

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 124

FL 021 588

AUTHOR Desmond, Cheryl T.
 TITLE German Language and Education in Pennsylvania, 1683-1911: Cultural Resistance and State Accommodation.
 PUB DATE Apr 93
 NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
 PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Culture Conflict; *Diachronic Linguistics; English; *German; *Government Role; Immigrants; Language of Instruction; Language Research; Minority Groups; *State Action
 IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This research investigated the nature of the language and educational experiences of the Germans who emigrated to the province and later, to the state of Pennsylvania. German migration into Pennsylvania began in 1683, peaked during the years 1717 through 1754, and continued throughout the nineteenth century. The research indicated that both official and unofficial colonial and state attempts were made to Anglicize the Germans through the use of the English language in schooling for the Germans. The Germans, nonetheless, strongly resisted these efforts to displace their "Muttersprach" through private schooling, political participation in local and state affairs, and through public support of substantial German language instruction in the common schools until the advent of World War I. These findings call into question research that concluded that an American tradition of bilingual education consisted strictly of local experiments in large, urban Midwestern and Southwestern schools and supports scholarship that has maintained that the United States granted language rights to its earliest minorities. (Author/JP)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

German Language and Education in Pennsylvania, 1683-1911:
Cultural Resistance and State Accommodation

Cheryl T. Desmond, Ph.D.
Millersville University

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, Georgia, April 12-16.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cheryl T.
Desmond

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

FL021588

Abstract

The purpose of this research was the investigation of the nature of the language and educational experiences of the Germans who emigrated to the province and later, to the state of Pennsylvania. German migration into Pennsylvania began in 1683, peaked during the years 1717 through 1754, and slowly continued throughout the nineteenth century. The research indicated that both official and unofficial colonial and state attempts were made to "Anglicize the Germans" through the use of the English language in schooling for the Germans. The Germans, nonetheless, strongly resisted these efforts to displace their "Muttersproch" through private schooling, political participation in local and state affairs, and through public support of substantial German language instruction in the common schools until the advent of World War I.

These findings call into question research which concluded an American tradition of bilingual education consisted strictly of "local experiments" in large, urban Midwestern and Southwestern schools and supports scholarship which has maintained that the United States granted language rights to its earliest minorities.

The passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968 and the federal mandate for the provision of "meaningful education" through bilingual instruction for linguistic minorities in the Supreme Court's 1974 Lau v. Nichols decision have not succeeded in quieting the debate and controversy over bilingual education in the United States.¹ Although bilingual education programs have been implemented in school districts throughout the nation, the decline of federal policy leadership and funding during the Reagan-Bush years and the rise of the official English movement² have only exacerbated the persistent tensions between late twentieth century cultural assimilationists and pluralists who have held strongly opposing views on this issue.³

Social and political tension regarding diverse cultures and languages within the United States is hardly new; historically, it predates not only federal school law intervention into state and local educational policies, but the Constitution itself. Thus it comes as no surprise that in the current debates on bilingual education, both sides have referenced this historical research to bolster their own arguments.⁴

The most comprehensive examination of an American bilingual tradition is German author Heinz Kloss's study of the history of language rights for the many ethnic minorities in the United States and its territories in which he concluded that "Americans

throughout their history have been more willing to grant language rights to old-established groups than to more recent immigrants" and that in some cases, "their languages [were] not only tolerated but actually promoted."⁵

A study by Schlossman for the Rand Corporation reviewed the historical literature of the two immigrant groups, the Mexicans and the Germans, for whom public bilingual education had been most salient, to determine if indeed, as claimed by Kloss, the United States has had "a tradition of bilingual education."⁶ In his review and analysis, which focused upon German language and educational experience in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the four cities of Cincinnati, St. Louis, Milwaukee, and Indianapolis, Schlossman concluded "that Germans never looked seriously to the public schools to preserve their powerful sense of cultural identity" nor "viewed school language policy as the key to their children's overall adjustment to life in a new society."⁷ He argued that urban school officials in the nineteenth century introduced German in the elementary grades as "local educational experiments," each city varying from the next, without the need to comply with the state or federal regulations and that the most notable bilingual "tradition" worth recalling for today's controversy on bilingual education is the that of decentralized community influence on school language policies rather than its use as a precedent for "one best" federal solution to resolving the rights of linguistic minorities.⁸

Recent historical research on the implementation of German language instruction has continued to focus upon Midwestern and Southwestern urban public schools during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and those waves of German immigrants who emigrated to the United States after 1830. Like Schlossman's research, it has paid only cursory attention to German language and education among the first wave of German immigrants who settled in rural areas in the Northeast in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, predominantly in Pennsylvania.⁹

The purpose of this research was to investigate the nature of the language and educational experiences of the Germans who emigrated to the province and later, to the state of Pennsylvania and to determine whether these Germans were easily assimilated into the English culture and language or whether they resisted such efforts. German migration into Pennsylvania began in 1683, peaked in the years 1717 through 1754, and slowly continued through the nineteenth century.

The study began as an examination of the nineteenth century German-English public schools which were initiated in Lancaster in 1867 and which were part of the public school systems in Harrisburg, Reading, and several county district schools. This research led to several documents which indicated that German language instruction was strongly entrenched in both private schools and the free common schools of Pennsylvania. These documents also indicate that in spite of colonial and state efforts to have English as the dominant language of instruction, the use

and the promotion of the German language in schools continued until the instruction of German in the elementary schools was prohibited by the state legislature in 1911.

This expanded research asked the following questions: What efforts were made to "Anglicize" the Germans through schooling in eighteenth and nineteenth century Pennsylvania? In what ways did the German population respond to these efforts? Did they acquiesce, compromise, or resist? How did the colonial and state governments, in turn, respond to German efforts to maintain their language as a sustaining element of their culture?

My examination of colonial and state documents and law, local histories and school board minutes, and historiographies of the German population in Pennsylvania and other areas of the United States and of the tradition of American bilingual education indicate that the experiences of the first wave of German immigrants and schooling was substantially different from that of the later waves who emigrated after 1830 and settled west of the original colonies into urban population centers.

The history of the German experience in Pennsylvania began in 1681, when William Penn's promotional pamphlets advertising for serious settlers who would take his experiment in establishing a territory based upon religious freedom and governed by the "peoples consent" were translated into Dutch and German and circulated throughout Europe.¹⁰ The promise of religious independence attracted several German Protestant religious sects who "took Penn at his word....and set up local governmental bodies, often with

personnel who did not speak English" upon arriving in Pennsylvania.¹¹

Abandoning the struggles of life in central and northern Europe, these Germans slowly entered the province through Philadelphia. Predominately peasant farmers, the vast majority of the new German arrivals found their way into the rural areas of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and into agricultural situations often as indentured servants to established English and German settlers.¹² The new Germans tended to congregate geographically with other Germans in the countryside. They were able to use and retain their own native tongue throughout their daily private and public encounters, for Pennsylvania laws, unlike those of other provinces, did not force them to learn English.¹³

By 1717, the province's governor noted that the arrival of so many non-Britons "may be of dangerous Consequences." As a response to the heavy migration of non-Britons, "Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration" were required by law in 1727 for new entrants into the province.¹⁴ To encourage already established Germans to take this oath, the Pennsylvania Assembly passed a naturalization bill in 1729 which extended the same "privileges which the native-born subjects of Great Britain" had to those various Protestants, including Germans, who took an oath of loyalty.

As a result of the required loyalty oaths for newly arrived German immigrants and the gradual compliance of those already settled, naturalized German males with property readily availed themselves of the voting privilege this oath provided, a privilege

and a liberty unknown to them in their native land. Their active exercise of their political franchise did not go unnoticed and would ultimately be a strong force in the nineteenth century state's accommodation of their language in private and public schooling.

The loyalty oath did not completely assuage the concerns of the English regarding the growing population of Germans in Pennsylvania. Governor James Hamilton reminded William Penn's son Thomas of the political strength Pennsylvania's Germans "might someday muster." In an effort to stem German entry into province, Hamilton signed a bill limiting their entry and for a short period German immigrants' duty upon entrance was twice that of any other immigrant. However, this bill was soon invalidated by Quaker assemblymen who had established a political alliance with the voting Germans.¹⁵ Although the German speaking settlers were hesitant in their years of colonial settlement to run for provincial office, they agreed to support Quaker policies in exchange for Quaker objection to bills limiting German immigration and at various times held the balance of power against the relatively equal blocs of Quaker and Proprietary voters.¹⁶

This German-Quaker political alliance which sent Quakers to the Assembly also allowed the German areas to elect their own people as sheriffs of the German counties. These sheriffs could serve when needed, official papers with explanations in the Germans' mother tongue.

The German tendency to separate themselves geographically in rural agricultural areas, to prosper financially in farming, and to persist in the use of their own language also did not make them popular neighbors of their English-speaking neighbors. Mid-eighteenth century English speaking Pennsylvanians complained that in the province there were more magazines, pamphlets, almanacs, broadsides, and newspapers written in German than in English.¹⁷

One citizen, Benjamin Franklin, expressed alarm at the size of German population which amounted to about one third of the province's population in the colonial period prior to the Revolution. In his Observations on the Increase of Mankind first published in 1755, Franklin asked

why should the Palatine (German) boors be suffered to swarm in our settlements and, by herding together, establish their language and manners to the exclusion of ours? Why should Pennsylvania founded by the English, become a colony of aliens, who will shortly be so numerous as to Germanize us instead of our Anglifying them?¹⁸

Franklin's statement was later used by German voters to stymie Franklin's 1764 attempt for reelection to the Speaker's seat in the provincial assembly. Leaflets printed in German reminded voters that Franklin ten years earlier had designated them as "German blockhead farmers" [die deutschen Bauerntolpel] and that Franklin's effort to have Pennsylvania change from a Proprietary to Royal government had included his support of a broad stamp tax to raise money for the Crown. The Stamp Act included a tax on penny newspapers and a double duty on any written in a language other

than English, which the Germans interpreted as clearly intended for them.¹⁹

Franklin's perceived animosity towards the Germans and their language did not preclude his recommending the teaching of German in the academy he and the American Philosophical Society founded in 1749 and which later became the University of Pennsylvania.²⁰ Franklin also supported the founding of a college in the city of Lancaster for the teaching of German in 1787 and was the largest contributor to its funds, giving the sum of \$1,000. For this the college was named in his honor, Franklin College.²¹

The German support of the pacifist Quakers and the pacifist beliefs of some of their own religious sects worked against them during the French and Indian Wars when they were suspected by the English of being Papists and of aiding the French. As the conflict between the English and French escalated in the colonies, the "Anglifying" of the Germans was promoted both officially and unofficially. During this time, the first official proposal for the use of schooling as a means of cultural assimilation was begun through the funding of charity schools for German speaking Pennsylvanians.

Eighteenth century Germans were not unified in regard to the education of their children. Those sects such as the Lutheran and Reformed religious groups encouraged education but were interested only in the practical and moral aspects of schooling. They supported schooling which prepared their children for the everyday, practical aspects of life and for the reading of the Bible, all of

which was to be accomplished in a few short weeks in the winter. Lessons were often taught by the minister of the church or by a schoolmaster hired by the congregation. By 1774, the Coetus of the Reformed Church (a regional assembly of ecclesiastical officials) complained, however, of "a lack of teachers for the church schools" and that such schools sometimes had to resort to hiring "English schoolmasters, most of whom are imported Irishmen."²² A few successful German parents, often in urban areas such as Germantown outside of Philadelphia imitated their English neighbors and hired traveling tutors. Some of the German sects such as the Amish and Dunkards, who met in their homes rather than in a church, distrusted education, finding it too worldly, frivolous, and expensive.

Many of the Germans who opposed schooling were suspicious that the "school would be used as a vehicle for subversion" to wean them away from their culture and language.²³ These fears were not groundless for an official effort was initiated in 1751 to provide schools for German-speaking Pennsylvania youths under the aegis of England's Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. A Royal donation began an extensive call for funds for these schools in England and the European continent.

In the dozen schools which were opened with the monies collected, the instructors were to give "Protestant Youth of all Denominations" a basic education, by teaching "both the English and German languages; likewise in Writing, keeping of common Accounts, Singing of Psalms and the true Principles of the holy Protestant Religion."²⁴ These classes taught in English would gradually

replace the German customs and values whereas the entire charity school proposal was "calculated to draw the Pennsylvania Germans to its support, since they were reluctant to spend money on their own schools."²⁵

One outspoken critic of the proposal was an influential German printer who charged that the English acted not from benevolence for the Germans, but out of fear of their alliance with the French in the New World. This fear was confirmed when Thomas Penn and the trustees of the movement officially spoke of "the great design for promoting the English tongue among the Germans" in 1755. By 1757 the German Reformed Coetus reversed their earlier support of the proposal and insisted upon the resignation of the German superintendent who had participated in the initiation of the proposal. The Coetus stated clearly in their minutes of that year:

Now with regard to the schools we can do but little to promote them, since the Directors try to erect nothing but English schools, and care nothing for the German language....Hence, now as before, the Germans themselves ought to look out for their schools in which their children may be instructed in German.²⁶

By the time the entire movement collapsed in 1761 due to German refusal to support the schools and the rising costs of the war and taxes, all twelve schools were closed. Any remaining monies were contributed to the charity school of the College of Philadelphia (later University of Pennsylvania). Although the Anglification effort had failed, it did succeed in pointing out the educational needs of the German populace. As a consequence, Germans rallied to support their own church schools and caused a group of Germans in the Germantown and Philadelphia area to

organize a German society which established its own German free school in Philadelphia.

The pattern of maintaining independent German church related schools continued after the American Revolution and well into the nineteenth century as did the German pattern of active political participation especially in the practical affairs of their local areas. Germans continued to vote more actively than other ethnic group, and when a German-sounding candidate competed with another on the ballot, they usually supported their own. As a result, Germans were elected to the governor's seat almost continually between 1817 and 1832.

One German, Governor George Wolf, would go against the predominate wishes of his own people in his persistent advocacy of free public schools in the commonwealth.²⁷ Governor Wolf consistently campaigned for free public schools in every annual address until he succeeded in signing the legislative bill creating a tax-supported public education system in Pennsylvania in April, 1834. An earlier law passed in 1831 had stipulated that income from certain sources be set aside in an education fund, the interest from which, after it had reached \$100,000 annually, was to be applied to the support of common schools. In 1834 when the income reached this goal, the legislature enacted the statute establishing a general system of education. In his effort to establish common schooling in Pennsylvania, Wolf had overcome the opposition of factory owners, parochial school advocates, and the

German community who together denounced the movement as an extravagance which would waste taxpayers' money.²⁸

Many of the Germans feared the public schools would end their own private schools and instruction in German in spite of official denials that these schools would not force the use of English upon the population. German resistance to English language instruction, their strong use of the plebescite, and the extensive system of German and Quaker private schools did not go unnoticed. The state educators in their desire to secure support for the state's common schools chose a path of subtle accommodation to these ethnic and religious minorities. Their strategy included the allowance of German as the language of instruction for basic literacy in the public schools and a tax subsidy of the parochial schools for several years. Thus, in time parents would come to accept public schools which maintained their language and would not return to private schools when a high rate of tuition did not include a public subsidy.

Although the Pennsylvania free school law of 1834 was nearly unanimous in its passage, this signified legislative dissatisfaction of the existing educational laws rather than a full comprehension of the doctrine of free schools. Enemies of the new law rallied immediately to repeal the 1834 law and to assail those representatives who had passed it. J.P. Wickersham, champion of the common school movement in Pennsylvania and state superintendent of schools, noted that as soon as the notices appeared for the

election of school directors and for the purpose of deciding whether or not a tax should be levied for the support of schools,

the discussion opened, and certainly no other question was ever debated so generally in Pennsylvania, or with the same warmth, with the same determination, and it may be added, with the same bitterness, as the question of free schools.²⁹

At first only a few districts accepted the provisions freely; a much larger number of districts acquiesced in light of the financial inducements offered by the states if they complied. However, of the 987 school districts in the state, 485 either voted outright against free schools or took no action regarding the law. In the contest between the free school advocates and the opposition, political parties, churches, neighborhoods, and families were split as well as the rich arrayed against the poor. In general, the law was well received by the northern counties which were often settled by people from New York and New England and who were already familiar with the common school movement. Western counties where social class distinctions had not yet been so clearly drawn also supported the legislation. "Opposition to it was most formidable in the southern, central, and southeastern portions of the State, and greatest of all in counties and districts in which the people were principally of German descent."³⁰

Wickersham noted that several religious denominations including the Quakers, the Lutherans, the Reformed, and the Mennonites were generally opposed to the law and to the taxes for free schools for they had an established system of schools and were against severing the tie of church and school and the resulting

absence of positive religious instruction. Of these groups, the Germans also feared that the German language would be displaced by English. They, consequently, resisted "this insidious attack on their beloved mother-tongue."³¹ Wickersham saved his most virulent attack not for the Germans but for "the class of men" who considered it "unjust to compel those who had no children to pay for the education of the children of others-unjust for the industrious man who had saved his money to support schools for the spendthrift who had squandered all he had earned."³²

Wolf's support of the free schools and other financial issues cost him the governorship in 1835. As they had done with the first law, a sizable number of districts ignored the school laws of 1835-36 or refused to comply with them. Realizing that the German and Quaker populace of these districts had stubbornly aligned against the "Zwingschulen" or forced schools, the friends of public education "resorted to more gradual and subtle methods of attaining their purposes."³³

To allay the fears of the Germans, the school law of 1838 provided that in

those districts whose citizens speak the German language shall establish schools in which the exercises shall, if suitable teachers can be procured, wholly or in part be conducted in that language as said citizens may desire.³⁴

Finding suitable German teachers was not a widespread problem at the time. But as the free common schools became established throughout the state and were opened to state and later county inspection, it became more and more difficult to find qualified teachers.

As an additional concession to those who opposed the free schools and supported parochial schools, the school law of 1842 allowed that public support could be given to schools "maintained by religious societies...as long as it were not injurious to the common schools."³⁵ In spite of this public subsidy which was meant to reassure as well as introduce state influence into the private school, many districts voted annually against accepting the public schools. In 1845, there were 177 non-accepting districts in the state, of which 141 were in German counties, but this was less than half the number of districts which had not accepted the common schools almost ten years earlier.

The school law of 1849 still allowed public financial aid to parochial schools, but stipulated that these schools must be open to inspection by local directors and be conducted in conformity with the common schools, the first overt statement of the state's intention to control any school receiving public subsidy. In 1854, the state school law cut off all aid to the parochial schools and provided legal means for removing from office, district school directors who did not open and maintain public schools.³⁶

The state's subtle encroachment upon the school rights of German linguistic minority followed a pattern similar to that of its gradual exercise of control over tax subsidized parochial schools. In 1853, the school law continued to allow the establishment of German schools, but stated that it was the sole power of the school directors to consider citizens' appeals for

German schools, and the citizens' only redress was to elect new board directors if the incumbents did not consider their appeals.

The school directors may cause German and English to be taught in the same school, but cannot be required to cause German to be taught. They should consult the wishes of the people of their district in this regard, and if any considerable number of Germans desire to have their children taught in German, their wishes should be gratified. It is the directors' exclusive jurisdiction over this decision, and from their decision upon it, there is no appeal. The superintendent may advise. If the voice of the people is not respected, the only remedy is to elect persons who will respect it.³⁷

Although Pennsylvania common school lawmakers would continue to allow the instruction of German, they inserted this editorial comment in the 1857 common school law:

The teaching of German and English in the same School, and the transition of German Pupils to the English, is attended with great embarrassment. An adequate remedy is very desirable; but probably time and the increasing prevalence of the English language in common conversation, will prove to be the only available cure.³⁸

The 1853 provision was intended to increase the difficulty of establishing German schools. The 1866 law required a majority vote of school directors in order to establish German language in the schools as an additional means to limit bilingualism. Nonetheless, local populations continued to establish public German schools as demonstrated in Lancaster City in 1866-67.

A German language school became the "all-absorbing" question for the Lancaster City school board in 1866 when a committee of school directors reported that there was a "considerable number of citizens[who] desire[d] the instruction of their children in the German language" and who were now attending the city's parochial schools. The report noted that it is an "injustice or inequality"

that these parents must pay school tax and an amount per capita for the parochial school.³⁹ The committee argued that the state general school law allowed the directors to establish combined German-English schools and that such schools had been "in operation for years in Harrisburg, Reading, and other places for years and are working well, and are giving general satisfaction."⁴⁰ Two German-English schools were thus established in Lancaster by the directors who were, "more or less swayed by the expediency of the occasion, or as a bid for the German vote" and were still in operation until abolished in 1911.⁴¹

The establishment of these and other German-English schools as well as the "militant efforts of the 'Verein der deutschen Presse' which attempted to restore German to its old position in the German counties," did not escape the notice of the state department of education and legislature.⁴² In 1879, the school law required that every school in the state provide at least five months of English schooling in each year for each child, which would require the rural schools to increase the length of their school year significantly in order to maintain at least equal time for the German language. By 1885 the demands for German schools had declined significantly.

State educators who were committed to a policy of furthering English and eliminating German also made no attempt to train teachers for the German schools, perhaps recognizing as early as 1838 in the common school law that a scarcity of German language teachers would help to undo the practice. The poor qualifications

of those who were teaching reading and writing in German was noted as early as 1855 by Wickersham who was then superintendent of the Lancaster county schools.⁴³ Berks County Superintendent William Good also noted in 1855, that there are only a "half dozen teachers who are masters of both languages. Good ones refuse to accept situations in this class of schools. They impose double labor."⁴⁴

An early effort was made in 1841 to establish a seminary for German teachers in Phillipsburg, New Jersey by the Pittsburgh Convention.⁴⁵ Money was to be raised for the seminary by committees representing Germans throughout the country. Young men who promised to teach for five years upon graduation would receive free tuition.⁴⁶ Not only did both German Catholics and Protestants distrust one another and wish to retain their own students in their own schools, all denominations were wary of the "free thinker" reputation of the founders of the seminary.

State Normal Schools as teacher training institutions provided for English language teachers only. Monroe County Germans hoped to establish one German Normal School in Gilbert where a private school existed, but their hopes were dashed when the legislature located the Normal School at East Stroudsburg.⁴⁷ The resultant dearth of German teachers finally compelled all rural schools to employ teachers trained only in English.⁴⁸

Thus, nearly two hundred years of German bilingual education in the state of Pennsylvania was slowly overwhelmed by the gradual legal encroachment upon the language rights of the German minority

and the neglect of the provision for trained teachers who could instruct children in German.

In conclusion, both official and unofficial colonial and state attempts were made to "Anglicize the Germans" through the use of the English language in schooling for the Germans. The Germans, however, strongly resisted these efforts to displace their "Muttersproch" through maintenance of their own language and through political participation in local and state affairs. Until anti-German and -Kaiser sentiments succeeded in the ratification of legislation which prohibited the teaching of German in the elementary school in 1911, state policies in Pennsylvania reluctantly accommodated public education in the German language and at times, its policies promoted the German language in its publicly supported schools.

These findings and conclusions contrast sharply with those of Schossman's regarding an American tradition of bilingual education as "local educational experiments" and indicate that his study relied too heavily upon the instruction of German in the urban public schools of the Midwest. The experience of the Pennsylvania Germans strengthen Kloss's position on the American granting of language rights to its earliest minorities. They also support Hagwood's study of the early and later waves of German migration into the United States, which asserted that "Germans used their language as a weapon to ward off Americanization and assimilation, and used every social milieu, the home, the church, the school, the

press, in the fight to preserve the German language.⁴⁹ Hagwood also concluded that the

German immigrant who settled in a city usually tended, even if he lived in a 'German quarter,' to become assimilated and Americanized much more quickly than the German who settled among his fellow countrymen in an American rural area.⁵⁰

Hagwood's observation of the German urban ethnic experience and this study's findings of predominantly agricultural and rural Pennsylvania Germans expose the limitations of studying only the experiences, practices, and policies affecting urban ethnic minorities and call for a reexamination of conclusions regarding the American tradition of bilingual education.

Endnotes

1. Rosemary C. Salomone, Equal Education Under Law (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986), 98-100.
2. Legislation has been passed in 17 states mandating English as the official language.
3. Mary McGroaty, "The Societal Context of Bilingual Education," Educational Researcher 21(March 1992): 7-9.
4. Lawrence Estrada and Alfonso Nava, "The Long Struggle for Bilingualism and a Consistent Language Policy: Early Chicano Education in California and the Southwest," UCLA Educator 19(1976):36-41. Aaronson, Arthur Charles, "The Involvement of the Federal Government in Providing Public Instruction for Non-English-speaking Pupils from 1800 to 1980" (PH.D. diss., Virginia Polytechnical Institute, 1980). James Crawford, Bilingual Education: History Politics Theory and Practice (Trenton, N.J.: Crane, 1989). Bill Piatt, Only English? Law and Language Policy in the United States (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1990).
5. Heinz Kloss, The American Bilingual Tradition. (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1977), 2. Kloss first published his findings concerning historical American language policies in 1940 and 1942 in German. When copies of this study found its way to American libraries, there was a call to devise an American version of Kloss' book in 1948. In 1963 Kloss published another study again in

Germany in which he found that as he did again in his 1977 English version, "the state of research...was exactly the same as if the forerunner had never appeared." (1977, xii).

6. Steven L. Schlossman, "Is There an American Tradition of Bilingual Education? German in the Public Elementary Schools, 1840-1919," American Journal of Education 91(February 1983):139-186.

7. Ibid., 179.

8. Ibid., 181. Quotations are Schlossman's.

9. Peter Bodo Gawenda, "The Use of the German Language in the Schools of San Antonio, Texas from 1880 to 1910" (ED.D. diss., University of Houston, 1986). Carolyn Ruth Toth, "A History of German-english Bilingual Education: The Continuing Cincinnati Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1988).

10. William Penn, "Certain Conditions or Concessions Agreed upon by William Penn...and those who are the Adventurers and Purchasers in the same Province," July 11, 1681, Colonial Records, I, xxiii.

11. William T. Parsons, The Pennsylvania Dutch: A Persistent Minority (Boston: Twayne Pub., 1976), 35.

12. Although most Germans gravitated to Pennsylvania, German settlements were established in New York, North Carolina, Virginia, and Nova Scotia.

13. Ibid., 57.

14. Ibid., 44.

15. Ibid., 79.

16. Ibid., 82.

17. Ibid., 35.

18. Cited in Stephen T. Wagner, "The Historical Background of Bilingualism and Biculturalism in the United States" in The New Bilingualism: An American Dilemma (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1981), 30-31.

19. Parsons, 108.

20. Edwin H. Zeydel, "The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present," The German Quarterly 37, 328.

21. Ibid., 331. This college later became Franklin and Marshall College.

22. Reverend Abraham Blumer, President, Coetus, to Very Reverend Fathers, Holland, June 6, 1774, Minutes of Coetus, 347-48 cited in Parsons, 121.
23. Parsons, 126.
24. Ibid., 128.
25. Ibid., 129.
26. Samuel E. Weber, The Charity School Movement in Colonial Pennsylvania (Phila.: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1905), 1-21 cited in Parsons, 132.
27. Ibid., 192.
28. Clyde S. Stine, "The School," in The Pennsylvania Germans. ed. Ralph Wood (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942), 116.
29. James Pyle Wickersham, A History of Education in Pennsylvania, Private and Public, Elementary and Higher, from the Time the Swedes Settled on the Delaware to the Present Day. (Lancaster, Pa.: Inquirer, 1886), 318.
30. Ibid., 319.
31. Ibid., 320.
32. Ibid., 322.
33. Stine, The Pennsylvania Germans, 119.
34. Thomas H. Burrowes, Common School Law, read in the Senate, January 15, 1838, (Harrisburg: E. Guyer, 1839), 18.
35. Thomas H. Burrowes, School Law of Pennsylvania, 1842, 42.
36. Stine, 119.
37. F.W. Hughes, School Law of Pennsylvania, 1853, 23.
38. Henry C. Hickok, The Common School Laws of Pennsylvania, 1857, 76.
39. William Riddle, One Hundred and Fifty Years of School History in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. (Lancaster: published by the author, 1905), 269.
40. Ibid., 270.
41. Ibid., 271.

42. Stine, The Pennsylvania Germans, 121.
43. J.P. Wickersham, "Notes in Visiting Schools, 1855" transcribed by Robert E. Coley, 1992.
44. A.G. Curtin, Report of the Superintendent of Common Schools of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1855, William Good, Berks County, 21.
45. Phillipsburg is located on the border between New Jersey and Pennsylvania.
46. Albert Bernhardt Faust, The German Element in the United States, Vol. II (New York: The Steuben Society of America, 1927), 240/
47. Parsons, 221.
48. Stine, The Pennsylvania Germans, 121.
49. John Arkas Hagwood, The Tragedy of German-America (New York: Arno Press, 1970), 39.
50. Ibid., 107.