Christenbote 7 (July 1860), 33; Funk, “Die ersten un ort ja re,” Notes 53,54.
33 Collyer, The Thiele Family, 35; see also Green, The Orchards of Doncaster, passim.
34 Though unconnected with the Lutheran church (but consistently supported) were the Moravian mission stations at Ramahyuck near Sale in Gippsland and Ebenezer near Dimboola. Administered by the Presbyterian Church, Ramahyuck’s missionaries and teachers were Germans sent by the Moravian mission centre at Herrnhut, Saxony, while Ebenezer was directly controlled by Herrnhut. Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 55 and “Die Missionare der Bruedergemeine,” 149-53. Small groups of Germans settled on the fringes of Ramahyuck, at Jingellic, Tyers, Willowgrove and later Walhalla, Bairnsdale and Orbost. See also Jensz, German Moravian Missionaries.
of the growing metropolis. Their intensive farming practices on very small allotments, prudent management, with the entire family chipping in, provided foodstuffs (especially meat, vegetable and dairy products), firewood, later fruit (Waldau), cheese (Berwick), milk and cream (Kilbundoora) to the metropolis and its hinterland.\textsuperscript{35}

2.2.1 Germantown

Victoria’s first truly German “village” was Germantown (Grovedale), established in 1849. Because it developed into what seems almost a template for an archetypal German community, I will examine and analyze it in greater detail as it presents a case study more complex than the Melbourne villages.\textsuperscript{36} Almost purpose-built by a ten-family group of vinegrowers specially indentured from Brandenburg, a strong village very quickly emerged. A solid rural economy soon developed, based on viticulture, horticulture, small-scale animal husbandry and a thriving carrier business. With a major urban centre (Geelong) only six kilometres away and the food and service demands of Geelong and the nearby goldfields, it became a magnet for follow-up immigrants. Over time, it also became a German population interchange comparable with Melbourne.

Analysis of biographical information of residents, based on lists provided by Phelan in \textit{The Geelong Germans} (1993), shows continuous population movements in and out of the Geelong region and Germantown itself: movements to, and in a few cases from, the Western district settlements of Victoria, to the Wimmera (from the early 1870s), and a small movement to Gippsland. The inward movement of several well-defined non-East-Elbian immigrant groups will be given special attention.\textsuperscript{37}

Germantown’s life as the first German village in the Port Phillip District began in 1849. In December 1849, the \textit{Geelong Advertiser} announced the arrival of Germans in the district, mostly passengers of the Godeffroy sailer \textit{Emmy}:

\begin{quote}
The batch of German immigrants consigned to Dr Thomson…arrived in Geelong on Thursday afternoon…The number, exclusive of children, appeared
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{35}The following sources were consulted for the preceding section: Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 53-55, \textit{passim}, 67; Collyer, \textit{The Thiele Family}, \textit{passim}; Darragh and Wuchatsch, \textit{From Hamburg, passim}; Beaumont, \textit{Early Days of Berwick, passim}; Wehner, \textit{Heimat Melbourne}, Chapter 3, “Marvellous Melbourne,” 25-45, \textit{passim}. Though referring to the Western District and somewhat later (1867), an article in the \textit{Australasian} notes that, though Germans were “slow,” their farming practices were deliberate, careful, focussed, “steady and persevering,” and instantly recognizable on account of their methodical approach on miniature farming blocks. “The Farm and Station,” \textit{Australasian}, February 16, 1867, 24.

\textsuperscript{36}See also article “German Immigration,” \textit{Argus}, March 7, 1850, 2.

\textsuperscript{37}Phelan, \textit{The Geelong Germans, passim}. See also Appendix 4.
to be somewhere about twenty. Dr T., it is said, intends to make an effort to
establish a German village in the neighbourhood of the town.38

This group fitted the bounty criteria by virtue of being vigneronst, purpose-indentured by
Geelong mayor and landholder Alexander Thomson to establish a viticulture industry.
Dr Thomson must have admired the successful operation of early vineyards established
by Swiss settlers in the nearby Barrabool Hills in around 1842. In an 1848 article, the
Rudolstadt Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung had mentioned the Swiss vigneronst, and
it is possible that some of the Germans in Dr Thomson’s party knew of this local
industry; they might even have seen the article.39 Many of the ten settler families hailed
from Zuellichau in Brandenburg. This and the neighbouring province of Lower Silesia
had been winegrowing districts since the thirteenth century. Several later arrivals to the
district also possessed viticultural skills, though they were not bounty passengers.

Viticulture became a thriving industry around Geelong, eventually extending as far as
Bendigo. It collapsed when the outbreak of phylloxera in 1875 destroyed most of the
vineyards in the Geelong area.40

The ten families from the Emmy were soon joined by a regular stream of other
Germans, including a number of Wends.41 Many also hailed from Zuellichau, Crossen
and other Brandenburg villages on either side of the River Oder, suggesting this was not
accidental Nachwanderung (follow-up migration) but one of the few clear instances of
chain migration in Victoria.

Soon a school (1854), manse (1855) and a Lutheran church (1858-9) were
established.42 Lutheran services were held by lay readers, while Melbourne’s Pastor
Goethe made occasional visits. In 1855 a former Queensland missionary, Pastor
Haussmann, became their pastor, serving also the small clusters of German settlerst at
nearby Mt Duneed, the Barrabool Hills, Batesford and Geelong.43 Geelong, only six
kilometres to the east—Heyne makes the exaggerated claim it was “a town of over
12,000 inhabitants”—provided employment opportunities for those not engaged in

38 Geelong Advertiser, December 29, 1849, 2; “German Immigration,” Argus, December 26, 1849, 2 and March 7,
1850, 2; “Shipping Intelligence,” Argus, December 22, 1849, 2.
39 “Australia Felix: Landreise von Portland nach Melbourne,” Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung 22 (May 29, 1848),
345-46.
40 Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 73-4.
41 Ibid., 54.
42 Paech, Twelve Decades, 185.
43 Ibid.
farming or horticulture. But as the *Geelong Advertiser* reported, some people were seen begging because they could find no work, despite the fact that elsewhere it was reported that “they appeared [to be] a most respectable class of persons.” Was this due to their inability to speak English? Did the community exclude some of its members from its protective umbrella? It questions Lodewyckx’ claim that the size and strength of the village protected its people, apart from ensuring they could retain their German language and customs longer than elsewhere.

Unfortunately, before long Germantown became the locus of a militant religious schism that undermined the cohesion of the village. In Victoria, religious disunity first surfaced in 1856. At that time Melbourne’s pastor, Matthias Goethe, commenced discussions towards formalizing the organization of the church in Victoria, which would eventually become the Victorian Lutheran Synod (ELSV). Complex and lengthy discussion with the Old Lutheran dominated South Australian synod (ELSA) ensued over the next few years, aimed at creating a unified Lutheran church. However, these talks eventually failed. Over time, the disagreements resulted in a great deal of bitterness and resentment between the two synods.

Germans “were God-fearing, frugal, hardworking, and, so long as they did not differ on matters of doctrine, they worked together in a way which did much to help their success,” writes Kiddle. But matters of doctrine eventually did come to a head. In 1862 the community split, and as a result, two rival pastors came to minister to two halves of the former congregation. One of them was the official appointee of the ELSV, the other represented part of the congregation with Old Lutheran (ELSA) sympathies. The outcome was that the ELSA pastor (Jacobsen) retained the church (Trinity) and part of the congregation, which eventually also absorbed a smaller congregation at nearby Waldkirch (Freshwater Creek), while the ELSV pastor, Hermann Herlitz, served the other half, Geelong and other smaller local congregations. For years Herlitz was forced to hold services in the Lutheran school or at the homes of members until another church could be built (St Paul’s, 1870). After Jacobsen’s departure the Hochkirch

---

46 Lodewyckx notes that unlike many other settlements in Victoria, Germantown retained a distinctive German character until World War I: Lodewyckx, *Die Deutschen*, 54. See also Phelan, *The Geelong Germans*, passim.
47 Argus, May 17, 1856, 4.
49 *Festsc rit zum An erken an* ie... *Ju el eier*, 17-19; Paech, *Twelve Decades*, 185,187.
(Tarrington) pastor, Clamor Schuermann, made the occasional 200-kilometre journey to preach to the Trinity and Waldkirch parishioners. For many years these two rival congregations co-existed almost side-by-side in this small community, never sharing services nor sympathies, and standing almost as symbols for the religious disunity in Victoria per se. A similar split took place at Waldau at much the same time, except here the ELSA sympathizers, led by Gottlieb Thiele, chose to secede and go their own way without also destroying the entire community. The religious discord, a fundamental flaw of Victoria’s German community that had been imported, unchanged, from their homelands, continued to afflict and disunite it for almost a century.\(^{50}\) As the very astute travel writer Albert Heising remarked about his countrymen as early as 1853, disunity was ever-present, for “wherever Germans may find themselves, disunity sticks to their very shoe soles.”\(^{51}\)

An analysis of Germantown’s population reveals that by the late 1850s its original composition of predominantly East-Elbian immigrants was gradually supplemented by four other small groups, largely returning from the diggings. They represented another instance of (albeit minor, internal) chain migration that, unlike South Australia, was generally atypical for Victoria. These included a number of persons originally from Holstein and the region north of Hamburg; another group of Germans also from outside East-Elbia; a smaller group, arriving singly, of Jews, originally from various non-East-Elbian districts of Germany; as well as some non-Germans, largely English.\(^{52}\) What makes this interesting is that, while Germantown’s population became less homogenous, it continued to function as a magnet for Germans. It has to be assumed that the thriving economy of Germantown had become known through reports in German and English-language newspapers. The Geelong Advertiser observed that “Germantown presents...a picture of prosperity.”\(^{53}\) Most of the new arrivals stayed, settled as farmers, and about half intermarried with locals. The Jews largely transited, moved on and either settled at Geelong or eventually other more urban centres, as merchants, money changers or businessmen, but none as agriculturalists. What seems quite evident is that Germantown, like most other rural settlements, remained remarkably stable. Leask repeatedly invokes the term “locational stability”

\(^{50}\) Mees, A German Church, 170-5. Without apportioning blame, evidence points to differences of opinion between the very religious Saxon Wends and more middle-of-the-road German Lutherans that led to occasional ruptures.

\(^{51}\) Heising, Die Deutschen in Australien, 38.

\(^{52}\) See Appendix 4, Population analysis of Germantown, 1860s to 1880s.

\(^{53}\) Geelong Advertiser, September 22, 1868, 3.
which in part she attributes to an emotional “special relationship” with the land the German settlers owned and worked.°

The religious split was not the sole adversity to befall Germantown. Two other events, of an economic nature, affected the community. As their properties were mostly of a sub-standard size, many farmers derived their income from a variety of sources in addition to farming. Their lucrative business as carriers to the goldfields and Geelong declined when the railway to Ballarat was opened in 1862, soon to be followed by construction of other rail links to the West and North. These developments occurred in tandem with the new *Lands Act* of 1869 which soon triggered a rush to the Wimmera that swept through the entire German community in the West. “The effect of the Lands Act was tremendous. It caused a rush from South Australia that was compared to the era when gold was discovered,” notes Roennfeldt.°° It also affected Germantown, whose population plummeted from 170 to 70 within a year. Eventually the village recovered, even surviving the disaster of phylloxera in 1875.°°°

What this shows is that, despite religious divisions, German rural communities were remarkably resilient, able to cope with growth, and able to re-locate at short notice if favourable opportunities arose. As this was an age of multiskilling and opportunism, wherever work was on offer or land became available, the opportunity had to be grasped. The *Geelong Advertiser* summarized the situation thus:

Prior to the opening of the Geelong and Ballarat line this village [Germantown] was in a thriving condition. Subsequent to this event, many of the German carters had to move from the scene of their first settlement and…it was anticipated by many croakers that it would never revive. Such gloomy anticipations, however, have not proven true. Germantown now presents a picture of healthy prosperity.°°°°

---

° See Leask, *Soil, Seed and Souls*, 9,145,151. Almost identical observations are made by Jordan in *German Seed in Texas Soil*, 193,198. See also Appendices 4 & 5. Although merely indicative, my results of a rural settlement “stability analysis” of a Western District village shows that German settlements were remarkably stable and exhibited a lower trend of migration outwards (to urban areas) than non-German settlements. In a different vein this also supports Rippley’s comments on (and partial rejection of) Turner’s influential essay “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” claiming that the frontier facilitated cultural amalgamation. See Rippley, “The Ethnic Frontier,” 200.

°° Roennfeldt, “The Early Years of the Lutheran Church,” 32.

°°° Ibid.

°°°° *Geelong Advertiser*, September 22, 1868, 3.
There were times when the Germans’ mobility irritated some of the more established Anglo settlers, for no other reason than lack of understanding of the Germans’ still tenuous economic security. The Hamilton Spectator, a widely read and influential regional paper that had espoused an anti-German attitude, observed another re-location, viz. the German exodus from Hamilton to the Wimmera, in these words:

We object to the destruction caused by...locusts, but the damage they do is trifling compared with the injury caused by the German hordes who migrate from place to place, exhausting every particle of fertility from the land and then settling down somewhere else...leaving nothing but desert behind them.\(^{58}\)

A jingoist tone entered the debate when the Ararat Advertiser demanded that the soil should only be worked “by men who have the national right to it.”\(^{59}\) The Melbourne Leader rushed to the Germans’ defence:

An up-country squatters’ print indulges in a wholesale denunciation of the “German hordes,” who, it alleges, are worse than locusts, shifting “from place to place, exhausting every particle of fertility from the land, and then settling somewhere else to repeat the process, leaving nothing but a desert behind them.” The allusion is unfortunate, as those who know anything of the colony are aware that no class are less migratory, or more noted for industry, and for making the most out of their land, than our German colonists.\(^{60}\)

The most eloquent, informed and disarming defence came from one of their own. Pastor Hermann Herlitz, by then Melbourne head of the Lutheran church, not only pointed out how undeserved the Hamilton Spectator’s attack was but also noted that “without the large German settlement around it, that fine and thriving place [he speaks of Hamilton] would very likely...have remained an insignificant little hamlet similar to many to be met with in this colony.”\(^{61}\)

I need to return, albeit briefly, to the unsympathetic attitude of the Hamilton Spectator. Although dealt with more thoroughly in later chapters, the attitude of some

\(^{58}\) Hamilton Spectator, no date, quoted Argus, June 10, 1874, 4.

\(^{59}\) Quoted Powell, Public Lands of Australia Felix, 242-3.

\(^{60}\) Leader, June 20, 1874, 7.

\(^{61}\) “German Settlers in Australia (Letter),” Argus, June 12, 1874, 7.
Anglo papers to German settlers—though rarely articulated in detail—so far conveys less of an attitude of hostility than of a profound lack of understanding of a cultural group whose background differed from what the paper assumed to be the norm. Thus, its attitude is symptomatic of the contrast between “we-ness” and “other-ness,” which will be explored in greater detail elsewhere.

2.2.2 Western District settlements

Germantown’s progress invites comparison with developments in the west of the colony, with which it was linked through a two-way stream of settlers. In terms of community dynamics, the Western District presents a picture as interesting, but different, to Germantown. As noted in Chapter One, immigration from South Australia to Australia Felix accelerated after 1852, and informal statistics show it continued for several decades, ultimately totalling about 4,500 new arrivals.62 An early group had arrived from Melbourne in 1849, straight from the Wappaus. While some stayed, establishing a small settlement near Warrnambool, others eventually returned to Melbourne or joined a later migrant stream to the Grange (Hamilton).63 Over time, new arrivals came from Melbourne, via Germantown or Geelong, the goldfields, and even direct from Germany via Warrnambool. Those from South Australia were largely part of a second big wave of mainly East-Elbian immigrants, including many Wends from Upper Lusatia, who were part of an initiative organized by Eduard Delius between 1844 and 1850. One of Delius’ ships, the Godeffroy-owned Alfred, arrived at Port Adelaide in 1848 with a large contingent of Upper Lusatian Wends who temporarily settled at Rosenthal and Hoffnungsthal. They found the local (non-Wendish) Magdeburgers unwelcoming, nor could they find suitable land. Saxon Wends, deeply religious and with strong conservative Old Lutheran beliefs, were more inclined to separate settlement. After exploratory but largely unsuccessful excursions to Portland, they eventually decided to move further north. Nielsen observes that local squatter resistance and the continuing problem of finding suitable land in the Portland area made this an unattractive place to settle despite the fact that the Portland Guardian wrote, “we shall be pleased of their obtaining land to their satisfaction.”64 Soon after their move to the

62 Kiddle, Men of Yesterday, 415; Borrie, Italians and Germans, 160.
63 Johann Gottfried Wahther, Carl Uebergang and Friedrich Gottlob Straube were among these early pioneers. Huf, Courage, Patience, 10.
64 Portland Guardian, May 7, 1852 and June 5, 1852; see also Nielsen, In Search of a Home, 15,16,19,29; Huf, op.cit., 18,19; Kiddle, op.cit., 415-16; Argus, June 4, 1852.
Grange (Hamilton) in 1853, the settlers found that even here the squatter establishment had virtually locked up all lands. They succeeded in a collective purchase of over 200 acres. Powell explains that they were among “some smallholders [who] had managed to obtain land under the provisions of the Occupation Licences and Section 2 [of the Lands Act].”

The Grange also remained merely a temporary settlement until Hochkirch (Tarrington), just south of it, was chosen as their permanent centre. This became a hub of German settlement that soon spread to Mt Rouse (Penshurst), Gnadenthal (Tabor), later Neukirch (Byaduc) and Warrayure, eventually encompassing ten substantial farming communities within a radius of some thirty kilometres. Hochkirch was named after a small town in Upper Lusatia, half-way between Bautzen (Budissin) and Loebau, the Saxon Wendish heartland whence many settlers had emigrated.

As already noted, often land was bought collectively and then distributed, a practice also evident at Waldau, Westgarthtown, Germantown, Tabor/Gnadenthal, Tarrington/Hochkirch, Berwick and elsewhere. One-and-a half decades later, after the Wimmera was opened up by the 1869 Lands Act, another exodus commenced into that new district from Hochkirch and surroundings. As Powell observes, similar co-operative methods to finance land purchases were employed. Until that time, the land question, especially for German settlers, had remained a major hurdle for financial as well as attitudinal reasons. It was partially solved after the government attempted to break the entrenched power of the squatters who controlled the Legislative Council, and the forceful intercession by their recently arrived pastor, Clamor Schuermann, on behalf of his communities.

### 2.2.3 Village life

In his history of Hamilton, Don Garden notes there were few instances of anti-German sentiments. He names a single incident where German farmers complained about the damage done to their fences by the Hamilton Hunt club. The *Hamilton Spectator*

---

67 Huf, op.cit., 11.
70 Powell, op.cit., 177. See also Kiddle, *Men of Yesterday*, 230-32, passim.
predictably ridiculed their complaint, dismissing it by arguing that hunting was “a legitimate and time-honoured sport.” There was little German sympathy when the club eventually folded.\(^{72}\) Margaret Kiddle writes that Germans “were accepted without rancour by the other colonists who seem to have admired the sterling qualities which made for their success, but [they] did little to try to imitate them.”\(^{73}\) Why might that be? Was it because the Germans behaved and looked somehow outlandish, were thrifty and stood out from the majority, locked into the rigid framework of their inherited East-Elbian ways? A letter in the \textit{Age} about the Hamilton district counters such an impression. It observed that the Hamilton district had “receiv[ed] \textit{a decided push} when a small German colony settled in its neighbourhood, at a place called Hochkirch” (my italics).\(^{74}\) Though written anonymously, the writer, presumably not German, saw Germans not merely as pioneers but as taking a proactive role in developing the region by giving it a “push.” The \textit{Hamilton Spectator} failed to see it that way, continuing to ridicule how Germans acquired and worked their land. On one occasion it republished, with obvious relish, an \textit{Argus} article that noted that many small farms of 20-100 acres were held by “Germans…and very ignorant Highlanders”; it claimed they were poorly managed and produced ever-declining yields.\(^{75}\) Within reason, it had a point—Lodewyckx explains that Germans, owing to lack of funds, were inclined to be prudent, and thus were unwilling to take out loans for bigger and more viable properties that would have ensured more economic operations.\(^{76}\) A German visitor, Hugo Zoeller, accused his compatriots of being unable to “think big.”\(^{77}\) They failed to shake off their traditional myopic view of agricultural practice, unable to come to terms with new opportunities. Quoting the \textit{Hamilton Spectator} of 4 March 1864, the \textit{Geelong Advertiser} takes up this theme:

\begin{quote}
We do not want German grubbers who live by self-sown crops of hay and the retailing of bad butter. These classes of men may certainly get an existence, but they do little good for themselves and none at all for the district. They add but little to the product of our land; they employ no labor, and they circulate no
\end{quote}

\(^{72}\) Quoted, Garden, \textit{Hamilton}, 115 and note 190.
\(^{73}\) Kiddle, \textit{Men of Yesterday}, 218.
\(^{74}\) \textit{Age}, June 10, 1876, 5.
\(^{75}\) \textit{Argus}, May 24, 1865, 5.
\(^{76}\) See Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 81.
\(^{77}\) In his book \textit{Rund um die Erde}, Zoeller uses the word \textit{Verkleinerungssucht} (inability to think “outside the square”): Hugo Zoeller, \textit{Rund um die Erde}, 254.
money. A score of them will not do the good or add to the wealth of the district half as much as one real farmer, who undertakes farming as a business which he understands and which he is in a position to carry on in a legitimate manner.78

Was the criticism unfair, even malicious? It appears to stigmatize thrift and prudence as flaws. The Australasian was far more sympathetic. Despite their small allotments, Germans “are good settlers,” it said, “steady and persevering…they deserve great credit—they never keep more stock…than they can feed well…” It comments about their modest homesteads surrounded by gardens with vegetables and flowers. And it particularly notes their “active and industrious [women] both in the field and the home.”79 Powell (1970) writes that by around 1870 “some of the best farmers were Germans, originally from South Australia,” who despite the “inferior soil and insufficient acreage” managed to make a living even though “[I]livestock farming, not intensive farming, was best suited to the south-west plains.”80 Praise for their venture into the Wimmera arrived a full century later. In 1936 the Sydney Morning Herald observed that, rather than behaving like “locusts,” Germans “began cultivating the land with the view of growing wheat [in a] district that had been looked upon as about as valuable as a desert.” Introducing “dry farming or rotation of crops,” it writes, they created “one of the richest wheatbelts in the Commonwealth.”81 At last, the 1869 Act had given them the opportunity to re-think their approach by buying bigger and moving into broadacre cereal growing that would overcome their “grubbing” habit. As Powell notes, they collectively bought land, improved it, then sold it at a profit. “This helped them to buy the larger holdings of less fortunate neighbours,” he notes.82 This at last also gave them the chance to operate in an economically viable manner.

Occasionally—but not very often—the Spectator had a good word for them, approving of their endeavours to establish vineyards, which incidentally allowed working on small acreages.83 The stereotype of being grubbers, or muddlers, or somewhat primitive outlandish operators is neither surprising nor specifically Australian. Jon Gjerde’s investigation on perceptions of German agricultural practices in the U.S. Mid-West clearly shows that a similar stereotype of German backwardness

78 Geelong Advertiser, March 8, 1864, 3.
82 Powell, op.cit., 177.
83 Garden, Hamilton, 109; Hamilton Spectator, March 27, 1863, March 18, 1864 and July 6, 1864.
also existed here. What was seen as intra-family exploitation, especially of farmers’ wives and children, and as primitive work practices, condemned as essentially un-American, was in fact a very effective if traditional response to local conditions that ensured economic success. Neither Gjørde’s American observers nor the Advertiser attempted to understand the reasons for such behaviour. Despite their initial poverty and inability to afford properties of adequate size to be economical, and an unwillingness to expose themselves to risk by borrowing money, thrift, plodding and grubbing would guarantee any debts to be paid off while also sustaining the farmer families. Few of the critics understood traditional German farm practice, where every person had an assigned (and respected) role, including wives, sons and daughters.  

While all settlements showed signs of ongoing growth—Hochkirch in 1869 had a population of 850—its population plummeted to just over 300 in 1876 after the opening of the Wimmera. Beginning in 1869, and following another migration as already noted, a string of new German-Lutheran settlements emerged in this new frontier area. Even that was not the final move: after 1884 it was followed by another move into the Mallee.

Like Germantown and Waldau, the West was also not spared the almost endemic religious rifts. Since 1852, a remarkable, gifted, strong-willed Lutheran pastor, Clamor Schuermann, a former missionary and South Australian Protector of Aborigines, was guiding the spiritual affairs of an enormous parish that extended from Germantown to Mount Gambier, and later as far as Horsham. By birth a Westphalian from Osnabruceck, highly educated and a linguist of note, Schuermann stood close to the South Australian ELSA. A quite superior community leader, he was also a martinet. The journalist known as the Vagabond saw him as a cross between Martin Luther and Oliver Cromwell; another writer described him as “like an Irish priest.” Schuermann’s task was not an easy one. Almost from the start, he experienced problems with one of his church elders and community leaders, Michael Deutscher. Soon a rift, eventually leading to an actual break, occurred in ca.1854-55. Deutscher, an Upper Lusatian Wend with little education, overwhelming self-confidence, strong pietistic leanings, and the

84 Gjørde, “Prescriptions and Perceptions of Labor and Family,” 117-37, passim; Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 66-8, passim. Lodewyckx comments on the “anererbe Sparsamkeit” (traditional thrift) and unwillingness of German settlers to take on loans rather than to pay cash (after first earning it): ibid., 68,80. See also Bull, Early Experiences in South Australia, 107.

85 Garden, Hamilton, 110; see also Huf, Courage, Patience, 45.

86 Kiddle, Men of Yesterday, 416-17; The Vagabond (pseud.), “Picturesque Victoria: Dunkeld and Penshurst,” Argus, April 11, 1885, 4.

87 Kiddle, op.cit., 417; The Vagabond (pseud.), “Picturesque Victoria: Herrnhut,” Argus, April 18, 1885, 4.
wish to control matters of belief and dogma from “the ground up,” rebelled against Schuermann’s rule. Joined by part of the Hochkirch congregation, he seceded, triggering doubts and disunity throughout the entire Lutheran community in the West.\textsuperscript{88} Nielsen sees the rift as a clash of personalities rather than of dogma. Yet the rift never healed, and for several generations an uneasy parallel religious development ensued. Schuermann also had other problems to deal with. A peculiar group of religious dreamers, led by a zealot named Friedrich Krummnow, established a pseudo-communist agricultural commune near Penshurst that lasted almost until the end of Schuermann’s pastorate, creating ongoing problems, especially of a religious nature. Despite the commune’s disruptive influence, Krummnow displayed considerable economic nous by establishing a large collective landholding that focused on pasturing and clever marketing of its produce. His management style contrasted starkly with the ineffectual small-scale farming practices of Schuermann’s flock.\textsuperscript{89}

The real problem besetting the German communities in Victoria’s West continued to be the clash between the Old Lutheranism of Silesian, Brandenburg and Saxon origin that had a firm hold on this district from its powerbase in South Australia, and the more moderate Melbourne middle-of-the-road ELSV Lutheranism of Pastor Goethe. The immigration into the Wimmera perpetuated this problem. As Roennfeldt writes, “there was no hope of having a united Lutheran Church form itself in the Wimmera...[because] [e]ach section of the Church...worked against the other.”\textsuperscript{90} This divisiveness undermined the unity, status, and resilience of the entire German community besides casting doubts on the sincerity of their Christian beliefs, and thus very likely diminishing the respect and goodwill of the wider community.\textsuperscript{91}

2.2.4 Religion
The nineteenth century was not only characterized by industrialization, urbanization and scientific discovery, it was also a century of religion. Religion occupied a prime place in society, and in British Australia it provided the glue that held society together while also

\textsuperscript{88} Nielsen, \textit{In Search of a Home}, 46-50, passim. The Deutscher group eventually established a new congregation at South Hamilton (St Luke’s) and for a time were affiliated with the Victorian Synod. See Huf, \textit{Courage, Patience}, 37-41, passim.

\textsuperscript{89} The Krummnow commune has attracted a considerable amount of research and is well documented. See Metcalf and Huf, \textit{ern at Australia’s First Utopian Commune}; see also The Vagabond [pseud.], “Picturesque Victoria: Herrnhut”; Garden, \textit{Hamilton}, 47-8.

\textsuperscript{90} Roennfeldt, “The Early Years of the Lutheran Church,” 46.

\textsuperscript{91} The following sources were among those consulted for the preceding section: Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 71; Huf, \textit{Courage, Patience}, 24-32, passim, especially 23,27; Sowell, \textit{Migration and Culture}, 73-8, passim; Nielsen, \textit{In Search of a Home}, 51; Price, \textit{German Settlers}, 12-30, passim; Garden, \textit{Hamilton}, passim.
assigning or conferring cultural, political and social roles to “subordinate” ethnic groups. The dominant religious denominations determined how these groups were to be seen and judged. In turn, most of these groups were also held together and defined by religious ties. Errors occurred in assigning roles, like the association of Lutherans with “the German church.” Most Scandinavians in Australia were also Lutherans—quite distinct and separate from their German co-religionists. For Scandinavians, their shared religion conferred a feeling of belonging together in their own right; more than that, it defined their identity. Koivukangas and Martin note that their strong and continuing affiliation with “their” Lutheran church, despite their readiness to becoming assimilated, made them stand out far more distinctly as Scandinavians than on account of their respective ethnicities.92 The identity of Irish immigrants—overwhelmingly Catholic—was even more clearly defined by their religion as a collective “unifier.” By far the largest of the non-English settler groups, their Catholic practices were, or according to O’Farrell often appeared to be, deeply suffused with concerns for the welfare of their homeland which, in turn, informed their attitudes to the majority and their way of self-assertion. Despite their long historical connection with the British homeland, by choice rather than in response to Anglo-Australian prejudices, Irish-Australians chose to become Australianized “with an Irish flavour.”93 As the result, “Irish Catholicism [may have] remained Irish-oriented in religion, but increasingly [it became] Australian in general culture.”94 The Irish clergy took it upon itself to direct radical ideas into legal and acceptable channels, like championing the symbolic striving for Home Rule.95 Afghan immigrants, partly because of their small numbers but also on account of the (perceived to be) exotic and alien nature of their Muslim beliefs, never even considered assimilation. Nor would they be accepted into mainstream Australian society on account of the prevailing belief in British superiority, encapsulated in Henry Parkes’ principle of the “crimson thread of kinship.” As Stevens notes, “excluded from society beyond their Ghantown boundaries…feared, despised [and] alienated, they locked themselves behind their religion and their…communities.”96 While perceptions about Italians, like the

94 O’Farrell, op.cit., 17.
95 Ibid., 204-6, passim.
96 Stevens, Tin Mosques and Ghantowns, viii; see also pages 148,239,251. Henry Parkes’ ideas are further discussed in Chapter Five, section 5.2.
Irish also a predominantly Catholic community, are largely coloured by the massive post-World War II immigration, Cresciani’s assertion that “The Catholic church is...the channel...which propounds the values cherished by...Italian migrants in the midst of a largely secular society” effectively equates, or even merges the concepts of ethnicity and religious practice.97

While Lutheranism defined the majority of German immigrants both in terms of their religious affiliation as well as their ethnicity, the internal religious rifts also divided them as an “ethnic group,” in contrast to Scandinavians or most of the other groups mentioned. Religious disunity was almost endemic among them, and it distinguishes German migration history from that of most other groups. It is a recurrent theme in the history of German communities everywhere, whether in Australia, America, Brazil, or elsewhere. It is not my intention to provide a detailed religio-philosophical analysis of the various causes dividing the Lutheran church, and thus ipso facto, the German community in Australia, other than to explain what they were, why they occurred, and how they manifested themselves. For the present purposes, at the root of this disunity lay the difference in how the opposing sides perceived the role of secular authority in relation to the church and its teachings. In Victoria, this manifested itself in views on how religious services were conducted, how Lutheran schools were managed, and whether state subsidies of teachers’ and pastors’ salaries, and land grants for churches and schools, were acceptable. In the literature, Old Lutheranism (represented in southern Australia by the South Australian ELSA synod) is often defined as pietistic, conservative, and unwilling to compromise. For their part, Old Lutherans saw the Victorian Synod as rationalist, ecumenic and concessionist with regard to modern ideas.98

The Old Lutherans of Silesia, whose beliefs would dominate (ergo, disrupt) religious discussion in Victoria in the nineteenth century, had clung to an old-style purist, somewhat fundamentalist Lutheran belief through more than two centuries of Catholic Habsburg rule. They had remained at arm’s length from the government, and after most of Silesia came under Prussian rule, and King Friedrich Wilhelm III attempted to rationalize Lutheranism and bring it under government control, they

98 The rift between the two synods was largely based on different, often minor, perceptions of the form of the liturgy and the symbolism of the Eucharist. The main disagreement was about the role of secular authority in church affairs. ELSA was totally opposed to any state involvement, financial or otherwise.
resisted. This eventually led to savage government persecution and the celebrated Old Lutheran exodus to America and South Australia. The influence of these events persists to the present day in the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (LCMS), the second-largest Lutheran group in the U.S. In the nineteenth century, the Missouri Synod determined the attitude and influence of the church in South Australia and Western Victoria. It formed the basis of the ELSA, which had affiliated with it. Apart from its total rejection of any formal link with the State, it was characterized by strong vicarial leadership: their pastors ruled their congregations more firmly than more “democratic,” open, and, importantly, more ecumenically oriented religious groups like the Victorian Synod established by Goethe in 1856.

The foregoing, in somewhat simplistic terms, explains the rift in the Germantown and Hochkirch, and to a lesser extent even in the Waldau and Melbourne Lutheran congregations, that in several cases turned into major confrontation or a complete community-wide split. Further complications often arose from the practice of congregations “calling” (appointing) pastors, unaware that training at various German missionary institutions was at variance or was seen as conflicting with what local congregations were expecting. As an illustration, Pastor Hermann Herlitz, though of Silesian background, had been trained at the Basle Mission Society. Having been called to the parish at Germantown, he was rejected (i.e. literally locked out of the church) on the grounds of his Basle training, his affiliation with Goethe, and his perceived ecumenism and unionistic tendencies.

Fundamental to understanding these deliberations is that, although most Victorian Germans were Lutherans, the overwhelming majority came from traditionalist rural Lutheran regions in East-Elbia, and that major disagreements as to the nature and practice of their belief were often amplified by contact with believers from less isolated and more urbanized parts of Germany. This became a major problem because, as already noted, the mid-nineteenth century was an age when religion was all-encompassing, affecting all communities, whether German or not. It touched every facet
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101 Missionary society training centres were located at various locations including Neuendettelsau (near Nuernberg), Basle, Dresden, Hermannsburg, Berlin (Gossner), Hamburg and in the Rhineland. Many of the early pastors serving in Victoria had been trained and were sent out from Basle. See also Wellnitz, *Deutsche evangelische Gemeinden*, passim.
102 Paech, *Twelve Decades*, 185,187. “Unionistic” attitudes denote sympathy for, or affiliation with, Prussia’s state church.
of life. When forming small communities in urban or rural locations, one of the first priorities for German settlers was to call a Lutheran pastor. The immigrant letters examined in Chapter One make clear reference to this. However, while the majority were deeply religious, Doerries observes that their faith was frequently rigid and intransigent to such an extent that, more than any other issue, it divided even small village communities, often over minor matters in the service “agenda.” Most communities invested their pastor with considerable powers to be their leader, advisor, and spiritual guide. But they also insisted that he had to conform; he and his congregation had to see eye-to-eye spiritually. As most parishioners were simple rural peasants, conservative and unwilling to compromise on what often were trivial differences of view or religious ritual, these were easily blown up out of proportion, especially if the candidate was an inexperienced novice coming directly from a seminary at Neuendettelsau, Dresden, or Basle, unfamiliar with their Old Lutheran ways. This was exacerbated when communities were geographically isolated. In Melbourne, hard-line religious dogma stood little chance. The ecumenic tendencies of Goethe were widely accepted, except by a group of dissenters such as Gottlieb Thiele at Waldau, participant of Melbourne’s sole religious split. Urban settlers were less religious and thus less inclined for divisive disagreements. The same also applied at Sandhurst, Ballarat and most urban goldfield communities.

2.2.5 Education and Lutheran schools

Almost from the start, as German rural communities formed, four priorities were invariably implemented: first, land was selected, or attempts made to acquire some; then houses were built—often quite primitive shelter-like hovels, to be progressively improved—then schools for their children were established, and finally, a pastor was called. As no state school system as we know it today existed at this time, the Lutheran church and schools were closely intertwined. Usually the local church also served as classroom, and the pastor as teacher, as at Waldau, Hochkirch, Germantown and
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103 Doerries, “Immigrants and the Church,” 3-8, passim. Agenda (Ger. Agende) is the fixed form of liturgy and order of service.
104 Old Lutheran congregations seemed to prefer a strong-willed, assertive pastor. They were, however, capable of revolting if disagreements arose, and occasionally even lock him out of his church. Germantown is an example of the latter.
105 Goethe’s ecumenism, continued by his ELCV successors, welcomed (and received) the help of leading members of other dissident denominations. The most notable was the Congregational minister Alexander Morison. Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Wesleyan ministers often gave support, lent their churches, or were in attendance as guests at major Lutheran church events like church dedications. One of the earliest examples of cooperation was the Collins Street Independent church where the inaugural Lutheran services were held.
elsewhere. What might explain this high priority on education, at a time when a significant proportion of British immigrants was still illiterate? Was it merely following Prussian tradition, where primary education by mid-century was not only the most advanced in Europe but also the most pervasive? It provided basic literacy skills to all children of both sexes. Evidence of this almost universal literacy is provided in some early Melbourne ships’ passenger lists that include a column headed “Reads/writes.”

Even older German immigrants are shown to possess these skills. Germans “placed [a high value] on education [which was] a characteristic that German immigrants took with them to other parts of the world,” writes Sowell. He adds that their “literacy…was above most other immigrants.”

In answer to the earlier question whether education had benefited the people in Prussia, or whether it merely served to equip them for simple writing tasks, to read the Bible, and to become obedient citizens, South Australian pastor Carl Muecke—admittedly some years later—provided a clear answer: “Volksbildung ist Volkskraft,” he wrote. This was tantamount to a fanfare for democracy.

Prior to 1862 Victoria was still an educational vacuum, without a government system, and compulsory state education was not introduced until the Education Act of 1872. Until then, the Lutheran church assumed that role for its adherents. This reinforced its status, but also served as a means of empowerment for those being taught. As a minimum, it guaranteed not only that German customs and language were maintained, but that all children received a basic education. In his 1856 (first) synodal programme, Goethe propounded a Schul-Ordnung (educational programme) that was copied directly from the Prussian system.

In his report he wrote, “As the pastor is the spiritual shepherd of the adult community, so the teacher is for the children. Both are united in the task of planting God’s kingdom within the community.” Despite the disunity in the Victorian church, a commitment to education was common to both synod
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106 In Prussia, and by implication among Prussian emigrants, illiteracy was virtually non-existent. By 1870, the illiteracy rate for Prussia is calculated at 3 per cent, compared with England at 20 per cent. See Vincent, The Rise of Mass Literacy, 9,10.


108 Sowell, Migration and Culture, 54,55.

109 idiomatically translated as “universal education is empowering.” Carl Muecke, in Australische Deutsche Zeitung, February 4, 1870, 17.

110 The Prussian Education Regulations of 1854.

groups, the more so where the community was geographically separate/isolated. Both Goethe and Clamor Schuermann invariably ensured that, as the community expanded into the Western District, then the Wimmera and eventually the Mallee, the church followed as the prime provider of Lutheran schools, its objectives merely mirroring that of the congregations. In the western part of the colony alone, over thirty Lutheran schools were established during the second half of the century; twenty of these by the ELSA.112 Gradually, pastors were relieved of the burdensome task of teaching when teachers were “called” (appointed) to various schools, as at Harkaway, Germantown, Hochkirch, Doncaster and elsewhere.113

The Victorian government progressively created a “national” and a “congregational” schools structure as the 1850s progressed, which subsidized building funds and teachers’ salaries for congregational schools. At this point the Victorian Synod and ELSA policies parted company. The latter, in keeping with its policy of resisting state interference, eschewed all government support. It saw state education as purely secular and materialistic. Yet even the ELSV was wary, seeing State-controlled education as representing “a growing coldness, weariness against God and holy things,” as Goethe observed.114

Despite the ELSA’s refusal, and the hardship this imposed on often quite small congregations, most of these schools persisted and endured until the turn of the twentieth century and beyond. Ten survived the onslaught of persecution in World War I.115 The Victorian Synod schools, in contrast, having accepted financial support and becoming subject to inspection by the Congregational Schools Board (after 1862, Board of Education), often failed the board’s quality criteria, and many did not survive.116

After compulsory free education was introduced under the Victorian Education Act in 1872, subsidies to all Lutheran schools ceased. Most of the ELSV day schools lapsed or were subsumed by the state system. A limited syllabus, including religious instruction, was subsequently provided by Saturday and Sunday schools for lapsed ELSV
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112 Meyer, “Lutheran Schools in Victoria”, 53-55, passim; Meyer, Nurseries of the Church, 41-90, passim. See also Mees, A German Church, various, including pages 69-70.

113 Among the most prominent teachers, regularly named in the Christenbote, were the formidable and innovative Max von Schramm at Doncaster, the long-serving Jacob Hessell at Harkaway, and the much loved J.F. Walther at East Melbourne, Murtoa and elsewhere.

114 Christenbote, September 1862, quoted Meyer, The Lutheran Schools of Victoria: Nurseries of the Church, 5.


116 For example, two teachers at Harkaway were forced to resign due to inadequate proficiency of English, resulting in a temporary closedown of the school. Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, 118. See also Meyer, The Lutheran Schools of Victoria, op.cit., 3.5.
schools. By the mid-1880s all had closed. A summary of Lutheran schools is given in Appendix 6.

What the foregoing discussion suggests is that rural communities may have given the appearance of relative simplicity. Held together simultaneously by church, school, their shared agricultural activities and concerns (harvest, weather, bushfires, etc.), deference to the pastor, and overlaying all, their common heritage of language, religion and customs, their structure conceals a far more complex paradigm, characterized by a high degree of self-sufficiency which was the most significant factor that ultimately ensured their survival.

2.2.6 A new horizon: migration to the Wimmera

A major factor for leaving their homeland had been the immigrants’ desire to acquire land to engage in farming. Their expectations were modest, translated directly from the standards they had grown up with. A rural block of 50 acres seemed heaven; 100 acres was paradise. In the Australian context this made little sense as agriculture (except perhaps viticulture or horticulture) would have been completely uneconomical on such small acreages. The common German practice of mixed farming, with a few acres of cereals, a few head of cattle, some pigs but rarely any sheep, farming seemed unsustainable on such limited acreage, and thus it had attracted the Hamilton Spectator’s ridicule. But this practice was not entirely irrational, as it protected the farmers from market fluctuations and invariably produced a small cash income.

Although the Spectator exhibited little insight or understanding for the reasons, it did show up how wasteful the immigrants’ undoubtedly hard work was and how little they understood local conditions. When the 1869 Lands Act threw open the selection of land in the Wimmera, “cooperative labour, a larger area than the Act normally allowed for individuals, and joint capital...[at last offered] unusual security,” writes Powell. This at last gave the Germans their chance. Had they stayed in the Hamilton area the Act would have done nothing for them, because the squatters blockaded any genuine inroads into land ownership. Migrating to the Wimmera offered substantial blocks of 320, later 640 acres for every applicant, with reasonable conditions for improvements and repayments of the government loan. It was good land, despite the very limited rainfall,

117 Meyer, The Lutheran Schools in Victoria, passim, especially page 55; Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 192.
118 “Statistics of Common Schools,” Ballarat Star, March 10, 1871, 3; March 27, 1871, 4; April 4, 1871, 4.
119 Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 66-71,80, passim.
120 Powell, The Public Lands, 160-1,177.
and it seemed ideal for large-scale agriculture, especially broadacre cereal growing. The application of the Dryfarming/Campbell system, developed in the Great Plains of America and the Canadian Prairie, led to very successful crops almost from the start.\footnote{Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 69.}

Migrating from Hamilton, Germans were now able to “built cohesive communities on this frontier…compact and rapidly-built communities…separated by open and scrubby plains,” observes Powell.\footnote{Ibid., 174.} Soon some districts became “almost wholly German,” though apart from those of South Australian origin, the new area also received many of the over 50,000 (non-German) ex-miners. As most of the Germans turned to wheat, by 1877 Victoria for the first time produced an excess that even allowed wheat exports.\footnote{Ibid., 277.} Streaming from all directions to the Wimmera, the \textit{Hamilton Spectator} and some other papers could not help themselves to continue spouting critical comments comparing the Germans to locusts, “leaving nothing but desert behind them.” Reality was quite the opposite: the desert was turned into productive wheat fields.\footnote{The following sources were among those consulted for the preceding section: \textit{Hamilton Spectator}, June 3, 1874; \textit{Ararat Advertiser}, June 30, 1874; Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 56-6, 69; Maroske, \textit{The Story of Pella}, passim; Kiddle, \textit{Men of Yesterday}, 230; Powell, \textit{Public Lands}, 174, 285; Horsham Art Gallery, \textit{German Heritage of the Wimmera}; Huf, \textit{Courage, Patience}, 35; Roennfeldt, “The Early Years,” passim.}

2.3 Urban communities and their institutions

Urban communities presented a picture entirely different to rural, to the extent that only the idea of an \textit{imagined community} helps to recognize commonality, like common language and cultural heritage. Urban communities appeared disjointed, disunited, loosely-structured, and in Lyng’s words, they “disappeared amongst the overwhelming number of Britshers.”\footnote{Lyng, \textit{Non-Britishers in Australia}, 48-9.} Moltmann ascribes a “transitory character” to urban communities.\footnote{Moltmann, “Where People Migrate,” xxvii.} The difference between rural and urban groups, while sometimes not obvious, was fundamental. The former were isolated and almost self-contained, while the latter were widely connected to outside organizations and activities. Urban communities also differed on account of other factors such as class, education, social engagement, perceptions of mission, religious commitment, and place of residence. Their origins were largely accidental, as will be shown in the following.
2.3.1 The German community of Melbourne

There were obvious gradations of urban living. If imagining a scale, Melbourne’s community would be posited at one end of that scale, and—as I will show a little later—many of the urban gold town communities would be placed at the other. Let me begin with Melbourne. Its German-speaking community had grown quite arbitrarily. Apart from the Western District, which continued to receive immigrants from South Australia and, in a few cases, direct from German ships berthing at Warrnambool or Portland, Melbourne was a major receiving and distribution place. Some immigrants arrived, stayed and settled, while the majority transited to the goldfields or trickle-migrated to Germantown, to other Victorian settlements or to other colonies. Physically and geographically, there was no visible Melbourne German community. Depending on their means, the arrivals spread all over the metropolis. A breakdown at the time of the 1861 Census reveals that West Melbourne had 209, East Melbourne 526, Collingwood 257 and St Kilda 158 individuals classified in the census as German-born immigrants.127 While in 1861 twenty-three per cent of Victoria’s population lived in Melbourne, Borrie claims that over one-third (36.9 per cent) of Victoria’s Germans lived in urban areas.128 This indicates his figure includes not only Melbourne but all urban areas, but it does not explain the dispersed residential status of Melbourne’s Germans. Victoria never showed the development patterns of the U.S. or Brazil, where whole German towns or in large cities, whole quarters became purely German, where families were living side-by-side with their own services, doctors, schools and newspapers, down to street names.129 An easy explanation for this is that Melbourne’s Germans numbered only a few thousand, compared with America’s millions or even Brazil’s almost 400,000.130

The principal glue holding together rural communities was provided by the overarching role of the church, in addition to the immigrants’ natural inclination to stick together, often assisted by geographic isolation. By comparison, urban Germans had an entirely different relationship with their new country, lacking that glue. More from necessity than desire, they lived dispersed. Their professions—merchants, artisans, labourers, teachers, musicians, a few doctors—were carried out in solitary fashion: there were no shared activities like harvesting, produce marketing, or even the intense personal engagement the rural church encouraged. Yet even well-educated urban
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128 Borrie, Italians and Germans, 163.
129 Bergquist, “German Communities in American Cities,” 1; see also Luebke, Germans in Brazil, 22-4,28,29.
130 “By 1914...nearly 400,000 persons of German origin resided in Brazil.” Luebke, op.cit., 1.
Germans, like their rural compatriots, yearned to belong and to engage in social activities based on their ethnic background, and for that reason they created supportive structures. Apart from the Lutheran church—which most of them endorsed and supported—the clubs they created provided the bonding that their rural compatriots enjoyed simply by close communal living. They offered greater reassurance and eased the feeling of loss of their original homeland and connections. While the church provided bonding without class or social distinctions, associations “served as a platform to negotiate questions of ethnicity, class and gender,” Manz observes.131 Panayi notes that support structures like clubs and associations, at their most basic, emerged in response to a “search for ethnic solidarity,” assuming a role paralleling that of the church.132

Luebke chose to divide Germans into rural “church people” and “Vereinsdeutsche” (club Germans), both groups deriving almost identical reassurance from belonging to these institutions which emerged seemingly automatically and in consequence of “the disorientation felt by newcomers in their new society.”133 Referring to Handlin’s seminal work on immigrants, Panayi writes that it was “the loneliness making immigrants to ‘reach for some arm to lean on.’”134 “Mostly financed by a small elite within the German business community,” Manz observes, “[it] used them [i.e. clubs and associations] to exercise power and confirm social stratification.”135 This exercise of power reached far. It included the dispensation of services like information, education, labour exchange, as well as social support, reassurance, advice, a link with the government, even emergency help. Roger Daniels observes that “the cultural apparatus created…by Germans in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries dwarfs that of any other ethnic group.”136 Although he speaks of the U.S., Manz claims this was a worldwide phenomenon.137 While the church’s main objective was the preservation of faith as well as the Deutschtum of Luther’s religion, the institutions’ take was more broadly human services-based. This included maintaining the connection with their culture and inheritance, links with the homeland, but also economic welfare.

Community leader Ferdinand von Mueller’s description only covers part of

131 Manz, “Negotiating Ethnicity, Class and Gender [Abstract],” 146.
132 Panayi, German Immigrants, 145.
133 Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty, 42; see also Panayi, op.cit., 145-9, passim; especially 148.
134 Panayi, op.cit., 148; Handlin (1951), The Uprooted, passim.
136 Quoted Manz, op.cit., 146.
137 Manz, ibid.
Melbourne’s Deutscher Verein, which he celebrated as ensuring “that the memory of so much that was precious to the members would continue and...help to maintain their German nationality.”

The founders of the Deutscher Verein of Melbourne in 1856—there had been an 1850 predecessor that had succumbed to the gold euphoria—were among Melbourne’s cultural elite: the educationalist, 1848 revolutionary and former Frankfurt National Assembly deputy Karl Damm, goldfields administrator and engineer Jacob Braché, Lutheran pastor Matthias Goethe, businessmen John Kruse and Julius Scherff, future solicitor and consul Alexander Brahe, artist Ludwig Becker, and others. The Verein’s constitution (more so its actual practice) included asserting the German community’s claim for political and economic rights and equality, while also providing or organizing broad, ideologically unrestricted support on many levels, as already named. These included assistance with work, providing emergency financial service in case of destitution or death, providing or supporting education and entertainment, and equally importantly, liaison with other parts of the community, with local Anglo institutions, with the government as well as with the original homeland. The Verein was a de-facto government and parliament in-one for the German community, and it saw its role as covering all Germans, rural and urban.

Melbourne’s Vereinswesen (clubs and associations) included several other associations, each with a focus serving specific needs. The Turnverein (gymnastics and social club) established in 1860, Liedertafel (choral society, linked with several small orchestras; established ca.1854) and Krankenverein (mutual sickness benefit society; established 1860) all attracted memberships. All organized social and cultural events. Turnvereine and Liedertafeln had a long tradition as patriotic organizations. Both had grown out of the opposition to Napoleonic oppression at the beginning of the century, and in Germany had been closely associated with the movement for national unity, a democratic society, and particularly the revolutionary movement around 1848-49. It is surprising that their popularity spread quite rapidly into Melbourne’s Anglo community, and both institutions were eventually almost fully absorbed into the broader culture. Thus one may coin the phrase institutional assimilation. What the foregoing underlines is that the urban community, compared with its rural equivalent, was more
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138 Kosmopolit, June 16, 1857, 235, quoted Darragh, “The Deutsche Vereine of Victoria,” 66; see also Panayi, German Immigrants, 183.

outward-looking and closely linked with the host society, both deliberately but also by
default.  

Apart from musical and social events organized by the Liedertafel and
Turnverein—always with the intention of appealing to non-Germans—the more notable
initiatives of the German associations included various campaigns, like fundraising to
establish and equip the Melbourne Observatory (1857) or for the erection of a
Shakespeare statue in Melbourne (1860-64), planning and fundraising for an expedition
to search for Ludwig Leichhardt and his companions (1865), and participating in plans
for the Victorian Exploring Expedition of 1860-61. In all cases members of the
Deutscher Verein assumed roles as coordinators and leaders.

Although attracting Anglo press interest, not all of these initiatives bore tangible
fruits. The Shakespeare statue was never cast, and the substantial funds raised by the
German community were eventually pooled with funds collected by the wider
community and lost in anonymity. The Observatory campaign became a great
success, but in the end the government took full control. The Leichhardt search was
eventually conducted without German involvement. But the Exploring Expedition of
1860-61 proceeded, unfortunately ending disastrously. Neumayer as vice-president of
the Royal Society of Victoria played a leading role in planning it, and three of the
original seventeen expedition members were Germans. The badly planned and poorly
directed expedition failed spectacularly, and the press put much of the blame on the
head of its German participants—one of whom died during the strenuous march north
(Becker), while the other two escaped with varying amounts of undeserved censure,
forcing them to leave Australia. It was the German press which staunchly defended
the honour of their compatriots, while the Deutscher Verein chose to remain in the
background. This was one of many missed opportunities that ultimately caused loss of
prestige affecting the entire German community.

140 For example one of the triggers for founding Melbourne’s Turnverein had been a German celebration in honour of
the impending tercentenary of the birth of Shakespeare. See Victoria Deutsche Presse, nos. 43, 46, 47, 50 of April 27,
May 18, May 25, and June 15, 1860, respectively.
141 A Shakespeare Scholarship was endowed at the University of Melbourne in 1864 with all moneys collected in
reponse to the Victoria-wide appeal for a Shakespeare Statue. Until 2015 annual scholarships were awarded under
University Regulation R6.2. As the Süed-Australische Zeitung implies, the keeness of the German community to
contribute far exceeded that of their fellow Victorians. “Victoria,” SAZ, February 13, 1861, 2.
142 Germany, June 22 and July 6, 1865.
143 The documentation about the so-called Burke and Wills Expedition is vast. Among the works consulted are
Puettmann, Geschichte der Victorianischen Expedition, and Bonyhady, Burke and Wills.
144 Various sources were consulted for the preceding section, including Burggraf, Die Deutschen in den
Hauptstaedten, 30-1; Meyer, History of Germans, passim; Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, 46-74, passim; Panayi,
German Immigrants, passim.
2.3.2 Urban communities: the goldfields

The stratification, on the basis of class, wealth and education, of Melbourne’s German community was less in evidence on the goldfields. Here most miners lived cheek-by-jowl. Thus we find Melbourne’s future art school director and painter Eugene von Guerard, scientist and future Melbourne Observatory director Georg Neumayer, and geologist Jacob Braché living in tents side-by-side with other diggers.\textsuperscript{145} It was an egalitarian and democratic society, in some way a precursor of future Australian society, quite different to Melbourne at the time.

By the early 1860s, Germans were quite prominent among Bendigo’s mining population. A letter writer to the \textit{Mount Alexander Mail} claimed there were 20,000 Germans on the goldfields; more recently, A.V. Palmer asserted a figure of almost 8,000 at Sandhurst alone. Cusack arrives at a more realistic figure of 2-3,000 in and around Bendigo.\textsuperscript{146} The Census figure shows 1,462 in 1861, though one has to assume that to be too low because of the floating population.\textsuperscript{147} Bate gives Ballarat’s number as 914 males and 209 females,\textsuperscript{148} and there were many hundreds more at Castlemaine, Beechworth, Ararat, Avoca, Maldon, Talbot and the many other goldfields centres. The majority were single young men, “adventurers, intellectuals, professional men,”\textsuperscript{149} with a sprinkling of miners from the Harz, the Erzgebirge, and displaced men from Holstein—as Frank Cusack observes for Bendigo.\textsuperscript{150}

It was noted in the preceding chapter that in goldfields districts East-Elbian immigrants were significantly outnumbered by Germans from north, west and south Germany, contrasting with the rest of the colony. However, one Silesian—perhaps the most famous of Sandhurst’s sometime residents (early 1860s)—was the adventurer Gustav von Tempsky, a nobleman, soldier of fortune and romantic hero.\textsuperscript{151}

Most of the diggers lived in tents close to their claims, though the highly successful quartz miner Christoph Ballerstaedt was able to build himself a huge mansion at Sandhurst. Despite the fact that singles vastly outnumbered married Germans, and that the German contingent, like others, was highly mobile, moving from

\textsuperscript{145} See the entries in \textit{ADB On-line} for von Guerard by Marjorie J. Tipping; on Neumayer by R.A. Swan; and on Braché by Helen Morris.
\textsuperscript{146} Letter by Alfred Wiere in \textit{Mount Alexander Mail}, September 14, 1855; A.V. Palmer, in \textit{Goldmines of Bendigo}, claimed that almost 8,000 Germans were at the Sandhurst fields consistently from 1853 and for the next 30 years. Quoted Cusack, \textit{Bendigo, the German Chapter}, 13,14.
\textsuperscript{147} Cusack, op.cit., 14.
\textsuperscript{148} Bate, \textit{Lucky City}, 107.
\textsuperscript{149} Cusack, op.cit., 13.
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid., 43-5.
one promising goldfield to another, small German residential precincts eventually emerged at Diamond Hill (with at one stage 500 German residents), Chum Gully, Ironbark, and a few others.\textsuperscript{152} This made these communities differ markedly from Melbourne’s dispersed settlements. Unlike in rural communities, many Germans married into English and Irish communities, which also accelerated assimilation. The emergence of a small permanent German community at Sandhurst occurred around the late 1860s. Cusack notes that most ethnic groups were distinct and recognizable. Unlike most others, Germans were particularly well-organized, establishing their own schools, a Lutheran church, and a variety of clubs and associations.\textsuperscript{153} A Deutscher Verein was founded in 1869, preceded by a short-lived earlier association in 1858.\textsuperscript{154} By 1875 it had 250 members and possessed a renowned library of over 5,000 volumes.\textsuperscript{155} It became a major social centre for the district’s Germans, though many of the Verein’s cultural activities—masked balls, dances, theatrical productions and its library—also attracted non-Germans. A Liedertafel was founded at much the same time. The Verein thrived until the later part of the century, and its eventual decline soon after the turn of the century paralleled the general decline of the German community.\textsuperscript{156}

A Lutheran congregation was established, initially served by Pastor Goethe who would occasionally visit from Melbourne, and from 1856 onwards by a local appointment—initially missionary Gericke from the Gossner Aboriginal mission in Queensland. Its church was built in 1865. The first Lutheran school commenced in central Bendigo in 1857, another was established at Ironbark in 1867.\textsuperscript{157} Gericke’s successor, serving his congregation for over sixty years, was the angelic Pastor Friedrich Leypoldt who also succeeded in nipping a potential religious rift in the bud.\textsuperscript{158} A small but significant community of businessmen, especially hoteliers, a successful architect (Vahlund) and, despite the fact that Bendigo’s Germans were almost all Lutherans, a highly regarded Catholic priest, Dr Georg Henry Backhaus, a Westphalian like his Lutheran colleagues Leypoldt and Schuermann, was part of the community. A German-born mayor, Conrad Heinz, a butcher from Hesse, served for a term in 1894-95.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[152] Cusack, \textit{Bendigo, the German Chapter}, 51-5, \textit{passim}.
\item[153] Ibid., 57.
\item[154] \textit{Bendigo Advertiser}, April 26, 1858.
\item[156] Cusack, op.cit., 17,101.
\item[157] Ibid., 53,55.
\item[158] Ibid., 102.
\end{footnotes}
An industrial dispute in 1860 threatened to reflect badly on the good reputation of the Germans. Through no fault of their own, they were drawn into a conflict that generated sharp press criticism at the time when the Murray River Railway line was being constructed by the Melbourne construction firm of Cornish and Bruce, linking Bendigo with Melbourne. The company—notoriously devious and corrupt, and aiming to sabotage a recently negotiated eight-hour working day agreement—had retained an equally corrupt Sydney immigration agent, Julius Lippmann, to indenture some 400 German stonemasons to work for them. Cornish and Bruce’s intention was to flout the agreement they had reluctantly agreed on with the unions by underpaying the Germans, who were unaware of the agreement. The Operative Stonemasons Society, the union covering these tradesmen, got wind of Cornish’s scheme and mounted a robust protest on arrival of the German masons, generating heated debates and strikes throughout the colony.\footnote{Melbourne Deutsche Zeitung 10 (November 11, 1859); Victoria Deutsche Presse 40 (April 6, 1860); 47 (May 25, 1860).} The press, unaware that the German masons had themselves been tricked, quite wrongly believed the Germans had colluded with the company. Following a government enquiry and union negotiations, the German masons eventually joined the union while the company was severely censured. It required much diplomatic intercession by Melbourne’s Deutscher Verein to rehabilitate their injured compatriots and to expose the corrupt parties.\footnote{Victoria Deutsche Presse 34 (February 21, 1860).}

Ballarat’s German community was smaller than Bendigo’s, and after 1861 it declined more rapidly. Yet, as was shown in the earlier chapter, Germans were politically very active. German support of the claims for miners’ justice, and their active participation at the Eureka uprising, are clear illustrations. This contrasts with Lucy Hill’s description in a 1951 commemorative article of Bendigo’s Germans as “industrious and contented (my italics).”\footnote{Bendigo Advertiser, Centenary Edition, January 1951, 68.} As in Bendigo, Ballarat’s Deutscher Verein and Liedertafel served the wider local community.\footnote{established about 1869. Ballarat Star, March 31, 1869, 4; Argus, May 10, 1884, 10.} The Liedertafel was a rebirth around 1880 of one founded in the 1860s. By the 1880s it had become fully assimilated and Welsh-dominated.\footnote{The conductor in 1873 was Herr Hartmann, in 1882 John Robson. Ballarat Star, May 26, 1873 and December 1, 1882. See also Bate, Lucky City, 229; Argus, May 10, 1884, 10.} The first Lutheran church was dedicated in 1865 in Doveton...
Street, though an active community started ten years earlier.\textsuperscript{164} Three Lutheran schools were operating in 1871.\textsuperscript{165}

Despite the temporary presence of prominent Germans like von Guerard, Becker and others, and although Germans were the largest non-Anglo group, German cultural influence in Ballarat appears to have been minimal, perhaps due to the enormous number of visiting international artists of the calibre of the great violinist Miska Hauser, the singers of the famous Lyster Italian Opera Company, and many others. Weston Bate provides statistics that indicate the small size of the German community which, with the exception of Sebastopol’s 5.41 per cent in 1861, scarcely exceeded one per cent. The 1857 census—in such a dynamic environment bound to be inaccurate—lists 914 German men and 209 women.\textsuperscript{166} In his family history \textit{An Evening with the Judge}, Graham Fricke—descendant of a Ballarat miner—observes that “the ratio of Germans was low but significant.”\textsuperscript{167} Nevertheless, one of their number succeeded to become Mayor (Emmanuel Steinfeld, a Silesian), serving 1866-69.\textsuperscript{168} Ferdinand Krause was a leading scientist who became a co-founder of Ballarat’s School of Mines.

An interesting offshoot and significant economic development for both Ballarat and Bendigo was the emergence of small German rural satellite communities on the edge of both cities. When land was made available to miners under special provisions of the \textit{Miners’ Right to Land Act},\textsuperscript{169} some former German miners turned their hand to farming in nearby districts endowed with highly fertile volcanic soils.\textsuperscript{170} Though many of these settlements initially showed typical East-Elbian patterns, they soon took on a quite different character. Established by more educated, more professional and financially more secure German ex-miners willing to experiment and take risks, they were set up for the sole purpose of providing the nearby gold towns with essential agricultural services like the supply of meat, dairy, and soon, the products of a successful viticultural industry. A number of these entrepreneurs were experienced

\textsuperscript{164} Paech, \textit{Twelve Decades}, 138-9.
\textsuperscript{165} Letter by “\textit{Expers},” \textit{Ballarat Star}, April 4, 1871; letter by “\textit{Enquirer},” March 10, 1871, 3. See also \textit{Ballarat Star}, March 27, 1871, 4 and April 4, 1871, 3.
\textsuperscript{166} Bate, \textit{Lucky City}, 107.
\textsuperscript{167} Fricke, \textit{An Evening with the Judge}, 33.
\textsuperscript{168} Goldman, \textit{The Jews of Victoria in the 19th Century}, 215.
\textsuperscript{169} VR XXXVII, Sec. III, enacted June 1855.
\textsuperscript{170} Powell, \textit{The Public Lands}, 68.
vignerons from the Rhineland. David Dunstan notes the wholehearted support this industry received from the influential local Roman Catholic priest Dr Backhaus. 171

Powell observes that the viability of these small settlements was enhanced by low transport costs for delivering their produce, minimal outside competition, and premium prices, often double metropolitan prices. 172 They were part of a growing infrastructure that bypassed Melbourne, and which to some extent even obviated the need for some imports while also sustaining and reinforcing the German communities in the nearby urban centres. 173 Unfortunately, this successful economic experiment ended dramatically in 1893 when phylloxera struck—almost twenty years after it had caused a similar collapse of Geelong’s wine industry. 174

Near Bendigo, these small rural settlements were established in the Colbinabbin Range, at Elmore, Emu Creek, Axe Creek, Sheepwash Creek, Strathfieldsaye and elsewhere. The best-known vignerons of the time were Georg Bruhn—no relation to the gold discoverer—and the artist Frederick Grosse. 175 As the gold industry and the German presence in gold towns declined—more in Ballarat than Bendigo—Germans held their own longer in these rural settlements, perhaps owing to a slightly more level gender balance. 176 After 1893, many of the bankrupted vignerons migrated to the West and joined the German migration into the Mallee, which was then still in progress. 177

Ballarat’s villages included Dead Horse, where Alsatian-German hotel owner Charles Fleischauer was also the leading vignerons, with others at Buninyong, Winters Flat, Magpie and Little Bendigo.

Germans were present at most other goldfields, and their influence varied. The structure of their communities, here as well as at Ballarat and Bendigo, fell somewhere between that of the compact rural, and the highly dispersed Metropolitan settlement pattern. A small but enduring community mined and later farmed at and near Castlemaine. 177 At Beechworth an Alsatian-German, August Borschmann, and later S. Fiedler, conducted a Liedertafel, 178 and the Wendish-German Zwar family operated a

---

171 Dunstan, “The Vignerons,” 101 and Note 2; also Cusack, Bendigo, 67-80, passim, especially 68,71; see also Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 73-4.
172 Lodewyckx, op.cit., 70.
173 Cusack, op.cit., 65-6, passim; Dunstan, op.cit., 67-8, passim.
174 Dunstan, op.cit., 69,76.
175 Ibid., 67-80, passim. A list of vignerons is given on page 76.
176 Bate, Lucky City, 148-9. The latter assumption is purely intuitive, not substantiated by statistical evidence.
177 Holst, Making a Home, passim; Paech, Twelve Decades, 143-4.
178 Woods, Beechworth, 127-8,165-74, passim.
big tannery until World War I. Maldon was the first of the gold towns with a German-born mayor, Friedrich Courtin (1860). Although here most miners were Welsh and Cornish, its small but active German community had established a Deutscher Verein, the only country Verein with its own building (1857). Its Turnverein was possibly the first in Victoria. In a survey by Thomas Darragh, fifteen German Vereine, Turnvereine and in several cases, Liedertafels are shown to be established at various goldfields, indicating the existence of strong resident communities. Beside Melbourne, Bendigo, Ballarat, Beechworth, Castlemaine and Maldon, Darragh also lists Maryborough (1857), Avoca (1859), Creswick (1859), Taradale (1860), Talbot (1859), Smythes Creek (1861), Majorca (1863), McCallums Creek (1863) and Middle Creek near Yackandandah (1870).

Although relatively small in numbers, the presence of Germans on the goldfields was more obvious than in the metropolis. They were prominent as businessmen, and some—like the Magdeburg-born Ballerstaedt—were extremely successful miners. Cusack notes that Sandhurst’s population was ethnically stratified, and thus Germans stood out and were recognizable. Apart from that, their more aggressive attitude to business and commerce, and an innovative attitude to mining, coupled with diverse cultural activities (libraries, Liedertafels, schools), further helped to make them stand out. The fact that fifteen claim sites bore the name German Gully adds proof of their apparent ubiquity.

While overwhelmingly Lutheran, few of the miners succumbed to religious schisms that might have divided the community, as was the case in small Old Lutheran influenced rural communities. Cusack notes another sign of greater tolerance, illustrated by the amiable relations between the long-time Lutheran pastor Friedrich Leypoldt (served 1869-1930) and Monsignor Georg Backhaus (1852-82). The heterogeneity of Ballarat and Bendigo’s German community doubtlessly stifled regional collusion leading to ideological and religious differences.

179 Woods, “Zwar, Albert Michael.”
181 Cusack, Bendigo, on page 55 quotes Frederick Streger, a long-time resident of Bendigo, interviewed in Bendigo Independent, February 27, 1913. The interview could not be verified in Trove which indexes the Independent. See also ibid., 12ff, 23-27, passim, and Birrell, “The Quartz Reefers,” in Cusack, op.cit., 29-42, passim.
182 Cusack, op.cit., 49.
183 Owens, A.E., “Backhaus, George Henry.” There are numerous references for Leypoldt in Trove.
2.4 Political engagement

Almost from its formation, Victoria’s German community was well-equipped and articulate to make its views known and to defend itself if attacked. That is, provided it chose such action. There was the Lutheran church, safeguarding its community’s beliefs, its rights and indeed, the type of Luther-Deutschum it represented. Not that there was any occasion prior to World War I when it was ever seriously challenged. There was also the Melbourner Deutscher Verein, an organization representing the leading members of the community. Some of its members during its formative years had considerable standing in the wider community—the voices of scientists von Mueller, Neumayer, Blandowski counted, as did those of artists von Guerard and Grosse, businessman Kruse, Consul Brahe, and many others.

While it appeared to act as a policy-making club for the entire community, one may ask how effectively it represented the community’s rights vis-à-vis the Anglo majority. While no doubt it aimed to serve its community, did it do so effectively? Was it prepared to stand up to critics and challengers? Did it have views, and make them widely known, and if so, how? Was it too weak or too deferential towards its host? Founded in 1850 and re-established in 1856, the Verein attempted to provide a meeting place for new arrivals and existing residents so that they could get to know one another, a sickness and distress support service, a social centre and library, a labour exchange (Arbeitsvermittlungs-Bureau), and a venue for social activities, for information interchange and for action aimed at advancing the needs of the community. Unfortunately, its Statuten (constitution) fail to provide a clear mission statement. They give the appearance of merely being a social club providing a few ancillary services, like employment assistance and support for distressed members.\(^{184}\) Without changing the constitution, the Verein soon realized this inadequacy and adopted the more proactive role of a committed community voice.\(^ {185}\) It was sincere in at least attempting to act as a “conscience” of the German community, a forum vis-à-vis the colonial administration and a rallying body for collective German actions and opinions. Its platform—never formalized in print—expanded over time, including dealings with Victorian government agencies, on one occasion negotiating citizenship issues directly with Governor Henry Barkly, as well as voting rights, ownership rights of land and

\(^{184}\) See Statuten des Deutschen Vereines in Victoria.
\(^{185}\) Victoria Deutsche Presse, February 3 and June 22, 1860. Additional background on the various programmes of the Deutscher Verein is given in Kosmopolit 1 (November 11, 1856); Melbourne Deutsche Zeitung 2 (June 1859); Victoria Deutsche Presse 45 (May 11, 1860).
property, and naturalization issues, beside educational matters, employment, social support and even entertainment. With the Anglo press it debated over grievances such as the misunderstandings over the stonemasons affair; with governmental associations in Germany, like the Nationalverein, it discussed proposals for German unification. Beside all these, a wide raft of charitable initiatives in support of flood, mine disaster and war victims in their old home country were part of its concerns. Numerous appeals in its name covered community-wide issues already noted above, like the support for the Melbourne Observatory, collecting funds for searching for Leichhardt (1865), or the Shakespeare statue, and others.

The other successful German associations, especially the Turnvereine and Liedertafels in Melbourne and goldmining towns, contributed to the community’s kudos and legitimacy, gaining wider community acceptance and social credit through their cultural activities. But they carried little political weight. However, both of the latter associations, as well as the Krankenverein (sickness benefit association), ultimately relieved the Deutscher Verein of some of its social service commitments, freeing it to play a wider role as a political defence and empowerment agency. In that respect the Verein was less successful. It often failed to raise an assertive voice over the legitimacy and the civic entitlements of its constituency. There were numerous occasions when it should have acted, often with the added force of natural justice, but failed to do so. Its membership may have been small, but many of its members were high-powered individuals carrying weight in the wider community. By way of illustration, when the political atmosphere became highly charged over the Eureka uprising, and a hostile Anglo press pointed at Germans as instigators, the Verein remained silent. It failed on two counts: first, by failing to articulate the genuine grievances of the diggers, and second, by not explaining German sympathies for their cause. A meek German community meeting rejected any guilt by association, weakly declaring its loyalty to Australia. Its display of political inertia and unwillingness to take a stand, even if unpopular, would justly stigmatize it as weak. This meekness would virtually determine its trajectory to the disastrous fate it met in World War I.

It is thus not surprising that writers like Lodewyckx, Manz, Voigt and others agree that, ultimately, the decline of the German community by the end of the century
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186 See for example Kosmopolit 32 (March 6, 1857).
187 Deutsche Zeitung 6-9 (June 7-28, 1861); Germania 24, 25 (June 21, 28, 1861).
188 A useful summary of Verein activities is given in Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, 49-65.
(in Victoria and elsewhere) was due not to loss of language or lack of cohesion, but the unwillingness of its leadership, and especially the Deutscher Verein, to encourage engagement in the politics of the majority. The Verein failed to capitalize on its good reputation, not only for general political objectives but to ensure the community’s survival.\footnote{Luebke, Germans in Brazil, 65 and Note 8.} Surprisingly, despite the fact there were over five million German-Americans (vis-à-vis 10,000 German-Australians in Victoria), a vastly more determined German-American community drifted into a similar direction.\footnote{The U.S. figures vary hugely: Bergquist gives a figure of 2.7 million, Manz 7-8 million, other writers give in-between numbers. Various writers comment on the failure of the German community to take a political stand. Sowell writes “The success and prominence of Germans in agriculture…was not repeated in politics” (page 79), or “their apathy about politics” (page 102): Sowell, Migrations and Cultures. For observations about Australia see Jupp, “The Hidden Migrants,” 63-64; Jupp, The Australian People (2001 edition), 364. Luebke observes that in Brazil an entirely different situation applied. While Germans did not participate in Brazilian national politics, their self-imposed marginalization protected their political control of their own diasporic community. Luebke, Germans in Brazil, 65.} Bergquist observes that German-Americans, passive participants in the electoral system, virtually squandered their electoral capital.\footnote{Bergquist, “German Communities in American Cities,” 12; Bergquist, “Germans and German-speaking Immigrants,” 240-1; Ripley, “The Ethnic Frontier,” 204. The lack of a tradition of participating in politics prompts Sowell to refer to as “apathy about politics,” and Luebke to describe as self-imposed marginality. Sowell, Migration and Culture, 102; Luebke, Germans in Brazil, 65.} There was one single institution that was an exception, both in America and Victoria: the German press.

2.5 The German press

In 1854, the Melbourne Age newspaper commenced publication with an editorial asserting that “The newspaper has become the great teacher of the age. It exercises an influence more immediate, more extensive and more powerful than that of the pulpit or the school. It is the lever that moves society…and gives real authority to the people.”\footnote{[Editorial] The Age, October 17, 1854, 4.} I will endeavour to measure to what extent the German press in Victoria pursued a similar policy.

Victoria’s German press has a remarkable history, even though its trajectory was both short and erratic. Gilson and Zubrzycki’s The Foreign-language Press in Australia (1967) listing of German newspapers devotes over seven pages to German-language newspapers, compared with less than one page for French or Chinese papers, respectively.\footnote{Gilson and Zubrzycki, The Foreign-language Press in Australia, 181,187-95.} The peak period lasted from the late 1850s to the late 1860s, with a brief resurgence in 1870-72. Yet by 1873 Victoria’s German-language press was dead. Was this because its mission was accomplished? Or did indifference kill it?
The first German paper, appearing in Melbourne in December 1854, was Victoria’s Deutsche Zeitung. Though briefly noticed in the Argus, and with a brief reference in the later paper Germania, nothing is known about its focus or fate because no issues have survived. We only know that its first issue appeared on December 2, 1854, and its editor was Ernst Heyne. Victoria’s Deutsche Zeitung had a predecessor of sorts. Although more of a Lutheran newsletter, its editor, Pastor Goethe, nevertheless considered Der Pilger in Victoria to be a newspaper, and he confirmed this in his editorial policy statement in 1853: “A German press [is essential] to help Germans to become familiar with the laws and events of the country.”

It may perhaps be a slight exaggeration to speak of a flowering period, but the twelve years from 1856-68 witnessed the birth (and death) of four remarkable newspapers, of which two had a lifespan of about one year; a third, with several name changes and varying frequency, survived for about four years; and the most successful, Germania, appeared for almost eight years (1860-68) and only ceased on the death of its owner. A fifth paper, Der Australische Christenbote, founded in 1860 as a successor to Der Pilger, survived longer—in fact it was published until being proscribed during World War I—but although in later years it partially assumed the role of a general newspaper, in the 1860s it was principally the organ of the Lutheran Synod in Melbourne, and its coverage of general news and commentary was limited. Essentially a South Australian ELSA paper, the Lutherische Kirchenbote fuer Australien was printed at Hochkirch between 1874 and 1903.

All the papers appeared in quick succession and in some cases even overlapped. The first, Der Kosmopolit, issued by Bremen-born Gustav Droege, claiming to be an “organ of the political conscience,” appeared from November 1856 to November 1857. Its aims were “to strive for a democratic society” and to encourage German “participation in politics to achieve full equality.” An interesting and aggressive organ, its demise may well have been due to the owner/editor being attacked by creditors in his office.

Chronologically, the next paper was Victoria Deutsche Presse (VDP), issued by Friedrich Gelbrecht, who also founded Melbourne’s Turnverein and Krankenverein.

---

195 Kosmopolit 1 (November 11, 1856).
Hard-hitting like *Kosmopolit*, *VDP* did much to expose the shenanigans of the railway construction contractors Cornish and Bruce in deceiving the German stonemasons they intended to employ, but it alienated the Deutscher Verein over some scurrilous accusations. *VDP* lasted fourteen months, from July 1859 to September 1860.

Hermann Puettmann, a seasoned journalist from his native Rhineland, was a sometime collaborator of Karl Marx and of poet and polemicist Georg Weerth. After fleeing Germany over his involvement with the 1848-49 revolution, and a brief association with Prince Albert as his librarian, he issued a series of excellent but extremely short-lived news and news-cum-literary serials between 1859 and 1863. These were *Deutsche Monatschrift fuer Australien* (May-August 1859, published by Degotardi in Sydney); *Melbourner Deutsche Zeitung* (September 1859-July 1860); *Australische Monatzeitung* (August 1860-April 1861); *Deutsche Zeitung* (May 1861-January 1862), briefly followed by a differently-formated *Australische Monatzeitung* until July 1862 and then by *Australische Vierteljahrsschrift* (ceased March, 1863). Despite his best intentions, the audience’s indifference eventually pulled the plug on Puettmann’s efforts. As his editorship overlapped with the so-called Burke and Wills expedition, whose disaster was unjustly blamed on its German participants Brahe, Becker and Beckler, Puettmann railed at the injustice his compatriots were facing in the mainstream press as well as by a kangaroo-court style Commission of Enquiry that followed, by publishing a critical history of the expedition. Part of this work was censored and seized by the police.196

The next entrant in the fray was *Germania; Allgemeine Deutsche Zeitung fuer Australien*. It was edited by a level-headed, mild-mannered revolutionary from Dresden, Johann Gottlieb Franke. *Germania* appeared without interruption from January 11, 1860 until Franke’s death in October 1868. A middle-of-the-road liberal-democratic paper, it may well have endured much longer but for its owner’s demise. Another paper, to be considered in the following chapter, *Melbourner Deutsche Zeitung*, appeared from 1870-72. It accompanied the fateful events and aftermath of the Franco-Prussian war that profoundly affected the German-Australian community.

All four newspapers, from *Kosmopolit* to *Germania*, can be described as liberal and democratic in outlook, distinguished more by their owners’/principal writers’ personal outlook rather than any significant ideological differences. What seems
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remarkable is that the owner/editors, with one exception (Puettmann), had had no journalistic training. What all had in common was an undoubted commitment to liberal ideals and their deep concern with the welfare of the German community. The modernity of their approach to many issues of politics, of citizenship, relations with Aborigines and the Chinese, is at times quite striking, especially when considering how new their editors were to professional journalism.

As an educational agency, Gilson and Zubrzycki see the migrant press as “without equal” because it prepared immigrants “for good citizenship in the countries of settlement.” Its approach was to encourage their readers to become more assertive, to take out citizenship, and to engage in local and colonial politics. It saw no inconsistency in maintaining cultural pride in their inheritance (without jingoistic overtones) and love and loyalty for their new home. While encouraging the link with their native country by reporting on homeland affairs (at a time when no unified Germany existed), most papers gave prominence to British and Australian affairs. Only German-Australian affairs, with the exception of what went on in the immediate local community, seemed somewhat neglected. Sentiments like “Australians, that’s what we are,” or “Victoria, our new fatherland,” expressed and encouraged pride in the new homeland and were constantly invoked. The greatest merit of the German-language press was that, not dissimilar to the Lutheran church but for different reasons, it connected Victoria’s Germans with each other. Intensely protective of their constituency—despite the latter’s indifference and apolitical attitudes—every German paper in Victoria nonetheless eventually succumbed to a raft of insurmountable problems. Foremost were, first, the lack of support due to the community’s failure to grasp the importance of having a free press in their own language, and second, the community’s political inertia. The readers, especially East-Elbian peasants, lacked both a tradition of open debate or even of reading newspapers, and on the other hand a tradition of organized protest. By comparison, the papers’ shaky financial base seemed to be the lesser of their problems.

As already noted earlier, political inertia was also a constant grievance for writers on Germans in America, even if that community was much stronger, steeled by its active resistance to hostile nativist attacks. Despite a highly successful German-language press, there were inherent weaknesses. As Bergquist points out, a successful and effective migrant press would ultimately bring about its own demise. By
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encouraging citizenship of the host country, it would eventually become expendable. Victoria’s German community was less sophisticated, and because it was numerically much smaller, its press was more vulnerable for a variety of reasons. In contrast, Brazil’s German-language press presented an entirely different picture. Luebke observes that, though often attacked (but counter-attacking in turn), it neither sought nor encouraged any involvement in the host’s politics. Far more successful than the press in America or Australia, it saw itself as “a strong force for the perpetuation of the immigrant culture.”

2.6 Relations with the wider German and Anglo-Australian communities

It would be wrong to assume that the links between various German settlements in Victoria were loose to the extent that there was little contact, and thus creating the impression that the German community had a mere fictitious existence. Quite clearly, their common ethnic heritage mattered to most members and drew them together. In addition, they were linked and kept in touch through various means, including German newspapers. Robin Walker claims that Germans, compared with Anglo-Australians, were not dedicated newspaper readers. However, as Deutsche Zeitung in 1861 lists twenty-three subscriber agencies in various rural areas of Victoria, Walker may have been too pessimistic. In addition, Goethe’s Lutherische Christenbote, received by all ELCV congregations, and the Lutherische Kirchenbote fuer Australien, printed on behalf of the ELSA in the rural publishing centre of Hochkirch, reached the various ELSA congregations. Thus, both rural and urban communities shared these media and were kept connected, both as Lutherans and Germans. It was in regard to joint actions, initiatives or campaigns that the various communities remained distant until a major event—German unification—temporarily unified them. That will be the subject of the following chapter.

Earlier in this discussion I put forward the hypothesis that German rural communities were more successful in surviving than urban communities. This requires strong arguments to substantiate. May one argue that unwillingness to assimilate and to
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201 Walker, “German-language Press,” 129.
accept the norms of the host country are adequate proof? Was separation (rural isolation) deliberate or accidental? If the former, what evidence exists? Was Price correct when claiming that not only “early immigrants kept to themselves…unaffected by the remainder of the colony” (my italics; he speaks of South Australia) but that by 1900, when the effect of isolation had largely broken down, “adherence to Deutschtum was very strong [even] in the town parishes”?203

I noted earlier that this is not the place to argue my hypothesis to its conclusion because more evidence needs to be canvassed. Anecdotally, however, it appears that until the early 1870s urban Germans presented a clearer idea of a collective will to preserve their Deutschtum (German heritage). When Price (1945) nominates the German-Australian press, church publications, and the activities of “clubs…all directed to preserve the German way of life,” he is largely correct.204 But when he goes on to impute that “the leaders and members [of these organizations] were consciously or unconsciously influenced by pan-Germanic ideals…of keeping the superior German ‘race,’ language and culture pure and untainted by alien influence,” his argument begins to assume an ominous ring dictated by prejudice rather than evidence.205 The fact is that the circumstances of their emigration, the rural poverty, landlessness and displacement they had shared, in addition to a natural bond through their common heritage, rather than pan-Germanic ideals—rural Germans would not even have understood that expression—preserved the integrity of rural communities, while lifestyle, geography, and economic necessity started to erode it in urban areas. There is no evidence supporting Price’s assertion of feelings of superiority by German-Australians. He advances various arguments in support of his claim that “Pan-Germanic policy greatly hindered the assimilation of German settlers, by encouraging them to retain their German language and culture and, to a certain extent, their political loyalty to Germany.”206 Wisely, he omits providing the evidence—because there is none.

2.7 Assimilation

Despite his claim that Germans actively resisted assimilation (he devoted an entire chapter in his book to this topic), Price overlooked the fact that, by about 1870, there were already signs indicating that assimilation was beginning to “bite.” In fact, as

203 Price, German Settlements, 16.
204 Ibid., 18.
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206 Ibid., 4.
Bergquist assessed the German-American community, he found that an assimilationist trend emerged almost from the beginnings of settlement, because an underlying assumption of both the community and its institutions was that assimilation was inevitable. No doubt this also applied in Australia.\textsuperscript{207} Charles Meyer observes that the lack of replenishment of new blood from the fatherland—by the 1890s immigration was at a near standstill—further contributed to assimilation occurring almost naturally.\textsuperscript{208}

Leaving aside the German Vereine (clubs) for a moment, Heidler presents a convincing case that German Liedertafels (choral societies), which over time generated a massive appeal among the Anglo majority, were gradually taken over by an ever-increasing number of English-speaking members. That eventually led these societies to becoming effectively de-Germanized by the 1880s, both in Melbourne and, as noted earlier, in Ballarat.\textsuperscript{209} Kuehlmann quite appropriately refers to such developments as cultural enrichment of the host country, while others, like the colonialist advocate Emil Jung, sarcastically dismiss it as \textit{Kulturduenger}.\textsuperscript{210} The situation was similar with Turnvereine (gymnastics clubs). Their social activities, their gymnastic displays, and especially the Melbourne Turnverein’s famous annual “picnics”—massive beer festivals accompanied by multicultural singsongs—and similar events taking place at Ballarat, Castlemaine and elsewhere had become so popular that \textit{Australianaization} was inevitable, with only rudimentary German characteristics remaining.\textsuperscript{211} Michael Clyne’s maps document the declining German language use in what once were largely German districts.\textsuperscript{212} Even the Lutheran church eventually had to give way. While the conservative Old Lutheran element had played a significant role as a virtual guardian of \textit{Deutschtum} (German-ness) in the 1850s and ‘60s, including its fierce protection of the German language, Moses’ description of the church as “the custodian of the essence of German culture” became progressively less apposite.\textsuperscript{213} While earlier in the nineteenth century Luther’s Bible translation was considered fundamental to German language and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{207} Bergquist points out that the numerous institutions established to preserve German culture had a flipside function, namely “of easing the transition from the previous society to the new society.” Bergquist, “German Communities in America,” 8, 9.
\item \textsuperscript{208} Meyer, \textit{History of Germans}, 41-2, passim. Buchanan observed that Germans were “rarely visible in the urban landscape,” implying large-scale assimilation. Buchanan, \textit{The Construction of Cultural Identity}, 81.
\item \textsuperscript{209} Heidler, \textit{The German Liedertafel}, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{210} Literally, culture fertilizer. The term seems to have been coined by physician and archivist Wilhelm Stricker in the 1840s but was used during the colonial period in a pejorative sense, as for example by Jung in \textit{Deutschtum} (p.29), as contributing to the development of new lands without getting credit for themselves or the home country. See also Kuehlmann, \textit{Deutsche in der Fremde}, 11; and especially Zoeller, who condemns the loss of human resources to the fatherland. Zoeller, \textit{Rund um die Erde}, vol.1, 251.
\item \textsuperscript{211} Walker, “Some Social and Political Aspects,” 28, 29.
\item \textsuperscript{212} Clyne, “Distribution of Languages other than English,” vol. 1, passim; vol. 2, 1-2.
\item \textsuperscript{213} Moses, “Deutschumspolitik in Australia, from Kaiserreich to Third Reich,” 123.
\end{itemize}
culture, and thus for conservative Lutherans it held an almost sacrosanct place, Australian Lutheranism was evolving. Even the ELSA’s American affiliate, the conservative Missouri Synod, did not share such views, and similarly the ELSA Synod was forced to introduce alternative English-language services.\textsuperscript{214} Bettina Goldberg’s case study of Lutheran schools in Milwaukee, dominated by the Missouri-Synod, shows that the use of English became a virtual necessity to make teaching effective, and from around 1900 the same also applied in Australia.\textsuperscript{215} When assimilation (and corresponding language loss) had proceeded past the point of no return, many congregations readily switched to English.\textsuperscript{216} Bergquist confirms that this was the experience throughout the U.S.\textsuperscript{217}

Assimilation means to adopt the cultural, social and political norms of the host society. Although it was almost inevitable, numerous factors propelled or slowed its progress. Rural settlements in Victoria’s West were the slowest to assimilate, protected by geographical and internal social isolation that promoted retention of language and customs (as Clyne’s language-use map shows). To pro-British integrationists, this became a cause of irritation and suspicion, as can be seen in comments by the newspaper columnist known as “The Vagabond.”\textsuperscript{218} By contrast, in the metropolis, and urban centres elsewhere, the continuing interaction with the larger majority community speeded it up, as observed by another observer, the journalist and author Hugo Zoeller.\textsuperscript{219} Assimilation was often accompanied by soul-searching and personal agony. While some semblance of ethnic identity (signifying only partial assimilation) remained in evidence, urban Germans were rapidly becoming German-Australians in word and deed.\textsuperscript{220}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[214] Compare this with Harold Schiffman (1987), “Language Loyalty in the German-American Church: the Case of an Over-confident Minority,” which makes the point that the (Old Lutheran) Missouri Synod was bilingual almost from its inception.
\item[215] Goldberg, “Cultural Change in Milwaukee’s...Congregations,” 115-28, passim; Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen, 191.
\item[216] The struggle over retaining or abandoning German-language services at Melbourne’s Trinity Church is well described by John Martin, “Pastor Herlitz,” in A Church in the Garden of God, 141-2.
\item[217] Bergquist notes that the church’s endeavours were however stifled by its own internal disunity, symptomatic of the overarching disunity in the wider German-American community, where the assimilationists and the conservatives were always at loggerheads. Bergquist, “German Communities in American Cities,” 8. In Australia the Lutheran U.S.-based Missouri Synod had quite early softened its attitude to the predominant position of German as the language of the Bible or the sermon.
\item[218] This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five, section 5.9.
\item[219] See Chapter Four, section 4.5.
\end{footnotes}
2.8 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter has examined various German settlements, some larger, some small, rural and urban. Its findings are that, despite their differences in origin and the variety of problems that affected, strengthened or weakened some of them more than others, the similarities between them still legitimate the generic, summary description of all of them as one (albeit loose) German community. In the course of its deliberations, the chapter identified and analyzed the large variety of problems, internal and external threats, the means developed to resist them, the organizations created to strengthen the community, the simultaneous role of the Lutheran church to protect but also divide. It also endeavoured to show how this community was assisted, viewed or criticized by the larger host society and its institutions, especially its press.

By singling out one particular segment of society—in this case the German community within the larger Anglo-Celtic Australian immigrant majority of Victoria—it is possible to observe a simple paradigm of nation-building en miniature. This shows the emergence of the nucleus of a body that evolves to become an identifiable as well as independent part of a larger society. From this it is merely a short step to assess its viability. Did the German community evolve to that state? The most plausible answer has already been provided. This chapter opened by drawing attention to the views of two leading historians, Stefan Manz and Benedict Anderson. Had the German settlers by the late 1870s drawn together, formed an active, dynamic community that went beyond the confines of mere settlements, motivated by communal self-awareness, the will to act in its group interest, and forming an independent part of a larger society as was implied in Manz’s perception? My view is that they had not reached that evolutionary state. As a group they had remained as a string of unconnected settlements, lacking the will or even the urge for joint action, forming part of an imagined rather than a real community: exactly as was implied in Benedict Anderson’s concept.

The investigation in this chapter of the two component parts of the community, rural and urban, aimed at identifying the strengths and weaknesses of either, as well as determining which of the two seemed to be more durable and why. A nineteenth-century belief, based on the writings of the late eighteenth century philosopher Johann Gottfried Herder, held that the strength of society (ergo, the state) lay in its rural communities: “Every distinct community is a nation,” Herder had written.221 Many later

221 The concepts of volk, blood and soil go back to the interest in language as an indicator of cultural and group identity by the influential late 18th century philosopher and writer Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803). See Manz,
writers have taken issue with Herder’s beliefs, including Leslie Bodi, Stefan Manz and others. While nineteenth-century history largely proves the fallacy of Herder’s ideas, the views of these writers are being examined at various points in this thesis and will receive further investigation in the following chapters.

Chapter Three
The Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 and its impact on Victoria

3.1 Introduction
The previous chapter examined a number of German settlements that were established after the initial goldfever had eased. It was noted that, quite early, a number of significant differences could be observed between some of these settlements, especially between those in rural and urban areas. I indicated my intention to examine the urban-rural differences in greater depth, and to test a hypothesis whether rural settlements might be more cohesive and enduring than their urban counterparts. I also indicated that the surprising reluctance of German immigrants in unifying the various settlements into a more integrated and cohesive community required further examination.

The present chapter will use the appearance in 1870 of a new German-language newspaper, the Australische Deutsche Zeitung (ADZ), as a starting point for a three-fold investigation, with the overall objective of assessing the nature and viability of the entire community, rural and urban. The first part will identify the objectives of the new broadsheet and consider how it intended to serve its constituency. This will be intimately connected with understanding the motivations, attitudes and influence of ADZ’s co-founder, Carl Muecke, including his “hidden agenda” of unifying the German community. The second part examines how that paper reported the outbreak, conduct and conclusion of the war between France and Prussia in 1870-71 and the subsequent proclamation of a unified Germany. The third part, closely connected with the two preceding, will test whether Muecke’s paper guided or perhaps even manipulated responses to these events so as to achieve specific objectives of its own. Did it aim to construct a parallel to the events in Europe, i.e. German unification, by interpreting and using them to bring the still disparate German community/ies in Victoria closer together? Or was ADZ passive, merely responding to the community’s own reaction to the war which, as will be shown, appeared to give it a focus that had been lacking previously?

The remainder of the chapter will examine how the wider Australian community responded to the war and how it interpreted the German community’s response to it. By far the most important investigation, however, will be an analysis of the longer-term outcome of the war, and how it shaped the future development of Victoria’s German community in the decades following German unification.
In *Germans in Brazil*, Frederick Luebke observes that the strength of the German community in southern Brazil largely derived from the emergence of a string of connected rural and small urban communities that were formed in the latter part of the 19th century.¹ Kuehlmann formulates a similar thesis, namely that Germans retained their identity (implying strength and influence) by regional concentration.² But did concentration really confer influence and strength? American experiences differ markedly from those in Brazil. Rather than by mere concentration, Hawgood argues that danger and threats posed by the onslaught of anti-German nativism led to the unification of America’s German community, establishing it as an influential political force for more than half a century.³

The present chapter examines whether different circumstances and an entirely different external event, namely the unification of Germany in 1871, proves Johannes Voigt’s claim that it helped the community to gain the feeling of “a sort of ‘inner’ support for their self-confidence towards the British Australians” which had been lacking.⁴

### 3.2 Carl Muecke and the *Australische Deutsche Zeitung*

Carl Muecke (1815-98), a liberal originally from Saxe-Anhalt, had emigrated after his outspokenness as an educationalist had raised the ire of the Prussian authorities. A disappointed participant of the 1848 revolution in Thuringia, he emigrated to South Australia where he served as a Lutheran pastor at Tanunda and later as an educationalist and consummate journalist and newspaper editor.⁵ A gifted and original thinker on education, agriculture, forest management, a journalist, writer, pioneering conservationist and Lutheran theologian with modern views, it is likely that South Australia’s Old Lutheran conservatism may have provided a *push factor* to move to Victoria in late 1869. During his wide-ranging career in South Australia, in 1863 he had co-founded a successful newspaper, *Tanunda Deutsche Zeitung* (re-named *Australische Deutsche Zeitung* (*ADZ*) in 1870) with his son-in-law and partner, M.P.F. Basedow. After his move to Victoria, from early January 1870 he edited a Melbourne edition of
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⁵ Muecke, D.C., “Muecke, Carl Wilhelm Ludwig (1815–1898).”
ADZ which, compared with the continuing Tanunda edition under Basedow’s editorship, he expanded and gave a new editorial direction.

As will soon become clear, it is reasonable to postulate that a second reason for coming to Victoria was Muecke’s perception that its disparate German community posed a challenge, and that he hoped to bring it closer together. Previous comments of his, in print and from the pulpit, had shown he was sanguine that the German experience in achieving unity could serve as an example to the German-Australian community. But he also hoped it would demonstrate to their hosts how to attain nationhood in their own right. As one of the most interesting and articulate commentators on German-Australian attitudes to nation, nationality, loyalty, citizenship, belonging, but especially unity, that was his long-held belief. His first editorial in ADZ, “Unser erster Gruss an unsere neuen Leser” (Greetings to our new readers) clearly spells out his intentions.6 He wanted his paper to help his fellow German-Australians to regain their Volksbewusstsein (self-awareness, cultural pride) which he noted was something the British and French retained as a matter of course, but which Germans seemed to lose readily and voluntarily. This task, he pointed out, required that they “participate in the politics and nation-building endeavours of [their] host nation with their Geist und Wille (spirit, ideas, gifts, determination).” Germans who fled from oppression to America also participated in American life by joining its press, its academy, its speakers’ fora, its public affairs, he noted. Have they not also “become true Americans” without giving up their Volksbewusstsein, but rather by sharing it, he asked. “They show us the way also in Australia.” And so he hoped his paper would be assisting “to create a bond that helps us to share our Geist and gifts…with the land of our choice, Australia.”7

Are these new ideas, we wonder, or had earlier German editors preached similar precepts? Perhaps in a more general way, the Kosmopolit’s editorial policy thirteen years before was, albeit more briefly, not that much different. It had demanded full equality for all, and a universal right of citizens to participate in the affairs of the state notwithstanding their different national origin.8 As unfortunately, the first issue of Victoria Deutsche Presse is no longer extant, one may assume its views were similar to Kosmopolit. A general assessment of its style, its strong support of the German community’s interests, and its endorsement of a proactive and collaborative German-
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Australian attitude all confirm this. Journalist Hermann Puettmann’s *Deutsche Monatschrift fuer Australien* in 1859 was more introspective, critically assessing past attitudes and noting that “our compatriots are so reticent [to participate in the majority’s political activities] as to attract contempt…and being looked at as an ‘inferior race’.” But then the *Monatschrift* also pointed at a future action plan in which they could take an active role. “[A]mong the negatives (‘Schattenseiten’) in Australia [is] the lack of confederation of the various colonies. That is a serious ailment that should be remedied as soon as possible,” it notes.⁹ *Germania*, the least confrontationist of *ADZ*’s predecessors, in its *Programm* had promised to abide by the existing laws and constitution, but reserved the right to contribute in a spirited manner to the discussion of political inadequacies and in advocating reform.¹⁰

*ADZ*’s appearance was welcomed by Melbourne’s leading dailies, the *Age* and *Argus*, the latter describing it as a “respectable-looking four-page paper.” It also noted that it was reasonable to assume that the editor “and his German brethren have no intention of foregoing the active duties of citizenship, but will cordially co-operate with their fellow colonists in promoting the general welfare of all.” This is an important concession that accepts the Germans’ intention to be both active Australian citizens who participate in “the general welfare of all” but also have the right to retain their ethnic identity.¹¹ After Muecke had enlarged the paper in June, the *Age* commended it as “a really presentable organ of public opinion.”¹²

In light of events that unfolded six months after its first appearance, *ADZ* may have had a greater chance to survive because, unlike its predecessors, it was able to run with a major issue—the Franco-Prussian War—which gave it enormous relevance. None of the earlier papers had such an advantage. Much of the following will explore how successfully it marshalled this advantage.

### 3.3 Historical background to the outbreak of the War

Hostilities between France and Prussia broke out on July 19, when France declared war, and two weeks later its forces crossed the border near Saarbruecken. The immediate cause is of little concern in the present context. In outline, it was triggered by Emperor Napoleon III’s unease over Prussia’s recent rise to become a continental superpower.
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and its treaty policies with Bavaria, Wuerttemberg and other southern German states; but particularly, what appeared to be its support for the accession of a Hohenzollern prince, Leopold, to the throne of Spain. Napoleon feared that France might become encircled. Historians sympathetic to France claim the war was in part provoked by Prussian Chancellor Prince Bismarck’s brilliant though perhaps not entirely honourably implemented strategy of uniting the German states. Although of little concern to this investigation, Michael Howard points out that since his unpopular war against Austria in 1866, Bismarck had steered Prussia into a position which made a French declaration of war almost inevitable and would receive almost complete national support. There was, however, a more profound cause to French-German antagonism that almost subliminally infused the perception of France in the German mind as an enemy and which achieved an unlikely alliance between the reactionary German (especially Prussian) bourgeois classes and a large part of German progressives at home and abroad: the fear of France’s long-standing antagonism to a united Germany.

The news of the outbreak of war reached Australia forty-four days after it was declared. Peter Putnis paints a fascinating picture of the dramatic interplay of delayed, but entirely unexpected and disturbing, overseas news and the problems caused by the limited communication facilities of the time. What is relevant is that, in the words of the *Argus*,

Like a thunderbolt falling out of a cloudless sky, giving no note of warning, and dazzling all eyes and startling all ears by the swiftness and violence of the phenomenon, has come upon us the news of a great war having broken out in Europe.

It was the suddenness, the violence, but especially its unexpectedness that elevated what might otherwise have appeared to be merely a distant war, perhaps on a par with the American Civil War a decade earlier, or the Crimean War, to attain the dramatic status it received in the Australian press. It brought close the real danger of Britain’s involvement, and thus very likely Australian involvement, with serious and unexpected implications. Australians reacted with anxiety, feeling exposed and largely unprotected at a particularly critical time, when Britain was withdrawing its garrisons from the
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Australian continent. Though for different reasons, the impact the war had on German-Australians deserves more careful consideration.

How did Victoria’s German community respond? Their concerns differed markedly from those of their fellow-Australians. Their reaction went beyond shock. Most of all, they experienced fear—for their native country; for the safety of friends and relations left behind; of what the French might do. The memory of the first Napoleon’s military terror, though half a century in the past, was still alive.\textsuperscript{16} However, the earlier generation’s resistance to Napoleon had also planted the initial seed for German nationalist sentiments and the longing for German unification. And now, juxtaposed to their alarm, the war against another Napoleon raised cautious hopes for the present generation that this might be the signal for the unification of their native lands into one single Germany.

3.4 The community’s response and the \textit{Australische Deutsche Zeitung}

This was ADZ’s moment. Though neither calculated nor programmed, Muecke saw the opportunity these dramatic and frightening events opened up, not only for his paper but for Victoria’s German community. These events could bring it together, to make it act in unison, to collectively share their grief and fear but also to act jointly towards alleviating some of the horrors the war was causing. By opening his paper to ongoing comprehensive reporting on the war, by dispensing advice, counsel, and encouragement of responsible action and support, Muecke had greatly enhanced the chances of turning the (previously only loosely connected) groups of German settlers in Victoria into a united community, with one common purpose.

Immediately following the announcement of the war, ADZ published a manifesto, simultaneously an address and appeal by community leader and Consul of the North German Confederation, solicitor W.A. Brahe. Headed “Germans of Victoria, the fatherland is in danger,” the manifesto generated an immediate and quite exceptional response. On the following day, over 250 Germans assembled at the German-run Criterion Hotel in Collins Street for news, and with the view of formulating a possible action plan.\textsuperscript{17} Viennese painter Eugen von Guerard, a Deutscher Verein committee member, recommended immediate action—to open subscription lists to collect funds to support wounded soldiers and their families. The proposal was unanimously endorsed,

\textsuperscript{16} ADZ, September 2, 1870, 177.
\textsuperscript{17} ADZ, September 2, 1870, 179.
and a committee of fifty-nine prominent men, styled the General Committee for Support of Widows and Orphans, was elected—five more joined soon afterwards. An appeal for support was drafted and sent to Germans in outlying rural districts. The committee included many notables such as botanist Ferdinand von Mueller, businessman Wilhelm Detmold, musicians Buddee and Elsaesser, Pastor Herlitz and others—but also German speakers from beyond the various German states, like von Guerard and Polish-born businessman Louis Monasch.

The response was immediate and substantial. Various additional offers of help were also made. Former Prussian army officer Gustav Techow offered to present talks on the military progress—with proceeds to go to the fundraising committee; ADZ editor Dr Carl Muecke promised a series of scientific lectures.\(^{18}\) The war had re-awakened a deep-seated national sentiment, readily responded to by ADZ’s readers. Re-printing the refrain from the 1813 poem by Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Was ist des Deutschen Vaterland*? (Which is the Germans’ Fatherland?), “Das ganze Deutschland soll es sein,” (That whole the German land shall be), Muecke knew this universally known and oft-quoted verse was a catchcry that would rally Germans as it had done at other times.\(^{19}\) Arndt (1769-1860) was the iconic poet of the *Freiheitskriege* against the first Napoleon.\(^{20}\) On various occasions—during the 1817 and 1832 student protest rallies, and again during the “Vormaerz” and 1848-49 revolutions and at the Frankfurt National Assembly, Arndt’s words were rallying calls for German unification.\(^{21}\) And again, now, in Melbourne.

For many Germans at home and abroad, national unity had become an existential imperative, an essential ingredient of their identity as a group.\(^{22}\) Formed as a reaction to Bonaparte at the beginning of the century, it had almost become an act of faith, understood and embraced by virtually every person from the diverse lands that were part of a symbolic, but not yet existing, united Germany. For many, it was also one of the fundamental political credos, on a par with the desire for religious and political freedom and a better life that German immigrants had sought when coming to Australia. Brahe had read Prussia’s intentions clearly, namely to unify the different German
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territories into a united Germany. This struck a chord with the nationalist yearnings of his audience; it stirred them into action, even though they may not have understood Prussia’s ulterior power-political intentions.

The emotions aroused by the war, and the enthusiastic support for the war victims, soon called for restraint and caution. Muecke felt the need to publish a warning by journalist and 1848 revolutionary Hermann Puettmann to beware of one-sided responses to the war.²³ French aggression, Puettmann had pointed out, was not the sole issue. Despotism and arbitrary laws also ruled in the German lands. Puettmann had good reasons for his warning: Prussian militarism had originally driven him into exile from his native Rhineland. But in the general war hysteria his words found little echo.²⁴

A week later Muecke’s editorial contained another warning. In “Our position in the [British] colonies during the German-French War,” he reminded his compatriots that Britain and her colonies were neutral, and this should equally apply to Germans living here. Their fellow colonists, be they English or French, should not be provoked by uncontrolled displays of nationalist fervour. Nevertheless, he claimed the right to give and encourage material support to their fellow countrymen and families adversely affected by the war, and to challenge those who resented such support. In Queensland, he noted, the press had criticized the solidarity with the wounded, and the Irish community even viewed the Prussian involvement as tantamount to a war on Catholicism.²⁵ Evidence for the latter, and a justification for their attitudes, were spelled out in an article in the Catholic Advocate.²⁶

3.5 The progress of the war

Throughout the war, ADZ focused the attention of its readers on the various campaigns, keeping them committed to donate money for the victims and providing a continuous stream of information on the progress of the war, the situation “at home,” in France and other European states, and especially in Britain. Though fearful that Britain might become embroiled in the war, ADZ praised its neutrality, which extended to allowing Germans unhindered freedom to support war victims.²⁷ Sensitive to press criticism of the German position, hostile comments, or what ADZ styled “misinformation” in the

²³ The name by which active participants of the 1848-9 revolutions in Germany are usually referred to.
²⁴ *ADZ*, September 9, 1870, 188.
²⁵ *ADZ*, September 16, 1870, 193; see also *ADZ*, October 21, 1870, 233.
²⁶ “Irish Sympathy with France,” in *The Advocate*, September 24, 1870, 8.
²⁷ Britain had actually offered mediation but Prussia had rejected it. The Prussian press was generally anti-British throughout the war. *ADZ*, October 14, 1870, 225.
Anglo press, were attacked. While commending the *Argus* for its reports “based on knowledge of the German situation,”28 Melbourne’s *Daily Telegraph* of September 17 is attacked, in ADZ’s mistaken belief, for being unsympathetic to the German community’s response. The *Hamilton Spectator* is chided for publishing a scurrilous letter claiming that Germans were getting better wages than Australians despite being poorly educated, and for being “weaker specimens” compared with their fellow colonists.29 The Queensland press comes in for special criticism.30 Yet, the majority of Australian papers were not without sympathy for the German cause. The *Argus* initially admired “the spirit which animates the German nation,”31 but as Prussia became triumphant it turned hostile, declaring Prussia to be “a grasping, self-seeking, insolent power.”32 The *Age* was more balanced, though clearly anti-Bonapartist and supportive of Prussia.33 The *Leader* even reproduced the famous Arndt poem, rendered in faultless English, a fairly clear gesture of its sympathy and support.34 The *Bendigo Advertiser*, under the heading “German Patriotism,” summed it up thus:

> Although the Germans may be characterised as phlegmatic in temperment and disposition in general matters, there can be little doubt that in their enthusiastic love for Vaterland they are not to be surpassed by any nation in the world. Patriotism is a quality which, whether at home or in distant climes, all Germans appear to be strongly imbued with, and we can hardly doubt that the feeling which is now animating the Teutonic race to fight against the aggression of the French, is stronger than that which has caused such fervent sympathy to be elicited amongst their brethren in these colonies. In all parts of the colony within the last few days there has arisen almost simultaneously a movement to “Assist the cause of Fatherland,” or in other words to subscribe to the relief of those who may be wounded...35

A few Anglo newspapers may have perceived a changed attitude in their fellow German colonists. They had previously seen them as “phlegmatic,” as politically

28 ADZ, October 7, 1870, 217.
29 ibid., September 23, 1870, 201. Lodewyckx in *Die Deutschen*, page 228, refers to another instance of that paper’s hostile attitude.
30 ADZ, October 21, 1870, 233.
31 Argus, September 30, 1870, 5. See also Argus, October 26, 1870, 4; October 29, 1870, 5; October 30, 1870, 4.
33 Corkhill, op.cit., 456-7; Age, September 28, 1870.
34 Age, October 8, 1870, 24.
35 Bendigo Advertiser, September 6, 1870, 2.
apathetic, self-effacing, as presenting no challenge to the dominant majority—exactly how Puettmann had summed them up in 1859, castigating their “modesty, indeed foolish timidity which…generated contempt.” Now, suddenly, they emerged as a unified group, expressing opinions and attitudes that were baffling and not readily comprehensible to the wider community. It is not difficult to postulate that the “other” in any political body always arouses suspicion. Hence the opinions expressed in various papers, including the Telegraph and Hamilton Spectator. It was one of the rare occasions when Anglo newspapers took a genuine interest in the Germans among them, going beyond merely reporting social events and Liedertafel concerts. Anglo-Australian newspaper readers, Peter Putnis observes, apart from shock at the suddenness, were fascinated by the war and everything connected with it, which seemed to unfold before their very eyes, albeit in chronological blocks delayed by more than six weeks—a consequence of the “tyranny of distance” not yet overcome because Australia was not yet connected to Europe by telegraphy. In direct consequence of the war, a telegraph line was commenced in 1870, linking Port Augusta and Darwin, to connect with the British undersea cable from Java. It was completed in August 1872, and at last brought the southern colonies into real-time contact with Europe.

The war was the first international conflict which evoked Australian responses considerably stronger than earlier wars, and many papers adopted an almost racy style of reporting. Newspapers were sold out in a frenzy. “Reams of newsprint were devoted to reports and analyses of the war both in the metropolitan and the country press. Each campaign could be followed by readers using maps…specially published as free supplements by newspapers,” Putnis notes. “Never before has the arrival of intelligence [about the war] created so great a sensation,” exclaimed the Argus on September 26, “…[it] went through the city like a flash, so intense was the interest felt.” On receipt of news reports at the Argus office, with crowds outside milling around in expectation of incoming news,

the public excitement was at white heat, the crowd grew denser, tongues grew louder…a considerable number of Germans—scarcely any of our French
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36 Deutsche Monatschrift, May 1859, 5.
citizens appeared—were present, but, though excited and exultant, no unseemly demonstration was offered.38

The war was even turned into entertainment. Entrepreneurs cashed in on what in fact was war hysteria. Charles’ *Grand Panorama of the Franco-Prussian War*, “A description of eleven views of the Nile and twenty-three pictures of the Franco-Prussian War presented as moving panoramas,” accompanied by Charles Muskett’s printed guide, *A Full Description of the Franco-Prussian War...as Illustrated by Charles Grand Panorama*, was first shown in Melbourne in early 1871 and then went on tour all over the colony.39 The sculptor Max Kreitmayer at his Waxworks advertised that he had just added “the King of Prussia, Count Bismarck, and others” to his 800 exhibits, “only equalled by Madame Tussaud’s.”40 At the Haymarket Theatre, the Weston and La Feuillades Minstrels performed the *Franco-Prussian War Galop* in April 1871, and at the Princess Opera House in December, Miss Lizzi Watson successfully appeared in the *War Medley of the Franco-Prussian War*. Such stage performances went on until 1874, while the topic of the war regularly surfaced in newspaper articles throughout the 1870s. Even a quarter-century later, the interest in the war had not fully abated when the Melbourne Cyclorama Company mounted a cycloramic exhibition of the *Siege of Paris*, with paintings, maps of battles and French fortresses, accompanied by a history of the war by B.A. Reeve.41

To Victoria’s Germans, the war was a sudden reminder that their connection with their native country and its welfare still mattered to them. But soon the pensive, worried tone of *ADZ*, and likewise the community’s attitude, made way to excitement as Prussia and her allies repelled and eventually defeated the French. This joyous attitude prevailed to the end, beyond the armistice (early January 1871), the proclamation of the *Reich* at Versailles (January 18) and the lifting of the Paris siege. The victory parties were exuberant. “Every German in Australia proudly joins the call, ‘hail the beloved unified fatherland,’” wrote Puettmann, whose usual style was far more level-headed and sedate. However, the earlier Puettmann was still there, rejecting the slogan of “blood for victory” for the more civilized “light for victory,” and hoping that the new Reich would

38 *Argus*, September 26, 1870, 5.
39 Numerous advertisements and articles appeared in metropolitan and regional papers, e.g. in the *Argus*, February 3, 1871, describing the show as “The largest and best in the world,” 8; “The Franco-Prussian War,” *Bendigo Advertiser*, March 6, 1871, 2.
40 *Argus*, January 17, 1871, 8.
41 Colligan, *Canvas Documentaries*, 78-80, passim.
create a climate of “wahre Bildung” (figuratively, “genuine wisdom”). Yet none of the celebrations were about victory over the vanquished enemy. Lutheran pastor Leypoldt’s sermon at Bendigo focused far more on “this great tragedy,” “the termination of the terrible war,” and “the restoration of peace,” while the president of Geelong’s Deutscher Verein hoped that “the prosperity of the two countries would soon be re-established.” Reports in ADZ of celebrations by various Vereine at Geelong, Melbourne, Maryborough and elsewhere are invariably headed “Friedensfeier” (Peace Festival); not one even mentions victory or triumph. Composer Elsaesser produced his own Friedenskantate for the Melbourne celebrations, to universal acclaim.

3.6 Coming together: e pluribus unum

The euphoria—almost entirely due to ADZ’s reporting, cajoling, encouraging, occasionally tinged with a degree of jingoism—can be measured by the remarkable response to the subscription lists, which far outstripped South Australia with its large German population. By early February 1871, Victorian Germans had already collected almost £2,700, by contemporary standards a considerable sum. The figures published in ADZ show that rural and urban German communities were equally generous. The campaign had virtually breached the gap between these two communities by sharing concerns and emotions.

Eventually, when news of the war became more commonplace as the result of Prussian victories at Gravelotte on August 18, at Sedan on September 2, and at other places, donations started to decline, and there was much discussion in ADZ how to revive the enthusiasm. A new method, to make monthly contributions, turned out to be successful, and two more donor lists and individual announcements indicate that by September 1871, £3,287/10 had been received. For a population of 9,264 male and female adults, representing a total German population of about 25-30,000 including children, this was an impressive effort. The size of the contributions, in 2015 terms, amounted to over £273,000, but in actual income value is calculated at over £2.5 million.

42 Puettmann, Gedenkbuch, 371-2.
43 Bendigo Advertiser, July 15, 1871, 2.
44 “Peace! German Celebration,” Geelong Advertiser, May 20, 1871, 3.
45 ADZ, April 28, May 26, July 7, September 8, 1871.
46 ADZ reported on November 4, 1870, that South Australia had collected £995 while Victoria was already way past at £1350. While Germans formed about 1.9 per cent of Victoria’s population, in South Australia it was over 7 per cent. Harmstorf, “German Migration,” 116.
47 Though Germans in Britain collected ten times that sum. Argus, February 6, 1871, 4; Age, February 6, 1871, 2.
48 ADZ, February 3, 1871, 37; March 17 and 24, 1871; April 21 and September 9, 1871.
49 Census for Victoria, 1871.
50 A figure assumed in ADZ, September 9, 1870, 188.
(over $5 million in Australian currency). After lengthy debates, all moneys were transmitted directly to the office of Chancellor Bismarck, on Muecke’s suggestion. He was the man they trusted and expected, as a man of integrity, to ensure that it was used for the intended purpose—help for injured soldiers and their families.

Darragh and Struve have analyzed the three subscription lists published by *ADZ* in 1870, though two more lists were published in 1871. Their survey gives an insight into who contributed, and where support was strongest. A selective tabulation is attached as Appendix 8. The authors assert that only approximately 20 per cent of Victoria’s Germans had contributed, though it seems likely that the participation rate was somewhat higher, as some donors may have pooled small donations. Further, in many centres large collections were submitted via single persons. The collections at Techow’s and Muecke’s lectures, at theatre, Turnverein and Liedertafel and other charity performances, even some shipboard collections, were recorded only in summary form, as was the ongoing collection running almost to the end of 1871. Among the contributors, especially of small amounts, some rather touching anonymous entries appear, such as “a well-wisher,” “a boy,” “a girl,” or “widow x.” Interestingly, among the donors a small but noticeable number of British names also appear. A participation rate of 30 per cent seems a more reasonable assumption, and thus the question arises why the other 70 per cent failed to contribute, and who they were. An answer can only be guessed at. Some immigrants—one may designate them the silent majority—remained suspicious of Prussia’s political aims. Unlike Muecke and Techow, these people had not been swayed by the *ADZ*’s sometimes rather overt pro-Prussianism. Few of the East-Elbians had reason to like or trust the repressive regime they had virtually fled decades earlier. Those possessing prescience would have found their misgivings validated by Bismarck’s subsequent policies. To Catholics in particular, his anti-Catholic *Kulturkampf*, beginning soon after unification, would confirm their misgivings, nor would his political conservatism and persecution of socialists and social democrats endear him to those in the German community who sympathized with the Left. Even the Lutheran Church checked its responses. While welcoming German victory and unification, the *Christenbote* did not join in the almost hysterical euphoria of *ADZ* and the South Australian papers. “We must not forget the streams of German blood with
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51 www.measuringworth.com; *ADZ*, September 8, 1871.
52 *ADZ*, September 23, 1870, 205; October 14, 1870, 229; October 21, 1870, 237; December 2, 1870, 285.
53 Darragh and Struve, *Germans in Victoria*. 125
which this victory was won, nor the countless gaps in German families left by the war, let alone the immense misery endured by the French people,” it wrote. The subject is deserving more research than the present thesis allows.

The sudden coming together of the community invites a comparison with America. There the community had also come together, but under entirely different circumstances. Almost two decades earlier, it had responded to a belligerent nativist reaction to foreign immigration that was especially directed at the massive German immigrant stream. In response, the German community had closed ranks to defend itself, becoming cohesive, resilient to attacks, and self-assured. It was the birth of what Hawgood calls *hyphenism.* Though quite different to Australia, more immediate and often quite local, it resulted in a German-American community that held its own throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century, drawing considerable respect from the wider American community. Australia was different, and here the euphoria and internal unity generated by German unification came later than in America and was not sustained over the long term, as will become evident later in this discussion.

### 3.7 After the war

Evidence shows that, for the following year or two, the German community remained in a state of mild euphoria and, after almost twenty years in forming, gave the appearance of unity. Success conferred a feeling of satisfaction and fulfilment of their hopes to many. Voigt defines the unifying sentiment the war had aroused as “nostalgic patriotism.” A united Germany now gave them the feeling of “a sort of ‘inner’ support for their self-confidence towards the British Australians” which had been lacking, and which had previously deprived them of recognition and status. This provided them with a powerful reference point, enhanced by new and living symbols (idols), like the consummate politician Bismarck, or the Kaiser. Voigt puts it rather succinctly and poetically by noting that the new German Reich “provided Germans with a ‘central
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54 *Australischer Christenbote* 6 (June 1871), 21.
55 While not providing a definition of *hyphenism,* Hawgood describes the term as a process whereby “the German in America” was turned into a “German-American.” This change, with a self-evident meaning, occurred in response to, and defence against, the native-born American resentment, and corresponding physical and political attacks, for undermining “the American way.” The background to this development was the massive German immigration after the Civil War. See Hawgood, *The Tragedy of German-America,* 227-308, *passim.*
56 Hawgood, op.cit., 231-57, *passim.*
57 Voigt, *Australia-Germany,* 61.
58 ibid.
Achieving unity implies a meaning that goes beyond euphoria, making generous contributions to a benevolent fund, or even jointly singing *Die Wacht am Rhein*. What did unity actually mean? How was it expressed? Was it empowering, generating a collective will to seek greater influence, a share in how the colony was governed, gain greater (i.e. equal) electoral status, attract greater respect from their Anglo fellow colonists, and remedy any other signs of their secondary status? I am a little ahead of my argument, and will return to venture some appropriate answers.

It is perplexing how the war, albeit only for a brief period, swept aside the prevailing political indifference—a characteristic noted by Puettmann, Muecke, and by more recent historians like Lodewyckx and Voigt—and unified the community in support of Prussia. *ADZ* had represented Prussia as synonymous with “Germany,” and it had swept its readers along to share its view. “[Their] enthusiasm for unification repressed…the downside of Prussian *Realpolitik*,” observes Corkhill. Yet Muecke knew first-hand the repressive and heavy-handed manner in which a suddenly glorified Prussia had treated him years earlier, by driving him from his homeland. Was the past forgotten simply because the community’s dream had become reality—a unified and secure common homeland had come about, and Prussia had created it? It was just as well few would ever return or even visit, nor would most have to live under Bismarckian rule. A conservative, Pastor Herlitz revisited his old homeland in 1876 and declared, “I….would not want to work and live there under the present conditions. In Australia we live much more freely.” But to most, living “twixt fatherland and motherland,” a suppressed yearning for “home” was now supplanted by pride in their former homeland.

Before long, the initial antagonism to France became largely subsumed by euphoria over unification. The hero cult of Bismarck and Kaiser was taking off, and even spilled over into the Anglo community. *ADZ*, the *South Australian Register*, and several other Anglo papers reported that a Melbourne businessman, Carl Berghoff, had been commissioned by Victoria’s German community to deliver a memorial and
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valuable present as a homily to Bismarck, and that the Chancellor had received his visitor warmly, dined with him, and shown much interest in the Victorian community. The report in the Mount Alexander Mail clearly basks in the glory of the friendly reception their fellow colonist had received from the great man. F.C. Klemm, a member of Sandhurst’s German Verein bearing another gift for the Chancellor, was equally well received although the German press, owing to misunderstandings, published derogatory comments about the emissary’s character.

For a year or two, even old and well-established German-Australian settlers’ associations now met under pictures of the Kaiser, and punctuated their proceedings with alternate toasts to the Kaiser and Queen Victoria. At the Geelong Verein, the Kaiser portrait by noted Melbourne artist John Hennings was unveiled for that purpose. German naval visits—still very rare but becoming more frequent in later decades—were making news, and in the case of the Nympe in early 1872 and the Arcona later the same year, were widely reported in both German and Australian papers, and officers and crew were lionized and shown off to German and Australian acclaim.

In 1862 and 1863 Theodor Mueller, known as “Victoria’s poet,” a miner and community activist, had organized two very successful Gesangfeste (Festivals of Gymnastic Displays and Choral Performances). In addition to numerous appeals, he had made enormous efforts to bring regional and metropolitan Vereine and the entire community together under an umbrella Centralverein, but that had been only partially successful vis-à-vis a reluctant community. Perhaps that disappointment made him return to his native land in 1869. But now, suddenly, new Vereine sprang into existence or were re-constituted, as at Ballarat, foreshadowing a more direct involvement in public affairs by the wider community. Mueller’s Centralverein, under the new name of Central Comité (occasionally “Ausschuss”) of German Associations in Victoria and Australia, was revitalized, foreshadowing a more proactive attitude to political participation. In the large centres of Ballarat and Bendigo, community and Verein activities made more regular appearances in the news. For the first time, the Germans in

64 “Visit of an Australian colonist to Prince Bismarck,” Mount Alexander Mail, April 15, 1873, 3.
65 Bendigo Advertiser, December 2, 1873, 2.
67 Geelong Advertiser, May 20, 1871, 3.
68 “News and Notes,” Ballarat Star, January 9, 1872, 2; see also Ballarat Star, March 18, 1874.
69 Details about the festival are found in Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, 71.
70 Ballarat Star, October 13, 1871, 2.
71 Leader, January 14, 1871, 25; Argus, October 9, 1871, 6.
Victoria perceived themselves as a true community, of belonging together and sharing the same fate, while also attaining a higher profile in the mainstream press. Can this be measured and substantiated? The increase of references to Germans in the *Trove* database can serve as an indicator. “German association” in the period 1871-79 draws over 300 responses for Victoria; in the corresponding period of the 1860s, the number was only 250, 20 per cent less. References to “German consul” in the corresponding periods increase from 13 to 479; to “German settlers” from 55 to 70; to “our German citizens” from 17 to 23, and to “German Verein” from 15 to 62. Only the phrase “our German fellow colonists” shows a decline, from 32 to 12; perhaps more due to the choice of the search terms.72

The most surprising shifts from liberal republican sympathies to Prussophile imperialism can be observed in the attitudes of three of the chief propagandists and cheerleaders during the war: Carl Muecke, Hermann Puettmann, and Gustav Techow. All of them had emigrated under the cloud of their previous liberal-democratic political activities and their participation in the 1848-49 revolutions; in the case of Techow this departure had taken place with the Prussian police in hot pursuit. What had influenced their conversion? Did the momentum of their conversion continue after German unification had been accomplished?

Gustav Techow (1813-93) had been a professional soldier in the Prussian army. His participation in the 1848 revolution in Berlin, and later his command of revolutionary forces in south-western Germany, forced him to flee Germany, where he was subsequently sentenced to imprisonment *in absentia*. In Australia he became a leading advocate and writer about gymnastics—a tradition that had grown out of the German student movement of the early nineteenth century.73 After presenting several lectures on the progress of the war, following the declaration of peace he faded into the background and took a lesser part in the affairs of the German community while concentrating on his main interest in school sport.74 Press references to him mostly concern his gymnasium and writing about gymnastics. Any disenchantment with Prussia, if there was any, is not recorded. However, as his obituarist noted, an important factor contributing to his death in 1893 was the shock of being turned back at the

73 Obituary, “Death of Mr Gustav Techow,” *Argus*, May 27, 1890, 5.
74 Crawford, “Thwarted Visions: the Physical Culture of Gustav Techow.”
German border when intending to visit his dying sister. The order to refuse his entry into his native land was said to have come direct from Bismarck.\textsuperscript{75}

Hermann Puettmann (1811-74)—in Leslie Bodi’s view the foremost German-Australian intellectual of his age—became radicalized in his youth by ideas of socialism. Several books, and editorial work as a journalist, drew him close to some leading left thinkers of his time, including Marx and Engels. He participated in the 1848 revolution by use of his pen but afterwards, fearing arrest, he escaped to England and later Melbourne, where he published several journals, newspapers and calendars.\textsuperscript{76} His short-lived \textit{Melbourner Deutsche Zeitung} was one of colonial Victoria’s finest in terms of its analytical commentary and balance of editorial contents. Puettmann’s changed outlook to supporting Prussia can only be explained by his deep love for a united Germany. His history of the Franco-Prussian War, published in 1871, with the Kaiser’s picture as the frontispiece, brims with uncharacteristic contempt for France and lacks the tolerance of his earlier journalistic work.\textsuperscript{77} His book contrasts sharply with a more balanced account of the war by Scottish-born Ballarat newspaper owner Thomas Wanliss.\textsuperscript{78} There is no evidence that Puettmann played a leading role in the German community in his final years. Part of the reason, no doubt, was his early death in 1874.

Despite his relatively short stay in Victoria, Carl Muecke was perhaps the most influential of the three principal community leaders during the war. Whether it was the war itself or his and ADZ’s doing, there is no doubt that his role was significant in unifying the Victorian community, even if that community abandoned their support for ADZ within little more than two years. The paper closed its Victorian office by April 1872 and reverted to Tanunda, South Australia, now only serving its Victorian readers with regular Victorian supplements. A true German-Australian who shared his loyalty evenly between the two countries he loved, Muecke “saw Australia as a nation in \textit{status nascendi}…[that] shared a common fate with the Germany [he] knew,” Gerhard Fischer observed. Complementing their respective strengths—Australia’s constitutional government and democratic system, Germany’s educational superiority and will to become a unified democratic nation, Fischer argues, “was precisely what the German-Australians thought they were able to offer: their experiences…that would contribute to

\textsuperscript{75} Struve, “Nineteenth Century German Melbourne on Display,” 114; Obituary, “Death of Mr Gustav Techow,” \textit{Argus}, May 27, 1890, 5.
\textsuperscript{76} Bodi, “Puettmann, Hermann (1811-1874).”
\textsuperscript{77} Puettmann, \textit{Gedenkbuch an den Deutsch-Franzoesischen Krieg}.
\textsuperscript{78} Wanliss, Thomas. \textit{The War in Europe of 1870-1: With an Enquiry into its Probable Consequences}. (Ballarat: Ballarat Star, 1871).
an awakening of a national consciousness [in the Australian colonies].” \(^{79}\) What Fischer implies is that Muecke and others, including Puettmann, Techow, and Basedow in South Australia, hoped to help Australians achieve unity just as had occurred in Germany. But did Australians actually want unity, on German or any other pattern? What some historians imply was a *desultory attitude towards federation*, i.e. federation without any pressing issues to push it along, was entirely different to what had occurred in Germany. Thus in reality, the two countries appeared to have very little in common. Yet Corkhill draws attention to the New Year’s message in the *Age* in 1871 that links the two. In his article, the editor ruminated on the “hopes and fears, the desires and aspirations…amongst the European masses…[now] *finding an echo amongst the people of Australia*…[while an] Australian people and an Australian nationality, distinctive in type and in aims [begins] to peer forth in well-defined shape (my italics).”

Could any words endorse Muecke’s dream more manifestly? \(^{80}\) Perhaps Muecke was indeed less of a dreamer, and divorced from reality, than it would appear. Both as a German and as an Australian, he was merely ahead of his time. Years earlier he had outed himself as an Australian nationalist. In his book *National Schools for South Australia* (1866), he had recommended a national school system that excluded the traditional dependence on Britain and argued that “each country must develop its own government and all other institutions.” \(^{81}\) Unfortunately, in *his* time nationhood and national unity were still only minor issues on the political horizon in Australia. A matter to be explored in a later chapter will be whether Muecke’s ideas of an Australian nation were merely his own, or whether his compatriots shared them. It seems they did; the evidence is provided by the enthusiastic celebrations by the German community when federation eventually came in 1901.

### 3.8 The 1870s

The new phase of unity and increased self-confidence of Victoria’s German community started even before the formal proclamation of the united German Reich on January 18, 1871. In its way as dramatic as the outbreak of the war, it commenced with a declaration by the newly re-constituted Central Comité mentioned earlier, stating the intention of the German community to play a greater part in the political affairs of the colony. This
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was a new and highly significant development. The *Age* report on January 13, 1871 under the by-line “A German Demonstration”—there were almost identical reports in the *Leader* and the *Ballarat Star* the following day—expressed no surprise; indeed the usual custom of Australian papers of not commenting was adhered to. The report stated that under the chairmanship of J.J. Pokorny, the Comité had met on January 12 and that

On the motion of the chairman, it was resolved to prepare for the united action of all German electors at the approaching general elections. It was contended that the German vote has proved itself already of great importance at various previous elections and that it is estimated by the contending parties.

The report continued, noting that the German voters of Mornington and South Bourke in a previous election had contributed to ensure the return of Premier James M’Culloch and Chief Secretary G.P. Smith because both had undertaken to support various German claims concerning civic rights. The *Age* continues with Pokorny’s motion (paraphrased, as was the practice at the time):

Without interfering with the political convictions of the individual voters, all Germans would be found ready to insist on the abolition of disqualification of Germans to be members of the Legislature and Executive Council; the introduction of a law to declare naturalisation in any other colony to exclude the necessity for renaturalisation in Victoria; to support compulsory secular education without any interference of religious communities; the organisation of an extensive system of free immigration unconnected with the management of State authority, [and so on].

This conveys an assertiveness rarely observed before that time. Was the midget community at last flexing its muscles, emboldened by the unification of the Vaterland and the unity they had witnessed among themselves? The Comité’s proposals were naturally also reported in *ADZ*, and one would assume in even greater detail. Indeed, a report appeared on the same date as the *Age* notice. But surprisingly, it is significantly more restrained, besides lacking most of the details concerning the community’s
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proposed action plan outlined in the *Age* report. It reports that Pokorny—again
describing rather than quoting his words verbatim—had said that—

Furthermore, as the election is impending it is essential that German voters
actively participate, and if possible, aim at sending German representatives into
the Parliament so that they can strive to achieve the political rights we presently
lack. All this points at how essential it is for this Central Comité to do its work.83

*ADZ* continues, noting that the persons present—representatives from the German
Vereine at Melbourne, Talbot, Majorca and Sandhurst, but none of the other fifteen or
so—then proceeded to discuss Pokorny’s proposal and other committee matters. But the
paper provides little additional detail, other than describing the discussion as “lively.”
How may one square off this report with the far more detailed *Age* and *Leader* reports? I
will return to this in a moment, after examining what fallout, if any, may have resulted
from the Anglo papers’ reports.

There was only one paper that responded: the *Ballarat Courier*. The *Courier* took
strong exception to the German proposal, responding with a long, carefully considered
but highly paternalistic rebuttal. What was surprising was that this was a gold districts
paper where, even more than in Melbourne, multi-cultural tolerance had always seemed
to be in evidence. It stated that:

Our German fellow colonists are becoming just a trifle too assertive. We trust
they will pardon us for saying this; and furthermore, that it will never have to be
said of us that we disapprove of a fusion of races on this neutral soil. But at the
same time, for the German residents in Victoria to combine for the purpose of
interfering prominently in our political affairs, is a little more than we are
prepared to approve of. Germany has, no doubt taught Europe a valuable lesson
in military tactics…but it does not therefore follow that its sons, who have
sought residence amongst us, are as able to teach us how to discharge our
political duties…The [*Age*] report of this gathering is about the most unique
incident which has occurred in this colony for some time. In the first place it was

83 The original runs thus: “Ferner stehen Neuwahlen bevor, und es sei sehr notwendig, dass deutsche Waehler sich
eifrig dabei betheiligen und womoeglich danach streben, auch deutsche Deputirte ins Parlament zu senden, und fuer
uns Deutsche die politischen Rechte zu erwirken, die uns noch fehlen, bei alledem sei die Nothwendigkeit des
Central-Comities recht ersichtlich.” *ADZ*, January 13, 1871, 12.
resolved that the “German vote” should become an institution in this colony, as that vote had already had the effect of placing the second M‘Culloch Ministry in power!

The *Courier* went on to itemize Pokorny’s motion. It then continued that:

The “German vote” is to be “mobilised” to carry out this somewhat ambitious programme, and though we agree with some of the items…we doubt the advisability of our German fellow-colonists combining for any such purpose…We cannot help thinking that people of British origin are much better judges of how a community should be governed than any continental race…and therefore…will not take kindly [to the Central Comité’s proposals].

This is an interesting repartee, one that brooks no notion of independent decision making, let alone the notion of a future bi- or multiculturalism. By “fusion” no other meaning springs to mind but full assimilation. The writer also offers no clue on the nature of his perception of “neutral soil.” Independent decision making is peremptorily rejected by stigmatizing it as “interfering.” One can almost envision the editor’s raised finger when concluding his piece with the admonition, “In the meantime we recommend our German friends to be content with matters as they stand, and so avoid giving offence to any section of their fellow colonists,”84 No doubt the editor would much prefer the “reticent” German settler “being looked at as [of] an ‘inferior race,’” as Puettmann had contemptuously castigated his compatriots in 1859.85

Charles Meyer in his *History of Germans* makes an important and far-reaching observation. Concerning “comments or criticisms of the Germans,” he writes, “the marked lack of discussion in both city and country newspapers is striking.” He then qualifies his argument by claiming that the Anglo press had an “overwhelming tendency…to…ignore the ethnic background of the people ‘who made the news.’” With the latter I do not agree, though in the present context that is irrelevant.86 As I interpret Meyer’s main point, references to meetings and performances of Vereine, Liedertafeln and German picnics appeared in the mainstream press with regular frequency, but they
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84 *Ballarat Courier*, January 14, 1871, 2.
85 *Deutsche Monatschrift fuer Australien*, Heft 1, May 1859, 4,5.
usually only alluded to events. Analysis of background, causes, effects or implications were almost always absent. This makes it difficult for the researcher to sift out and identify Anglo attitudes and opinions. Hence the significance attaching to the discourse between Julius Pokorny and his Central Comité and the editor of the *Ballarat Courier*. This was one of the few occasions when a mainstream paper openly revealed its attitude. Very clearly the *Courier* positioned the German community in a subordinate place, while Pokorny claimed nothing less than equality. How may we interpret the attitudes of the two contenders? Who were they?

Starting with Julius Pokorny, a highly successful financier, importer and merchant, a prominent member of the Deutscher Verein since the mid-1850s and at various times its vice-president, secretary and treasurer, he was undoubtedly committed to the welfare of the German community. After it was founded in 1862, he had chaired the Central-Verein, and after its re-naming, the Central Comité. Thus, he represented continuity of its objectives of collaborative community action and unity. One of the most active and committed community members, he had been a member of several delegations, once to the Governor, and then to several ministers, pressing for German civic rights. Besides that, he had been a leading participant in discussions concerning affiliation with the German Nationalverein in 1861; and a negotiator in the Cornish and Bruce spat. However, notwithstanding the Victorian government’s dragging its feet in granting full equality, Pokorny’s present case had two principal weaknesses. First, he took little account of the fact that less than half of Victoria’s Germans shared his views on participation in majority politics, by failing to take out naturalization.87 He was aware of the reason for this, namely the tenuousness of how naturalization was legally interpreted. Years earlier, he had drawn attention to the unfair distinction the Victorian law made between natural-born and naturalized British subjects, and he had emphasized this in a petition to the Governor he had fronted for the Deutscher Verein in 1857.88 Pokorny must have known that the low rate of naturalization weakened the Central Comité’s case.

The second chink in his proposal was that he did not speak for the entire community, but merely the urban minority. While metropolitan and regional (especially goldmining district) German associations were affiliated with his Central Comité, there was no such affiliation with residents of rural settlements like Doncaster, Harkaway,

87 *Mount Alexander Mail*, May 20, 1874, 2.
88 *Kosmopolit*, nos. 31 and 32, July 1857; “German Immigration and Naturalisation,” *Age*, December 31, 1857, 5.
Grove, Hochkirch, the Wimmera, and elsewhere, because they were neither members nor had German Vereine of their own. Did they endorse the proposal? They might have, but we do not know. What is known is that they were the least active participants in the cause of German political rights and the struggle for equality. In the case under discussion, their support was crucial. We may assume that they supported the Central Comité, but cannot be certain, because the evidence is lacking. Thus one must conclude that, on balance, Pokorny’s case, while reasonable and just, lacked global community endorsement and, in consequence, must be seen as weak.

The editors of the *Courier* were the Englishman Edward Bateman and Scottish-born Robert Clark. Founded in 1867, the *Courier* was considered liberal-progressive in outlook; a stable, well-managed newspaper, it continues to be published to the present day. The German community’s relations with persons of Scottish origin had always been friendly and supportive—we need only think of the Reverends Alexander Morison and J.D. Lang, of William Westgarth or Dr Thomson. If the *Courier* article stemmed from Robert Clark’s pen, of which we cannot be certain, that would signal that that amiable attitude may have run out. The article was courteous but also paternalistic to the point of being offensive, despite the writer’s disclaimer. It allowed no room for the German community to be considered an equal partner, and denied its right to rectify legal injustices named by the Central Comité. The dismissive tone (“to teach us how to discharge our political duties”; my italics) is a clear rejection of equality by adopting a “them” and “us” attitude. Apart from that, the article misses the Central Comité’s point on at least two long-term grievances, namely the electoral inequality of naturalized citizens and abolition of the ridiculous rule on re-naturalization. If naturalized Germans were qualified to vote, they should also be—indeed were entitled to—join together and to vote as a block for whom or what they fancied. But that the *Courier* objected to.

Concerning voting *en bloc*, the Catholic *Advocate*, though never sympathetic to the Protestant Germans, commended them for this preference which the *Courier* had taken exception to—and bemoaned the failure of the Irish community to follow the Germans’ lead.90

No debates of such intensity can be found in the Anglo press at any later date. Nor did *ADZ* or any other paper follow up the *Courier*’s comment, whether pro or con.
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89 Clark’s Obituary appeared in the *Ballarat Star*, March 17, 1902, 2; see also 100 Years of Service—Ballarat *Courier*, passim.

90 *The Advocate*, February 15, 1873.
What does this signify? Did the mainstream press—the Age, Argus, Leader—endorse the Courier’s argument? Or were they disinterested, i.e. adopting their usual no-comment attitude? No clue emerges from a perusal of the press in subsequent months. Only one endorsement, albeit years later, comes from an anonymous letter writer signing himself “British Without Prejudice,” who “rejoices in the fact that our German fellow-colonists...take part in the affairs of their adopted land.” Much later still is the opinion of a Queensland journalist writing under the pseudonym “Ghelelpie”: “I don’t think [there is] any perceptible German vote in Victoria...to play a very distinct part in general and municipal politics.”

Before appraising the longer-term fallout of the war and its impact on both the German and Anglo communities, I need to clear up the perplexing discrepancy between the detail provided in the Age and ADZ reports alluded to earlier. Did the Age spin a tale, or did it provide a fair summary of the position of both the Central Comité and the German community? Was its reporter perhaps a more diligent observer at Pokorny’s Comité meeting on January 12, while the ADZ reporter missed most of its significant points? Some of the items in the Age report seem rather dubious, like “support[ing] compulsory secular education without any interference of religious communities.” That certainly contradicts long-standing German views. But as ADZ neither responded to this significant discussion nor revisited it at a later date, and as no Minutes of the Central Comité survive, this intriguing matter must remain unexplained.

The final, indeed seminal question concerning the outcome of the war was whether the German community grasped what seemed a unique opportunity to reposition itself. Two major changes almost invited a realignment: first, Australians had gained a much greater awareness of and interest in the geography, politics and significance of metropolitan Germany, and second, they now perceived the German community to have gained in strength and confidence. Were the Germans prepared to claim their new role? On the evidence, they missed this singular chance. They failed to claim permanent recognition as a fully-fledged minority. This was a fatal mischance.

A serious setback, entirely self-inflicted, was the discontinuation of the publication of ADZ in Victoria in 1872. Lack of community support and postal rates were blamed. The Melbourne and Tanunda editions were now merged, and although the
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92 “Brisbane Notes,” The Australasian, July 18, 1885, 14.
paper continued to report from Victoria, the Victorian content quite rapidly declined. ADZ had brought together the community, and its disappearance as a local paper would deprive Victoria’s Germans of their sole voice, one that had consistently addressed their various concerns, foremost among them the need for political engagement, electoral equality, and compulsory education. Worse still, the community seemed unaware of its loss.

Despite promises by politicians, the electoral inequality, actual or perceived, persisted. A letter by Pokorny in October 1871 to the Chief Secretary once more reiterated the request to rectify the electoral disadvantage—to be granted the vote for both chambers of Parliament, and to stand for both—and to amend the 1865 Electoral Act. The reply he received confirmed that that would be done. But nothing eventuated, and it seems the matter was left hanging in the air. Sometime later, and without specific reference to Germans, the Mount Alexander Mail in 1874 editorialized that “We could, however, do a little towards encouraging the settlement of people from foreign countries amongst us by liberalising as far as possible the laws pertaining to the political rights of aliens.” When the Electoral Act came under review in 1877, the Ballarat Courier carried an article about “Mr MacBain’s amendment in the new Electoral Act to legalise the German vote.” The meaning of this is obscure.

Before it closed its Victorian office in 1872, electoral matters, such as the attitudes of candidates seeking support from the German community, corruption by various members of the government and other matters, had moved to centre stage in ADZ’s editorials. “Are German electoral meetings necessary?” it asked at one stage, regretting that only one German had stood for a seat in the Assembly—Emmanuel Steinfeld in Ballarat. Steinfeld did not succeed but gained a high percentage nevertheless. Several years later he was successful, commencing a brief but remarkable parliamentary career. The reliability of almost fifteen Anglo-Australian candidates who had sought specific German support was scrutinized. ADZ recommended three of these, B. Crews, David Gaunson, and L.L. Smith, all of them for their known German sympathies; it also commended the Talbot Germans for closely quizzing one of their candidates regarding his attitude to German demands. But despite
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94 “Rights of Naturalised Subjects,” Argus, October 9, 1871, 6.
95 “Mr Ramsay and Mr McCormick,” Ballarat Courier, May 9, 1877, 2.
96 ADZ, January 13, 1871.
97 Ibid.
98 Ibid., January 27, 1871.
ADZ’s ceaseless urgings, most of the community was largely lethargic to becoming politicized, whatever the issue.

Another prime topic for most of ADZ’s 1871 editorials was the impending legislation that ultimately became enshrined in the Education Act of 1872.99 The paper was fully in support of compulsory education, but insisted on professional training of teachers and competent government leadership. Quite contrary to the Age report in January 1871, ADZ hoped that the denominational school system that had enabled the Lutheran schools to carry on would somehow continue. While neither strident nor particularly self-assertive, ADZ displayed a more self-assured attitude towards the Anglo majority, complementing the raised profile of the German community’s profile. Though not always friendly, Corkhill notes that the Anglo press seemed better informed and interested in both the German community and the doings of the Reich.100

Occasionally, there were notable lapses in the level of goodwill. The fickle status of naturalized Germans was highlighted during the controversy over unseating Ferdinand von Mueller from his directorship of the Botanical Gardens. It started with a letter in the Argus complaining that British gardeners were being passed over by the appointment of “foreigners” to government service, whose qualifications were merely of “having 20 years ago seen the gardens of Charlottenburgh [sic] and Potsdam, and perhaps trimmed up to order the graves of the dogs of the great Frederick at Sans Souci,” owing to the patronage of “the now universally condemned rule of Baron von Mueller.” The letter alluded to the appointment of W.L. Homeyer to the curator’s position of the Government Domain. An experienced horticulturist, his was a government appointment, not one by Mueller. Yet the Argus took up the correspondent’s argument, enlarging it by a very personal attack on the director. Germans were no better than “hottentots,” it wrote—a more offensive innuendo scarcely imaginable at the time.101 ADZ was fuming and condemned the Argus, expressing its disappointment at its lapse of professionalism and policy of fair play.102 Even more offensive, Melbourne Punch took up the story by writing that “protection to native industry is systematically denied in favor of foreigners, who perhaps after all are only Prussian spies in disguise? [sic] This colony may yet suffer, as France has done, for its

99 See Editorials in ADZ on February 3 and June 30, 1871.
100 Corkhill, “Australian Press Responses,” 461.
101 “Injustice to British Gardeners” (Letter), Argus, 8 November 1872, 7; (No title), Argus, November 9, 1872, 4, 5; see also Argus, November 20, 1872, 4, and R. Right, “‘King’ Casey’s Papers,” in La Trobe Journal 32 (December 1983), 80.
predilection for the German element." Whether merely sarcastic or expressing more serious sentiments, this almost parallels the press hate campaign after the disaster of the Burke and Wills expedition, when press, government and community were fishing for culprits to blame and, apart from Wright, pointed their finger at the German expeditioners as convenient targets. Such attitudinal moodswings boded ill whenever they occurred, and they confirm what Walker Connor and Clifford had observed about the tenuousness of an immigrant community’s security. Fischer notes that it was a characteristic of colonial immigrant societies, including the Anglo-Celtic community in Australia, still unformed and immature, to turn against smaller/weaker groups (or their representatives) when something went wrong. In 1872, it was the conflict between what the government expected the true function of Melbourne’s Botanical Gardens to be, and what Mueller and his staff had created. Mansouri observes that resentment of the actions of “strangers” can easily lead to exclusion. Fortunately, this did not (yet) come to pass at this time.

Attitudes to the community were see-sawing, sometimes quite rapidly, between endorsement and resentment. A huge attendance in 1872 at the ever-popular New Year’s Picnic organized as usual by the Turnverein—the Age claims there were nearly 10,000 attending, the majority Anglo-Australians—is an indicator that Germans remained popular. Yet Lodewyckx observes that the relations between the two communities started to cool as the seventies rolled on. He attributes this to the “new-won eutsc es ationalgeue l” (German nationalist sentiments) that began to be challenged by hostile comments in the Argus, like the above, as well as by the opinions of various leaders. He refers to the views attributed to New South Wales premier and “father of Federation” Henry Parkes, who he alleges considered Germans “even worse than Chinese and Kanaks who should be kept out of Australia.”

A Question on Notice in the Assembly to consider publishing important government notifications in German for the information of German colonists was put to Treasurer Graham Berry, who “promised to think it over.” Though it never came about, it illustrates the prestige the German community was still enjoying.

103 “Free Trade in Foreigners,” Melbourne Punch, November 14, 1872, 1.
104 Discussed in Chapter 2, above.
108 Lodewyckx, *Die Deutschen*, 228. See also Schanz, *Australien und die Suedsee*, *passim*.
109 “Legislative Assembly,” Geelong Advertiser, November 17, 1871, 3.
German visitor Hugo Zoeller in 1880 commented about the internal disunity and endless disputes over minor matters.\textsuperscript{110} A case in point is a critical report in \textit{ADZ} in 1871 that cast some doubt on the effectiveness of the Central Comité.\textsuperscript{111} Meant to be constructive, it led to several claims and counter-claims that indicated that the unity of the community was perhaps not as firm as it seemed. \textit{ADZ}'s editorial was followed by a reply and detailed justification by the Comité. It rejected the accusation of not pulling its weight on behalf of the community.\textsuperscript{112} This in turn gave the Deutscher Verein of Melbourne an opportunity to buy into the argument, with a devastating critique of the Comité and the claim that it (the Verein) “gives a better guarantee of achieving the purpose [of representing city and country Germans] than the Comité ever could.”\textsuperscript{113} Fortunately, the feeling of overt distrust between the two associations did not blow up into open warfare and it gradually died down. However, the Verein’s sensitivity, in a subliminal way, dated back to past criticism made by the \textit{Kosmopolit} newspaper back in the 1850s, and later also by \textit{VDP}, that it was too Melbourne-centric. Hugo Zoeller’s criticism of the community’s “tendency for internal disunity over trivialities” was well justified.\textsuperscript{114}

As the 1870s proceeded—\textit{ADZ} had by then long closed its Melbourne office—other matters became newsworthy. Still in 1871, almost with a degree of prescience, the \textit{Ballarat Star} reflected on the expulsion of Germans from the French possessions in Indochina and suggested that this might be counter-productive, possibly leading to a more problematic German presence elsewhere in that region. It was proven right; German Imperial activities in the South Pacific started by the mid-1880s with the establishment of German colonies in New Guinea and later Samoa.\textsuperscript{115} Ominous in hindsight, this development was initially reported in brief, matter-of-fact announcements. Ultimately the alarm it created in Australia, and its repercussions, would affect the German community profoundly, as we shall see in the next chapter.

\section*{3.9 Conclusion}

For a short while, the roll-on effect of the Franco-Prussian War was profound in how it affected both the German and Anglo communities. For the latter, it fostered a realization
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that Australia was, after all, not immune to political events taking place half a world away, yet unfolding outside the British Isles. What is perplexing is that the war appears to have been largely ignored in recent Australian historical research, including by historians of the German community. The few exceptions are Peter Putnis’ investigation of overseas news services to Australia at the time of the war; Voigt’s brief but insightful examination of the community’s attitudes; Puettmann’s contemporary history; and Lodewyckx’s brief treatment, noting a change of attitude towards German-Australians, more because of the changed international status of Germany than their own behaviour or standing in the Australian community. Lodewyckx cites two incidents: an Argus attack on Emperor Wilhelm I for taking a pro-American stance in a U.S.-British border dispute in Canada, and a virulent attack on Consul Brahe over his advice to German investors to avoid dubious mining speculations in Australia.\footnote{Lodewyckx, \textit{Die Deutschen}, 227-8; \textit{Age}, December 5, 1873, 2.}

German historian Johannes Voigt is intrigued by the evidence of maturity within a more united German community that had to reconcile the conflict between what it perceived as strengthened links between the British Crown and Germany, as manifested by the dynastic ties between Queen Victoria and the House of Saxe-Gotha, and the growing Australian suspicion over the emerging rise of Germany and especially the colonial aspirations of the Reich in the South Pacific from the 1880s onwards. Voigt argues that the community’s loyalty to Australia and the Crown was largely unquestioned, and indeed was becoming stronger, as was their love of Australia. But were German-Australians aware of the problem arising from the overt and visible evidence of their sentimental nostalgic attachment to Germany, that to Anglo-Australians may have seemed incompatible with their love for their new homeland? Did the latter understand that the Reich merely “provide[d] Germans with a ‘central address’…to which they could direct their nostalgic feelings but never any concrete expectations”\footnote{Voigt, \textit{Australia-Germany}, 65.}?

The deliberations in this chapter aimed to demonstrate that the Franco-Prussian War was the first (and only) event that united the German community in Victoria, because it now gave all of them a common denominator concerning their original homeland. Other than through natural connections like their shared religion, their language and their common cultural heritage, they came together on account of acquiring that “central address” which linked them with their collective common past.
Instrumental in coming together was how the community responded to the arguments and polemics of *Australische Deutsche Zeitung*. For a time, the community, or at least some of its leadership, appeared to have a clear direction. But that, and the sentiments that fostered it, would soon lose their immediacy, relevance, and pulling power, and the clearest indicator of this was the cessation of *ADZ’s* publication in Victoria. That was more than a symbolic occurrence, because it exposed the community’s weak commitment to its ethnicity, or what might be called its tribal character and will.

How can this be explained? Was it because Victoria’s German community was never challenged, and thus had never been toughened—which Hawgood sees as the crucial factor consolidating the German-American community? Was its eventual decline due to internal rifts—the disunity of the Lutheran church, the urban-rural rift observed by Hugo Zoeller, the disunity which Albert Heising in 1853 had described thus: “Wherever Germans are found, disunity sticks to their very shoe soles,” or, as Bergquist observed for America, because “there was little inducement to unite.”

My findings are that all of these factors contributed to the community’s ultimate decline. Its gain of “inner strength” that Voigt had observed was short-lived because it lacked the will or even the intention to establish itself as an identifiable group, and it had no plan to exercise power and in the final analysis, to survive. Put quite simply, in the long run Victoria’s German community had no future.

Apart from the Lutheran papers *Der Australische Christenbote* and *Der Lutherische Kirchenbote fuer Australien*, no German newspaper survived to maintain the feelings of togetherness the German community had briefly experienced, and no Muecke or Puettmann, Techow or Theodor Mueller remained on the scene to remind them. They would neither seek nor find an articulate spokesperson able or willing to explain their changed status *either* to themselves *or* to the Anglo majority. This lack of mission and purpose would not augur well for the next few decades, when for a variety of justified or other reasons, the community would be exposed to very serious new risks.
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Chapter Four
Between nationalism and imperialism: 1870s to 1914

4.1 Introduction
This chapter investigates how the newly invigorated German community of Victoria responded to the foundation of the German Reich (Empire) in 1871, and the growth of its international influence from the early 1880s onwards. At the broadest level, it will address a number of questions such as——did it develop a formal relationship with its homeland? If so, did it maintain its independence? Did it consolidate its place in Victorian society and enhance its integrity? How did Imperial Germany’s relations with Britain and the Australian colonies affect the German community? In particular, did the Reich’s aggressive Deutschtumspolitik after the mid-eighties undermine the neutrality of the German community, and what was the Anglo press view on this development? The chapter will also test Veit-Brause’s claim that the standing of German-Australians at this time was as much a result of their day-to-day contacts with their fellow settlers as of the interaction at the official level between Germany, Britain and Australia.¹

By 1870, Australians had formed a general view as to whom they considered to be German (as opposed to French or Russian, for example). Their understanding, though fuzzy, may have been even clearer than that of the Germans themselves. The latter, after all, had arrived on Prussian, Saxon or Bavarian passports rather than German, and many still considered their regional connection important. Though their Kulturgut was German, namely their language, literature and a good deal of their history, the concept of what historians call a Kulturnation may have been somewhat remote to most of them because of their peasant background and limited education.² Now that Prussia, Saxony and all of the thirty-nine states and territories, though continuing to exist with limited sovereignty, had become part of a new federal polity, the situation had changed. If not yet naturalized, Saxons and Bavarians had automatically become citizens of Germany. This would instil in many a certain pride which they now felt gave them status they had not possessed previously. With that change, however, came the danger of being associated with a rising European power that Australians at a future date came to see as a competitor of Britain and its empire, or even of Australia’s own regional interests. Voigt has noted that the euphoria over gaining a single homeland——though remote in space and time for most German-

¹ Veit-Brause, “German-Australian Relations,” 201.
² This point is well argued in Dann, “Nationale Fragen in Deutschland,” 66-82.
Australians—may have given the community greater self-assurance, yet some Australians, including the editor of the *Ballarat Courier*, saw this as a cause for concern.³ No doubt, many immigrants themselves became progressively aware that the new Reich had designs of influencing them. This became one of numerous early signs of the dangers and risks they were facing and had to avoid. Thus, this chapter will also examine how aware they were of these risks, and whether they had re-assessed their new status. Their most obvious options were fairly simple. They could negotiate to become recognized by the host society as an equal partner, despite their differences. That could be risky if the majority rejected their claim. The alternative was to accept the fate of full assimilation and thus submission. Which option would they choose?

### 4.2 Changed circumstances?

Until 1870, the community had experienced an upward trajectory of acceptance among the host community. Admittedly, there had been occasional setbacks, like being seen by some of the Anglo papers as backward, muddle-headed and lacking in enterprise. But such perceptions mattered little; they did not challenge their place in the wider community. They obviously were liked and their quiet and industrious ways caused no trouble and required little thought. There had been little interference with their progress. Though rarely inquiring beyond the obvious and superficial, the mainstream press was consistently positive and superficially interested in their activities. Despite a few restrictions, scarcely noticed by the almost a-political German community, it was made to feel welcome.

Was their status now changing in Australian eyes, and if so, in which ways? Did the Anglo press concede their risen status, and did they see them as fellow citizens with rights of their own, rather than as “foreigners” and “hottentots,” as the *Argus* and *Melbourne Punch* had previously chosen to describe one of their leaders?⁴ Would the community continue to act in unison to promote its views and rebut any criticism—as it had just learned to do—or would its practice of delivering ad-hoc, kneejerk responses, usually by individuals or unrepresentative groups, revert to past practice? Was their loyalty to Queen and country questioned? Even at this early stage (1871), there were
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already signs that their progress might turn into an obstacle course, fraught with great danger.

In Bonds of Loyalty, Luebke outlines the evolution of self-awareness and self-value of Americans. During the early phase of settlement, he holds, Americans saw themselves “as a new people whose character was not fixed but was emerging from the blend of many peoples in the new environment.” In America as in Australia, at that time the German community was seen as equal but different. But Luebke continues that, as Americans moved from a post-colonial society towards nationhood, they developed and came to assert a claim for cultural superiority that implied that “their…way of living [now came to define] what was American, and that all newcomers were to conform to these standards.” That new attitude, and how Germans resisted the pressure to conform, is what Hawgood grapples with when trying to define what “becoming American” actually meant.\(^5\) What did this process involve, and did the position of the German community in Victoria reflect a similar evolutionary path? Referring to Oscar Handlin’s classic treatise The Uprooted, Luebke holds that Americans believed that a distinctly American life style had emerged, where “social and cultural homogeneity was desirable.” Thus, some of the differences the Germans exhibited to American (or Australian) eyes now could become causes of resentment, because they jarred with the majority’s desire for, and perception of, conformity.\(^6\) While in America the clash between nativism and immigrants became quite virulent, resulting in the emergence of a distinct German-American community that was subjected to regular attacks for their hyphenism—a synonym for behaving like Germans not Americans—there are few such incidents in Australia.\(^7\) The response of the Ballarat Courier discussed in the previous chapter was an example, as was the resentment over the preferment of foreigners to public office, like Mueller and Homeyer, over dependable British gardeners; both can be considered minor forms of nativism. But the negative press response on the latter occasion, even if it came from a mainstream paper like the Argus, cannot (as yet) be taken as deep-seated animosity. However, a certain edginess was creeping into

\(^5\) Hawgood is at pains to name forms of “resistance to Americanising tendencies” and merely comes up with German anti-sabbatarianism vis-à-vis the growing temperance movement. Hawgood, The Tragedy of German-America, xvi. See also Conzen, “German-Americans and the Invention of Ethnicity,” 134.

\(^6\) Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty, 67.

\(^7\) One of several Oxford English Dictionary definitions of nativism is “protecting the interests of native-born…inhabitants against those of immigrants.” Hyphenism was a direct consequence of active resistance to nativist hostility, resulting in a self-conscious German-American community where the hyphen became “a link and a bar between [its] Germanism and [its] Americanism.” Hawgood, op.cit., 254. This clash of cultures will be re-visited briefly in Chapter Five.
German-Australian relations, even if only occasionally. And while the German-American hyphenists tended to hit back hard, Germans (and ADZ’s responses were representative) reacted with what can only be rated as mild irritation.8

The previous chapter instanced how Australians saw their German fellow citizens after the experience of the Franco-Prussian War. It was noted that their views varied, displaying a latent ambivalence, at times approving, occasionally admiring, and at other times quite critical. A crude comparison of references in Trove-indexed newspapers exhibiting a critical “them” attitude, with more sympathetic references using descriptors like “our German settlers,” “our neighbours,” “our German citizens,” etc., still clearly inclines towards a positive attitude, even by the 1890s. The Horsham Times went as far as including a regular feature headed “German column.”

The methodology adopted in this chapter is to overlay major events occurring during the decades up to World War I, that is, events that particularly affected the German community in Victoria, over local Anglo-German responses. That will allow observations concerning changes in attitudes towards Australia, Queen and Empire, and towards the German Reich, its agencies and policies. Questions of loyalty, nationalism, tolerance and mutual trust can be highlighted. The German community will not be viewed as a monolithic entity; rather, this examination will focus on its component parts: the rural and urban communities, the Lutheran church, and the various Vereine and associations. For reasons of economy, this discussion must be limited to significant events and developments. Included will be events like the beginnings of an Imperial German naval presence in the South Pacific; the establishment of high-level German diplomatic representation in Australia in 1879; the establishment of a direct shipping service between Germany and Australia’s east coast (Sloman 1884, Norddeutscher Lloyd 1886); the proclamation of German colonies and protectorates in the South Pacific region commencing in 1884; the expansion of German-Australian trade and especially the impact of the international trade exhibitions in 1879/80 and 1888; the events surrounding the war in South Africa (the so-called Boer War) towards the end of the century; and Australian federation. This will be accompanied by ongoing references to the impact of the Reich’s Deutschtumspolitik.9

9 Deutschum (“German-ness”) was a peculiar concept that underwent various changes as circumstances changed. The term was a coinage of early nineteenth-century philologists Jakob Grimm and G.H. Pertz who linked the concepts of Volk and Sprache (people/ethnic group and language/daily speech) as applying to any group wherever they resided. As the usage of the term proliferated it acquired wider and more jingoistic meanings, like belonging to a mythical “Germany” both physically, emotionally, culturally and spiritually, with superior national characteristics
4.3 A new phase: the German Empire makes its first appearance

When the war between Prussia with France ended, it was followed by a full decade known as the *Grunderkrise*, during which the German Reich responded and adjusted to internal economic and political challenges. Towards the mid-eighties, with its economy now recovered and industrial growth accelerating at an amazing speed, it emerged on the international scene as a military and mercantile power.

Beginning from the seventies, the Australian press began to take a greater interest in the German navy, prompted by occasional visits: by the corvettes *Nymph* and *Arkona* in 1872, the visit of German naval officers in 1874 to observe the transit of Venus, and the visit of the *Louise* and the war corvette *Augusta* in 1876. Though quite sympathetic, the interest in the visitors went beyond the social aspects of the visits such as dinners given to captain and crew by the Mayor, the Deutscher Verein, etc. As yet the goodwill the visits generated was emphasized. Quite carefully, the papers also observed the physical characteristics of German sailors, their uniforms, discipline, and especially the engine size and mode of construction of their ships, their Krupp guns and the latter’s range and firepower. Comparisons were made with British seamen and vessels, and the British navy as such. And already they started wondering, though still quite innocently, what lay behind the visits. The *Argus* suspected it might be “to found a colony in the South Seas.” Indeed, did the emerging Germany already look for opportunities to expand its influence in the region?

To German nationalists, a great navy was inextricably linked to a great nation, and naval buildup was seen as “a cultural-missionary task” towards this end. As yet,
the emergence of the navy still seemed innocent enough to Australian observers, and the visits, mostly to Sydney, and often as support acts to Sydney’s “Kaiserfest,” still produced positive Anglo press responses until well into the early 1900s.\textsuperscript{14} When the war corvette \textit{Augusta} was reported “to take her station in Australian waters…probably Melbourne,” the \textit{Geelong Advertiser} reported it but did not ponder toward what purpose.\textsuperscript{15} Was it to protect the few dozen German plantation owners in Fiji, Samoa, and the Islands? Later in the decade there is talk of German naval stations at Samoa and possibly even Borneo.\textsuperscript{16} The great scientist Georg Neumayer, who in 1864 had returned from his government post in Melbourne to his homeland, perhaps in anticipation of a fate similar to that of his compatriot Ferdinand Mueller as a “foreigner,” in 1876 was appointed director of the German Admiralty’s Marine Observatory in Hamburg. Excitedly and somewhat hypocritically, the \textit{Argus} commented that “Australians have some reason to be proud to think that in the land of their adoption [\textit{sic}] the Professor began those scientific labours the results of which have earned for him a European reputation.”\textsuperscript{17} There is no acknowledgement that during his twelve years in Australia, the \textit{Argus} had rarely accorded Neumayer’s work with equal praise. Moreover, the credit is claimed for Australia while it is properly due to the German professor.\textsuperscript{18}

Meanwhile, the majority of Victoria’s rural Germans felt that the opening up of the land in the Wimmera held much greater interest than the rise of their former homeland and how the Anglo majority saw them. Disinterested, indeed virtually oblivious to the activities of the Reich, together with thousands of German immigrants from South Australia, they established farms and villages at this new frontier. The \textit{Leader} admired them: “These people have been successful under the most adverse trials.” The \textit{Australasian} commended “the plodding and uncomplaining endurance of these people” [my italics; it refers to German settlers], even if its prognosis was that the near future “will disclose [the region] as being unfitted for settlement.”\textsuperscript{19} This was a misjudgment, as numerous, soon thriving settlements sprang up at Horsham, Dimboola

\textsuperscript{14} This was one of the popular names of the celebrations on the anniversaries of the founding of the Empire. See note 9, above.
\textsuperscript{15} \textit{Geelong Advertiser}, November 17, 1876, 2.
\textsuperscript{16} Various news reports in the late 1870s and ‘80s, e.g. \textit{Age}, March 13, 1880, 6.
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Argus}, January 5, 1876, 9.
\textsuperscript{18} R.A. Swan in \textit{Australian Dictionary of Biography} notes that Neumayer “encountered a certain amount of prejudiced opposition, even in the colonial legislature. As a dedicated scientist, he was not discouraged by such pettiness.” See also “Professor Neumayer,” \textit{Argus}, August 20, 1864, 6.
\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Leader}, January 4, 1890, 13; \textit{Australasian}, August 10, 1872, 6.
and elsewhere. It was the German farmers’ consistency, their inner strength that both papers admired.

The attitudes of urban Germans were, by contrast, far more diverse, often quite ambivalent, and far more difficult to read. An illustration is the mid-1880s’ fear of a Russian invasion—part hoax, part rumour. One of the German community’s responses was a well-attended public meeting, called by Mr Clauscen, the mayor of Northcote, to form a German military defence corps. Little came of it, but the meeting was accompanied by shouts of hurrah for Bismarck and the Kaiser and the singing of the Deutschlandlied. The Ballarat Star actually had to explain to its readers that the German corps would be part of an Australian defence against the Russians! The proposal could have been interpreted quite differently, as it coincided with Australian concerns over the establishment of a German protectorate in New Guinea. Thus the military corps could easily have been viewed as an attempt to arm a fifth column. Clauscen never realized the potentially provocative nature of his proposal. Fortunately, the Age dispelled any possible misgivings: “It is satisfactory to note that, in the present crisis our German fellow colonists are alive to the importance of preserving the integrity of our shores, an object they must have as great an interest in as ourselves.”

4.4 The Reich comes closer: protectorates and colonies

The establishment of a German consulate-general in 1879 was a significant development. Since 1850, a number of consular offices had been operating in the various colonies. In Victoria, the Free Cities of Hamburg and Bremen had been represented by consuls since 1850 and 1857, respectively; Prussia from 1853. Their functions were largely commercial and, to a small extent, to assist travellers with interests in the geography of the continent and its indigenous inhabitants. Melbourne solicitor Alexander Brahe had occupied the Melbourne consul’s post from 1868, initially for Prussia, subsequently for the North German Confederation, and then the Reich. The establishment of the consulate-general introduced a new factor in German-Australian relations. Headed by a professional diplomat, it assumed responsibility for

---

21 Ballarat Star, April 20, 1884, 3.
22 Age, April 15, 1885, 5.
commercial, political and immigration matters, while the role of the honorary consuls in the various colonies was downgraded.

Initially, the office assisted with the organization of the international exhibitions at Sydney (1879) and Melbourne (1880), which the Imperial government rather reluctantly subsidized. The first consul-general, Dr Richard Krauel, chose Sydney as strategically well-placed, anticipating future Reich activities in the South Pacific region, although the *Bendigo Advertiser* commented resentfully that it was “a slap in the face of Victoria” that Melbourne was by-passed.\(^{24}\) From the beginning, it was clear even to Anglo-Australians that the upgraded consulate had other functions as well. The *Launceston Examiner* surmised that “Germany intends to acquire some of the South Sea Islands to increase her influence there,” and that the consulate would play a role towards that end.\(^{25}\)

Both the new and all later consuls-general were career diplomats and had held previous appointments in the south-east Asian region. While initially trade matters dominated their work, before long “a policy shift towards colonialism and imperialism [became evident] in the 1880s,” notes Veit-Brause.\(^{26}\) After Bismarck’s dismissal in 1890, the consulate transmogrified more overtly into an active agent for the promotion of Kaiser Wilhelm II’s *Weltpolitik*. Rather than directing itself to Australians to inform them about Germany, it focussed its propaganda on local Germans, trying to instil pride in the German Empire rather than their new homeland. Under the Kaiser’s policy, diaspora Germans were seen as “co-nationals,” i.e. members of the Kaiser’s “greater German Empire,” whose support was encouraged through naval visits, the German “Kaiserfeste” organized by the Sydney Consulate-General, and through subsidies to Lutheran churches and German schools. Even reluctant Victoria was won over through generous grants towards the highly successful Deutscher Schulverein von Victoria (1899), a prime example of an attempt to transnationalize education.\(^ {27}\)

The Melbourne international exhibition of 1880 became a great success, largely as a public relations exercise. The Reich acquired a significantly raised profile, while the much admired German exhibits and large number of visitors also cast a positive

\(^{24}\) *Bendigo Advertiser*, February 24, 1881, 3.
\(^{27}\) Manz, *Constructing a German Diaspora* 2,51,227-8; Tampke, *The Germans in Australia*, 112-14. Weidenfeller’s history of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Schulverein documents the hijacking of this liberal altruistic organization by imperialistic interests. Though not active in Australia, the Verein influenced German Government thinking with regard to schools support in overseas countries. Weidenfeller, *VDA*, passim, especially chapter 5, also page 231.
sheen on the local German community. Although modest, German trade increased fourfold in the following five years. John Martin notes that the exhibition made itself even felt by boosting attendance at Melbourne’s Trinity Lutheran church. Veit-Brause claims that by subsidizing the exhibition, “the Germans in Australia might be included in a strategy aimed at neutralizing the Australians’ preference for all things British.” However, this requires proof from a far more detailed economic analysis than the present thesis allows.

German colonial activities in the South Pacific started in 1884. They gradually led to an erosion of the good relations between the Australian colonies and Germany that also affected Australian relations with the motherland and, indirectly, with the local German community. It “was the beginning of Australia’s lingering resentment and distrust of German imperialism,” notes Tampke.

In 1884, when plans for a partial annexation of north-eastern New Guinea became known—the result of German-British agreements—the Australasian initially welcomed them quite sanguinely with the comment, “It would give us a new market for some of our products.” Even when the annexation became official later that year, it passed without protest. The Horsham Times was at ease: “The Empire of England...must...remain dominant throughout the world,” it noted confidently. But then, suddenly, Australians realized with some unease that they now had a new European neighbour in their own backyard. A protest meeting at the Melbourne town hall was attended by 4,000; another 1,000 had to be turned away. The Emerald Hill Record reported on another meeting, one of many held at various suburban and regional locations throughout Victoria during the first half of 1885. The latter had been called by the South Melbourne Mayor. After spirited debates, 500 local citizens voted to “unite with their fellow colonists in protesting against the annexation of the islands of the Pacific by foreign powers.” Guest speaker Mr Nimmo MLA told his audience that “with German people he had no quarrel...Germans were good colonists, they were thrifty and never disturbed the peace nor caused alarm. For them he had no feelings but those of

28 Veit-Brause, “German-Australian Relations,” 206.
29 Mees, A German Church in the Garden of God, 127.
31 Tampke, Germans in Australia, 111.
32 Australasian, February 17, 1883, 18. For background information, see Donald Gordon, “Beginnings of an Australasian Pacific Policy,” especially 80,84-5.
33 Horsham Times, November 28, 1884, 1-s.
34 “The Melbourne Mass Meeting,” Australasian, January 10, 1885, 28; Record (Emerald Hill, Vic.), January 17, 1885, 5.
respect and brotherly kindness,” but he wanted to express his “sorrow and regret that a large part of a territory that naturally belonged to Australia had been allowed to fall into the hands of Germany [my italics].”

This was an important change in attitude, both of the press and of Anglo community leaders: the actions of the metropolitan power (Germany) had become linked with references to the local community on the periphery. This would progressively become the norm. By-and-by it would challenge the place the German community believed itself to be occupying, that is of having become an integral part of the wider Australian society. A connection with their former homeland, which had in many ways become remote to many, especially politically, was suddenly being resurrected and imposed upon them against their wishes.

But there were those who quite openly approved the German takeover. At a picnic at Mordialloc, the Deutscher Verein president, in the presence of a number of Australian friends and the mainstream press, rejoiced in the annexation while stressing (rather naively) that his compatriots were equally loyal to Australia as their Anglo-Australian friends, but that they also loved their original homeland. The Mount Alexander Mail saw it differently:

[A] colonist of foreign extraction [the Mail writes,] when he takes the oath of allegiance to the head of the British Empire…[must agree] to consider the interests of the people among whom he lives paramount to all others… If he continues to feel in sympathetic accord with the aspirations and achievements of Germany in the Western Pacific…he must be aware that the British and Australian born inhabitants of these colonies regard the fact with the strongest disfavour.

But had not the Australasian approved the self-same idea? One is reminded of the Ballarat Courier’s attitude a decade earlier. Was this another case of quod licet Jovi non licet bovi? Were Germans disallowed to express opinions of their own? An Age report

35 Record (Emerald Hill, Vic.), January 17, 1885, 5.
36 Mount Alexander Mail, March 26, 1885, 2.
37 Literally “What is permissible for Jove [the god Jupiter] is not permissible for an ox.” A saying attributed to Roman playwright Terentius.
of the event was far more matter-of-fact. Though detailed, it noted the speeches, the patriotic songs, and the declarations of loyalty, but there was no condemnation.\textsuperscript{38}

Remarkable about the New Guinea developments was that the Australian public was more angered by what they considered the backstabbing action of the British Colonial Secretary, Lord Derby, for consenting to Germany’s annexation of a part of New Guinea without consulting the Australian colonies, rather than by the actions of the Reich. The \textit{Argus} even speaks of “estrangement between the colonists and the mother country,” and of their “exasperated state of feelings...at the way their interests have been sacrificed.”\textsuperscript{39} But surprisingly, the \textit{Kerang Times} picked up an interesting comment in the Adelaide paper \textit{Australische Zeitung} (\textit{AZ}). The \textit{AZ} had suggested that the best way to \textit{up} the dismissive attitude of the British government would be for the colonies to unite and declare their independence from Britain.\textsuperscript{40} They could then do as they liked. Now, if Carl Muecke was not the author of the \textit{AZ} comment—and we know he was still with the paper at that time—that is exactly what he \textit{might have} suggested.\textsuperscript{41} It was the same idea he had advanced in 1870. He dreamed of Australian independence, of national unity, and national action. It was surprising that none of the mainstream press responded. We will remember that in 1871, under the impact of German unification, an \textit{Age} editorial had reflected on the very same ideas, observing that the “hopes and fears, the desires and aspirations...amongst the European masses...[now find] an echo amongst the people of Australia...[while an] Australian people and an Australian nationality, distinctive in type and in aims [begins] to peer forth in well-defined shape.”\textsuperscript{42} It was only a few years later that—without Muecke’s prompting—federal conventions began to explore Australian unity.\textsuperscript{43}

It is important to bear in mind that the acquisition of colonies was \textit{not} a serious Reich policy until the accession of Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1888. A widely held assumption is to implicate Chancellor Bismarck as the progenitor of Germany’s aggressive \textit{Weltpolitik}. Although inaugurated during his chancellorship, that policy largely evolved under Bismarck’s successors, and it was that policy that eventually soured British-German and thus also Australian-German relations. Bismarck had been

\textsuperscript{38} “German Picnic at Mordialloc,” \textit{Age}, January 19, 1885, 5.
\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Argus}, February 17, 1885, 7.
\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Kerang Times}, January 6, 1885, 4.
\textsuperscript{41} The article, “Die Einverleibungen Deutschlands und Australiens Protest” (translated as “The German Colonial Acquisitions and Australian Protests”), in \textit{Australische Zeitung}, December 31, 1884, 2.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Age}, December 31, 1870, 2.
\textsuperscript{43} See Fischer, “Imagining an Australian Nation,” 179.
an unwilling participant of German colonial policies. Far more focussed on internal politics and the maintenance of a European balance of power, his prime concern was fighting “against dissenters inside the Reich.”\footnote{155} He and the German government had been coerced into acquiring colonies by the combined pressure of the German press and imperialist groups within the bourgeoisie, as well as the metropolitan lobby groups acting on behalf of business and plantation owners in the Pacific Islands.\footnote{156} An influential pamphlet by the mission society functionary Friedrich Fabri, *Does Germany need Colonies?* (1879) had stimulated debate along economic and ethnocultural lines, combining ideas borrowed from Wakefield’s *Sketch of a Proposal for Colonizing Australasia* (1829) and other writings with notions of preserving the German-ness of immigrants in various overseas countries, and incorporating them in a paradigm combining emigration, production, resources, trade and metropole geopolitics.\footnote{157}

Between 1884 and the 1890s, Germany established several colonies, designated protectorates (Schutzgebiete) in the Pacific region. Never successful economically or politically, and geographically and climatically quite unsuited to encourage migration on any scale, their failure validated Bismarck’s reluctance.\footnote{158} Though tolerated by Britain, as already noted, Australians were totally opposed, and thus it became the trigger for a marked decline in German-Australian relations that also affected the local community’s standing.\footnote{159}

The first and most influential Imperial consul, Dr Richard Krauel (1880-85), became the principal German official to oversee the establishment of the protectorate in New Guinea (later part of Kaiser-Wilhelmsland) in November 1884 that generated the intense and broad-based hostility described. Subsequently, he conducted the long and complex negotiations with Britain over German land claims in Fiji, which eventually settled the troubled relations between the two colonial superpowers and even earned him the praise of Britain’s Foreign and Colonial Secretaries in 1885.\footnote{160} His diplomatic skills even won over Australian press opinion, as indicated by a review of press comments. He succeeded in assuaging the hostile opinions over New Guinea.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[156] Veit-Brause, “Australia and Germany in the Pacific,” 34 and note 8, page 312.
\item[158] The number of German residents in 1913 in its various South Sea colonies was 1,340. Of these, 1,010 were in New Guinea and 330 in Samoa. See *Groesse und Bevoelkerung unserer Kolonien*, 1913. http://www.jaduland.de/kolonien/index2.html
\item[160] “Colonial topics,” *Argus*, July 24, 1885, 10; see also “English and German Diplomacy in Fiji,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, March 2, 1885, 7; Ohff, *Disastrous Ventures*, passim.
\end{footnotes}
4.5 German-Australian relations: exhibitions and trade

The 1888 Centennial Exhibition in Melbourne—there was no Sydney equivalent—became a great public relations success, and it also boosted German trade, as by now the Reich had become a formidable industrial and manufacturing nation eager to export. However, despite the very successful impact made by the German exhibits, trade failed to progress significantly. It was marred by serious three-way disagreements between Britain, Germany and especially the U.S. in connection with colonial claims over Samoa. Victoria’s economic collapse in the early 1890s also affected it adversely. However, a number of German-Australian firms became part of the German export drive as local agents. Though continuing to be marred by resentment over colonial matters, and hampered by preferential tariffs between the colonies and Britain as well as Australians’ natural preference for British manufactured goods, Germany’s trade with Australia kept rising, albeit slowly. By 1903 it had reached a modest 7 per cent. It was helped by the regular direct shipping service of the Norddeutscher Lloyd steamship line, established with the support of German government subsidies in 1886. This was a direct result of the earlier 1879-80 exhibitions, which had convinced the German government that trade was greatly hampered by the virtual monopoly enjoyed by British shipping. Most of the trade was one-way, dominated by export of Australian wool, metals and minerals.

The visit in 1879-80 of German journalist Hugo Zoeller, of the *Koelnische Zeitung* (Cologne), a leading, originally liberal paper, provides some interesting insights into how a representative of the metropole saw his Australian compatriots. Unlike other German visitors to Victoria, such as Seelhorst, Lendenfeld and Anrept-Elms—largely academics pursuing specific research projects or visiting as tourists—Zoeller was a reporter, trained to observe, a man with an analytical and critical mind. Giving his
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51 Veit-Brause, op.cit., 213.
52 Veit-Brause in “German-Australian Relations,” says there were 104 firms (page 211).
53 The head of the mission staging the German section at the 1888 Centennial Exhibition, Alfred Wermuth, walked out of a public function when his American colleague accused Germany of illegal colonial actions in Samoa. Wermuth, *Ein Beamtenleben*, 107-9; *Age*, January 18 and 19, 1888, 108-9; Veit-Brause, op.cit., 213.
56 Melbourne journalist and publisher Hermann Puettmann had been its literary editor between 1842 and his dismissal in 1844.
57 Seelhorst was responsible for organizing the German exhibits at the 1880 Melbourne international exhibition; Lendenfeld, an Austrian scientist, came to teach and research sponges and medusas in Australian waters (1881-6) and carry out cartographic research; and Anrept-Elms was a run-of-the mill tourist traveller. All wrote books on their experiences. Seelhorst, in a single sentence, observed that Germans had lost their national identity and had become “de facto Englishmen” (page 351). Title details given in Bibliography.
Melbourne compatriots a careful looking-over, he was dismayed by what appeared to him almost irreversible cultural and linguistic assimilation. Virtually every family seemed to be linked to “English blood” by marriage, and the higher in social status the more this appeared to be the case. Perhaps somewhat exaggerated, his claim that many settlers had “sacrificed their German nationality for material comfort” came close to the truth. Though what options did Germans have? It was essential to speak English, to mix with Anglo-Australians to conduct business or trade. Kerry Murphy observed that in Melbourne in the 1850s and ’60s, Germans could conduct all their business without knowing a word of English. However, by 1880 that was no longer realistic. Zoeller also noted what he considered a deep divide between urban and rural Germans; he was critical of the Germans’ lagging behind their Anglo competitors in business due to excessive caution and lack of aggression; at elections, they never seemed to form a block with specific demands or an agenda, and he bemoaned the fact that all the eligible German candidates (he no doubt meant capable leaders like Ferdinand Mueller, Alexander Brahe, Muecke and the late Hermann Puettmann’s son Hermann Wilhelm), declined to stand for parliament on the grounds of being ineligible because of their government employment. Zoeller’s observations seemed to indicate that the evidence of unity the newly invigorated community had exhibited in 1871 had now vanished.

Quite a young man (born in 1852), Zoeller was already a dyed-in-the-wool German imperialist, and he noted with regret that talented diaspora Germans “waste the talents that could serve the fatherland” (vergeuden die Kraefte des Vaterlandes) and failed to challenge the “monopolistic rule of the Anglos” (die Alleinherrschaft des Englaendertums). In summary, he noted and condemned the lack of communal cohesion, their lack of self-confidence, lack of political engagement, their failure to see the big picture (Verkleinerungssucht), and their tendency for internal disunity over trivialities. Perhaps his compatriots might have benefited if Zoeller had chosen to share his observations with them.

58 Veit-Brause, “Hugo Zoeller: A German View of Australian Society,” 153-174. Hugo Zoeller (1852-1933) was a journalist, explorer and later an academic, who visited Australia as a young journalist assigned to cover the international exhibitions in 1879, 1880 and 1888 in Sydney and Melbourne, respectively. No other German paper had before this time sent a reporter to Australia, and Zoeller’s assignment indicates the interest then prevailing in Germany for Australian and Pacific affairs generally. Zoeller’s paper was the Koelnische Zeitung, where Victoria’s venerable journalist Hermann Puettmann had been literary editor 25 years earlier.

59 Murphy, “Volk von Bruedern: the German-Speaking Liedertafel in Melbourne,” xi:14,56,64,70.

60 Bergquist observes the same weakness among German-Americans: Bergquist, “Germans and German-speaking Immigrants,” 240.

61 Zoeller’s harsh but not undeserved verdict became part of a book published after his return to Germany: Hugo Zoeller, Rund um die Erde, vol.1, 199-221, 228-63. In an article in Koelnische Zeitung (September 9, 1888), Zoeller gave the reasons for his two-year voyage to the East in 1879-80 as “to advocate Germany’s overseas interests, to
When Zoeller revisited Melbourne for the great Centennial Exhibition in Melbourne in 1888, the ground had shifted significantly. By then the furore over New Guinea had receded. The numerous German industrial exhibits at the Exhibition greatly impressed the Australian community and press. When he cast his eye over the local community this time, Zoeller was more impressed than eight years earlier. The German Empire’s Deutschtumspolitik seemed to be bearing fruit: the part-time consuls in the various colonies were now under the firm direction of a seasoned Imperial consul-general in Sydney; propaganda and support for the annual celebrations of “Kaiser’s Birthday,” and cakes, beer and flags to celebrate the regular visits by German warships at Australian ports (though rarely at Melbourne) were now dispensed through his office. Regular diplomatic visits by consular officials to German clubs and churches had become the norm; teachers and even pastors were sent from Germany to boost services in local communities, but also to infiltrate them and proselytize the message of the Reich. John Moses’ survey of the endeavours of various consuls-general in advancing the ideas of Deutschtum in South Australia and Queensland, however, shows they were less than successful. Manz notes that although “keen to remain informed about events in the Heimat, most Germans ‘lacked a higher idealistic patriotism’ and tried to avoid everything that would offend the feelings of their Australian fellow citizens,” as Consul-General Kempermann in Sydney had to concede. Yet there were signs that consular efforts made some impact on sections of the German community. In Victoria, the only real inroad was made through financial subsidies of the Schulverein von Victoria, established in 1899. But as noted earlier, a positive spin-off of the Reich’s various initiatives contributed to an increased awareness amongst Australians of both Germany and of their German fellow settlers.

study the colonial systems of the English, Dutch and French, and to explore the possibilities for German colonial acquisitions,” quoted in Veit-Brause, “Hugo Zoeller: a German View of Australian Society,” 249 (note 5).

Veit-Brause, “Hugo Zoeller,” op.cit., 164-8. Zoeller’s reports on his 1888 visit were published over a series of months in Koelntische Zeitung. As there are no copies of that paper held in Australian libraries I have relied entirely on Veit-Brause’s excellent article as well as on its extensive references on pages 249-50.

Sydney’s annual Nationalfest (also referred to as the Kaiserfest) is well documented in Tampke, Germans in Australia, 112-14, passim, and Voigt, “Das deutsche Nationalfest in Sydney vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg,” 139-48, passim. See also notes 23 and 28, above.

Manz, “Diaspora and Weltpolitik in Wilhelmine Germany,” 29, and note 8; Voigt, “The ‘Fatherland’s’ Solicitude,” in Australia-Germany, 73-80, passim.

Manz, Constructing a German Diaspora, 117-19 and note 89.

Australische Zeitung, May 24, 1899, 1; June 26, 1912, 8 (numerous other references); Manz, op.cit., 227-28.

See also Corkhill, “Australian Press Responses to the Franco-Prussian War,” 461.
4.6 The community

An analysis of the community in the last two decades of the century provides some useful insights. It will help to understand where the various German groups had positioned themselves by the 1880s, and whether they showed an awareness of how the world and their own situation were changing. Did they have, or seek to achieve, particular objectives, and if so, what were they, and importantly, did they include measures to strengthen the community? James Bergquist notes that, despite an appearance of disunity among German-Americans, based on what seemed opposed viewpoints, using the analogy of a large family, many opinions can be subsumed without breaking up a community.68 Though the German-American community was far larger, Bergquist’s observations lend themselves also to Victoria’s 10,000 German-born citizens.

Two-thirds of the Victorian German community, living in rural and semi-rural settlements, appeared to remain in a largely static state, showing relatively few obvious signs of acculturation, while remaining closely bound to their respective synod of the Lutheran Church, uninvolved in politics and often not even naturalized. For them, the euphoric phase of supporting German unification and their proactive involvement in various support measures had been brief, but was now a thing of the past. Loosely, they stayed in touch with their urban compatriots, and they maintained an old-fashioned Deutschtum that was virtually impervious to German imperial Deutschtumspolitik. The urban third displayed considerably greater variation, being socially and politically more engaged in the affairs of both the larger as well as their own ethnic community. But while they showed more advanced signs of cultural assimilation, their emotional connection with their former homeland also continued unabated. This complex dual relationship, as Gerhard Fischer has argued, was quite typical of an immigrant community.69 They were loyal to the Queen and Australia, yet also prone to respond to the call of the homeland, in this case the Reich’s Deutschtumspolitik. Initially, this essentially harmless dual loyalty raised no Anglo eyebrows.

Frederick Luebke, using rather colourful descriptors, broadly classes German immigrants in America into Kirchendeutsche (church Germans), Vereinsdeutsche (club or association Germans), and Sauerkrautdeutsche (a sarcastic idiom for typical a-

68 Bergquist, “German Communities in American Cities,” 8.
political Germans); the latter eating German food, drinking beer, even reading German newspapers, but apart from that conforming with most aspects of the host community without much commitment either way. The first group, Kirchendeutsche, conservative, were loyal primarily to their church, holding onto inherited ethnic sentiments that gave them the reassurance of belonging and group membership. Apart from sentimental links to their original homeland, imperial Germany, the Kaiser and the navy visits were matters of total indifference to them.\(^70\) Except for minor exceptions like the Consulate-funded Deutscher Schulverein, that summarizes the Victorian rural community described above.\(^71\) Vereinsdeutsche were urban dwellers, secular in outlook, ranging across a broad political spectrum from liberal to radical, often also quite determined defenders of their German heritage while not resisting assimilation. Among them, some responded to the enticements of Deutschtumspolitik, particularly those who had immigrated fairly recently. But most were well on the way to becoming assimilated German-Australians. The Sauerkrautdeutschen provided the most fertile ground for Reich propaganda.\(^72\) They were the fence-sitters, the equivocators.

A large proportion of the urbans, apart from merchants, teachers, and a few intellectuals, were drawn from artisan and labouring backgrounds, and a small group among them were socialists or social-democrats, emerging as a small and politically active group in the 1880s. Their activities left no doubt that they had serious issue with the nature of the emerging German empire; their outlook was largely internationalist.\(^73\) As the century slowly proceeded, it became quite obvious that the number of independent German community leaders, especially those endowed with charisma, widely known and respected and with a vision for their community, had drastically shrunk. Many had died, some had left Victoria or returned to Germany. Who did remain on the scene?

Alexander Brahe, the German consul, had become very close to the German Empire and its aspirations; besides, he was ageing (born 1824). Another prominent community leader in the past, Julius Pokorny, had moved to Sydney in the early eighties, and Carl Muecke had returned to South Australia, where he remained active with the Australische Zeitung. Gustav Techow had withdrawn from political activities

\(^{70}\) Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty, 34-5,42.
\(^{71}\) Manz, Constructing a German Diaspora, 227-28; Weidenfeller, VDA, passim.
\(^{72}\) Ibid., 42-3.
and was now closely involved with gymnastics education. Ferdinand Mueller remained both part of the wider establishment as well as the German community. But he was essentially an unpolitical intellectual, and the vicious attacks on his work had undermined his confidence and, to some extent, his status. In addition, born in 1825, he was also no longer young. Hermann Puettmann was dead; his son, Hermann Wilhelm, publisher and poet, and active as president of the Deutscher Verein, showed little inclination to become the community leader. Another prominent name was that of Lutheran church leader Hermann Herlitz. Fifty years old at the time of the New Guinea uproar (born 1834), head of “his” church with a membership of more than 5,000 notional Lutheran followers, publisher of Victoria’s only remaining German “newspaper,” the Christenbote, with a large raft of social responsibilities going far beyond his spiritual duties to his church and congregation, he was a networker inside and outside his church. Was he fit to inspire, to lead, to devise a German-Australian trajectory for his community? For many German residents of Melbourne,

Trinity Church became a symbol of the German Empire. Only a fraction of the German community had connections with the church…but for many of the unchurched Trinity Church played a dual role: it was a provider of religious services and an outpost of German culture…[as well as] a religious site for significant religious celebrations [italics are mine].74

The quotation invites two quite distinct interpretations, apart from that of the centrality of the church and its leadership. These are, on one hand, the German character of the church (an ethno-cultural link), and on the other hand, a connection with the German Empire (a political link). Would the church, and especially Herlitz, step aside from the role Matthias Goethe had assigned to it thirty years earlier, namely to “stay in contact with the evangelical mother church in the German Fatherland,” and re-prioritize its mandate to serve its German-Australian community without deferring to the fatherland?75 What might Goethe have meant by staying in contact? Obviously, he could not anticipate the political pulling power of what in the 1850s had been a relatively benign and passive fatherland, but had now become a leading mega-power.

74 Martin, “Pastor Hermann Herlitz and his Congregation,” 145.
75 Evangelical-Lutheran Church, Victorian Synod, Proceedings, 1856, quoted Meyer, History of Germans in Australia, 37. The Argus found this relationship sufficiently significant to report it: “German Lutheran Church,” Argus, May 17, 1856, 4. See also Lodewyckx, Die Deutschen in Australien, 101.
As this theme requires more extensive discussion, I will return to it a little later, and will now briefly consider the other community institutions.

What position did the Deutscher Verein, the Turnverein, and other such groups now occupy? What formal active or passive role did they play? Especially, were they aware of the changing situation, and how did they respond/adjust to it? When Manz stresses that “the German abroad did not exist,” but only “extremely heterogenous groups” with a wide range of opinions and alignment, does this indicate no consensus existed?76

The Deutscher Verein showed the inevitable effects of attrition. Its potential for leading the German community into an acceptable middle position of political and social equality, which had been its avowed policy in the 1850s and ‘60s, appeared to have dropped off its agenda. Formerly its proactive community role, though limited, had been its strength as well as a source of pride internally, and of recognition outside. In the mid-seventies, its pedantry over who was better, it or the Central Comité referred to in the previous chapter, already indicated a creeping irrelevance. By the eighties it had become merely a cultural organization, impervious to current political concerns, a remote and upper middle-class club pursuing “gesellige Zwecke,” like balls and musical evenings, as Jung noted in 1902.77 A notice of an 1884 meeting is a case in point—purely social in character, with Mme Wiedermann and tenor Ernst Hartung appearing as vocalists, and active musical soloists and conductors like Buddee and Siede participating.78 Politics is rarely mentioned. Its library was well-stocked, with local and overseas papers on subscription, but the hoi-polloi were excluded on account of the steep membership subscription rate. The services it had provided in past decades, like a labour exchange (Arbeitsvermittlungs-Bureau), its attempts to bring together and provide a meeting place for new arrivals and existing residents, providing a sickness and distress support service, its educational talks aiding those in the community not yet conversant in English, all these had now fallen by the wayside.

Luebke’s observation that “the elite found little in the vereine to attract them…[and rarely gave] them leadership,” clearly also applies to Melbourne by the mid-eighties.79 Jung noted that Victoria’s Germans “have only a negligible sense of belonging together,” and the Verein did little to stem this because the “well-to-do

77 Jung, Das Deutschtum in Australien und Ozeanien, 24.
78 “Musical Soiree at the Athenaeum,” Age, May 15, 1884, 5.
79 Luebke, Bonds of Loyalty, 44.
largely hob-nob with the English [i.e. Anglo-Australians],” to advance their own
interests.80 Schanz, like Zoeller, noted the widespread inter-marriage of upper-class
Germans with Anglo-Australians.81 “Bourgeois Germans had the ‘German Club’ [i.e.
the Deutscher Verein]; [it was] emulating the ‘Melbourne Club,’” remembered Bertha
Walker, noting that the latter’s venue was just around the corner in Alfred Place.82
Robin Walker notes that the Australische Zeitung implied that the Verein’s members
were aristocrats, while the Turnverein members were considered democrats.83
Judging by mainstream press comments, the more newsworthy events concerning the
German community were now mostly emanating from the other organizations—the
populist Turnverein, and regional Vereine in Ballarat, Bendigo and other former
goldmining centres; the Liedertafel, and the Lutheran church.

Compared with Melbourne’s Deutscher Verein, the Turnverein (and likewise the
regional Vereine) represented a broad church of ethnic, political and cultural affiliations
and sympathies. Of all German institutions, they retained the most substantial public
profile. Jung’s disparaging description that among their membership were numerous
“Englaender” who enjoyed its social activities (and he implies, the beer even flowing on
the publicly observed “puritanical sabbath”) merely speaks for what might be called its
multicultural, or even its integrationist character.84 Yet, more than the Deutscher Verein,
the Turnverein projected a clear German image, even more so than the Lutheran church
that was popularly known as German church. Despite this, while the Turnverein
cherished German customs and in many ways preserved them, by 1887 only half of its
members were Turner/gymnasts, and its social activities had a supra-ethnic appeal
amongst a broad spectrum of members and “followers.”85 Further, by 1887 half of its
600 members were non-German speakers.86 If there had been any civic leadership—
though there was little evidence at this time—one would expect it to come from this
source, as the German-Australian press, with the exception of the Lutheran
Christenbote, was now dead in Victoria. But with the exception of a small number of
politically aware individuals—mainly of social-democrat leanings—there were no

80 Jung, Das Deutschtum in Australien, 25.
81 Schanz, Australien und die Suedsee an der Jahrhundertwende, 50.
82 Walker, Solidarity Forever!, 51.
83 Walker, R.B., “Some Social and Political Aspects of German Settlement,” 30, and Australische Zeitung, July 1,
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84 Jung, op.cit., 24,25,27, passim.
86 Australische Zeitung, January 26, 1887, 3.
leaders of the calibre of Theodor Mueller or Carl Muecke, as had been the case in the
1860s and ‘70s.

This discussion must now return to the Lutheran church, its activities, and the
role it played. Previously, it was noted that the Victorian Lutheran church had
steadfastly supported and tried to guide the community. But almost from the start, its
influence was weakened by the rift between the ELSA’s conservatism on the one hand,
and by the Melbourne synod’s more open and less dogmatic Lutheranism that suggested
compromise but also weakness. Worse, when the tentacles of the Reich’s
*Deutschtumspolitik* eventually reached Victoria by official contacts and through
consular visits as well as offers of support for churches and schools, the contrast
between the ELSA’s aversion to any connection with the Reich and the Victorian
synod’s cautious pro-Reich attitudes became even clearer.87

Wellnitz observes that the peculiar name of “German Evangelical-Lutheran” the
Victorian church had conferred on itself, which we must assume was a legacy of
Goethe’s arrangements in the 1850s, suggests a more intimate connection with the
German, and especially the powerful Prussian state church.88 However vague Goethe’s
“contact” was meant to be, and whether there was any practical implication, this
remained a permanent irritant to the ELSA. By the late nineteenth century, it tainted the
Victorian synod with the “Pastorennationalismus” that attached to churches affiliating,
or at least collaborating, with the Prussian state church.89 “Global institutional networks
such as churches…acted as transnational trajectories to disseminate notions of a global
ethnic connectedness,” notes Manz, and thus he argues these affiliated groups “were
implicated in Germany’s Weltpolitik.” 90 Seemingly innocent events like the Melbourne
church’s celebration of the centenary of the reign of the late Kaiser Wilhelm I, the
massive mourning services at his, his successor’s and Bismarck’s death, the
congregation’s support for the German Empire-funded Schulverein von Victoria,91 or
even its clinging to German-language services long past their usefulness are all
indicators of a loss of direction or relevance, or even a failure to respond to change and

87 See for example Moses, “Deutschtumspolitik in Australia,” 123.
89 Manz, “Diaspora and Weltpolitik in Wilhelmine Germany,” 41.
90 Manz, op.cit., 46; Age, March 23, 1897, 5. The inconsistencies of the Kaiser’s concept of *Weltpolitik* are
perplexing. On the one hand, he supported the use of the Lutheran church to expand the influence of *Deutschum*, but
on the other he denied pastors to hold political views: “Pastors should stay clear of politics and instead take care of
the souls of their parishioners.” Quoted *Australischer Christenbote*, July 1896, 102.
91 Martin, “Pastor Hermann Herlitz and his Congregation,” 144. See also Manz, *Constructing a German Diaspora*,
227-28.
thus of an inability to protect or even educate its constituency. The latter made the Melbourne church appear to be even more backward-looking than the conservative Missouri-led ELSA.

The president of the Victorian Lutheran synod, Hermann Herlitz, was a man of considerable gifts, stamina, complexity, but also full of inconsistencies. His predecessor, Matthias Goethe, had been brought up in the Rhineland as a Catholic, and his unusual epiphany had eventually turned him into a Lutheran church innovator and founder of Victoria’s church and synod. Goethe’s diverse background and his skills had allowed him to apply them during a calm and less challenging time and environment. His successor Hermann Herlitz, of Jewish upbringing, had come to Lutheranism via the middle-of-the-road Basel Missionary Society, and then had survived a brief but rather cathartic pastorate during a congregational split at Germantown. He took over Victoria’s church leadership after Goethe’s unexpected departure in 1867, at a time when the political context around the community was beginning to change.

Hartmut Lehmann, in a detailed analysis of the history and editorial tone of the monthly church newssheet Der Australische Christenbote, edited by Herlitz for almost half-a-century (1867-1910), presents an intelligent but highly critical assessment of the man Herlitz as well as of the Christenbote. Goethe in the Pilger had defined the church paper’s function as “educating committed citizens of this their new fatherland” but added in the inaugural Christenbote the importance of “obligations of earlier nationality.” Lehmann’s picture of Herlitz’ editorial attitude is not flattering. It denigrates his considerable achievements, so much so that even a recent history of the Melbourne church depicts him more negatively than he deserves. According to Lehmann, central to Herlitz’s political beliefs were his pro-Prussian German nationalism, his antipathy to socialism and German social democracy, and his uncritical admiration of the German emperor—eventually readily transferred from the benign Wilhelm I to the aggressive Wilhelm II—and extending to chancellor Bismarck. His support for “our dear mother tongue” was inconsistent, though he

92 Martin, “Pastor Hermann Herlitz and his Congregation,” 112-42, passim, especially 114,115, 142. Though conservative, Herlitz’ (reluctant) offer of English services in 1870 was declined by the congregation, and another attempt in 1891 still met with opposition.
93 Der Pilger in Victoria 1 (1853), 4; Australischer Christenbote, April 1860, 16.
96 Ibid., 8,9,15, passim.
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shared the *Deutsche* aversion to assimilation.\textsuperscript{100} His anti-British attitudes but pro-Queen sentiments are highlighted as other inconsistencies.\textsuperscript{101} However, despite these criticisms, the *Christenbote*’s consistent interest in and critical assessments of the debates of the Victorian Parliament, and especially the proceedings of the various federation convention meetings, show what importance Herlitz attached to them. Most of all, his loyalty and care for his Victorian compatriot community shines through on numerous occasions.\textsuperscript{102} Why Herlitz did not meet expectations, according to Lehmann, was that

During the long decades between 1860 and 1900 German Lutherans like Herlitz had ignored the necessity to accumulate such credit (in the form of good relations to English domination, for example) which could have helped the German Lutherans in times of crisis...[by] giving his...readers the feeling that they need not care about the English community.\textsuperscript{103}

Lehmann’s verdict seems harsh. He gives no credit for Herlitz’ extensive and wide-ranging (extra-Lutheran) community involvements that extended deeply into the Anglo-Australian community and its power agents. Moreover, the value of the *Christenbote* as the sole German-language information source for several thousand Victorian Germans, with all its inherent weaknesses, is disregarded entirely. The incontrovertible truth of Lehmann’s censure, however, should not focus on either Herlitz or the Lutheran church, but on the lack of direction of the entire German community. That is apparent from the very beginnings in the 1850s, expressed in the critical comments by the *Kosmopolit*, VDP, Puettmann press, and the numerous sighs of frustration by Theodor Mueller. Germans wanted to be left alone, and were unwilling and unable, but often also inhibited by prejudice and deliberate obstacles, to lead and to claim credit for their significant contributions to Australian life. One need only consider the imploding careers of major achievers such as Ferdinand Mueller, Theodor Mueller, Gerard Krefft, Georg Neumayer, Frederick Kawerau, Ludwig Becker, E.B. Heyne, Johann Menge—the list is endless—men who ultimately failed to overcome Anglo prejudice despite

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 11.
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their true outstanding merits. It seems a truism that social credit does not accrue from unclaimed or maliciously suppressed merit.

When German immigration once more increased in the late 1870s, and in the expectation that some immigrants might face unemployment and hardship, Herlitz created a support organization known as the Immigration Mission. Doncaster pastor Max Schramm in 1887 was assigned to run this service. While Schramm’s reports, subsequently published in the Christenbote, indicated this was not a particularly rewarding programme, it led to developing useful contacts with potential employers in various urban and rural locations as well as with overseas immigration agents, advising them of the employment situation in Victoria. This operation continued until 1908, and to some extent helped in reducing unemployment while building a useful social network.104 Late in 1887, Herlitz described his experiences in a paper he presented to the Charity Organisation Society of Melbourne (COS), established that year with the aim of tackling pauperism in a constructive way. He described his own scheme, as well as an innovative programme developed in Westphalia by Pastor Friedrich von Bodelschwingh, whose experience he had drawn on. Bodelschwingh had established very successful workers’ colonies for unemployed men. Herlitz’ ideas were enthusiastically received by COS and further developed, and they were eventually implemented at the height of Victoria’s economic depression in 1892. The outcome was the highly successful Leongatha Labour Colony, a project that continued until 1919. Herlitz remained connected with its governance until 1914, yet scarcely ever trumpeted about his contribution to its creation and success.105 As a committed anti-socialist, Herlitz would have been deeply opposed to a small group in his own “ethnic camp” that supported alternate methods to eliminate unemployment by quite different means. In 1885 a small socialist organization, the Verein Vorwaerts, was founded in Melbourne.

In his report on the German community in 1902 Emil Jung, an avowed colonialist and imperialist, made disparaging and hostile comments about South Australia’s Fortschrittsverein (Progress Association) and Allgemeiner Deutscher Verein, both of which had strong socialist sympathies.106 He seemed unaware of the socialist sympathies lurking among some of the Melbourne Turnverein’s members. Nor

---

104 Australischer Christenbote, March 1887, 39,40. For immigration details, see Grothe, Die Deutschen in Uebersee, 276,280; Marschak, Deutsche Ueberseewanderung im 19. Jahrhundert, 49; Borrie, Italians and Germans in Australia, 164; Meyer, History of Germans, 26 and note 52; Mees, A German Church, 133-5 and especially 136-7. See also Schramm’s reports in Christenbote, e.g. no.4, April 1887, 57; July 1887, 119.
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did he notice the admittedly miniscule Socialistischer Verein Vorwaerts—named after
the German SPD party paper Der Vorwaerts.

One of Bismarck’s ill-conceived measures had been his attempt to subdue the
influential Social Worker’s Party of Germany (SAPD), later re-named Social
Democratic Party (SPD), by the so-called Sozialistengesetz (anti-socialist law, enacted
in 1878), a measure proscribing the SAPD, unions and working class associations, and
the jailing of hundreds of socialists. It generated enormous opposition throughout
Germany and ultimately failed, though socialists continued to be hunted down even
after the repeal of the law in 1890. Andrew Bonnell has calculated that even after the
repeal of the law, jail and hard labour convictions totalling over 1,600 years were
imposed, and fines exceeding half-a-million marks.107

Frank Borchardt notes that the threat of imprisonment resulted in thousands
escaping this persecution by emigration.108 Brigitte Beier concurs: “Many social-
democrats decided to emigrate.”109 In his autobiography Aus meinem Leben, German
Social democrat leader August Bebel also comments on the loss through emigration of
social democrats in consequence of the law, although his party was ideologically
opposed to emigration, rejecting the idea “which regarded emigration… as a general
remedy for [solving] social misery at home.”110 The socialist Hamburg Volksblatt
stated, “Our final end is not emigration…but revolution…through struggle at home.”111

Nonetheless, many socialists escaped by emigration. Where did they go? Several
contributors to Reichmann’s Emigration and Settlement document their activities and
presence in America, where many merged into the union movement. Radical German
socialists and anarchists were the principal participants of Chicago’s notorious
Haymarket Square Riot.112 Bertha Walker mentions the Hamburg socialist Louis Gross
who came to Victoria, having “fled from ‘Prussianism.’”113 Undoubtedly, there were
others. Andrew Bonnell’s recent paper on “Transnational Socialists” (2013), and Verity
Burgmann’s book In Our Time (1985), provide some useful details on the activities of
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Melbourne’s Verein Vorwaerts. Unlike the confrontational political environment in Germany, the Verein appeared to meet almost mainstream acceptance, perhaps because its espousal of a moderate socialism had none of the Marxist aggressiveness of social democracy in Germany. This differed sharply from the role German socialists played in America, where they reformed “the developing class-consciousness [of workers] to give it political substance and direction,” especially though strengthening union power. British-Australian union leader Tom Mann wrote in the German *Sozialistische Monatshefte* that Australian unionists “were simply social reformers of the mildest form. Few had a clear idea about capitalist society. Most believed that union and political action could merely strive to achieve a more humane society…genuine social-democratic propaganda is of very recent origin,” in part—Mann implies this—by learning from the German social-democrats, both here and through their published material.

Despite a lack of documentation, the few news references indicate the Socialistischer Verein Vorwaerts had close links with Victoria’s Trades Hall, and with other socialist or left-leaning organizations was jointly preparing celebrations of May Day as an international working class event—a custom it may have introduced from Germany where it had been declared illegal. In 1889, it joined with other left groups, including the Australian Socialist League and the Anarchist Club, in commemorating the Paris Commune uprising. Without a large membership like its South Australian fraternal association, the Allgemeiner Deutscher Verein with 500 members—it possibly did not even have links with the ADV—Vorwaerts nevertheless appeared to have a substantial support base. Its ninth anniversary ball was attended by 300 persons.

What is remarkable is that the Verein, in contrast to most other German associations,

---
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appeared to be fully accepted by Anglo groups including the Trades Hall, principally as an equal partner without any ethnic connotation. Among the Verein’s leading members were the subsequently famous woodcarving artist Franz Striezel, who later became active in the Socialist League of Victoria, the joiner Johann Heinrich Cordes, a founding member of Verein Vorwaerts, and its one-time secretary L.J. (Louis) Gross, a Hamburg bricklayer, described by his granddaughter Bertha Walker as “an ear-basher for socialism.” Their arrival times of the mid-eighties clearly indicate they were escapees from Bismarck’s anti-socialist witchhunt.

Burgmann and Serle observe that certain members of Melbourne’s Turnverein also held strong socialist views, and that the prominent physician and long-time Victorian MLA Dr William Maloney became a lifelong socialist largely due to their influence. Burgmann’s claim that “the Turnverein harboured many refugees from the 1848 revolution” is difficult to substantiate in Victoria, though Nadel observes that in the U.S., “Turnvereine…became the…most important expression of German-American radicalism” from the 1850s onwards, later espousing the anti-slavery campaign of the Civil War era and the labour movement of the 1870s. In Victoria, it is more likely that it was refugees from Bismarck’s regime who teamed up with the Turnverein but also founded Verein Vorwaerts. What gives an especially interesting twist to this investigation is the role Germans played in the Victorian labour movement. In a small way, they indirectly contributed to the formation of the Labor Party in 1890 by their various activities, such as supporting various labour initiatives like the Eight-Hour Day, the universal franchise, and to widening the discussion of the Australian labour scene by establishing a dialogue with the German socialist movement, as Tom Mann’s article seems to indicate. It is entirely feasible that news of the activities of Vorwaerts and its (albeit minor) involvement in Australian labour politics in the early twentieth century indirectly inspired several distinguished German academics, including Robert Schachner (1906-7) and Alfred Manes (1909), to visit and examine what the left press in Germany had acclaimed as the “worker’s paradise.”
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4.7 The Kaiser and his Weltpolitik

Ever since the Franco-Prussian War, a vague anxiety concerning the possibility of a war between Britain and Germany had grown in the minds of many Germans in the Australian colonies. The question of what if?, largely on account of the growing rivalry between the two empires, was hanging in the air since the war and was becoming ever more pronounced in the 1880s. This anxiety arose out of the events of 1870, at a time when Britain could have abandoned its long-standing neutrality by taking steps to defend the hallowed principle of the European balance of power. Fortunately, the war remained confined to the two principal contenders, Prussia and France, and Britain remained neutral. The threat of military action waxed and waned after that. At the time of the New Guinea annexation, Britain made concessions to the Reich, but the disagreements over Fiji, and in 1888 a serious spat over Samoa that particularly angered the U.S., could have led to military action.123

The greatest danger arose in the late nineties over events in South Africa, against a general background of major colonial expansion by both Britain and Germany in Africa. The German Empire, a latecomer, displayed a more aggressive attitude in claiming control over various territories, but both empires adhered to a convention of mutual agreements and treaties. The minerals-rich, Boer-governed Republic of the Transvaal in southern Africa had been agreed to fall into the British sphere of colonial interest, but Germany had also staked a claim. In early 1896, the agreements between the two superpowers suddenly fractured. An armed gang of freebooters led by a Cape official, Dr Leander Jameson, had invaded the Transvaal late in December 1895 under the pretence of “rescuing...[British]...women and children,” as one newspaper commentator claimed, but in fact aimed at triggering a revolt by British uitlanders (miners and farmers) to topple the Boer government.124 The attack was repulsed, Jameson and his gang were captured, and a number of the assailants were killed.125

These events would have remained largely local, but were exacerbated and blown out of proportion by a single provocative act. On January 3, 1896, Kaiser Wilhelm II sent a telegramme to the president of the Transvaal Republic, Paul Krueger,
congratulating him for having repulsed the attack. That missive (history has dubbed it the \textit{Krueger Telegramme}) was ill-considered and only retrospectively (and reluctantly) endorsed by the German Foreign Office.\textsuperscript{126} It raised a storm of protests and hostility in the British press that spilled over into the public domain, allegedly resulting in attacks on German visitors and businesses in London. Even sixteen years later, London’s \textit{Daily News} noted that “[N]o such fateful message has ever been sent over the telegraph wire…the Krueger telegram may be said to have sown Dreadnoughts.”\textsuperscript{127} To Anglo-Australians, the Kaiser’s action triggered almost identical anger, resulting in several attacks on German individuals and property, including some hooligans pulling down the German flag flying over the Bendigo German Club’s meeting place and tossing it in the dust.\textsuperscript{128} Individual responses by some German-Australians, and the now fairly \textit{kaisertreue}\textsuperscript{129} South Australian \textit{Australische Zeitung}, clearly indicated a climate of disagreement, indeed, an almost confrontationalist relationship. Many Germans sided with the Kaiser, while Anglo-Australians took the British side. It was not the first time that “latent tensions between the majority and the German minority…surfaced.”\textsuperscript{130} In the \textit{Christenbote} Pastor Herlitz, not without justification, asserted that the British hostility over the Krueger Telegramme could well be construed as a diversionary manoeuvre to deflect attention from the criminal intent of the Jameson raid, and the culpability of high British government officials who had given it clandestine support.\textsuperscript{131}

All the leading metropolitan and regional papers in the Australian colonies reported the event, and almost without exception condemned the Kaiser, part vilifying, part ridiculing his rash action. The response of the Footscray \textit{Independent} was one of relatively few moderate comments:

\begin{quote}
One feature [of the response of the British press]…which is much to be regretted…is the hostility manifested to German residents in England and the colonies. The Germans amongst us are excellent citizens, and orderly and law-abiding residents, and as such are entitled to the same consideration as
\end{quote}
ourselves, and such demonstrations are invidious and should be deprecated, if only for the reason that the people cannot be held responsible for any action of the arrogant Emperor.\textsuperscript{132}

The attitude to Jameson was mixed: some papers celebrated him as a hero, while the majority ranged from characterizing him as rash or even foolish.\textsuperscript{133}

The Krueger Telegramme was only the beginning of international tensions that would intrude into and undermine the relatively easy relationship of the German community with its Victorian hosts. In South Africa, after a brief period of negotiations, by October 1899 the situation would escalate into full-scale war. The rub-on effect from the attitudes of the Kaiser, the Reich government, and the German press was complex. While the detail goes far beyond the scope of this thesis, the extreme pro-Boer stand of the German metropolitan press, in contrast to the Kaiser’s and his government’s subsequent moderation, put Victoria’s German community under intense pressure.\textsuperscript{134}

Every comment they made was scrutinized, and even innocuous comments were interpreted as disloyalty in the context of an emerging super-patriotism in the Anglo-Australian press. Ever since the German annexation of North-East New Guinea, Australians had adopted quite aggressive imperialist attitudes that readily merged British and their own regional colonial ambitions; hence their enthusiasm for participating in Britain’s South African adventure.\textsuperscript{135}

South Australia’s Deutsche Zeitung came in for sharp criticism for its pro-Boer stand, yet Victoria’s sole newsheet, Herlitz’ Australischer Christenbote, remained rigidly neutral—an attitude incidentally un-observed by Lehmann. Whether it took its cue from the Kaiser’s perplexing change of mind is not clear. While most of Victoria’s Germans sided with the Boers, Bendigo’s German mayor, Conrad Heinz, was the exception with a strong pro-British stand.\textsuperscript{136}

When asked about the attitude of his compatriots, the Turnverein secretary admitted to the Bairnsdale Advertiser that “the majority of the German residents sympathized with

\begin{footnotes}
\item[132] “The Boer Difficulty,” Independent (Footscray), January 11, 1896, 2.
\item[133] “Twinklings,” Southern Cross (Adelaide), January 10, 1896, 7: “Dr Jameson and his chartered freebooters have been taught a sharp lesson.”
\item[134] The Kaiser had abandoned his pro-Boer stand after receiving a dressing-down from his grandmother, Queen Victoria. See Roehl, “The Kaiser and England,” 101, 102, passim, Queen Victoria noted in her diary, “I gave him [the Kaiser] a piece of my mind as to his dreadful telegram.” (Roehl, op.cit., 102). See also Geppert, Pressekriege, 93-4, 144; “The Kaiser Rebuke by the Queen.” In “Needles,” Chronicle (Adelaide), June 11, 1896, 5.
\item[135] See for example W.H. Dawson’s poem Marching to Pretoria.
\end{footnotes}
the Boers.” At times bitter, the fall-out over the following years showed that a serious rift was developing that would persist. Under the pseudonym “Bruni,” a Horsham Times reporter some time later wrote that “During the Boer war they [i.e. the Germans] got into disfavour through an exhibition of disloyalty to the flag under which they have been enabled to prosper [my italics].”

The events and responses indicate an important shift in relationships, where transnational links between the metropole (the Reich, the Kaiser, and the German press) and the German diaspora in the Australian colonies on the one hand, and a second metropole-periphery power relationship, namely that between Britain and Australia, came into serious conflict. I will argue that the latter relationship not only cut across the former, but essentially dominated it. The reason was that for Australians the mother country played a (the) paramount role. It determined their self-awareness, indeed, their identity: how they saw themselves—first as British citizens, and only secondarily as Australians. In that conceptual framework, for Anglo-Australians, Germany, the Kaiser and even their fellow German settlers only occupied a peripheral place, whose primary relationship was perceived as with the British Empire. Only on rare occasions did Australians posit themselves in a direct relationship with Germany, as at the time following the establishment of German protectorates in north-eastern New Guinea, and later Samoa, Fiji and Nauru. For German-Australians it was a simpler situation, of Germany versus Britain. But they drew massive criticism for holding views differing from what the Anglo-Australian press deemed acceptable. Pastor Heyer at Ballarat felt called upon to smooth over accusations of disloyalty. “[In] reference to the attitude of the colonial Germans on the war question,” he said, “he believed…[they] were as loyal to Queen Victoria as any colonials were…Here in this colony they [the local German community] were not foreigners but loyal British, and they, as well as the sons of Britain, would lay down their lives for the Queen.”

4.8 Watchful neutrality: from 1900 until the beginning of World War I

The new century began with two significant events to which the German community responded with genuine emotion: the death of Queen Victoria, and the inauguration of the Commonwealth. The latter in particular was greeted with jubilation. The captions
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137 Bairnsdale Advertiser, December 14, 1899, 2.
139 Horsham Times, March 20, 1900, 2.
adorning the triumphal arch they erected in Melbourne’s Collins Street, “We shall be a nation of brothers, never to be parted by danger nor distress” (a quotation from Schiller’s Wilhelm Tell) and “The German Citizens hail the Commonwealth,” are clear indicators of their loyalty to their new homeland.

A reading of both metropolitan and regional papers over the decade preceding World War I indicates that, despite at times warm and sympathetic expressions and comments, the German community (notwithstanding temporary Anglo press favourites like Leichhardt or Ferdinand von Mueller in earlier years) was never fully accepted as a true equal. Rarely considered as part of “us,” as German-Australians or even fellow Australians but always as Germans, Germans were rarely allowed to step outside the rules or hold opinions diverging from what was considered acceptable and mainstream. When it was found that in the Dimboola electoral district, most local German settlers of long standing had never been naturalized, the Geelong Advertiser was amazed and somewhat put out: “A novel proceeding has been taken in connection with the Parliamentary roll for the Dimboola division...A large number of German settlers, some of whom have been there for 20 years...are now being objected to on the grounds of non-naturalisation.”

Two quite different interpretations can be given to this incident. Was it that the settlers were politically naïve and/or were not committed to their new country? Or was it that they were well aware that, when it came to the point, naturalization was scarcely worth the paper that certified it? Prior to Federation, naturalization was valid only in Victoria; it was not transferable to any other colony, and did not confer British citizenship or truly equal rights which every Anglo person in Victoria enjoyed, whether born here or in Britain. Ever since the first German settlers arrived in Victoria, this electoral inequality had been a constant grievance of the community and of every German newspaper. It was a grievance that was never resolved, and as Maureen Leadbeater explains, when war came in 1914, the War Precautions Act made no difference between naturalized and unnaturalized citizens: they were equally treated as enemy aliens.

In 1910 H.R. Mertel, former secretary of Sydney’s German Club Concordia, gave a thoughtful speech with regard to his community that was lacking in the usual humility, but seemed filled with profound regrets. Covered by several East Coast
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140 Geelong Advertiser, January 31, 1903, 8.
mainstream papers, he observed that one could not help which flag one was born under, but “we [Germans] are an integral part of the community we live in...we as units of an Australian people contribute with all our might to the founding of a self-reliant and self-contained community which some day must have its voice heard in the conclave of nations.” What saddened him was that “a spirit of suspicion...cannot perceive that it is possible for a German to be a staunch Australian.”\footnote{142} The papers reported his speech, no doubt because they thought it important. But it was significant that none made any comment, nor even added a “hear-hear.”

The last word on Germans in Australia in the pre-World War I period should come from Sir George Reid, Australian High Commissioner in London, and his Minister of External Affairs, Patrick Glynn. In 1912, Sir George had been touring Germany, and he gave a well-attended speech at Berlin in which he called for more German immigrants: “Australians,” the paper paraphrased his speech, “were deeply impressed with the character and industry of German settlers and would rejoice at their increasing numbers.”\footnote{143} Almost two years later, shortly before the outbreak of war, Mr Glynn echoed Sir George’s speech. He indicated there had been a number of responses to the speech, and he concurred with all Sir George had said. He added that “he would welcome a large addition of settlers from the German Empire, for they had proved most valuable immigrants in the past.”\footnote{144} It was only a few months later that the hollowness of his sentiments became obvious.

4.9 Conclusion

The period under investigation in this chapter is pervaded by an almost palpable sense of ever-increasing danger and impending doom, resulting from the simultaneous occurrence—and eventual clash—of several powerful political forces enmeshing the small and largely passive German community. The most immediate among these forces was an emerging Australian nationalism, which in turn had spawned its own form of a regional imperialism that paralleled, almost cut across the British metropole’s own global imperialism. Australians, even prior to federation, saw the region surrounding the

\footnote{142} “The Land We Live In,” Argus, January 27, 1910, 6.
\footnote{143} Argus, May 17, 1912, 7.
\footnote{144} Argus, February 13, 1914, 7. Mr Glynn’s comments are reinforced by the fact that, only a few years earlier, the Victorian government had sent a delegation led by Edward Mead to various European countries and North America to persuade potential Scandinavian, German, Dutch and Swiss immigrants, persons “of kindred blood, highly civilized, industrious, and of strong predilection to agricultural pursuits,” to come to Victoria. See Langfield, “The Ideal Immigrant: Immigration to Victoria,” 6.
Australian continent as “a territory that naturally belonged to Australia.” The international scenario had, by the early twentieth century, become one where British and Australian imperialisms, with their slightly variant objectives, were meeting and competing with German colonial and imperial aspirations. Though not yet overtly hostile, the regional international atmosphere was highly charged with suspicion, fear, and resentment.

In the opening of this chapter I referred to Veit-Brause’s claim that the image Australians held of their German fellow citizens “were just as much influenced by contacts on the more official level…between Australia and Germany…[as] by the day-to-day…contacts between the settlers.” Her assertion assumes that, while Britain, Australia and the German Reich eyed each other suspiciously over their respective political and territorial claims in the South Pacific, the German community might have taken sides. What Manz shows is that they were more circumspect. Partly quoting a (resentful) comment by German Consul-General Kempermann, he observes that although “keen to remain informed about events in the Heimat, most Germans ‘lacked a higher idealistic patriotism’ and tried to avoid everything that would offend the feelings of their Australian fellow citizens.” While that may have been the case, in this chapter I have argued that to most Australians that seemed quite inadequate. Community leader Mertel in 1910 had expressed his regret that “a spirit of suspicion cannot perceive that it is possible for a German to be a staunch Australian.”

The German community’s long-held “let me be” passivity could no longer protect it, because it was automatically drawn into the larger conflict. Its attempts to accommodate, but also to combat, the forces imposing themselves on it proved futile, not least because of its lack of self-confidence and its vaguely defined purpose. As the result, it sensed its future was in jeopardy. As Lehmann observed by scrutinizing one of its leaders, the community had not been very successful. The social and political credit it had earned had not been accrued, but had been lost, if not squandered. Protected only by a thin and largely worthless, ultimately unenforceable garb of benignity from the Anglo majority, it became acutely aware of its vulnerability and conscious of how exposed it was to the dangers and threats it would have to face.

145 Record (Emerald Hill, Vic.), January 17, 1885, 5.
146 Veit-Brause, “German-Australian Relations,” 201.
147 Manz, Constructing a German Diaspora, 117-19 and note 89.
Chapter Five
World War I and the destruction of an imagined enemy: will peace allow the phoenix to rise again?

5.1 Introduction: the German community in 1914

“We are fighting side by side with Britain because of our British blood,” wrote Victorian farmer-politician Harry Gullett in an article in 1914, encapsulating the contemporary Australian self-perception as a people, as a nation, and as a combatant. His words consign the adage that World War I “made the Australian nation” to the pile of misperceptions that numerous historians have been at pains to dismantle ever since.1

In the process of this chapter, it will be argued that by making Britain’s war also that of Australia, and Britain’s enemies those of Australia, Australia placed itself in a closer and more dependent position to Britain than before. The evidence and outcome of this will form the background to this investigation of why the events of World War I, and the intimate connection between Australia and the British Motherland, had such a destructive impact on Australia’s German communities.

This final chapter aims to analyze the trajectory of the German community by re-visiting and developing further the concluding summaries in Chapters Three and Four, showing that the German community had neither consolidated nor matured to a level of internal self-assurance and external acceptance, nor that it was led by capable and recognized individual leaders and institutions. Unlike in America and Brazil, the Victorian community had failed to develop any form of a survival strategy. Its failure to anticipate future problems would eventually lead to catastrophic consequences.

Progressing from an assessment of the community’s initial responses at the outbreak of war in 1914, this chapter then traces the infinite manifestations of anti-German press, government and civilian home front campaigns, before re-visiting my hypothesis on community survival. By using the German village of Hochkirch in Western Victoria as a case study, the sum of arguments developed in the course of this thesis will be brought together in order to assess the hypothesis that proposes that rural communities, as illustrated by Hochkirch, possessed characteristics that helped them to survive, while simultaneously proving that urban communities lacked them. A
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1 Gullet added that “Australia is...at war...because Britain is at war...We have merely answered the call of the race.” Gullet, “Australia,” quoted Alonso, Australian Nationalism, 166. See also Beaumont, Australia’s War, xviii ff; Lake, A Divided Society, 189; Fischer, Enemy Aliens, 7; Andrews, The Anzac Illusion, passim. McKernan in The Australian People and the Great War observes that the war did not bring unity but “division and class antagonism. Sectarian hatreds threatened to engulf social life” (page 224).
counterfactual alternate hypothesis will be introduced to challenge some of the main assumptions of this thesis, including that the community succumbed to persecution, harassment, misrepresentation and racism because of its unwillingness to resist. The purpose of this approach is to test whether the German community truly aspired to gain its own distinctive place within the Anglo-Australian majority, or whether it simply wished to assimilate. The balance of the chapter charts post-war developments and assesses a number of outcomes.

Soon after hostilities commenced in August 1914, some news commentaries expressed regret, even empathy, at the position German-Australians found themselves in. However, the attitude of the dominant majority soon began to change. A presumption, especially to Empire-oriented Australian eyes, of being sympathetic to German imperial designs now became the principal threat to the German community. This development virtually negated the record of the community’s achievements during its 60-year history. Thus, this chapter will endeavour to answer how effectively the German community responded to continuing challenges it encountered, and how it attempted to rebut the accusations—overt or clandestine—of disloyalty, of sympathizing or even collaborating with the British Empire’s enemy on Europe’s battlefields, or more simply, how it envisaged to survive. Most of the evidence, overwhelmingly based on English-language resources in the absence of creditable German responses, indicates that overall, the community’s self-defence appeared to be un-focused and weak. On balance, the community lacked the determination and will to assert its rights and its just position.

5.2 The outbreak of the war
The German community’s initial response to the outbreak of the war was to loudly profess their loyalty to King and country. Numerous declarations were published in the metropolitan and regional press immediately upon the declaration of war. However, some of them implied what to Anglo-Australians could be construed as a threat: a claim of having a special two-way relationship with both the home and guest countries. Deeply enshrined in Lutheran theology, equal validity was accorded to their loyalty to the British King, to Australia, but also to their love for their original home country—
none of them diminishing the value of either. To many Australians, such a connotation was quite unacceptable; it even seemed duplicitous.

As the war progressed and the anti-German terror escalated, the community’s passive, and ultimately its dominant response to unremitting attacks and to restrictions of its basic human rights was to withdraw into a kind of internal exile, deflecting or avoiding the host population’s hostility by adopting an attitude of self-effacement, abandoning self-belief and self-identity. Crystal McKinnon, in a different context, identifies modes of creating safety zones which can serve as secure spaces for persecuted individuals and groups that help to protect their identity and self-belief, yet also provide an avenue for indirect political engagement. For most Germans, such safe spaces were provided by religious practice or faith, or both, and thus the Lutheran church assumed this role for many. American historian Kathleen Conzen elaborates. She argues that external pressures forced Germans to “develop…an ideology of ‘personal liberty’ [that also inspired their desire to defend]…the legitimacy of ethnic difference [within the host nation].” Conzen’s assertion is clearly an aspiration for multicultural rights. It was neither a quest for power nor influence, but merely a plea to be granted “the security of [their] livelihood,” or simply, the wish to be left alone.

Open defiance was completely anathema to the community. Even Ernest Scott in the un-ashamedly anti-German Official History of Australia in the War had to concede that “there were [no] German or Austrian spies in Australia…[and] no ships, wharves or buildings were blown up.” Nor was there a single incident of treasonable activities or any sign of collaboration with the “enemy” (i.e. their native country) ever proven in court, despite countless mischievous attempts to undermine the community with fictitious accusations. In any case, such behaviour would have run counter to the community’s traditional deference to authority, as the earlier chapters have clearly

---

2 Fischer speaks of a “triple identity,” as enunciated by early German-Australian patriots like Carl Muecke, already discussed in Chapter Three. Fischer names the three components as “a cultural identity linked to the German language and to the immigrants’ intellectual heritage; a political identity that implied loyalty to the King or Queen of England as the constitutional head of Australia; and a national identity as Australians, committed to a nation in statu nascendi.” In this particular context I closely link the two concepts, “identity” and “loyalty.” It is reasonable to assume that this attitude was shared by the majority of the German community prior to World War I. See Fischer, “Conversation,” http://theconversation.com/german-experience-in-australia-during-ww1-damaged-road-to-multiculturalism-38594


4 Conzen, “Phantom Landscapes of Colonization,” 17.

5 Conzen, op.cit., 12.

6 Scott writes that “Anything suggestive of German origin was positively toxic.” Scott, Official History, 149. Incidentally, Scott virtually glossed over the transgressions against the community by the home front.

7 Quoted Evans, Loyalty and Disloyalty, 46, Note 1.
demonstrated. McKernan quotes Major Piesse, chief of Military Intelligence, conceding that “no hostile outrage” could be attributed to Germans. Yet almost like sheep to the slaughter, few instances of open resistance or self-defence can be found. Peni quotes notable exceptions such as the courageous Riverina community leaders Pech, Heppner and Wenke who fought against trumped-up accusations all the way into, and during, internment at Holsworthy concentration camp, and after their release, throughout the 1920s. Geelong-born Pastor Johannes Darsow became one of the truly articulate defenders of his German compatriots through letters to the papers and court appearances. Little is known whether a call by R. Giesel of St Kilda proposing to convene a meeting to declare that “we are not all brutes as some people seem to think” ever went ahead.

Throughout this chapter, I also aim to analyze a wide range of events, attitudes, behaviours and outcomes of various conflict situations between the German immigrants and their hosts. My sources—the Anglo press and Army intelligence reports—abound with appropriate details. Alas, there are virtually no German eyewitness accounts, even in post-war recollections. This seems one of the clearest indicators of the impact of intimidation. In addition, I will attempt to identify the experiences of urban and rural communities and their attempts to survive.

Up to this point, this thesis has viewed the German community as the relatively more active agent (more in what it did than what it said) in the two-way relationship with its Anglo hosts, though it needs stressing that it was rarely assertive. The war now reversed that relationship. What changes occurred? Until World War I, as a political entity Australia was committed to what Henry Parkes in 1890 had defined as “the crimson thread of kinship.” That “kinship” excluded all but the shared Anglo-Saxon bloodlines as the building blocks of an Australian nation. This almost unquestioned belief—as also expressed in the opening quote by Harry Gullett—would even after Federation confer legitimacy on Australia’s deep connection and absolute loyalty to Britain and the Empire, and it was the rationale that explains the exclusion of some
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8 For example Sowell speaks of a “deference to authorities,” Migrations and Cultures, 102; Meyer speaks of their “loyalty towards authority, obedience to the law,” Meyer, History of Germans, 131; Price notes their belief that “civil authority is God’s regent on earth and must receive unswerving obedience.” Price, German Settlers, 11.
11 Argus, May 17, 1915, 8.
12 See for example Souter, Lion and Kangaroo, 12.
groups from any share in determining the affairs of state.\textsuperscript{13} As a political tool, the “crimson thread,” though conspicuous in the way Aborigines and Chinese immigrants were treated, remained largely inert in regard to any other group.\textsuperscript{14} Then, in 1914, it suddenly emerged to energize the majority’s transformation from benevolent tolerance to merciless persecution of its German immigrant partner. The war absolved it from feelings of guilt. Was this perhaps temporary, merely a response to the loss suffered at the front and a desire to take revenge on the local German community as a proxy, the next-best substitute for the distant enemy? Or did this changed attitude manifest a more fundamental attitude? Much of the discussion in this chapter will advance some explanations.

Britain declared war on Germany on August 4, 1914, and as the Australian Constitution conferred the prerogative of declaring war to the executive arm of government, which was then the British Imperial Government, Australia found itself also at war. Australia’s freedom to act on its own—by choice and law—did not exist, and Jens Christian König’s phrase of an “\textit{unfertige Nation},” though used in regard to America, describes the Australian position very aptly.\textsuperscript{15} Stephen Alomes, from an Australian standpoint, echoes König: “In law Australia was not a sovereign nation. It could not make war or peace.”\textsuperscript{16}

Within a few weeks, German ships at anchor in Australian ports or in Australian waters were seized, and between September and November the German possessions in North-East New Guinea and at Nauru were captured by a small expeditionary force, thus removing long-standing irritants to Australian pride. Otherwise, until mid-1915, mobilization proceeded rapidly, while the newly-formed AIF assembled an initial contingent (eventually named the 1\textsuperscript{st} Division, AIF, later 1\textsuperscript{st}ANZAC Division) that left for the European theatre of war in October 1914.

During the early August weeks, life for the German community proceeded almost normally. Newspaper reports of spy activities were not yet directed towards them. Letters expressing loyalty to the Crown were sent by the heads of the Lutheran churches, in the name of the entire German community, to both State and Federal
governors, and in all cases were acknowledged and warmly responded to. Pastor Nickel, President of the ELSA, assured Governor-General Sir Munro Ferguson of “our duty as British subjects…to defend the honour of our beloved King and of our dear country with goods and chattels and body and life.” A letter with similar assurances by Victorian ELSA president E. Kriewaldt to the Victorian governor, Sir Arthur Stanley, was personally acknowledged with much appreciation, and a similar message of loyalty by Pastor Nichterlein was replied to on behalf of the Governor-General with “great pleasure” and the assurance that “he realizes that the Australians of German descent are a most valuable element in the community.” “Loyalty to the state…in which they lived” was a central ingredient of the Lutheran faith, Fischer notes. Numerous German community meetings in various parts of the State fully endorsed similar sentiments. However, these meetings were all initiated by ELSA, and therefore primarily represented the views of the rural church, while the absence of declarations by the Melbourne-based Victorian Synod is perplexing. Perhaps that may be explained by the retirement of Pastor Herlitz in June 1914, and the changes taking place prior to the installation of his successor Gutekunst in October. But other reasons also suggest themselves. As Morton observes, the congregation had long toyed with the idea of reverting to the metropolitan church. Back in 1882, Herlitz had re-affirmed Goethe’s principle of a connection with the Prussian mother church, and although by 1914 he rejected the idea, some leading trustees of his congregation did not. Not only did this reaffirm the Victorian synod’s fundamental difference to the anti-Prussian (church) attitudes of ELSA, but it would exacerbate the Anglo majority’s suspicions of disloyalty, and thus seriously imperil its survival during and after the war.

Despite the various loyalty declarations of the German majority, would their effect be sufficient to protect them? As only a few months later the hand of the Governor-General would sign regulation after regulation that severely restricted the Germans’ rights and freedoms, it seemed not. Rather, they had suddenly ceased to be “valuable elements in the community.”
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17 Age, August 7, 1914, 8.
18 Hamilton Spectator, August 19, 1914, 6.
19 Ibid., August 21, 1914, 4.
20 Fischer, Enemy Aliens, 20.
22 In 1856, Goethe had declared to “stay in contact with the evangelical mother church in the German Fatherland.” This anticipated the synod’s formal re-affiliation with the German State church in 1933. Morton, “The Critical Years,” 221-3.
5.3 A peaceful community faces war

A perusal of mainstream papers, replete with expressions of war euphoria but still showing a detached, almost objective style of reporting from the front, gives little indication of the shock the German community experienced at home of suddenly becoming a defendant, deemed guilty until proven to be innocent, and unwittingly associated with wartime activities of the enemy at the distant front. All this despite press headlines like “Loyal German Residents Declare for Great Britain” which, as usual, lacked comment.23 Amongst them, one may particularly note one in the Hamilton Spectator, “Demonstration of Loyalty at Hochkirch,” to which my discussion will return later.24

There were some very rare expressions of sympathy for the predicament the German community found itself in. The Argus evidently empathized with their plight:

They are very fine colonists, honourable, frugal, and hard-working: and they have done a great deal for the development of this country...[T]hey cherish a deep affection for the Fatherland. At such a time as this they are watching events with anxiety and apprehension and recognising...the early future with profound sorrow. All British-Australians will be sympathetic with them in an ordeal which is particularly painful...[A]ll of them are fellow-Australians...who have actually helped to build our Empire.25

These were, however, still early days. For the time being, the declarations of loyalty were accepted and, one may assume, welcomed, while war fever had not yet reached the point where Irish Cardinal Logue’s polemics arguing that “the Germans were worse than the Huns” made much of an impact.26 In the mix of objective and hostile reports on German actions at the front, a clear distinction was still made separating them from news about the German-Australian community at home. Perhaps this was because, at that time, Australians were far from being fully involved in combat; they were still training in Egypt and on the Salisbury Plains. The Australian Worker could still write that,
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23 Hamilton Spectator, August 7, 1914, 6; see also similar reports in Horsham Times, August 11, 1914, 4 and August 28, 5; Bendigo Advertiser, August 24, 8; Hamilton Spectator, August 12, 4—all 1914, as well as in Warrnambool Standard, Ballarat Star, Rainbow Argus, Argus (Melbourne).
24 Hamilton Spectator, August 7, 1914, 6.
25 Argus, August 4, 1914, 8.
26 Age, September 30, 1914, 9.
[W]e must protect our country...but we hope no wave of jingo madness will surge over the land, unbalancing the judgment of its leaders and inciting its
coloration to wild measures, spurred on by the vile press...God help England!
God help Germany! God help us!27

It was not until well into 1915, when the terrible losses at Gallipoli began to show in
long casualty lists in the papers, and especially after the news arrived of the sinking of
the Cunard ocean liner Lusitania by a German submarine, that Australian attitudes
changed, almost overnight.28 The distinction previously existing between the German
government and its military leaders, and the German people at home and in Australia,
became rapidly blurred.29

The sinking of the Lusitania on May 6, by a torpedo from the German
submarine U-20, was whipped up by the British press, and the headlines were
syndicated throughout the Empire, naturally without giving details of her load of
munitions and of German embassy warnings to the owners not to sail. The resulting
outcry of horror initiated an unprecedented hate campaign against Germany and
Germans living everywhere. The campaign was further fuelled by news of the appalling
casualties at Gallipoli. Though Germans were only marginally involved here, yet these
events helped to sustain the hate campaign.30 A culprit had to be found on home ground.
Half-truths, press-manufactured atrocity stories, “gore” and “simplification of the
issues” would help,31 like horror stories claiming the rape and murder of nuns and
babies in Belgium, or the cutting-off of hands and feet of prisoners.32 Norman Lindsay’s

27 Australian Worker, Sydney, August 6, 1914, 15, quoted lan Turner, “1914-19,” in A New History of Australia,
edited by F.K. Crowley, 315.
28 The evidence, now readily available and extensively discussed and documented, is that the Lusitania was certified
by the Admiralty as an AMC (Armed Merchant Cruiser); that on her final journey she carried millions of rounds of
ammunition and shell cases, and that her owners had been urged by German embassy newspaper advertisements not
to sail because of the risks of sailing through a war zone. Yet defiantly, she left New York on May 1 for Liverpool.
Opinion is still divided whether Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, deliberately, and with the
ruthlessness of which some critics accuse him, invited the disaster to draw the U.S. into the war because he was
aware the liner carried numerous US citizens. Michael Martin rejects the conspiracy theory implicating Churchill and
distributes responsibility to “the German Navy, the Cunard Shipping Company, the customs officers at New York,
the Admiralty, [and] the Ministry of Defence of Great Britain.” He omits but implies the share of the liner’s gung-ho
29 See for example “Germans in Australia. Should They All Be Interned?,” Geelong Advertiser, May 15, 1915, 4.
30 While no German soldiers served under Ottoman command, German General Liman von Sanders served as an
adviser and strategist to the government at Constantinople.
31 Chapter 4, “Using and Abusing Oratory.” In Historians on the Homefront, by George T. Blakey, 57-81, passim;
McQueen, New Britannia, 27.
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grotesque caricatures of blood-dripping monsters dressed in German *Pickelhauben*33 and the Emperor’s uniform in the *Bulletin* stigmatized and dehumanized all Germans, including innocent bystanders like the German-Australian community.34 Both at official level through punitive legislation, as well by countless private acts of hostility, German citizens were now harassed and persecuted notwithstanding the fact they had nothing to do with the war.

At this juncture, a key question poses itself almost naturally: what causes a nation to turn on one of its parts? Is it a law of nature that the stronger turns on the weak? Earlier I noted that Connor and Cohen, quite independently, had observed the subordinate, indeed tenuous status of diasporic groups whom the dominant group treated as “outsiders” when it suited it, over whom it could “exercise [its] primary or exclusive proprietary right.”35 That seems to explain how the German community came to be treated during the war. What differs from the Connor scenario is that Australian society was still evolving, an immigrant society, still *unfertig* in many respects, an appendage of Britain, with most of her people claiming British imperial nationality rather than Australian. But there is an alternate explanation. Was the sudden anti-Germanism perhaps the result of an accidental concurrence of events? A misunderstanding? There are apposite illustrations throughout history. Johannes Voigt argues that Australian Prime Minister Hughes’ conversion to anti-Germanism was equally accidental and sudden. Hughes, emerging as the principal architect of anti-Germanism in Australia, bore a grudge because he had once been shown the door by an unsympathetic German consular official.36 No other explanations can be found for his ravings, referring to the German presence as a “cancer” that should be “extirpated, root, branch and seed.”37 If it was an accident, a misunderstanding that Germans in Australia were not the Kaiser’s soldiers but loyal fellow Australians, why did others not correct this misunderstanding? Virtually no prominent Australian dignitary, church or institution rose to defend the unjustly persecuted. Indeed, as McKernan notes, the churches were both anti-German and vocal supporters of the war, even the Catholic
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33 A spiked helmet worn in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by German military, firefighters, and police.
37 Quoted Evans, *Loyalty and Disloyalty*, 61, Note 1.
church in the early war years. And Marilyn Lake demonstrates that while attacked and reviled themselves, the Irish were as hostile as the rest. A few lone souls risked retaliation by speaking up: Eda McCallum expressed dismay about the “destitute Germans” having been sacked merely for being German; Cr Duggan of Kara Kara Shire dared to declare “there were many good Germans in Victoria.” It seemed that newspaper campaigns, the activities of the Anti-German League, and Prime Minister Hughes’ incendiary speeches would eventually silence any sense of moderation.

5.4 Victims and persecutors
The harsh treatment meted out to German-Australians has received widespread attention in historical scholarship, and there are clearly two opposing sides in the literature on this issue. Tampke, Moses, Overlack and Price lean towards a critical, at times even hostile position towards Germany that implicates the hapless German-Australians as sharing in guilt, while Fischer, McKernan and Lodewyckx take the opposite view. Selleck, Beaumont and Pennay, more even-handedly, occupy the middle ground. Their various writings are discussed elsewhere in this chapter.

Kamphoefner, reviewing Gjerde’s paper on the behaviour of German farmers in America’s Mid-West discussed in Chapter Two, notes that values (and value sets differing from those of the majority) can become “instrumentalized [at times of] social conflict” and thus can be used as weapons in an offensive way. War-time is such a time, allowing behaviour to bypass accepted convention. Earlier, I discussed Henderson’s observations on contrasting perceptions of the self and/or of others, contrasts of behaviour, looks and language. Using Kamphoefner’s line of argument, these contrasts now became instrumentalized as hate signals. Klaus Bade goes further, touching on the fundamental principle of identity that I interpret as synonymous with perceptions of nation and nationhood. “A necessary condition for acquiring the capacity to tolerate the foreign is a positive relationship to one’s own [identity, society, nation, nationality; my words],” he writes, “since feelings of a positive collective social identity

38 McKernan, Australian People and the War, 16,19.
39 Lake, Divided Society, 24-26,52 and Note 1.
40 Argus, December 4, 1914, 9; Bendigo Independent, January 30, 1915, 7.
42 Kamphoefner, German-American Immigration, xvii-xviii.
43 Henderson, “Die Deutschsprachigen in Melbourne”; see my discussion in Chapter 2.
That, while incidentally defining multiculturalism, is the crux that explains the internal war Australians waged against their German fellow citizens. The Australians’ we-ness, if it existed at all, still hovered in the half-way house of an immature national identity, which they sought to enhance or correct by eliminating distractive, non-conforming elements, i.e. the other, from their cherished crimson thread. It explains their racist outrages towards indigenous Australians throughout the previous century, and their hostility towards the Chinese.45

McLean observes the presence of a “potential for xenophobic violence present in Australian society” that progressively denigrated Germans as belonging to “an alien and inferior race.”46 Selleck goes further by observing that a crude racism pervaded the entire Australian society, except that now the European war gave greater justification and direction for “race”-based denigration.47 A letter to the Argus in 1916 neatly illustrates this argument: “The Germans are like the Chinese in one respect; a few scattered among the British are no harm…but when they are strong enough to form a German settlement…then they become a menace.”48 Clearly, the German loyalty declarations and the hundreds of ethnic German volunteers in the AIF carried no weight at all, and some of the power agents cynically admitted this. The Rev. S.P. Stewart preached that “If a German or other enemy-born person was loyal…the best test of their loyalty…would [be to] accept…internment as the proper thing to be done to them.”49 Babacan speaks of the artificial construction of an Australian identity that includes some cultural groups (often unspecified), and excludes others “in the national interest.”50 Mansouri, and especially Chiro, observe that prejudices, however irrational, once they take root, can rapidly degrade majority opinion into social exclusion of the minority group and thus denying it the feeling of belonging.51 Some punitive measures went to extremes. McKernan mentions the misfortune of a hapless German who lost his job for appearing “physiognomically…Teutonic,” indicating how scurrilous, even

44 Bade, Migration Past, Migration Future, 3.
45 This is documented extensively in Couchman, et al., After the Rush, 11,19,24-5. See also Markus, Fear and Hatred, 14-34, passim, 105.
46 MacLean, “War and Australian Society,” in Beaumont, Australia’s War, 85. See also Evans, Loyalty, 44.
50 Babacan, Migration, Belonging, 19.
51 Mansouri & Lobo, “Introduction: Social Inclusion,” 1-10, passim, especially 3,4; Chiro, “From Multiculturalism to Social Inclusion,” 18-20,28,29, passim; Babacan, Migration, Belonging, 18. There is evidence that the feeling of exclusion resulted in a number of naturalized and even some Australian-born German-Australians eventually leaving Australia for Germany, America or South America. Henderson claims 16 per cent of the German population were either deported or left voluntarily, especially as ostracism continued well into the twenties. The post-war percentage of German-born declined by 32 per cent. Henderson, “Die Deutschsprachigen in Melbourne,” 38,39; see also 40,46-7.
stupid, some punitive measures could be.\textsuperscript{52} What the foregoing confirms to me is that any society, especially one as yet not fully matured, when under stress, will react and often attack its weakest member, in the present case “the other.”

Oblivious of the inadequacy of their national self-awareness, Australians were proud of being British rather than Australian, referring to Britain rather than Australia as the \textit{Motherland}, and thus were quite unaware of their nation’s incompleteness, its \textit{unfertig}-ness. This attitude explains, and to them it also justified, the intensity of their anti-German feelings. Prime Minister W.M. Hughes’ claim that “We are more British than the people of Great Britain” proves the point.\textsuperscript{53} As Great Britain was at war, Anglo-Australians, behaving more like colonists and immigrants rather than fully-fledged members of their own nation, also saw themselves at war. There is an incongruity in their perception of which country they were fighting for: was it Great Britain? the Empire? Australia? The fuzziness of the letters to the press is an indicator: “Australians were shedding their life’s blood for the very existence of the nation,” writes one correspondent, though it is unclear which nation was meant.\textsuperscript{54} Ian Turner clarifies it thus: “Whatever there was of national identity was submerged in the surge of emotion for the home country.”\textsuperscript{55}

Differences of looks and behaviour were not the sole factors for exclusion. David Day observes that in the Australian psyche, the endeavour “to establish de facto proprietorship [of the land] remain[ed] a deep and ongoing concern…One of the distinguishing features of a supplanting society is the recurring fear that it will, in turn, be dispossessed of the land it has come to occupy.”\textsuperscript{56} Propaganda and rumour exploited this long-standing insecurity, fuelling the fear that the Reich planned to attack Australia from its nearby colonies and claim Australia as its prize.\textsuperscript{57} Australian maps with fictitious Germanized place names were added to the propaganda repertoire in the newspapers, and were regularly invoked by such well-regarded, though profoundly anti-German academics as Archibald Strong.\textsuperscript{58} The preposterous nature of such claims becomes clearer when considering that the total number of German settlers in its Pacific

\textsuperscript{52} McKernan, \textit{Australian People}, 165.
\textsuperscript{54} \textit{Age}, May 11, 1915, 7.
\textsuperscript{55} \textit{1914-19}, 314.
\textsuperscript{57} McKernan, \textit{Australian People}, 150.
possessions numbered a mere 1,340.\(^{59}\) When Carl Muecke in 1870 in his patriotic poem *Wacht am Suedseestrand* (1870) made poetic allusions to the nationalist anthem *Wacht am Rhein* (The Guard on the Rhine), he meant this to be purely a metaphor for a peaceful German contribution to Australia’s *Geist und Bildung* (spirit, education), rather than an expression of militancy or conquest.\(^{60}\) Attempts by the German consulate in Sydney to foster a spirit of aggression may have contributed to perceptions such as those held by Strong and his followers. But as Voigt’s research reveals, in the case of German-Australians they had largely fallen on deaf ears.\(^{61}\)

At home, Australians were fighting the stranger in their midst, the alien, in some cases even the competitor.\(^{62}\) How *un-fertig* they were is conveyed in how German-Australians perceived their hosts. Rather than considering them *Australier*, even after the turn of the century they routinely referred to them as *Englaender*, confirming Hughes’ sentiments of being “more British.” Gerhard Fischer notes that “[A]n ingrained feeling of inadequacy born out of a mentality of dependence and inferiority” made Anglo-Australians fight and defend against an imaginary enemy at home that carried with it the chance to “earn…the gratitude of the mother country.”\(^{63}\)

As the war proceeded, the fate of the German community gravitated gradually into the hands of one man: federal Attorney-General and future Prime Minister W.M. Hughes. The Germans were unaware of this, but Hughes had a clear plan. As the architect of the *War Precautions Act 1914*, originally assented to on October 29, 1914 and amended in 1915 and 1916, he created a framework of legislative procedures that enabled Australia to cope with every exigency the war demanded, and which also turned the Commonwealth into a *de facto* dictatorship in which personal rights could be readily overruled by executive regulation. The prime purpose of the *Act* was to eliminate the rights of the German community (and any other persons stigmatized as *enemy aliens*), stultifying their survival as a viable group besides eliminating their electoral, commercial and trade interests. The *Act* allowed the transfer of a large range of legal
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\(^{59}\) See *Groesse und Bevoelkerung unserer Kolonien, 1913*, http://www.jaduland.de/kolonien/index2.html. The numbers were South Sea islands including New Guinea, 1,010; Samoa 330. Sautter’s figures vary slightly; he gives the number in 1914 as 1,549. Sautter, *Deutsche Geschichte*, 24. See also Bade, *Migration in European History*, 128-29.

\(^{60}\) See Corkhill, “The Creative Writings of Carl Muecke,” *passim*, especially page 135; Walker, “German-language Press,” 121. Revisionist literary historians have derided *Die Wacht am Rhein* as jingoistic.

\(^{61}\) Voigt, “Das deutsche Nationalfest,” *passim*.

\(^{62}\) The case of company director Franz Wallach, naturalized but interned at Langwarrin, whose successful company was sequestered by the government, illustrates this. See “Interned Naturalised Subjects,” *Ballarat Star*, July 28, 1915, 2; NAA Australian Metal Co. Liquidation. Papers re Franz Wallach coming to Australia in connection with metal industry, files A457, A301/4, MP16/1, 1916/560.

\(^{63}\) Fischer, *Enemy Aliens*, 3.
provisions from the jurisdiction of courts to the executive government, to be implemented by promulgating various regulations which also effectively overruled most of the Federal Constitution (and of Parliament) by solely relying on Section 51(vi) of the Constitution. Regulations included the *War Precautions Regulations* (1915), allowing, *inter alia*, the expropriation of land and property, the removal of persons including internment without legal redress, the annulment of civic entitlements accruing from naturalization, the proscription of clubs and associations, and the limitation of freedom of movement. Over time, tuition at schools, publishing of books and newspapers, and any behaviour deemed to be “suspicious” came into the ambience of these continuously updated regulations, leading to closure of many Lutheran schools, prohibiting the use of the German language in print and public use, and the closure of German and Lutheran newspapers. 64 Any enemy alien, whether on parole or unnaturalized, was compelled to report regularly to the local police. This often extended to naturalized persons as well. Church services and any other activities involving more than two persons had to be registered and approved, and meetings were routinely attended by police officers. Their notes can still be found in the National Archives, and the detail recorded puts most peacetime secretaries’ reports to shame. 65 Other legislation included the *Enemy Contract Anulment Act* (1915), the *Aliens Registration Orders* (1916), the *Trading with the Enemy Act 1914*, and the multi-purpose *Unlawful Associations Act 1917*. Contravention of any of these measures was threatened by fines and/or imprisonment, though I have not been able to verify any genuine infringement of any of these by Germans, nor any conviction by a proper court. Other measures aimed at humiliating German settlers, and disassociating them from settlements they had founded and named, involved the renaming of virtually all German settlements under various state laws, giving them new Anglicized names. 66 Not surprisingly, the removal of any strictures and proper legal process protecting civic rights created a climate of fear
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64 Yearbook of the Commonwealth 11 (1918), 1034.
65 See for example Constable Sickerick’s report on the Lutheran Church Special Conference in Melbourne in August 1915. NAA MP16/1 1915/3/200 “Lutheran Church. Intelligence Section Case Files.”
66 While dozens of places in South Australia and Queensland were re-named, and a few in Tasmania, N.S.W. and W.A., in Victoria only Germantown (Grovedale), Hochkirch (Tarrington), Waldkirch (Freshwater Creek) and Gruenwald (Arkona) were affected. Arkona was actually a German place name. Protests from non-Germans “saved” Heidelberg, Coburg and Brunswick, and ignorance or indifference ensured the names of Altona, Arkona, Lubeck, Steiglitz (Stieglitz) and Walhalla were retained. Renaming of street names was more thorough.
among the German population, affecting them all, whether they were naturalized or not, including Australian-born.\footnote{“What is the use of being naturalized if it only applies to times of fair weather?,” complained a Warracknabeal farmer. “Mallee Settlement,” \textit{Warracknabeal Herald}, February 1915, 5.}

Despite his un-prepossessing looks, voice and manners—though he could be calculatingly charming and winsome—manipulative, bullying, and often inconsistent, Attorney-General (and later Prime Minister) W.M. Hughes possessed an innate intelligence, and he generated immense popularity amongst Australia’s almost 350,000 Diggers (soldiers) as well as a large part of the population, who kept him in office until 1923—though he was also loathed by many.\footnote{Beaumont, \textit{Australia’s War}, 38-39.} His skill to vituperate and generate hate was acute, and his use of “fear politics” that aimed “to bring people together against a real or imaginary enemy…[had] the capability of building cohesion…of the in-group, normally the majority,” while excluding those ostracized as enemies.\footnote{Babacan, “Integration, Nation State and Belonging,” 18,20.} The meek German community stood no chance against this determined man, who was instrumental in turning an initially neutral and even-handed population into German-haters. Babacan speaks of the collaboration between the government and the media to stereotype certain minority groups as “un-Australian.”\footnote{Ibid., 19.} The case studies in the ensuing section aim to document how the community was progressively destroyed under Hughes’ leadership.

Many months before the AIF faced their first real enemy, the home front came alive, mostly self-appointed guardians of the public good seeking to play a role.\footnote{In popular parlance referred to as “busybodies.”} It was they who, more even than the government, made the lives of German-Australians difficult and stressful. The home front’s initial role was to encourage enlistment, but also to make the as yet unreal war real. Its amorphous agents sought out culprits—real or imagined—to blame for rising food prices and unemployment, and it intensified the nation-wide obsession with spies, which the newspapers had started almost from the beginning of the war.\footnote{E.g. “German Spies at Altona Bay,” in \textit{Ararat Advertiser}, August 27, 1914, 9.} The home front itself owed much of its intensity to the feelings of vulnerability in the absence of British naval protection.

Civilian chicaneries, meted out on anybody deemed to be an “enemy alien” or sympathizer, commenced well before the \textit{War Precautions Act} could impose official sanctions after October 1914. Who or what drove such attitudes? In part it was the Anti-
German League, founded in Melbourne in late 1914, initially to boycott German goods but, over time, leading to press campaigns demanding that all Germans, native-born or naturalized, be dismissed and interned.\(^{73}\) It fed into the relentless German-bashing press that instigated ostracizing, shaming, occasionally physically attacking and otherwise humiliating persons of German background, in some cases of persons merely appearing to be German. It invented plots of sabotage and espionage that could never be proven. Every accusation was investigated by the police, quite unlike the transgressions committed against Germans (if they dared to report them) which were usually dismissed as “larrikinism.”\(^{74}\) But the League would be powerless without a compliant press. Here lies the explanation. It was the pervasiveness of the press that consolidated attitudes and actions, sensationalized rumours into proven dangers, and provided Australians, far away from the front, with a forum, through its readers’ letters columns, of pretending they contributed to the war effort. Richard Trembath, with reference to Gorman and McLean’s claim that “Journalists were largely in sympathy with government policy during the war...there was little conflict between the mass circulation newspapers and political and military intentions,” argues that “the press in Australia was neither the mouthpiece of a warmongering government nor its master. It was its ally.”\(^{75}\) He fails, however, to mention its equally powerful role in championing the prejudices and innuendos of the wider population.

5.5 Walter von Dechend and Eduard Scharf: case studies of war measures at the University of Melbourne

It may appear a platitude to describe the First World War as one of the most significant events in modern Western history, by noting that it literally changed everything, such as reversing the conventional meaning of honour, faith, decency, loyalty, compassion and trust, and eroding a belief in the goodness of man that had (more or less) characterized the prevailing mood at the beginning of the century, turning it into cynicism, nihilism and despair. It also turned untruth into truth, denunciation into patriotism, cruelty into

\(^{73}\) “Australian Trade,” *Age*, October 28, 1914, 10; “Against the Germans,” *Sun* (Sydney), August 14, 1915, 3; *Age*, December 23, 1915, 9.

\(^{74}\) McKernan, *Australian People*, 160.

\(^{75}\) Trembath, 1914-1918 *International Encyclopedia of the First World War Online*; Lyn Gorman, and David McLean, *Media and Society in the Twentieth Century: A Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 20. Trembath observes that after initial uncertainty the Australian press for the rest of the war saw their mission as promoting the message “that though the war was happening thousands of miles away, Australians were, in ex-Prime Minister Joseph Cook’s words, ‘fighting for the liberties of Australia, for the social ideals of this home of ours, as well as for the homes of the kingdoms over the sea.’”
courage. British historian John Keegan declared that “war is first and foremost a cultural act.” I strongly disagree; I see it much more as a social and political, and in the final analysis, as a criminal act.  

With these ideas in mind I will contextualize the lives of two men of German nationality who, in 1914, were teachers at the University of Melbourne. Their names were Walter von Dechend, a lecturer of German, and Eduard Scharf, a distinguished concert pianist who had been appointed to teach at the university’s conservatorium. Well-regarded by their students and colleagues, their misfortune was that, despite having been in Australia for many years, they had never considered becoming naturalized. Scharf, who was at that stage technically stateless as his German citizenship had lapsed, did in fact apply for Australian citizenship in February 1915, but this was refused. In any case, it would not have prevented his eventual dismissal, internment and deportation. As retired Melbourne Public Librarian and University Council member Thomas Bride quite openly admitted, in the context of war-time hysteria, “[N]aturalization is worth nothing.” One may perhaps postulate that, because both men were members of a cultural and intellectual elite, they may have considered nationality as irrelevant, of little significance. Neither man held a tenured university appointment.

The campaign against Germans at the university started quite early, with a claim by Mr Bayles MLA that the university had missed out on a donation of £15,000 because it employed “un-naturalized Germans.” A few months later that matter triggered other responses. As noted earlier, by 1915 Australian forces were in the thick of the murderous Gallipoli campaign. The number of killed and wounded was escalating, and even at the home front, the war had changed the mood from being considered an adventure into a serious conflict. As yet, apart from French and Germans, the dead and wounded at the Western Front still wore only British uniforms; the AIF would not set foot there until early 1916 after the withdrawal from Gallipoli, their ranks by then
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76 Quoted in Continuations or New Beginnings? Changing Attitudes to the First World War by Matt Leonard; see also Herberg-Rothe, “Primacy of Culture over War in a Modern World? John Keegan's Critique Demands a Sophisticated Interpretation of Clausewitz.”

77 Various arguments for and against naturalization are discussed in Chapter Four. Both von Dechend and Scharf arrived in Australia well before Federation (in 1893 and 1895, respectively), a time when many Germans avoided naturalization for two reasons: it was expensive, and it offered very few benefits. That attitude may have contributed to both men’s reluctance to seek citizenship. See also Leadbeater, “Non-British Colonists and Naturalization.”

78 “We are not at present issuing certificates of naturalization to persons of German origin.” Letter [in re von Dechend] Department of External Affairs to Professor Harrison Moore, July 13, 1915. NAA, A1, 1915/11913; see also MP 16/1, 1917/364; Scharf, Night in a City, 39-42, passim.

79 Selleck, The Shop, 532.

80 “German Teachers; University Incident,” Sydney Morning Herald, October 39, 1914, 7.
decimated by over 8,500 dead. In 1915 the feeling of gloom was intensifying, exacerbated by a wave of revulsion over the sinking of the Lusitania, whipped to fever-pitch by the press. In his 1927 study on war propaganda, Harold Lasswell wrote that “A handy rule for arousing hate is…use [of] an atrocity. It has been employed with unvarying success in every conflict.”81 This was the climate when the home front began seriously to turn on the fictitious enemy within. Under the headline “Germans in Australia. Should They All Be Interned?,” the Geelong Advertiser remarked that “Since the sinking of the Cunard liner Lusitania, hostility has been evidenced in Melbourne, not only to Germans who have recently been naturalised, but to those born in Australia, and others who have been naturalised for many years.”82 The synergy of the home front campaigns derived from various other factors, especially fear. “The use of fear…against a real or imagined enemy…[is a traditional tool by governments] of building cohesion…of the in-group, normally the majority,” notes Babacan. The spinoff of such action usually resulted in stereotyping and excising certain groups as unacceptable, and in this case as “un-Australian.”83

Von Dechend and Scharf fitted the bill, especially as neither was naturalized. One of the University Council members, Alexander Leeper, considered it his patriotic duty to rid the university of these two enemy aliens. Richard Selleck documents the depths to which Leeper descended to achieve what may be described as ethnic cleansing, by using lies, blackmail, arm-twisting, and badmouthing, all under the cloak of anonymity.84 He cleverly leaked half-truths to the papers that, in turn, generated hostile press responses. Thus “A Father” writes, expressing concern that “the conservatorium’s staff seems to be teeming with the German element,” and that “a clever German” would doubtlessly influence its young students.85 Leeper’s vindictiveness illustrates what was noted earlier: how the war turned seemingly honourable citizens into mischief-makers. Before his dismissal—a foregone conclusion in any case—von Dechend attempted to clarify his situation to the Arts Faculty’s request to explain why he still held German citizenship.”Why should it be impossible or wrong to love two countries equally well?,” he asked in his reply. He went on arguing that he could neither deny having been born a German nor loving his native country, yet

81 Lasswell, Propaganda Techniques, 81.
82 “Germans in Australia. Should They All Be Interned?,” Geelong Advertiser, May 15, 1915, 4.
83 Babacan, Immigration, Nation, State, 18.
84 Selleck, “Looking Glass,” 6 and Note 11. See also NAA MP16/1 and MT 269/1 “Intelligence Section Case Files.” For a discussion of ethnic cleansing, see notes 111 and 125.
85 Argus, May 13, 1915, 6.
he also loved Australia and his many Australian friends. Even the Intelligence report found that “no proof could...be obtained...to warrant action” except that “he is likely to foster German interest.”\textsuperscript{86} To Leeper, guilt didn’t need any proof. “The most dangerous people might be those who have committed no indiscretion,” he argued,\textsuperscript{87} a theme readily endorsed by an \textit{Argus} correspondent: “Among us are hundreds of Germans, quiet and harmless outwardly, but only awaiting the opportunity to be otherwise.”\textsuperscript{88} McKernan explains that “Germans could not simply shrug off their ancestry to cheer on the Empire as enthusiastically as British-born Australians.”\textsuperscript{89} Gerhard Fischer invites an interesting angle on dual loyalty by elucidating the concept of Luther’s teachings. Luther had asserted that “Loyalty [is owed] to the state [but also] respect for the secular authorities, based on the concept of the Zwei-Reich-Lehre (that is, the doctrine of the two kingdoms, spiritual and temporal).” Thus, as a Christian and a Lutheran, von Dechend would have been in no doubt that his first duty would be to obey the laws of the land he was living in, notwithstanding his German birth and love of his native country.\textsuperscript{90}

Although the university authorities wavered initially, it was not enough. Driven by Leeper’s harangues—he had gone on to denounce the two German lecturers to the Army’s Intelligence section and the press—he and Scharf lost their positions. They were not alone. Elsewhere, hundreds of other enemy aliens were dismissed in similar circumstances. Scharf was eventually interned at Langwarrin and later Holsworthy (1918), and in 1919 he was “voluntarily” deported to Germany, where his gifted and successful Australian-born son, the painter Theo Scharf, could take care of him. He died in Munich in 1928. Von Dechend remained at liberty, abandoned by his large circle of former friends. After the war, his desperate newspaper advertisements aimed at students wishing to learn German (were there any?) seem to tell the story of his descent into poverty.\textsuperscript{91} He died in Melbourne in 1931.\textsuperscript{92}

### 5.6 Civil measures: other case studies

\textsuperscript{86} Selleck, \textit{The Shop}, 534.
\textsuperscript{87} Stoljar, “Literature Teaching at the University of Melbourne,” 4.
\textsuperscript{88} Quoted Selleck, “Looking Glass,” 4.
\textsuperscript{89} McKernan, \textit{Australian People}, 154.
\textsuperscript{90} Fischer (2015), “German Experience in Australia during WW1 Damaged Road to Multiculturalism”; Selleck, \textit{The Shop}, 531,533.
\textsuperscript{91} This is well-documented in military intelligence reports about von Dechend. NAA MP16/1 1914/3/144 “Von Dechend W.H. Intelligence Section Case Files.”
\textsuperscript{92} \textit{Argus}, March 31, 1925, 23; April 17, 1928, 9; “Family Notices,” March 3, 1931, 1; “Personal,” March 3, 1931, 6.
Almost from the beginning of the war, harassment based on suspicion, or often mere personal dislike, became progressively more common, and Scharf’s and von Dechend’s story was repeated many times. Serle observes that even Australian commander John Monash did not escape investigation on account of his “German” background.93 “Progressively…individuals were forced out of employment, [and] their businesses were shunned,” notes Joan Beaumont.94 In November 1914, Melbourne’s wharf labourers struck because they wanted their German colleagues dismissed; and the Board of Works fired their German staff, resulting in dozens of destitute families.95 Matilda Rockstroh, Australian-born postmistress at St Kilda, was dismissed despite thirty-seven years of blameless service, for “her close lineal connection with the German race.”96 In most cases, dismissals followed threats of strike action by fellow workers, proving that press-initiated campaigns of ostracizing “the other” were proving very effective. We are reminded of the Australian Worker’s warning in 1914, of “inciting [the] population to wild measures, spurred on by the vile press,”97 but as Selleck remarks, the endemic racism and xenophobia of the unions may even have exceeded the “vile press” smear campaigns.98 Worse was that few complaints were ever dealt with by the police or courts, and Germans felt helpless and exposed. Protests against Germans being employed at Thompsons steel works in Castlemaine, and in Wonthaggi’s coal mine, led to other dismissals.99 As Joan Beaumont observes,

By May 1916 even people who had been “naturalised,” or who were born in Australia, but of enemy fathers or grandfathers, were caught in the net. Ultimately some 6,890 persons were to be interned in what was in many respects an arbitrary, capricious process as local authorities interpreted the regulations of the War Precautions Act as they saw fit.100

It seems needless to argue that every dismissal, of which there were many hundreds, was a betrayal of the principles in whose name the war was conducted. Contemporary
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93 Serle, John Monash, 196.
95 Melbourne Advertiser, November 28 and 30, December 19, 1914.
96 McKernan, Australian People, 165.
newspapers merely reported, never commented. Endemically racist in their outlook, unions and their members fully supported such punitive steps.\(^\text{101}\) Suffice to note that economic despair resulted from being dismissed, occasionally even ejected from their homes and circle of former friends and work colleagues, and psychological anxieties through having to endure xenophobic vilification wherever they went. Newspapers were mostly to blame, including mainstream mass media like the *Age* and *Argus*. Some publications, like the short-lived hate magazine *Graphic of Australia*, excelled in slandering their German fellow citizens. Name-calling such as Huns, Germs, swine, babykillers, squareheads, blacklegs and similar became the norm, depriving Germans of dignity and self-respect.\(^\text{102}\) The magazine’s mission statement clarifies where it stood:

> We make no secret of the fact that anything German is anathema to us. We do not like Germans, either as a nation or as individuals. Moreover, we do not want them in Australia. The Hun in our midst is a danger. Hitherto he has not been looked after as an unscrupulous, crafty and cleverly-evil foe ought to be. We shall endeavour to see that due attention is paid to these dangerous men and women.\(^\text{103}\)

Another jingoistic tabloid, *Truth*, fell not far behind the *Graphic* in its malicious treatment of matters involving Germans. Had the war suddenly awakened a dormant Germanophobia? Germans were suddenly stereotyped as aggressive, authoritarian and militaristic, seamlessly reversing a perception of them that had, only months earlier, seen them as “a most valuable element in the community.”\(^\text{104}\) How may we square off the attributes of negativity now displayed in the press with their description in the *Bendigo Advertiser* in 1870, of being “phlegmatic in temperament and disposition in general matters”?\(^\text{105}\)

While it is difficult to pinpoint the origin of Germanophobia, some press comments at the time of the Franco-Prussian War, notably in the *Argus*, had taken exception to Prussia’s aggressive conduct of the war. At the time, it required merely a single mental step to link this with the local community and its enthusiasm for the
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\(^{102}\) See *Graphic of Australia*, September 29, 1916, 1.

\(^{103}\) “What We Stand For,” *Graphic of Australia*, January 21, 1916, 3.
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\(^{105}\) *Bendigo Advertiser*, September 6, 1870, 2.
unified *Vaterland*, which had been perplexing in some quarters and not understood. Now, a generation later, a similar response was expected. No reason was required: “The Hun in our midst is a danger,” was the *Graphic*’s simplistic justification. As that danger failed to turn into action, the low profile adopted by most Germans came to be construed as a deliberate foil, a disguise for engaging in clandestine acts of mischief or sabotage.106 Sarcastically, *The Australasian* observed that “The naturalised German in the Commonwealth is in a very awkward fix…He does not know which way to turn.” It goes on to note that his contributions to patriotic funds were seen as “proof of hypocrisy and disloyalty,” his loyalty professions as “impudence,” and his silence was shouted down with “indignant public cries.” “The German in Australia seems to be between the devil and the deep sea,” the paper noted.107

While other enemy aliens, namely Austrians, Bulgarians and Turks, were treated exactly the same as Germans, the hostile comments in the press appeared to be far more focussed on Germans. Michael Connors believes the two major issues that triggered this attitude, already previously raised, were the *Lusitania* incident and the sustained atrocity propaganda.108 The effect was cumulative, and it was usually played up following Allied setbacks. Panayi makes the interesting observation that the *Lusitania* incident triggered off almost identical responses in other Allied countries. He defines the phenomenon as a “copycat element.”109

Meanwhile Dr Leeper’s denunciations—and he was one of an increasing number of rumour-mongers—created the impression of German-ness being somehow malignant, virus-like, infecting body and mind. A letter by *A Father* about German teachers at the University, already cited, clearly reinforced such an impression, warning of “obtain[ing] a hold in the minds of some of our citizens,” that “a clever German must influence [a] c il ‘ s min ,” “the nation has…to eliminate…every scrap of sentiment as far as a German is concerned”; my italicized words allowing multiple interpretations, all negative. The impression is created that perhaps inoculation or even surgery were needed to excise such infectious influences.110 But worse was to come. Soon spy fever spread like wild-fire across the land, like a mad craze. The press was
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flooded with reports of suspicious moves by black-coated “Germans” engaged in spy activities, moving in the dark of night and signalling enemy ships with torches. All such reports were taken seriously by a complicit police force.111 Leeper’s scurrilous claim of von Dechend, equipped with camera and motorbike, taking clandestine photographs of Melbourne may not have started the craze, but was part of an almost archetypical attempt to criminalize Germans.112 Some months prior to his dismissal intelligence officers seized both his camera and motorbike, the latter greatly inconveniencing his travel to work.113

In 1915, attacks on the infrastructure of the German community commenced, starting with “German clubs and similar hotbeds of disloyalty,”114 claimed to be “emblem[s] of Germanism, with its horrors… brutality… bestial savagery,”115 where “spying can be schooled without hindrances.”116 In January, the German club at Broken Hill was torched.117 A rowdy meeting outside the Turnverein in Victoria Parade in Melbourne, stirred up by two hundred members of the armed Bourke-Street Rats street gang, had to be broken up by a police baton charge—most likely more to protect the neighbours than the club members.118 Newspapers, and especially letters to the editor in ever-increasing numbers, demanded all German clubs be closed, claiming they were centres where “pro-German… sentiment [is] gloating over every disaster to the Empire.”119 Several correspondents wanted them confiscated and turned into hospitals for wounded soldiers.120 Later they were even linked with the Irish calls for Home Rule.121 The campaign was successful; the press-incited letters to the editor campaign had worked. Richard Trembath has already been quoted: “The press in Australia was neither the mouthpiece of a warmongering government nor its master. It was its ally.”122 On May 14, 1915 newspapers reported that “the Minister of Defence [told the federal Parliament] that this morning instructions had been given that all German clubs
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Meanwhile, Victoria’s Chief Secretary tried to deflect the blame from the government by recommending “that the members themselves should voluntarily take…action [i.e. closing their clubs] to obviate trouble,” suggesting that Germans should simultaneously shoulder guilt and humiliation rather than making it clear it was the government’s dictate.124

Next came German schools, churches and newspapers, ensuring the German community’s self-confidence, based on its various support structures, would be weakened and eventually destroyed. In its haphazard and clandestine way—the press goading the common herd, the common herd the government—this was a very effective and strikingly modern model of social engineering, a bloodless system of persecution. The demand put forward by a regional paper that “[the] only…way to win the war…is by making a clean sweep of the Germans and all their subtle influence,” comes fairly close in meaning to what in more recent political terminology is referred to as ethnic cleansing.125 Panayi comments that the war permanently changed the way majorities viewed minorities, and Tampke and Beuke observe that from that time onwards Germans in Australia lost their equal but different status.126

The assiduous Dr Leeper’s ubiquitous interests included the use of English at the surviving eleven Lutheran schools in the state—all located in the west of the state and under ELSA control. Perhaps to his regret, he found that all of them had long used English as the language of instruction except for religious education. And all schools—their number eventually shrank to a mere ten—had been under close Education Department supervision for years. At the Council of Education in June 1915, Leeper had to content himself with putting a motion “that all schools should be conducted on the basis of providing a good English education, and with the view of promoting sound Imperial and Australian citizenship.”127 It fell far short of what he hoped for. But that was not the end of the matter. Although the Legislative Assembly was advised that extensive investigation showed “no seditious teaching,”128 scurrilous accusations of treacherous activities kept the schools and Lutheran administrators continuously and
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mischievously in the firing line. 129 “Until every Lutheran school is closed we shall continue to be breeding a community of traitors throughout the Empire,” wrote “Another Horshamite” to the Argus. 130 A Mr C. Mudd from Wesley Church claimed that “there were a number of disloyal teachers” at Lutheran schools. 131 Investigation showed it was a mere case of mud-slinging, and as Mudd had also implicated Catholic teachers he soon found himself in deep trouble, judging by the response in the letters columns. The Director of the Department of Education, Frank Tate, courageously resisted calls to close the schools, and unlikely support came from Roman Catholic Archbishop Mannix, who reflected that “no reckless action be taken against these schools merely because of charges made by narrow-minded, vindictive busybodies.” 132

The possible closure was debated at length, and though Leeper and his assiduous co-calumniator Theodore Fink pursued their campaign with singleminded determination, only one of the Lutheran schools, Lake Linlithgow, was closed—more for technical reasons, i.e. lack of an “acceptable” native-born teacher. 133 The Graphic maliciously reported, “Hun teacher disqualified.” 134 However, the school almost immediately recommenced with an “acceptable” Australian-born substitute. 135

The press bulges with demands and scurrilous accusations—and although the advisory Council of Education recommended closure of all Lutheran schools, the Premier rejected it as “too drastic.” 136 Truth decried his decision with a sarcastic cartoon and the heading “Kultur in our midst,” and “Deutschland ueber alles.” 137 The debate went on for months. In the end the schools held out, literally by the skin of their teeth. Even after the Armistice came no relief. Now reinforced by calls from returned men, the papers were awash with reports and letters demanding “that all Lutheran schools, churches and clubs be closed,” 138 while the Returned Soldiers Interstate Conference also demanded “that interned enemies be deported.” 139

As Section 116 of the Australian Constitution guaranteed freedom of religious beliefs, the hostile campaigns had to be content to focus on Lutheran schools and church
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buildings rather than the “German church” itself, which the constitution protected. But while the schools barely survived the war, some church buildings did not fare as “well.” Three churches were torched: Murtoa in April 1916, Netherby the following August, and some time after the war, Bendigo in 1925. Attempts were made to burn down two others, at Jeparit and Nhill, both in November 1918, but vigilance of the parishioners prevailed. Castlemaine’’s church was vandalism so badly it became unserviceable and had to be sold as a ruin, and Maryborough was internally vandalized by a drunken mob. One single arrest was made and a fine of £2 imposed.\textsuperscript{140}

Meanwhile, the internment camps (the official designation was concentration camps) started to fill up.\textsuperscript{141} Langwarrin in Victoria, simultaneously serving as a venereal diseases treatment station for Australian military personnel, initially served as a camp for enemy aliens. By November 1915 it was responsible for 769 Germans, 104 Austrians and 72 Turks on parole, plus 62 German and 14 Austrian internees, while some others were held at nearby Point Cook. Initially the inmates lived in tents, sleeping on straw mattresses and were given water and food. Before long, bursting at the seams, and VD infected by AIF soldiers, the camp was progressively closed and inmates were transferred to Holsworthy Camp in NSW.\textsuperscript{142} Fischer points out that in twelve per cent of all internments, no reason was given for admission; in other cases, the record showed the internee had merely failed to prove he or she was not German. Legally, records were mostly worthless and probably illegal.\textsuperscript{143}

5.7 The press: a sequel
My original intention had been to conclude the discussion of the nature and effectiveness of the German press in Victoria with a more detailed final analysis. As it turned out, by 1914 all German newspaper publishing in Victoria had ceased, including the two Lutheran monthlies. Both the Lutherische Kirchenbote, formerly printed by Oskar Mueller at Hochkirch (Tarrington), and Lutheran Christenbote had moved to Adelaide by 1903 and 1911, respectively. They continued to be widely

\textsuperscript{140} Hebart, VELKA, 242-3.
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read in Victoria, and their prohibition from 1918 deprived German speakers of another spiritual and cultural lifeline in their own language. However, a close examination of the Christenbote reveals that since the beginning of the war, virtually all references to Germans, Germany, the war, or even Australia had completely disappeared. As newsheets, as opposed to religious and spiritual matters, they had become worthless. Nonetheless, little sympathy was shown by the Anglo press when war-time restrictions forced their closure. The West Gippsland Gazette cynically commented that “[A]n indignant British public [my italics] can be quietened only by one thing—their instant suppression.” The Age even claimed there was no press control. The Graphic continued to rant against the German-Australian press for “regal[ing] [their] readers with anti-British comments extracted from the dailies of Berlin, Hamburg, Cologne, and Frankfurt...The existing [it means surviving] papers are more circumspect, but they may be more dangerous!” Its claims lacked any evidence. Almost identical experiences were shared by the German communities in Canada, the U.S. and Brazil.

The War Precautions Act had closed Victoria’s German clubs, now shut down their press, and continued to threaten the Lutheran schools, their pupils and parents. Egged on by the press and some of the men who had returned from the front, the home front superpatriots now turned on the “German” (i.e. Lutheran) churches. Would they at last succeed in ending this last mainstay of the community? An unlikely glimmer of light appeared in the person of a newly appointed German teacher at the university: the Belgian academic Dr Augustin Lodewyckx. His activities will be discussed shortly.

5.8 The war in the country

Thus far, this investigation has largely considered wartime experiences of German-Australians in urban areas. In such an environment, it was relatively easy to single them out for vilification and abuse, as Germans went about their business, took their children to German Saturday school, went to Lutheran services on Sundays, shopped at German bakers or butchers, visited their German doctor or solicitor. More stratified socio-economically than rural communities, living isolated from one another and thus without
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the reassurance of neighbourly protection by compatriots, it was easy to target them. Their businesses stood out: a single shop among a number of others, usually with a German name above; among the employees in larger businesses, the public service or the railways their demeanour and accents gave them away.\textsuperscript{150} Anonymous superpatriots—even Leeper insisted on anonymity when reporting to the Intelligence Corps\textsuperscript{151}—soon became experts in sniffing out German-looking, German-speaking individuals. Observing them going to Lutheran church services suggested conspiracies, very likely hatching plans to take over Australia, or relishing triumphs of German arms. The thousands of Leepers had their day: the opportunities to snoop, to denounce, to insinuate were unlimited.

It was different in the countryside, especially in areas with a German preponderance. Here it was more difficult to single out individuals. German communities had cohesion, a \textit{belonging-togetherness} enhanced by common language, customs and general life-style, as well as the reassurance of their Lutheran Bibles and catechism.\textsuperscript{152} Home front operatives had to be more inventive to create alarm situations, like plans to set fire to haystacks or ripening wheatfields, blow up bridges or poison creeks or reservoirs. They had to act more clandestinely, by sneaking out at night to set the Lutheran church on fire, or damage farm machinery, or poison the dog.

But attitudes varied. In some areas hostilities were subdued, even absent. John Meyer observes that in the Mallee few transgressions took place.\textsuperscript{153} In John McQuilton’s study of Victoria’s north-east, where the German-Australian presence was less prolific though distinct, it was similar, though for different reasons.\textsuperscript{154} He found that by 1914 “the barriers between the Germans and the general community had substantially crumbled”; they were more widely accepted and even occasionally defended by their Anglo neighbours. He also notes that the potential for anti-Australian measures was limited.\textsuperscript{155}

Quite obviously, rural issues, which Germans had in common with their Anglo neighbours, differed from urban, like the quality of rail services, roads, schools and
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health, problems of population loss, employment opportunities, environmental damage caused by mining, or the serious drought in the 1914-15 summer. Further, Germans also tended to be more integrated, intermarried, and sharing wider community concerns.156

It seems an accepted truism that rural persons tend to rely more on one another. A number of Germans served as councillors, were active in politics, like Albert Zwar of Beechworth who had founded the liberal People’s Party, and many joined the Patriotic League.157 Although the Hun stereotype differed little from town, its implications were less severe; police and local officialdom tended to be more lenient and inclined to stem patriotic excesses, and the local papers’ inevitable hate propaganda was not translated into physical attacks.158 When proposing to vote about the disenfranchisement of Germans, Beechworth councillor Hodge opposed the motion with the argument that he had always found “Germans in this district [to be] honourable men.”159 In consequence, the council shelved the motion. And it was significant that no person from the region was interned; even un-naturalized aliens were merely put on parole, though as McQuilton argues, it was no pleasure being “out on parole” and becoming exposed to vilification and chicaneries.160

McQuilton concludes his account of the north-east with the comment that “the broad tolerance for the region’s German Australians…was a far cry from Walla Walla,” a district situated just across the border in NSW, with a much larger German community.161 That leads me to a quite different political environment, where anti-German outrages were as common as in Melbourne. Walla Walla, Germanton/Holbrooke and the district north of Albury became the subject of a different investigation by McQuilton, with different findings to the north-east. A study by Pennay shows similar results.162 The area extending from the Riverina to Tallangatta had been settled by Germans descended from the South Australian wave of immigrants, arriving after the celebrated “wagon trek” of 1868.163 Though geographically outside the scope of this thesis, the cases of Ernest Wenke and Hermann Paech are useful illustrations of the difference to the more benign situation in north-eastern Victoria. Australian-born
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Wenke was arrested—solely for having a brother who had spoken against the Conscription Referendum in 1916. The official report asserted that he was “pro-German, but [there were] no proofs.” Paech, denounced by local bank manager Carruthers, was arrested because he was considered “most disloyal and highly dangerous,” but again, “it would be difficult to prove.” The principle of British justice of presuming innocence until proven guilty no longer applied. Sergeant Quinn of Hamilton police station had to admit that often innuendo was acted on as proof of hostile action, even though “[Little] reliance can be placed on people who spread…stories. If asked about, they know nothing definite.” Yet as Spennemann and Rushbrook point out, more cohesive German rural communities had developed defence mechanisms that protected them from the excesses of unfair attacks. But what of Germans elsewhere in Victoria, especially in the larger settlements in the West?

5.9 Hochkirch

In 1870, the Hamilton Spectator reported that, though “the number of Teutons in this part is not large,” the Hochkirch community, like many others at the time, had come together to subscribe a sizeable sum (£15) as their contribution for the victims of the Franco-Prussian War. The Spectator noted that the Teutons’ meeting had concluded by singing a patriotic German song. It added no further comment.

Fifteen years later the ubiquitous journalist “The Vagabond” visited Hochkirch. In a long article on the village he observed that,

There is a population…of nearly 300, and as they are nearly all Germans it is sometimes called Germantown. Take away the eucalyptus and we might be in Deutschland. The post office is run by Oscar Mueller who is also teacher at the German Lutheran school. The German Lutheran church of St Michaelis [sic] is presided over by Pastor C.W. Schuermann. There is a German printing office and a library…The men and the women we see are stolid and patient, full of
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industry and capabilities of labour—true types of their race. The children are sturdy and flaxen-haired…  

He proceeds to compare the local state school and its rival, the Lutheran school at St Michael’s, and surprisingly expresses the hope that the St Michael’s school might eventually fail. What reasons does he give? He fears that otherwise Hochkirch will always remain a church town, a community apart from the rest of the country. Industrious, frugal, temperate, law-abiding as the inhabitants now are, if this system should be perpetuated I hold that, although on a small scale, it is a danger to the state. All the elements of the nationality which we are now building up should be fused together. The Australian of the future must be British in literature, language and feeling as well as law. We want no German inhabitants to hold themselves apart from the general mass of the people. We want no German vote at the disposal of one man. And do I plainly tell Pastor Schuermann that I have no sympathy with his church and state doctrine and hope St Michaelis’ School may soon come to grief…? [All italics are mine].

Years ahead of Henry Parkes, this is a classic precursor of the creed of the crimson thread. Parkes would not “admit into [this young nation’s] population any element that of necessity must be of an inferior nature or character.” Only conformity, fusion—the opposite to modern-day multiculturalism—would eliminate such “elements.” Quite instinctively, the Vagabond had tapped into prevailing beliefs. His response fits neatly into the paradigm of (American) nativism versus Germanism as discussed in the previous chapter.

To brief himself further, the Vagabond then called on Pastor Schuermann. Though impressed by the man, he failed to dissuade the pastor of his views. In his mind he compares him variously with visionaries and tribunes, invoking the names of Luther, Moses and Cromwell. After leaving, the Vagabond’s local guide explained that “these hardworking Germans are all sound and solvent, and honest as the day… They are excellent citizens now, and their children will be better citizens in the future.” Yet the
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Vagabond was not convinced. The rival German-Lutheran school, and the whole idea of an ethnic settlement jarred his sense of Britishness. He perceived it as “dangerous.”

What does either story tell us? In the first report, was the Germans’ solicitude for their kin in their former homeland seen as disloyalty to their new home? Or as evidence that their comfortable lives in Australia had enabled them to be generous to the unfortunates in their former home? Does the Spectator’s lack of comment imply a view, on the analogy that unsaid things are often meant to be negative?

The Vagabond is far more decided: he rejects the other as unacceptable. In that, he almost mirrors Price’s metaphor seventy-five years later, of “a community apart from the rest of the colony.” We may recall Luebke’s finding that the dominant society demanded that “social and cultural homogeneity was desirable,” and that immigrants had to conform. Thus, both the generosity towards war victims in Prussia and Schuermann’s educational policy appear to be contrary to majority expectations and thus highly suspect, notwithstanding the immigrants’ being “as honest as the day” and “excellent citizens.” Some conventional signs of assimilation may not have been obvious at Hochkirch, but Luebke observes that, even in Brazil, the non-integrationist German community had evolved a way of life that differed markedly from that in their homeland. At Hochkirch, the Vagabond could not see that because his crimson-threaded blinkers obscured the evidence. Perplexed but as yet without malice, his was an 1870s view. How will that stack up against the changed situation of 1914, we wonder?

We might now fast-forward four decades. Tarrington/Hochkirch historian Betty Huf writes that, when war was declared in August 1914, local German residents lost no time to declare their loyalty. In this almost exclusively “German” village of 450 inhabitants (52 families), on August 5 a congregation of 350, led by Pastor E. Kriewaldt, moved that,

Whereas the majority of us are born Australians and a small proportion are naturalized subjects who have sworn fidelity to the British Crown, we...express in unqualified terms our loyalty to the King of England, His Majesty King
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George V [and] That we are prepared, should the necessity arise, to sacrifice our property and our lives for the welfare of England.174

The motion was forwarded to the Governor-General and the local paper, which devoted two long columns to it. Close-by communities at Warrayure, Moutajup, Tabor and South Hamilton, the Warrayure Gun Club, and various other local communities passed similar declarations, and the Hamilton Spectator acknowledged them all. But as usual, no comment accompanied the reports.175 Over the following months, well over sixteen families allowed their Australian-born sons to enlist, their parents no doubt aggrieved for having to fight their own kin, and £1,250 was collected for the Patriotic Fund.176 But in the end, all these declarations and gestures amounted to nothing, and Huf has to concede that when it was all over, the prejudice and hatred would leave a profound scar on the next two generations, with the result that “much of their heritage has been lost.”177 But was it merely heritage, or was it indeed the essential ingredients that make a community hold together: its spirit, its vitality, that essential indefinable glue that protects it?

Accusations of disloyalty started quite early. Objections to the use of their native language in public, and especially at the Lutheran school, were soon raised and construed as conspiratorial.178 Worse was to come. One night some local hoons, suitably fortified by alcohol, broke into the home of postmaster Philipp Mueller, frogmarched him to the main road and humiliated him by forcing him to kneel down and sing the national anthem. Only a few months earlier, the Spectator had named Mueller as one of the main speakers at the community’s loyalty demonstration.179 Chicaneries by local and Melbourne-based police officers and private individuals became a daily occurrence. Police constable Federli was dispatched from Melbourne to Hochkirch to investigate an anonymous letter received by local councillor J.G. Stewart, a notorious German hater. Though without clear proof, a local man, Carl Burger, was arrested and subsequently interned at Langwarrin concentration camp. There was nothing the local community could do. Local police constable Moyle, subsequently interviewed, is quoted that “the internment of Carl Burger has had a splendid effect upon the actions of the German
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people.” The “splendid effect” rather cynically admits that they had been cowed into silence. For “actions,” as usual unspecified, “no proof” is given, as in Wenke’s and von Dechend’s cases mentioned earlier. Sandra Kipp found that a number of other locals were also investigated for spurious reasons. Cowed into silence and stigmatized as a “hot bed of Germanism,” they “found it safer to remain quiet and stay together in the security of their own small communities.” Throughout the war, the only safe response was to choose internal exile.

An obvious question is who their persecutors might be, in a rural community where everyone knew one another. Were they fellow citizens, with whom they had lived in peace for two generations? Outsiders? Don Garden suggests it was mostly locals. He names councillor Stewart as one of their leaders. Had they hidden their prejudices in the past? Was it a dormant dislike, a build-up of hatred for “the other,” or plain envy? The latter warrants some elaboration. Almost from the beginning of the community in Victoria, envy of their possession—totally disregarding their thrift and modest lifestyle that had achieved it—surfaced regularly. The Hamilton Spectator had accused them of “grubbing”; wage scabbing was another recurring accusation. Their thrift and pennypinning, of being “sound and solvent” and “honest as the day,” as the Vagabond was told, was mis-construed as having acquired their properties by dubious means. The Intelligence report on the arrest of Carl Burger perpetuates this myth:

> It was stated that the German tainted people hold 40,000 acres of the land between Hamilton and Penshurst, and in nearly every case the possession was made possible by the easy repayments, and low interest of German Government loans.

That was, of course, utter nonsense; at no time had there been any connection with the German government. Nonetheless, on similar fictitious—indeed malicious—grounds,
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this peaceable and thriving community was now progressively destroyed, its businesses were boycotted and many went to the wall. But in the end, two of its institutions survived: its Lutheran church, firmly anchored in its Old Lutheran survival strategy and, notwithstanding the Vagabond’s prayers, its school; the latter today the oldest continuing Lutheran school in Victoria. The state school, incidentally, had closed in 1929. While threats of internment and internal exile temporarily cocooned the community, this form of a passive surrender ultimately helped it to survive, if weakened and much reduced. Quite emotively, Robin Cohen (though with persecuted fellow-Jews in mind) observes that “bonds of language, culture and a sense of common fate impregnate such a… relationship [that] give it an affective, intimate quality.”

Here lay its hidden strength: religious faith, its church, its shared culture and customs (now carefully concealed), long-standing neighbourly collaboration confined to their own kin that ensured internal cohesiveness, a pastor who would often face the humiliations on behalf of his flock, but most importantly, its centuries-old Old Lutheran survival instincts. That protective shield was absent in the metropolis, where the community lacked that sort of inner strength, after associations were forcibly shut down, their buildings expropriated, personal connections severed, members interned, records of sixty years of shared activities dispersed or destroyed. Such loose, often informal connections were almost impossible to re-establish after the end of the terror. But not the least of its weaknesses was the inability of its Lutheran synod to project a creditable Australian allegiance. In that respect, the rural ELSA church and its adherents had a distinct advantage.

The most profound humiliation followed in 1917, when Hochkirch was renamed. Until World War II “residents in the village of Hochkirch were almost entirely of German descent,” observes Huf. They had founded the village, named it, and lived in it for over sixty years. It had been commended by an observer in 1876. But now they virtually lost it, though in some ways they were lucky: it could have become Borrine or Crosskey or Pierrepoint. Tarrington at least had some local relevance. Newspaper accounts provide ample background, the triumph concealed behind matter-of-fact reporting. “The ‘wiping out’ of German names is a wise course,” wrote an anonymous correspondent signing himself “Australian”; it indicated Anglo community

186 Cohen, “Rethinking Babylon,” 257.
187 Huf, Courage, Patience, 33.
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189 Huf, op.cit., 81-83.
consensus. The correspondent continued: “We don’t want our towns and settlements to bear German names.” Renaming appeared to serve three purposes: as a punishment for its residents; “to hand down to posterity the detestation… [for] the fiendishness of the German nation;” and as a cleansing tactic of a nomenclature symbolic of non-British identity. Judging by the flood of letters accompanying the news, it was a popular measure.

Germantown’s renaming in 1915 took on an almost farcical character, as various names were bandied around and variously rejected. Some of its original founders, still resident and still a majority, were consulted but then brusquely overruled, while once more a campaign of anonymous letters to the papers, signed “Britisher” or “Justice” went as far as virtually accusing its residents of assisting in sinking the Lusitania.

The Armistice eventually came, but immediate changes were minimal. None of the wartime government strictures were repealed for several years, and taunting and ostracizing continued, now with the added voices of returned men.

5.10 Why are rural communities different?

Rather cautiously, Kathleen Conzen proposed that “If there is a remaining cultural heritage in the U.S. stemming from the mass emigrations [of the nineteenth century] it is found in rural districts where Germans settled.” I will endeavour to link Conzen’s observation to Victoria, followed by an investigation where this leaves urban settlers. I begin this discussion with a range of views by several distinguished thinkers on rural settlement. Interpreting the essay *The Frontier in American History* by the influential American historian Jackson Turner, LaVern Rippley argues that Turner’s trope that “the frontier was the key element in the formation of an American character…[and] remains the cornerstone for an understanding of the melting pot metaphor and its capability for assimilating the newcomer,” cannot be sustained. Turner had claimed that ethnic characteristics would literally “melt away”; Rippley argues the opposite, namely (I extrapolate his views and apply it to Hochkirch) that the strong Lutheran beliefs, the close family bonds, and the importance frontier (i.e. rural) people attached to the family farm (or local business) and their local community mitigate against assimilation, and

indeed strengthened these communities while reinforcing their feeling of separateness and their ability to resist and endure adversity. That is a significant finding. By substituting “Australian” for “American,” and arguing that Hochkirch was as much a “frontier” as Turner’s anonymous American frontier, it can be argued that, notwithstanding their shared frontier challenges, it was here where the “newcomer” and the dominant culture parted and evolved separate identities. Unlike in Turner’s scenario, the newcomer did not surrender, “assimilate,” or “melt away.” This establishes the clearest distinction between settlers at the frontier, or rural settlers in general, and those living and working in urban areas.

Comparing urban-ness with rural-ness in a larger framework of modernity, Kate Murphy observes an interesting symbiotic relationship between rural community life and masculinity as symbols of endurance, and between urban life and femininity as symbols of compromise, accommodation, and what might be termed “surrender.” Other common relationships to which she alludes are “naturalness” (rural), which perhaps may be juxtaposed to artificiality or compromise (urban).

Much earlier I noted Bodi’s views, rejecting the Herderian idea of the evolutionary nexus between rural communities and the emergence of nations. Though perhaps somewhat remote from Hochkirch’s situation, Bodi offers the following argument:

[I]n the past scholarship adopted a 19th century concept of nation and nationality reliant on the preservation of language and culture typical for closed-in rural communities and ruled by religious beliefs aspiring towards independence and separation from the host society.

Rejecting that paradigm as “outdated,” Bodi insists that it was replaced by a new concept based on the ascendancy of urban-ness. German philosopher Walter Benjamin is less adamant: he observes that urban and rural are “in a perpetual process of mingling and contamination… losing their intrinsic character…[while] cities…are seen to be breached at all points by the invading countryside.”

195 Murphy, Fears and Fantasies, 4, 5, 190, passim.
197 Murphy, op.cit., 2; Dobson, “The Urban Pedagogy of Walter Benjamin,” 5-6. Benjamin (1892-1940) was a German philosopher and cultural critic with wide-ranging interests, including the philosophy of history.
While I see merit in Bodi’s and the other foregoing arguments, I incline more towards Benjamin’s alternative, a mix-and-match construct posited somewhere in-between. While neither seeking to challenge Bodi’s rejection of the Herderian (ultimately adopted as a fascist) concept of rural society as a precursor of the modern nation, nor endorsing Murphy’s innuendo of urbatiy symbolizing compromise or decadence, I attempt to prove that Germans formed strong rural communities based on religion, family, farm, and frontier challenges—as was the case at Hochkirch. Their objective was merely to endure rather than building a separate political entity. Kathleen Conzen’s comments about American rural communities have much in common with my own perception of Hochkirch’s trajectory. She writes:

From the beginning, those most committed to the reproduction of self-contained fragments of the homeland sought the isolation of the countryside. Here…[they] achieve[d] a…degree of autonomy in church-centred commercial farming communities. Theirs was as inherently…a culture in America as it had been in Germany, resting…on the family for farm labor, the farm for family sustenance, and the church to enforce the bonds of one to the other…[T]he intermeshed cultural defenses of farm, family, religion, and local political control insured…enduring cultural continuity.\(^{198}\)

In contrast to Mack Walker’s pessimistic assessment that American culture destroyed German identity,\(^{199}\) Conzen names a range of nation-wide impacts generated by rural communities in America that endured. For reasons of the smallness of German-Australia, such impacts are difficult to discern and measure. Heidler, in the process of his investigation of the assimilation of Melbourne’s Liedertafels, shares Walker’s pessimistic views by concluding that the intention “to keep one’s [separate] cultural identity” was unacceptable to Australians.\(^{200}\) But like Walker, his focus was the urban community, while Conzen’s was firmly directed on the rural community. Hers is a convincing argument, and the cultural continuity she associates with self-contained rural communities in America can also be observed in my “test” community of Hochkirch.

\(^{198}\) Conzen, “Phantom Landscapes,” 13-16.

\(^{199}\) Walker asserts that “[T]he philistine culture of North America destroyed the German national culture.” Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 119-20.

\(^{200}\) Conzen credits them with three main achievements, viz. the formulation of “heartland values”; a dominant interest in small-community political engagement; and a deep commitment to a personal liberty ideology. Conzen, “Phantom Landscapes,” 17-18; Heidler, The German Liedertafel, 22.
Only one modification is called for. In contrast to South Australia, “local political control” by the German community scarcely existed in Victoria. For what Conzen refers to as “local control,” I feel justified in choosing an appropriate substitute. In Hochkirch’s case this would be its overwhelmingly German-dominated infrastructure, that consisted of several hotels, shops, its post office and other businesses, the Kirchenbote printery, farms, and the regional pastorate of Pastor Schuermann and his successors. All these can be equated to “local control” mechanisms.

What conclusion may I draw from the various viewpoints outlined above, both with regard to Hochkirch but also with regard to answering the hypothesis on survival I proposed earlier? Does it prove my claim that Hochkirch, and rural communities like it, ultimately retained their identity by virtue of a combination of their rurality and other key characteristics, namely their shared values, memories and traditions, as expressed by the three “F”s—farm (or business), family, and faith? As I interpret Anthony Smith’s investigation of ethnic survival, ultimately survival depends on the will to survive, sustained by shared values and beliefs. Corroborating evidence can be easily found, for example in Tampke’s writings, who observed the greater homogeneity of rural settlers; in Kuehlmann, who noted that regional concentration gave reassurance and strength to rural communities; and in Harmstorf, who observed that the Lutheran church was the most effective protector of cultural and religious beliefs and values. A particularly emphatic observation comes from Jordan, who ranks “cultural memory” as a major sustaining factor. Direct and primary evidence comes from Hochkirch itself. Despite losing its German name—though in quiet defiance, St Michael’s continued to use the name Hochkirch until 1957—the community recovered remarkably quickly. Not from feelings of defiance; it was its inner strength, unconquered by war chicaneries, that saved it. But its recovery can not, or can only marginally be attributed to its German-ness. It was virtually predetermined by religious (Lutheran) factors, a continuity engendered by the role of the church itself, by the residents’ faith, and by their church-supported communal structure.

201 Smith, “Chosen Peoples: Why Ethnic Groups Survive,” passim. Entirely different scenarios described by Elsass and Byram, respectively, lead to surprisingly similar conclusions. Elsass, “The Psychology of Survival,” 176-78; Byram, Minority Education and Ethnic Survival, passim.
202 Tampke, Germans in Australia, 89; Kuehlmann, Deutsche in der Fremde, 9; Harmstorf, “German Settlement in South Australia,” 362.
204 Huf, Courage, Patience, 86.
Further proof of continuity, and thus survival, emerge almost immediately after the end of the war. Within a decade after the Armistice, a massive new Lutheran church was planned, built and dedicated (1928), catering for a congregation of 420 and capable of seating up to 600. 205 Dozens of the community’s former enemies joined the opening crowd. A number of (largely) church-related organizations were established in the post-war decade, strengthening the continuing and effective institutional infrastructure. On Tarrington’s initiative, a youth organization, eventually re-constituted as the Luther League, was established in 1921. 206 It ultimately became a nation-wide organization. In 1926 a Women’s Guild was founded; a successful Brass Band continued its pre-war role, and a choir—music always being an essential ingredient of Lutheran life—likewise continued. German-language services re-commenced for the older generation and continued until 1939. And while enrolments at the Lutheran school had declined to 47 by 1918, it subsequently rose to 65 in 1921, 80 in 1923, and 108 in 1926-27, while German was once more taught. 207 From 1930, a “rapid expansion” even required the appointment of an assistant pastor. 208 All these developments represent “cultural continuity,” based on “religion, family and farm,” exactly as Conzen argues. They adequately confirm my hypothesis on the viability of a rural ethnic community. Only a small number of other predominantly German communities existed before the war. These included Tabor, Warrayure, Byaduc, and several of the Wimmera and southern Mallee settlements. Like Hochkirch, many of them also recovered, even though their geographic structure may have differed from that of Hochkirch. The Hochkirch village was an integrated complex containing its Lutheran church and school, a village settlement of homes, a few businesses, and close-by farms. Beyond the village confines, Lutheran religious and school services were provided to the large surrounding rural district which thus formed part of its extended community. Tabor and Warrayure were different. They lacked a conventional village structure; their churches and schools stood alone, surrounded by open countryside. Yet their churches and schools, like Hochkirch, served a congregation and community spread over a large surrounding rural district. And like Tarrington, both congregations were held together by an infrastructure of support organizations beside their Lutheran churches and schools. At Tabor, a Ladies

205 At its opening in 1928 over 1,100 of the over 2,000 attendees were seated in the church. 50 Years of Blessings: St Michael’s Lutheran Church, Tarrington.
206 The local branch underwent various name changes in the early years; details omitted here.
207 St Michael’s...Church, Tarrington (Hochkirch), Seventy-fifth Anniversary; Huf, Courage, Patience, 86.
208 50 Years of Blessings: St Michael’s Lutheran Church, Tarrington.
Guild, brass band and a literary society continued since long before the war. The situation at Warrayure was very similar. Its church even had to be enlarged in 1929, and its school enrolments rose noticeably.\textsuperscript{209} Despite the intermixture of German-Lutheran and other ethnicities, the situation in the Wimmera and southern Mallee district exhibited very similar patterns. That contrasts with the by then largely “mixed” settlements at Germantown, Doncaster and Harkaway, for example, where assimilation was by then quite advanced. Little evidence of an ethnic resurgence was evident in these places.

5.11 \textit{Per aspera ad astra (or: Postera crescam laude): survival in an urban environment}\textsuperscript{210}

The survival of the urban community seemed much bleaker, principally because of its greater complexity. On one hand, this section of the community had sustained a more serious setback on account of wartime restrictions and persecution; but on the other, it had already been on a slide towards virtually inevitable assimilation. In 1927, casting his eye over Australia’s urban life, Jens Lyng found that “though numerous, the Germans usually disappeared amongst the overwhelming number of Britshers.”\textsuperscript{211} Robin Walker in 1972, though perhaps more tongue-in cheek, was more deprecatory, noting that little more than “the Christmas tree, Streuselkuchen, Mettwurst [and] Sauerkraut [remained as] humble but useful and permanent contributions of Deutschtum to the Australian people.”\textsuperscript{212} Kathleen Conzen, attempting to articulate a value-neutral assessment of the German presence in America, harks back to a metaphor coined in the 1870s by the German-American historian Friedrich Kapp. Kapp had conceptualized the German share in shaping the American identity in the form of an undersea fairy landscape that is rarely seen. That landscape becomes “visible” only occasionally, when the metaphoric waves of American life temporarily ebb away. Developing Kapp’s theme, Conzen observes that Germans in America, while realizing that to challenge the massive American identity was beyond them for a multiplicity of reasons, staked a claim for “the legitimacy of ethnic cultural difference” that, though hidden (like Kapp’s fairy landscape), nevertheless existed and may be conceived as ultimately enduring.

\textsuperscript{209} Warrayure Lutheran Church. \textit{History through Faith, passim.}
\textsuperscript{210} “Through hardship to the stars” or figuratively, “Through trials to success” (Latin saying). The second proverb, from Horace's famous ode, is commonly translated as “I shall grow in the esteem of future generations.” It is the motto of the University of Melbourne.
\textsuperscript{212} Walker, “German-language Press and People in South Australia,” 137.
within the pluralism of America’s modern society. This interpretation is as valid in America as in Australia. It means that, though the German community’s use of their native language may have ceased by the time the war broke out, and many of the signs and customs of their ethnic uniqueness had disappeared (as Lyng noted), or become akin to an undersea fairy landscape (as per Kapp), the “presence” of the community had become more indirect, imagined rather than overt and visible. This realization leads us directly back to Benedict Anderson’s imagined community concept. Thus, Robin Walker’s Christmas tree and Sauerkraut, Ferdinand von Mueller’s Botanic Gardens, Goethe’s and Herlitz’ perception of “their” German communities—all these had become mere signs or symbols, forming part of an underlying national and social progression, visible one moment and hidden the next.

Stefan Manz introduces several new, though relevant, ideas. Alluding to Luebke’s research on Germans in Brazil, he notes that that community had resisted assimilation into Brazil’s Latin and Roman Catholic culture, even including German Catholics. They felt no affinity for Brazil’s culture and preferred their German ethnicity; in this they succeeded. In America the situation was entirely different, because Germans felt an affinity with many of America’s social norms and actually sought to be “identified with the Anglo-American success story and thus were ready to assimilate [into it].”\(^{213}\) Manz uses the German word *Assimilationsbereitschaft* (willingness to become assimilated). It is not unreasonable to apply the same also to Australia. That signifies that, notwithstanding the hurt of having their institutions abolished, and having to endure persecution and loss of rights, the German-Australian experience clearly points to the fact that (especially urban) Germans, either deliberately or by default, chose to abandon their language and to jettison their customs and ethnic cohesion. In urban environments, that seemed to be not only natural, logical, and convenient, but inevitable. Their own leaders even encouraged this. Puettmann, Muecke and other German community leaders had consistently encouraged their compatriots with such admonitions as “Not Germans, not Englishmen, we want to be Australians,” and many of their compatriots must have agreed, as the evidence overwhelmingly proves.\(^{214}\) We have already noted that Victoria’s German-language papers lapsed, largely because they

\(^{213}\) Manz, *Constructing a German Diaspora*, 135.

lost the interest of their readers. Victoria’s “German poet” Theodor Mueller desperately tried to stem the trend by urging his compatriots,

Lasst euch nicht euer Deutschtum rauben, Vergesst die deutsche Sprache nicht!215

Let no-one take away your German ways, Do not abandon your German language!

It was all to no avail.

One may even argue that the decline of the urban German community confirmed a social Darwinism where, to quote Walter Bagehot, “the strongest tend to be the best” and survive.216 Ergo, that a natural law ensures that minorities disappear, either by being destroyed or by fading out of existence through voluntary assimilation. Thus, are we unjustly blaming Hughes and Anglo-Australian jingoism, however obnoxious their actions may have been? Did their actions not take place within a framework of inevitability? My conclusion is that there is no single cause that could be cited, or even be blamed for the decline of the German community. It was a combination of all of those alluded to above. Yet, surprisingly, few of the writers consulted appear to draw attention to this perplexing fact.

5.12 After the war

Perusing Trove references to Germans and their activities in the post-war years yields very little, indicating that, in the print media at least, the community had become virtually invisible. News of the inhumane deportation policy carried out by the Federal government’s Aliens Board, whose arbitrary practices bordered on illegality, where often German-born husbands were separated from their Australian-born wives and children, rarely made it into the papers. Over 5,000 persons of German background, including many long-time residents, naturalized and even Australian-born, were thus removed from Australia.217 Few Australians heeded the conciliatory call in the Yackandandah Times that “now the war is ended some formula of peace should be adopted with German-born Australians.”218 Rather, Canon Coupe, in what a local paper
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celebrated as a “masterly address,” in 1929 could still preach anti-German hate to Portland’s children.\(^{219}\) The German Club in Collins Street had been closed and turned into the Army and Navy Club.\(^{220}\) Yet there were some timid signs of survival. The former Club Tivoli was allowed to resume ownership of the Turnverein premises in Victoria Parade, and after long and protracted negotiations in 1931 was granted, by special parliamentary decision, a liquor licence for its over 220 surviving members. The report poignantly used the words, “to restore…[its] former position in its community.” That, however, was a pious hope because that had become impossible.\(^{221}\) There was little inducement to re-constitute a German community on the pre-war basis, not only because its numbers had drastically declined, but because they had lost the will to do so.

The post-war decade brought major changes to Australian society. Among these, a new force emerged in the person of Belgian-born academic Augustin Lodewyckx. Appointed under the most inauspicious circumstances, the successor to Walter von Dechend eventually came to play a major role in the rehabilitation of German culture, though few German survivors of the war were willing to re-constitute themselves as a distinct community.

Little did the university realize that Lodewyckx was an ideal choice. As a Belgian, he was free to speak his mind without raising eyebrows. Those able to judge real ability, like A.R. Chisholm, brilliant French and German scholar at the University, judged him “one of the finest scholars that the University of Melbourne has ever had on its staff.” “Although larger than most of the men around him, he…did not receive the formal recognition he deserved,” wrote Gavin Long in “‘His Human Milestones.’”\(^{222}\)

Never hesitant to use the press, Lodewyckx resorted to it frequently. In a long Argus report on a recent visit to Europe, he expressed the conviction that, like other European countries, Australia should encourage the teaching of languages, especially German. The reason, he argued, was that it was a language essential in research, especially in science and engineering. He noted that Britain, France and Belgium continued German studies throughout the war, and that Australia had been quite negligent. He dismissed the notion that it was “an enemy language,” least of all because thousands of ethnic Germans had fought on the Allied side. He concluded by noting that

\(^{219}\) Portland Guardian, April 29, 1929, 3.
\(^{220}\) Australasian, December 10, 1927, 64.
\(^{221}\) “A German Club,” Age, September 30, 1930, 12; ibid, November 21, 1930, 7; ibid., “German Club Registered,” February 3, 1931, 5.
French President Poincaré had pointed out that “to dominate German science we must know it ...[and] we must not close our eyes to foreign literature [including German].”

In consequence, in 1922 the Victorian Education Department announced plans to return German to the syllabus because of its importance in science.

There are regular reports on Lodewyckx’ activities, including his promotion to an Associate Professorship in May 1922. His numerous public lectures and appearances attracted attention, and his activities and projection of the importance of German studies once more raised its status, both at the university and in the wider popular perception. While a return to the halcyon pre-war days was unlikely, an awareness of their fellow Germans and their culture gradually re-emerged in Victoria without negative connotations.

5.13 Conclusion

The present chapter has brought closure to numerous issues raised in the preceding chapters, but particularly to the themes examined in the two preceding chapters. Recapitulating, these were the brief, and ultimately short-lived, attempt by the German community to unite and act as a purposeful and, to an extent, independent ethnic group within the Anglo-Australian majority, as discussed in Chapter Three. Chapter Four examined the complex relationships the community was forced to maintain within the context of German (metropolitan), British and Australian imperialist ambitions and the ideological crossfire this rivalry generated. In consequence, a weak German community, on all the evidence scarcely able to survive the grave challenges it would have to face, entered the phase of World War I. It seemed a foregone conclusion that it was ill-equipped to resist a fiercely pro-British superpatriotic onslaught by the cumulative effect of government regulations, home front assaults, and a biased and vicious press.

The investigation in the present chapter throws into relief the differences between urban and rural communities. Though not unique in themselves, these highlight significant factors able to hold a community together. For the former, this was manifest by the greater level of assimilation this community had experienced; its reliance on social and political support by an infrastructure of German Vereine.

223 “Study of German,” Argus, July 2, 1921, 4.
225 Between 1920 and 1930 Lodewyckx’ name has 105 “hits” in Trove. These continue in the 1930s, when he became a prominent author of historical and linguistic publications.
(associations) that was rapidly becoming vulnerable as the result of wartime measures and regulations, apart from showing signs of senescence; the dispersed residential arrangements and lack of ethnic neighbourhoods that would have been able to act as cohesive forces; a lack of shared professional or even “lifestyle” activities; and the loose involvement with the German Lutheran church.

Rural communities were characterized by their geographic isolation from the dominant Anglo community, which became a major cushioning factor; their close (at Hochkirch) or closely interconnected residential arrangements (at Tabor, Warrayure, Byaduc); the collaborative and often shared rural activities and resources (harvesting, machinery, draft animals); and a multifaceted participatory involvement with the local Lutheran church.

For urban dwellers, the protection by, and commitment to, their various protective facilities (associations and clubs) was often tentative and largely inadequate in stress situations. Community cohesiveness, that could serve as a protective mechanism to ward off attacks, was largely lacking. While rural dwellers faced almost identical forms of persecution, their stronger internal and inter-personal links with the community equipped them better to deal with them.

While canvassing a range of factors aiding or hindering the survival of the small German community within the much larger Anglo majority, including natural erosion, or the principle of social Darwinism of the stronger subduing the weak, the main thrust of this chapter has been to provide the documentary proof to the hypothesis originally put forward in Chapter Two, namely which of the two sections of the German community—rural or urban—was better equipped to withstand the challenges it encountered. The evidence in support of rural communities has been conclusively provided.
Conclusion

In charting the trajectory of the German community in Victoria over the eighty years between 1850 and 1930, this thesis set out to determine how that community was formed and held together, and why it eventually declined, by identifying and analyzing the numerous factors affecting its growth and decline. Significant in this investigation has been how the community was seen by its Anglo-Australian hosts, and how it saw itself. The surprising picture that emerges is that over time, instead of gaining strength and cohesion, the community became progressively weaker by disregarding its leaders, its press and its various institutions, thus losing focus and direction despite a brief period of unity. Its evolution highlights a perplexing paradox that, despite the respect it had gained on account of the ability, skills and industriousness of its members, in the end the community failed. What were the roots of its weakness? Why were the efforts of its press and its leaders in vain, despite continuously urging it to seek recognition and equality? Indeed, why did the community abandon its press and disregard its leaders? Was it aware that such shortcomings would adversely affect its future well-being?

When James Bergquist, though writing about the German community in America, noted that “Even the most elaborate of immigrant community structures may carry the seeds of its own [eventual] decline,” did he mean this to be an irrefutable fact or a self-fulfilling prophecy? Perhaps the answer does not matter because, in either case, it sums up the fate of Victoria’s Germans; it is the purpose of this thesis to identify the reasons.¹

In the first chapter of this thesis, the processes of displacement, emigration and the early stages of community development were examined. The investigation of a variety of push factors, including economic hardship, famine, political and social suppression, all leading to the often heart-breaking decision to emigrate, already points to the important fact that most East-Elbian emigrants coming to Victoria left their homeland in response to poverty and privations, but that their leaving represented an escape rather than a desire for reform. This reactive response, even at that early juncture, provides the evidence of a mental attitude that would ultimately determine the direction the German community would adopt. This passive outlook remains a core theme throughout the thesis. A brief examination of the activities of German diggers on the Victorian goldfields—many of them urbanized, often well-educated and

¹ Bergquist, “German Communities,” 16.
entrepreneurially motivated, but mostly from Western German regions—illustrates a conspicuous contrast with the political passivity of East-Elbian settlers, who would dominate Victoria’s German community. Another theme running through the thesis is the dichotomy between urban and rural settlements. This phenomenon became evident as early as the 1850s, and is examined in considerable detail in the second chapter.

While Chapter One provided the historiographical background on emigration and early settlement, Chapter Two focused on the early phases of community development following three separate waves of immigration: the arrival of East-Elbian peasants sponsored by Victorian businessmen Westgarth, Thomson, Dutton and others; the overland transmigration of Germans from South Australia; and the flood of German goldseekers arriving from 1852 onwards. While these newcomers represented a considerable increase in Victoria’s German population, and while three distinct settlement areas had already evolved by the late 1850s, the formation of a true, cohesive and actively interconnected community had not yet occurred. That was despite the fact that, by 1860, the community had established several German newspapers and a number of German associations, that a number of German Lutheran schools were active in various parts of the colony, and that two Lutheran Synods had given a formal character to religious activities.

A hypothesis about the vitality of the German community, and its potential to survive and retain its integrity in an Anglo cultural and political environment, was put forward in Chapter One. This hypothesis was further developed and re-examined progressively in all subsequent chapters, with particular regard to the community’s distinct rural and urban division. A conclusion is eventually proposed in Chapter Five.

The subjects examined in Chapter Three represent what might be termed an epiphany in the life of Victoria’s German community. In the period covered, commencing in 1870, the community for the first time acted as a true community, aware of its status, entitlements and the value of espousing—and acting according to—a collective will. The chapter then explored how this new-found self-assurance arose and manifested itself, how it helped to overcome the community’s previous passivity, and what impact the unification of its original homeland had in changing its attitudes. Though short-lived, this temporary change in the relationship between the community and its Anglo hosts resulted in increased respect and recognition. The concluding arguments of this chapter examined and analyzed the reasons why the momentum of the community’s unity was not maintained, and foreshadow some of the medium and long-
term consequences. Within little more than a decade after the unification of Germany, the new Reich’s emerging role as an economic and military power led to major international political re-adjustments by Great Britain and Australia. Their significance in turn impacted profoundly on how Australians saw the German community. Chapter Four assessed these changes, juxtaposing the attitudes of the German community towards their hosts and vice versa. The seminal findings and outcomes of this investigation point at the serious weakness evident in the German community. Its uncertainty, lack of direction and failure to encourage community leadership to guide its progress set the climate for its position at the beginning of World War I.

In the final chapter, the German community, weak and unprepared, but to some extent ignorant and unaware of these inadequacies, was turned into an Australian substitute for the hated enemy at the Western Front. Unable to respond to a system of massive political and economic persecution, both at the official and local level, the community largely collapsed. The investigation shows that, with few exceptions, the community’s institutions were neither able nor willing to offer any resistance, and it identifies the reasons that reveal clear differences between rural and urban community attitudes and responses. It was shown that several rural enclaves in Western Victoria survived, and the chapter explores the reasons for this surprising outcome. It identifies two chief factors, namely the strength of religious (Lutheran) beliefs, and the resilient nature of a congregational infrastructure that largely lacked any ethnic characteristics, but was based on faith, tradition, and the will to survive. The chapter closes by identifying the few remaining signs of the former community in the post-war urban environment, and advances suggestions for their long-term significance.

In some respect, this investigation merely represents a beginning. Countless topics invite further research, like the almost inexhaustible subjects of migration studies, of transculturalism, survival, access to and use of power, research on belonging, and of sharing in traditions and community memory. Studies on how competing immigrant communities relate to one another in a shared environment are still virtually non-existing. Other future research could focus on the pivotal role of the churches in the nineteenth century. Reference to the Lutheran church permeates this thesis, yet my own treatment has invariably been merely superficial. Few modern approaches to the role of religion as a political and social force have been attempted. More than any other desideratum, a comprehensive modern English-language treatise on the German community in Australia is badly needed.
It seems a paradox that the powerful but divisive force of the Lutheran church should ultimately serve as the godmother of the surviving German rural community, while the urban community’s influential cultural and scientific contribution to Victorian history seemed to be consigned to become virtually invisible. What the nineteenth century German-American historian Friedrich Kapp had described as a “submerged fairy landscape” was in fact far less of a phantom than a reality that has endured, in America as much as in Australia. This thesis has set out to address this important but largely forgotten part of Victorian history. It is a facet of Victoria’s history that deserves to be brought back to current awareness, and it is my hope that its complexity may serve to encourage further scholarly investigation.
Appendix 1

Table 1 Population growth: 1841 and 1890
East-Elbian provinces of Prussia, Mecklenburg and Saxony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population in 1841</th>
<th>Population in 1890</th>
<th>Growth in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>1,545,000</td>
<td>2,542,000</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerania</td>
<td>1,071,000</td>
<td>1,21,000</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posen</td>
<td>1,254,000</td>
<td>1,752,000</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>2,905,000</td>
<td>4,224,000</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Schwerin</td>
<td>498,000</td>
<td>578,000</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Strelitz</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingdom of Saxony</td>
<td>1,716,000</td>
<td>3,503,000</td>
<td>104.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Sautter. *Deutsche Geschichte seit 1815: Daten, Fakten, Dokumente*, vol.1, 17, 22-3.

Appendix 2

Table 2 German overseas emigration, 1835-1904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Total in 000</th>
<th>To U.S. in 000</th>
<th>* To Aust.</th>
<th>Others in 000</th>
<th>To US %</th>
<th>To Australia %</th>
<th>Others %</th>
<th>% of total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1835-39</td>
<td>94,0</td>
<td>85,4</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-49</td>
<td>308,3</td>
<td>285,0</td>
<td>23,3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-54</td>
<td>728,2</td>
<td>654,2</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>64,9</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-59</td>
<td>372,0</td>
<td>321,8</td>
<td>9,445</td>
<td>40,8</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-64</td>
<td>225,8</td>
<td>204,2</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>16,2</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-69</td>
<td>542,5</td>
<td>519,5</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>19,3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-74</td>
<td>484,7</td>
<td>450,9</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>28,3</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-79</td>
<td>146,4</td>
<td>120,0</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>20,9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880-84</td>
<td>864,3</td>
<td>797,9</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>61,5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-89</td>
<td>498,2</td>
<td>455,6</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>39,9</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-94</td>
<td>462,2</td>
<td>428,1</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>32,3</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-99</td>
<td>142,5</td>
<td>120,2</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-04</td>
<td>140,8</td>
<td>128,6</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:
The Australian figures (*) in Table 2, derived from Grothe, are surprising. They show a dramatic rise in the 1900-04 time bracket. The lower German figures for 1900-1901 have become inflated after much higher Australian immigration figures kick in from 1902 onwards.
Walker’s rough-and-ready proportions for the period 1871-85, of US: 95 per cent; Brazil: 2 per cent; other South America: 1 per cent; Australia: 1 per cent; Canada and Africa combined: 1 per cent, correspond fairly well to the actual figure for Brazil given by Hic Leones (43,661), but there is little correspondence to the Australian figures.¹ Hic Leones—a clandestine bureau providing German statistical data on the Internet that is considered reliable but lacks conventional source documentation—is useful by providing destination figures for departures from German ports (i.e. excluding French and Belgian ports) for 1871 to 1891, viz. Brazil: 43,661; Australia: 17,753.

Moenckmeier, using figures from Boedicker, provides a breakdown by East-Elbian Prussian provinces up to 1871 and independent (non-Prussian) states.² Hic Leones’ figures for selected periods then continue them to 1890. In both cases, they are based solely on departures from German ports, and thus leave a huge gap for departures via British, French, Dutch and Belgian ports.³

Grothe comments on the unreliable nature of various published emigration and immigration statistics, and particularly draws attention to the differences between German estimates, official German emigration figures, and official Australian immigration figures.⁴ Australia-wide, he claims a total of 54,028 immigrants for the years 1847-1901.⁵

The differences between the above figures and immigration figures given in Borrie, Italians and Germans, pages 157-67 passim, should be noted.

Table 3 Emigration figures for East-Elbian districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1844-71⁶</th>
<th>1871-81 and 1887-90⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg</td>
<td>52,091</td>
<td>49,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomerania</td>
<td>91,279</td>
<td>121,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silesia</td>
<td>39,957</td>
<td>32,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxony (Kingdom)</td>
<td>19,808</td>
<td>36,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Schwerin</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>33,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg-Strelitz</td>
<td>188,860</td>
<td>4,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Moenckmeier, Die deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung (for 1844-71); Hic Leones (for 1871-81 and 1887-90).

¹ Walker, Germany and the Emigration, 181; see also Josephy, Die deutsche ueberseeische Auswanderung, passim; Hic Leones http://wiki-de.genealogy.net/Deutsche_Auswanderer
² Moenckmeier, Die deutsche uberseeische Auswanderung, 78-9,82.
⁴ Grothe, Die Deutschen in Uebersee, 265-70, passim.
⁵ ibid., 276.
⁶ Moenckmeier, op.cit., 78-9,82. For Prussian provinces the figures are based on Boedicker, op.cit.
⁷ Hic Leones, op.cit.
Appendix 3

1. A select list of early travel accounts of Australia

Note: Few of the earliest German-language books and travel accounts are available for consultation in Australia. In part I had to rely on details provided by Koplin; Zimmermann; Bodi; Bodi, Jeffries and Radvansky; Jeffries;8 and the catalogue of the Deutsche Bibliothek (Frankfurt/Leipzig).

Titles marked with an asterisk * have been physically inspected.


*1966 reprint consulted.

*Forster, Reinhold. Jo ann Rein ol Forster’s Reise um ie Welt ren en Ja ren 177 is 177 , in em von einer itztregieren en Gross rittannisc en Ma est t au nt ekungen ausgesc ickten un urc en Capitain Cook ge rten c i e T e Resolution unternommen / beschrieben und herausgegeben von dessen Sohn un Reaise ge rten Georg Forster vom Ver asser sel st aus em en glisc en ersetzt, mit em Wesentlic sten aus es Capitain Cooks Tage c ern un an ern Zus tzen r en eutsc en Leser verme rt un urc Kup er erl utert. Berlin: Haude & Spener, 1784.


*A slightly later 1791 edition consulted.


A well-informed polemicist and historian who wrote extensively about Australia. A

geographer and teacher, he built up a reputation as the foremost expert on Southeast Asia and the South Pacific. However, he never visited the region.

2. Publications after 1840, including accounts by immigrants.
It will be noted that few of the titles relate directly to Port Phillip (Victoria).

Gerstaecker, Friedrich. *Reisen um die Welt.* Leipzig: Wigand 1847. 5 vols. The author was a prolific traveller and writer. The present work appeared in several editions, and it is likely that later editions covered the author’s experiences of a twelve-month stay in Australia in 1851, spent largely in South Australia but also visiting Victoria. Koplin, though not citing this work, claims that Gerstaecker painted a fairly sympathetic picture of German life in Australia but found America a more suitable migration destination. Australia provided the background to several of the author’s later novels briefly referred to in the preceding chapter.9


A merchant, *de facto* immigration agent and Prussian consul in Sydney, Kirchner published this pamphlet on his visit to his home town of Frankfurt am Main in 1848, not solely for the purpose of information, but also for reasons of self-interest.

*Westgarth, William. *Australia Felix; or, a Historical and Descriptive Account of the settlement of Port Phillip …* Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1848. On the initiative of Eduard Delius, part of this work, in German translation, was published in the *Allgemeine Auswanderungszeitung* 41 (October 9, 1848): 645-9.10


*Heyne, Ernst Bernhard, Mittheilungen ueber eine Reise nach Australia Felix. Vielseitige Nachrichten ueber das Land, seine Einwohner und Verhaeltnisse des seit Februar 1849 dort lebenden Ernst Heyne aus Dresden.* Dresden: Roempler, 1850. A botanist and gardener from Meissen, Saxony, who later built up a notable career in Victoria and later South Australia, arrived at Port Phillip in 1849. Several of his letters to his family in Germany were published in book form by C.H.R. Roempler.11


---

10 Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 37,69 (note 3).
11 Reproduced in Darragh and Wuchatsch, *op.cit.*, 147-62.
A South Australian settler and newspaper proprietor, Reimer presented a well-informed personal account including a critique of the immigration agent Eduard Delius for exaggerating the advantages of Australia.


Heising, Albert. *Suedaustralien: Vortrag, gehalten im wissenschaftlichen Verein zu Berlin... am 16. Maerz 1850.* Berlin: J.A. Wohlgemuth, 1852. A well-informed polemicist, historian and academic who wrote several books about Australia. He showed that Germans could live in that continent, and that there were some definite advantages—particularly noting the seemingly limitless supply of land. In overcrowded “Germany” land was always seen as one of life’s most desirable possessions. Though widely-travelled, Heising never visited Australia.¹³


*Heising, Albert. *Die Deutschen in Australien.* Berlin: J.A. Wohlgemuth, 1853. A strong advocate of a Wakefield-style immigration scheme, he was a well-informed yet highly critical observer of German activities in both South Australia and Victoria despite the fact he never visited.

*— —Das australische Festland, die Goldentdeckungen und die Civilisation er see.* Regensburg: Manz, 1855.

*Hoehne, Carl Traugott. *Auswanderung nach Australien: von ihm selbst erzählt.* Bautzen: C.G. Hiecke, 1853. Hoehne, a Wend, shoemaker by trade, emigrated in 1850 and published a book about his Port Phillip experiences between 1850 and his return to Saxony in 1852. Prior to the book, two of his letters to his family were published in the Bautzen Wendish newspaper *Tydzenske Nowiny* (on December 13 and 20, 1851).¹⁴ Hoehne was a disappointed immigrant, and his book reflects many of his negative impressions of life in Victoria.

*Bruhn, Georg H. *Mittheilungen über die australischen Kolonien, nach eigenen Erfahrungen und Betrachtungen.* Hamburg: Perthes, 1855. Dr Bruhn was one of the discoverers of gold in Victoria.


¹² Lodewyckx, *Die Deutschen*, 50-1.
¹³ Ibid., 49.
¹⁴ Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg to Hobsons Bay*, 167-217, passim.
includes a few glimpses of his personal experiences in Victoria, is a total re-write of Friedrich Christmann’s *Australien* (1870) and a comprehensive account of Australia, published in his capacity as an author and publisher.

**Appendix 4**

**Population analysis of Germantown, 1860s to 1880s**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Number of individuals</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandenburg, Silesia</td>
<td>ca. 245</td>
<td>“core” long-term settlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holstein and north of Hamburg</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>large proportion intermarried with locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews from various German districts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>did not stay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other German districts</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>an unknown number stayed &amp; intermarried with locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>ca. 20</td>
<td>approx. half intermarried with locals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on Lorraine Phelan, *The Geelong Germans*. 
Appendix 5

Rural stability survey

Purely as an illustration, ten German names were taken at random from E.V. Risk, *Properties and Residential: Western District, Victoria; Mid-1880s to 1990; Names, Time and Place* [n.p.: c.1995], Part 2, “Owner Names.” Risk took the names and property locations for this directory from the local newspaper, the *Hamilton Spectator*. I have noted the most recent mention of the names I selected.

These names were compared with early settler families bearing the same surnames listed in Elizabeth Huf, *Courage, Patience and Persistence*, 2003. Nine of the family names appear in both Risk and Huf and are associated with the same or a close-by district.

This tabulation is self-explanatory. Although it is not a scientific corroboration of my argument, it is a useful indicator of residential stability of early German settlers in the Western District of Victoria.

The stability of German rural settlements is also discussed in Spennemann, “Keeping it in the Family,” *passim*, Leask, “Soil, Seed and Souls,” *passim*, and Conzen, “Phantom Landscapes of Colonization,” *passim*. Ancestry.com has been consulted as an additional tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date first mentioned as local settlers in E.Huf, <em>Courage, Patience and Persistence</em></th>
<th>Date of most recent mention in E.V.Risk, <em>Properties and Residential</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buerger</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahle</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkenberg</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habel</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haebich</td>
<td>prior to 1919*</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrmann</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch</td>
<td>ca.1866</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehmann</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Verified in Ancestry.com
### Appendix 6

**Lutheran schools in Victoria from 1853. Alternate names are given after /**

1. Schools associated with the Victorian Synod

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operated from/to</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>1854-68</td>
<td>following the split in the church in 1860 brief dual (ELSA-ELSVic) operation, then run by both synods to 1868; then became a common, later state school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Melbourne</td>
<td>1854-73</td>
<td>building used as state school 1874-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mecklenburg/Westgarthtown</td>
<td>1855-64</td>
<td>operated informally before 1855 and final closure in 1880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Flats</td>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwick/Harkaway</td>
<td>1856-75 or 1876</td>
<td>became a state school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat</td>
<td>1857-ca.1864</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bendigo/Sandhurst</td>
<td>ca.1857-63, possibly to 1872</td>
<td>became a state school in 1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldau/Doncaster</td>
<td>1860-64. Contd. as a Congregational Lutheran school until 1884</td>
<td>continued as Lutheran school in the home of teacher Schramm until 1876. Eventually became a state school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoresby/Bayswater</td>
<td>ca.1870-ca.1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Schools associated with the ELSA Synod. Except for Germantown all are located in the Western District, the Wimmera, and the Mallee district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Operated from/to</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkona/Gruenwald/Katyil West</td>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>closed following major population exodus to Riverina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byaduc/Neukirch</td>
<td>ca.1857-80</td>
<td>see under ELSVic, above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>ca. 1860-(1-2 years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Lake</td>
<td>ca.1875-1914</td>
<td>long lapses between 1890 and 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hochkirch/ Tarrington</td>
<td>ca.1853-late 1900s</td>
<td>Victoria’s largest Lutheran school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katyil</td>
<td>1891-1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewell</td>
<td>1900-59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchheim/Minyip</td>
<td>1875-1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornheim/Dimboola</td>
<td>1877-1912</td>
<td>A second school 1898-1903; informal part-time to 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Linlithgow</td>
<td>1862-1953</td>
<td>very chequered but largely continuous history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murtoa/Marma Gully</td>
<td>1873-75</td>
<td>New school 1887-?? Closely connected with Concordia College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7

A survey of early settlers in Waldau (Doncaster), Westgarthtown (Thomastown), Berwick (Harkaway) and Hochkirch (Tarrington), showing origin (region, district) and approximate arrival date. Dates in some cases are of arrival in Melbourne rather than at the respective settlement. As all names have been randomly selected, these lists are indicative rather than comprehensive.

#### 1. Waldau

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Arrival/settlement date</th>
<th>Home town/village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aumann</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Profen and Kohlhoe, Lower Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denhardt aka Dehnert</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Ohlau near Breslau, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Quirl, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fromhold</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Striegau, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanke</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Lederose, Lower Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leber</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Metschkau near Striegau, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Ahrenloe, Holstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rieschieck</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Peterswaldau, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosel</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Pielitz near Bautzen, Upper Lusatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schramm</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Ellgut, Upper Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuhkraft</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Heilbronn, Wuerttemberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straube</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Torga, Upper Lusatia, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiele</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Saerichen near Niesky, Upper Lusatia, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uebergang</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Baersdorf, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walther</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Goerlitz, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Neu-Buckow, Mecklenburg-Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittig</td>
<td>prior to 1861</td>
<td>Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerbe</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Griesel, Prussia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Meyer, Nurseries of the Church, passim; Mees, A German Church, 104-8, passim; Wehner, Heimat Melbourne, 115-23, passim.
### 2. Westgarthtown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graf</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Preske near Bautzen, Lusatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Liegnitz, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Drehsa near Bautzen, Lusatia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreitling</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Steckendorf, Brandenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltzahn</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Heuckendorf, Mecklenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebel</td>
<td>ca.1855</td>
<td>Magdeburg, Province Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeber</td>
<td>mid-1850s</td>
<td>Rossach, Wurtemberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuchatsch</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Saerka near Bautzen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siebel</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Zachau, Silesia and Eichach, Wurtemberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziebell</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Neu-Buckow, Mecklenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmer</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Weissig near Bautzen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Harkaway

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aurisch</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Gross-Reichen, Lower Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolduan</td>
<td>before 1860</td>
<td>Pomerania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruhn</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Flensburg, Holstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubberke</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Altkrakow, Pomerania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edebohls</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>Debstedt, Hanover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelke</td>
<td>possibly Inse, East Prussia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erdmann</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Fehmarn, Denmark; Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleer</td>
<td>prior to 1862</td>
<td>Herford, Westphalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fritzlaff</td>
<td>ca.1853</td>
<td>possibly Stolpmuende, Pomerania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halleur</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Mecklenburg-Schwerin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessel</td>
<td>ca.1862</td>
<td>Kreuznach, Rhineland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillbrich</td>
<td>ca.1855</td>
<td>Goerlitz, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huebner</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Kreuznach, Rhineland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kobelke</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Bunzlau, Lower Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koenig</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Fraustadt and Bersdorf, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzenthin</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Zuellichau, Brandenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>ca.1852</td>
<td>Basle, Switzerland or Salzgitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump</td>
<td>prior to 1871</td>
<td>Ahrenlohe, Holstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumpf</td>
<td>ca.1854</td>
<td>possibly Pomerania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholz</td>
<td>ca.1844</td>
<td>Leutmannsdorf, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillack/Tillach</td>
<td>ca.1857</td>
<td>Reidnitz, Crossen, Brandenburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tschirner</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Bersdorf near Jauer, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsdorf</td>
<td>ca. 1854</td>
<td>Erbach, Nassau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanke</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>originally Merzdorf, Silesia, later Berlin, Prussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmbrunn</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Warmbrunn, Silesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiese</td>
<td>ca.1855</td>
<td>Wedendorf, Mecklenburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Between the 1854 and 1861 Victorian censuses, Harkaway’s population rose from 24 to 123 (Darragh and Wuchatsch, *From Hamburg*, 131)
Sources for Tables 1-3: Darragh and Wuchatsch, op.cit., passim; Trinity German Lutheran Church, East Melbourne. Marriage registers; Beaumont and Curran, *Early Days of Berwick*, 69-84, passim; Iwan, *Um des Glaubens willen, passim; Funk,* Die ersten hundert Jahre, passim; Ancestry.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Hochkirch (Tarrington) and district</th>
<th>1853</th>
<th>Rachlau, Lower Silesia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burger/Buerger</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Meschwitz, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutscher</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Doberschuetz near Bautzen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gude</td>
<td>ca. 1854</td>
<td>Baschuetz near Bautzen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huf</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Nekla, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hundrack</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Baschuetz, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mibus</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Nekla, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirtschin</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Doehlen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noske</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Nekla, Posen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Mueller</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Bad Schmiedeberg, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petschel</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Neukirch, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentsch</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Wohla, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuermann</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Schledehausen near Osnabrueck, Westphalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Gross-Saubernitz near Bautzen, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Weigersdorf, Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zerbst</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Schwersenz, Posen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Huf, *Courage, Patience, passim.*
Appendix 8

Analysis of the subscription lists of donors supporting victims of the war

This highly selective list is based on details given in the summary of contributions to the victims of the war provided in *Germans in Victoria: the Franco-Prussian War Benefit Subscription Lists*, compiled by Darragh and Struve (1995).

The purpose of this tabulation is to indicate rather than accurately enumerate donors at various locations. It includes only part of the 63 collection points claimed by the compilers, and it excludes later contributions and locations that brought the total from the compilers’ figure of £2,773 to a near-final total of over £3,300. New Zealand locations are also excluded. It should also be noted that the figures for Melbourne include the small villages and settlements on the periphery of the metropolis including Westgarthtown/Thomastown and Waldau/Doncaster, but Berwick/Harkaway is listed separately.

The compilers stress that often responses to the call for donations were uneven, and that the role of special collection committees, of local pastors, teachers and other especially committed individuals was significant in the number of donors and amounts donated. Further, as many donors made repeated contributions the compilers endeavoured to eliminate these by listing donors only once.

Of particular significance appear to be the large number of donors (and correspondingly large amounts, not indicated here) in goldfields settlements. My explanation for the latter, though undocumented, is that many of these donors were more recent arrivals, still more closely connected with their country of origin, and preponderantly of non-East-Elbian background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballarat</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beechworth</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castlemaine</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiltern, Indigo and Barnawartha</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnandenthal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton North and South</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harkaway</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hochkirch</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryborough</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neukirch/Byaduc</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhurst/Bendigo</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stawell/Pleasant Creek</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabor</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walhalla</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrnambool</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yandoit</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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