



Nebraska History posts materials online for your personal use. Please remember that the contents of *Nebraska History* are copyrighted by the Nebraska State Historical Society (except for materials credited to other institutions). The NSHS retains its copyrights even to materials it posts on the web.

For permission to re-use materials or for photo ordering information, please see:

<http://www.nebraskahistory.org/magazine/permission.htm>

Nebraska State Historical Society members receive four issues of *Nebraska History* and four issues of *Nebraska History News* annually. For membership information, see:

<http://nebraskahistory.org/admin/members/index.htm>

Article Title: Czech-Americans: An Ethnic Dilemma

Full Citation: Ivan Dubovický, "Czech-Americans: An Ethnic Dilemma," *Nebraska History* 74 (1993): 195-208

URL of article: <http://www.nebraskahistory.org/publish/publicat/history/full-text/NH1993CADilemma.pdf>

Date: 3/17/2015

Article Summary: Ethnically specific activities among Czech-Americans diminished after the world wars. The generation born in America refused to adopt its parents' romantic understanding of the Czech nation and its culture.

Cataloging Information:

Names: Karel Jonáš, F B Zdrůbek, A Geringer, T G Masaryk, Rev. O Zlámal

Czech-American publications: *Slavie*, *Potrok*, *Potrok západu*, *Svornost*, *Amerikán*, *Slowan americký*

Keywords: Habsburgs, Czech National Revival, *tabor lidu* (patriotic meetings), Catholics, freethinkers, socialists, Bohemian National Alliance, National Union of Czech Catholics, Slovak League, Czechoslovak Foreign Institute (CFI), proletarianization

Photographs / Images: table I: change in occupational status among emigrant families from the Tábor area, 1850-1870; fig 74: peasant cottage at Horní Heřmanice in northeastern Bohemia; fig 75: the Praha section of Omaha; fig 76: pages from the *modlitby* (Book of the Mass) of Alice Honzik Kovarik, illustrated by Václav Jelínek in 1826; fig 77: poet Jan Štěpán Brož on a souvenir commemorating the silver jubilee of his priesthood; fig 78: parish church at Pašticky, Stratonice, Bohemia, built 1750-1760; fig 79: St. Wenceslaus Catholic Church, Wahoo; fig 80: pages from a Catholic Czech-language schoolbook; fig 81: banner of the Katolický Dělník branch Narození Páně of Dwight, showing the organization's emblem on one side and the American flag on the other; fig 82: Šárka B Hrbková, University of Nebraska professor; fig 83: Dr Olga Sadílek Šťastný with Josef Melcer at the temporary grave of compatriot Albín Folda; fig 84: Nebraska congressman and radio personality Karl Stefan broadcasting over the Voice of America with Jan Masaryk, foreign minister of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile

Czech-Americans: AN ETHNIC DILEMMA

By Ivan Dubovický

A crucial question in the study of immigrant groups is how their culture was affected by contact with new surroundings. What processes were at work? Was it "uprootedness" or "transplantation," "assimilation" or "cultural pluralism?" Each ethnic group seems to have developed its own adaptive strategies, which reflected both the attitudes of the host society's citizens toward the ethnic group and the group's own cultural background. This study attempts to analyze some features of these processes in the case of Czech immigrants and their descendants in the United States during the early twentieth century.

Ethnicity is here understood as belonging to, and being perceived by others as belonging to, a specific ethnic group. The cultural values of such a group are able to meet the expectations of its individual members. This is a form of social identity that reflects an individual's effort to find his or her place in society.¹

The form of ethnic identity is not inherited and was not brought by immigrants to America. It is a cultural construct, and a continuous dialog or

interplay between immigrants and a dominant society.² As a process it cannot be preserved or lost, for it is ongoing at every historical moment. Assimilation, too, cannot be judged as purely negative or positive. It means only that immigrants accepted new strategies to cope with a variable reality in which they expected to meet their material as well as their emotional needs. This constant variability makes ethnicity seemingly unpredictable and illogical, and gives it the character of an autonomous social force.

The Character of Czech Immigration.

Like many other ethnic groups the Czechs never formed an integrated and homogenous community. It may be assumed that their further social and cultural disintegration is somehow related to their arrival in new and free cultural surroundings. Therefore, it is necessary and appropriate to show the extent of the political, social, and cultural integration of Czechs before they emigrated to America.

At the time of emigration, the social-occupational makeup of Czech society was changing from one composed mainly of peasants to one comprising an increasing number of day laborers and unskilled industrial work-

ers, as well as some craftsmen and artisans (fig. 5). This "proletarianization" process seems to have been underway since the very beginning of Czech emigration to the United States in 1848. It may be illustrated by the following analysis of 2,322 persons in 629 families who left the Tábor area of Bohemia between 1850 and 1870.³ During this period, peasants (i.e. richer farmers, cottagers, and crofters), day laborers and servants, together with craftsmen and artisans, formed ninety to ninety-one percent of the total number of Czech emigrants to the United States. As Table 1 reveals, the percentage of peasant families among Czech emigrants declined during the two decades, while the percentages of laborers/servants and craftsmen/artisans increased.

The decrease in the peasant category would be even greater if the poorest group—the crofters—was separated from the peasants because the proportion of crofters did not change much during the same decades. Such a separation would reveal a decrease of more than forty-five percent in the contingent of wealthy and middling farmers in the sample. It is, of course, difficult to distinguish a crofter from a day laborer because many crofters were forced to seek supplementary income

Dr. Ivan Dubovický is with the Institute of Ethnology at the Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic.

| Occupational Status | Number of families 1850-60 | Percentage of total 1850-60 | Number of families 1861-70 | Percentage of total 1861-70 | Change | |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|
| | | | | | Absolute | Percentage |
| Peasants (richer farmers, cottagers, crofters) | 101 | 33 | 69 | 21 | decrease 32 | -32 |
| Day laborers/servants | 93 | 30 | 131 | 40 | increase 38 | +41 |
| Craftsmen/artisans | 82 | 27 | 99 | 30 | increase 17 | +21 |
| Other | 30 | 10 | 29 | 9 | decrease 1 | -3 |

Table 1. Change in occupational status among emigrant families from the Tábor area, 1850-70.

by hiring out for day work in addition to their farming chores (fig. 74). If one could draw this distinction, one would expect the percentage of unskilled agricultural laborers to increase even more.

carried away only 80 to 100 gulden per family, and it was clear that some of them could not afford to purchase tickets for trans-Atlantic passage. A few cases were found where families left Bohemia without any money,

companies or other firms recruited heavily among these poorer social classes or among illegal emigrants.⁸ Evidence shows that an increasing proportion of emigrants were young men who wished to avoid military service, persecuted socialists, or legally emigrating young women recruited by Americans to come to the United States to work as housemaids.⁹ Each of these groups contributed to the proletarianization that soon became visible in the rapid increase of membership experienced by various workers' societies in America,¹⁰ or in an increasing urban concentration of Czechs who worked in packinghouses, as cigar-makers, or to a lesser extent in the building trades, manufacturing, and iron and steel production (fig. 75).¹¹ Evidence can also be found, beginning in the 1870s, in the rapid development in the United States of a Czech socialist movement, as well as of fraternal societies, whose growth peaked at the turn of the century.

This tendency reveals one important fact: at its beginning Czech emigration had all the characteristics later ascribed to the so-called "old immigration," that is, a high percentage of women and children and a relatively high proportion of skilled workers, craftsmen, and farmers. But the subsequent proletarianization of Czech immigrants, and the fact that Czechs were Slavs, led many Americans to begin to identify Czechs with the succeeding wave of "new immigrants." This viewpoint survived for a long time, even after World War II. Oscar Handlin, for example, then considered Czechs to be "new immigrants," but was surprised to find that in spite of their recent immigration, the proportion of men to women and children was so small that in this respect Czechs ranked far ahead of Germans, Scandinavians, and other groups traditionally identified with the "old immigration."¹² Meanwhile, the process of differentiation within the Czech community that had started with religious



Fig. 74. A peasant cottage at Horní Heřmanice in northeastern Bohemia. (D. Murphy, NSHS)

The gradual proletarianization of Czech emigration is also evident from the amount of money Czech immigrants took out of Bohemia. For comparative purposes, the two samples chosen were from the years 1853-54 and 1867-68, when emigration reached its highest intensity in each of the two decades. Whereas in 1853-54 the average amount of money taken per family was 892 gulden or 206 gulden per person including children, in 1867-68 it was only 554 gulden per emigrant family or 134 gulden per person.⁴ Especially at the beginning of emigration in the early 1850s, the differences in family assets were considerable. Some families of rich peasants had two, three, or even five thousand gulden. Poor families of tailors or shoemakers

expecting to travel to America free of charge by using "paupers paper."⁵ Misinformation had circulated in Bohemia since the early 1850s about the existence of an "American Bureau" that was said to have provided poor people with money for the overseas journey.⁶

Although data for the decades after 1870 have not yet been analyzed, it is clear from archival records that the tendency towards proletarianization continued.⁷ The proportion of unskilled industrial workers among Czech emigrants also increased. Moreover, cheaper steamship and railway transportation, as well as tickets prepaid for emigrants by their relatives in America, enabled even the lowest social classes to emigrate. Agents for steamship

Dubovický - An Ethnic Dilemma

controversies was later reflected in political, social, and intergenerational conflicts.

Beginning with the 1920s Czech immigration to the United States was deeply influenced by American immigration policy. According to the restriction law of 1921, about 14,000 Czechs and Slovaks were allowed to immigrate every year. After 1924 this quota was lowered to only 3,000 immigrants. Later, as a result of President Herbert Hoover's proclamation of 1928, the number was further reduced to 2,874. Theoretically, during the years 1922 through 1930, some 63,000 Czechs and Slovaks could legally emigrate to the United States. But official statistics estimated that about 87,000 Czechs and Slovaks were le-

causes: illegal immigration, and especially in the case of the 1930 census, because more Czechs and Slovaks claimed their true nationality after the peak years of the Americanization campaign (1916-25) had passed.

No doubt illegal immigration by Czechs occurred, although it is clear from consular reports that Slovaks constituted the majority of the "illegals."¹⁴ The proportion of Slovaks to the total immigration from Czechoslovakia reached seventy percent during the 1920s and early 1930s, and another eight to ten percent were Rusíns (Ruthenians). The concept of "Czechoslovakism" did not allow a distinction between Czechs and Slovaks in official statistics. Thus one may estimate that Czechs formed only

applications, even though the quota for immigrants had already been filled.¹⁶ The total number of Czechoslovaks who intended to emigrate to non-European countries increased to 250,000 in 1930, thereby placing Czechoslovakia second only to Italy among European nations.¹⁷ Of course, such a situation led some people to attempt to emigrate illegally to the United States through other countries in North or South America. The number of these "illegals" is not known, but official Czechoslovak estimates in 1929 spoke of "many thousands."¹⁸

The immigration policy resulted in an increase of Czech and Slovak emigrants in the 1920s and 1930s, mostly workers¹⁹ and close relatives of persons already settled in the United States. But even these had been admitted as regular quota emigrants since 1925. Generally speaking, the flow of Czech emigration to the U.S.A. practically stopped. In 1924-28 only about 2,800 Czechs left Bohemia and Moravia and in 1929-35 the total was only 2,188.²⁰ This development would considerably facilitate the assimilation of Czech and Slovak immigrants already in America.

Catholic or Freethinker, Czech or Austrian?

Many authors have tried to attribute the roots of the main antagonism within the Czech minority in the United States — the tensions between Catholics and freethinkers — to a freethought "spirit" brought from the old homeland, where it had grown out of centuries-old Czech Hussite and Protestant traditions.²¹ Such a general assumption is untenable, however, without considering the social structure of immigrant communities, the differences between cities and farming areas, and historical developments in the Old Country. For the first two decades of Czech immigration, this assumption is almost completely wrong. More correct were authors like



Fig.75. The Praha section of Omaha, one of several Czech urban enclaves in the United States, in a postcard view published by Jan Rosický's National Printing Company. (NSHS C998.1-30)

gally admitted between 1920 and 1930.¹³ If these data are compared to those of the U.S. censuses of 1920 and 1930, the number of all foreign-born Czechs and Slovaks increased by 139,338 persons during the decade. This difference of more than 50,000 may be attributed primarily to two

eighteen to twenty percent of the total 1920s emigration from Czechoslovakia.¹⁵

The great interest by Czechoslovaks in emigration to America is well documented by the number of visa applications. In 1929, for example, the American consular office in Prague reported that it had more than 30,000



Fig.76. Pages from the modlitby (Book of the Mass) of Alice Honzik Kovarik, illuminated by Václav Jelínek in 1826, prior to immigration to Saline County, Nebraska. (NSHS Museum 11424-1, C998.1-657)

Bicha and Svoboda, who considered the deeply rooted anti-Catholicism among Czechs to have been a symbol of Czech resistance to Habsburg rule. But Bicha also assumed a long tradition of these attitudes before 1848.²² Was this really the case with thousands of later immigrants to America or have the attitudes of a few intellectuals and a small group of Protestants been ascribed to all immigrants from Bohemia and Moravia?

A majority of Czech immigrants were Catholics, at least in a formal sense (fig. 76).²³ Up to the 1860s, the

number of immigrants with definite freethought convictions was very small, and their activity did not have a great impact in any Czech community, where Czechs, regardless of their religious views, typically participated in cultural life and sometimes joined the same societies. Josef Borecký wrote about this cooperative spirit: "One did not ask anybody whether he believed in anything or not. . . whether he visited a church or not; we lived together in peace and holy quietness. . ." ²⁴ Non-Catholics did not offend Catholics and vice-versa. Father Molitor, who came

to Chicago in 1866, used to visit freethought societies, but at the same time he published the *Katolické noviny* (Catholic News), edited by the freethinker Antonín Jurka.

A marked change seems to have occurred in the second half of the 1860s. Zealous freethinkers began to attack the Catholic church to the extent that editor Karel Jonáš finally refused to publish their inflammatory statements in his *Slávie*. Instead, in 1868 he decided to issue a new paper, *Pokrok* (Progress), in which militant freethinkers had free reign under the editorship

of Josef Pastor. This newspaper may have laid the foundation for the future disintegration of American Czechs into two opposing ideological groups, freethinkers and Catholics. Later, Jonáš was said to have felt sorry for having published this journal.²⁵

A former Protestant pastor, F. B. Zdrůbek, contributed much to the mutual distrust (fig. 66). Influenced by Robert Ingersoll, he founded the first Free Community in Chicago, which was officially registered as a sectarian community. When he returned briefly to Bohemia, *Pokrok* was discontinued. Upon his return to America, Zdrůbek edited the *Pokrok západu* (Progress of the West) in Omaha for a short while, and then in 1875 with A. Geringer in Chicago started a freethought daily, *Svornost* (Concord), and a weekly, *Amerikán*.

Why did the ideological division of the Czech immigrant community occur in the 1860s? At that time many Czech intellectuals ceased entirely to believe in the possibility of fostering any sense of Austrian nationality as a political, supraethnic identity that would be embraced by all cultures residing in the Empire. The Czechs, as well as other non-Germans, were not considered by the Habsburg authorities as independent, sovereign nations but only as ethnic and linguistic groups within the political German nation.²⁶

On the other hand, when the Habsburgs instituted constitutional rule in 1860-61, Czech political representatives began to claim the sovereignty of the Czech nation within the framework of the Habsburg Monarchy on the basis of historical Bohemian states' rights. When the Habsburgs refused to recognize these claims after 1867, the Czech political leadership began to define its enemy not only the Habsburg dynasty—with its tradition of germanization and administrative centralization—but the dynasty's main supporter, the Catholic church. Thus, Czech patriotism was

penetrated by anti-Catholic or even atheistic attitudes, which were soon disseminated throughout the country by the Young Czech party or through mass patriotic meetings (*tábor lidu*) held outdoors at actual and legendary historical sites. These meetings were organized after 1866 on the occasion of various anniversaries, with commemoration of John Hus's death being the most important (fig. 1).



Fig. 77. The poet Jan Štěpán Brož, a Catholic priest who nurtured Czech cultural identity in Nebraska; shown here on the souvenir commemorating the silver jubilee of his priesthood, St. Wenceslaus Parish in Dodge, Nebraska. (NSHS Museum 9977-388, C998.1-555)

For many Czech peasants, their Catholic faith did not automatically mean they were pro-Austrian as some Czech-American freethinkers or socialists mistakenly stated.²⁷ In many villages Catholic priests had been leading advocates of the Czech National Revival (fig. 77). Peasants did not consider their Catholic faith to be an obstacle to patriotism as is evident in southern Bohemia, the least Protestant part of the Czech lands, which was a main center of *tábor* meetings and an increasing adoration of Jan Hus and Jan Žižka.²⁸ Nevertheless, few Czechs converted to Protestantism, and the resurrection of Hussitism would not come until 1919 with the new Czechoslovak church.²⁹ All these developments testified to a weakness in religious enthusiasm among Czechs no matter whether they were Catholics, Protestants, or freethinkers.

Moreover, belonging to the Catholic church was not just a result of religious persuasion. The church filled various functions, especially in the countryside (fig. 78). It provided education, and its customs, celebrations, and feasts gave a rhythm to peasant life. This "practical" importance also helps explain why the stereotype of Catholicism as being anti-patriotic did not lead to the decatholization of Czechs in the Czech lands to the same extent and at the same time as it did among Czech-Americans.

In the 1860s emigration to the United States increased rapidly: during the three years after 1866, the same number of people emigrated to America as in the entire previous decade.³⁰ Among them was a small but influential group of intellectuals, including J. Pastor, the Čapek brothers, and A. Geringer, who had already been influenced by the new idea of Czech patriotism based on anti-clericalism that *Pokrok* immediately started to disseminate. *Pokrok* was said to be the first Czech newspaper to abandon



Fig.78. The parish church at Pašticky, Strakonice, Bohemia, built in 1750-60. (D. Murphy, NSHS)

definitely the “old-fashioned programme of Čech nationalism” and at the same time *Pokrok* “struck out boldly and openly against clericalism.”³¹ These ideas were soon taken up by *Svornost* and *Dennice Novověku* (Daily of the New Age).

The change in the character of immigration brought immigrants to America from those social categories that in Bohemia and Moravia had stood in the forefront in the spread of freethought ideas. They included the followers of Josef Barák, the so-called *baráčníci*, who were recruited from craftsmen, artisans, small tradesmen, and partly from industrial workers, occupational groups that were steadily increasing among emigrants at the expense of wealthy and middling farmers, traditionally the main supporters of Catholicism in Bohemia and Moravia. Immigrants in the former occupational groups, though originally Catholics,

believed the Church was unprepared to meet their practical needs and they joined fraternal societies, especially the ČSPS (Czecho-Slavonic Benevolent Society), whose members had embraced freethought at its founding in 1862.

Freethinkers by now presided over much of the social and cultural life of Czech-American communities, as well as over the leading newspapers and magazines whose editorial policy was consistently anti-clerical and sometimes hostile to all organized religion. Czech-American freethinkers exported their opinions back to Bohemia, where some of them were listed as “traitors” by the Habsburg authorities.³² Whereas the first freethought newspaper, *Slowan amerikánský* (The American Slav), was established in 1860, the first Czech Catholic newspaper in the United States did not appear until 1867-68. Not until 1872 did Father J. Hessoun of

St. Louis start regular publication of *Hlas* (The Voice).

The Catholic church in the United States also began to understand the great importance of patriotism for Czech-American believers. The “Czech” character of Catholic parishes and societies is often evident from their having been named for Czech saints (fig. 79).³³ Catholic publishers, too, tried to attract their readers by the patriotic names of their journals: *Čech*, *Národ* (Nation), *Vlastimil* (Homeland). As far as Czech-language education is



Fig.79. St. Wenceslaus Catholic Church, Wahoo, Nebraska; one of several Czech-American churches named for Czech saints. (D. Murphy, NSHS H673.2-9004/23:18)

concerned, Catholics gave it equal or even more attention than did freethinkers (fig. 80).

The more the freethought movement was atheistic, the deeper it penetrated among Czech socialists, whose numbers in the United States steadily increased as a result of their persecution in the Habsburg Monarchy, especially after the 1870s. Among the increasing number of workers were many out-

standing socialist leaders, as Zdeněk Šolle explains in his article in this issue of *Nebraska History*. Angered by their persecution by the Habsburgs, these immigrant socialists held strong anti-Austrian attitudes and in the United States organized their socialist party on the basis of ethnicity. By 1913 there were fifty-two branches of the Czech Section of the Socialist Party in America, with 1,400 members in sixteen states.³⁴ Meanwhile, Czech-American workers had experienced their own ideological conflicts, many of which replicated those of the workers' movement in Bohemia and Moravia. Consequently the Czech Section divided into a larger part advocating American reformism and trade unionism and a smaller, more radical part called the Marxist Federation, which later identified itself with the Third International.³⁵ In 1901 the Congress of Czech Workers in Chicago created a new Czech Workers party, but this new enterprise did not bring the anticipated solidarity.³⁶ Another briefly successful organization was the Social Speakers Club (*Sociálně řečnický spolek*) in Cleveland, founded in December 1901, whose speakers attracted listeners by their emphasis on "Czechness" as opposed to proletarian internationalism. But after this club began to advocate internationalism, it lost support and was soon disbanded.³⁷ Other Czech-American workers joined American political parties.

The attitude of Czech-American socialists towards Catholics was expressed by Joseph Martínek, an outstanding leader in the two struggles for Czechoslovak independence: "As progressive people we once forever cut our ties not only with the church and its dogma, but with the whole old religious worldview, therefore, we go strictly against the church. As Czechs we know too well that sad role of the Roman church as it had played in the fate of our nation and, therefore, each



6. JE-NI-ČEK V KO-STE-LE.

Je-ní-ček rád cho-dí na mši sva-tou. Ni-kde se ne-tou-lá, jen a-by ne-byl poz-dě do ko-ste-la a do ško-ly. Z do-mo-va vy-jde v čas, V ko-ste-le se cho-vá ti-še a zbož-ně. Ne-mlu-ví a ne-o-hlí-ží se. Mo-dlí se rů-že-nec a-ne-bo má s se-bou mo-dli-teb-ní kníž-ku. Rád se dí-vá na ol-tář. Je-ní-ček do-bře ví, že Je-ží-šek by-dlí ve sva-to-stán-ku a že se na něj dí-vá, jak se cho-vá v ko-ste-le. Hod-né dí-t-ky rá-dy cho-dí-vají kaž-dé rá-no na mši sva-tou. Je-ží-šek jim za to že-hná a jim ve ško-le po-má-há.

Fig.80. Pages from a Catholic Czech-language schoolbook. (NSHS Museum 11345-1, C998.1-581)

of us, if he had at least a little true Czech feeling, cannot do anything but take a stand against the church that had burnt Hus and caused so many national disasters. Finally, as workers we know too well that the idea of our emancipation, of economic liberation of our working class does not have a worse enemy than the Roman popes. . ."³⁸

Martínek clearly defined a stereotype of Czech patriotism, the very existence of which discouraged good relations between socialists and Catholics. Their quarreling ceased to a large extent only after the establishment of Czechoslovakia. As is well known, the Czechoslovak Republic did not thoroughly separate church and state, did not abolish church marriages, and in 1928 reached a modus vivendi with the Vatican. A Catholic monsignor, Jan Šrámek, became prime minister of the Czechoslovak government in London during World War II. Under these circumstances, anti-Catholicism and especially atheism lost political appeal.

Meanwhile in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s freethought de-

clined in popularity, especially among the acculturated second and third generation Czech-Americans. Their American culture, based on mutual tolerance, did not connect Catholicism, perceived as one religion among others, with hatred towards Czechs. The ideological conflicts of their fathers seemed completely strange; they were even ashamed of them before the American public. Thus, after the flow of Czech immigration had almost ceased in the 1920s, both ideological extremes were represented only by a small group of older immigrants, and it would be only a question of time until tensions disappeared.

The impact of Czech freethought in the United States should not be overestimated. Many American Czechs were ideologically indifferent. The typical Czech worker in Chicago or farmer in Nebraska put aside the problems of his old homeland in taking care of his job or his farm. Culturally he had been transplanted to new surroundings in which he tried to find a new strategy for ethnic survival. If Germanization had been the main threat to Czech national identity in the Habsburg Monarchy, in the United States the danger came from the very attractive American way of life. This new way of life was not spread forcefully, but it attracted immigrants and especially their children by its liberal political atmosphere, material prosperity, and technological sophistication. Its attractiveness best explains Czech-Americans' willingness to assimilate.

The First World War: An Ethnic and Political Dilemma

During the two world wars, Czech-Americans, despite their serious ideological differences, demonstrated a remarkable ability to unify themselves, especially on a principle of patriotism in support of American national interests and in opposition to American

isolationism. Karel Pichlík's article in this issue of *Nebraska History* discusses how Czech-Americans and Slovak-Americans gradually came together during World War I in advocacy of Czechoslovak independence (see back cover). In his article in *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, Bruce Garver emphasizes the experience during that war of Czech-American socialists and Catholics, many of whom did not initially share the anti-Habsburg attitudes of the majority of Czech-Americans.³⁹ In spite of unpreparedness and internal disintegration, formerly opposing Czech-American groups managed to unite under the leadership of the Bohemian National Alliance (BNA), which became recognized as the official representative body for Czechs in America.

Czech-American socialists had to cope with the dilemma of whether to endorse class internationalism or patriotism and like many socialist American workers, they took a firm stand against the war. At the beginning of the war, this attitude was seen as a way of expressing sympathy with Serbia, the victim of Austrian and German aggression. After the majority of Czech-Americans had endorsed Masaryk's struggle to create an independent Czechoslovakia, they rejected the anti-war attitudes of the socialists and even accused the socialists of being in the pay of Germany.⁴⁰ Because most Czech-American socialists did not subscribe to the view that the Russian Tsar, whom they considered a tyrant, would be a savior of Czechs, they strongly opposed the resolution by Czech "patriots" meeting in the Central Opera House in New York, whereby the Tsar had been celebrated and the Russian anthem played.⁴¹ The Czech Socialist Section and the Union of Workers Sokol continued to cry, "Away with the War!" and the socialists declared the struggle for Czechoslovak

independence to be "a national egoism."⁴² Nonetheless, they established a fund for postwar relief of the Czech proletariat in the Czech lands.

The situation of Czech-American Catholics during the First World War seemed even more complicated. For forty years the freethought press had been disseminating the prejudice that Catholics could not be true Czech patriots. This opinion seemed to be substantiated when, on the eve of the war, the Czech bishop in New York, J. M. Koudelka, officiated at a mass in honor of the assassinated successor to the throne of Austria-Hungary. Many freethinkers were further confirmed in their anti-Catholic prejudice when in 1914 the Catholic press and some priests appealed to Czech-Americans to help the Austrian war effort. As late as 1917 Father H. Dostál of St. Louis, in the Catholic journal *Hlas*, suggested that Czechs ask the pope to persuade the Emperor Charles I to be crowned king of Bohemia in Prague. The refusal of Czech-American Catholics to cooperate with the Bohemian National Alliance (BNA) caused resentment. The Catholics began to raise funds, not to support the Czechoslovak liberation movement, but for the suffering people in the Czech lands.

Some Czech-American Catholics, however, began to realize that they were becoming more and more isolated at a time when nearly all Czech-Americans and even Slovak-American Catholics were unifying in support of the liberation movement. Like Czech-American socialists, Catholics owed much to the efforts of a few individuals for helping to bring about their engagement in the liberation movement, especially to Rev. O. Zlámal. In various articles and presentations since 1916 he had explained the necessity of Catholic cooperation with the BNA. At the same time, he tried to convince freethinkers that their identification of Catholicism with animosity to the

Czech national movement was a senseless prejudice for which the Vienna government had responsibility, and not Rome.

Many Catholics believed T. G. Masaryk embodied this animosity for it was he who had taken an active part in the movement "away from Rome." It seems, therefore, that Masaryk's leadership was one cause of the Catholics' refusal to contribute financially to the struggle for Czechoslovak independence. Zlámal himself criticized Masaryk's anti-Catholic activity, but recognized him to be a sincere Czech and fighter for liberation.⁴³ Zlámal soon gained the confidence not only of the Catholics, but also of the BNA. He initiated the meeting in January 1917 in Chicago that demonstrated the Catholics' will to help liberate Czechoslovakia. Finally, in May 1917, the Catholics made common cause with the BNA.⁴⁴ At that time, the National Union of Catholic Czechs was organized and became the only representative body of Czech-American Catholics during the First World War.

The pre-1915 ideological disunity of Czech-Americans contributed to confusion among Anglo-Americans about the nature of the Czech nation, making the unification of Czech-Americans in support of Czechoslovak independence extremely important. So was the endorsement of this effort by outstanding Czech-Americans such as the renowned anthropologist Aleš Hrdlička and the congressman A. Sabath. Czech-Americans could then direct their arguments in favor of Czechoslovak independence to representatives of American political parties, as well as to the American public, in order to persuade them of the seriousness and rightfulness of Czech and Slovak claims to national independence.

Czechs, Americans, or Czech-Americans?

During the First World War, all European countries expected their overseas “branches of the nation” to support their war effort. In part because the Habsburgs hoped to arouse support for Austria-Hungary among immigrants in the United States, the newly created BNA immediately started propaganda among its members urging them to become American citizens. “We desire to say that we are not hyphenated Americans. There are no Bohemian-Americans. There are American citizens of Bohemian [Czech] extraction, . . . we owe no divided allegiance.”⁴⁵ Czech-Americans wanted to avoid arousing suspicion that they might become a potential “fifth column” and to prove their loyalty towards America. The district committee of the BNA in St. Paul, Minnesota, instructed its local branches to open every important meeting with the American national anthem.⁴⁶

Czech-Americans had to explain to their fellow American citizens that the American concept of a multi-ethnic nation did not square with the Czechs’ bad experience under the authoritarian practices of the supranational Austro-Hungarian Empire. The Czechs as an independent nation had no desire to support official Austro-Hungarian foreign policy or domestic politics. Czech-Americans in their letters, pamphlets, and brochures praised their capacity to be Americanized and carefully distinguished their “old homeland” from the United States, their new one (fig. 81).

Hatred toward the Germans was so strong among Czech-Americans that it spurred them to anti-German activities. “It is not known that many a Teuton plot to foment strikes, to set warehouses and docks on fire, to blow up munition-carrying ships was bared and many an evil-doer apprehended and



Fig.81. *Foreign or American? The banner of the Katolický Dělník branch Narození Páně of Dwight, Nebraska, shows the organization’s emblem on one side, and the American flag on the other. (Courtesy Catholic Workman Branch No. 32 and Assumption Parish, Dwight; NSHS C998.1-618)*

sent to prison on evidence furnished to the [U.S.] government by loyal Českoslovaks,” wrote Tomáš Čapek.⁴⁷ Critics of Czech-American support for the Allies contended that this “loyalty” towards America had been merely a consequence of the Czech-Americans’ wish to contribute to the utter defeat of the German bid for world power, and had not been motivated by love for America.⁴⁸ But long before 1914 Czech-Americans had begun to participate in American patriotic celebrations not as a separate ethnic group, but as

true citizens of their communities. “It is a source of genuine pleasure and an assurance of safety in the future to see our foreign-born citizens celebrate the anniversary of American Independence,” wrote the *Cedar Rapids Times* as early as 1878.⁴⁹

Horace M. Kallen was wrong when he asserted that eastern European immigrants could not be assimilated. Although Czech-Americans were trying during both world wars to make the “cause” of winning Czechoslovak independence clear to the American

public, there is no doubt that at the beginning of each war this activity was limited to a small group of Czech-American political and intellectual leaders and that the majority of American Czechs endorsed this "cause" only after the United States entered each war against Germany.

The younger generation was proud that it was "their" America that helped to liberate "their fathers' homeland." The idea of "homeland" is basically a cultural construct formed as a result of an individual's experience, and the Czech-American experience was an American one. While Kallen, H. P. Fairchild, and other "authorities" expressed doubt that eastern Europeans were capable of assimilation, Czech-American leaders were more and more troubled by the reality that "the second generation among Czechoslovaks is, generally speaking, thoroughly Americanized," and that mixed marriages were becoming common.⁵⁰

Among Czech-Americans, before as well as after World War I, there were two contrasting attitudes towards American culture and its manifestations in language and behavior. One lamented that Americanization, i.e. the loss of original ethnic characteristics, was a negative process and a disaster that could lead to "denationalization." This view, often held by the leaders of ethnic organizations, represented those Czech-Americans who rather romantically considered language, customs, and an Old World way of life to be the most important ingredients for the survival of the Czech ethnic group. They forgot that their countrymen at home had already given up much of this sort of fundamentally-regional culture in creating a new Czech national culture in Bohemia and Moravia. Surprisingly, they also forgot that it had been the introduction of American culture into the Czech lands and its appeal that had so frightened the Austro-Hungarian government. When

an immigrant visited his old homeland he was proud of having American manners and ideas, and of identifying himself as a so-called *Amerikán*, a man who could say whatever to whomever without obeisance, who could have truly black coffee every morning, who could donate dollars to repair a church or "your terrible sidewalk" in his an-



Fig.82. Šárka B. Hrbková, University of Nebraska professor and Czech patriot. (NSHS C998-62)

cestral village, or even actively participate—"you would not believe"—in shaping political events in America.

The second group, smaller but no less influential, consisted of those Czech-Americans who did not connect English language and habits or American citizenship—that is to say an outer manifestation of ethnicity—with any loss of their Czech identity. On the contrary, they understood assimilation as a means of reaching a higher social status and thus influencing the development of Czech-American life in a positive way. According to A. Hajdušek in Texas or Šárka B. Hrbková in Nebraska, Czech immigrants had

more to gain than to lose through assimilation (fig. 82). Even T.G. Masaryk, when visiting America in 1907, reminded his immigrant countrymen to preserve their traditions and love for the old homeland, but at the same time recommended that they learn English and concluded that "a lively, earnest, and sincere share of your efforts should be directed to being worthy citizens of this United States."⁵¹

At the time of increasing American anti-immigration sentiment in the 1920s, Czech-Americans made a major effort to prove their significant contributions to American as well as to world culture in order to counteract prejudiced stereotypes about Slavic immigrants in the minds of the American public.

The Loss of Identity: The Interwar Period

The First World War demonstrated the remarkable abilities of Czech-Americans to unite in support of the U.S. war effort and of Czechoslovak independence. At the same time it showed that the core of this liberation movement consisted of a small group of outstanding individuals, representatives of the three main Czech and Slovak organizations in America: the BNA, the National Union of Catholic Czechs, and the Slovak League. The war rather exhausted all Czech-Americans, physically and financially. They had fulfilled their role, and had a right to rest. But the war also revealed that some first-generation Czech-Americans had already assimilated to the extent that they had lost an understanding of the needs of their brothers across the ocean. This was an example of the significant changes in the ethnic identity of Czech-Americans. Czech-American civic leaders realized that in order to preserve the Czech-American community, they would have to try to stop "denationalization." Later it

Dubovický - An Ethnic Dilemma

became clear that this evaluation was correct. Czech-Americans nationwide did not resume work on behalf of Czechoslovakia until the Nazis had destroyed the Czechoslovak Republic in March 1939 and threatened to start another world war.

According to these leaders, the ethnic consciousness of young Czech-Americans needed particular attention. About 2,300 Americans of Czech ancestry fought in France not as Czechs, but as Americans (fig. 83). Most of them did not speak Czech at all. Membership in Czech societies and clubs did not attract them because the organizations continued to try to preserve the traditional Czech culture of the nineteenth century that seemed strange to young Czech-Americans of the twentieth. Even the Sokol, though primarily a sports club, had problems. "It will be our own fault to let the Sokol in Minnesota die out. . . Reality is really sad as far as the activity of our branches is concerned," wrote one Sokol member in 1929.⁵²

Czech-language education also declined as a result of wider contact by Czech-Americans with other Americans and from plain lack of interest, as well as from Americanization. The Czech-language Department at the University of Nebraska was discontinued in 1919, but reinstated several years later. Ironically, the dominance of the freethinkers in Czech-American life seems to have contributed to the decline of knowledge of the Czech language among younger generations. Compared with Catholic schools, the freethinking schools did not teach a full curriculum in Czech, but confined their courses to language only, with sessions held after public school hours. This, of course, was not attractive to children. The Czech-American leaders' European view of things, in which language was considered to be the main manifestation of the "spirit of a nation," governed their attempts to preserve the



Fig.83. Dr. Olga Sadílek Štastný, first Czech female physician in the United States, with Josef Melcer at the temporary grave of friend and compatriot Albín Folda, killed in action in France. Folda was from Clarkson, Nebraska, and Štastný and Melcer were from Wilber, Nebraska. (NSHS S796-62)

Czech language and by offering a traditional Czech education, to try to bring the younger generation back into ethnic organizations.

Restricted immigration and Americanization policies created a positive atmosphere in the 1920s for the gradual elimination of former tensions between Catholics and freethinkers. The older generation was dying, and younger Czech-Americans did not endorse the previous generation's ideological views or activities. The survival of Czech-American organizations and the Czech-language press became more and more dependent on a small group of active people who still continued in their prewar ways.

The second and third generations did not understand the origin of the ideo-

logical differences among their elders. Neither did they comprehend their fathers' deference for the ways and attitudes of the Old Country, because the young people had already adopted an American view of the world, which at that time did not encourage such deference. Moreover, the manifestation of Czech ethnicity brought nothing but derision from their fellow Americans. A Czech name was said to have been a stigma like a red flag. J. S. Rouček, a sociologist of Czech origin, stated that in confronting American culture Czech-American parents were failing to stimulate their children's pride in their Czech ancestry. The more these parents deferred to European matters the stronger grew the children's inferiority complex. This led the children to endeavor to break away from parental influence in order to avoid becoming isolated from the American way of life.

How Americans viewed the Czech ethnic group had the greatest impact on whether "Czechness" was accepted in a positive or negative way by Czech-American youths and by Americans generally. Rouček suggested establishing a Czechoslovak Institute that would publicize Czech culture in America because, in his opinion, the Czechoslovak government was doing nearly nothing in this respect.⁵³

On the contrary, the Czechoslovak consul in Pittsburgh, Milan Getting, believed young Czech-Americans were not interested in the folklore and folk traditions of their ancestors, but in the achievements of Czechoslovak technology and in the accomplishments of outstanding representatives of Czechoslovak culture and politics. "These are things that make our young people proud of their origin and the origin of their parents. Publications on the modern world. . . give the wrong impression that our nation is but a peasant-like one. Such an impression has a negative impact on our youth and leads

to an 'inferiority complex.' Demonstrating the high technological development in the Czechoslovak Republic is the best propaganda among our youth in America, then they will also ask for literature on arts, history, and so on."⁵⁴

The Czechoslovak government attempted to "save the branch of the Czech nation in America," especially after it established the Czechoslovak Foreign Institute (CFI) in 1928. Supported by various ministries, the CFI cooperated with many institutions at home as well as abroad. But its inadequate funding limited its activity to sending books and journals and other materials to schools. Due to its initiative, however, a few important institutions were formed in the U.S.A., such as The Masaryk Institute in New York in 1937 and The American Czechoslovak Bureau a year later.

The CFI focused on the younger generation, but soon discovered that the second generation of Czech-Americans was irreversibly Americanized due to the restriction of immigration, the Anglicization of education, and because "the attraction force of America is too strong." On the anniversary of Czechoslovak Independence in 1936, an article in *Věk rozumu* (Age of Reason) lamented that the ethnic group, whose greatest educator was Komenský, could muster only twenty-three children to attend first and second year Czech-language classes in Detroit, a city with 12,000 Czech-American adult residents.⁵⁵

Besides a lack of money the main problem lay in diametrically different opinions about how to preserve the Czech minority. Young Czech-Americans criticized the "short-sighted patriots" for their insistence on teaching in Czech only, even though no one understood the language. They wanted lectures in English with emphasis on Czechoslovak culture and business. The CFI felt the Czechs had discarded the most important means for preserva-

tion of national identity—the Czech language. In other words, the language should come first, then culture and business.⁵⁶ Some politicians like Vojta Beneš criticized this view for its naiveté.⁵⁷ The CFI issued its journal *Krajan* (Countryman), which intentionally avoided controversy, arguing that only a nonpartisan journal could achieve unity among Czech-Americans. Therefore, the journal accommodated various views, no matter whether they were Catholic or freethinking. Later it became clear that this policy did not attract any of the partisan groups.⁵⁸

Some Czech-American organizations did not display much interest in cooperation. The Czechoslovak National Council of America (CNCA), for example, accused the CFI of being "interested only in getting membership dues and the new subscribers. . . It is evident you do not know the problems of people who emigrated. Everybody has enough of this spiritual food. The only way to help them is with material support."⁵⁹ Similarly, the Czechoslovak American National Alliance, as was evident from a confidential letter of its secretary, F. Klepal, refused to cooperate with the CFI: "It would go for nothing to hope or look forward to our . . . participating in solving the serious problems expressed in your letter. Your suggestion seems to many of us to be but an attempt to take control and direct the activities of our immigrants in America."⁶⁰ It is significant that the majority of all institutions formed in America at the initiative of the CFI, that is, at the behest of the Czechoslovak government (The Masaryk Institute, The American Czechoslovak Bureau and others), were established during the late 1930s when the new German threat to Czechoslovakia emerged. Only then did Czechoslovak officials again begin to realize the importance of the *krajané* (countrymen), once so quickly forgotten. Eventually Czech-Americans again banded together in support of

their ancestral homeland.

At this time tensions between Czechs and autonomistic Slovaks, represented by the Slovak League, also intensified. The core of the problem lay in the old promise of Slovak autonomy included in the Pittsburgh Agreement of May 1918. The Slovak League had recognized the idea of "Czechoslovakism" only as a political construct, a necessary compromise that was useful for the peace negotiations after World War I. Slovak pressure for autonomy subsequently crystallized in attacks on this construct. No doubt the Slovak autonomists had a strong influence in creating the independent Slovak State in March 1939. Even after World War II the idea of an independent Slovakia never disappeared among Slovak-Americans, though it always took second place to their opposition to the Communist regime, the common enemy for Czech-Americans as well as for Slovak-Americans.⁶¹ Once the Communists relinquished dictatorial power in 1989, agitation for Slovak independence revived.

In the case of Czech-Americans, the ethnic dilemma of an acculturating ethnic minority in the attractive larger American society resulted in two basic processes. First was accommodation to the pressure of American spiritual and material culture to satisfy the American demand that every immigrant be "a good American." Second was the effort to preserve Old World cultural traits through ethnically-based commonalities whose loss was understood to be the loss of ethnic identity. The fundamental social units of Czech social and cultural life and ethnic consciousness were lodges, societies, associations, and clubs. These organizations and their leaders formed a societal structure through which the Czech community in America acted. They served as preservers of "transplanted" ethnic, i.e. cultural qualities, but at the same time, their attractive-



Fig.84. Nebraska congressman and radio personality Karl Stefan of Norfolk, broadcasting over the Voice of America with Jan Masaryk, foreign minister of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile. (NSHS S816-32)

ness was closely related to practical needs. Although the majority of newcomers soon failed to care much about what was happening in their old homeland, in times of crisis like 1914 and 1939, these organizations and their leaders constituted a stimulus and provided a highly developed organizational structure for political activity by masses of formerly indifferent countrymen. The organizations and their press also played a crucial role disseminating what might be called "prescribed patriotic behavior," patriotic in both the American and Czech sense.

It is not surprising that the most influential leaders of these organizations were recruited from relatively late newcomers to America like K. Zmrhal, J. Tvrzický, and K. Pergler. Moreover, an occasional but important stimulus to political activity was provided by the frequent visits to the United States of prominent political representatives or intellectuals such as T. G. Masaryk and Vojta Beneš before World War I, and E. Beneš, J. Masaryk, and others before or during World War II (fig. 84). These leaders, sooner or later, recognized the potential power of the largest

Czech minority living abroad.

The two world wars brought the decline of ethnically specific activities among Czech-Americans. Once the United States took the same stand toward German efforts to dominate Europe as did Czech-Americans, this ethnic group developed even more positive attitudes toward their adopted country, which facilitated their becoming more Americanized and assimilated. The case of the generation born in America was different. Though receiving some of their values from the Czech community and their families, yet another influence came from the larger American world in which they participated to a much greater extent than did their parents. Therefore, they accepted the American view on events in Europe and refused to adopt a rather romantic understanding of the Czech nation and traditional Czech culture. Acceptance of this understanding, they believed, would lead to their becoming strangers in their own land and would stigmatize them as less than fully American. This was something that the older generation of Czech-American leaders did not fully grasp.

Notes

¹ Werner Sollors, *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).

² April Schulz, "'The Pride of the Race Had Been Touched': The 1925 Norse-American Immigration Centennial and Ethnic Identity," *The Journal of American History* 77 (March 1991): 1267.

³ Data are based on the analysis of applications to emigrate deposited in the District Archives (OA) of Tábor, in the records of the District Offices (OÚ) of the cities of Tábor, Veselí, Mladá Vožice, and Soběslav.

⁴ Data are based on material cited in note 3, and recounted in accordance with the statistics of V. Mastný. See the table on emigration to the U.S.A. in *Začiatky českej a slovenskej emigrácie do USA*, ed. J. Polišínský (Bratislava: SAV, 1970), 48.

⁵ OA Tábor, f. OÚ Soběslav, k.42, sg.4/2/39.

⁶ OA Tábor, f. OÚ Mladá Vožice, k.11, sg.4/2/25.

⁷ The best sources for investigating the "proletarianization" are the applications for emigration found in individual district archives in Bohemia, for example, OA Pelhřimov, f. OÚ Pelhřimov, k. 108, or OA Písek, f. OÚ Písek, k. 37, 38, and 295.

⁸ See the activity of agents like M. Kohn and T. Reiner - cf. OA Strakonice, f. OH Strakonice, sg.4/2, k.137.

⁹ See the "Circular of the Prague Presidium," Febr. 15, 1890, which mentioned increasing illegal emigration, or the lists of emigrants from individual districts, for example OA Strakonice, f. OH Strakonice, sg.4/2, k. 137. On recruitment of young girls to work as housemaids in the U.S.A. see *Ibid.*, f. OÚ Strakonice - pres., 35/1905.

¹⁰ A. Novotný to F. Ballek, Mar. 8, 1917, in box "Socialisté," Archives of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad, University of Chicago.

¹¹ Martha E. Griffith, "The Czechs in Cedar Rapids," *The Iowa Journal of History and Politics* 42 (April 1944): 128.

¹² Oscar Handlin, *Race and Nationality in American Life*, 4th ed. [1st ed. 1950] (Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1957), 88-89.

¹³ *Statistická ročenka republiky československé* (Prague: Státní úřad statistický, 1938), 33-34, and A. M. Mayer, "Československé vystěhovalectví a jeho příčiny," in *Československé vystěhovalectví z hlediska potřeb naší doby* (Prague: 1934), 7-8.

¹⁴ Abstract from the report of the Czechoslovak Consul General in Chicago in State Central Archive in Prague (SÚA Praha), f. ČÚZ, k. 42.

¹⁵ *Statistická ročenka*, 33-34.

¹⁶ U.S. consulate to Czechoslovak Foreign Institute, Prague, n.d., č.1568/192, SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42.

¹⁷ *Vystěhovalecký zpravodaj*, June 15, 1930.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, Nov. 1, 1929.

¹⁹ *Program Československé federace socialistické strany americké* (Cleveland, Ohio: 1931), 5.

²⁰ *Statistická ročenka*, 33-34.

²¹ Tomáš Čapek, *The Čechs (Bohemians) In America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920), 122-24.

²² Karel D. Bicha, "The Czechs In Wisconsin History," *Wisconsin Magazine of History* 53 (Spring 1970): 201.

²³ Signatures 4/2 from the records of emigration matters in OA Strakonice, Písek, Tábor, Pelhřimov, and Jindřichův Hradec.

²⁴ Jan Borecký, *Kapitoly k dějepisnímu lidu česko-moravského ve Spojených státech* (Cedar Rapids, Ia.: Svit Pub. Co., 1896), 14.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ Also emphasizing events of the period 1848 through the 1860s in the development of Czech freethought is Bruce Garver, "Czech-American Freethinkers on the Great Plains," in *Ethnicity on the Great Plains*, ed. Frederick C. Luebke (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1980), 147-69, especially 149.

²⁷ Josef Martínek, *Američtí svobodomyšlní Češi v boji za naši samostatnost* (Prague: Volná myšlenka, 1936), 22.

²⁸ OA Třeboň, f. OÚ J. Hradec - pres. 1850-1948, sign. 47/1869.

²⁹ During 1861-89 only 7,410 persons in Bohemia and Moravia converted to Protestantism, of whom sixty percent were women. At the same time, 3,507 persons left this church, and compared to the end of 1850s the number of Protestants even declined! See František Bednář, *Památník českobratrské církve evangelické* (Prague: Kalich, 1924), 59.

³⁰ Vojtěch Mastný, "Statistika vystěhovalectví českého proletariátu do Spojených států," *Demografie* 4 (1962): 204-11.

³¹ Čapek, *Čechs in America*, 127.

³² OÚ Jindřichův Hradec to the regional governor, Jan. 18, 1868. OA Třeboň, f. OÚ J. Hradec - pres. 1850-1948, č.7/1868 and 21/1868.

³³ Jan Habenicht, *Dějiny Čechův amerických* (St. Louis, Mo.: Hlas, 1904).

³⁴ Report on Bohemian Section, 1913, box "Socialisté," Archives of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad.

³⁵ *Prohlášení výkonného výboru Českého odvětví Socialistické strany v Americe, n.d.; and F. Hlaváček, Proč jsem byl propuštěn z redakce "Spravedlnosti."* The copy of F. Hlaváček's undated letter to the board of directors of the Czechoslovak Marxist Federation is in the box "Socialisté," Archives of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad.,

³⁶ *Protokol sjezdu českého dělnictva v Americe* (Chicago, Ill.: 1902).

³⁷ *Program dělnické akademie pořádané Sociální sekci osmou. 13. ledna 1906* (Cleveland: B.F. Přihoda, 1906) in box "Socialisté," Archives of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad.

³⁸ Josef Martínek, *České podpůrné jednoty a dělnické hnutí* (Cleveland: 1914), 10 - 11.

³⁹ Bruce Garver, "Americans of Czech and Slovak Ancestry in the History of Czechoslovakia," *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 11 (Winter 1993): 1-14.

⁴⁰ Josef Klíma, *V boji za právu a pravdu. Památník k desetileté činnosti "Obrany"* (New York: 1920), 9-10.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴² Klíma, *V boji za právu a pravdu*, 23.

⁴³ O. Zlámal, "Moje stanovisko vůči Č.N.S." *Američan*, Nov. 16, 1916.

⁴⁴ *Pro vlast a národ. Za svobodu Čechie* (Chicago, Ill.: Národní Svaz Českých Katolíků, 1917).

⁴⁵ *The Position of Bohemians (Czechs) in European War*, n.d., n.p.

⁴⁶ "Circular of the District Committee of the BNA," M. Verner Collection, Immigration History Research Center, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.

⁴⁷ Čapek, *Čechs in America*, 270-71.

⁴⁸ Melvin G. Holli, "The Great War Sinks Chicago's German Kultur," in *Ethnic Chicago*, ed. Peter D. Jones & M. G. Holli (Grand Rapids, Mi.: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1981), 297.

⁴⁹ Griffith, "The Czechs in Cedar Rapids," 129.

⁵⁰ *Czechoslovaks as Americans* (Chicago: Bohemian National Alliance, 1924), 9.

⁵¹ *Cedar Rapids Republican*, Sept. 14, 1907.

⁵² "Mir," Verner Collection, Immigration History Research Center.

⁵³ Report on a visit of J.S. Rouček at the CFI, Prague 1937, SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42, č.1442/Tp/1937.

⁵⁴ M. Getting to ČÚZ, Pittsburgh, Oct. 22, 1931, SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42, č.349-31-p.

⁵⁵ *Věk rozumu*, Nov. 12, 1936.

⁵⁶ "Stolice češtiny na texaské univerzitě v Austin," SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42, č.595/TI/1936.

⁵⁷ Report of the meeting of J.S. Rouček with V. Beneš, Aug. 21, 1937, SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42.

⁵⁸ Directory of the *Krajané* (countrymen), SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42, cf. also the minutes of the advisory meeting of the CFI with Prof. dr.I. Karvaš, Prague, Dec. 20, 1937. SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42, č.3325/1937.

⁵⁹ Letter of the CNCA to the CFI, Chicago, Sept. 15, 1930, copy in SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42.

⁶⁰ F. Klepal to the CFI, Chicago, May 6, 1931, SÚA Praha, f. ČÚZ, k. 42.

⁶¹ Good evidence concerning the activity by Slovaks in America for an independent Slovakia can be found, for example, in records of the Národný Slovenský Spolok (National Slovak Society), Slovak Collection, Immigration History Research Center.