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INTRODUCTION

The field of German religious history still contains large areas requiring groundwork in order to build a complete picture. Recently Richard J. Evans, a respected scholar of German religious history, noted that important issues in the fields of non-orthodox religions have only now begun to be addressed.¹ This study, which will focus on the relationship between the Prussian government and Mormon missionary efforts in Prussia between 1870 and 1914, intends to add a few threads to the larger tapestry of German religious history with the hope that a more accurate portrait can emerge.

The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed the conflict of two vigorous, growing communities, the new Imperial Germany under Prussian dominance and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints or Mormons. Mormonism had officially come to Germany in 1850, but opposition there was ubiquitous and conversions few. Although the Germans—a recently unified state of forty millions flexing their new international muscle—held far more importance than the Latter-day Saints in world opinion and influence, the conflict

¹Richard J Evans, Rethinking German History: Nineteenth Century Germany and the Origins of the Third Reich (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 125, 128.
did not resolve quickly or easily. The challenge presented to the Germans, especially to government officials, by Mormon proselyting occurred in an arena of changing social and cultural norms, an area of unanticipated vulnerability for the Germans, and one which, more often than not, elicited emotional rather than rational responses. The treatment of Latter-day Saint missionaries, therefore, by German officials—both local and national—provides an interesting case study, not only of a different kind of church-state relationship between a powerful government and a small, unwanted American sect, but of the complicated evolution of new social and religious norms, in the face of established political, religious, and social traditions.

In the wake of unification in 1871, Germany experienced tensions between attempts by the established political elites—crown, church and landed and industrial aristocracy—to maintain the current forms of culture and government and the efforts of rising forces—the educated middle classes and the expanding working classes—to gain a voice in national and local government. Earlier forms of cultural stability, such as the role of religion as a social cement and the power of individual German states, faced the necessity of adapting to the new demands of the modernizing, industrializing emergent nation. New ideas and methods, especially in the sphere of culture, were perceived by those who defended the old order as threats to the public weal and German unity and were treated
accordingly, regardless of any actual danger. If the perceived threat came from outside the German cultural area, its presence was considered even less tolerable. The insecurity brought on by this internal turmoil was further enhanced by the ongoing challenges of participation in the increasingly competitive economic and political international arena.

In Germany, religion had long performed an important social and public role, influencing the education and behavior of Germans on a local level, particularly in the case of the Protestant churches which had supported the secular governments since the Reformation days of Luther and Melancthon. The fabric of the country had recently been torn by the battle of the Kulturkampf wherein the powerful Prussian state had unsuccessfully challenged the patriotism of German Catholics, the role of the Vatican and the power of the Catholic Church. Externally, the effort of the newly-established nation with its emphasis on military power, popular nationalist sentiments and search for its "place in the sun," disturbed old balances and allies, including the United States of America. Internally, the rising strength of the Social Democratic Party, the increasing power of agnostic Liberal politicians, the impact of theological intellectuals, and the transformation of the society from agrarian to industrial epitomized the new challenges to the old ecclesiastical culture. It comes as no surprise, therefore, that the presence of new religious movements, particularly those from outside the
accepted German tradition, were deemed irritants and possibly menaces by a state already concerned with an uncertain political future and the desired unity of society.

The activities and doctrines of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons,—an American-born faith viewed by Germans as yet another Anglo-American sect—presented just such an irritation. Established as a new dispensation of divine authority, the Church was intent on building a new society and world, rejecting traditional Christian churches as incomplete and apostate. The Mormon Church from its beginning in 1830 had long espoused a goal to preach its doctrines to the entire world, including the German people, a nationality noted for its cultural and intellectual excellence and held in high esteem by early Church leaders. Founded in a culture known internationally for its religious tolerance and divers religious sects, the Church and its emissaries believed in the enlightened traditions of religious tolerance, separation of church and state, and the legal protection promised by the German constitutions, including the 1850 Prussian constitution. Instead of civility or acceptance, Mormon missionaries in Germany frequently found themselves the target of dislike, distrust, persecution and dismissal, particularly by the local police and civil officials. The various forms of this political and legal treatment and the missionaries’ subsequent responses to them—avoidance of confrontation with local civil authorities, reliance on American diplomatic influence and
eventually laboring without visa until banished—as well as the outcome of the struggle forms the basis of this study. In turn, this inquiry will show that neither the German, primarily Prussian, effort to enforce religious conformity and the Mormon demand for religious freedom according to their interpretation succeeded in altering the opinion or activities of their opponent, but as the Mormons focussed less on confrontation and more on actual missionary work, their membership in Germany continued to grow—although the numbers were not large—until the 1914 outbreak of World War I.

Consideration of this subject requires an understanding of the Prussian governmental position in regulating religious affairs, as well as the areas in which the Latter-day Saints came into conflict with the Prussian government. Persecution of Mormon missionaries in Prussia, and elsewhere in Germany, does not seem to have had the populist participation that British, Scandinavian and Swiss missionary efforts excited. The impetus to remove the Mormons appears to have received support primarily from two elite coteries: the clergy and the educated bureaucrats. From these roots persecution usually developed into a local police matter, rather than a popular religious rejection.

As the majority of the Latter-day Saint missionaries working in Germany possessed American citizenship, they represented more than just a small religious body. They embodied the pluralism of the American democratic culture.
Thus, a unilateral rejection of their mere presence, despite their attempts to comply with legal prescriptions and still pursue their work, presages a growth of intolerance toward diversity within the German civilization.

The documentary evidence for this thesis has been drawn from three main bodies of primary evidence: Prussian police files on Mormon activities; the personal journals; and missionary publications of the Latter-day Saint missionaries and diplomatic documents of the United States representatives in Germany.

The police files reflect the viewpoints of a majority of the Prussian officials as well as a few interviews with actual church members and accounts of Mormon activities such as baptisms and church meetings. The main collection of police files are the Acta betr[effend] die Sekten - der Mormonen, vol. 1: 1853-1903, vol. 2: 1902-1914 [Documents concerning the sects--the Mormons] collected by the Prussian Ministry of Clerical and Education Affairs, which include the main banishment decrees, the few consular reports and a mass of interdepartmental memorandums. A second police file collection, Acta, die Gesellschaft der Mormonen, betr[effend], 1894-1933 [Documents concerning the association of the Mormons], primarily concerns Saxon experiences with the

---

2 A microfilm of volume 1 is in the possession of Dr. Douglas Tobler, while the four reels of volume 2 are in the LDS Archives, Salt Lake City. The originals were found in the Main Government Archive Depository in Merseburg, Germany.
Mormons and is richer in the period after 1914. Other files, primarily Saxon copies of Prussian originals, are cited in the course of the text. In addition to the police files, the study will examine relevant Imperial German legislative files and those legal codes, civil and criminal, which can be acquired, to determine part of the legal background.

The Prussian files are usually couched in official terms, and unless specifically instructed to provide analysis, the various authors adhered closely to the facts. These files do present a few important problems. First, although the Prussians preserved many of the relevant files, internal evidence indicates that several documents of value—including a 1901 ambassadorial report on Mormons—did not remain in the files. Second, the files do not really begin to record events until the 1880s and have significant lacunae, particularly between the years of 1905 and 1907. Finally, the reports from the provinces never refer to or discuss the local influences for actions against Mormons.\(^3\)

In contrast to the official tones of the Prussian files, Mormon sources speak with a variety of voices: the American missionaries, the church periodicals, the *Manuscript History of the German Mission*, and the *Journal History*. The last two sources are a compilation of private letters, public newspaper

---

\(^3\) The life histories and newspaper articles frequently attribute most of the initial problems to interference from the local Protestant clergy, but this information never surfaces in the police reports or the missionary diaries.
accounts and church periodical clippings. Speaking from the Latter-day Saint perspective these narratives present a worldview where events often reflect the providential interaction of God with the world of human beings. The most frequent references to the interference of German clergy in missionary work appear in these accounts, however, these assertions are often hard to verify from available Prussian sources. Mormon sources have unique limitations as well. Deliberations of high church leaders on missionary policy in the nineteenth century are not available for public perusal, and a similar policy governs use of the private papers of most of the church’s leadership—at least for those which are stored in the Archives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Missionary journals tend to be brief, sometimes to the point of incoherence, recording the mundane details of life rather than opining on local events. Letters provide more information, as they frequently describe the missionary’s world, but they are scarce and usually do not discuss mission decisions and policies.

The missionary periodicals, The Millennial Star and the German-speaking Der Stern, have different editorial tones. The Star loudly proclaimed its views with authority, while the Stern trod a more cautious path between religious enthusiasm and an apparent effort not to disturb the various German governments. This could, of course, reflect the fact that Germany and her states had stricter publication requirements
than did Britain, where the European Mission published the *Millennial Star*.

As one might expect, United States government sources do not project the same feeling of a police state oversight which radiate from the Prussian documents, and provide more extensive explanations for decisions. The two major collections used for this study are *Papers Relating to Foreign Relations*, published annually, and the *Diplomatic Instructions* and *Diplomatic Despatches* comprising the communications between the State Department and the embassies. There is some overlap between the two sources, but enough documents are unique to each collection to warrant the inclusion of both sources. Regrettably I have not been able to locate the private papers of some of the primary actors in the embassy during this period. The papers of Ambassadors Andrew Dickson White, Charlemagne Tower and Napoleon Hill, as well as Charge d'affaires/Embassy Secretary John B. Jackson might provide enlightenment concerning their efforts to help the American Latter-day Saints in Germany, particularly in Prussia.

Using these sources, the study examines the Prussian-Mormon relations in the following manner. Chapter One briefly addresses the background of both the German political and religious settings, the development of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the initial Mormon missionary experiences in Germany. Chapter Two considers three issues which played a part in determining the attitude of the
Prussian government: emigration, polygamy and the Social Democratic movement. Chapter Three begins a chronological narration of the interactions, covering the period from 1871-1890. Chapter Four examines the Manifesto of 1890, which marked an overt change in the Mormon practice of polygamy and then traces subsequent events until 1902. Chapter Five investigates the attitudes of the Prussian government and the process by which they determined to resolve the "Mormon question." Chapter Six narrates the reaction of the Mormon missionaries and the subsequent impact of the Prussian decision and its execution upon the missionary work from 1904 until the outbreak of World War I.

This study demonstrates that despite the relative insignificance of the Mormons in Prussian affairs and, by extension, in the affairs of the German Empire, the attitudes and actions of the Prussian officials who strove to resolve the perceived Mormon threat failed to take a fresh view of personal freedoms, including religious liberty, advocating instead a dismissive and potentially destructive course of action. The bureaucratic and often cavalier treatment of the Prussian officials towards American Mormon missionaries reflects the inflexible Prussian mindset towards personal freedom and foreign religions and hints at a future when a religious culture which differed from the accepted Christian norms could suffer more direct retributions.

Similarly, Mormon actions and protestations during this
period also demonstrate the difficulties of adapting to the political realities of a world which disdained Mormon doctrines, especially polygamy. Two goals of the Latter-day Saint leadership, increasing church membership through foreign converts and practicing polygamy, profoundly disturbed the Prussian civil and ecclesiastical authorities, resulting in active hostility and conflict between the Mormons and the Prussian government. Moreover, the Mormon decision to change their stand on polygamy and their missionary approach, and the effort by German Mission Presidents to downplay doctrines or practices repugnant to local German leaders in order to receive permission to preach their message, suggests a future when the church might choose the benefit of government recognition at the price of ignoring the morally oppressive nature of that government, such as later occurred in Hitler's Third Reich and the German Democratic Republic.

In effect, the results of the contest between the Prussian officials and the Mormon missionaries, while hardly affecting contemporary world events, offer insight into the attitudes of both groups which could offer explanations for future actions by both the German nation and Mormon church.
CHAPTER ONE
THE GERMAN AND MORMON SETTINGS

The nineteenth century witnessed the birth and expansion of a wide range of ideas, political movements and even nation-states and religious organizations. Among these new enterprises, the Prussian-dominated German Empire and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, an American-born religion, struggled to take their place on the world stage. Although operating on different planes of concern, they came into conflict over the ideas and practices of religious freedom and social morality. This conflict had its roots not only in the political and social issues of the day, but also in the ideological foundations on which these institutions were built. These foundations can be found in the German socio-religious developments during the Reformation and later, the emergence of the Latter-day Saint, or Mormon, community and the beginnings of Mormon missionary work in Germany.

Germany, which had not acted as a unified nation since 1618, nevertheless possessed a religious and cultural framework dating back for centuries. The introduction of the Reformation took place on German soil in the early sixteenth century. The writings of Martin Luther fostered strong feelings of German national identity, liberating the Germans
from the claims of Roman temporal authority. The German language flourished as Protestant ideas were expressed in the familiar common tongue, rather than in the exclusive Latin. On the negative side, the whole Reformation conflict, including the destructive Thirty Years’ War, 1618-1648, had a further divisive effect on German unity for almost three hundred years.

The Augsburg decision of 1555, which recognized the political impact of the Reformation, and the Peace of Westphalia of 1648\(^1\), established the principle of *cuius regio eius religio*—as the ruler so the religion—in the German states and contributed to the breakup of the unstable Holy Roman Empire into more than three hundred competing regions, Protestant as well as Catholic. New German states emerged from the religious-regional disarray, most importantly the transformation of the territories of the militant Catholic Teutonic Order into the Protestant Duchy of Prussia.\(^2\) This realignment of order in the wake of the Thirty Years’ War, in concert with many other contemporary developments, so weakened the German

\(^1\)The Peace of Westphalia signalled the end of the Thirty Years’ War, a conflict which had begun as a contest between the Catholic and Protestant princes of the Holy Roman Empire. Eventually the major powers of Europe, including Catholic France and Protestant Sweden, entered the fray which became more a struggle to establish a balance of power than a religious battle.

domains that their dominant place in seventeenth century Europe passed to the French kingdom of Louis XIII.

The identification of religious authority with the local political authority, part of Luther's ideals of church and state, led to some interesting developments in Protestant areas, where political reality transferred the office of summus episcopus, local supreme bishop or authority, from the ecclesiastical to the political ruler. This practice reinforced the close correlation between political and religious government. The rule of the populace changing to the religion of their current prince ended shortly after the Peace of Westphalia, so that a Catholic prince could rule a Protestant territory as its supreme religious leader without requiring the wholesale conversion of the populace. As Ernst Helmreich, a noted scholar of German religious history, points out, this odd religious rulership did occur in Prussia and elsewhere. Still, regardless of the denomination, from this period

---


See also Ernst Christian Helmreich, The German Churches Under Hitler, (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1979), 18-19. The office of summus episcopus remained in the hands of the Catholic hierarchy in Catholic lands, not reverting to the political leadership. The superior role of the Papacy remained as a check to territorial independence of the local Catholic church.

4Helmreich, 19.
through the nineteenth century a strong tie existed between the state and an established, dominant church.

A similar complication developed from the establishment of the Landeskirche, the territorial church, in the period following the Thirty Years' War. Every independent political unit initially embraced a single "state church" over which, in the case of Protestants, the prince/summus episcopus presided—in theory—as supreme servant, not master of the church, but this condition changed quickly so that the church soon became part of the state bureaucracy.\(^5\)

The majority of the smaller German states did not retain their independent status, particularly after the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire by Napoleon in 1805, the establishment of the pro-French Confederation of the Rhine in 1806 and the territorial decisions of the 1815 Congress of Vienna. Thus a group of individual Landeskirchen within a single state could come under the jurisdiction of a single political ruler, as happened when Protestant Prussia acquired the Catholic and Reformed Rhenish provinces in 1815. These churches might be unified, if they were all Protestant and both the leadership and the majority of the membership concurred.\(^6\) Again in


\(^6\) Helmreich, 24. This occurred in Nassau in 1817, when the Duke brought together the Reformed and Lutheran groups.
Prussia, the dilemma of a Reformed king and a Lutheran queen led to the development in 1817 of an Evangelical Union between the two faiths which added one more confession to confuse the believer.\textsuperscript{7}

Religious belief and practice did not remain static in Germany during the period following the Peace of Westphalia. New religious thought came over from England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which in turn elicited theological responses from German scholars, partially inspiring the contributions of such influential Enlightenment scholars as Gotthold Lessing and Immanuel Kant.\textsuperscript{8} Important controversy erupted when David Strauss, following the Hegelian model of rational theology, published his work \textit{Life of Jesus, Critically Examined} in 1835. Among a score of unpopular assertions, he implied that a "religious community was responsible for its faith, not the state," an attitude in direct conflict with the traditional social order.\textsuperscript{9}

Pietism, "a program of active Christianization of daily life," also began in the seventeenth century, eventually

\textsuperscript{7}Ibid., 25.


coming to influence government circles toward its view of Christianity by the mid-nineteenth century. The advocates of this movement tended towards social and political conservatism, centering their worship experience in a home environment.

As a further complication, the impact of the Napoleonic Wars kindled German nationalistic feelings, which had few avenues of expression because of the particularistic policies of the various German princes and their governments. Consequently a strong portion of the patriotic fervor attached itself to religious identity. Even Prussia, up till that time a very secular kingdom, began to proclaim itself a Christian state.

Efforts after 1840 by government officials and Pietists to establish their views as socially and politically significant, led to the formation of a counter group, the Lichtfreunde or Friends of Light, a group which spoke out


12The victory of nationalism in the German-speaking nations could conceivably require that independent principalities would have to give up their political existence in order to form a nation of German people. This idea did not sit well with the dynasties, most especially the influential Habsburgs of Austria who presided over a multi-ethnic realm.

13Ward, 53.

14Ibid.
vigorously against the role of government in religious matters. At the same time a different complication—the reluctance of local congregations to pay for more pastors and religious establishments—generated a decline in the number of new clergy at a time when the German population experienced tremendous growth. The efforts of the Prussian kings, particularly Friedrich Wilhelm III and IV, to unite the Protestant religious community and exercise government control over church activities only exacerbated the growing tensions between state-dictated doctrine and personal religious conviction. The general condition of the German Protestant community during the early nineteenth century, therefore, could hardly be called cohesive or cooperative.

The Revolutions of 1848 changed the political foundations of the German absolutist states, driving several princes—including the King of Prussia—to provide a constitution for their subjects. In addition, middle class nationalists joined together in a representative body in Frankfurt am Main to found a united German nation, Austria included. In keeping with the spirit of the day, they formulated a national constitution to codify and order the political rights of the people.

Article V of the Frankfurt constitution concerned itself with religious matters. It delineated four important reli-

---

15Groh, 187., and Sagarra, 213.
16Sagarra, 211.
igious rights. Every German should enjoy complete freedom of religion and conscience. Every German should enjoy unrestricted private [häuserlichen] and public [öffentlichen] worship. Each religious institution—such as the Jesuits and monasteries—should be self-governing, but subject to the state. The corollary stated that new religions could be formed without the permission of the state. Finally, no one should be forced to perform an ecclesiastical ordinance against his will. These rights, which did not survive the 1848 Constitution, were deemed so important that when the Reichstag from December 1900 to March 1901 considered the limits of religious freedom for the entire German Empire, these statutes were included in the source documents which the delegates studied prior to the debate.  

After 1848 Prussia worked to maintain the appearance of religious diversity and freedom, but legal safeguards were prepared by mid-nineteenth century to bolster the existing religious traditions and institutions at the expense of upstart religious bodies. The Prussian State Constitution of 1850, Article 12 states,

Freedom of religious confession, of association in religious societies and of the common exercise of religion in public and private, is guaranteed. The enjoyment of civil and political rights shall not be dependent upon religious belief. But the exercise of religious liberty shall not be permitted to

---

interfere with the civil or political duties of the citizens. 19

Articles 13, 14, and 17 established further legal ecclesiastical parameters: religious associations had no corporate rights, the Christian religion formed the basis of state religious institutions and patronage of the church could be ended by law.20 Similarly Article 30, dealing with non-governmental associations, indicated that these associations must not "contravene the penal laws."21 It further made clear that the law retained the right to impose restrictions on religious expression in the interest of public safety, a term left undefined. Article 31 clearly established that corporate rights, a status which unrecognized religious associations desired for their own protection--new, unorthodox religions--, were the domain of the king and the legislators, as opposed to


20 Ibid., Robinson notes further on page 29 that Articles 15, 16 and 18, which dealt with the internal self-regulation of churches and religious associations and preserved the right of the church leaders to have access to their superiors, became a casualty of the Kulturkampf on June 18, 1875. Prussian state law [Landrecht], for example, differentiated between a religious association and a church, with the former being merely a body of like-minded believers and the latter a government recognized religious movement. For more, see the 1896 edition of the Allgemeine Landrecht für die Preußische Staaten in seiner jetzigen Gestalt. (Berlin: Carl Heymanns Verlag, 1896).

21 Ibid., 32.
"ordinance" powers of the king alone.\textsuperscript{22} So long as the legislature was moderately independent of the king this last qualification would insure that religious bodies which possessed a corporate distinction--such as the recognized churches--would be relatively free from arbitrary treatment by the king and his ministers. Unrecognized bodies, such as the Baptists, suffered the banishment of clergy by royal fiat without recourse.\textsuperscript{23}

On the surface, it appeared that a form of religious freedom existed in Prussia by 1850. This condition was somewhat illusory, since many of the constitutional rights did not take effect until passage of enabling legislation which might take years to accomplish, as in the case of the civil marriage clause of Article 19.\textsuperscript{24} In addition, all that was required to rescind these rights for any particular religious group would be to determine that some part of their doctrine or activity violated criminal law, effectively disguising any effort at harassment as operating in the best interest of the public welfare. In December 1850, King Friedrich Wilhelm IV appointed as Minister of Religious Affairs, Karl Otto von

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 20, 28.

\textsuperscript{23}Orson Spencer, The Prussian Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (London: W. C. Armstrong, 1853), 5.

\textsuperscript{24}Ibid., The Constitution was promulgated in 1850, but the effective legislation waited twenty-five years until the Kulturkampf was raging and these matters became germane to the struggle.
Raumer, with whom he worked to effectively stop any chance of the Evangelical Union acquiring any independence from the state.25 Actual religious freedom along the lines of the nineteenth-century American model remained foreign to Prussia and to most of the other German states.

At the same time, with governmental involvement in religious affairs a legal reality, the conjunction of spiritual and temporal authority to maintain the status quo developed into the symbiotic relationship described as "throne and altar."26 Local church authorities played an important role as the protectors and arbiters of local culture, preserving and protecting the status quo and the local political authorities backed up the church’s rights. Eda Sagarra, a social historian, notes that German governments, especially Prussia, in the early nineteenth century encouraged this trend, in an effort to control the religious culture of the nation. The Prussians appointed conservative, mainstream Pietistic applicants as pastors and other local church leaders, rather than radicals, like the Lichtfreunde and others.27

While the focus has been on Protestantism up to this point, similar movements were occurring in the Catholic states and communities. Jonathon Sperber indicates that the German Catholic culture exhibited both a spiritual revival, similar

25Groh, 261.

26Pierard, 98., Groh, 187.

27Sagarra, 209.
to Pietism, and a tendency towards political and cultural conservatism. It should be noted that, while the parishes usually preferred little change, during the intense constitutional struggles of the 1860s German Catholics did support political liberalization. The most significant difference between the Catholic and Protestant worlds lay in the fealty owed by the Catholics to a non-German authority, the Roman Pope. In an attempt to control this situation, the Prussian Interior Minister von Westphalen and Minister von Raumer in 1852 together circulated a decree clarifying and narrowing the constitutional limits of a cleric's rights to preach, particularly for foreigners.

The declaration of papal infallibility in 1870 with its attendant implication of supreme papal authority in spiritual matters presented German Catholics with a conflict of loyalty whose resolution would eventually test their allegiance, both


30 Ernst Rudolf Huber and Wolfgang Huber Staat und Kirche im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Dokumente zur Geschichte des deutschen Staatskirchenrechts volume 2 "Staat und Kirche im Zeitalter des Hochkonstitutionalismus und des Kulturkampfs 1848-1890" (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1976), 70-71. The clergy would be liable if their actions or preaching transgressed any law or in any way affected "public calm" or in any way led to "dangerous excesses." The decree does not define public calm or dangerous excesses.
to the new nation and to the ancient faith. This tense relationship continued into the entire period of the hard-fought *Kulturkampf*, the struggle of Bismarck and the liberals in the 1870s against Catholic influence on German culture and education.

The year 1870 marks an additional important turning point in the political, and consequently religious, condition of Germany. Just prior to this date twenty-eight separate nations had a sizeable German-speaking population. Using the impetus of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71 on nationalist feeling, Prince Otto von Bismarck maneuvered the reluctant German princes into rekindling a German Empire, excluding Austria and Switzerland. With the creation of this new nation-state, dominated by Prussian interests and military, the German people and culture faced a new future.

In addition to the larger questions of national religious institutions, an important element of German religious culture resides in the traditions of the village. While the ruler might attempt to impose his religious views on a nation, in the individual villages the church played a crucial arbiter role. Karl Siegfried Bader, in his study of German village relationships, noted that the from the medieval period on, the

---

village church stood "at the natural center" of the community.\textsuperscript{32} Church officials supervised the religious and the moral lives of the parishioners.\textsuperscript{33} This condition existed not only in the mountain villages of Bavaria and Austria, but essentially throughout the whole German-speaking region. The pastor even oversaw matters of judgement outside the competence of religion.\textsuperscript{34} Thus, at the simplest level, the roles of the church and government were joined, rather than held separate.

In contrast to the centuries-long German religious evolution, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons, arose in the early nineteenth century from the social and religious setting of Protestant New England. In the American world constitutional guarantees of religious liberty had real political substance.\textsuperscript{35} Individual feeling possessed more relevance in matters of religious choice than state-based moral and spiritual decrees. Diversity, while not always popular, formed an acceptable basis for religious expression.\textsuperscript{36} Any person could profess any persuasion or faith so

\textsuperscript{32}Karl Siegfried Bader, Dorfgenossenschaft und Dorfgemeinde (Weimar, Germany: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1962), 195.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid., 209.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., 188.

\textsuperscript{35}Pierard, 88.

long as the rights of others in the community were not trampled upon.

Unlike the centuries-distant Reformation and the century-old Pietism, the sources of Latter-day Saint religious enthusiasm in the period just prior to 1870 were fresh; the founder, Joseph Smith, had suffered martyrdom only twenty-five years earlier. The majority of the church leadership in 1870 had direct ties to Smith and still carried the zeal of his vision. The Germans between 1618 and 1648, during the greatest conflict of the Reformation, had undergone devastating warfare initially motivated by religious creeds which resulted in a political and spiritual stalemate. The Mormons, on the other hand, had moved four times and 2,000 miles in a quarter of a century under the lash of persecution, culling the faint of heart and stiffening the resolve of those members who remained faithful.

Their primary focus was achieving personal salvation for themselves and their family and building the Kingdom of God before the Second Coming of Christ. Restoring and implementing the various characteristics which their leaders told them God’s realm required necessitated significant adaptations in orthodox Protestant Christian doctrine and behavior which isolated the Mormons from the general body of believers. Some of these new components, such as new scripture—The Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants—and claims of continuing revelation directly from God, threatened no political
institution directly. Other aspects, such as the construction of a literal kingdom of God, combining spiritual and political authority, the introduction of polygamy and the encouragement of emigration awakened serious concerns in the communities where Mormons actively proselyted.

The relationship between the Mormon Church and the political leaders of the various regions in which they sojourned, notably the states of Missouri and Illinois, was tense at best and vindictive at worst. Despite the American constitutional rights of freedom of worship and speech, local groups contested the presence of the Mormons, and these conflicts eventually caused so much turmoil that in 1838 the governor of Missouri ordered the expulsion or extermination of any Latter-day Saint within state borders. Comparable difficulties with local citizens culminated in the winter departure of the weary Latter-day Saints from Illinois in 1846 before the Mormon move to Utah, then an unnamed Mexican territory free of American settlements. After years of unrelenting persecution, the Church leaders saw the isolated, arid lands of the Great Basin as a refuge from the world and encouraged hard work to make a positive change among the bleak surroundings.

Relocation in Utah did not end the conflicts between the Mormons and their detractors. Two different military actions

---


38 Ibid., 220-222.
in 1857, the invasion of the United States Army Utah Expedition to install a new non-Mormon territorial governor and the southern Utah assault on an emigration group in the Mountain Meadows, demonstrate the ongoing distrust mutually felt by the Latter-day Saints and the United States. While little actual fighting occurred between the Utah Mormon settlers and Johnston's Army--the expedition's unofficial name--the very presence of the soldiers spoke volumes about the suspicions of the American government of the Mormon community. The Mountain Meadows Massacre, the title by which the tragic assault in southern Utah became known, equally expressed the frustration and tension which some of the local Mormons felt as a consequence of their treatment by the citizenry of the United States. While no general Mormon leader condoned the action, the Mountain Meadows Massacre was cited as an example, in Germany at least, of the callous disregard of the Mormons for any one not professing the Latter-day Saint faith.39

Military problems aside, the period from 1846 to 1871 witnessed the growth of the Utah commonwealth. Church leaders encouraged new settlements in the area from southern Idaho to Arizona. Attempts to encourage local economic independence flourished with limited success, affected eventually by the

39 Eduard Meyer, Ursprung und Geschichte der Mormonen, mit exkurs über die Anfänge des Islams und des Christentums (The Origin and History of the Mormons With Reflection on the Beginnings of Islam and Christianity translated by Heinz F. Rahde and Eugen Seaich, (Salt Lake City, Utah: University of Utah, 1961), 173-175; Undated German newspaper article "Amerika" Gottfried Blatter Journal, LDS Church Archives.
intrusion of the railroad in 1869. Continual missionary activities in the United States and Europe coupled with the doctrine of "gathering" generated an influx of emigrants, although German-speaking participation was generally limited until 1870 and never reached the same numbers which the British and Scandinavian members achieved.  

Numerical lack of missionary success did not mean that Germans did not know of the Mormons' existence during that time. In a study of German views of Mormonism during the nineteenth century, D.L. Ashliman indicates that a variety of books and pamphlets describing the strange Mormon physical and spiritual worlds appeared in German bookstores in that period. Early reports include the 1853 travelogue by Jacob Schiel, part of an unfortunate exploration party, which "had little good to say about Utah or its inhabitants."  

Along similar lines, the 1853 volume of the Brockhaus encyclopedia, a respected German sourcebook, took an almost conversational tone and uncharacteristic dismissive attitude to the entire Mormon endeavor. The article—inaccurately—recounts the beginnings of the Book of Mormon, refers to the founder as "Joe Smith," mistranslates Deseret--a Book of

40Douglas Dexter Alder, "The German-speaking Immigration to Utah, 1850-1890," Master's Thesis, University of Utah, 1959, 89. It should be noted that very few Germans joined the church prior to 1871.

41D.L. Ashliman, "The Image of Utah and the Mormons in Nineteenth-Century Germany" Utah Historical Quarterly 35:3 (Summer 1967) 213.
Mormon term referring to the honeybee—as desert, adheres to the Solomon Spaulding theory of the Book of Mormon origins and generally turns up it editorial nose at the whole movement. The reference to polygamy, however, comments on the practice in passing without the positive or negative views of later commentaries and does offer this favorable assessment:

If on the one hand, the extraordinary effort and vision of the Mormons in colonization, which in connection with the admirable endurance, led to the rapid blooming of the Mormon state, on the other hand the important geographic location and the enthusiastic, new immigrant-generating proselyting promised the development and future influence of the state.  

Seeing that the only external documentary reference is to Gunnison's *The Mormons or Latter-day Saints in the Valley of the Great Salt Lake*, this partisan attitude can be understood.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints had fostered a proselyting movement even before its inception in 1830. Even the idea of gathering the believers to a specified locale for their personal growth and benefit surfaced shortly after Joseph Smith organized the church. The various revelations on the subject never down-played the urgency of the work, particularly the initial labors and the missionaries who went to garner new converts did not worry over much

---


44*Doctrine and Covenants* 38:31-33 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1987), 65.
about whether they would get permission to preach.\textsuperscript{45} In this they felt themselves fulfilling the words of Jeremiah (16:16) and the injunction of Jesus Christ to bring his gospel to the whole world (Matt. 28:19, Mark 16:15).

Initially, these missionaries were mostly young, but mature, family men, anxious to share the word, but by the end of the nineteenth century the church assigned younger, single men the burden of spreading the message.\textsuperscript{46} Along the same lines, organized finances for the first missionaries did not exist--instead they travelled as the first apostles without purse or scrip. By the turn of the century, however, either personal savings, family or friends supported missionaries.\textsuperscript{47}

The converts brought in by the various missions provided much needed numbers in order to build the Kingdom of God in the western regions of America.\textsuperscript{48} Their numbers increased so that by 1870, European immigrants constituted the largest portion of Utah’s adults.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{45}\textit{Doctrine and Covenants} 4:4, 6:3, 11:3 and 33:3, all dating from the earliest months of the church’s existence, repeatedly stated that harvest was ready and waiting. In an atmosphere of anticipation and new revelations, the impetuous tendencies of the missionaries can be understood.


\textsuperscript{48}Allen and Leonard, 119.

\textsuperscript{49}Alexander, 212.
The venture to bring the new faith of the Latter-day Saints to Germany got off to a rocky start. From the very beginning, Joseph Smith had spoken highly of the German people and Luther's translation of the Bible. But when two Mormon apostles, Orson Hyde in 1842 and John Taylor in 1851, attempted to open a mission to the German states with literature and preaching, their efforts seemed to have had little effect. Hyde contributed the pamphlet "Ein Ruf aus der Wüste," while Taylor, a decade later, oversaw the first translation of the Book of Mormon into German. Hyde worked in the regions of Regensburg and Frankfurt, and Taylor worked in and around Hamburg, but they effectively accomplished very little in the German states. Prior to Taylor's arrival, George P. Dykes had arrived in northern Germany and performed the first native German baptisms in German water, along the frontier between Danish and German Confederation--Austrian and Prussian--forces. Political complications in his work area motivated Dykes to seek Taylor's advice and so he left the Duchy of Schleswig for England, where Taylor resided at the time.

50 Joseph Fielding Smith, ed. Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1979), 349.

51 Scharffs, 4.

52 Letter: George P. Dykes to Franklin D. Richards, October 14, 1851, German Mission Manuscript History, LDS Archives.
Dykes later returned with Taylor and aided him in translation and publication work.  

Shortly after Taylor’s departure in 1852 a replacement, a native German, Daniel Carn, arrived in Hamburg in the capacity of the first German Mission President and began working. He reached more individuals than his predecessors, but shortly became the subject of government scrutiny brought on by complaints of local priests. Carn did not speak cautiously, instead boldly asserting his message and attacking the beliefs of the local churches as wrong or misguided. While the Hamburg syndics, local government officials, cited no specific legal wrongdoing to justify expelling Carn, they summarily exiled him as a member of a dangerous church.

In 1853, a delegation of two men, Orson Spencer and Jacob Houtz, travelled from Utah to Berlin in response to a request by King Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia to know more about "the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints." Whatever the king’s motives—he had requested books on the matter from his legate, not from the church itself—the Mormons jumped at the opportunity and authorized Spencer and Houtz during the October Conference of 1852 to visit Prussia and preach the gospel. Arriving in Hamburg

---

53Scharffs, 8.

54*Millennial Star* 14:603 [1852]

55*Journal History* February 15, 1854.

56Spencer, 5.
during January 1853 not long after Carn's exile, the two men contacted the local American consul, a German native named Bromberg, who received them cordially and informed them that the Prussians would not accept their message, but would remove them "out of their kingdom immediately."\(^57\)

Moving on to Berlin, the emissaries sought out the American Legation for aid in determining the likelihood of meeting with the king and the legal condition of religion and emigration in Prussia. After initial maneuvers of diplomatic protocol, Spencer and Houtz visited both the Legation Secretary, Mr. Fay, and the Legate, Mr. Barnard. Fay questioned them closely about their mission and religion, while Barnard gave them a reasonably accurate description of contemporary Prussian religious conditions. He asserted that effectively only the Evangelical-Lutheran denomination received royal recognition, with the exception of the recently acquired Catholic provinces. Baptists, Barnard asserted, experienced significant persecution and had learned to keep their activities secret.\(^58\)

The legate also described the emigration laws, noting that the emigration required completion of service in the Prussian military before departure. He portrayed the king's current political attitude as more conservative than prior to the Revolution of 1848, with absolutism the king's creed.

\(^{57}\)Ibid., 3.

\(^{58}\)Ibid., 4-5.
Along these same discouraging lines, Barnard informed the men that the German newspapers had announced their mission, along with a notice of the emigration of Danish Mormon converts, inaccurately exaggerating the numbers of the emigrants, as well as the purpose for moving to Utah. In that sort of atmosphere he could offer them no hope of success for their mission.  

Their subsequent efforts to see the king, including a letter addressed to the Minister of Religious Affairs, von Raumer explaining that the king had shown interest in Mormon history and doctrine, did not succeed in gaining an appointment. Instead they were summoned to a summary hearing in a police court where their religious views underwent thorough scrutiny. Spencer notes that while questioned about the nature of Mormon marriage practices, the judges failed to specifically ask them about polygamy, a practice which Orson Pratt had announced publicly in Salt Lake City just a year earlier. The judges did not demonstrate any interest in the missionary message, nor any tolerance for religious freedom, even though constitutional provisions supporting this idea existed. Finally the court informed the men that they were banished, and after considerable discussion, including the officials checking the train schedule for the earliest time of departure from Prussian territory, Spencer and Houtz left.  

---

59 Ibid.  
60 Ibid., 6-11.
Although the judges refused to allow the Mormons to see the actual banishment decree, there can be little doubt that the April 26, 1853 decree originated in this courtroom.\footnote{The 1853 decree spends little time discussing polygamy, just as the justices did, and claims that the Mormons were interested in promoting emigration to expand Utah's population for purposes of setting up an independent state, similar to the newspaper and posted accounts which Spencer describes in his report. The text of the decree is found in Appendix A.} In an attempt to describe the mental and political views which prevailed in Prussia, and by extension, Western Europe, Spencer called up the nineteenth century image of ancient Egypt, a land ruled by despots and darkness. Prussians, according to Spencer, had been so long "estranged from their natural rights" to the extent that their consciences, instead of leading them to freedom, had instead become "despot[s] accusing and menacing them [the Prussian subjects] for presuming to think or speak in matters of freedom and salvation."\footnote{Spencer, 13.} The optimistic Mormon effort to address the king, rather than paving the way to religious opportunity, laid the groundwork in the form of the 1853 decree for a conflict half a century later.

In other places the early missionary work also suffered. Carn's successor in Hamburg, George Reiser, received the same treatment which his predecessor had. Carn's first convert, Christian Binder, apostatized while en route to Utah, wrote back to his brother and negatively affected fifteen members of
the Hamburg branch. These in turn collaborated with the local police to drive the missionaries out of Hamburg.\textsuperscript{63} The Hamburg branch disappeared.

The one light in the other dim tale of difficult work appears in the person of Karl G. Maeser, a Saxon educator. Attracted to the church by adversarial reporting, in 1855 Maeser contacted Mormon leaders and eventually met with a Mormon apostle, Franklin D. Richards. Their meeting and the subsequent conversation, without a translator, stands high in the annals of missionary miracles. Maeser, after his conversion and emigration to Utah, returned to the Swiss-German mission field in 1867. His work and success as Mission President are nothing less than remarkable, founding the German-speaking church publication, \textit{Der Stern}, as well as personally expanding the mission effort beyond the Swiss borders into southern Germany, converting enough local people to establish branches in Bavaria and Württemberg. After he left in 1870, succeeded by his brother-in-law, Edward Schönfeldt, the work decreased, partly due to the outbreak of Franco-Prussian war that year.\textsuperscript{64}

Thus in 1870, these two emerging communities, the unified German nation with centuries of religious tradition and development, and the newly established Utah church, with its

\textsuperscript{63}Justus Ernst, \textit{Geschichte der deutsch-sprechende Mission} (unpublished manuscript) LDS Archives, entry date 1854.

\textsuperscript{64}Scharffs, 27.
American-born idealistic fervor, met at an ideological and social crossroads. For the next forty-four years the two institutions contested or avoided each other in an effort to maintain and strengthen their own versions of religious and social order.
CHAPTER TWO

THE DANGERS OF MORMONISM: EMIGRATION, POLYGAMY AND SOCIAL EXPERIMENTATION

Prior to the end of the German Empire, the numbers of Mormon missionaries in Germany and their German converts never rose above 5,500 individuals, especially in the 1870s. Nevertheless, most German governments, especially the Prussians, seemed to consider the missionaries as a threat to their state. Since the number of Mormons never seriously menaced Prussia or any other German state, the concern which Prussian officials expressed about the presence of the missionaries must have been rooted in their perception of the Mormons—something about the American missionaries must have threatened the Prussians at an almost irrational level. In fact, Prussian authorities associated three attitudes with the Mormon missionaries—emigration, polygamy and social democracy—all of which challenged German social and cultural traditions. The variance between the Mormon and Prussian perceptions of these three concepts laid the foundation for the contest which erupted between the two at the beginning of the twentieth century.

On April 26, 1853, three months after Orson Spencer and Jacob Houtz had met with the judges in Berlin, the Prussian
government issued its first comprehensive banishment decree against Mormons. The ruling cited the undesirable tendency of Mormon converts to emigrate to Utah as a reason to expel Mormon missionaries. The language of the decree focused, not on doctrines and practices, but on a perception of the Prussian government that church leaders in Utah desired political independence from the federal government. If missionaries could attract a large enough immigrant population to qualify as a state, Utahns would be subject to its own local laws rather than federal decrees hostile to the Mormon way of life.

During an interview with the American Legate in Berlin, Spencer learned that

... the existing laws of the [Prussian] Government distinctly forbid emigration. ... The laboring poor [we]re regarded as constituting an essential part of the support of the Government, and any religion that favors emigration is obnoxious to the policy and laws of the Government.'

Only forty-six years had elapsed since the Prussian government had freed the serfs, and the possibility existed that the paternalistic mindset of the government had not yet shifted to recognizing the freedoms promised in the 1850 constitution. Also, the Prussian government perceived emigration as threatening to state welfare, particularly among the factory-working population. In the 1853 decree, the Interior Minister specified using Prussian criminal code § 114 as a further penalty for Mormons, should they persist in their

'Spencer, 5.
advertised pattern of encouraging emigration. The law forms part of series of statutes punishing military desertion and persuasion of laborers to leave Prussia. Specifically, § 114 discourages factory laborers from departing the kingdom for like employment in any other state, by requiring anyone encouraging emigration to be imprisoned for at least one month. The law makes no reference to improprieties of marriage or any other religious or social issue, dealing only with workers leaving Prussian posts. The original displeasure of the king and his ministers in 1853 fell on the economic, rather than social, aspects of Mormonism.

While the Prussian lawmakers viewed the common people as the essential foundation of the kingdom's economic strength, the latter did not always share that view. Emigration continued in spite of legislative difficulties. Already in 1817, the Württemberg government, concerned by the numbers of their people emigrating to different countries, appointed Friedrich List, later renowned for his national economic studies, to determine the causes of emigration and how to counteract them. List specified the main motives for departure as: "taxes, military costs, excise taxes, local oppression, and judicial delays," with religion and individual economic concerns as secondary.² Günter Moltmann, reevaluating List’s observations, postulates that in addition to List’s catalog of causes, the emigrant’s own dissatisfaction with his restricted

²Groh, 95.
place in the tight social hierarchy might have played a greater role in motivating emigration than List recognized. Moltmann notes that while the individual emigrant often had multiple reasons to relocate, complaints about social inequities, including frustration with religious freedom, would not be expressed to the local dignitaries so as not to provide an excuse for the customs officials to withhold permission for emigration. As illustration he cites List's own observations that in 1817 and again 1822, some emigrants, once they had safely embarked, would openly berate the society which they were leaving.  

Groh, commenting on the same events, agrees that while religion was not a primary motive, contemporary government reports regularly cited religion as a motive for a substantial portion of annual emigration. Sagarra states baldly that attempts to force some Protestants to join the Evangelical Union resulted instead in group emigrations to find freedom of worship. A leading clergyman in the 1820s, Johan Heinrich Jung-Stilling, openly advocated emigration as a religious act

---


4 Groh, 95.

5 Sagarra, 212.
in his journal *The Gray Man.* The connection between religion and emigration, therefore, while not statistically overwhelming, did achieve some notoriety, which may have affected the reactionary government of Prussia.

An article which appeared fifty years later in an 1872 Catholic journal provides another perspective on German emigration troubles. Using political irony, the Catholic author quoted from an opposition liberal weekly, *Im neuen Reich,* which bemoaned the ongoing loss of German citizens despite the recent "glorious reality" of German unity. He contrasted the liberal paper's bewilderment over emigration with the occurrence of increasing taxes, the specter of military service--three wars in the last eight years--and the decline of economic health of the farmer and artisan. Faced with an uncertain future, the author viewed the choice of emigration for the impacted groups, particularly farmers, as a rational alternative. He also faulted the various German governments for ignoring the plight of emigrants while they were underway to a new land. The author asserted that until the United States drew international attention to the miserable conditions of hygiene and overcrowding on board emigrant ships, the imperial German government refused to acknowledge any responsibility for German citizens.

---

6Groh, 95-96.

7"Die deutsche Auswanderung nach Amerika," *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland* 70 (1872), 252-270.
American solicitude in the mid-nineteenth century for emigrants from other lands has an easy explanation. Several American states--Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Kansas, West Virginia, and Minnesota--became involved in encouraging German emigration during this period. Even the embattled United States government solicited an influx of German immigrants towards the end of the Civil War. These activities did not go unnoticed by German officials or newspapers. Ingrid Schöberl, in her extensive examination of these activities, reports the general anger and frustration manifested by the German press in response to this type of population poaching. This uproar did not, however, stop the flow. Even the American Civil War did not discourage young men who wanted to leave Germany.8 She quotes an American consular report "that there were thousands of young able-bodied men . . . anxious to emigrate this country for the purpose of engaging in our military service."9

Prussian concern over the loss of workers was not simply the overreaction of bureaucrats to a political chimera. Emigration statistics tabulated in the 1880s confirmed that a significant number of skilled individuals already had left Germany for the United States in the nineteenth century. In a

---

8Ingrid Schöberl Amerikanische Einwanderungswerbung in Deutschland 1845-1914 (Stuttgart, West Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1990), 61-62.

9M.D. Ross to John A. Andrew Foreign Relations 1864 3:177, cited in Schöberl, 63.
report to Congress on European emigration in 1886, American consuls serving in Germany evaluated the nature of German emigration to the United States over the previous two decades. The consuls noted that during that period at least 90% of the emigrants, roughly 1,270,000 persons, leaving Germany ended up in America. The report also showed that the majority of that population possessed handicraft skills, notably carpenters, bakers and painters. Regrettably the categories of numbers of families, ages and social class did not attract the attention of the consuls who prepared the report.

Analysis by the consuls uncovered conflicting reasons for emigration, varying by region. The Consul General, stationed in Berlin, stated that dissatisfaction with current conditions, including political and religious troubles, furnished the primary motivation for seeking a new homeland. The consul in the Rhine city of Cologne specifically discounted the influence of political issues such as mandatory military service, heavy taxes or overpopulation as causes, focussing instead on the individual drive of craftsmen to maintain an existing standard of living. The consul in the new industrial region of Crefeld [Krefeld] noted that industrialization

---

10 State Department Consular Report, 1887 [hereafter Consular Report], 60.

The emigrants which left Germany via Antwerp and the German ports total 1,412,914 persons.


12 Consular Report 60.
deprived local weavers of traditional occupation, motivating their departure. The Hamburg consul, William W. Lang, working in the primary port of departure, blamed the movement on overpopulation. He defined overpopulation in terms of usable resources, rather than in square miles, noting that Pomerania, containing the smallest population and resources, suffered the largest per capita emigration. Further, areas such as Hesse-Nassau, Schleswig-Holstein and Hannover, recently annexed by Prussia, experienced a significant departure of native population, even though they did not suffer from the same resource shortage as Pomerania.

In addition, Lang characterized the behavior of the Imperial German government in emigration matters in benign terms, ignoring the role which individual states, such as Prussia, played in setting standards for emigration.

The Government neither favors nor restrains emigration; all its ordinances on the subject look only to the welfare and kind treatment which shall be extended to them on their journey. It was indeed a long time before the Government arrived at this wise conclusion. Prohibitive measures were tried and proved void of results. It would be impossible to check the tide of emigration without presenting through the industrial pursuits a more favoring prospect of a coming prosperity.13

This modification in attitude from the repressive views of 1853 appears in the later development of empire-wide emigration rules, not from a revision of the more austere and restrictive Prussian system. Imperial legislation prepared in

13Consular Report 104.
1878 placed careful attention on licensing and inspecting emigration companies. The statute stipulated substantial monetary deposits and fines in an effort to force emigration companies to pay closer attention to the well-being of their clients. As an indication that the Reichstag did not agree with the Prussian system, nowhere did any discussion of fines or imprisonment for soliciting emigration occur.\textsuperscript{14}

In a review of the circumstances surrounding emigration, the Reichstag legislative committee reported that in 1878 every German state had differing and often conflicting emigration requirements, making compliance with the various statutes governing departure very difficult.\textsuperscript{15} As a typical example, the deputies cited the existing disparity between Prussian determination to punish anyone who wanted to emigrate to Brazil while neighboring Hamburg "freely and openly" encouraged Brazilian emigration.\textsuperscript{16} This discrepancy provided the impetus for an overhaul of Imperial emigration laws.

The committee, which the Reichstag had designated to study the issue, postulated that the presence of emigration agents would not significantly add to the number of emigrants since "it is not so easy . . . to emigrate."\textsuperscript{17} Moreover, §

\textsuperscript{14}Deutscher Reichstag, Stenografischer Berichte des Reichtages, 25 February 1878, Aktenstück 44.

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 524-527.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 527.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.
144 of the 1878 Imperial Criminal Law Code punished persons caught deceitfully encouraging emigration with imprisonment from one month to two years. The delegates recognized that as long as circumstances conducive to leaving Germany existed "no legal or police orders" could prevent emigration. ¹⁸ The committee finally determined that it would be smarter to regulate emigration than to impose numerical limitations, stating that fear of legal emigration agents emptying Germany of her citizens was hardly rational. The numbers of immigrants arriving at New York, according to German sources, had declined in the years between 1872 to 1877 from 128,243 to 14,682.¹⁹

The committee report offered little commentary on the reason that these numbers had declined, simply expressing that they had. A few contemporary events may offer some reasons for the decline. The Franco-Prussian War ended in 1871 in a victory for Prussia and her German allies, boosting feelings of German nationalism and national pride. The formation of the German Empire in the wake of the war unleashed an enthusiastic, if fragile, economic boom, discussed in more detail in the next chapter, which could also have encouraged Germans to remain at home. Interestingly enough, however, the largest drop in annual emigration from 110,414 emigrants in 1873 to 47,623 emigrants in 1874 may reflect not the attraction of

¹⁸Ibid., 528.

¹⁹Ibid.
prosperity but instead the fact that perhaps people could not afford emigration for a while. Additionally, the *Kulturkampf*, also discussed in the next chapter, may have motivated Catholics to leave in the early 1870s, leaving behind those who either could not afford the move or preferred to fight the anti-Catholic government persecution.

On the other side of the ocean, the Mormon doctrine of gathering to Zion [Utah] did not propose to empty Germany of her people, especially women.\(^\text{20}\) Douglas Alder has carefully examined the Mormon motives and methods, noting that in addition to such secular motives, the idea of building the Kingdom of God in Utah presented a significant rationale for departure from Germany. His analysis does not ignore worldly reasons for emigration, but does indicate that the majority of German-speaking Latter-day Saint immigrants came in response to the religious and spiritual call to gather. Alder describes the church leaders' initial enthusiasm for German emigrants in 1850, noting an official change in attitude after 1908 directed membership to expand Mormon congregations outside of Utah. Preaching emigration to overseas converts constituted an important part of the Mormon message in the period between 1850 and 1900, but corresponding to political concerns in Germany, America and Utah, this practice declined after the turn of the century. See, for example, the 1904 Hannover police report, *Acta der Mormonen betr.* J Nr. 1 Pr. 457.

\(^\text{20}\)The idea that Mormon missionaries came to lure German women away to polygamous harems persisted well past the turn of the century. See, for example, the 1904 Hannover police report, *Acta der Mormonen betr.* J Nr. 1 Pr. 457.
The 1905 diary of President Serge F. Ballif specifically stated that no article should be published in the Der Stern, which would encourage emigration.  

It should be noted that at no time did the number of Mormon emigrants pose a real threat to the German or Prussian economy, external or internal security or tax base. As the end of the nineteenth century approached the number of German Mormons who remained in Germany reached the thousands. Despite the unpleasant treatment by the local officials--lack of permission for meeting halls, laws against teaching children Mormon doctrine, etc.--and even though the numbers of emigrants increased, the percentage of departees compared to those who stayed declined from 18% in 1890 to 4% in 1908. In fact, from 1894 to 1908, the percentage of emigrants varied between 4-6%. From 1909 to World War I Der Stern did not publish specific statistical information about German Mormon emigration, baptisms or membership.

By the 1880s, then, emigration no longer played a major motivational role for banishing Mormon missionaries. From 1853, but particularly after the Evarts circular of 1879, discussed in the next chapter, the charge leveled against Mormon missionaries by German officials was offense to public morals due to the Latter-day Saint doctrine of plural marriage.

21Alder, Chapter 6.

22Serge Ballif, Journals, 1905-1908, (unpublished) Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Historical Department Archives
age. The 1853 Prussian banishment decree refers to unusual Mormon views on marriage, but little appeared publicly about Mormon polygamous practices until the newspaper accounts of the 1880s.

From the 1880s onward, the longer reports of Mormon activities in official government documents and newspapers usually included some reference to missionaries offending public morals. This occurred despite the fact that missionaries in Germany took care not to make reference to polygamy after the United States took steps to stop the practice. The actual complaints which German officials leveled against the missionaries were more apt to be about literature distribution violating the press laws, rather than corrupting the public morals.

From the German perspective, teaching children religious doctrines other than establishment-approved material could be construed as affecting public morals. The Kulturkampf of the 1870s led off with a round of legislation which took education out of the hands of religious institutions. A Reichstag bill expanding religious freedom in the German Empire spent a large portion of its statutes regulating the religious instruction of children.²³

The Prussian Interior Ministry, in reaffirming the 1853 decree, never cited laws specifically aimed at prohibiting

polygamy. The 1853 Criminal Law Code § 139, coming under the heading of Crimes and Acts against Morality [Verbrechen und Vergehen gegen die Sittlichkeit], while specifically making commission of a bigamous marriage or authorizing a bigamous marriage a punishable offence, is never cited in all of the correspondence about Mormons. This discrepancy may stem from the fact that law did not forbid preaching polygamy, and so it was not specifically a crime. The authorities also did not use § 151, which specifically legislates against printed or spoken Unzucht, effectively pornography, against the Mormons, in spite of their marriage doctrines.

What then is the motive of the officials in avoiding the moral question in legalities, but citing in cause of banishment? They hid behind a punishable offense in order to enforce a moral view. Of course, the officials themselves were not free of bias regarding moral behavior. James Woycke notes that civil servants maintained lives of strict abstention "because of the expectation that their lifestyle should reflect their status as representatives of the state."24 Officialdom, therefore, was not likely to have any sympathy for an attitude which flouted the accepted norm, particularly in marital matters.

The whole concept of polygamy seemed repugnant to the local and national officials. Germany, as presented to the

---

public by its civil and clerical servants, possessed superior moral values. Kramer notes the persistent view that the German victory over the French owed much to the lower French social attitudes and behavior. The low status civil servants themselves tended towards a celibate lifestyle, in order to maintain the public image of a moral state. In contrast to this avidly pursued ideal, the literature of the time portrayed a very different set of general morals. Marriages occurred late in life, but society did not expect the men to enter marriage without sexual experience. Young farmers, East Prussian landowners and factory workers pursued accepted avenues of sexual interaction outside the socially praised marital limits. Prostitution, particularly in the period following the unification, continued as an element of society. Generations of spinsters proliferated, in part due to the economic and social barriers to marriage in nineteenth-century Germany.

---


26Woycke, 8.
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28Ibid., 133-136. Kramer is very explicit about the less than ideal nature of the German family, the lack of love and passion between the husband and wife, the consequent adultery, and the overweening role that social class played in the selection of a spouse and maintenance of a societally circumspect marriage.
That these conditions existed did not mean that immoral behavior received official approval. The Socialist movement, in its drive to rebuild society, advocated free love--i.e. not restricted by legal or clerical strictures--but that stance hardly represented orthodox political or social views.

Polygamy on the whole was not a topic for general discussion in Germany. Although bigamy was a punishable offense, it was not something which regularly appeared in official documents, press commentaries or family-oriented journals. Perusal, for example, of the Gartenlaube family journal during the period of the late nineteenth century when Mormon activities experienced particular scrutiny by the press, presents no articles on polygamy. Similarly the enlightened Evangelical journal, Die Christliche Welt, which discussing Quakers, Christian Scientists, Social Democrats and even the condition of Christianity in North America in its pages between 1880 and 1910, never concerned itself with the Mormon views on marriage, nor any other discussion of polygamy. In 1905 the political Catholic journal Historisch-Politische Blätter actually discussed polygamy, but only in reaction to a controversy about Phillip of Hesse's bigamous marriage in the 1520s and the Münster Anabaptist polygamy of the 1530s.

Interestingly enough, the same journal contained an article by R. Paulus about the work of the medieval Catholic scholar Duns Scotus about bigamy. Scotus indicated that polygamy was permissible if God chose to reveal its necessity.
Such conditions as a plague which slew men and left women behind would count as such an appropriate time. Nevertheless, Paulus down played this condition by saying that God would have to reveal it to the whole church.²⁹ Yet, by contemporary definition, revelation was sealed up in the Bible, no one was looking for direct divine communication, begging the whole question of how such a dramatic change would come about.

It was on this point, however, that the Mormon doctrine of polygamy rested, that is contemporary divine communication with modern man. The whole issue of superior authority—revelation versus societal expectation—centers on this point. Either the Mormons had a divine mandate or they were reprehensible upstarts and a threat to the orthodox status quo. Ironically the issue of authority also struck directly at the root of the conflict between the Mormons and other religions—as Paulus pointed out Luther, himself, did not want his words to be taken as authoritative because it was uncertain what positions he would have to abandon.³⁰ The Evangelical churches, by claiming their authority from the scriptures—open to interpretation by all believers—and the state, placed the political leaders in a situation where they could enforce their will on a population by fiat alone, rather than lead

²⁹R. Paulus, "Duns Scotus und der Vielweiberei der Münsterischen Widertäufer", Historisch-Politischer Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, 141 (1905), 776.

³⁰R. Paulus, "Cajetan und Luther über die Polygamie" Historisch-Politischer Blätter für das katholische Deutschland, 141 (1905), 86.
them in a spiritual unity by example, Christian love, and divine revelation.\textsuperscript{31}

Even more interesting is the distaste with which Leiden's nineteenth century biographer, Heinrich Detmer, portrays the influence of polygamy on the Münster community: "the [practice of] polygamy undeniably impressed the collected inner development of the events with a thoroughly peculiar, desolate and criminal imprint. . . ."\textsuperscript{32} His perspective offers a clear look at the disdain with which a nineteenth century, educated bourgeois German might view the idea of polygamy.

A pair of articles in \textit{Historisch-Politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland} cannot represent the views of a whole nation or culture. The reason that these articles are included in this study stems from the reality that discussions of the impact of acceptance of polygamy in a modern society failed to appear in any other venue. The commentaries which

\textsuperscript{31}The Münster Anabaptists, the only Protestants known to have encouraged polygamy on Germany soil, provide an interesting German parallel to the Mormon condition. The doctrine of patriarchal polygamy was not common among all Anabaptists, only popular in the Münster community. Moreover, it came at the instigation of a single leading individual, the tailor Johann von Leiden, just as the Mormon doctrine was propounded by the farmer Joseph Smith and later the cabinet maker Brigham Young. The Münster Anabaptist preachers initially struggled against the idea and then became its staunchest supporters, similar to the early Mormon leaders who centuries later were uncomfortable and then later proclaimed the principle as divine.

do appear, though not in any way a declaration of majority, can reflect the values of the time. A likely explanation is that educated Germans really did not care for a serious debate about polygamy, de facto leaving any deliberations in the hands of sensationalists. In none of the press articles denouncing Mormons perused for this study did the authors lay any particular weight on the actual nature of the plural marriages, but rather they recounted improbable stories about Mormon white slavery.

The inherent hypocrisy of this attitude, particularly in the period after the unification of Germany, is belied by the actual instances of pre-marital sex, adultery and prostitution which existed in Germany. Unfortunately, the research for the study did not find any statistics which indicated the extent to which these activities occurred, but the literature of the time offers the inference that these practices flourished, even among the educated classes.

While polygamy did not effectively exist in German society, it did flourish in non-Christian communities. In 1862, the Evangelisches Missions-Magazin addressed the serious concern which polygamy presented to the Protestant missionary effort in Asia and Africa. The article noted that, "the social conditions of people stand in a close, organic connection with their religious systems" and social norms develop
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directly from religious values. The author places polygamy on the same undesirable level as slavery and caste barriers. Interestingly enough, he next asks why current Christian missionaries concern themselves over these issues when the early apostles simply accepted them. The answer, he states, is that the apostles did not have the appreciation of the spirit of Christ's message to the same depth that nineteenth-century Christians did. Further, the author asserts that the Germanic peoples—Germans, Swiss, Englishmen and their kin—possess a "hegemony of the Spirit" superior to all others. By the same token, the Chinese, Indians and Africans would always play a lesser role in spiritual matters.

More importantly, the author used the Zulu custom of buying wife-slaves as his primary example of the degradation brought on by polygamy, focussing on the sorry plight of women under the system rather than whether their misery came from the multiple marriages. Similarly, when quoting an Anglican denunciation of the practice on the basis of New Testament scripture, the author related the practice of divorce and adultery to polygamy, but offers no direct scriptural statement saying polygamy falls into either category. He fur-

34"Die Polygamie und die Mission," Evangelisches Missions-Magazin (Basel, Switzerland: Bahnmaier's Buchhandlung, 1862), 237.

35Ibid., 238-239.

36Ibid., 240.

37Ibid., 243-249, 254-259.
ther declared that many people recognized the presence of polygamy in a new Christian community acted as a disease, mortally weakening the spiritual health of new converts.\textsuperscript{38}

The view of the author was that marrying multiple wives was a sin, a reality he felt was recognized by the spiritually superior Germanic Christian cultures. Once again, a general attitude ought not be drawn from a single article, however, the paucity of discussions of the issue in other journals or newspapers, as well as the lack of editorial discretion indicates that the author's position was not distasteful to the Evangelical missionary population.

The Mormon position, on the other hand, leaps to view. A typical attitude prior to the Manifesto of 1890 can be inferred from the responses of George Reiser to Hamburg officials:

At 11 o'clock a.m. of the 18th [August 1853] I was brought before the magistrate for examination. He asked me how I came to get into such a difficulty. I told him it was for preaching what I knew to be the truth. . . . He asked me if we believed in a plurality of wives. I answered that after the people were gathered to Zion, and had been taught proper principles, and had reduced them to practice, if the Lord saw fit, through His servants, to give a man more than one wife, we believed it to be right. He asked me why we did not believe in a plurality of husbands, as well as of wives. I answered that it was not in accordance with the established laws of nature, that it would degenerate mankind, and instead of multiplying posterity, would increase disease and deformity; that the

\textsuperscript{38}Ibid., 241.
object of the institution was the restoration of man, both temporally and spiritually.39

Leonard Arrington, in his analysis of nineteenth-century Mormon family values, sees the overall pattern of home life as "essentially Victorian," and consequently in the main stream of American behavior.40 The essential difference lay in the doctrine of plural marriage, which presented, in fact, a drastic departure from the norm and was not initially accepted by the Mormon community with any sort of complaisance. Arrington notes that the easy suggestion that Joseph Smith's libido lay at the root of the precept misses both the disturbing effect which it had on the Mormon community, as well as the actual quandaries which must have worried the Mormon prophet, such as providing for the female converts who had no real means of support.41

Plural marriage in the Mormon setting assumed a normal, acceptable nature, preferred to the woes of a single lifestyle in a Victorian community. Although American newspapers and journals adopted a tone similar to the Evangelical missionary author of "Die Polygamie und die Mission" decrying polygamy as an abusive exploitation of women, the reality lay somewhere in between. Life on a frontier was universally hard, and the work hard, regardless of whether a woman had to share a

39Millennial Star 16:621-23 (August 1853).
40Arrington, 194.
41Ibid., 195.
husband or not. Some of the families made a valiant and successful effort to make the system work, while others failed.

An important element, which seems to have been discounted by the nay-sayers, was that polygamy among the Mormons represented a religious sacrifice. The practice ideally embodied a "privilege of the pure in heart," rather than the Zulu convention of wife-buying.\textsuperscript{42} The religious nature of the doctrine did not lessen the actual burden of the wives or the husband, but it did place it in a framework which could provide some emotional and social support to the spouses working out their lives.

It is possible that the ideal of polygamy presented a social and spiritual codification of the imperfect human responses to emotional and physical drives. Perhaps the very ecclesiastical aspect of the Mormon marriage formula was what was so distasteful to the German political and ecclesiastical leadership: religion, which was supposed to be raising the spiritual consciousness of the lower nature of man, was instead capitulating on a visible field of struggle. Since very little was included in official government documents about the Mormons, even from the clergy, as to the reason why polygamy was so reprehensible, one can only conjecture and observe that the actual moral condition of the Germans was not such that they, as a people, could throw stones at the Mormon doctrine of plural marriage.

\textsuperscript{42}Ibid., 204; "Die Polygamie und die Mission," 245-250.
None of these observations should be construed as an argument for or against polygamy, but should demonstrate that what the German officials and ecclesiastical community condemned had more parameters than they noticeably examined. Whether polygamy would flourish in Germany presented almost a moot point, except that it seems to be this very concept which worried the officials of Prussia. And yet, they still did not defend their attack on the Mormon missionaries because of polygamy, but rather an outdated law regulating emigration.

In addition to anxiety over Mormon encouragement of emigration and the impact of polygamy on public morals, German officials worried about the growing influence of the Social Democratic movement in Germany and the possible existence of Socialist sympathies among the American missionaries. William Lang, the Hamburg consul, commented,

An opinion prevails that leading members of the German Socialistic party are going to the United States for the purpose of consolidating and molding into one solid, compact party the German Socialists who have heretofore emigrated there, and who are now acting in a separate and unorganized way. A natural sequence of the unmolested condition of the Socialists in America as compared with their condition in Europe, and detailed in their letters from banished co-laborers in the cause in America, is thought to be the leading reason for the large exodus of Socialists from the states of Europe to the United States.43

In order to understand the disquiet of German officials with regard to the Social Democracy, the background of this non-traditional political movement needs to be examined. As

43*Consular Report*, 104.
the majority of the socialist supporters came from the ranks of workers in factories and other new industries, such as railroads, their arrival in the German political scene began with the tremendous German industrialization of the last half of the nineteenth century.

Germany industrialized later than its international rivals, Britain and France. This delay derived, in part, from the internal economic barriers which existed between each of the independent German states. These obstacles diminished in 1834 as Prussia convinced a number of the northern German states to join an economic union, the Zollverein [Customs Union], which abolished tariffs between members. Groh observes that the dominant international presence of Great Britain in industrial textile production encouraged German industrialization to focus on metal and coal production, boosting interest in railroads. The railroads, in turn, dramatically improved communication and transportation, bolstering the Zollverein member economies.\textsuperscript{44} The Zollverein, in conjunction with the new railroads, dramatically hastened the industrialization of Germany.\textsuperscript{45}

The rise of new industries in Germany did not immediately generate a working-class consciousness. Sagarra maintains that worker social status varied dramatically, even in the

\textsuperscript{44}Groh, 450-451.

same trade, until after 1850. It is a historical truism that social revolutions occur, not when a class is so subjugated that it can barely survive, but rather after its conditions begin to improve and expectations rise. In the case of the socialist movement in Germany, of which Social Democracy was one branch, popularity and support flourished as the worker's lot improved a little. In the wake of the Revolution of 1848 and more noticeably as wages for workers began to increase after 1863, the working class began to seek for political and social acknowledgement.

In 1863, Ferdinand Lassalle founded a worker's political party, Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverband [Universal German Worker's Association], dedicated to the idea that eventually society would embrace a democracy of the working man and political concerns would be suborned to social needs—Social Democracy. Six years later in 1869, August Bebel and William Liebknecht founded the Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei [Social Democratic Workers' Party], as much an anti-Prussian party as it was a forum for the advancement of the working class. These two parties merged in 1875, by which time

---

46Sagarra, 363.

47Ibid., 368.

Marxist views of revolutionary change had become part of the socialist program.\textsuperscript{49}

In the period after 1870, Germany underwent tremendous demographic as well as economic change. Karl Born states that Germany "had caught up with Britain's technological head start in the raw material industries."\textsuperscript{50} He further observes that between 1870 and 1913, Germany progressed from producing 1,700,000 tons of iron a year, a quarter as much as Britain, to 19,300,000 tons of iron, almost twice the British production.\textsuperscript{51} During the period from 1850 to 1910, industrialization drew the population from the countryside into the cities. The urban populace grew from ten million in 1850, roughly twenty-nine percent of the German population, to forty million in 1910, roughly sixty-two percent of the national population.\textsuperscript{52} This migration also had the effect of moving people from conservative East Prussia to the more moderate Rhine region, effectively reducing numerical support for the status quo.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{49}Sagarra, 368-370.


\textsuperscript{51}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{52}Groh, 460.

\textsuperscript{53}Born, 24.
Both Groh and Sagarra point out that these new urban citizens, most of them working class, could not count on the community support which typified village life. Moreover, Protestant churches in the cities failed to provide social stability for these internal immigrants.\(^5^4\) In this vacuum, the Social Democrats reached out and provided help to workers, finding them employment, encouraging education and providing social interaction.\(^5^5\) By meeting the needs of a class otherwise neglected by society, the Social Democrats built up their popularity so that by 1877 they received twelve seats in the Reichstag with "493,000 votes, ten percent of the total."\(^5^6\) Hajo Holborn observes,

In contrast to the old parties, [the Social Democrat Party] was not a mere contraption for winning elections. Its function was the infusion of communal ideals into it members, something neither state nor church was capable of doing any longer. . . It broke all sentimental ties not only with the institutions of the monarchical state but also the other parties.\(^5^7\)

The development of this attitude posed a direct ideological threat to the German government. Chancellor Bismarck responded in 1878 by inducing the Imperial Reichstag to pass the harsh Socialist Law, essentially eliminating all legal

\(^5^4\) Groh, 474-475, Sagarra, 372.

\(^5^5\) Sagarra, 372.

\(^5^6\) Holborn, 287, Groh, 489.

\(^5^7\) Holborn, 289.
socialist supports, such as clubs, newspapers and taverns. The law provided for the dissolution of all socialist organizations, the banishment of socialists, and in "imperiled districts"--not defined, and therefore open to interpretation convenient for the anti-socialist government--the authorities might suspend the constitutional freedoms of free assembly and "free political speech" and even expel any individuals who might threaten "the public peace." Some Social Democrats chose to emigrate rather than suffer these indignities, sending German emigration figures from 29,313 emigrants in 1878 to an all-time high of 250,630 emigrants in 1882. Despite government persecution and loss of emigrated party membership, the Social Democrats struggled in an underground existence, gradually regaining strength, and when the Reichstag did not


Lamprecht also observes that the two assassination attempts against Wilhelm I, although neither assassin was an active Social Democrat, gave Bismarck the opportunity to rally public support against the party because the Social Democrats had acquired a public reputation as having no scruples in achieving their ends.

59Holborn, 287.

renew the Socialist Law in 1890, the party polled 1,427,298 votes in Imperial elections.\(^{67}\)

The Latter-day Saints, while not advocates of Social Democracy, already had a history of alternative socio-economic experimentation. From the beginnings of the church with its interest in early Christianity's communal living, the doctrine of "consecration and stewardship" and the later United Order communities in Utah, the idea of material wealth being a community rather than a personal possession persisted.\(^{62}\) In fact in 1875, during the height of German concern about Social Democratic influence, Mormon President Brigham Young encouraged the founding of the southern Utah United Order community of Orderville.\(^{63}\) The various Mormon attempts to build these communities did not have long-lasting success, with Orderville and other Utah United Order settlements essentially giving up their communitarian precepts by the mid-1880s.\(^{64}\)

Although Mormon missionaries in Germany advocated a distinctively Mormon viewpoint on early Christian values, they did not focus on economic issues, other than the doctrine of

\(^{61}\)Holborn, 288; Lamprecht; 149, Groh, 491.


\(^{63}\)Arrington, "Orderville," 3.

\(^{64}\)Allen and Leonard, 364-366.
tithing. In 1883, however, the mission leadership found it necessary to excommunicate several important southern German members and disband branches in Stuttgart, Nürnberg, Erlangen and Munich—an area where Social Democracy enjoyed strong representation—with the vague explanation "because of the laws of the land [Landesgesetze] and other relationships." Later, church leaders admitted that local involvement with the Social Democrats was one of the reasons for this drastic action. In an effort to distance the church from the Social Democrats, German Latter-day Saint leaders published statements in 1900 and again in 1909 in *Der Stern* discussing how Mormon doctrine adamantly opposed the actions and the materialistic ideals of the Social Democrats.

Despite these endeavors to portray themselves as normal, rational people, the Mormons could not overcome Prussian prejudice. Part of the difficulty lay in the distaste which characterized all the official contacts between Mormons and Prussian officials. The emigration issue, the first matter which separated them politically and ideologically, represented among other things, the coming Prussian struggle between the paternalistic, absolutist government of the past and the coming, constitutionalist future which to a certain
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extent, the American Mormons represented. The problem of polygamy struck even deeper, into the cultural traditions and bastions of Prussian religious life, with all of its legal defenses. Admitting the freedom of the Mormons to engage in polygamy on religious grounds threatened the boundaries which the Germans had drawn around their faith, and reminded them of the irrational days of Münster with all of the conflict and excesses. Finally, the political threat to both monarchy and bourgeois inherent in the social democratic movement, even though the Mormons did not support it, only deepened the suspicion of the government towards a religion already tarred with the stigma of fanaticism. These three elements fairly assured that when Prussian officials examined the merits of Mormonism closely, they would act with abhorrence rather than understanding.
CHAPTER THREE
1871-1890, GROWTH AND INTERACTION

Several important developments marked the period between 1871 and 1890: the unification of Germany, the Kulturkampf, the rise of a strong, powerful Germany in Europe, the growth of the Latter-day Saint Church commonwealth in the American Great Basin, the continuing worldwide Mormon missionary effort, and the negative reaction of the non-Mormon world to the peculiarly Mormon doctrines of polygamy and emigration to Utah. While the conflict between Prussia and the Mormon missionaries during this time did not manifest the same acrimony as at the turn of the twentieth century, both institutions began to develop their positions, the Prussians through the Kulturkampf and the Mormons in their fight with the United States government over polygamy. The attitudes manifested in the course of these conflicts would subsequently affect their actions at the turn of the century.

The Prussian victory in the Franco-Prussian War in 1871 laid the groundwork for both the rebuilding of the German nation and a dramatic shift of power in the international political sphere. The particularistic divisions of the vanished Holy Roman Empire, often played off against each other in the past, no longer dominated central Europe. In its
place a new German state, dominated by militaristic Prussia, struggled to achieve a significant role among the Great European Powers. At the head of this enfant terrible stood the determined Iron Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck. His driving ambition to solidify the new nation regardless of the required sacrifice set the tone for his administration.

Unification prompted a euphoric spirit among the majority of Germans, an attitude reflected in the hectic economy between 1871 and 1873 known as the Gründjahre [Foundation Years]. New business ventures, including railroads and banks, multiplied on the German stock market. In October 1873, however, this growth collapsed, and as Hajo Holborn explains, "wrecked the majority of the newly founded companies, ruining thousands of fortunes and lives."¹ The stock market crash ushered in a period of slower economic growth which lasted for twenty years. The end of this breakneck expansion did not, however, spell financial doom for average Germans. Prices remained low, wages rose slightly and unemployment stayed in check during the entire period. German economic power, therefore, continued to grow, but more slowly, eclipsing other European nations much later than it would had the Gründjahre continued unabated.

Meanwhile, international politics changed as new players, particularly the German Empire, a rising United States and Japan, fought for their share of influence. Austria-Hungary's

¹Holborn, 380-381.
role declined, especially after its defeat at Prussia's hands in 1866, but its gradual expansion into the Balkans heralded future conflict, especially with Russia. Britain and France competed for dominance of "new" colonialism, and Russia continued its internal colonization activities. The German and American economies expanded, poaching on British mercantile and industrial preeminence, and the subjugation of China by the Western colonial powers continued apace. Neither France nor Britain desired the growth of German and American power, and both were loathe to make room for the newcomers.

Bismarck's distinctive power diplomacy flourished in this competitive era. His diplomatic policies isolated France, placated Russia, supported Britain's complacency, and overawed Austria. In his relations with the German emperor, Wilhelm I of Prussia, nominally that of servant, Bismarck actually eclipsed his master. Until Wilhelm I's death in 1888, the chancellor wielded an overpowering authority, both in Prussia and the German empire.

Throughout the twenty years of his ascendancy, no evidence exists to indicate that Bismarck ever seriously concerned himself with the Mormon presence in Germany.² He had more serious matters to worry about. However, in his drive to

²The one indication that he was even knew about Mormons comes from an note written by the German ambassador to Switzerland with a copy of the 1887 decision by Swiss jurists in the Loosli polygamy case—discussed later in the chapter. Even the existence of the note does not mean that Bismarck paid any attention to the matter. see Acta der Mormonen betr. Abschrift der Kaiserlich Gesandtschaft, No. 49.
eliminate competition for loyalty to the new state, the chancellor unleashed a program against German Catholicism which clearly demonstrated how ruthless and unrelenting the newly unified Germany could be when confronted with a choice between loyalty to the new nation and religious liberty.

In an effort to break what he considered to be the emerging political power of the Catholic Germans and counter the threat of a resurgent Vatican, Bismarck and his anti-clerical National Liberal allies produced a series of legislative actions designed to cripple the Catholic impact on national life, particularly in the areas of education and public speaking. A liberal lawmaker appropriated the term *Kulturkampf*, or fight for civilization, to describe the goal of realigning the German culture with Protestant values.

The *Kulturkampf* had its roots in Bismarck’s efforts to unify the nation ecclesiastically as well as politically. Hajo Holborn maintains that Bismarck never understood the spiritual power of the major churches, seeing them only as centers of political control and that this narrow viewpoint prompted the immoderate and ultimately unsuccessful actions of the *Kulturkampf*. Even after the attempt had been abandoned as unproductive, he demonstrated no interest in the ideologi-
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cal or religious side of the struggle. Indicative of his perception, Bismarck appointed a new Minister of Religious Affairs, the anti-clerical Adalbert Falk. Falk perceived his duty as a commission to restructure the legal positions of church and state in such a way that the church could not challenge the state in matters of education or public loyalty.

The German public saw it differently. John E. Groh, in his study of German Protestant social views during the nineteenth century observes,

[The Franco-Prussian War and reunification] gave German Protestants the chance to validate, in a religious way, the revolution 'von oben' [from above] that had been underway for some time. . . . [I]t was now the churches' responsibility . . . to lend moral support to conservative nationalism.

The drive for a national church to go with the new nation had begun. Only one third of the German-speaking population, with the exclusion of the Austrians, professed Catholicism. As the majority, moreover, of Bismarck's external foes in 1871,
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6 So far as I'm concerned, the course of our [Kulturkampf] policy was determined not by religious considerations but purely by the desire to establish as firmly as possible the unity won on the battlefield. Herman von Petersdorff et al, eds., Bismarck: Die Gesammelte Werke (Berlin: 1924-35), 15:332, cited in Ronald J. Ross, "Enforcing the Kulturkampf in the Bismarckian State and the Limits of Coercion in Imperial Germany" The Journal of Modern History Sept 1984, 56:458.

7 Groh, 410. The Minister of Religious Affairs also handled educational concerns.

8 Groh, 370.

particularly France and Austria-Hungary, embraced Catholicism, the choice of a Protestant national church was no surprise.\textsuperscript{10}

It would be a mistake, however, to view the \textit{Kulturkampf} of the 1870s as an isolated political struggle. Other nations, notably France and Austria-Hungary, had also experienced a reaction to papal influence, particularly in response to the \textit{Syllabus of Errors} and the declaration of papal infallibility in 1870. Ideally a modern nation took a neutral position, preventing "any form of public or semi-public monopoly" of belief.\textsuperscript{11} In the case of Bismarck's government the reality fell somewhere in between total control and true disinterest.

The Imperial German government began the offensive against Catholic influence by expelling the influential and independent Society of Jesus--the Jesuits--in July 1872.\textsuperscript{12} While this action experienced great public popularity, the proceedings deprived the Jesuits of legal rights, including due process guarantees, based not on their personal actions, but solely on membership in an order which the government did not want in Germany.\textsuperscript{13} This same attitude would resurface a

\textsuperscript{10}Nichols, 223.

\textsuperscript{11}Nipperdey, 361.

\textsuperscript{12}Groh, 412.

quarter of a century later when officials deliberated the Mormon question.

As noted earlier, however, local and national German culture exercised less care keeping the role of the church separate from political authority. Nipperdey remarks,

The state financed the church. . . . It collaborated in the placement of bishops and demanded supervision of many of their activities. . . . The [Catholic] church, on the other hand, desired to be and remain the determining power publicly and socially.14

The government's response to this challenge came in the form of the 1873 May Laws, and in 1874 the Expulsion Law. While the May Laws enhanced the state's legal superiority to churches, requiring priesthood aspirants to pass cultural examinations, assuming power to disallow church nominations, reducing church disciplinary authority, and making departure from a denomination easier, their actual impact depended on ecclesiastical willingness to submit to political authority.15 Ironically, easing the restrictions for leaving a congregation hurt the Protestant denominations far more than the Catholics.16 The Expulsion Law, on the other hand, actually permitted the government to banish clergy who failed to comply with the May Laws. While the government applied the stricture to only 257 offending priests throughout

14 Nipperdey, 365.

15 Ross, 460-461.

16 Evans, 64.
Germany, its use against agents of a major religion hints at the predisposition of zealous government officials to eliminate irritants rather than provide some latitude for their point of view.

Very little was too sacred to be sacrificed for the cause of national unity. Even the Prussian constitution lost the three articles guaranteeing the privilege of churches to handle internal matters such as discipline without state interference, and access of clergy to their ecclesiastical leaders. Even personal dignity suffered. Holborn notes that a large portion of the German Catholic population experienced unjustified "humiliations and persecutions" and vilifications as "enemies of the Empire." The Kulturkampf also uncovered a different element of a religion-state conflict: the tendency of the persecuted group to flout the law in order to fulfill religious responsibilities. The banished priest would usually come home without government authorization to minister to his flock and they would protect him in return. One West Prussian cleric secretly came back before his term of exile ended and performed his local functions for two years without getting
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17 Günther Dettmer, Die Ost- und Westpreußischen Verwaltungsbehörden im Kulturkampf (Heidelberg, 1958) cited in Ross, 462.

18 Robinson, 29., see note 18 in Chapter One.
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caught. While it would be inaccurate to draw an exact parallel between the roles of a parish priest and a Mormon missionary, it is interesting that a major Christian denomination, during a period of harassment, decided to engage in civil disobedience in order to discharge spiritual duties, just as the missionaries and the German Latter-day Saints later did. Jeffery Anderson, in his study of Mormon struggles in Weimar Germany, has demonstrated that the Latter-day Saint membership in Germany grew prior to World War I in spite of emigration, banishment and police persecution.

In the final analysis, the drive to weaken and isolate the German Catholic hierarchy backfired. The growth of the newly-founded Center Party, primarily representing Catholic interests rather than liberal or conservative politics, in concert with increased Conservative Party strength, contributed to the decline of the National Liberal Party which had actively advocated the Kulturkampf. In fact, the strength of the Center Party made it the chief support of Bismarck's later legislative coalitions.

The analogy between the events of the 1870s and later Mormon-German misfortunes should not be stretched too far.
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The Kulturkampf had deep political and international underpinnings, while the Mormon problem occurred often more as a local police-clerical difficulty. Government interactions differed: the Reichstag debated every piece of Kulturkampf legislation intensely while a Reichstag discussion of the Mormon issue does not exist. In other areas, such as national security and the threats perceived by Bismarck and the Liberal Party, the Latter-day Saint presence does not even register, nor should it. The examination of the Kulturkampf clearly demonstrated, however, the extent to which the Imperial and Prussian governments would go to accomplish their ends, the kind of actions they would take and the underlying attitude which would motivate them.

In the midst of the German political struggle during the 1870s to suborn the Catholic church, the Mormons quietly increased their own modest but vigorous missionary effort. Prior to this time, despite Karl G. Maeser’s successful labors in southern Germany, the main focus of German-speaking missionary work lay in Switzerland. In the summer of 1875, however, this attitude began changing. European Mission President Joseph F. Smith, a member of the church’s First Presidency, the paramount Latter-day Saint ruling body, deter-

23Although a portion of the difficulties surrounding the 1902-03 banishment decrees also had international ramifications since the exiled missionaries had American citizenship and appealed to their Embassy for assistance, the Kulturkampf struggle mirrored activities in other nations, France and Austria as the best examples.
mined that waiting for government consent to exercise the religious freedoms promised in the constitutions of the German principalities was unproductive. In June 1875 he declared,

Hereafter, the Elders will not stop to ask permission of the Authorities of Germany to preach the Gospel there but they will go and do it the Lord helping them and opening the way. The law gives them the legal right and if denied by the bigotry of priests or rulers, contrary to the law, they will claim it at the hand of God, for it is HIS WORK.24

His comments may reflect the Latter-day Saints' growing sense of security, as the church had remained in Utah for the last twenty-seven years without being driven out, in spite of the Utah War of 1857. It might also have come in response to a visit he made to the Swiss-German Mission in early June.25 Regardless, Smith's declaration opened a new era in missionary efforts among the German-speaking people and its most populous state, Prussia.

The new demarche did not reap a large harvest of converts, but the Mormon elders did find a few souls. Missionaries baptized fourteen new German members in 1875, where during the previous five years earlier records showed that no one joined the church.26 This slow start owed much to old governmental prejudices. Henry Eyring, attempting to gain

24Millennial Star 37:394., italics in original text.


recognition for the church in the more liberal, western state of Baden, suffered banishment that same year on the twin charges of inciting emigration and preaching polygamy.\textsuperscript{27} One elder blamed the low rate of conversions on the self-satisfied attitude of the Germans in the wake of the defeat of France and the formation of the new empire.\textsuperscript{28} Subsequent years saw a rise in conversions during the time of economic hardship, peaking in 1882 with 221 baptisms, and receding below a hundred a year by the late 1880s.\textsuperscript{29}

Latter-day Saint experiences during the period, however, were not universally grim. Mormon success during 1876 in Ludwigshafen motivated a disgruntled individual to complain to the local authorities. The police visited the mission president, John Stucki, to judge the situation. Stucki, who earlier that year had suffered from police intolerance in Switzerland, received polite and open-minded treatment, a far cry from the troubles in Hamburg and Prussia in the 1850s.\textsuperscript{30} Police officials in Berlin even acceded to the formation of a congregation in Berlin in 1876.\textsuperscript{31}

The distaste with which the German hierarchy viewed the Mormons stemmed, in part, from the attitude of the United
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States government towards the Latter-day Saints. While Congress had passed the Anti-Bigamy Act in 1862, it was unenforceable due to the Civil War and later because of Mormon control of local courts. To rectify that loophole, Congress then passed the Poland Act in 1874 which transferred control of the courts to federal officials. In order to test the constitutionality of these statutes, Latter-day Saint church leaders convinced George Reynolds to surrender to federal marshals with clear evidence of his violations. Because of local judicial difficulties, the case was not tried until 1879, and then appealed. The United States Supreme Court subsequently upheld the Anti-Bigamy Act to the shock of the Mormon community and Reynolds was incarcerated.32

In addition to the growing number of punitive laws and actions which the American government pursued during the anti-polygamy drive, the State Department in 1878 sent a circular to all diplomats serving abroad addressing the Mormon missionary work. In it Secretary of State William Evarts condemned the immigration policy of the church as an effort to "swell the numbers of law-defying Mormons."33 He designed the note to play upon the fears of nations where Mormons had missions, by characterizing the missionaries as being particularly


active "especially in," and then leaving a blank space for the embassy to fill in the name of the host country. The circular also described new converts as victims of Latter-day Saint deception.34

After citing the specific federal law prohibiting bigamy, Evarts urged the various American diplomatic officers to further represent the issue as a matter of moral concern, as well as a diplomatic matter as the Mormons were involved in "deliberate and systematic attempt to bring persons to the United States with the intent of violating their laws."35 The diplomats received additional encouragement to find and call to the attention of their hosts appropriate anti-bigamy legislation, local cases at hand, and to use the public press to carry out the attack on Latter-day Saint missions.36 The diplomats were expected to leave no stone unturned in the effort to halt Mormon growth.

The efficacy of the circular remains doubtful, particularly in America and Britain where the newspapers roundly denounced its foolishness.37 The files of various German states on Mormon matters, including Prussia and Saxony, preserve no record of this circular, or any reference to

34Ibid., 11.

35Ibid., 12.

36Ibid.

37Brigham H. Roberts, Comprehensive History of the Church vol 5 (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret News Press, 1930) 552-553.
diplomatic conversations on the topic of Mormon emigration or polygamy during this period. German accusations against missionaries after 1879, however, tended to focus much more on polygamy and other moral issues than the emigration concern of earlier decades.

Hence, from that date until after the Manifesto of 1890 American missionaries in Germany and elsewhere obtained no help from American consuls or diplomats. On the contrary, in response to the expulsion from Bavaria of several missionaries, the local American consul wrote a note to "convey the thanks of the Government at Washington" for discouraging Mormon missionary work, more particularly the spread of polygamy "which violate[s] alike the usages of Christian civilization and the provisions of American law." No State Department response appeared to condemn his actions.

In the year following the Evarts circular, earlier Mormon missionary success underwent a reversal. Ludwigshafen clergy contacted police officials in neighboring Mannheim and succeeded in excluding Mormon missionaries from working in the city. The officials in Mannheim justified their actions on the expulsion order of Henry Eyring. Later that year, Berlin officials reversed their earlier stance of benign

---
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neglect and banished the missionaries from the city.\textsuperscript{41} In spite of these problems, the number of Mormon emigrants did not go above twenty-six a year until 1886.\textsuperscript{42}

American attitudes about polygamy and the Mormons did not improve. In 1882, Congress passed the Edmunds Act, stipulating a $500 fine and a prison term of up to five years for either polygamy—marrying more than one wife—or unlawful cohabitation—supporting more than one household. The act also disenfranchised all polygamists and set up a new commission to oversee voter registration as well as all elections in Utah Territory.\textsuperscript{43} With real power to hold the polygamists, federal marshals and deputies began to hunt down local and general church leaders.

Shortly after the implementation of the American measures began, German surveillance of Mormon missionaries increased. As noted earlier, President John Q. Cannon had dissolved several branches in southern German states in 1883 because of ties to the Social Democrats. Two years later, when mission president Fred Schönfeld visited the Berlin elders in April 1885, city police officials nearly succeeding in arresting him. Rumors had circulated linking the American Mormons with the Social Democratic movement, and the police explained that they wanted him to clarify the relationship between the
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Latter-day Saints and the German Americans who were agitating for the recognition of the Social Democrats in Germany.\textsuperscript{44} Even work in southwestern Germany, earlier a more fertile region, became difficult.

The best example of this increased official notice occurred in the case of Thomas Biesinger, who had left Nürnberg in May, 1885 for Munich to avoid police persecution. When he arrived in Bavaria the local police attempted to expel him, but he responded that their persecutions were intolerable and unsubstantiable and should be stopped. The policemen apologized and left. Biesinger received a banishment order two months later, dated a week after the earlier encounter, and he again determined to contest the ruling. A local police official, Baron von Freilitzsch, received him and affirmed the validity of the order on the basis that Biesinger was a Mormon missionary. Biesinger responded that the charge could not be confirmed. Von Freilitzsch, in turn, named all of Biesinger's activities for the past two years, including his 1883 missionary call from President John Taylor, his arrest in Austria for proselyting and his recent work in Nürnberg. Biesinger conceded the accuracy of the police report and left.\textsuperscript{45}

At roughly the same time, the Prussian police files on the Mormons began to expand after a thirty-year hiatus. Among the first materials for 1884 appear a pair of articles by a
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Herr Melzer in a Berlin daily newspaper, Neueste Mittheilungen. Dated January 24 and 26, the articles reported the growth of Mormon influence in the western United States. The first article discussed several notions with questionable accuracy including the failure of women's suffrage in Utah to limit polygamy, the positive community spirit of Mormon settlements, the improper use of tithing funds by church leaders and the growth of Mormon communities in Arizona as a bridge to the Mormon polygamous colonies in Mexico.

Although grudgingly recognizing beneficial elements of Mormonism and Mormon colonizing achievement like most German authors, Melzer generally disapproved of the Latter-day Saints. In the January 26 article, he lambasted the Mormons for their encouragement of emigration and asserted that church authorities cunningly acclimated European emigrants by allowing them to reside in the more civilized regions of Utah before sending them elsewhere, as the shock of Arizona's arid lands would drive them away. Melzer also accused the highest church officials of holding women in common as bed partners, citing local Protestant clergy as his reliable sources of information. He described the wife-swapping as one of the religious "mysteries" of Mormonism, an allusion to the covenants undertaken by Latter-day Saints in their temples.

Further, he misconstrued the Mormon reverence of the Bible as the word of God "as far as it is translated correctly" to mean that to Mormons the scripture had validity
only where it agreed with the doctrine of polygamy. He also inferred that the Book of Mormon advocated polygamy, a palpable falsehood indicating how little he had actually tested the various bits of gossip which he passed on. He finished by predicting that the Mormons would eventually leave Utah and move to Sonora, Mexico to preserve their church and doctrines.\textsuperscript{46} While Melzer's tales are entertaining at best, and libellous at worst, no other description of Mormons in Utah appear in the Prussian police files until 1907, giving his anecdotes an authority among Prussian officials which they hardly merited.

Matters did not improve for the Latter-day Saints as the decade drew to a close. Albert Riedel, in his uncritical chronology of the German-speaking Mormon missions, observed that 1886 was "a year of great unpleasantness" for the mission and the Utah church.\textsuperscript{47} In 1887 a law in the United States and a court case in Switzerland appeared which curtailed Mormon freedom of action in both places, as long as the church continued to practice plural marriage.

In spite of the sweeping disenfranchisement and arrests of prominent Mormon leaders under the Edmunds Act, the United States Congress sought new measures to finally eliminate the practice of polygamy on American soil. To that end, the 1887

\textsuperscript{46}A. L. Melzer, "Die Ausbreitung der Mormonen in Nordamerika Neueste Mittheilungen" (Berlin: Dr. Klee, 1884) January 24, 26, 1884, 3.
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Edmunds-Tucker Act attacked the public corporation of the Latter-day Saints on "political and economic" grounds.\textsuperscript{48} The government seized all church assets, even the religiously significant temples, emptied and terminated the Perpetual Emigration Fund set up to assist immigration to Utah, and ended the church's legal corporate status. Prosecution of polygamy and unlawful cohabitation trials could now require witnesses to attend and wives to testify against their husbands. The final restrictions of the law further narrowed franchise rights to those who took an oath to comply with anti-polygamy statutes, and placed schools under federal jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{49}

In Zofingen, Aargau, Switzerland, Johann Kaspar Loosli, a naturalized American citizen who also continued to enjoy Swiss citizenship, appealed an 1886 lower court decision which denied Mormons, on the grounds of public immorality, the right to practice their religion in Switzerland. Loosli maintained that he had taken great care as a missionary to stay within Swiss law by avoiding discussion or practice of the doctrine of plural marriage, as well as making no overt effort to encourage emigration to the United States.

When brought into court to answer the charge of "offending public morals," Loosli faced more charges of hypocrisy and public deception because he refrained from preaching
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polygamy and emigration. Adding insult to injury the presi-
ding magistrates also referred to a letter from someone they
termed a reputable source which accused the Mormons of
deceiving Swiss women by converting them without informing
them of the existence of Mormon polygamy, then influencing
them to emigrate to a land where polygamy held sway and
forcing them into "a miserable slavery." Finally the court
argued that the Mormons sought to escape public censure by
holding meetings in private homes.

Basing his appeal on the Swiss constitutional rights of
freedom of religion--article 49--free expression of opinion--
article 50--and freedom of association--article 56--Loosli
argued that polygamy, even in Utah, was a voluntary practice,
not required of everyone. He disagreed with the contention
that not discussing polygamy was deceitful, but argued rather
that he was trying to comply with Swiss laws governing moral
behavior. To the last charge he replied that Mormons had
nowhere else to meet. He insisted that "despite all
constitutional assurances, there is nowhere [else] that the
appellant and his Swiss co-religionists were permitted to
practice [their religion]."

After considering both presentations, on October 7, 1887
the Swiss confederation council decided against Loosli, and

50 Acta der Mormonen betr., "Bundesrathbeschluss" 7 October
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consequently against Mormons in Switzerland. While articles 49 and 50 worked together to assure the diversity and freedom of opinion, these statutes were, the magistrates reasoned, limited by the concerns of public morality. Moreover, since Loosli was a citizen of Utah and a missionary, no doubt existed on the council that he acted to benefit the Mormon church which included supporting its doctrines. Therefore, it did not matter if he discussed emigration or not, the idea was implicit in his attempts to convert people. The council agreed with the lower court that avoiding discussion of polygamy and emigration constituted public deception. Finally to clinch the argument that Loosli was duplicitous it quoted a passage received of a letter from a "representative of a foreign power" to the Swiss consul in San Francisco which described the lot of a hundred Swiss immigrants to Utah as truly pitiable. In consequence, the council determined that Mormons did not qualify as a religious association and thus

---

52Ibid., 77. Their reasoning is strained here, since he did not actively promote emigration, nor was there any deputation that Loosli had told Swiss converts that Utah was a paradise. He may have done so, but the court cites no evidence to that effect in its opinion.

The quote describing the miserable condition of Swiss emigrants has substantially the same message and writing style as that of an article sent to a Dresden newspaper by an evangelical pastor named Zimmer who had gone to Salt Lake City ostensibly to administer to the needs of Lutherans, but who had focussed on "revealing" the abuses of Mormons, especially against German-speaking emigrants. Even as an ordained Lutheran minister, Zimmer's status hardly ranked as a "representative of a foreign power."
were not protected by the provisions of the Swiss constitution.\textsuperscript{53}

The German ambassador to Switzerland sent a copy of this decision to Chancellor Bismarck preceded by a personal memorandum. The diplomat called the wording of the decision to Bismarck's attention, suggesting that the decision of the court might be of some value in dealing with German sects.\textsuperscript{54} He specifically noted the Swiss perspective placing public morals above constitutional rights, inferring that such an idea might be useful in Germany. The \textit{Kulturkampf} had long since retreated, American diplomats acted against Mormons and Mormon baptisms in Germany had retreated from their 1882 peak of two hundred twenty-one to fifty-seven in 1886, so the ambassador's motives for forwarding the decision to Bismarck remain unclear. The idea that public moral concerns outweighed constitutional rights now, however, had an international precedent which German legal theorists could and did use.\textsuperscript{55}

In 1890 Bismarck's tenure as Imperial German Chancellor and Prussian Minister-President and Foreign Minister abruptly came to an end. In 1888, Wilhelm I died. Three months later,}
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his son and successor, Friedrich III succumbed to throat cancer, leaving the young Wilhelm II as German emperor.

Wilhelm II, only twenty-nine at the time, was not the ideal ruler, lacking patience and depth of understanding. The inexperienced emperor would not submit to Bismarck’s domination, nor did the two strong personalities get along. A year and a half after Wilhelm II’s coronation, he released Bismarck, installing General Caprivi as imperial chancellor. Germany, which took its mood from its supreme executive, embarked on a new era of global expansion and drive to achieve international respect. Religious tolerance would not be a hallmark of this new reign, any more than it had been of the previous era.

Meanwhile, the issues of the legality of the Edmunds-Tucker Law had been settled by the United States Supreme Court. In 1890, the justices voted to uphold the constitutional basis of the law, substantiating the validity of enforcing its requirements. Now the Latter-day Saints faced the challenge of either upholding their unique and challenged doctrine or surviving the economic and political annihilation of their Utah community. It was at this point that President Wilford Woodruff of the First Presidency took the step which eventually brought about the cessation of polygamy among the Mormons.  

56Holborn, 290-291.  

57Allen and Leonard, 410-415.
CHAPTER FOUR
1890-1902, POST-MANIFESTO TENSIONS

In September 1890, President Wilford Woodruff of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints produced a document, ratified later that year at the semi-annual conference of the church, expressly advising the membership to comply with the national laws forbidding polygamy. Regardless of the motives or opinions of the people affected by this policy, or those of the individuals involved in the American anti-polygamy crusade, the Manifesto, as the document became known, marks a turning point in Mormon history. From that time onward, the relationship between the Latter-day Saints and the United States government began to improve, rigorous official efforts to prosecute polygamists tapered off, and United States diplomatic personnel began to no longer treat as pariahs the Mormon missionaries who worked overseas. This positive trend in Mormon-governmental relations did not immediately progress beyond the boundaries of the United States. Instead, the years between 1890 and 1902 marked a time of escalation in the already tense relationship between the powerful Prussian government and the Mormon missionaries.

The year 1890 stands also as something of a pivotal date for Prussia and Germany, and German-American relations as
well. After having forged a nation and served under two emperors, Bismarck found himself at odds with and then dismissed by the third German emperor, Wilhelm II. In Bismarck's place Wilhelm II selected General Leo von Caprivi as imperial chancellor, but began to take more control of foreign and domestic policy into his own hands. The chief danger which arose from Wilhelm II's intervention derived from his personality, which in public circumstances manifested itself as charming and persuasive, but equally abrupt, self-assured and brutal. Also, he pursued governmental actions by impulsive personal decision, rather than in concert with his chancellors and ministers. The result of this dramatic change in control of government policy eventually soured German-American relations, a association which President Benjamin Harrison described at the time as having been "traditionally friendly."

One of the decisive factors in the decline of German-American cooperation can be found in the determination of Caprivi to achieve the "economic independence" of Europe from America. To reach that end, he renegotiated several commercial treaties, risking the chance of alienating the United

---


2Ibid. 277-279.


States. He told a Reichstag assembly in 1891, "it is not [unlikely] that between [competing imperialistic] states a form of warfare will arrive, where shots will not be fired, but [the combatants] will have . . . tariffs in their hands."  

Since both Germany and America had become imperialist nations in the second half of the nineteenth century, this statement applied to the United States as much as to the existing colonial powers, France, Britain and Russia.

Public relations between Germany and America also experienced a downturn, due in part to the nature of sensational journalism in both countries. The rhetoric became so virulent, that in 1898, Ambassador Andrew D. White felt compelled to explain the situation to the State Department. He listed several causes which contributed to the altercation, including American economic protectionist policies, maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, increasing American productivity, the perception of America by Germans as a lawless nation, and America's political diversity.  

Additionally, the press of both nations made matters worse by calumnifying each other in the daily newspapers. When White requested some journalists to stick to the facts they reportedly told him that newspapers on either side felt
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that articles which did not go beyond the facts would get the sales which competitors who embellished commanded.\textsuperscript{7}

In the same vein, the educated German classes, those who wielded social power and determined conventional wisdom in a class-ridden society, on the whole had not gained any respect for the Mormons during the years that missionaries had actively worked in the country. The 1895 Brockhaus Konversations-Lexikon, a barometer of general German intellectual attitudes, treated the Latter-day Saints as a laughable collection of fools who had the socially unacceptable habit of polygamy. Unlike the 1853 edition which had treated Mormon history and doctrine as exotic but interesting, the later entry referred to the Book of Mormon as a series of "nonsensical fables [fairy tales] about the immigration of the patriarchs to North America (unsinniger Fabeln über die Einwanderung der Patriarchen in Nordamerika)" as well as the "unlikely" history of the Nephites and Lamanites.\textsuperscript{8} Further, the article accepted the Solomon Spaulding theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon, and leaned heavily on the opinionated works of Moritz Busch, D. T. Fernhagel and Robert von Schlagentweit. Interestingly enough, the article cited 1843 as the date when
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Joseph Smith received the revelation initiating polygamy, but made no value judgement about the practice.⁹

An interesting counterpoint to the Brockhaus perspective appeared in the 1893 edition of the Catholic encyclopedia Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon. The article "Mormonen" painted the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as a pantheistic reaction to the emotionless, rationalist Protestant movement. The "Book of the Mormons" did not devolve from the Solomon Spaulding manuscript, but came from Joseph Smith's inventiveness. Smith derived his ideas from Wesleyan [Methodist] fantasy. The article went on to describe the Mormon justification of polygamy as obedience to a divine injunction for church growth. Also, the author noted that Mormonism claimed to be the only church authorized to perform the rites of baptism. The research for the article differed from the Brockhaus entry in its use of American sources--Bancroft's History of Utah (1889) and George A. Smith's Rise, Progress and Travels of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (1869)--and its more objective tone. Of course, the article does not advocate submitting to the Mormon "propaganda."¹⁰

While not recommending the Latter-day Saint form of Christianity, the Catholic article tended toward a more even-

⁹Ibid.

handed, factual discussion than the non-denominational, intellectual Brockhaus.

Meanwhile, the Utah Mormon community began to comply with federal anti-polygamy mandates. Woodruff’s Manifesto did not end new polygamous marriages among the general church leadership, nor yet among the local members. The language of the Manifesto was conciliatory and non-binding. He "advised" compliance, rather than commanding obedience to the new instruction. Several members of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles remained undecided on the issue, while three, John W. Taylor, Abraham O. Woodruff and Matthias Cowley, stood firmly on the side of preserving the "principle." Although President Woodruff stated in 1891 that the Manifesto had worldwide application, the general church still viewed the document as policy rather than scripture. During the period between the declaration of the Manifesto and the turn of the century the number of polygamous marriages actually increased from the preceding decade.

The place of plural marriage in Mormon doctrine at this time had not been completely formulated, in the sense that continuation of the practice occurred, but no longer received unqualified advocacy from the general church leadership. Several years were to transpire before a general cessation
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resulted, and even at that point a sense of the loss of a precious opportunity permeated this transitional era. The American nation, however, would not tolerate any marriage practices which deviated from the Victorian mindset of the late nineteenth century, enforcing this attitude by law where necessary.

An 1892 Boston Monday Lecture presented by John Cook underscored this determination. Addressing the efforts of Mormon leadership to achieve statehood for Utah, he stated,

[Mormons] act under priestly control. Polygamy is not abandoned. The Mormon church publications contain the names of books that advise and champion polygamy precisely as heretofore. Mormon hymnbooks yet eulogize social pollution.

Cook continued his invective, accusing Mormon representatives, who had come to Washington seeking statehood, with the intent of building a state permitting polygamy in spite of their assertions that the church no longer advocated the doctrine. His rhetoric indicated that he did not consider Mormons as Americans, citing the election returns where Mormon voters were outvoted by "a great majority of Americans in Utah," and conveniently ignoring the provision of the Edmunds-

14John Cook, "Mormonism, Immigration, Sunday Newspapers." Our Day vol. 11 (1893), 39. The Boston Monday Lectures were delivered by John Cook in a forum organized by multi-denominational Protestant clergy. Brigham H. Roberts considers Cook to be among the most radical opponents of Mormonism in his time A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 5:557.
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Tucker Act which removed the franchise from polygamists. He advocated a re-education missionary drive to reclaim the state from the "Latter-day swindle" and in the next breath advocated keeping out Mormon European emigrants to prevent further Mormon growth in Utah.

While Cook's choice of words bordered on the inflammatory, his feelings reflected public American outrage. Several other opinion-shapers, including national magazines, offered similar comments. In the meantime, however, the efforts to make Utah a state continued. The Latter-day Saint leadership insisted that polygamy no longer provided a bar and the United States officials gave them the benefit of the doubt. Both President Harrison in 1893 and President Grover Cleveland in 1894 issued amnesties for current polygamists, and in 1894 Congress passed the statehood legislation.

This change in status worked to the benefit of the Mormon missionaries in non-American territory, including Germany, as the diplomatic personnel now would be under some obligation to intervene on the Mormons' behalf. For example, in September 1895, the U.S. Embassy sent a note verbale to the Prussian government complaining about the expulsion of Jacob Weiler, a...
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Mormon missionary. Among other concerns the embassy inquired why no explanation was given for the exile, and why the official who effected the banishment had rendered Weiler's passport unusable in direct defiance of an agreement with the United States. This communique presents the first evidence of diplomatic support of the Mormons in Germany ignoring the instructions of the Evarts circular.

Americans, non-Mormon as well as Mormon, often fell afoul of the social and cultural expectations of the various German states. The epitome of this type of snare appeared in the Louis Stern case of 1895. Stern, a prominent New York businessman, had come to Bavaria in pursuit of business interests. While there, his wife brought their son to a public dance, only to be accosted by a minor official, who objected to the boy's presence and demanded his removal. Upon finding out later that the official's request did not rest upon public regulation, but personal prejudice, Stern went to the offender's office and demanded an apology. During the course of the dispute, Stern found himself charged with lese majesté, tried, fined and ordered to jail, even after payment of additional substantial fines. Eventually he fled Bavaria in order to avoid imprisonment. Eight years later, the Bavarian government still refused to commute the sentence or allow him

---

within their borders, despite the intervention of the American ambassador and the editor of the *New York Times.*

At the same time, in faraway Tahiti, the local French governor, at the behest of French church authorities began an effort to prevent Mormons and other American clergymen from preaching to the native Tahitians. After complaints by affected Mormon missionaries, J. Lamb Doty, the American consul, became involved in the problem. Upon determining that the governor's attitude, previously benevolent towards all missionaries, had changed because of accusations of polygamy, Doty did his best to find a solution amenable to all. Finding this impossible in the short run, he then recommended to the Mormons that they not hold public meetings until a change in the laws had been effected. This conciliatory position became State Department policy for dealing with religious freedom problems in foreign countries for the next few decades.

American citizens, other than the Latter-day Saint missionaries, began to have more conflicts with the Imperial German government. The Americans who suffered the most at the hands of German bureaucrats were the naturalized citizens who
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returned to visit their former homeland.\textsuperscript{23} The circumstances became more acute after the turn of the century, but even in the 1890s, German customs officials zealously monitored the borders for natives avoiding army service.\textsuperscript{24} The 1898 case of Edward Fabian, a Austrian-born American citizen, exemplifies the suffering imposed by indiscriminate application of border regulations by insensitive customs officials. Local Prussian police officials at Breslau stopped Fabian on September 23, 1898 during his trip back to America from a sojourn in Austria-Hungary, appropriated his papers, and refused him entry into Germany on grounds of poverty, not even allowing him to contact the regional American vice consul. Fabian returned to Hungary, but could not find employment because of local work restrictions, and essentially sat stranded and penniless in Budapest until the American consul, Mr. Chester, there could arrange relief for him. The local Prussian police in Breslau did not report the case to the resident American Vice-Consul until after Mr. Chester wrote to him and the American Embassy in Berlin with the facts. On November 8, 1898—a month and a half later—the local police did communicate with the American Consul in Breslau, informing him that Fabian was treated as an Austrian emigrant because he did
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not show his American citizenship papers, a charge both Fabian and Chester hotly denied.  

Embassy secretary Jackson reported the Fabian case to the State Department, but did not follow up on the recommendation of Mr. Chester to seek for damages for Fabian's discomfort and loss of resources from an unspecified source, presumably the Prussian government. Jackson did note that "a convention exists between Germany and Austria in regard to the reciprocal delivery of persons endeavoring to avoid military service," inferring that the local police may have suspected Fabian of avoiding Austrian military service. He commented further that a Prussian governmental policy existed which empowered police to prevent indigent individuals emigrating from Germany, then being refused entrance by immigration officials of the new country. He sent instructions to the Vice Consul at Breslau to instruct the local officials that American citizens cannot be prevented from entering their own country. These actions seem to indicate that Jackson thought the local officials considered Fabian to be an Austrian national trying to avoid military duty, but hid their actual motives behind a sententious misunderstanding of American immigration laws.

When the United States State Department received notification of Fabian's dilemma, Secretary John Hay commended

25Diplomatic Despatches, No. 612, Jackson to Hay, November 21, 1898.

26Ibid.
Jackson for his choice of actions, at the same time strongly advising that the embassy take steps to make sure that American passports be recognized at all foreign frontiers.\textsuperscript{27} Nothing more about Fabian appears in the dispatches, making it difficult to ascertain his fate, but it is clear that the embassy felt that local Prussian border officials had little concern for tact or legality in their behavior. In the initial report, Jackson also noted that the attitude of the frontier officers towards naturalized Americans of Russian and Austrian descent was disrespectful at best. Frequently Jackson had to restrain local customs officials from forcing naturalized Americans of Russian birth to undergo delousing, a humiliating, unnecessary and uncomfortable procedure.\textsuperscript{28}

In spite of the growing tension between the Prussian state and Americans in the 1890s, Mormon missionary work in Germany proceeded calmly until 1898. Baptisms between 1895 and 1898 rose from ninety-four a year to one hundred seventy-seven. Mormon emigration in that same period only averaged thirty Germans annually. Overall German membership grew from 376 to 1,028.\textsuperscript{29}

This success soured as official persecution against Mormon missionaries picked up. Ambassador White reported in

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Diplomatic Instructions}, Hay to Jackson No. 677, December 10, 1898.

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Diplomatic Despatches}, Jackson to Hay, No. 612 November 21, 1898.

\textsuperscript{29}Anderson, 210.
September 1898 that Prussia had banished two Mormon missionaries, Charles Richards and Elijah A. Larkin, from Hannover because they were "troublesome foreigners." He remonstrated with Prussian officials, and received word that reports to Germany faulted the Mormons with preaching doctrines which harmed German society. In fact, the police told White that Mormonism had a malodorous reputation in Germany, on account of its supposed advocacy of polygamy, breaking up congregations and interfering with the peace of families, by inducing young and inexperienced girls to leave their homes and emigrate to Utah. Since the two missionaries had left Prussia in accordance with the banishment and had settled elsewhere, Richards in Stuttgart and Larkin in England, the ambassador decided not to pursue the issue, but made sure that their replacements in Hannover received instructions to pay scrupulous heed to the local laws.

In 1898, Prussia began to move against other "undesirables," this time dissident nationalities, within its borders. In November, less than two months after the Hannover case, Jackson reported the expulsion of a large number of non-German citizens in an effort to achieve internal tranquility. The Prussian government particularly aimed at

30Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 555, September 29, 1898.

31Ibid.

32Ibid.; Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 562, October 5, 1898.
individuals who cherished their nationality, such as the Danes of the Duchy of Schleswig, over citizenship in the German Empire. The embassy reports on this action over the next couple of months showed that the Prussian government would move with dispatch and determination to eliminate a perceived problem. White also noted that the German population of the affected areas saw nothing wrong with the Prussian actions. He concluded his last report on the issue with the observation that the Imperial Reichstag’s effort at ameliorating the dislocation ended unsuccessfully when Chancellor Hohenlohe cut off complaints from Reichstag members by noting that the expulsion of foreigners was a sovereign right of the individual states, and thus not subject to Reichstag debate. This type of action would later be directed against the Mormons with as little moral justification as the Danes and others received.

Reichstag delegates did, however, assert themselves in other areas which affected Mormon missionary work. In 1901, they addressed the issue of religious liberty in the empire. Noting that the imperial law courts had determined on July 11, 1898 that the German Empire recognized the rights of citizens,

33Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No, 610, November 18, 1898.

34Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 717, January 26, 1899.

35Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 748, February 18, 1899.
subject to local restrictions to assemble, to meet together in order to exercise religious unity through prayer, sermons and other activities, the legislature moved to expand that decision.\textsuperscript{36} In a discussion of the rights of the individual German principalities to enforce religious legislation, one delegate asserted that as long as the various religious associations obeyed the laws regarding public behavior, that "even Mormonism could not be excluded, but it must not preach polygamy in Germany, which is criminally [illegal]."\textsuperscript{37}

In this tense environment, Mormons began to expand their missionary program in Germany. Ironically, this expansion came at a time when the church, recovering from the financial consequences of the Edmunds-Tucker Act, chose not to expand other missions due to lack of funds. The First Presidency saw the financial burden as so onerous, that they called some missionaries to go without funding, although their families usually supported the missionaries.\textsuperscript{38} Nevertheless the German Mission grew at this time from fifty-four missionaries in 1898 to one hundred in 1900.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36}Deutscher Reichstag, Stenografischer Berichte des Reichtages, Reichstag Aktenstücke Nr. 372: 2393.

\textsuperscript{37}Ibid., 2393.

\textsuperscript{38}Alexander, 216., In the various missionary journals and letters, money concerns were among the most regular and consistent entries.

\textsuperscript{39}Anderson, 202.
In 1898, the Swiss-German Mission split into the Swiss and German Missions with Peter Loutensock as president of the German Mission. His initial inspection visit of the various congregations in Germany was marred when his travelling companion, LeRoi Snow, was arrested by police upon entering Bavaria. Despite this reminder of the troubles of working in Germany, the mission president expressed extreme satisfaction with the condition of the Latter-day Saint condition and declared his hope for future success.\(^{40}\) Complications continued however. As an example, in March 1901, priests in the city of Elberfeld twice persuaded owners of public halls which the missionaries had hired to prevent Mormon meetings after agreements had been made, and a publicity effort had been mounted. An attempt to explain the missionaries' side of the side in a local newspaper failed as well.\(^{41}\)

\(^{40}\)Riedel, 543-545.

After the unification of 1871, Germany did not become a monolithic state. The individual kingdoms, grand duchies, free cities and other principalities retained their own internal independence, laws, taxation and police powers. Prussia and Bavaria stood at opposite ends of the empire, not only geographically but also religiously and ideologically. The German Empire primarily oversaw the concerns of national defence and foreign policy and did not have the power to directly require a change in any member state by vote of the Reichstag or by decree of the emperor. Anyone like President Loutensack whose area of responsibility encompassed the whole of Germany had to constantly be aware of different laws, policies of expulsion, and customs. LeRoi Snow had previously been banished for life from Bavaria and his return, even in transit, was a violation of Bavarian law.

\(^{41}\)Millennial Star 63:187.
Loutensock took his responsibilities seriously and expected the missionaries serving in Germany to do likewise. He mailed his charges a twelve-point list of appropriate behaviors for missionaries, some of the instructions remarkably similar to directions given to Mormon missionaries today. He remonstrated against laziness, inappropriate use of finances, tours of areas outside of the work field, and use of unearned German honorifics—actual ones like Euer Gnade (your grace), or silly ones like Euer Hochgüteitgeborenheit (your goodness and well-bornness)—when addressing other missionaries. His final guideline reminded all missionaries that their behavior reflected their calling to serve God.\(^{42}\) Whether this directive motivated the missionaries to greater efforts or the German public was more open to the Mormon message, or new areas were reached by the enlarged numbers of missionaries, the number of convert baptisms grew.

As a further bolster various mission presidents and missionaries in Europe converged on Berlin, January 5, 1902, to hold a conference. The conference enjoyed remarkable success. Those missionaries who attended came away excited and revitalized. Their journals record every speaker and every song as though they had undergone an experience which

\(^{42}\)Letter to Elder William D. Neal and Sister Myra White Neal, September 6, 1898. LDS Archives.
changed their lives. Although the individuals felt renewed in purpose, the end of the conference marks the beginning of a concentrated effort to expel the Mormon missionaries from Prussia.

The Prussian ecclesiastical community was not amused by the apparent success of the conference. Although no evidence appeared in major newspapers or in the police files, Mormon sources claim that shortly after the Berlin conference concluded, a similar convocation of Evangelical pastors met to discuss how to put a stop to Mormon successes. Whatever the reason, after the conference in 1902, missionary work in Prussia, and later in the German Empire, became increasingly difficult. Newspaper articles for the next couple of years expressed strongly anti-Mormon feelings.

On March 11, 1902, the Regierungspräsident of the East Prussian Gumbinnen district banished two missionaries, John Ranzenberger and Ernst Peter Henrichsen, from their proselyting territory in Tilsit. The district governor justified his decision on the basis of Prussian national interest, since the missionaries allegedly worked among the Lithuanian population, a group which the governor saw as volatile and nationalistic. Therefore, he described the missionaries as "disturbing [unwanted] foreigners" and characterized their actions as


44Millennial Star 64:361; Walker, 38.; Ernst June 5, 1901.
dangerous to "concerns of state." The Regierungspräsident further asserted, "more to the point the suspicion is strong [that the missionaries were attempting to] tempt [locals] with emigration." This particular banishment, unlike the 1898 Hannover expulsion, prompted a comprehensive reexamination of the Mormon missionary presence in Prussia.

Characteristic of the difficulties in determining exactly what was happening from the local missionary point of view, Ranzenberger's diary doesn't even record or comment on the incident. An embassy despatch, however, indicates that the missionaries appealed both to the local American consul and to their ecclesiastical superiors for assistance in staying in Tilsit. The embassy staff, in the absence of Ambassador White, determined to follow a non-confrontational policy until they received further instructions from the United States State Department. Despite the hope to defuse the situation, once the American embassy entered the struggle, the problem

He cites § 171 of the Imperial Criminal code, which I have not been able to examine, but in none of the subsequent discussions or justifications of banishment does this section appear, from which I infer that it did not apply.

46 Ibid.

47 John Ranzenberger, unpublished *Diary 1901-1903*, LDS Church Archives.

48 *Diplomatic Despatches*, Jackson to Hay, No. 1892, March 14, 1902.
problem escalated until it affected every Mormon missionary serving in Prussia.

The ratification of the Manifesto ending polygamy in 1890 opened a door to improved relations between the Mormons and the Imperial and Prussian governments. The United States embassy stood ready to support their countrymen, the American Mormon missionaries. Complications, such as Caprivi's drive to improve Germany's economy status in Europe at the expense of American interests, the poor opinion of the educated public towards the Mormons, increased Mormon missionary presence and the ongoing uncertainties regarding the actual practice of polygamy in Utah, actually worsened German-Mormon relations. In spite of this atmosphere, a mission aimed specifically at Germany was organized. The mission-wide conference at Berlin in January 1902 showed the Germans that the Mormons took the work in Germany seriously, apparently disturbing the equanimity of the Protestant establishment and setting the stage for the problems which were about to trouble the new mission and its missionaries.
CHAPTER FIVE

1902-1903: EVALUATING THE MORMON THREAT AND CONFIRMING THE BANISHMENT POLICY.

The decision of the Gumbinnen Regierungspräsident to banish the Mormon elders provoked a watershed consideration of German-Mormon relations. Instead of local officials pursuing individually interpreted policy towards Mormons, as had been done in the past, the Prussian Minister of the Interior, urged on by the United States ambassador, chose to address the issue of Mormon missionaries and formulate a kingdom-wide policy. The method by which the ultimate decision emerged reflected the essential lack of sympathy of Prussia for religious alternatives, echoing the spirit of the Kulturkampf just a few decades earlier. Clearly, the Mormon leadership either did not appreciate or ignored this attitude when they appealed to the United States Embassy to intervene on behalf of the banished elders. Had they really understood Prussian disdain for their activities, the mission leaders would likely not have pursued a course of action which could threaten their entire effort in Prussia.

After the Gumbinnen Regierungspräsident sent in the report of his decision to exile the missionaries in Tilsit as undesirable foreigners, the Prussian Minister for the Interior
demanded reports from other Regierungspräsidenten on the presence of Mormon missionaries in the districts and their activities. His memorandum, dated 30 April, 1902, documented specifically that American diplomats had requested that other places be found in Prussia to accommodate the missionaries expelled from the Gumbinnen district. The Interior Minister asked the Regierungspräsidenten further from the "older regions" why the decree of 1853 specifically directing that Mormons be summarily banished was not being applied. So that no one could misunderstand his amazement, he sent a copy of the expulsion decree to the Regierungspräsidenten of regions that had been annexed by Prussia since 1853.¹ The Interior Minister further sought input from other ministries which might be involved, notably Foreign Affairs and Religious Affairs. Foreign Affairs was included because, now that Mormon polygamy no longer provided a bar to American intervention, the United States Embassy had begun taking up the fight on behalf of the American Mormon missionaries.

The chain of communication which developed at this time demonstrates the intricacy of the issue. The Gumbinnen Regierungspräsident banished the Mormons, reporting his actions to Prussian Minister of the Interior, who oversaw police matters. The missionaries turned to their mission

¹ *Acta der Mormonen betr.*, Ib1544, Berlin den 30 April, 1902.

The final statement of the decree is very clear: Mormons are either to be banished or prosecuted for illegally encouraging emigration.
president, Hugh Cannon, who communicated with the American Embassy in Berlin, presumably requesting a new location in the region where the missionaries could work. The American consular agent in Königsberg, a Mr. Eckhardt, also tried to intervene locally on the Mormons behalf. The embassy secretary, John Jackson, contacted the Imperial Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Baron von Richthofen, who then referred the matter to the Prussian ministers to resolve the issue.

Although under Bismarck a close relationship had existed between the Imperial Foreign Ministry and the Prussian ministries, these bureaucracies worked at different levels. The Imperial Foreign Ministry had no authority to intervene directly in internal Prussian affairs, and the Prussians did not possess the authority to dictate general foreign policy. The United States did not maintain diplomatic relations with each member state of the German Empire, however, so any communications from the American embassy to a German state had to go through the Imperial Foreign Ministry.

Opportunities for delay and misunderstanding between the principals abounded. A further complication emerged in the nature of the Imperial diplomatic corps. Lamar Cecil, concluding his study of German diplomats between 1871 and 1914, identified two general characteristics about them which might prejudice them against the missionaries. The first was that the Foreign Office chose diplomats to perform, rather than inform and advise, robbing them of initiative to look at
problems from new perspectives. The other relevant characteristic was the essentially aristocratic make-up of the corps. This class-sensitive selection policy did not mean that incompetent individuals staffed the respective offices, but it suggests that the aristocratic diplomats would likely have little appreciation either for egalitarian American Mormons or their working-class German converts.

The United States embassy responded to the Mormon plea for help with restraint. Upon being informed by the local consular agent that the Gumbinnen Regierungspräsident had claimed interests of state as justification for his judgement, the embassy secretary decided on March 14, 1902 to await the decision of the Prussian government before taking further action. Similarly, in an April communique to the State Department, Ambassador White reported

in view of the fact the Mr. Hugh J. Cannon . . . has assured Mr. Jackson that these missionaries had been especially instructed to comply with all local laws . . . and had stated that polygamy was no longer practiced or preached, it was found proper to call the attention of the Foreign Office to the matter.

---


3Ibid., 322.

4*Diplomatic Despatches*, White to Hay, No. 1892, March 14, 1902.

5*Diplomatic Despatches*, White to Hay, No. 1932 April 26, 1902.
At this juncture with the Embassy standing behind the official Mormon position firm in the belief that polygamy had ended, President Cannon walked a fine line. He personally had married another plural wife some time after the Manifesto, effectively giving the lie to his assertion to Ambassador White that polygamy "was no longer practiced." The inconsistency inherent between Cannon's actions and words makes the German distrust of Mormon guarantees less objectionable. It is not certain whether the Prussian authorities knew of his marital circumstances as these do not appear in the official police records.

Nevertheless, on June 16, 1902, the Embassy sent a note verbale to the Imperial Foreign Office specifically requesting that a "uniform action" be determined and that the Mormon elders "not be discriminated against because of their religious belief." Two weeks later, the Embassy reiterated the request, addressing the content of the expulsion orders based on the 1853 decree—that is, that missionaries abided by local law and that Mormonism no longer encouraged polygamy—and calling attention to the fact that most of Prussia, except Hannover, tolerated the presence of the missionaries. His choice of words implied that the decree was outdated and that a new ruling favorable to Mormons should be issued on the

---

6Hardy, Appendix II.,

basis of existing tolerance by local officials, rather than strict legal precedence. The note verbale then requested "that Mormon Missionaries of American nationality may receive the same treatment as is accorded to other American citizens sojourning in Prussia." In the meantime, the Imperial Foreign Office had forwarded the note to the affected Prussian officials, in which the Foreign Minister expressed his opinion that Mormon activities did, indeed, run counter to Prussian state interest, but deferred to the experience of the Interior Ministry, and further requested the input of the Religious Affairs Minister.⁸

The latter replied to this invitation by presenting the position of the Evangelical Union authorities. This action underlines one of the fundamental differences between the nineteenth century German/Prussian socio-political structure and the contemporary American model: the close interrelationship of political and ecclesiastical authority. While American clergymen enjoyed the respect and attention of their fellow citizens, they operated within the political framework as private individuals, not as privileged governmental corporations. The American Mormon missionaries prior to World War I never seemed to get beyond this perspective. To the Germans, as has been earlier argued, this state of affairs had


⁹Ibid.
natural and historical foundations and contributed to the maintenance of the German culture.

A note dated August 29, 1902 from the Evangelischer Ober-Kirchenrath (Evangelical Union Superior Church Counselor) declared in the strongest terms that the United States had stringently persecuted the Mormons because of the doctrine of "Vielweiberei" [polygamy], calling the teaching the "real [eigentliche] attraction of the Mormons." The apparent ridiculousness of this statement seems to have eluded the counselor. Polygamy as a social institution was so very foreign to the German marital and social norms, that while it might appeal to male prurience, the practice could hardly be said to attract women to Mormonism.

His note further cited an article in Der Stern issue 10, no year given, in which an unspecified Mormon church leader claimed a time would come when it would be possible to once again practice plural marriage, though not at present. The counselor referred to a police report--not included in the government files on the Mormons--in which two missionaries admitted that polygamists still lived in Utah, concluding from this that the "Sect" would not make any strong effort to end the custom, although polygamy had been outlawed by the church since 1890.

---


11 Ibid.
Significantly, he also described the "invasion" of American-born sects as a "disturbing element for the peace of the Christian churches and a cause for confusion of the moral understanding among our peoples."\(^{12}\) This revelation of German ecclesiastical insecurity in the face of competition with foreign denominations, although not explained in any detail, presages the observations of both Consul Bopp and Richard Lempp, whose views will be discussed in Chapter Six. Rather than recognize and deal with the attraction of the "invading" faiths, the counselor preferred to eliminate them from Germany altogether.

His note argued further that although the current missionaries had exercised more care in their preaching on the topic of emigration, state officers should not be deceived into believing that by avoiding discussion of leaving Germany the missionaries had changed. Preaching emigration had become unnecessary since accepting Mormon principles furnished sufficient motivation for emigration to Utah. This behavior followed naturally from conversion since Mormons could only find permission to live their principles in states in which they enjoyed a majority. Therefore, the interests of both the state and Christianity coincided with the need to banish these Americans.\(^{13}\)

\(^{12}\)Ibid.

\(^{13}\)Ibid.
A week later, on September 4, 1902, the counselor wrote again, clarifying that although since the decree of 1853 the missionaries had altered their practices, they had not altered their principles which contravened not only national laws, but also Christian morals. Therefore, it seemed needless to treat the missionaries with the same consideration as other Americans, because of their moral turpitude.14

While these opinions were being expressed in Berlin, the Mormons followed their usual procedure and sent replacements for the exiled missionaries. Both the regional governors in Königsberg and Gumbinnen sent memos in the last week of August requesting instructions on how to deal with the newcomers. One missionary, William Leonard, returned at the end of September to his field of labor in Bielefeld and was promptly incarcerated, prompting another note of protest from Ambassador White.15 This is one of the rare instances of actual imprisonment to be reported during the wave of mass evictions from Prussia in 1902. By September, Jackson reported that the deportation order had been placed in abeyance until the ministries resolved the impasse.16 This decision, in effect, permitted the missionaries to continue their labors without fear of expulsion.

14 Acta der Mormonen betr., GI. Nr. 621.

15 Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 2093, Berlin, October 2, 1902

16 Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 2075, September 9, 1902.
Simultaneous with these Mormon expulsions, German officials began to focus on a different group of Americans: naturalized citizens of German birth accused of emigrating to the United States to avoid military service. The dispatches to Washington for the period from 1890 to 1904 are full of appeals for intervention on behalf of young, naturalized American men either being detained or fined by local magistrates for avoiding military duty. It is not within the scope of this study to determine the cause for the increase in these sorts of cases, but it seems likely that the changing international climate, less cordial towards Germany and increasingly confrontational, may have stimulated concern in government circles about young German men avoiding military duty through emigration, similar to the public reaction towards American draft dodgers during the early years of the Vietnam War.

The 1904 case of Emil Herz follows the common pattern. He had emigrated as a youth of fifteen and acquired American citizenship in 1894 at age twenty-seven. Subsequently, he visited his parents in Germany once a year for a decade and until in 1904 the customs officials denied him a visitor's visa because, in their view, he had emigrated to avoid military service.\(^{17}\) Even children born to American parents inside

\(^{17}\)Diplomatic Despatches, Tower to Hay, No. 422 July 30, 1904.
German borders were contacted for military service upon reaching age seventeen.\textsuperscript{18}

In a communication from the embassy to the State Department dated August 12, 1902 Embassy Secretary Jackson clarified that while the United States did not condone draft-dodging, "where German emigrants have fulfilled the conditions necessary to entitle them to be 'treated as American citizens' they should actually be so treated."\textsuperscript{19} The embassy thus found itself, both in the case of the emigrants and the missionaries, suggesting German officials adopt a different perspective, but with little or no success. The relevance of these occurrences to the concurrent Mormon expulsions lies in the behavior which the German officials manifested, arbitrarily pushing the limits of their authority in the absence of clear legal boundaries, rather than seeking a solution equitable to all concerned.

On other occasions related neither to national defense nor to social protection, local magistrates and government officials pursued their objectives oblivious to the feelings of the Americans with whom they dealt.

In August 1902 the State Department lodged a complaint with the Imperial Foreign Office about the cavalier attitude of a German customs official towards official American diplo-

\textsuperscript{18}Diplomatic Instructions, Hay to White, No. 949, Oct. 17, 1899.

\textsuperscript{19}Diplomatic Despatches, Jackson to Hay, No. 1932, August 12, 1902.
matic property. During a customs inspection he apparently casually emptied boxes of official American consulate letterhead and stationery, dumping on them the dirty floor of his office. He did not attempt to contact the local consul for whom the shipment was intended and who could have easily unlocked the boxes. While this event did not constitute a serious international conflict, it does demonstrate the unwarranted disregard for politeness which local German officials could adopt towards foreigners and their property.

In a more serious case, during May 1903 an American consul, Joseph Langer, nearly suffered imprisonment in spite of diplomatic immunity when a local magistrate of Solingen expressed dissatisfaction with the consul’s behavior in court. When Langer produced the actual treaty which delineated the immunity, the magistrate refused to acknowledge its merit. Langer had to run to his home to prevent himself from being jailed and later had to appeal to a higher court before the arrest warrant was declared void.

Problems of this type occurred outside Germany as well. In the winter of 1902/03, a German warship arrested the entire graduating class of Caroline Island natives who studied in a mission school run by the Reverend Martin Stimson. Since he was operating under the protection of the American Board of

---

20Diplomatic Instructions, Hay to Jackson, No. 1027, March 31, 1900.

21Diplomatic Despatches, Tower to Hay, No. 98, May 8, 1903.
Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the Board intervened on his behalf with the State Department. The German ship's commander took the students to a different island, charging them with "preaching against the German Government." Since the instructors and students had received explicit instructions not to criticize Germany in any way, the commissioners were sure that the charges were invalid. The Board, having obtained assurances from the German government that no problems would arise from the Caroline Islands changing oversight to German control, felt the actions of the naval officers were incomprehensible.

These conflicts, arising as they did at the same time as the Mormon problem, indicate that the Mormons were not the only groups suffering from German high-handedness. Nor were they, as the Caroline Island experience shows, the only missionary group affected by perceived concerns of state security.

As Mormon problems continued, Jackson noted that police actions usually occurred only in specific regions such as Hannover, the Russian border and Cologne, while other regions effectively treated them with complaisance. The efforts of the embassy had always been to encourage a consistent policy:

22Diplomatic Instructions, Hay to Tower, No. 47, April 15 1903.

23Ibid.

24Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 1932, April 26, 1902.
either treat the American missionaries as normal citizens or decide why they are undesirable and act accordingly. On August 26, 1902, the Prussian Undersecretary of State, Dr. von Mühlberg informed the American embassy that he would address the Mormon problem. Von Mühlberg requested an account from President Cannon of his work and that of "his colleagues." No more is heard of von Mühlberg, nor does his name surface in the Prussian files after August, 1902. His intervention does not seem to have enjoyed any recorded success.

In accordance with von Mühlberg’s request, however, Cannon provided an account of the missionary efforts of the Latter-day Saints. His exposition, carefully phrased in polished German, noted that prior to setting up headquarters in Berlin, the Mormon leadership sought the permission and views of the local police. All of the proposed literature, doctrines and work techniques were exhaustively discussed. Cannon specifically encouraged chastity and public morality—perhaps trying to defuse the issue of polygamy beforehand—and further noted that police officers had listened at all their meetings and could verify these claims. He cited the Twelfth Article of Faith regarding the church’s belief in subjection to local governments and noted that the well-being of the Imperial Government was the object of their daily prayers. Cannon further noted that the one hundred forty missionaries

---

25Diplomatic Despatches, White to Hay, No. 2049, August 28, 1902.
then active in Germany received support from home, not from any form of begging or dependence on local institutions. He pleaded, "We are not come to engage in conflict with other churches . . . but [come] bearing the olive branch and . . . an equally meaningful message." 26

This message accompanied a request from Jackson asking the same privileges be extended to the Mormons which other religions enjoyed, so long as they complied with local legal restrictions. Also, he requested that until the investigation was completed, the exile decrees should be held in abeyance. 27 At that point the embassy dispatches to Washington fall silent for several months until a new ambassador, Charlemagne Tower arrived.

While Ambassador Tower did not cease efforts to help the Mormons, his exertions did not reflect the same intensity which had characterized the earlier labors of White and Jackson. Of course, by the time Tower started his term, the Prussian Government, and its near neighbor, the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg, had determined to implement a policy hostile to the Mormons and Tower was working against a fait accompli.

On December 14, 1902, the Prussian Foreign Minister submitted a memorandum to the Minister of the Interior re-


27 The William Leonard case is the recorded exception. see Diplomatic Dispatches, White to Hay No. 2093, October 2, 1902.
evaluating the legal standing of the Mormon missionaries in Prussia. The document is as important for what it does not consider as for what it does discuss. Nowhere does the idea appear that the Prussian constitution provided any form of religious freedom for unrecognized churches or that the missionaries were not harming the kingdom. The only diplomatic agreement with the United States that the Foreign Minister could find which he thought might offer the missionaries a legal claim to perform their activities in Prussia was a commercial treaty concluded May 1, 1828.²⁸

He wrote that any claim based on the first article of that treaty was questionable since the continued enforcement of the treaty stood in doubt. Since Chancellor Caprivi had actively labored in the 1890s to renegotiate several commercial treaties, including one with the United States, the view that treaties previously concluded could be invalidated by those negotiations or unification legalities had some force. On the other hand the treaty wording

\[
\text{they will be free to stop there and reside [in that place] . . . to take care of their affairs and they will enjoy to this effect the same security and protection that the inhabitants of the country in [which] they previously resided, at the price of submitting themselves to the laws and ordinances that are there established}
\]

²⁸ Acta der Mormonen betr., IIIᵇ15056/74260, 14 December, 1902.
did seem to offer some protection to the Mormon missionaries.29

The Foreign Minister appeared uncertain whether this clause offered missionaries the right to settle in Prussia to conduct their work. He did advise, though, that any decision to expel the missionaries build upon the premise that the Mormon mission effort in fact defied Prussia's "laws and ordinances." That approach, he opined, would assure that no answer to the embassy's note verbale would be required.30 The decision then lay with the Interior Minister.

In an undated memorandum—presumably written in late 1902—entitled simply Ausweisung der Mormonen [Banishment of the Mormons] the Minister for the Interior delineated his reasoning for the necessity of the unilateral expulsion of the Mormon missionaries. Recapitulating the Gumbinnen Regierungs- präsident's reasons for expelling the Tilsit missionaries, he stated that from the start he had agreed with the Gumbinnen judgement. Still, when the American embassy entered a plea for clemency on behalf of the missionaries, he thought it prudent to ask the Foreign Minister for guidance and also sent out requests for information from the various regional gover-

29Ibid. The text of the agreement reads: ils seront libres de s'y arrêter et résider . . . . pour y vaguer à leurs affaires; et ils jouiront à cet effet de la même sécurité et protection que les habitants du pays dans lequel ils résiderent, à charge de se soumettre aux lois et ordonnances y établies.

30Ibid.
nors and police chiefs. He particularly stressed his concern with the inadequate enforcement of the 1853 decree, notably in Berlin—the imperial capital and example to the nation.

At no time did he show any appreciation that the emigration concerns which had inspired the 1853 decree had since abated and were, in fact, resolved by Imperial legislation in the 1870s. He noted that in none of the responses to his request was there any proof that the missionaries had encouraged specific individuals to emigrate.

Despite this lack of illegal activity, the Regierungspräsidenten in Gumbinnen and Hannover insisted that an expulsion of the Mormons was desirable. Upon applying to the Religious Affairs Minister, the Interior Minister received the answer that the idea of permitting all of the "sects which blossom in America" to come over and be permitted to grow was not in the best interests of the Prussian state. He also stated that only a few years earlier the United States had not permitted the legal presence of the Mormons so long as polygamy represented the primary doctrine of their church. He agreed with the opinion of the Evangelical counselor that polygamy had not been eradicated from Mormon theology, and therefore the missionaries had no business in Prussia.

The Interior Minister offered as a compromise that any missionary who had lived in Prussia for several years and whose behavior did not offend public sensibilities could remain in the country. For new arrivals, however, the police
would enforce the 1853 decree. With regards to the Commercial Treaty of 1828, it only required that the foreigners be permitted residence as long as they obeyed Prussian law and expulsion would be justified when the missionaries activities were demonstrated as illegal. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary merely to view polygamy, neither preached in Germany nor legal in Utah, as a current part of church practice anywhere and then the missionaries could be expelled. As *prima facie* evidence of the continuing existence of Mormon polygamy, he cited two letters from the German Embassy in Washington—never included in the police files—which claimed that polygamy continued to be secretly permitted and encouraged by the Mormons. From this perspective, therefore, even the questionable rights of the 1828 treaty were negated and the missionaries had no right to import American sects to Prussia.

He then presented the text of the new expulsion decree, which essentially states that the 1853 decree was still in effect. In the second paragraph of the new decree he declared that it is not necessary for the missionaries to be engaged in any illegal activity, but could be expelled without explanation. The decree reiterates his offer that missionaries who had been in Prussia for a longer period and would stop "propaganda" activities—offending the public morals—would be permitted to stay in order to avoid undue suffering. The Minister concluded by noting that efforts by the missionaries
to retaliate in the press would likely avail nothing since the prevailing public mood was against them.  

To facilitate his decision the Interior Minister on January 9, 1903, prepared an extensive memorandum, I\textsuperscript{b} 4451/4529. In it he addressed every Regierungspräsident, giving them specific and deliberate instructions on how to deal with their individual areas and local Mormon missionaries. At the end of the memorandum, he responded to the advice of the Foreign Minister. The Interior Minister bluntly stated that he decided not to wait until an understanding had been reached with the American embassy before announcing the decree. The commercial treaty had limited scope and frankly presented no serious challenge to the banishment decision. He then quoted Treitschke as saying "foreigners who become undesirable to a nation must be able to be banished, without a statement of reasons, even if an agreement has been made which the prince or the subjects of another state have been assured."\textsuperscript{32} He continued by declaring that if the Foreign Minister is not comfortable with telling the embassy the reason for the decision, simply tell them that the banished missionaries cannot be reinstated. The Minister also faulted the embassy for getting involved in the Bielefeld problem, as it is not in their

\textsuperscript{31}Acta der Mormonen betr., "Ausweisung der Mormonen." [1902]

\textsuperscript{32}Acta der Mormonen betr., 9 January 1903, I\textsuperscript{b} 4451/4529, section 4. The Treitschke quote is in the second volume of Politik, 559.
field of competence. He concluded by encouraging the Foreign Minister to share the German Ambassador’s letter with the Minister of Religious Affairs, which might explain why those documents are not included in the Prussian police files.\textsuperscript{33}

A memorandum from the Interior Ministry of the Grand Duchy of Mecklenburg dated December 17, 1902 cited Prussian information as a significant reason for adopting their anti-Mormon policy. This document shows that the Prussian government was not averse to sending information about missionaries to other German state governments, perhaps in an effort to discourage acceptance of the missionaries elsewhere in Germany.\textsuperscript{34} The Mecklenburg Foreign Office called Mormonism a dangerous religion and cited the 1894 activities of a woman encouraging a female minor to emigrate as grounds for their policy. Interestingly enough, this policy was announced around the time the Prussian government finalized their expulsion procedures. Moreover, the same communiqué, addressed to Reichskanzler von Bülow, indicates that the Imperial Government was addressed by applicants other than the American Embassy regarding resolution of the missionary dilemma.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{34}No. 3707.25828, December 17, 1902
The reference cites a Prussian document III\textsuperscript{b} 14958/69963 of 23 the previous month, not included in the Acta betr. den Mormonen. The Burgi confession, discussed in Chapter 6, which was found in Saxon police files, is another example of Prussian influence outside its borders.
The mood, among the north German governments at least, was one of cleaning house. It hardly comes as a surprise, then, when Ambassador Tower sent a verbal note protesting the expulsion of two American Mormons from Mecklenburg that he met with a cold refusal to rescind the banishment decrees. The only action which he could take was to inform the State Department of the current status and note that the Mecklenburg banishments would be the first of several such actions.\textsuperscript{35}

Even a telegram from Utah’s senators understandably had little practical effect in reversing the trend of banishment. There is some irony, perhaps, in Tower’s assertion that the Prussian government had been lenient in its treatment of the missionaries, particularly when the Minister of the Interior specifically recommended not sharing the real reason for the expulsion, and viewed the facts of the case only in pursuit of a loophole with which to justify a preconceived decision to banish the Mormons.\textsuperscript{36}

The missionary reaction to all of these activities was not one of fear and trepidation. The majority of the surviving journals from this period concern themselves more with the number of tracts given out, gospel-oriented conversations pursued, concerns of local branches and financial worries. References to banishment were almost passé, noting that so-

\textsuperscript{35}Diplomatic Despatches, Tower to Hay, No. 83, April 9, 1903.

\textsuperscript{36}Diplomatic Despatches, Tower No. 93, April 30, 1903.
and-so arrived today because he was banished from Prussia.  

The life history of Lorenzo Walker and the journals of Gottlieb Blatter provide particularly specific valuable information about a few of these incidents.

Gottlieb Blatter’s personal history introduction to his journals recounts:

Mormon Elders had no freedom in Germany. All our meetings had to be registered before they could be held. Then while the meeting was being held a policeman would take every word down in shorthand and report back to headquarters. At one time, we had several converts who desired to be baptized, but we had to do all our baptizing on the sly unbeknownst to the authorities. If we had been caught we would have been banished from Germany.  

His journal entries reveal, among other things, the careful attention the elders paid to local registration policies, how they dealt with banishment, their general attitude about local authorities and their frustrations about the local clergy. Of definite interest during the 1902-1903 period are Blatter’s comments regarding Lorenzo Walker’s banishment from East Prussia. Blatter worked in Königsberg at the time that Walker had to leave Insterberg. His pithy account described meeting Walker and his companion at the train station, bringing them home and working with them for a few months while the decision whether to revoke the banishment orders lay in the

37See for example journal of John Ranzenberger, February 12 and 14, 1903 for his own laconic banishment entry, LDS Archives.

38Gottlieb Blatter, Personal History, unpublished, LDS Church Archives.
hands of the Prussian government. After a few weeks matters calmed down and in December 1902, Blatter was transferred to Dresden, Saxony.

The usual concerns of preaching, keeping the local branch in line, eating and bathing went along for a few months and then, in March 1903, Blatter was again called upon to host his old friend, Walker and his companion Zwahlen.

While they did not stay long, being reassigned to labor in Freiberg, two months later a second pair was banished from Königsberg and landed among Blatter and the Dresden elders.39 The tone of Blatter’s entries possesses a matter-of-fact quality, implying, in part, that these sort of sacrifices comprised a portion of the job he had accepted along with his mission call. His comments in conjunction with police behavior demonstrated a similar simplicity of acceptance. He was aware of the tension around him. Several newspaper clippings of contemporary interest on Mormons appear in his journal, but he consistently refrained from making any reference to them, even though some of the articles courted sensation more than accuracy.

Lorenzo Walker’s biographer, on the other hand, described his banishment in the context of the drive to expel the Mormons.

[Walker and his companion] were ordered to leave town because they were teaching "two wives." They [repudiated] the rumor and were given awhile longer

39Blatter, "Journals"
to stay but they must be very careful of what they taught. . . It was very evident that [there] was a push on to get the Mormon Elders out of Prussia and it was all happening after the big Conference in Berlin. . . . The Ministers of the various religions were concerned that the popularity the Mormon religion was having on their congregation and they were doing all they could to prevent it. . . The Elders began to grow beards and mustaches so that they couldn't be singled out as being Mormons, . . . A couple of weeks after the Elders in Tilsit had been ordered to leave, [Walker and his companion] received their banishment papers. . . As soon as they arrived in Konigsberg [sic] the Police summoned them to the Police Station and wanted to know why they had stopped [there] . . . [Walker] told them that their Ambassador had told them to remain there because the question was being handled diplomatically. . . The 2nd of August, [1902] . . . the banishment orders were lifted and Elder Walker and Flamm were sent back to Tilsit. 40

When the banishment decree of 1903 went into effect, Walker and others worked as though nothing had happened, then negotiated for a little more time and finally took a train for Dresden, stopping in Stettin and Berlin to see the sights. Subsequently transferred to Freiberg, Walker worked until he became seriously ill and received a mission release. 41 The account leaves no doubt that Walker and the missionaries he worked with knew the local motives behind the banishment order. The story in Königsberg about instructions from the ambassador cannot be substantiated by existing documents, and may even have been a ruse similar to the beards, but its use underscores the determination of the missionaries to stay

40 Walker, 37-41.

41 Ibid., 41-42.
close to their field of labor, in spite of official disapproval.

Once the expulsions began, President Cannon moved quickly to comply with Prussian demands. Applying to the Interior Ministry for an extension to wind up business dealings, he graciously accepted their offer of a few weeks. Neither in Der Stern, nor in any utterance recorded in missionary journals did he offer any comment on the inconvenient policy. In February 1904, however, as he neared the end of his tenure Cannon published a lengthy article in the Millennial Star roundly condemning the Prussian national and local officials for their intolerant actions. He praised the local members for standing true to their convictions and helping more actively in the missionary work. Then he stated,

the cause of our recent trouble can be traced directly to the papers. Who inspired them to make the utterly false and unjustifiable statements concerning us is to some extent a matter of surmise.

His angry rhetoric was further fueled by the apparent injustice and the actual cruelty of some local officials in execution of the banishment instructions. He declared that in their scrutiny of missionary activities

not a single charge of wrong-doing was brought forth. Missionaries were banished, were imprisoned, were marched through the streets like criminals, but were not accused of violating any lay (sic) [law] of the land, or of good order or morality. And still Prussia claims to have religious liberty, and has it, too, for all but the Church of Jesus Christ.
Describing the ongoing struggle and work in other nations, Cannon's castigation of Austrian and Hungarian bureaucrats could easily match his feelings towards the Prussians.

The officials would have every one belong to the church which happens to have the favor of the government, and forget that we are living in the twentieth century, when every man who is responsible to be at large should have the privilege of choosing the religion which suits him best.

Finally, he concluded with a paean in honor of the members he supervised. Cannon declared

the missionary is able to press forward in the face of every difficulty. His duty lies perfectly clear before him; it is not an imaginary conception; it is not shrouded in mystery or doubt. He is asked and expected to declare his message and warn the world of impending judgements unless it will turn unto the Lord, and he is not held in the slightest degree responsible for results. The Lord holds him responsible only for the work which he does.\(^{42}\)

In the September 15, 1903 edition of Der Stern, the releases column read:

Elder Lorenzo Walker, who arrived in the mission May 5, 1901, and labored most of his time in the Königsberg Conference and later in the Dresden Conference.

Elder Gottlieb Blatter, who arrived Feb. 11, 1901 and who had labored over two years in the Königsberg Conference and finished his mission in the Dresden Conference.

Elder Brigham Liechety, who arrived Feb. 25, 1901 and labored until the end of 1902 in the Königsberg Conference and since that time in the Stuttgart Conference.\(^{43}\)

\(^{42}\text{Millennial Star 66:97}\)

\(^{43}\text{Der Stern 35:280.}\)
No statement appeared about the banishment; no reference is made about any conflict with Prussia. The government disposed, the missionaries adapted and the work proceeded. From this point on, however, a consistent, draconian policy existed to handle the insignificant presence of Mormon missionaries, and that would not change until July 1922.
CHAPTER SIX

1904-1914, PRUSSIAN INTOLERANCE AND MORMON PERSISTENCE

In the decade after the implementation of the 1902 banishment decree, Mormon missionary work in Germany became significantly more difficult. In America the Senate hearings on Reed Smoot's election brought the specter of polygamy back to national and international attention, the results in part justifying the disbelief of the German governments in Mormon protestations of cessation of polygamy. Active police persecution of the missionaries in Germany became more consistent, and accounts of imprisonment increased in missionary journals. Initially Mormon leadership in Europe spoke out against the treatment, but eventually developed a pattern of continued work without significant complaint. The American embassy no longer regularly appealed on behalf of the Mormon missionaries. Effective missionary efforts decreased from the peak in 1908 of 548 baptisms to less than 300 in 1914. In essence, the Mormons persevered in face of continued persecution until forced to leave by the outbreak of World War I in August, 1914.

Perusal of accounts of Latter-day Saint sources during 1904 gives the impression that while the labor had been affected by the banishment decree, and American officials seemed powerless to help them, that divine support rallied to the Mormon cause. Hugh J. Cannon noted in the monthly report for April, 1904

During the past month four Elders have been banished from Saxony, and the officers in Prussia have been making many inquiries about the Elders who are travelling there. The papers are full of the Mormon question, and . . . the reports are unfavorable. On the whole, however, everything is in a satisfactory condition. During the month of April we distributed 13,944 tracts and 272 books . . . and baptized thirty persons.²

A Millennial Star article, dated February 18, 1904, credited the local members with the remarkable success that occurred since the banishment.³ A missionary stated in a different article that the recent troubles have interested many people, so that "a better class [of people] is being reached."⁴ The author of the earlier article noted that other German states seemed about "to assume a threatening attitude."⁵ Although the article does not identify which

²Millennial Star 66:315, May 19, 1904.

³Millennial Star, 66:107, February 18, 1904. Thomas Alexander states that the banishment order was lifted in 1905, but while the files are completely silent from 1905 to 1907, there is no record of the decree being recalled, nor does the Deseret News article cited by Alexander, see Journal History April 7, 1905, state that the order was lifted. Effectively then, the order was still in force, just not executed for those two years.

⁴Millennial Star 66:155.

⁵Millennial Star, 66:107
states stood on the verge of expelling the missionaries, Bavaria, Saxony and Mecklenburg had already taken steps to expel missionaries, although not en masse.

The missionaries did not greet these new challenges with unalloyed cheerfulness. A letter from President Joseph F. Smith’s son, Calvin, indicates that the missionaries resented the high-handed actions of the German police, and felt that the claims of German religious liberty were inaccurate at best. No date or place appears with this account, but the Manuscrypt History of the German Mission included this article among its 1904 entries.

I underwent an inquisition and was piled into a cab with all the movable property in the room, and taken to headquarters. They opened everything, taking Church property and all. I was turned over to the police, and the next day they took me to the station and bought me a ticket with the Church money, out of Germany. They also paid themselves liberally from the [Church] money for all 'services' rendered me. . . . A German professor has recently . . . demand[ed] . . . the right of Germany to a dominant place in the world’s affairs. But it is evident that as long as German states treat liberty of conscience and freedom of speech as strangers, the Empire is not quite prepared to take the foremost rank place in the advancing ranks of nations. The Germans are [a] great nation. At the time of the Reformation they were foremost as the champions of liberty. Militarism has, of late years, got the upper hand, and the result is retrogression. Let Germans rid themselves of the shackels (sic) and again raise the banner of both religious and political freedom. Then they will have a right to the position in the world which they desire. The demand for recognition should not come from behind guns and fortresses, but from the pinnacles of intellectual achievement.\(^6\)

\(^6\)Calvin Smith, Undated article, Manuscrypt History of the German Mission, LDS Archives.
By 1905, however, certain changes had been instituted or re-issued by the mission leadership to promote acceptance of the Mormons by Prussian officials. The new Swiss-German mission president, Serge F. Ballif, specified that emigration matters must be kept confidential. He made careful notations to himself in his journal to remind himself never to permit articles to appear in Der Stern about emigration. The entry also directed him to refrain from communicating emigration information in writing, or to allow use of Mormon emigration routes by unknown individuals—this last perhaps to prevent Prussian officials from gathering evidence of continuing Mormon emigration activities.\(^7\) His journals for the years of 1905 to 1908 chronicle periods of intense persecution in Germany, which alternate with stretches of indifference during 1905 and 1906. In March 1907 secret police appeared at a meeting which Ballif conducted, listened to him, took him to the police station, questioned him and then summarily banished him from Prussia. \(^8\)

To avoid this sort of treatment missionaries began disguising themselves. For example, the elders in Brasso, East Prussia registered themselves as English teachers, rather than as missionaries. On another occasion, July 17, 1907, while waiting in Hannover for some missionaries to arrive Ballif was informed that they had been arrested and banished

---

\(^7\)Ballif, Journals, Flysheet (1905).

\(^8\)Ibid., March 1907.
by the police. The next day he went to the American consul who prepared a letter for him and was otherwise very cooperative, although with no noticeable effect for the missionaries. He then continued on his way, unharmed.9

The value of intervention by consular and diplomatic officials declined as tensions between Germany and the United States increased. International tensions increased markedly during the period between 1904 and 1914 as Wilhelm II and his government tried to force Germany into a dominant role in European and world affairs. Earlier conflicts over the Philippines and Samoa had already tainted the relationship between the emerging national powers, Germany and the United States.10 Although these two principals worked together to reduce the fallout from the Russo-Japanese War, the Algeciras Conference over Morrocan independence, the Hague Conference of 1907 and ongoing struggles over a treaty of international arbitration effectively poisoned German and American amity.11 During this same time the struggles between the Mormons and the American government had not yet completely subsided in the wake of the Smoot Senate hearings.

The task of intermingling the monolithic Mormon church and the two-party system prevalent in the United States proved

---

9Ibid., July 17, 1907, passim.


11Ibid., 73-94.
to have its difficult points for both the country and the church. Perhaps the most significant element was manifested in the revocation of the practice of polygamy. Although the Manifesto had been proclaimed in 1890 and President Woodruff had repeatedly spoken out for its enforcement, portions of the leadership held stubbornly to the maintenance of the "principle." As mentioned earlier, the election of Apostle Reed Smoot to the Senate in 1903 refocused American attention on the struggle to eradicate polygamy. The attempt to seat Smoot set off a fight between the anti-polygamists and those who supported his right to represent Utah. The Senate called upon Church President Joseph F. Smith to testify on actual church adherence to the Manifesto. Senator DuBois of Idaho disputed Smith's claim that only two percent of church population was involved in a polygamous marriage, maintaining that the number was closer to twenty-three percent of the Mormon male population above eighteen years of age.

In this environment, the First Presidency issued a statement during the annual April Conference in 1904 stating that no plural marriages had

the sanction, consent or knowledge of the Church. . . . all such marriages [were] prohibited, and if any officer or member of the Church [should] assume to solemnize or enter into any such marriage he [would] be deemed in

---

12 *Doctrinal and Covenants* Official Declaration 1 and Woodruff Address excerpts 291-293; Alexander, 60-61.

13 Alexander, 62-64.
transgression against the Church and [would] be liable to be dealt with . . . and excommunicated therefrom.\textsuperscript{14}

The First Presidency also took the extraordinary step of removing permission for the apostles to perform sealings in areas where no temples existed.\textsuperscript{15} By 1906, the apostles who still advocated maintaining polygamy had either resigned from the Council of the Twelve under pressure or had died. Ironically, United States officers arrested President Smith, who had presided over this tremendous change, upon return from a European tour in 1906 because of his own continued polygamous cohabitation.\textsuperscript{16} There can be little wonder that the German officials, viewing this from across the Atlantic, put little stock in the assertion of the local missionaries that Latter-day Saints no longer preached or practiced polygamy.

In spite of all these difficulties, the church continued to grow in Germany. An evaluation of the statistics of Mormon activities in Germany, emigration and baptism in the period between 1904 and 1914 reveals some interesting trends. Emigration seems to have peaked in 1907 at 180 persons, after

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., 65.
\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 66.
\end{quote}

The unique Latter-day Saint ordinance of sealing is only performed in specially dedicated temples, entry to which requires a careful interview with two local ecclesiastical authorities to determine the candidate's spiritual worthiness. Revocation of the permission to perform marriages outside these premises effectively ended recognized plural marriages.
which emigration records become sporadic.\textsuperscript{17} Simultaneously, baptisms increased from 242 persons in 1904 to 548 in 1908 with the records being interrupted in 1909.\textsuperscript{18} No reason is given for the sudden lacunae in statistics, or for the subsequent absence of the numbers in a publication which otherwise showed great enthusiasm for such data. The possibility of renewed police persecution could explain the absence, but there is no concrete evidence to support that position.

If the editors of Der Stern hoped to prevent German officials from learning of the extent of missionary work in Germany, they did not succeed. In 1912 the German Consul at Denver, Herr Plehn, sent the Imperial Chancellor a list of baptism and emigration statistics for the German-speaking missions covering the period through the blackout, which he had received from the Western States Mission President, John L. Herrick. Herrick, in turn, had requested them from the church’s Office of the Presiding Bishop, consequently their accuracy seems probable.\textsuperscript{19}

Overlap in the years covered by these figures and those compiled by Anderson shows that the numbers given for emigration and baptism were for the entire Swiss-German Mission.

\textsuperscript{17}Anderson, 206.; Shortly afterward, during a talk given in Sweden President Smith began discouraging emigration. see Journal History, August 31 1910.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., 210. No baptismal records appear from 1909 until 1924, when 1697 baptisms took place.

\textsuperscript{19}Acta der Mormonen betr., p.19, III\textsuperscript{6}231, 29 April 1912.
Interestingly enough, 1909 was a record year for emigration, with a total of 299 emigrants. David A. Smith, preparer of the statistics, stressed the low number of recent emigrants and commented on how the German Mormon population had grown. Plehn observed, in his report, that baptisms had increased German membership by 1911 to 5,147 from roughly 3,500 in 1904 while the number of emigrants had dropped from 283 in 1904 to 101 in 1911. He also commented on the apparent change in Mormon attempts to build up the physical presence of the church in Germany, rather than move to Utah.\textsuperscript{20}

Despite Mormon efforts to downplay the presence of emigration and polygamy, persecution and surveillance of the Mormon missionary activities increased in intensity. The Prussian Foreign Ministry labeled a 1907 report on the approach of the steamship \textit{Cymric} to the Interior Ministry "eilt sehr" [very urgent] because 37 Mormons were on board. The report requested permission to refuse the missionaries the right to land in Prussia on the basis of 1902 banishment order.\textsuperscript{21} In the same year, a consular report appeared, which evaluated the Mormon presence in Utah. In a departure from earlier accounts, the consul paid more attention to the political and social stability of Utah. He did not concern

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Acta der Mormonen betr.}, Königliches Ministerium des auswärtigen Angelegenheiten, October 12, 1907, Nr. III\textsuperscript{b} 16527/70931.
himself with the issue of polygamy at all. Instead he particularly focussed on the future political importance of the Mormons in the United States and the possible importance of German converts in the church.\textsuperscript{22}

The officials at Breslau took a particularly hard stand on August 12, 1908, when police officers arrested two missionaries in the middle of a "public meeting in the interest of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints," kept them in jail overnight, and summarily expelled them from Prussia with "three days' notice."\textsuperscript{23} When the local American consul, Mr. Spahr, asked the police for a reason for that action, he received the cold reply that the police were "not in a position to accede to [his] request."\textsuperscript{24}

President Ballif lost no time in applying to the embassy for assistance, stressing that the church no longer preached or practiced polygamy and demanding redress from the German government. To support his position, he cited an earlier instance in Frankfurt am Main where similar arrests had occurred. In this case the local consul intervened with the Frankfurt dignitaries, who then freed the missionaries and reprimanded the responsible official.\textsuperscript{25} When Mr. Spahr,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22}\textit{Acta der Mormonen betr.}, unnumbered Consular Report, November 18, 1907.
\item \textsuperscript{23}\textit{Foreign Relations} 1907, 347.
\item \textsuperscript{24}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{25}\textit{Foreign Relations}, 1908, 367.
\end{itemize}
wrote to the American embassy, the embassy staff reversed the policy so effectively used in Frankfurt and advised against attempting intervention on the grounds that previous efforts had not achieved success.\(^{26}\)

Again, President Ballif responded by citing legal documents showing the separation of the Mormons from the practice of polygamy and begged the diplomatic staff to bend their efforts towards reinstating the missionaries, making their dilemma a "test case" if necessary, expressing the hope that good judgement would prevail. To bolster his position he cited a recent case in Chur, Switzerland where the appeals process did uphold the Mormon position.\(^{27}\) The German officials, as it turned out, knew of this trial, and had not yet determined whether to change their policy based on the Swiss judge’s findings.\(^{28}\) In October 1908, the State Department responded to the embassy’s request for help, noting that a similar case had occurred in the Netherlands as well. They encouraged the local American diplomats to perform their own investigation of the event, and determine if the missionaries

\(^{26}\)Ibid., 370.

\(^{27}\)Ibid., 347-349. This trial reversed the decision on the Loosli case, since polygamy was not preached or practiced in Switzerland.

\(^{28}\)Acta der Mormonen betr., Königliches Ministerium der auswärtigen Angelegenheiten, May 7, 1909; Nr. III.b.5011/32116.
were, indeed, culpable, and if not, approach the appropriate government officials to rectify the situation.  

Ambassador Napoleon Hill followed this advice, but the attitude of the Breslau officials did not equal the understanding of the officials in Frankfurt am Main. In a memorandum from the Prussian Foreign Office to the Ministry of the Interior, it was explained that the principal magistrates decided that the Mormon attitude about polygamy remained unclear and that the government must stand against the missionaries in order to preserve public order, even if the Mormons now avoided encouraging emigration. In other words, their finding indicated that they could not find anything wrong, but declined to change the policy anyway.

What the Latter-day Saint leadership thought about these various actions and accusations remains difficult to ascertain until such a time as the minutes of the General Missionary Committee become open to perusal, something not likely to occur at the present time. Official declarations or similar utterances occasionally appeared in either the European Mission organ, The Millennial Star, or the German adjunct, Der Stern. Quoting from a Utah German paper, the Salt Lake City Beobachter, Der Stern provided in January 1908 a direct appeal from the First Presidency in response to a unspecified number

---

29Foreign Relations 1908, 369.

of banishments from Saxony and Hamburg based on the old assertion that Mormon missionaries were undesirable [lästig].

The leaders reaffirmed the policy that the missionaries came in a spirit of peace, not to entice anyone to emigrate with promises of worldly plenty, but simply to preach the gospel. Further, they expressed the view that when Germans emigrants arrived in Utah, the local citizens received the newcomers with the best efforts at help and encouragement. Claiming a purity of lifestyle for Latter-day Saints, the First Presidency proclaimed the Mormon acceptance of standard Christian beliefs in God’s existence, and the efficacy of faith and repentance. They closed their appeal with an entreaty to all German officials with the words of Gamaliel, to let the missionaries be and if their work should be of men, it would fail, but if it was of God, it would not be well to be found fighting against him.31

These efforts appear to have had no little or no effect on the mindset of the Prussian government. The transcript of a Kiel police hearing in 1908 for the missionary Samuel Burgi provides further evidence of this official intransigence. The document, in the form of a confession, initially established the missionary’s identity and citizenship. Beginning with the third paragraph, however, the authorities showed a deep interest in his German travels and working companions, including

31"An das deutschsprechende Volk" Der Stern, 40:2, 15 January 1908.
his arrival with thirty-six other missionaries in 1907. Next, Burgi summarized his ecclesiastical responsibilities in each locale he had served as well as the site of meetings. He related his preaching activities, carefully emphasizing that individuals who conversed with him or accepted his literature did so voluntarily.32

Burgi then identified individuals with whom he maintained contact either to get mail and money from home or to acquire missionary materials. He named the publisher of his literature, President Serge Ballif, safely located in Switzerland. He also described his sources of income, noting that the money comes from family in Utah, not local members. He categorically denied any attempt at encouraging emigration. While stating that he believed himself the only Mormon missionary in Kiel, Burgi admitted that other missionaries might come through the area in transit to other places. This was his explanation for meeting a former companion at the train station the day before. He acknowledged that when he entered and left Kiel he was legally obligated to register his movements. Finally he admitted that two months earlier a large group of Mormon missionaries had landed on European soil.33


Interestingly enough, this Prussian document is preserved in a Saxon police archive on free Christian churches, not in the Prussian files.

33Ibid.
The transcript presents some interesting characteristics. First, Burgi, speaking in first person, regularly referred to the church as a sect, something that no missionary journal, letter or periodical or other Mormon speaking to the police did. Secondly the painstaking and succinct detail of Burgi's itinerant activities indicates careful preparation or editing of his actual account, since the events described extend back over a year and a half. Third, he provided names and addresses of important individuals—local Mormon leadership and the mission president—and the locations of meetings. Fourth he took great care to describe his activities in such a way that they did not break any Prussian law, particularly with regards to emigration. Finally his explanation of meeting a former companion, Arch Willey, at the train station appears contrived.

The first item strongly indicates the hand of a police editor, high-handedly "correcting" inaccuracy in recording. The second matter implies either an instruction to accurately prepare a narration of his movements or the presence of police records against which his account might be checked.\(^{34}\) Since his possessions were in police custody an accurate account of his travels might have been prepared. Providing names and addresses of important local Mormon figures and meeting places smacks very much of someone merely admitting what is already

---

\(^{34}\)This actually occurred in the Thomas Biesinger account, see Riedel, 428.
known, or gross naivete which does not correspond well with how he avoided admitting to punishable offenses, outside of being a Mormon in Prussia. As for meeting Arch Willey, it seems more likely that Burgi was trying to shield his companion so that the Kiel police would not be able to find him. The address which Burgi gives for him is in Hamburg, technically an independent city-state not far from Kiel, but outside of Prussian police jurisdiction.

The portrait of an intelligent young man, dedicated to his profession, emerges from the pages of this transcript. Where necessary he complied with local police, even giving them information possibly damaging to other individuals. The individuals which he named, however, were Prussian citizens more than likely known to the police and who had the protection of the Prussian legal system, as opposed to the American missionaries who had fewer rights in Prussia. On the other hand, Burgi carefully stipulated that his activities were innocuous and legal. Finally in any way he could, he shielded his fellow missionaries while giving the impression of complete compliance with his examiners. It is unlikely that the Kiel police were fooled by his cooperation, but their options were essentially limited, especially as the American consuls now actively worked to release American Mormons found languishing in German jails.

The Burgi transcript proves nothing by itself. However the preservation of a Prussian document in a Saxon police
archive file suggests a cooperative attitude between the officials of the two states with regard to the prosecution and expulsion of Mormon missionaries. Also, the strikingly different nature of this preserved report from others dealing with the missionaries offers the possibility that the Prussian police had begun to refine their methods of identifying and expelling these irritating foreigners, a development that could best occur after a kingdom-wide policy had been established. Unfortunately more documents of this nature have not turned up, making any firm assertions along these lines speculative at best.

Police persecution continued. Repeated statements by the Mormons that polygamy had been abolished and assertions that their doctrine did not threaten German culture, politics or society usually fell on deaf ears. In 1909, however, a request was sent to the German Consul at San Francisco to send his assessment of the Mormon activities. The twelve-page response by Consul Bopp comprises the most thorough and insightful document that appears in the entire range of Prussian or other German government files.

The consul began his evaluation of the Mormon problem by looking at the earliest Latter-day Saint activities. With typical Prussian bureaucratic thoroughness he carefully explicated the rise of Joseph Smith, the emergence of polygamy and the subsequent division of the main body of Latter-day Saints from those who later became known as the Reorganized
Latter-day Saint church. Since much of his information came from Reorganized sources, it was not surprising that he carefully distinguished between the two faiths. Late in his report, he even pointed out that, unlike the majority of the Utah Mormon missionaries, the Reorganized Latter-day Saint missionary in Germany never had trouble with the police. He then described the institution of polygamy in neutral terms, a perspective unusual among the German diplomatic corps and Prussian officials, noting the practice was already declining. Moreover, he admitted that breaking up existing polygamous families to satisfy legality would label the majority of the children as bastards and force the faithful wives to lose the support of their husbands. He registered concern, however, over a the Latter-day Saint doctrine that the church was destined to overcome the world. He stated,

I personally view as one of the main thoughts [of Mormon doctrine], that Mormonism casually presents [itself] as the one correct form of the Christian faith which is destined to conquer the world; this must cause great confusion in uneducated circles and in a country like Germany, where one is used to see in Christianity one of the pillars of our political and social directions, one cannot be indifferent to this [threat?].

The social and cultural disruption for Germany inherent in the Latter-day Saint claims apparently disturbed him deeply. In his view, converts to Mormonism lost all the reasonable, comfortable forms of Christianity. Mormons further served to alienate those people who viewed religion as

---
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superstition, by providing an example of the very fanaticism which was so repugnant to educated, agnostic Germans. He further argued that although German laws did not permit the extermination of Mormons, every effort should occur to deny the Latter-day Saints any more success in Germany. 36

This same worry about the corrupting influence of non-orthodox German religion appears in an 1909 address by a Harvard-educated native of Württemberg, Richard Lempp, to the faculty and students at Harvard Divinity School. Lempp tried to portray the German view of religion in society and culture to an American audience unused to German norms. He expressed the view that the government, not the church, held stewardship over culture, but that the state did not wish to exclude the church from a role in preserving culture, lest "[its] chief means of access to the hearts of the people would be cut off." 37 He noted that every German born is immediately a citizen of a nation and a member of a church. The churches,

36ibid.

The term which Bopp uses to indicate a complete elimination of Mormons in Germany is Ausrottung. This same word was used by the Nazis to describe their policies towards the Jews and other cultures they saw as inferior. Whether Bopp intended the total eradication of Mormons by execution cannot be determined, although it seems unlikely. What is more disturbing is the apparent ease with which he offers it as a solution to the preservation of German society and culture.

though overseen by ecclesiastical consistories, essentially stood under the jurisdiction of the state.\textsuperscript{38}

In part because of this relationship, the Protestant pastors took the active role in religious exercise, while the individual church member became passive, accepting the Evangelical church's presence and actions, but not getting personally involved. As a consequence, the German churches, despite endeavors like the Inner Mission to spiritually reclaim urban workers, seemed, Lempp argued, to have lost the spiritual enthusiasm of the Reformation, and in fact, were being successfully assaulted by "sects" from England and America, who preached against "modern theolog[y]" and won converts by their enthusiasm, rather than doctrine. Interestingly enough, Lempp, like Bopp, blamed sectarian missionaries, rather than any internal lack of emotional satisfaction in the established German churches, for driving the educated people away from religion.\textsuperscript{39}

From this time forward until the outbreak of World War I, all of the European missions, particularly the British and Scandinavian, as well as the Swiss-German seemed to be under repeated attacks by governments and the press. A Danish convert who later left the church, Hans Freece, first published an anti-Mormon book in 1908 and then preceded to

\\textsuperscript{38Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{39Ibid., 87-98.}
lecture on Mormon iniquities throughout Denmark in 1911.\textsuperscript{40} Similar difficulties beset missionaries in Britain with activities ranging from novels decrying Mormon depravity to an attack on a Latter-day Saint meeting at Birkenstead in 1911.\textsuperscript{41} When Mormon Apostle Rudger Clawson, who as European Mission President oversaw the activities of all the various European missions, came to Germany in the summer of 1910 to evaluate the circumstances and attend a conference, the police arrested him and obtained a banishment decree against him.\textsuperscript{42} In December 1910, the German authorities exiled German Mission President Thomas McKay and twenty other missionaries.\textsuperscript{43}

During this anxious period, in a rare departure from the usual policy of suffering in silence, Fritz Boede of \textit{Der Stern} editorial staff responded to the missionary expulsions with a lengthy editorial article. Citing Christ's warning and comfort to his disciples that while the world would hate them for their actions, it had hated him first (John 15:16-18), he described the missionary sufferings of Stephen, Peter and Paul, concluding with Paul's admonition to the Roman Christians to be obedient to political superiors. At this juncture, however, he varied from the typical interpretation,

\textsuperscript{40}Alexander, 228-229.

\textsuperscript{41}Malcom Thorp, "Winifred Graham and the Mormon Image in England" \textit{Journal of Mormon History}, 108; Alexander 230.

\textsuperscript{42}\textit{Millennial Star}, 72:476 (July 28, 1910).

\textsuperscript{43}Alexander, 227.
stating that Paul's advice bound the believer only if the government did not go beyond its rights, by dictating what a man might or might not believe. Continuing his argument, Boede took on the German press and their handling of the most recent missionary expulsions, condemning the sensationalist press, while noting that not all of the German newspapers held Mormons in contempt, inferring that those who sought after facts would support the Latter-day Saint position.

Focusing on one of the latter, the Badische Presse, he evaluated the newspaper's account of the reasons that the Prussian police gave as justification for their actions, particularly since Prussia was respected throughout the world as a "Rechtstaat" or a state governed by rule of law, rather than one ruled by arbitrary whim. From the Presse's account of the raid, however, Boede culled the information that the basis for closing the meeting was not polygamy or any other punishable offense, but the possibility which existed that the Mormons might offend the public order, not that they actually had, anymore than any other non-orthodox religious group in Berlin had. He stated ironically, "the practice of exiling men only because the possibility exists that they might transgress

44 "Einiges über die Ausweisung der Missionare" Der Stern 42:248-249.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid., 250-251.
the Prussian laws is original."47 If that reasoning applied
everywhere Prussia would be empty of foreigners in short time,
since all visitors possessed the same potential criminality.

Even more important to Boede, though, was the official
admission that plural marriage did not occur among German Mor-
mons. This small aside bore some importance, because as had
been pointed out in other official memoranda, the main reason
cited in the past for banishing missionaries was the doctrine
of polygamy, regardless of whether the Mormons actually
preached or practiced it. Boede concluded his editorial with
the observation that while God did not send woes upon his
children, he could provide the wherewithal to transform a
tragic situation into a positive experience.48

Other than these two replies to German banishments, the
church did not appeal in the German-speaking press for leni-
ency. Whether this silence represented specific policy, or an
attempt to avoid focussing on the unpleasant downside of mis-
sonary work cannot be determined from the available materi-
als. It seems likely, however, that the general church
leadership, having seen the ineffectiveness of diplomatic com-
plaints and noting the ongoing baptismal success, may have
opted to proceed with a lowered profile, avoiding the German
authorities where possible and simply sending in new mission-
aries whenever banishment created a vacancy.

47Ibid.

48Ibid., 252-253.
For their part, the various police and local officials did not pull back from their determined efforts to eliminate the Mormon missionary presence. To that end they watched known church members, paying attention to reports of any new baptisms. One example of this surveillance appears in a 1912 Frankfurt police report. Acting on information from the husband of a newly baptized woman, local police interviewed her, seeking specific information about the nature of the baptismal ceremony and the identity of the missionaries who participated or attended.49

Their report stated that the missionaries, in Frankfurt at least, had learned to avoid technical illegalities by having the local members invite investigators to be baptized. Also, the missionaries had apparently schooled the members to take care in how they answered police questions, stressing the fact that the missionaries did not encourage the individuals to be baptized. A former church member reported that the missionaries enlisted the aid of the members to avoid discovery by the police and local officials. The members received encouragement to find prospective members, let the missionaries teach the prospective candidates and then assume the responsibility of persuading the investigators to accept baptism. The report concluded with a listing of current meeting times, names of the local missionaries and results of

---

49 *Acta der Mormonen betr.*, Frankfurt am Main Königliche Polizei-Präsident Tagebuch S III No. 939, 16 October 1912.
the efforts to expel the missionaries, indicating a full awareness of current Mormon activities.50

One of the missionaries named in the report, Victor Sears, described the other side of the cat and mouse game he and his colleagues played with the police. In a series of letters to his mother, he related how he hid his vocation as a missionary under the guise of being a student, using student identification from Chicago to allay police suspicions. As he put it "As my diploma is labeled 'Utah' it wouldn't do to use it."51 A couple of weeks later he alluded to the impending visit of a policeman, who was to verify Sears's enrollment as a student, without any indication of concern.52 A week later, discussing a conference of missionaries, he noted that Prussia had banished President McKay and that the other German states "show[ed] their respect by doing the same."53 In November he reported that his method of avoiding the attention of the police had not succeeded.54 Five months later, he had moved to the city of Darmstadt in nearby Hesse-Darmstadt to avoid being served with banishment papers.55 Finally the

50Ibid.

51Victor Hugo Sears, letter to Mother, September 28, 1910, unpublished papers, ca 1910-1913, LDS Archives, Salt Lake City.

52Sears, letter to mother, October 10, 1910.

53Sears, letter to Mother, October 16, 1910.

54Sears, letter to Mother, November 15, 1910.

55Sears, letter to mother, April 21, 1911.
mission president transferred Sears to Leipzig, Saxony where he succeeded in overawing the local police officer by indignantely stating his intention to study and if the police bothered him he would leave town, much as Thomas Biesinger had done in Munich years before.56

Despite these sorts of tactics, the police regularly caught Mormon missionaries. Sears informed his mother in a January 1911 letter, that 50% of the missionaries serving in Switzerland or Germany had been banished from one place or another, and that 29 of the missionaries had suffered imprisonment.57 A Stettin police report, dated April 15, 1912, listed the individuals who regularly spoke in Latter-day Saint meetings in that city. Although a specific vocation, such as plumber, appears next to the name of each speaker, a parenthetical qualification, "Mormon missionary," right below indicates that the police remained aware of the missionaries identities in spite of their attempts at disguising their identity. Only one person on the list, Hermann Behling, avoided summary banishment because of his Pomeranian citizenship. Even that protection appeared ephemeral once the police had observed his participation in the meetings a sufficient number of times.58

---

56Sears, letter to mother, April 29, 1912.

57Sears, letter to mother, January 31, 1911.

58Acta der Mormonen betr., Regierungspräsident Pr. A.111 No. 2550, April 15, 1912.
As noted earlier, Mormon missionaries had come to accept expulsions with a certain equanimity. Sears felt so secure that in a letter discussing his sister's imminent visit, he discounted the threat of banishment, noting that if it happened, the two siblings would then travel to "Vienna or somewhere in Switzerland." The same flippancy did not prevail in the instances of imprisonment. Serge Ballif tried to reassure parents of missionaries that "very few of our elders ... . suffered in those prisons." John Marion Belnap, recording his 1908 Stuttgart incarceration, noted that the guards treated him with disrespect, provided poor food and shuffled him from courtroom to courtroom in an attempt to have him banished. Sears, who recounted every other hardship with a sense of humor, described a similar feeling of dismay during his time in a Breslau jail. He spent several days there, without opportunity to wash himself, get clean clothes, acquire edible food or communicate with anyone outside of the jail. He only escaped the miserable surroundings by the intervention of the local American consul, being released on Christmas Eve with a banishment order.

59Sears, letter to mother, November 16, 1912.
60Serge L. Ballif, Conference Reports, Salt Lake City, (Spring 1909): 79.
61John Marion Belnap, Papers, 1908 LDS Archives.
62Sears, letter to mother, December 25, 1912.
The efforts of the various police and judges to disrupt the missionary activity in Germany appear to have had an effect. Baptisms in the Swiss-German mission in the period from 1911 to August 1914 fell from 706 to 353 respectively. This decline occurred despite an increase in the number of missionaries called to serve in Germany during the same period. Emigration hovered between one hundred and one hundred fifty participants annually. 63

Public vilification of the Mormons had continued. In a respected Catholic encyclopedia which had previously treated the Mormons with gentle disregard a new strain of intellectual contempt surfaced. No longer citing moderate source materials, the article took at face value such works as E. E. Folk's The Mormon Monster (1900), W. A. Linn The Story of the Mormons (1902), and Pastor G. A. Zimmer's Unter den Mormonen (1908), which even the article admitted was biased. The author drew attention to the similarities between the Mormons and the Münster Anabaptists--always viewed with disdain by modern Germans--with regard to polygamy and otherwise portrayed the Mormons as troubling local authorities from the beginning of the movement. 64

Meanwhile, political events had marched on, pulling Europe into greater diplomatic strain. Paul Schroeder, com-

63 Anderson, 201.

64 Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Tübingen, :Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1913) Band 4, 504-508.
menting on the prevailing attitudes in Europe in the period from 1890 to 1914, observes that once Germany had lost the Bismarckian system of diplomatic control of world politics in 1890, no other nation succeeded in rebuilding a dominant European consensus. Britain, France, Germany and Russia all pulled at the fragile house of cards of peaceful coexistence, placing national interests ahead of international peace.\(^65\) The drive of Wilhelm II's political regimen to establish Germany's "place in the sun" and alienation of the three traditional Great Powers, placed Germany in alliance with Austria-Hungary, then trying to reassert its importance by expanding into the Balkan territories of the Ottoman Empire.

When the heir to the Austrian throne was assassinated in Sarajevo, Bosnia, the entire structure swayed and collapsed in a period of weeks, resulting in World War I. Concerned for the safety of the missionaries, the First Presidency called their emissaries out of Germany. The then Swiss-German Mission President, Hyrum Valentine, personally traveled the length of Germany, seeking out the missionaries and providing them with the funds to go to Liverpool and thence to America.\(^66\)

Finally the Prussian policy of expulsion came to fruition, but in the ensuing vicissitudes of the war, the Mormon


\(^66\)Scharffs, 55.
presence was hardly missed. Moreover, once the war had ended the Latter-day Saints sent their missionaries in again. Despite the efforts of both the Mormons and the Germans to force a change in the behavior of the other institution, neither side succeeded in altering the status quo.
CONCLUSION

In July 1922, the German Federal Minister of the Interior issued a circular decree to Prussian bureaucrats reversing the over half-century old official policy toward the Mormon missionaries.

Since the end of the war numerous missionaries of the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" are again residing in Germany. . . . On the basis of an old practice, banishment was continually exercised against missionaries from the American mother church. This practice of banishment is no longer justifiable.

In agreement with the [Federal] Office of Foreign Affairs, I must ask the Prussian Ministers of the Interior and Science, Art and Education to no longer hold to the practice, whereby the [mere] fact that the missionaries [are from] the Mormons in Utah justifies [their] banishment as offensive foreigners. It is more appropriate to test [on a] case by case [basis], whether the missionary through his actions shows himself to be an offensive foreigner.¹

With the same sweeping action that the Prussian monarchy had earlier initiated the expulsion of Mormons, the representative Weimar government of post-World War I Germany ended the policy of universal banishment on terms similar to those which the United States Embassy under Andrew D. White had attempted to accomplish in 1902.

By no stretch of the imagination can the Prussian-Mormon struggle be considered a major turning point in international relations. At best, the conflict involved a few thousand individuals--American missionaries, Prussian police and clergy and German Mormons--and never visibly affected even German-American relations, let alone the rest of the world. From one perspective the entire conflict, which reached a crescendo in 1902, was anticlimactic in that neither the Prussians nor the Latter-day Saints ever seemed to clearly appreciate the opposing point of view, nor could they work out a system of coexistence. Both combatants struggled to assert their position in changing circumstances--Prussia in a transforming economy and society and the Mormons in a less overtly political, more spiritually focused church.

The relevance of these incidents, then, must be sought in a different perspective. By focusing on what did change--the way the Mormons went about getting the Prussians to permit missionary work--the importance of the exchange emerges. Although Prussian officials successfully eliminated the right of American Mormon missionaries to operate legally in Prussia, they did not end Mormon missionary work in that kingdom. On a symbolic level, then, each contestant attempted to force its perspective of right and wrong on the other. When the Mormons stopped using government intervention and instead focused on their main purpose in Prussia--preaching their doctrines and seeking converts--the conflict became much less relevant to
the success of their goal, and consequently the church continued to grow in Germany.²

As the dominant state in the Imperial German system, Prussia struggled with the evolution of the international balance of power while at the same time contending with changes in its domestic social and economic framework, the transformation from an agricultural to an industrial power. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, while holding on to its goal of preaching its message in all the world, had begun to relinquish political control over its members, emphasizing a more spiritual focus for its efforts in the new 20th century. These institutions faced profitless disagreement as long as they both tried to assert complete control over their constituents. The Mormons appeared to have learned this lesson, but the Prussians seemed uncomfortable with the very idea of trying such a radical outlook, even if it could prove beneficial for them.

The Prussian system of church and state relations needed thorough revision. The complicated system of the Landeskirchen, while appropriate for a different society, reached unwieldy proportions as Prussia had absorbed other German

²It should be noted that a few of the elements which support this conclusion have a conjectural basis, rather than a clear one-to-one documentary correlation showing cause and effect. In particular the impact of Social Democracy on Prussian attitudes about Mormons does not enjoy clear documentary evidence. However, careful reading of contemporary Prussian sentiments on that topic supports the contention that any unorthodox ideas of the Mormons would hurt their cause in the eyes of the Prussian bureaucracy.
states. The crazy quilt of Prussian Landeskirchen begged for a new type of reformation which would simplify church administration. So long as individual sovereign states retained a role in the administration of the churches, the temptation would arise to exert social control through spiritual means for short term political benefits. Even the earlier Pietist movement, which had stressed individual religious fervor, had been institutionalized by a portion of the Prussian government and thus blunted as a tool of religious change. The involvement of the state in church matters, in turn, interfered with the primary mission of the Christian churches, bringing the Christian Heilsbotschaft to the world.

The Prussian government's inability to regulate religious feeling among its citizens became only too apparent during Bismarck's Kulturkampf. He fought to assert political control over the Catholic regions of Prussia and Germany and to bring them in line with the system already in place in Protestant areas of Prussia. His failure to institute effective government oversight over religious matters reflected a serious misunderstanding of the individual nature of religious feeling. Attempts to force, rather than persuade, a religiously-oriented person to change personal beliefs generally engenders strong resistance which leads to open opposition. This sort of resistance actually happened in the case of the German Catholics pressed by the Imperial government's heavy-handed tactics.
Ironically, both the well-educated Bopp and the religiously sophisticated Lempp, in their analysis of German spiritual needs, regarded state involvement in religion as essential to the survival of Christianity in Germany. With the lessons of the Kulturkampf before them, they failed to appreciate the value of personal enthusiasm, however chaotic, in maintaining religious values. To them the state church culture needed to be preserved or everything of value, culturally and spiritually, would be lost. Yet after World War I, dealing with a government potentially hostile to any state church, Lempp completely reversed his earlier contentions and praised the value of personal commitment rather than state enforcement in preserving the Christian community.3

Mormon missionary work hit on this very nerve of individual religious feeling. The Latter-day Saint faith developed in the crucible of American frontier fervor. The passionate, often intemperate, nature of American religion offended "cultured" German sensibilities with the excess of emotion Lempp politely termed "enthusiasm," but which Bopp and the Evangelical Ober-Kirchenrath saw as repugnant fanaticism. The emotional intensity of the Mormon message ignored the concept of enlightened rationalism as well as state-mandated religious and social sobriety.

3Richard J. Lempp, "Church and Religion in Germany" The Harvard Theological Review 14 (1921) 35.
Lempp recognized the strength of this component of American creeds and became concerned that the torch of German religiosity might be passed from the main churches to these "upstart" Anglo-American invaders. He would not, however, admit that traditional German churches lacked the spiritual ardor that appealed to many committed Christians.

Lempp was not alone in the distrust of American religious tradition. Germany, effectively divided among Calvinist, Lutheran and Roman Catholic traditions, did not appreciate pluralistic American religious tolerance. The relative homogeneity of German society prevented bureaucrats, clergy and the majority of the educated classes alike from comprehending the contributions of the Mormons in religious and social areas.

The works of Moritz Busch, Eduard Meyer and the authors of the various respected lexicons repeatedly described Mormons in terms of humorous derision. The perception of Latter-day Saints by these representatives of the German intelligentsia as an exotic cult appropriately fostered on the wild American

---

4The term Anglo-American is more applicable here, since many of the religions whose possible influence so concerned Lempp came from England as well as the United States. See Lempp "Present Religious Conditions in Germany" 97-99.

5A description of German society as homogenous does not imply that the various dialects and other cultural divisions ceased to exist within the Empire. Rather in religious terms the centuries-long religious traditions had developed into a status quo which had little room for new, non-native movements. This lack of ethnic heterogeneity would bedevil German society throughout the 20th Century.
frontier did not help the Mormon cause. Instead of being accorded the status of a "noble savage," since the Utah-based missionaries had received the benefit of Christian knowledge, they qualified as degenerate barbarians, threatening the civilized world with misapplied scriptural interpretations.

One wonders if the mild derision of the educated German classes reflects a general discomfort with emotional religion. Maybe the American tradition, represented by Mormon beliefs, went too far in its fervor for the Germans, away from educated foundations into regions of unrefined, uncultivated and irrational adoration.

The presence of Mormon missionaries, however, posed no genuine threat to Prussian ecclesiastical or cultural stability. The number of Mormons living in Germany by 1911--5,142--is tiny compared the 48,000,000 Imperial German citizens of the same period. Moreover, no prominent Germans joined the church prior to 1914. The influential upper classes, with the exception of Karl Maeser and his family, displayed no interest whatsoever in Mormon perspectives.

The reaction of the Prussian government to the Mormon presence in 1853 and again in 1902 seems extreme in relation to the size, significance and seriousness of the "menace." The contemptuous attitude of the Prussian magistrates reported by Orson Spencer in 1853 appears to have found continuity and equivalence in the disdain with which the Ministers of the Interior, Clerical Affairs and Foreign Affairs dismissed the
right of Mormon missionaries to proselyte in Prussia at the turn of the 20th century. The only difference between them is that by 1902, Prussian ministers had discovered more reasons for concern about the Latter-day Saint presence. While Mormon emigration, the main focus of the 1853 decision, no longer threatened the population or economic base of Prussia, Mormon doctrine and culture did present some new worries—polygamy and political radicalism.

The documents of the Prussian police files and American diplomatic correspondence from the 1880s until 1909 regularly refer to Mormon polygamy. In 1890, President Woodruff issued the Manifesto, a directive finally confirmed as binding by the First Presidency announcement in April 1904 of excommunication against future offenders. This fifteen year lag in forceful adherence to monogamy provided Prussian officials with the premise, as noted by the Evangelical Ober-Kirchenrath, that Mormons did not take the prohibition of polygamy seriously, had not really changed their stripes and therefore offered a threat to the moral fiber of German society. In fact, political leaders in both the United States and Prussia had reason to believe that the Mormons still held to the ideals and practice of polygamy, despite the 1890 Manifesto.

With the available materials, it has not been possible to determine precisely whether or not Mormon polygamy indeed threatened prevailing German moral standards, but that prospect seems unlikely. The popular publications of Busch, von
Schlagentweit and Meyer condemned the practice of polygamy out of hand as a mockery of the important social and moral convention of marriage. There can be no doubt that Prussian officials viewed the Latter-day Saint practice of plural marriage with disgust and apprehension. With the continuing disapprobation of the 1530 German Anabaptist polygamous experiments and the contemporary Evangelical missionary campaigns against polygamy among non-Europeans, it appears unlikely that the general German public in the nineteenth century would have ever accepted polygamy.

Polygamy, more than likely, stood as a powerful indication of the worst aspects of the fanatical excesses of Mormonism to the Prussians. Efforts by the church to downplay the importance of this belief had a two-fold, negative impact on Latter-day Saint credibility. So long as the principle remained in the Doctrine and Covenants and evidence existed that polygamous marriages continued to be performed, Prussian government officials could continue to view the Mormons as licentious extremists and justify their prejudice and rejection of Mormonism as a Christian faith. When the church leadership denied that polygamous marriages had continued to be performed after 1890, the Prussians could assert their view that the Mormons had no moral integrity and as such did not deserve permission to proselyte in Prussia.

As plural marriage likely did not threaten German public morals, its true role may have been to act as a screen to
cover official concerns over the other threat which Mormons brought with them, that of political radicalism. The Latter-day Saints had had their own stormy history of difficulties with political authority in the United States, but when they arrived in Prussia, the missionaries behaved as if they could rely on American religious privileges despite their residence in a more authoritarian, religiously conservative society. As Bopp and others pointed out, since the Latter-day Saints had defied national laws in the United States, they could be expected to evade Prussian laws as well.

No Prussian elite—whether aristocratic or professional—would condone the idea of breaking laws or defying the state to accomplish any end. The romantic notion of an organic state with natural progression, coupled with the nascent Prussian militaristic desire for order, left no room for the defiant actions of the Mormon missionaries, regardless of how harmless they appeared. The persistence of the American Mormons must have disturbed Prussian cultural sensibilities.

The dominant American identity of the church—despite its claim to universality—raised also some concern among Prussian officials because of the plurality of the United States political system. Although two main political parties dominated American governmental institutions, few restrictions existed to regulate freedom of expression. As William Lang reported to Congress in 1887, the formation in America of a branch of the Social Democratic Party by German-American immigrants
deeply disturbed the German governments, including Prussia. Rather than provide an excuse for the German states to outlaw Mormonism because of ties to the Social Democratic movement, mission leaders dissolved branches which had ties to the Social Democrats.

The German consuls in Denver and San Francisco approached their assignment to evaluate Utah Mormons seriously. While their accounts invariably focus on the grimmer side of Mormon social and political behavior, they did not stoop to making up facts. Thus the topics with which they concerned themselves reflect, in some measure, those topics which disturbed German officials. By 1907, the German consular report had switched its focus from polygamy to concern over future Mormon political power in the United States and the role of German immigrants within the church. 6

Finally, the church, like the Social Democrats, enjoyed most of its success among the German lower classes. One of the few benefits to the Mormons from the 1902 banishment order was that "a better class of people" showed interest in the Mormon message. With the exception of Karl G. Maeser and a few others, German Mormon immigrants to Utah did not figure prominently in educated professions. That statement does not mean that the immigrants lacked ability or intelligence, but

6 Bopp’s 1909 report is perhaps the final flirtation with concern about Mormon polygamy. Subsequent police files review the 1902 banishment decree, emigration, and actual missionary activities, rather than polygamy.
simply that German converts as a rule came from the working and lower middle classes rather than from the nobility, intelligentsia and other social echelons which exerted influence in legislative and bureaucratic circles. In a hierarchical society such as that of Imperial Germany, which laid a great deal of importance on social standing, Prussian officials could easily continue to ignore the "lower class" Mormon point of view when making decisions regarding the future of Latter-day Saints in Prussia.

The Prussian government never did address the issue of Mormon political influence. The immorality of polygamy and the concerns about emigration served to hide the very definite uncertainty which the officials felt about Social Democracy and other social experiments. Officials kept a close watch on the church's activities, however, and were quick to report any sort of behavior which might resemble political radicalism.

The incredible amount of attention paid by the Prussian government towards an obscure, American denomination points to the possibility that they were, in fact, aware that the world was undergoing massive change, but could not conceive of how to affect such a change in Prussia and still retain their unique cultural identity. Prior to World War I Lempp stated that without the support of the government, church affairs would not stay unaffected by outside influences. If the government was unable to conceive of new responses to the problems which began to arise with the changes in Prussia and the
rest of Germany, their repressive strategies begin to make sense. If no change was permitted to occur, then the threat of new ideas, such as those of Mormonism, would not develop.

While the Prussian government certainly demonstrated their misunderstanding of Mormon motives and activities, the Latter-day Saints also showed their misconceptions about the German community and what constituted acceptable behavior in Prussia. Although the Mormon missionaries never sought an adversarial role with the Prussian government, or other German authorities, they also never demonstrated an understanding or appreciation for the interrelationship of the native religious, political and social structures, developed over centuries in response to German experiences.

Joseph F. Smith's 1875 declaration failed to recognize the significance of the standing 1853 decree against Mormons in Prussia—the narrower German perception of religious freedom. Whether Smith was correct or incorrect in his recommendation to the missionaries to preach without obtaining official permission for proselyting, his counsel helped set the stage for the collision of Mormon expansion and Prussian authority twenty-five years later.  

---

7The possibility exists that both the missionary work and the relations with the Prussian government might have been better had the missionaries studied German history and culture along with the language. While such preparation offered no guarantee of softening the governmental positions, the missionaries might have determined ways to achieve their goals without finding themselves in a no-win situation.
Along the same lines, Orson Spencer dismissed the Prussian alliance of church and government as a recurrence of ancient despotism, designed to keep the people in spiritual and intellectual bondage. His German contemporary, Moritz Busch, leveled similar charges at the emerging Mormon community in Utah. In fact, the separation of church and state which the Latter-day Saints so hoped to enjoy in Germany did not develop in the Great Basin along the American model until decades after the United States sent in its own non-Mormon territorial administrators to assure the division of power. In a general sense, the Mormons were just as concerned about total control as the Prussians—a comparison that would not have sat well with the church leaders of that time.

The issue of polygamy eventually forced Mormon political development to follow more traditional American patterns. Missionaries in Prussia generally did not engage in polygamy, with the known exception of Hugh Cannon, but the practice was extensive in Utah. Once the United States had claimed the territory which included Mormon settlements, the church became increasingly vulnerable to government interference in day-to-day affairs because of laws forbidding bigamy. Latter-day Saint attempts to have polygamy recognized as a legitimate form of marriage or to establish self-rule in order to avoid giving up the practice failed. Unlike the Catholic Church in Germany during the Kulturkampf, the Mormons eventually had to accept the moral dictates of the United States Congress. This
unpleasant ordeal gave the church a model of how to accommodate political authority while retaining the essence of an important doctrine.

The events which led to the Prussian expulsion order of 1902 also demonstrated Mormon misunderstanding of German religious and political culture. Appeals to the United States Embassy to intervene on behalf of the banished missionaries, merely complicated matters by adding a layer of bureaucracy between the missionaries and the officials who would decide the future of Mormons in Prussia. The Latter-day Saint leaders did not seem to perceive that the 1871 German constitution reserved the authority to regulate religions to the member states.

The situation was further complicated as Prussia had expanded during the nineteenth century, so that a variety of regions--such as Hannover--existed within the kingdom with their own history, identity and tendencies. It follows, then, that the attitudes of officials within Prussia regarding a Mormon peril would vary from locale to locale. Secretary Jackson of the United States embassy actually noticed this condition and used it in his request for the Prussian government to relocate the missionaries banished from Tilsit to some other Prussian region.

This variant view of the Mormon threat highlights an element of this study which differs from other treatments of related topics: the role of the bureaucracy in pursuing the
expulsion of the Mormons. Unlike American and British Mormon persecution, the Prussians did not have a number of incensed private individuals, such as John Cook, who found it necessary to rail against the Mormons. Rather the civil bureaucracy, notably the Interior Ministry—especially the judiciary and the police—were the instruments of harassment. Moreover, once a decision had been laid down regarding the Mormons, the conservative nature of bureaucratic decision-making never seriously reconsidered its position. It is precisely this faceless indifference which makes Bopp's extermination recommendation even slightly plausible, and so disturbing.

In spite of government opposition, the Latter-day Saint work in Prussia prospered the most when the missionaries simply adapted to whatever complication the government threw in their way. The success in the post-1902 years occurred in spite of repeated attempts by the Prussian officials to eliminate the Mormon presence. By focusing on their message rather than tangling with the government over religious recognition, the missionaries built up the local church membership by thirty percent in seven years, 1904-1911. The Prussian government, on the other hand, enjoyed the same success in the elimination of the Mormons as it experienced in reorienting the Catholics during the Kulturkampf—none.

Both the Prussian government and the Mormon mission leadership acted to force the other side to accept the validity of their position. In all of the police records, perio-
dical articles and personal records, the idea that the other party might have a reason for its position, and thus a justification for its actions, does not appear. This narrowness of vision seriously affected the creative element in solving the dilemma. By centering the issue on an us-vs.-them attitude, the larger vista of what should be accomplished became obscured.

When the Prussians forced the missionaries to leave the state, the Mormons had to deal with the larger issue—the importance of ongoing missionary endeavor. By working out methods to continue placing missionaries in Prussia, they dabbled in subterfuge, but the proselyting continued. The 1922 decree vindicated their legal position, but the mission did not wait two decades until it could officially operate again. In a symbolic sense, then, the Mormons outflanked the Prussians, not by victory in the courts, but by preserving sight of their purpose in the heat of the dispute, instead of wasting their energies without addressing their real goal.
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APPENDIX A

1853 Prussian Expulsion Decree

Es sind in verschiedenen Theilen der Monarchie sowie überhaupt in nördlichen Deutschland, Abgesandte der Sekte der Mormonen aus Amerika erschienen, und ihre Lehren und einzelne Schriften über dieselben zu verbreiten. Diese Bestrebungen verdienen---abgesehen von den Vorwünschen, welche gegen die Grundsätze jener Sekte über die Ehen und einigen andere solche Gegenstücke erhoben sind---deshalb die besonderen Aufmerksamkeit der Behörden, weil ihm Vernehmen nach, die Mormonen Ansiedlungen in Amerika noch nicht die zur Bildung eines Staats erforderliche Bevölkerungszahl haben und die Häupter der Sorte deshalb bemüht sind, Auswanderer aus Europa dahin zu ziehen, so darf also der Verdacht naheliegen, daß die hier auftretenden Abgesandten es sich zum Geschäft machen, dieselbe einzige Unterthanen zur Auswanderung zu verleiten.

Die königliche Regierung hat daher die Polizeibehörden mit Anweisung zu versehen daß sie auf das Erscheinen derartigen Abgesandten mit Aufmerksamkeit achten, dieselben vorkommenden Falls ausweisen, oder, wenn hinreichende Gründe dazu sich finden ihre gerichtliche Verfügung wegen Übertretung des §114 des Strafgesetzbuchs veranlassen.

Berlin, den 26 April 1853
der Minister des Innern
APPENDIX B

The Evarts Circular Instructing American Diplomats to Take Action Against Mormon Missionary Efforts in Foreign Lands

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Washington [D.C.], August 9, 1879.

Sir: The annual statistics of immigration into the United States show that large numbers of immigrants come to our shores every year from the various countries of Europe for the avowed purpose of joining the Mormon community at Salt Lake, in the Territory of Utah, under the auspices and guidance of the emissaries and agents of that community in foreign parts. This representation of the interests of Mormonism abroad, which has been carried on for years, is understood to have developed unusual activity of late, especially in , among other countries, where it has unfortunately obtained a greater or less foothold.

The system of polygamy, which is prevalent in the community of Utah, is largely based upon and promoted by these accessions from Europe, drawn mainly from the ignorant classes, who are easily influenced by the double appeal to their passions and their poverty, held out in the flattering picture of a home in the fertile and prosperous region where Mormonism has established its material seat.

Inasmuch as the practice of polygamy is based upon a form of marriage, by which additional wives are "sealed" to the men of that community, these so-called "marriages" are pronounced by the laws of the United States to be crimes against the statutes of the country, and punishable as such.

On the 1st of July, 1862, the Congress of the United States passed an act (Chap. XXXVI) expressly designed, as appears from its title, "to punish and prevent the practice of polygamy in the Territories of the United States, and other places," &c [etc.]. That act remains the law of the land as its continuing provisions, which, in the revision of the statutes of the United States, made in 1874, reads as follows:

SEC. 5352. Every person having a husband or wife living, who marries another, whether married or single, in a Territory or other place over which the United States have exclusive jurisdiction, is guilty of bigamy, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than five hundred dollars, and by imprisonment for a term not more than five years; but this section shall not extend to any person by reason of any former marriage whose husband or wife by such marriage is absent for five successive years, and is not known to such person to be living; nor to any person by reason of any former marriage which has been dissolved by decree of a competent court; nor to any person by reason of former marriage which has been pronounced void by decree of a competent court on the ground of nullity of the marriage contract.

Whatever doubt, if any, has heretofore existed as to the efficiency of the law above cited, and in the intent of the general government to enforce it, has now been terminated by
the recent decision of the Supreme Court, the highest tribunal of the land, sustaining the constitutionality of this legislation and affirming the conviction and punishment of offenders against that law.

Under whatever specious guise the subject may be presented by those engaged in instigating the European movement to swell the numbers of the law-defying Mormons of Utah, the bands and organizations which are got together in foreign lands as recruits cannot be regarded as otherwise than a deliberate and systematic attempt to bring persons to the United States with the intent of violating their laws and committing crimes expressly punishable under the statute as penitentiary offenses.

No friendly power will, of course, knowingly lend its aid, even indirectly, to attempts made within its borders against the laws and government of a country wherewith it is at peace with established terms of amity and reciprocal relations of treaty between them; while, even were there no question involved of open and penal infraction of the laws of the land, every friendly consideration of comity should prevail to prevent the territory of a friendly state from becoming a resort or refuge for the crowds of misguided men and women whose offenses against morality and decency would be intolerable in the land from which they come.

It is not doubted, therefore, that when the subject is brought to its attention, the government of ______________ will take such steps as may be compatible with its laws and usages to check the organization of these criminal enterprises by agents who are thus operating beyond the reach of the law of the United States and to prevent the departure of those proposing to come hither as violators of the law by engaging in such criminal enterprises by whomsoever instigated.

You are instructed, therefore, to present the matter to the government of ______________, through the minister of foreign affairs, and to urge earnest attention to it, in the interest not merely of a faithful execution of the laws of the United States, but of the peace, good order, and morality which are cultivated and sought to be promoted by all civilized countries. You will fortify your representations on the subject by citation of any facts which may come to your notice concerning emigration of this character from ______________; and to this end the consular officers in your jurisdiction have been instructed to communicate to you what information with regard thereto may come to their knowledge. Your timely protest in cases where the probable departure of Mormon emigrants is reported or known to you would prove a weighty auxiliary to the general representations you are now instructed to make. You are also authorized, in your discretion, to call attention to this subject and the determined purpose of this government to enforce this law and eradicate this institution, through the public press of the principal
cities or ports of the country, as you may find useful towards the end in view.

I desire to be informed of the steps taken by you under these instructions and of the disposition shown in reference to the same by the government to which you are accredited.

I am, &c.,

WM. M. EVARTS

[NOTE.--A similar instruction was sent to consular officers directing them to cooperate with the diplomatic officers of the United States in the premises.]
APPENDIX C

Gumbinnen Regierungs-Präsidens Report

Pre Regierungs-Präsident.

Dr. I. D. d. 431.

Be tragen:

die Ausweisung von zwei amerikanischen Missionaren der Mormonengemeinde.

Ohne Erlass.

Berichterstatter: Regierungs-Assessor Berthold.

Anlagen:

1) Ein Aktenheft.
2) 3 Traktate.

Obener Präsident
pr. 11. März 1902.

Nach Seite 6 und 7 des anliegenden Aktenheftes sind kürzlich 107 Mitglieder der Heiligen der letzten Tage "alias Mormonen" in Utah von Amerika nach Deutschland gekommen, um hier als Lehrer unter Leitung eines Präsidenten und mehrerer Unterpräsidenten das Evangelium der Kirche Jesu Christi zu predigen und hier Anhänger zu gewinnen, zu welchem Zwecke sie auch Schriften nach dem Muster der beigefügten Traktate vertheilen.

Zwei Mitglieder dieser Sekte, der Missionar John Ranzenberger und der Missionar Ernst Peter Henrichsen, haben sich in Tilsit niedergelassen, sind aber auf meine Veranlassung aus Preußen ausgewiesen, weil bei der grossen Neigung

An

den Herrn Minister des Innern
zur Sektenbildung, die leider hier unter der litthauischen Bevölkerung herrscht, die Befürchtung besteht, dass durch die Lehren dieser Missionare der kirchliche Boden noch mehr aufgewühlt und untergraben wird, als es jetzt schon der Fall ist.

Bei dem leicht aufrégbaren Charakter der Litthauer wirkt dies erfordnungsmäßig auf ihre politische und nationale Haltung ungünstig zurück und verleiht sie zur Verfolgung ungesunder national- und litthauischer Bestrebungen, welche bekanntlich gerade von Amerika aus durch den sogenannten Bund der Litthauer unterstützt werden.

Wenn daher, wie mir der Consularagent der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika in Königsberg, welcher gegen die Anweisung bereits protestirt hat, mittheilt, auch anderwärts, zum Beispiel in Königsberg und Berlin die Missionare der Mormonengemeinde den diesseitigen Staaten trotz der Vorschrift des § 171 des Reichsstrafgesetzbuches geduldet werden sollten, so scheint mir doch stützender Grund vorzuliegen, dieselben wenigstens aus dem diesigen Regierungs...
Ich habe deshalb dem Consularagen- 
ten, welcher Übrigens die Zugehörigkeit 
der beiden Missionare zur Mormonenge-
meinde unumwunden zugiebt, erwidert, 
dass ich die Entscheidung Eurer Excel-
lenz eingeholt und inzwischen nichts 
einzuwenden hätte, wenn die beiden Mis-
issionare bis dahin in einem Orte des In-
landes ausserhalb des Regierungsbezirks 
Gumbinnen ihren Aufenthalt nehmen.

Dass Übrigens die Zwecke dieser 
Mission lediglich auf religiösem Gebiete 
liegen, ist nicht anzunehmen; vielmehr 
liegt der Verdacht der Verleitungs zur 
Auskümmung sehr nahe.

Ich bitte die Ausweisung eventuell 
nach Bekenntnis mit dem Herrn Minister der 
geistlichen Angelegenheiten aufrecht zu 
erhalten.

[Unterschrift]
APPENDIX D

1902 Prussian Expulsion Decree


Wenn gleich das jetzige Auftreten der Abgesandten der Mormonen stellenweise nicht mehr direkt zu klagen Veranlassung gegeben hat, so lief doch schon mit Rücksicht auf die Bestrebungen der Mormonen ein ausreichenden Anlaß zur Aufhebung des Runderlasses vom 26. April 1853 nicht vor. Um jedoch übertriebenen Härten zu vermeiden, will ich nicht dagegen einwenden, wenn solchen Abgesandten der Mormonen aus Amerika, welche sich bereits seit längeren Jahren in Inlande niedergelassen und einwandfrei gesucht haben, bei fortgesetzten Wohlerhalten auch fernerhin der Aufenthalt in preußischen Staatsgebiet nicht verwehrt? wird, sofern sie sich jeglicher propagandischen Tätigkeit enthalten. Eurer Hochwohlgeboren überlasse ich hiernoch das Weitere.
APPENDIX E

Newspaper Clipping Reporting Mission President Hugh Cannon’s Opinion of the Impact of the Prussian Expulsion Order

Deseret News
Friday April 7, 1905

Work in Germany is Progressing
Order of Banishment Fails to Bring about the Results Expected
Missionaries are Encouraged

Their conduct closely scrutinized by Secret Service Men--
Last Year’s Baptisms

The German Mission, despite banishments, is not one whit behind other European missions, is the the encouraging word brought back by Elder Hugh J. Cannon, who returned several days ago from presiding over the work in that country. It will be remembered that a little over three years ago the edict went forth that "Mormonism" was to be no longer tolerated in Prussia, especially, steps were taken to banish the Elders from that neighborhood. In some cases the missionaries were thrown into jail for no cause whatever and they were so hounded by the officers that it was finally decided to quit the empire and leave the work to local elders. This was done and with what assistance the Utah missionaries could give, some times at long distances, the work continued as though nothing had occurred to mar its progress.

When the order of banishment was first issued, President Cannon had a conference with Andrew D. White, the American ambassador, who kindly proffered to do all he could to have the order annulled. Mr. White laid the matter before the government and after awhile the answer came back that Germany did not deem the promulgation of the doctrines not excluding polygamy compatible with good order and morality. It will be noted that no charge of preaching polygamy was made against them, but simply that the government could not tolerate the preaching of principles not excluding it.

Failing in the efforts to have the banishment cancelled, the Elders were sent into other parts of the country and in due season mission headquarters were changed from Berlin, Germany to Zurich, Switzerland. While the "Mormon" question was under consideration, it was learned later that secret service men had been following the missionaries in their travels, closely observing their conduct, in order, if possible, to prefer charges against them and have them thrown into jail. But despite their efforts no fault could be found with them, so that all that could be done was to have them banished on general principles. There were some few places where the order was not effective, but in these the Elders
were cautioned against praying, singing hymns, and instead had to read the hymns and pray in secret.

In spite of the difficulties referred to, the work has continued in good condition and last year 340 baptisms were performed in that country. A year ago the German mission was annexed to the Swiss mission and the work in both countries is now under one head, the president being Elder Serge F. Ballif of Logan, Utah. There are now about 130 Elders in that mission and all are much encouraged with the success attending their humble efforts. Most of them are young men, just out of school, and as they are generally studious they acquire the language in a comparatively short time, being able to speak it quite well within a year. The American ambassador, Charlemagne Tower, is a genial gentleman and he affords the Elders all the protection possible in his official capacity.

Elder Cannon left home July 8, 1901, and returned March 30, 1905. He had an interesting experience while away and comes home in splendid health, ready to assume his new duties as president of the Liberty stake of Zion. Before leaving for home he made a tour of the Alps and passed over the great Simplon tunnel, which is considered to be the largest in the world and a most wonderful piece of engineering.
APPENDIX F

Consul Bopp’s Analysis and Recommendations regarding the Mormons in Germany

Nr. 882
Auf Erlaß 78 vom 3. Febr. d.Js. IIIb 781


gez. Bernstorff

an seiner Durchlaucht, den Herrn Reichskanzler Fürst von Bülow

Kaiserlich Deutsches Konsulat San Francisco, den 8. April 1909

Für das Verständnis die die Vielweiberei im Mormonentum hat, ist es erforderlich auf die Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirche zurückzugehen.

of Mormon" wird die Bibel "soweit sie richtig übersetzt ist" als Wort Gottes anerkannt.


Die Frage der Vielweiberei ist aber damit auch für die Utah’sche Kirche nicht aus der Welt geschafft. Zunächst wird von den Mormonen selbst offen zugestanden, daß die vor dem geschlossenen Mehren fast allgemein fortgesetzt werden. Mit
dieser Tatsache haben sich auch die nicht-mormonischen Nachbarn abgefunken; in der Tat ist dies zu entschuldigen. Durch mehrere Bundesgesetze sind die aus den früher eingegangenen Mehrehen hervorgegangenen Kinder für legitim erklärt worden. Wo aber der Vater verpflichtet ist, für sie zu sorgen und sie zumeist in seiner häuslichen Gemeinschaft behalten wird, würde es eine große Härte sein, die Mütter, welche jene polygamische Ehen in guten Glauben eingegangen sind, aus dieser Gemeinschaft auszustoßen.


Mag man nun auch mit Bezug auf die Praxis zu einem "Non liquet" gelangen, so steht es doch mit dem Dogma der Vielweiberei m.e. anders. Da ist zunächst zu beachten, daß die Woodruff’sche Proklamation nicht etwa die Folge einer Änderung der Überzeugung war, sondern lediglich unter dem Druck von Außen erfolgte. Woodruff selbst sagte darin, daß, nachdem der höchste Gerichtshof der U.S. sich gegen das Institut ausgesprochen, er sich fügen (submit) wolle. Demgemäß erfolgte die
Erklärung gegen die Polygamie denn auch nicht in derselben Form, als in der das Institut eingesetzt worden ist, d.h. durch göttliche "Offenbarung"; Woodruff erklärte auch die Vielweiberei nicht etwa für Sünde, er verbietet sie nicht einmal direkt, sondern erteilt seines Glaubensgenossen nur den guten Rat, sich in Zukunft der Vielweiberei zu enthalten: "my advice to the Latter-day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land." Das Dogma also blieb nur seine praktische Ausübung wurde suspendiert. So ist es auch zu verstehen, daß, als im Jahre 1901 die Legislatur von Utah ein die Verfolgung des Ehebruches einschränkendes Gesetz annahm und der damalige Gouverneur Wells das selbe vettierte, er das mit der Befluchung begründete, daß das Inkraftsetzung eines solchen Gesetzes eine gegen "gewisse Zustände hier" ("certain conditions here") gerichtete Amendierung der Bundesverfassung zu Folge haben würde; damit dann nur die mormonische Auffassung von der Ehe gemeint sein. Ich selbst legte in einem Gespräch mit dem höchsten Geistlichen der reorganisierten Kirche für das nördliche Kalifornien derselben die Frage vor, ob denn nicht mit der Woodruff'sche Proklamation jeder dogmatische Unterschied zwischen der Führerschaft geblieben sei. Der Genannte erklärte darauf mit großer Bestimmtheit, daß nach wie vor die Frage der Vielweiberei die beiden Kirchen trenne, denn die Utah'sche Kirche habe das Dogma der Vielweiberei auf jeden Fall beibehalten. Zum Beweis legte er mir die Ausgabe des oben erwähnten offiziellen Lehrbuchs der Utah'sche Kirche "Doctrine and Covenants" vom Jahre 1901 vor; darin befindet sich nach wie vor die oben erwähnten "Offenbarung" über die Vielweiberei unverkürzt und ohne jeden Vorbehalt, während das entsprechende Lehrbuch der reorganisierten Kirche eine entschiedene Verurteilung der Vielweiberei in unzweideutigen Worten enthält. Daß auch die Utah'sche Kirche trotzdem die Polygamie nicht mehr offen predigten ist bei der Lage der Verhältnisse nur natürlich, steht aber dem Fortbestand des Dogmas nicht entgegen. Ich habe geglaubt, auf die Geschichte des Instituts der mormonischen Vielweiberei so ausführlich eingehen zu sollen, weil sie m.e. für die Beurteilung des Mormonentums in Kalifornien und der Mormonenmission in Deutschland notwendig ist. In ersterer Beziehung was mir das Urteil des Präsidenten des höchsten kalifornischen Gerichtshof (Chief Justice of the Supreme Court), dessen Erfahrungen bis die 60er Jahre zurückreichen, von besonderem Interesse; derselbe erklärte mir, das die Mormonen in Kalifornien niemals mit der andergläubigen Bevölkerung und den Behörden in Konflikt geraten seien, weil sie eben niemals Vielweiberei gepredigt oder getrieben hätten. Die Geschichte des Mormonentums in Kalifornien, wie ich sie, insbesondere auch durch Umfragen in Mormonenkreisen selbst, ermittelt habe, gibt dafür die Aufklärung. Als die Mormonen im Jahre 1846 den Exodus von Illinois nach dem Westen antraten, schlugen die meisten den Landweg unter der Führung von Brigham Young ein; ein kleiner Teil


Erst wesentlich später—etwa Mitte der 90er Jahre—setzte die Utah’sche Kirche mit ihrer Propaganda in Kalifornien ein, d.h. mehrere Jahre nach Erlaß der Woodruff’sche Proklamation gegen die Vielweiberei. Es ist begreiflich, daß die Kirche damals in einem seit Jahrzehnten bestehenden geordneten Staatswesen wie Kalifornien, mit ihren polygamischen Gelüsten nicht mehr hervorzutreten wagen konnte; sie hat es bisher in Kalifornien nur auf eine Mitgliedschaft von einigen Hundert gebracht, offenbar weil ihrer Propaganda der Boden durch die in Kalifornien wesentlich ältere reorganisierte Kirche entzogen worden war.

So erklärt es sich, daß die Frage der Vielweiberei in Kalifornien niemals aktuell geworden ist.

Was nun speziell die Mormonenmission betrifft, so wird solche sowohl in den Vereinigten Staaten wie auch in Europa, speziell in Deutschland, von beiden Zweigen der Kirche betrieben, in Deutschland anscheinend von der Utah’schen Kirche lebhafter als von der reorganisierten. Der hiesige erste Geistliche der letzteren meinte, daß seine Kirche in Deutschland nur einen Missionar namens Jungk, einen naturalisierten Amerikaner von deutscher Herkunft, habe; er erwähnte daß derselbe sich beklagen habe, wie schwierig es sei, neue
religiöse Ideen in Deutschland einzubürgern, von Schwierigkeiten mit den Behörden erwähnte er nichts. Ich neige daher zu der Ansicht, daß es sich bei der Ausweisung von Mormonenmissionären aus Deutschland um Emissare der Utah'schen Kirche handelt.


Ob aber nicht auch sonst genügende Gründe vorliegen, um ausländische Mormonenmissionare--solche der Utah'schen wie die reorganisierten Kirche--von deutschen Boden auszuschließen, wage ich nicht zu entscheiden. Ich darf mir gestatten, in der Beziehung nur auf folgendes hinweisen.

Der Mormonenglaube dürfte von allen jüngeren Religionsformen diejenigen sein, die an den gesunden Menschenverstand die größten Zumutungen stellt. Die ganze Entstehungsgeschichte--wie vor noch nicht 90 Jahren die goldenen Tafeln mit Hilfe eines Engels aufgefunden, wie die rätselhaften Schriftzeichen mit Hilfe der Steine Urim und Thummim entziffert wurden,, usw.--trägt auf der Stirn den Stempel plumper Erfindung, wie sie sich nur ein verschmitzter Bauernjunge ausdenken konnte, um seine ungebildeten Nachbarn zu betören und die Herrschaft über sie zu gewinnen, das "Book of Mormon" ist das denkbar flachste Machwerk, würdig des Stifters der Religion, jedes tieferen Gedankentums bar, ausgenommen da, wo es die Bibel zu kopieren sucht. Dabei ist die Geschichte des Mormonentums voll blutiger Schandtaten, ausgeführt auf Geheiß der kirchlichen Oberrn, die umso abstoßender wirken als die ältere jetzt lebenden Generationen sich noch erlebt hat und als schnöde Habsucht und Wollust dabei ebenso im Spiel gewesen sind als religiösen Fanatismus, ein Vorgang wie das sogenannte Mountain Meadows Massacre, bei dem eine Utah auf dem Wege nach Kalifornien passierende harmlose Auswandererkarawane von 120 Menschen--Männer, Frauen und Kinder--die sich unter dem Schutz der Mormonen vor den Indianern begeben hatten, in verräterischen Weise auf das Lösungswort "Do your Duty" hin abgeschlendert wurden, sucht seinesgleichen in den schwärzesten Episoden der Religionsverfolgung des Altertums und Mittelalters. Aber selbst wenn darüber als über vorübergehende Verirrungen hingewiesen will, so dürfte doch selbst der zu weiterer Toleranz Geneigte zugeben, daß für diese Religionsform, richtiger dieser Köhlergläuben, keine Berechtigung geschweige den ein Bedürfnis besteht. Ich persönlich erblickte eines der Hauptbedenken darin, daß sich das Mormon-
entum als eine beiläufig die einzig richtige, zur Eroberung
der ganzen Welt bestimmte Form des Christentums ausgibt, dies
muß man in ungebildeten Kreisen verwirren und dem gegenüber
can man in einem Land wie Deutschland nicht gleichgültig
bleiben, wo man gewohnt ist, in dem Christentum eine der Säule
unserer staatlichen und sozialen Einrichtungen und unser
Kultur zu erblicken.

Diejenigen, die für das Mormontum gewonnen werden,
gehen aber nicht bloß den vernünftigeren Formen des Christen-
tums verloren, worüber man sich wohl leicht trösten könnte,
sondern sie geben auch diejenigen Elementen, die an der Unter-
grabung des Christentums überhaupt tätig sich, neue Waffen in
die Hand, und fördern den Kampf gegen eine Religion, in der
solch Auswähle möglich sind. Es kommt hinzu, daß die Mormo-
enkirche den denkbar größten Despotismus über ihre Mitglie-
der ausübt und deren willenlose Unterwerfung nicht bloß in
geistlichen, sondern auch in weltlichen Dingen erwartet, wie
das mit unseren Anschauungen nicht vereinbar ist, daneben sie
auch schonungslos finanziell ausbeutet; die Zehnten sollen
noch jetzt willig gezahlt werden. Bemerkenswert ist in der
Beziehung, daß gelegentlich der Smoot'schen Untersuchung der
erwähnte Mehrheitsbeschuß des Senatscommittees "On Privilege
and Elections" unter anderen auch als festgestellt annahm, das
die Mormonenkirche entgegen der in Utah'schen Staatsverfassung
gegebenen Garantie auch die weltliche Herrschaft erstrebe und
däß Smoot nicht als Vertreter des Staates Utah, sondern der
Mormonenkirche anzusehen sei. Schließlich ist auch nicht zu
übersehen das von jeher die Mormonenpropaganda ausserhalb der
Vereinigten Staaten gleichzeitig eine offene oder versteckte
Auszünderungspropaganda gewesen ist. Aus allen diesen Gründen
scheint mir eine Mormonenpropaganda in Deutschland, auch abge-
sehen von der Frage der Vielweiberei, in höchsten Masse
unwillkommen. Es mag sein, daß unsere Gesetze keine direkte
Handhabe zur Ausrottung des gegenwärtig numerisch nur
schwachen Mormontums in Deutschland bieten, aber wenn die
Möglichkeit gegeben ist, zu verhindern das ihm von Ausland her
neue Nahrung zugeführt wird, so sollte diese Möglichkeit nach
Kraften ausgenutzt werden. Es ist zu hoffen, das sich selbst
überlassen dieses von Amerika verpflanzte Sumpfgewächse auf
deutschen Boden schnell eingehlen wird.

Es mag auf den ersten Blick auffällig erscheinen, das
sich die Washington Regierung für die amerikanischen Mormonen-
missionare verwenden, die Erklärung dafür das Mormontum
wirklich erwärmt, das man es noch heute bedauert, nicht mit
grösserer Energie dagegen von Anfang an vorgegangen zu sein
und es im Keim erstickt zu haben, und daß man Deutschland
geradezu beneidet, weil es dazu in der Lage ist. Aber--und
darin liegt der springende Punkt--im Senat sind der Regierung
die zwei Utah'sche Stimmen ebenso wertvoll wie die zwei
Stimmen irgend eines anderen Staats und wenn man in Washington
auch nicht gewillt sein würde, dem Mormontums auf
amerikanischen Boden die geringste Konzession zu machen, so
wird man jedoch jeder Zeit gern bereit sein, Wünschen der Utah'schen Vertreter entgegen zu kommen und sich dadurch ihr Wohlwollen für Fälle, wo man ihrer Stimmen bedarf, zu sichern, wenn das auf Kosten anderer Länder geschehen kann. Aber auch ausserhalb des Senats sind die Mormonen eine politische und wirtschaftliche Macht und zwar eine infolge ihrer Geschlossenheit und Disziplin nicht zu unterschätzen, sie sind auch ausserhalb Utah's in vielen Staaten und Territorien, namentlich den Utah benachbarten numerisch stark, ihre Stimmen sind auch dort den Politikern wertvoll. Daraus erklärt sich, daß die Mormonen entgegen der allgemeinen Volkstimmung wiederholt in Bundesparlement Fürsprecher in nicht mormonischen Abgeordneten gefunden haben, denen es um die Erhaltung der mormonischen Wahlstimmen zu tun war, und daß manche gegen sie gerichtete gesetzgeberische Massregeln zu Fall gekommen sind.

Ich glaube nicht, daß Deutschland Veranlassung hat, der innern amerikanischen Politik zu Liebe den Mormonen irgende welche Konzessionen zu machen. Für uns sind Mormonenmissionare in höchsten Grade "undesireable", um diesen Ausdruck zu gebrauchen, der in der amerikanischen Fremdenpolitik eine solche Rolle spielt, und wir sollten gegen diese "Undesireables" mit der gleichen Rucksichtslosigkeit vorgehen, wie die amerikanischen Regierung gegen wesentlich harmlose Fremde, die sie von ihrem Standpunkt aus als "undesireable" betrachtet.
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ABSTRACT

Between 1853 and 1914 the kingdom of Prussia and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Mormons, disagreed over the issue of Mormon missionaries proselyting in Prussia. In 1853 royal magistrates banished all Mormon missionaries from the kingdom for advocating emigration. A new church policy of preaching without seeking for official permission, in addition to an improved relationship between the Mormons in Utah and the United States government after the Manifesto of 1890, led to an increase in missionaries sent to Germany, including Prussia. By 1900 Mormon success alarmed the Prussian Protestant clergy and a few Prussian governors as well. The governor near the Russian border banished Mormon missionaries as "undesirable" foreigners. In response to an appeal by the United States Embassy, the Prussian Interior Minister decided in December, 1902 that the Mormons posed a threat to the public morality of Prussia. He issued a new banishment decree in 1903. Despite this decree and increased scrutiny by local police officials, Mormons continued to work in Prussia, enjoying limited success until World War I put a hiatus on American Mormon missionary work in Europe.
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