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Chapter 1

Introduction

This is the book I didn’t want to write. At least not at first.

The topic of race was something I stumbled upon when I was researching my dissertation in immigration history, a study of the Slovak community in Philadelphia.1 Scrolling through reels of microfilmed immigrant newspapers, I was on the lookout for news of parish foundings, strikes in factories, and celebrations of American holidays.

With limited time and the admonition of an astute graduate chair in my ear that “There are two kinds of dissertations, perfect and finished,” I honed in on the articles in Slovak newspapers such as Jednota and Národné noviny that related directly to my project, and rapidly scrolled through the microfilm when articles spoke of matters that I considered tangential.

At some point while looking through those reels and reels of fading Slovak newsprint—at what point in my own research, and in which newspaper, who can say?—an article caught my eye and made me pause. “Negrov lynčovanie,” the headline stated. “Negro lynched.” The article may have been only a paragraph long, for as in the English-language press, the front pages of many Slovak newspapers at the turn of the twentieth century were jigsaw puzzles of small items run one on top of another, with few photographs or illustrations, and little attention to the logic of a “lead” story with larger headline type and prominent placement on the page, modes of layout with which a modern newspaper reader is familiar. “Negrov lynčovanie,” the headline read, while above it a story spoke perhaps of a storm in Cuba, or a church social sponsored by Slovaks in New Jersey.

And I turned the page.

After all, what I was after was immigration history, so what could the sorrows of black Americans, as horrific as lynchings were, possibly have to do with East Europeans who had migrated to America? Why would someone writing about immigrants pay any attention to race? Lynching stories, even if they implausibly appeared in the middle of a Slovak paper, offering a foreign-language account of a Mississippi or Texas hanging, seemed to have little to do with East Europeans, and so mentally “negrov lynčovanie” was relegated to the category of tangential as I forged ahead in search of more relevant material.
But facts have a way of grabbing one’s attention, even from the corner of one’s eye, as microfilmed newsprint goes whirling by. “Negrov lynčovanie” might not have been what I wanted to focus on, but this first sighting was far from tangential. In subsequent weeks, on other Slavic front pages, dozens, then hundreds, of other accounts of black lynchings appeared in papers from the 1890s into the 1920s, running side by side with articles that related the kind of material I was after, immigrant acculturation to America. Other articles dealing with race—accounts of urban race riots, news of U.S. imperialism in the Philippines and the Caribbean, slighting accounts of colonized Africans, minstrel-show jokes and notices—similarly intruded into the neatly self-contained immigrant narrative. But again I turned the page, for my work was on immigration history, and the masterful accounts of Polish, Slovak, Italian, Irish, and Jewish immigrants that I had read in grad school—this was the early and mid-1990s—had little to say about African Americans, whose saga was told by other subspecialists in history, their story seemingly, yes, tangential, to immigration historians.

In retrospect, to an almost amazing degree some scholars effaced consideration of race from the immigrant narrative. However, during those same early and mid-1990s, several historians, notably David Roediger, James Barrett, Matthew Frye Jacobson, Alexander Saxton, George Lipsitz, and Michael Rogin, began to argue that new immigrants’ interactions with African Americans, and their assertion of the privileges of white citizens, were central to their acculturation to America. Reading these scholars persuaded me that maybe accounts of “Negro” lynchings had something to do with Slavic immigrants’ history after all. These stories appeared week after week, selected by immigrant journalists as news they felt their readers needed. So what were these stories doing there, in Slovak, in editions of Národné noviny and other papers?

So I began printing out these dozens, hundreds of “negrov lynčovanie” accounts, filing them away for the time when I might finish my decidedly imperfect dissertation. Filed those “negrov lynčovanie” accounts in a figurative file folder that was vaguely labeled “Wait a minute. Something is going on here.”

Upon reflection, what is surprising is that I was surprised by all the articles covering race matters. Almost from the moment they got off the boat, immigrants had been telling stories about their first bewildered encounters with the “Negro.” The steerage passenger’s first sighting of American blacks has become a trope, representing the newcomer’s fear and amazement at this frightening new place. On June 4, 1921, a story appeared on “Šídló,” the Slovak newspaper New Yorkský denník’s humor page, about a greenhorn met at the train station by a black porter. One day at the station he saw a lady get off the train with a big knapsack on her back. “Our black friend” saw at once that she was a “greenhorn.” “So,” he said, “I see you’re just off the boat from the old country.” The lady was amazed. She couldn’t believe her eyes, because never before in her life had she seen a black person. And the most amazing thing was that he was speaking to her in Slovak. “I’m from Vranov, in Zemplin. And where do you come from?” she
asked the black man. “Same as you, honey, I’m from Zemplín, over in Humenne.” “Impossible, I know Humenne very well, the whole place, and I’ve never seen black people there. Not even the gypsies are this black.” “Look, my dear countrywoman. I’ve been here twelve years already, and I’ve had it so hot the whole time since my flight that I’ve become completely black. If you stay in America you’ll become completely black too.” And with that, the author concluded, “Our black fellow countryman went on his way.”

The greenhorn of the joke page wasn’t alone. Polish immigrant Adam Laboda in 1939 recalled for an interviewer in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, “The thing that seemed strangest to us boys when we came to America were the black people, you know, the Negroes. . . . [W]e could not understand why there would be black people here.”

Perhaps more traumatic was Anna Kikta’s 1928 first encounter with American race. “It was rough, it was rough,” she remembered for an interviewer years later.

I remember that first summer. . . . I didn’t know much English yet. I was just learning. And there was a black girl going down the street, and this one boy says, ‘Go say, “Hi, Nigger,” to her.’ And I went up. I didn’t know what that was. And I said, ‘Hi, Nigger.’ And she came and she slapped my face. And I said, ‘Mickey, what did you, what did I tell her?’ And they all laughed, of course. They thought it was a great big joke. But that’s the way we were. That, it was pretty rough.

Like the greenhorn in the joke above, Rose S. similarly recalled for the present writer that when a black porter tried to take her bag at Ellis Island, she screamed because she had never seen a black man and thought he was a monkey.

As Robert Orsi notes, some of these stories, especially those recalled decades later, may have been apocryphal, projecting later racial attitudes onto the moment of arrival. These tales nevertheless reveal something of immigrants’ learned sense of distance from blacks. As early as 1921, immigrant papers provided articles, some intended as humor and others not, that affirmed to readers that blacks were qualitatively different.

Clearly some traumatic encounter between Kikta and blacks occurred. As her story suggests, a subtext of shame can be read in such articles, although usually because of humiliation inflicted on the immigrant rather than a newcomer’s outrage at racial injustice. The focus is on the immigrant’s unfamiliarity with American racial mores—it is Anna who is mocked for not knowing the significance of the slur word “nigger,” and in the joke, the real buffoon is the greenhorn, afraid a black porter is the devil or a darkened and degraded compatriot from Humenne. But these stories also embody the immigrant recognition that blacks occupied undesirable social space, and that the distance between Negro and Slovak had to be policed at the risk of becoming “the same as you.” If she weren’t careful, a newcomer from Slovakia might indeed become black.

As Orsi and Catherine Eagan have argued, many immigrants, such as the Italian and Irish, came to America with more than passing familiarity with non-Europeans, including blacks in the Atlantic and Mediterranean worlds. Even
Slovak tinkers of the nineteenth century were documented as wandering as far afield as the Ottoman realms, and thus could plausibly have encountered black workers years before the paradigmatic Ellis Island moment. Nevertheless, the absolute binaries of Jim Crow segregation, America’s “one drop rule” that disfranchised virtually all citizens with even a remote African American ancestor, and the reign of terror waged against blacks in the South and other parts of the country, were matters with which immigrants were unfamiliar upon arrival and about which new immigrants such as the Slovaks had to learn if they were to accept their place as “white” (read: full) citizens. While Thomas Guglielmo may argue that Italians (and by extension, other Southeast Europeans) were “white on arrival” since unlike Africans and Asians they were eligible for emigration and citizenship, even a cursory glance at restrictionist screeds by nativists such as Edward Alsworth Ross demonstrate that to many native-born Americans the Caucasianness of Slavs and Mediterraneans was no sure thing. In 1908, when looking at a nation full of Italians and Slovaks, Alfred P. Schultz asked, “race or mongrel?” While new immigrants such as Slovaks may have had a dim sense of their whiteness, they nevertheless had to learn the salience of this part of their identity in the American context.

Many newcomers learned such lessons all too well. Near the end of Thomas Bell’s novel of Slovak immigrants, Out of this Furnace, immigrant old-timers in the 1930s lament the coming of the “niggers,” who have ruined their neighborhood. While Bell’s book is a novel—albeit one that accurately translates many features of Bell’s own life as a Slovak American in western Pennsylvania—by the 1930s some other Slavs had joined other white ethnics in enforcing restrictive covenants to prevent blacks from moving into their neighborhoods, and during and immediately after World War II race riots erupted as blacks endeavored to move onto white ethnic blocks. Adam Laboda of Pittsfield began by regarding blacks as “the strangest” thing; the wonder regarding blacks was soon supplanted for some (certainly not all) South and East European migrants by more ominous emotions.

So how did Slovaks, like other South and East European immigrants, learn to fit into America’s racialized landscape? Matthew Frye Jacobson has noted that part of demonstrating one’s fitness for “republican citizenship” entailed an embrace of physical and “social whiteness.” Dominic Pacyga argues that Polish Chicagoans initially resisted the American stigmatization of blacks, battling them when they served as strikebreakers but otherwise accepting blacks as one group among many in the competition for jobs. He notes, though, that after 1919, “In the case of blacks, the American tradition of racism may have played an important role in the acculturation of Poles into American urban society.” Indeed, very quickly “inbetween peoples” demonstrated by their language and behavior that they had acculturated as “Caucasian.” By the 1920s, Slovaks were “passing,” not just physically but also in behavior, as self-respecting white persons. Yet this only poses a further question: How did some Slovaks go from being bewildered by
blacks to being shamed into calling them “niggers,” laughing at them, and finally shunning them as pariahs? 11

As the joke about “the greenhorn and the Negro” suggests, Slovaks often encountered press articles that promoted thinking in black and white. Immigrant papers provided extensive coverage of race. Graphic accounts of mutilation lynchings often appeared in the same issues containing minstrel-show jokes in “humor columns.” Reading frequent accounts of lynchings, race riots, and the “savage” non-Europeans under imperial rule helped Slovak readers to “naturalize” the black-white divide.

It is the coverage of race, chiefly in Slovak and Rusyn (Byzantine Catholic East Europeans) newspapers, with which this book is concerned. These papers may be characterized as palimpsests of race. Coverage of race, whether in lynchings and race riots at home, as minstrel-show humor, or in stories of imperial adventures abroad, permeated the Slavic immigrant press. Newspapers served as palimpsests of race in that the impressions of a lynching article lingered as a reader (even an academic turning a microfilm reel decades later) came upon a story of a minstrel show in Passaic or an account of savage Filipinos or African cannibals. Each trace remains, adding to an accretion of references in these papers that tutored newcomers in the salience of race in the new homeland.

Yet sadly scholars of immigration who turn to ethnic newspapers for trace evidence of newcomers’ developing ethnic nationalism or American patriotism still discount the degree to which race was a part of this acculturation process. June Granatir Alexander has impressively documented immigrants’ simultaneous development of Slovak nationalism and American patriotism. This bi-nationalism developed in large measure through reading articles in immigrant newspapers. The American culture into which newcomers adapted, however, was rife with racial inequalities. Articles in papers are often used as evidence of immigrants’ growing Americanism, working-class grievances, and ethnic nationalism. It would be odd if coverage of race did not correspond in some way to an incipient sense of whiteness among immigrant readers. Yet these same papers are understudied as markers of racial identification; Alexander, for example, discounts all consideration of race as irrelevant to Slovaks’ identity formation, suggesting only in her conclusion that race just wasn’t important to East European immigrants. She therefore asserts that later scholars who raise issues of race are bound by intellectual fashions ancillary to immigrants themselves.12

I argue, however, that the myriad articles covering African Americans’ status cannot be isolated from matters of immigrant adjustment to America. Articles that portrayed blacks as devoid of full personhood appeared week after week in Slovak papers, just as they did in the early twentieth-century English-language press. Such cultural productions must be interrogated as central to the immigrant narrative.

Indeed, Jacobson’s *Roots Too* has argued that the Ellis Island saga has in some quarters supplanted Plymouth Rock as America’s foundational myth, but it is a
foundational myth that elides the experience of Americans of non-European background who were until relatively recently barred from the benefits of full citizenship. Jacobson has documented how the foundational Ellis Island myth relegates non-European Americans to a peripheral status. While narratives of immigrant roots often highlight the “hard work” and talents of South and East European immigrants (which surely there were in abundance), these tropes endeavor to erase the pernicious racial boundaries placed before African Americans and Asian Americans and minimize the degree to which white ethnic success relied on an uneven racial opportunity structure. Such cultural work in early immigrant newspapers has hitherto been largely understudied. What I hope to contribute, then, is a close reading of one ethnic group’s own newspapers with attention to race.\textsuperscript{13}

My intention here is not to stigmatize Slovaks as any more or less racist than those who were native born, new immigrant, or old stock. Not every immigrant accepted without debate what a paper printed about blacks, or on any other topic, for that matter. Yet the voluminous coverage of race by immigrant papers has been little studied when considering Slovak acculturation to America.

Certainly in the United States many cultural productions, from silent movies and minstrel shows to government policies and actions, demonstrated to immigrants the low regard in which blacks were held, whether in Northern cities or the Jim Crow South. Nevertheless, through reprinted articles on lynching and other matters, the Slovak press demonstrated to readers the hypervulnerability of African Americans and tutored its readers in racial identity formation. Moreover, in propagating the tropes of racial difference, black criminality and violence, and acceptance of reports of blacks’ supposed sexual depredations on helpless white women, the rewrites of lynching narratives featured in the immigrant press seem to have conveyed ideas about African Americans’ “otherness” and unacceptability to East European newcomers just as effectively as the mainstream press aided and abetted native-born whites’ acceptance of the Jim Crow regime.

Race was much on the minds of at least some Slovaks and Rusyns, the newspaper editors of foreign-language journals who selected stories for inclusion in their newspapers. The heyday of East and South European emigration coincided with a rise in public violence against African Americans, most notably lynchings, and these matters were reported in immigrant papers just as lynching stories filled the English-language journals. From roughly 1880 to 1914 around 15 million people migrated from Southeast Europe to the United States, with more than 225,000 identified as Slovak. Slovaks primarily were fleeing the poverty of their hilly region of Upper Hungary, but also often resented the official Magyarization policy that relegated them to third-class status in their homeland. Slovaks were familiar with oppression, most notably in the form of laws barring the use of Slovak (and other non-Magyar) languages in public. They also endured occasional official violence, such as soldiers’ 1907 murder in Černova of people
protesting the imprisonment of Father Andrej Hlinka. If they thought of it, Slovak immigrants were familiar with the violence of pogroms against Jews and Romany (Gypsies) prevalent throughout east central Europe. And once they arrived in the United States, Slavic immigrants toiling in industrial jobs experienced the brutality of the “Cossacks,” state militias beating or murdering strikers, as in the infamous 1897 Lattimer massacre of Slavic miners. Such immigrants, then, knew all too well the scorn and violence rulers often visited on minority groups.14

What seems to have been new to such immigrants, though, was the atrocity of lynching, in which hundreds if not thousands of citizens publicly hung, shot, burned, or otherwise tortured primarily black victims. Slavic emigration to America coincided with an upsurge of acts of mob law against blacks and such matters did not go unnoticed by immigrant newspapers. While historians have recently debated the precise nature of collective, extralegal violence, Slovak and Rusyn newspapers referred to such public mob killings as “lynčovania.” It is these extralegal killings of mostly black, and, less frequently, Mexican, Italian, and Jewish victims as reported in Slavic papers and identified as “lynchings” that will be considered in Chapter 2. Almost weekly, fatal acts of mob law were publicized via newspaper accounts of these rituals of white supremacy.15 That Slavic newspapers saw fit to reprint such accounts among news of the old country, church socials, and picnics may at first seem surprising. Why did this concern immigrants, or, at the very least, papers’ editors? What message did immigrant editors hope to convey to their foreign-language readers by continually placing these horrific stories on the front page? I will argue that these accounts of the depths of race hatred were salient narratives for liminal groups such as Slovaks—part of the “inbetween peoples,” as Barrett and Roediger aptly termed them—as they acculturated to the United States.16

By the first decade of the twentieth century Slovak and Rusyn newspapers such as Slovák v Amerike (Slovak in America), Jednota (Union), and Amerikansky russky viestnik (American Rusyn Messenger) had already published hundreds of accounts that were reported as lynchings. Others followed in later newspapers such as Národné noviny (National News) and New Yorkský denník (New York Daily). These accounts, together with frequent reports of urban race riots (“plemenný boj”), minstrel-show jokes, and slighting references to “savage,” “cannibal” Africans and Asiatics served as a tutorial for immigrants as to who were the most vulnerable citizens in their new homeland. Into the 1920s, papers continued to feature lynching accounts on an almost weekly basis. Many of these public mob murders occurred in places where few Slovak immigrants dwelled—although some notorious lynchings occurred in places with which Slovaks were quite familiar.

I will not argue that the Slovak American press alone accomplished the feat of making immigrants aware of their (potential) whiteness and their new country’s Herrenvolk attitudes toward African Americans. Vaudeville, silent movies, English-language newspapers, and the casual, street-level discourses of fellow workers
and foremen provided plenty of running commentary on race in America at the
turn of the century. Still, Slovak and Rusyn immigrants’ own newspapers offered
a wide array of articles and editorials regarding African Americans, as well as
colonialism and empire. These papers were avidly read by immigrants and cer-
tainly played a part in influencing readers’ worldviews on race as well as other
matters.

Nařodné noviny, the weekly paper of the National Slovak Society, by 1915 was
sent to approximately 29,000 members of this secular fraternal organization,
although wartime enthusiasm for Czecho-Slovak independence boosted NSS
membership above 50,000 by 1918. Although emphasizing its members’ Slovak
identity and looking out for their ethnic interests, particularly in advocating
independence from Austria-Hungary, the NSS required that its members eventu-
ally adopt American citizenship. Although the NSS was often critical of industrial
America, its frequent articles on black-white relations were short on criticism of
Jim Crow.

Amerikansky russky viestnik was the organ of the Byzantine Rite’s Sojedinětie,
the Greek Catholic Union. Although speaking for a religious fraternal society,
this newspaper was, in its coverage of social life in the United States, including
race relations, practically indistinguishable from Nařodné noviny. Amerikansky
russky viestnik at the end of World War I reached about 90,000 readers. Jednota,
weekly of the First Catholic Slovak Union (Jednota), claimed more than 40,000
readers in 1918. In spite of its name, Greek Catholic Union lodges were open to
Roman Catholic Slovaks, too, while Jednota also accepted members from the
Greek Rite. Moreover, immigrants frequently belonged to several lodges, secu-
lar as well as religious. In Philadelphia and Camden, for example, the same men
were officers of both the GCU and NSS. While at the national level there may
have been some animus or ideological differences between lodge leaders, on
the microlevel these differences seem to have been less salient, and the editori-
als and articles of many fraternals’ newspapers were often reaching the same
immigrants.

Readership figures may have to be multiplied beyond fraternal societies’
members, too. In Philadelphia, Svatopluk Slovak Hall subscribed to various news-
papers—secular, religious, and even explicitly socialist—for club members and
their guests. Within the same families various members belonged to the GCU,
Jednota, or NSS, as well as other fraternal societies, and swapped newspapers with
brothers, cousins, and uncles. The immigrant press thus gained a wide circula-
tion, and its presentation of the news went a long way toward shaping readers’
views, including on race.

Just as the penny press had once helped orient Irish readers, among others, to
the Caucasian race, Slovak papers provided a surprising amount of coverage of
racial issues. Articles on lynchings and race riots and America’s imperial adven-
tures at the turn of the century helped tutor newcomers in who belonged and
who did not in the “white man’s republic.”
Chapter 2 will demonstrate that Slovak lynching accounts often followed the lead of mainstream papers and foregrounded moral equivalencies between black criminality and white mob violence. While the assertion of vengeance might be macabre, such accounts provided a narrative that justified such extraordinary assertions of “the people’s justice” by the enormity of the black victim’s crime against white women or children. The articles often summoned the mob’s “authority” to act; mob actions were characterized not as disruption but rather restoration of the peace and social order. Collective public murders, no matter how horrific, for Slovaks as for other white Americans, fit into a framework of sometimes necessary communal grassroots justice when lenient courts failed to “avenge a poor white girl.”

To be sure, race was not an entirely unfamiliar concept to many Southeast European immigrants, but newcomers did have to learn what the Jim Crow hierarchies meant in their new homeland. The baggage that Slavs, like other newcomers, carried to Ellis Island also contained concepts of race, and some migrants were well traveled years before they ever laid eyes on America. Slovak tinkers, for example, traveled throughout Europe, North Africa, and Asia prior to the move to America, becoming familiar with non-Europeans. Notions of race among Slavs prior to arrival in America are treated in Chapter 3.

Just as news of “negrov lynčovanie” originally intruded on my field of vision, accounts of Italians invariably slighted as criminals involved in the “Black Hand” or Slovaks’ diatribes against Jewish Americans complicate the narrative of race. In the early twentieth century some accounts in Slavic newspapers depicted their fellow provisional white people from Italy or the East European shtetl as a menace in stereotypes similar to those expressed by nativist Americans. Still, over time, a qualitatively different treatment of other white ethnics and blacks and Asians developed. For all the venom at Sicilians occasionally employed by Slovak letter writers, no all-out assault on Italians or Jews akin to antiblack race riots occurred in Slavic neighborhoods, and anti-Italian diatribes, and even anti-Semitic writing, became less frequent in Slovak papers by the 1930s. This process of covering other European provisional white groups is considered in Chapter 4.

Articles considering European and American imperial projects in colonizing nonwhite parts of the globe established a binary between civilized and uncivilized places, and many of these items with Filipino, African, and Caribbean datelines were reprinted in Slovak newspapers, too. As with lynchings, the coverage of African and Australasian “cannibals”—either as straight news stories or just as jokes—were adapted from mainstream newspapers covering the rise of Euro-centered empires, and, as with lynchings, such phenomena were relatively new to Slavs and required a neologism. Slovak articles referred to cannibals as “ľudožrúti”—literally “people chewers,” and, as in mainstream journals, such characterizations relegated non-Europeans to the category of savages fit only for colonial subjugation. These colonial articles are the subject of Chapter 5.
At home, humor and blackface minstrelsy were frequently employed at immigrant parishes to portray “blacks” as figures of fun. In Chapter 6 the minstrel shows of Slavic parishes and clubs are explored. While scholars have recently argued that these shows were not necessarily racialized satires of black Americans, but often a sly subversion of the bourgeois social order, in immigrant parishes these productions must be considered in conjunction with the racial palimpsest simultaneously presented by immigrant papers’ coverage of lynchings, empire, and urban race riots. Indeed, in some of the very white ethnic neighborhoods in which minstrel shows were staged, white-on-black violence erupted when blacks attempted to move into white ethnic neighborhoods, or applied for jobs that were regarded as “belonging” to white men. Chapter 7 will explore the Slovak and Rusyn press’s coverage of race riots, arguing that such articles often characterized blacks and Asians as illegitimate intruders in ways that other white ethnics were rarely depicted.

By paying attention to those ephemeral lynching accounts, as well as other articles dealing with race, it becomes possible to read the immigrant newspapers as a cumulative narrative of legitimacy—a moral road map to the United States, in which readers are tutored as to which groups had a valid claim to the New World’s neighborhoods, job sites, voting booths, and the name of real Americans. Immigrant newspapers created a moral, imagined community for readers, a tale of who belonged and who didn’t belong in the United States.

A few important caveats must be added. These accounts were largely reprints from English-language news sources. Nevertheless, the selection of these items tells us something of what Slovak editors thought their readers needed to know about America. We can never know for certain how these articles were received by immigrants or how readers interpreted this material (and, of course, not all immigrants came to the same conclusions on their conception of black people or on anything else, for that matter.) Still, immigrant newspapers were in fierce competition with each other, and editors presented material they thought their readers desired or needed. The selection of these articles indicates Slavic journalists regarded such material as important for inclusion in their newspapers. While much of the material in papers such as New Yorkský denník consisted of rewrites of articles from English-language wire services or journals, there were articles dealing with race that originated within the immigrant community. Letters to the editor also appeared from Slovak and Rusyn readers, and some of these commented on African Americans, Asians, and other topics of a racial nature. Readers contributed jokes to New Yorkský denník that scathingly mocked African Americans. These items suggest acculturation to America by some immigrants that internalized some of the stereotypes featured in these newspapers.

Moreover, Slovak editors likewise affixed their own editorial comments to some articles regarding lynchings or race riots. And editorials written by Slovaks and Rusyns themselves occasionally took on the topic of race. This material provides a more direct glimpse into immigrants’ views of non-Europeans. And
Introduction

even the material gleaned from English-language sources was read and consumed by East European immigrants.

Outside of the socialist press, though, Slovaks for the most part offered little criticism of the racial status quo. My examination of Slovak newspapers from the 1890s to the 1920s reveals no letters calling for an end to lynching, or disputing the portrayal of blacks as deserving their horrific fate. It may be that no such letters were written, as immigrants may have felt that the plight of black lynching victims didn’t directly concern them. Alternatively, editors may have received letters but opted not to print them. That editors chose to run these salacious stories week after week, though, indicates race matters were very much part of immigrants’ weekly news cycle.

In Slovak immigrant newspapers, selective reprinting of articles reflected and shaped discourse that defined racial identity as black or white. Reading frequent accounts of public collective violence and the “savage” non-Europeans under imperial rule helped Slovak readers to “naturalize” the black-white divide. These publications aided in putting in place boundaries defining appropriate Slovak social identity as being in the latter group.

Radical immigrant papers were often better on race matters, condemning lynching and colonialism alike, and by the 1940s some Slovak newspapers faulted Jim Crow segregation at home, but during the heyday of Slavic migration to the United States editorial condemnation of antiblack measures was rare.

The articles cited in the following chapters were with rare exceptions written in Slovak and Rusyn (prior to the 1930s, only a few English-language articles were printed in most of these papers). The translations used are the author’s own. Slovak words that may be translated several ways are included in italicized parentheses. When English-language articles are cited, they are noted as such. When neologisms were used by Slovak journalists, these are noted. The biggest example of such a loan word from English is “lynčovat,” which had to be imported into the Slovak language to describe this American atrocity.

Let me stress again, my goal here is not any facile stigmatization of white ethnics as racist. Rather, I hope to consider the immigrant press from a new angle, one that introduces the consideration of race, and how it operated (in immigrant newspapers no less than in “mainstream” American institutions) to facilitate the acculturation of some people, and not others, into full U.S. citizenship in the early twentieth century. Race was all over the Slavic immigrant newspapers; it is time to reintroduce it, and to consider what these articles meant to immigrants’ interpretation of their new American home.
Chapter 2

“Let Each Reader Judge”: Lynching, Race, and Immigrant Newspapers

In June 1903, newspaper readers throughout the country learned of a particularly brutal outbreak of lynch law. “Negro Lynched—People’s awful justice condemns criminal,” proclaimed the headline of the torture of George White in Wilmington, Delaware. Subheads focused not on the actions of the mob, but rather that the “Negro robbed and murdered the daughter of Evangelical minister E. A. Bishop,” a crime for which he “was summarily burned alive.”

The writer began his story not with the violence of the mob that seized White from his jail cell, but rather with a lengthy description of the black man’s “awful crime.” “Horrible was that crime to which he alone confessed in the following words: ‘My boss Woodward sent me to the field and when I went there, I saw the pastor’s daughter. I sneaked up on her and grabbed her by the neck and demanded all her money.’ The girl gave him all she had, 60 cents. Then she begged God for mercy, that he wouldn’t hurt her. He made sure she couldn’t cry out, and choked her to suppress her screams, choked her until she lost consciousness.” The account neglected to mention this “confession” was delivered while White had a noose around his neck and was threatened with being burned alive. “He would not have been lynched if he had been a white man,” the reporter admitted. “It was said, though, that he was a beast in human form and in an instant he was handed over to the authority of the lynch mob.”

The article went on to detail the process by which more than 300 men broke into the jail and delivered White to mob justice, with “the terrible theater as the crowd of people emptied their revolvers into him.” After detailing White’s cries for mercy, the writer noted, “At the end of this horrible justice everyone made sure to cut off a piece of his body to take for themselves as a souvenir!” After the lynching, “The people partied in the morning and the peace of the grave reigned over the whole countryside. The people bloodily avenged the death of a poor girl!”

By 1903 such lynchings were a common occurrence not just in the South, but even in states with significant urban, industrial centers such as Delaware, Minnesota, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Nor was the macabre, detailed coverage of the torture and mutilation of George White atypical, for many newspaper articles
went into elaborate descriptions of the burning alive of human victims or their vivisection by souvenir hunters. Lynchings indeed served as “theaters” in which white supremacy was reasserted—in one well-publicized 1911 case in Livermore, Kentucky, literally staged as theater. The wide dissemination of such stories via newspapers broadened the white public’s policing of the nation’s racial boundaries beyond those who actually took part in and witnessed these lynchings. Moreover, as in the account of White’s lynching, the assumption of authority by whites to judge and execute sentence against offending blacks was often portrayed as a restoration, not a disruption of “the peace of the grave” that should reign over a white-dominated countryside. In its excruciating detail of White’s crime, his torture, and the tropes of white citizens acting to restore racialized justice, this account was quite prosaic.

As Leon Litwack, Grace Elizabeth Hale, and others have noted, more than five thousand such lynchings were recorded between 1890 and 1930, with many broadly publicized via newspapers and, later, radio accounts of these rituals of white supremacy. George White was not alone in his suffering or in the elaborate coverage given to his death.

What was seemingly unusual about this article is that the account was written in Slovak and informed an immigrant readership of the racial mores and atrocities of America. That a Slovak newspaper saw fit to reprint such an account in a paper that otherwise advertised old country news, church socials, and picnics, may at first seem surprising. Why did this concern immigrants, or the paper’s editors? What message did editors hope to convey to their foreign-language readers by placing this horrific tale on the front page as its lead story?

Yet the account of White’s brutal torture and execution at the hands of more than 300, as reported in Slovák v Amerike, was only one of hundreds that appeared in Slavic papers. By the first decade of the twentieth century Slovak and Rusyn newspapers, such as Slovák v Amerike, Jednota, and Amerikansky russky viestnik, had published hundreds of accounts of lynchings. By the 1910s the earlier newspapers were joined in this journalistic obsession with race by New Yorkský denník and Národné noviny, founded in 1913 and 1910, respectively. Into the 1920s all these papers continued to feature lynching accounts on an almost weekly basis. Many of these lynchings occurred in places where few immigrants settled—although some early twentieth-century lynchings occurred in places where Slovaks lived.

As in the article concerning White, Slovak lynching accounts often followed the lead of mainstream (white) papers and foregrounded moral equivalencies between black criminality and white mob violence. While the assertion of vengeance might be macabre, such accounts provided a narrative that justified such extraordinary assertions of “the people’s justice” by the enormity of the black victim’s crime against white women or children. The article on White was not atypical in summoning the mob’s “authority” to act; mob actions were characterized not as disruption but rather restoration of the peace and social order. Once White had been lynched, the peace of the countryside could supposedly
reign once more. Yohuru Williams notes that the evidence for White’s alleged “crime” was circumstantial at best, and that his lynching occurred in a state with a long-standing history of extralegal violence against blacks. When black ministers asserted White’s innocence and demanded an inquest into the lynching, white mobs indiscriminately attacked any blacks they found walking or riding through Wilmington. These details were omitted, however, from the Slovak account. Lynching was characterized as necessary when lenient courts failed to “avenge a poor white girl.”

Race was not an entirely unfamiliar concept to many South and East European immigrants, but newcomers did have to learn what the Jim Crow hierarchies meant in their new homelands. Indeed, almost from the moment they got off the boat, immigrants have been telling stories about their first bewildered encounters with the “Negro,” if one can believe what immigrant newspapers report. The first sighting of blacks by steerage passengers became a trope, representing newcomers’ fear and amazement at this frightening place, the United States. Newspapers did more than report existing facts, however. From humor pages to lynching reports, immigrant publications phrased community experiences in increasingly racial terms.

Immigrant papers provided extensive coverage of race. Graphic accounts about mutilations of lynching victims often appeared in the same issues containing minstrel-show jokes in “humor columns.” Reading frequent accounts of Lynchings, race riots, and the “savage” non-Europeans under imperial rule helped Slovak readers to “naturalize” the black-white divide characterizing reports about race in their ethnic newspapers.

Articles included in Slovak newspapers for humor and as accounts of lynching, race riots, colonialism, and other racial matters were, for the most part, reprints from English-language new sources, but immigrant editors had to select these stories for inclusion in their papers. Moreover, writers of letters to the editor often argued vociferously with papers’ stances on labor, politics, Slovak nationalism, and other topics. Such backlash is absent on the matter of Lynchings, race riots, and portrayals of blacks. Either no immigrant readers saw fit to write condemning Lynchings or editors neglected to publish letters. In either case, most stories of Lynchings were left to stand alone, with little editorial condemnation, as a commentary on the new country’s racialized landscape.

As Christopher Waldrep argues, “White Southerners, and the nation as a whole, created an intellectual environment that sometimes tolerated, and on occasion actively encouraged, mobbing. The creation of that tolerating environment took place in the imagination of men and women, in oral conversation, and on the pages of newspapers and magazines.” That newspaper-aided process occurred among immigrants, too. Selective reprinting of articles from other sources reflected and shaped discourse that defined racial identity as black or white. These publications aided in putting in place boundaries defining appropriate Slovak social identity as being in the latter group.
Hale has demonstrated that English-language papers were full of graphic reports of lynchings. Such accounts, she argues, served to create as well as publicize the caste system and shore up the solidarity of the Caucasian race. For immigrants sifting their way through a new land’s racialized shibboleths, racial community was even more directly formulated around an imagined whiteness fostered, in large measure, through cultural productions such as the immigrant press. Indeed, lynching was such a new phenomenon to Slavs a new English loan word had to be created. Although many stories described the work of lynch mobs using “zničit” (destroy), “zabít” (slaughter), “vraždit” (murder), or “strielať” (shoot), very quickly “lynčovať” was invented. (Curiously, “pogrom,” a concept with which East Europeans were familiar, was not used to refer to lynchings, even in the infamous case of the lynching of Leo Frank, a northern Jewish factory manager who in 1915 was pulled from a Marietta, Georgia, jail cell and lynched. “Pogrom” was only used to refer to news of anti-Jewish mob violence out of Russia, and Národné noviny’s one-paragraph account of Frank’s murder speaks of a “lynčovaný,” of which the paper noted, “Only a slight report on this lynching is expected”).

Slavs’ mass emigration to America coincided with an upsurge of violence against African Americans and such matters did not go unnoticed by immigrant newspapers. As early as 1896, Slovák v Amerike spoke of “Judge Lynch the Destroyer,” in a California case in which three men (two blacks and a Mexican) were hung from trees by a crowd of 250 people. As would become a frequent refrain in years to come, Slovak readers were informed that the sheriff and his deputies had been holding the men as prisoners, but were unable to restrain the crowd in its search for justice, and that members of the crowd “shot them through and through, and then lynched them.” In 1906 Slovák v Amerike reported that in Chattanooga “more than 4,000 whites had attacked the municipal jail for more than three hours” to get at two black men jailed for “violating” white women. As in the California case, “the heroic efforts of municipal police and members of the state police” proved ineffectual in repulsing the mob. In the coming years, such accounts were so frequent that a standard headline—“Judge Lynch”—was employed.

Often it was a supposed black crime, or resistance to white authority figures, that led to the lynching. On February 5, 1914, readers of Národné noviny learned of “People’s Justice.” “Black man Ben Dickerson was on the 29th of January in Oklahoma City shot dead by a crowd of citizens,” the paper matter of factly reported. “A few days before that Chaffin, the business manager of the Kellogg Corn Flake Company, had been robbed, and out of anger, over a matter of $4, the unfortunate man Dickerson was shot dead. The mob of citizens arrived at the jail, seized the Negro, and murdered him.” This, in full, is the text of a story that by 1914 was a regular feature in the Slovak press. One effect of such routine reports was perhaps to normalize the reign of terror against African Americans, even for those newcomers who were mostly living far from the scene of these
crimes. But whether Dickerson had actually robbed the white manager or merely had an argument with him over back wages, which Philip Dray and Waldrep argue was often the black “crime” that led to a lynching, immigrants were learning just what minimal rights were afforded blacks in their new country. In such instances blacks resisting third-class treatment by white authority figures were subject to evisceration by “a mob of citizens” that rejected courts as inadequate protectors of the racial status quo. The “people’s justice” was a folkway immigrants had to learn.\textsuperscript{13}

Not all reports were this cut and dry, but even more vivid depictions often offered little sense of outrage or shock on the part of the translators. In 1904 \textit{Amerikansky russky viestnik} reported, “In Cartersville, Georgia, a Negro was burned alive after a mob of 200 grabbed him from the hands of the sheriff.” He had been accused of committing violence against a white girl. The reporter added, “While he was burning alive in the evening, he was hit by more than 500 shots.”\textsuperscript{14} And \textit{Národné noviny} reported on a 1914 case unusual only in that this time it was a black woman who had been lynched. “The crowd summoned from the city murdered her and then hung her from a tree” after her “confession” to killing a 12-year-old girl. “The corpse hanging from the tree,” said the paper, “was used as a rifle target by the crowd. At the scene of the lynching were some thirty blacks, who were, however, prevented from interfering with the enraged people’s justice.”\textsuperscript{15} “The people,” with their enraged sense of justice, were set in opposition to helpless black onlookers.

Hundreds of formulaic lynching accounts appeared week after week in Slovak papers. By the time of this “black lady’s lynching” the naturalization of ritualized violence against blacks, as well as suspect immigrants, had been an ongoing feature in immigrant papers for 20 years.\textsuperscript{16} Accounts of lynchings followed a predictable format: a few brief paragraphs on Negro crimes, white outrage, and mob justice. The thousands of lynchings of black Americans that occurred between 1890 and 1930 were faithfully reported issue after issue in the major immigrant weeklies and dailies; often several lynching accounts appeared in the same edition.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1896, \textit{Amerikansky russky viestnik} reported, “Not far from New Orleans, there were two murders, the burning at the stake of Irishman Patrick Morris and his Negro wife. The enraged local citizens quickly judged him to have grossly exceeded the law and carried out the dreadful sentence on the terrified Morris.” Another account related the case of Charles Mallpast, a white man lynched with his black wife and mulatto children in Arkansas after he tried to defend his family from an enraged mob of citizens. While the headline referred to Mallpast as “an innocent old man,” as in the case of Morris the article noted a crowd of “citizens” had “competently and speedily” shot and strung him up to a tree; no further condemnation of the Arkansas citizens was added. The moral transmitted by such reports may have consisted in learning the social component of whiteness, of behaving in a manner that placed one on the correct end of the racial divide.\textsuperscript{18}
As in many English-language lynching accounts, the report of Mallpast’s lynching in *Slovak v Amerike* stressed the calm and deliberate fashion with which the disciplined white people set about their business. Depictions of lynchers as “citizens” who “competently” and “speedily” or “determinedly” engaged in restoring racialized justice, and then retired peacefully, abound in Slovak newspapers’ lynching accounts. Amy Louise Wood has noted that the early twentieth-century reports of lynchings highlighted the discipline of white lynchers who supposedly behaved in an orderly fashion, even as they burned a man alive. Depictions of white self-control were balanced against assertions of innate black brutality, irrationality, and licentiousness. Unlike wild and animalistic nonwhites, even lynchers were said to be orderly and self-possessed; as Wood notes, a “good” lynching was one allegedly free of irrationality or unneeded exuberance. Lynch leaders from Dewitt, Arkansas, near the immigrant colony of Slovaktown, could even assert to a reporter in 1916 that their lynching of a black man had been “humane.” (These same accounts, speaking of white self-control, determined and orderly action, nevertheless often detailed the torture and dismemberment of the victim by souvenir seekers. Evidently this activity did not disrupt the binary between civilized whites and savage blacks in newspaper readers’, or reporters’, eyes.)

Moreover, Mallpast’s defense of his family, and murder by the mob, indicates that the real crime here was a consensual crossing of the color line—that it wasn’t black criminal sexuality, but the fact that at least some people would voluntarily ignore Jim Crow when choosing a marriage partner, which had to be suppressed violently. Neither Slovak editors nor their readers commented on this, nor did they object to such handling of the miscegenation “problem.”

Most such lynching accounts didn’t even go into as much detail as the articles on Morris and Mallpast, noting with little skepticism a lynching had followed some horrible black crime. In 1913, *Národné noviny* decided the important fact in the double lynching in Mississippi of two black brothers was not their hanging and shotgun execution, but the alleged murderous rampage by the teens that left “Eight People Dead.” After drinking alcohol, “The two youths, it was reported, were walking along the street with loaded revolvers, when they began firing on the people.” A troop train was dispatched from Natchez to try to restore order, but before it could arrive, the citizens of Mississippi had taken matters into their own hands.

The likelihood of two black brothers actually going on a shooting rampage in 1913 Mississippi is slim. Rumors and white phobias/outrages at insolent or even undeferential blacks probably fueled the lynch mob, rather than any actual violence by blacks. In any case, newcomers were learning something of the racialized sense of justice in America. Ritual evisceration of offending black bodies into souvenir pieces, with the commemoration of such occasions via souvenir postcards, was, as Litwack put it, a “response to growing doubts that this new generation (of blacks) could be trusted to stay in its place without legal and extra-legal force.” East Europeans, too, were regarded by many “old stock”
Americans as usurpers of the prerogatives of real white people. Reading of the 500 rifle shots fired into the “Cartersville Negro,” liminal immigrants likely felt simultaneous horror at the crime, contempt for the victims, and sober awareness of their own tenuous place in America’s racialized justice system.22

Stories invariably characterized black self-defense itself as illegitimate, as did accounts of “plemenný boj”—race wars—that broke out in the North and South when blacks objected to subjugation. Even cases in which white gangs terrorized black communities were so characterized, with any black attempts to organize resistance to lynch mobs portrayed in tropes of black violence. In 1903 a “plemenný boj” broke out in Lake Village, Arkansas, with an “enraged battle between blacks and whites,” headlines and subheads informed Slovak readers. The “war,” however, was the enraged reaction of a white mob when a black victim-to-be pulled a revolver and attempted to defend himself. It is this very act of self-defense on the part of blacks that often proved most provocative, in that such black men rejected the imposed role of perpetual victim and sought to behave like free people with full rights, including gun ownership and self-defense. None of this made it into the Slovak account, however, which noted that the offending black was quickly lynched. Likewise, in a case from Aurora, Missouri, “Race war is feared” after a Negro who had fatally wounded a white worker was lynched. Whether “Negro Frank Smith” had fatally wounded the “white worker” in self-defense was immaterial or perhaps further cause for white outrage, and immigrant readers learned that “the whole community dragged him to a tree and decreed his fate. After three days the body of the Negro was taken down. . . .” The “race war” that the headline writer “feared” may have been a result of blacks objecting to Smith’s hanging in Aurora for three days. As in later accounts of Northern cities in which “plemenný boj” broke out, the “race war” often turned out to be blacks resisting the terrorist violence of whites.23

Two items on page four of the March 29, 1904 edition of Slovák v Amerike told of a “race war” in the area of Dewitt and Saint Charles, Arkansas. “Thirteen Negroes have been lynched in a week” in Saint Charles, one story recounted, while the other told of “war with the Negroes.” “During the war between the Negroes and whites in Saint Charles three whites have been shot to death,” the second article noted. “A squad (oddiel) led by the deputy sheriff surveyed the countryside and visited the homes of the blacks, who were a danger to the embattled whites afraid to walk in Saint Charles. When the sheriff went to a small forest, he surprised the cabal of blacks and immediately they started shooting at him. Whites responded by also shooting and in the town three Negroes were shot dead. The whole region subsequently saw a large agitation (outbreak) and there is expected to be further unrest.” That the black deaths came from lynchings and the white ones when some blacks organized to resist this fate is unremarked upon in these dispatches.24

These accounts may have been of more than passing interest to some readers, for as early as 1894 Slovaks were living in the South, in an agricultural colony in
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the vicinity of Dewitt. Slovaktown was the brainchild (or swindle, depending on one’s outlook) of P. V. Rovnianek, president of the National Slovak Society. In 1894 Rovnianek established the “Slovak Colonization Society,” an organization ostensibly aimed at improving the lot of the thousands of destitute Slovaks thrown out of work during the Panic of 1893. Historian M. Mark Stolarik relates that Rovnianek and his partners

claimed to have bought 50,000 acres of fertile land when in reality they had purchased only a few hundred acres and an option on a few thousand more. They then sold the non-existent acreage to credulous countrymen. . . . When the victims arrived in Arkansas and found much of the “good” land to be little better than a wilderness, they demanded their money back but received only about 5 percent of their average $600 investment. . . . The community of “Slovaktown” which remained at the Arkansas site consisted of only about 200 families.25

Slovaktown was alternately praised as a utopia and denounced as a “swindle” in the pages of the Slovak press. A writer to Slovák v Amerike in 1895 decried the falsehood that sent folks down to Arkansas, where they were starving. The writer, C. L. Orbach, a Lutheran minister who was a foe of Rovnianek’s, said that the NSS president couldn’t possibly know the true situation in Arkansas, as he and his partners were comfortably ensconced in Pennsylvania. A letter signed simply “Worker” said the only thing plentiful in the Arkansas colony were “the dusty sheep,” before denouncing “the swindlers.” “Only the dusty sheep have remained in Slovaktown,” he repeated, “while all the residents are victims of sharp double dealing.” A report “From Blissful Arkansas!” on February 20, 1896, was countered the following August by a letter from Racine, Wisconsin, detailing the woes of buying a nonexistent piece of Arkansas land.26 The colony persisted, however, with a Slovak Catholic church that is still celebrating Mass and an NSS lodge enduring until at least 1969.27

Around the same time that Slovaktown was being boosted, a group of Slovaks from Nitra established a colony in western Georgia near Tallapoosa. In April 1895 a Georgia Slovak wrote, “The community currently consists of more than 50 families. In Nitra 15 buildings have been erected, and three are currently going up. . . . The land is the most beautiful, with beautiful trees. We have a church community, with Rev. Janušek, to the delight of our farmers.” In September 1894 readers of Slovák v Amerike learned of “the successful christening of the Slovak vineyard community, founded by the members of the Slovak King Svatopluk society—Nitrans. . . . They have built homes and vineyards to emulate a Slovak community. . . . May God grant that Nitra in America may bloom!”28 The community did put down some roots, for as early as 1908, nearby Buchanan, Georgia, supported a Catholic jednota lodge.29 Some enterprising Slovak and Rusyn businessmen later established farming communities in the Petersburg,
Virginia, area. “New colony,” Nikolaj Zajacz wrote in a letter to Amerikansky russky viestnik in February 1919, describing the “new colony” he and other Rusyn farmers were building. “It’s the best security and freedom to have an American farmstead,” he continued. Zajacz again wrote the paper two months later, boosting the “Ruthenian farmers’ colony” in Claremont. It is unclear how Slavic immigrants were received in the South during an era of intense anti-immigrant, Nordic xenophobia. Italians and Sicilians had, as we’ll see, already been lynched in New Orleans and rural Louisiana when they had been judged to have transgressed communal boundaries of acceptable behavior. Whether Georgians or Arkansans welcomed Slovak and Rusyn newcomers to the white community, or Slovaktown farmers were interested in being so received, there are no letters in Slovák v Amerike denouncing the terrorist assaults by whites on Saint Charles’s blacks, from Slovaktown or elsewhere. Coverage of “race wars” between blacks and whites in a place where at least some kinsmen lived may have caused immigrants to think about with which group they should ally.

Some accounts of “race wars” were presented as lurid scenarios that might have given even George Romero nightmares. “Black beasts,” a headline in April 1912 in Slovák v Amerike screamed. The report breathlessly informed readers that Clementine Barnabet, a 22-year-old “half-blooded black” admitted that he had by his own hand killed 17 people. He confessed to being a member of a “Voodoo” sect that had recently expanded throughout all of Louisiana. Police say that in their opinion 37 people have been sacrificial victims of that cult. . . . The members of this sect are all blacks of the lowest sort, almost half-savage.

A Slovak reading this article among the other quotidian accounts of floods, robberies, strikes and wars may have learned to naturalize the trope of “black beasts.” As Rebecca Hill has noted, a long history exists in America of characterizing black self-defense as illegitimate and senseless violence, in opposition to “manly,” legitimate white exercise of Second Amendment rights. Even white bandits such as Jesse James became rugged individualist folk heroes, while gun-wielding blacks, for Slovaks, became “loathsome bandits.” Such dichotomies went back to the years just before the Civil War, with the differential characterization of John Brown and black abolitionists as madmen or liberators, depending if one were a defender or opponent of slavery. In the Jim Crow and lynch-law era of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America, too, the immigrant press fostered a narrative that saw black self-defense against white mobs as aberrant.

In this era, every moment of rising black expectations for full civil equality was met by an upsurge in white attacks on “insolent” blacks. Such attacks were faithfully reported in Slavic immigrant papers, but, as in the mainstream (white) press, the events were framed as allegedly lawless and violent blacks in need of the firm hand of “civilized” white “citizens.” White mobs even assaulted blacks serving in the armed forces, for in the eyes of white Southerners, the stationing
of black soldiers—some of whom had participated in America’s wars in Cuba and the Philippines—in the segregated South sent a dangerous message of the possibility of civil equality to civilian blacks. The most widely publicized such incident was a 1906 “riot” in Brownsville, Texas, when black soldiers were attacked by a white mob, but, rather than accepting their fate, fought back, shooting whites. “The citizens of Brownsville are violently agitating against the stationing of black soldiers in their city,” Slovák v Amerike reported. “Armed citizens are defending the city day and night and demanding that the black soldiers leave. . . . All of Texas is agitated over the shooting of two whites by soldiers.” President Theodore Roosevelt refused to intervene when the soldiers of the Twenty-fifth Regiment, some veterans of the Spanish-American War, were court-martialed, and subsequently senators proposed bills permitting white communities to veto the stationing of black soldiers in their midst. Jednota, too, reported that in the aftermath of Brownsville, Secretary of War William Howard Taft was rethinking the stationing of black soldiers in the Philippines, where they evidently developed ideas that they were American citizens. Further alleged violent attacks by black soldiers against their white officers were reported from El Reno, Oklahoma.36

In the aftermath of World War I, black hopes that the “New Negro” would be afforded equal rights by a nation that had just fought to “make the world safe for democracy” were again quickly and violently crushed. Another suppression of allegedly dangerous black troops stationed in Texas occurred, after they objected to the fine points of Jim Crow. Sharecroppers organizing for economic advancement in Arkansas were not portrayed as engaged in efforts at collective self-help, but rather alarmingly regarded as plotting a murderous race war against whites. (Sigmund Freud’s notion of transference is useful here.) New Yorkský denník reported from Elaine on a “race war in Arkansas,” where “this evening a race rebellion was renewed.” Three days later readers of that paper learned that “a band of blacks in southern Phillips County is waging war against whites, who[m] they want to murder.” Whenever blacks fought back, it was characterized as a “race war.” Black self-defense or attempts at economic advancement, it is suggested in these Slovak rewrites from American wire services, are prima facie illegitimate and regarded as violent, and thus a justification for white self-defense.38

As Amy Louise Wood has noted, and Ray Stannard Baker reported as early as 1908, often whites were convinced even after they had lynched blacks they had only scratched the surface of a wide-ranging, secretive black army bent on slaughtering all whites. Thus after a mob burned alive Will. Cato and Paul Reed in Statesboro, fears of a murderous black “Before Day Club” still permeated the Georgia countryside. Similar fears caused whites to drive all blacks out of Phillips County in the lynchings’ aftermath. Again, in the 1919 incidents the farmers of nearby Slovaktown were silent on papers’ characterization of black organization as a war against all whites. By 1919 the items of the violent suppression in Elaine and Phillips County fit into a long-established narrative of savage blacks engaged in a “plemenný boj.”39
Perhaps even more sobering than these graphic longer pieces, though, is that many lynching accounts in Slovak papers were only a paragraph long and even omitted the name of the victim. The ritual evisceration of a black person’s body had become so prosaic, that even for immigrant readers the specific details of a victim’s identity or the alleged crime were regarded as unworthy of being recorded. Hale has argued that lynching participants had as their aim the erasure of black identity as moral or political agents. In this respect, editors who omitted a victim’s identity achieved what lynch mobs had set out to do—the negation of black personhood (see Figures 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3.)

In 1919, a single sentence sufficed to tell the story of a lynching in Mineral Wells, Mississippi. “A Negro was lynched because he accosted a woman.” Again, the victim’s name is unimportant to the trope of black criminality and enraged people’s justice, and his “crime” is given as fact. Moreover, this brief item on the quotidian mob murder of an offending black man appeared directly beneath a Slovak-language editorial extolling the American holiday “Decoration Day.” Likewise, on July 4, 1922, in an issue otherwise devoted to coverage of celebrations of America’s Independence Day, New Yorkský denník reported the lynching of two “Negroes” in Georgia. June Granatir Alexander has correctly noted that Slovak newspapers were important facilitators of a developing dual “ethnic pride and American patriotism.” But what is regrettable is the rapidity with which she dismisses the salience of race in these immigrants’ construction of their patriotic American identities, and her avoidance of any consideration of race’s voluminous coverage in the Slavic press. Stories teaching immigrants the joys of baseball, too, appeared on the same page as a report from Hattiesburg, Mississippi, that “A black in jail was lynched.” The visceral shock of this normalized quotidian flow of the news cycle—stories of Ty Cobb, Hugh Jennings, and the Detroit Tigers, as well as reports of Slovak league teams in Bridgeport, Connecticut, and elsewhere, appearing alongside routinized lynching accounts—is the kind of naturalization of the justness of lynching via the press that Walter White would later denounce. And, in the midst of World War I, a brief report of the lynching of Ben Harper in Courtney, Texas, ran in New Yorkský denník just above another item, reporting on a meeting of the American Defense Society, which held an America First night, sponsored by the Foreign National Citizens at New York’s Cooper Union. There Czech and Slovak representatives, among others, made patriotic speeches; citizenship evidently extended only so far during the War to Make the World Safe for Democracy. Appreciation of the new world’s holidays and institutions developed in tandem, not apart, from the creation of a racialized identity.

Of those accounts that did go into greater detail, most noted, with little skepticism, the lynching invariably followed a conviction of the black victim for some horrible crime (rape, robbery, or murder) that justified the atrocity that followed. This was the case on February 15, 1906, when Amerikansky russky viestnik reported that a “Lynčovanie Nigra” had occurred in Gadsden, Alabama, after a
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Figure 2-1: “Black in Mississippi is lynched.” This single-sentence-long lynching story from Mineral Wells, Mississippi, fails to give the victim’s name. New Yorkský denník, May 30, 1919, 1.

Negro named Richardson was only given life for the murder of a white woman during a train robbery.12

In this instance, as in many others, immigrant readers learned that it was the supposed leniency of the courts that led to the actions of the lynch mob. A lynching
account out of Belair, Maryland, began by noting Lewis Harris’s arrest for “violating” a white woman.43 When 4,000 whites broke into Chattanooga’s jail and seized two black suspects and lynched them, Slovák v Amerike’s readers were informed that, “The authorities at this place have declined to condemn several Negroes to death, so that the unrest has broken out again, with hostility against imprisoned Negroes being particularly extreme.”44 As Wood and Hill argue, lynching accounts in English-language papers likewise often condoned a higher people’s justice that stepped in when courts proved too permissive or ineffective to rein in black crime; immigrant newspapers disseminated this message to newcomers as well.45

Slovaks toiling in coal fields or steel towns may not have faced lynch mobs, but they were familiar with the violence of the New World. In 1912 Národné noviny dismissed “[t]hat American freedom” by charging “the offenses of the capitalists are more excessive in their barbarism than those of the Persian tyrants in darkest
Figure 2-3: "Lynching of a black." This one-paragraph story of the lynching of 20-year-old Henry Mouson from a telegraph pole not far from the courthouse in Cooper, Texas, appears right above an invitation to a Slovak celebration in Passaic, New Jersey. Lynching accounts became merely another part of the daily news cycle in immigrant newspapers. *Slovák v Amerike*, January 21, 1913, 2.
Asia,” citing West Virginia’s coal country as a particularly benighted realm. This editorial indicates race-thinking among Národné noviny’s editors had already proceeded to the point where insidious assumptions of Asiatic despotism had become part of their cognitive atlases. But the slur word “capitalists”—more despotic, another editorial claimed, “than anything since the time of Nero”—suggests it wasn’t Negrov lynčovanie that caused Slovaks to recoil at American brutality, but rather scabs or hireling state police (“the Cossacks,” as depicted in Slovák v Amerike during a 1906 coal strike and the socialist paper Rovnost ľudu during the 1920s.)

Indeed, massacres of striking “Hunky” miners had been known to occur, as at Lattimer in 1897, when striking Slavs who had dared rise up and defy the wishes and economic interests of “real white folks” were laid low by machine-gun fire.

Even in Národné noviny, organ of the National Slovak Society, which required members to become U.S. citizens, there appeared approving reports of Slovak celebrations on the First of May at which “the workers of Ohio declared they were waging war against capitalist exploitation” before singing “La Marsellaise.”

Into the 1930s Národné noviny’s editors were not averse to criticizing those features of the land of freedom they found particularly brutal or unjust. Readers were well versed in distinguishing between American ideal and real.

On race, however, received wisdom from mainstream America was less often contested. And Slovak readers frequently provided letters to the editor that quickly reflected their own racialized sensibilities, even when railing at the brutality of the Cossacks. A letter writer from the steel town of Munhall, Pennsylvania, argued in 1918 in Jednota that “Lincoln freed the slaves, but the Slovaks in their slavery have it worse!” Similarly, by 1915, some complaining of oppression in Europe compared Slovak “slavery” to the supposed ease with which pampered blacks in America lived. “Indeed if you really look at it, we have it worse than the Negroes,” Andrej Bugoš of Los Angeles wrote to Národné noviny. “Indeed these days in California Negroes are enslaved to luxury, and you see what ‘tents’ they have!” Stereotypes of sybaritic blacks seem to have already been gestating. And when a letter writer to New Yorkský denník denounced a hated McKeesport, Pennsylvania, priest, he could think of no greater slur than that Father Liščinsky “is defending the blacks, who treacherously worked against the Slovak people,” presumably as strikebreakers.

Still, immigrants’ fashioning of a self-conception as part of the “Caucasian race” was something of a collaboration between native-born actors and ethnic elite. Dispatches reprinted in Amerikansky russky viestnik, Národné noviny, Jednota, and other Slovak newspapers were almost always rewrites from English-language wire services. As Gunther Barth has demonstrated, the metropolitan press of the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was instrumental in homogenizing and modernizing a polyglot and diverse urban population, instructing citizens of mass society on the proper behavior necessary for negotiating in an increasingly anonymous, complex society. Slovaks might know something about mine strikes
or the oppression of the Habsburgs, but had a lot to learn about New World race relations. Immigrant papers often ran rewrites of the mass press’s homogenizing, “received wisdom,” and thus played their part, too, in instructing their readers in how to behave as responsible Americans.51

Benedict Anderson has noted, too, that the press created the illusion of a common national identity among members of a newspaper-reading public that may never have met one another but nevertheless began to conceive of themselves as sharing bonds of nationhood or ethnicity. Although Anderson concentrated on this process among colonial elites in East Asia, as well as an interesting discussion of Magyars chafing at their perceived subservient position within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, something of the same “imagined community” formation was occurring within the United States.52

Among Slovak immigrants, creating an imagined community was first a matter of conceptualizing a common Slovak nationhood, and second fitting that identity within a “Caucasian” polity. Národné noviny and other Slovak papers melded together a national identity for immigrants who may have had at best only a regional conception of themselves as residents of Zemplín or Trenčín province, not as Slovaks, when they first emigrated. When Juraj Kracha first emigrates to America in Thomas Bell’s autobiographical novel, Out of this Furnace, the first “outsider” he makes fun of is not a Čierńy but an immigrant from Zemplín, who Kracha thinks is pronouncing his own language incorrectly.53 Likewise, early immigrants established separate Roman Catholic parishes based on region of origin, not Slovak identity per se. In Philadelphia “they didn’t really regard themselves as the same people,” an immigrant informant recalled, so a separate parish was established in 1907 for immigrants from Trenčín “who didn’t want to sit with these easterners here,” who had a second, Zemplín-based parish. Similar patterns developed in Pittsburgh.54 Some of these regional frictions may have eroded in the face of generic discrimination against Hunkies, but M. Mark Stolarik notes, too, newspapers’ use of central Slovak dialect broke down some of the regional frictions.55

But such identity formation didn’t occur in a void, rather in a society in which blackness remained the mark of the outsider. By reading reprinted lurid accounts of the ritualized evisceration of the ultimate American outcasts, East European immigrants could potentially join in the American construct of whiteness.

Slovak immigrants fashioned identities out of an admixture of “assignment” and self-proclaimed identity, a process they had known even in Austria-Hungary, where “racial” differences certainly were known. Caricatures disseminated in fin de siècle Austria mocked Czech, Moravian, and Slovak day laborers in Vienna, indicating Slavs were often on the receiving end of racial slights.56 But Slovaks, too, made fun of those who didn’t make the grade. Initially, Kracha mocks these foreigners, immigrants from Zemplín, for not speaking their language correctly. After 15 years in America, he and his friends in Braddock still use “Čierńa” not to refer to African Americans but to dark “Gypsy-like” characters. His mistress,
Čiarna Zuska (Black Susan), earns the condemnation of Braddock for her free and easy ways, but there is also a racialized condemnation of her Gypsy looks. Fast forward 40 years, and the Slovaks now use “nigger” to denounce blacks they charge with ruining their neighborhood.57

What had changed in the intervening decades were Slovak readings in black and white. New distinctions, which became most salient in the context of Braddock, were picked up through items in the Slovak press. Should Kracha or any other Slovak have opened Jednota on October 15, 1902, he would have read yet again on page one of a “Lynčovala nigrov”: “In the town of Newbern, Tenn., it is reported that a mob of nearly 500 people hung two Negroes from a telephone pole... The marauding rabble arrived at the jail and seized the struggling Negroes, pronouncing justice at once that very day, condemning them, tearing the Negroes from jail and lynching them.” This paragraph-long account is thus far typical of the rewrites found in the Slovak press. In this instance, however, the editors tacked on a concluding sentence: “We are incapable of doing justice to these rabble judgments by the most unadorned Americans.” The condemnation is unusual, for most stories of lynchings, no matter how graphic the detail provided on the victims’ torture, omit even such a cursory editorial remark, and often instead link mob actions to the achievement, not miscarriage, of justice. (Here as well, the lynch mob achieves justice, even if the word is repeated as an expression of the reporter’s inability to capture that “justice’s” brutality.) These few atypical, isolated words of condemnation likely didn’t leave as lasting an impression on immigrants as the steady repetition of stories of black criminality and victimization. After reading hundreds of lynching accounts, year after year, differences between Zemplín and Trenčín became less important than the line between black and white.58

Often even the most implausible portrayals of black licentiousness were presented as just-so stories, and passed with little or no comment or dissenting view from editor or reader on the brutality or injustice of lynching. Slovák v Amerike in 1895 reported as a simple matter of fact, “80-year-old William Henderson was lynched by upstanding citizens of Jackson, Mo., after he had been caught dallying with 14-year-old Minnie Rust, the daughter of a respectable white family.” The paragraph account concluded, “It is likely that the lynching will go unpunished.” As another lynching account, out of Hopkinsville, Kentucky, noted, “The enraged people are many.”59

As in the English-language press, so, too, Slovak immigrant papers accepted as a given the fact of black criminality, and many lynching accounts foregrounded the crimes for which the victim suffered, often almost giving more details on the victim’s misdeeds than the tortures inflicted on him by the white mob. Just as the story of George White’s slow and torturous roasting alive in Wilmington began with a long account of his horrible crimes—thereby perhaps negating any revulsion at the account of the macabre execution that followed, or at least estab-
lishing an equivalency between black crime and white reaction—the Jackson account juxtaposed “upstanding citizens” with black sexual predations.

It’s not surprising then that by the 1910s papers such as New Yorkský denník and Slovák v Amerike also frequently ran short crime stories giving prominent play to black burglars and stickup men. Indeed, as early as 1901, Slovák v Amerike warned readers “Watch out for this gang,” and wrote of a “loathsome, murderous band of Negroes in the coal region.” The article alarmingly spoke of a gang of black robbers that had allegedly been terrorizing the coal fields around Connellsville, Pennsylvania, an area where many Slovak immigrants lived and worked. “A large indignant body of citizens” captured the murderous robbers, and the article concluded that the angry citizens expected that the blacks would be lynched. New Yorkský denník in August 1921 likewise reported in a single paragraph that an unnamed black man had been lynched in Hot Springs, Arkansas, after robbing a small store. (This news appeared in a single paragraph that lumped two separate lynchings—the other occurred in Macon, Georgia—into one filler item.) One Jednota story even implausibly portrayed a black crime wave that in 1909 had Pittsburgh authorities helpless. As in lynching accounts, lurid accounts of “loathsome” (ohavný) black criminals established a binary for newcomers of who was acceptable and who permanently alien to the national community.60

The frequency of lynching accounts and other articles foregrounding race suggests the status of blacks and other racial outsiders was a matter of morbid curiosity to new immigrants. Coverage of race was fraught with conflicting layers of condescension, belittlement, and repugnance at the brutality delivered to transgressors against white supremacy. As in English-language newspapers, the immigrant press sometimes documented lynchings in excruciating, macabre detail, and there is evidence that initially newcomers were horrified by these lynchings. The report from Wilmington noted, “At the end of this horrible process everyone made sure to cut off a piece of his body to take for themselves as a souvenir!”61 A similar account in 1901 from Balltown, Louisiana, noted that before dousing a hanging victim with gasoline, “All the pieces of his body were cut off and distributed to the crowd. Before they were done he cried and begged for mercy.”62

Gruesome headlines were sometimes matched by lurid copy and editorial comments that hint initially some Slovaks reacted with revulsion to lynchings. “Determinedly use knife to rip out his tongue and tear off his skin and hide,” a subhead to a West Virginia lynching story announced. “In Bluefield, it is reported that there was a bestial lynching of a black,” the story began. “Near Devon in Mingo County this disgraceful deed was staged.” While he was being hanged from a tree by chains, the victim didn’t cry out, but the report then went into gorier detail:

In a second moment, though, there began a penetrating roaring and with the authorities’ whole hearted support, they cut into pieces the body of the living Negro, cut him into pieces and distributed the various pieces to the participants in the cruel lynching. With a glance on the girl, the unfortunate Negro’s
sinful soul departed his body. The enraged people then cut his tortured body and took out his heart. It wasn’t enough for them yet, they had to have a souvenir! Then they poured gasoline on the deceased and set him on fire. Such terrible, vengeful methods are beyond even committed criminals! Whether or not the people’s feelings of outrage were assuaged, let each reader judge.63

Still, the victim’s humanity is denied him in several ways. In the entire lengthy story the victim is never named—he is subject of the mob’s action, an anonymous burning, tortured body for the Slovak readers. In this lengthy item of the West Virginia lynching, every detail of the case is provided: the victim’s alleged crime, the enraged citizenry’s determination to restore justice after a lax judicial system is found wanting, the elaborate torture that ends in the victim’s graphic dismemberment at the hands of souvenir hunters, his burning alive. The one detail that is omitted is the victim’s name.

And while “the people’s feeling of outrage” takes a form that seemingly spurred Slovák v Amerike’s appalled editor to affix at least some atypical critique of mob justice, the story begins by foregrounding his alleged crime (not alleged in the story, by the way, rather taken for granted). The black criminal’s deviance leads the report, which only several paragraphs in details the lynch mob’s actions. The black rapist was said to have chained his white female victim to a tree, thereby setting up a moral equivalency between the black man’s crime and the later, overawing decree of bloody justice by the lynch mob. While he suffers, his soul is presented as unequivocally sinful.

“Shaming the Cannibals”

Another story related a 1911 Kentucky lynching in which the white ringleaders erected a stage and charged three dollars admission to those townspeople wanting to shoot at the torture victim. In this case, the story condemned the barbarity, saying “an opera was performed that was brutally plotted and would have shamed even the strangest of cannibals.” The story noted,

The “committee” immediately announced that those who had bought a ticket would have the right to shoot at the Negro. The opera in a short time came true as a crowd of citizens of that town avidly witnessed and guffawed at the murder of the anguished Negro. When a bell was rung, the curtain was raised. Boys and women then rose up, and began shooting with fury at the tied-up Negro. . . . No one in the town in any way prevented this performance.64

The savagery of American assaults on blacks was likely not lost on Slovaks, and in these few cases editors affixed some condemnation of the brutalities these longer stories related.
Yet for every such elaborate torture account, there were dozens of one-sentence or one-paragraph items merely stating a lynching had occurred. Many only noted “a Negro” had been eviscerated, not even bothering to provide a name or other detail. If the intention of lynch mobs, as Hale argues, was to destroy the very personhood of victims, the brevity of such lynching fillers suggests how little such victims’ plight registered with readers.65

As Walter White of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People argued in Rope and Faggot (1929), the repetitive lynching accounts that ran week after week alongside other prosaic news largely served to numb white Americans to the practice, with even the most lurid accounts merely another feature of the “if it bleeds it leads” sensationalist press and a “naturalized” part of America’s landscape. White argued, “An uncomfortably large percentage of American citizens can read in their newspapers of the slow roasting alive of a human being in Mississippi and turn, promptly and with little thought, to the comic strip or sporting page. Thus has lynching become an almost integral part of our national folkways.”66 These lynchings, Hale argues, were fashioned by middle-class Southern whites alarmed by both the intrusion of market forces to their region and the presence of a small but persistent black professional class during the 1890s. Lynchings, she writes, “eased white fears of a raceless consumer society even as they helped structure segregation, the policy that would regulate this new southern world.”67

But it wasn’t only unambiguously white “old stock” Southerners who consumed these vivid accounts, or felt their whiteness reconfirmed by the victimization of outcast others. Through their readings in Negrov lycôvání, even working-class immigrants (who might have raised Southern horror of a “raceless society” almost as much as visions of “Negro misrule”) vicariously participated in these national folkways, too. It is no special condemnation of Slovaks to say in this regard they were typical of other white Americans. Slovaks learned of the permanent pariah status of blacks as they adjusted to their new homes in many ways, not least through the lynching stories that dotted nearly every Slovak newspaper.

As David Roediger stresses, a level of analysis positing working-class struggle as occurring merely between capitalists and exploited workers fails to address the central question of why the white working class settled for being white. The “wages of whiteness” could be redeemed by Slavic newcomers reconfirming (or perhaps discovering for the very first time) their whiteness in large measure through their readings of these newspaper rewrites. Slavs knew of the dangerous conditions they faced in industrial America. But as Roediger reminds us, no less a social critic than W. E. B. Du Bois recognized white men low on the totem pole were compensated for their low-wage, miserable work at least in part by a “public and psychological wage.”68 Dominic Pacyga likewise argues that for new immigrants, part of Americanization was to develop a white frame of reference. Slovak papers’ voluminous coverage of lynchings and anti-black riots provided a running commentary on the degree to which blacks were a vulnerable people apart.69
Most accounts were brief and offered no outcry over mob actions, as when Slovák v Amerike reported in 1894 that a black man in Atchison, Kansas, was "hung from a tree, in a word, suffered at the hands of judge lynch," after he was said to have raped a white woman. After around 1910 editorial comments on the horrors of lynching became rarer, and more typical is a similarly brief notice in 1924 of a triple lynching in Illinois, printed in Amerikansky russky viestnik. The article is devoid of all but the barest facts.

Only when Robert Prager, a white man, was lynched for expressing pro-German sentiments in the middle of World War I, did a lengthy editorial appear, unequivocally denouncing lynching. Prager was lynched in Collinsville, Illinois, at the height of anti-German hysteria. And while Slovak newspapers, as we'll see, had many unflattering things to say about the alleged atrocities of Magyars (Hungarians) and Germans, in this instance Národné noviny reached a level of journalistic indignation that was never matched when lynching victims were black. "Clearly these are ugly and deplorable values," the paper's editorial writer declared (at least in this case, the lynching of a white man), "and each civilized man must deplore the (mob's) decision. . . . " The paper continued, "Civilized laws must be followed, customs must be followed, and the municipal authorities must be determined to prohibit this practice. . . . " For all the outrage at Prager's lynching, the editorial nevertheless concluded by warning those "people with pro-German thoughts to beware and to watch their tongue!" It was only the lynching of a white man that spurred Národné noviny to editorialize on the need for "a civilized people to end this savage practice," "the practice of wild, savage anarchists."

Likewise, a sexual assault on a white Englishwoman who had moved to New York ran under a story headlined "Bestiality." The assault spurred Jednota to thunder, "Judge Lynch is said to be the scourge of American civilization. Humanity, under the government that we have today, is something stunted. Lynching therefore not only condemns its victims, but you and me as well." But it was not collective mob violence against a murder victim that raised the editor's ire. Rather, here lynching seems to have been rather broadly defined as any assault on a victim, and was used discursively to make a point about a crime against a white woman. Scores of lynchings of African Americans had already been reported in this and other immigrant papers, and more would follow; never, outside of the socialist immigrant press, would such a lengthy article or lead editorial denounce the lynching of blacks. And, sadly, by the end of this brief article the Slavic writer was endorsing collective mob violence against presumed sexual criminals: "These are horrific crimes, but quite ordinary. In many American cities it's dangerous for women to be out on the streets in the evening. I am a law-abiding man, but if I caught the beast responsible for such abominable crimes, I'd help with joy to string him up to the nearest tree or lamp post."

As noted, the easy acceptance of collective violence when an alleged sexual crime had occurred was even more frequently asserted when the offender was
black, and in all cases such condemnations of “Judge Lynch” were missing when blacks were lynched. Rather, even longer accounts of black lynchings, too, sent messages of black illegitimacy. *Jednota* reported that “in the town of Berkley, Va., . . . the black man George W. Blount . . . was released by the police and before their very eyes strung up from a lamppost and burned alive.” Before this, though, “masked men had seized Blount and taken him to a field, where he was beaten and then shot into pieces.” This occurred even though “Blount was said to be the political leader” of blacks in the region. Whether editors explicitly intended it or not, immigrant readers may have drawn the conclusion even successful blacks were vulnerable.

As Hale notes, rhetoric on black depravity and criminality aside, blacks who succeeded were often regarded by whites as the real threats and thus often targeted by lynch mobs. Disparities between images of black criminality and the respectability of many victims such as Blount, however, are not elaborated on by Slavic immigrants. Rather they reflected the fears of mainstream America, where, as early as 1908, journalist Ray Stannard Baker noted white Southerners admitted blacks who fit stereotypes of laziness and unintelligence were no threat to the Jim Crow order. Rather, in spite of the self-justifying arguments of lynchers that this punishment was only meted out to the most brutal of criminals, especially rapists, such crimes were merely a minority of the proximate causes of lynchings. Often victims were respectable black businessmen or landowners, followers of Booker T. Washington’s message of racial uplift. As with Blount, black achievement became in these lynching stories the impermissible threat to the racialized status quo. Such messages were conveyed also to liminal (provisional) white newcomers such as Slovaks; as we shall see, when blacks migrated to the North in search of industrial jobs they were quickly denounced as threats to immigrants’ natural rights to first call at jobs in factories, mines, and mills. The template for blacks as illegitimate competitors in the marketplace was arguably forged in such lynching accounts of successful blacks.

Even if editors ran stories at least partly for their shock value, we are left to ponder the readings immigrants themselves drew from weekly lynching stories. Far more numerous than *Pán Redaktori* (big-shot editors) were the average Slovaks and second-generation Slovak Americans who continued reading these papers for decades. Their responses to stories of black victims were more salient factors in building a “white” polity than any editor’s purpose in running a story.

A Slovak in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, reading that in a hamlet in neighboring Indiana County “blacks had been expelled,” may have drawn his own conclusions on the victims’ fate, and his own precariousness as a suspect white person, regardless of editors’ intentions. In this case, after “a black man had killed a white boy,” “the whites in a body took care of the matter themselves, despite the black man’s prattling that he was innocent.” The mob “in the second place told all those blacks of his fellow race who lived in that place that in another day they had to entirely clear out of the place.” When “the blacks didn’t heed them, the
whites as a body returned and destroyed the homes of all the blacks and expelled them from the place.” Whatever editors intended, those reading that, “The (whites) have established a strict new form of order, that no one can come back to the place, so long as some living there don’t want them,” learned something of blacks’ pariah status.76

Nor need these readings have been univocal. As Eric Lott has argued regarding the antebellum patrons of minstrel shows, desire for the freedom of “care-free” plantation life and lust for the black body coexisted with harsh mockery of the black underclass. Notes of pity also crept in, at least when minstrelsy merged with “Uncle Tom” shows. Likewise, an immigrant may have simultaneously experienced terror at the atrocities of lynching, contempt for the victim exhibiting a lack of manhood or condemned as a brute, and a sober awareness a similar fate might await Slovaks if they weren’t careful. All these emotions and more may have contended, until repetition and years of residence in the racialized new land taught the reader which sentiments were truly American.77

Occasionally stories offered more than a straightforward report of noose and flaming torch. Amerikansky russky viestnik twice in 1903 reported “the President is against lynching” after Roosevelt denounced the practice, and added that the editors were, too.78 Articles on the violent suppression of strikes appeared alongside accounts of even more violent evisceration of the bodies of distant Southern black men. “In the states of Georgia, Alabama and Louisiana there lately has actually been a noticeable uprising, a war of the white people against the blacks of those places,” a front-page item in Jednota reported in August 1904. “Whites have hunted blacks down like rabbits, and even flogged them to death. The indignation of whites has been greatly roused against blacks in all regions of the southern states.” Directly beneath this report was a short item from Statesboro, Georgia. Near there “the rabble seized two Negro men, Paul Reed and Will Cato, tied them together with chains, poured gasoline on them and burned them alive. The Negroes were quickly baked. . . . Neither the American authorities nor the unfortunate Negroes have been able to stop these terrible deaths.”79

For all the foregrounding of Cato and Reed’s criminality, a difference between the fate of white transgressors and black transgressors is clear from the end that befell the two. Burning alive is a verdict that only awaited black perpetrators, not members of other groups. It’s perhaps understandable, then, that some sympathy for the victims arises at least in some Slovak articles such as this Jednota account.

Certainly in the era of yellow journalism, graphic and sensationalist accounts were par for the course in American newspapers. But the very lurid and salacious nature of these accounts may have desensitized readers. In any event, no editorial calls in Slovak newspapers went out for an end to the practice, at least outside of the socialist press. Hale argues lynching became naturalized through newspaper accounts, merely another part of the ebb and flow of daily occurrences. And in Slavic immigrant newspapers, graphic accounts of horrific
mutilations of lynching victims often appeared in the very same issues with minstrel-show jokes in “humor columns.” News columns likewise spoke of “cannibal” or “barbarous” Africans or Filipinos in need of white guidance. Again, sensationalist foreign coverage was a staple of yellow journalism, but this in and of itself served to hierarchize the world into civilized Europeans and savage everyone else. Slovak papers reprinted accounts of the “ľudožrúti” of Africa—literally “people chewers.” Qualifiers such as “savage” whenever African or Asian uprisings against European colonialism were reported were not neutral descriptors, but ideologically loaded words that suggested non-Europeans were not fully civilized beings. Even humor pages featured odd jokes on “the cannibals in darkest Africa.”

It is these telling juxtapositions in immigrant newspapers which indicate that even lynching accounts, over time, may have become for immigrants (as for other white Americans) merely a gruesome part of a naturalized landscape of racial hierarchies. No doubt some were repulsed to read a victim’s body was “chopped into souvenir pieces,” but as with English-language newspaper readers, immigrants were reading of black savagery in nearly every weekly paper, so that blacks over time likely became alien to Slovaks’ consciousness of being full citizens deserving of respect.

As Perri Giovannucci has astutely noted with regard to the literature of North Africa, discourses of “modern,” “backward,” “savage,” and civilized” are not neutral descriptors or words that merely entertain. Rather, travelogues and novels (and for immigrants, newspaper reporting) established a hierarchy of peoples, some ready for self-government, others in need of “improvement” or restraint. These hierarchies are on full display in Slovák v Amerike, Jednota, and New Yorkský denník no less than in travelogues from the Maghreb.

Occasionally some horror at the brutality of lynching broke through the “just the facts” reporting. Amerikansky russky viestnik noted, “In the United States, Negroes are murdered in every way possible, and even burned to death from time to time in a few cases on the slightest pretext.” The paper reported that when a mob of 3,000 in Evansville, Indiana, was prevented from breaking into a jail where a black suspect was housed, “the enraged white mob reversed direction in anger, and started attacking every black they could find walking in the area. They laid dynamite under the foundations of black people’s houses and their parishes in town and in the outlying area.” Even the specter of dynamited churches, though, couldn’t arouse a stronger condemnation than “Those people were greatly incited against the blacks, who obviously need some strong defensive society.” After three white Texas farmers were lynched, the editor of Slovák v Amerike commented, “McKinley needs to look into this. He needs to introduce some culture here, and not in the Philippines.”

Jednota likewise saw fit to comment on the treatment of blacks in the South only when it wanted to critique U.S. imperial policies in the Philippines, asking
why the army was trying to “civilize” Asia when we had a war against our own black citizens in the South. This was a rhetorical ploy aimed at imperialism, however, and not a denunciation of lynching. Similarly, African American newspapers sardonically commented on the sending of U.S. troops to far-flung places to bring supposed culture to Asians when lynching persisted in the South. The Cleveland Gazette commented on the U.S. participation in the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion in China, “[T]here are plenty of ‘Boxers’ (Red Shirts, Ku Klux, and the like) in the South who are greatly in need of the presence of soldiers.” The Indianapolis Recorder suggested it was “a sinful extravagance to waste our civilizing influence upon the unappreciative Filipinos, when it is so badly needed right here in Arkansas.”

With or without comparisons to military expeditions abroad, condemnations of lynching figured much more prominently in black papers than in Slavic ones. Indeed, some of the only times American lynchings were criticized was when the writer wanted to make a point not about the brutality in America, but about some other topic against which he deployed lynchings discursively. This was the case in articles faulting American imperialism—a topic to which we’ll return at greater length in Chapter 5. Jednota likewise evoked mob violence against blacks by America’s “indignant people” in a defense of tsarist Russia (often regarded by Slovak editors and priests as the group’s pan-Slavic big brother) from American attacks following pogroms. The point the writer stressed was not that lynchings had to end in Alabama, but that President Roosevelt and other Americans had no business intervening in Russia regarding pogroms, unless they would accept Saint Petersburg’s admonition to “look after American affairs when every second black in the United States was lynched by the indignant people.” Only a defense of Russia and its alleged leniency toward her Jewish subjects spurred this mention of America’s racial sins.

In the case of the Texas lynching reported in Slovák v Amerike, perhaps it was because it had been whites who suffered at the hands of the people’s justice, or dissatisfaction with the country’s imperial adventures, that caused the editor to critique the people’s justice. Indeed, the instability of race for new Americans, and the perilous degree to which Nordic immigration restrictionists denounced Southeast Europeans as Asiatic or African, may account for an 1895 report from Denver in which Italians had been mistaken for blacks and lynched. Over time it may be that Slovaks wanted to make sure that they weren’t so disastrously “misidentified.”

At home, though, lynchings of blacks more often passed without editorial condemnation. To be sure, in 1897, Slovák v Amerike ended an account of an Arkansas lynching, “Nice granting of justice and acknowledgement of equality according to law!” As late as 1913 a Slovák v Amerike report of a Hot Springs, Arkansas, lynching noted, “A crowd of a thousand citizens” lynched William Norman, black man. “He was hung from a telephone pole in the main business district and hung there for more than an hour. The murdered Norman was shot by more than a hundred
machine guns. This is what passes for justice in civilized America!” Sometimes, then, editorials condemned the brutality of lynching.90

After about 1910, however, such denunciations of ritualized violence against blacks grew increasingly rare. More frequent were prosaic accounts such as an item in New Yorkský denník recounting the 1920 lynching of Grant Smith from a railroad bridge in Millersburg, Kentucky. “After the lynching, the crowd peacefully departed,” the brief item concludes. A similar item relating a burning at the stake of a black man in 1911 in Purcell, Oklahoma, notes the 3,000 citizens involved had doused the victim, Peter Carter, with petroleum and burned him alive. The one-paragraph item concludes, “After the lynching, everything was peaceful.”91 Slovák v Amerike likewise on November 24, 1905, featured a story of “Judge Lynch in Mississippi” which noted that in Cohama, Mississippi, “A Negro was this morning lynched by a mass of people.” The story typically ended by noting, “When their work was done, the white people peacefully departed.”92 As in the English-language press, in Slovak translations hanging or burning a black man was not breaking, but rather restoring, racialized “peace.”

Slovak immigrants were not alone in learning that native-born whites regarded lynching as a sometimes necessary measure to rein in especially heinous crimes by blacks. The Jewish, Czech, Slovak, and other immigrant children attending “The Fellow Citizenship Association” at New York’s East Side Settlement House in 1901 heard an address by J. F. Crowell, ex-President of Trinity College, North Carolina, “Is Lynching Sometimes Justifiable?” Settlement houses have long been regarded as one of the main institutions through which new immigrants’ children were acculturated to America; such newcomers were tutored through a variety of institutions on the low regard in which African Americans were held in the New World.93

But Slovák v Amerike’s Cohama lynching account indicates, too, the instantaneous nature of mass-circulation newspapers’ dissemination of such stories, and suggests the complicity of authority figures such as editors, law-enforcement officials, and town fathers. As here, often an account could state that “this morning” a lynching had occurred; a morning lynching could be arranged in time to make the afternoon paper. Indeed, lynchings had become so ubiquitous by 1905 that, in the mainstream press, they actually could be advertised ahead of time, with headlines such as “lynching to occur.” Such advertised lynchings-to-come appeared in Slovak newspapers, too, suggesting for immigrants just how marginalized black Americans had become. This was the case in 1905, when Slovák v Amerike reported that the citizens of Gadsden, Alabama, were preparing for a lynching the following day; even in a story of a black criminal apprehended in Moorestown, New Jersey, in 1921, New Yorkský denník noted that “it is likely that the black man will be lynched.”94

When blacks sought to defend themselves from the onslaught of white mobs, Slovak newspapers employed another trope that lumped self-defense in with images of lawlessness and violence, and headlines screamed of “plemenný boj”—
“race war.” This was the phrase used when Delaware blacks protested lynchings such as White’s, or defended themselves in the World War I era in cities such as Chicago, East St. Louis, and Tulsa. In its coverage of the 1919 Chicago riots, New Yorkshý denník nervously highlighted the military training and weapons stockpiling of black Army veterans, suggesting a race war was in the offing before reporting a few days later that the army had occupied the Black Belt and restored “order.”

Within the riot stories appearing in Slovak papers, lurid tales of blacks battling whites in East St. Louis and Chicago offered a sense of blacks as permanent outsiders, illegitimate intruders in these whites-only spaces. Slovak papers had been reporting since at least 1903 on white vigilante mobs cleansing cities such as Rankin, Pennsylvania, and Morgan City, Illinois, of all blacks, perhaps establishing a binary for new immigrants of who was permissible and who unacceptable on one’s block. The very act of black self-defense was recast as criminality; headlines asserting a “race war” established a moral equivalence between sides, with no hint blacks were actually engaged in resistance to lynching mobs. When blacks in Lawrenceville, Illinois, attempted to attend a carnival, they were set upon by a white mob and another “race war” erupted, reported Slovák v Amerike. Such coverage sent a message that black use of public space was in itself an outrage whites could be expected to resist.

Immigrant papers, though, also offered a reassuring escape clause from urban disorder. As early as 1903, papers featured suburban real estate ads pitched to Slovaks looking for their idyllic “colony” away from the cities. Graphically illustrating the different fates of blacks and white ethnics for decades to come, one such ad trumpets the beauties of Wallington, New Jersey, a “Slovak colony”—right alongside the macabre and gory account of the torture, mutilation, and lynching of the supposed criminal, George White, in Wilmington. While reading that the crowd hacked off various souvenir body parts until White begged them to kill him and end his agony, immigrants also learned that Slovaks of Passaic (where my great-grandparents lived) could gain the comforts of homeownership. No doubt many readers were appalled by the story of White’s torture death. It is likely though that the mobility available to some people and not others was apparent as well. Seeing the normal, naturalized torture of African Americans alongside normal, suburban real estate ads for Slovaks already partially on the way to becoming white Americans suggests that a race-tutoring project existed within the immigrant press. Nothing could spell out more gruesomely for newcomers just who was protected, and who was perpetually vulnerable to being tortured and burned alive (see Figures 2-4 and 2-5).

There was even one notorious Northern lynching in which there’s some evidence Slavic immigrants participated. This lynching was related to Slovak newspapers by an eyewitness “reporter,” unlike the usual rewrites from English-language wire services. In 1911 in Coatesville, Pennsylvania, a town which was then 40 percent foreign-born, and in which there were already three National Slovak Society
A black man was arrested after robbing a Slovak and then shooting at the police officers called to arrest him. Although the robber had been wounded during his arrest, and was lying handcuffed to a hospital bed, the mostly immigrant crowd broke into the hospital to exact their own vigilante justice. As the “reporter” for Jednota related,

With a roar our people on 13 August rushed toward the hospital, where the injured black man lay. . . . And so also there our nation waited, . . . until they succeeded in penetrating the hospital, rushing and taking the black man out of there, even though he was tied in his bed. They carried him out of the hospital, making for a field, where they deposited him on a pile of straw and wood, and then burned him alive. Up to 5,000 people witnessed and took part in this terrible execution. . . . The blacks in our town are afraid of the residents. It’s understandable that no one can possibly approve of the awful act of the crowd. The people don’t have the right to take into their own hands the power of justice. But on the other hand, we must also acknowledge, that the people had reason to be indignant.
Figure 2-5: Headline, “Negro is lynched.” The report of the lynching of George F. White was the lead story this day, and appeared alongside an advertisement offering homes in Wallington, New Jersey, in a prospective “Slovak colony.” Slovák v Amerike, June 26, 1903, 1.
A mob of 5,000 (out of a town of barely 10,000) avenging a Slovak immigrant’s robbery in a place where 40 percent were foreign-born suggests there had to have been at least some Slovak witnesses to the lynching, if not participants. And the switches in language in Jednota’s account suggests that in this case immigrants were more than just readers about lynching. The writer of this article from Coatesville begins by describing the perpetrators of the deed as “our people” (ľud), then refers to them as “our nation” (národ) indicating that in this instance immigrants not only sanctioned, but participated in, the harsh rituals of racialized justice. Or a Slovak affinity with other whites (“our people”) is indicated. The “reporter,” though, pulls back and recognizes that such lynchings might be in need of condemnation—at which point he refers to the lynchers as a “crowd” (dravu), but then concludes that the “people” (again ľud) had every reason to be indignant. In this, the accounts from Coatesville were typical, as when New Yorkský denník could report that after a 1920 lynching in Millersburg, Kentucky, “the crowd peacefully departed.” By 1911, to many Slovak “reporters” or readers, the burning alive of a man by “our people” could be conceptualized as a matter of restoring, not breaking, communal justice.

Slovák v Amerike reassured readers that the male and female lynchers were some of Coatesville’s most respectable citizens, noting that women had insisted on taking part in the people’s justice. And yet as sometimes occurred, the coverage here was an ambivalent mixture of acceptance of mob members’ respectability and revulsion at the lynchers’ excesses. The paper further reported that “souvenirs” were taken from the black body by both men and women, and then sardonically noted, “Such special women behave this way in the wild, just like the most savage member of humankind in darkest Africa. This is a demonstration of that spreading of American education.” African savagery was a common assumption in 1911, but here it was used to stigmatize female participants in a lynching mob. Nevertheless, it was only after blacks demanded the extradition of one of the alleged lynchers, Kennedy Boyd, that the paper subsequently reported fears of a coming race war. (Amerikansky russky viestnik reported “Pennsylvania Permits Lynching,” but the story noted of the “bestial lynching” that “three people were arrested,” and “more arrests are expected.”) Evidently blacks demanding protection of the law could by 1911, in the eyes of immigrants, signify racial tumult. Coatesville residents rallied to support a white man to protect him from the indignity of being tried for a lynching; they remained at best onlookers, if not participants, when a black man was burned alive.

The African American newspaper, the Chicago Defender, similarly reported in 1917 that “Eight hundred oil field workers—whites, Mexicans, Germans, and Italians—employed in a Houston, Texas, suburb, seized Bert Smith, had a ten-year-old white boy castrate him with a knife, brutally hung him to a tree, riddled his body with bullets, and horribly mutilated it with sledgehammers and butcher knives after cutting it down.” At least in lynch mobs, even Italians and Mexicans in Texas could occasionally take part in assertions of the country’s caste.
system. In this instance the victim had been accused of insulting white women; it’s telling that after the lynching he is referred to as “it,” again accomplishing the negation of black humanity. One wonders if this is how new immigrants—as mob participants, spectators, and newspaper readers—viewed the situation.\textsuperscript{103}

It was only the radical press that raised its voice unambiguously against lynching and other manifestations of racial oppression. \textit{Rovnost řudu (Equality for the People)} extended its calls for justice to include all Americans, and, beyond that, the colonized races of the globe. This paper was the organ of the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section, affiliated with the Workers’ (Communist) Party, so this is perhaps not too surprising. In its account, “Two Negroes Lynched,” \textit{Rovnost řudu} exhibited a degree of anger at the crime, and skepticism toward assertions of black criminality excusing lynchings, that is rare in other Slovak and Rusyn immigrant papers:

Hal Winton and an unidentified black person were with savagery grabbed by a mob from the arms of town officials and lynched. Officials reported that he had killed Willey P. Martin, manager of a plantation, but does anyone think that this was actually likely? Indeed, lynching is the worst form of barbarism. This travesty was executed with the complicity of the court, which knew of it, and yet permitted it.\textsuperscript{104}

Also in 1925, \textit{Rovnost řudu} sneered at the work of the Baptist Young People’s Union. In an article headlined “Good Christians Approve of Lynching,” editors sarcastically referred to “Respectable and dear Christians.” “They’ve organized into a ‘fine’ body, ‘the Baptist Young People’s Union.’ The lynchings of blacks are justifiable, under certain conditions, their 34th national convention has decreed. . . . And these are Christians?!”\textsuperscript{105} Again in 1925, the editors lamented that “already as early as 1885” lynchings were known. Still, as scientific socialists, they were sure the declining number of such torture murders indicated that “although the vile business endures, one can see that it’s only a matter of time before the land is entirely free of it.”\textsuperscript{106} The paper also asked in 1926, “How can lynching effectively be stopped?” The article lamented that “for 37 years many people have lost their lives to this bestial custom.”\textsuperscript{107}

Elsewhere \textit{Rovnost řudu} wrote approvingly of Gandhi’s campaign in India\textsuperscript{108} and anticolonialism on the world stage. A cartoon in 1924 showed a muscular, rifle-toting man (“the Communist International”) confronting a rich, top-hatted “British imperialism,” dragging “Egypt” by a rope fastened round his neck. “The Fops of English Capitalism in Egypt Foiled by the Solidarity of the International Proletariat,” the cartoon proclaimed. A second cartoon had workers labeled “China,” “India,” and “Africa” carrying hammer, pickax, and gun greeting marching workers with a red flag. In the middle, a rather oblivious “Kipling” scribbles on a pad, “The East is the East and the West is the West, and never the twain shall meet.” A class-conscious cockroach tells him, “You’re a liar.”\textsuperscript{109}
Into the 1930s and 1940s, the radical Slovak press continued to denounce lynch law and other manifestations of blacks’ Jim Crow subjugation. The *Robotnícky kalendár na rok 1921* (*People’s Calendar for 1921*) presented a cartoon of a lynching labeled “The dictatorship of capitalism,” an image that persisted into the Popular Front era. The *Robotnícky kalendár na rok 1937* ran a beautiful woodcut illustration of a lynching with the condemnatory caption, “‘Democracy’ in the South. Black citizens in the Southern states of the U.S.A. until now have been vulnerable to white lynchers, while they haven’t united with white workers.” As in the English-language publications of the Communist Party, this equation gave little consideration to the racism of white workers, which may have stood in the way of class solidarity. Still, such an unequivocal denunciation of lynch law was found only in leftist Slovak publications. The calendar also ran a feature on boxer Joe Louis and a photo of two hooded Klansmen, commenting, “The treacherous Ku Klux Klan, which secretly organizes throughout the United States against the workers. In 1936 it was revealed that they had committed the murder of many working-class people.” The 1939 edition of the calendar ran an article by Richard Wright on “Joe Louis, symbol of freedom.” And in 1942, *Ľudový denník*, the Slovak-language edition of the *People’s Daily*, ran a cartoon of a soldier destroying a scarecrow labeled “poll tax.” “The defeat of the poll tax is the triumph of democracy,” ran the caption (see Figures 2-6, 2-7, 2-8, 2-9, and 2-10.)

Likewise, some socialist Croatians meeting in Chicago in the 1920s and 1930s may have been sympathetic to black lynching victims, as they ordered plays from the *Rebel Arts Bulletin* series, including *Bivouac* by Paul Peters. The *Rebel Arts Bulletin* summarized the play’s plot as “A Negro Threatened with Lynching is Saved Through the Militant Action of Friends and Sympathizers.” Still, Chicago’s Croatian-American Dramatic Society, “Nada,” also performed minstrel shows, not just socialist plays of class solidarity, suggesting that developing class identities were sometimes in conflict with developing racial identities.

To be sure, earlier, less militant Slovak newspapers had reported on the ill-fated attempt to pass a federal antilynching bill, the Dyer Bill. But in the 1920s *New Yorkský denník* offered no endorsement of the bill, although in the midst of the debate on the effort to make lynching a federal crime, the paper noted that the country had recently achieved a record number of monthly Lynchings, twelve, with ten occurring in Texas. In any case, as the paper reported, Southern Democratic congressmen quickly filibustered the bill into its grave.

The antilynching imagery and rhetoric in the socialist press mirrored the line of *Robotnícky kalendár*’s parent organization, the CPUSA, which had spoken consistently against lynching, Jim Crow and other manifestations of white supremacy. Yet even at *Rovnost ňudu*, by 1925 editors were sadly becoming a little too white. An English-language cartoon told of the exploits of “Squire Edgewater.” A lawyer tells his black bootlegger client, “Frogeye,” “You told me you were innocent, and I was able so to convince the squire—Now what do you think my services were worth?” The stereotypical shiftless, lying bootlegger replies, “Mistah
Figure 2-6: Antilynching illustrations only appeared in radical Slovak journals. The “workers’ calendar” for 1921 ran a cartoon, “The Dictatorship of Capitalism.” This image may refer to the lynching of Industrial Workers of the World organizers such as Frank Little. Robotnický kalendár na rok 1921, 101.
Figure 2-7: Antilynching woodcut illustration. “‘Democracy’ in the South. Black citizens of the southern states of the U.S.A. are vulnerable to lynching by whites, because they haven’t organized with the white working class.” Illustration from Robotnický kalendár na rok 1937, 40. Of course, some of the same white working class—in the South as well as the Midwest—sometimes participated in lynchings, too.
Stone, Ise broke flatter’n a pancake. But ah kin bring you a quart ob dat liquor Ise bin sellin for leben dollars.” Little racial enlightenment exists in this cartoon of black moonshiners. Rather, it fits in the American grain of *Amos ‘n’ Andy* cartoon-strip minstrelsy so prevalent in 1920s English-language dailies. To find it here among calls for an end to lynching and colonialism is lamentable.\textsuperscript{114}

Lamentable, but not surprising. For if they backed “Negro rights,” Slovak socialists did so from afar. In Philadelphia, the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section met from 1921 at Slovak Hall. And while they might have approved of Gandhi, they drew the line at the clubhouse door. As a social worker noted, “Slovak Hall was available for rental by all other groups, but Negroes were excluded because it was feared that their cleanliness standard would not measure up to that of other groups.” This policy stood, even though the Workers’ president, Ján Kolumbus, was also manager of the hall. Thomas Bell’s Slovak characters cursing “niggers” who had ruined their neighborhood no doubt understood the Philadelphians’ distaste.\textsuperscript{115}
Slovaks had by 1921 read for years of the hazardous cost of being caught on the wrong side of the color line, and by then also had too much of a stake in behaving like whites. In this way, members of the National Slovak Society, the Greek Catholic Union, and even the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section, learned the racialized etiquette of their new homes.

Many of the men and women congregating at Slovak Hall were by 1921 American-born, naturalized citizens, or, at the very least, resident in this country for decades, and had no doubt naturalized some of the United States’s racial mores. The hyper-Americanism and suspicion of all things foreign exhibited during World War I and its immediate aftermath had a chilling effect on individual Slovaks, too, spurring them to conform to American folkways wherever possible. With the Palmer Raids and deportations as fresh as yesterday’s newspaper, radical Slovaks in the 1920s had two strikes against them; did they need to court a
third by serving blacks? Yet the social worker’s report cited above suggests that radical Slovaks weren’t merely being prudent in barring blacks from their socialist fraternal hall, but acting according to generally accepted “fears” of unclean Čierny. Certainly not every Slovak reacted in precisely the same way to calls for 100-percent Americanism or learned the same attitudes regarding race relations all at once. But I suggest that characterizations of blacks in the Slovak press, in

**Figure 2-10**: Anti-poll tax cartoon in the Slovak edition of the CPUSA’s *Daily Worker*. The caption reads, “The defeat of the poll tax is the triumph of democracy.” *Ľudový denník*, September 21, 1942.
tandem with other cultural productions, contributed to Jim Crow-thinking at Slovak Hall.116

Reading of racial atrocities, especially lynchings, immigrants learned which boundaries not to transgress and how in America one might make a plausible case to pass as white. Lynching accounts in immigrant papers, as in English-language dailies, stressed black licentiousness and brutal criminality, while positioning white discipline and restraint even when stepping in to provide a “justice” lenient courts couldn’t deliver. This binary, in tandem with other race coverage, provided new immigrants with a cognitive and moral map of their new homeland coded in race. Slovaks took away from these accounts not just horror at the brutality of vengeful Amerikansky, but, more important for their own self-conception, new ways of thinking of who they were and how they fit into their new country.

Most lynchings occurred in places far from where Slovaks settled, although, as noted, in Coatesville there is strong indication that Slavic immigrants reacted to a black usurper in a horrifically similar manner to that of whites in Georgia or Arkansas. But by the first decade of the twentieth century, Slovak newspapers commented on blacks in their midst, first mockingly, but then with alarm and outrage, as blacks “invaded” their neighborhoods, too; ultimately white riots developed against blacks perceived as encroaching on “their” residential space.

And yet race was not an entirely new concept to East Europeans, even if the binaries of American segregation had to be learned. How had ideas of race carried with immigrants from the old country affected their perceptions of “negrov”? And how had these notions of race been adapted to the New World context? To begin to answer these questions, we must travel far from the United States, and consider Slavic conceptions of race premigration, back in the homeland.
Chapter 3

Spectacles of Difference:
Notions of Race Pre-Migration

Very quickly new immigrants came to mark their introduction to America in racial terms. Jokes in newspapers such as New Yorkský denník of the greenhorn’s first encounter with “čierny” operated as racial foundational myths, as the naif learned for the first time that there were black people on the planet, and, decades later, oral histories of immigrants related the shock newcomers at Ellis Island felt when first meeting black people.\(^1\) Recently, however, scholars have questioned the accuracy of characterizations of migrants as *tabulae rasae* when it came to matters of race. Race was not an entirely unfamiliar concept to many Southeast European immigrants, even though newcomers did have to learn what the Jim Crow hierarchies meant in their new homeland. While African Americans may have been encountered for the first time, even here there is evidence that many groups had ample opportunity to learn of, and even meet, Africans and Asians prior to their migration to the United States. Simply put, Southeast Europeans did not arrive in America “race-neutral.”\(^2\)

As Mathew Frye Jacobson and other scholars have demonstrated, in the eyes of late-nineteenth-century commentators, race was a fluid concept that entailed divisions among European groups regarded as just as salient—or pernicious—as the distinctions between Asians, Africans, and Europeans. When immigration restrictionists warned of the danger America faced from the Slavic race, they were not merely being rhetorical or misusing the term, but imposing moral classificatory schema they were convinced had as much scientific validity as the more enduring “three races of humankind.” Progressive Era American race theorists such as Edward Alsworth Ross advanced and popularized the earlier racial classifications of such European thinkers as Johann von Blumenbach and Comte Gobineau in asserting the moral, cultural, and intellectual disparity between Mediterraneans and Slavs and the Nordic stock from which the Sons of the Mayflower had supposedly descended; in any case, most immigrants didn’t need to have read scholarly tomes to have heard of the inferiority of some Europeans from Habsburg officials or xenophobic Magyars (Hungarians).\(^3\)

By now academics are familiar with the valid assertion that race is a social construct, a political fiction. But it is a fiction that was imposed at great political and
psychic cost on other European groups, too. Indeed, the Senate’s Dillingham Com-
mission, charged with studying the immigrant “problem,” identified 35 races com-
ing to the United States from Europe alone. The categorization of even Europeans
into such fine gradations was disseminated via science, popular culture, and
political rhetoric, in some ways that were new to Slavic migrants to America but
which in others might have seemed all too familiar. As residents of the polyglot
Habsburg realm, Slavs knew before they set foot in America of a variety of peo-
pies who were racialized as lacking in full personhood; here the depiction of Jews
and Gypsies in Slavic folklore is most salient.

Pre-migration, many Southeast Europeans were familiar with race (as it was
defined circa 1890) in four ways. Slavs were themselves the object of scorn as
lesser beings, particularly when they performed certain jobs that were regarded
as almost Gypsy-like. The tinkers (drotári) of Trenčín province were particularly
prone to belittlement, but Larry Wolfe ably demonstrates that beginning in the
Enlightenment, all of East Europe came to be regarded by Western Europeans
such as the English, Germans, and French as the seat of barbarism, a stereotype
that continued in German literature during the nineteenth century.4

Second, other marginalized people within Central Europe were frequently
denigrated as racial outsiders both by Slavs and the German and Habsburg
empires’ rulers. Slavic folk culture cast certain groups as mythical pariahs. Dur-
ing Slovak and Rusyn Christmastime pageants, for example, characters portray-
ing Jews and Gypsies often wore garish, black masks designed to distance these
characters from the viewer’s concept of “normal” people.5

But it is also likely that by the time of the mass migration to America (beginning
in the 1880s) actual Africans had long been known to many Southeast Europeans
who later migrated to New York, Chicago, or Philadelphia. African natives were
familiar on the streets of many port cities by the sixteenth century, and in Central
Europe, too, provincial nobles emulated their Habsburg or Bourbon superiors
by importing Africans to serve at their courts as butlers, musicians, and denizens
of the aristocrat’s “Cabinet of Wonder.”6 At least some Slavic tillers of a count’s soil
would have encountered such servants. And by the 1870s a more direct experience
of Africans, albeit in an exotic, “primitive” light, was possible for East Central
Europeans. A thriving band of impresarios such as Carl Hagenbeck presented
exotic “human zoos” featuring African “tribesmen” performing for audiences in
places such as Warsaw, Saint Petersburg, Vienna, and Prague, as well as smaller
provincial cities.7 And when Slovak tinkers got tired of being mocked or starving
at home, they wandered, as early as the sixteenth century, to places where they
would have encountered black citizens, as well as Asians.8

Finally, Slavs and other Christian Southeast Europeans employed stereotypes
of blackness against the Turkish Ottoman Empire, which only in the late seven-
teenth century had been expelled from Hungary, and still ruled over fellow Slavs
in other places in the Balkans. These slights at the Asiatic Ottomans occasionally
surfaced in Slovak newspapers such as Jednota and New Yorkský denník as well.
By broadening our conception of race, we can see that such concepts of racialized group difference predated Slavic migration to the United States, and these depictions of race in all its various European inflections appeared in immigrant plays and on the pages of *Amerikansky russky viestnik*, *New Yorkský denník*, and other papers. Not surprisingly, these newspapers gave no credence to Germans’ or other peoples’ depictions of Slavs as semi-Asiatic nomads. However, the racialization of other European groups (both those familiar and those newly encountered) continued in Slavic immigrant newspaper accounts of Italians, Jews, Irish, and Gypsies. To be sure, such characterizations appeared less frequently than the voluminous coverage of black lynchings, criminality, and the race riots in which African Americans were attacked *en masse* and desperately fought back. These depictions of European others will be addressed in the following chapter.

It is important to stress that for all the discrimination and animus from nativists that Southeast Europeans faced, there never were legal barriers to their immigration and citizenship (as there were for Chinese and other Asians), nor did they face Jim Crow restrictions and mass disenfranchisement or threat of persistent spectacle lynchings (as blacks faced into the 1960s). Still, in these newspapers’ denigrating depictions of Jews (with whom Slavs were quite familiar pre-migration) and Italians (with whom their contacts were less frequent if at all) we can see the writers of the Slavic press trying on racial roles to determine which barriers would persist as the most salient in asserting full American citizenship.

The Magyars, ethnic Hungarians who after the 1867 “Ausgleich” (Equalization) ruled in Budapest in a power-sharing relationship with Vienna, were frequently racialized in Slovak and Rusyn newspapers as despotic, Asiatic “Mongols.” In these depictions Slovaks asserted their right to break free of the empire during World War I, and established a different form of alterity for Magyars—an Asiatic one. Therefore the persistently racialized treatment of Magyars will be considered separately.

**Race in the “Half-Asian” East**

Before they came to the United States, Slavs had often wandered far and wide in search of work, and encountered a wide variety of ethno-racial groups. As such, they were often familiar with unflattering ethnic hierarchies, but they were often on the receiving end of ethnic slurs. When Slavic workers migrated to Habsburg cities, they were likely to be denigrated as less than intelligent simian oafs, as in an 1886, almost racialized, cartoon that scoffed at “how the Czechs help build the parliament building.” In this cartoon the bungling workmen have vacant expressions and apelike features, indicating with what low regard many Germans held Slavic migrants. Early twentieth-century Slovak immigrants likewise constructed identities out of an admixture of “assignment” and self-proclaimed “identity,” a process they had known even in Austria-Hungary, where “racial”
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differences certainly had been emphasized. These caricatures, disseminated in fin de siècle Austria, mocked Czech, Moravian, and Slovak day laborers in Vienna, indicating Slavs were often on the receiving end of racial slights.9

Worse depictions of Slavs filtered through Central Europe. The widely read German novelist Karl Emil Franzos published a series of novels beginning in 1876 that portrayed the Slavic provinces under Berlin and Vienna’s control as “Half-Asian,” stereotypes that would carry across the Atlantic and appear in the immigration-restrictionist diatribes of American authors and academics such as Edward Alsworth Ross, Lothrop Stoddard, Madison Grant, and Henry Cabot Lodge.10

Larry Wolfe notes that attitudes such as Franzos’s had a long and storied pedigree. During the Enlightenment, the seats of civilization and progress were judged to be Western capitals such as Paris and London. Balancing these centers of learning, cartographers, philosophers, and popular writers posited a backward, Asiatic East, a land of superstition and decidedly unenlightened despots such as Russia’s tsars. Earlier, Wolfe argues, civilization was centered in the Mediterranean South, with Northern realms held to be backward. But during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the rise of powerful empires inconveniently centered in the north, this dichotomy was no longer politically expedient, and the line between light and dark was repositioned. This reorienting of a dividing line to West versus East persisted at least until the fall of the Berlin Wall; much earlier Poles, Slovaks, Rusyns, and other Slavs were classified by many writers such as Franzos as at least half-Asian.11

When tinkers or other migrant Slovaks took to the roads, they therefore were the ones often stigmatized as lesser beings. During stays in Prague or Vienna, tinkers who were natives of Kolárovice lived together in spartan and unsanitary boarding houses. An ethnographer of the tinkers, Karel Prochazka, noted in 1905:

The Kolárovice tinkers have meager funds for lodging. Nightly they wander in search of lodging. For their payment they get a mattress in the “quarter” living by the sugar mills. In this wretched, underground place there’s a single window in the door, without a table, without a light.

Tinkers scrimped on lodging so as to return home with as much cash as possible. Criticisms of unsanitary and overcrowded “foreign quarters” in 1905 were heard in both American cities and Europe. The photographs accompanying Prochazka’s work, as well as 1880 photos of Slovak street urchins peddling tinware in the streets of Vienna, indicate that wandering Slavs were looked upon by respectable burgers as disreputable, dirty, and “un-white” (or at least un-German) even before they sailed for America.12

Prochazka notes that jokes and curses often greeted these Slovak wanderers, and they seem to have had something of a roguish reputation akin to traveling
salesmen. Roving drotári (tinkers) were said to have had an unusually frank way of drumming up business. “Chiefly he goes about getting work calling in at the house . . . ‘How’s it going, little mother; tinker?’ At this she looks heavenward. ‘I’ll give you something to tink—I’ll give you something to hammer!’” The drotári spoke “tinker slang, a glorious East European mishmash, krpsština, which contains many elements of Czecho-Slovak prison slang.” Perhaps it’s not surprising then that Hungarians and South Slavs denigrated the “wandering Slovak” as outcasts, even as they needed his expertise to repair broken pots and agricultural tools. Even in 1930s Philadelphia, new workers at the bench were taught ribald songs about the roving wireworkers, while as late as the 1970s, a Czech man recalls, his parents chastised dirty or disobedient children that they were looking and behaving like filthy drotári.\(^\text{13}\)

Tinkers in other regions of Europe such as Ireland were viewed suspiciously as vagrants; in East Central Europe, too, the Slovaks of the Trenčín region often competed with Gypsies in metalworking, and both groups were frequently stigmatized as vagabonds and thieves. Other itinerant craftsmen, such as the glass-blowers of Carmaux, France, were likewise looked at askance by more settled villagers.\(^\text{14}\) Robert Pynsent notes that in 1920 the Prague police issued special instructions designed to rein in young apprentice tinkers with a reputation for begging and thievery. All tinkers were to be kept under official scrutiny, while “Wandering youths who are defective, or indeed already criminal, must be transported straight back to Slovakia.” Pynsent further notes that this stigmatization of all Slovak drotári bears some similarity to the official harassment of Slovak-speaking Gypsies in the post-1993 Czech Republic.\(^\text{15}\)

Even Slovaks and Rusyns who did not practice the tinker’s trade recalled in oral histories that they were treated shabbily by the German and Magyar ruling partners of the Habsburg Empire. A man who immigrated from Trenčín province to Philadelphia said of the Germans, “That people don’t look kindly on Slavs, you know. That Germanic feeling that you’re sub, sub-people, the Slavs, you know. A lot of people still think that.”\(^\text{16}\) Another migrant recalled that his father couldn’t get a better job on the railroad, such jobs being reserved for Magyars or Germans, while immigrant newspapers frequently denounced the slavery to which they were subjected under “Mongol” Magyar rule.\(^\text{17}\) Still, it is unclear if even itinerate drotári had the same conception of race as they would come to experience it in the United States, with brutal lynch law, the rigid “one-drop rule” ostracizing any American with even the slightest African ancestry, and Jim Crow reigning in virtually all public accommodations.

Other groups in East Central Europe faced even more pernicious stigmatization. Slavs knew of, and sadly sometimes participated in, pogroms that had raged across Jewish communities in tsarist Russia and elsewhere, most notoriously in 1903 in Kishinev. Interestingly, though, as noted in Chapter 2, the term “pogrom” was not imported by Slavs to describe the lynchings of African Americans, even as some papers such as the socialist Rovnost lúdu denounced the pogroms against
Jews near Košice, Slovakia, who were blamed for ritual murders, the shameful blood libel. Indeed, Slavic migrants often accorded pariah status to Jews and Gypsies, but even here Slavs were sometimes equated with these outcasts. In Vienna, in 1902, a Slovak dealer of wire goods and calendars was labeled a “peddling book Jew.” Perhaps as they were engaged in commerce, even of a marginal kind, wandering Slovak tinkers also faced some of the same prejudices that Jewish merchants faced.

If they knew of these associations, Slovaks may have bristled. In 1905 the Catholic newspaper Jednota denounced an anti-immigration article in Collier’s Weekly, “Our Imported Criminals,” which alleged, among other things, that most of the Poles in Chicago were criminals, murderers, and agitators. The editorialist denied that Slovaks, at least, lived like Gypsies, thundering, “Such an honor it is to be noticed by American journalists. They’ve besmirched an entire class of people. They are right who declare, think before you write. This should apply to the English newspapers. What then can we expect from the publishers of so-called ‘yellow’ newspapers, who think we live like gypsies?”

Gypsies, however, were stigmatized in the recollection of Slovak informants, who referred to them as black people in the Carpathians. The Gypsies or “buducśni” they knew were recalled as “sort of like wild people, from Uzhorod,” farther east in present-day Ukraine. Such references suggest that a cultural equation of blackness with evil or the Evil One himself existed in the Carpathian mind. Sander Gilman similarly argues such ingrained cultural notions, “mythic structures of blackness” as connoting immorality, permeated German understanding even before migrants encountered actual African peoples. While Gilman focuses a bit heavily on German high culture’s depictions of blacks, even folk culture, with which many Slavic immigrants would have been familiar, utilized tropes equating blackness with evil. Slovaks of the eastern provinces who performed Christmas jasličkari plays and other entertainments in the Carpathians already knew that a blackened face or dark mask connoted the equally vile figures of the thief Gypsy, the duplicitous Jewish merchant, and the conniving Čert (devil). Even non-European figures made it into some Slavic Christmas pageants, for the costumes of hairy-coated shepherds conjured up images of the “barbarous” East. And in her pioneer research among Slavic peoples, Emily Greene Balch, too, in early twentieth-century Bohemia encountered children “masquerading as the Three Kings, one, of course, as a blackamoor.” Even before setting foot in the New World, such people had a conception of non-European races through their own folklore. Czechs, Slovaks, and other Slavs thus may have already carried these conceptions of what race might come to mean, or learned of blacks from traveling tinkers.

Stereotyped ethnic characters from East Central Europe persisted in the New World, too, even as new prejudices were learned. In describing the work of missionaries in Africa, New Yorkský denník helpfully explained to its readers that the Christians toiled among “dark people with sharp teeth who, just like our
gypsies, don’t really want to work.” More will be said about Slavic papers’ coverage of colonial empires in Chapter 5, but the reprise of Gypsy stereotypes was frequent among many Slavs. Theater troupes such as “Nada,” the Croatian-American Dramatic Society of Chicago, which had both Croatian and Slovenian members, into the 1930s performed plays such as Črnošolec, Cigani, Ciganska Krš, Rokovnjači, and Prisega o Polnoči, village dramas that featured broad caricatures of Gypsies. In 1901 Rusyns in Trenton staged Šenk Palenčený (The Whiskey Bar), which featured Gypsy tipplers. Digs at thieving, or lazy, Gypsies were not atypical. A letter-writer from Glassport, Pennsylvania, could think of no greater slur against socialists than to label them “stateless gypsies.” Amerikansky russky viestnik as late as 1924 continued to publish a column of Gypsy jokes, while New Yorkský denník continued running disparaging Gypsy jokes as late as 1953.

Other Slovene, Czech, Rusyn, and Slovak plays featured stereotypical Jewish innkeepers and merchants, figures with whom Slavic migrants had pre-migration familiarity. The play Vdávání Líly Grün, a Jewish Comedy, for example, was performed in 1934 by the Czech-American Dramatic Society of Chicago at the Sokol of Chicago, Twenty-fourth Street and Kedzie Avenue. The troupe also performed Potash and Perlmutter’s Firm and Polsky Žid (The Polish Jew). Croatian and Slovenian socialists in Chicago also performed plays with Jewish village figures, while the Educational and Dramatic Society of Young Slovaks in Fort William, Ontario, between 1924 and 1943 frequently presented plays with Gypsy and Jewish stock characters. On April 11, 1943, for example, the play Tatar featured the character “Simon Rozenfeld, Žid (Jew).” (The Tatars themselves are Muslim Asians, who, as we’ll see, were stigmatized as savage threats to civilization in Russia.)

Casting a Jewish character as village innkeeper or merchant may not in every instance have been a directly anti-Semitic gesture. Amerikansky russky viestnik, though, in 1909 advertised a theater evening and ball presented by parishioners of Cleveland’s Greek Catholic Church of St. John the Baptist. On the bill was Štrajk, a comedy in three acts that featured “Ivan, a Jewish agitator.” And in 1921 the paper published a play which left little room for benefit of the doubt. The short script, by Maria Kushnir, a student at Lincoln High School, Cleveland, includes a “boarding house keeper,” “a worker,” “coal miner”—and “Levi-Silverman, Jew, owner of everything.”

Still, for all the stereotypes, Slavs and Jews continued to live in American cities in sometimes wary proximity, as Ewa Morawska notes. While some of the stereotypes of Jews were decidedly unflattering, Jewish storekeepers continued to be patronized by dedicated Slavic customers in places such as Philadelphia’s Marshall Street, even if theater groups at other moments mocked Jews. The psychic distance between Jews and Slavs evidently was not as great as that which would develop between white immigrants and African Americans.

Other plays performed at Slovak parishes, published in the Slovak press, express the desire of immigrants to perform the role of regular Americans. Plays such as Cesta k americkemu Občianstvo (The Road to American Citizenship) were
published by Denník Slovák v Amerike and Národný kalendár as early as 1897, and included Gypsy musicians in its cast list. In 1937, Slovaks and Rusyns at Philadelphia’s Holy Ghost Greek Catholic Church were still performing a self-mocking Grinorka (The Greenhorn.) Seven years later Peekskill, New York, Slovaks reprised the play. Grinorka contains no black characters, instead satirizing the immigrants’ own comical process of acculturation—although with some digs at “Tony the Italian Ice- man” as well as Irish and Jewish peddlars, Gypsies, and “Herško Rozenthal, innkeeper.” Only the Gypsy and Jewish stereotypes likely were familiar to Slavs in the Old Country, while the vaudeville depictions of Italians and Irishmen were readily available to immigrants from American popular culture. Such European group stereotypes, though, often were juxtaposed with black stage types. On the bill in Philadelphia was also a selection of American songs by a parish quartet—including the minstrel standard, “My Old Kentucky Home.” Earlier “greenhorn” plays had also been twinned with immigrant “Banjo Jass Orchestras,” which performed in blackface. Greenhorns were set along the road to Americanism, if not exactly citizenship, by a process of blackface, and reading of blackness in black and white. Still, room was made for enduring Old World caricatures as well.

**Spreading Civilization to ‘Kindly Devils’: Slavic Views of Asia**

Slavs had likewise encountered the Asiatic outsider prior to emigration, and here the supposed threat was of a dual nature. Russian emissaries of the tsar had to contend with another successful cultural model, Islam, but also seek to civilize even more “savage” Siberian and Central Asian “tribes” who might set the Russians down the path of devolution. Russia had been sending merchants, fur trappers, and missionaries eastward since the sixteenth century, but in spite of some initial success proselytizing along the Volga, the counterappeal of Islam, with its sophisticated centers of learning, culture, and economic dynamism proved quite attractive to Kazakhs, Bashkirs, and other Central Asian peoples. Wayne Dowler writes that by 1840 “a wave of apostasy among baptized non-Russians in the Volga” led to great fears that the Tatars (Asian Muslims) were winning the battle for non-Slavic hearts and minds. Russian Orthodox priests had little ability in Central Asian languages, and were “no match for the confessional schools of Islam (maktabe), which by the 1860s were spreading rapidly in the region.”

Fears of the attractiveness of Islam to Asians in the tsarist empire continued into the twentieth century. In 1906 education officials issued stridently nationalist demands that instruction in the Russian language and the Orthodox faith must be at the center of pedagogy, although exceptions were made for “especially savage, undeveloped and stupid” peoples of the Caucasus and Siberia. Conversely, developed peoples such as Poles were also allowed to conduct some history and religion classes in their native languages. When a Muslim Duma member nevertheless asked for textbooks in native languages, a delegate shouted,
“Go to Turkey!” Other Russians belittled Asians who sprinkled their Russian with “idiotisms,” an indication of the condescension many Slavs held for the idioms and culture of supposedly less enlightened Easterners. Darwinian hierarchies of lesser developed Asians and grudgingly acceptable fellow Slavs (Poles and Ukrainians) permeated debates in Russia on the course of empire.34

Even more worrisome to many tsarist officials was the appeal that pagan, supposedly less civilized Asian cultures had for certain Russians in the East, the backsliding “starozhily” (“old settlers”). Willard Sunderland notes that the few early Russian settlers who had established tiny villages across Siberia often were integrated into Asian cultures by the time other Russians revisited these places in the nineteenth century. “By the late imperial period, ‘nativized’ Russians of one kind or another could be found throughout the imperial east. In the northern Caucasus, for example, whole Russian villages looked and lived like gortsy; in the Volga-Ural region, other Russian peasants performed ‘pagan’ sacrifices like Voguls and Maris; on the Kazakh steppe, still others had converted to Islam...”

Contrary to the Orthodox Church’s civilizing mission, “lapsed Russian northerners” proved susceptible to “nativizing” into Siberian and Central Asian cultures and destabilized Slavic certainties of the power of their self-regarded superior religion, culture, and race. The fear of the inexplicable appeal of savage peoples and ways to “nativizing” Russians was palpable. Attempts to counter backsliding were expressed first in cultural terms in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, although by the nineteenth century appeals to “race” and blood were evoked in an effort to preserve the superior Slavic type and improve Siberian and Central Asian peoples such as the Samoeds and Irkuats. In either trope, the alarm at “nativized” Russians was apparent, for as Sunderland notes, if the Russian peasant “went native, what did that say about the invincibility of his national spirit or, for that matter, about the difference between savage and civilized?” In either cultural or “racial”/biological terms, the threat of contamination by a savage East was much on the mind of Slavic commentators by the 1870s. Ironically, Christian Slavs such as Russians, Slovaks, Rusyns, and Ukrainians would themselves be characterized by Nordic nativists as barbaric, Asiatic hordes once they arrived in the United States. Hierarchies of civilization and savagery seemingly cut many unkind ways.35

Such discourses on race influenced non-Russians, too, for the tsar’s empire was looked up to by many Slavs ruled by the Habsburgs as a pan-Slavic big brother. Ethnic elites such as the editors of Jednota and Amerikansky russky viestnik often defended Saint Petersburg and emulated its Russophile condescension of the Asian East. During the Russo-Japanese War, for example, some Slovaks took pains to make the distinction between white, European Slavs and non-white Japanese. Jednota congratulated Pavel K. Kadak, a member of the First Catholic Slovak Union, for answering American newspapers’ anti-Russian editorials and their approval of “the glorious Mongols” (i.e. Japanese). Kadak’s letter to American newspapers was reprinted in Jednota in both English and Slovak. “What is it that
induces this pro-Japanese enthusiasm on our part?” Kadak demanded. “Is it . . . because Russians belong to the same Caucasian race as Americans or because the Japanese are of the Mongolian race? Because the Russians are . . . spreading Christian civilization in northern and eastern Asia, and the Japs are pagans and enemies of Christianity? . . . Do they not dream of uniting the whole Mongolian race under their leadership for the purpose of chasing out of Asia the ‘white devils’?”

Later that year, Jednota was more to the point. “Yellow Peril” was the English headline to a Slovak editorial conflating the Japanese menace on the world stage and in America under an “open door” policy that actually, the editors argued, left America susceptible to a flood of docile Asian laborers who worked for distressingly low wages. “Asiatics once inundated Europe,” the editors warned. “The Huns of Attila were actually wild savages who slaughtered women and children like bloodthirsty animals. . . . Why it is impossible to educate the world, that Japan similarly wants to destroy us, is difficult to say. ‘Yellow Peril.’” Such an editorial would likely have found favor with Senator Lodge and other immigration restrictionists, even if they might have tacked on a paragraph or two on “the Slavic peril” not altogether to the liking of Jednota’s editors. Slavic American championing of Russia as a defender of white, Christian civilization against barbarous Asia also continued during World War II. Racialized attitudes toward the backward East prominent among educated Russians filtered into immigrant newspapers as well.

In this denigration of Asian and Muslim cultures, Slavic Europeans were not alone, for southern Italians and people of the Balkan region also worked and journeyed in places where Muslim Africans and Middle Easteners were a known quantity, as did English, Dutch, and French mariners by the seventeenth century. A polyglot community developed, for example, in Tunis well before its explicit colonization by the French. But again Islam was seen as a threat. Intriguingly, Peter L. Wilson argues that it was not the barbarism of Islam but its very success at appealing to new converts, not just in North Africa and the Balkans, but also among northwest European sailors, that made the “Moor” such a threat to the European public. He was winning the battle for far too many hearts and minds. To counter this—and also to capitalize on English, French, German, and Dutch fascination with forbidden, supposedly decadent Islam—the “captivity narrative” genre flourished into the early nineteenth century. Memoirs of European sailors who swore they had suffered at the hands of the Turk were salacious bestsellers that didn’t let the facts of life under Islam get in the way of good sales. As Linda Colley notes, at a time that Britain and other European powers were expanding their overseas slave trade from Africa, captivity narratives branded the men responsible, whether they were Moroccan, Algerian, Tunisian or Tripolitanian, as Barbary or Turkish pirates, terrorising the seas, preying on legitimate, peaceful trade, and selling innocent Christians into
Muslim slavery. . . . [T]he assonance between Barbary as a geographical signifier and the insult “barbarian” was a gift of which generations of polemicists made abundant and predictable use.

There were also many popular-culture depictions of evil North African Moors on the English stage, fitting like the narratives into a framework of savage Moors preying on enlightened and innocent Europeans—even if the very act of bringing to light the vulnerability of Englishmen (and Irish, Dutch, and other West European sailors) unsettlingly called into question the era’s belief in the ultimate progress of reason and white rule. Stage Moors often displayed less sensitivity to foreigners’ humanity than Shakespeare achieved with *Othello*. These dramas were avidly consumed by working-class Britons and Irish as early as the sixteenth century.39

By the nineteenth century, Istanbul was on the decline, but many ethnic groups carried recollections of the threat posed by the “Turkish times” into the twentieth century. Although most Slavic immigrants arrived with not much familiarity with high culture, folk plays conveyed similar fears of Tatar invaders or the “Turkish Times” (rule by the Ottomans, 1526 to the 1680s), which equated blackness, non-Europeananness (African, Asiatic) with barbarism and evil. Croatian American actors in Chicago portrayed characters in plays that depicted uprisings against Ottoman rule, with evil “Musselman” characters featured in dramas such as *Zulumčar, Hasanaginica*, and *Mlada Breda*. The last play, published in 1922 in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, was set in 1472.40 Newark Slovaks in 1917 similarly presented a play in which stage Turks threatened the pure during “the Serbian uprising against the Turks at Jagodine in 1787.”41 As late as 1965 a similar play was presented by New York Slovaks, in which “Jozef Šottník played a Turkish type” with outlandishly long nails, odd fez headdress, funny nose, glasses and beard, and pointy shoes. Amateur theater groups practiced their own form of “orientalism” which depicted Muslims as barbaric (even if sometimes comically so) no less than practitioners of high culture.42

Earlier, during World War I, papers such as *New Yorkský denník* characterized the Ottoman Empire as a backward land of despotism, and cheered on imperial Russia in its fight against the Turks and the rule of the burka. “The Russian in Asia battles the Turk, who brings Islam with its veiled ‘burka.’ Kindly devils!” was the caption for a cartoon of a misshapen midget Turk battling a calm, noble-looking Russian (see Figure 3-1.)43 *Slovák v Amerike* in 1912 had already characterized the Turks and Islam in general as barbarian and “Mongol” in support of the war by Serbia, Montenegro, and Greece against Istanbul. “The sick man of Europe should get out of Europe and go back to Asia!” an editorial’s headline declared. Anti-Asian, “Mongol” rhetoric frequently was used elsewhere against the Magyars.44 *Jednota* took a more lighthearted look at the “Mahommedan,” publishing a joke in which a dervish demonstrates the existence of God, free will, and suffering by throwing a clump of dirt at a skeptical nonbeliever.45
Figure 3-1: “The Russian in Asia Battles the Turk, who Brings Islam with its Veiled ‘Burka.’ Kindly Devils!” Stereotypes of Asians and Muslims as not fully human were prevalent among Slavic peoples even before some of them migrated to the United States. *New Yorkský denník*, January 31, 1917, 1.
Figure 3-2: “Once the cultured Germans found that no one in the world would help them to achieve their fine cultured work, they asked the Turks for help. The Turks, who declared holy war against all Christians. Thus the Turks turned the Germans against Christianity. The Germans are great friends of the Turks. One very good old Latin proverb says the following: ‘I can tell who you are if you show me your friends’.” Slovák v Amerike, November 9, 1914, 1.
When Germany announced its alliance with Istanbul, *Slovák v Amerike* was quick to point out what uncivilized company the Kaiser was keeping. “MORE CULTURE,” a front-page cartoon was captioned on November 9, 1914, with Wilhelm embracing a devious, grinning sultan under the hated crescent. “Once the cultured Germans found that no one in the world would help them to achieve their fine cultured work,” the editors noted, “they asked the Turks for help. The Turks, who declared holy war against all Christians. Thus the Turks turned the Germans against Christianity. The Germans are great friends of the Turks. One very good old Latin proverb says the following: ‘I can tell who you are if you show me your friends’” (see Figure 3-2).46

These characterizations were often conflated with critiques of the supposedly “Mongol” Magyars, as when *New Yorkský denník* ran a letter to the editor that said that under the Magyars Slovak women had it worse than among the Turks, where the women are regarded as slaves. This letter-writer also compared Slovaks to the blacks freed by Lincoln, who he argued had it much better than his countrymen ruled by Budapest. There were many arrows in the racial quiver, but at a time when the United States still barred emigration by Asians, the “Mongol” characterization was employed liberally by Slavs against their enemies.47

Gilman has argued for the cultural equation of blackness with evil as early as the Middle Ages among German writers. He further argues that by the seventeenth century black retainers were already prized at aristocratic courts as symbols of the exotic world of less civilized beings with which enlightened nobles wished to show their familiarity.48 While few people in certain more remote East Central European regions may have come into direct contact with blacks, other peoples by the late nineteenth century were more conversant with non-Europeans. As Robert Orsi and Catherine Eagan have argued, many immigrants such as the Italians and Irish came to America with more than passing familiarity with non-Europeans, including blacks in the Atlantic and Mediterranean worlds. Other Europeans settled in ports such as Tunis prior to 1800, while even London had a sizable non-European population by the eighteenth century. And even Slovak tinkers of the nineteenth century were documented as wandering as far afield as the Ottoman realms, and thus could plausibly have encountered black workers years before Ellis Island.49

If Slovak *drotári* were sometimes disparaged as Gypsy vagabonds, they were well-traveled vagrants. Indeed, the tinkers of western Slovakia had had many opportunities to experience non-European peoples prior to arriving in the United States. By 1905, a Slovak tinker community could not be studied in isolation from the wider world to which *drotári* wandered. In that year an ethnographer studying wireworkers of Kolárovice noted,

All over the world can be found the sons of Slovaks. They have wandered throughout the world in search of work and many a wife can tell of an expedition made by the whole family in search of work. . . . We are familiar
with wireworkers not only in our place (Bohemia and Slovakia), but also in Austria, Moravia, Hungary, Slavonia, Serbia, Russia, Germany, Spain and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{50}

The ethnographer divided his study into a section on life on the road and at home just as \textit{drotári} themselves divided the year as a matter of course. Tinkers returned to Kolárovice three times a year, especially in the summer to help with farm work.\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{Drotári} (wireworkers or tinkers) of Trenčín villages such as Čadca as early as the sixteenth century established a name as itinerant craftsmen, selling wares and metalworking skills across Central Europe. Initially working in nearby Silesia, \textit{drotári} soon spread across the Slovak region and as early as the seventeenth century Slovak tinkers had traveled to Russia. During the eighteenth century they established trade routes and workshops in Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Russia, Serbia, and Slovenia, repairing all manner of household goods. So famous did the Trenčín \textit{drotári} become that, in 1905, Manó Somogyi devoted considerable attention to them in his study of the Empire’s “wandering dealers and workers.”\textsuperscript{52}

Writing on the tinkers in the 1950 \textit{Ľudový kalendár} (People’s Calendar), Adam Kosinec noted wireworkers amicably lived and worked among the neighboring Czechs and Poles, but quickly made an appearance in “foreign regions,” with Štefan Huncík and Jozef Zimula noted as establishing a workshop in Moscow, which brought several hundred Slovak workers to that city by the mid-nineteenth century. The author’s grandfather, Michal Backor, by 1870 was successfully established in Essen on the Rhine, while other Trenčín natives were working in Stuttgart, Switzerland, “the present-day Yugoslavia,” Tbilisi, Irkutsk, and Siberia.\textsuperscript{53}

In relating the tall tales of Magyar and Slovak itinerants, Béla Gunda notes that before World War I the tinkers “traveled all over Europe and occasionally even as far as Asia,” again indicating non-Europeans were a known quantity to those who later established workshops in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Newark, St. Louis, and other U.S. cities. Perhaps because of this noted itinerancy, in some Hungarian villages it was said that when Columbus “discovered” America, he also discovered Slovak \textit{drotári} who, although drunk, told the explorer they’d been working the place for years. The disreputable vagabonds’ drunkenness and truth-stretching likely fit into stereotypes many villagers held of these outcasts, but whether they really reached America, their worldviews had already expanded beyond their home villages.\textsuperscript{54}

As Thomas Čapek noted, hundreds of families in the towns along the Kysuca were dependent on the wire trade. In 150 villages of Trenčín province, it was determined that more than two-thirds of the male population worked as wireworkers in the second half of the nineteenth century. The result of so many people reliant on a single trade was frequent migrations in ever wider circles in search of broken pots and the gold that might come from repairing them. In
1877 it was noted 10,000 Trenčín wireworkers annually journeyed into the world. Trenčín natives established wire works in the eastern province of Spiš, a secondary, distant “branch office” for Westerners. Other drotári did business in Germany, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Romania, the Balkans, Poland, and Russia. By the 1870s Spiš Slovaks likewise had been making trips to Bulgaria, Serbia, Turkey, and Russia for decades. Other tinkers established manufactories in Samara on the Volga River; Baku, Azerbaijan; Tbilisi, Georgia; Saint Petersburg and Moscow. Even Argentina, Madagascar, Ceylon, and Harbin, China, knew the Slovak tinkers by then, while Tomáš Fasunek of Kysuca had already established himself in Tunisia, where he owned 45 manufactories.\(^{55}\)

Certainly in their wanderings to Mediterranean ports, the drotári had come into contact with many Africans, and whether Tunisian drotári themselves later wandered to the United States or not, far-flung tinkers were still in contact with relatives and fellow townsmen in Trenčín, sending remittances and letters as well as visiting their home base.\(^{56}\) Like Irish migrants to London or Italian fishermen sailing to North Africa, these itinerant laborers had to have known of black people prior to emigrating, and did not arrive in America race-neutral. They may not, however, have experienced race as a hard and fast Jim Crow binary, as it developed in the United States.

Still, scholars have recently begun to address the evidence that many European immigrants did not arrive in America as innocent of ideas of race as was once imagined. Orsi notes South Italians and Sicilians had been scorned as “Africans” by northern Italians, and Scott Malcomson notes Sicilian and Mezzogiorno fishermen and merchants had come in contact with North Africans for decades, if not centuries, by the time of mass migration. Certainly the tinkers working for Fasunek in Tunisia knew something of race.

Eagan, too, argues that while Irish subjects of the British Empire knew far too well what it meant to be stigmatized as a quasi-racialized other, they nevertheless were learning to distance themselves from African subjects of the crown, those they met as slaves, servants, or sailors in Ireland, England, or the West Indies, and as exhibits in traveling spectacle carnivals that toured the Irish countryside. In the latter instance, a traveling exhibit of “wild African tribesmen” spurred the Cork Southern Reporter to comment the blacks “come so near the monkey tribe, as almost to make us question their humanity.” Such cultural productions distancing Irish subjects from black objects cause Eagan to conclude, “[E]ven as early as the eighteenth century, there are indications the Irish had begun to differentiate themselves from blacks in the empire; thus, they had begun to claim the privileges of whiteness long before they emigrated to America.”\(^{57}\)

In East Central Europe, too, from 1874 on Carl Hagenbeck and his rival impresarios offered “anthropological exhibitions” that emphasized the savagery of supposedly primitive Africans. As William H. Schneider notes, these zoo-like displays “placed West Africans in a setting of spectacle and emphasized their warlike, savage nature.” One such Dahomean village was exhibited in October 1892
in Prague, while other human zoos fabricated cannibalistic displays, or presented scantily clad African women warriors in titillating tours that mixed sexual and racial voyeurism. In the 1880s and 1890s, such supposedly “scientific” displays of backward African natives (often portrayed by non-Africans, including black American actors) entertained huge crowds in Prague, Vienna, Warsaw, Budapest, Saint Petersburg, and Moscow, while the impresario R. A. Cunningham in 1883–84 brought a “tribe” of Australian aborigines to Berlin, Saint Petersburg, Istanbul, as well as “many zoos and music halls throughout provincial Europe.” As late as 1922 it was still possible in Prague to purchase a souvenir postcard of an “Abyssinian warrior” in order to commemorate one’s visit to the zoo. Tens of thousands of Slovaks by the 1880s had migrated to cities such as Budapest, Vienna, and Prague in search of seasonal work, while Trenčín’s tinkers had an even broader familiarity with the cities in which African savagery was offered as entertainment.58

Many Slovaks, then, were often not as race-neutral in their thinking pre-migration as had once been assumed. Indeed, East Central European zoo visitors’ preoccupation with “Dahomean” cannibalism or savagery prefigures similar coverage of these matters by Slovak American newspapers such as Slovák v Amerike and New Yorkský denník. These “human zoos” were known/consumed pre-migration by Slavs and Irish, but continued well into the twentieth century as popular attractions at world’s fairs, circuses, and other popular-culture venues that immigrants avidly consumed after they came to America. Earlier, in 1889, the U.S. humor magazine Puck satirized both the display of exotic Asiatic and African savages and the only slightly less savage Irish who still alarmed WASP nativists. A cartoon from that year shows Mr. Patsy O’Rourke taking a break from his midway carnival job masquerading as the Fiji Chief, while Tooley rehearses his part as the Wild Man of Borneo.59

This is not to deny that Slavic viewers of Dahomean villages and other racialized spectacles of supposed African inferiority were not themselves stigmatized once they arrived in America. Still, the prevalence of “human zoos” in Budapest, Prague, Vienna, and even “many zoos and music halls throughout provincial Europe” suggests that many Slavs’ race-thinking may have begun gestating years before boarding a Cunard liner for America.

Similarly, while a woman who emigrated to New York in the 1920s recalls she saw images of plantations and seemingly contented slaves on cotton packaging that arrived at the textile factory in Usti nad Orlici, it wasn’t until after she arrived in New York that she met actual black people, and learned these idyllic images had little resemblance to slavery or sharecropping on plantations.60 Non-Europeans such as African Americans were known to many Slavs from a variety of sources pre-migration. Still, the absolute binaries of Jim Crow segregation, America’s “one-drop rule” that disfranchised virtually all citizens with even a remote African American ancestor, and the reign of terror waged against blacks in the South and other parts of the country, were matters with which immigrants
were unfamiliar upon arrival and about which new immigrants such as the Slovaks had to learn if they were to accept their place as “white” citizens.

Such a designation was not as automatic as the descendants of Southeast European migrants might assume. As scholars such as Matthew Frye Jacobson, David Roediger, Alexander Saxton, and others have demonstrated, Southeast Europeans were white and not-quite-white all at the same time; in the eyes of many nativists they were indeed “inbetween peoples.” Legally, European migrants were eligible to settle permanently in the United States and establish citizenship, unlike Chinese, Japanese, and other Asians, even the Filipinos who after 1898 were ruled by the United States. Culturally and politically, however, Southeast European newcomers were greeted with a torrent of diatribes asserting that they were so alien to American traditions of republican self-rule, or so lacking in intellectual capacities, as never to fit into the country.61

This nativist discourse prevalent in English-language papers found its way into immigrant papers, combining with Slavs’ own Old World prejudices, as writers and readers sifted their way through the hierarchies of peoples. Slavic newspapers reflected this obsession with inter-European notions of the fluidity of race. Papers reported on Jewish, Italian, and Irish residents, often in terms just as unflattering as the alarmist rhetoric employed by the Immigration Restriction League. The coverage in Slavic papers of two ethnic groups in particular—Jews and Italians—indicates the enduring wariness, even hostility, of many Slavs toward other European “outsiders.” One group was quite familiar to Slavs pre-migration, while only those tinkers who had wandered and worked in Mediterranean ports prior to migrating to America likely knew firsthand of the latter. Nevertheless, stereotypes old and new were adapted from American papers and reflected in Slavic journals as newcomers tried out which racial boundaries were most salient in America. In the end, fellow Europeans were regarded, albeit grudgingly, as acceptable neighbors and fellow citizens, but, as with the Slav’s own “promotion” to white fellow citizen, nothing was guaranteed. Many column inches of anti-Italian and anti-Semitic coverage had to be printed first.

It is to these articles that we next turn.
Chapter 4

“A Slav Can Live in Dirt That Would Kill a White Man”: Race and the European “Other”

When bread rioters attacked New York’s Waldorf-Astoria to target the high cost of living in the lead-up to World War I, a newspaper report quickly blamed the protests on “crafty Jews” and “a revolt, it is said, that was called out by foreign agents.” Seven years before this, however, a competing paper had a different culprit on which to readily blame New York and other cities’ recent crime waves: “[M]ost of these crimes can be traced to the nature of the Italian, for most of the crimes are those that require a treacherous, secretive, violent, fatalistic and bloodthirsty people. Such a criminal system could only have been developed in Italy, where superstition is prevalent and the people have a very lively imagination that is inclined to maniacal anger, the opposite of cowardly fear.”

These ethnic slights were frequent refrains in the Progressive Era, when those demanding immigration restriction were determined to bar the gates of Ellis Island to Southeast Europeans. What’s notable, however, is that these calumnies appeared not in nativist journals, but in Slovak papers. Edward Alsworth Ross and other Nordic “race experts” were important in influencing the creation of a hierarchical conception of not-quite-white-enough races. But immigrants’ own responses and practices in shaping their racialized identities have been neglected. A group itself regarded by many as a threat to the wage rates and self-government of Nordic Americans could read in its own papers the familiar slurs against violent, criminally minded Italians and rapacious Jews. Sadly these images were more ideas from the mainstream of American culture that were propagated in immigrant papers. While not as prevalent as the articles covering black lynchings or race riots against African Americans, derogatory depictions of European strangers suggest that in their first years in America Slavic migrants were as likely to view other “inbetween peoples,” to use Barrett and Roediger’s phrase, in a probationary light, not necessarily acceptable as neighbors or work mates. Only after a testing out of various racial guises did editors temper critiques of fellow Europeans.
In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, immigrants would have heard from a variety of authority figures that their whiteness was not necessarily unadulterated. The Dillingham Commission that was tasked with studying the immigrant “problem” documented 35 races of Europe sending migrants to the United States, and during World War I intelligence quotient tests were developed to confirm the unsuitability of Slavs and Mediterraneans for officer training. Sociologist Edward Alsworth Ross stated categorically that in one steel mill city, 54.5 percent of Slovak schoolchildren were mentally retarded, but he also devoted much room in his *The Old World in the New* to the deficiencies of Sicilians, possessed as they were of “a backless skull.”

Slovaks rejected the first assertion but indulged in coverage of supposedly innate Italian criminality that would have delighted Ross. Articles faulting Jews and Italians appeared in the same editions in which Slovaks read of lynchings and white workers’ battles with blacks, cumulatively suggesting that the indeterminacies of race were being sifted by immigrant newspaper readers and editors as they tentatively aligned on the white part of America’s cognitive landscape. Whether these assertions convinced armchair phrenologists is doubtful. Ross also stated, “A Slav can live in dirt that would kill a white man.”

Academic and popular press writers alike often characterized Slavic, along with East European Jewish, immigrants as “Asiatic” or “Oriental.” Future Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, indulging these suspicions, commented that Slovak immigrants were regarded by the U.S. consul at Budapest as

> not a desirable acquisition for us to make, since they appear to have so many items in common with the Chinese. Like these, they are extremely frugal, the love of whiskey of the former being balanced by the opium habit of the latter. Their ambition lacks both in quality and quantity. Thus they will work similarly cheap as the Chinese, and will interfere with a civilized laborer’s earning a “white” laborer’s wages.

Writers who feared that Slavic immigrants would undercut the wages of “real white men” stigmatized their “Asiatic” docility and lower standard of living. Political economists couched discussions of wage rates in alarmist rhetoric of invasion, as when Frank Julian Warne evoked Mongol hordes to describe the “Slavic invasion and the coal miners.” Russian distinctions between cultured, Christian Slavs and Siberian, Asian savages were lost on such Nordic writers.

Ross worried “the superfecund Slavs may push to the wall the Anglo-Americans, the Irish-Americans and the rest, until the invasion of our labor markets by
hordes of still cheaper West Asiatics shall cause the Slav, too, to lose interest in America. . . .” While cold comfort to slighted Slovaks, Ross seems to have differentiated between new immigrants such as Slavs, as big a threat as they were, and “West Asiatics.”

Other writers weren’t so sure. When Burton Hendrick warned in 1907 of the dangers of “The Great Jewish Invasion,” the double focus of his phobia was on display. “New York . . . seems destined to become overwhelmingly a Jewish town,” he wrote. But what really alarmed him was that since 1881 “Jewish immigrants have come largely from Eastern Europe.” Hence, he concluded with alarm, “New York is not only largely, and probably destined to be overwhelmingly, a city of Hebrews, but a city of Asiatics.” Not Jewishness per se, but immigrants’ residence in uncivilized, benighted Eastern Europe is what seems to have marked them as Asians, beyond the pale. Earlier, E. S. Martin’s condescending magazine safari to the slums, “East Side Considerations,” had been illustrated with a picture of a Jewish immigrant girl captioned “An oriental type.” Such exoticization of racial others was perhaps inevitable, for even a writer sympathetic to Slovaks wrote of “racial problems in Hungary.”

Well into the 1930s, Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard lamented the “passing of the great race” and “the rising tide of color against white world supremacy.” The biggest wave of this threat, as conceptualized by such pseudoscientists, was not American blacks, who Jim Crow had seemingly neutralized, but the millions of immigrants who belonged to the non-Nordic “races” of Europe, Slavs included. As Michael Rogin notes, “Lothrop Stoddard . . . dismissed Franz Boas’ denial of racial difference between immigrants and old-stock Americans as ‘the desperate attempt of a Jew to pass himself off as a white.’” Stoddard was just as dismissive of Slovaks and other Slavs trying to do the same. It wasn’t merely Slovaks’ lack of English or unfamiliarity with the wage rate in anthracite Pennsylvania that alarmed nativist writers. Racial liminality as an Asiatic, or, at best, quasi-Asiatic invader, was what really raised alarms.

Slovak newspapers were intent on countering anti-immigrant rhetoric such as Ross’s. But could the ethnic press be heard above the eugenics chorus? Native-born opinion of Slavs was probably little affected by what was written in Slavic-language journals, or even in English-language publications such as the World War I-era Bohemian Review, which advocated Tomáš G. Masaryk’s independence movement. Where the immigrant press was critical was in contributing to the identity formation of immigrants themselves.

Within industrial America’s many Slovak enclaves, the words of Ivan Bielek of Národné noviny carried more weight than those of Ross. The sociologist proclaimed with certainty that the Slav, unlike the white man, has “a horror of water applied inside or outside.” But Slavic immigrants themselves drew cognitive racial boundaries, courtesy of their own newspapers. As noted in Chapter 2, lynching accounts began the process of othering African Americans. But here,
too, some of the nativists’ stereotypes—surely not against Slavs, though—were avidly reproduced in Slavic publications.9

A “Swarm” or a “Flood”: Coverage of Jewish Immigrants

For one ethnic other, however, Slavic immigrants had arrived in America with a template of enduring stereotypes already in their cultural baggage; they didn’t need E. S. Martin or Burton Hendrick to tell them about “Oriental” or “Asiatic” Jews.10 In Central Europe, Christian Slavs had long been exposed to prejudices against Jewish fellow townsmen. Not surprisingly, then, in their early, sometimes inflammatory depictions, some Slavic journalists indulged in defaming stereotypes that portrayed Jewish residents of both Central Europe and the United States as almost as alien and threatening as African Americans.

Old World assumptions about Jews crossed the ocean and sometimes appeared in immigrant newspapers. The Rusyn newspaper Amerikansky russky viestnik, for example, was skeptical of the accuracy of reports of the 1903 pogroms in Kishinev, in tsarist Russia. Instead the paper blamed Jews themselves for instigating the attacks, in which an estimated 49 were killed and hundreds wounded in a two-day melee in April 1903. The attack had occurred after a nationalist newspaper blamed the murder of a Christian on unnamed Jews.11 When Jewish residents of America, England, and other countries began to organize emigrant aid societies to assist their coreligionists wishing to leave Russia and Russian-controlled parts of Poland, the paper again was more alarmed at the possibility of further Jewish migration to the United States, not the violence that had spurred the exodus.

The paper alleged that “News of the persecution of Jews in Russia at Kishinev was spread through the Jewish newspapers in America, so that all the Jews in Russia, as many as 65,000 of them, are wandering on the road to the United States.” The paper asserted that it was alleged Jewish control of newspapers that caused them to defame tsarist Russia; similar charges of press control would be repeated in various Slavic papers such as Amerikansky russky viestnik, Slováč v Amerike, and New Yorkský denník into the 1940s. In language reminiscent of the Immigration Restriction League, the paper further warned that New York now faced a “Jewish flood tide,” repeating the ominous phrase twice. “When these Jews who are in Russia arrive here, it’s unlikely that the local Jews will know what to do with them or how to put them to work,” the paper continued.

Already in New York there are half a million Jews, and in the whole United States there are five million. These Jews already have trouble supporting themselves and the newcomers would cost a lot of money to support. As a result we hear that they are now writing to the Jewish bands that they should remain in Russia and not come to America. The Russian Jews, in turn, have neither the
will nor the money to come to the United States, and therefore they won’t come here. To this I say, with my band in America: “Thank God!” A Jew in London, Israel Zangwill, told a meeting that he would gladly pay 12 dollars for every Jew who could be sent back to Russia. But this resistance to the Russian Jews’ emigration to the United States can no longer be just a Jewish task of the “Geseres.” They must remain there so Slavs can earn their bread.

In the last sentence is reflected the fears of economic competition from another ethnic group, one that was often stigmatized in the Progressive Era in both English-language sources and Slavic newspapers as particularly predatory. The paper’s treatment of the aftermath of the Kishinev murders, though, indicates more concern about the arrival of Jews in America than their murder in Russia.12

A week later the paper again focused on alleged Jewish control of newspapers in critiquing the harsh words leveled at Russia in the wake of Kishinev. “In recent times the gentlemen of the American press have very unpleasantly in their newspapers carped against Russia, the result of the special influence the Jews have on journalism, and at the urging of Jews America insists that the U.S.-Russian friendship has been transformed into enmity,” an article stated. “[I]t’s inevitable to see the need for a restoration of American friendship with Russia, and how the Jewish American newspapers have killed this traditional friendship between Russia and the United States.”13

Many Rusyns looked up to the Russian Empire as a fellow Slavic big brother and potential defender of their interests, and editors at Amerikansky russky viestnik often seemed more interested in defending the tsar’s good name than interrogating the truth about the regime’s anti-Semitic policies. Moreover, like other Slavic papers, Amerikansky russky viestnik showed no hesitation when it came to publicizing other immigrants’ grievances. On the same page as the dismissive reports on Jewish concerns over Kishinev, the paper told of a series of “indignation meetings” by Slovaks and Croatians in Cleveland and elsewhere protesting the heavy-handed rule by Budapest. Ethnic grievances were differentially assessed depending on the degree of kinship Rusyn editors felt with the complainants; Jewish concerns were treated with contempt and spurred slurs on “control” of the press and “flood tides” of unworthy migrants. And during World War I, a meeting of Slovaks in Palmerton, Pennsylvania, asserted that many Slovaks “are convinced that the most blackened people in those various ‘journals’ are actually not so black; not even the Jews are painted in such a manner [as the Slovaks].”14

Five months later the paper was still reporting, with some alarm, on “The Flight of the Jews to the United States.” A meeting of “the Jews of New York,” the paper noted, was held, “designed to serve all the Jews of Russia by bringing them to the United States.” The plans of the Baron de Hirsch Fund were discussed, as well as proposals to tax “the rich Jews in the United States” to establish a steamship line between Odessa and New York to aid in colonization. Images of a monolithic,
wealthy community were suggested in this report, and a critique was also leveled at the United States’s “liberal immigration laws” that might permit an influx of Russian Jews. The irony of such a statement is palpable, coming as it did from a Rusyn newspaper, the official organ of Sojediněníje (Greek Catholic Union), a fraternal association representing the interests of Slavs who themselves were disparaged by many Nordic critics of the invading “incoming millions.” But the writer reassured his readers that the colonization of five million Russian Jews in New York was impractical, so that “this Jewish organization’s plan seems like a dream. . . . “ Still, the writer noted that the meeting looked beyond New York and “also considered plans to settle Jews in Argentina, in Palestine, in East Africa, and in Manchuria.” As in June, Amerikansky russky viestnik again said “Thank God!” that only a fraction of Russia’s five million Jews were heading to America.15

The relief was short-lived. The following month the paper reported “American Jews Again on the Move.” This time the paper denounced “the great Jewish international ‘Geseres’ and American Jews in its service in the U.S.” for asking President Roosevelt to give the Russian Jews protection after rumors circulated that another massacre was planned for Kishinev on January 7th, Russian Christmas. Amerikansky russky viestnik dismissed these rumors and again defended Russia, instead attributing any unrest in East Central Europe to the victims themselves, arguing that

the Russian government was only protecting the Russians. . . . Every man knows well that the Jews in Russia are working to create a revolution there in all possible sides through revolutionary societies, and that is why the Russian government is working stringently on all sides to protect Russians against the Jews. The Jews have practiced revolutionary ways of hatred and now have screamed that the Russians lack Christian charity.16

This refrain bears some similarity to the far more prevalent lynching accounts that Amerikansky russky viestnik and other Slavic papers had already run by 1903, and would continue to run through the 1920s. Here, as in lynching accounts, a victimized, marginalized ethnic/racial group is blamed for bringing a massacre onto itself through supposed deviant behavior. But while a few assertions of black organized conspiracies against whites were floated in the immigrant press (repeating the alarmist transference of mainstream white American papers and books), more typically blacks’ lone crimes, sexual or otherwise, were said to have triggered the lynching.17 In this account, established slurs of Jewish “revolutionary societies” justified for the writer anything innocent Christian Russians might have done. Assertions of an international conspiracy, with revolutionary aims, regrettably greeted many Jewish immigrants from a variety of conspiracy-minded sources.

Sadly, Amerikansky russky viestnik was not alone in blaming East Central European Jews for their persecution. Národné noviny also reported that a Jewish boy had been murdered in the province of Kiev. There, the paper reported, “the
most recent spate of ritual murders is still going on.” The bloodletting began when “a small Jewish boy was murdered, with an infamous 13 blows like a farm animal, the infamous method of slaughtering the Jews, akin to hog-butchering for ritual purposes.” The paper further explained that “During Lent . . . the farmer believed that the 12-year-old son of a Jewish tailor in the neighborhood had been taking liberties with two little [Catholic] girls. . . . The farmer gave him the first blows on the boy’s neck and chest, at which the boy let out a blood-curdling cry. The farmer confessed that he had murdered the boy, but he was not prosecuted, but rather found innocent by reason of insanity.”

As in the case of so many lynchings of black Americans, rumors of “cross-racial” or deviant sexual activity, especially against children, were said to be the justificatory trigger for a community’s collective vengeance. As in the most horrific American lynchings, that vengeance here took the form of a ritualized torture and murder, but as with the vast majority of lynchings reported in the immigrant press, here, too, no condemnation supplemented the murder’s report.18

An even longer account of violence against Jews, also published in Národné noviny, sought to explain, not condemn, the origins of many East Central Europeans’ belief in the infamous “blood libel,” the vicious rumor that Jews needed the blood of Christian victims during Passover. A story from Kiev, headlined “Ritual Murder,” reported that a Jewish man named Menahem Mendel Beilis, a factory superintendent, had been accused of murdering Christian children. The case became another international scandal and embarrassment for Saint Petersburg. Yet as in numerous lynching accounts rewritten for the Slavic press, in this lengthy account Beilis’s guilt is never questioned, even though he was still to be tried in a tsarist court. Rather, the paper’s account noted that “Beilis stands charged that he murdered a Christian boy, and that he engaged in a blood sacrifice as is needed in the synagogue for the Jewish religious ceremony.” Such superstitious hatreds were likely familiar to many immigrants reading this account; even decades later Slovak informants could laughingly recall the foolish fears their parents had imparted to them regarding Jewish neighbors in Philadelphia.19

Still, the writer for Národné noviny endeavored to explain the origin of the blood libel, since, regarding Beilis, “[t]he question now occupies the entire educated world, whether the case will go further. . . .” The author noted the use of lambs’ blood when the Exodus occurred, as well as in Abel’s sacrifices. These early sacrifices “began the presumption that later developed into a suspicion that the Jews need human, Christian blood for their religious ceremonies, especially, however, that Christian blood was used in Passover Matzoh. . . .” The author continued his speculations for several paragraphs, guessing that the metaphorical evocations of a sacrifice, or references by early Christians to the Lamb of God, caused them to literalize the metaphor and suspect their Jewish fellow townsmen of some barbaric human sacrifice. “In the time of Christ, at the Jewish holiday
Passover a lamb was sacrificed with great religious ceremony, before the high priest,” the author wrote. “But this has been gone some time, and now only the myth of the ritual murder remains. . . .” In all of this folk theology, no condemnation of the persecution that greeted Beilis or other Jewish East Europeans was offered.20

The socialist newspaper Rovnost l'udu was one of the few journals that treated seriously reports of East Central European attacks on Jews, as in a post-World War I outbreak of violence near Košice, Czechoslovakia; the paper was also atypical in deploiring these attacks.21 New Yorkský denník likewise reported on post-World War I “pogroms in Russia,” but noted, perhaps as exculpation for the rioters, that “of the 479 Bolshevik leaders in Russia, 428 are Jewish.”22 The paper again revived charges of innate “Jewish bolshevism” in an editorial under that headline decrying the short-lived Béla Kun communist regime in Hungary. The editorial repeated the phrase “Jewish bolsheviks” several times in denouncing the “barbaric” and “monstrous” regime. Jewish, radical, and monstrous were conflated here.23

Even more vituperatively, Slovak and Rusyn papers bristled at the criticism of fellow Slavs, and accepted slurs of Jewish conspiracy and deviance that “explained” the animus they faced. Soon after World War I, Amerikansky russky viestnik editorialized in a manner quite unsympathetic to Jewish victims of postwar pogroms. In an editorial titled “The cry of the Jews: Terror and Pogroms,” the paper commented, “All over America, in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and elsewhere protests were held against the pogroms committed by Russian people and Polish soldiers against the struggling Jews; and Christian Americans read with amazement these battles and the harassment of innocent females.” But within a paragraph any hint of sympathy dissipated. “The struggling masses are not murderers, not menacers, but instead are only attacking parasitic Jews!” the editorial writer argued, “who, according to ten letters, are perennial lawbreakers, disturbers of the peace, and not worthy of our time.”

While this lengthy editorial clearly indulged in anti-Semitic stereotypes, it also offered some history of the accomplishments of Jewish musicians, writers, philosophers, and doctors in spite of the many pogroms and expulsions that they had endured, whether in Navarre, Seville, and the rest of Spain in the fifteenth century or in Tsar Alexander III’s Russia. Nevertheless, the editorial dismissed the stories of anti-Jewish atrocities in 1919 as fabrications, the work of journals that were in Jewish hands, repeating a frequent refrain of Slavic immigrant papers. The writer asserted, “[W]here political troublemakers, anarchists, revolutionaries, and so on, are found, they [the Jews] provide the main roles.” As proof he cited, for example, “Lenin and Trotsky, better known as Bronstein,” who had played a role in toppling the tsar.

An editorial that began with reports of American protests against East European pogroms ended with a distressingly familiar refrain of blaming the victim. Referring to Russian Jews, the writer declared, “They’ve discredited Russia, they’ve murdered
their best moral and material sons, so the first thing the nation must do is throw these weeds in the stream!" Even before the war, Jednota had run a similar editorial. “The Jews and the Slavs,” which spoke of the Jews’ supposed control of all businesses, banks, and shops in Slavic realms, as well as their many bomb-throwing anarchists, to explain the attacks in Poland and Russia. The paper faulted American Jews for demanding that President Roosevelt “intervene with Russia in the interest of the Jews.” The paper said Jews seem to have forgotten that Russia had never intervened to look after America’s affairs, even though “every second black in the United States was ‘lynched’ by the indignant people.” As noted in Chapter 2, no editorial explicitly called for the end of American lynchings; U.S. collective violence only was employed as a discursive device in immigrant papers, to criticize foreign adventures or, as in this editorial, defend tsarist Russia.25

During World War I the Rusyn newspaper Amerikansky russky viestnik curiously also ran a poem, “Jews,” by Lev. A. May. Among other things, the poet mused, perhaps ironically, “Jews, Jews! What a strange word, / What a people [nation] [národ.] / How strange and foreign, / Obedient to their killers—and cruelly jealous, / With high Jewish threats to high heaven. / They want to live—and threaten to strike many places. . . . / A nation at risk wanders in the desert, / Their god in the clouds sits on a fiery throne.”26

American lynchings could even be used discursively to assert the comparative leniency of Russia toward its Jewish subjects, and to suggest American hypocrisy in condemning that country. A triple lynching in Cairo, Illinois, or “Glorious Cairo,” as the headline put it, was covered by Jednota, but not to express sympathy with black victims. Although the article sneered at “pious white people” who had strung two of the blacks on trees, the main point the editor wished to make was American hypocrisy in faulting Russia’s treatment of Jews: “And if a little Jew in Russia bombs and kills a policeman, the U.S. magazines call it a protest against atrocities in backwards Russia.” Solidarity was expressed with fellow Slavs in Europe, not black fellow Americans.27

Interestingly, the most notorious case of a Jewish man lynched in America elicited no anti-Semitic venom in Slavic immigrant newspapers, unlike in many Southern English-language journals.28 In 1913, when Mary Phagan, a pencil factory employee in Marietta, Georgia, was found murdered, suspicion fell on the factory’s manager, Leo Frank, who as a Jew and a Northerner, was regarded with hostility by many Georgians who saw the incipient industrialization of the New South as a threatening intrusion. Moreover, as in many Southern cases involving black men, phobias of sexual crossing of race, or, at best, ethnic lines were on display in the courtroom and in mainstream Southern press coverage of the case. Frank was accused of having made sexual advances to the young woman. In spite of contradictory testimony and many courtroom irregularities, Frank was found guilty of murder and sentenced to die.

The Slovak press’s coverage of the Leo Frank case and the victim’s subsequent lynching was cursory, although the protest by Jewish organizations in the aftermath
of Frank’s questionable conviction in a trial rife with judicial misconduct was given somewhat lengthy coverage in Národné noviny. The article was fairly sympathetic to this effort, and seems to have shared the outrage of groups such as B’nai B’rith that a travesty of justice had been committed in Georgia. On May 28, 1914, the headlines of the paper, the official journal of the National Slovak Society, announced “Prosecution against the Jews rouses our attention” and “It was the duty of the authorities to do something to protect the defendant, after this death sentence was pronounced.” Such concern, as noted in Chapter 2, was rarely expressed in even the most egregious travesties of justice involving African Americans, suggesting that for all the Old World prejudices held against Jews, some recognition had developed for Slovak editors on the similarity of the vulnerable positions of the Jews and Slavs in nativist America. An additional subhead informed readers that “Jews all over America will do their best to save their friends from the disgraceful murder—Many witnesses are accused of perjuring themselves, and with untruthful testimony, with which the court conspired.”

Indeed, after Frank’s lynching the following year, it developed that several prosecution witnesses had been coerced into perjuring themselves; one of the witnesses against Frank was a black employee of the factory where the defendant was manager, surely one of the few cases in early twentieth-century Georgia in which a black man’s testimony was believed over a white defendant’s. Again, though, the different, sympathetic treatment of the Frank case compared to the many unsympathetic lynching stories involving black men indicates a hierarchy of compassions was by 1914 developing for Slovak immigrants, who assessed injustices against whites, even Jews, as more worthy of their attention and indignation.

Perhaps it was the almost immediate suspicion of official misconduct that aroused the editors, but, again, such frequent judicial farces involving black victims had already passed without comment. In any case, Národné noviny’s writer fumed,

The little justice, which at one time in America we knew, and which inspired some confidence, has dwindled after the summary judgment against Leo Frank, who was condemned to death for the brutal murder of 14-year-old Mary Phagan. Frank was the manager of a factory, where the girl worked. He was an exceptional Israelite, and was, at the time of his death sentence the newly elected president of the Atlanta city office of the national organization B’nai B’rith. It could perhaps be said that his death sentence dealt a blow to all Jews in America.—There are some people who are convinced that in America you can buy anything with money, and maybe they aren’t that far from the truth.

As proof money had here greased the wheels of justice, the writer noted, “About this interesting murderer there were numbered several witnesses who differed.—Some who said it was a black man—others a white, and already (at the trial) there were some who recognized that all the witnesses couldn’t agree on
the truth.” The article concluded by documenting several cases of perjury, and the campaign by authorities to remove from the state witnesses who favored Frank’s alibi.29

The writer of this article was critiquing the conviction of Frank, which, although characterized as such, was not yet a literal lynching. That fate awaited the Northern Jewish defendant a year later. The writer may have had predictive powers, or perhaps his darkest fears had a way of coming true for those persons caught in the provisional white person stage—the inbetweenness that historians Barrett and Roediger refer to in commenting on the perilous lives of Southeast Europeans in early twentieth-century America, a country with racial phobias obsessing many citizens.30 Sure enough, when a year later Georgia’s newly inaugurated governor commuted Frank’s death sentence to life in prison, an enraged mob broke into the jail and lynched Frank.

In contrast to the lengthy article devoted to the trial’s aftermath, the actual lynching was reported with almost fatalistic sorrow by Národné noviny. The paper related the lynching in two brief sentences before concluding, “The next morning his lifeless body was found hanging in the tree.—He was lynched. After a brief investigation, nothing more is expected to be done about this lynching.” New Yorkský denník likewise devoted only a two-sentence story that noted Frank’s abduction from the jail and that he was hanged by a mob from a tree. While the stories were mercifully free of anti-Jewish invective, the actual lynching elicited no outcry in these Slovak papers.31

Conversely, even the lynching of the German man Robert Prager in Illinois during World War I was condemned in an editorial in Národné noviny. The paper deplored the lynching, arguing it was necessary for “a civilized people to end this savage practice,” “the practice of wild, savage anarchists.” In the aftermath of the war, though, it was anarchists and other radicals who were quite vulnerable to collective mob violence. Extensive, front-page coverage was granted by New Yorkský denník to army and mob assaults against radicals, suspected Bolshevists, and union organizers, as in the lynchings of Industrial Workers of the World organizers at Centralia, Washington, in 1919. “Enraged people lynch the leader of the radicals,” the paper reported, while in subsequent issues the paper declared “In the whole country there is truly a war against anarchism,” also promising, “Bolshevik aggressors are to be strictly punished.” Not just blacks, but Jewish newcomers, and laboring men seeking justice, too, were in danger of violently being put in their place, the pages of the Slovak press seem to have warned. Likewise, news of the dispatch of a special excursion train, the “Diamond Special,” full of vigilantes bent on expelling all the “radicals” and “communists” from Springfield, Illinois, ran on the front page of New Yorkský denník. “In Springfield, the lynching of the reds is feared,” the headline proclaimed. (The paper noted that all but one of the anarchists were foreigners.)32

These lynchings of supposed radicals and union men were presumably of interest to working-class Slavs, or alarmed editors wary of Bolshevism or fearful
of being tarred with the red brush in World War I’s aftermath, as a national anti-
Red scare ensued.

Compared to this coverage of mob violence against radicals, the Frank case
elicted minimal commentary, but thankfully was not used as an occasion to
rehash familiar ethnic slurs.33

On other occasions prior to World War I, however, fears of Jewish radicalism at
times were expressed by editors who saw something intrinsically radical or
anarchist in an alien ethnic group. Amerikansky russky viestnik, which as noted
regarded Kishinev as caused by Jewish troublemakers, attributed the failed 1905
Russian revolution to a Jewish plot that had abettors in America. “How American
Jews are revolutionary,” the headline declared, while the article’s text explained,

In the city of Baltimore, on January 21 it was announced that America’s Jewish
congregations would honor the occasion of the anniversary of the slaying on
January 22 in Saint Petersburg of Jewish Russian revolutionaries. At the New
York congregation, the Jew James Pauken, with permission from a large con-
gregation of Jews, called for the raising of money to buy arms for Russia’s
revolting, revolutionary Jews. Consequently, those American Jews present at
the time offered money lavishly and thus became partners in that week with
the Russian rioters [rebels, agitators] [buntovnikov], those Jewish revolutionar-
ies; the Jewish revolution in Russia was thus made with the support of American
Jews.34

The following year the paper devoted coverage to “Philadelphia’s revolutionary
Jewry.” And in 1908, to be ecumenical about it, Amerikansky russky viestnik denounced
anarchists, socialists, the Black Hand allegedly controlling Philadelphia, and Italian
and Polish Jewish workers in that city.35

In reporting on a Zionist meeting in Philadelphia, Jednota exhibited more
interest in class than ethnicity or race. The article noted that delegates to the
convention endorsed Palestine as the optimal site for Jewish settlement and
founding of “a Jewish kingdom,” rejecting previous proposals for colonization in
Africa or South America as “a useless act.” The reporter further noted, “As usual,
to carry out this plan the convention encouraged the wealthy Jews to act, but they
do not care to, they lose courage, unlike the poorer class; it is famously known
that every living thing comes down to class.” The reporter concluded, “True to
their wealth, the rich don’t do much, their activity is usually limited to the decep-
tions necessary to conducting business.” While this sentiment possibly contains a
slur at allegedly endemic Jewish business practices, such sentiments were mild
compared to a rather vitriolic letter from “G. H. of Syracuse, New York,” that
Jednota published 13 years later. The correspondent accused Austria-Hungary of
being in the thrall of socialists, anarchists, Magyars, and Jews. Allowing for the
anger many Slovaks felt at the Habsburg Empire in its final year of existence, the
letter indicates distrust and worse sentiments regarding Jews persisted among
many immigrants. The pro-Czechoslovak independence journal *Obrana* likewise published a poem, “Easy Questions,” accompanied by a cartoon in which the Habsburg double-headed eagle strangles helpless Slovak, Romanian, Czech, and Serbo-Croatian peasants. The eagle is crowned with the Star of David (see Figure 4-1.)
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Even in America the actions of Jewish residents were often depicted in these newspapers in an unflattering light. As noted, Národné noviny, which on other occasions was quite supportive of strikes and other worker initiatives, condemned the 1917 food riots as the work of “foreign agents” and “agitating Jews.” In that year New Yorkský denník advertised a coming serial novel it was running, The Eternal Jew (see Figure 4-2). Four years later, the New York daily spoke of the “Jewish slavery” under which the new Czechoslovakia suffered, and also reported on the publicity Henry Ford gave to old phobias of an international conspiracy. “Americans are warned of the Jewish menace,” the paper wrote in the article about Ford.38

Figure 4-2: Advertisement for a serialized novel, The Eternal Jew. New Yorkský denník, March 26, 1917, 4.
Such coverage could quickly segue into ethnic slurs against duplicitous shopkeepers or businessmen. As early as 1896 Amerikansky russky viestnik reported on a “Jewish swindle” run by con men in Berlin. Slovák v Amerike, too, reported on a strike called by Slovak, Polish, Magyar, and Italian workers against the Acheson Harden Handkerchief Company in Passaic, New Jersey. The “greenhorn” workers protested against making only 65 cents after working 13-hour days and having wages deducted for the cost of new uniforms. While news of such job actions against intolerable conditions was standard fare of this and other immigrant papers, the filler of this report regrettably made sure to note that the business was “owned by a Jewish company.”

Similarly, Národné noviny reported on an Old World “Revolt against the Jews.” In Veľký Gemereš in Zemplín province peasants who had founded a cooperative grocery society were certain that “Jewish merchants have done everything possible to thwart this society, and consequently the people have become enraged against the Jews, who had to flee. A whole lot of troops were sent in to the place.” Just as when militias or police forces were called to the scene of lynchings in the United States, one has to wonder if the victims could expect much help from the forces of law and order; Slovak newspapers, though, were silent on such symmetries, and reports didn’t question established, unflattering stereotypes regarding “Jewish merchants.”

As they printed these canards, perhaps it’s not surprising that many Slovak newspapers sometimes also expressed resistance to Jewish emigration to America. Vituperative articles in Slovák v Amerike, for instance, asserted Jewish control of all the world’s newspapers, explaining in this manner the bad press that tsarist Russia had received after anti-Jewish rioting as at Kishinev and again in the wake of the failed 1905 Russian revolution. A 1908 article innocuously enough headlined “Something about the Jews” led off in purple fashion, asserting as fact the existence of a secretive, world-dominating cabal:

The Jews are holding in their hands the seventh great power of the world, which is called journalism. All the newspapers of the world are in their hands. They fix the national economic and political courses, they cause the wars, they influence all businesses and industry. When Rothschild heaves a sigh, the whole globe reverberates; if anybody steps on the corn of a Jew, the whole world reads about it, even in Japan.

A lengthy list of German, English, French, and Austrian newspapers was given as “proof” of this “foreign” control of the world’s newspapers. As Amerikansky russky viestnik had already claimed, here, too, the bad press that the tsarist regime received was attributed to “[t]he Jewish press . . . wailing and crying for help, scolding, cursing . . . “ The paper asserted that it knew the real, understandable reason for the people’s attacks on Jewish residents of Russia. “[F]or the most part they are defending themselves against the [Jews’] riots, their impertinence, their
Leeching parasitism, against all those tricks by which the Jews know how to plunder.

The writer provided a long list of outrages he asserted justified the Russian people’s rioting against them. As in American lynching accounts, a similar trope was employed by which the “enraged people” acted to restore justice. When a group regarded as non-citizens was assumed to violate communal morality, the “enraged people” acted not as lawbreakers but law preservers—of course, the social order in tsarist Russia, no less than in Jim Crow Mississippi, was a racialized hierarchy. And as in the United States, the supposed “leniency” that the writer here asserted was practiced by enlightened tsarist officials toward their Jewish subjects only caused a secretive cabal of Jews to rise up, which “the people” had to resist as a matter of self-preservation. A mass upsurge of indignation (and violence) was here characterized and explained away as an understandable mass action.

Indeed, Slovák v Amerike’s writer asserted that, “Through the weakness of the Russian officials . . . the Jews have organized a whole army. . . . They were about 40,000 strong and were armed with revolvers. They burned down, pillaged and devastated everything. . . . And when the people, undefended by the authorities, took into their own hands the whip of justice, the government has sent a military force against them to defend the Jews.” The self-denying psychology of transference is on full display, as is the writer’s anti-Semitism.

The writer further asserted that “[T]here was no conspiracy, no assassination, no robbery of state moneys, no nihilistic, anarchistic bomb-throwing band where the Jews had not occupied the front place.” Warning that “more than 800,000 Jews in the last few years” had settled in America, the writer darkly proclaimed, “Neither will Russia regret when the side-curl-whiskered patriots will leave her, but woe it will be to our free America, which they will overflow.”

With less venom, and more distance from the sentiments it reported, Národné noviny, too, published articles on the calls for restrictions on Jewish “swarming” of America. “Native Americans have recently encountered the wandering Jew, and while various other immigrants were regarded as guilty, and a sort of danger to him, the Native American looked on the Jew favorably, or at least indifferently,” the paper reported. “Consequently, the Jews have been welcomed in the land and swarmed in.”

The paper then noted the rise of anti-Semitism in America, comparing it to earlier measures taken in ancient Egypt and tsarist Russia leading to the recent pogroms. But the writer argued that somehow the persecuted always arose from this adversity more successful, arguing that “the Russian pogroms have brought them . . . the great sympathy of the world’s press, which is in the hands of Jews.” The familiar assertion of a pariah group’s domination of the media is repeated here.

But Národné noviny noted a recent backlash against Jewish immigrants, citing the publication by the New York Herald of a “diatribe” by the author Poultney
Bigelow. In that newspaper Bigelow had asserted that “during my recent journey through the state of Connecticut, all I saw were multi-lingual Jews of a disgusting kind, living in place of the people whose ancestors originally purified this country from the Indians and the tree stumps.” When rabbis and other correspondents objected, Bigelow continued the attack:

I can’t see how a Jew who has newly wandered under the American flag as he conducts his business is my equal fellow citizen. He could just as easily find his homeland by wandering to Australia, France, Germany or Russia. A Jew who can just so easily trade in his patriotism as he shuttles between two railway stations and roll it [the patriotism] into his jacket is a dangerous witness indeed. He shouted that he is just as good an American as me, whose family had been pioneering in this land nearly three centuries ago, in a land that Jews had never even heard of—and started to feel at once a protective duty to pave an easy path for these speculators and money lenders.

Bigelow praised the *Herald*, repeating the calumny already asserted by Slavic editors that it was “one of the few living newspapers yet under the control of a non-Jew,” asserting the paper could help America by “point[ing] out the difference between a true American, one of those disappearing among the hordes of Jewish patriots. . . .” After several more enlightened sentences from Bigelow, the editor of *Národné noviny* added an amused last word: “Well, in America, the Jews have never before been talked to like this!”

That such a diatribe appeared in a mainstream New York daily indicates that immigrants were exposed to anti-Semitism from a variety of sources, and not just Slavic papers. And by reprinting nativists’ laments that had first appeared in the mainstream *New York Herald*, the editor of *Národné noviny* could put some distance between himself and anti-Semitic nativism. Still, the immigrant paper’s editor did not see fit to provide any condemnation of Bigelow’s screed. And the last line, an interpolation by the Slovak editor himself, not Bigelow, offers some bemusement, perhaps amusement that the hitherto uncriticized Jews are now being talked to in this way. The sardonic remark that Jews in America had never before faced criticism would itself likely have been read as either willed ignorance or a subtle dig at Jewish Americans. Evidently the employees of *Národné noviny* had allowed their subscriptions to *Amerikansky russky viestnik* and *Slovák v Amerike* to lapse.

Still, the perceived success of Jewish Americans sometimes led *Národné noviny* to express a grudging admiration for these immigrants, and suggest that Slovaks should emulate them as they sought to advance in the world. In 1910 and again in 1911, editorials ran in the organ of the National Slovak Society urging readers to “Learn from the Jews.” The editorial writer began, “It is not the first time I’ve said that we can learn from the Jews, and when I say it I’m not saying anything bad against the Jews, but rather even the reverse, I pay them respect. . . . I was
glad that the Slovaks have embraced at least one characteristic of the Jews, namely, to jointly promote trade as well as nationalist movements. May we learn, we Slovaks, from others’ experience.” Still, the admiration was a bit left-handed, as in urging Slovaks to go into business, the writer urged his co-ethnics to “Learn from the cleverest and learn to be so clever, or even cleverer than he is. . . . ” Stereotypes of sharp businessmen seem resurrected here. The following year, the paper again editorialized, “Learn from the Jews,” but argued for developing culture and the educated professions, not just moneymaking, as forms of group advancement. “Slovaks often still have a lot to learn to fully catch up to the level of culture of other nationalities,” the writer argued. Even if admiration mixed with envy and, at times, worse traits, Jewish fellow immigrants were a known quantity, and one from whom some Slovaks believed they might be able to learn ways to advance one’s “race.”

Such articles offering praise were rare, however, and coexisted with stories of Jewish criminality, especially in matters of white slavery, which several nativist commentators argued was controlled throughout the country by Jewish immigrants. *McClure’s Magazine* had in 1909 run a celebrated series exposing the alleged Jewish control of prostitution throughout the country, even in the rural West, through its politically connected tentacles. More locally based stories of Jewish crime followed in Slovak journals. *New Yorkský denník* reported in 1915 on the arrest of William Rosenbloom, Len Silverstein, and Joe Treidberg for running a Coney Island whorehouse. *Amerikansky russky viestnik* ran an article on the Brooklyn gangsters, “‘Lefty Louie,’ alias Louis Rosenberg, ‘Gyp the Blood,’ alias Harry Horowitz.—They live at the house of Goldstein.” Even violent Jewish gangsters were featured at times, as when the notorious Monk Eastman was murdered on a streetcar. While less frequent than the numerous evocations of black criminality, or the frequent articles on the Italian “Black Hand” that, as we’ll see below, appeared with regularity, stories of Jewish criminality reflected the assertions of English-language papers and some officials that Jews were a criminal “race.”

Slighting jokes at the expense of this group appeared in newspapers’ humor columns, too. *Slovák v Amerike* published a joke in 1896 chiefly concerning Gypsy musicians who worm their way out of paying the bill at an inn, but a Jewish innkeeper figured here, too. On another occasion the paper’s humor column, “Kmoter Švablik z Kakošovec” (“Godfather Švablik from Kakošovec”), had the readers’ fictional, fulminating relative repeatedly denouncing the doings in “Judapest.” Švablik’s more frequent target was the hated Magyars, but as noted above, Slovaks such as letter-writer “G. H. of Syracuse, New York” often conflated the supposedly pernicious Hungarian and Jewish influence in Budapest.

Either some readers were influenced by these “comical” diatribes, or more likely they reflected long-standing suspicions of Jewish control of East Central Europe’s metropolises. The screeds continued into the 1920s. *New Yorkský denník* in 1924 published a humor column item that mocked Father Andrej
Hlinka, leader of the Slovak People’s Party in Czechoslovakia, for allegedly being in thrall to the usual suspects: “Our Holy Father Hlinka” began, “Our Father who art Hlinka, blessed be the sell-out in Judapešt, hallowed be thy name.” In this case, there is strong evidence that these prejudices reflected views that were out there among the readership, for this “humorous” catechism was contributed to the paper by a “Slovak woman from Brooklyn.” But as with crime stories, Jews were only occasionally the target of such humor columns, where ethnic jokes more frequently mocked Gypsies, Italians, and, by the 1920s, blacks. “Edna from Scranton” contributed a minstrel show-like joke against blacks two weeks before her Brooklyn peer’s submission. Similarly, German newspapers in that decade printed scathing black cartoons as fears of blacks accelerated in the years that migrants headed north during the Great Migration.46

The most offensive anti-Semitic stereotypes appeared less frequently from the 1920s on, as second-generation white ethnics increasingly subsumed ethnic differences and focused attention on black residential incursions into Northern and Midwestern cities during the Great Migration.47 And for all the suspicion of Jews depicted in some Slavic newspapers, residential proximity to Jewish neighbors never aroused the enmity that, as we’ll see in Chapter 7, black migrants elicited.48 Still, while as Ewa Morawska notes, Jews and Poles and other Slavs shared residential neighborhoods with minimal friction, compared to antiblack animus, in the late 1930s and 1940s some Slovak papers expressed angry diatribes at Jewish criticism, even as authors prefaced their diatribes with an attempted exculpatory protestation that they weren’t anti-Semitic. Such caveats had been rare 30 years before this, but in the more liberal New Deal era, such protestations may have been regarded as necessary.

The disputes developed around many Slovaks’ support for the authoritarian Slovak regime of Monsignor Jozef Tiso, which after 1939 was granted independence, of a sort, under the aegis of Nazi Germany in Hitler’s reordered Europe. Understandably Jewish Americans viewed this situation with alarm, for even before Bratislava gained independence, the paramilitary Hlinka Guard’s newspaper said that the “Jewish question” had to be settled. This settlement lamentably followed the pattern that had already been established by Berlin, as Slovák v Amerike in 1940 reported, “Slovakia sharpens the laws against the Jews.” Jews were barred from the professions, from owning property, and from owning shops or businesses. Still, the paper, and many individual Slovak Americans, continued to admire Tiso’s regime.49

Two months later, Slovák v Amerike bristled at criticism leveled at the Slovak League of America for supporting the Nazis’ Slovak allies. The Jewish Review had condemned the group, and now the Slovak journal fired back. The paper’s editorial writer prefaced his defense of the journal from charges it was pro-Nazi by writing, “I am not anti-Semitic. On the contrary, I have always been against anti-Semites. But neither do I believe that Jews were separately the chosen people
to reign over the rest of the world, whether intellectually, territorially or politically.” The writer assured readers that he was against the Nazis, but also condemned communists. And here he resurrected old suspicions:

The Jews, I think, are the intellectual elite, but a good half are Communists or pro-Communists. . . . I am not trying to blame all the Jews. But it is certain that if the Jews everywhere hadn’t claimed more than their rightful place and been satisfied with their lot, then truly, anti-Semitism would be defanged. Their arrogance is what stirred the masses against them. Some Jews have seen this and have criticized their fellows for their extremism, but such voices it seems are voices crying in the wilderness.

This was an odd way to reassure the editors and readers of the Jewish Review that one wasn’t anti-Semitic. Assertions that some people had overstepped “their rightful place” were heard in many alarming places in 1940. Other, older charges were revived, too, as the writer charged “a significant portion of our newspapers is in their hands.” Similarly well-worn class resentments ended the editorial: “We Americans of Slovak origin are good American citizens and democrats. There are in truth only a million of us in the U.S. A few dozen Jewish individuals here could easily buy all of our worldly assets, but our Americanism is just as good as theirs even though we earned it by the sweat of our brow. . . . ” In bitterly critiquing the communist and rich Jews that he asserted predominated, the editorialist resurrected two familiar canards—the predominance within this beleaguered group of revolutionary plotters on the one hand, and plutocrats on the other.50

In a few years, however, sober news of the Holocaust made it back to America, and as Matthew Frye Jacobson argues, the ferocious implications of anti-Semitism made unpalatable overt expressions of prejudice against white ethnic groups of all kinds. Anti-Jewish bias most especially became anathema. Yet as Jacobson further notes, the emergence of a unified, all-American white “race” composed among others of recently ostracized Southern and Eastern Europeans, only brought more starkly into focus the other groups, African Americans and Chinese and other Asians, against which legal restrictions still very much remained in force for another two decades.51

This synthesis of the white “races” was already well under way in the Slavic press. As early as 1920, New Yorkský denník offered a group photograph captioned “Americans All.” The gathering was of “thrift leaders of twenty-eight racial groups in America,” with Slavic, Jewish, Irish, Italian, and other white leaders of ethnic fraternal associations assembled for a joint meeting. The assertive “Americans All” suggests that the melding of European groups into one polity was tenuously progressing. While they were still regarded in common parlance as separate “races,” they were acceptable Americans. Even as some Slavic newspapers, as noted, continued trading in anti-Semitic, and as we’ll soon see, anti-Italian, slurs, a “Perora” could sit beside a
“Konigsberg” or “Modelkovich,” who could break bread with a fellow American named “Jankus.” Tellingly missing from this conference, and the photographic coverage of it, were any black or Asian Americans. The races represented as suitably American were European groups; other “races” were not yet in the picture.52

In 1943, though, the gravity of anti-Semitism’s effects was demonstrated when Národné noviny ran news of extermination camps in Slovakia. A camp initially designed to contain foreign Jews prior to their deportation had recently been converted to slave labor, and “under the ‘supervision’ of the Hlinka Guards there died in the labor camp 240 persons. . . . These days in Poland, it is known that there are death camps. Those who were living in Slovakia for almost three years are now deemed no longer employable. Therefore they were deported to Poland, where it is expected they will be exterminated.”53

Intriguingly, one of the few condemnations of antiblack bigotry to be found in Slovak papers of the World War II era appeared in Národné noviny on the same day as news of the Slovak death camp. In that issue an editorial deplored the white attacks on blacks that had occurred in Detroit at Belle Island Park and other locales. As we’ll see in Chapter 7, coverage of race riots in previous decades had been less sympathetic to blacks, and even during World War II only a few articles spoke of the need for greater tolerance of African Americans. But on at least a few occasions the pernicious effects of race-thinking for both European ethnic groups and black citizens was on display.54

As it became apparent how grave the Holocaust was and where anti-Semitism had ultimately led, other papers began running appeals to combat prejudice. Amerikansky russky viestnik reprinted an English-language article by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman of New York, “We must check the spread of bigotry.” The prelate summoned patriotism and the spirit of “Valley Forge and . . . other American shrines” to combat bigotry, “a contagious, virulent disease.” Near the end of World War II Popular Front appeals to tolerance and icons of Americanism in support of one’s cause were common. But perhaps with the savagery of Nazi atrocities in mind, it was some Catholics’ anti-Semitism that Spellman singled out, with nothing said regarding the antiblack animus that had already been demonstrated by many Catholics combating black residential incursions into Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia and other Northern cities. Following the war, New Yorkský denník likewise endorsed an educational film coproduced by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith called The High Wall. “This film deals with the discrimination and prejudices which greatly affect a Polish family. The film is very important for parents, teachers and others who deal with youth and their education,” the article said. Nothing, though, was mentioned of antiblack racism. Prejudice was still conceived as something that affected Jewish and Slavic Americans, as no doubt in 1952 still was the case. By this time, too, for many Slavic Americans, discrimination that smacked of anti-Semitism could be decried, but, as we’ll see in Chapter 7, less was said, here or elsewhere in their newspapers, regarding antiblack actions and attitudes. White ethnics hitherto marginalized
were embraced under the rubric of patriotism and Valley Forge, but the concerns of black Americans still rarely were featured in Slavic papers.55 

The following year *New Yorkský denník* even publicized an upcoming Purim Ball to be held in New York by natives of Košice. Of course, many Jews who were natives of Slovakia had been holding such affairs for decades. But only in the post-World War II years did the activities of non-Christian Slovaks garner the paper’s favorable attention. White ethnics had melded to such a point that this notice appeared with none of the biting criticisms that accompanied news of Jewish citizens 40 years before. Then, too, as the East European communities of New York and other cities were dissipating, facing the “threat” of racial integration and suburbanization/assimilation of second-generation white ethnics, the paper may have sought to attract any readers—Christian, Jewish, or nonbeliever—that it could. *New Yorkský denník* went out of business in 1962.56

Acceptance of Jewish and other white ethnic Americans as acceptable neighbors may have been eased by changes within second-generation ethnics themselves as they came to embrace American folkways, not least concerning race. Regarding Jewish immigrants in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Karen Brodkin has distinguished between ethnoracial assignment—what other groups said about Jews’ status as “off-white” immigrants—and ethnoracial identity—the sense of peoplehood created for themselves, at least partially in reaction to other groups, especially African Americans, with whom they interacted in the New World. In post-World War II America, she argues, Jewish whiteness became more “naturalized,” in large part because of the migration of second-generation Jews (as well as Eastern and Southern European Catholics) into the suburbs. Increasingly, too, Jewish intellectuals began to emphasize their group’s “prefigurative whiteness,” their alleged affinity with the white Protestant mainstream, and their cultural distance from African Americans’ supposed “tangle of pathologies.”57

While Brodkin sets her saga of Jewish whitening as a primarily post-1945 phenomenon, in the case of Slavs, and other ethnic Catholics, the binaries of black-white race-thinking appear to have hardened earlier, at least as early as the 1920s. Russell Kazal demonstrates a growing German Catholic wariness toward African Americans during that decade in Philadelphia.58 And Slovaks had already slighted blacks in humor columns as well as news stories of lynchings and race riots by the twentieth century’s opening. But whatever the starting point, various white ethnics’ distancing of themselves from black fellow citizens eased the amalgamation of a white ethnic identity.

“A Bloody Minded, Violent, Treacherous People”:

Covering Italians

In their early years in America, though, for Slavs the lines were not just between African Americans and whites. Coverage was devoted by Slavic editors, too, to
other immigrant groups that were regarded as endemically deficient. As noted, coverage of Jews carried forward prejudices sadly all too often indulged in Central Europe. But immigrant papers expressed opinions of Italian immigrants, too, and these rewrites in the Slavic press often uncritically propagated Nordic stereotypes of Italian violence and criminality with which many Slavs were likely unfamiliar pre-migration. The press indulged in race-tutoring in inter-European ways, not just in disseminating antiblack animus. The most commonly recurring judgment on Italians accepted the myth that all members of this group were intrinsically violent, with many tainted by association with the Mafia, or, as it was more commonly labeled in the early twentieth century, the “Black Hand.”

The Slovak press was full of accounts of violence by dark and secretive cabals of Italians, as well as the national wars between “American mobs” and Italians lynched from Pennsylvania to Louisiana. The instability of the notion of race in America circa 1900 as the country confronted “probationary white” strains such as Slavs and Mediterraneans has been well documented by contemporary scholars, and this liminality is reflected in the immigrant press, too. Just as earlier the Irish had to “prove” their whiteness circa 1860, now it was the Slavs’ and Italians’ turn.59

Perhaps the most notorious case of collective mob violence against Italians occurred in 1891 in New Orleans, when more than 250 Italians were arrested for suspected Mafia complicity in the assassination of Police Chief David Hennessy. Eventually 19 of these Italians were charged in the Hennessy case, but when the suspects were found not guilty, a mob broke into the jail where they were being held and lynched 11 of them. The Italian government protested to Washington, but as in the far more frequent black lynchings, no lynchers were identified or brought to trial.60

The 1891 New Orleans lynchings occurred before the major Slovak and Rusyn newspapers began publication, although the Slovak historian Konštantín Čulen, in his two-volume *History of Slovaks in the United States*, published in Bratislava in 1942, discusses these barbarous lynchings. In the following years, however, several accounts of other lynchings of Italians were published in these papers. Lynching accounts of Italian victims contained lurid details of mob violence, but, as with black lynching accounts, stereotypes of the victims’ supposed deficiencies abounded, too. While the violence of Italians was assumed, this didn’t diminish *Amerikansky russky viestnik*’s alarm at violence directed against Italians. Indeed, Italian vendettas, it was reported, had quickly led to Americans’ intervention. On July 17, 1894, *Amerikansky russky viestnik* reported that after “Majk” Scomana murdered his fellow factory worker and countryman, Giovanni Perna, with a small revolver at a dance, a mob of Americans showed up at his doorstep the following morning and lynched him.61

A somewhat longer article greeted *Slovák v Amerike*’s readers in 1895 when a multiple lynching occurred in Colorado. There five Italians had been lynched. Race was a fraught concept not only for immigration restrictionists but for newcomers, too, and through the pages of these newspapers one sees a cumulative
attempt to try to figure out who fit in and who did not in the new country. Perhaps the instability of race for new Americans, and the perilous degree to which Nordic immigration restrictionists denounced Southeast Europeans as Asiatic or African, may account for the report that in this case the Italians had been mistaken for blacks and therefore lynched. Slovaks wanted to make sure they weren’t so disastrously “misidentified.” As this case indicates, blacks weren’t the only ones threatened by lynching, and several notorious cases of the lynching of Italians disfigured America in the 1890s.

Brutal persecution awaited “Talianov” who refused to honor Jim Crow. *Amerikansky russky viestnik* reported in 1896 that, “In Hahnville, La., three Italians were seized from behind their doors and murdered. On August 9th a ‘national mob’ showed up on the door of three Italian workers accused of a crime, and lynched the three together.” The paper solemnly added, “In that part of the country all Italians are regarded as disturbers of the public order, as highwaymen and the like, and are therefore murdered.” For all sorts of racial minorities, the Promised Land depicted in the Slovak press was a dangerous place.

As with the coverage of black lynching victims, such stories seem to have inspired not sympathy but contempt. Other articles in the Slavic press depicted Italians as innately prone to violence, suggesting that, like African Americans similarly characterized in crime stories, collective mob violence was sometimes justified against a brutal “race.” After all, the Hahnville Italians were part of a collective of “highwaymen and the like,” against whom brutal measures up to and including lynching might regrettably be necessary.

Elsewhere in the world, Italian migrants experienced violence at the hands of mobs, but sometimes refused to accept their lot as a hyper-vulnerable people. In 1908 in Brazil, a murder of an Italian worker by Brazilians spurred an Italian anarchist to write, “[We reproach the other Italians for not having] had the least courage, or the dignity, to lynch the hero of this tragedy. Do you want to wager, Mr. Chief of Police, that lynching would be more effective than all your jails, all your cops, and the entire comic and grotesque apparatus of your system of justice?” Assertions that courts and officers of the law had failed in their duty to protect the public resonated in the American South as justifications for lynch law, and here even Italian radicals employed similar warnings. Elsewhere in Brazil’s Italian anarchist press slighting assertions of Afro-Brazilians’ laziness and deficiencies as a labor force appeared, too, suggesting yet again that new immigrants were not above employing derogatory epithets at others. Stereotypes of race and acceptance of collective violence could be embraced even by marginal immigrant groups who themselves were often subject to mob animus.

Even in the Northern United States, Italians could meet with brutal, violent ends, or be threatened with this fate. *Slovák v Amerike* reported in 1903 on the “Bloody Battle against the Italians” in Donora, Pennsylvania, that ended with two lynchings. That same year a crowd attempted to lynch an Italian in Jamaica, Queens. The “Loathsome Deed of an Italian” was proclaimed in a headline for a
story of the immigrant’s violation of a 12-year-old girl near a school. While the term “lynching” was rather broadly deployed here, for the crowd seems only to have seized the Italian suspect with some degree of force, as in many black lynching accounts it is the supposed sexual deviance of the minority victim that was foregrounded.66

Even law-abiding Italians were depicted as behaving in ways that were interpreted as innately violent. In 1920 a crowd of Italians on New York’s Mulberry Street were reported to have lynched Alfredo Caruso for defaming police Lieutenant Joseph Pellegrino, “who is a hero to all the Italians on Mulberry Street . . . .” While as in the 1903 account from Queens, the usage of the term “lynching” seems to have been a rather elastic one, the by-1920 familiar trope of violent Italians was furthered by depicting even law-abiding Italians as hot-headed brutes. To be sure, such behavior, as demonstrated in Chapter 2, was prevalent among enraged white citizenry when black men were said to have violated moral codes, especially around matters of sex. In the South, however, proponents of communal morality characterized native-born white members of lynch mobs as disciplined and orderly as they set about restoring the peace. Here, on Mulberry Street, Italians were seen as quick to express outrage, possessed of explosive tempers.67

As this account of a mob of his fellow countrymen assaulting Alfredo suggests, articles also appeared depicting Italians’ violence against their own kind, reinforcing the belief that the vendetta was an Italian “racial” trait. As noted, it was the 1894 inter-Italian murder at a dance that caused an “American” crowd subsequently to lynch “Majk” Scomana. Later that year Amerikansky russky viestnik again featured feuding Italians, as factions in the Poughkeepsie immigrant community settled their differences by dynamiting each others’ houses. In 1905 a card game between paisans ended in a violent tragedy, while Amerikansky russky viestnik reported that in Old Forge, Pennsylvania, near Scranton, the Italian Crescenzo Merola had killed Emanuel Loro because he refused to hand over 15 cents. New Yorkský denník noted that a battle between the Italians of Salemville, Pennsylvania, left one man dead and his brother critically injured.68

In this respect, these rewrites from mainstream wire services reflected the sensational coverage of Italians’ supposed deficiencies that appeared in many metropolitan dailies. The New York Times, for example, in 1906 reported on an “Italian’s body found with hatchet.” Police were “puzzled” by this Yonkers case, as the victim still had jewelry on him. Likewise, the Philadelphia Inquirer in 1913 reported on three murdered South Philadelphia Italians who were “shot without cause.” The immigrant papers were not the only source from which Slavs could learn of the “deviant” ways of Italian immigrants, but these organs nevertheless often followed the lead of English-language journals.69

Fears of intrinsically violent immigrants and radical foreigners were expressed in the nativist, English-language newspapers, but also made their way into the Rusyn-language Amerikansky russky viestnik. That paper in 1903 reported on a case in Barre, Vermont, seat of a significant Italian anarchist community. “[A]t
an Italian socialist meeting,” the paper noted, “Italian Eli Corti was fatally shot by
Italian Alessandro Garreto. The fatal shot came in a battle between Italian socialist
and anarchist parties. The latest reports indicate that Eli Corti has died from
the injuries that he suffered.”70

While not exactly anarchists, Italian women factory workers on strike battled
among themselves, not just the police, at a rally in front of New York’s City Hall,
while more prosaic Italian gunplay in East Harlem was twice splashed across the
front page of *New Yorkský denník*. That paper also reported on an Italian man in
Chicago who had murdered his wife; for good measure, the paper also reported
when an “Italian woman kills her husband.” Crime featuring Italians was often
reported in the Slavic press.71

These seemingly quotidian crime stories (wife kills husband; husband kills
wife) in and of themselves might carry no racial freight. But when they appeared
in the same papers as news of Italians’ lynchings, and, as we’ll soon see, race wars
against these immigrants and incessant coverage of the ubiquitous “Black Hand,”
these crime stories contributed to a habituated conception of Italians as an
intrinsically murderous, pariah “race.”

Indeed, Italians, like blacks, and other Southeast European immigrants, were
sometimes regarded as impermissible outsiders that nativist mobs were deter-
mined to repulse at neighborhood borders or factory gates. The Slovak press was
full of accounts of “the national wars” that “American mobs” launched against
Italians. The instability of the notion of race in America circa 1900 has been well
documented by scholars, and is reflected in the immigrant press, too. As Jacobson
has noted, Sicilian immigrants in Louisiana ran afoul of the rigid caste system not
solely because of their swarthy skin or suspect “Saracen” ancestry. Rather, they
were not white in their customs, and suffered for their fraternization with African
Americans in workplaces, neighborhoods, and in several cases, marriage beds.72
Native-born America, jealously guarding the Nordic germ plasm of the country
from Eastern and Southern European invasion, was nervously suspicious of not
just the phenotypes but the social behavior of newcomers.

As early as 1894 *Amerikansky russky viestnik* reported on a fatal battle that had
erupted in New York between Irish and Italian workingmen.73 And, to the paper’s
horror, a full-blown “nationalities war” erupted in the anthracite coal region of
Pennsylvania two years later, which now required at least some editorial com-
ment tacked onto the usual dry news service rewrite:

In Hazleton, a bloody strife erupted between the Italians and the Americans
(mostly Germans, Irish and English), in which the Italians suffered great casu-
alities. More than 300 people faced off against 400 boys. . . . Yesterday at night
the Americans visited the place where the Italians dwell, blasting their camp
with revolvers. The Italians have found a war everywhere they’ve gone in
America. Evidently, they didn’t need to stay in their country to go find a war in,
say, Abyssinia.74
In this regard the attitude is light years ahead of the solicitation usually shown to African Americans. No story of Negrov lycˇovanie made sarcastic reference to blacks’ relative security back in Africa, and, as noted, it was only the infrequent article that expressed even mild shock at the atrocities reported. This jibe, though, at the kind of opportunity awaiting Italians, who at least were fellow Europeans, suggests editors were coming to regard fellow “provisional whites” as somewhat deserving of their solicitation. As we’ll see, too, the Italian kingdom’s sporadic adventures seeking colonies in Africa, even if thwarted, were admiringly cheered in Slavic papers as part of a civilizing mission. Italians were often regarded with suspicion, but, as in Hazleton, they could sometimes elicit a modicum of sympathy.

More frequently, however, back home in the United States, “Americans” continued to battle Italians, who were often regarded as a scab race, even though this appellation was hurled at Slovaks, Poles, and other Slavs, too. Slovák v Amerike ran news of a “Battle between American and Italian coal miners” in Giatto, West Virginia, where three people were killed. Two years later “The Outbreak of a Bloody War” occurred in Wellsville, Ohio, as American workers again battled Italians. In St. Louis the following year “American” workers battled Greek and Armenian rivals at the American Aluminum Works. But, ironically, when Slovak strikers reported from Washington state on their troubles on the picket line, they noted that “scabs for the most part are Americans, then Italians and Swedes.” Still, Italians continued to be regarded by many native-born Americans as pariahs. As late as 1920 New Yorkský denník reported that a mob of 300 had taken over West Frankfort, Illinois, demanding all Italians be expelled as they assaulted the offending immigrants.75

Of course, by 1920 such extraordinary assaults on Southeast Europeans were atypical compared to the far more common attacks on blacks by whites of many ethnicities during World War I and its aftermath. As we’ll see in Chapter 7, Italians—as well as Slavs—by the early 1920s were joining with other white ethnics in antiblack neighborhood improvement associations. These organizations enforced restrictive covenants, which, in Chicago, Detroit, and elsewhere, prevented potential African American homebuyers from encroaching into white ethnic neighborhoods. The Slavic press noted, too, that white ethnics such as Italians participated in antiblack melees; as early as 1895, Amerikansky russky viestnik noted that 300 Italians expelled the “Negroes” from Spring Valley, Illinois. And during World War I, a Texas mob of 800 oil-field workers, composed of Germans, Italians, “whites,” and Mexicans, castrated and lynched a black man accused of a sexual assault on a white woman. In lynching mobs even Italians could now be found among the participants defending white people’s prerogatives through torture spectacles. While Italians in West Frankfort—and Slavs throughout America reading about them—no doubt felt that they trod uneasily on American ground, and still possessed a somewhat liminal white space in their new country, assaults such as the West Frankfort case were a disappearing
phenomenon, whereas antiblack assaults would persist for at least another three decades. Of course, Slavic newspaper writers or readers had no way of predicting the acceptance that Italians, and Slavs, would eventually be accorded by mainstream white society. Papers therefore also initially reported on interracial conflicts that involved Slavs fighting their fellow newcomers. On October 20, 1910, Národné noviny reported, “Brother attacked by Italians.” Italians armed with stones and knives attacked two members of the National Slovak Society as they walked through a tunnel in Vandergrift, Pennsylvania. Following the assault, “Mister Jozef Galovic telephoned for a policeman, who that evening arrested some Italians. The following day the rest of the Italians were also arrested.”

On the job site, too, papers sometimes reported “Battles between Slovaks and Italians.” That was the headline when Slovák v Amerike reported that Slovaks had for the most part voted to go out on strike in Mingo Junction, but the National Steel Company responded by calling in Italians to serve as scabs. A bitter battle ensued, and the writer editorialized that “the company silently acknowledged, that the Slovaks are better workers than the Italians.” More genteelly, a Slovak wrote to Národné noviny to report on the progress of a strike in Lochrie and Dunlo, Pennsylvania. “Among our scabs there were several Poles, Italians and Englishmen, who the striking miners nicely (politely) asked not to scab,” he wrote. How polite the asking was is subject to question, but other groups besides blacks—Italians among them—were often suspected of being prone to scabbing. Slovak assertions that Italians were a race of scabs continued into the 1920s. A letter writer told New Yorkský denník, for example:

[H]ere in America it is said that other people, who are better than the Italians, do all the work. Indeed, during the war, the Italians weren’t wanted for work in the factories. And Italians who were in factories where strikes occurred went and scabbed. Even today, wherever an Italian won’t work, a Slovak is generally preferred, because of his cleanliness, quiet nature and the industriousness of our people.

The writer was answering a defense of Italians that had appeared earlier, and had a ready explanation for why anyone would defend an Italian: “You, dear Slovak, you must be married to an Italian, if you write so.” Evidently some Slovaks were contemplating this horrible act, or at least defending Italians. The previous year the paper had run a series of letters asking, “Can Slovaks Marry Italians?” The first letter writer warned, “If a Slovak marries an Italian, she’d better have a taste for gaudy clothes, because the only way to keep harmony and peace in the house is to have a taste for such clothes. And then to have him eat macaroni! . . . And then we know that almost every fourth Italian is in the ‘Black Hand.’” All sorts of familiar slurs of Italian criminality, poor taste, and the like were on display in this letter, but it is evident from this diatribe that
some Slovak American women by 1921 were perceived as looking to marry outside their ethnic group. Indeed, the letter continued, “We fought for our Czecho-Slovak nation, and even our prostitutes wouldn’t marry the Mongols [i.e. Magyars], but now they marry Irishmen and Italians.” As we’ll see in the following chapter, the Magyars who had ruled over Slovaks in their half of Austria-Hungary were often stigmatized as Asiatic and barbaric, but evidently Italian and Irish marriage partners were viewed by some immigrants with almost as much alarm, even as others took them to the altar.80

As this letter indicates, the Irish, too, were occasionally criticized, as when a letter writer from Jersey City thundered in New Yorkský denník against Irish domination of Catholic schools. Referring to the Slovaks of his city, the writer noted, “They say they refuse to give one red cent to a school that sacrifices American history to Irish fanaticism. . . .” 81 More often, however, Italians were the target. Also in 1921, a second letter again asserted Slovaks couldn’t marry, or even live among, the Italians. “How could a Slovak eat Italian dishes and live among Italians?” a writer using the pseudonym “Jánošík,” legendary defender of the Slovaks, rhetorically asked.

I well know the Italians, a few families are living here and a couple of them are working in the shop where I am and I see many of them during their lunch time. They eat long bread, herring, and as they eat that bread and fish it’s always dripping down on their sleeves. The bread’s almost alive with maggots, the fish is wrapped up in paper, and then they take it out a second day, they eat that same fish and bread for the whole week.

This letter writer was only repeating nativist critiques of Italians’ supposed barbaric foodways, especially that odd spaghetti, comments that New Yorkský denník likewise ran eight years before this.82

For all these letter writers’ protestations, Italians were different, and sometimes mocked, but not too different. Fellow Catholics, and while provisionally white in a social sense, Italians and Slovaks were both legally eligible to enter the country as immigrants, and there were no bars to Slovak-Italian marriages (whereas even as late as 1967, 16 states still prohibited whites of whatever ethnicity from marrying a black person). And while many old-stock workers scorned Slav and Mediterranean alike, such white ethnics were not statutorily barred from union membership, as was the case with blacks who were kept out of many American Federation of Labor craft unions.

Consequently in the pages of papers such as Jednota and Amerikansky russky viestnik at times even Italians were afforded a level of empathy largely absent when it came to African Americans. Some solidarity was expressed with Italians, especially when they were seen as exploited fellow workers. Amerikansky russky viestnik in 1894 decried the conditions of Italian women working 12 hours a day for an hourly wage of 12 cents. “What kind of paradise is that?” the writer asked.
When Slovaks read that “Three Slavic countrymen and an Italian were torn to pieces early yesterday in an explosion in Safe Harbor,” near Lancaster, Pennsylvania, they might have realized that dangerous industrial conditions made distinctions between Slav and Mediterranean irrelevant. This incipient white ethnic solidarity only grew as black incursions into Northern cities expanded with the Great Migration. Kazal notes that, by the 1920s in Philadelphia, Germans, Slavs, and Italians tenuously shared parishes and neighborhoods, but drew the line at African American residents or worshippers.83

Yet for all these few homages to work mates, most early Italian-Slovak encounters reported were of a more contentious nature, and some ended in tragedy. A report from Morrisdale Mines, Pennsylvania, related a “sad case that unfolded here. . . .” John Jurko, a boarding house resident, went for his pay. “But when he was on his way home he was attacked by some Italians who fatally wounded him. The unlucky traveler was transported to the hospital, where five days later he succumbed to his wounds.” The writer added, “This band of murderers isn’t like us.” Italians’ complete alienness was asserted here. Similarly, when the bartender at the Slovak Catholic Sokol Hall in Passaic, New Jersey, was murdered by an Italian, the crime was depicted as senseless, “without any cause.” Rehearsals of which groups were to be ostracized, which embraced as fellow workers, or neighbors, were in evidence in the Slavic press. Italians were as yet on probation.84

Just in case battles with vengeful, knife-wielding Italians weren’t enough to demonstrate Slovaks’ consanguinity with “white” Americans, editors hastened to point out they had had their share of run-ins with blacks, too. On May 14, 1896, Amerikansky russky viestnik reported that, “In Bluefield, West Virginia, there was a large battle between Slovaks and Negroes, which ended with the murder of two Negroes and one Slovak, and two Negroes were seriously wounded.”85 These press accounts seem designed to demonstrate that there was no danger of “unwhite” behavior in a social sense on the part of Slovaks.

Some of that social whiteness seems to have been trying on guises reflecting distaste for the Progressive Era’s racial pariahs. As we’ve seen, lynching accounts established blacks in the eyes of some new immigrants as America’s permanent liminal people, but other groups were also regarded with skepticism in the Slavic newspapers. This was particularly so in the case of Italians, especially when images of violence were attributed to these immigrants. Like more widely circulating newspapers such as the New York Times, Slovak papers judged “Italians” quick to reach for dynamite or stiletto when settling personal grudges. “The Čarna Ruka (Black Hand), better known as the Mafia to some, has been busy extorting money from the richest American Italians throughout the land,” Amerikansky russky viestnik reported on February 1, 1894, while on January 12, 1911, Národné noviny noted that 32 members of the Italian “Camorra” were on trial in Viterbo for the murder of Jacobo Cuocola, former chief of the society. New Yorkský denník noted, “Police break up the whole band of the Black Hand” with the arrest of
“24 Italianov,” although two months later the news was less happy when two bombs rent the air in “the Sicilian quarter, between Prince and Elizabeth streets.” “Fortunately, no one was hurt,” the paper reported, although a store was destroyed.86

More violence was reported, as when “In the city of Youngstown, Ohio, recently a high-spirited Italian organization set fire to the office of Judge W. C. Haseltine, because he had attempted with the utmost energy to hinder that society’s murderous business.” In 1894, more prosaic inter-Italian knife fights were interspersed with livelier accounts of fatal dynamitings—as when Eugenio Geneva was eviscerated by his rival, Michael Salvatore, over a woman. These accounts couldn’t have left readers of Amerikansky russky viestnik with a good opinion of the Mediterranean “race.” 87

The most vicious and common criticism of Italians centered on their supposed universal membership in the Black Hand. Tales of extortion, white slavery and dynamiting, as well as Italian gangland rubouts, appeared regularly in Slavic immigrant papers. While the lynchings following the Hennessy assassination occurred too early for coverage in Slavic papers, Amerikansky russky viestnik in 1895 reported on an alleged Mafia vendetta in New Orleans. “The Mafia is a secret organization of Italians that murders its fellow countrymen,” the writer informed his countrymen.88

In years to come the Black Hand, or Mafia, made a steady appearance in these papers’ coverage of Italians. Among the articles were reports of fire bombings in East Harlem after extortion letters were ignored; the dynamiting of several houses in the Bronx, which was attributed to two Italian white slavers; another story of Italian white slavery rings, that is, houses of prostitution, in Mineola, Long Island; a report of “the Black Hand in practice” that related to a dynamited porch in Lansford, Pennsylvania; and stories of the “Camorra” destroying Italians’ shops. In the last case Lieutenant Joseph Petrosino of the New York police’s anti-Mafia squad cautioned readers that not all Italians are in the Black Hand. This may be why Slovák v Amerike in 1909 ran an editorial praising Petrosino and condemning the Black Hand. However, the paper also had to run the story of a “Funeral of a Victim of the Black Hand” after Petrosino was murdered during a trip to Italy in an attempt to eradicate the European center of the crime organization. Other stories told of further extortion letters and dynamitings in New York and elsewhere in the country that were the work of the Black Hand.89

Inter-mob violence appeared in these papers, too, with news of “six slaughtered in Brooklyn” during a Black Hand war; notice that “the King of the Black Hand is murdered” in 1915 (and again in 1922 in Chicago); report of the demise of “Louis the Murderer,” erstwhile head of the Black Hand in Newark, New Jersey; and the capture of the leader of the Black Hand in White Plains, New York.90 In 1921 New Yorkský denník reported that “Frank Dago, bandit, complains of being shot.” The story began, “Franco Tuscano, who is known to the police in New York as one of the most dangerous bandits, last Sunday was shot in a manner similar to that done to his friend recently and at very near the same site. At that time,
Tuscano was arrested, but as usual, released because he is always aware of how to get out of everything.” Now that Tuscano, “who is known to police as ‘Dago Frank,’” was himself shot, he decided to spill the beans on who was responsible. This surprised both the police and the writer, for “up to this point, none of the thieves disclosed the name of their gang members, even if they worked to get them murdered.” The myth of omerta was rehearsed for Slovak readers in the tale of “Dago Frank.”

Stories of gangland murders were a staple of English-language tabloid papers by the early 1920s. But evidently more appalling to immigrant editors were the ways that even ostensibly law-abiding and venerated Italians were alleged to be vulnerable to the Black Hand’s depredations, or be suspected of serving as the respectable face of this secretive cabal. Jednota reported that “Caruso, the world-famous singer, has also become a victim of the world-famous criminal ‘Black Hand.’ Both belong to this Italian parody [párodnosti]. But still there is resistance among those who love their motherland. You’ll believe it, if you read this.” The writer relayed the news that the famous tenor had received two extortion letters demanding 15 thousand dollars, but “since he’d ignored their demand for this significant sum, the crew, this ‘Black Hand,’ fit up a bomb for him, which exploded into small pieces.” In a classic journalistic ploy, hints of dark deeds were planted that the paper could later say it was only reporting, not asserting. “Evil rumors whisper that Mr. Caruso is in cahoots with the ‘Black Hand,’” the writer hissed. “If this is true, we see that they, the Italians, haven’t learned anything from Americans.” The following day a similar article on Caruso’s troubles ran in Slovák v Amerike.

Other, less famous, law-abiding Italians also made it into Slavic papers only when they were targeted by the mob. A Brooklyn Italian priest was murdered in his parish house, after he announced that 300 dollars was stolen from his church. “It is said that the Italian Mafia murdered him.” Another Brooklynite, an Italian tailor, was murdered after, like Caruso, he ignored extortion letters. Even a student at Columbia University was said to have been threatened with Black Hand letters. After he ignored them, a bomb blew up the building where he lived. Even successful Italians, these articles suggested, were susceptible to violent Black Hand crime; as the Caruso article indicates, they also were often suspected of being in league with their criminally minded co-ethnics.

With all of the negative coverage of Italians featured in their papers, it is perhaps not surprising that Slovaks often embraced anti-Italian views of their own. This was perhaps most evident in a vicious 1907 Slovák v Amerike front-page story, “The Movement against the Italians of Sicily,” that equated all Sicilians with criminals:

Sicilians are a bloody minded, violent, treacherous people, thieves, liars, vindictive extortionists, many are members of the “Black Hand,” and in general are the most outcast pariahs in human society. If the government of America wants
to have peace it should prohibit their emigration from Sicily. Deport them. Yes, we don’t want them, we have no love for Sicilians. They aren’t honest.\textsuperscript{94}

In a similar vein, \textit{Amerikansky russky viestnik} reported on February 1, 1906 on “The Black Hand.” “Italians who have come here to America have brought with them that custom from Italy, that secret society known under the name of the ‘Black Hand’, generally known as the Mafia, which extorts money from all rich Italian Americans,” the paper informed its readers. Still, the writer allowed that

The Italians themselves are angry at this highwaymen’s organization, and generally do everything they can to end this secret bandits’ society. These murderous cutthroats are already regarded by the U.S. authorities as a secretive, energetic and dangerous company of foot pads. But so far they have had very little success in penetrating or breaking up this murderous society.\textsuperscript{95}

\textit{Jednota}, too, got in on the act, condemning both the criminal Italians and the ineffective New York police helpless to stop them. It was asserted that, in New York, “their dangerous criminal activity thrives. It is known that these robbers extort a large sum of money by menacing their countrymen. . . . They have their agents in all the banks, who communicate to them how much money their countrymen have in bank accounts.” And, as noted, \textit{Slovák v Amerike} in 1910 attributed the Black Hand’s crimes to “the nature of the Italian,” with his inbred “maniacal anger.” Editorials inveighed against not just the Black Hand, but the criminal nature of the Italian.\textsuperscript{96}

With such editorials and news articles trumpeting this “race’s” lawlessness, it was perhaps not surprising that some Slovak readers developed hatred of all Italians. A letter writer from Reading, Pennsylvania, wrote to \textit{Slovák v Amerike} of the alarming invasion of his city by the Italians. While the writer eventually got around to describing the specifics of the capture of two Italians who he said had murdered Constable Kelliher, he was far more interested in condemning an entire ethnic group. “Dear editor! I will show you the horrible abominations which these Italians have committed in our town,” his letter began. “It seems that the Italians are the most dangerous natural hazards among all ethnic groups in the United States. Wherever there are more Italians, there you hear about the ‘Black Hand’ and their murders. Our countrymen should give careful attention to this little bird [vtáčkov].”\textsuperscript{97}

In 1907 America, this Slovak “little bird” was not alone in making blanket statements about entire races, whether blacks or South and East European “races.” For decades to come Italians would face the calumny that they were prone to violent vendettas. That another immigrant group’s newspapers reprinted the received wisdom of America’s mainstream society evidently affected the way at least some Slovaks perceived the wretched refuse arriving at Ellis Island from other parts of Southeast Europe.\textsuperscript{98}
For all of these slighting characterizations, Italians and Slavs found it tolerable, if not always amicable, to share residential proximity, sometimes right across the street, in cities such as Philadelphia. In that city parishes accommodated various white ethnic groups, Slavs and Italians among them. This was especially the case in the second generation. And, as noted above, members of both white ethnic groups made common cause in organizations that enforced restrictive covenants against African Americans. Italians were different but not too different.99

This was especially the case when they were compared to African Americans. While in December 1924 a humor column joke could still mock an Italian greenhorn who mangled the English language with disastrous consequences during a doctor’s visit, blanket references to a “dago” race prone to extortion dropped away as greater numbers of non-European residents moved into the formerly Southeast European neighborhoods of American cities.100 In Leechburg, Pennsylvania, Slovaks by 1927 were comfortable enough with their Italian neighbors to rent their Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol lodge hall to Italians. (To be sure, on at least one occasion in 1930, these Slovaks, who subscribed to socialist papers, rented their hall to blacks, too.)101 Following World War II, New Yorkský denník could still in 1951 report of “bloody youth gang battles” in New York’s Queens Village between the “Breakers” of Ozone Park and the “Black Angels” of Queens Village. Two young gang members killed were John Fuzio, 21, and Pasquale De Rosa, 17. The article does not, however, make any editorial comments on the violent nature of all Italians. Conversely, the paper reported on East Harlem as “Jungletown,” and warned that New York now faced a Puerto Rican invasion. While a few battling Italians still made it into the pages of the Slavic press, no articles referred to Queens Village as “Dagotown”; the prevalent discourse of white ethnics in the 1940s and 1950s and when recalling their “ruined” neighborhoods in decades to come, was of nonwhite pathologies and hard-working white ethnics.102

This dichotomy is perhaps not surprising, for even 40 years earlier papers such as Slovák v Amerike had offered hierarchies of civilization in which Italians scaled the ladder of civilization, at least as compared to some peoples. Some of the few times that Slavic papers offered complimentary words to Italians occurred when articles covered Rome’s attempts to “civilize” the “barbaric” Turks and Africans of Tripoli. These colonial wars proved unsuccessful, but at least established that ethnic group’s bona fides as Europeans.103

The shores of Tripoli were not the only place immigrant newspaper readers vicariously visited. Colonial and imperial matters figured prominently in immigrant papers, and established a hierarchy of civilized and savage, a discourse of barbarous and cannibal peoples in need of control. Colonial ventures of all kinds served to establish black, Caribbean, and Asian peoples as less developed, whether the object of the journalistic gaze was situated in the Philippines, Haiti, Cuba, Africa, or Asia. For all that Italians might be viewed warily they were never
regarded through the lens of potentially captive peoples. The same language of alterity leveled at black Americans was also employed in coverage of colonial matters, an unfortunate symmetry that Italians—for all the Mafia articles—were able to escape.

It is to the imperial adventures that spanned the earth during the Progressive Era that we will next turn.
Chapter 5

“Ceaselessly Restless Savages”:
Colonialism and Empire in the Immigrant Press

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries lynching accounts abounded in immigrant newspapers, but they were not the only articles that reminded newcomers of the ways in which non-Europeans were treated as less than fully human. Slavic dailies and weeklies provided extensive coverage during the Progressive Era of the African and Asian subjects of various colonial empires, giving readers a discourse on less civilized peoples in need of tutelage by white, European masters. As recent captive subjects of the Kingdom of Hungary, Slovaks and Rusyns had some familiarity with empire, but the condescension visited on the peoples to whom President William McKinley referred as “our little brown brothers” was a new phenomenon that Slavic immigrants, like most Americans, learned about courtesy of the press.

As for many Americans at the turn of the century, race was also configured for Slovaks through the incipient United States empire, and in this regard they participated fully in the melding of a white identity. Several scholars have noted that Irish immigrants had, in part, secured their place in the white man’s republic by serving in the mid-nineteenth-century army subduing Mexicans and Indians. While not always unequivocally embraced by immigrant newspapers, the U.S. imperial project arguably also helped Slovaks become convincingly white. In 1898, Slovak newcomers established their white credentials by waving the red, white, and blue, cheering President McKinley’s shouldering of the “white man’s burden” with full-page, flag-draped homages to the president, Admiral Dewey, and General Miles.

Even the few articles that questioned the wisdom of America acquiring colonies overseas in the Caribbean or the Pacific often appeared in newspapers that in other issues ran copy asserting the savagery or less civilized state of Africans and Asians. Tropes of African savagery or even straight-faced accounts of the prevalence of cannibalism in non-European settings provided the cultural context which surrounded any consideration of America’s “splendid little war” against Spain, and the question of whether America had a right to colonize the Philippines and
Puerto Rico, or impose suzerainty over Cuba. The imposition of Theodore Roosevelt’s “big stick” policy in the Caribbean and Central and South America received a fair amount of coverage in *Slovák v Amerike, Amerikansky russky viestnik, Jednota*, and other papers.

Fraught coverage of the never-quite-concluded Filipino wars in Slavic papers was at times more ambivalent than in other, English-language papers. But the stories reported out of Luzon and Mindanao were accompanied by stories of Africans and Asians subject to European rule, and these articles propagated tropes of menace and savagery that situated non-European peoples as objects of the voyeuristic colonial gaze, occupying lower rungs in the era’s Social Darwinist hierarchy of civilization.

Articles also frequently provided news of the Dark Continent, with worried assessments of the restlessness of unwillingly colonized people. And America’s obsession with a supposed “Yellow Peril” from China or Japan, especially after her victory over Russia, led Slavic newspapers to report growing concern with Asians as rivals either in the Pacific or as immigrants sent to swamp a “white” people’s wage rate. In assessing the threat black and yellow races posed for Europe and America, Slavic immigrant newspapers again reflected the culture in which their readers found themselves, one in which a racialized hierarchy of development and Darwinian race struggles were taken as givens by most Progressive Era commentators. As with domestic matters of race—lynchings, Jim Crow laws, and race riots—Slavic papers often offered rewrites from the English-language press, and thus often reflected the predilections of many Progressive Era writers to treat with condescension colonized peoples in Asia and Africa.

At the end of the nineteenth century America’s self-conception as a nation apart, “a city upon a hill” immune to the European virus of empire, came into conflict with growing calls for the United States to adopt a “large foreign policy” that required overseas possessions after all. Proponents of the country’s earlier Manifest Destiny began to look across oceans just as Slavic immigration to America became a mass phenomenon. Much of the earlier dispossession of native peoples by and large had ended by the time hundreds of thousands of Poles, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Rusyns, and other Slavic peoples emigrated after 1880, and little concern for native peoples made it into the Slavic newspapers that arose after 1890. After the Western Indian wars were long over, *Národné noviny* in 1916 ran a photograph of “Civilized Indian brides of the Chilkat tribe on display in San Francisco,” evocative of the ethnographic carnivals of Carl Hagenbeck and other impresarios that some Slavs had already visited in Prague, Warsaw, and elsewhere. But in the 1890s the United States fitfully moved toward assuming an overseas empire, and, like other American residents, East Europeans pondered whether the country in which they’d recently arrived was all that different, in its expansionism at least, from the empires they’d left behind.
“Innate Thieves and Fanatical Fighters:”
The Philippines

The yellow press’s interest in the unrest brewing in Spanish possessions was reflected in immigrant newspapers, too. Slovak papers were sometimes ambivalent on whether the U.S. ventures in Cuba, the Philippines, and elsewhere were wise, but depictions in Slovák v Amerike invariably used qualifiers such as “blood-thirsty” and “savage” to describe Filipinos or Cubans. Moreover, as it quickly became apparent that not all Filipinos greeted the Americans as liberators, some frustration developed toward recalcitrant islanders, especially those who were non-Christian.

As early as December 1896, Amerikansky russky viestnik noted the developing “rebellion in the Philippines.” As Paul Kramer states, at this early date, few Americans paid attention to Spain’s Pacific colony, reading more often of the injustices inflicted on Cuba, a colony only 90 miles from Florida. Indeed, Amerikansky russky viestnik used the more familiar Jewel of the Antilles to situate readers in a trope of Spanish misrule. “The Spanish bred poverty on their island of Cuba, but that is nothing compared to their other island colony, the Philippines. There are reports coming from there that an uprising is brewing, but now a revolt has grown more and more.” The article’s author observed, however, “It is unlikely that the uprising will spread to Manila.”

This prediction proved wide of the mark, although Slavic papers gave little other notice to the Filipino independence movement until after Admiral George Dewey easily defeated the Spanish Pacific fleet. Once the U.S. war had ended, Jednota reported that Emilio Aguinaldo “filed a memorandum asking the recognition of the independence of the Philippines, or at least that it be recognized that the Filipinos are belligerents.” The paper, which was the organ of the First Catholic Slovak Union, would, in the years following the war, often be critical of U.S. policy, at least toward Catholic Filipinos. But in the immediate aftermath of victory over Spain it had little sympathy for any group not bowing to American preeminence. “The rebels sent a strong military expedition to the southern islands, there to pillage and murder,” the paper reported. Jednota further noted that “A confidant of General Aguinaldo confided that most Filipinos want to give in to President McKinley’s request that the United States annex the Philippines, because otherwise there can be no order maintained there. Aguinaldo again said that a republic should be established under United States protectorship, under which he would be president.” Hoping to seal the deal, the paper’s headline asserted, “Filipinos want to live as ours.” Suggestions that only American suzerainty would prevent Filipinos from giving vent to their predilection for “pillage and murder” already were being aired in a paper that would later reassess the wisdom of empire, at least for its own coreligionists.

Similarly, Slovák v Amerike reported on “Aguinaldo’s telegram,” in which “the natives [the Filipinos] call for independence.” Some Slavic immigrants, like
many of their American peers, were unwilling to consider such arguments when they came from non-Europeans. The same paper at the end of 1898 ignored the assertions of Hispanicized Manilans that they deserved independence because of their embrace of European culture and the Catholic faith. Instead Slovák v Amerike editorialized,

The primitive tribal population is the same as when the Philippines were first discovered by Magellan. The majority are Malays, in the interior of the islands the natives tend to be Negrito, dark in color, like a Negro. On the coast are the Chinese and Japanese. The whites in the Philippines almost all stick together in Manila. Among the Malays there are again recognized many separate tribes.9

In a milieu in which American “Negroes” were being dispossessed of their civil rights and Asian migrants were barred from naturalization, the few whites who stuck together in Manila were insufficient to warrant an independent nation. By March 1899, the paper reported, “In the Philippines there is no change in the war between the Americans and the Filipinos.”10

The parallel treatment of race in its imperial and domestic contexts was often on graphic display in the Slavic press. When Aguinaldo and his supporters redirected their warfare from the Spanish to their American “liberators,” Slovák v Amerike reported on April 13, 1899, that General Arthur MacArthur was coming to bring “freedom” to the Filipinos. This story appeared right alongside an account of Slovak strikers battling “nigger scabs” in the coalfields of Pana, Illinois. Harsh battles against nonwhite competitors continued to grow in the Philippines, too, as the paper noted, “A proclamation by the U.S. Bureau in the Philippines had an effect on the natives, as the Americans expected.” While residents returned to the strategic hamlets (the Spanish had called them concentration camps when they employed such a strategy only a few years before in Cuba), the paper noted, “the war is continuing as before and there the people are starving, but neither are they near surrendering.” While the paper was supportive of the U.S. effort to make the Malays see reason, already some concern at the war’s endurance crept into the article, and even a hint of the unsettling implications of Filipinos’ resistance to the American gift of freedom: “The United States are facing a danger as they want a weapon to conquer the Philippines. The Philippines are again determined that they will sell their freedom only at a high cost.”11

As with lynching accounts, such articles were by and large rewrites from English-language newspapers or wire service dispatches subscribed to by immigrant newspapers. Still, from whatever source these dispatches originated, they did appear in Slovak and Rusyn newspapers, and thus give some indication as to what immigrant editors believed it was important their readers learn about race in an imperial context. Such editors could have chosen to have omitted these
items, or to have denounced the imperial project (as some editorials later did, particularly in the Catholic Slovak and Rusyn newspapers). But from whatever their original provenance, immigrants, like other white Americans, were reading of the U.S. missions among McKinley’s “little brown brothers.”

In 1900, with war against insurgent Filipinos in full swing, Slovák v Amerike ran illustrations of the former sultan of Jolo’s palace; while this arguably was nothing more than an appeal to the interest of immigrants in a distant, exotic place much in the news following Admiral Dewey’s successes, the accompanying text established Jolo’s residents as less than civilized: “The inhabitants of these islands are of the Mohammedan religion and stand at a low level of education.” Later that year the paper ran a helpful illustrated primer, “The savage Igorots of the Philippines and their weapons.” Readers learned that

The Philippine Island inhabitants are from many tribes, but with little in the way of civilization. The most civilized tribes are the Tagalogs, who live in Manila and the vicinity; the most savage are the Igorots. The Igorots live up in the mountains of the island of Luzon. They are very bold and courageous, but, as shown in our illustration, armed only with bows, arrows, different kinds of axes, and knives. It is understood that with such a meager store of weapons they can’t win against the American guns and cannon.

Insets of the civilized American generals MacArthur and Otis were juxtaposed with the wild Igorots wielding Stone Age weapons. Whether the “meager store of weapons” could hold out against the Americans, a binary of savage natives and civilized Americans suggested to immigrants the folly of imagining an independent republic composed of such citizens (see Figure 5-1.) As Paul Kramer notes, Filipinos’ use of guerrilla warfare tactics was pointed to by Americans as further proof the natives weren’t high enough on the human hierarchy of development to warrant independence; cartoons in English-language papers similarly mocked Filipino headhunters as potential legislators terrorizing white Americans.

At times Slovák v Amerike was less overt in its assumptions of Filipino backwardness, even as it embraced the U.S. self-justificatory message of tutelage and racial uplift for the islanders. An illustration of “Tagalog teachers in Manila” presented well-dressed men and women under Uncle Sam’s guidance, not the grass-skirt-wearing knife wielders facing off against MacArthur. The paper sought to explain the Tagalogs’ hesitance to accept the proffered American assistance, stressing, “[t]he most important thing that the Filipinos need to be taught is that not all ‘white people’ are Spaniards. Up until now the Filipinos have mistrusted all white people. They’ve only meant slavery and heart ache. Once the Filipinos are convinced that the Americans mean them well, and they want to help them in the field of culture and progress, everything will get better there.” Still, the paper was not ready to jettison Progressive Era Americans’ accepted hierarchies of backwardness and modernity, suggesting that the predicted new order would not
usher in all that different a brand of “white people.” The article further noted, “The Filipinos are very backward in civilization, as was painfully evident to an American lady who came to the Philippines”\(^{15}\) (see Figure 5-2.)

Other papers were less avid in accepting the tropes of savagery, even while being noncommittal regarding the justice of Aguinaldo’s cause. Amerikansky russky viestnik reported the Filipinos petitioned the U.S. Senate “invok[ing] Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln on their behalf, to argue for an end to the war in the Philippines and that there be no more shedding of Filipino blood and foreign blood.” Still, the report noted, “They prattle that their petition should be

\textbf{FIGURE 5-1}: “The Savage Igorots of the Philippines and their Weapons.” Filipinos resisting U.S. colonization were characterized as primitive but a menace. \textit{Slovák v Amerike}, May 11, 1900, 1.
heard and that they can never be satisfied with such a protectorate as they have in Canada or in Australia.” The report noted that the senators refused to accept the petition, “and considered this document to be a treasonous document and an insult to our troops.” The United States had indeed pointed to international law and the Treaty of Paris by which Spain handed the islands over to Washington to justify labeling the Filipino rebellion as an outbreak of treason. Immigrants, too, evidently disregarded homages to American icons as “prattle,” even if in this instance forbearing to employ tropes of savagery.16 A week later, when the paper again commented on the Philippines, it documented “reports . . . coming back to Washington . . . that suggest there is a lot of sad news.” The news, though, was not of atrocities committed against Moros, but of the “very bad health conditions” causing U.S. troops to fall “to many different tropical diseases.” The article noted rumors of drunkenness and low morale among American troops in these remote postings. As in much of the English-language press’s reporting on the U.S. expedition to the Philippines, here the war and occupation were characterized as terrible things because of the hardships suffered by Americans, not the occupied peoples.17

**Figure 5-2:** “Tagalog Teachers and their Pupils in Manila.” The civilizing mission of Uncle Sam was emphasized in Slovak news stories from the Philippines. *Slovák v Amerike*, March 23, 1900, 2.
Reservations regarding ill or drunk soldiers, or even veiled questions of the wisdom of America’s adventures, were absent from Slovák v Amerike, which was more optimistic about the wisdom and ultimate success of the mission. In 1901 the paper reported “Aguinaldo captured” after his betrayal by a compatriot, and noted “end of the Filipino war is expected” (see Figure 5-3). A month later the paper reported, “Of Aguinaldo we haven’t heard anything new, and so it seems that the Manifest Destiny of the Philippine nation will have a good result. The Philippine masses have given way.” Amerikansky russky viestnik, too, condemned Aguinaldo when he refused to see the justice of American hegemony, and reported the capture of “the main rebel ringleader, the dictator of all the Filipinos who are rebelling, Emilio Aguinaldo.” The rebel leader had “sacriﬁced many lives,” and could not have been captured, the paper argued, “unless [he] had been betrayed by his own people.” The paper then provided a lengthy account by General Funston of the circumstances surrounding the “dictator’s” capture. A week later the paper reported on some of the difficulties surrounding the surrender of Aguinaldo, who was evidently having trouble translating “the American-drafted constitution into Tagalog,” encountering many words “whose true meaning eludes him.” Whether this was a dig at Tagalog ignorance or the incomplete, untranslatable nature of the democracy the United States was bestowing on the Philippines, is unclear. The paper noted, however, that while Aguinaldo “call[ed] on his compatriots to put aside their weapons and submit to the Americans,” the United States still was unsure what to do with Aguinaldo, as “[t]here are sections where the insurgents are healthy and others that have sworn loyalty to the United States.”

As the United States settled into an open-ended colonial occupation, promise of eventual autonomy was held out to those Filipinos who could demonstrate a vaguely articulated standard of civilization, a benchmark that the natives—even the Catholic population of Manila, but certainly the Tagalogs, Igorots, and other peoples—could never quite reach in the eyes of American authorities. Colonial Governor William Howard Taft and his successors had two ready answers for why self-rule could not as yet be granted. The Muslim and animist populations were not ready to engage in democratic rights, but the United States also argued that it was Washington’s duty to protect the “backward” islanders from Catholic Manilans, who, if given a chance, would surely exploit their less-developed neighbors. It was an argument it was diffi cult for Filipinos to win. In a series of insular cases, the Supreme Court decided that Filipinos, like other new, non-North American subjects of the United States, were ineligible for citizenship, even though Chief Justice Edward White declared they remained “definitely under the protection of this country.” As late as 1914, Slovák v Amerike reported on the proposed Jones Bill, which sought to set a timeline for eventual Filipino independence. The paper reported that Congressman William A. Jones proposed that the Philippines should get their independence within two or three years, but the article further revealed that this might be pushed forward to 1920. The following day the paper’s headline gave the verdict: “The Philippines must wait for independence.”

21 In a series of insular cases, the Supreme Court decided that Filipinos, like other new, non-North American subjects of the United States, were ineligible for citizenship, even though Chief Justice Edward White declared they remained “definitely under the protection of this country.” As late as 1914, Slovák v Amerike reported on the proposed Jones Bill, which sought to set a timeline for eventual Filipino independence. The paper reported that Congressman William A. Jones proposed that the Philippines should get their independence within two or three years, but the article further revealed that this might be pushed forward to 1920. The following day the paper’s headline gave the verdict: “The Philippines must wait for independence.”
Figure 5-3: “Aguinaldo Captured.” The leader of the rebellious Filipinos was a subject of much interest to Slovak newspaper editors. *Slovák v Amerike*, March 29, 1901, 3.
This interminable wait may be explained by the tropes of wild Moros that regularly appeared in many papers and in other cultural productions such as the St. Louis World’s Fair of 1904. Kramer notes that U.S. authorities and Manila elites alike sought to present a tableau of progress at the exposition, but that such signifiers of progress as the Filipino Scouts unit of the U.S. Army had a hard time competing with long-ingrained sideshow displays of wild men from Mindanao and the like. Such carnival images, which had been on display in European “human zoos” presented by entrepreneurs such as R. A. Cunningham in the late nineteenth century, recurred at Chicago’s 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition. Primitive Filipino villages were again some of the most popular attractions at St. Louis in spite of the complaints of Catholic Filipinos that such denizens represented their country as well as a band of Sioux might stand in for a typical American.23

Even in immigrant papers such as Slovák v Amerike rhetorical assertions of Filipino savagery continued well into the era of American rule. By 1904, the paper offered illustrations of Filipinos, “who are now, for the most part, peace-loving people.” The degree to which such papers were palimpsests of race-thinking is suggested by the fact that the same edition featured a horrific lynching account out of Mississippi, with no suggestion of whether the newspaper’s editors regarded white Mississippians as peace-loving. In a strictly colonial context, however, for all the assertions of colonial tranquility, the paper couldn’t help noting that, “Insurgents in the Philippine Islands are causing the United States a lot of difficulties.”24

Two years later the paper offered “Portraits of the Philippines” that framed predictably savage “inhabitants of the islands of Jolo and Sulu” with a garland of knives and machetes. In more vitriolic language that suggests the editors shared much of America’s impatience with the recalcitrant natives, the caption explained that “these islanders . . . have been known since ancient times as innate thieves and fanatical fighters.” Primordial, unchanging backwardness was one of the justifications colonizers used for ruling non-Europeans for their own good, although the caption hastened to add that some European powers evidently were not up to shouldering the white man’s burden: “The Spaniards, who sometimes owned these islands, despite all diligence could not handle these natives.” Regrettably, as often as the “Spaniards” thought they had “completely pacified” their ostensible subjects, “the natives rose up again and all their fanatical mischief [śarapatilī] raged again [zuristō].” The illustration’s caption concluded that following the Spanish-American War these possessions, “like all the Philippine Islands, passed into the hands of the United States,” implying that a colonial empire was something that had simply dropped into the lap of an unwilling Uncle Sam. Unwanted or not, the paper recognized that with empire came duties and declared, “[T]he American Army must strike at these fanatics and subjugate the Moros”25 (see Figure 5-4.)
While immigrant papers often reprinted wire service copy that originated elsewhere, they were quite adept at criticizing features of America’s culture that they found deplorable; if Slovák v Amerike’s editor had wished to, he could have omitted slighting references to “fanatics” and “Moros.” Indeed, on the very next page,

**Figure 5-4:** “Portraits of the Philippines.” The “Stone Age weapons” of Filipinos surround the “primitives.” *Slovák v Amerike*, June 12, 1906, 1.
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a cartoon condemned the use of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary (precursor to the State Police) in the suppression of a coal strike. “Brave state murderers under the Russian laws of Pennsylvania,” the caption bristled. If American strike-breaking brutality was denounced, the editors and letter writers at Slovák v Amerike took the “fanaticism” of Filipinos at face value. When troops were employed overseas, and not in the coalfields of Pennsylvania, their deployment was deemed just, and in Jednota and other papers the discourse quickly passed from the civilizing mission of Tagalog teachers to the subjugating mission of U.S. soldiers.26

While some Slovak papers expressed horror at the brutality of U.S. troops subjugating the Philippines, at other moments articles cheered McKinley’s shouldering of “the white man’s burden.”27 When Filipinos refused to see the light of rule by Washington, Amerikansky russky viestnik ran editorials condemning “the brutality of the dictator Aguinaldo,” who was “the chief leader, the dictator, of all the misguided Filipinos in rebellion.”28

It was not only newspaper editors reprinting mainstream America’s suppositions of Malay inferiority. Immigrant papers quickly featured letters from soldiers engaged in America’s imperial adventures that replicated a narrative of savage Asian enemies. As early as 1899, with America already deep in an undeclared guerrilla war against Aguinaldo and his followers, some Slovak immigrants were relating firsthand impressions of the Tagalogs who had no desire to be coerced into an embrace with America. Tomáš Pavliak of Glen Lyon, Pennsylvania, was serving in the artillery with the U.S. Army seeking to subjugate the erstwhile Spanish colony for its own good. This Slovak soldier wrote to Slovák v Amerike providing his assessment of the native Filipinos. He also praised the effectiveness of “the Gatling guns, which can shoot 800 times a minute. With a twist of the butt, it can then fire 1,200 times per minute.” This correspondent recounted some of his harrowing battles during an assault on Iloilo. “The last battle I truly thought that I’d never see America again,” Pavliak wrote, but he summed up the philosophy of his lieutenant whenever they encountered a Filipino: “Boys, keep him gone!”29

This last injunction appeared in Pavliak’s otherwise Slovak letter in the original English with which his lieutenant delivered the order, an order that mirrored the frank directive of U.S. General Jacob Smith to his command in the Philippines: “Kill and burn, kill and burn, and the more you kill and burn, the more you will please me.” Scholars of immigration have rightly stressed English acquisition as an important marker in immigrants’ acculturation to the United States; that some of these English phrases carried racialized meanings has been less often noted.30

Pavliak’s letter was echoed in coming years by other Slavic soldiers serving in the Philippines. The wisdom and justice of U.S. rule was not accepted by all indigenous peoples, and the war that President Theodore Roosevelt declared at a victorious end on the Fourth of July, 1902, sporadically continued to flare up for years. In 1906 Štefan Zaniat wrote to Slovák v Amerike from his barracks on
“Olongapo, Zambales, Filipíny,” saying that “The land is deserted, the people here are uneducated.”31 Jednota noted a wedding celebration in Youngstown, Ohio, for Jozef Molčan, “who recently served with the Seventh Regiment of the regular Army in the Philippines.” Molčan and “his young little wife” would be heading back to the Philippines to await orders. The “good Slovak and musician in the Army” did not offer his opinion of the natives on this occasion.32

But in 1914 New Yorkský denník reported on a “nice Sokol celebration,” a festivity in Freeland, Pennsylvania, attended by gymnasts from Palmerton, Hazleton, Lansford, Minersville, Coaldale, Shamokin, and Mahanoy City. “At the ceremony Polish Sokols performed and wore costumes of the Filipino Army and the state [U.S.] forces.” A masquerade of savage Moro Filipinos was on this occasion enacted by Slavic coal miners, who in other contexts raised the alarm of American nativists.33

By the 1910s, some of the American soldiers patrolling a by-now partially pacified Philippines were members of the National Slovak Society who wrote back to the fraternal society’s Národné noviny with their impressions of the natives. What these opinions were might be gleaned by the headlines: “Mohammedan Fanaticism” and “Savage Love Ends in Murder.” Regarding “Mohammedan Fanaticism,” a subhead informed readers, “If you swear to kill a Christian, for that you can hope to get to seventh heaven.” Ján Dianiš (or Dianish as the second letter had it) sent a letter from Parang, which, as he described it, was an even more exotic locale than his Chicago home. Admitting he was “not much of a philosopher, perhaps,” Dianish endeavored “to describe some of the customs of the inhabitants of these tropical regions.”

As was the case with English-language reports from the colony, it was the non-Christian population that most alarmed Dianish. “The first thing to mention is the so-called ‘Guramentado,’ which means an oath,” the reluctant philosopher wrote.

The local tribe of the population, called “Moros,” belongs to the Muslim faith and as such, they have maintained a strong hatred for Christians. In their fanaticism they go so far that many of them swear even these days, that it is not murder to kill a Christian, but a just sacrifice of life. These fanatics are blinded so much that they believe that the very fact that one has killed a Christian, no matter how one has spent one’s life, causes one’s soul to soar into seventh heaven, and there it will forever be served by lovely “houris.”

Dianish asserted that many American soldiers’ lives had been “extinguished by these fanatics,” although in another context one might regard such enemies as lawful combatants defending their homeland, were it not that Washington had already labeled resistance to U.S. domination as treason or fanaticism. As a U.S. soldier, Dianish followed suit, citing three of his comrades’ deaths not as the cost of warfare but examples of martyrs to alleged Muslim extremism. Still, even his
peers’ deaths from rifle and knife wounds could not deter Dianish from the narrative of patriotism to his adopted homeland. “Here I have provided a brief illustration of the sacrifice and danger to which our young men are exposed by serving under the flag of the republic,” he concluded, “but don’t let me deter any young man, or anyone who may be considered bold and has a desire to serve in the ranks defending our dear new homeland [vlast].” The elision “homeland” to cover distant Mindanao, employed by a transplant from Upper Hungary, was an irony on which neither the good soldier nor his Slovak readers remarked.34

Dianish’s assertion of “Mohammedan fanaticism” in the matter of Christian-hating may have been acquired from listening to the prejudices of his fellow soldiers or commanders, but similar diatribes had already appeared in papers he could have read before enlisting. Slovák v Amerike had already published an editorial on “the fanatical residents of the island of Jolo.” “It seems therefore that the Moros are such fanatics because it is rooted in their religion,” the editors explained in an item that otherwise detailed the reprisals U.S. troops levied upon Moros resisting American occupation of their island. “They are Mohammedans, and within their religious law is a kind of dictate, that whoever sacrifices his life for the faith gets to go to the seventh heaven. Whoever kills a Christian becomes worthy to come to the seventh heaven. These fanatics have been granted by their priests the right of self-sacrifice. . . .” This immigrant newspaper was not alone in accepting authorities’ glib characterizations of “fanatical” Islam when seeking to understand why benevolent occupation was resisted. Echoes of invasions to come were already emanating from Jolo more than a hundred years ago.35

The year after his first letters, a more optimistic letter from Dianish, stationed on Mindanao, promised “Let There Be Peace on Earth—The Unbelievers are Coming Around Through Hearing the Word of Our Father.” Still, Dianish said he always prefaced the sermons he gave by waving his revolver in the air, so it’s likely the peace that prevailed was of the predictable, colonized kind. In this regard, Dianish was behaving like any other American infantryman, with some of his own foreignness thus effaced. Slovaks and other suspicious racial stock at least partly became white by helping to subdue even more “wild” races. As Alexander Saxton and Matthew Frye Jacobson have noted, earlier white ethnics had been able to assert their place in the “white man’s republic” through service in the armed forces. Some Irish Americans, denigrated in eastern cities as a Catholic threat to the republic, joined the cavalry and served in the Plains Wars campaigns of annihilation of Indians. Now, too, some of the soldiers pacifying Moros were Slavs who in other contexts were condemned as “not a desirable acquisition for us to make, since they appear to have so many items in common with the Chinese.”36 By operating a Gatling gun, a U.S. soldier convincingly demonstrated his whiteness, even if he were a Slovak or Rusyn.37 And even if other immigrants couldn’t get over to Luzon to help in this imperial project, they could read about the savagery of other, even less convincing white folks who didn’t always grasp the wisdom of Washington’s rule.
Not all Slovak papers were always as supportive of colonization, though, especially when uprisings were brutally suppressed. The ambivalence of the response can be gauged since Sloväk v Amerike in 1906 labeled “Filipinos robbers and fanatics” and in January 1913 dismissed Moros as “savage citizens,” but later denounced General Pershing for slaughtering 2,000 Moros. This story ends with a sarcastic editorial comment, which indicates not all Slovaks always unequivocally accepted America as an enlightened nation. “That’s spreading that American civilization!” the editor sniped. “And then if necessary, they say they need more soldiers to do the job!” Amerikansky russky viestnik, which had previously supported the Spanish-American War, and even published soldiers’ letters on the suppression of the “savages,” in 1904 criticized “American brutality” in the Far East, including the American water torture used on Filipinos, and the suppression of the Boxer Rebellion by “the scandalous American gladiators.”

Indeed, the nation was divided on the wisdom of acquiring overseas colonial possessions, but, as Christopher Lasch has pointed out, some opponents of empire acted for less than altruistic reasons. They were motivated not out of sympathy for Filipinos or Puerto Ricans, but out of a fear that the non-European colonial subjects the United States might obtain would dilute America’s racial stock or degrade Anglo-Saxon traditions of self-rule. Some of this ambivalence with projected empire was reflected in venues and cultural productions with which immigrants were familiar. New York’s East Side House Settlement, for example, which sought to acculturate Bohemian (Czech), Slovak, and other immigrant children to American mores, in 1900 sponsored a debate for the Settlement’s Fellow Citizenship Association on “Does the Retention of the Philippines Tend to Imperialism”? Whatever the conclusions Slavic immigrant attendees at the club reached, they learned that the colonial war was opposed by prominent Americans ranging from Mark Twain to William Jennings Bryan.

Some of these reservations about colonial projects made it into Slovak and Rusyn papers, too. The Catholic newspaper Jednota, organ of the First Catholic Slovak Union, in 1902 went so far as to report that McKinley “wanted to embark on a war with the Spanish so that the Philippine Islands could be taken by U.S. troops.” Consequently, the paper alleged, the president had declined Andrew Carnegie’s offer of 20 million dollars with which to purchase the islands’ freedom from Spain and thus avert war. Even more heretically, the paper charged that McKinley “knew that the battleship Maine in Havana harbor wasn’t blown up by the Spaniards, but the Americans themselves were responsible for the explosion, and as a result, our shameless pretext for war with Spain was groundless. That Carnegie says as much these days in his own words is enough to terribly tarnish McKinley’s memory.” Indeed, years later, it was determined that a faulty boiler had scuttled the battleship, not the Spanish saboteurs conjured up by newspaper magnate William Randolph Hearst and other proponents of war. Evidently nonexistent weapons of mass destruction have been with us in many war scares.
Jednota continued to criticize U.S. rule in the Philippines, but it was often a tempered and qualified brand of anticolonialism that was expressed in this paper. Slavic editors were only concerned with the effects colonialism had on certain Filipinos, and less sympathetic to the plight of others. Like several Catholic Polish papers, this Catholic Slovak journal worried fellow Catholics were being treated unfairly in the Philippines, and criticized U.S. imperialists’ lack of respect for Filipinos. The same day as the report of Carnegie’s ignored attempts to thwart war, the lead item in the paper’s “American news” column was about a meeting of Cleveland area Catholics held to protest “the atrocities committed by the U.S. government and U.S. forces against Catholics in the Philippines.” The Irish priest chairing the meeting “read letters from American soldiers, who described the deeds of Americans against Catholics and Catholic interests” in the Philippines. The article charged American troops with desecrating Catholic churches and monasteries and “committing atrocities and barbarism that make everyone’s hair rise.” It was related that the meeting was told of a Catholic priest who was subjected to water torture after criticizing the American military, and further reported, “Filipino Catholic priests, who Americans described as wild Filipinos, say the Americans are the biggest villains, who are injuring and defrauding the Filipino Catholics and their interests. The Filipino people are tortured and murdered as if by savages. . . .” The meeting urged all Catholics to write President Roosevelt, Senator Mark Hanna, and Congressmen Burton and Beidler, to denounce the “barbaric American-Philippine administration and the American Army in the Philippines.” Binaries of civilized and savage, already employed by rival Slavic papers such as Slovák v Amerike to stigmatize Igorots and Tagalogs, were now turned against the soldiers of Uncle Sam.43

Jednota continued to look out for the interests of some colonized peoples, reporting that Archbishop Guidi had intervened with colonial Governor William Howard Taft on behalf of Filipino Catholics.44 And in considering the “Filipino question,” the paper editorialized on behalf of Catholic, but not Moro or other, Filipinos. The editorial writer wanted to know, “Why is the Catholic property in the Philippine Islands a thorn in the side of our liberal American government? Because the liberal (pagan) world does not love the fact that the Catholic Church has its assets, because they well know that if the Church enjoys her property she also has her liberty and independence.” The writer asserted that the would-be appropriators of church land wished to see priests and bishops become penniless “dependents of the atheist state.” In the Philippines, the writer saw a danger that the American authorities wished to “turn the Filipinos into unbelievers or Protestants,” urging Catholics to support fellow Catholics, even if they were “Negroes and Indians.”45

Three years later the paper was less sympathetic when reporting a “Protestant protest.” Jednota faulted Protestants and “journalists of Israel” for condemning Catholic Filipinos’ celebrations and public processionals on the Feast of the Virgin Mary. Noting that the U.S. colony was home to “some seven million-plus
Catholics,” the paper derided the “Ikies” who “protest[ed] against such ‘recognition’ of the Catholic Church as a ‘state’ religion, as protesters characterized it.”

Of course, as noted, other Slovak soldiers had already written back to Slovák v Amerike with slighting reference to the savage and fanatical non-Christian Filipinos, a distinction in treatment and regard that was reflected in the United States’ differential behavior toward Catholics and “savages” in the colony as well. Even Jednota, which denounced depradations of Catholic Filipinos’ rights, cheered a Slovak soldier’s stationing in the colony, and accepted the standard, early twentieth-century denigrations of non-Christian Filipinos. When it came to Muslim Filipinos, the paper often embraced the necessity of militarized American rule. Five months after news of the Cleveland Catholics’ meeting, Jednota ran a brief item noting, “The Muslim people of the Philippines refused to be governed by the United States and argued rather that their own laws should govern. The U.S. made them succumb.” As with lynching accounts, the brevity of this item speaks loudly when contrasted with the much angrier denunciation of alleged U.S. despoliations of Catholic Filipinos. In 1904 not all Muslim Filipinos, however, had realized they were fated to succumb, and Jednota reported, “Our soldiers’ mission in the Philippines is not yet finished and now comes the report from Catabalo, Mindanao, of a new bloody battle between the Filippinos and U.S. troops.” Four hundred men under the command of the Dattah (ruler) Ali stood up to an American cannon attack and even inflicted a hundred American casualties. “The Dattah and his entourage are now hunted,” the item concluded.

While a Catholic paper certainly was more concerned with the interests of coreligionists, the cursory attention paid to any water cures, cannon shots, or other methods designed to make non-Christian natives “succumb” is striking. In the earlier articles, evidently it was not that such atrocities had occurred that bothered Jednota; the real outrage was that they had occurred to Catholics.

Still, as the nature of American rule in Asia became apparent, characterizations of savage Filipinos were at times tempered, even reversed, as when the editors of Amerikansky russky viestnik belatedly expressed the opinion that the real culprit in the Far East was “American tyranny.” “Americans are wont to show off before the world, that they are the friendliest and the tamest, also the most educated, people on earth. We’ve seen some of this friendliness on sentry patrol in the scandalous Boxer Rebellion, which has been carried out by the American gladiators. Also we’ve seen the American ‘water cure’ practiced on the enslaved Philippines. This doesn’t strike us as particularly civilized.” Jednota in 1904 likewise fretted over the wisdom of America embarking on “Imperialism,” with less than citizenship rights granted to the “low citizens” of the Philippines and Puerto Rico. The paper noted that it was only a few years before this that the people of Cuba had rebelled against such treatment at the hands of Spain, and observed that anti-imperialists such as William Jennings Bryan and ex-President Grover Cleveland argued that it would be best for the republic and its institutions
if as many statehood rights “as practically possible” were extended to Puerto Rico and the Philippines. The paper also questioned the wisdom of embarking on a project to civilize the Philippines, when it waged war against its own black citizens, citing the intolerable conditions in the textile mills of Gaston County, North Carolina, as evidence. This was one of the few times in the early twentieth century that the paper expressed any sympathy for blacks; it seems that the plight of black millworkers was here employed discursively to criticize U.S. foreign policy.  

Such ambivalence on the United States’ imperial project suggests editors were not always sure the Anglo-Saxon race was so very superior, or something into which self-respecting Slavs would even want to assimilate. Still, Jednota—like many English-language newspapers—was hesitant about extending full equality to America’s new insular possessions. As noted above, in 1904 the paper questioned the wisdom of acquiring overseas possessions, and urged the extension to Filipinos, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans of as many rights “as practically possible.” While imperialism caused some unease to recently captive subjects of the Habsburgs, that caveat “as practically possible” speaks to the psychic differential some new immigrants felt when assessing the distinction between denizens of Chicago or New York and San Juan and Manila. These papers’ expressions of anti-imperialism, too, came a little late in the game, and were drowned out by other items more in keeping with mainstream opinion. In a story headlined “35 Hindus deported,” New Yorkský deník noted that a federal judge in California ruled Filipinos to be “foreign Asiatics, and declared that they be deported.” The paper similarly reported a strike in Panama by Chinese merchants and small shopkeepers after they learned that the United States was intending to deport them from its newly acquired colony. And when Jednota objected to U.S. policy in the Philippines, it was not because of mistreatment of Filipino human beings but only to protest U.S. confiscation of the Catholic Church’s property.

“A Ridiculous Farce for Our Civilization and Culture to Play!”

To be sure, any criticisms of empire occurred within a racialized framework, mixing Old World prejudices with new. An editorial in Amerikansky russky viestnik could think of no worse condemnation for the Americans than noting “Such barbarism doesn’t occur even in Turkey and Americans demand that they be treated as the height of civilization.” As noted in Chapter 3, “Turks” and “Mohammedans” were viewed with hostility by many Slavs, and in the discourse of empire, Muslims were frequently condemned as especially primitive.

At other moments Jednota’s coverage hinted at some of the racial complexities for the United States at home and abroad when managing an empire. In reporting that black army regiments were being transferred to the Philippines, the paper noted, “Although officially denied, it has nevertheless been ascertained that this regulation is a matter in connection with the dissolution of the
three black regiments at Brownsville, Texas,” where black soldiers faced court
martial after they forcefully resisted Jim Crow humiliations in the city in which
they were stationed. This policy was a reversal of earlier decisions to keep most
black soldiers out of the colony, because, the paper explained, “the Filipinos
have a great hatred of the black race, as in America, the people of the islands
would have been humiliated if blacks tried to keep order in the country. . . . The
government is still afraid that a second black regiment might be destroyed by the
Moro population.” While this explanation parroted the government’s rationale
for initially transferring black soldiers out of the archipelago, it is likely their
transfers were hastened after Filipino freedom fighters started soliciting blacks’
desertions from the U.S. Army by citing the lynchings and segregation that
awaited them back home in the country they were serving.54

A 1909 editorial in the Catholic paper indicates growing frustration with the
cost of occupation and military adventures; skepticism toward the government’s
assertions that it was civilizing the natives, and disgust at the squalor and savagery
of a population still bent on resisting U.S. rule. The editorial argued that “our
mighty imperialists need to show proper respect and defend our uncivilized
people,” and referred to the squalor of Manila even after 11 years of U.S. occupa-
tion; the segregation of hotels that barred native Filipinos was labeled “a
ridiculous farce for our culture and civilization to play!” The editorialist also
complained Filipinos “never before have seen or been shown respect.” Still, it
was the financial cost (more than $200,000,000, the article said) and mounting
U.S. casualties that had “left a stain on the shield of our republic.” The writer
declared, “Our government has actually become imperialist and believes that
providence has selected us as the protector of these uncivilized people, even
though perhaps they think we haven’t delivered all that much civilized help
through our deeds and words.” The futility of the war, which still dragged on
after more than a decade of U.S. occupation, was faulted, but the writer also
noted that the natives were “a piratical horde,” which could easily inflict a guer-
rina war on U.S. troops ad infinitum, “but we of this country are not used to such
hardships.”

As in an earlier Amerikansky russky viestnik article, the hardships of concern
were those visited on Americans, not occupied natives. And as in the case of Ján
Dianish writing of his exploits defending “our country” (even if so far from
North America), this writer speaks to the ease with which Slavic immigrants
embraced Americanism, albeit within a racialized context. Indeed, Jednota’s edi-
torialist went on to mock the folly of attempting to educate Filipinos, whom he
characterized as “lazy and indifferent.” The “savage tribes are still human oddi-
ties,” he concluded. Evidently not every Slovak embraced the U.S. imperial
venture as wholeheartedly as Trooper Dianish, but the racialized assumptions
of Asiatic and “Negrito” savagery persisted even for those critiquing
imperialism.55

All in all, Slovaks’ coverage of America’s colonial venture in the Philippines
was ambivalent, and even when papers critiqued U.S. policy, articles often
accepted racialized stereotypes and hierarchies. Catholic newspapers, perhaps out of an awareness that many of the country's new colonial captives were coreligionists, seem to have been more ambivalent in their assessment of the imperial project, at times quite critical of the brutality, economic cost, and hypocrisy of empire, even as they accepted notions of savagery of many non-Europeans.

*Slovák v Amerike* and *New Yorkský denník*, secular papers, were more consistent in labeling Filipinos as innately savage, thieving, and violent. An eyewitness “report from the jungle” in *New Yorkský denník* from the still-not-pacified Philippines related in 1915 that “Insurgents in the Philippines, who are still a small gang, are half patriots and half bandits; they are deceitful and treacherous.” The reporter noted that when “the whoop sounds anew” from the “half bandits,” “The bravest soldier would have rushed out of that place.” 56 In relating stories of battles between Moros and U.S. soldiers, *Slovák v Amerike* referred to the natives as “savage residents,” and the “tribesmen in Jikira” confronting soldiers were “the most bloodthirsty gangs who caused trouble” and “bandits.” As in Mexico, which was also extensively covered by the Slavic press, any opposition to the forces of order or colonial rule was denounced as the work of lawless “bandits.” Only the most egregious bloodletting by U.S. forces, as when General Pershing ordered the slaughter of 2,000 Moros, elicited a condemnation from *Slovák v Amerike.*57

Old canards of Filipinos’ savage customs persisted into the 1920s in *New Yorkský denník.* “The most favorite meat of some people in the Philippine islands is dog meat,” a filler item related. Kramer notes that such sideshow exoticism of Filipinos occurred in sites such as the St. Louis World’s Fair, to the consternation of Manila elites. Less savage stereotypes were no less flattering. A humor-page joke has a white lady in the colony experiencing problems with her Filipino houseboy. “One day a young American lady was dressing in her bedroom and her servant started entering the room. ‘Juan!’ she indignantly exclaimed. ‘Whenever you come in, knock first; I could have been naked [neoblečený].’ ‘No,’ retorted [vyšletoval] the servant, ‘that wouldn’t happen. I always peep in the keyhole and only put on clothes and come in if I see that you’re dressed.’” The naked, dog-eating Filipino trickster continued to bedevil the Slovak imagination.58

Other ethnic groups, though, were often quite critical of U.S. imperialism. Jacobson notes Polish newspapers often objected to America’s imperialism, although with some ambivalence. Many Poles saw participation in the U.S. Army in the war to liberate Cuba as military training for a national uprising in Poland. But when *Dziennik Chicagoski*, which had never been that supportive of the call to war, saw how U.S. “liberation” quickly degenerated into occupation, it ran a front-page cartoon in 1900. A Cuban is reading a newspaper, and behind him is a poster saying the U.S. will remain until law and order are established. The paper’s headlines scream of several lynchings in the United States. The Cuban sighs, “When I read of these atrocities I come to the conclusion that my old, bloody friend Weyler is now the chief commander in the United States.”59
Many Polish papers likewise denounced the brutality in the Philippines far more consistently than Slovak papers. Jacobson points out that Poles’ own captive status in Europe caused immigrant journalists to look with sympathy on natives’ national aspirations. The editor of Kuryer Polski sighed, “For us Poles, this war is not necessarily pleasant. Traditionally we always stand on the side of the oppressed; since we have repeatedly taken up arms in defense of our independence, we naturally sympathize with all other peoples struggling for independence—even if they be half-savage Malays.”

Sympathy for Filipino aspirations was repeated in Zgoda, and it seems many Polish papers, to a greater extent than Slovak ones, had reservations (if not outright opposition) to imperialism. But Jacobson notes even here an ambivalent, conflicted attitude toward Asians was expressed. “Half-savages” were sympathized with only up to a point. “[A]s white Europeans in a context where white supremacy and European centrality were the founding assumptions of so much public discussion, many immigrants could distance themselves from the Filipinos and adopt American ‘responsibilities’ in the Pacific as their own.”

Still, strong condemnations of McKinley as a shameful heir to Lincoln and cartoons and editorials criticizing Teddy Roosevelt’s racism in pursuing colonial ventures against non-Europeans appeared in Polish papers such as Zgoda, Straz, and Dziennik Chicagoski. Straz pointed out the hypocrisy of a nation that allowed Kentucky lynch law seeking to “civilize” the “savage” Tagalogs. Such Polish denunciations appeared far more frequently than in Slovak papers. These publications rightly demonstrate that not every immigrant automatically and unequivocally embraced America’s imperial ventures.62

Yet Jacobson notes much of the Polish press’s coverage—even that which expressed outrage at McKinley’s war—was a fraught mixture of emotions. Zgoda, for example, seems often to have ambivalently expressed nationalistic support of the United States, opposition to imperialism, but ultimately pride in the “manly” success of U.S. soldiers. Kuryer Polski was more sympathetic to the Filipinos than many Slovak journals, but thought the Malays were not quite ready for independence, and wondered if, unlike for European Poles, partition or occupation might be a blessing for such “half-savages.” Sympathy for Cubans or Filipinos, Jacobson argues, “did not preclude Eurocentric, racialist conceptions of ‘civilization’ and ‘savagery,’ which comfortably cast the Filipinos as ‘other.’ Through the prism of race, an unthinkable sympathy with the conquering nation became thinkable for many.”

“An Interesting Case of Illness”: Cuba

This ambivalence is seen in the pages of Slovak papers, which in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War seemed unsure what to think as America’s erstwhile allies continued to pursue liberty beyond the parameters of what American
authorities were willing to grant. *Slovák v Amerike*, as early as 1899, ran an illustration of the Cuban rebel leader, General Máximo Gómez (see Figure 5-5). “In Cuba, there is now a spreading unrest,” the caption informed readers. “Cubans want to be a free people and can’t see why they shouldn’t get rid of the

**Figure 5-5**: “In Cuba, There Is Now a Spreading Unrest.” “General Máximo Gómez and a Map of Cuba.” Cuba was another misbehaving little brother of the United States. *Slovák v Amerike*, October 13, 1899, 1.
occupying United States.” Still, readers were given lurid details of the violent criminality “rampant in Cuba,” with common lynchings and riots “giving rise to general discontent.” Unlike in accounts of disciplined white citizenry restoring order in Mississippi, this account suggests that Cubans’ dream of becoming “a free people” was a chimera due to the lawless nature of the populace.

As with the Philippines, sometimes it was Catholic papers that were more sympathetic to the Cubans, although not without some condescension. Perhaps because of his own captivity in the Kingdom of Hungary, a Greek Catholic Rusyn writing in *Amerikansky russky viestnik*, on June 6, 1901, added a few comments of his own to a report that “A Cuban constitutional convention has approved the Platt Amendment by a majority vote.” After the convention accepted this American-drafted addition to the likewise American-crafted Cuban constitution, a rebellion erupted. The article noted that under the Platt Amendment, “the United States will have the right to decide upon all commercial treaties that Cuba has concluded with foreign countries. The United States can intervene in Cuban affairs in times of need, when the U.S. decides it is in the protection of their interests.” Consequently the article noted that “the country has split apart into Cuban patriots and traitors and such,” although the writer didn’t indicate whether supporters of Platt were patriots or traitors, and to whom. Still, he sardonically added, “The United States has the right to a healthy supervision of Cuban laws and to me that is an interesting case of illness, considering the epidemic that the United States introduced there.” He concluded however, “The amendment is in many respects liberal, but all the combatives in Cuba want freedom.”

Other papers were more laudatory toward the United States and the gift of freedom the country had ostensibly bestowed on Cuba. *Jednota* ran a story headlined “Glorious Cuba,” but the article had little praise for the passive recipients of American benevolence, instead hailing President Theodore Roosevelt for handing independence to a grateful island nation. Indeed, while Cuba’s new president, Estrada Palma, was said to have received into his hands the new government from American General Leonard Wood, the article left little doubt as to the real father of Cuban independence:

If President Roosevelt had not been at the helm of the United States on this glorious day, the Cuban people today would barely have a life; therefore we can boldly say that the president, who himself personally fought for the freedom of the island of Cuba, really made them free. Indeed, if President Roosevelt had never done anything else special in his life, he would through these actions alone have made himself immortal in the history of the world. He has fulfilled all the dreams and hopes of all Cubans and of all the noble people of the world.

Forgotten were the Cuban patriots or traitors cited by *Amerikansky russky viestnik* who the year before had condemned the Platt Amendment.
Evidently not everyone had as healthy an opinion of Roosevelt’s achievements, for in three months *Jednota* reported that “The Cuban government has made it clear to the Americans that their regaining of their freedom in the Republic of Cuba is near.” While this brief item made no mention of it, the Cuban impatience may have been at the continued presence of U.S. troops and at Washington’s decision to maintain a protectorate over Havana—a situation that would not be ameliorated until 1939. Most Americans dismissed Cubans’ reservations at this arrangement, as did *Jednota*, which in October 1902 belittled Cuban President Estrada Palma for balking at signing “a reciprocal commercial treaty,” and dismissed as fanciful the Cuban leader’s request that the United States “just suddenly pull those troops from Cuban territory.” The American “big stick policy” toward her Latin American neighbors seems to have been internalized by some Slovak newspaper writers as well.

The ambivalence toward Cuba, especially when race was factored into the equation, is demonstrated through the pages of *Jednota* and *Slovák v Amerike*. In 1909 *Slovák v Amerike* editorialized, “The U.S. must retreat so that Cuba can be free.” Yet the “prism of race” that Jacobson says prevented even sympathetic Poles from always affording equal rights to Cubans or Filipinos operated for Slovaks, too. As noted, Catholic Slovaks denounced depredations against coreligionists in Manila, but accepted at face value a narrative foregrounding savage banditry among Moros and Igorots. And when black Cubans organized to oppose segregation or assert political rights in a country in which they were a majority, the Slovak press expressed alarm. The prospect of a black republic in which whites would take orders from those of a different race was simply too great an offense for Slovaks to imagine; after all, editors at *Jednota* and *Slovák v Amerike* were now reporting from the United States, a country in which many states had only recently disfranchised their own minority voters. By January 1907 *Jednota* was viewing with alarm the actions of black activists in the Caribbean. When a Liberal victory was predicted in elections on the island, the paper noted that “[t]he Liberals are 73 percent black and only 27 percent white . . . blacks are well represented in the leadership. Above all blacks want to get the presidential chair.” Such a prospect was labeled “a public menace threatening the island,” especially if U.S. troops were withdrawn. The writer informed Slovak readers that those troops “are there to stop an outbreak of a revolution, for they will never tolerate an impermissible rule of blacks over whites.”

The article also alerted readers that the Liberals were violating property rights (although the article didn’t say so, these were likely American business interests’ generous “rights” to operate free of Havana’s regulation or oversight, as granted under the Platt Amendment) and that personal safety was threatened by the prospect of a majority-black Liberal government. In an era when whites organized mass vigilante violence against blacks who sought to retain some civil rights in places such as Mississippi, Atlanta, or Wilmington, North Carolina, a black-majority political party may have been perceived as self-evidently indicative of coming
anarchy. The island “revolution” that the article warned was imminent and the “complete anarchy” that “many argued” would occur within six months of a black-led victory in Cuba, seems to have been nothing more than a white phobia of black political organization. Certainly any vestige of black self-defense or organized political activity that had survived into 1907 in the United States was often so stigmatized. Roosevelt reiterated his faith in the “maturity” of the Cuban people, but warned that U.S. troops would remain stationed on the island during “the present turmoil” and reminded audiences foreign and domestic that “Cuba was built under the protectorate of the United States. . . .” The self-congratulatory tone at Roosevelt’s achievements that Jednota had published five years earlier was absent in this report. While the article is typical of the English-language metropolitan press’s despair at Cuban (especially black Cuban) anarchy, tellingly the Slovak paper’s editors added no critique of the report’s ominous tone warning of a black-led anarchist reign. These assumptions seem to have gone unquestioned. Roosevelt reiterated his faith in the “maturity” of the Cuban people, but warned that U.S. troops would remain stationed on the island during “the present turmoil” and reminded audiences foreign and domestic that “Cuba was built under the protectorate of the United States. . . .” The self-congratulatory tone at Roosevelt’s achievements that Jednota had published five years earlier was absent in this report. While the article is typical of the English-language metropolitan press’s despair at Cuban (especially black Cuban) anarchy, tellingly the Slovak paper’s editors added no critique of the report’s ominous tone warning of a black-led anarchist reign. These assumptions seem to have gone unquestioned.70 This article appeared on the same page as the report of black U.S. soldiers being reassigned to duty in the Philippines. Empire—or quasi-empire in the case of Roosevelt’s firm role in Havana—could not easily be disentangled from domestic matters of race.

In 1912 black Cubans again organized in an attempt to remove some of the racial inequities that had persisted under the American protectorate; now, facing the prospect of organized black resistance, Slovák v Amerike forgot its earlier opinion that “The U.S. must retreat so that Cuba can be free.” Headlines warned of a “Rebellion of the blacks,” surely words to alarm readers in the Jim Crow era. As the “rebellion” grew, the paper ran news that the United States was sending a battleship from Key West, Florida, to assist the government’s army that was “deployed against the rebellious blacks.” Illustrations of the opposing race-based armies accompanied the article. Amid news that “the government is failing to obey the blacks’ demand that they withdraw the Morne law, which is regarded as unjust to blacks,” the paper reported “a prediction that Cuba will rather break apart into two parts, one consisting of the white population and the other of black people. . . .” A week later, the paper alarmingly opined, “Most of the rebels are anti-American plantation workers, great enemies of order.”71 Neither article noted that the movement of black Cubans had begun as a political party, and that even this was violently suppressed by the island’s establishment. Instead, images of blacks manning machine guns signified to Slovak readers, as to other newspaper readers, that a race war was brewing, one that could be attributed to the black “great enemies of order.”

Even if race was sometimes not as explicitly spelled out as here, Slovak papers often used words such as “savage,” “cannibal,” “bloodthirsty,” and “barbaric” in supposedly objective foreign news coverage of Cubans, Filipinos, and other colonized peoples. While these signifiers were staples of yellow journalism, it’s difficult to dismiss them as having no effect on at least some readers’ perceptions of other races and continents. Perri Giovannucci has astutely argued in our own
age that reportage and literature that speaks of “backward” or “timelessly primitive” peoples serves an ideological function. Likewise when Slovaks read newspaper accounts of wild Filipinos or Cubans resisting Uncle Sam, more than objective battle accounts was conveyed.72

This is not to say every Slovak was anaesthetized to the brutality of empire, for, as noted, a particularly fierce slaughter could elicit from Slovák v Amerike (otherwise supportive of the colonial project) a denunciation of Pershing’s harsh imposition of “culture and civilization.”73 A letter in New Yorkský denník recommended the article “On that Hawaiian Slavery” in the radical paper Rovnost ľudu.74 After three white Texas farmers were lynched, the editor of Slovák v Amerike commented, “McKinley needs to look into this. He needs to introduce some culture here, and not in the Philippines.”75 Perhaps, though, it was the whiteness of the victims that spurred this editorializing. Regarding America’s imperial adventures the Slovak press was less condemnatory than Polish papers. It may have been memory of the homeland’s own partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria that made Polish journalists acutely sensitive to the injustice of colonization, but, for whatever reason, Slovak papers less frequently questioned American colonial ventures, and never as virulently as in the Polish press.

“Endless Big Headaches for Uncle Sam”:
The Big Stick in the Caribbean

In other parts of the Caribbean where Uncle Sam wielded the “big stick,” immigrant newspapers often regarded native peoples with condescension. Haiti, for example, was periodically characterized as a lawless realm full of bandits that was a troublesome thorn in Washington’s side. C. L. R. James ably documented the degree to which a republic of “black Jacobins” was regarded by Europe and the United States as a threat to the racial status quo since Haiti’s beginning. At the turn of the twentieth century Slavic immigrant newspapers embraced the trope of black Caribbean lawlessness, even if it was not a phobia of their creation.76 Jednota reported in 1902, “On the island of Haiti it is still not quiet and the revolution is raging on. These days more Negroes are battling among themselves there,”77 but when the revolution didn’t subside, the paper reported three years later that the United States had been forced to intervene. “The United States has assumed a protectorate over the republic of Negroes,” Slovak readers read. In noting that “Santo Domingo” and Haiti “have been falling into one revolution after another; thus causing American and European businessmen there no end of damages and many vices,” the writer said that President Roosevelt had arranged to take over the ports of the violent black republics. “The United States will have control over customs and will prevent further unrest,” the article concluded.78 No more accepting explanation of the necessity of President Roosevelt’s “big stick” interventions in the Caribbean could have been found in the English-language press.
Eight months later the paper reported on “the American colony of Santo Domingo,” in which businessmen hoped to establish plantations with docile, inexpensive native laborers now that Roosevelt and his army had prevented further unrest. For all its criticism of the alleged depredations against European-ized fellow Catholics in the Philippines, Jednota accepted the logic and justice of gunboat diplomacy directed against a “republic of Negroses,” even if, as in Haiti, they were fellow Catholics. Race evidently negated religion in the hierarchy of civilization and sympathies.

Similarly, on the very day that Amerikansky russky viestnik editorialized that the “Americans are tyrants” for their mistreatment of “the poor Filipinos,” the paper reported on “the looting of property” and threats to lives by rebellious people in “the two black republics of Haiti and Santo Domingo” that necessitated the shelling of the island by U.S. warships and the landing of 400 troops. While arguably the editorial included in its critique this action in the Caribbean, too, there was no explicit condemnation of the rumors that the United States “intends to occupy the whole black republic of San Domingo.” Slavic immigrants were not always entirely comfortable with America’s growing imperial role in the world. Like more prominent Americans, they worried about the potential damage insular possessions would cause to republican institutions, and sometimes deplored the cost in treasure and human lives. But of the folly of a “republic of negroes” Slavic newspaper editors seem to have had little doubt.

Especially when Latin American republics stood up to U.S. business interests, as appears to have been the proximate cause of Roosevelt’s ordering warships to San Domingo, the Slavic press joined with many other American journals and supported “gunboat diplomacy.” In 1905, Slovák v Amerike assessed the growing crisis of “Venezuela and the Monroe Doctrine.” An editorial that appeared on the same page that reported a brutal Mississippi lynching spoke dismissively of the Venezuelans’ incapacity for self-government, suggesting again that the accretion of articles dealing with race at home and abroad are difficult to disentangle. While, unlike Haiti, “the South American republic” was not labeled “a republic of negroes,” the editorialist nevertheless noted that it was bedeviling Washington by rejecting “the ‘Monroe Doctrine,’ a matter of principle that America is the only country to look after the Americas.” The writer noted that “due to poor administration,” Caracas was unable to pay its debts to foreign businessmen, and that President Roosevelt’s efforts to “urge Venezuela to properly pay its debts” were “greatly hated by Castro, president of Venezuela, who believes his country shouldn’t have to pay the debts.” When Castro moved to nationalize foreign mining properties, Roosevelt threatened to “send warships and thus . . . protect its citizens’ interests in Venezuela.” This is one of the few occasions when a Slavic paper expressed sympathy for mining “interests,” which otherwise suppressed strikes by immigrant laborers at places such as Lattimer, Pennsylvania. On this occasion, too, the writer noted, the president reasserted “a strict interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine,” declaring as “a matter of fact that the Monroe Doctrine
meant that the whole of the Americas belongs only to the United States, and that no foreign power should be mixed up in the Americas.”

Three years later, Haiti again was of concern to Slovak journalists, as when Jednota reported on “Chaos on the island of Haiti.” Threats to foreign businesses and embassies were related, and the writer stated, “We expect a great deal of trouble from this little republic of black people.” Unlike in the Philippines, no defense of fellow Catholics was articulated by Jednota when it came to Haiti. By May 1908 the paper spoke of a “new revolution in Haiti,” while by December an editorial again invoked the Monroe Doctrine and “the big stick,” English-language references to America’s foreign-policy tenets in discussing the worrisome situation in the Caribbean. “What can arise from the revolution in Haiti?” the headline asked, and the writer quickly suggested, nothing good. In embracing the standard view of the United States that Port-au-Prince was a failed state since its inception, the writer asserted, “The rebels in Haiti are intoxicated by their victories. This happened long ago, for in this republic, ever since its inception in revolution, unrest has never ceased, and insurgents always managed to topple the government. Now how long happiness will persist, we don’t know. It is certain that revolution will come again . . . .” The editor failed to mention the onerous trade embargoes and indemnities placed on Haiti by France and the United States back in 1804 as the price of freedom, but such elisions were usual in most newspaper accounts of Haiti from the early twentieth century. Jednota was merely following the hegemonic narrative of eternally lawless Haiti, not expressing any special Slavic animus toward Port-au-Prince. Still, the writer also accepted the sacredness of Roosevelt’s assertions of the Monroe Doctrine and America’s sole proprietorship over the Western Hemisphere and warned, “The last Haitian revolution may have far-reaching consequences as regards the United States.” It was not so much Haiti’s strength as her weakness that was the worry, as the writer foresaw a coming “tussle [zápletick] with Germany, with this incessant international ‘trublmakerom.’” Here New World hegemony collided with Slavs’ Old World enmities, for the editor warned that “the Germans want to have their ‘big stick’ in Haiti, just as our government does, too,” employing, as in earlier articles, the English phrase that T. R. had popularized. The writer asserted for his immigrant readers that “it is imperative to command here,” again echoing the aggressive U.S. stance toward smaller Caribbean nations; all worries of the justice of imperialism, as occasionally expressed with regard to the Philippines, were cast aside.

Still, while some worry was expressed at growing German “craving for new colonies to add to her African and Pacific possessions,” the editorialist was fairly confident that German “butting into Haiti” would amount to nothing. “We are satisfied it will be enough to invite Haiti to behave properly, to keep her an obedient child, who will refrain from buying German goods and who will pay her debts honestly,” the writer went on in an apt summary of McKinley’s earlier “little brown brother” thesis. The writer added, “[T]he United States presently is perhaps thinking of taking the island of Haiti; they can get to this step by step,
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depending on the circumstances. And many argue that these circumstances will certainly appear in the near future.”

The editorial’s final judgment was likewise almost a mirror of official expressions of unwilling assumption of Caribbean police duties: “This little republic of black citizens has supplied endless big headaches for Uncle Sam.” As in coverage of the Philippines, it was the United States, not the occupied country, that was portrayed as the aggrieved party.86

The Slavic press often published citizenship courses, lessons on Americanization culled from high and popular culture, and primers in U.S. history, and certainly played an important role in facilitating immigrants’ acculturation to their new homes. Some of these history lessons likewise hastened an embrace of whiteness and condescension to a “little republic of black citizens” that might stand up to Uncle Sam.

When the United States indeed took the next step toward taking Haiti, and in 1915 began a 19-year-long occupation of the island, Národné noviny ran an almost minstrel-show image of a pipe-smoking black, “a native of the islands,” to accompany a feature on the “revolution” in Haiti (see Figure 5-6). The marines who restored “order” to the island imposed martial law, as well as segregation of the kind familiar to black residents of the United States. As in the earlier subjugation of the Philippines, some of the soldiers here were Slovaks, effacing some of their foreignness by engaging in imperial projects. One Slovak marine, however, did not fare well in Haiti, for in a story headlined “Murderous bandits in Haiti,” readers of Národné noviny learned that Mathew T. Liptak, Slovak of Coatesville, Pennsylvania, was drowned. His brother marines, however, blamed Liptak’s death on the “bandits of Haiti,” whom they slaughtered in retaliation.87

As in the Philippines, those resisting occupation were axiomatically labeled “bandits,” for in the duration of this exercise in colonialism no possibility of legitimate black resistance to invasion was permissible. While it’s possible to commiserate with Liptak, meeting a sad death so far from either his Pennsylvania or Carpathian homeland, one wonders, too, if he or any member of his family had been witness—or participant?—in the 1911 Coatesville lynching, and whether this event had any effect on his perception of race four years before he shipped out to Haiti.88

Articles in immigrant papers treating the rebellious black Haitians as bandits mirrored the mainstream press’s frequent contempt for colonized (or quasi-colonized) nonwhites. Henry Lewis Suggs has argued that only the African American press unambiguously “championed the Haitian revolutionaries [fighting U.S. marines] as freedom fighters in the tradition of African American abolitionists such as Gabriel Prosser, Denmark Vesey, and Nat Turner.”89 While Slavic papers never went this far, even here the condescension of Caribbean peoples occasionally was mixed with an uncomfortable awareness that American colonization replicated an Old World pattern. Amerikansky russky viestnik, for example, in 1919 described the inhabitants of the island of Puerto Rico as “with regard to color,
black, and thus are known as [nazvaný] niggers.” In a mix of Rusyn and English, the article detailed with some amusement the pretensions of San Juan’s “black gentlemen” and “black ladies” [čiernych džentlemenov, čiernych lejdis]; to this extent the report seems to fall into a minstrel-show model of mocking colored peoples’
aspirations to enter high society. And yet this article’s writer also saw some parallels between the Caribbean and the Carpathians. “The Puerto Ricans are a little like the black Carpatho-Rusyns,” the writer admitted, speaking of “our patriots” who had recently won their freedom from Hungary. Astoundingly, and quite atypically, at least rhetorical similarity was expressed with the “niggers” of Puerto Rico, indicating that the stance that new immigrants took toward colonized peoples could sometimes be ambivalent, expressing both a racialized bemusement and some sympathy for a plight that might have resonated with recollections of Old World oppressions all at the same time.90

More typically, however, when colonial subjects resisted their allotted, docile roles, it called up not comparisons to Slavic patriots, but alarm at rebellious natives. A strike of 40,000 sugar cane workers in Puerto Rico was depicted by New Yorkský denník as a sort of rebellion, noting that, “After the strike began, many plantations were destroyed by fire.” While Slavs often read in their papers of the justified job actions of their peers, a racialized rebellion of Puerto Rican workers was characterized in less flattering terms.91

When the United States started building its Panama Canal, matters of race and labor were also at the forefront. The canal commission found that the use of non-white laborers would keep the construction costs down. Rusyns read in Amerikansky russky viestnik that contractors on the canal were exempt from the anti-padrone laws, and, while the paper asserted that “American laborers only should be employed on building the canal,” a labor shortage was nevertheless forcing contractors to “import black islanders from Jamaica . . . to work on the canal. . . . They have been mixed together with Chinese coolies.” As we shall see, Rusyns and Slovaks frequently read in their papers of the illegitimacy of black scabs and of the “Yellow Peril” that Chinese and Japanese laborers supposedly posed to wage rates in the continental United States; now nonwhite labor was viewed with alarm on this imperial engineering project as well. The paper neglected to mention that the United States authorities overseeing the canal project divided the work force into “gold” and “silver” workers, with Europeans and Euro-Americans judged gold and given better living quarters, higher pay, and generous vacation and recreation allowances; “silver” workers, from Jamaica, South America, and Asia, were given lower pay and none of the perks extended to whites.92

Two years later, Jednota, too, reported, “After lengthy trials, our government and the building committee for the Panama Canal have finally figured out that in the building of the canal they inevitably need Chinese coolies.” The paper hastened to reassure its readers, however, that those supplied by contractors would be ineligible to become permanent workers in the United States. Nevertheless, the peril to regular (white) wage rates was spelled out for readers, as some contractors sought to pay the Chinese only a dollar a day, while “others argue that the Chinese coolie can get 50 to 60 cents for a daily wage. On the Indian islands, lying quite near Panama, the wage rates are very low. There workers get 25–35 cents a day and food, which costs no more per day than
5–10 cents.” While stereotypes of Asian and Caribbean docility and lower standards of living were on display here, *New Yorkský denník* would later report that Chinese merchants and small shopkeepers in Panama were organizing to protest intolerable conditions in the Canal Zone; Chinese militancy was viewed no more favorably than the supposed threat “coolie” laborers posed.

Slovak and Rusyn newspapers rarely questioned the justice of America’s various interventions in its self-proclaimed Monroe Doctrine sphere of influence. At the end of 1909 readers of *Slovák v Amerike* learned that Washington was again sending the navy and the marines on a mission to restore a favorable business climate. “On the unrest in Nicaragua” featured a photograph of “Major Smedley Butler, U.S. Marine Corps.” It would take another 26 years for by-then Major General Smedley Butler to confess in his memoirs that “I was a Gangster for Wall Street” and that “War is a Racket.” None of this interpretation made it into *Slovák v Amerike*, whereas visits of Butler and his military peers to Nicaragua, Haiti, and Cuba were reported in detail.

Radical immigrants received a less celebratory vision of colonialism. *The Daily Worker*, many of whose readers were immigrants or children of immigrants—Slovaks, Rusyns, Ukrainians, Poles, and East European Jews among them—published a scathing cartoon on July 25, 1927, in the aftermath of yet another visit to Nicaragua by the U.S. marines. A bloodied, black campesino lies on his back, shaking his fist at an airplane labeled “U.S. Imperialism.” Behind him are the ruins of a devastated city, “Republic of Nicaragua.” For Slovak readers of a radical bent, *Rovnost ľudu* of the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section offered the serialized “program of the Workers’ Party in America” on “American imperialism.” The predecessor to the Communist Party of the United States of America in May 1922 published Slovak tutorials on U.S. actions “in Texas, Puerto Rico, Philippines, hegemony in Cuba, Panama, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua under the sign of Wall Street. Guam and Samoa.” *Rovnost ľudu* delivered lessons on “A history that scandalized half the world.” Two years later the paper urged, “Let’s stop talking about German imperialism; what about American imperialism?” and cited the Philippines, Haiti, Cuba, Puerto Rico, Santo Domingo, and Mexico as proof. These were not the American history lessons regarding the Monroe Doctrine that appeared in *Slovák v Amerike*.

**“U.S. Border at Risk”: Mexico**

Within the nonsocialist papers, Mexico, too, was often characterized as a land of people prone to banditry. As early as 1906 *Slovák v Amerike* reported “Battles between Mexicans and Americans” along the Rio Grande, but this narrative refrain escalated with the outbreak of the Mexican Revolution against long-time President Porfirio Diaz. Shortly after Diaz’s contested re-election to an eighth term in early December 1910, *Slovák v Amerike* related the growing rebellion
against the Porfiriato in the province of Chihuahua. The paper offered “Scenes from the Mexican uprising” and said that “the insurgents are the winners.” The term used to describe the “rebels” or “insurgents”—“povstalci”—did not necessarily carry connotations of savagery or primitiveness, but, as the Mexican Revolution grew, other Slovak papers began to employ such language.99

By the fall of 1913, Národné noviny was cautiously optimistic that the worst of the violence was over, reporting that “the situation in Mexico is more promising.” “After many fierce battles, intrigues and bloodshed, it is hoped that the unfortunate occurrences in Mexico perhaps will soon end and be followed by better and more peaceful times,” the writer noted. At this point in the revolution, however, some doubt was voiced as to whether Mexicans could ever escape the cycle of violence, with a suggestion that lawlessness was something endemic to the land and its people. “For Mexico, the place of incessant warfare and bloody battles, there now comes news that, although slowly, but still surely the war may be coming to an end,” the writer noted, “although maybe it’s just simply a silent pause before the storm rises even more strongly.” Still, the article relayed reports that Mexican President Victoriano Huerta would step aside and let more able men—men who met with Washington’s approval—run for president. Two weeks later, however, any room for hope of peace was gone as the paper reported “Huerta is dictator of Mexico.”100

Huerta’s self-appointment was resisted within Mexico from many quarters, and within five weeks, Národné noviny offered less optimistic assessments. “U.S. border at risk,” the headline cried on November 20, 1913, in a refrain that might even speak to the phobias of some readers today. In 1913, though, Slovaks themselves were regarded by many immigration restrictionists as threats to the Anglo-Saxon sanctity of the republic; the long report out of El Paso, Texas, translated into Slovak, made no mention of the irony of this situation, however. Instead immigrants read that in El Paso one could hear the cannon fire in Juarez. “Rumors are flying throughout the city that General Villa has seized Juarez, and he is one of the leaders of the rebellion. . . . Bullets are flying across the border in El Paso, and there are serious concerns about the safety of the local American population.” A month later the newspaper published a lengthy story on Pancho Villa, “the savage Mexican bandit chief.” Even though the article said that Villa had restored order to the city of Chihuahua, it also related that he had issued new regulations in Spanish with respect to seized assets. The English-language press’s narrative privileging the sanctity of private property—no matter under what conditions foreign assets had been acquired in Mexico under the Porfiriato—and as signifiers of Villa’s “savage,” “bandit” Mexican nature, were soon to result in the sending of U.S. marines to Veracruz to restore order, at least for American investors. Such narratives of Mexican banditry at least in this instance were replicated in Národné noviny.101

The cries of “banditry” and lawlessness were picked up with even greater intensity by New Yorkský denník. “Anarchy in all of Mexico,” the paper reported on
February 3, 1915, while a sidebar warned “Foreigners are menaced.” The U.S. consul in Tampico reported that the Mexican Army commander there “issued a decree, which says that every foreigner in Tampico will be immediately executed if they are providing assistance to the enemy.” Six months later the paper reported “serious unrest in Mexico,” where it was noted that “Francesco Villa is taking extreme measures against foreign businessmen in the territory that he controls. Foreign traders have been expelled or imprisoned. This general practice is occurring because of charges of loan sharking by foreigners due to food shortages, in which the poor people, especially in the city of Chihuahua, are dying of hunger.” The article continued:

The heroic general had to summon all the merchants, and tell them to abandon their war profiteering, and then he addressed the government of the United States: “I’ll take you to your business; your business is to help people. And if the U.S. government does not like my behavior, it can go to hell.” . . . This tirade ended with the confiscation of all the businesses in Chihuahua by his government. . . . [A] merchant who tries to open his door for business will be immediately shot.

The context of a “tirade” against the United States suggests the general’s “heroic” nature was read by many as ironic. Rather, alarming cries of “anarchy” and “serious unrest” implicitly equated Mexicans and lawless banditry, even if, for the moment, that charge was held in reserve.

Other articles indicate that this anarchy was regarded as reflective of degenerate stereotypes of an innately Mexican lawless character, requiring U.S. intervention to impose order. Reports more explicitly referred to Mexicans as bandits who were terrorizing their own benighted country and had now crossed into the United States, as when the paper alarmingly announced “Mexican bandits terrorize Texas.” In this report, “a great number of Mexican bandits” were said to have “assaulted ranches” near Cameron. The report said that, “It is understood that the fight developed between the federal army, horsemen and Texas ranch men on one side and Mexican bandits on the other.” This report appeared on the same day as a six-column headline ran on page one, trumpeting Mexican banditry south of the border and the sending of two further warships by the United States to Veracruz in response. Another report related that “Mexican bandits kill two Americans” in the village of Sebastian, 30 miles from Brownsville. Killed were Al Austin and his son, Charles. The report noted that “Austin was chairman of the League of Law and Order in Sebastian.”

Neil Foley has documented the peonage under which Mexican farm laborers suffered in Texas during the early twentieth century, and the efforts campesinos made to seek justice, efforts that were invariably stigmatized as banditry. He further notes that paramilitary forces such as the Texas Rangers were utilized by Anglo ranchers to keep Mexican laborers in subjugation, with vigilante groups.
such as the League of Law and Order often aiding the Rangers in maintaining the “white scourge.” Any suggestion that “law and order” were differentially applied to non-white peoples, however, is absent from New Yorkský denník’s report. The paper already was too busy reporting on the anarchy of Mexico; under such circumstances it was impossible to suggest the “bandits” “assaulting” ranches and vigilantes (or U.S.-owned businesses in Veracruz) were actually seeking justice.105

This Slovak paper continued to relate skirmishes between “Mexican bandits” and U.S. troops, with little reflection that Washington was intervening in its neighbor’s civil war and thus some of the “bandits” were likely combatants. One report, however, of “a battle that developed between Mexican bandits and American troops, who swooped into the United States” noted that Mexican President Carranza promised that “Villa’s troops are on the run” and asked Washington for four trainloads of armaments to finish the job. Under such circumstances it’s perhaps not surprising that Villa and his “bandits” fired back, even if New Yorkský denník didn’t draw this conclusion.106

When Villa raided the United States at Columbus, New Mexico, this paper referred again to the “menacing Mexican bandits”; Národné noviny likewise spoke of “Mexican bandits” and warned “the consequences . . . may be grim.” While in January 1917, after a visit to U.S. troops stationed in Mexico, General Funston optimistically reported “there is no fear of Mexican bandits,” accounts of Mexican bandits and their “audacity” recurred in New Yorkský denník into 1922. The following year the paper reported that two Protestant preachers had been lynched by rebels in a Mexican village. Images of bloodthirsty Mexicans recurred with regularity in the Slovak press.107

Still, not every paper always accepted the hegemonic narrative, either with regard to Mexican lawlessness or the justice of U.S. authorities’ actions at home and abroad. Národné noviny, which often denounced the injustices immigrants faced in industrial workplaces, in 1914 likewise denounced the hypocrisy of America using force at home against Southeast European strikers while arguing that U.S. forces likewise were needed to bring order to Mexico. The context for this comparison was the Ludlow Massacre, where the children and wives of striking immigrant coal miners were murdered at the hands of state militia. In September 1913, miners had gone on strike against the Rockefeller-controlled Colorado Fuel and Iron Company over deteriorating wages and working conditions, but also the company’s refusal to recognize the United Mine Workers’ right to represent their employees. After miners struck they were evicted from company housing and erected a series of tent colonies, including one at the small town of Ludlow. There on April 20, 1914, a day-long battle erupted between state militia working hand in glove with the corporation and armed miners. The militia and local deputies eventually gained the upper hand and torched the tent colony. Two women and eleven children who had taken refuge in dugouts burrowed into the ground under the burning tents died that day.108
It was this disaster that caused Národné noviny to denounce the hypocrisy of using troops to bring both order to “lawless” Mexico and miners’ funerals to Colorado. “There is no crime that capitalism cannot even imagine, for capitalism itself is a case of crime,” the editorialist thundered. “A capitalist is the greatest patriot, his property is never in danger, but he wants to protest the fact that we protect the assets of our labor with our lives,” the writer continued, before asking, “Wouldn’t it be better if the United States forced Rockefeller to surrender battalions in Colorado before it forced Mexico to do so?” The writer further asserted that, compared to the militia of Colorado, the Mexicans elsewhere stigmatized as “bandits” were fairly innocent: “The only difference between the war in Mexico and the war against workers in Colorado is that the Mexican soldiers didn’t kill innocent women and children, but in Colorado they did.” In a display of international worker solidarity atypical in Slovak articles relating to Mexico, the writer recognized that, “The workers of the United States have nothing against the workers in Mexico, nor do the workers in Mexico have anything against U.S. workers.” A month after the Ludlow Massacre, the real enemy to this writer seemed easy to identify: “[W]ell, therefore, what war does concern our workers?—Who wants to take a guess!” The editorial concluded, “When will you free the workers, you big shots, when Uncle Sam deals unfairly with Mexico and always sends troops to fire on striking workers and their families?” In the aftermath of the latest coalfield war martyrdoms, the wisdom of chasing after “lawless” Mexicans was mocked.109

Such recognition of immigrant worker solidarity with slaughtered Mexican “bandits,” however, was rare. More frequently the trope of Mexican bandits and primitiveness stood alone to create once again Latin American alterity for Slavic readers; even Národné noviny on other occasions referred to Villa as a bandit who spelled trouble for America.110

Indeed, the conflicted nature of some Slovaks’ identity formation was on display in the pages of Národné noviny. The paper spoke to a largely working-class membership that likely read with mixed glee and outrage accounts of Ludlow that lambasted Rockefeller as a hypocrite and capitalist political parties as assemblages of whores. The rhetorical twinning of Mexican and American workers as kindred people facing the bosses’ army likely resonated with Slovaks who were veterans of Ludlow, McKeesport, Homestead, or any one of numerous other working-class battlefields. Nevertheless, other Slovaks were already serving with the U.S. Army in places such as the Philippines, as we’ve seen; in such places whiteness, not class, became the most salient boundary marker. And other Slovaks sent letters to Národné noviny relating their own small part in the U.S. effort to rein in the bandit Villa. Like Dianish and Pavliak writing from the Philippines before him, in 1916 Ján Juhas, serving with the U.S. Army chasing “bandits” in Mexico, sent a letter to Národné noviny. “From New York we departed for Galveston and thence to an island,” Juhas, who had been unable to find work in his home of Clarksburg, West Virginia, wrote of his enlistment. “And then
things really got hot for the Fourth Regiment. I think you have read something about it in the newspapers. . . . We’ve had a few unpleasant times, as when we chased seventy Mexican bandits across the river.”

Like other writers, Juhas made comparisons between newly encountered backward peoples and Old World pariahs. “What is the population like, these Mexicans?” he asked. “They’re all poor people. Wherever we go, everywhere we see shacks made of straw, in which the poor people live miserably—worse than our gypsies in the old country. And they can’t help it, they have no opportunity to earn something. The people here speak Spanish, and we, therefore, are uncomfortable, we can hardly speak with them. . . .” In a final paragraph, Juhas referred three times to the Mexicans as “bandits.”

Unlike most news accounts from Mexico and other colonized or quasi-colonized territories, this letter was not a rewrite of mainstream wire services, but reflected a Slovak writer’s own acceptance of the hegemonic construct of nonwhite, lawless Mexicans. Either Juhas hadn’t read the editorial denouncing the even greater lawlessness of Rockefeller and the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, or, as a soldier of Uncle Sam, he was already having the enemy’s inferiority drilled into him by January 1916. In either case, the irony is palpable. What was someone saying about the “fanatical” Dianish or backward Juhas—as well as other slighted Poles, Slovaks, Rusyns, Ukranians, and Italians—back in West Virginia or Chicago chapters of the Immigration Restriction League? Whiteness was situational, and one of the situations in which it shone was in policing the borders of empire.

Nor were Slavic immigrants alone in articulating a notion of Mexican savagery or backwardness. Jewish children at New York’s Christadora House settlement on the Lower East Side in 1913 wrote and performed *Mexicana, an original musical farce in two acts* for the settlement’s Unity Club. While such ethnic masquerades were common, the show included the musical number, “Stand Back, You Swarthy Pagan!” which was sung by the characters Vivian (Kate Schechter), Pierre Le Prue (Irvin Tannenbaum), and Tweezle (Herman Martinson). In 1913 reports of lawless Mexicans embroiled in a bandit-fueled revolution were common in English- and foreign-language newspapers. That Jewish immigrant or second-generation children, guided by settlement workers engaged in a project of Americanization, wrote songs warning of Mexican “pagans” suggests that messages of Mexican alterity were internalized by some white ethnics. Then, too, labeling Mexicans “swarthy pagans” suggests a melding of Old World phobias of the heathen East with New World concerns with racial boundaries.

“People Chewers” of the World: Africa and Colonization

Even more explicitly denigrating boundaries were drawn between the savage and the civilized when Slovak papers considered Africa. Largely following the tropes of mainstream, English-language newspapers, immigrant journals often depicted
the natives of the “Dark Continent” as backward cannibals in need of the light of progress, even if cannons and rifles had to accompany this modernizing mission. Some of these stories in Slovák v Amerike, New Yorkský denník, and other journals were run for their cannibal “humor” content, but others were straightforward news accounts; in either case, a discourse of a hierarchized racial world order, in which European peoples naturally deserved to colonize other parts of the globe, was replicated for immigrant readers.\textsuperscript{114}

As in Juhas’s letter relating tales of backward, bandit Mexicans, travel accounts in New Yorkský denník similarly presented a picture of African primitiveness in language that East Europeans could understand. A two-part series, “Bravery in Africa,” related a Hungarian baron’s recent trip to Zanzibar and other parts of Africa. The nobleman followed well-established tropes in blaming both the climate and the natural indolence of the natives—not European exploitation and colonization—for Africa’s backward state: “Infernal heat. The blacks here are lazy and don’t want to work. It’s not just the heat, they are sluggish and lie, because they’re just like our gypsies in this sense, they don’t want to work.” The equation of African blacks with Gypsies may have resonated with Slovaks, but another slur applied only to non-Europeans was added when the baron referred to Africans’ supposed cannibalism and “really sharp teeth.” After spending some time in Zanzibar, the baron concluded, “[W]ell, blacks are all interesting, but they don’t like to work.”\textsuperscript{115}

Still, the Slovak readers were given a little dig at backward Hungarians (Magyars), too, for the baron recognized some potential kinship with these lazy black natives with “really sharp teeth”: “I go. I greet them. Perhaps some of them from Hungary.” As we’ll see, Magyars were often cast in Slovak papers as savages, although more frequently as “Asiatics” or “Mongols.” This series on “Bravery in Africa” was more interested in casting black natives as completely alien to European humanity, for the baron later commented on his trip into the interior, “That way the white man never walked.”\textsuperscript{115}

Either at home or abroad, blacks were often portrayed as savage, and the baron’s reference to cannibalism was not atypical. It was echoed in a 1917 editorial, “The Latest in Cannibalism,” which spoke of cannibalism in the Congo and also in Brazil, even though the writer said,

It would seem that around the world the days are already numbered of that terrible cannibalism—people chewers—and that this monster of human culture has died out for good. Man-eating is not mentioned at all by the latest tropical scholars . . . already it is safely stated that this is a dying habit or practice, a lingering religious ceremony, which in these days will be destroyed by the penetration of European culture.

The writer referred to the cannibals with a neologism, “ľudožrúti,” literally “people chewers.” Still, his faith in the ameliorative effects of “European culture”
is telling; Slovak immigrants were themselves judged to be lacking in such gifts by many nativists, but here the editorialist made common cause with other white, European culture-bearers. Faith in culture’s curative powers, however, was tempered by German Professor Wilhelm Volz’s discovery of the Bataks of Sumatra, “the last cannibals under the hot sun.” Slovak fears of the Bataks may have been allayed by learning that, “It is said on the whole island of Sumatra that the Batak tribe does not enjoy the meat of white people, and it’s said that they always avoided it.” Through such news items Slovaks made a case, at least among themselves, for alliance with fellow Europeans as “white people.”

Other references to cannibals appeared on the humor pages of New Yorkský denník in 1921. “A missionary wandered into the midst of a bunch of cannibals and asked one of them, ‘And you know absolutely nothing about Christian religion?’” To which the cannibal replies, “Indeed, yes, we tasted it, when there last was a missionary here.” While arguably this joke falls into a vaudeville strain of ethnic humor, in other articles African and Pacific Islander cannibalism and savagery were presented as straightforward news items. In 1902 an article told of the “people chewers” of New Guinea. “In spite of all the English efforts to help and educate them, these people show little interest in becoming civilized.” The indigenous people, who the article made a point of noting were “blacks,” reportedly still widely practiced cannibalism, in spite of many years of enlightened English rule. “In Malaysian the island is called Papua, and they are considered the most uneducated people in the world,” the reporter added. “Travelers say that Papuans are very stupid and wild.” Who was saying or considering this to be true, the article did not say. Other natives resisting colonization by the French in African Guinea were dismissed as “ceaselessly restless savages” who now had to be punished by the French military because their sultan had been unable to pacify them (see Figure 5-7). By 1911 Slovak papers were not considering whether European colonization was what natives were ceaselessly restless about. Instead, this supposed savagery was said to justify colonization. As early as 1901 Slovák v Amerike had also informed readers “people chewers” in New Guinea and Spanish West Africa threatened missionaries. “The cannibals in West Africa have gobbled up seven swimmers,” one report stated, noting, “A military expedition will be sent against the people chewers to punish them.” Illustrations of savage cannibals in front of skull-bedecked huts drove home the need for European pacification (see Figures 5-8 and 5-9). Similar illustrations of cannibal chiefs also appeared on humor pages, but the jokes were reinforced by the supposedly hard “news” accounts of the travails of colonizers and missionaries facing “ľudožrúti.” While occasionally mild condemnation of white lynch mobs appeared in Slovak papers, curiously no illustrations of Mississippi people chewers accompanied the texts.

As Rosyln Poignant notes, many European authors’ exposés of cannibalism in Australia had only the most tenuous connection to fact, and “the cannibalism invoked in show business publicity and newspaper reports was a product of Western
fantasizing” regarding savage colonized people. The showman R. A. Cunningham, for example, from the 1880s published lurid souvenir tracts that appealed to European and American consumers’ appetite for cannibal spectacles. And as in the interchangeable illustrations in *Slovák v Amerike*, the same “graphic stereotyping” was used in circus advertisements and news stories regarding “cannibals”
and “wild men of Borneo,” thereby “[giving] form, and therefore substance, to the image of the savage” through “the constant recycling of the same pictorial elements. . . . “ The Slovak press similarly presented such ethnic exotica in the guise of news stories accompanied by graphic reproductions of wild Africans.¹²⁰

The coverage of “darkest Africa” with its cannibals accompanied news of black subordination at home, for many stories that uncritically asserted African brutality appeared on the same day as American lynching accounts. Even when some headlines screamed of “the brutality” of a particularly savage torture-mutilation of a lynching victim, often in the same edition other stories reported on

**Figure 5-8:** Illustration of life “Among the cannibals” to accompany a “news” story about the New Guinea islands. *Slovák v Amerike*, July 1, 1902, 6.
non-Europeans as barely human. The weekly accretion of such stories provided a cognitive map of racial differences, indicating for new immigrants which people were subject at a moment’s notice to the brutality of the “enraged people,” in Africa or North America. By 1915 notions of African cannibalism were so
ingrained that New York’s Slovak National Hall saw nothing untoward in hosting blackface musicians billed as “the Cannibal Symphony Orchestra.” The festivities also featured a Charlie Chaplin impersonator, suggesting for new immigrants popular culture and race-tutoring went hand in hand.121

Africans even earlier had proven to be spectacles of amusement for Slovaks, as for other white Americans. Slovák v Amerike gave front-page coverage to “Ota Benga and his Orang Outang,” discussing how he and other African “bushmen” were living at the Bronx Zoo and New York’s American Museum of Natural History. Benga had already been brought for public display to the St. Louis World’s Fair, where, like Filipino “savages,” he proved quite a draw. He then was moved to New York the following year. “We publish these pictures of African blacks, who are now on display at a New York museum,” the immigrant paper captioned the illustrations of the collectible bushmen. “They are primitive bodily specimens even when full grown. Spectators are flocking to the Natural Museum and admire these little wretches.” It was not only Anglo-Saxons who were learning a science of race (see Figure 5-10).122 Certainly many only regarded Ota Benga as a humorous diversion, yet others by their silence at the very least accepted the notion of an African dwelling in a zoo. Marianna Torgovnick and Elizabeth and Stuart Ewen have documented the manner in which presentations of non-Europeans as zoo, museum, or world’s fair “natural history” specimens served to “naturalize” the inferiority of blacks as belonging in these subordinate spaces, not civilized locales. Now even Slovaks who couldn’t flock to the New York museum could gaze on African primitiveness. When such a message was displayed in lead-story position, it likely influenced at least some Slovaks’ sense of the racial taxonomy

Figure 5-10: “Blacks of South Africa. Ota Benga and his Orang Outang.” Natives of Africa and Australasia were often displayed in carnivals, world’s fairs, and zoos, a practice familiar to many southeast Europeans courtesy of impresarios such as Carl Hagenbeck and R. A. Cunningham. Slovák v Amerike, October 26, 1906, 1.
of their new homelands, where blacks from whatever locality were accorded less than full human status.123

Even before they had migrated to the United States, some Slovaks, like other Southeast Europeans, had seen spectacles of Africans and Pacific Islanders displayed in “human zoos,” often literally in zoos, as in Prague, where postcards of savage Dahomeans could still be bought as souvenirs into the 1920s. These zoo-like depictions of “savages” from Africa and Australasia continued in venues such as the World’s Columbian Exposition and St. Louis World’s Fair. The irony of at least some immigrants judged as not all that civilized gawking at wild Africans and men from Fiji—not always really from those places but sometimes professional actors masquerading as African warriors—was not lost on the humor magazine Puck, which as early as 1888 offered a peak “In the Dressing Tent.” There the “Wild Zulu” asks his mate, “How wor t’ings in Roscommin, phin yez lift th’ place, Corrigan?” To which the “Savage Moor” replies, “Fine Diniss, fine, barrin’ the evictions; it’s many a poor man over there wud be thankin’ the saints fer the foine, plisant job that you an’ me do be havin!” This sly dig seems to be directed more at Irish backwardness than at the “Zulus” or “Moors” on display. But Slovák v Amerike offered no irony with its depiction of the savage bushman in his zoo cage, and even those Slovaks who couldn’t make it to the Bronx Zoo enjoyed a front-page glimpse of Ota Benga and his Orang Outang.124

In their own venues, too, Slovaks mocked savages, as when residents of Yonkers heard “a hilarious lecture of Mr. Novák” regarding “a journey to Tahiti.” At least no references to cannibalism were employed here, but when he “noted that on the island of Tahiti people live a care-free, work-free life, and that they have no need to work, which is said to be the ‘duty’ of women, not men, some of our men [in the audience] deeply sighed. And one who was near me murmured, ‘That’s the life!’ ” The reporter rebutted this desire for “primitive” indolence, however, asking, “Who’d want to live there, where the natives know nothing of fashion. Or it might be you’d like to always wear the kind of ‘dress’ that Adam and Eve wore in Paradise!” While the author allowed that in Tahiti “You don’t even have to worry about food as the trees bear fruit all year round, the food of the ocean is also plentiful. Hey, that’s the life!” he nevertheless cautioned that this was not suited for non-Tahitians. “But civilized people,” he added, “and here for example, we can cite our Slovaks, know that we would not want to live without work.” The contrast between civilized peoples—and here Slovak ascendancy to this category would not automatically have been granted by Nordic Americans—and lazy savages is again on display. Yonkers Slovaks had by 1921 begun presenting their annual parish fundraising minstrel show, a topic about which we’ll hear more in the following chapter. Hard-working Slovaks had already begun making slighting reference to lazy blacks at home and abroad.125

Lessons of black savagery came from a variety of venues. In 1923, New Yorkský denník advertised new Hollywood offerings being screened in New York. The Hottentot was playing on the same bill as Land of Our Forefathers. In the same
issue it was reported that Passaic Slovaks performed a play demonstrating that although they were becoming Americans, they had preserved the Slovak ways that they had brought with them from the land of their forefathers. That land was decidedly not the land of the Hottentots; as early as 1896, when Yonkers Slovaks asserted their right to have non-German priests ministering to them, they complained to New York Archbishop Corrigan, “Does your Grace keep us for U.S. citizens or for Kaffirs or Zulus of Africa? Why do you punish us . . . with German or English priests. . . . ?” Presumably colonial administrators were acceptable for “Kaffirs or Zulus,” but not white immigrants, even Slovak ones.126

Czech Americans in Chicago and Saint Paul, Minnesota, likewise performed their own depictions of African savagery, evidence that immigrants did more than just passively consume mainstream stereotypes of black inferiority. Dramatic societies in both cities staged The Daughter of Africa, a 1918 comedy by Bretislav Ludvík that was first published in Prague. The farce features Hroneš, an explorer returned to Prague from Africa with tales of the “charitable Zulu-Kaffirs” who pulled him out of the mud, and his various exploits among the sun-tanned “people chewers,” but also with a surprise for Czech society—his African daughter. The play seems to have had much in common with the vaudeville farces featuring blackface slapstick, but Ludvík also likely was influenced by the African zoo-like displays featured in Prague and other East Central European cities in the late nineteenth century.127 The African explorer’s friend, Dr. Materna, tells him that he knows all about blacks, for

In vaudeville once, it is already twenty years ago, there performed a duet of black dancers, Mr. Bob and Miss Amanasi. One time an alarmed citizen went up to them on the day of their performance, since he’d fallen in love with a black girl. He met with her and then she confessed a love of champagne. Although she didn’t really understand him, she knew what he meant when he offered her a gold bracelet. Soon it slipped to her foot. She said to the citizen: “Amanasi love you so much!” And to prove her love for him, she rubbed her nose on his nose.

The African explorer assures his friend, “Yes, that’s how the black nations do it, instead of kissing.” Materna’s friend is reunited with his African lover 20 years later, and Hroneš, too, gets reacquainted with his African daughter. Indeed, the explorer has difficulty integrating into Czech society after having been so long in Africa; he is told by Dr. Materna, “But you’re also all tanned and burned! You look like a native of Africa!” an observation that alarms the explorer. The doctor also wants to know why Hroneš’s daughter insists on wearing an “African costume,” even though by the end of the play fashionable ladies of Prague are adopting “savage” dress. Hroneš also, it turns out, has forgotten most of his Czech: “I still talk a little bit with a foreign accent, different from how the natives talk, but I get by.”
Hroneš thinks he’s being helpful when he paints another of his friends completely black, a minstrel-show gesture that by 1918 would have been familiar to many Chicago or Saint Paul Czechs. “White men are eaten by the people chewers,” Hroneš helpfully informs his friend.

The explorer’s daughter despairs of finding a lover in Prague, and asks her heathen deity, “Why do I have these lion claws, or have teeth like a crocodile?! Why can’t I eat men like a cannibal, like my mother did! Oh great U-kulunkulu, why hast thou forsaken me?” In general, the play pokes fun at the difficulty/ impossibility of blacks—and those who have gone native—fitting into “normal” Czech society. While the jokes are no more mean-spirited than the barbs of the Marx Brothers’ Captain Spaulding, “the African explorer,” the fact that they were performed by East Europeans who otherwise read straight news stories of African “people chewers” indicates a trope of African savagery was propagated in a variety of venues.128

Czech actors in the Chicago troupe likewise purchased sheet music such as “Dance of the Hottentots” and the “Cottonfield Dance,” both composed in 1895 by Arthur M. Cohen. Michael Rogin has argued that by performing minstrel-show sketches, recent arrivals to the United States, such as Jewish immigrants, were able to stress their whiteness under a familiar, American genre of a satirical black mask. Whether “Dance of the Hottentots” was performed in blackface or not, Czech immigrants likewise enacted a tale of African savagery (maybe humorous, maybe not) against which Czech whiteness stood in relief. To be sure, vaudeville and Tin Pan Alley were certainly replete with ethnic humor—including minstrel-show moments of humor about blacks, as we’ll see in the following chapter. Nevertheless, such cultural productions did not occur in a void. Immigrants performing such songs were also reading straight news stories in their papers concerning African cannibalism or ostensibly dangerous blacks reined in by the “people’s justice” closer to home in places such as Mississippi; such songs contributed to a worldview placing blacks lower on the scale of civilization.129

The discourse of empire and colonialism occurred in a context in which assumptions of non-European savagery were never far below the surface. In noting that Abraham Cahan included in the inaugural issue of his socialist Arbeiter Zeitung a condescending translation of a Scribner’s article on “Life Among the Congo Savages,” Rogin observes that Jewish immigrants “began to move from being the objects of exotic interest to being the reading subjects interested in exotic places, from what they shared with cannibals to what they shared with readers of Scribner’s.”130 Sometimes radical Slavs at least could use tropes of African savagery as a cudgel with which to beat supposedly even more savage American capitalists. When the socialist newspaper, Rovnost ľudu, wanted to stick it to the capitalists in 1922, it ran a cartoon of top-hatted millionaires with knives and forks cavorting around a cauldron in which enchained “labor” was boiling. “Modern cannibals callously dispense with labor,” ran the caption.131 Less class consciously, though, notions of African or South Seas cannibalism were deployed,
humorously or seriously, with regularity in Slovak newspapers, as well as on the immigrant stage. The Catholic paper, Jednota, related that the savage island cannibals (again, labeled “people chewsers”) had “slaughtered, baked and eaten two Protestant missionaries,” and while the paper reported the “details of this horrific, cannibalistic act,” it skeptically noted that no one had actually witnessed the people eating, and found it “interesting that Protestant missionaries were appealing to the taste of black patriots.” As a dig at Protestants, punch line of a joke, or a filler news item, black people chewsers were an editor’s best friend. As for Cahan’s Jewish readership, so, too, Czechs and Slovaks moved from being just the objects of persecution to readers of colonized African “savages.”

As late as 1953, African savagery was advertised in New Yorksky dennik when it noted the premier of “the great travelogue film of darkest Africa,” The White Witch Doctor, at New York’s Roxy Theater. The film, starring Robert Mitchum and Susan Hayward, would never be mistaken for high art, but ever since Birth of a Nation Hollywood had been peddling black savagery to an eager, partially immigrant audience. The ad indicates how ingrained in the culture by 1953 were tropes of witch doctors, “darkest Africa,” and exoticized black savagery. Moreover, the ad promised that the film, premiering on July fourth, would be accompanied by a stage show, “Broadway Memories” and the ‘Yankee Doodle Review’ for the Fourth of July.” Whiteness and patriotism were entangled on screen and stage—and elsewhere—not just for Slovaks but for most Americans. One wonders, however, if African Americans felt welcome at this celebration.

While it is possible to overstate the effect that popular culture such as newspapers, carnival side shows, world’s fairs, and, later, motion pictures had on consumers’ and spectators’ worldviews, when we consider that newspaper depictions of Africans appeared in tandem with coverage of blacks’ subordination at home, these articles contributed at least partially to the creation of a hierarchy of races for some new immigrants.

While Slovaks often had nothing good to say about Magyars, and certainly contended bitterly with Irish foremen and other immigrant groups for scarce urban resources, it was only non-Europeans who were categorized in such a fashion. Even considering the anti-Semitic and anti-Italian articles studied in Chapter 4, nothing like the treatment of Africans as cannibals or zoo denizens is repeated in Slovak papers regarding other European groups. This is not to suggest Slovaks were any more racist than other white groups, simply that hierarchies of civilized European versus savage everyone else were part of U.S. culture to which new immigrants acculturated, and that these hierarchies were reproduced in immigrant newspapers.

Learning a Lesson from the “Half-wild Blacks”

The slighting treatment of nonwhite anticolonial aspirations was on display in the sympathetic coverage of the Boer rebels against British rule, when compared to
the scathing condemnation later offered to natives of “Tripoli” resisting Italy’s
civilizing colonial missions. Complimentary articles on the Boers’ war against
English imperialism appeared in the same issues of \textit{Slovák v Amerike} that carried
illustrations of the savage, Stone Age Igorots battling the enlightened rule of Uncle
Sam. Perhaps it was the fact that Afrikaner soldiers such as General Piet Joubert
and President Steyn were white that earned them laurels of glory in articles detail-
ing their martyrdom.\textsuperscript{134} A certain symmetry between the Boer fight for autonomy
and as yet inchoate Slovak discontent with rule by Hungary may also have influ-
enced the sympathetic treatment afforded Joubert and his Afrikaner comrades.

Yet in at least one Slovak article it was the whiteness of Boer \textit{Vortrekkers} that
was celebrated as they heroically brought civilization to a backwater in spite of
the treachery of the bloodthirsty Zulus. \textit{Slovák v Amerike} in 1900 featured a his-
tory of the Boer nation with an illustration of a “Zulu-Kaffir” chieftain almost
identical to the “people chewer” illustrations accompanying other articles (see
Figures 5-11 and 5-12).

The “History of the Boers” translated into Slovak could have come from the
desk of President Steyn. Readers learned how in the 1830s “emigrants,” led by an
Afrikaner “noble patriot,” had “purchased land in Natal from Dingaan, the wild
king of the Zulu-Kaffirs.” But the \textit{Vortrekkers’} legitimate purchase of the land—a
trope that resonated with images of “civilized” homesteading and property-
owning familiar from the American pioneering narrative that effaced displaced
native peoples—was invalidated by “Zulu-Kaffir” treachery, when the “savage”
king told the Boers “he wanted to take back the land that they had bought.”

English duplicity was evoked in the article as well, for the imperialists offered
no protection “against the treacherous, wild blacks.” The British arrived not to
aid the Boers in their cause,

but to confiscate their weapons so that they could not defend themselves
against the barbarian Zulu-Kaffirs. Such a tyranny, such a persecution of an
innocent people is unprecedented in the history of the world! Today, this land
is the English colony of Natal, because England robbed the Boers. . . . There
was great fear that the English would call on the Kaffirs for assistance, and
against the allied forces of the wild and the civilized barbarians [the Boers]
could not stand. As a result of English perfidy, the “wild savage Zulu-Kaffirs
fiercely besieged the settlement. . . . The Boers learned that the sword alone
can ensure the peace and life against the wild barbarians.”\textsuperscript{135}

When a colonizing nation sided with blacks against whites it was judged a “rob-
ber” or “civilized barbarians”; other operations, such as the French mission to
Guinea, were deemed necessary against “ceaselessly restless savages.”

It was not until after World War II that some reservations about the justness of
the Afrikaner cause were expressed in Slovak newspapers. When Pretoria began
implementing strict racial apartheid following the 1948 victory of the National
Party, *New Yorkský denník* editorialized against the “fantastic solution to the race problem in South Africa.” It lamented that such “Nazi ideas and methods” were being spread in a “land that once was a model of coexistence among people of different nationalities.” Such a characterization of South Africa suggests a naïveté, or lingering sympathy, for the Boers on the part of Slovak writers. Such a characterization is profoundly at odds with the actual state of race relations in the Orange Free State; even if apartheid was a hardening of a formerly more fluid situation, the asserted model of harmony was more a mirage. Still, if by 1953 full-bore apartheid
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Figure 5-12: This illustration of a cannibal, which accompanies a “Rip and Račik” humor column, is almost identical to the illustration of a “barbarian” king of the “Zulu-Kaffirs” that accompanied a news story in the same newspaper. As amusement or news item, Africans were depicted as interchangeably savage. 
Slovák v Amerike, August 14, 1906, 3.

unsettled the paper’s editors, they did not embrace independence and anticolonial movements by black Africans, either. The Mau Mau seeking independence for British East Africa (Kenya) were denounced a year later as violent fanatics in their own right. Even in the more enlightened milieu of post-World War II America, old habits of race-thinking were difficult to jettison completely.136
In the heyday of empire the attitude toward Africa was more unequivocally spelled out in narratives of civilizing missions by Europeans and ungratefully bloodthirsty savages. As the great power participants at the Congress of Berlin had already carved up most of Africa in 1885, not many prizes remained to be grabbed by the time Slavic newspapers were founded. Coverage of the fate of some of the last autonomous African nations, however, indicates the ambivalence with which some Slavs could view nonwhite Africans and their battles against colonizers. In 1896 Amerikansky russky viestnik reported on “The Italian War in Africa,” Rome’s ill-fated attempt to acquire a colony in Abyssinia. The justification for such a project was perhaps apparent to Rusyn readers, who also that year read of a riot of wild Algerian colonial troops against their French masters. And two years prior to this, Slovák v Amerike reported that the death of the sultan of Morocco, Muley Hassan, was certain to set off a jockeying for power in the North African country between France, England, Italy, and Spain. In 1902, reports were again published, this time in Jednota, on England’s recognition of Italy’s right to preeminence in Tripoli (Libya), although in this instance the paper admitted it was unclear how Turkey would view this European gentlemen’s agreement. At other moments Moroccans seeking to limit foreign influence in their country were labeled “fanatics.” European power plays in North Africa were made to seem natural through such coverage.

Yet Slovaks were not always condescending toward Africans fighting against colonization, and miraculously on at least one occasion native resistance to subjugation by imperialists was held up as a template possibly worthy of emulation. “The Slovaks can learn a lesson from the blacks in Africa,” Slovák v Amerike editorialized upon the occasion of the death of Ethiopia’s Emperor Menelik II. The emperor was praised for keeping his country free of European colonization, a lesson that the Slovaks still in thrall to the Magyars (Hungarians) were urged to take to heart. “Here is a new example for the Slovaks,” the editorials wrote. “Half-wild blacks in Africa have shed their blood for the freedom of their nation, and defeated their enemies, just as did the Americans and other nations. History teaches us that only those nations that loved freedom above life itself ever gained liberty.” This was one of the few times, prior to World War II, that any admiration was shown for blacks, in or out of Africa; Ethiopia’s successful resistance to Italian colonization earned the respect of Slovak editors frustrated by their countrymen’s continued captivity in Central Europe. Still, the labeling of Ethiopians as “half-wild blacks” indicates that tropes of African savagery acquired in side shows, “human zoos,” and news stories of cannibals had left their mark.

“Civilization Lies Only in Europe”

When Africans were less successful in resisting colonization, Slovak writers were even less charitable. Slovák v Amerike reported in 1903 that the British army’s “King’s
African Riflemen” put down an uprising of the “Mad Mullah of Somaliland.” The “English expedition . . . pacified the Somali population and has already defeated the dreams of these savage, wild Mullahs,” the paper reported. And the year after Menelik’s death the Italian invasion of Tripoli (Libya) occasioned sympathetic portrayals of Italians as bearers of civilization to an ungrateful and half-wild people. An editorial in Slovák v Amerike approved of Italy’s expedition to North Africa. “Replacing Mohammed’s Crescent with Christ’s Cross,” ran the headline. Stereotypes of African backwardness were in this instance wed to tropes of “barbaric” Turks and “Mohammedans” as the Slovak press finally had a good word to say about Italians. The paper reported on Italy’s ultimatum, but Národné noviny also noted, “Apparently the Turks are not willing to surrender Tripoli to the Italians without a fight.”

When some of the Italian troops’ actions in Libya were criticized as inordinately brutal, Italian dignitaries came to their country’s defense, employing tropes of European culture in conflict with African savagery. In reprinting a letter first sent to the New York American, Národné noviny reported that “Italians justify the atrocities [ukrutností] committed against Arabs” and that “The Arabs’ treachery [zradcovstvom] is said to have forced the Italians to have used such sharp rigor in invading.” The immigrant paper’s editor noted that,

The rumors of abuses by Italian soldiers, who have allegedly committed horrid murders of Arab women and children, is every day I find seriously refuted by influential people in Italy. The Pope himself was very offended over these reports that foreign journalists fed to their readers, and instructed his Tripoli missionaries to examine the matter in detail, and if the Italian troops were somehow guilty of this, he told them not to be silent about it. The missionaries said the anti-Italian items were based on false reports, as can be imagined.

The editor then urged, “Now hear the words of Italian historian and socialist member of parliament, Professor Guglielmo Ferrero, against the ‘atrocities in the newspapers’ and the vicious rumors.”

Ferrero’s letter, as translated from the New York American, complained of the “great enthusiasm for the Arabs” expressed throughout Europe and America. This angered the professor, for he asserted that it was the “rebellious natives” who “used dirty tactics against the Italians.” How a people defending their homeland against invasion could be “rebellious” or “revolting” the scholar did not say. Instead, he charged, “We equate them with the wild herd of Hun-Hungarians, who in their travels have left nothing behind but wilderness and rivers of blood.” While Ferrero was writing in the first instance for a mainstream, English-language American readership, his invocation of “Hun-Hungarians” surely had resonance for Slovak readers, who, as we’ll see below, had already for years charged their Magyar (Hungarian) rulers with Hun tactics and Mongolian and Asiatic despotism.
Any Italian transgressions were excused as the result of fear “in the face of religious excesses by the fanatical, murderous Arabs, and due to the unusual climate.” Ferrero wondered at the criticisms from Europe, which “wants us to liberate this land, and also to recognize the rights of Arabs, that is, to let the Arabs go when they have transgressed against us, stabbed us in the back and murdered our troops.”

Ferrero blamed the “sneaky, secret, traitorous” Arabs for any “strict measures and appropriate punishments” taken by Italian generals, in order “to deal with any possibility of future betrayal” by the Arabs. Again, assumptions that “Arabs” ought to be loyal and grateful, not resentful, toward Italian invaders underscored the professor’s letter. “Similar pictures of savagery occur only in the wild lands of the half-savage,” he added, “such as Tripoli. Civilization lies only in Europe.” Such hierarchies of enlightened Europe and “half-savage” everywhere else abounded in 1911 America; now they were reprinted in the newspaper of the National Slovak Society.

Ferrero further invoked stereotypes of Arab cruelty to justify Italy’s firm measures. “It must be remembered that the Italians were fighting against the rotten Arabs, who are only impressed by severity and violence. . . . [T]hey are the barbarians, the Arab savages are bloodthirsty, and they were justly and duly punished. . . . [T]hese lies must also account for the hysteria of civilized people living abroad in the midst of these Arab things.” Similar language arguing the necessity of violence against a savage people was invoked in other contexts. When the Pennsylvania State Constabulary was founded to suppress striking Slavic coal miners in 1903, the force’s official historian explained the necessity of force, for, “A Polack only understands an argument that comes at the end of a knout.” Such symmetry between anti-Slavic and anti-Arab violence was, however, unremarked upon on this occasion by Národné noviny. Instead, the paper’s editors allowed Ferrero to conclude his letter uninterrupted, and the professor had a warning for the rest of Europe:

If the Turks and Arabs drove the Italian forces into the sea, this would be seen by the Turks and Arabs, both Muslims, as a victory for their arms, and would at the same time be a triumph for the Islamic religion. Arab and Muslim populations in Egypt, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco after their decades-long wars and struggles [against the European colonizers] would now easily rise in revolt, following the flags of holy war. This would deal a fatal blow to European rule in Africa.

The warning to the rest of Europe and to Euro-Americans was clear: We must be allowed to succeed, by whatever means the Arab “barbarians” made necessary, or your colonial possessions will be threatened.

The opinions of “influential Italians” such as Ferrero, the Pope, and the inventor Marconi were reprinted verbatim in Slovak to refute allegations of atrocities in a
colonial invasion. No Libyan voices made it into this paper; whatever enmity they felt toward working-class Italian competitors for jobs, some Slovak immigrants developed more affinity for fellow Europeans than for fellow colonized peoples.

Ferrero’s letter was first disseminated to English-language newspapers, seeking to rally American public opinion behind Rome’s imperial ventures on behalf of Christian civilization. That it was reprinted in Slovak by editors of Národné noviny, who affixed no criticism of the Italian soldiers’ actions, indicates colonial ventures in Africa were regarded as something editors felt readers needed to learn about and understand from the European powers’ point of view. Menelik II no longer offered Slovaks a lesson.

To be sure, as in the English-language press, the most egregious excesses of European colonization were denounced, but not as a call to jettison the imperial project, rather as inoculation of more “enlightened” colonizers such as the British and French. The aberrations of King Leopold’s rule in the Belgian Congo were related in Slovák v Amerike, which noted President Roosevelt and Secretary of State John Hay joined a missionary delegation in lodging a complaint of atrocities committed against natives. “The delegates had produced many photographs of maimed children, some only a few years old,” the paper noted. “The Belgian authorities had committed atrocities against these native children simply because their parents hadn’t provided the daily quota of rubber.” Still, neither the delegation nor the president condemned colonialism per se, and Slovák v Amerike was likewise mute on the broader issue. By exposing the supposedly more horrendous excesses of the Belgians against the accepted rules of the colonial game, newspapers permitted inoculated British and French administrators in Africa to continue with their allegedly more humane civilizing missions.

Whether Leopold needed curbing, Slovak newspapers joined most white Americans in endorsing colonialism for non-Europeans. More typically an editorial in Jednota in 1902 considered “paganism” and the threat to civilization posed by black and yellow regions of the world. For all its earlier denunciation of Rockefeller’s brutality, Národné noviny in 1916 reprinted an article first published in the Chicago Examiner on “The Seven Rivals, or, The Race Struggle.” This article repeated the prevalent Darwinian view of white struggle against other races, and warned “the United States must reckon.” While the article was more alarmed by the growing power, and large numbers, of Japanese and Chinese, it also had quite unflattering things to say about blacks, and in this instance the received wisdom of mainstream English-language race-thinkers was passed directly to new immigrants. In a subsection on “blacks and the competition,” the writer discounted meaningful competition from blacks “for the time being,” but added, “[T]heir vale of tears is the worst. They constantly have to wrestle with the tropical sun, jungle and wild beasts, and therefore cannot be as developed or evolved as members of other races.” Still, the writer warned that the 200 million Africans could yet become a menace to whites: “[T]he Mohammedan faith [úšaėsne] has spread in Africa, and . . . one fine day these millions of blacks may become a tool
and weapon of Islam.” In the end, though, the writer believed “the inhabitants of Africa would be ignorant troops, not easily unified or mobilized.”

*New Yorkský denník* likewise in 1920 ran an editorial offering the standard Eurocentric view of “the development of human civilization,” with unflattering comparisons to less advanced Africa and Asia. The nativist 1920s saw the imposition of immigration restrictions that sharply curtailed the annual inflow of Slavs, Italians, and other “new immigrants,” but it also saw the publication of popular racial diatribes such as Lothrop Stoddard’s ominous warnings of “The Rising Tide of Color” and “the menace of the underman.” Some Slovak editorials seem to have accepted the fears of Asian and African demography, even if many immigrants likely would have disagreed with Stoddard and other Nordic thinkers on the danger posed by Slovaks. The hegemony of the social order circa 1920, at least in terms of European subjugation of Africa and Asia, was naturalized in Slovak newspapers.

Just as Professor Ferrero defended Italy’s venture in Tripoli and warned other Europeans of the danger of restless Africans, *Jednota* editorialized on the potential menace posed by the Dark Continent. In assessing “Africa now and in the future,” the paper noted, “Look at the present map of Africa and you see that almost all of it is controlled by European powers.” While acknowledging that Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and Morocco were independent, “at least nominally,” the editorialist noted that both countries were “small and weak.”

“Aside from Abyssinia and Morocco,” though, “the Dark Continent of Africa, with no less than 150 million black people, is all partly or completely under the control of whites.” But the paper reflected on the trouble Germany had been experiencing with her “natives,” as well as the difficulties Zulu uprisings had caused England, before noting Menelik’s successful resistance to the Italian invasion of Ethiopia. “There’s no doubt that black African natives can fight and will fight, even if they don’t have half a chance of gaining independence from whites,” the writer added. “The future of the earth lies in their combative skills and modern equipment. If each native had a Mauser rifle, and he knew how to use it, whites would soon have no place in Africa.”

Fears that Africans would gain modern weaponry were exacerbated by the rivalries among European powers, notably Germany and England, which had extended to Africa. It was alleged the rivals had been arming natives in the other powers’ colonies. “In these ways the African blacks may come to possess modern weaponry, and then all they’ll need to do is join together and the days of white rule in Africa will be numbered. . . . [T]he white race is coming to a battle with the black and yellow races. And that day of reckoning is not far.”

When World War I broke out, the mustering of nonwhite troops was reported, sometimes in ways that reflected the fears of an armed contingent from “the black and yellow races,” as *Jednota* had warned. A front-page photo ran across all six columns of *Slovák v Amerike* of the disembarkation of Indian soldiers at Marseilles. “The Indian Army, which disembarked at Marseilles, was sent to the front, to assist
the French left wing,” the accompanying story reported. Perhaps engaging in wishful thinking, the article added, “The Indian Army is with great enthusiasm fighting for Great Britain, which reigns today in all of India.” Two months later the paper reported on the use of Indian soldiers by the British Army fighting in the trenches of Europe’s western front. The article described the colonial troops as “Pathans,” and “fanatical Mohammedans,” but at least these “fanatical Mohammedans” were fighting on the side of the Allies, unlike the Ottomans who two years earlier were urged to get back to Asia.149

Indians and other Asians had not always been so avidly greeted by the white subjects of the British Empire. Just before the outbreak of World War I, Slovák v Amerike had reported on a riot that broke out in Vancouver when the army sought to prevent the landing of 350 “Hindus.” Earlier, riots against Japanese “Mongols” in Canada were reported, with illustrations of Prime Minister Sir Wilfred Laurier and a Vancouver mob chasing Japanese.150 The internecine warfare in Europe required the assistance of Asian and African colonial troops; by war’s end more than three million Indian troops had been employed by the British alone, many serving even in the European theater. For some, the empire was coming to roost uncomfortably close to home.

Perhaps with fears of assertive colonial peoples on their minds, the editors of Obrana, a Cleveland-based journal advocating Slovak independence, ran in October 1916 a grinning, Rastus-like cartoon of “The African” designed to remind readers that they were white people, too (see Figure 5-13). The accompanying poem mocked both blacks and hypocritical British imperialism, but the broadly racist cartoon left little doubt as to the real target of the satire:

A nigger from Africa serving in the war
While reaching for some honey
Hurt himself on the shelf.
On the shelf, but also in his hand.
He woke up in the hospital with his hands bandaged up.
In the hospital all the nurses,
They petted him and treated him like a king.
The African was happy with this but not a little puzzled
Because it was the first time the Brits hadn’t greeted him with curses and blows.
Finally he asked a nurse, who told him it was, everyone knew,
Because a Negro with a broken hand can’t swing a razor so well.
At that he looked happy.
But suddenly exclaimed,
Quick, Miss, send me back to Africa before I get better!151

It is certainly possible to read this poem as a sardonic commentary on European imperialists’ dilemma now that they were reliant, at least in part, on colonial
troops in order to beat back the Hun. But the invocation of Africans swinging razors—as we’ll see in the following chapter, a standard trope of the minstrel shows so avidly attended and performed by Slavic Americans, among others—suggests the joke is at least partially at the benighted, out-of-place colonial native’s expense. By 1916 Slovaks on the world stage had already set up an invidious comparison between themselves and Oriental despotism by semi-Asiatic Magyars (at least as told by Slovaks). Paeans in Bohemian bazaars to Slovak kinship with the principles of Juraj Washington, Otec Vlast’ (Father of Our Country), occurred during the war, too. Now came “The African.” Here Slovaks fell into the familiar pattern already practiced at home: comparison to an even more benighted group could only heighten—or was that whiten?—chances for inclusion as part of the self-ruling elite. Indeed, as the war neared its end, readers of Amerikansky russky viestnik learned that “England was determined to protect Portugal’s interests in Africa.” Self-determination was not for everyone.

Any sympathy for “niggers” hurt in the war collapsed when Slovaks were conflated with Africans as captive, colonial peoples. Following the war, a Czechoslovak
Legionnaire—one of the Slavic soldiers who fought with the French to win freedom from Austria-Hungary—wrote to New Yorkský denník objecting to his compatriots’ treatment by the French. “The brethren who came out of the Balkans were told that they should be lumped together with the Foreign Legion, numbered as just like the blacks and other African tribes, who whenever they protest are sentenced by the four gods of the military court to time in Algiers.” While the writer allowed that the Bohemian and Slovak volunteers had agreed to serve in the French Foreign Legion, the injustice of their relegation to the status of Africans was, to the writer, beyond question. Bohemians and Slovaks, he continued, “have nothing in common with Senegalese, Arabs, and Kabyle Anamim [Algerian Berber] Foreign Legions; these are colonial armies.” While some immigration restrictionists questioned Slavs’ fitness for self-government, this writer was certain of the injustice that had occurred when his people were grouped with Africans. By 1920 Slavs’ service to the Allied cause had won them independence; the Algerians would have to wait 40 more years.155

Following World War I, it was only socialist Slovak newspapers that suggested the right to self-determination championed by President Woodrow Wilson ought to be extended to African and Asian peoples. Rovnost ľudu, organ of the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section affiliated with the Workers’ (Communist) Party, ran photos of African anticolonial fighters accompanying stories noting that, “The defenders of imperialist France and England are interested in Africa.” Cartoons featured the confrontation of a muscular, rifle-toting man, “The Communist International,” with a rich, top-hatted “British imperialism” who was dragging a slave, Egypt, by a rope. “The Fops of English capitalism in Egypt foiled by the international forces of proletarian solidarity,” ran the party-approved caption. Most of these items first ran in the CPUSA’s English-language newspaper, The Daily Worker, but were reprinted for Slovak comrades, too. A second cartoon appearing in both newspapers had workers labeled “China,” “India,” and “Africa” carrying hammer, pickax, and gun greeting marching workers with a red flag. In the middle, a rather oblivious “Kipling” scribbles on a pad, “The East is the East and the West is the West, and never the twain shall meet.” A class-conscious cockroach tells him, “You’re a liar.” Elsewhere Rovnost ľudu wrote approvingly of Gandhi’s campaign in India and anticolonialism on the world stage and told of Slovak cooperatives’ humanitarian mission to Turkmenistan, now a Soviet Socialist Republic, while immigrants who picked up The Daily Worker in 1925 would have seen a cartoon featuring giants labeled “China, India and Africa” confronting the well-dressed midgets of U.S., British, and French imperialism. “Who is that you are going to whip, Mr. Legree?” the grinning proletariat asked.156

Into the 1930s, other radical immigrants criticized imperialism in Africa, as when Croatians and Slovenians read in Majski Glas (May Herald) denunciations of Mussolini’s campaign against Ethiopia. Still, even writers for this socialist paper elsewhere employed hierarchical race-thinking, as when they criticized Franco and the Spanish fascists for bringing in “these foreigners,” troops from
“black” regions such as Spanish Morocco, to subjugate “civilized Europeans.” This label may have been sarcastic, for the same article declared European civilization to be “bankrupt.”

In the middle of World War II, colonialism became an embarrassing piece of baggage for at least some supporters of the Allied nations. Národné noviny reprinted an English-language argument to this effect from Progress, the journal of the United Electrical Workers, a left-leaning affiliate of the CIO. In considering the case of “Our Colonial Allies,” Progress noted that the peoples of the South Pacific, India, and Africa had not fully committed themselves to the Allied cause, but argued this was understandable, since “these nations and their inhabitants have suffered in the past from the exploitations of imperialistic interests in America and England.” The writer pointed to rule in Puerto Rico as “a black spot on America’s honor,” that had “roused much suspicion of our motives in South America.” He hoped, though, President Franklin Roosevelt’s steps toward granting some self-government toward the island would rectify earlier missteps of gunboat diplomacy.

Progress further noted:

Japan has used to great advantage all instances of anti-Negro discrimination in this country, seeking to win the peoples of the South Pacific to their side by propaganda about “co-prosperity,” and the fight against white supremacy. This is, of course, a vicious fraud, for the Japanese exploitation is the worst ever, and “co-prosperity” is a bitter sham. But as long as we in America permit discrimination to exist, the Japanese will have a talking point.

For a brief moment, with wartime talk of guaranteeing to all peoples the “four freedoms,” unionists and some white ethnics could consider the necessity of decolonization abroad and civil rights at home. Perhaps it was no accident that both Národné noviny’s parent organization, the National Slovak Society, and the United Electrical Workers ran afoul of postwar anticommunist witch hunters and ended up on the Attorney General’s List of Subversive Organizations.

In the Cold War aftermath of World War II, Slovak newspapers more typically denigrated anticolonialism in the name of resisting Third World communism. New Yorkský denník reported France was standing up to Moscow-backed Ho Chi Minh, and needed U.S. aid in retaining her Indochinese colonies. The paper likewise editorialized on the dangerous Mau Maus fomenting trouble for Great Britain, a bad example also followed by anticolonialists in Guyana. The Mau Maus, the writer noted, were even engaged in violent activities in the heart of London. Lest Slavic American readers felt this had no relevance to their lives, the editorial warned, “We may have a similar situation to contend with in New York. There are beginning to grow some conspiring Puerto Ricans, not just on that island but here in the heart of New York.” The fine words of Progress advocating more autonomy for the U.S. colonies were forgotten, or maybe the Slavic press’s
earlier pronouncements on savage and ungrateful little brown brothers held more salience for white ethnics, even in 1954.160

“Yellow Peril”: China and Japan

A slightly different, if no less racist, discourse circulated in the immigrant press regarding China and Japan. While belittling treatment of colonized peoples implied these savages deserved, even needed, the firm hand of European civilizing administrators, the larger Asian empires were often depicted as demographic, and, for Japan, military, rivals who might subsume the white race. Such alarmist screeds were rife in English-language sources that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries warned of a “Yellow Peril,” but this rhetoric was reproduced in Slovak and Rusyn sources, too.

As early as 1894, Amerikansky ruský viestník hinted at Japanese brutality in its conduct of its war with China, but only to argue coal companies were as brutal as Asian despots in their treatment of striking immigrants. In an article on the strike in Connellsville, Pennsylvania, the paper reported, “One of the leaders of the strikers at the coke mills, Valent Nováck, Polack, reported that 5,000 Polacks have been treated the way the Japanese fighting against China treat their enemies.”161 While on this occasion Japanese brutality was used to criticize coal barons, in other instances it was the supposed docility and lower living standards of the Chinese that repulsed Slavic writers and served as a metaphor for the unjust working conditions against which they struck. Amerikansky ruský viestník again invoked Asian metaphors in 1907 when it reported agricultural workers near Budapest were on strike in opposition to the Chinese-like “coolie wages” they had been paid.162

Slovaks, Poles, and Rusyns toiling in coalfields or steel towns may not have faced an invading Japanese army per se, but they were familiar with the violence of the New World, even if industrial warfare was sometimes depicted using tropes of Asian savagery. In 1912 a Národné noviny editorial charged “the offenses of the capitalists are more excessive in their barbarism than those of the Persian tyrants in darkest Asia,” citing West Virginia’s coal country as a particularly benighted realm. This editorial indicates race-thinking among Národné noviny’s editors had already proceeded to the point where assumptions of Asian despotism had become part of their cognitive atlases.163

Nor were anti-Asian stereotypes only employed as metaphors. Slovak papers avidly covered the United States’ efforts to exclude Chinese and Japanese immigrants. While this coverage will be more fully treated in Chapter 7, it should be noted here that foreign reporting on the “Yellow Peril” abroad occurred in the same years in which papers such as Národné noviny were informing readers that anti-Chinese laws were “one of the means of learning to discriminate between desirables and others” and “a protective measure of the white race” and necessary
to protect “our white country.” Slovák v Amerike likewise reacted with outrage when it learned that Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson had, in some of his academic writings, made less than flattering remarks about Southeast European immigrants. Especially galling was Wilson’s assessment, “[A]nd yet the Chinese were more to be desired as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.” The paper urged its New Jersey readers to remember this when they headed to the polls to elect a governor. The paper had already reported on court cases in Chicago that had decided that “As members of the Mongol race, Japanese can’t become citizens of our republic.” The pronoun is telling, for in 1906 there were many immigration restrictionists who were convinced it was Slavs, Mediterraneans, and other European newcomers who were polluting their republic, even if, as Thomas Guglielmo, Matthew Frye Jacobson, and others have demonstrated, marginalized Caucasians were permitted to emigrate and naturalize, something Asians were not. Whatever little advantage Slavs had in the marketplace or court of public opinion was pressed vis-à-vis Asian migrants, as when Slovák v Amerike urged continued restrictions on Japanese migration. The paper had earlier reported on a court case attempting to determine whether Chinese born in the United States were nevertheless ineligible for citizenship. The applicant at first appeared to be on solid ground, as he was born in California so therefore an American citizen. But the customs official at the port wouldn’t let him enter, saying he was a member of a nation that is not allowed to be U.S. citizens. . . . Up until this time the U.S. has held to the logical insight that only he is a U.S. citizen who was born here and he whose parents are also local people. If at the time of birth, however, his parents are second-class citizens, then and there the person born here is not a citizen of the United States.

Likewise, 19 years later, the South Carolina federal court decision that Syrians were ineligible for naturalization earned front-page coverage in the paper. Following this decision, Syrian Christian writers to Syrian American newspapers began to make their claims to citizenship rights by casting aspersions on blacks and East Asians, asserting their whiteness as against these pariah groups. Questions of who was eligible to work and live in the U.S., and who deemed permanently alien, appeared frequently in the immigrant press.

The United States’ derogatory treatment of Asians at home and abroad caused some degree of foreign policy woes for Washington, and these were covered in immigrant journals as well. Jednota reported on the aftermath of the Western powers’ suppression of the Boxer Rebellion when they alleged that “the Chinese are extremely glad” to have their cities handed over to Western military authorities. Still, on the same day the paper reported that two Protestant missionaries had been killed in the city of Zhu Chen, “but the Chinese government has already brought the murderers to justice and asked forgiveness from the Australian and
English governments.”¹⁷¹ Three years later the paper reported on the end of a Chinese boycott of American goods, and also reported on “the unpardonable tactlessness of the Chinese envoy” in criticizing America’s Chinese Exclusion Act. The paper likewise showed about as much contempt to Asian American residents as President Roosevelt, who when petitioned for a relaxation of the immigration restrictions simply noted that the courts had upheld these regulations.¹⁷² In 1906 Slovák v Amerike reported on a recurrence of Boxer insurgency, with illustrations of the Chinese rebels. “Boxers again on the move,” read the headline. “The hatred of the yellow race against white people and against Christianity is inextinguishable [nevykoričná]. The fanatical Chinese, called ‘Boxers,’ again are on the move and have become the terror and danger of all white people residing within the borders of the yellow empire, particularly Christian missionaries.” Any suggestion that the Chinese might have grounds for resentment of quasi-colonizers, 60 years after the Opium Wars, was left out of this edition.¹⁷³ Yet, as is frequently the case, the juxtaposition of various stories in the Slovak press is instructive. On the same day as news of the “savage, fanatical,” white-hating Boxers, items were printed, too, of the U.S. Army’s continued attempts to subjugate the wild Igorots of the Philippines. Published on that day, too, was news of an imminent lynching of a black man by an enraged group of white citizens in Virginia. The hierarchy of fanatical and civilized was a discourse that operated worldwide in 1906, and Slovak readers viewed race in all its permutations courtesy of immigrant newspapers.

At least regarding “Japanese, Chinese, and Hindus,” some Slovak immigrants learned to embrace shibboleths of illegitimate outsiders. In 1907, Jednota ran an article titled “Against Japanese Immigration,” but alongside it also ran a letter from Allegheny City (Pittsburgh) from a “Slovak of Šariš province.” The letter writer declared, “The war is on, we have a great anger toward these nomads from Asia who wandered from Mongolia. They should go to find their houses over there and not invade our houses. . . . For now, they are still in Asia.” Ironically, the letter writer was complaining not just about the Japanese “invading” America, but also about the Magyars (Hungarians), to argue that the Magyars had also illegitimately invaded the Slovaks’ Old World home, employing tropes of invaded homelands that were first directed against the Japanese and Chinese.¹⁷⁴ Similarly, and more directly targeted at Asian “invaders” of America, in 1915 Štefan Ďuraňa of Detroit wrote to New Yorkský denník of the menace caused by ostensibly lax immigration policies in Canada, the “anti-Mongolian” riots in Vancouver reported in Slovák v Amerike notwithstanding. “Uncle Sam has become worried by some of the actions of the Canadians,” Ďuraňa wrote. “It’s stupid to worry about Austrians, when we know that some of those entering the United States from Canada are Chinese, Japanese, Hindus and Mongols.” Even though a year into the Great War many Slovaks had no love for Austrians, this Slovak migrant had already learned that in the New World Asians were regarded as a greater threat to the white man’s republic. A similarly alarmist report had been
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published in Slovák v Amerike seven years earlier, warning in that instance that Chinese were sneaking into the United States from Mexico. Ďuraňa’s letter, and the report of Chinese “invasion,” indicates that at least some immigrants were developing anti-Asian biases of their own, perhaps after reading years of anti-Japanese coverage in their newspapers. To be sure, Pittsburgh steelworkers and other laborers faced dire competition for jobs that paid a pittance; that some at least chose to see Japanese as impermissible competitors, in ways that few fellow Europeans were characterized, suggests something more than a rational economic calculus. By the early twentieth century, Slavs were looking to collect the “wages of whiteness” to which David Roediger refers.175

The greater threat to the white race was perceived to come from Japan, for while China had proven to be relatively easy to subdue, by the early twentieth century Tokyo seemed to be on the ascendant. As early as 1904 the Russo-Japanese War led to alarmist warnings that Europe and America faced a “Yellow Peril” that only Russia could thwart. “The Japanese Army has behaved against the Russians completely like Tatars,” Slovák v Amerike declared in an editorial, “Mongolians at War,” which repeatedly denounced the Japanese for their barbarism and “Mongolian blood.” In the Social Darwinist milieu of 1904 America, many writers were obsessed with the threatening activities of supposedly inferior “races,” Slovaks among them. But here it was an immigrant writer who sounded the trumpet of white supremacy.176

As noted in Chapter 3, the tsarist regime was sometimes embraced by Rusyn and Slovak newspapers as a bigger Slavic brother, but the war with Japan also offered an opportunity to assert one’s whiteness as a European Slav, in distinction from the “Mongolian” Japanese. As is also detailed in Chapter 3, Jednota lauded a member of the First Catholic Slovak Union for condemning American newspapers’ alleged support of “the glorious Mongols” (i.e. Japanese). The writer Pavel Kadak praised Russia’s role in “spreading Christian civilization,” as opposed to the “pagan” nature of the enemy.177 Later that year, as it became clear that the tsar’s forces were hopelessly outclassed, Jednota’s editorial warned of a coming “Yellow Peril” on both the international and domestic fronts. In an otherwise completely Slovak editorial, the familiar English-language phrase, “Yellow Peril,” was repeated several times. Immigrants had many venues in which they could learn of the threat that white Americans saw from the East, but slurs of Japanese savagery and menace were repeated in their own journals, as well.178

After Japan’s defeat of Russia warnings of the danger of allowing Tokyo’s power to grow unchecked were sounded in Jednota, which again praised Russia as a valiant (albeit recently unsuccessful) defender of “Aryan” civilization. In publicizing a book, Aryans and Mongols, by the German author Carl Christian Spielmann, the Slovak Catholic journal quoted Spielmann as warning for 20 years in pamphlets such as “The New Mongolian Storm” that “the danger now consistently is going against us . . . . [T]he ratio between the Aryans and Mongols, will grow even greater and then shine in the future. After twenty years of studying the history of the Far East I am able to make such a statement.” Spielmann saw Russia
as the defender of Aryans from a Mongol onslaught and wrote, “Europe has committed a great error by allowing the Japanese to reinforce the Asiatic lands that are bordering Russia, which is our last defense before the Asians.” He further argued that, “[a]ll the Japanese . . . who live outside of their country should be under strict supervision by the police because they are dangerous spies; this crafty little island is a menace to the whole civilized world.” Prefigurations of the World War II internment of Japanese Americans are on display here, but seem to have worried the editors not at all, for no condemnation of such sentiments is offered. Instead, the article concluded that, “The whole Aryan race should see in Russia their front line of defense and their first champion fighter.” At a time when many immigration restrictionists in America discounted the Slavs’ qualification for Aryan status, Jednota’s editors no doubt welcomed praise from whatever quarter. Still, by their selection of such an article for inclusion, at least some Slovak editors deemed it important to make a case for Slovak membership in the “Aryan” race, as part of America’s white “us.”

As Tokyo objected to anti-Asian measures enacted in California and other states, fears of a U.S.-Japanese conflict grew. “Will it be war or not?” a Slovák v Amerike editorial pondered. The writer urged Washington to build more battleships to keep pace with the Japanese. “We know that America lives and works for peace,” he added, “But if the Mongols want war, fine, they should well know that the outcome will be that the harmless Mongols will be humbled by generous Uncle Sam!” As in coverage of America’s gunboat diplomacy in the Caribbean, Uncle Sam’s innocence in any brewing dispute was taken for granted. Four years later, fear of a coming war with Japan was still in the news. The paper ran a composite photograph of President Taft and the emperor of Japan “playing chess,” and expressed the growing fear of Japan as an emerging power. “In recent years, reports have frequently circulated that in a short time war will break out between the United States and Japan,” the paper reported. “As a matter of fact, after the victory over Russia Japan has actually acted as if they wanted to be boss of this whole country.”

The frequent reports in Slovák v Amerike and other Slovak newspapers of anti-Japanese measures relegating migrants to second-tier status went unremarked on this occasion. There was no suggestion in the main Slovak newspapers that a relaxation of anti-Japanese measures in California or elsewhere might be warranted to ease international tensions. Instead, for example, reports were published of the justice of moves in California and Nebraska to exclude Japanese children from white schools. Alarms of the “Yellow Peril” rang just as loudly in immigrant newspapers as in the journals of Hearst.

“That Roving, Tyrannical, Revengeful Horde”—Mongolian Magyars

Notions of a “Mongolian” threat were familiar to many white Americans circa 1910, but Slovak immigrants had another enemy less infamous to other Americans: the
Magyars in charge of the Kingdom of Hungary. When the Slovak press urged its compatriots to shake off the “Mongolian, Magyar yoke,” and during World War I called upon the American government to recognize Slovak difference from Magyar and support an independent Czechoslovak nation, some of the arguments at their command were formulated in anti-Asian tropes.

Politicians and academics disparaging the new immigrants often questioned their whiteness or European backgrounds. Senator F. M. Simmons of North Carolina dismissed newcomers as “nothing more than the degenerate progeny of the Asiatic hoards [sic] . . . the spawn of the Phoenician curse.” Slovaks readily employed such tropes against their enemies. Slovaks never tired of pointing out that Magyars (Hungarians) were Asiatic nomads who were interlopers in the European heartland, even if they had first trespassed there 1,200 years ago. That distant Asian connection was emphasized by Slovaks, such as a letter writer from Mahanoy City, Pennsylvania, who objected to the slur “Hun” when used in English-language newspapers “against all hated foreigners.” Only the Magyars, he claimed, were “the true ‘Huns.’” When a group of Magyars celebrating on Scranton’s Court House Square paid homage to George Washington, Slovaks felt compelled to write an English-language letter to the *Scranton Times*. The Slovaks reassured English-speaking readers of the paper that “we Slovak American citizens, born in Hungary, subscribe to each and every word said about George Washington and in regard to our glorious adopted country of the United States. However, we protest against the misrepresentation of Hungarian liberty and against the comparison of Kossuth to George Washington.” Instead, the Slovak writer painted a portrait of “unheard of tyranny and oppression” perpetrated by the Hungarian government. The writer asserted that, “The Slovaks lived in the territory of Hungary many centuries before the arrival of Huns and Magyars from Asia. At present Hungary is inhabited by several nationalities of entirely different tongues and even of different races, the Magyars being of Mongolian, and the Slovaks and others of Caucasian race.” Not the least of the writer’s complaints was the injustice of “Caucasians” under the control of “Mongolians,” even if the Magyars had converted to Christianity in 1000 and been resident in Central Europe for a century before this. While much has been made of new immigrants’ assertions of their fealty to symbols of American patriotism, little attention has been paid to immigrants’ simultaneous embrace of their place in “the Caucasian race.”

In 1907 a spate of “Indignation Meetings” were held by Slovaks throughout the United States. These were held to protest first the imprisonment by the Austro-Hungarian authorities of Reverend Andrej Hlinka, a deputy of parliament and advocate of greater Slovak autonomy, and then the infamous Černova Massacre, in which Slovaks holding a protest vigil at Hlinka’s parish were fired upon by Habsburg soldiers. The rhetoric at these Indignation Meetings reflected the growing anger of some Slovaks at continued rule by Budapest, but in the United States hatred of Magyars was often couched in “anti-Asian” rhetoric. Slovaks in the
Connellsville area were called to a meeting slated for New Haven, Pennsylvania, under the cry “Away with the Huns!” The meeting’s Slovak organizers particularly resented being referred to as Hungarians in the English-language newspapers and the Cleveland “Sabadság,” a Magyar newspaper. Jednota similarly editorialized that the Magyars were Gypsies who did not speak for the Slovak nation.

At one Indignation Meeting, Dr. J. M. Slabey made explicit these slurs on Hungarians’ pedigree. In an English-language speech in New York reprinted in Slovák v Amerike, Slabey decried the oppression of Slovaks “under the control of the Magyars:—an entirely different race, with as different a language as it is possible for the mind to conceive, different habits, customs, and entirely different physical appearance.” The Magyars, he charged, “are descendants of that roving, tyrannical, revengeful horde originating from Asia at whose head was that beast Attila. This Attila, a man without conscience, had only one object in view and that was destruction of everything in his path.”

Slabey asserted that the Slovaks had already been occupants of the lands now known as Hungary, and out of pity allowed the Asian interlopers to settle among them after the Huns’ eventual defeat by the Germans. Alas, this mistake was realized too late, and the brutality of the Asians in their midst led to Slovak suffering. Slabey added, “I also believe in hereditary traits of character, and now more than ever as I don’t see more gentleness, at least not in the Magyars who constitute the Magyar Government today as in the olden times under Attila or Zoltán.” At the beginning of the twentieth century Social Darwinist belief in racial types was commonly paraded before New York audiences, and now Slabey followed suit. To underscore the injustice Slovaks faced from an official policy of Magyarization of Slavs, he declared, “[W]e cannot be coerced to become Magyars any more than become Chinese. . . .” Another Indignation Meeting in Passaic heard the Rev. Jozef Martinček thunder,

Hungary, this land of wild and savage people, has blasphemed against the faith of Christ. . . . The Magyars in general arrived with no cultural knowledge, no economy or agricultural know-how, etc. . . . Our Slovak ancestors helped Saint Stephen and the Hungarians in acquiring some knowledge of farming and of various cultural things, etc. . . . The Magyars, it is said, are Turks. Murderers, these Turks. The Slovaks have to strike down these murderers, the Turks.

Hungarians were portrayed as interlopers in the country they ruled, and savage, Asiatic ones at that. In years to come, other letter writers such as Ján Vanco of Sharon, Pennsylvania, referred to the Magyars and their supporters as “not even as civilized as the savages in darkest Africa,” while the humor columnist, Godfather Švablik of Kakašovec, demanded, “[A]re we Slovaks like those Hottentots in Africa? Nosiree!” Other Slovaks in Yonkers, New York, had years before this likewise framed their grievances at being denied Slovak priests as an unfair treatment only fit for “Zulus or Kaffirs,” and in the opening months of World
War I Národné noviny accused the Germans of being “more savage than the Hottentots.” In Jim Crow, Asian-excluding America, there was no greater slur than to accuse one’s opponent of employing African or Asian methods.\footnote{189}

More frequently items in the Slovak press reminded readers of the Asian forebears of the Magyars. When Hungary’s Count Apponyi made a goodwill tour of the United States to burnish Budapest’s reputation, Slovák v Amerike’s comic columnists, “Rip and Račík,” were quick to note that all Magyars were “Asiatic” and “Mongol,” and therefore “Count Apponyi should be deported” from the United States, since “Apponyi is a Mongol” and “Mongols are Asiatics, and Asians are not permitted to travel to the U.S.” In this instance most venom was directed at the Hungarian nobleman, but tropes of perpetual Asian alienness were malleable, powerful weapons in the fight to gain Slovaks a nation. A year later the paper’s other humorist, Godfather Švablik of Kakašovec, took up the cry: “Every one of them therefore came out of Asia. We should therefore conclude that we should ship all the Magyars C.O.D. to Asia, let them all go.”\footnote{190}

If “Asiatics” from China and Japan were regarded as a threat by most Americans, characterizing one’s Magyar foes as Mongolians or Asians might win Slovaks a sympathetic hearing in the United States. Yet it wasn’t only, or even chiefly, to native-born Americans that Slovaks were addressing their comments. While some of these speeches were reprinted in English, their appearance in Slovak newspapers indicates it was the cognitive maps of immigrants themselves that were being rearranged to situate Budapest and her Magyars in the heart of Asia.

Prior to the 1910 census Národné noviny editorialized against the indignity of immigrants being forced to identify themselves solely as natives of Hungary, with no way to indicate ethnic affiliation. To make clear just what an outrage this was, editors turned to racialized language. The paper urged its readers to answer the question “place of birth” with “Slovakland—Slovakia! Wake up, unite in our camp with this deed!” Editors ruefully observed, “On the one hand, we are branded by all officially as ‘Hungarians,’ which has given rise to the derogatory ‘Hunky,’ while on the second we have been amalgamated on the other side of the water by the old rulers, in statistical assignations as Magyars.” The editors continued with all the racial indignation they could muster, “‘Hungarian’ and ‘Magyar,’ it is not all the same! They are two different things and the difference is huge! That DIFFERENCE is acknowledged by every linguist, that the Magyar will never lose his INNATE MONGOL-CHINESE CHARACTER!”

A curious linguistic fact, that the Magyar language was not Indo-European, was transformed by Slovak editors into a matter of “huge” difference over “innate character.” Pointing out to Washington the travesty of classifying a Slovak as a Magyar might only get one so far. The idea that a Caucasian, even from the Carpathians, was in danger of being amalgamated with a race innately “Chinese-Mongolian”—in 1910 America, this almost certainly would be acknowledged a far graver sin.\footnote{191} The Slovaks, who 20 years earlier had been denigrated by Henry Cabot Lodge as “not a good acquisition for us to make, since they appear to have
so many items in common with the Chinese,” were now highlighting their European consanguinity with Anglo-Saxons by belittling Magyars as Asians. As early as 1904, in the same *Jednota* article slurring “the pagan Japs,” Magyars were derided as “Hungarians of the Mongolian race.”

What more lethal weapon could editors lob in the battle for acceptance vis-à-vis Magyars? Asians in 1910, and for decades to come, were ineligible for citizenship. The Census Bureau relented to the pressure of Slovak and other immigrants’ complaints, and in 1910 added a question on “native tongue” to record Central Europe’s varied ethnicities.

During the Great War, matters of Slovak identity assertion reached fever pitch, and cries of Mongolian Magyarism helped immigrants make their case for independence. As early as 1914, Vincent Kubiš of Daisytown, Pennsylvania, sent in to *Slovák v Amerike* his satirical reworking of the Slovak national hymn, “Hej, Slováci!” The satire was at the expense of the Mongolian Magyars, whose time in power, some hoped, would now be short. “Hey, dear Slovaks, / We have all survived / All the horrible Habsburgs— / At least to this moment!” Kubiš began, with many digs at “Old Franny Joey.”

But then Kubiš got to the heart of the matter, asserting that after the fighting “each lamb could go to his rightful place in Asia.” He repeated, “Let them take / Their place in Asia, / And that may be / In pagan Turkey.”

He continued equating the Magyars with Mongolians:

Now we Slovaks
When we win the war,
The Mongolian Government
Will be given no more.

The Mongolian Government
Has long plagued us
And Slovak schools
We were also prevented.

Truly we were wronged
In our old country,
We also had to in our churches
Sing in Mongolian

Old Franny Joey,
Tyrant over Slovaks,
Open to you
The hell gate.

Old Franny Joey!
Death is at the door
And devils are waiting
For you with forks.

They wanted to uproot
All we Slovaks,
Slovaks, they wanted to sell you
To their Mongolian horde.

But the Mongols
Somewhat miscalculated,
Because it is already upon them,
The whole world’s angry force [zhnevany]

Of all the world’s parties
Only the Mongolian horde,
Was a foundation that would destroy
Our Slovaks.

In his concluding verses, however, Kubiš reassured his compatriots that the Magyars would fall before the Russian Cossacks; as in coverage of the Russo-Japanese War ten years before, the Cossacks were forces not of barbarism but civilization and liberation. In the war’s first months, it was the Magyars who already were reworked as Mongols and Asian tyrants.195

The Habsburgs continued to be derided as a motley racial crew, as when Národné noviny mocked the state funeral for Franz Josef in Vienna. Of the Habsburgs and Hungarian nobles, the paper wrote, “On the face of these people is the cast of a gypsy portrait.” In the weeks following the armistice the paper similarly mocked Count Károlyi’s short-lived Hungarian government. “They started a democratic republic and elected ARCHDUKE Joseph, the son of the eccentric, nay, tainted lover of gypsy lore, gypsy language, and gypsy women, as their president,” the paper wrote of the Hungarians. “His estate at Alcsut was the scene of many a feast, where the gypsies walked around clad in a string of beads and a smile. . . . How foolish and benighted are these Asiatic Nobles of the Empty Cranium. . . . Thus we have the oddest thing in the world, worthy of Barnum’s Side Show. . . . ” The evocation of carnival freaks and displays from Asia such as the “human zoos” that thrilled crowds in Vienna and Prague (as well as American extravaganzas such as the “Asiatic” Filipino villages at the St. Louis World’s Fair) put the Magyars in their place. Poignant notes that Barnum’s “Ethnological Congress of Strange Savage Tribes” in the 1880s featured Australian aborigines, as well as “other performing groups of Zulu, Toda, Nubians, and Sioux, who had been . . . dispossessed on other colonial frontiers.” By invoking Barnum side shows in relation to Magyars, Slovaks asserted that wild Magyars weren’t fit to run an empire and more properly belonged behind bars.196
Without the side-show references, regular Slovaks writing to their papers from across the country slighted the Magyars’ Mongolian savagery. Štefan Cmero wrote to New Yorkský denník on behalf of his “Sparrows Point Slovaks” in Baltimore to denounce the “Mongolian slavery (yoke)” under which “that old sinner Fraňo Jozef,” with the aid of “Willie the Lunatic” kept the Slovaks. “I’m sure we’ll find that every freedom-loving Slovak wants to shake off our hated tyranny and the shackles and oppression of that wicked, wild Mongolian scum.”

Other letter writers combined Old World and New World racialized stereotypes in arguing the Slovaks’ case. Andrej Bugoš of Los Angeles wrote to Národné noviny in 1915 to denounce the Mongolian Magyars, saying “Slovaks live under the worst slavery and suffering in the world.” In this regard he was on familiar terrain, making arguments readily understandable even to those back in the Carpathians. But he continued in a complaint that could only have been learned in the New World: “Indeed if you really look at it, we have it worse than the Negroes. Indeed these days in California Negroes are enslaved to luxury, and you see what ’tents’ they have! But among our backward, dirty [zadubení] Austrians, see how we’re treated like sheep, how our women are enslaved. . . . The Slovaks are kept as slaves.” Later familiar tropes of lazy blacks supposedly living in luxury while hard-working white ethnics were cast as the real victims were already employed during World War I to argue that Slovak suffering trumped anything African Americans had known. Even before the war, a little filler item in Jednota complained, “Blacks in the United States have established various high schools and institutes. Blacks are allowed to have these, and our brothers in Hungary are truly worse off in this than the American blacks!” While it was a familiar complaint that the Magyars’ prohibition on Slovak-language high schools was an injustice, the allegation that blacks were benefiting in special ways from Jim Crow schools was an unusual argument on behalf of Slavic suffering.

More problematically, Slovaks even employed rhetoric and imagery of lynching to highlight the alleged severity of Slovak oppression back in the Kingdom of Hungary. In early 1917, at a time when Czech and Slovak Americans, as well as other captive peoples of the German and Austro-Hungarian empires, were attempting to coax America into the war, a grim cartoon appeared on the front page of New Yorkský denník. Three lynched corpses sway in the wind as buzzards peck at their flesh. But this was not a condemnation of the lynching of black Americans, a phenomenon that along with urban anti-black race riots was on the ascendancy during World War I and shortly thereafter. While New Yorkský denník and other Slavic immigrant newspapers failed to condemn these atrocities, this lynching cartoon told readers that, “In Hungary at Christmas they erect such Christmas trees.” The hanging bodies are labeled “freedom,” “truth,” and “humanity” (see Figure 5-14). While Budapest’s rule over non-Magyars was far from kind, lynchings were not endemic to Upper Hungary. Once again tropes of violence against blacks were redeployed to allege that our (white ethnic) suffering was “the worst slavery in the world.”
At other moments immigrants readily turned to racialized language when writing of their woes. In a speech at Gettysburg National Cemetery, Rusyn advocate Gregory Žatkovich reminded Woodrow Wilson and the world that while Lincoln had freed the slaves, in 1919 many white nations still lived in slavery in Europe. Similarly, Ján Smolnicky of McKeesport, Pennsylvania, wrote to Jednota of the 16-hour days Slovak agricultural laborers toiled on nobles’ estates. “And about
this slavery, haven’t we poured out our hearts? Has anyone said a prayer for us in church? No! . . . Make no mistake, what these vile Magyar counts have been doing is worse than what occurred on American plantations, with their black slaves, who were freed by the sainted honored martyr, President Lincoln. What other people can be said to have endured what the Slovaks have?” Of course, Smolnicky had answered his own question as to who had it worse. But just as Irish-born workers of the 1850s spoke of their woes as “wage slaves” to disparage blacks’ supposedly lesser plight, not build cross-racial working-class alliances, Slovaks now referred to slavery to heighten their grudges.

At other moments Slovaks asserted their identity as non-Magyars. In 1915, Jednota, worried that Slovaks would be mistaken for Magyars or Czechs, published its declaration of identity:

Us?
No. We are Slovaks.
The Magyars say that we are Magyars.
And the Czechs that we are Czechs.
But we are Slovak!
And may God grant that we remain Slovaks.
We say so nevertheless clearly.
Why is it our brother Czechs do not understand us?

Slovaks took great pains to differentiate themselves from the hated Germans and Magyars. “WRK” of Philadelphia wrote to Obrana in February 1916 insisting, “we are not Germans, not Magyars,” but rather “thoroughly-purely Slovaks.” He railed at “the deaf-mute-blind idiocy” of Americans who couldn’t tell the difference. In 1918 with the United States in the war, Anton Chlebuch, also of Philadelphia, rhetorically asked, “Am I happy at being called an Austrian?” before going to a “Mr. Honorable Notary to draw up an affidavit that I am a Slovak and not an Austrian and not a Magyar! And that neither Germany nor Austria-Hungary are my true country!”

Chlebuch was right to worry. In April 1918 the front-page headline in Jednota again screamed, “Accused in lynching.” Only this time it wasn’t an African American but a German who met this fate. The story chronicled the investigation into the murder of Robert Prager in Collinsville, Illinois, noting one of the accused “said that the crowd claimed it was acting under the authority of the Army of the United States.” Two weeks later several Teutons narrowly escaped Prager’s fate. “Two Austrians Tarred and Feathered,” Jednota announced, telling the story of two miners “grabbed from the mine in Mineral Spring” near Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, “and then smeared with tar and covered in feathers because they had refused to buy Liberty Bonds.” A German nearby was likewise assaulted by a mob of “maybe 200 workers,” who “tied him with a rope and said they were going to lynch him.” After the German begged for mercy they “marched him to
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the bank, where he pledged to buy a Liberty Bond for $500.” Perhaps superflu-
ously, editors placed as a tag line to this and every other story in Jednota the mes-
sage “KUPUJTE LIBERTY BONDY—BUY LIBERTY BONDS.”205

The most familiar slurs against the Magyars, though, continued to be that they
were Asian aliens to civilized Europe and thus had to be defeated. Slovaks meet-
ing in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, passed a “grand manifesto” declaring the justice
of the Czechoslovak independence movement. The manifesto began, “Whereas,
the foreign invaders of Mongol, Hun origin, succeeded by wile, intrigue and
force to foist their unwelcome rule over our peace-loving and unwary forebears,
which rule they exercised ruthlessly and pitilessly for over 1,000 years. . . .” Like
much of the Slavic agitation for independence, the manifesto echoed American
icons such as the Declaration of Independence, asserting that the “Huns” had
denied said “peace-loving forebears” the “God-given right to life, liberty and the
pursuit of happiness. . . .” Nevertheless, invocations of Hungarian “Mongol” ori-
gin resonated with Johnstown audiences, too. A few weeks later Národné noviny
again derided the “Mongolian origin” of the hated Magyars. 206

In the war’s aftermath, a letter writer gleefully wrote that “a thousand years of
slavery has ended and the Slovak nation has finally dawned. . . . At last we can
proudly shout: We are a nation! No longer are we under this Mongolian yoke!”
A second writer confirmed that Slovaks had “chafed under this Mongolian yoke,”
while New Yorkský denník compared the Magyars’ brutality toward captured
Legionnaires to darkest Africa and “the Chinese barbarian warriors.” The paper
later dismissed Magyars’ continued irredentism toward the Slavic lands they had
lost at Versailles by stating, “Mongols will always remain Mongols.” In 1920
Národné noviny continued to kick a Magyar when he was down, deriding the “arti-
ficial hegemony of a Mongol-Turanian tribe with a veneer of European culture,”
“a race of parasites,” with “the Asiatic mind of a nomad. . . .”207

Only a year after the war’s end, however, the brutal suppression of the Great
Steel Strike dampened Slovak laborers’ glee at European liberation. In places
such as Donora, Pennsylvania, the promise of Wilson’s Fourteen Points rang a bit
hollow, and Slavs again equated their industrial woes with black slavery. From
that city a letter writer lamented the situation. “Look out now,” he warned, “we’re
in darkest Africa, and the culprit is the state Cossacks. . . . Freedom, in a word,
has been suppressed.”208 The equation of the strikebreaking State Police with the
Cossacks is more typical of Slovak štrajkujúci (strikers) in this period, but the
writer already equated un-freedom with “darkest Africa” and seemed to suggest
the troopers’ suppression of freedom was the kind of treatment no white working
man—not even a Slovak—should have to endure.

* * *

The continued evocation of black slavery to depict an immigrant’s injustice sug-
gests that we should not overstress the anti-Hungarian animus of Slavic
Americans. For all their grievances with Magyars, Slavic immigrants had learned
that non-Europeans were America’s ultimate outsiders, who, as we’ve seen, continued to be derided in stories of colonialism or as figures of cannibal “fun.” Indeed, when New York immigrants founded a Slovak Hall, they celebrated its inaugural, as noted, with a blackface cannibal orchestra.

Such minstrelsy became a staple of white ethnic entertainment. Jokes at blacks’ expense, including the popularity of minstrel shows at immigrant parishes and social clubs, indicates New World boundary lines continued to be important even as Old World grudges were carried and elaborated upon in racialized language. The coverage of savage African cannibals coexisted with denunciations of Hungarians, but lines of black-and-white for some came to seem the most salient identity markers. Whether as minstrel-show jokes or, more seriously, as victims of white-on-black urban race riots, African Americans continued to appear in immigrant newspapers, figuring as America’s ultimate pariahs.

In the final two chapters, we shall return to immigrants’ coverage of black Americans, first in minstrel-show distortion and then in violent competition for urban residential and economic resources.
New immigrants embraced many aspects of American popular culture in their quest to find a way to belong in their new homeland, and as with news reports of colonized Africans or lynched Southern blacks, some of the plays presented in immigrant parishes and clubs and at settlement houses carried racialized codes on who belonged. By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as South and East Europeans arrived by the millions, one of the most popular native American theater forms was the minstrel show. Blackface minstrel shows had first been presented by and for working-class whites in the 1830s, a time when urban artisans feared that industrialization was decreasing their standing as independent craftsmen and pillars of the virtuous republic, and relegating them to wage slavery. While early minstrel shows satirized the pretensions and hypocrisies of wealthy white urbanites as well, the buffoonery of Jim Crow in depictions of supposedly idyllic Southern plantations, and Zip Coon, the dandified urban black, were the characters who kept Irish, German, and native-born whites coming to the minstrel show. Satires of white foibles did not preclude mockery of minstrel “blacks” themselves, and many theatergoers who flocked to the minstrel show also witnessed or participated in anti-black riots such as Philadelphia’s 1834 Flying Horse Riots or New York’s 1863 Draft Riots in which at least 120 blacks were killed. Many minstrel-show patrons also embraced the Democratic Party, which was allied with slaveholding Southerners and, after the Civil War, the later regimes of Southern “Redemption” from “Negro Misrule” through disfranchisement and Jim Crow segregation. For early minstrel-show patrons, appreciation of stage blacks rarely translated into sympathy or common cause with real-life blacks.¹

By the late nineteenth century new immigrants embraced the form as well, and Slavs, Jews, and other newcomers avidly blacked up in order, as Michael Rogin has argued, to solidify their claims to a place in the white nation once the veneer of burnt cork was removed.² Minstrel shows became staples at Slovak parishes and social clubs, and, as for other groups, blackface plays paradoxically served to legitimize new immigrants’ claims to belong as “regular” (read “white”) Americans. On occasions when immigrants wished to present their right to
partake of American identity and celebrate patriotic holidays, and when they christened sites of ethnic pride, the celebrations often included a minstrel show in which new immigrants masqueraded as blacks, members of an even more benighted group.

As we’ve seen, Slovaks were not above denigrating European rivals in racialized terms, but by World War I Magyar bashing was sometimes accompanied by minstrel shows, conflating slighting comparisons to Magyars and blacks. In 1918 a Slovak from Brooklyn wrote to *Jednota* declaring, “Our people have had quite enough of this comedy!” The “comedy” that enraged him was the travesty of sitting in the same parish with both Magyars and Magyarones (Slovaks who had adopted Magyar as their first language). But Slovaks had finally succeeded in expelling the unwanted element. “Magyars and Magyarones are no longer welcome in our parish,” he informed the editor. “Now we can announce that our parish is purely Slovak, free of any filthy polluting Magyars.” The language of purity and filth in decades to come would almost exclusively be used in sneering reference to dirty *čierny* (blacks), who within three years of this letter would be singled out and barred from Philadelphia’s Slovak Hall (hostile treatment not even leveled at Magyars). But in Brooklyn on this instance ethnic distinctions between Slovaks and “filthy” Magyars were still made, even though within a few years such markers became less salient as more blacks moved North.

But the tale of Slovak triumphalism in Brooklyn isn’t over. In order to drive the message home, the parishioners had also founded the “Slovak American Citizens Club” to replace the former Hungarian-Slovak Citizens Club. To highlight this transformation, the writer cited the club’s “many noble intellectual deeds. Such as our St. Joseph’s young people’s organization, which presented its first ‘Minstrel Show’ in our Slovak Hall before more than a thousand people, and many more had to be turned away for lack of space. The young people sang and acted beautifully, such that everyone marveled it was really only their first performance. Thus this is only a glimpse at what kind of a future our youth have before them.” It is not clear which aspect of the Brooklynites’ new identity transformation—into Slovaks—into Americans—into citizens—the use of blackface was supposed to cement, but it indeed pointed to the future for many Slovak youth.

As Slovak anger at Magyarones—“the traitors to our Slovak language,” the Brookynite wrote—makes clear, language usage was central to many immigrants’ sense of identity. But if Magyar was unacceptable as an alternative in Brooklyn, we must wonder if blackface minstrelsy made the English language a little more palatable for those in the Slovak American Citizens’ Club, who very likely did not sing “Swanee River” in Slovak.

Slovaks and Rusyns of Passaic similarly objected to public displays of “Mongolian” flags (i.e. flags of the Kingdom of Hungary), but minstrel shows also were presented there by Greek Catholic churchgoing Rusyns as parish fundraisers and also as claims on the attention of the wider city. Tuxedo-clad performers commanded respect as they staged familiar minstrel jokes and
songs, for by the turn of the twentieth century minstrelsy had become domesticated as a symbol of respectable, middle-class gentility. Many YMCA’s and middle-class Protestant churches had minstrel clubs, and minstrel show sheet music was produced for an avid audience that performed such songs in the parlor, epicenter of the nurturing domestic haven from a heartless, industrializing, and suspect polyglot world. In this regard immigrant performances of minstrel shows were bids for legitimacy and acceptance from mainstream native-born white society; indeed, German and German-Hungarian Lutherans—no doubt facing perils of their own as suspect Teutonic enemy aliens—performed their own minstrel shows during and shortly after World War I at Passaic’s St. John’s Lutheran Church. And even most Slovaks and Rusyns, whether they liked it or not, were subjects of an enemy Kaiser. The easiest way for such enemy aliens to deflect attention from their ethnicity was to call attention to their ostensible racial consanguinity with other Americans. Blackface minstrel shows were an important, somewhat overlooked aspect in immigrants’ identity assertion and acculturation to the New World (see Figure 6-1).6

![Passaic minstrel show, circa 1919. Slovaks, Germans, Jews, and others dressed in tuxedos to establish claims to respectability, but in blackface—to assert claims to whiteness.](image)
Some second-generation German Americans in Philadelphia and elsewhere also chose minstrel shows as their premiere English-language productions. As early as 1897, the German American Freundschaft Club decided that its first-ever English-language theater piece had to be a minstrel show, thereby wedding their acculturation as Americans to a recognition of the salience of whiteness in the New World. This staging of German minstrelsy grew more frequent, Russell Kazal argues, as more African Americans arrived in Philadelphia during the Great Migration even as German Americans were stigmatized by the events of the Great War.7

Minstrelsy was a malleable practice that could even on occasion facilitate Slovak nationalism. In 1913 New Yorkský denník noted that Juraj Kazamek of New York had “stitched together a four-page songbook of Slovak songs for young schoolchildren.” Along with such predictable Slovak fair as the anthem “Hej, Slováci!” was “Starý Dzho,” “translated from the English ‘Old Black Joe.’” The question of which language to speak, which caused resentment of Magyarization, became less important if English and Slovak were both used, at least in part, to belittle an even less privileged group, African Americans.

While it is odd to see such songs rechristened as “Slovak songs,” by 1913 songs and plays taken from the minstrel stage had for years been employed by reformers to teach immigrant children about America. From the late 1880s settlements had made it one of their prime missions to Americanize the children of immigrants while valorizing ethnic gifts brought to America by the newcomers.9 But some lessons on America possessed a racial message as well. At settlement houses such as Christadora House on New York’s Lower East Side Jewish and Slavic (plus some Italian) children were enrolled in the Loyalty Club in 1898 and 1899. In this club they learned to sing tunes such as “Alabama Coon” and “Coal Black Coffee.” In 1907 other children sang “some patriotic songs . . . which brought back the memories of our forefathers,” and heard lectures on why the old immigration was superior to the new, but that once naturalized an immigrant became an American. Still, “coon songs,” which were popular mass entertainments performed by black as well as white blackface singers, helped acculturate immigrant children to the New World, as well.10

The Americanizing mission of settlement house workers was facilitated too through the staging of minstrel shows. As early as 1904 a minstrel club under the direction of “Mr. Edwards” met weekly at the East Side Settlement House in New York’s heavily Slavic and German Yorkville section.11 Back downtown, at Christadora House, as early as 1908 Jewish and Slavic children performed in plays such as The Nigger Night-School and Darktown on Parade, which, like citizenship classes, presumably told them much about becoming American. The Nigger Night-School featured “Dr. Solon Sloe, B.A., ph.D.,” and “his evening pupils,” all performed by actors with Jewish or possibly Slavic or Hungarian surnames. As on earlier minstrel stages, the pretensions of pompous, self-important blacks with grand titles were mocked. Black ministers, politicians, and shady businessmen had from the 1880s
similarly been the butt of cartoons in the humor magazine *Puck*, and the genealogy of such ridicule of blacks striving way over their supposed class “place” continued with the white comics on radio’s *Amos ‘n’ Andy* lampooning the Kingfish and the Fresh Air Cab Company. In 1908 the Christadora minstrel show was the entertainment sponsored by the settlement’s Washington Club, which performed the play at the Girls’ Hebrew Technical School on Saturday evening, April 4, 1908. Americanization and racial masquerade went hand in hand at the Washington Club, and ethnic institutions were enlisted in delivering lessons in the salience of whiteness.\(^{12}\)

As at the East Side Settlement downtown immigrants were regularly coached in the minstrel-show aspect of American identity. In 1912 the Settlement’s Boys’ Glee Club presented the “grand annual minstrel show,” indicating blackface had become a regular feature at the settlement. As in 1908 the show was presented at an ethnic venue, this time Hebrew Technical Hall, and the main parts—Bones, Zeke, Tambo, Skillets, Bingo, Brown, and Mr. Jones, interlocutor—were standard minstrel show clowns. The actors were Jewish immigrants or children of immigrants, and the chorus of “pickaninnies” likewise consisted of Jewish children. The regular minstrel show was followed by an intermission, after which an “extra feature—skeleton rag” was performed by “Mr. Jones and Skeletons.”\(^{13}\) In 1913, as noted in the last chapter, an original musical farce, *Mexicana*, was performed at the settlement house; Herman Martinson, Kate Schechter, and Irvin Tannenbaum sang the musical number, “Stand Back, You Swarthy Pagan!”\(^{14}\)

The 1915 presentation of *Darktown on Parade* may have been an even more elegant affair. The “minstrel sketch in one act by Mr. Charles D. Orth Jr.” was presented by the Senior Young Men’s Association of Christadora House at the Palm Garden. Actors with surnames such as Goldfarb, Weinberger, and Weiss impersonated pretentious blacks such as “Rastus Cornstalk, a Chauffeur and a Darktown Sport.” The action took place during a reception at Cornstalk’s house, an occasion to satirize black claims to a place in high society, a comedic situation even for immigrant actors at a settlement house. The actors also engaged in a double masquerade time-honored on the minstrel stage, for Irving Weinberger donned both burnt cork and a dress to portray Melinda Cornstalk, Rastus’s wife. Supposed threats to the status quo from racial as well as gender strivers were lampooned in Orth’s play, staged at a time when suffrage marchers were haunting Woodrow Wilson’s White House and the minds of many Americans.

As Alexander Saxton and W. T. Lhamon Jr. have noted, antebellum minstrel shows often combined class criticisms of the wealthy with portrayals of clownish black dandies and indolent plantation hands, and Orth continued this tradition in *Darktown on Parade*. Cornstalk’s guests “Sam Crowfoot,” “Mose Whitehouse,” “Jerry Hawkins,” and “Phoebe Snow” (like Melinda, portrayed by a man, Morris Goldfarb) mingle with the chauffeur’s employers, the millionaire “Morgan Vanderfeller” and his wife. The character was a swipe at three bosses in a play by Lower East Side Jews steeped in the union battles and socialist oratory of the
era. As Lhamon argues, in the antebellum theater the minstrel mask was often a pretext to critique the status quo and subvert capitalism’s verities, and not solely a diatribe at blacks. Evidently something of this tradition continued in 1910s New York. 

Moreover, the “order of songs, dances, and specialties” printed in the *Darktown on Parade* program indicates that the play was an opportunity to satirize many ethnic groups and show business genres. “Night Time Down in Dixie-Land” was followed a few numbers later by selections from “Pagliacci,” then “Everyone Sings Tipperary,” “Back to Carolina You Love,” “Chicken Reel Clog Dance,” and “Chinatown.” Robert C. Toll notes that early minstrel-show scripts were often loose collections of gags and musical numbers, and this may have been the case at Palm Garden that night in 1915 (see Figures 6-2 and 6-3).

Eric Lott has written on the ambivalent attitude antebellum working-class audiences expressed while watching minstrel shows. Along with racist mockery, increasingly Irish immigrant attendees projected onto blackface representations of slaves their longings for a supposedly idyllic life down South, far away from the time clock and encroaching factory system. Envy of course mixed with degradation, and desire rarely went so far as to spur minstrelsy’s audience to make working-class alliances in trade unions or other organizations with real-life captive blacks. Critiques of wealthy capitalists were aired, too, as in the Jewish immigrants’ later sendup of “Morgan Vanderfeller, millionaire,” in Orth’s *Darktown on Parade*. But at the end of the staged farce “black” assertions to citizenship rights by Zip Coon were mocked as ridiculous chimeras. I have argued a similar ambivalence toward blacks existed in Slovaks reading of lynchings in their newspapers—horror, titillation, racism, anger at the brutality of Americans—all these coexisted, with the less admirable of human emotions often winning out over time. Through their production of minstrel shows, East European immigrants likewise expressed a range of emotions. As with Lott’s 1850s Irish, Slovak immigrants, watching and performing minstrel shows in places such as Passaic and Brooklyn after finishing their 66-hour work week, engaged in a similar transference onto blacks of their envy for a mythical, carefree life.

Settlement house workers exhibited some ambivalence on race following World War I, for Jewish and Slavic immigrant children at the Christadora House continued in 1918 to perform minstrel shows through the house’s Northover Cadets, and featured “a monster minstrel show and dance” in 1922. But the house by 1925 also sponsored a “program of Negro poetry and music, with Countee Cullen and Harry T. Burleigh performing their own work. It seems as if the staff at Christadora House was by this point uncertain whether to satirize or celebrate America’s “Negro” heritage.

Already by the first decade of the twentieth century, however, Slavic immigrants had moved beyond a reliance on native-born reformers’ tutelage, and Slovak, Czech, and Croatian theater troupes were producing minstrel
**DARKTOWN ON PARADE**

A Minstrel Sketch in One Act

by

*Mr. Charles D. Orth Jr.*

Presented by the

Senior Young Men’s Association

of

Christadora House

PÅLM GARDEN

MAY 6, 1915

Scene: A Reception in Rastus Cornstalk’s House.

Time: The Present.

**CHARACTERS**

Rastus Cornstalk, a Chauffeur and a Darktown Sport ............ Tony Algis
Melinda Cornstalk, His Wife .................................. Irving Weinberger
Morgan Vanderfeller, a Millionaire, Rastus’ Employer .......... Henry B. Cohn
Mrs. Vanderfeller, His Wife .................................... Jack Weiss
Sam Crowfoot .................................................. Aaron Lindenthal
Mose Whitehouse .............................................. Friends of Rastus
Jerry Hawkins .................................................. Alex. Cooper
Phoebe Snow .................................................... Benjamin Gold

Men and Women Guests

---

**Figure 6-2:** Program, *Darktown on Parade*, a minstrel show performed by mostly Jewish children enrolled in the Christadora House Settlement on New York’s Lower East Side.
**Order of Songs, Dances, and Specialties**

1. Night-time Down in Dixie-land .......................... Chorus
2. I Wonder Who Wished Her On Me ....................... Tony Algis
3. Plankety-Plank ......................................... Tip Top Trio
5. Virginia Lee. Song and Dance .......................... Balsam, Harris and Chorus
7. Algermon .................................................. Irving W. Weinberger
8. Modern Dances ......................................... Miss Sophie Frank and Jack J. Reich
9. When You Wore a Tulip and I Wore a Big Red Rose ........... Goldfarb, Cooper and Chorus
10. A Little Love a Little Kiss. Violin Solo ............... Max Merksamer
11. Ventriloquist Act ...................................... Henry B. Cohn
12. Rose in the Bud ........................................ Jack Boyd
13. Back to Carolina You Love ............................. Dan Ferone and Chorus
14. Chicken Reel. Clog Dance .............................. Aaron Lindenthal
15. Chinatown ............................................ Benjamin Shor and Chorus
16. Rufe Johnson’s Harmony Band ......................... Christodora Octet and Chorus
17. Solo ....................................................... Louis Eichelbaum
18. Goodbye Girls, I’m Through ........................... Tony Algis and Chorus

**Produced under the Direction of**
Mr. Harry G. Treadwell, Mr. L. T. Getty

**Tip Top Trio:**
Tony Algis Dan Ferone
Walter Fisher

**Christodora Octet:**
Tony Algis Philip Algis
James Algis Paul Stellmach
H. Granzow A. Weintraub
W. Engleman

**Specialties:**
Max Merksamer Morris Cohn
Miss Sophie Frank Jack J. Reich
Irving Balsam Harry Harris

**Chorus:**
Lester Bachner Sam Norkeen
Louis Eichelbaum Harry Greenbaum
Adolph Reich Irving Tow
Hyman Goldberg Meyer Klein
Sam Goodman Jacob Jacobowitz
Maurice Geller Harry Schneider
Charles Scherzer Edward Gelb
Morris Thrush David Rosanofsky
H. Kornbluh Pincus Honig
Joseph Bratsky Henry D. Ellenbogen
Herman Moscowitz R. Lunney
J. Levy Arthur Kainarth
L. Figli Benjamin Schor
E. Katz

**Figure 6-3:** Second page of the program for *Darktown on Parade.*
extravaganzas in their own venues. Moreover, such productions were often regarded as celebrations and assertions of immigrants’ rightful place in the American community. Minstrel shows were performed at moments when immigrants asserted their normality and right to belong in America—at dedications of Slovak American Citizens’ Clubs, for settlement house Americanization clubs, on Fourth of July or other holidays, or, later, to dedicate servicemen’s memorials following World War II.

As with Christadora House programmers offering minstrel shows but also the poetry of the Harlem Renaissance, a similar ambivalence existed to blacks in some ethnic fraternal theater troupes. From the 1910s through the 1930s, the Czech-American Drama Society of Chicago offered village plays and comedies in the language of Prague as well as translations of classics, but also performed minstrel show numbers in English. Sheet music for “Old Black Joe,” “My Old Kentucky Home,” “Massa’s in the Cold, Cold Ground,” and even more offensive tunes were part of the society’s repertoire. The Czech actors performed a minstrel song, “Crowded Hole”; the hand-written lyrics and sheet music to this song were found among the theater troupe’s many Czech-language plays:

> Yonder comes a nigger with a sack on his back, Honey.
> Yonder comes a nigger with a sack on his back, Babe.
> Yonder comes a nigger with a sack on his back, Honey.
> 2nd: Nigger, fell down and busted sack, Honey.
> Nigger, fell down, broke the sack, Babe.—
> Nigger fell down and broke the sack,
> Daughter seen the crawdads backing back.²⁰

English-language acquisition, rightly regarded as a hallmark of immigrants’ acculturation to a new country, is here used to denigrate an even more marginal group and to learn one’s place as a white American.

The Chicago Czechs also performed an English-language play, The Night Riders, that was written by Frank Dumont in 1908. While the Night Riders, vigilantes closely akin to the Ku Klux Klan, had been deployed to terrorize black and white Republicans in the South during the Reconstruction Era, in Dumont’s play the targets of vigilante action are duplicitous white plantation owners. Nevertheless, the play script instructed actors that the “Night Riders” should “dress up like Ku Klux Klan; long white gowns, white masks with large holes for eyes, short white peaked caps like dunce caps.” The play also transposed stereotypes of shiftless and pretentious blacks from the minstrel stage; Czech actors were cast in Dumont’s play as “Uncle Solomon, an old darkey servant” and “Silas Stickney, a colored politician—very flashy coon politician; large checkers in trousers.” Stock characters familiar to minstrel-show patrons were adapted to the needs of Slavic immigrants.²¹
Other plays performed by the troupe may have been minstrel shows as well, although perhaps *Fox-Trott Molly* (*An American grotesque by L. MacDonald and R. Skeets*) was merely a sendup of American middle-class foibles. Still, some of the outlandish names of characters in this play—Archibald Ralph Wandersprout; Serafina Gramophon; Fifi Cheeks Maserka—are the kinds of mockeries of ludicrous black pretensions at middle-class respectability familiar to minstrel-show patrons. Another Czech play similarly had “swindler” and “bootlegger” characters named “Good Buy, professor,” “Jeannie Pumpkin,” and “Sylvie Rhubarb.”

As noted in the previous chapter, Czech American actors in Chicago as well as Saint Paul performed a Czech play, *Dceruška z Afriky*, written by Bretislav Ludvík in Prague in 1918. The exploits of the explorer and his African daughter were recycled for immigrant audiences, with belittling blackface tropes of cannibalism of the kind mass-produced for consumers in news reports and carnival, circus, and world’s fair publicity brochures and souvenir journals. Slovak actors in 1915 New York similarly donned blackface and savage costumes to perform as the Cannibal Symphony Orchestra in opening ceremonies at Slovak Hall, while Polish Sokols in Pennsylvania’s anthracite coal country masquerading as Filipino savages likely used burnt cork to lend “authenticity” to their performance. On the New York occasion the minstrel savages cavorted with a Charlie Chaplin impersonator, too, again suggesting that popular culture and mass entertainment often were enjoyed by immigrants in racialized contexts.

Not every depiction of blacks was this mocking. In Chicago the Czech actors performed an odd comedy of Czech immigrant timber workers in the Wisconsin forests, *All Right!* (The tag line is the only English phrase that one of the timber beasts understands.) The Czech characters speak a mix of pidgin English and Czech, although one worker seems to understand little or no Czech. When the workers decide to go back to Prague to look for “ženuška,” little women, this character wants to know if that’s something good to eat. Fortunately there is one character who can mediate between the bad Czech of some and minimal English of the others. Washington is described in the stage directions as “a lame, comic Negro,” but he seems to be one of the more dignified characters, and the foreman praises him as “very good labor.” He tells Joe, the character who hopes to eat “ženuška,” that his friend will “go back to Europe for a wife—ženuška—get it?” He adds in perfect Czech, “You need to study your Czech a little closer.”

For their part the immigrants accept Washington as one of their own, since he has spent so much time in “Little Bohemia” that his Czech is better than that of the American-born Joe. The real butt of the humor in *All Right!* seems to be the immigrants who are having a hard time adjusting to the New World. “James,” a Czech greenhorn, speaks nothing but Czech except for “All Right!” which he enthusiastically exclaims whenever a whiskey bottle is near. In the end Washington accompanies his friends back to Prague as they search for wives.

As Lhamon has argued, early blackface characters used the minstrel mask not simply to mock slaves or free blacks, but as a guise under which satirical
commentary on many aspects of industrial society could be expressed. While a
Czech immigrant likely used burnt cork to portray Washington, and the instruc-
tions “a comic lame Negro” left some room for anti-black buffoonery, this play
seems to portray greenhorns as more comical than black fellow workers.26

In a similar vein, Slovak writers employed the figure of a black porter to turn a
greenhorn into the butt of a joke about the credulity of unwary newcomers. At the
train station in Braddock, Pennsylvania, runs this 1921 item on New Yorkský denník’s
humor page, a black porter who had lived among the Slovaks for years, spied a
newly arrived Slovak lady. He went over to her and said in Slovak, “So, my dear,
where are you from?” After she gets over her amazement at a black man talking in
Slovak, she asks where he’s from. When he replies, “Same as you, honey, I’m from
Humenne,” she finds this impossible, because she knows Humenne, and not even
the Gypsies are this black. “Look, my dear countrywoman,” he replies. “I’ve been
in America twelve years already, and I’ve had it so hot the whole time that I’ve
become completely black. If you stay in America twelve years, you’ll become
completely black, too.” “And with that our black fellow countryman went on his
way.” This joke seems to be a mockery of greenhorns ostensibly horrifi ed that
there are black people on the earth, but also a cautionary tale of how “hot” new-
comers to industrial America found factory work. A warning is delivered that
Slavs, like blacks—“same as you”—would fi nd discrimination in steel towns of
America. As for Lhamon’s pre-Civil War minstrels, a black face sometimes permit-
ted biting commentary on wider social issues.27

In Chicago evidently members of the Czech-American Dramatic Society shared
in class-conscious militancy prevalent in many immigrant communities. Czechs
here performed translations of plays of workers’ struggles such as Gerhart
Hauptmann’s The Weavers and others by Zola, Dumas, and Shaw, and sang hom-
egages to “The First of May,” even if they also performed a “Haiti Ballad” that ignored
the U.S. Marines’ occupation of that island.28 Perhaps it is not surprising, then, that
the company also performed a Czech-language play, When Slavery Was in Bloom in
America, which celebrated the quixotic battle of John Brown. Rebecca Hill has
noted that the abolitionist who raided the federal armory at Harpers Ferry in
1859 has since his hanging been alternately stigmatized as a fanatic and lionized
as a martyr to abolitionism. But in the decades since the Civil War, she notes, it
was only African Americans and radicals who unequivocally embraced Brown as
a hero, while other commentators developed a selective squeamishness toward
the use of violence in furtherance of a political goal.29

In Chicago in the 1920s and 1930s, however (and no more precise date for the
staging of this play can be ascertained from the Czech-American Dramatic Soci-
ety’s records) Czechs performed a Czech-language play in which Brown is cele-
brated and a blackface Frederick Douglass articulated the justice of the
abolitionist cause, even as he tries to talk Brown out of his suicide mission.

The play has characters question the “civilized” nature of American society,
and Brown himself cautions about relying on the legal system and well-meaning
politicizing to bring about change. When a character praises Abraham Lincoln, Brown says,

There’s still a long way to go yet. Abraham Lincoln is an especially good lawyer. But what now passes for our law is an evil that has roots as deep as hell as far as the black man’s concerned. Slavery is a hydra. The Southern states are able to fight for slavery and I have no wish for the United States to suffer from a civil war. I am sure that it is possible to lead a rebellion against slavery, and that my way is right. . . . And without shedding one drop of blood.

Lincoln’s fan points out the unlikelihood of a bloodless revolution, countering Brown’s assertion by asking, “By leading a foray that will cause a nationwide armed slave insurrection?” Indeed, the historical Brown was no pacifist, but the play is unusual for the immigrant theater in presenting a sympathetic portrayal of blacks and their plight. Even a critique of lynching makes it into this play, when prior to Brown’s hanging a Virginia soldier suggests that maybe he should just lynch Brown. When a lynch mob develops on the day of the hanging and terrorizes the surrounding countryside, Gallagher, a reporter for the New York Herald, exclaims, “What? Who was hanged? Lynching? Oh, you say lynching? Gosh. History will remember it with sauce. Lynching in the newspapers, the top spice.” As noted in Chapter 2, lynching accounts were “the top spice” of many newspapers, Slovak journals included, and Gallagher’s comments may have called to mind for his immigrant audience ongoing white terrorism against blacks in the 1920s and 1930s. Later in the play Gallagher tells Robert E. Lee, the army officer who captured Brown, “Following this terror came the worst violence by thousands of marauders.” A grim Colonel Lee replies, “For a long time we won’t be able to suppress [nepobavili] these serious lynchings. The devil take it.” While one would have preferred to see the condemnation of lynching come from Frederick Douglass or one of the play’s black slave characters, the Czech version of John Brown, “a play in three acts on the historical battle against slavery,” is a sympathetic portrayal of blacks and their plight that is rare in the immigrant theater.

The socialist Slovak newspaper Rovnost tudy similarly offered praise to John Brown as part of its ongoing feature on counterhegemonic news “from American history.” Brown was praised for his effort to win “liberation from slavery.” Such depictions were rare outside the socialist press, however. And on the immigrant stage unfortunately other performances were less complimentary to blacks and more directly drawn from minstrel-show traditions. Slovaks of Trescow, near Hazleton, Pennsylvania, in 1909 gave notice in Jednota of a “grand picnic” slated for the July Fourth holiday, and promised “good entertainment,” including “base-ball, target shooting, nigger minstrels, and contests between known sportsmen.” The minstrels likely were blackface immigrant performers, for while African American actors in 1909 did tour in blackface, often appearing as
adjuncts to circuses, the Trescow affair was a Slovak-run celebration. As on other festive occasions celebrating American holidays, blackface was on this instance regarded as a necessary component of the patriotic program.32

Other plays performed at Slovak parishes, published in the Slovak press, express the desire of immigrants to perform the role of regular Americans. Plays such as Cesta k americkemu občianstvu (The Road to American Citizenship) were published by Denník Slovák v Amerike and Národný kalendár as early as 1897, while 40 years later, by now second-generation Slovaks and Rusyns at Philadelphia’s Holy Ghost Greek Catholic Church were still performing a self-mocking Grinorka (The Greenhorn). The play contains no black characters, instead mocking the immigrants’ own comical process of acculturation—although with some digs at “Tony the Italian Iceman.” On the bill that evening, though, was also a selection of American songs by a parish quartet—including that minstrel standby, “My Old Kentucky Home.”33

Such bricolage, appropriating bits of racialized American culture into immigrant productions, had occurred even earlier. In 1918 “greenhorn” plays had also been twinned with “McDonough’s Jass Band Orchestra,” in which musicians with Irish and Slavic surnames performed in blackface. Letter writers from Luzerne and Larksville, Pennsylvania, recounted for Jednota the performances of the same play, V Službe (At Your Service.) This comedy of immigrant foibles in the New World contained no black characters, although it did include “An Italian, seller of fruits, books and fish, also a vagabond,” performed by Ján Kester in Luzerne and Jozef Benkovsky in Larksville. But the production was accompanied by the blackface syncopators. 34 Greenhorns were set along the road to Americanism, if not exactly citizenship, by a process of blackface, and reading of blackness in black and white.

These racial masquerades occurred around the time famed actors such as Al Jolson performed the same feat in vaudeville, on Broadway, and then in 1927’s The Jazz Singer, and as Matthew Frye Jacobson and Michael Rogin note, the audience no longer notices Jakie Rabinowitz’s Jewishness under the obviously sham blackface, but rather his whiteness. The babushkas of Brooklyn likewise were lost beneath burnt cork. Newspaper accounts of “Negrov lynčovanie” were perhaps forgotten, too, in the fun-filled evening of beautiful singing and acting.35

I do not mean glibly to label such performances as simply racist. By 1918, the minstrel show was a staple of American popular culture, and Slovak newcomers also internalized this entertainment as a further step in their assimilation, something one did to become an American—at least of the white variety. As noted, the minstrel show was often seen as a marker of middle-class respectability (again, at least for white performers in church socials or comfortable parlor sing-alongs). The tuxedoed Passaic Rusyns performing at St. Michael’s auditorium at least partially saw a route to legitimacy in such stagings—but legitimacy came at a price of another, excluded group that was the “original” of the masquerade. Americans loved minstrel shows in the very years that real blacks were excluded...
from any meaningful integration with whites, even in Northern venues such as New Jersey.36

Some immigrants surely gave little thought to the status of blacks as they performed with minstrel bands, for there were other motives for enjoying minstrelsy. Jazz, too, by 1918 was a popular culture form avidly consumed by Slavs and Irish in Larksville and Luzerne and thousands of other towns; as Eric Lott, John Strausbaugh, and Lhamon have noted, the “love and theft” (to borrow Lott’s phrase) of “black” culture (in authentic and inauthentic minstrel forms) has been an ongoing process of almost simultaneous envy and scorn since the 1830s. Slavs in McDonough’s “jass” combo had a variety of motives for blacking up— including pleasure and perhaps financial gain.37

The “readings” of minstrelsy may not have been univocal, even within the head of a single Slovak. As Lott has argued regarding the antebellum audience at blackface minstrel shows, desire for the supposed liberty of pre-industrial labor embodied in stage “slaves,” as well as more carnal desire for the “black” body, coexisted with a biting and savage mockery of the racialized underclass held in bondage. Elite Northern Whig abolitionists, perceived as hypocritical, were also satirized in these minstrel shows. Then, too, notes of pity crept into the audience’s reaction, at least when minstrelsy merged with “Uncle Tom” shows. But in the years in which Slovaks and other Slavs—like other white Americans—were engaged in minstrelsy, other references to the fate of real blacks, as lynching victims, subjugated colonial captives, despised American outcasts, permeated immigrant newspapers. Thus an immigrant donning blackface may have simultaneously experienced thrill at the comic fun; terror when he considered that he had read of the lynching of real blacks; contempt for the hapless victim who had exhibited his lack of manhood by “allowing” himself to be hung; repugnance at the brutality of Amerikansky engaged in this barbaric ritual; and a sober awareness that a similar fate might await Slovaks if they weren’t careful. All these emotions and more may have contended, until repetition, and years of residence in the racialized United States, taught the reader which sentiment it was preferable win out.38

Another cultural artifact in which Slovaks would make their mark, the New Year’s Mummers’ Parade in Philadelphia, was also at times an occasion for racialized mockery. Competing in the 1916 parade were marchers dressed as blackface “Zulus,” although early entrants were also often apt to portray stock vaudeville Germans in their musical masquerades. As we saw in the previous chapter, tropes of savage Zulus were often employed in immigrant newspapers. While the parading “Zulus” harkened back to these journalistic and side-show models, elements of blackface had been employed before the rise of the side-show and minstrelsy in carnivalesque revelries such as those employed by Mummers. Indeed, the founder of the most successful Mummer string band, the Slovak Philadelphian, Joseph Ferko, knew of other blackface traditions from his family’s homeland. Christmastime jasličkari likewise donned blackface to impersonate the Čert (devil) or hairy Father Winter figures as they went door to door begging holiday alms.
In Philadelphia, though, such costumes were eventually adopted for the Mum-mer’s Parade to satirize African Americans.39 Even before the “Zulu” marchers stepped down Broad Street, Slovaks in Philadelphia and elsewhere consumed blackface humor courtesy of their newspapers. Rip and Račik, the humor duo of Slovák v Amerike, often accompanied their banter with illustrations of a grinning, simple-minded minstrel-show black. The jokes sometimes have no overtly racial component, as in one 1903 column, where Rip says, “Hello, kinsman! I see that you’ve shot yourself in the arse! How’d you do it?” “Indeed, with great difficulty, my kinsman!” Račik replies, and then the black minstrel fool appears.40 Three years later an identical minstrel image of a black buffoon accompanied another humor column, Godfather Švablik from Kakašovec, where the old country curmudgeon argues in broken Slovak over whether he has been properly tutored in English, and if he isn’t really a Persian in disguise. The joke is interrupted, however, when Godfather notices that “the black porter has just arrived, like this,” at which point the minstrel image reappears.41 A third iteration of the minstrel face accompanied a 1907 item in a humor column concerning black islanders that began, “I heard it said one day, in an account of Africa, that there’s an island there, on which there live the blackest people on earth, and these blackamoors had the blackest luck” (see Figure 6-4).42

Perhaps the minstrel image merely symbolized the introduction of bad vaudeville humor, but, if this was the case, the black caricature appeared in a newspaper permeated by race. Rosyln Poignant has noted that the same illustrations (literally

**Figure 6-4:** A minstrel-show black cartoon accompanied several items in humor columns. This one is from the “Rip and Račik” humor column in Slovák v Amerike, July 7, 1903, 3. That same day, the paper ran three news items of lynchings on page two.
stereotyped) of cannibals appeared in multiple news accounts of traveling side-
shows as well as news stories of cannibals, establishing a ready template for white
consumers of a standard image of black savagery. Likewise, the same grinning
black fool appeared interchangeably in Slovak papers, whenever an African
American was mocked, and sometimes even when he was not. In either case the
stereotype of a simple black buffoon was etched on the immigrant paper’s pages.
And on July 7, 1903, the day when the minstrel black followed Rip and Račik’s
first quip, three lynching stories appeared on the previous page. The immi-
grant newspaper offered a palimpsest of race in a variety of contexts, not all of
them humorous.

Humor items mocking blacks grew more pointed following World War I, a
time when more blacks were migrating into Northern cities, places where Slovaks
and other new immigrants encountered them. As Kazal has noted, anti-black
cartoons began to appear in German newspapers in Philadelphia during the
1920s, a decade when some German Philadelphians took steps to keep blacks out
of their neighborhoods and parishes. Similarly, in the 1920s, New Yorkský denník
ran many black jokes on the paper’s humor page. An item headlined “That’s
enough of the blacks” has a mother asking her son, “Joey, weren’t you told yester-
day that God gave us our daily bread?” “Little sonny” answers, “Hey mom, but I
told him that we’ve given it all to the whites, just like before the war!” As we’ll
see in the following chapter, blacks were indeed forced to “give back” any prom-
ise of equality hinted at during World War I, as whites attacked blacks in urban
race riots in Chicago, Omaha, Tulsa, and other places. This joke may have been
a sardonic comment on the plight blacks faced during years in which racial sub-
odnation was reimposed on blacks.

Other jokes, however, employed slurs of supposed blacks’ oversexed and
unclean features. In one joke, contributed by a “native of Uzhorod,” in present-
day Ukraine, a black lady with a small child boards a streetcar in Cleveland and
sits not far from the conductor. “All at once the child began to cry, and no lullaby
dissuaded him, he only bellowed some more. The black lady took out her breast
and gave it to the infant, which still turned away and wept. At this the wrathful
black woman shouted to the child. ‘Hey, if you don’t take the breast, I’ll call the
conductor, damn it!’ The conductor grew all red, but didn’t take up the black
woman’s offer.” A newcomer from Uzhorod was in 1921 mocking a black woman’s
streetcar faux pas. One wonders if her urban neighbors similarly mocked a green-
horn’s ineptitude on the “strit kar.”

Other jokes have a “nigger” asking his son why he doesn’t go swimming with
the white boys. “Because, Papa, they were white before they went swimming, and
they want to stay white.” The joke, contributed by a Slovak who signed himself
“Šťrbanška” (“Toothless”), is not all that funny considering that young black
Chicagoans had recently been stoned by a white mob enraged when they drifted
too near a whites-only beach, triggering the 1919 race riot. But the joke of con-
tamination of whites due to swimming with blacks speaks to developing white
ethnic phobias of supposed pollution. It should be noted, however, that by 1923 this stereotype of black uncleanliness was supplied to the humor column by a Slovak, not merely accepted from the wider white society. A Sicilian immigrant similarly noted for the present author that in New Brunswick, New Jersey, a public swimming pool “had to” be closed in the 1950s when blacks sued for the right to swim with other residents.49

Another joke contributed by “Edna from Scranton” plays to post-World War I fears of blacks with military training, apprehensions that, as we’ll see in the following chapter, were expressed in relation to the Chicago riot. Edna’s joke perhaps defused for her readers the fear of such black combat veterans. Headlined “I knew the role well,” the joke tells of a black soldier on guard. “When he saw an approaching officer, he hollered ‘Halt!’ The officer stopped and said, ‘OK’ and started back on his way. But a few moments later the nigger again screamed halt! ‘You’ve stopped me a second time,’ the officer said. ‘I’d like to know what you’re going to do next.’ ‘Just so you know,’ said the nigger, ‘my orders are holler halt three times and then shoot.’”50

Another joke explicitly questioned blacks’ full personhood, albeit in a “humorous” context. This item, too, was forwarded by a Slovak contributor, “Damsel,” whose joke was headlined “On creatures, and why the Negro is black.” “When God created the first man in the far-off times the devil loved to watch him, and wondered at it, that such a nice, white man was created by God in the image of God. And then the devil set to thinking on it, and thought that he’d like to shape for himself such a nice man, too.” So the devil set to work creating a man in his image, but “when his work was done, he saw that the man created by God was a nice white color, whereas his was all black. So he went up to him and slapped him one on the butt. Very quickly the black began to cry, and therefore the devil began stroking his head, telling him not to weep.”

Damsel offered this moral to her story: “The Negro therefore is black because he was created by the devil, and all his works from that time on are so feverishly blackened [černala], his hair was singed [oškvrnely] by the devil’s hot hands and therefore he has ever after been stained by where the devil laid his hands, and has always been lacking.”51

Even at the socialist paper, Rovnost ľudu, the editors by 1925 could run odd cartoons of blacks’ supposed foibles, even as they maintained a stance deploring lynching and colonialism. An English-language cartoon concerns the exploits of “Squire Edgegate.” A lawyer tells his black bootlegger client, “Frogeye,” “You told me you were innocent, and I was able so to convince the squire—Now what do you think my services were worth?” The stereotypically shiftless, lying bootlegger replies, “Mistah Stone, Ise broke flatter’n a pancake. But ah kin bring you a quart ob dat liquor Ise bin sellin for leben dollars.” To find this cartoon minstrelsy here among calls for an end to lynching is lamentable.52

The black-white divide was naturalized to the extent that jokes in Negro dialect were an accepted part of the English pages of immigrant papers, which by the
1940s were seeking to recruit or retain second-generation readers. An English-language panel cartoon in *Národné noviny*, “Our Neighborhood,” has children rummaging around in a garbage dump. “Oh, boy! A Sambo Doll!” one boy exclaims (see Figure 6-5).53 While another English-language cartoon that ran in *Národné noviny*, “Teddy Ronson,” featured a black teen who joined white comrades in fighting crime, there were no black faces in “our neighborhood,” just as by 1941 many white ethnics in Detroit, Chicago, and a variety of other cities resisted black residential incursions.54

*Amerikansky russky viestnik* turned to even more scathing minstrel caricatures on its English-language humor pages. In 1943, one item, headlined simply “HUMOR,” presented a joke Rusyns could have heard on their radio if they
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**Figure 6-5:** Comic strip, “Our Neighborhood.” *Národné noviny*, July 2, 1941, 6. During the early 1940s, English-language features ran in ethnic newspapers in a bid to retain second-generation readers. The jokes, though, were sometimes at blacks’ expense. “Oh, boy! A Sambo doll!”
turned to *Amos ‘n’ Andy*. “‘Breddern an’ sistahs,’ said the visiting colored preacher. ‘Ah’s got a five dollar sermon and a two dollar sermon, and a one dollar sermon. De deacons will now pass de plate, and Ah will know which o’ dem dis congregation wishes to hear.’” Such English-language items, designed to retain American-born members as part of the Rusyn community, served too to bind the immigrants as part of a wider white community (see Figure 6-6).

By 1943 such minstrel humor had been an ingrained feature of immigrant journals’ humor pages for decades. Other jokes in the early 1920s had featured tales “from the days of slavery,” in which a slave, told to “fix the roof,” laughs at his master: “You bought me for $50? Man, you could easily have gotten an Irishman to do the same job for two bucks!” While arguably this was a gibe at the Irish, it must be recalled that in other issues illustrations of grinning minstrel blacks punctuated jokes at blacks’ expense in the very editions in which multiple lynchings were reported. In discounting suggestions of Polish anti-black racism, Thaddeus Radzialowski says such black stereotypes and jokes were a staple of the early twentieth century and in Polish papers were importations from mainstream, English-language culture. No doubt they were in the Slovak press, too, although as noted some jokes employing well-circulated anti-black gibe were contributed by Slovak readers. But unlike in Polish papers, where Radzialowski says anti-American and anti-Irish jokes also appear, in *New Yorkský denník* such jokes are absent. Jokes in which Jews and Gypsies are targeted ran in Slovak papers, but, while lamentable, of course these groups were familiar to East Europeans, while minstrelsy traditions were learned and conveyed after arrival. And as we’ll see, such jokes at blacks’ expense ran in a decade in which ferocious anti-black riots broke out in many Northern cities, atrocities that were never systemically directed at Jews, Italians, or other white ethnics, for all the anti-immigrant animus that such newcomers faced in America.

In considering minstrelsy and the appearance of black “humor” in the immigrant press, context is important—and offstage, as we’ll see in the following chapter, from the 1910s Slavic whiteness was naturalized as a hardening anti-black animus occurred. While *The Jazz Singer* is often regarded as the last gasp of acceptable white ethnic use of blackface, evidently news of its demise never reached many Slovak First Wards. Ann Douglas has argued, “Inevitably, the return of the black musical to Broadway, inaugurated by *Shuffle Along* in 1921, spelled the decline of white blackface, and hence of Jolson himself.” This argument may hold for Broadway, but Michael Rogin has demonstrated the enduring life blackface enjoyed in Hollywood well past World War II. Regarding live theater versions of minstrelsy, Douglas likewise fails to consider the degree to which amateur “provisional white people” living far from the Great White Way continued to use blackface minstrelsy to solidify their racial identity through the 1940s and even into the modern civil rights era.

As Lott, Rogin, David Roediger, and James Barrett have documented, “inbetween peoples” newly arrived from Europe often solidified their racialized place
in their new homes via insidious comparisons to African Americans through such productions as minstrel shows. Indeed, minstrel shows continued to be staples of Slovak parishes, fundraisers that helped solidify the community financially, emotionally—and racially. Even in the 1950s such shows were advertised in the immigrant press and were prominent entertainments at church gatherings.60
At Most Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church in Yonkers, from 1920 until 1962 Slovaks performed in an annual minstrel show, which Thomas Shelley writes “was a powerful unifying force in the parish and a source of great pride to the parishioners.” I would argue that the shows were also “a powerful unifying force” for Slovak parishioners’ sense of white entitlement, as well as a force in establishing new immigrants’ American identity, too. Part of that American identity was learning to think of one’s self as white, and Slovak theater played a role here as well. In the Yonkers Slovak community the minstrel show raised money for the parish, inaugurated the new parish school building in 1926, and played before standing-room-only crowds at the school’s 1,300-seat auditorium. Ads printed in the minstrel-show program generated income for the ethnic parish. While during the Depression receipts from the blackface performances fell off, and in 1936 “the profits from the well-attended Minstrel Show amounted to only $1,500,” the festivities rebounded with better times. The minstrel extravaganza was expanded to two nights, and avid consumers of blackface even paid a dollar apiece to attend dress rehearsals (children were admitted for 50 cents.) Shelley argues that the shows were an important forum in which Slovak parishioners learned American popular culture by performing songs such as “Rose Marie” and “The Indian Love Call,” or tried out a few tentative dance steps to the fox trot.61

While Shelley’s emphasis is on the fun and communal warmth generated by the Yonkers minstrel show, he omits any consideration of the racialized component of these festivities. To be sure, it is impossible to gauge the meaning every attendee or performer took away from the annual blackface shows, but, while the minstrels continued at Holy Trinity, many Slovaks began in the 1950s to resist the incursion of blacks into their city neighborhoods, picketing proposed public-housing sites. When one of the chief employers of Yonkers Slovaks, the Alexander Smith Carpet Company, in 1954 threatened to move to Greenville, Mississippi, unless it won wage concessions, a Slovak woman characterized the demand with reference to another minority. “Greenville for coolie wages. Not us.” Another historian of Yonkers Slovaks argues that when the demographics of the city changed, parishioners were forced to abandon their beloved minstrel show. Slovaks familiar with the blackface tradition employed racial tropes as well as the language of victimization to characterize their lives.62

Of course, as noted in Chapter 5, even six decades earlier, Yonkers Slovaks had characterized the injustice of being assigned German or English priests as a fate only fitting for “Kaffirs or Zulus of Africa,” not “U.S. citizens.” Distinctions between blacks and whites—even provisional ones such as Slovaks—were paramount for many newcomers to America.63

Elsewhere in the country, Slovaks continued to perform minstrel shows through the 1930s and 1940s, and proudly pointed to such performances as symbols of the elite culture on display at ethnic parishes. Parishioners at Saint Francis Slovak Catholic Church in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, performed such
shows in the 1930s; moreover, a Slovak informant in the 1980s provided a photograph of one such performance to an ethnographer as an emblem of the elite productions that bound second-generation East Europeans to ethnic institutions even as they were acculturating to American mores. The naturalization of immigrants as white Americans continued to go uninterrogated well into the 1980s. The photograph appears in a section of a masterful study of this steel city's East Europeans that discusses the Americanization of Rusyns, Poles, Slovaks, and others. But nowhere in an otherwise insightful account of the city's Slavs is a linkage made between the embrace of whiteness and their Americanization.64

In 1947 young Lutheran Slovaks of New Kensington, Pennsylvania, were praised for offering “a beautiful theatrical presentation, a ‘minstrel show’ . . . . There will be a lot of humor and laughing, so everyone will feel good.” By 1947 other residents of the Pittsburgh area were organizing to break the segregated barriers that prevented black equality, even in the North, but Slavic minstrelsy continued to be celebrated.65 Likewise, Wilkes-Barre Rusyns performed a minstrel show at St. Mary of the Assumption Greek Catholic Church as late as 1949, a graphic example of Slavic immigrants grotesquely blacking up to emphasize their whiteness. Any horror these immigrants may have felt when reading of lynchings had been supplanted by, or at best uneasily coincided with, an assertive whiteness. Moreover, the minstrel show was still pointed to with pride 39 years later as parishioners prepared the church’s hundredth-anniversary souvenir journal, where a photo of the minstrel show appears as a representation of “parish plays.” Race has often been omitted from the immigrant narrative, regarded as something having little to do with how immigrants and second-generation white ethnics acculturated to America. But such telling traces as the mementos of these parish galas suggest the color line was a salient marker for East Europeans’ acculturation as Americans.66

Nor were Slovaks alone. By 1930 minstrelsy was big business, and T. S. Denison’s and other companies mass-produced minstrel-show scripts, costumes, and accessories for amateur thespians. Many of the patrons of this phenomenon were immigrants and second-generation white ethnics. In 1945 Scranton high school students performed a “Musical Americana,” which included the blackface “Licorice Quartet” and three other minstrel acts. In Lawrence, Massachusetts, Lithuanians at Saint Francis’ Roman Catholic Church in 1945 staged a minstrel show to raise money for the erection of a servicemen’s memorial. Even Chicago’s Croatian socialists, who otherwise presented plays extolling Proudhon, the 1870 Paris Communards, and 1930s unionization battles, unemployed people’s councils and sit-down strikes, presented minstrel shows and “darky” plays. Croatian immigrant actors of the “Nada” theater troupe in the 1930s performed plays such as The Starvation Army, a Labor Play on Unemployment and The Forgotten Man from the Brookwood Labor College, and English-language plays from the Rebel
Minstrel Shows

Arts League of the Socialist Party that included “Negro plays” by Langston Hughes.

Another play, *Miners*, written in 1926 by Bonchi Friedman, a student at the Brookwood Labor College who was a member of Local 248 of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, had a cast including “An All-Devouring Capitalist” and a “A Kleagle” arrayed against comradely Polish and “Negro” miners. This would suggest at least some radical ethnics endeavored to treat the plight of American blacks seriously on the stage.\(^{67}\)

But the Croatian actors also performed minstrel shows such as *Down on the Levee*, procured from T. S. Denison’s *Blackface Plays*. The book *Everything for Your Minstrel Show*, which the Croatian actors also had ordered, provided instructions on the proper performance of minstrel shows for amateurs, and promised, “Denison’s Minstrel First Parts have put NEW LIFE into the MINSTREL FIELD. Our staff of Professional Writers have met the demands of a New Age.” Slavic immigrants were willing consumers of this genre, breathing new life into the minstrel field in the 1930s and beyond.

Denison’s book also included a list of props, costumes, and makeup available for order, such as a comic prop razor, “for what blackface show is complete without the cullud man’s favorite weapon?” Denison’s offered to the Croatians—and other amateur actors—an array of clownish blackface skits “expertly arranged and ready to use, for the convenience of inexperienced amateur minstrel directors and others seeking a modern, properly constructed first-part.” The company promised that, “These books will prove the salvation of the many amateur minstrel troupes which lack the personal counsel and guidance of an experienced director.” Makeup and props were offered for sale, too, such as a “Negro Fright Wig” and a “Negro Mammy Wig,” which the catalogue promised was “Very natural and woolly and has the real ‘Swanee Ribber’ appearance.” Of its quality tambourines, Denison’s catalogue writer asserted, “A minstrel show without tambourines is like a Thanksgiving celebration without turkey.” As with Lithuanians raising money for a patriotic servicemen’s memorial, this example suggests that East Europeans’ expressions of American patriotism and support of ethnic institutions cannot so easily be disentangled from U.S. binaries of race. Even Croatian socialist immigrants could not subsist solely on plays about sit-down strikes and turned to minstrelsy for fun (see Figures 6-7, and 6-8).\(^{68}\)

In other lands, too, blackface satirization of rustic Africans, as well as blackface sendups of pretentious blacks ridiculed for putting on elite airs, were employed to assert a nationalist identity. Jill Lane has documented the use of blackface satires during the nineteenth century as part of a growing sense of (white) Cuban identity in opposition to continuing *peninsulare* rule by Spain. As in the United States, the popularity of blackface theatrical performances did not preclude a hardening segregation of actual black citizens. Patriotism, parish
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All-Around Opening Chorus; Rhythm of the Tambourine; An Old Kentucky Lullaby; Black Cat Blues; The Minstrel Strut; Linda; Lucky Sam; There's a Kiss in the Middle of Dixie; Rattle 'Em Bones; Song of the Levee; Ghost of the Minstrel Show; Finale (with Opening Chorus).
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OLD VIRGINIA SONG PROGRAM
Seven-Eleven Opening Chorus; Gwine to Heaven Some Day; Oh, How I'm Longing for You; Chick, Chick, Chicken; Any Place in Dixie Is Home, Sweet Home to Me; Henpecked Sam; Minstrel Man's Dream; Lucy Jackson's Man; My Girl of Twilight Dreams; Playing Poker; Take Me Back to Tennessee; Finale (with Opening Chorus).
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Figures 6-7 and 6-8: T. S. Denison’s *Everything for Your Minstrel Show* enabled amateur actors such as Chicago’s Croatians to inject “NEW LIFE” into their minstrel shows. As Denison’s book declared, “A minstrel show without tambourines is like a Thanksgiving celebration without turkey.”
fundraising, and acceptance as a white man were all hastened by an embrace of blackface.69

* * *

Recently some scholars have argued that depictions of minstrel shows as profoundly racist cultural productions are ahistorical and miss the satirical component of such early, antebellum shows. Indeed, Lhamon at times goes further, arguing for a subversive, ribald alliance between black and white demimonde performers and patrons of early minstrel shows, who targeted the real enemy and butt of the humor, an upper class imposing a new industrial capital order on reluctant wage earners losing their standing in the early republic. Lhamon cites many satirical early minstrel scripts in support of his argument that more than mockery of lazy plantation slaves or pretentious or ludicrous urban black dandies was at work in early evocations to jump Jim Crow.70

Certainly much was contained under the blackface mask that upset the status quo, and more than racism was at play in the liberatory energy of early stage performers. Nevertheless, by the time Slavs and other new immigrants arrived in America, any subversive potential to blackface—at least for cross-racial alliances—had been anaesthetized if not eviscerated by the violent imposition of segregated Jim Crow statutes, lynching, and disfranchisement. By 1900, minstrel shows occurred, simply put, not in a void where satire spoke truth to power, but in a profoundly racist society.

And the minstrel shows and jokes that Slovaks and other new immigrants read and performed likewise appeared in a surround of racial messages hardly subversive of the segregated, Jim Crow status quo. In the very issues of newspapers that have Rip and Račík tell minstrel jokes, lynchings are reported, in stories that announce as uninterrogated reality the sexual licentiousness of black libertines and the acceptance of vigilante justice when white mobs burned black offenders alive. Croatians purchasing minstrel scripts featuring razors—“every cullud man’s favorite weapon”—contributed little to lower-class white-black solidarity. Minstrel shows were performed in some Slovak parishes into the 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s, during a time when white ethnic anger at black migration into Northern city neighborhoods exploded into race riots. Indeed, the 1910s and 1920s heyday of minstrel shows as fundraisers and community celebrations at immigrant parishes already coincided with a spate of white-on-black race riots. It is the impossibility of separating the minstrel show as “just” a play from its larger racial surround that I have hoped to suggest here. The Slovak immigrant press, for example, abounded with slighting coverage of African cannibals as well as frequent accounts of black lynchings at home, in the very years that the minstrel show was enacted on many Slovak parish stages. The minstrel show was only one layer of a palimpsest of race presented by the immigrant newspaper; the traces of black cannibalism, savagery, and illegitimacy remained when a reader turned the page and read that “fun was had by all” at a parish minstrel show. Every turn of
the page presented an overlapping layer of condescension to black personhood, and, save in the few instances where radical immigrants such as the Czech actors of Chicago celebrated John Brown and Frederick Douglass, minstrelsy contributed to, rather than diminished, this portrait of black alterity.

In order to accept the minstrel act, as Lhamon suggests, as in some way a transgressive act celebrating the black trickster character, even as a cultural production forging a black-white alliance against the upper-class, respectable agents of social control, evidence would have to be presented for some acts offstage that built such alliances. Lhamon’s treatment of pre-Civil War minstrel actors and audiences is lacking in this regard. Similarly, many Slavic immigrants blacking up did not reach out to blacks as fellow laborers getting the short end of industrial America’s stick. Rather, Slovak newspapers as early as the 1890s presented stories that characterized blacks as impermissible outsiders, illegitimate competitors for residential space, and subjects unentitled to the jobs that they were characterized as stealing from immigrants.

We must therefore consider the Slovak newspapers’ jokes yet again, not as mere humor, but in light of what they can tell us of the ferocity of white ethnic resistance to black residential and economic mobility when new immigrants faced African Americans in Northern neighborhoods. The final chapter will interrogate the coverage of urban race riots in the Slovak newspapers; in the face of such grim atrocities as occurred in Chicago, East St. Louis, and other cities, perhaps it is wise to retell a few jokes about black porters and greenhorns with an eye for what they can tell us about immigrant attitudes toward blacks.
Chapter 7

“We Took Our Rightful Places”: 
Defended Job Sites, Defended Neighborhoods

In 1921, readers of *New Yorkský denník* enjoyed a humor-page joke about a lady met at the train station by a black porter. “Our black friend” saw at once that she was a “greenhorn” and greeted her in her own language. After some banter, the astonished lady disputes “our black friend’s” claim that he’s a Slovak. “Same as you, I’m from Zemplín, over in Humenne.” “Impossible,” she says, “I know Humenne very well, the whole place, and I’ve never seen black people there. Not even the gypsies are this black.” “Look, my dear countrywoman. I’ve been here twelve years already, and I’ve had it so hot the whole time since my flight that I’ve become completely black. If you stay in America twelve years you’ll become completely black too.” And with that, “our black fellow countryman” went on his way.¹

As this story suggests, by 1921 the greenhorn herself could often be the real butt of newspapers’ jokes, afraid that a black porter is the devil or a darkened and degraded compatriot from Humenne. But these stories also embody the fear that, yes, Negro and Slovak, “the same as you”: if she weren’t careful, a newcomer from Slovakia might indeed become black. Sitting behind the joke, though, is an even more ominous fear: perhaps new immigrants might be evaluated as worthy of only the same marginal wages, slum dwellings, and status as the country’s long-established pariahs.

In this vein, another joke, “from the days of slavery,” may speak to new immigrants’ fears of their marginality. A slave was bought for 50 dollars and his new master ordered him to fix the roof [*fiksovať* RUF]. So “the nigger” climbed up onto the roof, looked four stories down, and promptly fell asleep. After he had a good nap, the slave told his master, “If I fell off the roof and was killed, you, poor master, would be out 50 dollars. Dear master, you could get an Irishman to do the same job for two bucks, and if he fell off, it’d be no great loss.”²

Such a joke deftly encapsulates immigrants’ awareness of the low regard with which their employers assessed them, while nevertheless also getting in a few digs at lazy and cunning blacks. Then, too, this joke is an early assertion of the claim,
later quite prevalent, that white ethnic laborers actually had it worse than blacks and were accounted of even less worth by old-stock Americans in the competition for work. Matthew Frye Jacobson argues that from the white ethnic revival of the 1960s and early 1970s, the expression of such collective memories of who had it worse only served to magnify both the value of white ethnic achievement and the culpability of blacks who supposedly had failed to work as hard as even some disadvantaged white ethnic newcomers. Evidently, though, Slavs worried about their tenuous place in industrial America were telling stories of lazy or duplicitous blacks in the 1920s, decades before “the rise of the unmeltable ethnics.”

Immigrants quickly learned to assert their claimed “correct” place in the hierarchy of race. In *Out of this Furnace*, an astute novel of Slovak steelworkers, by the mid-1950s old immigrants wistful for the “good old days” in Braddock, Pennsylvania, mutter, “It’s too bad the niggers had to come. They never bother me, but some of my neighbors have moved, especially the ones with daughters. The men are always getting drunk, and fighting, and you hear women screaming during the night. They all live together like so many animals. And so dirty!” Even though a third-generation union organizer suggests “the very things the Irish used to say about the Hunkies the Hunkies now say about the niggers. And for no better reason,” by 1935 most Slovaks were comfortable both in their whiteness and their prejudices. His grandfather and his friend, like many white ethnics, are already certain that blacks attempting to move into their neighborhood will bring stereotypical dysfunctional behaviors that will ruin a tight-knit Slavic neighborhood. (Of course, earlier in Bell’s account of Braddock, the reader has already seen plenty of Slovak alcoholism, wife-beating, and family abandonment; nevertheless, by the 1930s the novelist could plausibly present a conversation in which immigrants naturally assumed such faults were the sins of “our black fellow countrymen” alone.)

While immigrant newspapers’ lynching accounts (and, as noted above, there were hundreds of such reports in these papers) were the most gruesome demonstration for immigrants of the contempt with which “black fellow citizens” were treated, most such atrocities occurred far from the places Slavic immigrants dwelled. While I argue elsewhere that the accretion of race coverage in the press – including lynching accounts and news coverage of “savage” Africans – served to cast blacks as completely alien to immigrants’ consciousness, the Slavic press also devoted extensive coverage to blacks dwelling and working in places with which Slovaks and Rusyns were quite familiar. Newspaper coverage of blacks in the urban North – especially coverage of the race riots that erupted during and immediately after World War I – was instrumental in casting black Americans as perpetual outsiders for acculturating immigrants. At least for Slavic immigrants, the harsh resistance to black movement into white ethnic neighborhoods in the 1940s and early 1950s was, I argue, grounded in the foreign-language press’s coverage of the earlier urban race tumult, especially in Chicago, Omaha, East St. Louis, and other flashpoints of the first Great Migration.
Rhetorically anti-Semitism and anti-Italian attitudes were expressed by some Slovaks, as noted in Chapter 4, but qualitatively a different set of actions ultimately was engaged in toward blacks as they moved northward, where Slavs – like other white Americans – often came to view blacks as illegitimate competitors, usurpers of jobs and housing; this view quickly emerged in Slavs' newspaper reporting, too.

Indeed, in some of the earliest coverage of blacks in Slovak newspapers, they were often cast as illegitimate competitors in the scramble for jobs. Often stories of strikebreaking afforded editors and letter writers an occasion to vent anger at black scabs. In April 1899, Slovák v Amerike reported that striking coal miners in Pana, Illinois, “zealously pursued Negro scabs,” up to and including murdering some of them. Scabs of all kinds were frequently denounced in the pages of papers such as Slovák v Amerike. That the editors saw fit, however, to single out “Negro” scabs for particular condemnation, even expressing glee when they were murdered by enraged miners, indicates that as early as 1899 Slovaks may have been developing a rudimentary sense of white entitlement of the kind David Roediger and others have explored.6

The same articles that denounced “the organized rapaciousness of capitalism” also decried “Negro scabs” in coal-mining regions. Slovák v Amerike praised the Western Federation of Miners for aiding striking miners and appealed to the spirit of Bunker Hill in resisting U.S. soldiers used against miners. The same day, however, the paper published a report out of Arkansas that, “Negroes have been imported by the coal company as scabs from Illinois.” (The paper noted that “one black scab and one policeman were killed.”) Patriotism and enmity to blacks were already being invoked on the same page of this paper. A “committee against blacks” composed of striking miners in Webster County, Kentucky, attacked blacks they assumed were scabbing. A letter writer to New Yorkský denník cursed a priest for “defending the blacks, who treacherously worked against the Slovak people.”7

Often economic grievances in the emerging capitalist economy were cast in racialized language. Strikers at Lattimer, Pennsylvania, in 1897 complained to Slovák v Amerike that the bosses’ “brutal tyranny cuts us down like we were mere Indians.” An item in the “Workers’ News” column of Amerikansky russky viestnik regarding a Budapest strike noted that farm laborers out in the provinces had also joined the struggle, as they were sick of working for the past 20 weeks “like Chinese coolies.”8

Virtually no Chinese labored in 1907 Hungary, but American lawmakers and labor leaders had stigmatized Asians as unacceptable outsiders in the nation and its workforce. Slovák v Amerike reported that “American workers, constructing the line for the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad, have organized to expel all the Japanese from the city. The Japanese workers this evening were put on a car for Denver. . . . Sheriff Chivington thanked them and said that no more Japanese should be sent to America.” The paper likewise reported on July 28, 1910, on the
supposedly harmful effect Asians were having on workingmen’s wages, an ironic report considering that immigration restrictionists such as Henry Cabot Lodge and Edward Alsworth Ross had been making the same argument regarding Slavs and other Southeast Europeans. Indeed, Lodge had argued in 1891 that the Slovak is “not a desirable acquisition for us to make, since they appear to have so many items in common with the Chinese.”

With little irony, though, Slovaks themselves again invoked these stereotypes of unfair “coolie” competitors when editors reproduced in Slovák v Amerike an illustration of a degraded Japanese laborer with its article, “Why California Objects,” explaining the danger such “Mongolians” posed. This argument appeared in a front-page feature, “Pictures of the Day’s News,” suggesting the salience such categorizations of threatening and acceptable labor held for immigrant editors (see Figure 7-1).

As if to reinforce the point, alongside the story of “coolie labor” ran another blurb on Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and the Industrial Workers of the World’s work on behalf of striking (white) silk workers in Paterson, New Jersey. While many native-born whites regarded the I.W.W. with horror, in this Slavic newspaper the organization’s efforts were praised. Already the dichotomy between acceptable labor and illegitimate, non-European competitors was being spelled out for immigrant readers. The month before this the paper ran an editorial approving the exclusion of Asians, explaining, “People of the white race don’t want Mongolian Japanese, who are dangerous to the morals of a Christian nation, and who, like the Chinese, have a small need of a livelihood, and therefore work for minimal wages and will lower the wages of all workers.” The paper also reported on “the Japanese invasion of America,” and progressive California Governor Hiram Johnson’s defense of his state’s restrictions on Japanese. The paper also covered a labor convention resolution supporting immigration restriction, noting “the AFL is Against All Asians.” In the midst of World War I, Národné noviny similarly editorialized that Asian immigration was a completely inferior and unacceptable answer to America’s labor shortage. Japanese and other Asian workers were already portrayed to Slovaks as a menace.

But stereotypes of Chinese cut both ways. When Chinese laborers working on the Panama Canal went on strike, they were stigmatized as rebellious, not docile, and, as readers of New Yorkský denník learned, warned to return to work, “otherwise they would all be deported.” Amerikansky russky viestnik likewise reported that unions in San Francisco and throughout California were demanding that further measures be taken against the Chinese who were getting ahead. Either as docile labor or troublemakers, Asians were faulted in the Slavic press.

Following World War I, Národné noviny opposed Congress’s efforts to limit European immigration, but again made a point of noting that editors had no problem with preserving the ban on Chinese and other Asians. This English editorial hastened to assure readers, “Where the standard of living and citizenship is involved we are the most ardent supporters of any movement that will
Figure 7-1: “Why California Objects.” Slovak newspapers consistently advocated restrictions on Chinese and Japanese immigration to America. *Slovák v Amerike*, May 8, 1913, 1.

help accomplish these so very important questions of our national life.” The racial component of America’s “standard of living and citizenship,” though, had already been embraced by the leaders of the National Slovak Society (the parent institution of *Národné noviny*), for the editorialist added, “All aliens should be
required to register annually until they become naturalized. That is highly proper. It is one of the means of learning to discriminate between desirables and others. The Asiatic exclusion laws do not worry us. They are a protective measure of the white race.” For many nativist Americans, the bar between “desirables and others” left Slavs, as well as Mediterraneans and Jews, on the far side of Ellis Island. At least some immigrants, however, were accepting of the ban on Asian outsiders.12

All of this coverage established non-Europeans as deserving of less respect than white Americans. To some degree something more than “rational” economic competition was occurring as the American language of racialized hierarchies of illegitimate black and Asian competitors was employed by Slovaks. Like other new immigrants to the United States circa 1900, Slovaks were often in desperate competition for unsteady, low-wage jobs in dangerous heavy industries. For such migrants there was no doubt an economic component to asserting their whiteness, one of the few advantages they possessed in a harsh industrial economy. Language that dehumanized Asian rivals, though, was employed to justify an economic competition in moral terms; a similar rhetorical strategy was deployed against blacks. For low-wage Southeast European immigrants, the economic component to whiteness was faithfully policed by coverage of exclusion of Asian and black competitors. Slovak readers learned of the threat degraded Chinese labor would pose to their morals and pay packet, even though they themselves had in other contexts already been pejoratively dismissed as having “coolie” standards.13

Asians were effectively barred from the workplaces and neighborhoods of Slavic immigrants courtesy of the Chinese Exclusion Act and other federal legislation. African Americans, on the other hand, by the beginning of the twentieth century were increasingly coming North, where they were encountered by new immigrants as rivals for jobs. Blacks often were resented by Slovaks and other new immigrants for their frequent role as strikebreakers. Thaddeus Radzialowski has noted that some of the first Polish-black interaction came during strikes of the 1890s in which blacks were employed as armed strikebreakers and implicated in the deaths of several Polish strikers. He argues that these violent confrontations account in large part for the enduring Polish equation of all blacks with scabs. He further argues later “real” and “rational” competition for housing and jobs accounts for white ethnic-black friction. No doubt such economic resentments played a large role in immigrants’ thinking regarding black competitors. Yet the economic model seeks to explain too much, for many other groups engaged in scabbing, as Radzialowski notes. Poles scabbed in 1893 in a lumber-yard strike in Tonawanda, New York, and elsewhere. But already they, and other white ethnic groups who engaged in scabbing on at least as widespread a scale as blacks, were let off the hook compared to blacks. Dziennik Chicagoski even editorialized after the Tonawanda strike, “We Poles should for our own good, and for the preservation of our honor as a people leave the role of scabs, those
drudges of capitalism, to the Negro and the Chinese.”14 Clearly race was already much on the minds of new immigrants, for Swedes, Irish, Italians—and all other white groups—were not so stigmatized as “scab” races or the “drudges of capitalism,” even when some of these “races” performed this ignoble work.

This is not to deny the anger Poles and Slovaks felt when black strikebreakers were set against them, merely to suggest that the racialized American economic landscape was already being learned by new immigrants. James Barrett has noted that in the 1904 Chicago stockyard strike some blacks scabbed but others stood by the union, yet still faced indiscriminate attack as blacks. “Contemporary accounts tended to focus on the introduction of blacks, but as a group the scabs were quite mixed ethnically, the largest groups being Italian, Greek, and black.” As noted, Slovak papers sometimes disparaged the moral worth of other white immigrant groups, especially Italians and the Magyars whose rule in Upper Hungary they resented. But on the job sites and in unions, Slovaks made common cause with other European-descended workers far more often than with blacks. As late as 1919, at least 37 of Chicago’s American Federation of Labor (AFL) affiliates barred black members or relegated them to separate blacks-only locals.

To be sure, John Kikulski and other leaders of the Stockyard Labor Council made an admirable, concerted effort to build interracial solidarity in 1919. But a proposed interracial march, to begin at Forty-seventh and Paulina in heavily Slavic Back of the Yards and end in the Black Belt, had to be called off after threats of racial strife, suggesting many rank and file workers were not as accepting of black coworkers as Kikulski would have liked, or at least balked at allowing blacks even to march through their neighborhoods. Barrett notes that after 1919 blacks were stigmatized as a scab race, even though, as in 1904, black and East European workers were on both sides of the battle, members of these groups scabbing and standing by the union. Slovaks, too, were often found among strikers and scabs. A report in Jednota of the woolen mills in Passaic, New Jersey, proclaimed, “The strikers are mostly Slovaks,” before admitting, “well, yes, scabs, scabs are actually found, too.” Blacks were often a misplaced scapegoat on the picket line.15

As George Lipsitz has convincingly documented, “rational” competition for jobs and housing in America has often occurred on an unequal racial playing field where resources are disproportionately allocated to those who can make a plausible claim for white status. By 1910 the black-white binary seems already to have been accepted in labor relations by some Slovaks. A Slovak from Lowber, Pennsylvania, wrote to Jednota denouncing the sheriff for bringing in “Negroes” to break up a strike, but his brief letter ends by noting virtually all the scabs were Romanians and Magyars. Were there actual “Negroes” in this case or had a correspondence already developed between “scabs” and “Negroes” for this Slovak so that a Romanian or Magyar became a “Negro” the moment he scabbed? And if there were some “Negro” scabs, why did an entire race become stigmatized, while Romanians and Magyars could retain their place in the house of labor, even if
some members of these groups scabbed? Indeed, a report sent in 1915 to Národné noviny from Lochrie, Pennsylvania, at the conclusion of a miners’ strike notes, “During our strike there were some miners who backslid into scabbing. Among our scabs there were several Poles, Italians and Englishmen, who the striking miners nicely (politely) asked not to scab.” Whether the request was polite or threatening, what’s noteworthy is that in subsequent years Slovak papers never characterized Italians, Poles, or Englishmen as scab races, but did label blacks this way. Another letter writer complained to Národné noviny about the arrival of black scabs in Bradley, Ohio; the letter was headlined “Black scabs at work.”

The equation of all scabs with “blacks” occurred in many localities. During a bitter coal strike in Walsenburg, Colorado, in 1913, the wife of a German American miner nicknamed “Dutch” who defied strikers and continued working was threatened. “Mrs. Dutch, if you don’t move within forty-eight hours, we will blow you out. Scabs can’t live with white people.” A German miner could be demoted from the realm of “white people” through scabbing, but the supporters of mining corporations likewise blamed trouble on blacks. When a melee broke out as “Mrs. Dutch” was removing her family, mine guards claimed the first shots came from “a negro’s house.” The competition for jobs may have been both rational and racialized.

Even when blacks were not engaged in strikebreaking they were invariably regarded by many Americans as illegitimate competition, and occasions of anti-black job actions were frequently reported in immigrant papers. Blacks seeking work, not just scabs, were assaulted by other workers. Jednota noted that in a coal-mine area near Brazil, Indiana, “bloody battles” ensued between black and white miners, although the same story noted that in Brazil and Jacksonville the battles had also occurred between “American” and “foreign” miners (“English” versus “Magyars”).

On the very day that Slovák v Amerike reported on the Springfield, Illinois, race riots, the paper ran an article from Tennessee, “Black miners are expelled.” “In the mining towns of this country there has for a long time been nothing but hatred for blacks on the part of white people,” the article noted, “and therefore they have looked to banish them from their circles.” The article told that miners expelled all the blacks from a 30-mile area near the mining communities of Jellico and La Follette. While the article was rather neutral in its tone, it did have an explanation for the action by white miners that may have resonated with Slovaks sensitive to charges they were undercutting a “white man’s” wage: “This outrage against the blacks has arisen from the fact that black idlers have agreed to work much cheaper than the whites, and therefore many mine owners have fired [prepuščali] many of the whites and the blacks have taken their places for themselves.” While the article seems to have been somewhat sympathetic to blacks’ plight, labeling the expulsion an “outrage,” the story also likely conveyed to immigrants a lesson on the low regard in which black coworkers – or “idlers” – were held.
However they came to occupy job sites, blacks were quickly equated with scabs, even if they were sometimes not the main thrust of Slovaks’ ire. A Pennsylvania letter writer who signed himself “F. M., Truth Teller,” informed readers of New Yorkský denník, “In the strike ongoing in the Masontown area, the coal barons are seeking to defeat us not just through the use of ‘skébov,’ ‘nigrov,’ deputies, and so on, but also through some priests who are eager to help them.” While it’s clear that “Truth Teller” was angriest at priests “who don’t preach the Gospel of Christ, but rather preach the ‘Gospel’ of Mr. Frick,” he nevertheless established a cautionary binary for his readers between slaves and self-respecting miners. He warned “brother Slovaks” not to listen to priests who “only want to sell us out into slavery.” “Don’t obey such traitors and Judases,” he added. “Truly it’d be a great shame and scandal if such worker-miners, who earn their bread by their callused hands, would then sell out and become the company’s slaves.” The letter writer ended his lengthy denunciation of priests who shilled for the coal companies by declaring, “We won’t stand any more injustice and suffering, no more kicks! We want to live as intelligent workers and not slaves.”

This Masontown correspondent reserved most of his ire for “Judas priests,” not blacks, and the fear of becoming slaves may have been rhetorical. But the letter writer’s passing denunciation of “nigrov” as enemies of the miners suggests that a racialized sense of miners’ entitlement to good treatment had also developed for this letter writer. “Worker-miners” and “intelligent workers” are juxtaposed to slaves, and invocation of “nigrov” along with “scabs” suggests that for some Slovaks blacks could never be welcomed into the favored group.

But as with this “Truth Teller,” other Slovaks angry at the brutality of the Cossacks quickly learned to invoke racialized language when appealing for justice. Jednota’s editorial writer on September 9, 1908, declaimed on “Slavery in America.” “We’ve been fans of American freedom ever since we were foreigners,” the editorialist wrote. “When he abolished slavery, Lincoln built the foundations for an ideal republic, in which all people, it was said, would have freedom, equality and brotherhood! But now Lincoln must be turning over in his grave if he could see what’s going on in the southern states, and he’d need a new sword to abolish this current slavery.” But it was not lynching, Jim Crow segregation, or blacks’ disfranchisement that stirred this writer’s indignation; rather, he wrote denouncing the suppression of strikes in the coalfields of Pratt City, not far from Birmingham, Alabama, through the use of convict labor and scabs. To be sure, the overwhelming majority of convict laborers in the South were black. But the plight of white miners, including Slovak immigrants in Alabama, again trumped any alleged hardship blacks faced. Three years later, Slovák v Amerike similarly editorialized against “slavery in the South” without once deploring the myriad injustices against blacks, focusing instead on the grievances of miners (presumably white) facing unfair competition from convicts. The new “Southern slavery” denounced in Jednota and Slovák v Amerike concerned white workers’ complaints.
These injustices were fair game for complaint, but black evisceration or subjugation came in for no condemnation.21

Similarly, a letter writer from the coal mines of West Virginia denounced slavery, the conditions under which he and other white miners toiled. Miner Leskoviansky argued that Lincoln freed the slaves but slavery still existed in West Virginia. This was not the last Slavic writer to argue that blacks had it better than immigrants. Likewise, by 1915 some Slovaks complaining to Národné noviny of oppression in Europe compared Slovak “slavery” to the ease with which pampered blacks in America lived.22

It was only the socialist journal Rovnost ľudu that seemed to understand a divided workforce in a free-market war of all against all made scabbing by starving workers almost inevitable. “A worker, who has a family and is unemployed for some time, watching his starving family every day makes him desperate and he takes a scab job, thereby helping to break the unions. The capitalistic system is all right for the capitalists themselves, but for us workers it is endless starvation.”23 Of course, as noted, many unions barred blacks and even when blacks engaged in “manly” job actions they were severely attacked. In Bibb County, Alabama, striking black coal miners were attacked and killed with dynamite, and other black miners jailed. A strike of black railroad firemen in Georgia was broken up by whites, giving the lie to the assertion it was always blacks who scabbed. Likewise in Fort Worth, Texas, blacks on strike were beaten to death. The perilous place of blacks in industrial America was reinforced by such news stories.24

As noted, Slavic newspapers covered in detail the colonization of Africa and Asia by a variety of European powers and the United States, and seriously reported the peril that “people chewers” posed to civilizing missionaries. While few natives of Africa emigrated to the United States until changes to immigration laws in 1965, such coverage of savage Africans and Asians, in tandem with voluminous lynching accounts, served to establish non-Europeans as people apart. Sherrilyn Ifill convincingly argues that English-language newspapers “were among those institutions principally responsible for dehumanizing the black population in the minds of many whites.” Such papers’ condescending coverage of blacks enabled white readers to “at worst develop a sense that blacks did not lead normal lives in which education, work, and family were paramount and central. Instead, blacks could be seen as ‘other,’ ‘different,’ not possessed of the same humanity as whites.”25

Slovak immigrant papers likewise were palimpsests on which cannibal stories, minstrel jokes, and news stories of lynchings, race riots, and savages in need of a civilizing mission coexisted week after week. Perhaps it’s not surprising, then, that when blacks ventured into the urban North, immigrants often read of their approach as a similar “black peril.” Russell Kazal notes that this phrase was explicitly used in 1923 by Philadelphia’s German-language Tageblatt. Such row-house phrenology occurred even earlier, however, in the nation’s Slavic newspapers,
which cast black newcomers as illegitimate intruders who were “naturally” resisted by whites. New immigrants such as Slovaks read of the black movement into the North, and the coverage often spoke in alarmist tones. When blacks sought to defend themselves from onslaught by white mobs, Slovak newspapers employed tropes that lumped self-defense in with images of lawlessness and violence, and headlines screamed of “plemenný boj” – “race war.” This was the phrase used when Delaware blacks protested lynchings, a term that would continue to echo during the World War I era in cities such as Chicago, East St. Louis, and Tulsa. In its coverage of the 1919 Chicago riots, New Yorkský denník nervously highlighted the military training and weapons stockpiling of black army veterans, suggesting a race war was in the offing before reporting a few days later that the army had occupied the Black Belt and restored “order.”

Riot stories appearing in Slovak papers offered a sense of blacks as permanent outsiders, illegitimate intruders in these whites-only spaces. Slovak papers had been reporting since at least 1903 on white vigilante mobs cleansing cities such as Rankin, Pennsylvania, and Morgan City, Illinois, of all blacks, perhaps establishing a binary for new immigrants of who was permissible and who unacceptable on one’s block. In the latter city, all blacks were given 48 hours to abandon the town. Often, the very act of black self-defense was recast as criminality; headlines asserting a “race war” established a moral equivalence between sides, with no hint blacks were actually engaged in resistance to lynch mobs. When blacks in Lawrenceville, Illinois, attempted to attend a carnival, they were set upon by a white mob and another “race war” erupted, reported Slovák v Amerike. Such coverage sent a message that black use of public space was in itself an outrage whites could be expected to resist.

As noted, there were occasions on which the Slavic press reported similar outbreaks of anti-Italian riots, but these were far rarer and less violent. And for all of East Europeans’ suspicions of “Talianov” neighbors, when neighborhood geography was zealously guarded it was more typically devoted to policing black-white boundaries. As Thomas Philpott and Olivier Zunz have noted for Chicago and Detroit, areas that were colloquially regarded as the preserve of one ethnic group were always a mélange of white ethnicities living in close if sometimes wary proximity. As Philpott notes, the area around the famous Hull House settlement contained 26 nationalities in the 1890s, while by 1920 areas near Wentworth Avenue regarded as Polish actually had 14 other white ethnic groups that outnumbered the Poles.

What had not changed was the absence of blacks in these neighborhoods. “No large city,” Richard H. Wright Jr., a black student from the University of Chicago, observed in 1906, “shows a greater degree of segregation.” Wright had good reason to make this claim. The segregation index of the 33,000 blacks in Chicago in 1898 was a staggering 91.8, but as more blacks migrated to the city their segregation increased still further. The segregation of Chicago blacks was 92.4 in 1910; 94.0 in 1920; and 98.4 in 1930. Philpott notes, “Eventually Negroes achieved jobs
in the gut shanties of Packingtown, the furnace rooms of Steeltown, and the factories of Burnside and Pullman, but, unlike the immigrants, they could not obtain housing nearby.” Middle-class, as well as working-class, white areas, he demonstrates, were always “polyethnic and uniracial.” While blacks were forced into hypersegregation, in 1930 Chicago only 43.7 percent of Czechs and 61 percent of Poles were ghettoized, at a time when, Philpott notes, “more than nine out of ten black Chicagoans lived in areas over 80 percent Negro. No immigrant group was, or ever had been, so impacted.”

James Barrett confirms that in 1919 Chicago, blacks worked in the Stockyard district but by and large lived outside of the area, confined to the Black Belt. Blacks faced a degree of residential hypersegregation new immigrants never did. While no one would glorify the squalid streets along Bubbly Creek, even ethnic groups with a history of enmity such as Poles and Lithuanians, Slovaks and Magyars, or Jews and Ukrainians lived in proximity to each other, and a myriad of job sites, while blacks were shunted to the ghetto.

In Philadelphia’s Nicetown area, too, Italians lived right across the street from Slovaks, Poles, and other East European immigrants in 1910. While informants agreed relations between the two groups were often tense, as in Chicago, the proximity of groups bred over time an interaction in the streets, saloons, and workplaces that enabled one to conceive of Italians, Poles, Irish, Lithuanians, and other new immigrants as legitimate (even if resented) competitors for scarce economic resources (housing, jobs, etc.). Barrett confirms a similar cross-European mingling in Packingtown, Chicago, an area from which blacks were residually barred. In Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, and other industrial cities, blacks were confined to the city’s most miserable slums, still beyond the pale.

**Race Riots: Defended Neighborhoods**

When blacks sought to break these racialized boundaries, cities exploded in a frenzy of race riots, and the rhetoric repeated in Slovak papers such as *Jednota* and *New Yorkský denník* often attributed the ferocity of white assaults on African Americans to some deficiency or deviancy in the newcomers themselves. While the Slavic press had reported on an anti-Italian mob in West Frankfort, Illinois, which expelled immigrants from their town, the story did not in this instance seek to explain the nativist mob’s actions by citing Italians’ lawlessness or unfair undercutting of wages, explanations that would be laid by the Slavic press at the feet of blacks attacked in Chicago, Omaha, and elsewhere. The frenzy that greeted blacks heading northward during the Great Migration was of a far greater, more virulent magnitude than any expression of anti-immigrant animus. As Malcolm McLaughlin has noted in the case of East St. Louis, Illinois, white attacks on blacks were often spurred by a fear of black assertions to citizen rights in the context of World War I, a war to make the world safe for democracy. When
blacks organized some resistance to white assaults in this city, it was only cited, McLaughlin notes, as proof blacks were organizing a racial rebellion and drilling in paramilitary fashion. David A. Davis notes, too, that returning black veterans often were targeted with violence for daring to wear their uniforms in public; rising black expectations of equality once again were met with extralegal force by whites determined to re-impose the racial status quo.34

Even minimal efforts at black self-organization to better their economic status were projected in white accounts as violent plots by blacks to impose another era of “Negro Misrule,” as most whites in the country by 1900 had come to regard Reconstruction. When blacks in places such as Elaine, Arkansas, attempted to organize sharecropper unions, these campaigns were mischaracterized as a fearful cabal, and both English-language and Slavic newspapers reported that blacks were plotting to exterminate all the whites in Arkansas’s Phillips County. In an act of journalistic transference, the slaughter of as many as 250 blacks in Phillips County, and the subsequent mass exodus of blacks from this Mississippi River delta county were reported in Slovák v Amerike as a timely defeat of a black-led revolution. As M. Langley Biegert notes, for the suppression of an earlier movement for black agricultural organization, the 1891 Colored Farmers’ Alliance sharecroppers’ strike, “Part of [whites’] success came also in controlling the narrative of the event . . . . In the end . . . the white version of the events was accepted as fact.” Immigrant newspapers’ accounts of the Elaine “race war” and other outbreaks of this era were no less one-sided.35

Coverage of black-white violence in this era in immigrant papers often mirrored many of these assumptions of black culpability. As was the case with English-language papers, journals such as Jednota and Slovák v Amerike often, although not always, accepted with little skepticism mainstream accounts assigning blacks a measure of blame for the disturbances for stepping out of their assigned subordinate place. In 1902 a report spoke of a “race war” in an Atlanta suburb. “A Negro who the police tried to arrest resisted and shot it out with them in a store.” This escalated into a full-bore fight, “with shooting like a war,” between “police and blacks.” The account concluded, “The army is now working to restore order, but they are predicting that there will be further bloodshed between whites and blacks.”36

The following year Evansville, Indiana, erupted into a “race war” in which headlines said “37 were killed and more wounded” as “armed bands of whites and blacks engaged in fierce skirmishes.” In actuality, the armed bands of blacks seem to have been attempting to protect themselves from an enraged mob that targeted all blacks indiscriminately, but these distinctions weren’t spelled out for immigrant readers. While still characterizing the Evansville melee as a “race war,” the report did note, though, that a mob had burned the homes of blacks, and several homes in the black section of Baptist Town had also been dynamited. For good measure the dance hall owned by Bud Pruit was dynamited, suggesting that even black businessmen were regarded as a threat to many whites. Crowds also
used trains to pursue blacks who had fled the city to Vincennes. While 2,000 whites had rampaged through the black Baptist Town section and "Niger Brown" was taken to Jeffersonville and lynched, the mayor of Evansville blamed anarchists for disturbing his otherwise law-abiding town. The story ended by reassuring readers that the militia had been called in and worked all day to restore order.37

The 1908 white assaults on blacks in Springfield, Illinois, served for some as a wake-up call that the nation's race problem was not confined to the South. Jednota headlined its story from the land of Lincoln, "Bloody war against the blacks," and noted that three had been killed, 75 wounded and up to 40 houses belonging to blacks had been burned down. Slovák v Amerike likewise documented the murders and carnage, as well as the 5,500 soldiers now patrolling Springfield's streets, but noted, "The riots, whose outbreaks are now breeding resentment against the blacks, have not ceased." Blacks were said to be attacking soldiers, which may explain the "resentment" the paper spoke of, as well as the fact "a large number of blacks have . . . fled from the city." Thus "according to the latest reports, on Friday 2,000 blacks left the city and settled in Chicago and other surrounding towns." As noted, on the same day Slovák v Amerike reported that Tennessee coal miners had expelled all blacks from a 30-mile-wide region; such cumulative coverage of assaults on blacks likely established for new immigrants a sense of blacks as subordinate citizens, with few rights worthy of the name.38

It seems that every time blacks tried to defend themselves, it was regarded as a race war and characterized as such in the press. Periodically, blacks' expectations to enjoy democratic rights were raised, too, and such rising black hopes were met by a new spate of lynchings and "race wars." This had been the case in the 1890s, when many blacks participated, along with white sharecroppers, in the Populist movement and the People's Party it spawned,39 and then served with distinction in the Spanish-American War. In the first decade of the twentieth century, President Theodore Roosevelt gave rhetorical support to black self-help groups and set off a furor when he invited Booker T. Washington to dinner at the White House. Even this modest lip service to black citizens provoked a new round of assaults, as in the Atlanta and Evansville mobbings reported in the immigrant press. As we'll see, rising black expectations during World War I were again met by a fierce backlash in many cities, where blacks were violently attacked on the slimmest of pretexts.

But as implausible as it may seem to twenty-first-century readers, such assaults were often straightforwardly presented as defensive measures aimed at thwarting organized black violence targeting innocent, helpless whites. In 1911 Slovák v Amerike reported on a "race war in Coweta, Oklahoma," 20 miles southeast of Tulsa, scene of a more infamous 1921 "race war" in which aerial bombardment aided mobs in destroying a black neighborhood. As in later race riots, the immigrant paper's account of the Coweta incident placed the blame on the town's blacks. "More than 2,000 armed blacks are overrunning this city, threatening to seize control and slaughter the white people," the report proclaimed. "Fortunately,
the municipal authorities have called in the militia in time. When the militia arrived, the population was already prepared for defense. Women and children have been removed to secure buildings, and men have barricaded themselves and are preparing to fight against the attacking blacks.” The brief account concluded by noting that the militia had fired what little ammunition it had at the blacks, and “order” and “peace” were restored.

As Oklahoma was in 1911 well in the midst of a decade-long campaign to disfranchise and segregate its black and Native American communities, it may be that Coweta blacks were engaged in attempts to defend their dwindling democratic rights when this “race war” took place. In any case for Slovak readers another worrisome portrait was painted of violent blacks menacing white people. As in numerous other accounts, here the racial status quo was defined as “order” and “peace.”

Other “race riots” ensued when an unlikely hero emerged in Jim Crow America for black fight fans. In 1908, African American Jack Johnson defeated Tommy Burns, to seize the heavyweight title. As Dan Streible notes, fight films were a staple of nickelodeons, but with cinematic evidence of the ease (and enjoyment) with which Johnson decimated white-hope opponents such as Stanley Ketchel, white-initiated riots broke out in a myriad of cities. Lest blacks get ideas that a new equality was dawning, they were mercilessly beaten in a series of riots in the aftermath of Johnson’s triumphs. Fight films were blamed for inciting this violence in viewers (something that had never worried authorities before Johnson’s ascendance) and also faulted for giving black viewers unsettling notions of equality. Many jurisdictions therefore passed laws banning fight films. Slovák v Amerike, which had given extensive coverage to Johnson’s fights as well as his exploits on the stage, editorialized in approval of banning the films and thus ameliorating racial violence.

Johnson further raised racial alarms for white America by merging stereotypes of brute force and unrestrained sexual libido, for the black boxer had a white wife and well-publicized affairs with other white women. Slovák v Amerike also gave coverage to the effort of a Georgia congressman to enact a federal ban on marriages between blacks and whites, citing Johnson’s scandalous marriages and affairs with white women. The bill went nowhere, but the paper later covered Johnson’s prosecution and eventual imprisonment under the Mann Act when he took an alleged (white) prostitute across state lines for immoral purposes. While popular culture, including American sports, was well-covered by the immigrant press, the racialized morality tale of Jack Johnson tutored immigrants in other matters as well (see Figure 7-2).

Other films evidently didn’t raise fears among Slovak editors of a race war. When blacks demonstrated in 1915 against the screening of Birth of a Nation, New Yorkský denník reported that a hundred Philadelphia policemen armed with truncheons and revolvers had to break up the picket in front of the Forrest Theater. As Michael Rogin has noted, many immigrant moviegoers received their first
Defended Job Sites, Defended Neighborhoods

219

Figure 7-2: “Heavyweight Boxing Champion Jack Johnson.” The Slovak press, like the English-language newspapers, was quick to call for a ban on boxing films after Johnson easily defeated a series of “Great White Hopes.” Slovák v Amerike, July 5, 1910, 1.

history lesson from this film regarding the supposed “Era of Negro Misrule” that ensued when “irresponsible” blacks were given the vote after the Civil War; judging from this brief article, for Slovaks it was black demonstrators, not director D. W. Griffith, who were characterized as acting irresponsibly. 42
Still, extraordinary outbreaks of white-on-black violence such as East St. Louis could be reported sympathetically, and in this 1917 riot no assessment was given of black blame for the battles:

Yesterday afternoon there were again many attacks on blacks in various city neighborhoods, although after midnight it was relatively peaceful. . . . In the black neighborhoods fires were still raging [in the afternoon], and blacks barricaded themselves in these neighborhoods seeking some shelter from the rage. Many hundred men, women and children spent the night in the city jail. The police have indicated that at least one hundred blacks were killed, but precise estimates are impossible because no one knows how many corpses are lying under the ruins [zříceninan] of the demolished homes. . . . The unlucky blacks have fled the entire city. A large number of them are hiding in forests and fields. While on the other side of the Mississippi River in East St. Louis blacks are exposed to the most brutal [najsurovéjším] persecutions known to man, in St. Louis, there are now currently no riots. The blacks go peacefully about their business without anyone showing them any hostility. In contrast, the unrest is growing in East St. Louis, spreading to Venice, Illinois, a town about sixteen miles away. There a black man was wounded in the dark and a disturbance has been reported there.43

While this report atypically spared blacks any criticism, as in the reports out of Springfield, Lawrenceville, Evansville, and elsewhere, a picture of the perilous place blacks occupied even above the Mason-Dixon Line was presented to immigrants.

More typically journals mixed lurid accounts of the violence with attempts to explain for readers what blacks had done to trigger the assaults. A sample of this genre can best be gleaned from the coverage of the 1919 Chicago race riot, in which New Yorkský denník ran a six-column headline on its July 30, 1919, page one story, “Battle rages between blacks and whites.” “In Chicago,” the story ran, “the battles between blacks and whites have killed 25 people. In the city the army has been invited in, to restore order.” The story explained the urgent need for such measures: “15,000 blacks have Army experience, and along with that, many of them have weapons. The blacks have more than 2,000 rifles.” The following day, the paper’s headlines warned, “in Chicago the battles and unrest are even bloodier than yesterday,” but by August 1 the reporter reassured, “6,000 soldiers are working to restore order in Chicago.” “At the mayor’s request,” he wrote, “soldiers will occupy every Negro quarter. Still, blacks continue to attack the soldiers – the number of murdered people after five days is more than 30.” Nevertheless, the reporter noted, “The situation in Chicago is improving.”44

Ominous foregrounding of blacks’ worrisome military training and their stockpile of rifles overlooks the real perpetrators of this and similar riots, the white gangs that attacked blacks for daring to swim too near a whites-only beach.
or walk through a white ethnic neighborhood. It is black self-defense that seems to have alarmed the reporter. The implication was that it was blacks who were in need of control, as the mayor invited the army to occupy black neighborhoods, not enclaves such as Bridgeport, whose residents had initiated the attacks on blacks.

It’s important to note that not all new immigrant groups accepted the argument of black lawlessness. Polish newspapers, Dominic Pacyga has demonstrated, were instrumental in calming Back of the Yards. After a fire was set in the neighborhood, some Polish-black skirmishes seem to have occurred, at which point the Reverend Louis Grudzinski of Saint John of God Roman Catholic Church called for peace. Grudzinski and other Polish priests and business leaders reminded their compatriots that Poles and blacks had worked together amicably in the packinghouses, and Dziennik Chicagoski blamed the riots and fires on the Irish, who were the “traditional enemies” of the Poles. However, rumors flew fast in that chaotic summer and other columns in Dziennik Chicagoski blamed blacks for the fires in the Back of the Yards. Lamentably, Naród Polski on August 6, 1919, went so far as to suggest blacks deserved their fate due to their supposed sexual promiscuity. Still, this seems to have been a minority Polish view, as many other organs were sympathetic to black victims. Another Polish paper, Dziennik Związkowy, on July 29, provided a short article discussing the racial turmoil but also provided a history of blacks in America, asking, “Is it not right that they should hate the whites?”

The city’s Polish papers, then, were more sympathetic to victimized blacks than the Slovak New Yorkský denník. They approvingly reported the citizens committee meeting of Polish luminaries, and noted that Grudzinski urged calm, saying, “We must not be moved by agitators and then be condemned for having caused the black pogrom.” The efforts by Grudzinski, businessman Bronislaw Kowalewski, and others must be praised, although as Poles and blacks had already been killed in the neighborhood infighting, the call for calm suggests the committee was reacting after some Poles had not been calm (i.e., had rioted). In his study, The Gang (1927), Frederic Thrasher records some Polish gang members from the neighborhood boasting that they had killed several blacks during the summer of 1919, but this could have been retroactive embellishment, at a time, as Pacyga notes, when hostility to blacks was building. Nevertheless, in 1919 Grudzinski’s admirable, tolerant statements were instrumental in largely keeping a lid on the stockyard district. Regrettably, though, no similar sentiments were reported in the Slovak-language newspapers during race riots – in Chicago or elsewhere.

As Pacyga suggests, after witnessing Chicago’s race riots, new immigrants formed a perception of the hypervulnerability of African Americans by the 1920s. Yet coverage of the brutal treatment of blacks had been an ongoing feature of Slovak-language papers since the 1890s, and it is possible that some Slovaks in Chicago and elsewhere had already begun to form an impression of African
Americans as a distinctly disadvantaged group even years before the long hot summer of 1919. Charles Lumpkins notes that while Poles by and large sat out the Chicago melee, after the East St. Louis riot in 1917, some of those brought before the grand jury for their participation in the riot had East and South European names. Not only did the Slovak papers fail to editorialize for calm in Chicago and elsewhere, no Slovak version of Father Grudzinski urged his parishioners to sit out the violence. Rather, McKeesop’s Father Liščinsky was already being criticized in 1919 by a Slovak for being too friendly to the blacks.

Indeed, *New Yorkský denník* went beyond generalized fears of racial tumult; the paper foregrounded alleged black acts of violence and lawlessness in seeking to explain for its readers the events in the Windy City. Not only did the paper note that 15,000 Chicago blacks had served in the army (and perhaps developed an expectation that democratic rights would be granted them, a commonly expressed fear of mainstream white commentators). *New Yorkský denník* also reported that blacks were alleged to have charged the city’s armories in an attempt to stockpile further weapons. “The blacks only with great effort were beaten back” from the Eighth Regiment Armory, the report noted. While the account allowed that whites had assaulted blacks trying to get to work, it was such black responses to these attacks that were painted in the most lurid and alarmist tones. “New outbreaks occurred this evening, when blacks who work in large factories were traveling home from work. Blacks fought back and attacked whites with stones and with deadly razor blades. Some blacks armed themselves [ozbrojili] and in one car, they went into neighborhoods where whites lived, and shot at people. One woman was in fact injured but not seriously. It took quite a long time before police managed to catch these blacks.” The paper further reported that, “On 35th Street very many blacks gathered and they started throwing rocks at the police who were on duty there. . . . Blacks have fired into the homes of whites, and the police have arrived to restore order.” This was necessary, because “Blacks later began to attack white shops and robbed them. Police fired into the black crowds, but this didn’t deter them from engaging in further demolition.”

As Rebecca Hill has documented, African Americans exercising self-defense and gun-ownership rights have often been recast in the white imagination as lawless and violent outcasts; this trope was on full display in Slavic papers. An immigrant reader relying solely on *New Yorkský denník* (which had a nationwide circulation in spite of its Manhattan locale) would have likely concluded that black attacks on the forces of law and order were responsible for the Midwest’s mayhem.

The following day, the paper’s headlines warned, “in Chicago the battles and unrest are even bloodier than yesterday,” and gravely stated, “The worst situation reported is that blacks in burning houses have fired on firefighters who have been called to put out the fires. Orders have therefore now been issued to firefighters that they should carry weapons. Blacks have now threatened that they
will burn whites’ houses.” As in much later white assaults on blacks, such as the 1967 Newark unrest, where commentators from Ronald Porambo to Tom Hayden have demonstrated that off-duty police shot unarmed, fleeing black looters, in the Slovak coverage of Chicago’s turmoil attacks on blacks were trumped by unfounded rumors of black snipers and arsonists. Soon, though, reports noted, “6,000 soldiers are working to restore order in Chicago.”

Not every article unequivocally accepted the argument for black lawlessness. Even New Yorkský denník, where overall coverage played up black violence as responsible for the riot’s intensity, noted that authorities were more lenient toward white lawbreakers than black. “The Chicago city police have been accused of favoring the white people,” the paper noted. “Meanwhile, blacks have been disarmed, while whites are still allowed to carry weapons. Many whites who were supposedly arrested were already released on the riot’s second day.” On August 7, after the riots had ended, the paper sardonically noted, “Already seventeen blacks have been indicted before the courts, but not a single white man. So far the lords of Chicago have not placed a single guilty white man before the courts, and whites have been killing just as well as blacks. As proof that justice is still blind in one eye and truly unequal, let’s look at even a bit of American democracy that has driven whites to treat blacks even as wildlife, and when finally blacks push back, then they are condemned, but as to whites who kill blacks, they can kill and even escape without punishment.”

These are admirable sentiments, and indicate the ambivalence with which new immigrants often viewed the “plemenný boj” that swirled around them while nevertheless exhibiting sympathy toward blacks on many occasions. Still, these sentiments coexisted with unalloyed reportage of black violence and criminality, and may not have effaced the impression among some newcomers that there was something natural in whites’ resistance to black incursions into residential space.

Pacyga suggests Poles and other new immigrants may have learned in the coverage of assaults on blacks just which Americans could be dismissed as interlopers in the neighborhood or hiring hall. Certainly the weeklong assaults in Chicago, like similar indiscriminate white mobbing of African Americans in other cities, demonstrated the vulnerability of Slavs’ black fellow countrymen. Yet coverage of the brutal treatment of blacks was already by 1919 a regular feature in Jednota, New Yorkský denník, Amerikansky russky viestnik, and Slovák v Amerike, and similar stories had been read by many immigrants for decades. Some Slovaks in Chicago and elsewhere may already have formed an impression of African Americans as a distinctly disadvantaged group even years before the long hot summer of 1919. James Barrett notes Poles’ and other white immigrants’ distinct resentment of blacks as strikebreakers in Chicago’s packinghouse district, even though other white ethnics scabbed, suggesting a differential treatment of black job competitors compared to the attitude toward members of other groups.
While there were critiques of white assaults on blacks, as when New Yorkský deník on August 2 faulted whites for abusing blacks trying to get to work at the stockyards, such criticisms were brief. In any event the paper also had a ready explanation for the ferocity of white reaction to a black presence in “their” city.

In Chicago there are now so many blacks that the city has now been unable to give any advice as to how to resolve the whole situation. Specifically, in the black district there are now a half million blacks presently in Chicago. This huge amount of blacks moved to Chicago during the war, when many large factories needed laborers. These factories sent agents to all the places in the South and everywhere they recruited blacks with promises of great conditions in the factories and the mines, if only they’d go to work. They were told that in the North there was no difference between blacks and whites, and that they would make a lot more money than in the South. . . .

But the War is over, and ultimately the Army is coming home, and the soldiers have begun reporting to work at the places where they formerly had jobs, resulting in the layoffs of blacks everywhere. Many blacks now are out of work, and thus they’ve started stealing and looting, the very thing that motivates whites against them.

Consequently, in America there are reports in Chicago, as in many other places, of white schoolchildren who refuse to sit with black schoolchildren. This too has been the cause of many outbursts. Whites are further greatly enraged when blacks have migrated into places that were formerly purely white neighborhoods. Blacks have moved into those houses in which white people lived. In one neighborhood in Chicago, home owners not knowing what else to do then placed bombs in the houses where blacks lived.53

In this account, white Chicagoans (not blacks pulled off streetcars and beaten) are portrayed as almost helpless before a dire onslaught, for what else could a homeowner do but firebomb an African American neighbor? The very presence of blacks in the city is posited as a problem, a dilemma that Chicago authorities are unable to solve. As with lynching accounts, white mobs, it is implied, were in some respect forced to take matters into their own hands and solve the problem of black residential and job-site intrusion themselves. The dramas about which Slovaks read in 1919 would a generation later be repeated in Slavic enclaves such as Cicero or Detroit when further black migrants were forcefully resisted.54

In a sidebar, the paper again sought to explain why the riots had erupted:

Chicago’s slaughterhouse and packinghouse [vékojatkárov] agents during the war heavily agitated among the blacks of the South. They distributed various leaflets, which contained many nice images, and they handed these out among the blacks. The pictures were of a nice house, in which blacks and whites lived
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together. Under the house were the words “Social Equality.” They contained a photo, it has been shown, that portrayed blacks and whites receiving the same salaries. Below was the inscription, “First pay.” In this way, Chicago’s packing-houses [velkojakāri] received several hundred thousand blacks who migrated to Chicago. Many blacks were successful and became wealthier. They moved to neighborhoods. Their children went into the same schools that white children attended. They earned the same salary that white men earned.

But the war came to an end. Blacks were laid off as the firms’ war work wound down, and returning soldiers took their rightful places. . . . Many blacks have become idle. Rents increased and blacks found they could not pay. As a result, they often became loafers and the status of blacks has become unsustainable and consequently, there arose racial unrest.55

Such coverage seems to suggest there was something almost criminally liable in employers “agitating” among blacks by promising equal pay for equal work, or reassuring them they could live wherever they chose. Mainstream white shibboleths of the dreaded “social equality” between the races were also repeated for newcomers who themselves were only provisionally white in the eyes of many native-born Americans. Such fears of proximity were repeated in explanations for the Omaha and Tulsa race riots, too. Moreover, in Chicago it is soldiers – almost certainly the unstated assumption is these are white soldiers – who had a natural right to jobs and to expel blacks who lapsed into idleness or criminality once the war was over. Boundaries were very quickly erected, via such coverage, around deserving, white neighbors and coworkers, and black interlopers.56

Even the paper’s last-paragraph attempt at evenhandedness merely established a moral equivalence between those who had assaulted blacks and those defending their homes and lives. “The better class of people in Chicago did not participate in any of the riots, everything was perpetrated by the lowest classes, in the white neighborhoods as well as among the blacks,” New Yorkský denník reported. “Blacks, who have for years been living in Chicago, will still remain here, but the leaders of the whites and the blacks have just made it clear that it will take years to forget the mutual persecution, which prevailed in recent days between the two races.” Thus this “race war,” as so often in the past, was labeled by the immigrant press a matter of “mutual persecution.” What blacks pulled from streetcars and beaten had to do to avoid being characterized as part of “the lowest classes” was left unstated in this paper.57

Further stories soon warned Slavic readers that unscrupulous employers were again seeking to lure Southern blacks northward. On August 30, New Yorkský denník again posited white entitlement to industrial jobs and consequent anger at blacks who had illegitimately taken their jobs during the war as well as criminal blacks as explanations for Chicago’s week-long melee. “[N]ow, when U.S. troops have returned home from France, they are eager to get their jobs back from
those black replacements. This was also the true cause of the bloody fighting [srážok] between blacks and whites in Chicago, where very many black people have been left without work, and yet have to do something to live, so they’ve taken to stealing what they can.”58

As in East St. Louis, where in 1917 “local union leaders began to complain that black workers ’took work’ that ‘belonged to the white man,’ ”59 a racial, hierarchical job market is assumed in this account. Of course, such an account of rational fights for jobs by hard-working, patriotic white veterans fails to explain why blacks were pulled off streetcars or beaten for even walking through the wrong neighborhood. The white sense of entitlement to jobs, though, was faithfully reprinted in the immigrant press.

In the 1919 riot’s aftermath, the paper continued to foreground black criminality as the cause for whites’ resentment, and mass resistance, to the Great Migration’s newcomers. “Murder of white boy by blacks in Chicago causes rioting,” a September 22, 1920 headline announced. “The blacks used their razors” in a robbery, the story noted, to sever the head of their victim.60

In this, the coverage of the rioting followed a well-established trope of highlighting black criminality that papers such as New Yorkský denník had been following for years, and the razors that were featured in coverage of the previous year’s rioting were resuscitated as a fearsome black weapon. Even as early as 1901, stories of black criminality abounded in the immigrant papers, as when Slovák v Amerike reported a “nigersky bandy” (Negro band) was marauding through the Connellsville, Pennsylvania, area with revolvers, robbing and murdering white farmers. In 1903 the paper reported that 200 whites in Chicago had chased and nearly lynched a black man for saying something insulting to a white woman. Two years later the paper reported, “Bloody Battle Between Negroes and the Police” on New York’s West Sixty-first Street. Amerikansky russky viestnik also featured black criminality as early as 1894, while in 1909 Jednota headlines more alarmingly warned “Blacks terrorize Pittsburgh” in telling of a gang of 126 blacks who supposedly were sexually assaulting all white women in the Hill District.

With less of the fears of cross-racial sexuality prevalent in lynching stories, other accounts of violent black crime were featured in Slovák v Amerike telling of robberies and murders in New York, Beaver, Pennsylvania, and Baltimore. New Yorkský denník reported on a black robbery gang in Providence, Rhode Island; a black wife-murderer in Red Bank, New Jersey, and a vacationing doctor from Bangor, Maine, who was “fatally shot by a Negro in his lodgings” in Jacksonville, Florida. Tellingly, while a few stories related the violence of Italian gangsters, no regular drumbeat of “white” murderers was carried in the Slovak papers.61

This foregrounding of black lawlessness only accelerated in the aftermath of World War I. In the same year as the Chicago and Omaha race riots, stories in New Yorkský denník related that a black man had murdered a farmer of Arundel, Maryland, burned his victim’s corpse, and then severely injured his daughter.
The paper also told of the apprehension of a black murderer in Camden, New Jersey. “A black man who is suspected of trifling with a certain Mrs. Mary Notzer of Merchantville, a woman worker in the shipyards, will probably be lynched a short time from now by a crowd of people, from whom he fled into a swamp where he hid in the grass.” The following year on the same day the paper reported two stories of black murderers who were killed when trying to flee, one in Cumberland, Maryland, the other in Montgomery, Alabama. In the latter case it was alleged the black man had fatally wounded a policeman. While he lay in his hospital bed, “several people went and killed the black man there.” His accomplices were likewise dispatched. “It is generally recognized that the crowd was justified in catching and lynching the three black men.” Another time the headline screamed, “Negroes battle police in the streets,” reporting, “People’s lives were endangered in New York City last Wednesday in two places as a result of blazing revolvers.” In 1922 the paper reported on Oklahoma’s execution of a 14-year-old black boy for murder. And in the next issue after its coverage of the Rosewood, Florida, massacre and routing of all the town’s blacks, New Yorkský denník again reported on a black murderer. The repetition of stories of black criminality established for readers a template of black lawlessness that explained urban race riots.62

To be sure, the paper did see fit in December 1922 to run a “Report on what blacks really have in America,” which faulted Jim Crow railroad carriages in Mississippi, but within weeks it was running yet another story of black criminality regarding a young murderer from Orange, New Jersey; the drumbeat of black crime drowned out the very occasional critique of Jim Crow. The previous month a headline writer labeled a story of black crime in Watervliet, New York, “Negro has a strong thick skull.”63

Even when reports noted that innocent blacks suffered, the proximate cause of a race riot was often given as a black-on-white crime. In Charleston, South Carolina, in 1919, it was reported that “2,000 marines surged into the streets and killed the blacks, and also injured many others, many of whom were innocent.” While the article said an investigation had been ordered “to determine what was the origin of all this mess and battles,” it also noted that “It has been reported that Isaac Doctor, a black man, was fatally injured after he killed a marine.”64

Reports of 1919’s Omaha race riot likewise stated, with no skepticism, “The unrest in Omaha is due to the fact that blacks have recently committed several crimes against whites. The worst of all these evils was that last Thursday, William Brown, a black defendant, was tried for violating a prominent young white woman, Agnes Lobeck.” This account from Omaha was not alone in the Slavic press in accepting tales of black sexual malfeasance as established fact.65 As in the earlier Chicago riots, New Yorkský denník played up blacks’ efforts to arm themselves, suggesting this was the largest contributing factor to the severity of Omaha’s tumult. Although on September 30 the paper detailed the torture and murder of
a black prisoner by a large mob of whites, the following day it was the organized defense by the city’s black community that most alarmed the reporter. On the first day the reporter noted that

Some of the mob grabbed the black prisoner, and tied clothing around his neck and threw him from the window. The cloth was lashed around his neck. When he was brought down he was already half dead with fear. Once abducted, he was taken across the street and hung on an electric pole. People were beating each other as everyone wanted to get to the end of the rope and get at this black victim. When he was hung, someone pulled out a revolver and shot the dead black man. After this everyone started to shoot him. It was indicated that the black man had suffered more than a thousand wounds. The black man then was cut into souvenir pieces, but the black’s carcass was tied to a car and dragged through the streets.

As in lynching accounts, these tropes of the evisceration of black personhood were all too familiar by 1919 to Slovak newspaper readers, and established a narrative of hypervulnerable black people. However, in this instance, black Omahans refused to play the roles assigned them, and this seems to have been interpreted by New Yorkský denník as even greater cause for alarm than a white lynch mob. “In the black neighborhoods was where one found most soldiers,” the paper reported. “At 24th and Lake streets were stationed 300 soldiers with eighteen machine guns.” The reason for these deployments was quickly supplied. “Blacks are well armed and have ample supplies of ammunition. City officials confirmed the reports by the city commissioners that there are 10,000 blacks in the city who are fully armed and that the blacks are fully ready to fight to protect their lives and families.”

The report further noted that “The people in this city are already satisfied justice has been done, and there is not even the smallest sign that they want to continue the riots, which began raging here last Sunday.” As in Chicago, onus for the “plemenný boj” ultimately rested with blacks, who had to be disarmed so order could be restored. Slavic papers faithfully reprinted this dominant narrative of the meaning of 1919. New Yorkský denník reported on the winding up of the Omaha riots, “The people truly have no remorse about the deeds that were committed here last Sunday, . . . because everyone says that some stronger measures had been necessary to stop the onslaughts of blacks against whites. As a result of these fears, these race wars between the blacks and whites broke out in Omaha.” As had been the case in East St. Louis two years earlier, any black behavior that broke the mold of complete deference to Jim Crow mores was recast as “the onslaughts of blacks against whites,” and here this foreign-language paper echoed white America’s fears of an assertive “New Negro.” While the paper stated “No one should be so bold as to stand against a regulation of martial law. Today Omaha is as quiet as a cemetery,” the report added, “Omaha residents are not
ashamed for having made what they regarded as a fight to the death.” In further speaking of General Leonard Wood’s efforts to mop up lingering mob violence in the city, the paper noted, “Of special concern are reports of evidence that blacks are well-armed and ready to defend themselves against any attack by the whites. Complete order cannot be restored to the city until all these blacks’ weapons have been confiscated.” Black self-defense, not the white mobs, was portrayed as the biggest cause for alarm.66

Slavic papers, though, expressed dismay at particularly flagrant outbursts of anti-black violence. The coverage of 1921’s Tulsa race riot in New Yorkský denník suggests some Slovaks were still ambivalent in their attitudes toward the New World’s racial mores, by turns appalled at the severity of white attacks and then accepting of the dominant narrative of black culpability or violence in triggering the riots. “Perhaps not even in America has there been a racial disorder of the size of the one that occurred here,” the paper’s lead article of June 3, 1921, began. In writing of Tulsa the reporter said, “It was only here that one encountered more than 85 people killed and several hundred injured. . . . Ten black streets were completely demolished.”

When explaining the cause of the riot’s severity, however, the paper seemed to fault blacks’ self-defense. “When the firing broke out in the black district, blacks began to resist and shot at the attackers. The city then had to call in the Army, which now has imposed martial law.” The report further explained that it was black Tulsans’ attempt to forestall the lynching of a black rape suspect that triggered the first battles between whites and blacks, but that “The unrest really began on the first night, when a policeman stopped a black man who was armed.”67

In subsequent days the paper blamed the riots on the overreaction of the authorities in imposing martial law (which presumably enraged white Tulsans). “People of the city . . . only now see the folly and wrong act committed by General Barrett pursuing a declaration of martial law, which was imposed as a result of the pleas of lewd Negroes, hysterical young girls and some Yellow Journalists.” Blacks’ expectations that the authorities would protect them from lynching mobs were thus discounted. The next day the paper reported “one of the four blacks who is known to be the cause of nearly all the unrest was arrested. He walked and loitered among all the blacks, inciting them against the whites.” A subsequent article located most of the damage “in the troublesome black neighborhood.”

No mention was made that in Tulsa, as elsewhere, it was actually respectable and successful blacks who were the particular targets of white terrorists, or that blacks later charged only they were disarmed while the National Guard subsequently stood by as white vigilantes attacked them. In the aftermath of the terror campaign against black property owners and businessmen, white Oklahomans proudly sold and traded postcards labeled “Running the Negro out of Tulsa.” Such details likewise were omitted from the Slovak press even as black criminality was highlighted by New Yorkský denník as a supposed proximate cause for the Tulsa carnage.68
The salience of urban race riot coverage becomes apparent if we note the joke with which I began, “the Negro and the greenhorn,” where the porter needles the greenhorn about turning black, appeared in the same edition of *New Yorkský denník* that featured rampaging whites burning out Tulsa’s blacks after they dared fight back. Coverage also naturalized the assaults on blacks as part of the country’s quotidian news cycle by juxtaposing race riot stories with other passing tragedies. Reporting of the 1921 Tulsa race riots in *New Yorkský denník* ended with photo illustrations of the homes and businesses of black Tulsans that had been firebombed and gutted by white attackers and strafed by military aircraft called in after blacks fought back against white would-be lynchers. Whether the mobs rampaged in Chicago, Tulsa, Rosewood, Florida, or Philadelphia, the ultimate outrage seemed to be that blacks would think to defend themselves.69

On the very day following the paper’s coverage of the Tulsa riots there appeared a photo of a “huge flood in Colorado.” To the casual observer, the photo is almost identical to the one of the Tulsa carnage that had run the previous day. Flooding rivers, rampaging whites firebombing blacks – both were equated as natural disasters that might occur in the daily news cycle. To the immigrant, both might have seemed just a part of nature70 (see Figures 7-3 and 7-4).

Of course, in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina many Americans are perhaps learning or relearning that even the disasters of nature are differently experienced based on one’s race or socioeconomic standing. But the juxtaposition of race riots with flooding coverage points to a lesson on newspapers’ naturalization of America’s social order that was first articulated more than 80 years ago. As Walter White of the NAACP noted regarding mainstream newspapers’ lynching coverage, the quotidian mixing of white assaults on blacks with natural disaster and human interest stories cast the violently imposed racialized order in America as simply part of the ordinary course of events. Slovak newspaper readers consumed a moral order, not just a daily newspaper, when they read such coverage back to back. A flood might rip through Colorado, with nothing anyone could do to stop the force of nature. So, too, from time to time blacks were assaulted for daring to ride trolley cars or buy a home or business where they wished in Tulsa or Chicago. That was just the way things were.71

A similar naturalization of white-on-black violence was reported in 1923 in *New Yorkský denník*’s brief account of a New Year’s assault on the relatively prosperous blacks of Rosewood, Florida. The account explained the assault on all blacks in the town by a mob of more than 200 arose “as a consequence of the brute force of that violent deed” by Jesse Hunter, who had “perpetrated forcible violence on a young white girl.” As a result, the paper, said, “a great indignation arose among the white people, which in truth erupted into a war between the whites and the blacks, in which two whites and six blacks were slaughtered. Several other people were injured.” The two brief paragraphs devoted to the Rosewood rampage offered no hint the black part in this “race war” was a futile defense of their homes. Nor did the article mention that it was relatively prosperous black
**Figure 7-3:** “After the Racial Unrest in Tulsa.” The destruction of Tulsa’s black neighborhood by white mobs was depicted as akin to a natural disaster. *New Yorkský denník*, June 14, 1921, 1.

**Figure 7-4:** “Big Flood in Colorado.” The damage caused by a flood and a white mob are almost indistinguishable. *New Yorkský denník*, June 15, 1921, 1.
homeowners and businessmen who were targeted by white Floridians, not the stereotypical violent and oversexed black beasts of white phobias. As Sherrilyn Ifill notes, many white mobs of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries explicitly directed their terror at successful blacks, for, as in Rosewood, “In these communities, black prosperity was a form of racial insubordination, which could provoke violent reprisals.” Such an analysis was absent from New Yorkský denník; instead, in mentioning the suspected assailant against white womanhood, Jesse Hunter, the immigrant paper furthered the dominant narrative. The brief report concluded by reassuring immigrant readers that “Peace has already partially been restored [zavedený], as all the blacks have fled the little town and are hiding in the nearby hills. All the blacks’ houses were burned and destroyed.”

Here, as in the earlier accounts from Chicago, Tulsa, and Omaha, punishment of blacks for daring to exhibit any hints of resistance or self-defense was couched as a restoration, not a disruption, of the racialized peace. It’s impossible to gauge exactly how Slovak readers interpreted such accounts (and of course not all readers came to the same conclusion on matters of race or on any other topic). Still, a trope of the illegitimacy of black residential or occupational presence in the American landscape seems to have been followed in the Rosewood account, so that as more blacks took part in the Great Migration into the urban Midwest and North they already came with a stigma so far as Slavic immigrants were concerned. The African American version of the events of Rosewood – attempts to ward off a lynch mob – were absent from New Yorkský denník, just as the mainstream, English-language newspapers omitted these mitigating factors. It was not until the late 1990s, after all, that a few elderly black survivors of the Rosewood massacre won a minimal financial settlement and apology from the state of Florida. (In this they at least fared better than black Oklahomans, who the Supreme Court decided deserved neither apology nor restitution for the 1921 atrocities.)

Some radical Slavs might have learned that treatment of blacks in the North was not that different from in the South, for Rovnost ľudu (Equality for the People) often reprinted material from The Daily Worker, which, for example, printed a cartoon by Fred Ellis of a somber, strong black man at a crossroads under signs reading, “The North,” “The South.” At his feet is a newspaper with the headline, “10 Killed in Gary.” Such cartoons or commentary were absent, however, in the major nonradical immigrant papers. These journals published tales of “race wars” such as at Tulsa or Rosewood that implied black criminality was the factor that triggered a popular uprising to expel intruders and reestablish communal peace. The actions of Rosewood whites prefigured the violent welcome Slavs (as well as other whites) extended to blacks in Chicago, Detroit, Cicero, and other localities beginning in the 1920s and again during and immediately after World War II.

For years Slavic newspapers had recast the very act of black self-defense as brutal criminality, as when headlines relating a 1908 Delaware “race war” established a moral equivalence between blacks and whites, with no hint that what blacks
were actually engaged in was resistance to lynch mobs. Even while noting that whites had attacked the houses of four blacks, the paper reported that blacks fighting back required deployment of the First Delaware Regiment. This coverage came only five years after the graphic coverage of George F. White’s torture lynching in Wilmington. Any vestigial revulsion at such accounts did not translate into sympathy for blacks caught in urban race wars; nor did it prevent writers from branding blacks who reacted to attacks with armed self-defense in Chicago or East St. Louis as “lawbreakers” or members of “armed mobs.” As noted, when blacks in Lawrenceville, Illinois, attempted to attend a carnival, they were set upon by a white mob and another “race war,” Slovák v Amerike reported, erupted. The paper reported all the whites of the town ran to the assistance of a white man who got into a fight with a black man named Goines who objected to being expelled from the fairgrounds.75

To be sure, white ethnics were often violently attacked, as Frederic Thrasher’s The Gang noted for 1920s Chicago. New immigrants such as Slovaks knew straying into the wrong block might earn one a beating from Irish toughs, and thus arguably the frequent items on “race wars” could have been seen as merely more examples of such urban mayhem. Still, the weeks-long assault on all blacks as blacks, not just gang members, that broke out with greater frequency in the World War I era likely caused many new immigrants to conclude blacks were indeed the country’s permanent pariahs, as Pacyga argues.76

For all the extreme violence of early twentieth-century cities, there is a qualitative difference between the territorial battles between lawless groups – gang members – and the ongoing terror perpetrated against blacks by those who proclaimed themselves upholders of moral law and community standards. Even those gang battles between ethnically defined gangs were largely based on neighborhood geography, Thrasher notes, and the majority of Chicago gangs he documented were multi-ethnic white. When an Italian, say, moved onto a Polish block and was so inclined, Thrasher notes he easily joined another ethnic group’s gang.77

By contrast, gang hostility against blacks, Thrasher says, won the approval of respectable sectors of white neighborhoods. And in the phrase repeated in numerous Slovak newspaper lynching accounts, “the enraged citizens” in Tulsa took it upon themselves to eviscerate blacks with rifles, dynamite, even aerial bombardment called in by the state militia. This surely is a far cry from battles, even fatal battles, between gang members who were deviant, not upstanding community members.78

In Chicago, Tulsa, and elsewhere, blacks of respectable mien were particularly targeted as hundreds of whites of all walks of life – what Arnold Hirsch called an “ecological mob” – pulled blacks from streetcars, firebombed houses and indiscriminately beat blacks wherever they were found. Sherrilyn Ifill and Grace Elizabeth Hale both note that often successful blacks were especially regarded as offenders against white supremacy because their achievements gave the lie to Jim Crow’s white supremacist rhetoric. Such rage at blacks stepping beyond their
“place” often motivated urban mobs, too, as when Detroiter in 1925 mobbed the house of Ossian Sweet, a relatively well-off black physician who sought to buy a home in an all-white neighborhood. This was beyond the deviant behavior of gangs defending their hangouts from other gangs. From 1917 to 1922 riots were only the most extreme form of violence against blacks, for dozens of firebombings of black homeowners continued at a pace of better than one a month, as William Tuttle, Hirsch, and Philpott demonstrate. Hirsch notes firebombings continued from 1917 to 1922 in Detroit, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and New York whenever not gang members but black homeowners threatened whites-only neighborhoods. Here thousands of “law-abiding” whites reacted to a black presence intrinsically regarded as illegitimate. Black citizenship rights were called into question in the most graphic fashion in a way Slovaks and other new immigrants, for all the strikebreaking goons or gang skirmishes they faced, mercifully never experienced.79

Within the riot stories appearing in Slovak papers, accounts of whites targeting all blacks for expulsion from neighborhoods and even whole cities offered a sense of blacks as illegitimate intruders in these permissibly whites-only spaces. When news reports told of how white mobs terrorized all blacks into fleeing Rankin, Pennsylvania, a city where many Slavs labored, a cognitive map may have been laid for new immigrants of who was permissible, who unwelcome, on one’s block.80

As early as 1903, though, Slavic papers advertised for their readers a way out of the cities already characterized as dangerous sites of racial strife. As noted in Chapter 2, one such ad for a Wallington, New Jersey “Slovak colony” appeared alongside the account of the torture and lynching of a black teenager in Wilmington, Delaware. Offers of home ownership were extended to Slovaks who were reading of the lynching of blacks, surely a tutorial on the further marginality of African Americans compared to those newcomers to New Jersey. The avenue to mobility was offered to some Americans, not others.81

The same issue of New Yorkský denník covering the East St. Louis riot featured an ad for a suburban realty company, in which a cartoon Uncle Sam points the way to New Jersey’s subdivisions. Slovaks were “invited” to the splendor of Somerville and Metuchen, newly created oases from the dark city. “Such an offer has never been made!” a 1917 ad promised. “For each buyer in our beautiful Floral Park, Somerville, New Jersey, we will build a HOUSE free. FREE! FREE!” To be sure these were modest pieces of the American dream. “A large steel mill sits adjacent to this property, and they are always in need of skilled workers and unskilled workers,” the ad continued. “Here’s your chance to make a start in a place where you can live right and where you can make money. We sell 10,000 four-year leases on easy installments, on plots which are sufficient for HOMES and gardens where you can grow your vegetables.” A similar ad from 1920 urged Slovak readers, “Overcome your lack of livelihood. Here is your opportunity. This five-bedroom house and 10-foot lot goes for $2,450. $200 down, then $12 a
month. This property is situated between Perth Amboy and Metuchen, New Jersey, which city is surrounded by factories, where you can easily get enough work”82 (see Figures 7-5 and 7-6).

While some scholars have argued the suburbanization of white ethnics was first facilitated by the post-World War II federal programs such as the GI Bill of Rights, it is clear the process had begun decades before. An advertisement championing the GI Bill almost parallels the earlier Slovak ads. On April 14, 1945, in the same edition reporting on President Franklin Roosevelt’s death, the Altoona Mirror ran an advertisement, “Home Mortgage Loans Under the GI Bill of Rights.” A line drawing accompanying the ad shows a happy white veteran and the Missus in front of a suburban house, very similar to the ads Slovaks had been reading since at least 1903.83

**Figure 7-5:** “Free! Free!” Uncle Sam Pointing Slovaks the Way to the Suburbs (ad for Floral Park, Somerville, New Jersey). This ad appeared as the East Saint Louis antiblack riots were simmering. The text promises potential home buyers, “A large steel mill sits adjacent to this property, and they are always in need of skilled workers and unskilled workers. Here’s your chance to make a start in a place where you can live right and where you can make money.” New Yorkský denník, July 2, 1917, 4.
Figure 7-6: Illustration of a little suburban house accompanying real estate ad for Metuchen, New Jersey. “Overcome Your Lack of Livelihood. Here is Your Opportunity.” New Yorkský denník, June 5, 1920, 8.
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Such early ads may have appealed to Slovaks’ desire to live in proximity to a variety of industrial sites, and the promise of some steady income or at least self-sufficient food in times of economic downturn. The ad for the Slovak colony in Wallington likewise highlighted as a positive feature of the prospective home sites the proximity of myriad chemical works, enamel works, woolen mills, and other factories, as does an ad for homes near Philadelphia’s Hog Island shipbuilding center, which noted the proximity of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, Remington factory, Eddystone American factory, DuPont, and other plants.84

The point is that such ads, however, were not running in black newspapers such as the Amsterdam News or Chicago Defender. At least not for the real-estate developments to which Slovaks began flocking. Rather, these ads, when juxtaposed with news coverage of urban racial tumult, were the silent escape hatch from urban unrest, an escape hatch that was barred to other Americans. Indeed, only if certain (black) Americans were kept out could the nation’s Somervilles and Metuchens effectively serve as an immigrant idyll, a place where Slovaks and other white ethnics could “make a start in a place where they could live right.”85

As early as 1903, then, ads promised prospective home buyers in quasi-suburban spaces a “Slovak colony,” while reporting on prosaic lynchings, and, when blacks ventured North, white-initiated race riots that were characterized as understandable reactions to a threatening black presence. As with so many other issues of the immigrant press, various racial commentaries were printed side by side, and the sum total of race coverage in all its manifestations – these off-putting juxtapositions – again point to the multi-vocal ways in which race lessons were articulated for new immigrants, and the different paths afforded to those who could make a claim, no matter how tenuous, to a Caucasian identity in the New World. No friendly cartoon uncle similarly invited blacks to buy suburban homes. The disproportionate mortgage benefits extended to white ethnics and not blacks only became sharper with the redlining policies of the Federal Housing Administration, exclusionary policies that continued in effect into the 1970s.86

Such row-house phrenology was an ongoing process, never a seamless matter in which all readers drew the same lessons, all at the same time. There is no way to know how these stories of race riots were interpreted by each and every reader. But, as with lynchings, there were no Slovak editorials condemning the urban assaults on blacks. And the evidence suggests that from the World War I era on, many Slovaks began to regard blacks in much the same way as other whites. Slovaks participated, among other white ethnics, in the week-long race riots that ensued in 1918 when the first black person moved into the Grays Ferry section of Philadelphia. In this neighborhood, which had a significant Slavic component, white ethnics of many backgrounds banded together and attempted to burn down a row house into which blacks had moved. The “outsiders” in this instance, though, were equipped for self-defense (as Rebecca Hill notes, perhaps the most outrageous black “crime” in the eyes of many whites) and fired on the jeering, polyglot crowd, and the black-white battles continued for days, as black clergymen
complained police did nothing to restrain white rioters, only stopping blacks from fighting back.  

This was a frequent lament of middle-class blacks, such as business owners or clergymen, and, as in East St. Louis in 1917 or Chicago in 1919, police seem to have abetted white rioters attacking black newcomers to the neighborhood. In any case, none of these black complaints of official hypocrisy made it into the Slavic immigrant newspapers, just as they were largely absent from the mainstream (white) papers such as the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. Only when blacks fought back did an alarm about lawlessness lead to calls for law and order.  

As Vincent Franklin notes, only Philadelphia’s black newspaper, the *Philadelphia Tribune*, articulated African Americans’ grievances, and when its editor did so, he unapologetically urged his readers to exercise their rights to self-defense. “We favor peace but we say to the colored people of the Pine Street war-zone, stand your ground like men,” editor G. Grant Williams thundered. “This is a free city in a free country and if you are law-abiding you need not fear. . . . [I]f you are attacked defend yourselves like American citizens. A man’s home is his castle, defend it if you have to kill some of the dirty foul-mouthed, thieving crew of Schuylkill rats that infest the district. They have ever been a menace to the peace and decency of the district and many of the police either feared or worked in collusion with them.  

“You are not down in Dixie now and you need not fear the ragged rum-crazed hellion crew, prototypes of your old cracker enemies. . . . They may burn some of the property, but you burn their hides with any weapon that comes handy while they are engaged in that illegal pastime.”  

Whether besieged black homeowners needed Williams’ encouragement or not, a month later some did choose to resist white mobs, but black assertions of self-defense rights only further enraged the mob. As luck would have it, one of the slain South Philadelphia whites was a policeman, Thomas McVay, whose mother exclaimed in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, “He didn’t deserve to meet with such an end, to be killed by the bullet of a negro!” No similar lament was heard about “my boy” being shot by a Slovak or *Talianov*.  

For a week after this incident blacks were indiscriminately pulled from streetcars and beaten by marauding white mobs. Nothing like this week-long racial paralysis developed when white ethnics bought houses in the formerly Irish neighborhood; for all the simmering hostility between varying provisional white groups, lessons in who was really an acceptable neighbor were already being learned by 1918. Slovaks were only a minority of the mobs in Philadelphia, which editor Williams characterized as “the scum of Erin’s sod.” But as the immigrant members of the Coatesville, Pennsylvania, lynch mob had demonstrated seven years before the Grays Ferry riots, the binaries of black and white were the salient lines being drawn largely through newspaper coverage of illegitimate black presence in workplace and neighborhood. Whether they were yet overwhelmingly participating in antiblack actions, Slavic immigrants were reading and learning
of the perilous place blacks occupied in the United States in ways that did not apply to other groups. Slovaks may have enjoyed Masaryk’s tweaking of Teutonic or Magyar pretensions, but didn’t riot at rumors of German or Hungarian incursion into their neighborhoods.91

In Chicago, Detroit, and other cities during the early 1920s, restrictive covenants barred blacks from neighborhoods that accommodated many white ethnic groups. Philpott observes this exclusionary device was something “in which ethnic and native whites collaborated.” Pacyga notes, too, the same Chicago Polish paper, Dziennik Chicagoski, that had urged forbearance during the 1919 riots, by 1928 publicized a meeting of a restrictionist society to keep undesirables out. Another legal mechanism to keep blacks out of neighborhoods, municipal ordinances formally designating certain streets “whites only” and others “blacks only,” was publicized by Slovák v Amerike and New Yorkský denník, but such measures were declared unconstitutional. Restrictive covenants, though, proved a more durable device for enforcing residential segregation. In Saint Louis, a Polish American association enthusiastically backed the enactment of that city’s 1916 residential segregation ordinance. But in New Yorkský denník an account of a Dallas segregation ordinance was headlined “In the land of the free,” suggesting Slovaks could still object to racial hypocrisy, or at least identify it.92

The persistent assaults, on blacks but not other white ethnics in defended neighborhoods, would suggest, as Pacyga argues for Poles in the 1920s, that antiblack animus very much had to be learned. Perhaps in the case of the Slovaks, such venom supplanted other, Old World distinctions. Papers such as Slovák v Amerike and New Yorkský denník were full of anti-Magyar vitriol and even, lamentably, anti-Semitic stereotypes. Based on these prejudices, one would expect Slovaks to have rioted against the very first Magyar or Jewish family on the block. Yet, for all the suspicion with which Slovaks greeted Magyars, Jews, Italians, or Czechs, this was not the case – a wary coexistence was worked out among white ethnics in cities such as Detroit, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Gang battles occurred, and often there was no love lost between Slovak and Italian, say, but never was there broad-based communal opposition to Italian or other group residential proximity.93

White ethnics with Slavic, Italian, Irish, and other white ethnic backgrounds united in the early 1920s in neighborhood improvement districts which enforced racially restrictive covenants (while some such covenants prohibited sales to Jews, the major targets of these devices were black home buyers). Homeowners’ associations in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, and elsewhere devised and enforced racially restrictive covenants that prohibited homeowners from selling to anyone other than a member of the “Caucasian” race. In Chicago, when the Greater Pullman Property Restriction Association was formed to restrict more than 40,000 residential properties in the industrial South Side, the African American Chicago Defender sourly noted the leaders of this and other restrictive associations were often immigrants from a variety of backgrounds. Philpott notes that in Greater Pullman, the members were Protestants, Catholics, and Jews of
Swedish, Dutch, Italian, Polish, Lithuanian, and German background (and 20 other nationalities). Surnames of the restrictive association’s leaders include Korzeniecki, Larocco, Zimmerman, Perlman, Novak, and Bezdek. “Ethnically diverse, the people of Greater Pullman were sticklers for racial purity,” Philpott observes. Thomas Sugrue demonstrates in Detroit similar restrictive covenants covered 80 percent of the Motor City outside of the inner city.94

More violently, in Chicago in the early 1920s, firebombings of black homes averaged one per week as African Americans moved into areas where Slavs, Italians, Irish, and other white ethnics had tenuously coexisted. For all the anti-immigrant prejudice that Slavs and other white ethnics endured in the early twentieth century, nothing like this orchestrated campaign of intimidation had greeted other newcomers to the urban Midwest and North. By 1924 the Chicago Tribune could report that a “Negro” was killed “in the Jewish ‘ghetto’ section of Chicago” after he “was kicked and beaten by a one-hundred-person mob comprised principally of foreigners, and died from a blow to the head with a baseball bat. Racial tension had been running high in the ghetto since a number of Negro families moved in.” The proximate cause was a rumor that two girls had been “accosted” by “a Negro.” That a mob of “foreigners” already reacted in such a manner to a “black threat” suggests that fears of blanket black criminality had already been absorbed by many newcomers.95

This is not to label all Slovaks or other white ethnics with a glib epithet such as racist, merely to observe that members of this group had already learned which other group was vulnerable, and that they soon knew they could enjoy economic resources not available to others. By defending their neighborhoods, East Europeans defended their whiteness, a commodity with tangible economic value in the American context and an identity whose worth they may have begun considering while reading of the attacks on blacks in cities as diverse as Omaha and Tulsa (where few Slovaks lived) and Chicago (where many did).

While Karen Brodkin and David Roediger have done an admirable job of showing how suburbanization in the post-World War II era solidified a sense of defended whiteness among people of many European backgrounds, we may have to move the time line for this process back even further, for in the case of Slovaks (and, as Kazal demonstrates, Philadelphia Germans, too), the process may have started as early as the 1900s and 1910s. Before immigrants lost their ethnic identities, as they read of race riots and offers of suburban homes for immigrant buyers, they also began to understand the salience of whiteness in an American context. Something very multivocal was occurring here. Already by 1920 Slovaks had several options: they might become black after 12 years in America — or they could move to New Jersey and “become” white. In coming years the defense of suburban bungalows from black incursions served to meld distinctions between Jews, Italians, Slovaks, and Irish.96

There were some exceptions to this hardening stigmatization of blacks. As noted in Chapter 2, the Communist paper, Ludový denník (The People’s Daily),
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denounced lynchings and poll taxes, as did the 1937 Robotnícky kalendár (Workers’ Calendar). Unlike the earlier harsh treatment of Jack Johnson, the kalendár in 1937 and 1939 praised the boxer Joe Louis as a black hero. And on at least one occasion in 1930, in Leechburg, Pennsylvania, Slovaks who subscribed to the socialist papers did rent their hall to blacks. Czech socialist-affiliated theater groups in Chicago performed a play in the 1920s and 1930s, When Slavery was in Bloom in America that lionized John Brown for fighting against that institution. While a Czech comedy, All Right!, featured a “Negro, Washington,” he was regarded as a good fellow by his comrades for speaking a pidgin Czech better than they could manage in English. Another Chicago socialist group, the Croatian Theater Society “Nada,” performed an English-language play, Miners, from the Brookwood Labor College. The play features a “Negress” neighbor as well as “an all-devouring capitalist.” While scabs are denounced, as in other, Croatian plays, Hrbeťnica and Jernejčik, the scabs are Irish and Italian, and blacks are regarded as fellow workers and union brothers and sisters.

Such expressions of sympathy seem to have been the exception, and in line with these groups’ radical regard for black “fellow workers.” And, as noted above, Czech and Croatian socialist actors also performed plays in blackface or featuring cannibals in Africa, suggesting that even within the same immigrants radicalism was at war with race consciousness. The Croatians also performed a play by Upton Sinclair, Singing Jailbirds, that had a character called “One Lung, a Chink.”

Other radical Slovaks balked at embracing black fellow workers, for, as noted above, in Philadelphia the Slovak Socialist Workers’ Section from 1921 met at Slovak Hall, where the charter stated facilities were “available for rental by all other groups, but Negroes were excluded because it was feared that their cleanliness standard would not measure up to that of other groups.” Certainly many clubs and parishes were ethnically defined, with entrance only to those with a membership card or willing host. But in this instance it was advertised other (white) ethnic groups were invited to rent the hall. Even if Slovak socialists muttered about Magyars or Irish, no other group was explicitly barred at this venue, and the explanation of a Negro lack of a “cleanliness standard” suggests some immigrants had read these stereotypes somewhere – surely the Slovak press was not the only possible source – and internalized them. For these Slovaks blacks had been accepted as a people apart only two years after the Chicago and Omaha race riots.

Philadelphians were not alone in embracing the New World’s race phobias. Typically, an editorial in Chicago’s Osadné hlasy (Community Voice) in 1931 wanted to know “Where Are the Slovaks?” In demanding support for the Pilsen “protective association,” the editorial asserted “our community is being menaced . . . by the invasion of the yellow race.” Whether this referred to Asians, Mexicans, or African Americans, this editorial suggests there were some potential non-European neighbors who by this point many Slovaks would never accept as part of the community.
Similar demands for neighborhood protection had already come in 1928 in *Dziennik Chicagoski*, which reported on Poles meeting in Back of the Yards to discuss ways to stem the “gradual arrival of other races” that was said to be depressing real estate values. Pacyga notes that Poles who might have by and large sat out the 1919 race riot were only a few years later thinking in racial terms, even though defended Chicago neighborhoods had previously accommodated Irish, Lithuanian, Slovak, and Polish competitors for the same scarce houses and jobs. Pacyga suggests many Poles’ embrace of “the American tradition of racism” and “the acceptance of racism and racial stereotypes may have been the single most important sign of white immigrant acculturation in the United States.” Slovaks’ newspapers seem to have played at least some part in conveying that “American tradition.”

In the internal workings of the American Slav Congress, one can see the tension within members between socioeconomic radicalism and a growing investment in whiteness. Race-thinking had progressed so far that the group’s English-language journal, *The American Slav*, in 1939 pitched its appeal to second-generation white ethnics in explicitly racial terms. “If you are of Slavic origin, you are a member of the biggest family of white people on earth,” the inaugural issue said. But the journal also praised America as “the only nation in the world which had a Civil War for the liberty of negroes,” and, unlike earlier evocations of the freeing of the slaves in papers such as *Národné noviny*, this seems not to have been a rhetorical device arguing Slavs had it worse than blacks.

Shortly after the war the congress’s George Pirinsky reminded readers that his organization had been one of the few East European groups unequivocally to condemn the 1943 assault on blacks in Detroit. “The American Slav Congress by its very nature is averse to racial bigotry and prejudice,” Pirinsky stressed. “Imbued with the philosophy of dynamic democracy, it joined hands with the labor movement and other liberal groups in sharply condemning these disgraceful and dangerous riots. It spoke out vigorously against the Slav Negro baiters, most of them innocent dupes who swallowed the vicious propaganda of native fascists and permitted themselves to be used in their nefarious game.”

Pirinsky continued,

Less than a month after these riots, while the city was still tense, the American Slav Congress publicly condemned them at a Slav Day rally in Hamtramck. More than 5,000 Slavs, assembled in Keyworth Stadium, heard . . . Joseph Martinek, executive secretary of the Czechoslovak National Council of America, and the noted military commentator, Capt. Sergei Journakoff, castigate the fomenters of racial disorders in the sharpest terms. Sharing the platform with them was a youthful Negro leader, Shelton Tappes, secretary of Ford local No. 600, UAW, who described the Detroit riot as Hitler’s last effective weapon and warned the American people not to be taken in by the domestic
Nazi agents. Practically the entire City Council of Hamtramck, the most Polish city in America, attended the rally. . . .

As Pirinsky notes, by 1943 his leftist group had its hands full countering the Slavs who condoned the attacks on blacks. Even before the riots, in a partially Slavic neighborhood in Detroit, whites of many ethnicities had already challenged the planned opening of Sojourner Truth Homes, a public-housing project they feared was designed for blacks. A Polish priest inveighed against the invasion of “the niggers” as a riot ensued to prevent the homes. Perhaps in an effort to rally such unsympathetic Slavs, in the aftermath of the Detroit antiblack riot Národné noviny likewise published an English-language article noting that Congressman Samuel Dickstein blamed the “KKK riot” on far-right agitators such as House Un-American Activities Committee Chairman Martin Dies of Texas. Three weeks after this the paper again published an English-language editorial (reprinted from the CIO News) arguing “Race Hatred is Sabotage.” The paper was the organ of the National Slovak Society, which had many members of the left-leaning unions of the CIO and would itself land on the Attorney General’s List of Subversive Organizations following the war, perhaps because of its embrace of biracial cooperation. The CIO editorial asserted that “job discrimination, poll-tax denials of political rights, [and] unequal community treatment of racial minorities” were “some of the dark spots in American life where race hatred is bred.” Still, the editorial was sure the riots were the work of Hitler’s agents provocateurs, suggesting that even some writers such as this CIO author weren’t all that willing to question the culpability of white Detroiter acting against blacks of their own volition. Other papers were even less forthcoming. While the following year Amerikansky russky viestnik reprinted a statement from New York Archbishop Francis J. Spellman arguing, “We Must Check the Spread of Bigotry,” the cleric only made generalized critiques of bigotry, and did not have anything to say about the treatment of blacks in America.

Even Pirinsky’s own group was conflicted. In spite of denunciations of the Detroit white-on-black riots, from the start the congress’s journal contained frequent invocations of Slavs’ Caucasian or white identity. Assertions of whiteness needn’t have been unequivocal calls for the exclusion of blacks from one’s neighborhoods or job sites, and Matthew Frye Jacobson has persuasively argued that in the 1930s and 1940s race-thinking was in flux between an earlier era in which many people regarded Slavs (and other non-Nordics) as separate races, and a coming time in which all Americans of European descent would take their racial identity for granted. Slavs asserting, as they did in this journal, the “Slavic Racial Contribution to American Culture,” were not necessarily speaking the language of race as it is understood today; indeed, such articles may have been attempts to overcome the non-Nordic stigma that had greeted Slavic immigrants only a short time before.
Still, that such assertions of Slavic worth were couched in racial language suggests second-generation writers and readers of Slovak, Polish, and Ukrainian background had internalized a sense of white identity, partly through their reading of the earlier foreign-language press. For Slavic Americans less committed to working-class solidarity across the race line the salience of one’s naturalized sense of whiteness only grew. In any case, it is difficult to square Pirinsky’s denunciation of Detroit rioters with The American Slav’s 1939 praise of America’s Anglo-Saxon founders and assertion that “Slavic peoples appreciate this spirit very much, indeed, for the leadership of our white men’s civilization and culture depends now mainly on America.” It’s unclear what role the author of these sentiments foresaw for African Americans in “our young, unfinished American nation.” Even though radicals championed black rights, Slavs’ whiteness also seems to have been a hard-won commodity that editors vociferously asserted.105

Within a year Pirinsky and other officers of the congress would have bigger headaches, for the group, like the National Slovak Society, was placed on the Attorney General’s List of Subversive Organizations and succumbed to the anti-communist witch-hunts that permeated the nation. The American Slav Congress advocated continuing friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, suspect after VJ Day. Calls to end racism such as Pirinsky’s, however, were also viewed suspiciously by J. Edgar Hoover and other professional patriots. Likewise when the CPUSA-affiliated Ľudový kalendár for 1947 published a photograph of black and white steelworkers walking a Baltimore picket line together, this likely only provided federal agents with more evidence this publication was beyond the political pale.106

Even papers that sometimes printed noble sentiments about the need to combat “discrimination in public places” were conflicted, for by World War II and its aftermath they had already been running belittling coverage of blacks’ criminality and illegitimacy for decades, and in the 1940s and early 1950s they continued to run such stories even if the editorial page endorsed tolerance. In 1952 New Yorkský denník ran an editorial that approved of the “18 northern states [that] have adopted a variety of civil laws designed to eliminate discrimination from the commercial and entertainment businesses under the collective name Places of Public Accommodation. State intervention has been spotty, however,” the paper noted, and the editorial ended by declaring, “Democratic principles sought through state and local laws . . . at bottom depend on the opinions of individual Americans, their willingness to abide by a moral principle on which our ancestors built this country and to honor the words that all men are free and created equal.”107

Still, at other moments the paper remained quite tin-eared regarding the status of blacks and other non-Europeans. In 1952 the paper also editorialized on “The Progress of American Blacks”: “Only blind people cannot see the milestones on the path of progress for American blacks in recent decades, no matter whether it is in housing, employment, in politics, or in the application of civil law and in education.” As proof of such progress, the editorial referred to articles in
Defended Job Sites, Defended Neighborhoods

the *New York Herald Tribune* citing new blacks-only high schools recently erected in Louisville and North and South Carolina. The justice of Jim Crow itself was not questioned, nor did the editorialist cast his gaze above the Mason Dixon Line; evidently segregation or the attacks by whites on blacks in Detroit and several other Northern cities were unworthy of comment. The “race problem,” for this Slavic paper, needed only ameliorative tinkering, and was, in any case, deemed a Southern problem.\(^{108}\)

In this respect *New Yorkský denník* should not be singled out for special condemnation, but rather seems to have reflected even mainstream “liberal” newspapers’ and institutions’ limited conceptions of what it was reasonable to grant blacks. Endorsements of measures designed to improve, not eradicate, Jim Crow apartheid continued in both Northern and Southern liberal circles in the 1940s and throughout the 1950s.\(^{109}\)

The paper also editorialized a year later that, “Not every Negro in the United States earns his bread shining shoes or as a janitor, as the people in Europe imagine.” The paper extolled the 500 black Texas millionaires, some of whom, the paper marveled, lived in Houston, where only a mere few decades ago slavery had been practiced. Of particular pride, the paper added, were those blacks who had made a success selling cosmetics to their people. The editorial argued that progress was being made for blacks courtesy of the free-market system, neglecting to say much about the continued restrictions on black political, educational, or civil rights. In the post-war championing of the consumer society, many liberal voices for reasonable, gradualist progress on civil rights similarly pointed to a few individual economic success stories while averting their gaze from enduring Jim Crow facilities, wholesale denial of black political rights, and violent attacks on blacks demanding more than hair-care products.\(^{110}\)

But even self-satisfied editorials competed for space in *New Yorkský denník* with less flattering stories. The paper would also use a story on “Mau Mau” rebels resisting rule by London to score points against a perceived racial problem close to home. “We may have a similar situation to contend with in New York,” the paper noted. “There are beginning to grow some conspiring Puerto Ricans, not just on that island but here in the heart of New York.” Further confirmation of *New Yorkský denník*’s attitude toward the nonwhite danger within may be gleaned from an article on Harlem, “Rebellion of a resident of ‘Jungletown.’ ”\(^{111}\)

Within Slavic circles, editorials may not have swayed Slavic Americans as much as references to “Jungletown,” for the Caucasian component of East Europeans’ identities seems to have taken on greater salience in the 1940s, as indicated by The American Slav’s frequent homages to its readers’ whiteness and by the actions of many individual white ethnics. During and shortly after World War II, some Slavs made common cause with other white ethnics in vocally and sometimes violently resisting black moves into residential neighborhoods regarded as “whites only.” In Detroit, Slavs and other white ethnics had already violently resisted the planned opening of Sojourner Truth Homes. When Detroit blacks
challenged racially restrictive covenants in the early 1940s, neighborhood homeowners’ associations united officers with names like Csanyi, Kopickto, and Klebba with Irish and Italian neighbors.\footnote{112}

To be sure, by the World War II era immigrant newspapers were not the only cultural productions in which resistance to integration was proclaimed, or in which the proposed introduction of public housing was fiercely resisted. In coded language that would persist for decades, public housing was soon marked as the site of crime, neighborhood dilapidation, and, not least, racial integration. As George N., a Byzantine Catholic parishioner of Holy Ghost of South Philadelphia told an interviewer, his boyhood neighborhood of Point Breeze was ruined by public housing. “It’s all black down there,” he said, referring to Point Breeze Homes and Tasker Homes. “When they first put them up, it was nice. White families kept the projects safe. But now – The neighborhoods are going to hell in a hand basket.” Almost immediately, though, he amended himself, “It’s not that they’re black, it’s that they’re bad.” Another Rusyn informant who never moved from Point Breeze told an interviewer, “I’m so disgusted with the blacks here, they’re not ready for us. I wish I had saved my money to move.”\footnote{113}

Such feelings about blacks’ arrival, via public housing, were repeated in many cities. As Sugrue notes, prospective black incursion was resisted in Detroit neighborhoods by whites of many ethnicities who posted flag-bedecked billboards trumpeting “We want WHITE tenants in our white community” in a multiethnic Detroit neighborhood of the early 1940s. Foreign-language papers’ appeals to wartime patriotism evidently coexisted with a racially defined sense of citizenship, for other foes of housing integration in the Motor City likewise asserted a right to solely white enclaves, citing service by family members in World War II as earning them the right to a black-free neighborhood. By 1945 Michael Harbulak wrote to Detroit’s mayor warning of repercussions if he allowed his neighborhood to be “invaded and occupied by the Africans.” Other writers with East European surnames warned of black hypersexuality in demanding “whites-only” neighborhoods. In 1951, 5,000 citizens in heavily Slavic Cicero, Illinois, mobbed the first blacks in an apartment house for more than a week. In that city, where many Slovak parishioners of Chicago’s St. Michael the Archangel parish had relocated, a woman publicly declared, “I don’t want those jigs sitting in the pews with me!”\footnote{114}

In less inflammatory language, but with no less a barrier to black-white socializing, the 1948 constitution and by-laws of the Slovak Calvinistic Presbyterian Union declared this fraternal society’s objects as “to unite into a fraternal membership all white persons of sound health and good moral character between the ages of 16 and 50 years. . . .” By the 1940s the barrier to socializing was not between second-generation Slovak Presbyterians and those who might have some German or Irish – or even Magyar – ancestry but between whites and blacks.\footnote{115}

And when Philadelphia sought to build some of the city’s first integrated public housing in the Point Breeze section, not far from the scene of the 1918 Grays
Ferry antiblack riots, it was the Rusyn priest Father George Powell who led his East European parishioners of Holy Ghost in barricading the construction site. “The area is too built up,” Father Powell was quoted in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. “And anyway, if housing is to be built, it should go to the people of the area – the people who belong here. Not to these outsiders. We don’t want these undesirable outsiders here.” His flock likely knew just exactly who their pastor regarded as “these undesirable outsiders,” for in this he was only echoing the reports they had been reading for more than 50 years on black illegitimacy and intrusion whenever racial barricades were broached at the job site or neighborhood.116
Chapter 8

Conclusion

In 1941 the editors of Amerikansky russky viestnik ran an English-language editorial that indignantly asked the question, “Who is an Alien?” Seven months before the United States entered the world war, the editorialist worried about a rising tide of jingoism. “We Americans are great label makers,” he noted, adding, “We do the same with people. We may not know what they are all about, yet we label them and tuck them away in pigeonholes. And right there we make a big mistake.” The writer worried, however, that, “Now, in a time of national tension and danger, we are indulging this bad habit more than ever. We feel jittery and it makes us feel secure to call people names. One of the worst of these tags we attach to people is the word ‘alien.’ We use it for people whom we feel ‘don’t belong.’”

But the writer asserted that the 40,000,000 Americans who were foreign-born or with foreign parents had just as good a claim to the American label as anyone else. “We call ourselves, proudly, ‘melting pot.’ Well, we are. And the first man to throw a stone at an alien is throwing a stone at himself.”

“What makes us different from the Europe most of us hark back to?” he continued. “Just this. We have proved that people of all races and religions can live together for centuries in peace, going about their business, getting things done, and not getting in each other’s hair, whether it’s blonde or brunette, kinked or red. The Red Indian can sit on his reservation and say he isn’t alien. The rest of us can’t. And we can’t be so sure about the Indian either. Didn’t his ancestors – way back – come over from Asia?”

This editorial is emblematic of the growing white ethnic assertion of a rightful place in the nation, calls that from the 1920s were often couched by members of the second generation in the language of American patriotism. Matthew Frye Jacobson notes that during World War II rhetorical homages to “my children,” Americans all, became frequent rallying cries, although all the children of the Statue of Liberty presented in patriotic cartoons were white ethnics from the Irish to the Ukrainians. No black or Asian faces intruded into such happy refrains of “racial” harmony under the stars and stripes. And, as noted in Chapter 4, New Yorkský dennik as early as 1920 celebrated “Americans All” in a gathering of leaders of 28 “racial groups,” all of them white. But of course not all Americans
harked back to Europe, and even in 1941 black and Asian Americans seem to have little place in Amerikansky russky viestnik’s editorial assertion of a melting pot with “centuries of peace” for all.

Indeed, if the editorialist had looked through his own paper’s morgue he would have soon learned a lesson of black and Asian subordination that for decades his own journal and Slovak papers presented and accepted with little criticism. Amerikansky russky viestnik and Slovak journals reported on efforts to keep blacks from city neighborhoods and had for decades been arguing for the restriction of Asians from the United States, decrying the “Yellow Peril” and “coolie wages” that threatened the country from China and Japan. Following the declaration of war against Japan at the end of that year, the United States interned thousands of Japanese migrants, and even American-born Japanese, fates that thin-skinned Rusyns were never in danger of facing. And, later in the war, Americans with “kinked” hair were viciously assaulted by whites bent on keeping blacks from parks, neighborhoods, and work sites in Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and other cities. Intent on asserting the nonalien nature of his own people, the Rusyn editorialist developed convenient amnesia on black and Asian subordination in the land where “all races and religions” stayed out of each other’s hair.3

Similarly, immigration historians looking at processes of assimilation and Americanization in isolation from questions of race have told an incomplete story. These silences of who belongs, who fits in, conveniently omit lessons immigrants learned courtesy of their own newspapers – as well as many other cultural productions from mass consumer society, entertainment venues, English-language politicians and newspapers – on who like the Rusyns reading Amerikansky russky viestnik could fit in after taking out citizenship papers and patriotically waving a new nation’s flag, and who would perpetually be marginalized, at least if many Americans had their way. At their worst moments, by World War II some Slavs, like other white ethnics, already asserted a right to bar blacks from their neighborhoods, as Thomas Sugrue documents. At other moments, as in this editorial, an amnesiac silence reigns about non-European people who didn’t seem to fit into the grand American narrative that white ethnics wished to embrace as their own.4

I have argued that Slovaks and Rusyns were well-primed for categorizing blacks as less than full Americans by the coverage of race in the immigrant press. The presentation of lynching articles, coverage of race riots, minstrel shows, and depictions of exotic, savage Africans and Asians in need of the civilizing hand of European colonial masters presented a portrait of black alterity for immigrant readers of the Slavic press. The coverage of black Americans, particularly, in Slavic newspapers cumulatively added up to a portrait of a hypervulnerable people who might occasionally garner editorial sympathy, but more often contempt, as editors reproduced lynching articles that often presented black criminality and sexual deviance as givens.
Other groups engaged in similar boundary-making exercises. Regarding Jewish immigrants, Karen Brodkin has made the important distinction between ethnora-
cial assignment – what other groups said about Jews’ status as off-white immi-
grants – and ethnoracial identity – the sense of peoplehood created for themselves,
at least partially in reaction to other groups with whom they interacted in the New
World. In post-World War II America, Jewish whiteness became more “natural-
ized,” in large part due to second-generation Jews (as well as East and South
European Catholics) moving into the suburbs courtesy of the federal largess of
the GI Bill and the Federal Housing Administration, out to the cul-de-sacs from
which blacks were barred. In the same years many Jewish intellectuals began to
emphasize their group’s “prefigurative whiteness,” in supposed affinity with the
white Protestant mainstream, and cultural distance from African Americans’ “tan-
gle of pathologies.”

This process – both the suburbanization and the “prefigurative” whiteness –
for Slavs occurred even before the post-World War II years. In their newspapers,
Slovaks and Rusyns had been reading since the 1890s of blacks’ hypervulnerabil-
ity. While some sympathetic treatment of black lynching emerged in immigrant
newspapers, far more frequently such stories emphasized the licentiousness and
criminal nature of black victims and the supposedly restorative justice repre-
sented by white lynch mobs. Likewise, articles documenting urban race riots as
early as the first decade of the twentieth century established a binary between
deserving white ethnics and blacks as impermissible intruders on job sites and in
residential neighborhoods.

Jacobson has argued that with the 1960s’ rise of what Michael Novak called the
“unmeltable ethnics,” Ellis Island overtook Plymouth Rock as America’s founda-
tional pilgrimage site, the place where “we” Americans built this country. Of
course, such a narrative was just as amnesiac of black and Asian Americans as the
Amerikansi russky viestnik editorial discounting Slavs’ alienness.

By the 1960s many of the immigrant papers cited in this book had passed out of
business, while others printed less frequently, and with more material in English. As
the immigration generation died out, second-generation white ethnics turned to
other sources of news. But the naturalization of Southeast Europeans’ place in the
American pantheon, even as blacks were marginalized, continued in the 1960s. In
among the collection of Chicago’s “Nada,” the Croatian-American Dramatic Society
that presented both socialist and blackface minstrel plays, some Croatian American
placed a flyer, the GOP Nationalities Reporter, August 1964. The flyer featured an
Executive Committee of the Nationalities Section of the party, replete with Slavic,
Greek, Italian, and Lithuanian members. The Republican Party already was appeal-
ing to white ethnics, especially those of East European background. During the
previous presidential election, the ill-fated Nixon campaign issued a Lithuanians
for Nixon brochure that featured an executive committee of suburban and urban
members from across the country. In 1964, the party’s Nationalities Reporter carried a
front-page article that invited readers to “Meet the Goldwater Family.” The article
noted that the Arizona senator “told an audience of over 1,000 at the Republican Salute to Captive Nations, ‘Like all Americans, my grandparents weren’t born in this country.’” A second article on vice-presidential nominee William Miller, “Meeting the Miller family – Speaking of ethnic backgrounds,” pointed out that Miller’s grandparents were Irish and German “and that Mrs. Miller’s father came to this country from Klimkowce (Galicia) Austria, (subsequently Poland and now incorporated into Ukraine). Her mother was Mary Nowak, born in Buffalo, N.Y., of parents who came from Poland. How typically American.”

While this Republican pamphlet explicitly targeted white ethnics, and highlighted the party’s “Captive Nations Plank,” with reference to “the people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains,” the erasure of black Americans in Goldwater’s “like all Americans” referring to white-ethnic immigrant grandparents is telling. The election year of 1964 was also the year that President Lyndon Johnson had signed the Civil Rights Act, beginning to sweep away the hurdles placed before other Americans for decades. Of course, Goldwater had voted against the measure in the Senate, basing his opposition on constitutional grounds. While some Northeastern Republicans were instrumental in the act’s passage, on the national stage the party began to court white ethnics at least in part by distancing itself from the cause of black civil rights. The GOP strategy of reaching out to white ethnics – who certainly could have voted for Goldwater based on the senator’s anticommmunist bona fides – was on display here.

To be sure, not every reader of Slovák v Amerike developed an antiblack animus, nor were performers at minstrel shows invariably Barry Goldwater and George Wallace voters in waiting. Many Slovak members of my family, steeped in the ethnic culture I have explored in these pages, resisted the urge to disparage blacks or use the generic slurs that some other distant relatives did employ. My Slovak grandmother recalled the kindnesses extended to black neighbors. My mother’s father, of southern Italian background, remained in Newark until he passed away, defiantly voting for the city’s first black mayor, Kenneth Gibson, over his fellow Italians who had previously run Newark into the ground. “I have more respect for the colored than I do for my own damn people,” Grandpa Albanese often said. “My own people are no damn good.” This in spite of the fact that he had performed in his own parish’s minstrel shows in the 1940s and 1950s, events fondly remembered by this talented tenor.

Anecdotal evidence, to be sure, but a corrective reminder that the articles one reads or popular culture one consumes and performs does not automatically lead to anything as glib as a “racist” mindset. Other Rusyns and Slovaks whom I have grown to know as a researcher and churchgoer have been much more complex, contradictory, thoughtful, and warm human beings than such reductionist labels (here I can at least agree with Amerikansky russky viestnik’s editorialist and shun one-word epithets). It has not been my intention to condemn, but to understand, the reason for those Slavic articles on “Negrov byňovanie” that first caught my eye so long ago.
What I have hoped to provide is a corrective to the amnesia that has developed considering immigrant newspapers’ coverage of race. Such papers were reflective of their era, and the 1890s to 1920s were years in which subordination of black and Asian Americans prevailed. Conversely, South and East Europeans were lucky enough to have “a possessive investment in whiteness,” as George Lipsitz aptly terms it, that allowed them many housing, employment, citizenship, and other benefits that were off-limits to black and Asian residents of the United States well into the 1960s. I have argued that it was to a great extent through their own newspapers that Slavic immigrants learned of the marginality of blacks, and the contours of America’s racialized opportunity structure.8

I’d like to think these early newspapers have relevance for our own day, too. At an academic forum where I first presented some of this book’s findings, I was asked if my research on lynching articles and the like in the immigrant press left me feeling optimistic or pessimistic regarding the future for a multiethnic America. Depends on what day you catch me, I answered. It is easy to find unsettling parallels between our own day, with antiimmigrant fervor and demonization of migrants “stealing” American jobs and smuggling in “foreign” faiths and ideologies, and the era in which slurs of “Yellow Peril” or worse greeted Asians, and lynchings were a quotidian part of the news cycle. To be sure, the rhetoric is less heated, and the number of what today are called “hate crimes” are a fraction of the lynchings and race riots of the 1890s to 1920s.

But optimistic days and thoughts intervene. If white privilege is something that was learned and consumed in immigrant journals and many other sources, then it is something that can be unlearned. Studying the manner in which immigrants reacted to non-Europeans, in positive ways as well as negative, begins to uncover a shared American history, the study and experience of which remains segregated and incomplete. It is only by frankly acknowledging where we have been that we as a nation can chart a saner course to where we’d like to go.
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