

---

A CROSS TO BEAR

---

# THE MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL EMBLEM DEBATE

KAREN FASTER





*After the dust had settled: Governor Orville Freeman and the Furness sisters (granddaughters of Alexander and Anna Ramsey) at the Minnesota Statehood Centennial kick-off ceremony, capitol rotunda, December 31, 1957*

As soon as Samuel L. Scheiner, executive director of the Minnesota Jewish Council, saw the new statehood centennial emblem revealed in the *St. Paul Dispatch* in October 1956, he quietly made a few phone calls. He asked for just a small revision: removal of the Christian cross from the image. That slight modification would ensure that the seal would represent all Minnesotans during their 1958 centennial.

What Scheiner may not have known was that the emblem already had been distributed to newspapers throughout the state. Several thousand dollars had been spent on reproduction artwork for businesses and organizations statewide as part of the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission's campaign to promote Minnesota's 100th birthday.<sup>1</sup>

Scheiner would pursue the matter through the next year. His inquiries

led to a meeting with the centennial commission, which voted to retain the cross. A coalition of religious and civic groups then demanded removal of the cross. Months of debate and newspaper coverage culminated in a second commission vote, in October 1957, that again endorsed the presence of the cross. Throughout 1958 the image appeared statewide on stationery, billboards, banners, vehicle decals, brochures, envelopes, the governor's holiday card, and athletic uniform patches.

The emblem was meant to capture the meaning of Minnesota and

being Minnesotan, to symbolize the entire state and its achievements. Ultimately it failed, as some people felt that the cross not only ignored contributions of non-Christians but also excluded them from being Minnesotan. In the end, the controversy illustrates the difficulty of trying to represent all people, the sense of exclusion and frustration members of minority groups may feel, and the inevitability of an outcome affected by politics.

For Jews, the dispute came at a time in the wake of World War II when many had attained status nearly equal to that of white Christians. Like Scheiner and other Jewish leaders, some felt they should protest an emblem that encapsulated a discrimination more subtle than swastikas painted on synagogues or denials of employment, despite suggestions that protest would reignite local anti-Semitism. During the first half of the twentieth century, employment opportunities for Jews were limited and anti-Semitism was a political campaign tool. In 1946 a nationally recognized journalist labeled Minneapolis "the capitol [*sic*] of anti-Semitism in the United States."<sup>2</sup>

In response, Twin Cities leaders

*An expatriate Minnesotan living in Madison, Karen Faster is publications director for the Robert M. La Follette School of Public Affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where she completed a Ph.D. in mass communication and print culture studies in 2003. She presented a longer version of this article in 2004 at a conference, Religion and the Culture of Print in America: Authors, Publishers, Readers and More Since 1876.*



intensified efforts to address this and other forms of discrimination. Economic, political, and social opportunities widened, and Jews joined the migration from the cities to the suburbs and expanded their institutions in the Twin Cities and elsewhere, just as many white Christians were doing.<sup>3</sup> Changes like this took place across the United States as Jews claimed a position in America's white majority.<sup>4</sup>

should in general include manufacturing, agriculture, tourism, our lakes, forests and transportation. . . . For state-wide use, all major features must be portrayed if universal use [of the emblem] is to be obtained and large segments of our state industry and people not offended." The emblem should represent the state's greatness by symbolizing it as "hearty and progressive—a polyglot state with all ethnic groups represented,

Litman, a member of Mount Zion synagogue in St. Paul, for not calling attention to the cross at the July 1956 meeting when the emblem was approved.<sup>6</sup> Ray Hemenway, state chair of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party (DFL) and a Methodist, accused centennial commission chair Peter Popovich, a DFLer and a Catholic, of inserting the cross to advance his faith.<sup>7</sup> Charges went back and forth that the cross had not been in the draft approved in July but was added during the revisions that eliminated an airplane and a rocket to preempt complaints from the trucking and railroad industries, made the woman's hair look less "Frenchy," added two ore boats, and changed the buildings to better represent industry.<sup>8</sup>

An early drawing, possibly the original by winning artist Will Schaeffer of St. Louis Park, however, includes the cross along with the rocket, airplane, and other elements that were later changed. Schaeffer said the cross was his idea; it was a device to balance the height of the silo on the design's opposite side.<sup>9</sup> The final emblem shows the back-to-back profiles of a man and a woman, each holding up a hand. In the woman's palm sits a farmhouse, barn, silo, and two trees. A line of rippled water, on which float two iron-ore boats, flows across to the man's palm. He cradles several rectangular industrial buildings and, about the same height as the silo on the emblem's opposite side, a spire topped with a cross.

Unveiled to the public in October 1956, the emblem was one small component of statewide events and programs for which the legislature would eventually appropriate \$1.1 million. According to a draft of the news release that announced the emblem and the winning artist, the

## Unveiled to the public in October 1956, the emblem was one small component of statewide events and programs.

In 1956 the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission staged a contest, judged by four commercial artists, to select a centennial emblem. A letter from the commission's executive director, Thomas Swain, suggested to the judges: "If our state and its many features—firsts, mosts and bests—are symbolized, they

with a life expectancy third highest in the nation."<sup>5</sup>

The 15-member centennial commission—five state senators, five state representatives, and five gubernatorial appointees—did not anticipate objections to the cross. As the controversy unfolded, some blamed appointee commissioner Aaron M.



*North Minneapolis's Talmud Torah, 1951, a flourishing afternoon school founded to educate Jewish children in modern, urban, secular America*





*Early version of the emblem with penciled notes at margins:  
"Black changed to maroon" and "color only."*

man and woman are "holding in their hands Minnesota's agriculture, homes, forests and lakes, iron ore, communities and institutions, business and industry and schools and churches."<sup>10</sup> While Schaeffer may have added the cross as a design element, it clearly signified religion.

Scheiner immediately interpreted the spire and cross as a symbol of Christianity. He quickly sought its removal by contacting Commissioner Litman, who got in touch with Chairman Popovich, who, Litman said, promised the matter would be addressed. Scheiner told Minnesota Rabbinical Association president Louis Milgrom that he had suggested the commission fill in the crossbar so the remaining spire could "symbolize electricity, radio, TV, etc." He also talked with Popovich, who advised him to wait until after the November 1956 elections. By January 1957, DFL chair Hemenway was concerned enough about the lack of action to complain to Popovich, then in the hospital.<sup>11</sup> While these events

unfolded and helped Scheiner secure time to air concerns at the commission's quarterly meeting in January, the commission staff continued distributing copies of the emblem to businesses around the state. Unable to attend the January meeting, Litman wrote Popovich the week before and urged him to "make every effort to join with others in resolving this issue in a manner that will be satisfactory to all concerned."<sup>12</sup>

In addition to Scheiner, representatives from three religious groups spoke to the ten commissioners present at the January 1957 meeting: Rabbi David Aronson of Beth El Synagogue in Minneapolis, Richard Sykes of the First Unitarian Society in Minneapolis, and Carl Olson of the First Universalist Church of Minneapolis and Universalist Convention of Minnesota. All voiced their concerns about the emblem being discriminatory, exclusionary, and in violation of church-state separation. Several commissioners commented that they had not realized the spire

and crossbar were indeed a Christian cross. They then discussed the costs and adverse publicity that would ensue should they vote to remove the cross. They were keenly aware that changing the emblem would not play well. Removing the cross would anger some people because of religious feeling and annoy business owners who had already, at the commission's urging, manufactured items with the emblem. Newspapers statewide, having received artwork in the fall of 1956, would lambaste the group. And so, the commission voted eight-to-two to retain the emblem as it was.<sup>13</sup>

Once notified of the decision, Scheiner and others contacted additional legislators and Governor Orville Freeman's staff. The Minnesota Rabbinical Association requested a hearing with the commission. This campaign coincided with legislative consideration of a centennial budget of more than \$1



*Samuel L. Scheiner of the Minnesota Jewish Council (later Jewish Community Relations Council of Minnesota)*

million, and commissioners worried that irritation about the emblem would hurt support for their budget request. Their executive committee, which included Litman, formed a subcommittee to hold a hearing on the emblem and sought to meet with Freeman about the budget.<sup>14</sup>

Serving on the subcommittee were Litman, publisher of the *White Bear Press*, and two Catholic senators, Henry M. Harren of Albany (Stearns County) and Harold J. O'Loughlin of St. Paul. They met March 20 with 16 representatives of religious and civil rights groups, including Jewish, Seventh-Day Ad-

ventist, the Missouri and Augustana Lutheran synods, the Minnesota Council of Churches, and the American Civil Liberties Union. At that hearing, protesters said the cross "violates church and state separation, offends non-Christians and profanes a sacred symbol." Harren, the chair, adjourned the meeting after everyone had been heard. At the full commission's April 5 meeting, the panel granted Harren's request for more time so the subcommittee could hold hearings for people favoring the cross. None ever occurred, however.<sup>15</sup>

Instead, the debate played out in the newspapers. The March 28 *Minneapolis Star* ran a page-one story that focused on a letter to Freeman from ACLU secretary Donald G. Paterson. Paterson said the cross was discriminatory and would "give serious offense to humanists, Jews, Buddhists, agnostics, atheists and other groups of citizens who regard the cross as solely emblematic of the Christian religion." The symbol's appearance on commercial items like stickers or highball glasses might offend many Christians, the *Star* reported, noting the religious and secular makeup of the protest coalition.

Support for the cross also came from the *Star*, however. An early April editorial rejected the possibility that anyone would view the inclusion of the cross as an attempt to use religion to influence politics or that it would lead to laws directed at religious groups. Instead, the cross symbolized the historical importance of missionary explorers. Fighting the cross was a waste of energy for political liberals who had more important issues to address, the editorial concluded.<sup>16</sup>

That same week, Catholic Archbishop William O. Brady wrote in his weekly column (printed in two local Catholic papers) that Jews should not feel that the cross was an affront; he, as archbishop, would continue efforts by his predecessor to defend Jews in times of persecution. Atheists, agnostics, and the ACLU had no business protesting the cross, the archbishop said, because they were not present when Minnesota was

founded. "If today's pressure removes the 'cross' from the emblem that marks the past, tomorrow's pressure will attempt to tear it from our church and our homes," he wrote.<sup>17</sup>

That was hardly the last word on the matter. Summarizing Brady's column, a *Star* news article also quoted Oscar A. Benson, president of the Augustana Lutheran denomination: "To have the cross on the emblem of a state for a centennial which is supposed to represent every citizen of Minnesota is to discriminate against those citizens to whom the cross is not a symbol."<sup>18</sup> The next day, however, Clifford Ansgar Nelson, another pastor of that denomination and the state Senate chaplain, said Benson spoke for himself, not the denomination. The *Star* reported that Nelson "favored retention of the cross because 'it is such an integral part of the history of Minnesota. For the protection of minorities, this ought not to become an issue at this time.'"<sup>19</sup>

The Minneapolis weekly *American Jewish World* argued against the cross. Acknowledging comments

## Atheists, agnostics, and the ACLU had no business protesting the cross, the archbishop said, because they were not present when Minnesota was founded.

ventist, the Missouri and Augustana Lutheran synods, the Minnesota Council of Churches, and the American Civil Liberties Union. At that hearing, protesters said the cross "violates church and state separation, offends non-Christians and profanes a sacred symbol." Harren, the chair, adjourned the meeting after everyone had been heard. At the full commission's April 5 meeting, the panel granted Harren's request for more time so the subcommittee could hold hearings for people favoring the cross. None ever occurred, however.<sup>15</sup>

Instead, the debate played out in the newspapers. The March 28 *Minneapolis Star* ran a page-one story that focused on a letter to Freeman from ACLU secretary Donald G. Paterson. Paterson said the cross was discriminatory and would "give serious offense to humanists, Jews, Buddhists, agnostics, atheists and other groups of citizens who regard







Aaron M. Litman, photographed for the Statehood Centennial Commission

about the cross in Minnesota history, an editorial pointed out that the centennial's slogan was "Today and Tomorrow." Using the cross to represent the historical role of missionaries was spurious—that emphasized the *past*. "The cross is a revered symbol of Christianity. It is not the symbol of the non-Christian citizens of the state. Moreover, there are many sincere and devoted Christians who are convinced that a state agency may not impose a denominational symbol upon its citizens, and may not use tax money to disseminate a religious symbol of any particular denomination." During

the hearings, the *World* revealed, a centennial commission member had asked a Jewish protester whether demands to exclude the cross would prompt a revival of anti-Semitism. This, coupled with another argument that the cross should not be debated

been keeping the governor informed of the debate and lobbying journalists in an attempt to influence how newspapers played the emblem story. Like Scheiner, he seemed to think his behind-the-scenes connections would make a difference.<sup>21</sup>

## At play in the background of the emblem debate were decades-old political alliances based on religion and ethnicity.

in order to protect minorities, was "a direct threat against citizens who dare to defend their conscience and speak freely in this state." Paralleling the Catholic archbishop's argument that barring the cross could lead to restrictions of its use elsewhere, the *World* pointed out that using the cross as the sole symbol of religion in Minnesota could lead to government intrusion into other areas.<sup>20</sup>

In the wake of the March 20 subcommittee hearing, Litman had told Scheiner that he expected resolution, perhaps at the full commission meeting on April 5. When it became evident at that meeting that no change was forthcoming soon, Litman tried to limit circulation of the emblem by banning its use on anything related to alcohol. He had

Expectations that Litman serve as the Jewish voice on the commission complicated his role in the controversy. Jews in Minnesota were divided as to whether the cross was worth fighting about.<sup>22</sup> Litman's initial approval of the emblem in July 1956 was problematic: Scheiner, Popovich, and O'Loughlin criticized him for not speaking up then. Indeed, Litman had called the emblem "an outstanding job."<sup>23</sup> However, like three other commissioners who said at the January meeting—perhaps for political expediency—that they had not realized the spire and cross bar were intended to be a Christian cross, Litman may not have recognized the symbol. He may not have felt strongly about a representation of Christianity, or, at the time, he may have chosen not to fight that fight. But once Scheiner contacted him in October 1956, Litman began protesting to Popovich. The two were at odds throughout the controversy.<sup>24</sup>



At play in the background of the emblem debate were decades-old political alliances based on religion and ethnicity. Before the 1944 merger of the Democratic and Farmer-Labor parties, Catholics tended to be Democrats and lacked much political clout unless a Democratic president was in office. The



Farmer-Labor Party attracted Scandinavian Lutheran rural progressives and industrial workers. It also manipulated ethnic prejudice and developed a strain of anti-Catholicism. Jews typically supported Farmer-Labor, though a few went with the Republicans, who usually attracted Yankee magnates and Scandinavian Lutheran farmers. As Hubert H. Humphrey, with help from Freeman and others, built the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party in the 1940s, he emphasized civil rights and gained support from Catholics and Jews at the same time that anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism were beginning to wane in Minnesota. Freeman, a Lutheran, was Minnesota's first DFL governor.<sup>25</sup>

Internal party politics may have affected the emblem debate more than religion. When asked if he thought DFL Party chair Hemenway had called him in the hospital because of politics or religion, Popovich replied, "At this point I don't know why I am in the dog house with him any more. It might even go back to the old Stevenson-Kefauver days." Popovich had been one of the delegates who supported Estes Kefauver in his win in Minnesota's 1956 Democratic presidential primary, a challenge to the DFL establishment that increased friction within the party



*Emblems everywhere: Peter Popovich (right) presenting the first centennial flag to Governor Freeman on the eve of the anniversary year*

issue. Rural areas were overrepresented in the legislature and would lose political clout should reapportionment occur.<sup>27</sup>

In addition, commissioners knew that some legislators were unhappy with how the centennial was organized and represented at the county level.<sup>28</sup> These factors all may have influenced the emblem debate. The commission's actions—from telling Scheiner to wait until after the November 1956 elections to establishing a subcommittee that did not act for months after its initial hearing—may have been delaying tactics to avoid making a change.

on a nonpartisan basis, though they caucused in two groups: the Conservatives tended to be Republicans; the Liberals, DFLers. Controlled by the Conservative caucus, the Minnesota Senate on April 23 trimmed the centennial budget request from the \$750,000 that its finance committee had approved to \$500,000. In the Liberal-controlled House, the appropriations subcommittee, led by Popovich, had initially recommended \$1,475,000, but this was cut to \$1,250,000. Lawmakers denied that legislative and political differences between DFLers Popovich and Freeman accounted for these cuts, the *Minneapolis Tribune* noted. The budget sent to the governor settled on \$1.1 million, more than twice what Freeman wanted. Signing the bill in early May, Freeman encouraged the centennial commission to return unused money to the general revenue fund at the end of 1958.<sup>29</sup>

## Letters to the editor in secular papers and *The Wanderer* expressed many shades of opinion.

and highlighted divisions between rural and urban voters.<sup>26</sup>

The rural-urban split often was the tipping point in whether Conservatives followed the Republican Party platform, as well. Bandied about since 1949, the threat of reapportionment further complicated the

Whatever their motivations, the commissioners and staff did not want the emblem controversy to jeopardize the centennial budget, then working its way through the legislature, and so did not want another vote until the legislature adjourned. State lawmakers at this time were elected

Two days after the centennial commission secured its budget, the *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*

reported the result of its Minnesota Poll, which queried a “balanced cross-section of Minnesota men and women aged 21 and older”: 66 percent of respondents favored retaining the cross, 19 percent opposed it, and 15 percent had no opinion. Further analysis showed that 82 percent of Catholics favored the cross while 10 percent opposed it. Among Protestants, 62 percent backed the cross and 20 percent rejected it. The article did not say whether Jews were polled.<sup>30</sup>

Meanwhile, the Catholic weekly *The Wanderer* continued for months to lobby for the cross, seeing opposition as part of a larger campaign to eliminate the cross as a symbol of Christianity. It emphasized the importance of missionary priests and religious colleges in Minnesota’s history and suggested that the spire and

bar were tiny and perhaps not even really a cross.<sup>31</sup> Letters to the editor in secular papers and *The Wanderer* expressed many shades of opinion. Some objected to the cross appearing on car decals and glasses of alcohol; others opposed discrimination and/or endorsed a separation of church and state. Of those favoring the cross, some disliked involvement of the ACLU and other groups that sought to remove the symbol. Others believed the emblem should recognize the state’s Christian history, including the roles of Catholic and Episcopal missionaries.<sup>32</sup> The state attorney general’s office reported after the April commission meeting that the emblem with the cross did not violate the constitution and that it represented historical events.<sup>33</sup>

With no final decision from the commission, the emblem de-

bate intensified in late May. The ACLU announced it would look into church-state issues, including the cross on the centennial emblem but also the ban on Sunday car sales and release time from public schools granted for religious education. The presidents of the Minnesota Jewish Council and the Minnesota Rabbinical Association wrote Popovich to restate their disappointment that the emblem issue had not been solved and their concerns were not being taken seriously. That letter, Popovich later told the *World*, erroneously said he had promised Scheiner that the problem would be addressed and “there was no need for a concerted action.” The commission would do nothing until its subcommittee acted.<sup>34</sup> Scheiner, however, reaffirmed that Popovich had told him in November 1956 that the problem



*Official portrait, in the style of the times. The women are Jane Preston and Noella Audette.*



---

## A DELICATE BALANCE

The mix of religion, political affiliation, and home region of the centennial commissioners illustrates the delicate balancing act involved in creating a public body that allocates money. Including resignations and reappointments, 17 people served on the 15-member commission in 1957, with reappointments maintaining the demographic balance and the three-way split among representatives, senators, and gubernatorial appointees. Records show that eight commissioners were Catholic, seven were Protestant, one was Jewish, and the affiliation of one could not be determined. In a time when the legislature was officially nonpartisan, nine were Republicans or members of the Conservative caucus; seven were in the Liberal caucus or active with the DFL, and the political bent of one is unknown. Nine commissioners hailed from the Twin Cities metropolitan area; the remaining eight were from all corners of the state.<sup>1</sup>

Despite charges, countercharges, and expectations at the time, ascribing purely partisan, religious, or regional reasons to commissioners' stances on the emblem is difficult. Indeed, their votes could be evidence that supports historians' observations that ethnic and religious differences were becoming less important by the late 1950s.<sup>2</sup>

In January 1957, eight of the ten commissioners present voted to retain the cross. Four were Catholic: two Liberal, two Conservative; three urban, and one rural. Four were Protestant: three Conservative, one Liberal; two rural, and two urban. Both commissioners opposing inclusion of the cross were Conservative: one rural, religion not listed (but likely of Protestant heritage—and the only commissioner to vote “no” twice), and one urban Protestant.

In October's ten-to-three vote, those opposing the cross were the rural Conservative of unknown religious affiliation, an urban Jew, and an urban, liberal Catholic. The abstentions were a rural Protestant Liberal and an urban Protestant Conservative who had earlier favored retention. Those in favor of the cross thus represented the spectrum of Christian denominations, political affiliations, and places of residence.

---

### Sources

1. Listing religion, of course, does not mean that an individual practiced or shared all of its tenets. Votes recorded in MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 21, 25, 27, and abridged minutes, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 1. Backgrounds of commissioners, here and below, from Minnesota Legislative Reference Library, “Legislators Past and Present,” [www.leg.mn/legdb](http://www.leg.mn/legdb) (all entries accessed Mar. 22, 2008); local newspapers, mostly obituaries; *Who's Who in American Politics, 1967–68*; and the 1941 and 1958 *Who's Who in Minnesota*, the latter a centennial publication.

2. Delton, *Making Minnesota Liberal*, 151–54; John T. McGreevy, *Catholicism and American Freedom: A History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2003), 208–12.

would be “solved to the satisfaction of every one.” Popovich wrote Scheiner in August that he did not believe the commission would alter the emblem; those members once inclined to do so had changed their minds because of newspaper publicity, public opinion polls, and involvement by other organizations.<sup>35</sup>

Tensions increased in September when Litman gave up on waiting for action by the three-person subcommittee. At a full commission meeting, he offered a compromise: replace the cross with an unadorned spire. Popovich refused to entertain the motion, saying the subcommittee had to consider the matter first. Litman said subcommittee chair Harren refused to hold more hearings, then withdrew his motion in exchange for a promise that the subcommittee would convene within ten days. The next day, a *Pioneer Press* editorial noted that the state constitution called for all religious groups to be treated fairly and forbade spending state money on a religious group. It urged the commission to follow the constitution.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, on September 20, the subcommittee voted two-to-one to recommend that the cross be retained and no more hearings held. O'Loughlin said he offered the motion after considering newspaper editorials, letters to him and the commission, and the supportive Minnesota Poll results. That same day, before the full commission formally accepted the recommendation, centennial executive director Swain wrote his contact at the University of Minnesota that the campus could start using the centennial emblem. Swain had held off sending artwork to the university.<sup>37</sup>

The public debate continued in anticipation of the final commission vote in October. In addition to letters to the editor, community groups and political leaders issued statements and news releases. Some entities, including the *American Jewish World*, called for an unadorned spire.<sup>38</sup> Individuals sent letters and postcards to the commission, many demanding that the cross be kept.

At its October meeting, the full commission voted ten-to-three, with two abstentions, to reject Litman's subcommittee minority report that recommended using up supplies with the emblem and then printing new materials with a plain spire. The commission then voted (with Litman as the only recorded dissenter) to accept the majority recommendation to retain the centennial emblem with the cross. Anticipating this outcome, the Minnesota Jewish Council and the Minnesota Rabbinical Association had readied a statement of condemnation that Scheiner distributed to media after the vote.<sup>39</sup>

In the months that followed, Scheiner and others turned their attention to assisting members of the Jewish community with questions about the centennial. The Minnesota Jewish Council, the Jewish War Veterans, and the *American Jewish World* advised individuals and businesses not to display the emblem or contribute financially in ways that would aid its display.<sup>40</sup>

The final commission decision to retain the cross may have been inevitable despite all the lobbying and protests by a broad coalition of secular and religious organizations. Political expediency, the desire to avoid bad publicity, religious faith, the logistical difficulty and expense

of replacing the emblems already distributed, and the stated desire to recognize the role of Christianity in Minnesota's history outweighed feelings of minority exclusion. While the outcome was unsatisfactory to some, 50 years of hindsight may show that the debate was valuable. The resulting behind-the-scenes lobbying,

media coverage, and public meetings forced people to think about the meaning of being a Minnesotan, the nature of subtle or inferential prejudice, the frustrations of minority and majority groups accused of wrongdoing—and the difficulty of crafting an inclusive, representative symbol. □



Minnesota's Statehood Sesquicentennial has avoided the controversy of the centennial. For events and information, see [www.mn150years.org](http://www.mn150years.org).





## Notes

1. Donald Padilla to Virginia Huck, Sept. 17, 1956; Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission (MSCC), minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 12—both in MSCC Administrative Files, Minnesota State Archives, Minnesota Historical Society (MHS). All minutes cited below are in these files.

2. MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 15; MSCC executive committee, minutes, Mar. 2, 1957; *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 5, 1957, p. 11A; *American Jewish World*, Apr. 12, 1957, p. 24D; Hyman Berman and Linda Mack Schloff, *Jews in Minnesota* (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2002), 18, 45–49; Laura Weber, “Gentiles Preferred”: Minneapolis Jews and Employment 1920–1950,” *Minnesota History* 52 (Spring 1991): 166–82; Carey McWilliams, “Minneapolis: The Curious Twin,” *Common Ground* 7 (Autumn 1946): 61.

In the 1930s anti-Semitism was used to discredit candidates, including Farmer-Labor Party governors Floyd B. Olson and Elmer Benson. In the 1948 U.S. Senate race, after candidate Hubert H. Humphrey had helped engineer the merger that produced the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, Benson attributed anti-Semitic remarks to Humphrey, and Scheiner worked behind the scenes to squelch them. Jennifer A. Delton, *Making Minnesota Liberal: Civil Rights and the Transformation of the Democratic Party* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002), xxii–xxiii, 141; Berman and Schloff, *Jews in Minnesota*, 46–47.

3. Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), 23–26, 207–12; Karen Faster, “Newspaper Coverage and Cultural Representations of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Minneapolis, 1941–1971” (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2003), 154–56, 166–74, 197. See also Albert I. Gordon, *Jews in Suburbia* (Boston: Beacon Hill Press, 1959).

4. Karen Brodtkin, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998), 3, 36–37, 138, 154; Eric L. Goldstein, *The Price of Whiteness: Jews, Race, and American Identity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 2–3, 189–94, 204–08, 212. See also Faster, “Newspaper Coverage,” 198–221; Matthew Fry Jacobson, *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 6–9, 13–14, 91–135, 246–73.

5. Thomas Swain to emblem judges, June 19, 1956, quoted in Peter S. Popovich to Ray Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files.

6. *American Jewish World*, Sept. 13, 1957, p. 1; Peter Popovich to Louis R. Weiss and Louis Milgrom, May 22, 1957, Samuel L. Scheiner Papers, MHS. Litman is listed in

W. Gunther Plaut, *Mount Zion, 1856–1956: The First Hundred Years* (St. Paul: Mount Zion Hebrew Congregation, [1956?]), 136.

7. Cecilia M. McHugh, untitled typescript, Jan. 3, 1957, and Popovich to Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files. The McHugh typescript summarizes a telephone conversation between Hemenway and Popovich. McHugh, the centennial commission’s secretary, was visiting Popovich in the hospital when Hemenway telephoned. MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 14. On Popovich’s religion, see p. 24 of those minutes. *Who’s Who in Minnesota, 1958*, p. 406, lists him as Catholic and Hemenway as Methodist (p. 91).

8. Thomas Swain to Will Schaeffer, June 29, 1956, MSCC Administrative Files; MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 14; Popovich to Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957.

9. Artwork, handwritten notes about changes; Swain to Schaeffer, June 29, 1956; Will Schaeffer to Thomas Swain, Mar. 1, 1957—all MSCC Administrative Files.

10. *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, May 2, 1957, p. 24; draft news release, Oct. 8–13, 1956, MSCC Publicity and Promotion Files, MHS.

11. MSCC Special Sub-Committee Hearing on Centennial Emblem, abridged transcript of minutes, Mar. 20, 1957, p. 3; Scheiner to Milgrom, Oct. 12, 1956, Scheiner papers; MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 2, 3, 12; McHugh, typescript; Popovich to Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957.

12. H. N. Zinsmaster to Thomas Swain, Nov. 5, 1956; J. L. Morrill to Swain, Nov. 6, 1956; Donald Padilla to W. H. Kircher, Nov. 8, 1956; J. J. Pentek to Swain, Nov. 21, 1956—all in MSCC Publicity and Promotion Files. Popovich to Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957; Aaron M. Litman to Peter Popovich, Jan. 10, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files.

13. MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957; Thomas Swain to Samuel Scheiner, Jan. 21, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files.

14. MSCC executive committee, minutes, Mar. 2, 1957; untitled typescript addressed to “Tom,” ca. Apr. 1957 (hereinafter, typescript to Tom), and Popovich to MSCC executive committee members, Mar. 6, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files.

15. MSCC Sub-Committee, abridged minutes, Mar. 20, 1957, p. 1, 5; *Minneapolis Star*, Mar. 28, 1958, p. 1A; MSCC, minutes, Apr. 5, 1957. On Harren: Sarah LaVine, Stearns History Museum archivist, to Karen Faster, e-mail, Feb. 12, 2008; O’Loughlin, *St. Paul Dispatch*, Apr. 29, 1968, p. 10.

16. *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 4, 1957, p. 8A.

17. William O. Brady, “The Archbishop’s Observations,” *The Wanderer* (St. Paul), Apr. 4, 1957, p. 1, and *Catholic Bulletin*, Apr. 6, 1957, p. 1. *The Wanderer*, a German Catholic newspaper, regularly printed the archbishop’s weekly column two days before it appeared in the official archdiocesan newspaper.

Brady’s predecessor, Abp. John Gregory Murray, had presented a statement on behalf



Brochure for the “crowning event” of the “Parade of the Century,” promising “Historic Units—Bands—Parade Pageantry—Floats—Clowns—Drum and Bugle Corps”



of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews at a March 1933 rally at Temple Israel, Minneapolis, to criticize treatment of Jews in Germany; Robert J. White, "Minnesota and the World Abroad," in *Minnesota, Real and Imagined: Essays on the State and Its Culture*, ed. Stephen R. Graubard (St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2000), 263.

18. *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 5, 1957, p. 11A. See also *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Apr. 5, 1957, p. 17.

19. *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 6, 1957, p. 9A. Yet, an October 26, 1957, letter to the editor in the *Minneapolis Star* from Lael H. Westberg, executive director of the parish education board of the Augustana Lutheran Church, reported that 15 pastors and seven laymen representing the denomination's boards had supported Benson's stand.

20. *American Jewish World*, Apr. 12, 1957, p. 24D, also summarized in news articles: *St. Paul Dispatch*, Apr. 13, 1957, p. 7, and *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 12, 1957, p. 8A.

21. *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Apr. 6, 1957, p. 9A, 24; *St. Paul Dispatch*, Apr. 6, 1957, p. 4; MSCC, minutes, Apr. 5, 1957; typescript to Tom; MSCC executive committee, minutes, Mar. 2, 1957.

22. Mount Zion's rabbi, W. Gunther Plaut, initially opposed the fight because, he felt, the battle could not be won; see his *Unfinished Business: An Autobiography* ([Toronto]: Lester and Orpen Dennys, 1981), 176–77. Popovich told his executive committee that he and centennial staff members had heard from Jews who thought the emblem should be left alone; MSCC executive committee, minutes, Mar. 2, 1957, p. 15.

23. Popovich to Hemenway, Jan. 16, 1957; MSCC Sub-Committee, abridged minutes, Mar. 20, 1957, p. 3; Popovich to Weiss and Milgrom, May 22, 1957, p. 2, and Samuel Scheiner to David Aronson, Oct. 29, 1957, both in Scheiner papers.

24. MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 3–4, 9, 14, 19–22; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Sept. 6, 1957, p. 14; *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Sept. 6, 1957, p. 1; *American Jewish World*, Sept. 13, 1957, p. 1; typescript to Tom. Plaut wrote in *Unfinished Business*, p. 177, that he did not believe it to be a cross.

25. Delton, *Making Minnesota Liberal*, 2–7, 40–60, 118–29, 134–35, 151–54; Robert (Bob) Latz, *Jews in Minnesota Politics: The Inside Stories* (Minneapolis: Nodin Press, 2007), 4–5, 12–13, 23–25; G. Theodore Mitau, *Politics in Minnesota* 2d rev. ed.

(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1970), 24.

*Who's Who in Minnesota*, 1958, p. 143, lists Freeman as a deacon in the Lutheran church. Humphrey, raised Methodist, later became a Congregationalist; Hubert H. Humphrey, *The Education of a Public Man: My Life and Politics* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1976), 29.

26. MSCC, minutes, Jan. 18, 1957, p. 15; Laura K. Auerbach, *Worthy to be Remembered: A Political History of the Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, 1944–1984* (Minneapolis: DFL Party, 1984), 38–39, 76; Latz, *Jews in Minnesota Politics*, 49–50, 67–68. Mitau, *Politics in Minnesota*, 27, mentions another point of contention: the DFL's use of pre-primary endorsements, which some former Farmer-Laborites opposed.

27. Hennepin and Ramsey counties, with 34 percent of the population, elected 22 percent of legislators. Mitau, *Politics in Minnesota*, 91–99; Steven J. Keillor, *Shaping Minnesota's Identity: 150 Years of State History* (Lakeville, MN: Pogo Press, 2008), 216–18.

28. Typescript to Tom.

29. Swain to Douglas C. Rigg, Mar. 29, 1957, MSCC Publicity and Promotion Files; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Apr. 24, 1957, p. 7, May 2, 1957, p. 24, May 3, 1957, p. 19; *Minneapolis Star*, May 3, 1957, p. 2A.

30. *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, May 5, 1957, editorial-business sec., p. 3.

31. See Walter L. Matt articles, *The Wanderer*, Apr. 25, 1957, p. 4, May 23, 1957, p. 4, and Sept. 12, 1957, p. 4.

32. Only one letter writer, Betty Bradshaw, identified herself as Christian; the others do not mention religious affiliation. See, for example, Claudia Dziuk, "The Use of the Cross," *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 11, 1957, p. 8A; Elwood Sundeen, "Hits Centennial Group," *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Apr. 11, 1957, p. 14; Marie R. Owens, "Can Minnesota Deny Its Cross?" *The Wanderer*, Apr. 11, 1957, p. 5; Betty Bradshaw, "Protests Use of Cross in State Symbol," *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, May 5, 1957, editorial-business sec., p. 3; Irving Shaw, "Church-State Issue Raised About Cross," *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, May 12, 1957, editorial-business sec., p. 3; F. B. Trisko, "The Cross," *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Apr. 26, 1957, p. 6; Rose Arnold Power, "Centennial Cross Sign of Progress," *Minneapolis Sunday Tribune*, Apr. 21,

1957, editorial-business sec., p. 3; James F. Campbell, "The Centennial Cross," *Minneapolis Star*, Sept. 28, 1957, p. 8A.

33. "Report to Centennial Commission on Legality of its Official Emblem," n.d., MSCC Administrative Files.

34. *Minneapolis Star*, Apr. 12, 1957, p. 3A; *American Jewish World*, May 24, 1957, p. 1; Louis R. Weiss and Louis Milgrom to Peter Popovich, May 15, 1957, and Popovich to Weiss and Milgrom, May 22, 1957, p. 1, reiterating that Scheiner did not recount the conversation accurately—Scheiner papers.

35. Samuel Scheiner to Al Vorspan et al., May 27, 1957; Peter Popovich to Samuel Scheiner, Aug. 9, 1957—Scheiner papers.

36. MSCC, abridged minutes, Sept. 5, 1957; *Minneapolis Tribune*, Sept. 6, 1957, p. 14; *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Sept. 6, 1957, p. 1, Sept. 7, 1957, p. 6; *American Jewish World*, Sept. 13, 1957, p. 1. See also *Minneapolis Star*, Sept. 14, 1957, p. 2A.

37. MSCC Sub-Committee, abridged minutes, Sept. 20, 1957; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Sept. 21, 1957, p. 19; *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Sept. 21, 1957, p. 15; Thomas Swain to William L. Nunn, Sept. 20, 1957, MSCC Administrative Files.

38. For retaining the cross, see, for example, *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Sept. 13, 1957, p. 15, Oct. 5, 1957, p. 2; *St. Paul Dispatch*, Oct. 11, 1957, p. 6; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Oct. 11, 1957, p. 17. For a plain spire, see *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Oct. 10, 1957, p. 20; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Oct. 10, 1957, p. 15; *American Jewish World*, Oct. 11, 1957, p. 1, 4. On the wish for resolution, see *Minneapolis Star*, Oct. 11, 1957, p. 14A; *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, Oct. 11, 1957, p. 30.

39. MSCC, abridged minutes, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 1. One commissioner was absent but passed along his support of the cross to Popovich. The press simplified the vote, reporting it as ten-to-three in favor of keeping the cross. *Minneapolis Star*, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 1A; *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, Oct. 18, 1957, p. 20; *St. Paul Dispatch*, Oct. 17, 1957, p. 1. For the statement, *American Jewish World*, Oct. 25, 1957, p. 1.

40. *American Jewish World*, Oct. 25, 1957, p. 4. Samuel Schmuckler to Jewish War Veterans members, Dec. 2, 1957; Samuel Scheiner to Phil Krelitz, Dec. 23, 1957; Scheiner to Sam Horowitz, Mar. 14, 1957; Sherman A. Levenson to "Dear Friend," Apr. 28, 1958—all Scheiner papers.

---

*All images and objects are in MHS collections. The two emblems, full commission portrait, and flag presentation (from the commission's final report) are in the commission's administrative files, Minnesota State Archives; p. 103 and 104 are Minneapolis Star/Tribune/Journal photographs. All object photography by Eric Mortenson/MHS.*





Copyright of **Minnesota History** is the property of the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, or email articles, however, for individual use.

To request permission for educational or commercial use, [contact us](#).