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ABSTRACT
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Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Chester Dunning

This dissertation examines elite and popular consciousness among Czech speakers in America during their mass migration from Bohemia and Moravia, the two Habsburg crownlands that became the largest part of the Czechoslovak Republic in 1918. Between 1860 and 1910, their numbers increased tenfold to almost a quarter-million, as recorded in the United States census, and to over a half-million with their children. That was almost one-twelfth of their population in Bohemia and Moravia. In the same half-century, a stable group of men made Czech-language journalism and publishing in America. They included Karel Jonáš in Wisconsin, Václav Šnajdr in Cleveland, František Boleslav Zdrůbek and August Geringer in Chicago, and Jan Rosický in Omaha.

Students of the first Czech-language secondary schools in Bohemia, they came to the 1860s American Midwest in their twenties and modernized a print culture launched by bricklayers and tailors. They also became leading voices in what the subtitle calls contention and brotherhood among their countrymen. Contention formed the three large camps, subcultures and allegiances—liberal/Freethinker, Catholic and Socialist. Brotherhood denotes the forms of association and security that made the fraternal benefit societies the largest and most durable platforms for Bohemian identity and advocacy in America. The dissertation uses Czech-American newspapers from the period, historiography and new archival sources from both sides of the Atlantic to more closely examine definitive episodes, personalities and institutions among Bohemians while they
formed important urban and rural communities in American society from New York to the Great Plains.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANC</td>
<td>Bohemian American National Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLU</td>
<td>Central Labor Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMCO</td>
<td>Cigar Makers Central Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIU</td>
<td>Cigar Makers International Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCA</td>
<td>Czechoslovak National Council of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSA</td>
<td>Československé spolky v Americe (Czechoslovak Society of America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ČSPS</td>
<td>Česko-slovanský podporující spolek (Czecho-Slavonic Fraternal Benefit Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Dennice novověku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWPA</td>
<td>International Working People’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPJST</td>
<td>Slovanská podporující jednota státu Texas (Slavonic Benevolent Order of the State of Texas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZČBJ</td>
<td>Západní česko-bratrstká jednota (Western Bohemian Fraternal Association)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In September 1892 a group in the American Midwest that called itself the Bohemian American National Committee (henceforth BANC) began publishing a monthly journal, *The Bohemian Voice*, to influence American public opinion on the “Bohemians” as a Slavic immigrant ethnic group, to counter the perceived influence of German sources on American perceptions of ethnic conflict in the Habsburg Empire and its Czech-speaking crown lands, and to foster a Bohemian identity among the children of Bohemian immigrants. The journal was one part of a broad agenda of efforts devoted to these three goals, but it was the most striking part and greatest success of that ambitious agenda. For over two years *The Bohemian Voice* and its young immigrant editors and Michigan-educated attorneys, Thomas Čapek (1861-1950) and Josef Jiří Král (1870-1951), parried American nativists and Habsburg authority on behalf of the Bohemian immigrant ethnic group, other Slavs in America, and the Czech-speaking majority in Bohemia and Moravia and its struggle for “home rule.”¹

Czech mass immigration to the United States had begun at mid-century, and by 1890 the national census recorded 118,106 natives of Bohemia, although many of the additional 123,271 natives of Austria were probably Czech-speaking Bohemians and Moravians. By then Poles probably displaced Czechs as the largest Slavic immigrant ethnic group in the United States: they included 147,440 natives of “Poland” and probably a share of the census tallies recorded for natives of Austria, Russia and Germany, since Poland unlike the Kingdom of Bohemia no longer existed as a legally and territorially defined entity. Nevertheless, Czech speakers would remain not only the second largest Slavic immigrant ethnic group but also the conspicuously most literate and socioeconomically privileged one. Thus, the 1911 *Reports of the Immigration Commission* found illiteracy among immigrant “Bohemians and Moravians” at just 1.7 percent in 1899-1910 but in the range of 24 to 53 percent for other Slavs, while by occupation it found 25 percent of

¹ This dissertation follows the style of *The Journal of American History*. 
1Czechs but only 2 to 9 percent of other Slavs in the “skilled labor” category. Czech speakers were also the only Slavs to join Germans and Scandinavians in large numbers on the American agricultural frontier, beginning in Wisconsin and Texas in the 1850s and proceeding across the Upper Mississippi basin and the Great Plains.  

With their large German minorities and the persistence or at least recent legacy of German as the language of authority, education, public discourse and social mobility, Bohemia and Moravia were biethnic and bicultural. They were also important centers of the capitalist economic transformation and integration of German Central Europe after the Revolution of 1848: by 1880 Bohemia and Moravia contributed two-thirds of the Habsburg Empire’s industrial product as the Czechs became the only nationality besides the Germans whose share of the monarchy’s industrial workforce exceeded its share of the population (Czechs 22 percent and 13 percent in 1900, Germans 41 percent and 25 percent). These conditions fostered a striking bipolarity in the Czech-speaking immigration in the United States: its ethnolinguistic affiliation with other Slavs and its Panslavism contended with a historical experience and socioeconomic characteristics more in common with the German immigration.  

Such was the immigrant ethnic group whose voice the BANC set out to become in 1892. Its numbers would grow in the remaining two decades before World War I. By 1910 the United States census recorded 539,392 Czech immigrants by native language and their children, while the Austrian census of the same year recorded a Czech-speaking population of 6,291,237 in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia. Thus, first- and second-generation Czech residents in the United States amounted to at least 8.6 percent of the source population in the Czech lands! But this growth was overshadowed by a much more spectacular rise in the immigration rate of fellow Slavs from the Habsburg Empire: Poles, Slovaks, Ukrainians, Carpatho-Rusyns, Southern Slavs. The presence of these fellow Slavs, American nativist reaction and their effect on Czech immigrant elite
consciousness was already evident during the early 1890s in the BANC. So was the effect and legacy of Bohemian affinities with the German immigration in America, including both labor radicalism and a commitment to middle-class legitimacy. All three major urban Bohemian immigrant communities, in New York, Cleveland and Chicago, were prominent in labor’s Great Upheaval of 1877, and Bohemian radicalism culminated in the May 1886 Haymarket events in Chicago, where the “native born and Irish tend[ed] toward moderate politics while the Germans and Bohemians [were] more revolutionary” (Eric Leigh Hirsch). Bohemian labor was receptive to German socialist thought and practice, which were also suspect for being German and could be undermined on that basis by those countrymen who emphasized Czech nationalism.  

As for Bohemian middle-class society and aspirations, they were also bound up in complex ways with the Czech-German relationship and with Czech nationalism as embodied in Bohemia’s so-called Young Czech Party. In reaction to an Old Czech elite that cultivated the Bohemian nobility, the Catholic hierarchy and the kingdom’s history, the Young Czechs embraced liberalism, capitalism and rationalism, and they staked the legitimacy of Czech nationalism on business, professional, technical, scholarly and cultural prowess. In this they competed on similar terms with the middle-class nationalism of the German liberals in Bohemia, Moravia and Habsburg Austria. They also cultivated a populist nationalism that was quite beyond the more deferential and elitist style of the Old Czechs and that first culminated in the tábory (mass rallies at historical sites) and student activism of the 1868-1871 Bohemian state rights struggle provoked by a Dualist political settlement that institutionalized a German and Hungarian partition and dominance of the Habsburg Empire. At the beginning of the Habsburg constitutional era in the 1860s the Young Czechs were also preoccupied with emancipating the kingdom’s schools from the Catholic Church and grounding them in rationalism, and when they formally constituted themselves in 1874, they did so as the Národní strana svobodomyslná, or National Freethinker Party. Meanwhile, in America the immigrant elites that would produce the BANC and The Bohemian Voice also
proclaimed themselves “Freethinkers.” As such they claimed leadership of Czech nationalism in emigration in the New World, and they turned their energies against the only representatives of Habsburg authority that followed them there, the Catholic clergy. 

The BANC’s founders were former students and student activists of secondary schools and schools of higher learning in Bohemia during the pivotal decade of the 1860s. Charles Jonas (i.e., Karel Jonáš, 1840-1896), editor of the weekly Slavie in Racine, Wisconsin, where he was elected Democratic lieutenant governor in November 1890, left Bohemia in October 1860 to avoid persecution for his participation in nationalist demonstrations five months earlier as a student of the Prague polytechnic and for his pamphlet on the “Germanisation of Austria’s secondary schools,” which was confiscated by the police before its distribution. Václav Šnajdr (1847-1920), editor of the Cleveland weekly Dennice novověku, was another student radical and political refugee. As a Gymnasium student in Prague he participated in a June 1868 demonstration on the occasion of Emperor Franz Josef I’s visit to the city and fled abroad to avoid prosecution for treason. František Boleslav Zdrůbek (1842-1911), the leading Czech journalist in Chicago, studied in Prague, as did Jan Rosický (1845-1910), editor of the Omaha weekly Pokrok západu. Lev Palda (1847-1913), public speaker, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, cigar merchant, and former labor organizer and newspaper editor in New York and the Midwest, attended the reálka in his native South Bohemian Vodňany during this practical secondary school’s transition from German- to Czech-language instruction. August Geringer (1842-1930), a business patriarch of the Freethinkers in Chicago, was the largest publisher of Czech-language books and newspapers and the largest employer of immigrant journalists in America, including Zdrůbek. Geringer’s older brother Karel (1839-1902), a young assistant priest in the Catholic parish of Vodňany, Palda’s hometown, was persecuted for a Panslavic pilgrimage to Belgrade and for writing about it in the Prague Young Czech daily Národní listy in 1867, less than two years before August emigrated to Chicago! All these men were born in the 1840s and shared
formative experiences in 1860s Bohemia before arriving in the United States in the same
decade.6

This 1860s generation of immigrant journalists and publicists came together in the
BANC at a time when dramatic events in Bohemia appeared like a reprise of their youth
and no doubt quickened their hearts and thought. The Young Czechs at last displaced the
Old Czechs after the latter came to terms with the German liberals and Habsburg
establishment on an ethnic partition of Bohemia. (Such a partition would finally be
realized only at the 1938 Munich conference.) The mass opposition that this deal
aroused in the kingdom’s Czech-speaking majority led to a stunning March 1891 Young
Czech electoral sweep of districts representing this majority in the Vienna Reichsrat, and
Lev Palda, popular orator of the immigrants in America, moved the Česko-slovanský
podporující spolek (i.e., ČSPS, or Czecho-Slavonic Fraternal Benefit Association) to
form what became the BANC at its convention that November. The excitement in
Bohemia quickly led to mass rallies, martial law, persecution of journalists and the
Omladina show trial of student activists. The Young Czechs disappointed popular
expectations, especially after the January-February 1894 Omladina trial, and the BANC
faltered by the end of the year.7

But the committee was no mere echo of events in Bohemia. Its work and ideas also gave
the 1860s generation a means to successfully attract a younger generation of American-
educated professionals to a common purpose. Outstanding in this other elite were
Thomas Čapek and Josef Jiří Král, successive editors of The Bohemian Voice. Both were
University of Michigan law graduates, and Čapek, a decade older, was an Omaha
attorney and legislator. Both had worked for immigrant journalists of the 1860s
generation—Čapek for Jan Rosický in Omaha, and Král for Václav Šnajdr in Cleveland.
Bohumil Shimek (1851–1937), a botanist and professor at the University of Iowa in Iowa
City, was also prominent in this “American” group. He was closer in age to the older
1860s group of journalists, but unlike Čapek and Král, who came to America in their late
teens and with a Bohemian secondary education, Shimek came as a child with his farmer parents.  

As the most inclusive and ambitious common venture of an 1860s generation that was the mainstream of Czech immigrant journalism across five decades, and as a venture that activated American-educated professionals, the BANC calls for broader study than its brief treatments in the literature. Thomas Čapek, who went on to become (and remains) the most prolific (if amateur) historian of the 19th-century Czech-American immigration, devoted one paragraph to the committee and to The Bohemian Voice in his English-language history of the immigrant ethnic group, even less in his monumental, seven-hundred-page Czech-language treatment, and less than two pages in his memoir. In these books from the 1920s and 1930s, and in a 1911 history of the Czech immigrant press, Čapek did devote much space to the 1860s generation of immigrant journalists and to their contemporaries from other generations who made up the Czech cultural and business elites in America, but he did so in the fashion of a reference handbook or as a memoirist. In the most substantial of other minor treatments of the BANC as a crossroads in the long career of the 1860s generation of liberal journalists and as a major transgenerational locus for 19th-century Czech immigrant elites, Josef Martínek (1889-1980), a Socialist editor in Cleveland, wrote six pages about it in his capable centennial history of the ČSPS and related fraternal benefit associations in 1955. In the half century since, a time of great development in the historiography of American immigration, no further treatments appeared.

The present study uses the title of the early 1890s journal The Bohemian Voice as a complex metaphor for journalism, nationalism, identity and elite dynamics in the Czech-speaking immigrant ethnic group and for the 1860s generation that was so prominent and durable in its public discourse and representation. As a brief but definitive episode the BANC is a useful focus, while its remarkable promise and failure raise questions that guide an examination of its larger context and period in the 19th-century Bohemian mass
immigration to America. Chapter II examines this immigration’s historiography, whose structure, limitations and authors are a part of the “story” to an extent that is perhaps unusual. History, historical myth and historiography were essential elements of the 19th-century nationalism that Czech-speaking immigrants brought with them to America, a nationalism that sought inspiration from and continuity with the medieval Bohemian kingdom. František Palacký (1798-1876), political patriarch of Czech nationalism from the Revolution of 1848 until his death, was foremost a historian. Not surprisingly, the 19th-century Bohemian mass immigration to America wrote (e.g., Thomas Čapek) and published (August Geringer) much of its own history, although it had less success preserving primary sources, including newspapers.¹⁰

Chapter III on “Bohemian America” describes the Czech-speaking immigrant ethnic group in the nineteenth-century United States. The section titled “In Numbers: When and How Many?” seeks an elusive consensus between independent statistical sources on the migration’s volume and periodization. The next section, “Where from? Classes and Places,” examines the changing rural social structure and economic geography of the Czech Lands. The Revolution of 1848 completed the peasantry’s emancipation from feudal landlords but also inaugurated its impoverishment in an agricultural market that favored large holdings and investments. The liberal and capitalist transformation of ownership and production in the decades after the revolution also impoverished rural and small-town craftsmen, bypassed marginal regions like Southern Bohemia and the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands and made them leading sources of migration to America, sources that the chain migration of relatives and neighbors further sustained. A third section, “Their Culture and Consciousness?” uses social historian Miroslav Hroch’s model of nationalist movements to sketch its progress in the Czech Lands. Czech-speaking society took over the system of self-government, and it developed its own school system up to the university level, expanding networks of popular associations, and thriving cultures of publishing and reading. A final section, “To What Places? Bohemian America,” examines the changing settlement patterns and economic
geography of Bohemian natives and their children in the corridor of cities from New York to St. Louis and in the vast rural spaces of middle America.

Chapters IV through VII are a look at how contention, brotherhood and journalism developed and affected each other in this Bohemian America during its three formative decades before the 1890s. Chapter IV, “Wisconsin Slavia,” examines the origins of Czech-language journalism in that state and St. Louis, the places where most of its rural and urban audiences lived in the 1860s. The title invokes the weekly Slavie as the first professional and long-lived newspaper—but also “Slavia” as place, as a real and imagined new Bohemia, and as the new American setting for the popular nationalism from the ancestral Bohemia. In the middle of German-speaking Central Europe, the Panslavic idea of belonging to a much larger nation as Czech-speaking Slavs was reassuring, and in Wisconsin Bohemians seriously considered projects for their own colony not just in the American West—but also in the Russian Far East. The project for a Czech-language press was also a collaboration of elite and popular nationalism. Vojta Náprstek (1826-1894) started it, and he was the scion of a Prague merchant family and an 1848 student refugee from Vienna. Ten years after the revolution, he returned to Prague, where his salon became a de facto “consulate” for the American Czechs. Today the state-owned Náprstek Museum is still the largest archive anywhere on their history. But back in the American Midwest, ordinary workmen actually launched the first newspapers. Karel Jonáš and the fellow students who came later that decade already found a working press to take over and modernize. This chapter also evokes Racine County as an unusual but congenial community of countrymen—unusual for their origins in nonconformist Eastern Bohemia, where the relics of Czech Protestantism were strongest, and congenial to a liberal Czech press for the same reasons.

Chapter V, “Cleveland Progress in Conflict with Catholics,” looks closely at the weekly Pokrok (Progress) and its large role in forming the mutually hostile relationship in the American communities between liberals and Catholics, who would not cooperate for
half a century until late in the Czechoslovak independence movement during World War I. With five successive editors and four successive locations (Chicago, Racine, Cedar Rapids, Cleveland) in its ten-year career from 1867 to 1877, this newspaper was an early crossroads for many articulate individuals with long personal careers in both camps. Karel Jonáš launched *Pokrok*, and F.B. Zdrůbek, Jan Vratislav Čapek (Thomas Čapek’s eldest brother), and Václav Šnajdr succeeded each other as its longest-serving and final editors. Zdrůbek and Cleveland’s Father Václav Řepiš (b. 1822) started a duel in the law courts that aroused popular support for both of them and brought the *Pokrok* newspaper to that city. In St. Louis, the first Catholic newspaper appeared—the weekly *Hlas* (Voice). That city’s Father Josef Hessoun (1830-1906) was a capable patriarch of the Catholic camp from his arrival just after the Civil War until his death four decades later. Cleveland’s younger Father Josef Maria Koudelka (b. 1852) was a rising star and one just as confrontational and unrelenting as any of his journalist counterparts in the liberal camp. The Czech-speaking lower clergy and laity were as nationalist in action and sentiment as liberal society in Bohemia. So was Jan Valerian Jirsík in South Bohemia, bishop of the diocese where Hessoun and other priests in America took in their early influences, attended schools and even made their early careers. But Catholics were suspect because of their more compelling other loyalty to a hierarchy that other ethnic groups dominated—and that did not change in America. Koudelka and many others completed Milwaukee’s St. Francis seminary, founded by Austrian native Josef Salzmann in a state that long remained a German bastion in the American Catholic Church. Liberals organized as anticlerical Freethinkers, but most Czech speakers were simply indifferent to the Church. F.B. Zdrůbek and Václav Šnajdr were the severest critics of the Catholic camp, and this chapter closely examines their journalism and long careers in Chicago and Cleveland, respectively.

On the pattern of its predecessor, chapter VI examines the origins of another lasting arena of contention among Bohemians in America—between liberal nationalists and that other “international” camp, the Socialists. Its title, “New York Patriot in Conflict with
Anarchists,” refers to another noteworthy weekly newspaper: former Cleveland *Pokrok* editor J.V. Čapek (1842-1909) published *Patriot* for a few months in 1883-1884. By then refugee Social Democrats radicalized by persecution in Bohemia and Austria were arriving and succeeding more acclimated countrymen and comrades in New York and Chicago, where harsh conditions shortened working-class lives. The newcomers and their violent revolutionary rhetoric provoked Čapek, who took the field as spokesman for middle-class values. A talented writer, Čapek was a South Bohemian peasant son who attained some university education in Prague. The chapter uses *Patriot* and Čapek’s polemics as a magnifying glass on the Czech-language social debate in American cities. But it closely examines Bohemian working-class life and Socialism across the 1870s and 1880s. In 1877, Bohemians and their neighborhoods in three cities took a consciousness-raising leading role in American labor’s Great Upheaval. As lumbershovers in Chicago, barrel makers for Standard Oil in Cleveland, and cigarmakers in New York, they achieved what Herbert Gutman called community uprisings against capital. Two journalists sustained them with their newspapers. One was the early Socialist Lev Palda—and the other was J.V. Čapek.

Chapter VII is in two parts. Part one, titled “Self-Made Men,” continues the story of Czech journalism in America. Palda and Čapek both failed at the business of journalism and publishing, but Jan Rosický and August Geringer succeeded marvelously. By the decade of World War I, Rosický employed some fifty countrymen in his firm and Geringer a hundred. They employed many talented editors who would have most likely not made it on their own—not to mention typesetters and other workers in print shop and office, plus correspondents, agents and traveling salesmen in other states. The peripatetic František J. Kuták, whose career as typesetter, editor and publisher led through many shops from New York to Omaha, including Geringer’s and Rosický’s, is one example of the firm ground that these two men made in the shifting archipelago of Czech publishing from Manhattan Island to the Great Plains. They did it in two very different places—Geringer in the great metropolis of Chicago, and Rosický at his Omaha vantage point on
the vast diaspora of Bohemians on their lonely farms across the American interior. Both
men set out on their hard and doubtful careers in the 1870s. Rosický made his harder
with a relentless and relentlessly unprofitable devotion to quality ventures in Czech and
Czech-American literature, starting with the mid-1880s weekly *Květy americké* (American blossoms). To compensate for this weakness, he became a savvy job printer
outside the Bohemian market and the best farm journal publisher inside the Bohemian
market. Geringer was more pragmatic and popular in literary output. Or even crass and
scandalous, as his critics saw it. But he also launched an almanac that was innovative
and influential in its attention to Czech-American history and biography right from the
start of its eighty-year career. And maybe he had a weakness of his own in his zealous
commitment to Freethought: in the 1890s the newly organized Bohemian Benedictines
quickly built up a Catholic establishment that matched his in scale of business and range
of output.

Part two of chapter VII, titled “Brothers,” turns to the ČSPS fraternal benefit society. To
its rise as the largest and most inclusive Czech-speaking institution across social classes
and across the country in the two decades before it founded the BANC at its 1891 Cedar
Rapids convention. The ČSPS endorsed, adopted and even funded Freethinker and labor
newspapers, and it named its local lodges for their editors, including lodges Václav
Šnajdr, Karel Jonáš and Jan Rosický. For their part, these editors played leading roles in
the society, whose nationalist spirit is evident in its generous monetary contributions to
the embattled Slavic nations of the Balkan Peninsula and to the Ústřední matice školská
(Central School Foundation), devoted to opening and supporting Czech-language
schools in German-speaking parts of Bohemia. Socialist newspaper editor Josef
Martínek wrote a critical centennial history for the ČSPS on over four hundred pages in
the 1950s and used its internal archive.11 This narrative builds on Martinek’s
achievement to more closely examine the symbiosis between Freethinker journalists,
ČSPS officers, Bohemian identity in America and Czech Transatlantic nationalism. For
fifteen years the ČSPS was just a local affair in St. Louis, like other fraternal benefit
societies that Bohemians formed elsewhere in America. Its national expansion began in 1870 Cleveland, just before the contest there between Freethinkers and Catholics that was the subject of chapter four. This narrative examines the Cleveland connection, which remained important, and draws on Václav Šnajdr, who published and edited the brotherhood’s national organ for twenty years. In its fraternal benefit mission and practices, the brotherhood harnessed the compelling idea that personal welfare was best secured among one’s own countrymen. Svůj k svému (To each his own) was the slogan for the increasingly autarkic tendencies of Czech nationalism in Bohemia, and it hung on Václav Rychlík beer hall in Cleveland when the brotherhood gathered there for its first major national convention in 1878.\textsuperscript{12}

Chapter VIII, titled “A Bohemian American National Committee,” and chapter IX, “Bohemian Voice,” are a close look at the ambitious organization and English-language monthly that we already described above. It begins in Cedar Rapids with the 1891 ČSPS convention—the largest that the brotherhood would ever bring together—and ends in the Panic of 1893, the severe cyclical turn to hard times in America that took several years. The BANC was a high point for the journalists around Karel Jonáš as national leaders among their countrymen. It was also striking as their one common venture, which brought them together with other kinds and generations of countrymen in its work and for at least two conventions at the ČSPS hall in Chicago. Addressing America and the second generation were the goals now. In a word, it was about public image and not about a separate colony somewhere, like in the 1860s. But the BANC’s short career and demise reveal the limits of grand nationalist visions for Bohemians in America, even if they were more realistic now. Its bylaws and minutes preserved the thought of men who saw a clear and open road ahead to national authority and independent means for the BANC: Bohemians and their associations would take up membership, send delegates, make voluntary contributions, and motivate others to do the same. But this social engine never steamed up to the power expected from it, and it did not take the BANC very far through its evolving agenda.
The Panic interfered, but the Bohemian world had its own forms of friction and resistance. Egos also came together with men like Jonáš, Šnajdr, Palda, Rosický and Zdrůbek. The minutes record perfect harmony, but their private letters do not. And larger antagonisms were part of the background—between socialism and self-reliance, between city and country, between East and West. These antagonisms were already well-practiced in the ČSPS brotherhood, where Jan Rosický voiced Western resentments of Eastern wage labor and its higher mortality. Rosický came to the BANC conventions. Its Eastern delegates did not, but just three years after the BANC Rosický and the Westerners quit the ČSPS to form their own fraternal brotherhood. Personal reputation was another problem in the small Bohemian world: the case of publisher August Geringer is a good example. And finally, the BANC and its ideas were perhaps just not compelling enough. Maybe its income in dollars donated, which soon tended toward zero, was a true measure of its value to countrymen, who gave enough to build fine new Bohemian national halls in Cleveland and New York, where they still stand today. In Chicago, the BANC became just an episode on West Eighteenth Street’s market of identities and not its culmination. A few blocks away, the Pilsen Sokol gymnastic society raised a stone hall and made it another center of Bohemian social life. Even closer, the new Bohemian Benedictine chapter remade St. Prokop’s parish and revitalized Bohemian Catholic Chicago and America. The last two-thirds of chapter eight turn to a brighter part of the landscape for the BANC—to The Bohemian Voice.

The last chapter, number X, is titled “After the Voice.” Karel Jonáš, now a United States consul in Europe, ended his life in January 1896, when American politics and an unforgiving Habsburg state encouraged self-doubt about the meaning and future of his Transatlantic career. But the other young Bohemians who followed him to America in the 1860s carried on as before to the end of the era. Every day or week, Šnajdr, Rosický and Zdrůbek produced the most experienced newspaper in his locality. Each laid on seniority in his great part of Bohemian America, and each wrote for a national audience.
Palda had no journal or press of his own, but he was still an important old voice as publicist, orator and memoirist. As for eras and endings, the Great War ended the century of European immigration before the American nativism and quota laws that it prefaced. For Bohemian America the new era meant two great departures. One into the common long decline in numbers and vitality but another toward its own nationalist millennium—the Czechoslovak Republic and the later efforts to restore and rescue it. The four men from the BANC passed into silence just in the last five years before 1914—Šnajdr by retirement, and Rosický, Zdrůbek and Palda in death. J.V. Čapek also died then. He never returned to Czech journalism in New York, where he was its pioneer, but in the years after the turn of the century he turned to a history of Bohemian America. He left this new role and unfinished work to his youngest brother Thomas, the former editor of the Bohemian Voice.

As its centerpiece, this final chapter explores what it calls the “great gathering” of 1907. For three days that June, nearly three hundred delegates gathered at the ČSPS brotherhood’s West Eighteenth Street hall in Chicago. They also attracted an audience of unknown numbers. But by delegate count alone it was the largest American representative assembly to be conducted in the Czech language before the Great War. In fact, it was probably the largest such assembly in the entire half century since the Bohemian Transatlantic migration began. The purpose was to revitalize Freethinkers intellectually and to reorganize them. Catholics were more formidable now, two decades into the Benedictine era. The allegiance of countrymen was still a matter of contention large enough for mass protest meetings and other popular methods. And new personalities arrived to take up the old interpersonal ones, like the libel suit. All this was part of the prelude to 1907 since the times of the BANC. But 1907 on West Eighteenth Street was more than a Freethinker convention. It was a larger intersection. Regions, generations and eras met there. Rosický, Zdrůbek and Palda came. But they shared large roles with younger and more recent arrivals from Bohemia, who cast more influence now. Rosický still spoke for the rural West, the source of many older and more
assimilated delegates in 1907. The new men (and women) were more educated and Socialist—and their arguments and modernism more compelling. Some of them led Bohemian America into the wartime Czechoslovak independence movement just a few years later. Other became its historians and next publishers—or led the ČSPS and other fraternal brotherhoods well into the new era’s long decades of decline.
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CHAPTER II  
HISTORIOGRAPHY OF 19TH-CENTURY CZECH-AMERICAN IMMIGRATION

The Atlantic Ocean divides the historiography of 19th-century Czech-American immigration into two continental parts. In the American portion contributions can be classified by their origin in either the immigrant communities or the scholarly establishment, while in the Czech Lands the succession of interested political regimes serves as a convenient basis for categorization. A review of this Transatlantic literature over its thirteen decades serves the usual purpose of charting the possibilities and opportunities of the present contribution. But the literature is also part of the present study and story to an unusual extent because many of its authors, editors and publishers were part of Czech-language immigrant journalism and its elites.

In the Immigrant Communities

Mass emigration from Bohemia and Moravia to the United States began after the Revolution of 1848 in the Habsburg monarchy, and its historiography began to appear in the immigrant community three decades later. František Boleslav Zdrůbek (1842-1911), educated at Prague’s Akademické gymnasium and the University of Basel, edited the Chicago almanac Amerikán as a kind of Czech immigrant historical and literary yearbook from its 1878 inception. Memoirs of individual immigrants, several in each issue, were a regular feature until Amerikán’s demise in the late 1950s. Occasionally Zdrůbek devoted the memoir section to special groups, including legislators and war veterans. He also wrote fifty pages on Czech Chicago and its pioneers, but other occasional articles on historical subjects were briefer, like Václav Šnajdr’s (1847-1920) five pages on Czech Cleveland in the inaugural issue. A university student from Prague, Šnajdr arrived in the United States two years after Zdrůbek in 1869 and became Czech Cleveland’s leading journalist. Individual Czech communities in rural Wisconsin,
Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Michigan and New York, as well as urban centers like Baltimore, Chicago, New York and St. Louis, were the subject of most other articles, but the earliest issues of Amerikán also contained contributions on the statistics and geography of Czech immigration as a whole.¹

Zdrůbek’s employer, August Geringer (1842-1930), operated the largest and most long-lived publishing firm in the Czech immigrant community. A rural schoolteacher and bookbinder who came to Chicago in 1869, Geringer wrote no literary or scholarly contributions himself, but his business success and goals made the Geringer publishing house relatively favorable to the development of Czech immigrant historiography. Geringer endured financial losses to launch the first daily newspaper in Czech as an alternative to German-language dailies, and he commissioned Zdrůbek to produce a Czech reader intended to replace schoolbooks imported from Bohemia and deemed too deferential to Habsburg ideology. Historiography was a part of these efforts to foster an independent and comprehensive Czech literary, educational and intellectual culture in America. Among some two hundred books, mostly textbooks, Freethought polemics and popular novels, that Geringer published by the 1920s were a few historical titles. In what is otherwise a compilation and translation of American sources on the Civil War, Josef Čermák interviewed and corresponded with veterans for his account of Czech immigrant participation in the conflict. Matěj Mašek (1899) wrote about Czechs in the Spanish-American War.²

Geringer’s press, its editors and authors represented a so-called Freethinker camp in the Czech immigrant elite, one whose journalism and institutions developed a larger national following than their Catholic counterparts. Although the Freethinker elite pursued a distinctive intellectual and institutional development in America, it was reminiscent of the so-called Young Czech political, business and journalistic elites in Bohemia. Like the Young Czechs, whose official self-designation was Svobodomyslná strana (Freethinkers’ Party), the immigrant Freethinkers espoused rationalism and economic
liberalism in a Czech nationalism directed all the more vehemently against the Catholic clergy, the only representatives of traditional Habsburg authority present in America. Freethinker immigration historiography culminated in the work of Jaroslav Egon Salaba Vojan (1872-1944) and Thomas Čapek (1861-1950). Vojan earned a doctorate in law at the Czech university in Prague and taught political economy there before his 1904 emigration to edit immigrant newspapers in New York and Chicago and to serve in Freethinker organizations. His 1911 book of essays promoted the idea that the Czech immigration had inherent American and Transatlantic ethnic interests to affirm and serve for decades before its assimilation was complete, but the book also surveyed the state and history of the community and its institutions on the eve of World War I.Čapek was more preoccupied with history than with contemporary conditions. After three years of secondary education in Bohemia, he graduated in law from the University of Michigan and briefly studied history at Columbia. In a 1911 history of the Czech immigrant press he compiled what was meant to be an exhaustive bibliography of 326 periodicals, many defunct or lost even then. Besides publication dates, addresses, frequency and affiliation, entries on individual titles list successive editors. A separate bibliography describes books and pamphlets issued by Czech immigrant presses. The few brief narrative chapters and passages in the book describe only selected editors and periodicals, mainly from the 1860s and 1870s. Čapek was by far the most prolific historian of the Czech immigrant ethnic group, and his work culminated in the 1920s with *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America* in English and *Naše America* (Our America) in Czech. Both books are encyclopedic in intended scope, and in structure they are compilations of disconnected subject chapters rather than an integrated narrative.Čapek knew many Czech immigrant newspaper editors and publishers personally from his own early experience working for them in Chicago and Omaha and from his elder brother Jan Vratislav Čapek (1842-1909), who edited newspapers in Cleveland and New York after 1871. Čapek drew on personal correspondence, newspapers and American
government sources, including Immigration Commission reports and Census Bureau statistics in his books. *Naše America* was by far the larger of his two encyclopedic treatments at seven hundred pages and with its gazetteer of Czech-American communities and chronology of events in Czech immigration history. Its coverage of all Slavic immigrant groups provided a broader context and comparative perspective. The encyclopedic structure was also a major limitation, as was Čapek’s overemphasis on Freethinkers and neglect of Socialist and especially Catholic journalism, elites and societies. Čapek also had filiopietistic preoccupations but dealt with them mostly in minor publications on such topics as alleged Bohemian immigrant noblemen in colonial America and on the earliest Czech-language publication in the United States.5

The Catholic camp also produced a significant body of historical literature. Antonín Petr Houšť (1857-1935), a Franciscan priest, compiled the first comprehensive history of Czech-American immigrant parishes in 1890. Physician Jan Habenicht (1840-1917) followed two decades later with a monumental treatment of eight hundred pages arranged by state and locality and based on extensive personal travel and correspondence. Habenicht’s coverage of individuals and societies ranged from lists to biographies of priests, early settlers and prominent figures and from lists to histories of devotional, fraternal benefit and cultural societies. This coverage extended, albeit unequally, to non-Catholic communities in what was intended as a “history” of the entire Czech immigration. Other parish histories covered the archdiocese of St. Paul and the state of Texas.6

Just as August Geringer fostered and published Freethinker historiography so the Czech Benedictines, who formed an abbey in 1885 Chicago, took on this leading role for Catholic historiography at their print shop and at their St. Procopius College in Lisle. Benedictine Arnošt/Ernest Žižka (b. 1889) applied American sociological theory to Czech immigrant assimilation and cultural persistence in a study that he first presented for his 1931 Prague Ph.D. Joseph Čada/Chada wrote general histories of the Catholic Central Union fraternal
benefit society, Czech immigrant radicalism, Czech-American Catholics and finally the Czech immigration as a whole. Harvard byzantinist Francis Dvornik (1893-1975) wrote a popular survey of “Czech contributions to the growth of the United States.” Peter F. Mizera (b. 1893) and Vitus Buřes, both members of the order, were historians of the Czech Benedictines in Chicago. The memoirs of machine tool manufacturer František J. Vlček/Vlček (b. 1871) and Msgr. Oldřich Zlámal (1879-1955), both of Cleveland, Ohio, are prominent examples of Czech Catholic autobiography.  

As for the Protestants minorities in the Czech immigration, Vilém Šiller, Václav Prucha and R.M. De Castello edited the first comprehensive collection of parish histories. Adolf Chlumský (1842-1919), organized parishes of the Unity of the Brethren, which originated in the Bohemian Reformation, in Texas and described them in a pamphlet. More recently this Texas immigrant church’s Christian Sisters Union Study Committee compiled a fuller treatment. Václav Vojta described the community of Czech and Slovak converts to the indigenous American Baptist church. Least prolific was the large organized labor and Socialist portion of the Czech immigration. Here the most significant work was Lev Palda’s memoir Z usnulých dob (Bygone times), serialized in the inaugural 1903-1904 volume of the Omaha illustrated weekly Osvěta americká. Palda (1847-1913), a weaver turned cigarmaker in New York, first became prominent there in the 1870s as a radical public speaker, organizer and journalist but joined the Freethinker elite in the Midwest in the 1880s.

The history of individual geographical communities was a thriving genre among immigrant authors and remains so today among their descendants. As the largest community Chicago is the subject of the most extensive such body of literature. Rudolph Jaromír Pšenka (1875-1903), who succeeded Zdrůbek at the Geringer firm, edited a history of Czech Chicago to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Svornost daily newspaper. Rudolf Bubeníček (1887-1958) published the last, most extensive and most accomplished such history on the eve of World War II. Bubeníček was a music teacher.
and contributor to Czech newspapers after emigrating to Chicago in 1905. Originally published as a series in the daily newspaper Denní hlasatel, his nearly six-hundred-page history draws both extensively and critically on interviews and published primary sources, including newspaper articles and memorial books of individual associations, which he collected and studied over three decades, to describe individual personalities, associations, landmarks, institutions, neighborhoods and events in a chronological framework that relied on the 1871 fire, 1893 world fair and World War I for a four-part periodization whose latter two parts, from 1893 to the 1933 world fair, were intended for a second volume that never appeared. Bubeníček’s critical acumen is most evident in his comparative treatment of conflicting sources and claims on the early 1850s beginnings of Czech settlement in Chicago and on the so-called Slavic Company of Civil War volunteers. A Freethinker, Bubeníček nevertheless included a balanced and ample treatment of the Catholic and Protestant communities and of the working class. To what extent Bubeníček was indebted to Václav Lenoch, whom he did not acknowledge, is unknown. An amateur actor in the city since 1863, Lenoch commenced a serialized history of Czech Chicago in August Geringer’s illustrated Duch času on June 2, 1907. Titled Ze starých vzpomínek (Of old memoirs), it was still ongoing in the following year and also drew extensively on primary sources. Another notable publication between the two World Wars was Daniel D. Droba’s biographical dictionary of Czech Chicago.9

Meanwhile, in Nebraska, which had the largest rural Czech immigration, Rose Rosický edited a five-hundred-page history in an encyclopedic arrangement with categories like biography, journalism, associations and, by far the most extensive, individual counties, where she drew on local authorities to describe Czech settlement. These narratives focus almost exclusively on the early years but record the names of many settlers and often their former places of residence and occupations in Bohemia and the United States, as well as their experiences in Nebraska. Coverage ranges from memoirs spanning several pages, with details on land acquisitions and crop cultivation and poignant passages on life in dugouts and sod houses, prairie fires, grasshopper plagues, Indian encounters and other
pioneer trials, to simple lists of names, birthplaces and years of arrival. The contributors to the county histories, which comprise over half of the volume, did not conform to a consistent pattern, and the space devoted to individual counties is out of proportion to the size of their Czech immigrant populations. Thus, Omaha’s Douglas County, which ranked third by number of Bohemians in the 1870 census, is only eighth by length of coverage (eight pages) while Cuming County, eighth in the census with a mere 25 Bohemian households, is fourth with seventeen pages (and Otoe County, with 23 households and boarders is not covered at all)! Josef Dvořák published a history of the contiguous settlements in South Dakota, while Estelle Hudson and Henry R. Maresh did so for the Czech immigration in Texas, distinctive for its sources in eastern Moravia, migration routes through New Orleans and Galveston, and its Southern destination.¹⁰

As for immigrant societies, the 1877 Bohemian National Cemetery in Chicago, important in the ascendancy of the Freethinkers, who used it effectively to encourage and ease departures from the Catholic Church, is the subject of several successive anniversary volumes, including Rudolf Janda’s of some six hundred pages on the seventy-fifth anniversary. In a chronological, year-by-year arrangement, one-to-two-page entries cover annual meetings, other cemetery foundation deliberations during the year, annual festivals, changes to the charter, the foundation’s contributions to Czech-American schools, and elections of officers. Also included is an exhaustive directory of officers since the cemetery’s founding. As for the fraternal benefit societies, Josef Martínek (1889-1980) covers the organizational but not social development of the Česko-slovanský podporující spolek (Czecho-Slavic Benevolent Society) in the century after its origins in 1854 St. Louis. A Social Democratic newspaper editor in Cleveland after 1909, Martínek was scholarly and prominent in the Freethinkers’ ČSPS, the largest Czech immigrant society by membership and by the geographical extent of its numerous local lodges. Nick A. Morris described the Slovanská podporující jednota státu Texas (Slavonic Benevolent Order of the State of Texas), formed by Texas lodges that seceded from the ČSPS in 1897, but no published history describes the more numerous lodges, centered on
Nebraska, that seceded that year to form the *Západočesko-bratřská jednota* (Western Bohemian Fraternal Association). Another mass society so neglected is the *Sokol* gymnastic movement, whose local lodges broadly cultivated Czech immigrant culture, like those of the fraternal benefit societies. One of its leaders, physician Jan Rudiš-Jičínský, wrote a period pamphlet.\(^{11}\)

In recent decades genealogy and heritage enthusiasts among descendants of the 19th-century Czech immigration have produced a notable volume of family, parish and local histories, as well as English editions of some of the early works by immigrant authors mentioned above. Among these publications, whose reliability and value to scholarship varies, Margie Sobotka’s compilation of Frank Mareš’s newspaper series is outstanding. Mareš, now obscure, single-handedly compiled an evidently exhaustive census of “Czech settlers” in 45 Nebraska and 11 Kansas counties published in the Omaha *Hospodář* (Farmer) from this semimonthly’s inception in March 1891 to May 1894 and from March to September 1895. Mareš recorded each individual’s full name, location, occupation and birthplace by village, nearest town and county. For farmers he recorded acreage and exact location of property by precinct, township, range and section. Mareš even drafted township- and range-level maps for each of his Nebraska counties and marked the location, contours and owner of each Czech farm! Sobotka’s compilation in one volume, including maps, makes Mareš’s work more accessible as a substitute for the burned 1890 United States census records on the Bohemians in Nebraska, albeit excluding the important eastern counties of Cuming, Dodge, Douglas, Otoe and Nemaha.\(^{12}\)

Continuity and succession in immigrant historiography is evident in the work of Vlasta Vráz (1902-1989) and Esther Jerabek (1897-1979). Granddaughter of August Geringer, Vráz edited a landmark immigration history volume for the Czechoslovak National Council of America whose contributors and coverage, including Joseph Chada on Czech Chicago and Josef Martínek on labor, combined 19th-century with Cold War
immigration. Jerabek, a descendant of 19th-century immigrants and librarian at the University of Minnesota and Minnesota State Historical Society, compiled what remains the definitive bibliography of Czech- and Slovak-American immigration history and immigrant imprints, with over 7,600 entries. The Czechoslovak Society of Arts & Sciences in America, founded by émigré scholars and writers in 1958, published this bibliography, Joseph Chada’s history of Czech immigration and numerous papers in this field from its ongoing conferences, which recently bring together American scholarly and amateur authors with their counterparts in the Czech Republic.13

**In American Scholarship**

The authors of the earliest scholarly journal articles, master’s theses and doctoral dissertations on the Czech-speaking immigrant ethnic groups, to judge by their surnames, were largely immigrants of this ethnicity themselves and their children. As early as 1895, Hull House resident Josefa Humpal Zeman (1870-1906), educated at Cleveland’s College for Women of the Western Reserve and at the University of Chicago, wrote about the Bohemians of Chicago in *Hull-House Maps and Papers*. Valentine Kohlbeck (b. 1864), editor of Bohemian Benedictine newspapers in Chicago and a member of that order, wrote about Catholic Bohemians in a contribution to the Progressive-era literature a decade later. In 1914 May C. Cermak and Stanley Armstrong Hunter, both at Columbia University, wrote master’s theses on the Bohemians of New York. Other important kinds of publications that appeared at least once, in this case in state historical journals, are a memoir of one immigrant family and a collection of another’s letters home to Old World relatives, both of which also illustrate what may (still?) be a common neglect of the particular subject’s broad historical context. Like the Czech-language writings from immigrant presses, these various contributions to the English-language scholarly literature most often took individual communities and localities as their subject, which they treated chronologically or thematically in the manner of introductory surveys. Inevitably, this geographical coverage of immigrant
Czech America was more or less uneven and favored the rural component over the urban.  

Perhaps most remarkable is the ample coverage of Texas, which in 1920 had some fifty thousand Czech-speaking immigrants and their children, a modest 8% of the national total. Nevertheless, they are the subject of at least eight master’s theses and two doctoral dissertations, most written at the University of Texas at Austin and ranging from histories of the entire group to studies of localities (Snook and Ellis County), subcultures (Brethren Church), prominent individuals (politician and journalist Augustin Haidušek) and the social group’s various functions (education, insurance). Literary scholar Clinton Machann has contributed several books to this literature in the past two decades as a coauthor and editor, and Czech immigration history and sociolinguistics in Texas is the subject of several contributions to *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* since he became its editor in 2000. In another recent book linguist Eva Eckert examined group persistence and assimilation as revealed on tombstones and in Haidušek’s weekly *Svoboda*.  

The rural immigration in other states is the subject of a similar pattern of master’s theses, doctoral dissertations and contributions to state historical journals. Oklahoma, where only 1% of first- and second-generation Czechs lived in 1920 and Kansas (2%) have perhaps fared relatively better than Wisconsin (7.4%), Minnesota (5.7%), Iowa (5.3%), South Dakota (1.8%) and North Dakota (1.4%). The phenomena of secondary rural community migration, especially from Wisconsin to the other states, and of tertiary migration, such as from Nebraska to other Plains states and even to such remote destinations as Virginia, remains unexplored. Francis Svehla’s insider’s account of the community in central Kansas, with its rich accumulation of facts on individual settlers, families and their origins and destinations, is an example of the kind of earlier scholarship that could support such conceptually and methodologically more ambitious studies. Nebraska (8.7%) is rightfully the subject of numerous writings and more
innovative recent work that examines Czech-speaking immigrants as an integral part of a multi-ethnic frontier society.\textsuperscript{16}

Bohemians were prominent in Wellesley sociologist Emily Greene Balch’s landmark 1910 study of the Slavic immigration, but they remain relatively neglected in what has been a vital immigration subfield of American historiography for the past half century. For its broad scope and early use of sociological methods, including statistical analysis and Transatlantic field work, Balch is still the best study of its kind. Her generous attention to Bohemians, by then a minor part of the ongoing Slavic immigration, is suggestive of their more developed contacts with American elites. The Slovaks, who were about as numerous but later and more controversial in the century of mass European immigration than Czech speakers, have fared better in more recent work. They have been the main subject of M. Mark Stolarik (b. 1943) and June Granatir Alexander (b. 1948) for the past two decades, and they are also prominent in the work of such other prominent immigration historians as John E. Bodnar (b. 1944) and Victor R. Greene (b. 1933). Emblematic of the neglect of Czechs is a recent reference volume on the ethnic press that contains essays on virtually all (and mostly smaller) Slavic immigrant ethnic groups except them.\textsuperscript{17}

Labor history has paid more attention to the Czechs, especially in Chicago, the home of 22.5\% of the first and second generations and the subject of earlier graduate-school work. To Eric L. Hirsch, Bohemians and Germans formed a revolutionary-minded counterpart to the more moderate Irish and Anglo-Americans in his model of an ethnically-segmented Chicago working class. Bohemians are also a presence in Bruce C. Nelson’s social history of Chicago anarchists, and Richard Schneirov has written most extensively about them as an important and distinctively radical part of a Chicago working class and labor movement during its grand journey from marginalization to legitimacy between the 1870s and 1890s. Dirk Hoerder and Christiane Harzig included Czech-language newspapers in a bibliography of the immigrant labor press, whose effects on community consciousness Jon Everett Bekken examined. Bohemians were
prominent in Dorothee Schneider’s article on the New York Cigarmakers Strike of 1877, but otherwise their communities and history there and in other cities, especially St. Louis, remains neglected. A final major urban center (Cleveland) at last attracted the attention of a dissertation writer, as did a numerically minor one (Allegheny City). A remarkable group migration of Czech-speaking workers from Northern cities to rural Louisiana was the subject of another dissertation, albeit one focused on this group’s schools.\(^{18}\)

The much more substantial work in German-American history is inherently relevant to its Czech-American counterpart and often includes “Bohemians” in its scope. Notable examples are Carl Frederick Wittke’s work on the German-language press; more recent work on the German-American radical press; such topics as libraries in the German-American Turner gymnastic movement, which had a vibrant and kindred counterpart in the Czech Sokol societies; and especially the University of Munich’s multi-volume *Chicago Project* on German workers in the Midwestern metropolis. Dorothee Schneider devoted over twenty pages of a book on German workers in New York to the city’s otherwise neglected Bohemians. Wittke discusses Slavs (Vojta Náprstek from Prague, Ivan Tyssowski from Cracow) and Germans from the Habsburg Empire and neighboring states (Friedrich Hassauerek, Oswald Ottendörfer from Moravia, Bernhard Domschke from Saxony) among German-language journalists in America, but their Czech-speaking readers, employees, and influence on the Czech-language press remains unexplored, as does the potential of German-language newspapers as sources on the Czech-speaking communities in cities where Czech-language newspapers appeared much later. As for work on German immigrant social classes, the capitalist development of Bohemia and Moravia as integral parts of German Central Europe makes it a convenient point of reference and departure for the study of their Czech-speaking counterparts.\(^{19}\)

The Midwestern elites so central to the present study are the subject of some significant work, including studies of Josef Václav Sládek and Charles Jonas/Karel Jonáš. Bruce
Garver, author of a definitive study of the Young Czech Party, also wrote about its kindred group of Czech-speaking Freethinkers on the Great Plains. Matthew Frye Jacobson’s analysis of 1890s Irish, Polish and Jewish immigrant nationalism has comparative value. Other work on Bohemian Jews and Thomas Garrigue Masaryk’s 1918 American sojourn are also relevant to an understanding of the Czech-speaking immigrant elites, as is Plummer Alston Jones, Jr.’s, work on Progressive-era public librarians in urban immigrant neighborhoods and such American contributions to Czech historiography as Jeremy King’s on politics, ethnicity and conflict in 19th-century České Budějovice (Budweis in German), metropolis of the leading source region (Southern Bohemia) in the migration to America. The papers of early Czech-speaking elites and their societies and enterprises are not systematically preserved in American archives, where attitudes toward (Eastern) European immigrant groups were long presumably as dismissive as those that Edward N. Saveth described in the American historical profession. Thomas Čapek composed an eloquent paragraph of lamentation on his countrymen as poor keepers of documents and went on to amass what became, at some six thousand items, by far the largest and most diverse archival collection on the 19th-century Czech-speaking immigration and its elites. The papers of some prominent individuals (Geringer, Jonáš and Šnajdr) survive in small collections and those of most others, notably Jan Rosický, the most influential journalist and publisher west of the Mississippi, evidently not at all.

In the Czech Lands

In Bohemia writings about this migration appeared early but suffered discontinuities in a succession of divergent political and intellectual regimes. In the Habsburg era Czech minority status in a state dominated by Germanophone elites and the ethnic conflict in Bohemia fostered a defensive nationalism that permeated education, journalism and scholarship. This motivated contemporaries of the mass migration to write about it subjectively as an undesirable national problem to be solved. Writing in 1876 the young
Josef Fořt (1850-1929) blamed German commercial and administrative predominance and the influence of shipping company agents for the emigration of Czech smallholders and shopkeepers, which was to be reduced by raising their national consciousness. A graduate of Prague’s Akademické gymnázium and law college, Fořt was a leader of the Young Czech party’s radical faction and a founder of the Czech economic profession. Three decades later the nationalist and Panslavic journalist and publicist Jan Hejret (1868-1947) treated emigration as a problem of socioeconomic conditions and their development and reform. Antonín Pimper (1884-1959), who wrote about emigration at the same time, was an economist like Fořt. Perhaps the indifference to Czech communities in the United States evident in Ottův slovník naučný is emblematic of a pervasive tendency to discount the emigration as foremost a loss to Czech nationalist aspirations in Bohemia: this monumental 1888-1909 national encyclopedia devoted little more to the subject than a few sentences in its entry on the United States, where it had just one contributor (an immigrant priest in Nebraska).21

The Habsburg-era “policy” approach to Czech emigration culminated in a 1912 survey of opinion on the subject by the Foreign Affairs Section of the National Council. Founded a decade earlier as a common institution on matters of national interest in an era of multiple Czech political parties, the National Council included a Foreign Affairs Section charged with looking after the national image and diaspora abroad. Jan Hejret proposed its survey on emigration, published as a pamphlet together with summarized and selected responses. The sixty-one respondents were a “miniscule percentage” of the survey’s addressees and included local governments and officials in Bohemia and professionals, prominent citizens and associations there and abroad, mostly in Germany and other European countries. (Smithsonian anthropologist Aleš Hrdlička was the sole American respondent.) The survey was an attempt to improve understanding of emigration, but its questions and responses dealt most of all with institutional arrangements, publicity and policies to reduce emigration, preserve national consciousness in the emigrant communities, make the diaspora useful to Bohemia and encourage return migration.
Another relevant research publication from an official body in this period was the Bohemian Agricultural Council’s eleven-hundred-page survey of the kingdom’s rural population and its “material and cultural conditions.”

The National Council’s 1912 emigration survey was also an early milestone in the career of statistician Jan Auerhan (1880-1942), its principal author and the founder of diaspora studies in the postwar Czechoslovak Republic. Auerhan was a student of Albín Bráf (1851-1912), who founded a Czech school of economics, emphasized economic over cultural nationalism in his critical 1902 “letters of a political heretic,” and influenced a generation of students in law and other fields. Auerhan used his extensive 1907-1914 European travels and subsequent correspondence with a network of sources to become the leading authority on the continent’s Czech diaspora. After the war he founded the first journal on the subject (Naše zahraničí, 1920-1930), was a prolific contributor to its literature and became the first lecturer on diaspora studies at Charles University. Diaspora studies in Germany and the Deutsches Ausland-Institut (1917) in Stuttgart were models for Auerhan’s work and for the Československý ústav zahraniční (Institute for the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad), established for the study and support of the international Czech and Slovak diasporas (1929).

The United States, with the largest Czech immigration of any country, was relatively neglected. The book series of the Institute for the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad was the largest contribution to the literature, but most of its nine volumes were devoted to European countries and regions with far smaller Czech and Slovak communities (Yugoslavia, Romania, German Silesia, Netherlands, Belgium, England). As for other literature of this period, Stanislav Klíma (1925) included a section on the United States in a survey of the contemporary international Czech and Slovak diaspora that was more informative (schools, banks, newspapers, prominent individuals) than scholarly. Certainly distance and expense might have inhibited research in the United States, but perhaps Thomas Čapek in New York had an effect as well. He published his mature work in Czechoslovakia during these years, including the encyclopedic Naše Amerika (Our America), which was issued by the
Czechoslovak National Council and made his reputation as the leading authority on the American immigration.24

Vojta Beneš (1878-1951), educator, Social Democrat and older brother of Czechoslovak president Edvard Beneš (1884-1948), was prominent in the Czechoslovak independence movement in America during World War I and then its prolific publicist and memoirist. His memoir of the first war year in immigrant America is at the same time a major source on the elites, personalities and newspapers that were already active in the years before the war. The Czech immigration in America and its wartime role were also the subject of contributions to Naše revoluce (1923-1938), journal of the anti-Habsburg odboj (resistance) edited by historian Jaroslav Werstadt (1888-1970). Perhaps that wartime role encouraged the First Republic’s encyclopedists to devote more attention to emigrants: Ottův slovník naučný nové doby (1930-1943), publisher Jan Otto’s encyclopedia for the “new era,” included entries on such prominent Americans as Jan Vratislav Čapek, Thomas Čapek, August Geringer and Josef Jiří Král before it ended with the letter “U” during the German occupation. Jaromír Korčák’s (1895-1989) demographic study of the “depopulation of Southern Bohemia,” a principal source of 19th-century emigration to both Vienna and the United States, is an example of important indirect contributions to Czech-American immigration history in the First Republic.25

In 1939-1945 the German occupation, during which Jan Auerhan was executed, interrupted Czech diaspora studies. Afterward the Institute for the Czechs and Slovaks Abroad revived its book series and Auerhan’s journal Naše zahraničí, but a new administration at the Institute abruptly ended all such publishing in 1950. This was the beginning of restrictions and discontinuities that scholarship, including diaspora studies, would suffer during the Communist Party’s 1948-1989 dictatorship in Czechoslovakia. The (Marxist-Leninist) partisanship that the party demanded and imposed, if imperfectly and sometimes ambivalently, deformed scholarship by distributing power to the like-minded and to the pliant in the scholarly communities and their institutions. Josef Hanzal (b. 1934)
described the experience of the Czech historical and archival communities during these difficult and disruptive four decades. However, the study of 19th-century Czech-American immigration also made progress as historians and ethnographers turned to immigrant newspapers and other primary sources in archival collections.\(^{26}\)

The most extensive collection of such newspapers on either side of the Atlantic was and remains at the Náprstek Museum on central Prague’s picturesque Bethlehem Square, named for the chapel where Jan Hus preached at the beginning of the Bohemian Reformation. Vojta Náprstek organized Bohemian immigrants in America as a refugee student radical and, in the decades after his 1858 return to Prague, made his home, salon and museum a welcome destination for them and a natural depository for their newspapers, documents and artifacts. Vladimír Zahradníček (b. 1925), the librarian there in 1959-1990, and Marcela Linková compiled a four-volume bibliography of the monographs and periodicals (but not manuscripts) in this *Krajanská sbírka* (Countrymen abroad collection). Zahradníček also described the museum’s extensive scrapbook collections, including the twenty volumes titled *Čechové mimo vlast* (Czechs outside the homeland) and containing thousands of clippings from newspapers in Bohemia, America and other countries. His successor, Milena Secká, described further sources, including the 19th-century Náprstek guest books in which Czechs from America recorded their visits and often added biographies narratives. The Náprstek Museum is also the subject of two academic theses written at the Department of Librarianship, College of Liberal Arts, Charles University.\(^{27}\)

Not surprisingly, historians in socialist Czechoslovakia first turned to the working-class emigration. The prominence of Cold War motivations is evident in Bedřich Šindelář’s 1950 contribution on a “Manifesto from revolutionary Czech, Russian and Polish workers in London,” including Russian emigre Petr Lavrovich Lavrov’s (1823-1900) group, to the “American proletariat” on the centenary (1876) of a republic overtaken by capital. Two years later Šindelář (1917-1996) belabored a rather artificial class-conflict
framework but drew at length on the Prague Social Democratic newspaper *Budoucnost* in a pioneering study of early Czech workers’ associations in London, Germany and the United States that was published in a leading Moravian historical journal whose perspective Šindelář also dutifully narrowed to an orthodox Marxist-Leninist one as chief editor. Šindelář would remain an “enthusiastic” servant of this perspective, while other historians became more open-minded. Two decades of occasional contributions to journals culminated in a collective 1970 volume on the “Czech and Slovak working-class emigration to the USA in the era of the First International.” Here Josef Polišenský (1915-2001) and Jan Staněk drew widely on Czech-American newspapers to effectively supplement American historian Samuel Bernstein, who said little about the Bohemian Section (or Bohemian immigrant workers) in his book on Karl Marx’s “First International in America.” (Earlier Jan Staněk also drew on the Prague *Dělník* [Worker] and wrote about Lev Palda and the Paris Commune.) Other contributions to the volume that drew on newspapers were Polišenský’s and Milan Dostalík’s on Czech immigrant labor in the 1886 Haymarket events and in the 1870s, respectively. Not represented in this landmark volume were Zdeněk Šolle (b. 1924), whose prolific work on labor and socialism culminated in a book on Social Democrat Josef Boleslav Pecka (1849-1897) in Bohemia and America, and Jan Měchýř (b. 1930), who wrote about Pecka’s 1883-1886 Chicago newspaper *Budoucnost*. Šolle’s early work in the 1950s was in the “period schematic anti-bourgeois” style but broadened its source base, period context and perspective while he was chief editor (1959-1965) of the provocative journal *Dějiny a současnost*. Měchýř, who studied 19th-century north Bohemian labor, was fired from Charles University’s department on Communist Party history after the Prague Spring, while Šolle found an “asylum” in the Academy of Sciences archive.  

A broader social history also developed during the era and took up 19th-century Czech immigration in America. The articulate František Kutnar (1903-1983) turned from the early 19th-century national revival to the 1850s beginnings of Czech mass emigration. Kutnar drew on the papers of the Bohemian viceroy and police, and on popular literature
and private letters, to reconstruct the interdependent actions and reactions of Bohemian peasants and artisans, shipping company agents and government officials. The papers of the viceroy’s office, which yielded the intercepted correspondence of individual emigrants in America (including journalists Jan Bárta Letovský and Jan Rosický), amount to over 2,300 archival boxes (!) just for the period 1850-1890, of which Kutnar surveyed only the first decade. Similar studies based on archival research were microhistories of emigration from individual districts. Oldřich Kašpar (b. 1952), a historian of Spain and Latin America who wrote about Czech perceptions of the New World and about Czechs as Jesuits in Mexico and as American veterans of the Spanish-American War, took up another aspect of Kutnar’s work to edit a volume of immigrant letters, albeit most previously published in the immigrant press. Otto Urban (1938-1996) and Jiří Kořalka (b. 1931) were the most receptive to Western currents of social history among historians of 19th-century Czech society, while Leoš Jeleček (b. 1945), despite his orthodox Marxist-Leninist framework, contributed substantially to the understanding of changing agrarian conditions in Bohemia, which so stimulated emigration. Štěpánka Korytová-Magstadt (b. 1956), who lived in Nebraska for some years, pioneered a more Transatlantic scope and archival source base in her study of Czech migration to the rural American frontier. Local historians like Václav Štěpán at the Ostrava municipal archive and physician Josef Šimíček in rural eastern Moravia, as well as such groups as the Czech American Civil War Association, whose book on that conflict discussed its Czech immigrant veterans, have become important contributions to the literature in the post-1989 era.29

In the years before Kutnar’s seminal 1964 social history, Vojtěch Mastný (b. 1936) made a brief but rare contribution to the statistics of 19th-century Czech emigration to the United States and František Štědronský (1914-1964), a librarian at the National Museum, compiled an exhaustive bibliography of the Czech-language press abroad that amazingly discovered numerous American titles that Thomas Čapek missed five decades earlier. Štědronský was also a founder of the Commission for the History of the Czechs
and Slovaks Abroad at the Academy of Science’s Institute of History in 1962 and contributed to its collective (and farewell) volume eight years later. The labor historians mentioned above wrote the articles there, but František Kutnar’s compilation of immigrant letters made up one-third of the volume. In the next two decades historian and commission veteran Josef Polišenský continued to work quietly, but Czech diaspora studies became the preserve of ethnographers. However, the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore’s journal Český lid and post-1986 annual Česí v cizině focused on the European diaspora (especially the Balkan states and Volhynia) or South America, while its recent publications betray a preoccupation with the 20th century. More relevant to the 19th-century American migration are Stanislav Brouček’s (b. 1947) historical survey of Czech diaspora studies, Antonín Robek’s (b. 1931) West European-inspired studies of Czech working-class culture and Leoš Šatava’s (b. 1954) use of Czech-American newspapers for insights on assimilation among immigrant journalists.30

Even work on middle-class immigrant elites appeared in socialist Czechoslovakia, much of it republished (and revalidated) after its demise: Zdeněk Šolle on Vojta Náprstek; literary historian Josef Polák (1913-2003) on Josef Václav Sládek; Lumír Nesvadbík (b. 1919) and Josef Polišenský on Karel Jonáš; Karel Pichlík (1928-2001) on Professor Thomas Masaryk’s Czechoslovak independence movement during World War I (1968). Jiří Pernes (b. 1948) wrote about an Omladina student generation whose 1894 show trial reminded the 1860s generation of immigrant journalists in America of their own experience, while Helena Kokešová’s (b. 1965) Gustav Eim was a Young Czech correspondent in Vienna with whom they sought to make common cause. Miroslav Hroch (b. 1932) influenced international scholarship with his periodization and typology of nationalism among European subject peoples as social movements led by middle classes of varying composition. Jan Křen (b. 1930) wrote about the middle classes as a locus of Czech-German symbiosis and conflict in another classic contribution to Bohemian social history with relevance to the circumstances of Czech immigrant elites in America. In a pioneering study of Czech immigrant literary writing and publishing
there, Vladimír Papoušek (b. 1957) devoted overdue attention to the Chicago Bohemian Benedictines and its national circle of authors. In other relevant contributions to a (modest) renewal of Catholic historiography in the Czech Lands, Jaroslav Kadlec (1911-2004) invoked an older literature in his brief history of the south Bohemian diocese of České Budějovice, while Pavel Marek (b. 1949) was an editor and author of several volumes on the popular political and Modernist literary turns that enlivened Czech Catholicism in the homeland at the same time as the Chicago Bohemian Benedictines enlivened it in America. Meanwhile, German and Austrian scholars continue to make important contributions to Czech social history, notably Peter Heumos (b. 1938) on the social milieu of handicraft workers, an important social class in the emigration, and Josef Ehmer (b. 1948) and Hermann Zeitlhofer (b. 1965) on the overlooked dimensions of rural-to-rural migration in Bohemia.  

In the context of this Transatlantic historiography, a study of 19th-century Czech-American journalism and its elites can reduce what is one of numerous important gaps and can rely on earlier studies of individual personalities, societies and communities, and on immigrant newspapers and archival collections preserved at research institutions in the Czech Republic and the United States. It must also consider some basic facts about the 19th-century Czech-American immigration for which the literature still does not offer a satisfactory understanding and consensus.
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CHAPTER III
BOHEMIAN AMERICA

In Numbers: When and How Many?

In the long 19th century of immigration to the United States from the decade after the Napoleonic Wars to the American nativist legislation that effectively ended European immigration in the mid-1920s, thirty-six million individuals arrived, and more than four of every five were Europeans. Some 366,683, or about one percent of all immigrants, were from the Czech lands of Bohemia and Moravia, which were crownlands of Habsburg “Austria” to the end of the First World War. This was little more than 6% of the 5.9 million that came from Germany and only 8% of the nearly 4.6 million from Ireland. Thus, for every Bohemian and Moravian sixteen Germans and twelve Irishmen came to the United States.  

Three hundred sixty-six thousand six hundred and eighty-three? This is the sum of the annual numbers of immigrants from the Czech lands to the United States for the years 1850 through 1924 as tabulated by historian Vojtěch Mastný, who cited and reviewed the statistical sources most completely and who selected the best conservative source for each year.  

For the years 1850-1870 Mastný quoted official Austrian statistics for all emigration from Bohemia and Moravia abroad. While the United States was by far the predominant destination, Russia and Serbia were also significant, at least for some localities and years. In 1852 authorities in the east Bohemian region of Pardubice reported to the viceroy’s office in Prague that since the region’s inception in the previous year 653 of its inhabitants emigrated to the United States and another 330 to Serbia.  

Austrian authorities counted only individuals who obtained official permission to emigrate, and so the 1850-1870 figures exclude those “illegal” emigrants who left with just a passport for foreign travel or even with a journeymen’s papers. Since officially sanctioned emigrants forfeited their citizenship, *Heimatsrecht* (local right of domicile)
and the right to return home, the incentive to emigrate illegally was significant.

Emphasis in the literature on the scale of “illegal” emigration suggests that the official 1850-1870 figures grossly understated true emigration to the United States. Yet these figures add up to 23,009 for the years 1850-1860, when nearly 78% of all emigrants from the Habsburg Empire (excluding Hungary and northern Italy) were from Bohemia and Moravia, and this is close to the 25,061 natives of Austria recorded in the 1860 United States census.

For the years 1871-1878 Mastný quoted the numbers of Bohemian (but not Moravian) Transatlantic emigrants from Bremen, the port of embarkation for a “large majority” of Czech speakers to 1875, and for the years 1879-1882 he could include the numbers (of Bohemians) from Hamburg. For 1883-1897 Mastný quoted official American statistics on arrivals from Bohemia, although in these years Bremen and Hamburg embarkation statistics on Bohemians were 20-30% higher. All these figures exclude Moravia, which became an increasingly important source of Czech-speaking emigration. From 1898 official American statistics counted (and Mastný quoted) the numbers of individuals arriving in United States who were “Czech by nationality,” regardless of geographical origin.

Mastný did not compare annual migration with the numbers of immigrants recorded every ten years in the United States census. These two series of statistics, with complex qualifications, should be related. A comparison might illuminate their relative reliability. In Table 1 the 1860 census figure is for natives of Austria, the next four from 1870 through 1900 for natives of Bohemia (but not Moravia), and the last two for immigrants whose “mother tongue” was Czech, regardless of geographical origin. “Arrivals in Decade before” gives the sum of Mastný’s annual numbers, including the census year. “Census Increase” gives the difference between each two successive census counts. Ideally, the census increase should be less than the decade’s arrivals by the numbers of individuals who left the United States or died. The literature contains no evidence or
arguments that Czech return migration was ever significant. Even as late as the years 1908-1921, when nearly three hundred thousand Poles left the United States, fewer than nine thousand Bohemians and Moravians did so.\(^5\) The Czech migration to the United States consisted of entire families from its 1850s beginnings, when males only marginally outnumbered females, and the proportion of those aged seventeen and younger ranged beyond 40\%.\(^6\) So many children and youths would also reduce the group’s mortality, as would the high incidence of rural settlement and growing prosperity. But more importantly, mortality would tend to rise as the immigrant population aged because its rate of replacement with new arrivals declined. With increasing mortality the census increase would also decline as a proportion of the decade’s arrivals. Thus, the ratios “Arrivals/Census” and “Census Increase/Arrivals” in Table 1 should fall (and rise) more or less together. But for the Czechs, the latter proportion was rather more volatile.

Table 1
Do Czech Immigrant Arrivals Match Census Counts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Arrivals in Decade before</th>
<th>Census Increase</th>
<th>Arrivals/Census</th>
<th>Census Increase/Arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>25,061</td>
<td>23,009</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>40,289</td>
<td>33,123</td>
<td>15,228</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>85,361</td>
<td>52,079</td>
<td>45,072</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>118,106</td>
<td>62,030</td>
<td>32,745</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>156,901</td>
<td>42,709</td>
<td>38,795</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>228,738</td>
<td>94,603</td>
<td>71,837</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>234,564</td>
<td>41,895</td>
<td>5,826</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The introduction of Bohemia as a place of birth in the 1870 United States census may
explain why the census increase then was less than half of the decade’s arrivals: perhaps many Bohemians declared themselves, or census takers recorded many of them, as Austrians, who numbered 30,508 that year. Even if the number of “Austrians” in the 1860 census could be reduced by the minority who were not from Bohemia, this kingdom’s 1870 census increase would still be conspicuously low. And mortality is hardly an explanation, since most Bohemians were still such recent and relatively young arrivals. In 1880 the census deficit was dramatically smaller. Did Bohemians and census takers become so much more conscious that few Bohemians were recorded as Austrians? Then why did the census deficit again approach one-half in 1890, after a decade in which the small relative decline in immigration suggests no great increase in mortality? And why did the census deficit shrink to just one-tenth in 1900, after relative immigration did fall greatly and mortality should have put more upward pressure on the census deficit? By 1920 another large relative decline in recent arrivals, and the group mortality increase that it would foster, did produce a large census deficit. A more sophisticated analysis might largely explain these contradictions away. Or it might as well implicate so many unknowns, including the unknowns inherent in positing ratios between arrival and census counts whose scope and accuracy vary over time, that these contradictions might remain to inhibit undue confidence in the statistics of Czech immigration to the United States.

The contradictions also draw attention to the particular problem of Czech speakers among other nationalities of stateless immigrants. Irish immigrants were also stateless but English-speaking and more familiar to American officials. Polish speakers were perhaps more profoundly partitioned in their European homeland between Russia, Germany and Austria than Czech speakers were between the two Habsburg crown lands of Bohemia and Moravia in Austria. But in American immigration and census statistics “Poland,” however elusive as a European administrative and territorial entity, was more inclusive than “Bohemia”: Czech-speaking inhabitants of Moravia, who at home would have rejected the German territorial term Böhme, even if they accepted the
ethnolinguistic *Tscheche*, were not likely to accept the designation “Bohemian” in America. Since nearly 1.9 million Czech speakers lived in Moravia (and Austrian Silesia) by 1900, to Bohemia’s 3.9 million, and since the ratio of Moravian to Bohemian immigration probably increased over time, “Bohemian” nativity was a progressively poorer proxy for Czech nationality until its replacement by “Bohemia and Moravia” in American immigration statistics (1896) and by the native language criterion in the United States census (1910). In 1870 fifty-two individuals were recorded as natives of “Moravia” in the manuscript census schedules. Twenty-one lived in Texas, which also had 1,748 natives of Austria and only 780 natives of Bohemia. A decade later 1,365 natives of “Moravia” were in the census, 1,304 of them in Texas, which also had 3,474 natives of Austria and 2,669 of Bohemia. Natives of Austria outpaced those of Bohemia in Texas and peaked at 20,566 in 1910. Since Texas was a prominent destination for the Czech-speaking immigration from the beginning, since it was the only such state where (eastern) Moravians predominated, and since Czech speakers were by far the largest “Austrian” nationality in Texas, these figures suggest the significance of Moravia as a growing but elusive part of the Czech-speaking immigration. Joseph Chada, who had a University of Chicago doctorate in history, had been publishing on Czech immigration history for three decades when he wrote that “numerically, the Czech immigration seemed to favor the Moravian group after 1880,” but he cited no sources for this claim.

Even as late as 1920 census enumerators did not record Czech immigrants correctly. Thus, Cleveland cabinetmaker “John Tepka” (i.e., Jan Tipka) is a Czech-speaking native of Austria, while his wife was allegedly born in Ohio. In fact, Anna née Matějková was born in Zbiroh, Bohemia, and arrived in Cleveland with her husband in December 1905. Frank Opatrný, a machinist in Cleveland’s automobile industry, is another false native of Ohio. Such errors and the pervasive exclusion of Moravians suggest that both arrival statistics and the United States census undercounted Czech-speaking immigrants. Some unknown number larger than 366,683 came to the United States. But since the statistics of other American immigrant ethnic groups are also, if differently, problematic, the
relative size of the Czech-speaking group might still be reliable. Even compared to Scandinavians, to whom they were close in time of arrival and Midwestern destinations, Czech-speaking immigrants numbered only one-third of Swedes, little more than half of Norwegians, and outnumbered Danes by barely one-fifth. As for the Poles, such close ethnolinguistic relatives and by far the largest Slavic immigrant ethnic group, the contingent from Germany was comparable in numbers and timing to the Czechs, but in the quarter-century after 1890 four times more Poles (albeit with high rates of return migration) arrived from Austrian Galicia and Russian Poland.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Where from? Classes and Places}

The emancipation of the peasantry that was the main achievement of the failed Revolution of 1848 also made it the beginning of mass migration from the Czech lands. That emancipation and Revolution were part of a capitalist transformation of these Habsburg crownlands in the third quarter of the 19th century, which produced large-scale social mobility, dislocation and migration. Peasants became owners of their parcels of land and as such acquired both the right to sell it and the obligation to reimburse their former landlords over a twenty-year schedule of payments. Property and the opportunity to liquidate it made them more mobile and so did the burden of payments. These were one-third of a compensation flow whose remainder came from the state and amounted to an enormous transfer of wealth to the landed nobility, which used much of it to modernize their farming operations and expand their landholdings. Such economies of scale and the development of national and international markets for agricultural commodities imposed hardships and insecurities that drove middling and small farmers to emigrate. An 1869 law that ended primogeniture and introduced the practice of subdividing peasant holdings contributed to rural social polarization and pauperization, as did the decline of prospects in the trades, the traditional outlet for younger peasant sons, with the development of capitalist industry. After emancipation the nobility were no longer obliged to provide relief, and unsympathetic wealthier peasants dominated
local self-government and divided communal properties and assets among themselves. All these processes sustained emigration as a permanent but variable feature of Czech social history in the second half of the long 19th century.\textsuperscript{12}

Czech-speaking society remained mostly limited to the peasantry, artisans and laborers in the rural and small-town interior of Bohemia and Moravia even after the Revolution. The peasantry consisted of \textit{sedláci} and \textit{chalupníci} with land and handicraft income; \textit{domkáři}, i.e., homeowners dependent on handicrafts and farm labor income; and \textit{podruzi} and \textit{čeledini}, i.e., farm laborers and servants bound by annual contracts. Lack of migration produced insular, self-regulating villages of extended families.\textsuperscript{13} This would change dramatically later in century, as recorded in the declining proportion of individuals native to their places of residence in Bohemia: during the 1857 census, this proportion was still 86.9\%, but by 1869 it was only 68.9\% and by 1890 just 47.9\%.\textsuperscript{14} At the same time “neighborly relations” (\textit{sousedské poměry}) in forms of address, oral contracts, local marriage partners, folk traditions and dress gave way by the 1880s to more formal social relations in the village and migration to towns and cities for education and marriage.\textsuperscript{15}

Mass overseas emigration began soon after the revolution: in fall 1849 the Habsburg consul in Bremen dated its onset to the previous May and ascribed it to the revolution’s transformation of land into a commodity that peasants could sell. In 1852, at the request of a concerned viceroy’s office in Prague, Bohemia’s seven newly constituted administrative regions reported a total 3,650 emigrants, to the United States and Serbia, for the first eight months of the year, based on the emigrant and foreign travel passports that they issued. Plzeň and Pardubice led the tallies, the former alone contributing a quarter of the emigrant total. Both were high in the proportion of Czech ethnicity, and both were largely peripheral in economic and geographical conditions, Plzeň in the rugged and forested southwest and Pardubice on the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands between the Elbe and Sázava in the east. České Budějovice in the south was similar, but
its inhabitants were still oriented toward seasonal and permanent migration to Vienna and the Alpine Habsburg crownlands. The Prague and Jičín regions were richer and centered on the Elbe, Jizera and Ohře lowlands, where commercial agriculture, food processing industries and transportation networks were developing. Jičín reported only twenty-five families. As for the most Germanophone regions, Cheb and Česká Lípa in the Ore Mountains on the Saxon border, their migrants went to other Habsburg crownlands and German states rather than overseas. From the Plzeň region’s Březnice district 46% of emigrants were day laborers and servants, another 46% were master craftsmen and journeymen (usually the younger sons of peasants), and only 6% were peasants with holdings of various size. In the neighboring Strakonice district, perhaps because of its larger towns, the proportion of master craftsmen and journeymen was 66%, while in Rokycany to the north 33% were peasants of various classes, but master craftsmen alone were 39%. Tailors, cobblers, bricklayers, cabinetmakers, blacksmiths, weavers, tanners and furriers were prominent.

By the following year the emigration to America took on its classic geographical form as local district captains reported its spread across the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands and into southern Bohemia. And in April 1854, when the gendarmerie reported to the viceroy that 683 families had applied for emigration to the United States, a total of 3,844 individuals, 71% were from these two source areas (i.e., the Plzeň, České Budějovice and Pardubice regions), 17% from the two largely German regions (Cheb, Česká Lípa) and only 11% from the two relatively affluent Czech-speaking lowland regions (Prague, Jičín). To avoid the burden of indigent returnees, the state required each adult emigrant to carry at least 200 Gulden and 150 for each child. The wealthiest applicants were from the German-speaking Cheb region at 345 Gulden per person, while the Czech-speaking regions ranged from 224 for Prague to just 147 for České Budějovice in southern Bohemia.¹⁶

This emigration system emerged against the background of a capitalist revolution in the
Czech lands during the third quarter of the 19th century. The state not only made land a marketable commodity but also introduced tariff reforms, chambers of commerce, railway privatization and liberal commercial law codes (1859, 1862) that eliminated traditional privileges and restrictions to favor universal access to all trades and professions and an unregulated labor market. Article 142 of the December 1867 Habsburg Constitution abolished all paternalistic socioeconomic relationships and embodied the transition to a liberal order of money and contracts. During the venture capital fever of the 1867-1873 Gründerjahre over one thousand businesses were incorporated in the monarchy, or one every two days. Industrial centers emerged in Prague, nearby Kladno (coal mining, metallurgy, machine building), Plzeň (coal mining, machine building), Brno (textiles, machine building) and Ostrava (coal mining, metallurgy). Food processing, brewing and distilling stimulated intensive and market-oriented sugar beet and grain farming in the fertile Ohře-Elbe and Haná basins of northern Bohemia and central Moravia, respectively. The railway network in the Czech lands was also largely built in the third quarter of the 19th century. The May 1873 Viennese stock market crash and subsequent depression formed a transition from extensive to intensive capital formation. The Czech Živnobanka became the fifth-largest institution in the monarchy by 1913 as trade and industry increasingly relied on investment banking. Technological innovation in electrical engineering and automobiles sustained new ventures, but capital needs made these merge with established firms. Cartels, state intervention (protective tariffs, social welfare legislation) and labor activism were symptoms of a transition from laissez-faire to regulated capitalism. A 1902 business census documented the concentration of capital and power: firms of 21-1000 employees had 64% of total mechanical power and 42% of work force. But small producers could still persist in various old (clothing, shoes) and new (electrical and mechanical services) sectors: firms of 1-5 employees had only 8% of power but also 42% of work force.¹⁷

The Czech lands took on a new economic geography, and its most striking feature was
the contrast between developed and underdeveloped regions. A persistent agrarian crisis sustained emigration from the marginal Bohemian south and southeast. The kingdom’s network of local railways developed between the 1870s and 1890s, and it exposed even small producers to international markets. American and Russian competition depressed wheat and rye prices, forcing Bohemians out of this formerly profitable market and into less profitable alternatives, including barley and small-scale livestock raising. And local competition from modernizing noble estates only increased. These adopted innovations in farm machinery and chemical fertilizers that their former subjects could not afford. If the differences between the large estate and the small plot in technology and productivity were modest in 1800, they were enormous a century later. Unfortunately, small plots proliferated after the 1869 abolition of primogeniture: by 1905 the number of individual agricultural holdings in Bohemia was 55% greater than half a century earlier. Low productivity pushed smallholders into wage labor, renting additional land, excess indebtedness and foreclosure, which averaged 2,800 per year in Bohemia in the years 1868-1902. The numbers of medium-sized farms (10-50 ha) declined, while small and large ones increased, and the “disappearing middling farmer” became a political cause. By 1902, Bohemia’s agricultural social structure was roughly as follows: farm laborers (28%), smallholders 0-5 ha (49%), middling farmers 5-20 ha (21%), large farmers and managers (2%).

The few quantitative studies of Czech emigration to America after the 1850s suggest that South Bohemia and the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands continued to be major sources. In early 1890s Saunders and Saline Counties, Nebraska, an “overwhelming majority” of Czech-speaking immigrant residents were from a “wide belt” that extended “from southwestern Bohemia to eastern Moravia.” Karel Kysilka found other continuities, along with obstacles to further research, is his study of emigration from Polička, a district in eastern Bohemia and part of the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands, based on passport applications and accompanying documents preserved in local archives. For the years 1858-1875 no such records were found, but the study describes cases from the
earlier 1850s and from the 1880s, including one hundred twenty applications, with
details on 390 individuals, from the latter period, when economic decline motivated
emigration. In both periods family emigration predominated. In the 1880s children were
40-50% of emigrants. Seventy-five cases, less than two-thirds of the total, included
information on social origin, which suggested a doubled proportion of laborers by the
1880s. In what was a local anomaly, Catholics were still rare.21

By then the proportion of Bohemians and Moravians in the Habsburg emigration to
America was falling steeply. Routinely over four-fifths in the 1860s, it dwindled to just
3-7% (!) in the two decades after 1894.22 In the first decade of the twentieth century,
which Heinz Fassmann calls the “Austrian decade” of American immigration history,
early two and one-half million arrivals were from the Habsburg Empire. “Politically
disadvantaged” nationalities from “economically marginal regions of the monarchy”
predominated, including Galician Poles, South Slavs and Slovaks.23 As for the Czech
lands, they increased their share of Habsburg industrial product to nearly two-thirds by
1880 while outproducing rural Galicia and Bukovina in wheat, rye, barley and oats.
Comparable per capita to France and approaching Germany in steam power, iron, coal,
agriculture, railways and communications, the dynamic Czech economy was
conspicuous in a multinational monarchy that was well behind those countries overall.
By 1900 Czechs (22% and 13%) were the only Habsburg nationality besides Germans
(41% and 25%) whose share of the monarchy’s industrial workforce exceeded their
share of the population, and in Bohemia they also matched Germans in capital
accumulation.24

The social consequences of this capitalist transformation were striking. By 1902 more
Bohemians were employed in manufacturing (1.19 million) than in agriculture and
forestry (1.09 million), and they included factory workers (41%), artisans (23%), home
contract labor (17%), individual producers (7%), shops with up to 20 employees (8.5%),
upper bureaucrats (2%), capitalist entrepreneurs (0.5%).25 But these proportions also
reveal a persistence of craft production in small shops and homes.\textsuperscript{26} Vulnerable to eventual competition from factories, these social groups in the growing cities and towns were a large potential emigration reservoir but one that remains unexamined in the literature, which has little to say about the evolving structure and character of the Czech-speaking emigration to America in the half century after the 1860s. Among the Swedes, “more and more [came] from towns and cities rather than from the countryside” by 1900.\textsuperscript{27} Did this trend develop in the Czech-speaking immigration also? One immigrant, a professor of political economy from Prague, noted the arrival of unemployed miners from industrial Kladno and Plzeň after the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{28} Meanwhile, pauperization and hybridization of agricultural smallholders with wage and handicraft labor probably changed the character of rural Czech-speaking immigrants.

The passage of decades also favored the chain migration of relatives and neighbors, which is another unexamined aspect of the evolving Czech-speaking immigration. When cabinetmaker Jan Tipka and his wife made the Transatlantic crossing from Písek to Cleveland in December 1905, the passenger lists recorded that they traveled with two men from the same South Bohemian town and that Jan intended to work in the family bakery of one of these men. As for Jan’s wife Anna, she already had two uncles in Cleveland. One of them, František Matějka, had lived in the city since the 1880s and now had a tailor shop in the Broadway neighborhood, the largest of several Czech immigrant neighborhoods in Cleveland. Jan Tipka’s father was a younger peasant’s son from Brusy who did not inherit any land under the prevailing system of primogeniture and became a tradesman in nearby Písek, where Jan was born in 1873. Brusy, where baptismal records place Jan Tipka’s paternal line back to the 17th century, was a small village, whereas Písek was a major town in the classic South Bohemian emigration region. Jan’s geographical mobility was already wide-ranging even before his emigration to America. Military service took him to Kutná Hora in eastern Bohemia and to Dalmatia, the southernmost Habsburg crownland. His wife, born 1881, was from relatively distant Zbiroh, between Prague and Plzeň, and they met in Linz, capital of
Upper Austria.29

Cleveland was a mature industrial city by the early 20th century, but Brown County, Nebraska, was part of the unsettled Northern Plains when Josef Svoboda arrived there in his mid-thirties with his family in 1889. The occupational designation in Svoboda’s passport, čtvrtlánik, or “quarter peasant,” leaves no doubt about his modest standing and prospects in Boskův Týn (now Boskovštejn), which numbered 77 houses in the Znojmo district of southern Moravia, less than sixty miles north of Vienna. His wife Kateřina was born in the parish seat of Hostim, just three miles away, and both villages formerly belonged to what was still the large local estate of Karl, Prince of Liechtenstein. By 1892 Josef Svoboda owned 160 acres near Fort Randall and the Missouri River in Boyd County. A census and atlas of Nebraska’s Czech-speaking immigrants then serialized in Jan Rosický’s Omaha weekly Pokrok západu included him among 110 individuals in Boyd County. Their Bohemian and Moravian places of origin ranged widely from the Plzeň region in the west to Brno in the east, but several were from the district of Znojmo. In fact, Josef Svoboda’s neighbor, Karel Janoušek, was from Kravsko, just a few miles from Boskův Týn, and Jan Janoušek, a blacksmith in nearby Spencer, was from Boskův Týn itself.30

Their Culture and Consciousness?

Bohemian America failed to sustain itself and dwindled away. Of course that had much to do with the subordinate position of Czech speakers in John Higham’s “settlers, immigrants and captives” composition of the common America. But in Habsburg Austria Czech speakers were also profoundly subordinated to another (Germanophone) social group and might have assimilated into its Pan-Austrian project of capitalist-era ethnogenesis. In fact, as their emigration to America began in the 1850s Czech speakers at home were still more of a social class than a complete society, a rural population still inclined to take on the language and allegiances of the German-speaking towns with
urbanization, education and social mobility. Marx and Engels alluded to this incomplete social structure when they dismissed the Czech and other Slavic nationalisms that emerged in the Revolution of 1848 as the unrealistic projects of what were *Ruinen von Völkern* (ruins of peoples), and it was a *leitmotif* of the three Czech social scientists who wrote a recent synthesis of the nation’s history under the pen name *Podiven* (Surprised), and who conveyed some of the ambivalence that was itself a part of the Czech nationalist project. *Podiven* aroused a controversy that revealed how deep and enduring that ambivalence was.\(^{31}\)

In any case Czech nationalism in the decades after 1848 was no less dramatic in its development and profound in its effect than the socioeconomic revolution that it accompanied. Historian Miroslav Hroch defined the nation as a large social group bound by an evolving combination of economic, territorial, political, cultural, religious, linguistic and other ties, and by a consciousness that these ties produced.\(^{32}\) Small nations were those that lacked their own ruling elites and state as capitalism and political liberalism affected European states and their provinces at different times between the French Revolution and the First World War, took unique courses of development there and modernized the ruling nations politically, socioeconomically and culturally. A national movement was the additional factor required for a small nation to avoid assimilation and achieve such modernization. For the beginning of this period Hroch posited over thirty potential small nations in Europe and distinguished two (Poles, Hungarians) with a limited ruling aristocracy, five (Czechs, Catalans, Croats, Norwegians, Irish) with medieval state experience and relict state rights, at least five more (Serbs, Greeks, Lithuanians, Welsh, Icelanders) with only the former, and a remainder of “unhistorical nations” such as the Latvians, Estonians, Finns, Bretons, Slovaks, Slovenes, Macedonians, Belarusians, Frisians and Galicians.\(^{33}\) For the national movements Hroch proposed a phase A of interest in folk culture and language among Enlightenment scholars and aristocrats opposed to centralizing states, a phase B of activism by an emerging native elite, and a phase C of mass consciousness and
activization eventually culminating in the complete social structure and political program of a modern nation. In this model the Czech national movement (along with those of the Finns, Estonians, Croatians and Norwegians) represented an “integrated” type, in which phases B and C coincided with the transition from feudal to liberal political and capitalist socioeconomic conditions.

The Czech phase B was under way for at least two decades before the Revolution of 1848. Historian František Palacký (1798-1876) made the Bohemian Museum in Prague, originally an enterprise of the aristocracy, its flagship institution. In 1827 the museum launched the learned journal Časopis českého muzea and four years later the Matice česká, a foundation to support scholarly and literary publishing in the Czech language. From then to 1848 the number of subscribers and contributors increased from less than three hundred to over eleven hundred. Three of every ten were students, another three were clergymen, and most of the rest were officials (both royal and patrimonial), small businessmen and teachers. The proportions of these latter three categories were stable since the early 1830s, but the proportion of students tripled, reducing that of clergymen by a third and crowding out members of the nobility and the professions. As for the social origins of those educated at Prague university or Bohemian seminaries, what Hroch called the “patriotic intelligentsia,” fully half were the children of “merchants, artisans and millers,” and more than half were from towns of over 1,500 inhabitants. Indeed, in the town of Polná on the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands three-fifths of the actors in the amateur theater, a popular form of Czech nationalism, were artisans and tradesmen. But most towns, contributors to the Matice česká and other supporters of the national movement were in the northern part of Czech-speaking Bohemia, in an arc from Plzeň in the west across the Elbe watershed to the north and east of Prague. By the 1840s the highest proportion of craft, proto-industrial and industrial employment in Bohemia was here and in the German-speaking areas to the north.

Most of the emigrants to America in the second half of the century were artisans,
peasants, laborers and servants from the more rural south and the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands in the southeast, what Hroch called the “nationally passive areas.” There most supporters of Czech culture were clergymen, except in towns with secondary schools (and perhaps amateur theaters). But communities of fewer than 1,500 inhabitants contributed an increasing proportion of Hroch’s “patriotic intelligentsia,” from 39% of those born before 1810 to 45% for the generation born in the 1820s, so the source regions of the emigration to America slowly became less “nationally passive.” Moreover, in just the seven years before 1848 the proportion of peasant subscribers to the Dědictví svatojánské, a Catholic foundation for publishing more popular literature in Czech, increased from one-tenth to over one-half.38

The Revolution of 1848 in Bohemia is well known as political history, in which it is the coming-out of a Czech nationalist elite. Its key events include the formation of a National Committee of liberals and radical democrats (March), its petition to the imperial court for liberal reforms and common institutions in the lands of the medieval Czech crown of St. Václav (Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia), historian František Palacký’s letter to the Frankfurt parliament rejecting its inclusion of the Czech lands in the project of German unification (April), a Panslavic congress (June), an abortive armed struggle of students and workers against the army (June), and Karel Havlíček-Borovský’s pioneering Czech-language political journalism (since 1846). These acts of a Prague-centric elite may have affected popular consciousness but not enough to move the Czech-speaking peasantry to provide the kind of support that might have mitigated that elite’s defeat. For the peasants the long-delayed completion of their emancipation from feudal obligations, which Emperor Josef II commenced in the 1780s, made the revolution a success, one not worth risking for what by comparison were the unimportant nationalist and liberal preoccupations of distant elites.39

In the Revolution of 1848 rival elites articulated political visions for Bohemia that produced popular conflict and furthered Czech (and German) national consciousness.
Historian Palacký argued for a federal Habsburg Empire to empower its Slavic crown lands and majorities, including Bohemia and its Czech speakers, but for the Frankfurt parliament Bohemia was to be part of a German unitary state. The call to elect Bohemian delegates to that pan-German parliament produced popular campaigns for and against the election, and the latter, Czech nationalist campaign prevailed. The Slavic congress that opened in Prague on June 2nd was another elite response to Frankfurt, a kind of demonstrative counterpart to Frankfurt in its gathering of spokesman from the various nationalities of Austria’s Slavic majority, but it also raised the popular tensions that culminated in the clash with the Windischgrätz army ten days later. Journeymen, apprentices, factory workers and students predominated among the participants and casualties in this Prague uprising, while peasant political consciousness was still inadequate to motivate a mass response elsewhere. But the memory of the uprising and the Czech-German ethnic tensions that it further intensified would stimulate such consciousness: German towns in Bohemia declared gratitude to their “savior” Windischgrätz, and German civic leaders in Prague petitioned him (in vain) not to rescind martial law. The Svornost (Concord) armed corps attracted and molded small numbers of middle-class Czechs, but the Slovanská lípa (Slavic linden), devoted to liberal reforms, pan-Slavic solidarity and the cultivation of Czech nationality through school and reading, became the first popular organization with sixty-six Bohemian branches, six in Moravia and several thousand members during its brief existence in 1848-1849.

Material grievances against the nobility preoccupied the peasantry but also encouraged its ethnolinguistic consciousness in the Czech-speaking interior, where the nobility and Catholic hierarchy but also the new upper middle classes were German-speaking. Bohemia and Moravia had not only a linguistic frontier between a Czech-speaking interior and German-speaking peripheries but also a linguistic stratigraphy to their interiors. There the social divide was also linguistic. German speech accompanied power, status, education and wealth, which Czech-speaking peasants challenged in
property and contract disputes with the nobility before 1848. By then the fractional term “quarter-peasant” already applied to more than three-fourths of Bohemian peasants because they made a living on so much less land than the eight hectares established as a satisfactory minimum in Josef II’s time six decades earlier. One wonders about the insidious effects of so stark a term of value and devaluation. And by the 1840s pamphleteers elaborated and circulated accounts of the debts and obligations to the nobility, local community, church and state that took 70% of the peasant’s profits.  

In the decades after 1848 the new liberal order encouraged Czech nationalism through social mobility and self-reliance. Even in the absolutist climate of the 1850s, when the Bach regime in Vienna reversed advances in Czech-language political journalism and school instruction, the popular need to understand the new economic conditions and to survive in them offered a broad and legitimate refuge in which a modern and modernizing Czech-language public discourse and form of popular education could continue. The *Patriotisch-ökonomische Gesellschaft*, a society founded in the 18th-century to promote rural improvement, became a vehicle of the Czech national movement as the *Vlastenecko-hospodářská společnost*. In Mladá Boleslav, a regional center northeast of Prague, local peasants took control of one local branch by appearing en masse at a meeting. Peasants from districts across Bohemia, and even some in Moravia and Silesia, wrote about their innovations in agricultural methods and implements in the society’s Prague newspaper, *Hospodářské noviny*, which one rural priest and promoter called a “peasant parliament.” In the 1820s historian František Palacký and Czech intellectuals in Prague had taken over the Bohemian Museum from a Germanophone nobility and made it a center of Czech-language scholarship. Just three decades later the kingdom’s Slavic peasantry assimilated their methods to join and make a role for themselves in the Czech nationalist movement.

An indifferent state fostered this kind popular initiative and self-reliance. The Habsburg state emancipated the peasants from the nobility but left them with no competitive
advantages and no social protections. After the Revolution of 1848, a communal law code introduced a property-based franchise that allowed wealthier peasants to dominate local self-government, acquire communal property and impose new hardships on their poorer neighbors. Local communities inherited the nobility’s former obligations to care for the indigent, but they avoided these obligations in practice by denying the right of domicile to the unpropertied and laboring inhabitants. The new conflict in the countryside between empowered propertied peasants and powerless cottagers divided two Czech-speaking social classes, and how this affected the national consciousness among the rural poor is an unexplored question. But rural hardships also allowed the growing Czech elites to form more vital bonds with the concerned peasant majority. Like Filip Stanislav Kodym (1811-1884), the physician who edited Hospodářské noviny, publisher František Šimáček (1834-1885) devoted his newspaper to the practical problems of ordinary people. Posel z Prahy promoted a Czech ideology of self-help in its advocacy of such projects as savings and loan associations for community and personal financial improvement when the liberal Habsburg state offered no alternatives to private lenders and high rates. In fact, readers of Posel z Prahy and members of the Czech záložny in town and country could come to see matters in starkly nationalist terms: a German state that offered no protections against German lenders. Worse than indifferent, this state could also be punitive, as when it suppressed (February 1854) the Mistrovská porada and its popular weekly publication. This association advanced the interests and education of tradesmen, the other large Czech-speaking social class besides the peasantry.

But in the two decades after the revolution the liberal Habsburg state also introduced representative local self-government and allowed it to develop into a powerful nationalist institution. Local administration could no longer be left to the nobility, but the state also could not afford the large number of royal officials required to take it over. The March 1849 Gemeindegesetz gave the vote to only a minority of high taxpayers, but this would be democratized in the future. More importantly, the law divided Bohemia
into self-governing communities based on the cadastre and empowered the propertied Czech-speaking peasantry, which predominated in the new community councils. When the Habsburg monarchy reaffirmed a constitutional political system a decade later, Czech speakers won control of elected city governments, including Prague’s, and entered the Bohemian diet, which introduced (1864) elective district councils as an entire new level of local self-government and one which Czech speakers promptly took over throughout the Bohemian interior. By 1883-1884 Czechs took over the Prague, Plzeň and České Budějovice Chambers of Commerce, a sign of the growing weight of their business and professional elites. Of course, the elective bodies of self-government were constrained by an appointed royal administration, which the viceroy in Prague and the captains in Bohemia’s districts directed.

The complex of popular administrative bodies and jurisdictions came to be called samosprávy in Czech, and whatever their constraints the samosprávy quickly developed a formidable capacity for mobilizing Czech nationalist consciousness, as they first demonstrated after the Augleich. This pact between German and Hungarian elites affirmed their dual hegemony, reorganized the empire as Austria-Hungary, and disappointed Czech hopes for a federalization of the empire to empower the Slavic majority, in which the Czechs were the largest nationality. In response the samosprávy organized “more than 100 large open air demonstrations ... in Bohemia between 1868 and 1871 and another 40 in Moravia and Silesia.” Some of these tábor, as they were called in solidarity with the Hussite movement of the 15th-century Bohemian Reformation, brought out Czech speakers in tens of thousands from “all levels of the rural population” and from the various skilled, unskilled, craft and industrial working and small proprietor classes that were changing the ethnolinguistic identity of many towns and cities. Most impressive was the May 1868 tábor on Říp, a high hill in the Elbe Valley on which the legendary 5th-century progenitor Čech was to have proclaimed Bohemia the new homeland of his wandering Slavic people. The Říp tábor was the work of the district councils in nearby Mělník and Roudnice, part of an emerging sugar beet
corridor where prosperity in commercial agriculture and food processing supported the elites that formed the Young Czech party, whose more popular nationalism and mass support inspired another round of activism across the social spectrum in the 1890s.

Freedom of association was another advantage that the liberalizing Habsburg state gave to the Czech national movement and the development of Czech popular consciousness. A dense network of *spolky*, popular associations devoted to all kinds of interests, promptly arose across the Czech-speaking territory in the 1860s and only became more articulated in the following decades. The *Sokol* gymnastic society took inspiration from the *Turner* tradition in the German states and attracted mass participation in its pursuit of physical fitness, impressive display of precise mass exercises, and cultivation of nationalist solidarity and self-confidence. Singing was another pursuit that strongly affected individual emotion and group identity but did not challenge political power, which enabled the *Hlahol* society to become another leading agent of national consciousness. An older form of association that became a surprisingly effective carrier of Czech consciousness were the journeymen. Journeymen in small shops long predominated over factory workers and inherited a sense of prestige that helped them to endure low wages and cohabitation with masters in often squalid conditions. But high proportions of journeymen to masters reduced prospects for advancement, and after 1848 authorities and masters abandoned feudal traditions of paternalism in the trades for a stark new capitalist calculation of personal interest that provoked journeymen protest and radicalism. With their brotherhoods and *herberk* inns the organized and mobile journeymen joined and influenced factory workers in 1860s beer hall discussion groups, which were open, not conspiratorial, because journeymen sought to emulate the respectability and nationalism of middle-class *spolky*. Journeymen also made a great contribution to the preparations and scale of the *tábor* political demonstrations.

Schools were another kind of major influence on consciousness. In 1774 Maria Theresa introduced compulsory education in the empire from the ages of six to twelve. The
Czech lands enjoyed a relatively dense and rapidly growing network of schools, so that by the mid-nineteenth the attended rate in Bohemia was already over 90%. But the quality of education was less impressive than its extent. Czech-speaking children could obtain no more than an elementary education in their native language. And many lost even that modest opportunity when the Catholic diocese, which managed the empire’s new Trivialschulen, assigned a German speaker to teach them reading, writing and religion. Overcrowding and poorly educated teachers also made the parish schools less effective. The 1774 code required only three months’ training for teachers and allowed as many as eighty pupils of various ages in a single class, which in fact often had many more. The spirit of instruction enjoyed far less lenience. The emperor, as Franz I declared, wanted compliant subjects, not intellectuals.54

After 1848 the new Ministry of Religion and Instruction made classical secondary education in the Gymnasien more rigorous in mathematics and natural sciences, extended its length from six to eight years, made graduation dependent on a Matura comprehensive final examination. On the other hand the 1855 Concordat with the Vatican reaffirmed clerical control of primary and even secondary schools. Most directors and teachers in the Gymnasien were already Catholic clergymen, and they were exempted from the new requirements of a university education and certification for Gymnasium teachers. As first this exemption was revoked in 1867 and then the Concordat itself in August 1870, the proportion of clergymen among secondary school teachers declined by almost half from over three-fifths to over one-third. The Reichsvolksschulgesetz of May 1869 secularized compulsory primary education and extended it by two years to eight years and age fourteen. All eight years could be spent in a Volksschule, or the last three years could be spent in a more demanding Bürgerschule. Students who entered a Gymnasium or a seven-year Realschule still left primary school at age ten. Realschulen, which prepared students for the technical colleges, proliferated in the 1870s after the Matura comprehensive final examination was imposed there and raised the status of these secondary schools closer to the
Gymnasien, which led to the universities. At the same time entrance examinations were imposed in both types of academic secondary schools. An eight-year Realgymnasium was finally introduced in 1908. Various kinds of trade schools offered a non-academic secondary education.  

Liberal reforms in the 1860s not only secularized and modernized the Habsburg school system but also allowed it to teach in Czech in Bohemia and Moravia. A new local government code (1862) gave communities in the empire powers over schools, including their language of instruction, and this contributed to a proliferation of Czech-language primary and secondary education. Czech-language instruction returned to the secondary schools, this time permanently and over most of the Czech-speaking territory. The decade introduced a dramatic and sustained rise in the number of secondary school students in Bohemia and Moravia, which doubled in less than a decade to over seven thousand in 1865. By then the Bohemian diet divided the kingdom’s Gymnasien by language into ten Czech, eight German and five bilingual institutions. But city governments in Bohemia established another forty-three Czech secondary schools over the next four decades, which the Habsburg state adopted as its own and financed. For Prague university the Bohemian diet in 1866 sanctioned examinations in Czech and the provision of Czech lecturers in all examination fields. This was soon achieved in the Philosophical Faculty. At the same time Prague’s technical college was divided into Czech and German institutions, and when this was done with the university in 1882, Czech speakers finally had a complete, modern education system in their own language.

But even as attendance at academic secondary schools and institutions of higher learning in Habsburg Austria became more common, it remained limited to a small minority of each generation. In 1880 Bohemia and Moravia less than 3% of the cohort aged eleven to eighteen years was in academic secondary schools, yet only Lower Austria marginally exceeded these rates among the fifteen “Austrian” crownlands. In the same year about one-half of one percent of the cohort aged eighteen to twenty-two in Bohemia and
Moravia were university students, and another one-quarter of one percent were enrolled in technical colleges. While the Bohemian and Moravian rates of university enrollment were unremarkable among the crownlands, the proportion in technical colleges was extraordinary. It was almost two-thirds greater than the proportion for Lower Austria, which was next highest and strikingly high among the crownlands. Thirty years later Bohemia and Moravia still had by far the largest proportional enrollments in technical colleges, at nearly two-thirds and three-fourths of one percent, respectively. This ample and durable primacy reflected what was the same kind of primacy in industrial development compared to other Austrian crownlands.\textsuperscript{60} New electrical engineering and motor vehicle industries at end of the 19th century were “almost exclusively in the Czech regions and were predominantly in the hands of Czech entrepreneurs.”\textsuperscript{61}

Participation in demonstrations, political societies and beer-hall debates was part of student rebellion against restrictive school regimes and fostered a Czech nationalist consciousness. Pilgrimages to iconic sites in Czech nationalist history became a summer-vacation tradition.\textsuperscript{62} Students were prominent among protestors after the 1867 Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich and again in the 1890s, which began with the electoral triumphs of a strident Young Czech party opposed to the ethnic partition of Bohemia and ended with the demise of prime minister Badeni’s attempt at Czech-German reconciliation through official linguistic parity. Most Czech university and technical college students in Prague participated in the Akademický čtenářský spolek, a society devoted to reading and discussion, and its successors. Habsburg authorities disbanded the original society in 1889 for declaring its “provocative” political sentiments in a letter to Parisian students, and five years later Czech students were the victims of the Omladina conspiracy show trial.\textsuperscript{63} Karel Jonáš and Václav Šnajdr left Prague’s technical college and university, respectively, in the 1860s to avoid persecution and became leading Czech journalists in America. But the reforms of that decade, which introduced provisions for minority schools, made even primary schools a major theater of the ethnic conflict in Bohemia and one with great emotional appeal. After 1880 the Ústřední
matice školská, founded in response to a German society, took up its campaign for Czech schools in majority German-speaking communities and became one of the most popular beneficiaries of fund drives and donations even among Czech speakers in America.⁶⁴

Publishing and reading also remade Czech society during the Habsburg Empire’s constitutional era in the last half century before World War I. They were among the reasons why at the “turn of the twentieth century the Czechs were the ethnic group on the European continent which had reached the highest degree of development but ... still lacked an independent or autonomous state of their own.”⁶⁵ The permanent return to constitutionalism more than a decade after the failed revolution allowed Czech journalism to again become political and polemical. It aroused popular sentiment a few years later as it took on the German-language press over the Austro-Hungarian Ausgleich and as embattled Czech journalists endured legal penalties.⁶⁶ This was the beginning of a major role in the increasingly comprehensive contest of wills between the two nationalities. After the 1890s the Czech press expanded with the political spectrum as socialist, nationalist and Catholic parties arose to compete for allegiance in the mass labor and agrarian classes. Leisure reading also rose to a new scale. Three years after Czech liberals founded the Matice lidu in 1867 to disseminate domestic and translated fiction, as well as popular works on the natural and social sciences, especially history, they had twenty thousand subscribers, and two-thirds of them were peasants, artisans and workers.⁶⁷ By then Jan Otto (1841-1916) started a business on modern principles that would become the largest of many in a new Czech mass market and scholarly publishing industry. His profile ranged from the Ottův slovník naučný national encyclopedia, which rivaled the German and British ones in sheer extent, to the Zlatá Praha (Golden Prague) illustrated news magazine, to the Laciná knihovna národní popular literature series.⁶⁸
To What Places? Bohemian America

In their native Bohemia and Moravia Czech speakers occupied a substantial settlement area of some twenty thousand square miles that was also unbroken in its contours and stable over time. The language frontier between Czech and German speakers stayed the same despite the pressure from both sides to move it. In the half century before World War I, while still part of a much larger state with Germanophone central institutions and elites, Czech speakers also developed their own remarkably complete systems of local self-government and education, as well as a complete social structure and modern industries and forms of culture. In America none of these familiar conditions and achievements came about. Collective consciousness and personal welfare, sometimes complementary and sometimes in opposition, still motivated individuals but produced different results. Czech speakers did settle together in America, because society and individual prospects were still ethnically divided and the language barrier made them even more dependent on each other than in Austria. But the Czech-speaking territories were just parts of American cities and rural counties, and even these enclaves were ethnically mixed and scattered. The major urban communities in New York, Cleveland and Chicago were far from the rural ones in Wisconsin and beyond the Mississippi. And secondary and even tertiary migration dispersed both kinds of communities. In the cities dependence on industries controlled by other ethnic groups and their own social mobility displaced the Czech-speaking neighborhood from one location to another or produced several neighborhoods. In the transcontinental countryside the changing location of the best land at least cost and its diminishing but still powerful attraction made personal welfare work against compact settlement around a unifying center. And everywhere the Czech-speaking communities were subject to larger administrative, judicial and educational jurisdictions, as well as those of political parties, labor unions and churches, that were part of even more imposing national systems. Small-scale settlement in dispersed enclaves and conditions of comprehensive occupational and institutional dependence largely limited Czech-speaking society to one generation.
But sustained immigration obscured this reality, and perhaps this illusion of greater permanence also contributed to the actual duration of the community and its institutions. Czech-speaking immigrants made beer halls their community centers, just as they were in their native villages and towns in Bohemia and Moravia. They also recreated amateur theater and associations like the Sokol as familiar forms of popular culture and as collective edifices and sanctuaries. The Catholic church was less attractive because so many Czech speakers were indifferent or even hostile to religion, while many others who were believers found themselves in parishes where other ethnic groups and languages predominated. The self-reliance that Czech speakers practiced so successfully in Bohemia was a useful tradition in their American immigrant communities, where they formed local and national fraternal benefit societies, building and loan associations, and banks. By 1920 Czech speakers and their descendants owned the majority of stock in nearly one hundred banks, including forty-six in Nebraska alone, with another fifteen in Iowa and ten in Chicago, where they also operated 128 building and loan associations. In Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the Czech-speaking community relied on its own merchants to build sidewalks that it could not obtain from city authorities. It was a response that the same community might have made to hostile Habsburg authorities in Bohemia, where public subscription built even the imposing national theater in Prague. Today a sequence of mosaics advertising local Czech businesses survives in one Cedar Rapids sidewalk, where Czech immigrant consciousness survives in and amidst new kinds of associations and landmarks. As for Czech-language print culture, newspapers were a successful medium in America. Well over three hundred titles appeared in the half-century after 1860. While many were indeed ephemeral, this number in such a small community of potential readers could only be the result of an enterprise that inspired enthusiasm. Schools for the Czech language as a subject to supplement English-language public schools were another typical institution in the immigrant communities, but this objective, along with their attendance and quality, were too modest to produce meaningful rates of real linguistic persistence in the second generation.
Wisconsin, with nearby parts of Iowa and Minnesota, contained the Czech-speaking immigration up to the middle of its second decade in the 1860s to a degree that appears remarkable when compared to the next four decades. But even the original settlements here formed not one coherent region but instead three widely separated ones in rapid succession during the 1850s. Racine and Milwaukee were neighboring counties at the southern end of Wisconsin’s shore on Lake Michigan, while coastal Manitowoc and Kewaunee were eighty miles further north and the riverside counties on the Mississippi from the Illinois border to La Crosse were two hundred miles to the west. In all three regions Czech speakers took up residences in towns and properties on nearby farmlands. Near Racine they paid from five to ten dollars per acre, and near the Mississippi River they bought from speculators and on ridges and slopes because Germans and Scandinavians were already established on the prime lands.\(^{72}\) Earlier on the agricultural frontier American squatters formed claim associations to defeat speculators and secure for themselves purchases at land offices at the minimal $1.25 per acre price until the 1841 Pre-Emption Law institutionalized this practice.\(^{73}\) Wisconsin’s population increased from thirty thousand to three hundred thousand in the 1840s, and Czech speakers arriving in the next decade were too late to expand their original rural settlement areas. The lumber industry soon offered less prospect for such growth also. In Racine County, Czechs supplied wood to the railroad builders, but these converted to coal by 1870. In more remote Kewaunee they supplied the lake steamer companies, but only until they cleared their lands.\(^{74}\) In Iowa, Czechs settled in three eastern counties. In Winneshiek on the Minnesota border the first party of six, all from southern Bohemia, purchased land at the government land office in Dubuque on April 29, 1854, after wintering in Cleveland.\(^{75}\) The preemption price of $1.25 per acre was available here.\(^{76}\) One hundred miles to the south in Linn and Johnson Counties Czechs took up employment in Cedar Rapids industries and farms near the city. In Minnesota they clustered around New Prague in Scott County just thirty-five miles southwest of Minneapolis.
Congress affected migration with its 1862 Homestead Act, which offered 160 acres for free further west. Many Czech speakers left the Wisconsin lakeshore and the upper Mississippi valley for the Platte, Missouri and Red River watersheds. Most went to Nebraska, especially to Omaha, to Colfax, Butler, Saunders and Dodge Counties on both sides of the Platte from forty to eighty miles west of the city, and to Saline County eighty miles southwest of it. In South Dakota Czechs concentrated in the southeastern counties of Bon Homme and Yankton on the Missouri River and the Nebraska border, and in North Dakota they did so in two counties on the Red River and the Minnesota border. Richland County was in the state’s southeast corner and Walsh some one hundred sixty miles to the north. Settlement in Nebraska began in Cuming County in 1866, a year after four Czech wives evidently married to Germans arrived. Five years later Mathias Shonka (i.e., Matěj Šonka, 1827-1907) arrived in Butler County with his family by “prairie schooner” from Iowa, where he could not afford to buy more land near Cedar Rapids and sold his 80 acres. He had left Bohemia at his wife’s urging to spare their four sons from ten years of military service. Far to the north Albert Chezik (sic?) found just one Anglo-American in a dugout in the spring of 1871 when he arrived at the eventual site of Wahpeton, a major town in North Dakota, and became a squatter on land not yet surveyed. Twenty-four years old, Chezik had come from Bohemia twelve years earlier with his parents and four brothers to a farm in Grant County, Wisconsin, and countrymen from there followed him to the Red River.

By 1890 Nebraska overtook Wisconsin in numbers of residents who were natives of Bohemia and Moravia. Nebraska had gained 90% of its number (16,803) over the preceding two decades and Wisconsin (11,999) just 12%. Before the Homestead Act Wisconsin, Iowa and Minnesota had 43% of the “Austrian” natives recorded in the 1860 census, a good proxy at that early date for Czech speakers. Thirty years later these three states of the original rural settlement areas on Lake Michigan and the Upper Mississippi were the home of only 28% of all Bohemian and Moravian natives in the United States.
Meanwhile, the share of Illinois, Missouri, Ohio and New York, which contained the large urban settlements in Chicago, Cleveland, New York and St. Louis, had grown from 36% to 42%. But the new rural population on the Great Plains in Nebraska, the Dakotas and Kansas had also grown to become a major share at 20%. In Nebraska, Bohemian settlement proceeded steadily westward into progressively more arid parts of the state. In 1874 Bohemians took up farms in Webster County, where the novelist Willa Cather would eventually write about them. Just four years later they were already in Red Willow County, four counties further west on the Republican River, and in the same years they proceeded through the counties on the Loup River toward the Sand Hills. They followed another river valley all the way to the Wyoming border by the mid-eighties, but in a few years farming in the westernmost counties on the Niobrara would prove to be an illusory prospect.

Over time Czech speakers and their children dispersed across the entire Great Plains and then to all three coasts of the United States, but they resettled in groups and formed their own communities even in this ultimate, transcontinental dispersion. In 1874 Francis J. Svehla (i.e., Švehla) left grasshopper-infested Saline County, Nebraska, with the words “Česká osada,” meaning “Czech colony,” emblazoned on his wagon, took up a new homestead in Ellsworth County, Kansas, and commenced a prodigious correspondence with Czech-language immigrant newspapers and their readers that made central Kansas into another piece of American Bohemia with former residents of cities (New York, Chicago) and other rural states (Nebraska) but also with arrivals directly from the European homeland. A decade later Czech speakers and their children resettled as far away as the Petersburg area of Virginia, and Oklahoma became a major destination beginning in 1889, when homesteads became available in former Indian lands. In the last five years before the First World War ended emigration from the Habsburg Empire, rural Czech speakers associated, sent their representatives on extensive expeditions to examine lands, and corresponded about their findings in their newspapers, notably Jan Rosicky’s Omaha weekly Hospodář for farmers. Colonies in the Pacific Northwest and
Louisiana arose from these remarkable collective efforts. In numbers of people this dispersion was much more modest than its transcontinental geographical scale. By 1910 the United States census recorded 5,227 Czech-speaking immigrants and their children in the Mountain states of Colorado, Montana and Wyoming. Less than one-eighth of this number lived in Denver, and Czechs were not prominent in the mining industries, which attracted other Slavs. But Montana farmers were prominent among correspondents of the weekly *Hospodár*. Of the further 5,356 individuals in the Pacific Northwest states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho, less than one-fifth were in the three cities with more than one hundred thousand inhabitants, Seattle, Spokane and Portland. And another 5,703 were in the New England states of Massachusetts and Connecticut, where fewer than one in four resided in such cities. The phenomenon of Poles buying up farms in the Connecticut River Valley by 1900 after appearing there as farm laborers two decades earlier impressed sociologist Emily Greene Balch, the only prolific American scholar of the Slavic immigration in those years. The 1910 manuscript census schedules suggest the presence of Czech-speaking farmers only in Connecticut’s river counties of Middlesex and Hartford, but many more Bohemian natives lived in the cities of New Bedford, New Haven and Bridgeport. Altogether the three outlying populations just described, which were the result of migrations from the Midwest and Great Plains to the coastal and mountain extremities of the country, including another eleven hundred in Virginia, amounted to 17,388 individuals, just 3% of the 539,392 foreign-born Czech speakers and their children in the United States.

The 41,080 individuals in Texas amounted to nearly another 8% of this national population and were the largest “outlier.” It was an outlier by location, but otherwise it was another original area of settlement, which emerged in the 1850s just like its counterpart in Wisconsin. The Texas population remained distinct from what became the main body of Czech-speaking immigration to the north, which spread in fragments across the continent but remained a single arena of secondary migrations. The Texas
population stayed small and took up further places within the state, largely among the fertile counties between Houston, San Antonio and Dallas. It was also distinct for its more exclusive and narrower regional origins in eastern Moravia. And Czech-speaking Texas was more Catholic than its counterparts to the north, or at least it did not develop a polemical, anti-Catholic party of Freethinkers.\textsuperscript{85}

The Czech rural immigration largely remained in the Midwest, and there it was part of a large and coherent “European homeland.” Plotted as a space where more than one-fifth of inhabitants were foreign-born in 1890, this homeland covers most of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa and North Dakota, with large contiguous and nearby parts of South Dakota, Nebraska, central Kansas, northern Illinois and northeastern Ohio.\textsuperscript{86} Czech speakers were a large presence only in individual and sometimes neighboring counties. In fact, township-level plats best reveal their communities, which often elude larger-scale maps.\textsuperscript{87} Natives of Bohemia never amounted to more than 2\% of the entire population of Nebraska (1880), and even this was twice their share in Wisconsin and Minnesota and over three times their share in Iowa. In these latter three states the Bohemian proportion of the foreign-born was in the range of 2-4\% in the half-century after 1870 and 6-10\% in Nebraska. But in Nebraska’s Saline County Bohemians were already 70\% of the total foreign-born population in 1870. In Butler County their 19th-century share of the foreign-born population peaked at nearly 38\% in 1880 and in Colfax at 49\% in 1890.\textsuperscript{88} A century later the highest proportions of residents with “Czech or Czechoslovak single ancestry” among counties nationwide were precisely these three in Nebraska, a striking example of the persistence of Bohemian immigration in its rural American destinations.\textsuperscript{89} In the midst of the Dust Bowl catastrophe in the 1930s a case study of rural “Czechs” in Lincoln County, Oklahoma, found that they achieved higher farm ownership rates and savings balances and that they practiced a more diversified, intensive, capitalized, self-sufficient, sustainable and remunerative agriculture than their “native” neighbors. These skills and values could be a legacy of conditions in Bohemia and so could, with more qualification, the community spirit (fraternal lodges, beef clubs)
and disregard for class distinctions (farm owners and tenants) in Oklahoma.\textsuperscript{90}

As for the urban Czech-speaking immigration, it formed a small constellation of cities. St. Louis was the only major star to dwindle, while Chicago became more dominant. In 1910 fifty-five American cities had over one hundred thousand inhabitants, and the census counted the “foreign white stock” in each city by “mother tongue.” Czech-speaking immigrants and their children numbered 109,764 in Chicago, 40,188 in New York and 39,025 in Cleveland. St. Louis was a distant fourth with just 10,134. It had been first in the 1850s, but by then railroads reached Chicago, connected it with the immigrant ports of New York and Baltimore, and out-competed the Mississippi River route from New Orleans to the rural frontier. In 1910 only another six of the largest American cities had more than 2,500 residents who were Czech “foreign white stock.” In descending order they were Baltimore, Milwaukee, St. Paul (with Minneapolis), Omaha, Pittsburgh and Detroit. As for the 219 American cities with populations from twenty-five thousand to one hundred thousand, Czech-speaking immigrants and their children numbered over five hundred in just 11 cities. Six were part of greater Chicago, St. Louis, Cleveland or New York, but the number in Cicero (13,205) was largest by a multiple of seventeen and added to Chicago’s dominance as the Czech metropolis. Among the five other, more remote cities, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, had 7,491 Czech “foreign white stock,” far more than the 2,370 in Racine, Wisconsin.\textsuperscript{91}

In New York a Bohemian immigrant neighborhood formed on the Lower East Side east of Avenue A between Houston and Eighth. This was also the northeast part of the German district, \textit{Kleindeutschland}. The two ethnic groups also shared a small business corridor on Avenue B.\textsuperscript{92} In 1870, fifteen hundred Bohemian natives lived in New York. A decade later eight thousand and in 1890 nearly twelve thousand lived there.\textsuperscript{93} These were small numbers compared to the German-Americans, who amounted to one-third of the city’s population by 1875. By then they abandoned the Lower East Side to form a new Uptown neighborhood east of Second Avenue between Sixty-Fifth and Seventy-Eighth. But Germans, Italians,
Hungarians, Slovaks, Greeks, Jews and even African-Americans also occupied residences and operated businesses on these blocks. The Bohemians migrating Uptown followed the Germans, who moved farther (between Eighty-Third and Eighty-Ninth) and earlier (1870s). Unlike the Bohemians in Cleveland and Chicago, those in New York (like most other New Yorkers) were not homeowners. Even at the end of the 1880s, when they followed the cigar manufacturers uptown, they only moved into “more sanitary tenements” there.94

Most Czech speakers in New York, whatever their former occupation, worked as cigarmakers. But they entered an industry that was becoming more exploitative, and they did so as its most powerless workers. The cigar mold device and the depression favored large manufacturers of lower quality cigars over small shops and craftsmanship. Bohemians became the less skilled work force in the large establishments and also became trapped in a new tenement work system, in which low wages and high rents made entire families labor endless hours at home for employers and landlords who were one and the same. A greater language barrier made these Slavic speakers even more powerless than the Germans in an industry and city whose employers, elites and labor unions spoke either German or the closely related English language. By the end of the 1870s more than one-third of New York’s cigarmakers were natives of Austria-Hungary while one-quarter were natives of Germany. And the four thousand or so who worked in tenements were one-third of all cigarmakers.95 By the end of the 1880s and in their new uptown locations Czech speakers were still enmeshed in the semi-feudal tenement system and never rose in the cigar industry to become manufacturers or labor leaders.96 Tenement work declined as employers sought economies of scale in larger factories, but Jacob Riis could still associate it with Bohemian families in his expose of How the Other Half Lives.

As residents of the larger neighborhood of Kleindeutschland, Czech speakers lived among the much more numerous Germans. Czech societies met in German halls97 until they founded their own national hall in 1882.98 Czech-speaking Catholics attended the St. Nikolaus church until they founded their own Ss. Cyril and Methodius church in the
eleventh ward at the end of 1875. Many Czech speakers attended German-language productions in the Germania and Thalia theaters, but those who neither spoke nor understood German, such as the cigarmakers whom Jacob Riis visited in their tenements, were probably a large majority. Even so, Czech speakers had much in common with Germans. From its handicraft traditions to its emerging Socialist political movement, Bohemia was at one with its surrounding German states, and Czech speakers in New York joined recent German immigrants in a dissident Cigar Makers’ Progressive Union that embraced Socialist political radicalism and endured for four years after 1882.

In Chicago, Bohemian natives were consistently over two percent of the city’s population in the years 1870-1910, and in 1900 Bohemians and their children were nearly nine percent of all Chicagoans. The first neighborhood, “Prague,” was (clockwise from the north) between Polk, Canal, Twelfth and Halsted Streets, an area less than one-half mile on each side and just southwest of downtown across the South Branch of the Chicago River. After the 1871 fire destroyed Prague, the Pilsen neighborhood, about three times larger in area, formed about one mile further south on the river along Cermak Road between Ashland and Canal. Here Bohemians labored in lumberyards at $1.50 or less per day in 1870s while Irish seasonal dockworkers earned $3-5. While the Anglophone job market devalued their skills, Bohemians used their capacity for thrift and self-help to achieve home ownership and build model working-class neighborhoods through their own savings and loan associations. Indeed, by 1910 the Illinois Auditor of Public Accounts found that 94 of Chicago’s 197 “building, loan and homestead associations” were Bohemian, and they controlled more than half of the assets in this category of financial institutions. At the same time a diverse class of Bohemian businessmen developed in Chicago and documented itself in at least five directories published between 1895 and 1915 and ranging to over three hundred pages each. Social mobility produced new neighborhoods and residential dispersion. Even in the Sixth Ward’s thirty-block Fourth Precinct, the core of working-class Pilsen, the 1880 census recorded that only 57% of household heads were Bohemian natives, while
another 23% were German and 10% Irish.\textsuperscript{107} By the 1890s Czech speaking residents were calling their part of the South Lawndale neighborhood \textit{Kalifornie}, presumably because it was west of Pilsen and more attractive, like the state on the Pacific coast.\textsuperscript{108}

In Cleveland the Bohemian experience was similar. The city was a station en route to western rural destinations until Czech-speaking immigrants formed a resident community in the latter 1860s and concentrated at the bottom of the occupational structure. The neighborhood around Croton just southeast of downtown formed as the prominent lawyer and politician Harvey Rice, who “employed many on his farm, sold them land on very easy terms, in some cases allowing them to work out the price.” Countrymen from various trades exchanged work among themselves, and as early as 1869, when some seven hundred Czech-speaking families lived in Cleveland, three of every five were already homeowners.\textsuperscript{109} A decade later Bohemians increasingly became unskilled and semiskilled barrel workers for John D. Rockefeller’s rising Standard Oil Company, and they bought lots on newly subdivided farms further south across Kingsbury Run and closer to their chief employer. This neighborhood, around Broadway Avenue from E. 37th to Union, became their largest, but it was far from exclusively Bohemian, and the several smaller and later concentrations of Bohemian natives and their children on Cleveland’s East and West Sides were more diluted.\textsuperscript{110} As Rockefeller’s barrel-makers, Bohemians were the disadvantaged successors of skilled coopers in a mechanizing trade, but some achieved remarkable social mobility: Michael Albl went on to a career in real estate and insurance that included terms as president of the Svet Publishing and Forest City Brewing Companies, waterworks trustee and director of Broadway Savings & Loan.\textsuperscript{111} Bohemian men and sons were also cigar makers and tailors, while as laborers they also entered the Cleveland Rolling Mill Company, precursor to US Steel. Bohemian wives and daughters worked at the Cleveland Paper Mill, as washerwomen and on nearby farms.\textsuperscript{112}

The literature on other urban and rural places reveals striking local characteristics and
changes that likely had a larger validity in Bohemian America, but each with an extent and qualifications still unknown across the span of that America’s space and time. In Cedar Rapids, city directories from 1870 to 1881 reveal a proportion of laborers among Bohemians rising from 20% to 38% as Sinclair’s meatpacking and Stuart & Douglas’s oatmeal and barley processing plants arose. Meanwhile, some immigrants not only persisted in their Bohemian trades but made American careers in them on a larger and more profitable scale. In Baltimore “Colonel” Venceslaus J. Shimek came to own barrel-organ factories, while blacksmith Joseph F. Shimanek became a carriage and wagon manufacturer. And in 1915 Baltimore, three-fourths of Bohemian natives with children owned a home, a rate much higher than the one-half of German natives and one-third of American natives in the city. In Nebraska, Saunders County plat books, marriage records and census schedules reveal that spatial self-segregation, endogamy and native language persistence among Swedes and especially Czechs were high and hardly changed from 1880 to 1910 as both rural populations passed three sample decades impervious to assimilation. Meanwhile, in Minnesota the main New Prague cluster of small-town and rural Bohemia, in LeSueur, Rice and Scott Counties, declined from 35% to 27% in its share of the state’s “foreign-born” and “foreign-mixed” Bohemian residents in the quarter-century after 1880, while the urban cluster in Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, which contained Minneapolis and St. Paul, increased its proportion from 14% to 21%. But if the persistence in rural Saunders County, Nebraska, was impressive, it was in urban St. Louis as well. There the Bohemian Hill neighborhood formed on less than half of one square mile of the near south side between (clockwise from the north) Park, Broadway, Allen and Eighteenth as natives of the Slavic kingdom succeeded German residents. Seven decades later it was still there. Residents numbered seven to nine thousand by mid-1890s as the self-sufficient neighborhood Expanded south to Cherokee and California. Even after the turn of the century the St. Louis Republic newspaper heard only Czech spoken there when it reported admiringly on a well-articulated Bohemian Hill.
It was a piece among many cast in number and kind over the continent. A Bohemian America so broadcast could not as easily come to a consciousness of itself, enmeshed in a well-structured state of another will and overtaken amidst an Anglo-American ethnogenesis in numbers of a higher order. The small dimensions of its minority and the continental scale were not of the centuries in Bohemia. But could a place like Bohemian Hill still be more than another city’s neighborhood? Could it be a modest other “city on a hill,” a place of visions? What individuals would contend and come together (with what circumstances) there to take up visions and a voice for this Bohemian America?
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among Czechs in Cleveland.”


A striking fact about Czech-language journalism in America is that it arose early and by community effort. In the community of Czech-speaking immigrants, publishing the first newspapers was not the usual business affair of individuals or even the preserve of an elite. It was a community campaign. The newspaper was a popular objective and form of voice. And when it appeared some of the editors who wrote and put it together week after week were tradesmen with little education. The intellectuals who eventually replaced them had a secondary or even some higher education but were themselves sons of peasants and small-town tradesmen. Just as in Bohemia, the divide between elites and masses was just one generation. And just as in Bohemia, journalism and nationalism had allegiances to rationalism and liberalism. After all, the origins of the Czech national revival were in the late 18th-century Habsburg Enlightenment. In America this mainstream of immigrant journalism and society came to be called svobodomyslnost, or Freethought.

Czech-language journalism in America would amount to over three hundred periodicals in the half century after 1860. Most did not survive long, and most that were more durable had only local concerns and importance. One newspaper that was both long-lived and important nationally was the weekly Slavie. It spanned the entire half century and never moved from Racine, Wisconsin. Its editor for three decades, Karel Jonáš, had the education and talents of a professional journalist. He was also the Bohemian who made the most successful political career in America, which culminated in election as lieutenant governor of Wisconsin and appointments as United States consul to Prague and St. Petersburg. After the 1860s Chicago replaced Wisconsin as the largest demographic piece of the Czech-speaking immigration, which also became more widely dispersed across the country, but Slavie remained nationally important for the next quarter century as Jonas’s newspaper until his suicide in 1896. And even in the late years
thereafter, it was an attractive prize. Josef Jiří Král chose to become its editor, and later August Geringer paid to become its owner. Král earned a law degree at the University of Michigan and was one of the most versatile and prolific authors in Bohemian America, while Geringer was its biggest publisher. ¹ Geringer’s editor, František Boleslav Zdrůbek, began his career at a weekly that Jonáš founded, and Václav Šnajdr did so at Jonáš’s Slavie. These four early associates of Jonáš and successors to his legacy were among the leading national voices in the Czech-speaking immigration as early as the 1870s.

Slavie was the forum where the immigration’s mainstream, liberal nationalist discourse began. Its name meant “realm of the Slavs” and suggested an ethnolinguistic space, community, consciousness and vision. Perhaps it could be best expressed in English as “Slavia,” on the pattern of Yugoslavia, which was so called because it was the state of the Southern Slavs. Nineteenth-century Czech nationalist discourse often used “Slavs” in the local sense of “Czechs” to emphasize their difference from (and differences with) the German speakers in Bohemia and Moravia. The usage also invoked a self-encouraging Panslavic identification: in alliance with the Slavic majority in the Habsburg Empire or with Russia, the Czech nationalistic project so deep in German Central Europe did not appear quite so dim. Slavie was a name that affirmed this mainstream, liberal national discourse familiar from Bohemia and Moravia. In Wisconsin and America, where Czech speakers were such a small presence, it also appealed to emotion and solidarity.

Remarkably, Slavie did not get its name from an educated intellectual. Instead, a farmer gave the newspaper its name. This fact suggests that modern Czech nationalism was not limited to the elite that created it but that it also came to Wisconsin with ordinary immigrants, with peasants and small-town tradesmen. And their participation in Slavie, in printed Czech-language discourse, was not limited to the newspaper’s symbolic name. They largely created the newspaper and sustained it until educated intellectuals like Jonáš arrived to make their careers. Slavie emerged from a remarkable collaboration between immigrants from the Bohemian countryside and educated intellectuals. Even in
the late years after Jonáš, a local farmer bought the orphaned newspaper as if to be its guardian. The immigrant journalistic elite valued this popular sanction. Thomas Čapek made the popular origins of *Slavie* and the Czech-language press in America a conspicuous part of his narratives on the immigrant ethnic group’s history.

The farmers and townsmen who made Racine County such a supportive home for *Slavie* were also largely Protestants from congregations in eastern Bohemia. These included both the settler who gave the newspaper its name and the one who became its guardian owner decades later. This religious and regional dimension of *Slavie* and the formation of liberal Czech-language journalism in America has remained overlooked and unexplored. Protestants were a small minority in Bohemia and Moravia. Only about one in fifty Czech speakers was a member of the Reformed and Lutheran congregations that formed in the century after the 1781 Edict of Toleration legalized these two denominations. Reformed congregations, which affirmed the Swiss confession and the Calvinist legacy, predominated. Both Reformed and Lutheran congregations concentrated in the Elbe Valley and eastern Bohemia, but the latter region was also the center of charismatic forms of peasant Christianity in the Czech lands. The Protestant churches cultivated the memory of the 15th-century Hussite movement and the larger Bohemian Reformation, and they styled themselves as its inheritors. Liberal nationalism laid claim to the same historical experience, for which it had its own uses. Protestants and secular nationalists found a common cause, and the Revolution of 1848 quickened their mutual affinities, while the majority Catholic Church remained on the other side, anti-modern and integrated into the Habsburg and German state.

The effort to launch a Czech-language newspaper began with Vojta Náprstek (1826-1894), a student refugee of the 1848 revolution. His parents were vintners in Prague, and the family hailed from the countryside around the city. Their imposing establishment shared a small square with the former Bethlehem Chapel, where Jan Hus preached four centuries earlier. The location must have been meaningful in a family that was part of an
emerging Czech nationalist consciousness in the capital and its middle classes. Of course, such families still became quite at home in German-speaking society and high culture. Their use of equivalent names in two languages traced their bi-cultural lives, which nationalist discourse would eventually anathematize as “amphibian” by the last quarter of the century, and Vojtěch Náprstek functioned equally well (perhaps better) as Adalbert Fingerhut. He studied law at the university in Vienna, where he also became a correspondent of (and for) Karel Havlíček, who created a modern, liberal Czech journalism in the half-decade before his Tyrolean exile in 1851. Náprstek also organized and represented “Slavic” students from Bohemia and Moravia in the imperial capital. In New York, where he arrived in December 1848, Náprstek promptly organized the first “Czecho-Slavonic” association, but by June 1850 Fingerhut was in Milwaukee and at the forefront of German immigrant society and intellectual life. Money arrived in installments from his mother in Prague, and he could concentrate on the intellectual side of his bookstore-cum-salon and newspaper. Forty-eighters reinvigorated an enlarged German population and its press in this decade, and Fingerhut with his weekly *Milwaukeeer Flugblätter* was in this camp of revolutionary refugees. As a spokesman for liberalism, one with Czech nationalist allegiances, he was perhaps distinctive for his popular and anticlerical emphases. “Popular” included the working class, which he championed as a public speaker and in the *Arbeiter Bildungs- und Leseverein*, an association dedicated to advancement through self-education. “Anticlerical” was the final motivation for Fingerhut’s journal, which countered one that the German bishop of Milwaukee launched half a year earlier. Fingerhut integrated American tradition (Paine, Jefferson) in his message, and the journal achieved real notoriety and influence, including a proposal in the state senate to ban its mail distribution and an eventual print run of nearly six thousand copies.  

Náprstek also made his German newspaper a forum for Czech-speaking immigrants. He left no doubt about his ethnic allegiance by printing his Czech name in the masthead. Its Roman letters amidst a mass of Gothic type made it stand out even more, and he used
the popular form of his given name, “Vojta.”6 Náprstek’s papers and items printed in his Flugblätter reveal that he reached countrymen in scattered locations not just in Wisconsin but also out of state, in New York, Cleveland, Detroit, Cincinnati and even in small towns like Cape Girardeau, Missouri. And when Jan Přibyl in Springfield, Massachusetts, read the Flugblätter a year after they ceased, he discovered the location of his family in Racine County, Wisconsin. He had been left behind two years before, aged fourteen, for lack of money to pay for the entire family’s train fare to Chicago.7 Náprstek’s mother and brother Ferdinand pressured him to abandon his popular weekly, and he obliged in November 1854. Austrian authorities had banned the Flugblätter, and Náprstek’s family in Prague devoted years toward an imperial pardon on his behalf. When they succeeded, Náprstek left America by December 1857.

Náprstek did not have time to establish a Czech-language newspaper in America. Certainly the German-language press and its post-1848 renaissance were an example and a challenge. Emulating German achievements and institutions was a habit well-practiced in the decades of the Czech national revival, and the recent revolution had introduced real antipathies. Even in New York a German newspaper forced out a Polish editor for “defending the Slavs,” as Náprstek recorded just ten days after his arrival.8 Five years later he drafted a leaflet for gauging interest in a prospective Czech-language newspaper. “I often receive letters and inquiries from countrymen,” he wrote, “asking whether I might not publish [one] once or twice each month.” He was “quite willing” to oblige, “if enough subscribers could be found,” and he asked for the names and expectations of interested individuals. Besides a part of this leaflet, Náprstek’s papers also contain a reply from twenty-two prospective subscribers who wanted a publication that would explain “foreign concepts like communism, terrorism, bureaucracy, hierarchy and dogma.” It was dated February 1854 in Kossuth Township of Manitowoc County, Wisconsin. Perhaps that is why Náprstek chose this location for the first mass meeting of Bohemian immigrants in America in November 1856, although his address was on political values and in support of Fremont’s presidential campaign. The initiative for a
resolution to support a prospective Czech-language newspaper evidently came from the audience of “several hundred men, women and children,” including some “affluent” residents who offered cash.9

Náprstek’s leaflet from three years earlier had made a lasting impression in Kossuth Township, but did its author forget his own project? Perhaps, if this response from Kossuth Township was the only one. And the irrepressible Náprstek had taken up other projects since then, including one to collect American artifacts for the Bohemian Museum that led to more unfriendly attention from authorities in Prague.10 But the popular enthusiasm in Kossuth Township moved Náprstek to return to the newspaper project. Local committees formed in response to his correspondence and the public meetings that were part of his parting tour of America, beginning in Chicago and St. Louis in June 1857 and ending in New York.11

Then a tailor led the newspaper campaign. Jan Borecký (1826-1911) was born in the same year as Vojta Náprstek and just east of Prague in Břežany, a village in the Elbe Valley. But his formal education ended by the age of twelve, when he became an apprentice. He also read “political journals,” meaning Karel Havlíček, and “educational books” from the Matice česká, meaning Czech history and literature. It was a common body of texts, with an egalitarian community of readers that extended from the educated elites, including the Catholic clergy, to craftsmen and peasants. By 1848 Borecký lived with relatives in Kovanec, near Mladá Boleslav, and attending sermons on constitutionalism, parliamentarism and liberal citizenship. This village priest, Karel Alois Vinařický (1803-1869), had a national reputation, especially as editor of the Catholic clergy’s Czech-language journal.12 Borecký joined an early local of the Slovanská lípa, or “Slavic Linden,” and after Prague’s June rising the “reaction in Bohemia made him escape to Saxony.”13 For the next six years he worked and traveled in Saxony, Bohemia, Austria and Hungary.14 In September 1854 Borecký arrived in Milwaukee and entered into a “fast friendship” with Vojta Náprstek. Borecký regarded
Náprstek as a mentor on “political affairs,” had access to his personal library, and later donated a bound and complete collection of Náprstek’s German Flugblätter to a Czech society in Chicago.\textsuperscript{15}

Borecký was among the Manitowoc County residents who revived the Czech newspaper idea when Náprstek addressed them in November 1856, and he was present again the following June when Náprstek came to St. Louis, Borecký’s third American home.\textsuperscript{16} Whether by coincidence or intent, Borecký acted as Náprstek’s advance agent. Náprstek used the German newspaper Anzeiger des Westens to convene local Czechs at Rieder’s Garden, where they elected a newspaper committee of twelve. Náprstek conceived of local committees and the sale of shares as the means to gather the capital and subscribers for a sustainable newspaper despite the small numbers of Czech immigrants and the great distances between them. This made correspondence, coordination and the work of secretaries all the more important. Borecký was secretary in St. Louis, where shares were promptly printed. The Panic of 1857 depressed the sale of shares, and New York, which printed its own shares, did not contribute proceeds, but the St. Louis committee eventually launched a newspaper on its own. Like any author, Borecký would tend to magnify his own role, but historian Thomas Čapek, an insider who knew the Czech immigration and its literature so well, found Borecký’s to be the “only substantive and detailed account.” Unlike Borecký, none of the other principals that he mentions would remain prominent in Czech-American affairs. And to Borecký’s credit, the important role of at least two other individuals is clear from his account. Borecký personally detested Jan Božený Erben, but he wrote that Erben “roused [St. Louis countrymen] to renewed activity” with “his impassioned letters” from New Orleans for the cause of a Czech newspaper and then in person after his October 1859 arrival in the city, where funds promptly doubled to $400. The newspaper committee and campaign had evidently been moribund for the past two years, and Erben was editor when the Národní noviny (National newspaper) appeared on January 21, 1860. Money remained a problem, and so another important figure was a “certain Silesian” who (for a 25% commission) made the
rounds of Anglo Republicans during Abraham Lincoln’s presidential election campaign. But Borecký remained the newspaper’s godfather. Erben lasted just fourteen issues. At the first quarterly “assembly of shareholders to hear and review accounts,” the executive committee found that Erben did not record his expenses and receipts, while he denied responsibility for financial management. The same concerns about financial irresponsibility and ineptitude just as quickly led to the next editor’s dismissal. Borecký was no longer on the executive committee that dismissed Hynek Sládek, who edited eighteen issues. By then the newspaper was sinking into debt and its resigned stockholders and their elected officers stopped attending meetings. At least two concerned officers asked Borecký to take charge of Národní noviny. He did so at the beginning of September and promptly published an appeal for support. He accompanied the Silesian who called on local Republicans for money, and he came to terms with the newspaper committee in New York. Those Eastern countrymen sent their capital from stock sales, and St. Louis accepted their man as editor. Since František Mráček had the commitment and education to be a superior editor, this was no concession. In fact it was another gain, one perhaps worth more than the capital, which amounted to $230.

Besides these successful steps to rehabilitate the newspaper financially and intellectually in the fall of 1860, Borecký also wanted to cultivate a readership for it. He founded the Slovanská lípa in St. Louis two years earlier when he “saw the fallen, neglected, indifferent and careless people, without any national awareness, absent of all desire to read, their only pastime and pleasure in cards and drink.” Borecký’s words for the state of his countrymen suggest his passion and sense of mission. His remedy was to “found a reading and educational society that might awaken the subdued Czech spirit.” At least this was how he put it half a century later. Borecký recruited from person to person and “found twelve who gave a dollar each for books,” which he ordered from Jaroslav
Pospíšil’s establishment in Prague. In January 1859 Borecký’s Slavic Linden adopted bylaws.\(^{20}\) The society on the Mississippi resurrected the name of a society in revolutionary Bohemia a decade earlier and invoked its popular appeal for an immigrant quarter forming in the middle of the New World. Borecký moved back to Milwaukee in summer 1861 and carried on there. When he “read Herlossohn’s novels about Huss, Žižka and the last Taborite aloud on winter evenings in a German schoolroom, many men and women gathered to listen.” Herlossohn was a Bohemian native who wrote in German, and his treatments of the kingdom’s history were popular in Czech translation. Borecký also “taught Czech reading and writing to children, and recitation to the older ones ... to make their entertainments more cultured, especially at summer picnics.”\(^ {21}\) Whatever his effect, Borecký had an ample field for his efforts in each generation. When he turned to the minute books of the Milwaukee Slavic Linden as a historical source decades later, he instead found in them a “record of how poor those beginnings were, and how every place lacked men educated enough to write anything meaningful.”\(^{22}\) As for businessmen, they could be philistines. František Červený, brother of a musical instrument manufacturer, organized a fraternal benefit society in Milwaukee to provide payments in case of illness, but he rejected a merger with the Slavic Linden because the latter wanted $25 per year to continue purchases for a reading library. And Červený happened to be Borecký’s classmate and fellow native from the village of Břežany.\(^ {23}\)

But František Mráček (1829-1896) made Slavic Lindens the object of a sweeping itinerary when he left New York for St. Louis to become editor of Národní noviny. He “stopped in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, Racine and Caledonia, where, having convoked the Czechs to meetings, he roused and encouraged them to found educational reading societies and libraries after the example of St. Louis.”\(^ {24}\) The meetings served just as well the need to call out for subscribers and new support for that city’s imperiled newspaper, but the Slavic Lindens also drew Mráček with a personal attraction. They invoked a lost revolution, and Mráček was a prisoner and refugee of that revolution. His parents were prosperous peasants and wanted an education for their
eldest son. At age ten Mráček went from his village school in Nenakonice on the Morava River to the Gymnasium in Olomouc just ten miles upstream. But it was a great social distance, and he went unwillingly. His parents provided for his material comfort, but the school and the city, which was the seat of the Moravian archdiocese, were German-speaking. “Hanák,” as the Czechs of the surrounding countryside called themselves, was an epithet there and the cause of Mráček’s fights with his schoolmates. He eventually used the same epithet during returns to his native village, and this was a sign of his passage across the social divide. But the Prague polytechnic, where he continued his studies, drew him back to the Czech side of this increasingly nationalist divide.

“Eighteen forty-eight was his fateful year,” as his widow recalled, and Mráček “did not hesitate to join the ranks of those prepared to sacrifice themselves for their beloved homeland.” Was he among the students who opposed the army in Prague’s June uprising? Evidently so, because Mráček was arrested after a flight home, sentenced to twenty years for high treason, and imprisoned at the fortress of Kufstein in the Tyrolean Alps. After amnesty Mráček came home to the prospect of police surveillance, and so in spring 1854 he arrived in New York. He did well in the American metropolis. He arrived with enough capital to open an art and framing studio, where he employed the artistic talent that he had practiced in prison. He evidently also had practical talents, because he stayed in business, employed several countrymen, and eventually married and started a family on the strength of this livelihood. But Mráček never abandoned his nationalist passions. When the homeward-bound Vojta Náprstek’s appeared in New York, the meeting of two veterans of the Bohemian revolution “produced so many plans and ideas for the common good, and their every word to each other came from the heart.” When Náprstek left America, Mráček “followed in his footsteps with the solemn aim to carry on his legacy.” Mráček organized get-togethers, called for donations and ordered Czech books. When Jan Borecký wrote a letter “lamenting the sad state of the only Czech newspaper ... and encouraging Mráček to take the good cause upon himself,” Mráček left New York and his successful business behind.
Meanwhile, in Racine on Lake Michigan a bricklayer started another newspaper in Czech. At least this was František Kořízek’s (1820-1899) first trade, as an apprentice aged twelve, while he also played on the fiddle. Later he learned upholstery and locksmithing in the service of Count Kálnoky, but during the revolution he chose instead to be the town postman and a train station laborer. Kořízek’s native Letovice was in the Svitava valley that led north through the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands from the capital of Brno to eastern Bohemia. On January 1, 1860, less than six years after his arrival in Racine, Kořízek published the first issue of Slowan amerikánský. It appeared three weeks earlier than the Národní noviny in St. Louis and was the work of just one man. The Slowan amerikánský was less remarkable as a modern newspaper than as an unlikely achievement. Kořízek had neither the education nor the capital that normally admitted to such a venture. Instead he relied on commitment and sacrifice. Son-in-law Karel Jonáš reported that (a German edition of) Benjamin Franklin’s autobiography motivated Kořízek. A critical Thomas Čapek later argued that it was more likely the closer example of Vojta Náprstek. But preceding any new, American influences were decades of formative experience in Moravia. Kořízek’s act as publisher and journalist make sense as an expression of popular nationalism there and its latest elaboration in the Revolution of 1848. “I was moved to start a newspaper,” he recalled two years before his death, “above all by the unforgettable Karel Havlíček.” Kořízek took inspiration from the journalist’s remark that “every patriot has a wide field for his activity.” In America the most urgent need was a Czech newspaper, Kořízek reasoned, because “without literature there is no nation.”26 Kořízek learned the new trade of typesetting at Racine’s German newspaper, mortgaged his home to buy a used press in Milwaukee, paid “$2 in gold” for each custom-made letter with a Czech accent to extend the standard set of German Gothic type, personally wrote a volume of letters to potential subscribers that amounted to $67 in postage. Then he compiled, translated, wrote and typeset the contents of each issue, and he printed and mailed the copies, all with the help of just his children. He also handled the business matters that arose with the newspaper. To keep it going and to provide for his family, he had to continue his livelihood. In Wisconsin he
worked as a lumbershover and musician. After twenty-four issues Kořízek turned editorship over to a companion from Letovice. Jan Bárt (1821-1898), who affected the second surname “Letovský” after his birthplace, was a watchmaker.

The two Czech newspapers reacted differently to the American Civil War. **Slovak americánský** became more ethnocentric and Panslavic. The setting encouraged this, although Kořízek and Letovský were also more provincial than their counterparts in St. Louis. The war was remote in Racine County, and most Czech readers were landowners in the countryside. The **Národní noviny**, its more worldly editors, and their wage-earning countrymen were in the midst of a city, and it was a frontline city in a frontline state. Local influences and practical calculations led the two Czech newspapers to support different American political parties. St. Louis was Republican, and as we saw above Jan Borecký relied on the party to save his newspaper from insolvency. Moreover, Missouri was a slave state, and slavery could only offend Czechs as a reminder of their recent feudal status. When Texas banned **Národní noviny** in September 1860, Borecký could use it as a ticket to Republican subsidies. In Racine slavery was distant, and **Slovak americánský** expected taxes and hard times for Czech landowners from the Republican Party. Also, Kořízek learned the typesetter’s trade on the **Demokrat**, a local German newspaper, and in St. Louis Borecký and his predecessors looked to the Republican **Anzeiger des Westens**. When war came the **Slovak americánský** dutifully supported the Union cause, but both Czech newspapers became casualties of the war and the falling currency. The last issue of **Národní noviny** appeared on June 24, 1861, soon after editor Mráček announced that he and his typesetter volunteered for the Missouri Home Guard. They and other St. Louis Czechs, including the newspaper’s preceding editors, Jan Borecký and Hynek Sládek, became veterans of the campaign that kept their state in the Union. A month earlier **Slovak americánský** published an invitation from the Russian imperial government for American Czechs to resettle on its new lands on the Amur and Ussuri in the Far East. It was an alternative that made Kořízek and Bárt Letovský even more severe in their criticism of party politics and prospects in America.
as they made greater sacrifices from one issue to the next. By September they even advised their readers on the practical steps of how to return to Austria.  

At the same time Racine became the site of a remarkable meeting that combined what was left of the two moribund newspapers to launch *Slavie*, one that would become surprisingly durable and important. Several roads led to the town on Lake Michigan whose French name means “root.” In mid-June the Prague polytechnic student Vojta Mašek (b. 1839) landed in Boston with Count Anton Nikolaevich Malinovskii, who was on assignment from the Russian imperial government to study frontier settlement and what the American government did for its benefit. He was also to “visit the Czech communities, inspect their condition, and inquire if some 200 families might not be willing to relocate to the Far East with the Russian government’s support.” Mašek was his secretary. They went on via New York and Chicago to the towns and Czech townships on Wisconsin’s coast, including Racine County, Milwaukee and Manitowoc County to “prepare a report for the Russian government.” The Czechs in Caledonia Township, Racine County, impressed Mašek most, and this was where he and Malinovskii lingered. Meanwhile, Jan Borecký arrived in nearby Milwaukee to rejoin his family, refugees from frontline St. Louis. Just days later, at a September 20th *beseda* to benefit the *Slowan amerikánský*, Borecký met Kořízek and suggested a merger of the two Czech newspapers. On Sunday, the 28th and the day of St. Václav, patron saint of Bohemia, Borecký repeated his call to what was evidently a meeting of the Slavic Linden in Caledonia. Now Letovský agreed in the presence of Mašek and Malinovskii. Only Mráček remained absent, and the Caledonians paid to move him and the *Národní noviny* from St. Louis. “Two weeks later” [sic] on October 5th, all the principals convened, the merger became final, and *Slavie* appeared by the end of the month.  

Borecký and Mráček had finished their brief careers as Civil War veterans. Before hostilities began they had wanted to raise a company of Czech volunteers in St. Louis. Just forty men joined, so the Czechs became part of the German Home Guard company
from the First Ward, which was sworn in for a three-month tour on May 7th as Company C, First Regiment, Missouri Reserve Corps, United States Army. Three days later they helped to capture the enemy outside the city at Camp Jackson, the first engagement of the war in Missouri. But Mráček “soon returned gravely ill” from the campaign that followed. He was among the Czechs infected with typhus at Rolla, halfway to Springfield, and Borecký arranged for his care in St. Louis. Their company was at Bird’s Point, Missouri, when it was disbanded twenty days past its tour. Mráček was still not well, but in Caledonia “strength and health suddenly returned to him ... and his spirit became vibrant again.” “Indeed,” his wife recalled half a century later, “the short sojourn among those citizens was the brightest time in Mráček’s life, and we both often said, ‘Here to live, here to die.’”

What are we to make of Mráček’s good feelings in Racine County? Why did early Czech journalism survive and spread from here? How was it different from Bohemian immigrant communities elsewhere? In Caledonia Township Vojta Mašek found “for the most part enlightened countrymen of Protestant confession who were well-read in Czech literature and whom the desire for freedom and not riches drove to America.” They were from eastern Bohemia, from the towns and villages in the present districts of Chrudim, Ústí nad Orlicí and Svitavy. Count Malinovskii “mostly lingered in Racine, where Josef Novotný had a small saloon, the meeting place for all things Czech.” Novotný (1813-1887) founded a Czech library and amateur theater in revolutionary-era Brandýs nad Orlicí, which was the last Bohemian home of the 17th-century Protestant theologian and 19th-century nationalist icon Jan Amos Komenský. In Racine Novotný founded the Slavic Linden and an amateur theater. Six miles northwest of town in Caledonia Township, Jan Eliáš (1827-1875) hosted both meetings on the newspaper merger. His native Sloupnice, which had a Reformed congregation and a Catholic parish, was a frequent site of popular conflict between the two religious communities in the Czech lands. Eliáš’s store, hall and eventual post office became the rationale for a place named Tabor, for the town and Hussite icon in Bohemia. Eliáš’s place was where
twenty-six countrymen founded the Slavic Linden on March 3, 1861, where they met on Sundays to read and sing, and where František Mráček, “so weak that he couldn’t even walk,” arrived with his family half a year later. The Slavic Linden in Caledonia had formed in response to Mráček’s urging, but in this it was not unique. A rural location among Protestant eastern Bohemians was what distinguished this Slavic Linden, the one that acted to save Czech-language journalism in America. It paid $55 to move the property of Mráček’s Národní noviny to Racine.42

At the meeting that followed, another local farmer, like Eliáš and those in the Slavic Linden, took initiative in the newspaper question. František Nechuta (1813-1901) argued most resolutely for the merger, along with Borecký, Novotný and Mašek. And when the discussion on what to call the new newspaper went nowhere, Nechuta, the “passionate admirer of Kollár’s Slávy dcera” (Slavia’s daughter), took the floor and proposed the name Slavie. Jan Kollár (1793-1852), the popular poet of Panslavism, hailed from a Slovak Protestant family. “All applauded,” Mašek recalled, “and the name was adopted unanimously.” (Some did worry that Americans could think it meant “slave” and that it was pro-slavery.)43 Nechuta impressed Borecký, who recalled him as “Mráček’s best, selfless friend,” and as a “well-read Biblical patriarch and prophet among the Caledonian citizens.”44 Seven years later poet Josef Václav Sládek found the walls of Nechuta’s home decorated with quotes from the Bohemian Reformation Kralice Bible.45 Nechuta came to Racine County in a party of eight Moravian families that included those of Kořízek and Bártta Letovský, the editors of Slowan amerikánský. Four of these families, including Nechuta’s, belonged to the Vanovice congregation just five miles east of Letovice. Vanovice was one of the first four communities in the Czech lands after the 1781 Edict of Toleration to send a request to the Miskolc province of the Hungarian Reformed Church for a pastor.46

Nechuta’s brother Karel was recorder of the Slavic Linden, and his fellow founding officers were also from conspicuous places. Vice chairman Jan Mikulecký and treasurer
Jan Eliáš were from the religiously contentious village of Sloupnice.  (So was František Kořízek’s musical partner and Jan Novotný’s business partner, the tailor František Hájek.  Chairman Daniel Střítecký was from a hamlet near Lužice, in the middle of a region where popular, charismatic and anti-clerical forms of Christianity arose in the decades after the Edict of Toleration.  The region and its ethos of criticism and dissent attracted a classic novelist, Teréza Nováková (1853-1912), and became the subject of her eastern Bohemian cycle. The cottage weaver in the eponymous Jiří Šmatlán is a “passionate reader” whose intellectual evolution takes him beyond church authorities to a “dying vision of a just order to come after the Social Democrats triumph in parliament.”  (A Josef Šmatlán, born 1844 in Telecí, squarely in the country of the novel’s setting, came to Cedar Rapids just after the Civil War and made his fortune as a lumber dealer in Schuyler, Nebraska.)  The Caledonians read a newspaper for radical democrats, one from as far away as Switzerland: just a month after it formed, the Slavic Linden turned to František Mrácek for a subscription to Čech, edited by the emigre Josef Václav Frič and French Slavist Louis Léger.  Earlier they supported the Freethinker Vojta Náprstek and the campaign for a Czech newspaper in America.  A Josef Střítecký writing from Racine briefed Náprstek on local efforts, quoted the Panslavic poet Jan Kollár and argued that the prospective newspaper belonged in Wisconsin.  When the New York committee eventually sent the Národní noviny its proceeds from sales of the newspaper stock, $129 was local money and $101 from the Caledonians.

Manitowoc County also had Protestants, but their origins were different, and they were part of a community that became more Catholic.  Jan Heřman (1812-1888) was from a family of “passionate Protestants” and “direct descendants of the [Bohemian] Brethren” in Nebužely, just twenty-three miles north of Prague.  During the revolution he was successively elected deputy to the Bohemian Diet (over the radical democrat Emanuel Arnold), gathered local volunteers to join the “valiant students” in Prague, and as the elected representative of the national church petitioned Emperor Franz Josef I to free Protestants from tithes to the Catholic Church.  Heřman was also “one of the first fighters
in the party of [Karel] Havlíček,” whose liberal and anti-clerical writings he distributed, along with other “freethinking” literature that he smuggled from abroad. A large landowner in Bohemia, Heřman bought a farm and opened a sawmill in Kossuth Township, about eight miles northwest of the lakeside county seat of Manitowoc. The name of this township, where Czechs settled earliest, says much about them: it refers not to the Hungarian revolutionary Lajos Kossuth but to the outspoken Prague Reformed pastor Bedřich Vilém Košut, who pursued a “Protestant effort to tie together religion and nationalism,” styled himself after Jan Hus, and suffered trial and exile after the revolution. Kossuth Township was the site of the first mass meeting of Czechs in America, which we described above, and Heřman was likely one of the wealthy residents prepared to support Náprstek and a newspaper. Perhaps another was Robert Ferdinand Šáry (1832-1903), with whom Heřman opened a distillery. A veteran of the June 1848 rising, Šáry belonged to an “old, wealthy Prague family, which for centuries owned one of the city’s largest breweries.” Just three months after the meeting, Jan Borecký wrote to Náprstek that local newspaper stock sales amounted to $300. As for the early Slowan amerikánský, its only contributing correspondents were Václav Šimonek in Kossuth Township and Josef Satran in Milwaukee. Šimonek (1815-1897), born in Heřman’s Nebužely, had been a Protestant schoolteacher in Ledčice, just fifteen miles to the west near Říp, the hill of the Czech origin myth. And Satran (1829-ca. 1920) was a tailor from the next village.

Jan Heřman emigrated in 1853 with several families. A year later Jan Borecký led “13 families, over 60 individuals, from Nebužely and its surroundings” to America. And when Borecký lived in Manitowoc County, they were coming in increasing numbers from Heřman and Satran’s Elbe Valley region around the towns of Mělník and Roudnice, but also from around Domažlice in southwest Bohemia. Czech settlement would spread across the northern two of Manitowoc County’s five rows of townships and rather more widely across the four rows of Kewaunee County to the north, but its Protestant and Elbian component evidently dwindled. Borecký moved to St. Louis in
May 1857, and in October the Reverend Josef Malý (1829-1909) took charge of a
German parish outside Manitowoc. Malý was a native of the České Budějovice diocese,
where he attended a Gymnasion (Písek) and seminary. In the next decade his
countrymen built and formed a majority in five Manitowoc County churches, and by
1874 they built and sustained seven more in Kewaunee County. Around St. Joseph’s in
Kellnersville, located astride Kossuth and Franklin Township to the west, “Czech
immigrants mostly from Domažlice began to settle and cultivate the still wooded country
en masse in the decade after 1856.” The Domažlice district contained the western
extremity of Czech-speaking territory, bordered Catholic Bavaria, and was evidently a
source of German-speaking Wisconsinites: at the center of Franklin Township was Taus,
the German name for Domažlice. Czech speakers from Domažlice were also prominent
in Kewaunee County and its parishes, while those around the Virgin Mary parish in
Reedsville at the western end of Czech Manitowoc County were “almost all from the
Tábor region,” which was also in southern Bohemia. Liberal Czech institutions
evidently kept to the two eponymous county seats, where Slavic Lindens formed as early
as 1863. On the other, riparian side of the state Czechs formed St. Bartholomew parish
with Germans in Muscoda in 1859. They would form five more parishes in the next
three decades, one in the seat of the diocese at La Crosse and the others scattered with
St. Bartholomew in four different counties across the lower Wisconsin River watershed
downstream from the Sauk-Richland county line.

Racine County was an unusual place, but František Mráček also felt good there because
of the time. It was a time that could be called Racine’s Panslavic fall of 1861. The
collective effort to sustain the new newspaper Slavie, the presence of the Russian Count
Malinovskii, and the negotiations with the Russian imperial government on resettlement
were a definitive experience for the Czechs who lived here, those who came here from
elsewhere to participate in the events, and those who read about it all in Slavie and later
accounts. On October 14th a fund-raising festival for Slavie at Racine’s Titus Hall
brought together stockholders and supporters of the former two newspapers from
Milwaukee to Chicago. “The new social life in Racine came from Slavie and soon after from that question of resettlement to the Amur,” recalled Mráček’s widow Marie half a century later in Odessa. “Meetings bearing on that question were called together, and countrymen from Racine, Caledonia and many from other towns and places in the country came to them.” The spontaneous singing that followed these meetings appealed to emotion and produced solidarity, but the deliberations compounded the effect of the songs with a solidarity of the mind. The discussions among American Czechs eventually produced separate memoranda addressed to Count Malinovskii, to the governor of the Russian Far East, and to Czar Alexander II. They articulated an assertive proposal that detailed Czech expectations on material support from Russian authorities and Czech corporate rights in the Amur basin, including self-government, their own schools and other liberal provisions in legal status and matters of property.

It was an elevating atmosphere, and by all accounts it formed that fall largely around Malinovskii. His secretary, Mašek, recalled that Malinovskii had a “noble character, very freethinking views and a liberal education.” Borecký also recalled that “despite his birth in the upper Russian nobility, he conducted himself democratically among us.” He was a guest of honor at a wedding on the Smrček farm in Caledonia, one of the events that attracted many countrymen from far afield to the county that fall and one that was “celebrated in the Old World [peasant] style to the last detail and lasted several days.” Marie Mráček also recalled his effect at a fund-raising festival, where the “Racine ladies gave a very good account of themselves and outdid one another, all so that the Russian would not think that he had fallen in among uncivilized people.” He showed her his travel diary, where she “read a very sympathetic entry on the Racine society.” Mašek also recalled that Malinovskii “took a liking to Czech society” and that he even learned Czech in his company, while Mašek, who had attended Hanka’s university lectures on Russian in Prague, was unable to oblige.

Mašek and Malinovskii called for two representatives to travel to Russia to discuss terms
with the government and to inspect the prospective lands in the Far East. The Russian government resolved to pay their expenses. Czech immigrants gathered again at Jan Eliáš’s Caledonia hall and elected Jan Bártá Letovský and František Mráček, who turned over to Mašek the editorship of Slavie after just the sixth issue, dated December 4, 1861. To honor their departure “so many countrymen” from the county and from Milwaukee and Manitowoc came to Racine, where the “best hall was rented,” that the “Americans thought that some sort of Czech congress was going on, when instead it was a real Czech ball and amateur theater.” It was the last event of Racine’s Panslavic fall. Russian authorities and Slavophiles like Aleksandr Fedorovich Gilferding, who suggested the resettlement project, lost interest after the January 1863 Polish uprising and its sympathetic reception in Prague. (Vojta Náprstek’s biographer speculates that he conceived the idea of Czech resettlement to Russia in Milwaukee, where German immigrants discussed visions of “compact colonies in America.”) Indeed, even in Racine and Chicago the Slavic Lindens “collected money to support the [Polish] insurrection.” After their Far Eastern odyssey and dealings in St. Petersburg, Bártá Letovský returned home and soon moved back to Cedar Rapids, while Mráček settled with his family in Odessa, Russia, where he died as a city engineer. But Racine County would attract new personalities and remain a center of Czech immigrant journalism and self-articulation.

Mašek remained the only Czech journalist in Racine, but not for long. He invited his Prague schoolmate and student comrade-in-arms, Karel Jonáš (1840-1896), who arrived from London to take up the editorship of Slavie from June 12, 1863, to the end of his life more than three decades later. The importance of Racine would attract more nationalist students. František Boleslav Zdrůbek (1842-1911) arrived on May 12, 1867, Josef Václav Sládek (1845-1912) on August 4, 1868, and his friend Václav Šnajdr (1847-1920) by the end of June 1869. Mašek and Jonáš studied at the Prague polytechnic, while the younger Sládek and Šnajdr did so at the university. All four left Bohemia as victims of official persecution. Zdrůbek studied Catholic theology for one year at Prague
university, converted to the Reformed confession, and continued his studies at Basel. In his case Protestantism was a form of nationalism and protest, but he also had personal ties to the others: Sládek escorted his bride from her native Prague to the wedding with Zdrůbek in Racine. These five men all came of age in Bohemia during the suppression of Czech nationalism and its triumphant reemergence in politics, journalism, education and the street with the monarchy’s turn from neoabsolutism to a constitutional order after the 1850s. In America four of these men would be at the intellectual forefront of Czech journalism for up to half a century, while a fifth (Sládek) would play a kind of counterpoint to them in Bohemia as a literary figure, pioneering Americanist and critic of Czech emigration to America. Jonáš employed Šnajdr on the Slavie and Pokrok, another weekly that he launched in Racine on September 25, 1867, and he employed Zdrůbek on the latter. But within a decade Šnajdr and Zdrůbek would make their own careers as journalists, the former in Cleveland until retirement in 1910 and the latter in Chicago to his death in 1911. Mašek retired from journalism after Jonáš arrived and made his fortune in shipping and other interests in Kewaunee, but he remained involved as “one of the wealthiest countrymen in America” and Jonáš’s loyal benefactor.

The long careers of these embattled students makes their arrival to take up journalism in Racine quite a modernizing break from their ephemeral predecessors. Kořízek and Bártá Letovský used German Gothic type and wrote in a quaint style of Czech that made Slowan amerikánský similar to the Napoleonic-era newspaper of Matěj Václav Kramerius and his sixteenth-century models instead of to Karel Havlíček’s modern newspapers, which they had read a decade earlier in Moravia. The early editors of Národní noviny wrote in a similar conservative style of Czech, with the tortured sentences and unwieldy syntax that came with antiquated Latin and German influences. The first two Czech-American newspapers survived less than two years each and together had six successive editors. They never returned to journalism. Bártá Letovský launched Slovan amerikánský in Cedar Rapids on November 5, 1869, but he was only its publisher. Bártá Letovský, who insisted that his native language was
“Moravian,” was all the more a quaint bird for his anti-Bohemian chauvinism. To edit the paper he invited František Matouš (Ladimír) Klácel (1808-1882) from Moravia, where he was already well-known as a social philosopher and journalist. An Augustinian monk in Brno, where he was the “teacher of [geneticist] Gregor Mendel,” Klácel was a striking example of intellectual evolution from establishment Catholicism to rationalism and even socialism in the Czech homeland. But in Klácel’s case it was a utopian rather than popular socialism, and in America he consumed himself in a lonely crusade for a communal Czech society in his inaccessible journalism of the mind. For all the affirmations of Klácel as an intellectual influence from liberal Czech-American journalists, he was a marginal and decidedly unmodern figure in emigration. Perhaps he attracted the liberals more as the best available object for their myth-making with his martyr-like trajectory of devotion to his cause despite all poverty. Klácel was a native of Moravská Třebová in the Moravian part of religiously unorthodox and freethinking east Bohemia. In America he left Bárta Letovský to edit his own weekly Hlas Jednoty svobodomyslných (Voice of the Freethinkers’ Union) twenty-six miles away in Iowa City from February 19, 1872. Nine years later, after removing to Chicago, Omaha, Milwaukee and New York, he finally gave up “for lack of subscribers.”

Jan Bolemil Erben (1837-1923) “escaped from a Benedictine monastery in Bohemia to Prussia, where he converted to the Protestant church.” After his ephemeral career in Czech journalism as first editor of Národní noviny in St. Louis, he was a “German Protestant pastor.” The pastor of the German congregation in Cat Spring, Austin County, Texas, was another Czech who had left Bohemia for Silesia, where he had served in the Prussian state church. Jozef Ernst Bergmann (1798-1877) and Klácel had attended the eastern Bohemian Piarist school at Litomyšl, where the persecuted Bonifác Buzek (1788-1839) influenced them with his “philosophical liberalism.” Karel Hrubý (1794-1882) studied at the philosophical faculty in Prague and wanted to teach at the university, but “like every Czech [nationalist], he could not overcome the obstacles that foreigners, who governed the university then, put in his way.” Hrubý instead left for the
German states and then (1834) to America, where he was successively a farmer, druggist and Oxford University professor of French and German in southwestern Ohio, opened an “English-German” school in Collinsville, Illinois, and retired to live with his daughter in nearby St. Louis in 1870. All these qualified men were marginal or passing figures in Czech immigrant journalism. What separated them from the new men in Racine who occupied the center and expanded this journalism into new states? They variously belonged to an older generation, pursued religious (or utopian) preoccupations, and still made moves across a Czech-German linguistic divide that nationalism in post-revolutionary Bohemia increasingly vilified.

The neoabsolutist and Germanizing regime there intimidated the nationalist movement and allowed no Czech political newspapers to appear, but students remained outspoken. They were a chronic problem for Anton Freiherr von Päumann (1802-1870), the Gotha native who became Bohemia’s police chief in September 1854 and “wanted to mop up the Czech nationality within six years.” When the Austro-French Piedmontese War undermined the Bach regime in Vienna five years later, the students could be more defiant. At the Prague polytechnic they “followed the example of the Hungarian and Polish students: just as in Pest and Cracow they demanded their national language (Czech) as the language of instruction.” The technical students were bolder than their comrades at the university because their prospective careers were in business and industry, while liberal arts students especially depended on state service for jobs. Among the capital’s secondary schools, Czech student activism was strongest at the Old Town, so-called “Academic” Gymnasion and the nearby reálka in Panská Street, one block from Wenceslas Square. (A Gymnasion had a classical curriculum and prepared students for the university, while a reálka, or Realschule in German, had a more practical curriculum, including the natural sciences and living languages, and it prepared students for the empire’s polytechnical institutions of higher learning.) Josef Wenzig (1807-1876), a German convert to the Czech nationalist movement, presided over the Panská Street reálka, the only secondary school in Bohemia that taught in Czech. Vojta
Mašek came to this school in 1856 from the lower Realschule in Vodňany, in his native part of southern Bohemia, where “not a single student understood German,” yet instruction was in German. A year later Karel Jonáš transferred to the Czech reálka from the Týn school at the Church of St. James. Másek and Jonáš sat together, lived together, became comrades for life, and went on to the polytechnic together.  

On August 20, 1859, Jonáš left Prague to observe conditions in the Czech lands and Vienna—and to gather facts until early October for a pamphlet (in German) on Germanization in the secondary schools. He traveled with the endorsement of the most distinguished figures in the Czech nationalist movement, including politician Dr. František Ladislav Rieger and novelist Božena Němcová. En route he came into the company of Karel Sabina, a writer and radical democrat respected for his eight-year imprisonment after the revolutionary conspiracy of May 1849. Jonáš did not know that Sabina had just become a well-paid informer for police chief Päuermann, who promptly confiscated Jonáš’s pamphlet after he and Mašek paid for its publication. Josef Wenzig published his own pamphlet on the same topic at the same time, which suggests a more than perfunctory relationship between the school director and the recent student at his school. By March 1860 Jonáš was studying English every weekend at the house and salon of Vojta Náprstek, another anti-establishment figure since his return from America two years earlier as a pardoned student activist of 1848. Jonáš also wrote for František Šimáček’s Posel z Prahy (Messenger from Prague). Šimáček’s brother Josef (b. 1837) attended the polytechnic. In 1857 the young František (1834-1885) commenced his newspaper to address the practical concerns of Czech peasants, craftsmen and laborers in the new capitalist era. He conveyed a nationalist philosophy of cooperative self-reliance, instruction on methods of capital accumulation, and awareness of ethnic discrimination, as in the Germanized school system. Frequently quoting Benjamin Franklin, Šimáček invoked a “Calvinist work ethic (industry, thrift) and common sense as the way to prosperity.” Police chief Päuermann knew from his informants that Posel z Prahy had a devoted readership, and he accused the newspaper of nationalist and anti-German
agitation in memos to the viceroy.  

Certainly Karel Jonáš was one of the Czech students best known to the Prague police administration when he joined a demonstration on May 15, 1861. That night twelve thousand people crowded around Charles Bridge for a fireworks display. They were in town for the annual veneration of St. Jan Nepomuk, who was also the unpopular symbol, for nationalists, of the Counter-Reformation as a Catholic, Habsburg and German aggression against the Czech nation. Two hundred young people, mostly technical students, marched down the embankment and sang nationalist songs. The police detained one-fourth of the demonstrators, including Jonáš. Two days later Jonáš and Mašek attended a social evening for students on Střelecký Island that turned into another demonstration. Afterward, as they passed police headquarters on Bartolomějská Street, barely four hundred yards away, thirty policemen arrested them “at bayonet point,” as Mašek recalled forty years later. Mašek was confined to Prague and to his quarters on Wenceslas Square after eight each evening, but Jonáš was banished to his parental home at Malešov, in the countryside around Kutná Hora, some forty miles east of the capital. In these circumstances, they both left the country. Mašek hired on with the Russian Count Malinovskii, and in October Jonáš took refuge in London. On the twentieth Emperor Franz Joseph I issued his October Diploma, a constitutional reform that embodied the federalist principles of the nobility and Czech nationalists. By December 8th crowds in Prague demonstrated against police chief Päu mann as they greeted a new viceroy, who contributed to Päu mann’s dismissal by the end of January. Even earlier Viceroy Count Antal Forgách allowed Josef Baráč, Jonáš’s fellow polytechnic student, to return to Prague. Päu mann had banished him for leading the May 15th demonstration.

At this point the new viceroy might have allowed Jonáš to return as well, but Jonáš wrote more freely abroad in defense of Czech nationalist interests, including the empire’s federalization, which Franz Joseph I abandoned with his 1861 February Patent
in favor of centralization and German predominance. At first Jonáš wrote for Šimáček, then after the New Year also for the new political daily *Národní noviny*. By March Jonáš was writing for fellow emigre Josef Václav Frič, a convicted traitor since the revolutionary conspiracy of May 1849. But Frič’s *Čech*, which had readers in Racine County, expired after just twelve issues. By June 18, 1862, a Prague court fined and sentenced Dr. Julius Grégr, editor of the *Národní noviny*, to jail for printing seven articles, including one from Karel Jonáš. Even a poor correspondent’s livelihood became untenable for Jonáš, and the international community of exiles in London had no use for a Czech nationalist. Karl Marx had been at one with German nationalists when he denounced the Czech revolution in 1848. Alexander Herzen at first provided the new exile Josef Václav Frič a “comfortable existence in the editorial office of his *Kolokol,*” but by March 1860 the two Slavs parted company over Czech politics, which aimed to preserve (and federalize) Austria as protection against a greater Germany and which Herzen (like Marx) denounced as reactionary.

On March 17, 1863, Karel Jonáš arrived in Racine. Here he could rejoin his comrade Vojta Mašek, who prepaid his passage. Here he could also carry on as a Czech nationalist and journalist. Here, after the cosmopolitan but unfriendly exile scene in London, he could feel at home again in a community of supportive countrymen. The previous summer Czechs in America addressed two declarations of solidarity to Dr. Julius Grégr, Jonáš’s persecuted fellow journalist in Prague. One was from New York and the other from Wisconsin. “We ... who still console ourselves with the hope of return to a free Bohemia,” wrote the Wisconsinites, “cannot be indifferent when men of the nation are persecuted with a bitter lot for their and the nation’s beliefs.” An impressive list of signatures endorsed the impassioned text. They were in the name of eight Slavic Lindens and even mentioned the number of members in four of them: Racine (35 members), Milwaukee (30), Manitowoc, Detroit, Rochester, Racine County, Caledonia (21) and New York (22). Rochester, like Caledonia, was a township in Racine County but located at its western extremity. Also signed was the *Český spolek* (Czech society) in
Francis Creek, which was in Kossuth Township, Manitowoc County, with 80 members, and the “Czecho-Slavs living in Norfolk Co. in Canada.” Altogether it was ten associations that declared their solemn solidarity with the Czech nationalist journalist in Bohemia, and seven of them were on the lakeshore of Wisconsin. Here was a new “Slavia” where Jonáš’s countrymen were more numerous than elsewhere in America, where they owned land, and where their national consciousness was so much in evidence. Here Jonáš had better prospects for a livelihood and independence but did not diminish his prospects for importance.

For a student and journalist from Prague and London, Jonáš settled in remarkably well among his small-town and rural countrymen in Wisconsin. When they built a stage and painted their own scenery at Jan Eliáš’s hall in Caledonia Township, Jonáš played in their amateur theater. On August 11, 1864, he married his employer’s eldest daughter (and typesetter), Christine Kořízek, with whom he fathered five children. The following year Jonáš brought his younger brother Bedřich (b. 1846) to Racine, and he married the daughter of saloonkeeper Josef Novotný, Julie, on December 24, 1868. That August Jonáš “bought out Kořízek’s interest” in Slavie. Another daughter of bricklayer Kořízek, Celia, married the Prague university student Václav Šnajdr “soon after” he became editor (September 1873) of Pokrok in Cleveland. Both daughters of Alois Kareš (1825-1885), the only Czech emigration agent in Bremen, married into a rural family in Caledonia Township. Czech society was still egalitarian. Education and social mobility made “better” families, but their origins in farming and the crafts were still recent. Jonáš’s father was a weaver, albeit a master with “several journeymen,” while Mašek’s was a peasant and Šnajdr’s a shoemaker for the Imperial 25th Infantry Regiment.

Jonáš could make Slavie more successful because of his education and experience, but he also relied on a supportive community of countrymen in Wisconsin and on his personal relationships among them. As early as May 1862 the Slavic Linden in
Caledonia sent $21 to help relieve what it respectfully called his “lonely standing” in London. “We also assure you,” wrote the Caledonians, “that if fate allows you no choice and you please us with your presence, you will always find devoted friends in us.”

When Jonáš did come to Racine, he managed to increase Slavie’s number of subscribers by five hundred to 1,250 in less than a year and a half. Two-fifths of those subscribers were in Wisconsin, where he was pleased to report that “only a few of our countrymen” in Racine, Caledonia, Manitowoc and Kewaunee did not subscribe. But Slavie also had a respectable presence everywhere else in the Czech diaspora, with the following numbers of subscribers in the top seven states outside Wisconsin: Iowa (180), Illinois (150), Missouri (80), Ohio (80), Michigan (75), New York (75) and Minnesota (45). From two to fifteen subscribers each resided in eight other states and Canada, while another twenty were “soldiers in the field.” Certainly this was a legacy of Slavie’s origins in the previous decade’s interstate campaign for a Czech-language newspaper, but Karel Jonáš’s skills made it a national forum for the decades to come.

He and his brother drew a modest $50 per month but had annual profits to split as sole owners. They also received donations from supporters, including their new relatives and old friends. Beside his saloon business, Bedřich Jonáš’s father-in-law, Josef Novotný, owned 160 acres in Caledonia and sold lumber to the railroad. Later Otto Kubín, the wealthy chief stockholder of the Atlas brewery in Chicago, who had other business holdings from there to Arizona, became the son-in-law of Karel Jonáš, who was also invested in the brewery. By the end of his life, Karel Jonáš had $30,000 in the safekeeping of another successful businessman, Vojta Mašek, his comrade of youth and later generous benefactor.

Jonáš came to America with a classic nationalist conception of the Czech emigrants: they were a part of the nation, and they could be organized and preserved as such. To accomplish this was a journalist’s calling. In Bohemia Karel Havlíček had pioneered this larger role for the newspaper editor even before the Revolution of 1848, and Jonáš could learn it personally from František Šimáček, who also had a larger potential for national
importance in the absence of electoral and parliamentary politics, which the emperor permitted only after Jonáš left Bohemia. While still in London, Jonáš’s diary “reveals that he contemplated lobbying the U.S. congress for land for ‘Bohemian’ settlement, modeled after the example of the Mormons, in the western United States.” It was a goal that connects Jonáš with various individuals from Central Europe to the American Midwest and with their earlier effort. After the 1848 Revolution Alois Kareš returned home after two years or more as a successful weaver near Pest and then a veteran of the Hungarian revolutionary army. His political discontent led to a new livelihood on commission with German emigration agents. By May 1855 Kareš moved to Hamburg and built his own network in the Czech lands, for which he recruited journeymen and students from the country around his native Vamberk, which was in eastern Bohemia and close to the recent homes of the emigrants in Racine County. Kareš moved up in the trade, but he used his success to work for the compact settlement of his countrymen abroad, which he promoted in brochures addressed to potential emigrants. He took up discussions with the Chilean embassy about its country and with a German colonization society about Fredericksburg, Texas. In October 1856 Jan Bárta Letovský in Iowa City advised him to ask American authorities for a county in Iowa, where allegedly the “revolutionary Hungarians had received Kossuth County.” That same month Kareš distributed a call to mayors in Bohemia and Moravia for collaboration on a Czech colonization project with a sustaining economic relationship to the homeland. By early December the police broke up his momentum and organization when it interrogated Josef Richard Vilímek and banished him back to Vamberk, where his father was a miller. (Millers and their sons were a major cohort in the social and educational mobility that produced the nationalist Czech middle classes.) Less than three years later Vilímek, a graduate of the polytechnic, was back in Prague, where he resumed what would be a major career as a journalist and publisher, and he was back in clandestine contact with Kareš, now in Bremen, to whom he supplied books for distribution to the Czech diaspora in America. En route to his exile Jonáš visited Kareš, a “close acquaintance of Vojta Náprstek” who “facilitated Jonas’s voyage to England ... with
Náprstek, Kareš, Frič, eastern Bohemia, Racine County, the Prague polytechnic—Jonáš was in the midst of what was already a complex and international Czech nationalist network so early in the mass migration to America, a network not entirely lost to history thanks to the diligent Austrian imperial police and its informers. The American Civil War ended in April 1865, and on the last day of that year Jonáš was elected chairman of a three-day convocation of American Czechs that he organized in Chicago, where his compatriots were already more numerous than in any other single location and where the Slavic Linden had built a hall whose September 17, 1864, opening ceremony was itself a national event, one that the Racine Slavic Linden attended en masse. Ten Slavic Lindens and at least six other associations sent delegates, who numbered twenty-two, to Jonáš’s convocation, where he presided over the founding of what was to be a national organization for the Czechs in America, one that adopted his newspaper as its organ. The Slovanská jednota, or “Slavic Union,” was to support “national culture and to look after the material life of Czech-Americans.” Toward this end it promptly “urged the founding of Czech schools, and recommended that 2 June, the anniversary of the 1848 Prague Slavonic Congress, be celebrated.” The delegates were “mostly young men” who attracted a “large audience of Chicagoans” to their proceedings. Their most important resolution was to petition the United States Congress to reserve lands for a Czech colony, and they elected Karel Jonáš and Jan Bořemil Erben as their representatives. Erben and delegate Jan Borecký were at least two familiar figures from the older and earlier generation that made a start at Czech-language journalism and formed the Slavic Lindens.

Now the Lindens were to be part of something larger. As if to announce and envision itself as a counterpart in America, the Slavic Union at its founding convocation resolved to address a greeting to the Bohemian Diet in Prague. It was another part of the impressive display and impressive expectations that the three days in Chicago produced,
but the organization that was to carry on and make these expectations into reality foundered. Only fifteen delegates from just six associations attended its second convention, in Chicago at the beginning of 1868. By now monies amounted to the $300 that the founding convention had called for to send Jonáš and Erben to Congress, but instead the Slavic Union loaned $200 to the Chicago Slavic Linden and the rest to Jonáš for his new weekly, _Pokrok_, which he refused. The second convention also transferred the Slavic Union’s executive committee from Chicago to Racine.\textsuperscript{131} There Karel Jonáš was in charge, and his brother’s father-in-law, Josef Novotný, was secretary. Ironically, Jonáš did go to Washington: not to the United States Congress, but to the embassy of the Russian Empire! There, on October 20, 1868, in a delegation of no less than eight individuals, he submitted a proposal in the name of the Slavic Union to Czar Alexander II for the resettlement of Czech emigrants from America to Russia’s farming frontier north of the Caucasus.\textsuperscript{132}

The detailed proposal was like the one that had already come out of Racine County earlier in the decade. It called for Russia to provide transport, inexpensive land and self-government for “large colonies in suitable areas on its southern peripheries in Europe or Asia.” Jonáš and his men in Racine wanted not just to transfer Czechs from America but also to divert the ongoing Transatlantic emigration of their countrymen to Russia. They had deep concerns about the “development of the Slavic nationality” in America and “its preservation for the future.” What endangered the Czech nationality was “distance from the Slavic world, life among a completely foreign element that assimilates [them], and also dispersion” around the country. While the “ruling elements” did not restrict the Czech immigrants, the language barrier and vast distances made them powerless, so that “efforts to establish, develop and preserve the Slavic nationality” were in vain. In Russia “education in the ancestral language” would produce a more satisfactory young generation. If Russia accepted the terms proposed, then it would enjoy a net return in capital, skills and development, because the “emigration of American Czecho-Slavs would be massive.” As its negotiator the Slavic Union named Vasilii Ivanovich Gubin, a
law student at Moscow university, correspondent for the newspaper Moskovskie vedomosti, and member of the Moscow Slavic Committee.¹³³

In Slavie this new project had first appeared on June 3, 1868, when Jonáš published a letter from Julius Grégr, editor of the Prague daily Národní listy, who urged resettlement to southern Russia, where the “soil was fertile and a Czech state could be established.” In the previous year the Czech political leadership in Bohemia and Moravia had very publicly traveled to Moscow and cultivated relationships and Panslavic solidarity there in protest against the Austro-Hungarian compromise and constitution that entrenched the monarchy’s two dominant nationalities in power and frustrated Czech efforts for a federalization that would empower the Slavic majority. The new connections in Russia could be used to respond to another problem: rising Czech emigration to America, where the Prague politicians and journalists could turn to Karel Jonáš. By September 23rd Slavic Union chairman Jonáš announced in Slavie that he and secretary Novotný had drafted what was evidently the proposal that they submitted to the Russian embassy less than a month later. The draft still required approval from the executive committee, which was to meet in Cleveland on October 4th. Jonáš promoted the Russian alternative in his weekly to the end of the year, but he evidently expected to host a public debate and to assist a popular response that never occurred.¹³⁴ In its report on the matter, the Russian embassy regarded the Slavic Union’s proposal, which Gubin had urged on personally in Racine, as an “expression of the thought and goals of Czech leaders” in America. Could these leaders mobilize a popular following? The embassy was doubtful but open to reassessment when Russia became the subject of the Slavic Union’s next convention.¹³⁵ That never took place, and Jonáš published a final financial account as a belated requiem for the Slavic Union in Slavie on July 17, 1872.¹³⁶ The Russian embassy recommended a financial requirement to selectively attract wealthier farmers from America to a small pilot Czech colony that would then attract immigrants directly from Bohemia, and the Caucasian viceroy, Grand Duke Mikhail in Georgia, wanted no special expenses and privileges for foreigners. So, the foreign ministry in St. Petersburg eventually rejected
the Slavic Union’s proposal in a dispatch to Washington dated September 11, 1869. Just eleven days later, back from an “extensive journey through Iowa and Minnesota,” where he admired the “growth of the railroads,” Jonáš published an article on the “Great Future of the Northern States of the Union.” It was an endorsement of Czech settlement westward, and Slavie carried it to what was already a widespread community of readers.137

The proposal to Czar Alexander II suggests that five years after coming to America Jonáš painfully realized that he was in a population of countrymen that would not sustain the Czech linguistic culture and consciousness that mattered so much to him as a nationalist and journalist. It was enough time to observe the patterns of settlement, power and assimilation. Even in Wisconsin, Czech settlements were far apart and extended over a few townships at best. They were too small and scattered to support the kind of social development that could counteract the assimilation that was already evident in the second generation. The turn to Russia was a well-practised defensive instinct and sentiment in contested Bohemia, but Jonáš tempered emotion with the practical attitudes that were also well-developed in Czech nationalism. The proposal to the czar focused on the practical matters of resettlement, and Jonáš set the project and the Slavic Union aside when his countrymen’s indifference became clear. Less than one year after drafting the proposal to the czar, Jonáš sanctioned a completely different course for his countrymen: instead of removing to a kindred Russia and concentrating to form presumably one self-governing territory, they were to consider further locations in an ethnolinguistically uncongenial America. He had retreated from the grand nationalist project of leading and moving the Czech immigrant population with an instrument like the Slavic Union. He had learned something of the limits of central direction and appreciated the power of local and popular self-direction. But perhaps he did not discount the possibility that the Czech immigrant population could sustain something of its essence and separate existence. Its size, structure, distribution and settlements were still changing. Perhaps its popular actions and American conditions could eventually
work to conserve group identity. Perhaps a different situation could arise in the new states to the west: a larger, more concentrated and more isolated Czech settlement. In any case, if ordinary Czech immigrants would make their own way in America and would not enliven and follow a body like the Slavic Union, Slavie could still serve and perhaps influence them as a weekly forum.

Czech secondary migration in America was extensive and complex but not unorganized. It proceeded from Wisconsin and from St. Louis, Chicago and more easterly cities to Iowa and Minnesota, then from all these places to the Northern Plains. Individuals and families made their own decisions, but they also influenced each other and collaborated. The chain migration of relatives, friends, neighbors and individuals with various other relationships was the most productive form of organization, and a landmark history of Czech settlement in Nebraska and its individual counties records many personal examples. Czechs also formed colonization clubs in cities. In Chicago on February 12, 1863, almost three years before the Slavic Union appeared, “many Czechs gathered for a discussion on founding a settlement somewhere in the West.” They elected three representatives, including Chicago Slavic Linden activist Jan Praus (b. 1833), and published a call in Slavie to countrymen elsewhere. The Česká osada (Czech settlement) association, founded five years later, attracted 500 members in Chicago and another 300 to its branches in Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee and other cities. Only a small minority actually left Chicago in four parties by 1873, but they founded the Czech settlements in the southeast counties of South Dakota and in neighboring Knox County, Nebraska, that chain migration would later enlarge. Czech newspapers could assist that private form of migration as well by publicizing the personal letters on which it relied.

In the winter of 1875 František Švehla (b. 1845) wrote to “all the different Bohemian papers published in the United States” to extol the land around his new homestead in Ellsworth County, central Kansas, as the “best escape for the unemployed of the congested cities, as well as an escape from the cruel tyranny of the Austrian Empire.” It
was the same stand that Karel Jonáš and Jan Oliverius took seven hundred miles to the east in Racine and Chicago, respectively, after the Panic of 1873. In response Švehla had “as high as a dozen letters at a time in the post office at Wilson, and answered them all.” By springtime his countrymen began to arrive, and in his account for the Kansas State Historical Society forty years later Švehla named many individuals. They came from rural Nebraska, Iowa and Minnesota; from Milwaukee, Detroit, Saginaw, Toledo and Allegheny City; and even directly from Bohemia and Moravia. Arrivals from New York were members of a colonization club that enlisted city authorities to secure reduced rates for transport by railroad. The largest party of arrivals, twelve families and five single men, belonged to a Chicago club. It had failed when “few were willing or able to pay their share” for a “committee to be sent out to discover a favorable location,” but editor Jan Oliverius used the weekly Chicagský věsník (Chicago herald) to revive it. Back in Wilson Township, Jan Charvát from Racine built a Bohemial Hall for the growing Kansas community, and when a reading society formed there on May 2, 1880, it printed bylaws its bylaws in Slavie.¹⁴⁰

Karel Jonáš and the journalists who came after him could not mold a new Bohemia of their nationalist conceptions, but they could influence their countrymen’s American migration and community development in collaboration with men like František Švehla. He shared their modest social origins in rural Bohemia, where his father was a “master wheelwright” in the south (Albrechtice, Písek district), but instead of a Bohemian education he had American experience. In Iowa’s Winneshiek County by age nine, Švehla attended a Ft. Atkinson public school for two winters, enlisted in Company D, Sixth Iowa Cavalry Regiment, on October 6, 1862, for a three-year tour in pursuit of the Sioux across the vast Dakota Territory, and homesteaded in Saline County, Nebraska, until a ruinous prairie fire motivated his personal campaign for Czech settlement in Kansas.¹⁴¹ The peasant son, Prague university alumnus and poet Josef Václav Sládek, who was the same age as Švehla, also knew the country. But to him the countrymen in America were a “bough severed from the trunk that will soon die,” as he put it in “Lost
Souls.” The story appeared in the Prague daily *Národní listy*, where he was editor for Anglo-American affairs in the years 1870-1875, after his two-year sojourn in Wisconsin, Chicago, St. Louis and Texas.¹⁴²

For Karel Jonás, Švehla and Sládek embodied the poles of his emotional and intellectual landscape in America: hope and doubt, opportunity and illusion. Did he find a meaningful place between them? On June 13, 1870, Sládek arrived at his childhood home in Zbiroh. Barely two weeks earlier, on May 28th, Karel Jonáš let Václav Šnajdr, Sládek’s comrade from the university, edit *Slavie* as he left home for just “a few weeks.” Instead, it would be eighteen months. He wanted to see Bohemia again, and he conferred with George Bancroft, the historian and American ambassador in Berlin, who had made an agreement with the south German states three years earlier on the status of American citizens on their territory. From a Silesian spa on the Bohemian border, Jonáš was working with Vojta Náprstek in Prague and the American ambassador in Vienna on his own legal status when the Franco-Prussian War opened, and from September to February he followed Bismarck’s armies as a correspondent for *Národní listy* and *Posel z Prahy* in Prague, as well as for American newspapers. When the German Empire arose from the war, compromise with the Czechs became a defensive priority for Austrian emperor Franz Joseph I, who appointed Count Hohenwart to form a new cabinet for that purpose. Hohenwart announced an amnesty for press law violations on his first day in office, February 7, 1871. Even Josef Václav Frič, who had carried on a publicity campaign against the Habsburg state under the cover of Prussian occupation five years earlier, used it to return from exile, and by May 14th Jonáš was speaking to an audience at Vojta Náprstek’s salon in Prague. To permanently rehabilitate his status he consulted first the senior Czech political leaders, František Palacký and František Ladislav Rieger, and then Count Hohenwart in Vienna. At the same time he joined the debate on the Bohemian compromise in the Czech press and even published two books in Prague. In one he argued in the very title that “federation will make Austria strong and satisfy both Germans and Slavs.” In the other he offered an account of “American federalism and
self-government.”

Jonáš seemed on his way to the promising career in Bohemia that he had had to abandon as a polytechnic student more than a decade earlier. On September 12th the emperor sanctioned an agreement on Bohemia’s autonomy, but opposition from Germany, Hungary and especially the German-speaking population and press in Bohemia forced a reversal. On October 25th the Hohenwart cabinet submitted its resignation, and just three days later Posel z Prahy printed a “lengthy article” on Jonáš, his recent work and his “departure from Prague.” The failed Bohemian compromise would end the so-called era of constitutional experiments, and the multi-ethnic monarchy would stand and fall with its German-Hungarian dualism of dominance over the next half century. In Bohemia it unleashed an ugly press war that carried the “siege mentality and almost complete break between the politicians over to the population” on both sides of the Czech-German ethnolinguistic divide. After Hohenwart the politics of federalism versus centralism increasingly coarsened into a politics of Czech against German nationalism. Jonáš evidently sensed all this. In any case, he had failed to put his legal status in order, and he could hardly look forward to a career while the Prague police confiscated only the Czech newspapers for excesses. In November the justice ministry in Vienna made the press regime even harsher, and in December alone the police confiscated Czech papers on twelve occasions. By then Jonáš was back in Racine, where he soon closed the books on the Slavic Union and set out on a more pragmatic course, including a very successful political career in the Democratic Party. At the beginning of his European sojourn Jonáš had defended Czech emigration to America in a “brief polemic with his old acquaintance Karel Sabina,” who would at last be unmasked as a police informer two years later. If Jonáš could hope during the Prague spring of the Hohenwart ministry that emigration might become unnecessary, that hope was now gone.
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CHAPTER V
CLEVELAND PROGRESS IN CONFLICT WITH CATHOLICS

While Karel Jonáš was away in Europe, a newspaper that he had launched in Racine became the vehicle for the first court trials between Czech Freethinkers and Catholics. The trials escalated a conflict that would keep the Czech immigrant population segregated into two hostile camps that would be unable to move past their resentments and begin to cooperate until the last year of World War I and of Thomas Masaryk’s campaign for Czechoslovak independence. The trials would make Cleveland the first major theater in that conflict, major because of its methods, setting and audience. The resort to lawsuits involved the surrounding Anglo-American society and its authorities in a personal problem between a newspaper editor and a priest in the inconspicuous and opaque enclave that was the Czech immigrant community, its language and its few blocks of Cleveland. This kind of escalation exposed the community, where feelings would harden on both sides as the proceedings unfolded and perceptions of betrayal and damaged reputations lingered. A few years later the newspaper editor, František Boleslav Zdůbek, would bring the conflict to Chicago, the largest Czech community in the country. But his successor at the Pokrok (Progress), Václav Šnajdr, would keep Cleveland just as important and embattled. Pokrok opened the newspaper front in the contest for the allegiance of the Czech immigrants in America between Freethinkers and Catholics, and Šnajdr edited his own Dennice novověku as its more durable sequel from 1877 to his retirement in 1910.

Jonáš launched the weekly Pokrok in Chicago on September 25, 1867, but whether he did so with pleasure or reluctance is not clear from the accounts of two acquaintances. According to Lev Palda, who recalled a personal conversation with Jonáš, Slavie received “more and more polemical letters and essays on religion” by 1867, but Jonáš would not publish them there. He wanted Slavie to embrace the entire immigrant ethnic group, to “belong to all Czechs whatever their differences.” But Jonáš also wanted to
“provide for the religious freethinkers a newspaper of their own,” and this is what he intended *Pokrok* to be.¹ Jan Borecký’s account suggests more reluctance: the “hotheaded freethinkers” whose missives Jonáš would not publish accused him of “selling out to the Jesuits,” and so Jonáš, “still so young, let a few agitators carry him along into” publishing *Pokrok*, an act that Borecký would “hear him regret.”² Jonáš was certainly closer to Borecký, a leading figure in the Slavic Lindens of Milwaukee, Chicago and Racine during the 1860s, than to Palda, who was more of an acquaintance from the 1890s. But Borecký wrote to discourage divisive religious polemics among his countrymen, and he avoided the subject of his own role in *Pokrok*. Yet thirty years earlier its editor, noting Borecký’s departure from Racine to a homestead in Caldwell, Kansas, praised him as a “devoted disseminator of *Pokrok*.³” That was a month before the weekly ended its ten-year career, when it had already perfected its anticlerical reputation. And Palda’s editor noted that “Chicago freethinkers, with Jan Borecký at the forefront, started the campaign for a newspaper that soon led to *Pokrok*, published with money from Alois Kareš in Bremen.”⁴

As early as 1862 Jonáš published a letter from Chicago in *Slavie* that mentioned a religious divide: in a city with “some 500 Czech families, the Slavic Linden had just 53 members” because too many countrymen use “religion as an excuse and say that the Linden is a center of nonbelievers.”⁵ Three years later “at the first June meeting the St. Václav society presented a call for support toward construction of a church and a Czech Catholic school.” The Slavic Linden “resolved that its amateur theater troupe would stage a play for the benefit of the Czech Catholic building fund,” but objections after adjournment led to a new vote at the next meeting, where a two-thirds majority rejected any support. For its part, the St. Václav society, which had the “fathers and mothers of 85 families” as founding members, ignored the Slavic Union convention at the Linden six months later.⁶ After the convention, its chairman Karel Jonáš regretted the absence of “delegates from Catholic organizations” in *Slavie*, where he drew on the many religious differences in England and America to argue that these should “not stand in the way of
Jonáš appealed to the Catholics not to segregate themselves from other Czechs in America, but it was an appeal against attitudes and behaviors already entrenched in Bohemia, where secular nationalism “drove” Catholics into a “ghetto” with a prodigious defensive capacity for forming parallel institutions but with less ability to overcome the “cultural inferiority” that isolation and self-isolation imposed. Of course nearly all Czechs were Catholics, but they were increasingly indifferent matrikoví katolíci, the elegant term for those who were Catholic only in the documentary sense of entries in the church’s vital records. Those committed enough to inhabit the “Catholic ghetto” were a minority. The revolution worked in favor of a secular and anticlerical majority. As early as 1849 the priest and popular journal editor Václav Štulc “reviewed the Catholic clergy’s contributions to the Czech national revival, which meant that they needed to be reviewed, because they were being forgotten,” despite their extent and recent date, under the influence of secular nationalism and its cult of the Bohemian Reformation. At the same time Štulc clashed with the liberal journalist Karel Havlíček over what was to be, in Prague’s Karlín suburb, the first working-class church. In an early version of a controversy that would become commonplace in Czech immigrant America, Štulc wanted to raise capital by popular collection, which Havlíček criticized as an injustice to the poor by a wealthy church and upper clergy. Havlíček articulated a Czech liberal nationalist anticlericalism in his call for the Catholic Church to renounce power and dogma to become a more useful social and spiritual institution. Former friends, Havlíček and Štulc were just the most prominent examples of the “intellectual and spiritual parting of ways between the Catholic Church and the majority of Czech society.”

In the American Midwest the ubiquitous Jan Borecký might have marveled at the transformation of Karel Alois Vinařický, whose liberal sermons he remembered from 1848 Bohemia. Just three years after the revolution Vinařický was chosen as the compiler for a new “Czech school reader that was to be pro-Habsburg, have a ‘Catholic
tendency’ ... and avoid any ‘Hussite’ subtext.” By the end of the decade Vinařický was editing a journal devoted to “apologetics and polemics” against “everything that interested the modern, liberal and nationalist middle classes.” But by then undesirable attitudes had spread lower and farther to the social classes and rural places of the Czechs who emigrated to America. In Petrovice (now in okres Příbram), a village in the Catholic bastion of southern Bohemia, the potter Jan Novák (b. 1819) was a “loyal subject” of the emperor, a veteran of nine years with the army in Hungary, and an “exemplary Christian” until the revolution changed his consciousness. Then he challenged the local priest and lost respect for the “ruler and the church,” who had “taken back the freedom they had promised the nation before God.” Novák settled and wrote a capable memoir in Caledonia Township, just a few miles from Karel Jonáš’s editorial office in Racine, where he could hear a similar story from his own father-in-law. When the priest in Letovice after the revolution refused to bury a woman whose widower could not pay the required fee to the church, František Kořízek and his friend Jan Bárta buried the woman in the Catholic cemetery on their own authority. And later they arranged for an army priest to consecrate the Svitava River to free their fellow citizens from dependance on the church for holy water. Moravia was also a Catholic bastion, but during the revolution villagers petitioned the diet to nationalize “all church properties” and to fix a state salary for the clergy, who were “individuals to whom excessive incomes accrue without the least work or exertion.” The Moravian villagers still described themselves as impoverished “workers in Lord’s vineyard,” a once popular, Catholic refrain. By then popular usage had secularized this common phrase, whose incidence could be studied as a measure of advancing nationalist consciousness in 19th-century Czech society. The apostate priest Tomáš Juránek used the new refrain when he took two lines from the Panslavic poet Jan Kollár as the motto for a tract that he wrote in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin: “Let us all work with a spirit trained forth / On the nation’s ancestral field.” The Czech peasants and middle classes had turned from the “Lord’s vineyard” to their own earthy “nation’s ancestral field.”
But the Catholic minority did not dwindle away or come to be completely at odds with the times. The lower clergy, which came from rural families in the Czech-speaking hinterland, could work in both places, the “Lord’s vineyard” and the “nation’s ancestral field,” just as they had done in the decades before the revolution, when they had cultivated the Czech literary language and disseminated its printed culture in larger numbers and more places than most other social groups. As for the laity, its scope for activism increased with immigration to America, where the church was more of a missionary venture still in development and not the familiar and formidable institution grounded in the state and nobility that it was in Bohemia. In Chicago the St. Václav society was a successful lay initiative to establish a Czech parish. At first the new parish repeated the disappointing experience of St. Jan Nepomuk in St. Louis, which had no lasting or effective resident priest since its founding in 1854 as the first Czech parish outside Bohemia. But the fortunes of both vacant but strategic urban parishes changed at the same time. Father Josef Hessoun (b.1830) arrived in St. Louis, the seat of an archdiocese, on September 30, 1865, and would remain the priest at St. Jan Nepomuk until his death on July 4, 1906. Father Josef Molitor (b. 1842) first led services at St. Václav, in the seat of another archdiocese, on October 28, 1866, and would carry on there to his death on August 23, 1906. Both responded to calls from the two respective archbishops, who acted on the initiative of their Czech immigrant parishioners.

Hessoun came from the southern Bohemian diocese of České Budějovice, from a peasant family in a village (Vrcovice) just outside Písek, where he began Gymnasium studies, which he completed, along with the seminary, in České Budějovice. It was a diocese whose long-serving Bishop Jan Valerian Jirsík (1851-1883) made into a bastion of Czech Catholic nationalism. Long before the revolution he was both a founder (1833) and contributing author of the Dědictví svatojanské publishing society, which intended to “1. cultivate religiosity, 2. perfect our beloved language, and 3. reward Czech authors, so that they might be encouraged and receive decent compensation for their work.” It was a union of Catholic and nationalist goals, and Jirsík would successfully work for
both to the end of his life and clerical office. To “counter the mole-like work of contemporary liberalism,” Jirsík used “modern methods” with skill and entusiasm: he promoted Catholic literature, founded lay associations, and took his personal charisma to every parish in his diocese. In 1867, “at a time of great attacks against the church, concordat, church weddings and church oversight of the schools, Jirsík stood among the foremost defenders of the church’s rights.” Yet four years earlier he “left the Vienna parliament in solidarity with the other Czech deputies” to protest the turn to centralism and German predominance. The “many declarations of support” for Jirsík made him the object of an “extensive official investigation.” Undeterred, Jirsík used his own funds to open a Czech-language Gymnasium in České Budějovice after aldermen moved the imperial education ministry to reject his proposal for the school and even to cancel Czech-speaking classes at the existing German Gymnasium in the second half of 1867. Jirsík’s motivation was to keep his seminary attractive to Czech-speaking peasant sons.

The young Josef Hessoun would have already been well acquainted with Jirsík, who “regularly visited the seminarians and spoke to them.” Jirsík ordained Hessoun on July 31, 1853, and Hessoun was the priest at two successive parishes in his diocese for the next twelve years. Jirsík would symbolically sanction Hessoun’s work in America by naming him honorary canon of České Budějovice after 1870. Hessoun arrived in St. Louis with the energy and example of an extraordinary mentor in the Bohemian Catholic Church. Soon the successes of the two clerics, Hessoun and Molitor, would alarm the Freethinkers. In St. Louis Hessoun opened a parish school just four years after his arrival. He had raised $9,000 among his parishioners for a building, and he enrolled 230 children. Regarded as “incapable of any progress, the poor Czechs suddenly built a beautiful school, the likes of which few other communities have to show,” Father Hessoun wrote home triumphantly. Before the end of that first school year, on May 15, 1870, he presided over a celebration to inaugurate construction of an impressive new church in stone. Sixteen priests and the city’s Irish and German Catholics, including some 700 of the latter from their fraternal benefit society alone, joined the nearly 200
Czechs of the St. Václav society and their orchestra in a parade. It was on St. Jan Nepomuk’s day, the day that Karel Jonáš and other polytechnic students had chosen for their nationalist counter-demonstration in Prague nine years earlier, and one wonders what Jonáš made of his circumstances and those of his American countrymen now. For Hessoun, the parade was their vindication: “St. Jan Nepomuk had not abandoned the name of his faithful countrymen in disrepute.” Hessoun boldly took on a large debt, made haste and built in grand (and Gothic) style because “only one-third” of his countrymen in St. Louis were parish members but many others used the “excuse that they have no space in our church and can’t understand the sermons in other churches” to lapse into “wild company” in the saloons.\footnote{26} The new church was consecrated just six months later on November 27th.\footnote{27} The following year Father Josef Molitor matched Hessoun’s scale and tempo to build a second church, school and parish in Chicago, also called St. Jan Nepomuk, on the South Side.\footnote{28}

All this could be dismissed as the recreation of the Catholic “ghetto” in America: the St. Jan Nepomuk school in St. Louis had 300 children in 1875, which suggests no great expansion of the parish.\footnote{29} But Fathers Hessoun and Molitor were prepared to contest allegiances beyond their parishes. On August 7, 1867, Karel Jonáš’s Slavie announced that the insolvent weekly Pozor in St. Louis had ceased publication.\footnote{30} Just two weeks later Hessoun bought it out and moved his new press to Chicago, because “that city was the center of the Czech population.”\footnote{31} In October Father Molitor began editing the weekly Katolické noviny.\footnote{32} That was just after Karel Jonáš launched Pokrok, but even if the “Catholic newspaper” was a response to Pokrok and not vice versa, it arose on the ruins of a predecessor that had carried this bold declaration: “A weekly devoted to progress and radical politics.”\footnote{33} Such irony could only increase the shock among Freethinkers. With Hessoun’s well-connected mentor, Bishop Jan Valerian Jirsík, the Katolické noviny had no lack of material from the Catholic literary camp in Bohemia. And if the newspaper expired after barely six months,\footnote{34} it was to be no consolation to the Freethinkers: by January 1872 Hessoun launched its durable successor, Hlas (Voice), in
St. Louis. In the five years after 1878 it would double its number of subscribers to some four thousand, and the succession of talented clerics and laymen that it attracted as editors and authors would be another measure of its success.

As for Pokrok, Jonáš engaged Josef Pastor (1841-1899) as its editor from New York, where he was a stenographer for Oswald Ottendörfer, influential publisher of the Staatszeitung. Pastor was an example of how the large and established German immigrant press and society could be a refuge and a reservoir where qualified Czechs could work until alternatives arose on the struggling papers and ventures in their own language. Born in Hostokryje, a village outside Rakovník, Pastor completed the Žatec classical Gymnasium (1863) on the other side of the language divide in nearby northern Bohemia. After sojourns in Galicia and Russia, he arrived in the United States three years later. He demonstrated his abilities to Jonáš with letters to Slavie. But after six months at Pokrok, Pastor was in grim circumstances. Jaroslav Vostrovský (1837-1901), a successful tailor and shopkeeper in women’s apparel, invited him to visit Cedar Rapids. “I am chained in the foul and oppressive city,” Pastor replied and blamed poverty and endless hours, because Pokrok was his work alone, with one typesetter as his only help. He had long resisted advice to publish a call for material support, but now he had no choice. Pastor had coped with poverty in Bohemia and as a cigarmaker in New York, but now it was too much for a “person to work intellectually.” Jonáš was evidently aloof, and just after Pastor’s personal letter to Vostrovský he passed Pokrok off to Josef Zrcadlovský, whom he announced as its new publisher. A veteran of the Polish struggle against “czarist despotism” who affected a Czech calque for his German surname (Spiegelhauer) and who then worked on the German-language Czech nationalist newspaper Politik in Prague, Zrcadlovský was part of Jonáš’s network in Bohemia.

But Jonáš’s two fellow nationalists and liberals, who were also close to him in age, soon abandoned Pokrok. Pastor abruptly resigned. “Free thought is out,” he explained in a
brief, angry note to Vostrovský, with a return address care of Jan Borecký. Now the newspaper was to “deceive the people ... so that Zrcadlovský and Kareš can fill their pockets with Russian rubles.” It was a reference to the prospective resettlement of Czechs from America to Russia, in which Jonáš would in fact be the chief protagonist.

Two days later survival was on Pastor’s mind: he was prepared to “work by the sweat of [his] brow” and inquired if Vostrovský might not know of opportunities for him in Iowa. But Vostrovský evidently sympathized more with Zrcadlovský, who thanked him for “not believing the malicious stories that Mr. Pastor was spreading around.” Zrcadlovský was personally in favor of Russia as the destination if Czechs “must emigrate” from their homeland, but he “never dreamed of discussing it in Pokrok,” which is strictly “devoted to truth in religion.” Zrcadlovský was also more agreeable and forgiving than Pastor, whom Zrcadlovský had rewarded with a “decent pay” ($12 per week) and whom he would still welcome back. But Zrcadlovský tired of controversy, sought anonymity as a clerk for a Czech shopkeeper in Kewaunee County, married his daughter and asked Vostrovský about opportunities in Cedar Rapids or “maybe somewhere further west.” Pastor tried to carry on in the Czech immigrant press. At the St. Louis Národní noviny he still attacked Zrcadlovský, who explained privately that if he “took up” the Russian resettlement issue, it was only because Jonáš’s Slavie took the lead. Pastor eventually returned to the New York Staatszeitung, and his successor in St. Louis, the poet Josef Václav Sládek, used the Národní noviny for a cautionary sketch on the miseries of the Czech emigrant press after his return to Prague. In 1871 Pastor took a brief turn at that weekly’s Chicago successor, Nová doba, until its destruction in that year’s great fire. Then he made a more successful career as an emigration agent in Hamburg, where he issued České osady v Americe in the years 1884-1891. It was a monthly of almost scholarly quality on the “Czech settlements in America.”

Karel Jonáš did not let Pokrok expire. František Boleslav Zdrůbek, “despite his aversion to public life, was prevailed upon” to became its next editor, which he announced under
the title “To my countrymen!” in issue no. 31 on May 11, 1868, when he also revealed that he had already contributed to the newspaper under the pseudonym “Pravdomil” (Truthseeker). As a familiar local resident, Zdrůbek was certainly a choice of convenience. But if Jonáš wanted Pokrok to be a lightning rod for controversies with the Catholics so that he and Slavie could continue to pursue leadership and unity above the factions, then he had found the right conductor. Strictly speaking, Zrcadlovský was still in charge. This is clear from his first-person, singular verbs and pronouns in a June 12th letter to Vostrovský on the latter’s business advertisement, subscribers in Cedar Rapids, and Pokrok’s move to Racine, where another “printer’s estimate was a full $1,000 cheaper.” (Unnamed, the printer was evidently not Jonáš, who had had his own shop for three years.51) But Zrcadlovský soon quit, and Jonáš would keep Zdrůbek as editor for as long as he owned the paper. In fact, Jonáš “let him have all the paper’s income.”52

Pastor did enough to attract Catholic “mudslinging,”53 but anticlericalism was absent from his only declaration of principles, where he set out a kind of social positivism in very general terms and where American political partisanship, which he urged his countrymen to avoid for unity’s sake, was the only specific target.54 With Zdrůbek, anticlerical controversy would be a real preoccupation. His education amounted to quite an investment toward such an editorial career at Pokrok. Zdrůbek’s primary education took place at two magnificent churches in Prague’s Old Town: the parish school at St. Castullus and the Minorite Hauptschule at St. James.55 He went on to the Old Town’s classical Gymnasium, which he chose to complete after a vocation in the Graz monastery of the Brothers Hospitallers of St. John of God. As a Catholic theology student at Prague university, Zdrůbek converted to the Reformed Church after one year and continued at the Swiss university in Basel, where he was “indebted to the lectures of professor Schultz for his firm principles of free theological inquiry.”56 After Basel Zdrůbek came to Racine County, where he was ordained five months later and became pastor to his countrymen in Caledonia Township, who had built a church two years earlier.57 Zdrůbek’s October 18, 1867, ordination was “from the Sheboygan classis,” and since he
“rejected two German congregations,” he probably answered to the Reformed Church in the United States, which German and Swiss immigrants had founded in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1793. As pastor, Zdrůbek promptly “eliminated doctrinal principles that were at odds with enlightened morality, love and human progress; sought, where possible, to reconcile science with religion; and where impossible, he chose science.” He also preached “national consciousness” to his countrymen and revived the Czech school, where he trained their children’s voices on “patriotic songs.” His supervising church was “freethinking and accommodating enough” to tolerate him, and he continued as pastor even after becoming editor of Pokrok. Three decades later Racine County’s Czech Presbyterian minister, Josef Břeň, claimed that Zdrůbek ruined the early church there. But if its minutes mention just three names behind a complaint against Zdrůbek for deviation from the “word of God and the Heidelberg catechism,” the fact remains that in 1869, while or shortly after Zdrůbek was minister, the congregation had 40 families. (Břeň had just 10 individuals after a decade of effort.) Zdrůbek had “many friends” among these eastern Bohemian countrymen, whose congregation more likely lapsed from their own ecclesiastical ambivalence and religious tradition, which ranged from a questioning, personal Christianity to secular forms of spirituality. Among them Zdrůbek could begin his evolution as a Czech immigrant Freethinker.

By the time Karel Jonáš left for Europe, Zdrůbek had hit his stride. In April 1870 alone he published three anticlerical letters in Pokrok. He titled one letter “To Jan Žlebčík, pastor of the poor Catholic sheep in Solon and around Cedar Rapids.” It was from the Czech farming community in Johnson County, and to the Catholics Žlebčík (b. 1843), ordained just a year earlier, was a real “pioneer in the Lord’s vineyard of Iowa,” where he would eventually build nine churches. Two weeks later it was the turn of a St. Louis resident, who attacked Father Josef Hessoun. A Jewish merchant had offered the author, in a saloon, five hundred Czech books, which the author examined and found to be from the parish library. “Hessoun is worse than Koniáš,” thundered Zdrůbek in an editor’s note, and he ramped up to the appeal “Countrymen, free yourselves!” A Jesuit who
seized and destroyed Czech books in the early 18th century, Koniáš was an especially reviled figure in the Czech popular imagination. Another week later an embittered Racine resident had opened a Transatlantic front. He presented a letter that came from a priest after he had written to relatives that “in America we are free of the priests.” The relatives, in religiously contentious eastern Bohemia, took his remarks to confession. By the summer Zdrůbek held forth on the life of Jesus, and by September he expanded his caliber to a four-part volley against Milwaukee’s Father J.M. Gartner. The priest from Moravia posed a serious challenge in what was already a worrisome state. More Czechs lived there than anywhere else, and its dioceses happened to be the bastion of German and Austrian clerics in the American Catholic Church. John Martin Henni, founding archbishop in the years 1844-1881, provided a church to the local St. Jan Nepomuk society, which was unable to build its own. Henni was Swiss. Josef Salzmann (1819-1874), a native of Upper Austria, founded Milwaukee’s St. Francis seminary, which prepared many immigrant and American-born Czech priests. Henni and Salzmann had used their institutions, the press and even the state against journalist Vojta Náprstek, whom the Czech Freethinkers celebrated as their forefather in America. Now they wanted a special institution to train Czech priests for missions among their own immigrant countrymen, and they sent Father Gartner, who was priest at St. Jan Nepomuk and professor at the seminary, around the country to raise funds and even on to Rome for consultations with Pope Pius IX. To Zdrůbek this eventually unsuccessful venture was a “secret plan” for a “Jesuit nest” in Milwaukee that would impose a “Jesuit clerical monopoly” around the country.

The Catholic clerics imperiled Zdrůbek’s countrymen with their appetite for power but also because they retarded the progress of Czech reading and literary consciousness. Parishioners read only prayer books and hymnals. Other books were at best a “pleasant memory, soundly locked away in the trunk.” “Why didn’t they at least take pains to keep their Catholic newspaper going and lead their people to take up reading it?” wondered Zdrůbek about the priests and turned regretful: “Even that would help to awaken our
nationality.” The image of a priest “selling books to a Jew for cheese” still preoccupied him, and in the midst of attacking Father Gartner, that “new savior for the Slavs in America,” Zdrůbek published a sequel from his man in St. Louis, a “Czech Catholic citizen” there. Hessoun had sent apologies to Slavie because the affair had spread to newspapers in Bohemia, but “that donkey’s” claim that the books were worthless was false: the letter writer found them to be uncut editions of history, geography and science. At the same time Father Hessoun’s nephew in southern Bohemia praised his uncle for the leadership that won Bishop Jirsík’s approval, galvanized the diocese, and so quickly produced the “foremost Czech library in America.” Already facts and perceptions had split in the Czech immigrant world: they had become Catholic and anticlerical. And now Zdrůbek was about to stumble into a fateful encounter with a more experienced Catholic nemesis in Cleveland.

On September 28, 1870, Zdrůbek topped off his salvo against Father Gartner, the Jesuit, with the earnest call “Freethinkers unite!” and on the same page he published a letter from Cleveland in sarcastic counterpoint. It was unsigned and insinuated that Father Václav Jan Řepíš (b. 1822) had conceived a child with his cook, Alžběta Doubek, who was “pretty, around thirty” and on her way to bear the “holy spirit” in Omaha, where the “Christians should get a manger ready.” It was not the first story about the priest in Pokrok. Five months earlier the paper reported that a tailor had taken Řepíš to court for non-payment of a coat and settled for $10. But this time was different: on the afternoon of November 9th, just after he had sent the week’s issue to press, Zdrůbek was arrested at his home, where he had a wife and baby, and he was taken five miles by train to face a judge in Marion, seat of Linn County, Iowa. Waiting for him with a confere, Antonín Dominik Urban, was Father Řepíš, who had traveled over six hundred miles from Cleveland. Whether the libel suit came as a surprise to Zdrůbek is an open question. He had already battled in court with Father Urban, a monk from the Premonstratensian monastery at Želiv, Bohemia, who had abandoned St. Václav’s in Spillville, Iowa, after two years (ca. 1867) amidst “turmoil in the parish.” Now Zdrůbek was defiant and
ready to mobilize witnesses against Father Řepiš, whereupon the judge postponed trial to March.\textsuperscript{76}

Zdrůbek could be confident because Cedar Rapids was a supportive bastion of secular Czech nationalists. Forty-one of them formed a Čtenářský spolek, or Reading Society, on November 8, 1868, the anniversary day of White Mountain (1620), the battle outside Prague that opened the Thirty Years War and, to the popular mind, symbolized the Catholic Counter-Reformation and the Czech independence that was now to be reclaimed. In 1869 fifty-two more individuals joined the society, where Jaroslav Vostrovský, the tailor and shopkeeper, made a proposal to attract the Pokrok to the city.\textsuperscript{77} In Racine County, where Czechs were mostly farmers, crucial advertisement income had “dwindled almost to zero,” and the weekly owed its survival to the “extraordinary support of its passionate friends.” Cedar Rapids had both passion and a business class, so Zdrůbek moved there by issue no. 99 in August 1869.\textsuperscript{78} The robust Reading Society inaugurated its own $4,000 building on June 6, 1870, with a parade of several hundred countrymen, and Zdrůbek was a featured speaker. Jan Hus Day one month later was the occasion for another festival and demonstration of strength that even drew in “fourteen wagons of farmers,” who were “met at the bridge by the band and a group of girls in Czech costume” and with the Reading Society’s Panslavic flag. For Zdrůbek as an evolving Freethinker, the society’s hall was a secular, nationalist and so perhaps more comfortable pulpit, and he lectured there on weekends.\textsuperscript{79} With the triumph of the Italian risorgimento, the downfall of the Papal States, and the reactionary Vatican council that proclaimed papal infallibility, 1870 was an exciting year for liberal and anticlerical nationalists. On October 5th, perhaps in reaction to the ominous, archdiocese-sponsored project in Milwaukee for a special seminary to reinvigorate Czech Catholicism in America, Zdrůbek called for a national Jednota svobodomyslných, or Union of Freethinkers, to be formed on November 8th, the date of the “great downfall of the Czech nation’s civil and religious freedom” and the best reminder for the membership to “help the nation recover its former freedom and honor.” This was
necessary both in the Czech lands and in America, where the Catholic Church was present. Indeed, the defense of “intellectual and civil freedom” was the foremost objective among the bylaws that Zdrůbek proposed in his call. Significantly, the Union of Freethinkers was to do this not only with “inexpensive monthly tracts” and with lectures: it was also to “support its members against injustice in the courts.” Eleven local Svobodné obce, or constituent Free Communities, appeared by the appointed date, a quarter-millennium after White Mountain. The next day, Zdrůbek could face arrest with confidence and a sense of mission.  

In fact, Zdrůbek’s arrest would propel Pokrok to its fourth, final and most radical home—Cleveland. Just three months after the arrest, on February 9, 1871, the first issue appeared there and the paper had its own print shop! It was now the property of the Bohemian Printing Company, which had quickly built and equipped the wooden print shop as an addition to Martin Krejčí’s stone building in the Czech neighborhood around Croton Street, less than two miles southeast of downtown’s Public Square. Krejčí (1829-1911) and Josef Václav Sýkora (1840-1915) formed the joint-stock company to buy Pokrok from the Jonáš brothers, and Sýkora wrote to Bedřich Jonáš in Racine just three weeks after Zdrůbek’s arrest. Sýkora was already a local subscription agent for both Slavie and Pokrok. Editor Zdrůbek’s account of his encounter with Father Urban in an Iowa court roused members of the Perun society in Cleveland, who read Josef Barák’s Svoboda from Bohemia, where it “so famously slammed clericalism.” In Zdrůbek and Pokrok, they could have their own embattled journalist and paper in Cleveland. (In his last Cedar Rapids issue, when he assured his readers that the “letters from the homeland would continue,” Zdrůbek specified Barák and Svoboda. A “small band of educated men,” the Perun men were younger and more radical than those in the local Slavic Linden, as their chosen name emphasized: Perun was a god of the pre-Christian Slavs. The Perun men welcomed the arriving Zdrůbek with a grand banquet at their hall after “nationally conscious Czechs from all around set out with banners” to escort him there. “It was likely the first and last time,” recalled the elderly Václav Šnajdr at the end of the
era in 1914, “that our people honored a journalist with such an enthusiastic and earnest reception.”

Josef Václav Sýkora and Martin Krejčí had standing and ambitions in Czech Cleveland. Krejčí arrived in 1854, more than a decade before his countrymen mostly came to stay in the city, instead of proceeding further west. He sold them real estate, tickets for Transatlantic travel as an agent for Alois Karel in Bremen, and liquor and goods in his saloon and general store, where they came for their mail and founded the Slavic Linden on May 11, 1862. Sýkora arrived the following year on September 17th and two months later directed the first amateur plays for the Linden. He worked in a tailor shop, perhaps for his older brother, but became a notary public by January 1869, passed examinations at the Union State Law College by July 3, 1871, opened his own office on Public Square, and “for many years he was the only Slavic lawyer in the state.” Like Krejčí he quite literally created the Czech neighborhoods with his dealings in real estate: in *Pokrok* on August 7, 1873, he offered one hundred lots of John D. Rockefeller property for sale to his countrymen and led them to new areas further south along Broadway Avenue. He had a grand, romantically speculative “vision of a Czech colony,” at least in his early American years, when he wrote about it for *Slavie* and aroused the excitement that led to the convocation that founded the ephemeral Slavic Union in Chicago.

Sýkora and Krejčí already had radical and anticlerical tendencies when they arrived in Cleveland, but here they gained the business and professional standing to influence a growing urban community of countrymen. Krejčí went “out into the world” from Mahouš, a village fourteen miles northwest of České Budějovice, as a journeymen tailor, took part in “some conspiracy,” and experienced a brief imprisonment in Vienna. Sýkora left another south Bohemian village (Nevězice), on the middle Vltava between České Budějovice and Prague, at age twelve for eleven years of classical secondary education at Písek, where Czech nationalism was relatively strong. To avoid the seminary (Prague)—and evidently unable to afford an alternative—Sýkora followed a
brother to Cleveland. There he was no doubt a chief protagonist of the Perun society, because it formed as the theatrical section of the Slavic Linden on February 25, 1866, before it seceded the following year to escape “tensions.” Religion was likely at issue, because the Linden “accepted members without regard to religion” and attracted “many Catholics.” But Catholics also formed their own society, one determined enough to build the stone St. Václav church in just the last two months of 1867. Also conspicuous was the personality of the first priest, Anthony Krásný (b. 1815). Remarkably, three assistant priests were among the revolutionaries arrested for May 1849 conspiracy in Bohemia. One of them was Krásný, who was imprisoned until the March 1857 amnesty and who arrived in Cleveland that fall. There he resumed both his nationalist activism, as a distributor for Czech books and newspapers from Alois Kareš in Bremen, and his clerical vocation, at two German parishes before St. Václav, whose formation he accelerated. But prison had broken his health, and he left the Czech parish by October 1869 to die a few months later.

Father Krásný’s successor immediately confronted the provocatively-named Perun society on the emotional ground of the Czech community’s children and their education. Václav Řepiš took charge of St. Václav in February 1870, and just three months later Josef Václav Sýkora sounded an alarm “for every Czech everywhere, but especially in Cleveland.” It ran to three successive issues of Pokrok with Sýkora’s signature as Perun’s starosta, a usefully antiquarian and popular term for “chairman.” With the city council’s approval, Perun had leased a lot on which it intended to raise a building for a school, Sokol gymnasium and theater. But as early as February 8th Father Řepiš addressed a call to the city council for it to revoke its approval. He argued that Czech children were already well provided with his school and a public school, but he also impugned Perun’s character and morality. Perun (like the Slavic Linden) formed and met at a dance and beer hall. It was the ordinary practice for the myriad societies in the Czech immigrant neighborhoods, which usually offered the same entertainments if they became successful enough to move into their own buildings, but Father Řepiš evidently
played on the unfavorable impressions that these Czech cultural practices could arouse among Anglo-Americans. He even published his memorandum in the *Morning Leader* newspaper. Sýkora replied to him there, reassuring readers that the “Perun Bohemian School and Literary Society” wanted to open a school where, besides any Czech instruction on offer, “immigrants could learn English.” The city council referred the matter to its school commission, which summoned both parties to a hearing but did not find Father Řepíš’s arguments compelling. In retreat, Řepíš elegantly claimed that he had been “misinformed about the Perun society’s activities and intentions” before Sýkora laid them out for the commission. Restraint in the halls of Anglo-American authority served self-interest, but among themselves and in their own language the Czech immigrant antagonists could cast it aside. The last installment in *Pokrok*, now signed “many members of Perun,” took Řepíš to task for “heaping dishonor on the Czechs before a foreign people” and for passing himself off as the “superintendent of the Bohemians in Cleveland.” Instead, he was a predatory manipulator who had turned away a delegation of parishioners to sign the parish property over to the bishop in the value of $750, when his residence alone had cost his countrymen $1,200. For emphasis the Perun men and *Pokrok* cited the volume and page numbers in the deed records where readers could review the transactions. “Jesuit!” rang the conclusion, “Any descendant of the Přemyslids, Hus, Jerome of Prague and Žižka must hate you.” This declaration stood opposite a stern opening warning: “We are not in Austria.”

But if Father Řepíš seemed an easy target, he would in fact be a formidable opponent. As a miller’s son in the old royal town of Vodňany, Řepíš came from a higher social class and a more distinguished place than Sýkora and Zdrůbek, but he was still a familiar countyman from the south Bohemian hinterland. Zdrůbek signaled this when he informed his readers that the priest’s real surname was Pimprle, which was also a droll and dismissive word for a small and insignificant person. “Řepíš” was a less problematic cottage name, the other surname that Czechs could adopt from the houses where they lived, because popular speech called each house by some earlier owner. And in America
the priest had even restyled himself as the “sweet Rewis,” as Zdrůbek noted further, evidently referring to réva, the Czech word for “vine.” Indeed, the diocesan chancellor would record the Czech priest as “Wenceslas Revis” in his history of the Cleveland diocese, and in St. Louis, for Father Hessoun’s assistant priest and historian of Czech immigrant parishes in America, it was “Vilém J. Revis,” as if even the given name had changed, to “William.”97 But more important than these successive names and Anglicizations themselves was what they signified and what evidently escaped Zdrůbek: Řepiš was resourceful and experienced. Zdrůbek could feel superior with his university education from Prague and Basel, but Řepiš had far more American experience than Zdrůbek or anyone in his camp. In České Budějovice the consistory’s register of priests contains an entry for Václav Řepiš, who was ordained and assisted at three successive parishes in the diocese for six years until he was “released on September 2, 1852, for the American missions.”98 According to the diocesan chancellor in Cleveland, Řepiš practiced his vocation in three successive American dioceses: Philadelphia, Alton and Nashville. In the first diocese Řepiš could learn from his countryman, Saint John Nepomucene Neumann (1811-1860), the native of Prachatice, just fifteen miles southwest of Vodňany, whom Pius IX had named archbishop of Philadelphia on February 1, 1852. Neumann went on to build the first Catholic school system in the United States as some one hundred parishes opened schools in his diocese.99 All three dioceses would have amounted to quite a school for Řepiš: he had to become competent in a lay population and a hierarchy that were Irish and German, and he had to contend with Anglo-American anti-Catholic nativism. He was a worldly and experienced American cleric by the time he came to Cleveland and long since no simple south Bohemian curate with a funny name.

Zdrůbek had just two years of experience in the United States when he published the story that Father Řepiš used to sue for libel on behalf of Alžběta Doubek and himself. But Zdrůbek had allies in Cleveland, and he joined them on January 4, 1871, to see Řepiš arraigned the following day.100 At trial on the eleventh, Dr. Jan Habenicht and his
wife testified against Father Řepiš. They had lived with the priest for four or five weeks after Alžběta Doubek’s departure, when Františka Habenicht kept house for the priest. They were present when Řepiš read the letter in Pokrok that identified him as the father of the child that Ms. Doubek was expecting. According to the Habenichts, Father Řepiš exclaimed that he wanted to shoot Zdrůbek or to have him shot. When Mrs. Habenicht remarked that this would be a sin, Řepiš allegedly retorted that on the contrary, it would be a service to God. Sýkora informed Zdrůbek about the threat and was his junior counsel in court, where Sýkora’s employer represented Zdrůbek. On the thirteenth the trail reconvened elsewhere (Temperance Hall) to accommodate its large audience. Zdrůbek’s lawyer questioned “Wentworth Rewis” about his alleged record as a defendant in a Bohemian court during his residence in Vodňany. The priest denied any such record, as well as the present charge against him, and in defiance of his lawyer, who urged silence, Řepiš accused the Perun society of bribing the Habenichts. A week later Pokrok reported that six of eighteen character witnesses for the defense were questioned at the next session, whereupon Řepiš cried out to Zdrůbek, “Let us have peace!” But the prosecution countered that it had 72 witnesses against the priest’s good character, and all had volunteered.

In the same report Zdrůbek quoted his legal expenses to date: $115 for lawyers in Iowa and Cleveland, and another $50 for travel. Was he less committed to the struggle still ahead than his confident counsel and volunteer witnesses? Was it an early sign of his disengagement one month later? The expenses were already large enough to weigh on the mind of a poor Czech newspaper editor with a family at a time when a “very good reward for his work” was $50 per month. Zdrůbek listed “donations toward Pokrok’s court expenses” in two earlier issues, but the top amount was just $5, from Martin Krejčí and others, while Sýkora gave $3. Five weeks after his triumphant entry into Cleveland, Zdrůbek announced his retreat with the headline “Lawsuits over! Reconciliation!” He “hereby withdrew the shallow and groundless accusations in Pokrok” against Řepiš and Doubek. This retraction on the pages of the newspaper was
necessary to “effect cessation of the lawsuits.” Evidently eager to see the whole affair put to rest, Zdrůbek concluded with these words: “To truth, concord and the nation!”¹⁰⁶

But a week later he admitted that he was a target of verbal attacks and resorted to another exclamatory headline: “Explanation!” Řepiš had filed a criminal suit on behalf of Alžběta Doubek, the testimony that was to vindicate Zdrůbek was false, as even Krejčí and Sýkora now believed, and Zdrůbek lacked the means to bear the penalty: $1,000 or one year in prison.¹⁰⁷ In fact, Father Řepiš was an uncle of Ms. Doubek, whose father had taken her to America six years earlier, far away from an abusive husband, as Zdrůbek had reported at the time of his arraignment for libel in Cedar Rapids. But he was then more preoccupied with his opponent’s imperfect command of Czech than with the stakes in American courts, which he likely misunderstood: he “counted 53 mistakes in a brief and unintelligible” Řepiš letter to his informant on Doubek.¹⁰⁸

On June 18, 1871, the Bohemian Printing Company met in extraordinary session in response to the resignation, effective September 1st, of Pokrok editor Zdrůbek, who wanted to return to Bohemia. The board approved secretary Sýkora’s proposal to offer the editorship to a classmate from the Písek Gymnášium, and it instructed chairman Krejčí to obtain Transatlantic tickets from Alois Kareš in Bremen. Sýkora offered his younger classmate, Jan Vratislav Čapek (1842-1909), $50 per month plus 10% of subscriptions, and encouraged him to consult Karel Jonáš, then in Prague, who was “in all ways an unconditional truth-lover.”¹⁰⁹ A tutor and law clerk who proceeded from one employer to another in an unhappy search for a decent living to finish his university studies in the capital,¹¹⁰ Čapek accepted. He introduced himself in Pokrok on September 8th and also announced Zdrůbek’s “intention to return to Europe.”

The news prompted Father Řepiš to revive at least his civil suit against the paper, because Zdrůbek, who had just buried his infant daughter, was arrested on the same day in the establishment of Martin Krejčí’s, who was arrested in turn with Sýkora five days later. Five hundred countrymen rallied in the Perun society’s hall against Ms. Doubek
and Reverend Řepiš, who sought $6,000 in damages from Krejčí and Sýkora. The attorney for the plaintiffs offered to settle what was evidently a separate and perhaps new suit against Zdrůbek for $200, which he rejected on advice from Sýkora, with whom he was evidently still on good terms. Řepiš and Doubek wanted Zdrůbek as a witness in their case against Krejčí and Sýkora, set to begin in court on October 4th, but Zdrůbek left town for Bohemia that very day and put their case in disarray. Ms. Doubek died on the night of October 31st. But these two departures did not deter Father Řepiš indefinitely: on June 20, 1872, Pokrok announced that the priest now sought $10,000 in damages from the paper’s stockholders. The final act in the Czech immigrant community’s polarizing legal drama did not come until the middle of its third year. Outside their common pleas courtroom, where their Monday afternoon, March 24, 1873, jury trial was delayed and finally postponed to Thursday, the two sides waited and faced each for hours, with Řepiš wielding a “carpetbag full of Pokrok’s back issues!” Inside the courtroom, Řepiš translated from the Bohemian newspaper and faced his old nemesis, Sýkora, who was again counsel for the defense, this time with two different, Anglo-American lawyers. One, J.K. Hord, delivered an “impassioned two-and-a-half hour speech” that inspired editor J.V. Čapek, who admired it as a defense of free thought, to publish it in abridged translation. Father Řepiš fared poorly. The constable confiscated his effects for nonpayment of legal fees. Then the jury found Pokrok innocent, and the judge ordered Řepiš to pay court expenses. Even worse, the bishop of Cleveland ordered him to leave the diocese within forty-eight hours.

J.V. Čapek had a parting message for Řepiš in Pokrok and titled it “Read the Word of God,” but in the same issue Čapek also addressed conciliatory words to his successor. He praised the new priest’s first statements, which were “tolerant and conciliatory,” in the “spirit common among the clergy in Bohemia.” It was a build-up to this concluding offer: “Go speak about your faith amongst yourselves in church, and let us speak about ours in Pokrok. But outside of church and the newspaper let us be only Czechs and Czechs, and as Czechs friends.” The new priest’s hometown (Ţatec), Gymnasium
(Chomutov) and diocese (Litoměřice) were all in German-speaking north Bohemia, so Čapek’s conciliatory gesture was even more remarkable. In fact, Father Antonín Hynek (b. 1839) had protested his “unsatisfactory command of Czech” and resisted his recent assignment to St. Prokop because it was a “purely Czech parish.” Čapek announced in his first issue almost three years earlier that Pokrok “will remain the same,” but his moderate manner immediately aroused hostility from its radical readers. Cleveland’s Free Community, which was local no. 1 in Zdrůbek’s Union of Freethinkers, complained in Iowa’s distant Czech newspaper that it could not use Pokrok to elect a chairman to succeed Zdrůbek because Čapek “denounces the religious struggle and sanctions idleness in the philosophical field.” The Freethinkers even condemned the new editor in Zdrůbek’s name for the article “Let’s Have Concord,” an early version of Čapek’s call to Hynek, which he defended in his account of their criticism.

At least they had no grounds to quarrel with Čapek on the question of Czech children and their schooling, the field where the struggle with Father Řepiš had started. Toward the end of the school year and his first year abroad, Čapek called the attention of “eight to ten thousand Czechs” in Cleveland to the state of the Perun hall’s school, where “half a handful of kids come on Sundays to frolic,” with no books to occupy them. Řepiš’s parish school was no alternative, with its foreign nuns for teachers. Čapek proposed a complete, daily, year-round school and calculated that if parents enrolled just a hundred children at ten cents per week and if the city council gave another three to five hundred for English instruction, altogether $1,000 per year, then this school could offer a dependable and quality alternative. Three weeks later Čapek was pleased to report that on the day of a Slavic Linden picnic, forty countrymen attended his meeting. They elected a school committee of twelve, with Čapek chairman, Lev Palda secretary and Martin Krejčí treasurer. On the Fourth of July and before Saturday’s Jan Hus day picnic to raise money for the school, Cápek intoned that education is best conveyed in the native language and that English is best introduced through Czech. Thus, and “also in our national interest, instruction will be in Czech.” These were arguments taken to
Cleveland from the school wars in Bohemia. As for the anniversary of Hus’s martyrdom, it afforded wide scope for nationalist and anti-Catholic departures to the featured speakers, Palda and Sýkora. A year later Čapek could write a few idyllic words on the “pleasant spectacle” of over one hundred children at the Perun summer school with their fine teachers, the Landa sisters. Four weeks later he abruptly announced his resignation, accelerated by politics at Perun, whose expelled Sokol gymnastic section elected him chairman, and at Pokrok, where a hostile poster in Krejčí’s and Sýkora’s hand turned up for typesetting.

On September 15, 1873, Pokrok’s fourth and final editor, Václav Šnajdr, proclaimed his principles: “reason, nature, the perfectability of mankind through science, rational work as the path to man’s happiness, and, in politics, opposition to the concentration of power.” But one minor (and bizarre) element in the fallout from the Řepiš affair marvelously illuminated Šnajdr’s radical temperament: after the priest’s last day in court another former cook turned up and claimed that Řepiš fathered her child. J.V. Čapek saw it as a stunt and suspected the “Perun crowd or other swindlers.” But when the woman came back in winter to look for Řepiš, who used to give her “some concoction,” Šnajdr’s commentary was quite different: “That lout most likely aimed for an abortion with both cooks but killed one and left the other bereft of reason.” Zdůbek and Řepiš were gone, but J.V. Čapek’s moderation did not clear the air in Cleveland. The Perun hall, St. Václav parish and Pokrok print shop still stood, only blocks apart and still affected. Veterans of the contest in Cleveland would carry its legacy to other places, and new antagonists came to carry it on in Cleveland.

After just four months in Bohemia Zdůbek returned to America, where he was first a typesetter for the Houston Daily Times and then pastor at Veselý (now Wesley), some eighty miles to the west. On September 15, 1874, he emerged from obscurity to reside in Omaha and succeed Václav Šnajdr (now at Pokrok in Cleveland) as editor of the weekly Pokrok západu. But eleven months later he was in Chicago to edit the first Czech
daily in America from its October 25, 1875, inception to his death in 1911. Zdrůbek’s past from Cleveland conveyed something of an ambivalent resonance to that newspaper’s name: Svornost meant “concord.”

As for Father Řepiš, after Cleveland he “went to the diocese of Chicago, where he remained till his death, at Feehansville, June 19, 1886.” In this important diocese Řepiš evidently never resided at any parish with at least some Czech communicants, but he was briefly conspicuous for reasserting central clerical authority in one remote Wisconsin Czech parish that had challenged it in a uniquely radical way. In 1873 Josef Melcher, bishop of Green Bay, imposed an interdict over St. Václav parish in Cooperstown Township, Manitowoc County, because the laymen’s committee refused to surrender title to its property. It was the oldest Czech parish in the state and among the larger rural Czech parishes there with over 150 families. Church property disputes and the resort to interdicts and lawsuits were common, but this parish committee published a call in Karel Jonáš’s Slavie for a “Czech Catholic priest independent of the bishop.”

Tomáš Juránek (b. 1810), who lived nearby, provided František Matouš (Ladimír) Klácel, the utopian social philosopher whom Czech Freethinkers and liberal journalists in America celebrated as a kind of elder. Juránek and Klácel were both apostate priests from Moravia and already acquainted there. Juránek had defied clerical superiors to work for the popular Slavic Linden movement during the revolution, and a “nationalist and liberal spirit” still animated him in Wisconsin. Klácel was estranged from the Chicago Free Community and could not sustain himself as a utopian journalist when the Cooperstown parish offered “$400 and the use of 3 acres.” Even if this was known in clerical circles, other facts were alarming and more obvious: Klácel would make any personal sacrifice to issue his Hlas Jednoty svobodomyslných, the “voice” for the Union of Freethinkers, and he was in Chicago (since April 26, 1873) by their invitation. More alarming was his presence among the Cooperstown Catholics: from the vital records, which he drafted in Latin, Klácel was priest at St. Václav’s from September 28, 1873, to September 22, 1874. This was just three years after the First Vatican Council,
and the Old Catholics were a schismatic challenge in Germany and its neighbors. Klácel could appear as their missionary to the Czech immigrants in America, and Václav Řepiš was the first priest dispatched to St. Václav parish, which dwindled to just 58 families, after it returned to the bishop’s authority. Whatever the fears of ultramontane clerics, Klácel’s St. Václav’s was an isolated episode and not the prelude to something like the Polish National Catholic Church of America that emerged a quarter-century later. But sixteen years after Klácel Cooperstown’s St. Václav’s still had just 81 families, barely half its former strength.135

Lev Palda and Jan Habenicht were two more veterans of Cleveland. Palda (1847-1913) was a journeyman weaver from Vodňany, where his father was a miller’s apprentice turned poor baker, and where the father of Reverend Řepiš was a miller. In late April 1867, Palda arrived in Cleveland, where an older brother clerked for Martin Krejčí and joined the Perun society. At J.V. Sýkora’s invitation, Palda returned to Cleveland by year’s end to become secretary of a fraternal benefit association and subscription agent for Slavie and Pastor’s Pokrok, where he was “first to reject faith in a physical god.” In a “few weeks” Palda was “already at the forefront of Czech public life in Cleveland” as a newspaper writer, stage actor and speaker, even to a “congregation of Czech Brethren.” (Protestant writers mention no such early congregation: Protestants were “soluble” in liberal nationalist society, Catholics insoluble and reactive.136) Palda left Cleveland by October 1868 but spoke there on Jan Hus day in July and returned by spring 1871 for a six-year sojourn after the Řepiš trials.137 “Impassioned and crusading free thought in those years,” wrote Palda, “had its headquarters in Cleveland and the Perun society,” whose members could be “like the early Christians in self-sacrificing devotion” to their cause. They exalted the Řepiš libel trials as if they were “some kind of Austrian government campaign to persecute Czech newspaper editors.” But Zdrůbek, the expected “first martyr,” acted sensibly when he saw through the claim against Řepiš and Doubek, who was “by all accounts a decent and educated woman.” Palda would be a leading figure in Czech immigrant socialism, liberal nationalism and free thought, yet
after thirty years of Catholic hostility he was forgiving even toward the priest: when J.V. Čapek held a “small party in the Pokrok editorial office to celebrate the happy outcome” of the trials, even “pater Řepiš” came. “During the hour that he spent with us,” wrote Palda, “his behavior, among complete opponents, impressed us all,” and he “would have stayed longer if not for some parishioners on guard outside, who stormed him all the time, impatient for him to leave.”

Jan Habenicht (1846-1918) was extraordinary in the Czech world around Croton Street for his education and allegiances to both sides of the great divide that editor Zdrůbek and Father Řepiš opened there. His father was a Saxon native, physician and Austrian colonel at Čáslav in east Bohemia; his mother a devout Catholic from a Czech village. The young Habenicht studied at the Piarist Gymnasium in Litoměřice and at the medical colleges in Prague and Leipzig. This was the assembly of religious and liberal formative influences that he took to America in 1869, where his passion for amateur theater brought him into the company of countrymen who staged the nationalist repertoire that flourished in Bohemia. He also wrote on medicine for Karel Jonás’s Slavie, but his consuming work became a book on Czech-American history centered on Catholic parishes and their priests. Habenicht’s unusual geographical mobility was another form of influence and exemplified how widely individuals could carry their personal accounts of the Cleveland conflict. (Pokrok editors Pastor and Trojan moved on to the German emigration ports and Bohemia, respectively.) After his testimony against Father Řepiš, Habenicht moved to Chicago, where Jan Rosický wanted him for the Slavic Linden’s theater. By June 11, 1880, Habenicht resided in Wilbur Precinct, Saline County, Nebraska, and his four children in census enumerator John Dudek’s entry indicate that the family lived in at least two more states since Cleveland—Minnesosta and Texas. Habenicht lamented the enduring divide between his countrymen, and he praised Karel Jonáš and Father Hessoun as prudent voices on opposite sides. Šnajdr and especially Zdrůbek were the archvillains. Šnajdr was also not a personal acquaintance, whereas Zdrůbek had accepted allegations that Sýkora’s Perun gang had bribed
Habenicht to testify. If this darkened Habenicht’s assessments in the book that he published four decades later, it was another example of the lasting legacy from the Cleveland trials.

In fact, Zdrůbek was the more moderate anticlerical at Pokrok and, after his return to center stage four years later, at Svornost in Chicago. Anticlericalism was absent altogether from his two editorials for the October 8, 1875, opening issue, as if no longer important. Instead, the work ahead was to end social coarsening and introversion and to restore Chicago to the purposeful center that it was for Czechs nationally up to the second congress of Karel Jonáš’s Slavic Union six years before. “Concord,” the title of the daily, was the program, and Zdrůbek even counted churches among the institutions with an “honorable purpose” in the Czech community. When he commenced printing a directory of associations giving the times and places of their regular meetings, four of the eighteen listings were for the lay associations at the Czech parishes. That amounted to all the attention that Zdrůbek paid the Catholics until Monday, February 21, the day after Fr. Josef Molitor overruled the St. Václav lay society and proceeded to carry around the collection plate in church himself. Angry parishioners eventually wrested it away, and two policemen had to restore order. Conflict had no doubt developed for some time in the parish, but now it immediately became the talk of the city, and Zdrůbek could not ignore it. But he called on both sides to give account in the newspaper, and within a week he paraphrased the lay society’s position and published two replies from Fr. Molitor. At issue was the lay society’s collection and disbursement of various parish funds. With real estate and construction debts now approaching zero, the lay society suspected a power grab. Fr. Molitor dutifully backed Bishop Thomas Foley’s decisions, but he also challenged the St. Václav society’s continuity because it now called itself a fraternal benefit society and no longer included all parish members. By the end of the week Fr. Molitor took a personal guard of twelve policemen to Sunday mass; a “Czech and Polish Catholic savings association” faced worried creditors and depositors; and at St. Prokop’s parish the lay society intended to move its free-and-clear
building and leave the bishop with an empty lot and debt.

Yet Zdrůbek did not welcome the “turmoil in Catholic ranks.” He dreaded further escalation and “ruination of cohesive community life” in the Czech population. “Just property management and no article of faith is at issue here,” Zdrůbek reasoned, and he called on the Czech priests to “stand with their countrymen” and assured them of solid community support.148 Still moderate, Zdrůbek paid little more attention in the next ten days. But then Fr. Molitor personally broke into the St. Václav parish school after the lay society produced a deed for the policemen that he had summoned. Now Zdrůbek let loose under the title “Priest’s crime” and five subtitles, including “Is the Catholic Church a thief?” and “Father Molitor as robber.”149 Three weeks later a court judge upheld the priest’s suit to reoccupy his parish residence, if not the school, and Zdrůbek again turned away from clerical issues.150 When the Thalia society announced an upcoming comedy at the TJ Sokol hall, one titled “Father Modlitor and his maid, or, Sodom and Gomorrah,” Zdrůbek added no comment.151 But by the following winter Zdrůbek welcomed the dissident St. Václav society into a new project for solidarity—the coalition for a (secular) Bohemian National Cemetery in Chicago. With his theological training and cast of mind, Zdrůbek was also prepared to publicly debate the priests, but he went about it with perfect civility. After making the call in Svornost, he hosted Fathers Molitor and Vilém Čoka (b. 1840) at his home to agree on ground rules. Zdrůbek was for unlimited admission at St. Prokop’s in the new Pilsen neighborhood, but Čoka wanted no “circus” at his Czech parish, the third in Chicago, and insisted on a limited audience of fifty for Zdrůbek and fifty for himself. The two men compromised at one hundred for each and met in debate over the question of Zdrůbek’s making: “Does the holy faith harm morality and well-being among the faithful?”152

Pokrok editor Václav Šnajdr traveled 350 miles to see these events for himself, but he had less use for civility. In Cleveland, he kept anticlericalism a basic fare, and he served it sharp and often. In a commentary on its gendered consumers titled “What Pokrok has
joined let no one tear asunder,” he spoke of the “many wives” who were its enemies. Emotional and “not fond of thought,” women were “more susceptible to clerical wiles,” and one man even complained that he had to subscribe and read *Pokrok* at a neighbor’s address. Šnajdr knew only one household with a reversed polarity, but there the Catholic husband allowed his wife to read *Pokrok* openly, men being more “tolerant.” 153 It was an unwitting commentary on the tensions that Šnajdr’s pounding and unrelenting anticlericalism produced in real families.

He targeted priests far and wide, and he provided an outlet for like-minded critics. One spoke his mind from Chicago: Molitor arrived a beggar but knew how to “lend at ten dollars per hundred and borrow at just four or five.” He “kicked out the lay society,” yet his “flock did not diminish.” It was “proof that people stricken with faith are incurable,” and Molitor could “keep taking them to the cleaners.” Čoka had less reason to smile, with laymen who were not all of the “stupid kind who only follow the herder’s woolly cap and even have some rebellious spirit.” The cupidity charge against priests and the shame-them-to-defiance tack with parishioners were two commonplaces in Šnajdr’s journalism. The sarcastic title for the letter, “What fine progress the Chicago Czechs do make,” was made to sting in a time of depression. 154 A trademark column with Šnajdr was “Clerical spyglass,” where he put his imagination and polished style to work on reports of priestly deviance and malfeasance. An early example was on J.V. Čapek, now publisher-editor of *Newyorské listy* in Manhattan. A humorist at heart, he was the hero in a kind of burlesque and immigrant Czech specialty that included a night at Ludlow Street jail for libel, a carriage and brass band ride around the neighborhood, and Čapek’s complaint against local pater Vendelín Vacula, lodged with the Catholic *Hlas* in St. Louis. 155

But above all Šnajdr kept Cleveland the epicenter of the turbulence for his countrymen across the United States, and in this a counterpart of like fervor and stamina joined him on the Catholic side. Five years younger, Josef Maria Koudelka (b. 1852) was born some
thirty-three miles south of Plzeň. From his native village (Chlistov) he attended the Klatovy Gymnasium some six miles away, but in May 1868 his parents took him to Wisconsin. Koudelka entered St. Francis in Milwaukee, the German seminary that its presiding founder Josef Salzmann also dedicated against Czech apostasy and liberals in America. From there Koudelka was “sent” to St. Prokop’s on Cleveland’s West Side in February 1875 and ordained deacon. Since Václav Řepiš’s dismissal nearly two years earlier, Father Hynek had to take on both Czech parishes in Cleveland, and the bishop called for relief. Koudelka came with quite a sense of imperiled Catholicism from both home and seminary in Wisconsin. Just months earlier, Father Řepiš ended the apostasy at St. Václav’s in Cooperstown Township, just a few miles from the Koudelka family farm near Manitowoc. Deacon Koudelka would become bishop in thirty-three years, the only native Czech speaker to reach that rank in the American hierarchy. But more than a pragmatic participant in its German power base, he was an enthusiastic Germanophile and Habsburg loyalist who served a demonstrative requiem mass for the assassinated Archduke Franz Ferdinand in 1914.

Václav Šnajdr was a fugitive from the Habsburgs. He already became “known to prominent nationalist circles” while still a lower Gymnasium student at Mladá Boleslav, where he “provoked” the principal by wearing the (originally Polish) Panslavic style of čamara vest, hat and red-and-white colors. Here, at home, he also became a protege of Prince Rudolf Thurn-Taxis (1833-1904), who owned an estate nearby (Niméřice) and was a close associate of Palacký and Rieger at the head of the Czech nationalist party. Even Šnajdr’s sister suffered persecution for serving as flower girl at a reception for the nobleman after his imprisonment for a nationalist speech. After completing classical Gymnasium studies in southern Bohemia (Jindřichův Hradec), Šnajdr went on to the liberal arts college at Prague university. At their beer hall opposite the New Town Hall, where the Habsburg judiciary tried and jailed opponents, nationalist students elected Šnajdr to lead them in a January 21, 1868, demonstration against Dr. Eduard Herbst, leader of the German Liberals in Bohemia and Austrian Justice Minister. A
sympathizer in the viceroy’s council saved Šnajdr from serious consequences, but after a June 21 demonstration on the occasion of Emperor Franz Josef I’s visit, he was to be tried for high treason. A court official in Mladá Boleslav tipped him off, and with assistance from Prince Thurn-Taxis, Šnajdr fled to Berlin, where he worked for Josef Václav Frič before joining Karel Jonáš in Racine. Nationalist leaders in Bohemia sought the best possible terms within Austria, with its federalization as their ultimate goal, but the radical democrat and publicist Frič rejected the Habsburg state. When they met in Cleveland, Václav Šnajdr and Josef Maria Koudelka were at odds over both religion and nationalism, a combination exponentially more volatile than either conflict by itself.

Soon Šnajdr reported that Koudelka was preaching against Pokrok and “progressives” with coarse rhetoric, angry body language and calls for vigilance against spies in the parish. Šnajdr called him a “half-pater,” but Koudelka was ordained priest within eight months. He also sought a national audience by writing for Hlas, the Catholic newspaper in St. Louis. Turning around the argument that Catholics were incapable of reason or resistant to it, he dismissed freethinkers as deficient for inability to comprehend the mysteries of Christianity, but they were also doomed to damnation. By 1882 Koudelka compiled a primer and a series of three readers, all titled “for our dear Czech youth,” that remained in print for Catholic schools for at least seven decades. He even became editor of Hlas that year by clerical acclaim. According to Jan Habenicht, who involved much of the Czech-speaking clergy in America as sources for his book of history, many of their names followed an “earnest petition” to the bishop of Cleveland, who was to release Koudelka for a greater opportunity to preserve Czech Catholics and engage their enemies. Most notable were Monsignor Josef Hessoun and Chicago clerics Molitor and Čoka but also the personal entreaty of St. Louis Archbishop Ryan and his vicar Muehlsiepen. After a year the bishop called Koudelka back to Cleveland but assigned him to Archangel Michael’s, a German parish. There Koudelka showed his managerial talent by raising a “$100,000 church, the most magnificent on the
West Side,” but his Czech “literary work” fell off.\textsuperscript{162}

Koudelka’s unordinary ability, style and zeal could only confirm Šnajdr in his mission of chief anticlerical journalist. In St. Louis, patriarch Josef Hessoun preached against subscription to \textit{Pokrok}.\textsuperscript{163} But under Koudelka’s influence the St. Prokop lay society in Cleveland soon dispatched pairs of delegates to each West Side shopkeeper and saloonkeeper with the demand to drop subscriptions or face a Catholic boycott. To Šnajdr it was a modern auto-da-fé, and he provided his account, titled “Terrorism,” to Cleveland’s Anglo dailies, which printed full translations, including Koudelka’s “shameful and insulting” letter to \textit{Hlas}. A grateful Šnajdr vowed to “keep defending freedom in this great and beautiful land,” and he chided \textit{Dělnické listy}, which considered Catholics harmless, with reports of drunken Catholics shouting for Šnajdr to be shot.\textsuperscript{164} “Verily” it was easier to castigate “monopolists, stock traders and bloosuckers” than Czech priests in America, wrote Šnajdr of the new Socialist newspaper.\textsuperscript{165}

Koudelka even turned his strong-arm tactics inward, with ruinous consequences for his parish, and provided Šnajdr with more material for his image of Catholic clerics as despots. While with Father Hynek a minimum Sunday donation was one nickel, Koudelka expected fifty cents and scandalized his parishioners when he loudly drove two of them out the door for offering just twenty-five. By his departure a year later, Koudelka was the subject of repeated complaints to the bishop.\textsuperscript{166} Just before Koudelka’s return from a year in St. Louis, supporters at St. Prokop’s drove his stand-in, František J. Antl (b. 1843), to resign,\textsuperscript{167} but the anti-Koudelka faction was stronger. The bishop assigned the divisive Koudelka to Our Lady of Lourdes, just opened in the Broadway neighborhood, and sent its Štefan Furdek (b. 1855) to St. Prokop’s. But now Cleveland’s entire Czech Catholic community stonewalled in impressive spontaneous solidarity. Lourdes parishioners called in the police to keep Koudelka out, those at St. Prokop’s vowed to reject him at the cost of quitting the Church, and St. Václav’s nervous churchgoers scheduled a meeting in case he should be imposed on them.\textsuperscript{168} The
bishop sent Koudelka to the Germans, but seven months later he shut down St. Prokop’s, and city policemen guarded the property day and night. Father Furdek gave the last mass there on February 10, 1884, and hastened back to Our Lady of Lourdes that afternoon.

As in Chicago eight years earlier, it was a power struggle between parishioners and bishop, but one that the priests, Koudelka and Antl, evidently brought on with their contradictory styles. By diocesan regulation, the priest was to nominate a parish committee on the first Sunday in January, but the popularly-elected body from Antl’s time refused to comply. It also wanted a “say in the choice of priest,” as a spokesman informed Šnajdr,¹⁶⁹ who reported that a majority wanted Antl back and distrusted Furdek as a puppet of Koudelka, who regularly visited supporters in his favorite beer hall and this novice successor from Slovakia.¹⁷⁰ Where Koudelka “goaded” parishioners against all “independent thinkers” week after week, Antl preached “peace and tolerance.” Where Koudelka accustomed the people to special collections for his personal needs, Antl would have none of it, and the altar society was to keep its monies for a fraternal benefit fund. “Was this not a personally ideal priest?” asked Šnajdr in rare admiration.¹⁷¹ But the bishop praised Koudelka as the most capable Bohemian priest in America and as a “noble man.”¹⁷² Son of Scottish immigrant Covenanters, Bishop Richard Gilmour (b. 1824) was a model administrator and proud nemesis of the hostile Protestant establishment. He ruled a diocese with 225 churches, 187 priests and 126 schools for “upwards of 200,000” Catholics.¹⁷³ St. Prokop gave in. When services resumed on Sunday, August 9, 1885, Bishop Gilmour’s vicar lectured the Czechs on proper obedience to Church authority, and their patriarch Josef Hessoun from St. Louis dutifully interpreted.¹⁷⁴ For all the troubles with them, the Czechs were not important enough for Gilmour’s chancellor to mention them two years later in a handsome history of the diocese.¹⁷⁵

But from Reverend Řepiš to Reverend Koudelka, from the city’s law courts to St. Prokop’s parish, and from *Pokrok to Dennice novověku*, which meant “Morning star of
the modern era” and which carried the masthead slogan “Dedicated to the advancement of spiritual and intellectual freedom,” Cleveland was the school of Czech anticlericalism in America and its two leading voices, Václav Šnajdr and František Boleslav Zdrůbek. Šnajdr put the struggle into grand context. When Reverend Hessoun’s Hlas suggested that the Czech language was more endangered with the Protestants because the Bohemian diet had to require that officials know it before the Thirty Years War, Šnajdr titled his reply “Who saved our nationality?” Even the circumspect František Palacký and “clerical” Václav Vladivoj Tomek, leading historians in Šnajdr’s time, did not conceal its “rapid decline” in the Catholic centuries. It was the luminaries of the Bohemia Reformation who developed the Czech language and its literature—Šnajdr invoked Hus, Komenský and several more with evident pleasure—while the Catholics only persecuted them. Even now the clergy used Czech only to better manipulate the people, while all diocesan consistories in Bohemia and Moravia still used German in their internal business, as Šnajdr knew from the constant complaints in the Prague and provincial papers that he read.\textsuperscript{176} This piece illuminates an important part of the ground that Šnajdr shared with other liberal nationalists and the emphasis that distinguished him. Language and history were the (portable) heart of that common ground, which included the more recent preoccupations of capitalist modernization and social progress in Bohemia and Moravia. The attraction and gravity of the Bohemian Reformation made history a latently anti-Catholic part of Czech identity. For Václav Šnajdr it sustained a polemical habit that a fellow liberal like Karel Jonáš avoided. When the three Cleveland parishes stonewalled Koudelka and his bishop, Šnajdr titled it “Czech Catholics rebel against Roman despotism.”\textsuperscript{177} When they faced down an interdict at St. Prokop’s, he invoked the historical stamina that averted the Germanization that overtook the Polabian Slavs. He also recalled Jan Hus and King George of Poděbrady as targets of the Church and assured the West Siders that they were “not in bad company.”\textsuperscript{178}

In America the stakes were just as high. When a Republican advocate of legal affirmation for Christianity (and temperance) campaigned for state secretary, it was a
threat to “intellectual or religious freedom,” which was more important than civil freedoms and which “all Christian sects, with the sole exception of the Bohemian Brethren, had suppressed with shocking violence.” When Šnajdr asked “What is the purpose of an atheist newspaper?” it was to explain his own effort. Atheism was unpopular and unprofitable, he agreed with its Christian critics, but it was “free thought that gave us science, like a spring in the desert gives new and better life wherever its drops reach, and where this freedom is absent, enlightenment and progress will never come.” When Šnajdr noticed (1881) that “this year Czech immigration must be the greatest since 1866-1867,” he called for integrating the new arrivals and preserving Czech identity to whatever extent possible in American circumstances and toward compensation for the nation at home. But after this opening paragraph, four more were about keeping newcomers out of busy Catholic hands. It was for the “benefit of common freedom, intellectual development and national progress,” because the influx of believers was “making the Church and its prospects a danger in this country.” Šnajdr feared that freethinkers, contentious and unwilling to sacrifice much for common causes, were no match for the Church, which was thoroughly military in organization and militant in action. In Cleveland, “believers for the churches were on the rise amidst the new wave of Czechs, but not so subscribers for the press.” Thus Šnajdr opened another discourse on the meaning of the press and another call for support, this one on the local news page, others in editorials and all around. It was a litany of regular frequency, and it gave his anticlericalism a defensive and urgent edge.

Šnajdr’s anticlericalism also had something of a source in culture shock. “Spontaneous and neighborly fellowship with parishioners is quite common in Bohemia, especially among the country priests,” he wrote, “but in America you will not find it even in a thousand cases.” Giving account of the segregation that the clergy urges on Catholics, he remarked that “even in Europe, in those villages and towns where Catholics, Protestants and Jews lived together,” they left the children on their playgrounds alone. In the early Czech neighborhoods of American cities, liberals and Catholics were also at
close quarters, and it fostered vehement personal animosities. After Labor Day one year on Croton Street, Father Hynek could turn away children that he saw attending the Perun summer school down the street.\textsuperscript{186}
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CHAPTER VI
NEW YORK PATRIOT IN CONFLICT WITH ANARCHISTS

On August 18, 1883, Jan Vratislav Čapek launched a new weekly in New York, one named Patriot. Shortly before, he set out its purpose in a leaflet addressed to his working-class countrymen in America’s largest city, where they remained mostly cigarmakers and in misery on the Lower East Side. Here were “neglected stretches of the nation’s ancestral field,” wrote Čapek, invoking the familiar nationalist topos, and he wanted to “take up their sowing.” He knew the crop that would bring well-being: thrift, family and enterprise, both cooperative and private. As for a title, the invocation that would loom large at the head of every sixteen pages of print, Čapek chose Patriot “to remind the Czech people at least once a week that a Czech origin is no disgrace or sin and that a Czech can be an honest working man and a cultivated human being.”

Unspoken in Čapek’s call to middle-class virtue as the way to working-class salvation was his real purpose: to counter the influence of anarchists on his New York countrymen. Anarchists were recent refugee Social Democrats from Bohemia, radicalized there in persecution. Nationalist and international, the name Patriot could give a journal against them the right resonance and appeal. It could include more than one kind of nationalism, as Čápek suggested in his proclamation: “We live in a country that offers us the freedom to develop independently and to better ourselves. Let us make use of it.”

Freethinkers and Catholics were no longer the only two camps in Czech immigrant society and journalism: Social Democrats had formed a third camp that now mobilized its own form of radicalism. Wage laborers and urban residents amounted to a large proportion of the Czech immigration from the beginning, so various socialists had a ready audience and potential following. But unlike liberal nationalists and Catholics, socialists did not have ready institutions. The Catholics had their church, international and enduring since late Roman times. Freethinkers could emulate the many Czech
nationalist institutions developed in Bohemia since at least the late eighteenth century (amateur theater) and especially since the revolution, including the Slavic Linden, Karel Havlíček’s journalism and the Sokol gymnastic society. Emigrating socialists had no solid institution until the Austrian Social Democratic Party (1874) and its constituent Czecho-Slavonic party (1878) organized, but the Habsburg state followed the example of Bismarck’s Germany and persecuted the new worker’s party until 1890.

As a Czech liberal nationalist J.V. Čapek welcomed moderate forms of socialism and was in fact friendly with Lev Palda and František Škarda, the first socialist journalists among his countrymen in America. Before crossing the Atlantic Palda worked as a journeyman weaver in Vienna, Chemnitz, Bayreuth and St. Gallen for six years, and at the same time he was a student of socialism. In the fall of 1868, after some eighteen months in Michigan and Cleveland, Palda came to New York, where he quickly moved up from cigarmaker to foreman in a textile factory. He also read the German labor daily *Arbeiter Union* and the tracts of its editor, Dr. Adolf Douai (1819-1888), who was then turning from the ideas of currency reformer Edward Kellogg to those of Karl Marx, whose *Kapital* Douai serialized in his newspaper. By then the number of German immigrants and their children in New York approached three hundred thousand. That was one-third of the city’s total population. It was a large, familiar and experienced host community for the otherwise isolated enclave of Bohemians, and it was the best school for working-class consciousness and socialism in America. This school had already accumulated two decades of history and the influences of diverse labor organizers, utopian socialists (Wilhelm Weitling) and Marxists (Josef Weydemeyer, Friedrich Adolf Sorge). Palda arrived in time for a new round of activism, journalism and innovation. The *Arbeiter Union* newspaper had emerged in June from a convocation of German trade unions, and Karl Marx’s International Workingmen’s Association, the so-called First International, formed its first American section among the New York Germans by the end of 1869. On his way to New York Palda had addressed his countrymen in Allegheny City and inspired them to form the “nationalist and liberal society Slavoj,”
but just eight months later his subject was the “labor question” and the result a “politically socialist Czech workers’ society” in Cleveland, where Palda was an invited speaker for Jan Hus day. Ephemeral, the society was nevertheless the “first of its kind in America.” Back in New York, Palda “lectured on the relationship of labor to capital” in a failed effort to bring the lowly Bohemians into the elitist Cigar Makers International Union.

Palda succeeded the poet J.V. Sládek, who returned to Prague, as editor of the Chicago weekly *Národní noviny* on June 16, 1870. Two months later his close friend Vilém Jandus and “several” other Czech immigrants in New York formed the First International’s third American section. The *Národní noviny* became their organ when the newspaper’s publishing association approved their request, but the transaction occurred just weeks before what became editor Palda’s last issue (November 17), and the weekly’s brief final editor, Josef Pastor from Oswald Ottendörfer’s middle-class *New Yorker Staatszeitung*, was not receptive to socialists. An orator at heart, Palda returned to New York only to address the First International’s rally against Prussian militarism in France. Illness kept Palda in the city, but nationalism routed internationalism in the German community, and his local inspiration, the *Arbeiter Union* newspaper, did not survive. As for the Czech section, it still had “many” members in good standing by springtime, but they were of the kind that “soon tire of higher goals.” By then Palda relocated back to Cleveland with a bride and turned to a cigarmaking business and his new personal obligations. Insolvency had made quick work of Palda and Jandus’s bookstore and took away their labor newspaper after one issue. Palda could no longer take on the misery and honor of the “higher goals” with the abandon of his editorship in Chicago, where he wrote and slept on straw in one place. In New York the First International’s Czech section courted the distant Iowa City *Slovan amerikánský*, where utopian socialist Ladimír Klácel was still editor, but never won ardent commitment from this weekly. In an August 1871 battle call to countrymen, perhaps a last act, the section left behind a roster of sixteen names.
In Cleveland Palda evidently became politically eclectic, because he worked for Horace Greeley’s 1872 presidential campaign as a public speaker. But the five-year Panic of 1873 renewed working-class hardship and activism. In Chicago immigrant Lassallean socialists from Germany, where the Social Democratic Party had formed four years earlier, led a multi-ethnic march of twenty thousand to city hall in the days before Christmas, where they called for public works or relief, an action that offended the Anglo and Irish majority in the establishment, press and even the labor movement. But the Germans promptly formed the Workingmen’s Party of Illinois and a socialist counterculture of associations, including the Socialist Publishing Society and its weekly Vorbote, after the example of their parent party in Germany. By March four of the Workingmen’s Party’s thirty-one sections were Bohemian, which was by this measure the second largest ethnic group in the party. The Bohemian section in Chicago had 175 members at this early date. Their representative was Prokop Hudek (1843-1886), a native of the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands (Uhlířské Janovice) who arrived in America at age twelve and became a notary public. A veteran of Chicago’s Czech rifle company in the Civil War, Hudek was the founding captain of the Bohemian Sharpshooters, another institution of the city’s postwar German working-class counterculture that the Czech immigrant community emulated.

In Cleveland Palda formed another workers’ society by the end of the year, and from May 22, 1875, he edited and František Škarda (1848-1900) published the Dělnické listy, which meant “Workingmen’s pages.” In the next two years they published reports from Bohemian sections in Chicago, Milwaukee, New York, Cincinnati and Detroit of what was now the Workingmen’s Party of the United States, and eventually Palda and Škarda’s newspaper announced itself each week as an “organ of the Socialist Labor Party,” as the party called itself after December 1877. Škarda was another native of south Bohemia (Strakonice), where he completed several years of secondary education. In New York, where he arrived in the late 1860s, Škarda was a cigarmaker and managed
to save up $1,400, which he used to launch the newspaper after his association with Palda. As the only Czech labor newspaper in name, political affiliation and spirit for the next seven years in America, the Dělnické listy was the most stable, visible and authoritative working-class institution in the immigrant ethnic group. Marginalized in unskilled jobs for their stark linguistic and ethnic otherness, most Czech speakers were not welcome in the craft unions, where the predominance of much larger ethnic groups (English, Irish, German) was another obstacle. Isolated in their small and widely separated urban communities (New York, Cleveland, Chicago), Czechs formed fraternal benefit societies, but these were still mostly diminutive and uncoordinated in the 1870s.

To become “effective they needed a press organ that could promote their cause,” as Palda recognized after he formed one of two such societies in Cleveland. He also wanted to challenge Pokrok’s “harmful monopoly in political matters” there and most of all to satisfy his “irrepressible urge for a public role on behalf of the working class.” In 1878 nearly three hundred “members of the Socialist Labor Party systematically canvassed city wards, precincts and blocks in New York and Brooklyn” to sign up four thousand subscribers for the Socialistic Cooperative Publishing Association, which launched the Volkszeitung, a landmark German daily for the next half century. In their much smaller immigrant world, Palda and Škarda relied on a “few friends” in New York and especially Chicago to attract seven hundred subscribers in their first year. This generated invitations for the two Czech socialists, who traveled, spoke and quickened subscriptions, which rose to 2,200, including 700 in Cleveland, with the high tide of labor conflict in 1877.

Reaction from other Czech newspapers radiated another kind of appeal for the Dělnické listy. In Chicago Jan Oliverius advised the “so-called workingmen’s party” to stop “meddling in politics,” where “strikes and so-called laws for the protection of labor” were futile because the “natural development of competition” could not be turned back any more than the great Mississippi River. Such a party’s only useful purpose would be
to help wage labor go west and farm, because it had flooded the labor market in the cities. A native of Královice, a town on the language divide twenty miles north of Plzeň, Oliverius (1843-1904) trained for the merchant’s trade but aspired to challenge Karel Jonáš for journalistic leadership in America. Editor and (after 1875) publisher of sixteen successive titles in three decades after arrival in St. Louis (1865)—for which Jonáš dismissed him as a “newspaper gravedigger”—Oliverius persisted with money from a sister in Prague. Another benefactor was the Republican Party, which he promoted with caustic and lonely conviction in Chicago after 1873. In Racine Karel Jonáš welcomed laws favorable to labor but also opposed strikes and the Socialist Labor Party, which he discredited with the nationalist argument that it was a German organization, where Czechs would return to the subordinate status that they endured in the Habsburg Empire. Moreover, Jonáš denied that wage laborers were even a meaningful socio-political class, because they often became farmers or small businessmen. In October 1876 he published a supporting nationalist critique of socialist internationalism from his old acquaintance Jan Borecký, the outspoken tailor turned saloonkeeper who had quit Chicago for the Great Plains during the panic. Lev Palda’s response opened a three-month exchange between Slavie and the Dělnické listy, part of an even longer exposition of differences with Jonáš, whom Palda even challenged to a public debate.

The years of the panic had divided the two newspaper editors. In 1872, just months after his return from Bohemia, Jonáš abandoned the Republican Party for the Liberal Republicans and their president candidate, Horace Greeley. Like its German critics, Jonáš resented Republican nativism, as in the Graham Law, which penalized immigrant beer-hall culture in Wisconsin, but the party also offended his emotions as a Czech nationalist when it affirmed federal over state power, which Jonáš likened to the affirmations of German centralism over Czech and Slavic federalism in Habsburg Austria. Four years after Greeley and one year after the Liberal dissenters lost the Wisconsin governor’s office to the mainstream Republicans, Jonáš moved on to the
Democratic Party and in 1877 won one term in the Wisconsin State Assembly. There he sponsored bills, which Republicans defeated, against child labor and the payment of wages in company vouchers. Palda, who had moved on from Greeley to revolutionary socialism, dismissed Jonáš’s effectiveness on behalf on workers, and Jonáš dismissed socialist ambitions and visions as delusional.20

In the years from the Civil War to the panic, Jonáš had to acknowledge Catholic separatism among his countrymen and their institutions. Now he had to accept another departure from the liberal nationalist mainstream that he tended as a kind of chief journalist. Now thousands of Czech wage laborers responded to something more than fitful reforms from state officials, uncertain prospects for betterment in prairie farming and small business, or even respectable and restrictive Anglo trade unionism: they turned to independent labor politics and to the socialist promise of a new order to replace capitalism. In the Great Upheaval 1877, despite their small share of America’s urban population, they managed to launch three mass strikes their own. In three successive cities—Cleveland, Chicago and New York—they fashioned their own versions of what labor historian Herbert Gutman recognized as community uprisings. Czechs were especially well qualified for this kind of labor struggle because of their socially-motivated nationalism, collectivism and experience with popular activism and “self-help.” As in the German states, recent feudal conditions and a flourishing culture of popular associations encouraged collective identity in Bohemia and Moravia. But with no state and with the propertied classes foreign or estranged, Czech nationalism relied much more than its German (or Scandinavian) counterpart on the lower classes and on the defensive and emotional solidarity of its upwardly mobile elites with the common people. Like the Irish and Poles, Czechs developed forms of mass mobilization in a permanent struggle for political emancipation. The last peasant uprising occurred as late as 1821, and it was in the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands, eventual heart of the emigration to America. Two decades after the Revolution of 1848, elected local governments and brotherhoods of impoverished journeymen organized the tábory, three
years of mass demonstrations in the Czech-speaking territory to claim modern autonomy
for the crown of St. Václav and its historic lands in the Habsburg Empire. But Czechs
were more advanced in indifference to churches and religions than the Irish or Poles and
so more removed from a powerful source of conservatism, complacency and hostility to
secular and socialist allegiances.

On Thursday, April 19, 1877, Lev Palda and František Škarda, socialists at work on their
newspaper in Cleveland for not quite two years yet, found themselves facing some one
thousand countrymen who had marched to them for leadership. They were hoopers-off at
Standard Oil Company in the Cuyahoga valley below town, finishers in a barrel-making
process undergoing mechanization since the Civil War. That day they learned upon
arriving for work that their piece rate wage was cut from ten cents to nine, and up to
1,500 laborer in barrel shops no. 2 and 3 walked out in spontaneous response. At least
two-thirds were Czechs and the rest German and American-born. Josef Buňata, who had
joined Palda as editor, gave the first account of events in Dělnické listy on Saturday,
because Palda was occupied with the strike. Both socialists (Buňata paraphrased Palda’s
speeches) crafted narratives of social oppression, long endurance, just defiance and
collective consciousness in the reassuring and legitimizing rhetoric of established Czech
nationalism. “Let us open the great book of history,” Buňata began his account, “and
seek the places that relate the mass or unanimous arisings of the people for the purpose
of self-preservation.” Lid, the Czech singular form of “the people,” is the subject and
refrain of this luxuriant opening paragraph devoted to the commonplaces of popular
history. “Alas, when the oppressors’ greed, aroused amidst the people’s patience, finally
reaches for the people’s throat and constricts it to the point of suffocation,” so reads
history’s lesson in this Czech nationalist-socialist perspective, “then all the strings of
patience snap, as if severed by a magical power ... and in one instant the people come
into full awareness of their suffering, their oppression and also their rights.”

It was an affirmation of spontaneous action written in the passion of the moment, when
little else was at hand to be affirmed. The Bohemian barrel makers had no union, and their community was isolated in a city where it had been a noticeable presence for barely a decade and where it could not expect understanding from the Anglo majority, its press or government. And Standard Oil, the first large corporation, had already defeated a strike just three years earlier in New York. The Coopers’ International Union, founded at Cleveland in May 1870 to preserve skills and status, never recovered. As for the Dělnické listy, Palda admitted that it had “few subscribers in Rockefeller’s barrel shops,” because the “poor souls there,” when not laid off, “worked from five in the morning to eight or nine at night and had no time to read.” In its narrow circumstances the paper still “trained its effort on political orientation and enlightenment.” Yet when spontaneous action ended outside after the walkout, the call that arose among the barrel makers was “Let’s go to Dělnické listy, to Palda,” as Buňata reported, and they marched without leadership but in “perfect order” to the print shop. Palda addressed them elsewhere, from a table in a vacant lot at Broadway and Forest, and Škarda spoke as his interpreter in German and English. They spoke there again that evening by torchlight, when the strike already turned into a community affair: now three thousand residents gathered, and Mudra’s band, “which no one had engaged and no one paid, nevertheless arrived in almost full strength to move their fellow workers and inspire them to endurance with the magical power of their instruments.” Škarda became chairman of an elected and proportional strike committee of ten Czechs, three Germans and two Americans. The next night’s rally raised the total to forty. Mudra’s band struck up after seven-thirty, then Škarda and Palda reported on the committee’s meeting at Standard Oil, which rejected its demand for a twelve-cent wage. Now “not just the mothers, wives and sisters of the strikers were present, but also hundreds, even thousands, of other workers and shopkeepers.” Palda, who again spoke in Czech, referred to Standard Oil officials as “your lords,” as if to put old resentments against the German nobility in Bohemia to new use in Cleveland: “We conveyed your misery and suffering to them, but they just shrugged their shoulders.” After more explanation, “not a single muscle moved in their faces, as if they were made of marble,” and when the committee “pleaded for you,
working people, who create all the wealth in the world and help them achieve power and leisure, they only laughed.”

Two days of rallies and marches, including one to Standard Oil’s Euclid Avenue offices, with a Bohemian brass band at the head of up to four thousand demonstrators, remained orderly but unsettled Anglo society. By the twenty-fifth Palda and Škarda addressed Standard Oil’s hand coopers. Four hundred left work and elsewhere in the city smaller numbers of sewer workers, masons, carpenters, brickmakers, cigarmakers also struck. Mayor William G. Rose restricted the strikers’ use of streets and other public areas by executive order. Police superintendent Captain Hoehn deputized hundreds of willing employees as special policemen to reopen the two idle barrel shops by May 3, and Standard Oil enticed many strikers, especially the Germans, back to work. The speeches, rallies and music resumed in the Czech community, but it could not outlast Standard Oil, which shipped in barrels by the thousands from elsewhere. Increasingly desperate residents, especially women, argued with returning workers outside the refinery, which escalated to what the city’s two English dailies called the “Battle of Fort Standard” on the tenth, with 500-1,000 civilians versus 100 regular police and 300 “specials.” Two days later the strike committee called off the conflict as the city deployed three militia companies, Standard Oil expanded its private police force, and the Leader newspaper reviled Škarda, Palda and the Bohemian strikers as “ignorant of the English language [and] limited in general intelligence.” Škarda could only deplore this overwhelming concentration of power. But he moderately concluded that labor needed cooperatives and working-class politics, and he campaigned as the Socialist Labor Party’s unsuccessful candidate for lieutenant governor.

Two months after the Battle of Fort Standard, Czech lumbershovers and their community in Chicago’s South Side Pilsen neighborhood fought against police and militia in the Battle of Halsted Street. Thirty-seven of the eighty-eight street-battle casualties reported in the city’s press that summer were sixth-ward residents, and Pilsen
was the heart of this ward. Its Czech residents called it “Plzeň” after the beer hall—named for the rising west Bohemian city of machine-building and brewing—that appeared among the vegetable farms on this marshy prairie periphery less than a decade earlier. A local police lieutenant who had been stoned there cursed Pilsen as a “hotbed of communism” in an issue of the Chicago Tribune after the Battle of Halsted Street, and journalist Jan Oliverius made the same complaint in a letter to the Chicago Inter Ocean. Oliverius dated the “communistic feeling” in Pilsen, where he was a rare dissenter, to the rise of the Workingmen’s Party three years earlier. The Pilsen lumbershovers, including minority Germans and Poles, had a knowledge of socialist doctrine from their close association with the party, but they were also veteran strikers. After a brief first action in June 1875, they earned a reputation for militancy with marches and two violent confrontations with police over a May 1876 wage cut, and in July 1877 they exported the strike to other industries and the Irish. The Pilsen Czechs also had a military formation in the Bohemian Sharpshooters, and when a reporter allegedly overheard talk of calling on the Sharpshooters for defense against police, the commander of the Illinois National Guard ordered the Bohemian company to be disarmed on the same day.

The captain of the mistrusted Bohemians, Prokop Hudek, was also the most recognized Czech member of the Socialist Labor Party in the city, and the party had an ally in the city’s most recognized Czech journalist, František Boleslav Zdrůbek, who successfully used anticlericalism as the instrument and identity to bring liberal nationalist, socialist and unaffiliated laborers and tradesman together as the majority in Chicago’s Czech community. An impressive first manifestation of that new majority was the Bohemian National Cemetery, which eliminated a major motivation for nominal church membership and which arose in the months before and after the Battle of Halsted Street. On July 25, 1876, Marie Šilhánková died, but Father Josef Molitor refused to bury this St. Václav’s parishioner at the St. Vojtěch (Adalbert) Cemetery that he founded four years earlier and some fourteen miles northwest of town in Niles with his Polish fellow priests in Chicago. He stated that Šilhánková had failed to make confession, but he was
also then a plaintiff against the majority of his parishioners in a lawsuit that upheld the bishop’s property rights by August 19, 1880. Zdrůbek responded with a January 7, 1877, speech a few blocks away at the old the Prague neighborhood’s $30,000 Taylor Street hall, overlooking the lumber yards on the South Chicago River, that the fading Slavic Linden had opened seven years earlier and then ceded to the Sokol gymnastic society a year before the panic. The Statue of Liberty topped the facade, and inside Zdrůbek urged his listeners to free themselves from “subjugation to the priests in all the instances of their lives” and called on all Chicago societies to come together and create a “free national cemetery, where any Czech could be buried without regard to religion.”

Most responded, and their delegates amounted to eighty individuals. Eight societies founded the cemetery association, which obtained articles of incorporation from the state secretary in Springfield on April 11. The eight included one tailors’ and two “workingmen’s” benefit societies. Prokop Hudek represented one of the latter, but he was also the “Bohemian national” benefit society’s founder (with trade unionist Frank Dvořák) and the new cemetery association’s secretary. The four labor groups provided two-thirds of the cemetery association’s $1,500 in loans from member societies by the cemetery’s Sunday, September 2, opening festival, when Captain Hudek led a procession of four thousand countrymen, their societies and their musical bands, which filled twenty-five railroad cars. Located far from Prague and Pilsen in Chicago’s northwest (but seven miles closer than the Catholic St. Vojtěch Cemetery), the Bohemian National Cemetery required a motivated association of caretakers, offered lasting space for burials in large number with impressive monuments, and in these ways reinforced the new, anticlerical Chicago majority’s identity. The association had to prevail over Jefferson Township, which resisted the cemetery in court and on site, and it attracted more member societies, including five Chicago lodges of the national ČSPS “Czecho-Slavonic” fraternal benefit society in just two years. In one hundred years the Bohemian National Cemetery Association published four thick memorial books, one every quarter-century. In the first quarter-century 16,179 burials took place at Bohemian
National. By 1952 just the names, terms and affiliations of all delegates to the association to date filled twenty-eight pages.

In rural and small-town Wisconsin, Karel Jonáš could afford to criticize a separate identity for labor in socialist doctrine and politics, but in Chicago Zdrůbek was wise to welcome it, speak for it and coopt it. In the two years after the Battle of Halsted Street, the sixth ward’s largely Czech third, fourth and fifth precincts achieved ranks in the top ten of the city’s eighty-five precincts by number of socialist votes in three of four successive elections. In fact, the Socialist Labor Party won majorities here in each election and swept away former Czech loyalties to the Republican Party. The party was home to five Czech sections by 1879, and Zdrůbek was one of its outspoken ward club members. That spring he condemned Democrats, Republicans and the ruling classes with sharp editorials in Svornost, where he publicized the Socialist Labor Party’s platform, which called for government ownership of monopolies and for jobs and political representation for Czechs on the school board and city council. The party’s Czech sections adopted Zdrůbek’s daily as their organ. For larger effect Zdrůbek also endorsed the socialist idea of a cooperative economic system to replace exploitative capitalism and bristled with class rhetoric in the next issue of his almanac, the beloved form of book-reading that carried in volume far outside Chicago and stayed in homes and minds across the years. Was it a self-serv ing pose? As Chicago’s leading Czech journalist Zdrůbek had quite a measure of self-interest to serve, but he also had origins in the suffering social classes, and his theological education could work with messianic socialism, unlike Jonáš’s technical education. Besides, Chicago’s Czechs had their own sections in the party, and socialists were still willing to participate in a larger nationalist majority.

“Socialist science is the savior of all human society,” Zdrůbek wrote, because the only escape from panics and misery was to “replace the wage system and make the character of work cooperative, collective and social.” The capitalist “thief” would resist, because
then he would have to “work like everyone else, without enriching himself by
impoverishing others.” The system could not be reformed, because “all capital, whatever
its form and field, cares only for its own multiplication,” and there was “no use voting
for another party with the same principles to govern the country.” Zdrůbek translated the
resolutions of the Socialist Labor Party’s December 26-31, 1877, convention as a
companion piece to his almanac essay, titled “On Socialism.”

During his half-year sojourn as a newspaper editor at the start of the decade, Lev Palda found just two
workingmen’s societies, including one for tailors, among his countrymen in Chicago, but just eight years later cabinetmaker Lev Meilbek (1850-1883) of the Socialist Labor Party won election to the Illinois House of Representatives from the fifth, sixth and seventh wards. Earlier Meilbek was Chicago’s first “conscientious” and effective subscription agent for the Dělnicke listy in Cleveland. With the likes of Meilbek, Zdrůbek and Hudek now at work, leadership was assured in Chicago, but on October 1, 1877, Palda received a telegram from the other city of his former efforts: it urged him to “set out at once for New York, where 1,200 Czech cigarmakers had stopped work, and the leading ones wished for [his] presence.”

The American cigar industry had risen after the Civil War thanks to duties on European
and Caribbean imports, and by 1870 it was already Manhattan’s second largest
employer, with 5,549 cigarmakers. With more expansion and the cigar mold invention,
which demanded low-skilled specialization (bunching, rolling), the industry drew
increasing numbers of Bohemians into large shops and company tenements, where they
paid $8-10 per month rent and worked 17-18 hours daily, even as the depression cut
their wages to $5-7 per week. The Cigar Makers International Union (CMIU) was only
for the skilled and its two locals a Germanic linguistic family affair, with its membership
from England, Holland, Scandinavia and Germany. Adolf Strasser’s Vereinigte Cigarren
Macher von Nord-Amerika, which disregarded skill, nationality and gender, arose as a
union home for Bohemians in 1872, but just three years later it merged with the CMIU
into one big local, no. 144, where president Samuel Gompers shut them out again with
unfriendly policies of high dues and English only. In mid-September 1877 the tenement workers suddenly broke out of their isolation to join strikes under way at five different factories since early August. The CMIU discouraged large-scale strikes, because it favored concentrating resources and support on small numbers of strikers. But newly-elected president Strasser reversed this policy and called an October 14 meeting at Germania Assembly Hall, where he addressed five thousand in German and Gompers in English. There Strasser also became president of a twelve-member executive committee in a Cigar Makers Central Organization (CMCO), with one or more elected stewards from individual shops, to direct a strike that peaked with ten thousand workers at sixty factories by the end of October.\textsuperscript{34}

Lev Palda was in New York by the morning of Sunday, October 14, in time to address Adolf Strasser’s Germania Hall rally that afternoon. But he was not the only one to do so in Czech: in a brief account for \textit{Dělnické listy} after a “long succession of speakers,” Palda dwelled on two female cigarmakers, Haeuslerová and Dlouhá, who spoke with such “understanding of the situation and transcendence” that “many educated people would be grateful to possess their eloquence.” But the aroused popular will that attracted Palda was also too powerful to train on just a few shops and the limited, reasonable prospect of success that he preferred. In the days after the rally it “hit almost all shops,” motivated employers to unite in defense, and inflated its participation past ten thousand to numbers that could awe but could not be supported in idleness against an industry with a large back stock of product. Bohemians came to predominate on the street and in the strike committee, Palda claimed, but were inarticulate and inexperienced in the dominant culture, so “other people” and the CMIU stayed in charge. Palda stayed “about three weeks, reassuring and encouraging the embattled workers in their various meetings.”\textsuperscript{35} He also “came into agreement” with J.V. Čapek, editor and co-publisher of \textit{Newyorské listy}, to merge his local daily with \textit{Dělnické listy}. Palda was “quickly going broke” and blamed it on the weekly, which consumed his energies and created impressions that he no longer depended on his cigarmaking business and clientele. Palda
reported to “citizen” Škarda, who “made the final agreement” in New York with “mister” Čapek, and by Christmas they moved their weekly there.\textsuperscript{36}

Čapek had left Cleveland and made no farewells three years earlier. Just four weeks after announcing his resignation as editor in \textit{Pokrok}, he ended his own weekly, originally devoted to humor, in bitter words: “The shovel is heavy for a Czech in America, the pen even heavier, and so I am throwing away the pen with which I wasted three of the best years of my life.” A “wearied, harried and depressed laborer,” Čapek “abandoned the plow in mid-field” because $800 remained hopelessly in arrears among subscribers, whom he “would not call Czechs, so as not to disgrace the nation.”\textsuperscript{37} But in two quick letters he succeeded Jan Reindl, a tenor who arrived in New York with a Russian opera company and edited the Slavic Linden’s \textit{Newyorské listy} for three months after its July 25, 1874, appearance.\textsuperscript{38} Čapek even bought the weekly by the start of 1876, seven weeks after its forced sale at auction, and made it a daily the following May in another bid to be a successful publisher.\textsuperscript{39} He started with just “500 subscribers and a handful of beggarly-paid advertisements”\textsuperscript{40} but evidently counted on his cigarmaking countrymen, twelve thousand by his estimate, if not on the “small number of other tradesmen” who presumably had the only businesses to advertise. In their first reaction to the panic, six hundred Czech laborers had put over $30,000 into a cigarmaking cooperative, which soon failed for other reasons.\textsuperscript{41} But whatever the community’s willingness to sustain a daily newspaper, the long strike diminished its abilities to do so.

The capable CMCO strike committee appealed to the local German and Bohemian communities, to fellow cigar makers and trade unionists in America and Europe, and it organized fund-raising concerts, theatrical performances and fairs. The collections amounted to $38,000 between October 15, 1877, and March 30, 1878, but the Bohemian contribution was most conspicuous in the CMCO’s post-mortem financial report, which listed no less than ten “Bohemian sickness societies.” German benevolent associations and the much larger and wealthier German community were relatively unresponsive.
The strike committee’s minimum wage demand of $6 per thousand cigars was not quite realistic for tenement workers, whose demands for lower rent, decent lighting and cleaner premises the committee also adopted, but the Bohemian majority remained loyal. When evictions began November 5, the CMCO countered with lawyers to contest the court warrants and a housing committee, which placed some two-thirds of fifteen hundred homeless tenement families in new quarters with escort parades. But sympathetic press coverage ended after December 14, when the large employers’ National Cigar Manufacturers Association prematurely declared the strike over. A narrow majority of some 1,150 remaining strikers did not do the same until January 24, 1878, and the CMCO continued material support and cash payments to “over 900 families” until March, but its residual $8,000 debt became a matter of controversy between mutual aid associations and the CMIU, which eventually paid it off. The CMIU allowed “ethnic groupings” after 1881 and accepted women but still kept out tenement workers as the Gompers and Strasser “program of high dues and financial stability” prevailed. As for the Bohemians, they never again became “prominently involved in the city’s working class politics.”

For J.V. Čapek the strike brought on but also redeemed another business failure. “With passionate and inspired words, he roused the embattled to perseverance day after day,” wrote Lev Palda in admiration, “and at the same he excoriated the strike’s betrayers—the hated, so-called ‘Chinamen’—with the incinerating acidity of his pen. The influence of his frail daily became enormous during the strike, first of all because everyone was eager to read how things stood with each new day.” But with small savings already exhausted from the preceding bad years, countrymen with shivering and starving families begged even for pennies at the strike committee’s office, where Palda observed “heartbreaking scenes.” Čapek did not even manage to stay in business quite long enough for František Škarda to complete their buyout agreement, but the three
typesetters who bought Čapek’s failed paper at auction soon agreed to join Dělnické listy.45

Čapek left his editorial office at Fourth Street and Avenue B but soon married Louisa Schaefer, the American-born daughter of his landlord there, an independent German baker. Čapek read German newspapers and books aloud for his mother-in-law, who praised his command of the language and “polished manners.” With such favor in the family and a handsome dowry, Čapek moved to a new three-story house on a new street in Brooklyn that he equipped and turned into a laboratory for his “beloved experiments with electricity.” He counted on making a fortune with one of the “inventions swarming in his head” before the dowry ran out, but in this he failed as well. He had already made an attempt at a “horseless carriage” in Cleveland. In New York he devoted as much as eighteen hours a day to his new career, completed designs and prototypes for a wide range of devices, attracted investors and obtained six patents by 1893, but he lacked what one of his three younger brothers in America called a “sense for business.”46

Lev Palda left the Dělnické listy by April 1879, unable to bear worsening poverty, poor health and dejection. The paper had finally consumed all his former business capital, and Škarda owed him some $500 in back wages but offered a mere parting $6. But with relatives, including two American brothers in small business, and with celebrity, which brought a free ticket from steamship agent Brodský and a loan from the Czech Socialist section, Palda could afford a sojourn in Karlovy Vary, Bohemia’s famous spa town. In the fall he paid his way west with a lecture tour of Czech communities, and by January 1880 he settled in Cedar Rapids with his family to start another successful cigarmaking livelihood.47 František Škarda carried on as a socialist newspaper publisher. The move to New York was badly timed, the turn to a daily edition brought only some five hundred subscribers while those in Cleveland and elsewhere largely fell away, but with the “return of better financial times” the Dělnické listy also became more of a livelihood.48
But on June 18, 1882, Leo Kochmann (1845-1919) arrived in New York to edit *Dělnické listy* at Škarda’s invitation and to avoid a one-year prison term in Prague. The son of a schoolteacher in Nové Strašecí, Kochmann became a flour mill apprentice and shopkeeper just twenty-seven miles to the southeast in the capital, where he sold whole grains. Like Škarda, he used his own money to launch a Socialist journal, *Pochodeň* (Torch), but it became a target for the hostile Habsburg state. Kochmann also wrote for the labor press in Prague, where he translated and serialized Marx’s *Kapital*; in Cleveland, after Škarda and Palda launched their weekly; and finally in New York, where his “writing aroused interest in the Czech neighborhood.” In fact, Škarda published the poem, “Why Am I a Socialist?” used to convict Kochmann for lese majeste.\(^49\) But on October 10, not four months after Kochmann’s arrival, Škarda’s typesetters struck and launched their own cooperative daily, *Dělník americký* (American worker). At issue, as Josef Buňata put it in a manifesto to the community, was the absurd spectacle of a workers’ paper that one individual owned as his personal property.\(^50\) Škarda’s *Dělnické listy* ceased by July 10, 1883.\(^51\) It was all like a Socialist version of the Catholic parish property disputes that made allegiance and identity dynamic in the Bohemian immigrant world. *Dělnické listy* was the first voice for a Socialist alternative in the contest for the community and its imagination. Eight years later the newspaper’s demise announced the arrival of persecuted Social Democrats from Central Europe and the turn to a more radical Socialist voice in the Czech-language discourse across the American states.

Leo Kochmann was the new influence that entered the healthy *Dělnické listy* before its demise and accompanied three of its earlier employees to the new daily. Jaroslav Chudoba and František Lier were hardly profound radicals. After three years Chudoba, who was born in New York and studied at the Prague polytechnic, joined the Democratic *Svoboda*, which county judge Augustin Haidušek launched in La Grange, Texas. Lier opened his own print shop in the later, Upper Manhattan Bohemian neighborhood but used it for a monthly on popular medicine.\(^52\) Lifelong cigarmaker Josef Buňata was a
more durable socialist, but one who turned against Škarda only after Kochmann arrived. Buňata came to the Lower East Side in mid-April 1870 and promptly sought out the local source for the Czech press. Its purveyor, Vilém Jandus, became Buňata’s “first instructor in socialism” and led Buňata to his own sources—Lev Pald, then writing out his views as a newspaper editor in Chicago, and the local Germans (including Adolf Strasser) in the First International, whose meetings they both attended. By 1877 Buňata formed a small Czech section of the Socialist Labor Party in Detroit, then joined Škarda as an editor of Dělnické listy and as a stump speaker for his lieutenant gubernatorial candidacy. By 1886 Buňata left New York and socialism to eventually settle among his rural countrymen in Texas, but Kochmann kept to New York and socialist journalism to the end of his full life.

Kochmann was the earliest American journalist to emerge among the persecuted and radicalized Social Democrats from Bohemia, who amounted to a distinct stream of arrivals in the 1880s. The Habsburg state prosecuted 4,086 members of the party, including its large Czecho-Slavonic organization, during the decade, after which it abandoned such repression. Its vehemence and shock effect encouraged radicalism among the novice Czech Social Democrats, who followed the responses of their German comrades at home and across the border. Johann Most, who launched the London Freiheit in early 1879, took up a shrill rhetoric in favor of revolution as the only worthwhile goal, but even the party’s mainstream, which launched Der Sozialdemokrat by October in its Zürich refuge from Bismarck, now amended its program to include illegal activity. It also expelled Most, but the Bavarian native influenced comrades in Austria, where he had worked and whose problems he treated in Freiheit. Except for Prague, the Czech party’s textile, metal-making and mining base labored where its parent German-speaking Austrian party concentrated and issued its newspapers, in Vienna, Brno and north Bohemia, which had many relationships with Saxony along a populous borderland. Zukunft, the Austrian party’s organ in Vienna, aligned itself with Most. By August 1880 Norbert Zoula argued in Most’s spirit at a Prague meeting, and
much of the Czech party made the radical turn, including its most influential journalist, Josef Boleslav Pecka.\footnote{56} Johann Most turned more radical after his June 26, 1881, sixteen-month conviction for praising Czar Alexander II’s assassination and after the landmark London anarchist congress three weeks later. Now he became anarchism’s German spokesman and urged his countrymen to take up the “propaganda of the deed,” the stark term for assassination by individuals acting alone as the method of class warfare to destroy the state and make way for a society of independent communes. The Czechs already receptive to Most were also deeply Russophile, and the chief protagonists of anarchism were M.A. Bakunin and P.A. Kropotkin. Marx and Engels were Germans who vilified rising Czech consciousness,\footnote{57} but their ideological rival Bakunin was an anti-German Slavophile who had joined Prague’s 1848 revolution. Zoula and Pecka took up contacts with Russian nihilists in Vienna, a mutual refuge where Pecka resumed editing the Czech party’s Dělnické listy by fall 1883 after imprisonment and expulsion from Prague.\footnote{58}

After his own imprisonment in London, Johann Most took refuge in New York by the end of 1882 and influenced one Czech population at close range. In the previous year radicalized Social Democrats from Bismarck’s Germany had already quit the Socialist Labor Party to form the Revolutionary Socialist Labor Party, which joined the Most-influenced International Working People’s Association (IWPA) at an October 14-16, 1883, Pittsburgh congress. The IWPA became the umbrella for an anarchist movement that attracted nearly three thousand individuals in its Chicago capital in the three years before the Haymarket tragedy, and Czech immigrants were a prominent part of it.\footnote{59} Jakub Mikolanda represented them in Pittsburgh and became one of four secretaries at the IWPA’s Information Bureau in Chicago. In May New York Czechs had already cofounded an Austrian Revolutionary League that joined the IWPA.\footnote{60} The name alone was a new challenge to the mainstream liberal nationalists in the Czech immigration, where even the Catholics, with their pro-Habsburg heritage, avoided the title “Austrian.” A year later the Austrian Revolutionary League appealed for donations to “obtain the
kinds of arms” for “Austrian anarchists” that would render harmless the “Habsburg-cannibalistic state and its lackey-filled courts.” It was open code for assassination and dynamite. That it appeared in Leo Kochmann’s new “organ of Czech Radical Socialists” is one loud advertisement for the commingling of anarchist and radical identities. Even Communist-era historians in Czechoslovakia, for all their clinical pains to isolate three strains of resistance in the persecuted Social Democratic Party, admitted that these “combined according to local conditions and the temporal situation into specific variants.” Classic radicals were in the middle, reemphasizing revolution with anarchists to their left and rejecting terrorism with moderates to their right. In America real radicals and anarchists had mostly each other for company, because moderates could stay at home to carry on their law-abiding campaign for civil rights and electoral power.

By June 16, 1883, the “First Socialist Labor Section” launched Budoucnost (Future) on May Street in Chicago’s Pilsen, with Jakub Mikolanda as editor. In a call for readers titled “To Czech labor,” they promised to “illuminate the shortest route ahead” to “world revolution” and “liberation from the capitalist yoke.” Their program, in seductive and permissive summary, was that “all methods must be used to liberate the oppressed,” and a like-minded writer already declared that “one rifle in firm hands is more effective than 50 ballots.” All this was in the opening issue, and the anarchist spirit lost no intensity as the weekly marched on, with Norbert Zoula and then Josef Boleslav Pecka as later editors, until it became a casualty of Haymarket. Moderates were “those laborers and louts who claim that labor can better its circumstances in the law’s shadow,” when in fact violence was labor’s “surest road to victory.” The state was an instrument of power and oppression, and it had to go so that a federation of communes could form a free, cooperative society. A Socialist state would also be coercive and no better, but the state and its legitimacy were a malignancy so ingrained in consciousness that even socialists (read Marx, Lassalle and their like) could not rid themselves of it. That was why Budoucnost sanctioned the freedom of action principle for individuals and cells, what Bakunin (and Most) wanted, over hierarchy and centralized direction as the most
important result of Pittsburgh and formation of the IWPA. Here, under the title “On organization,”68 was the heart of the matter. A movement that embodied “unlimited individual freedom”69 now was the way to ingrain the mentality needed for the egalitarian stateless future, and it was also the best military posture for the imminent mortal struggle against the state. Kropotkin wrote that individual men of action were necessary to embolden the masses, and Budoucnost, under the title “Preparation for the socialist revolution,” prescribed a dissemination of leaflets after each terrorist deed to redouble the incendiary effect.70 Decentralized “guerilla” or “terrorist” methods of class war would negate the state’s preponderance of power and withstand its wrath.71

It was all quite a departure from the Czech nationalist mainstream and earlier labor leadership in America. “Our homeland is the world and our countrymen all mankind,” because “everywhere the land belongs to all mankind.”72 In another rejection of identity by ethno-linguistic territoriality, Budoucnost asserted that German Socialists and anarchists acknowledged the right of national self-determination and could not be thrown in with German liberals.73 For an example of inter-ethnic harmony, it pointed to working-class north Bohemia, which also happened to be anarchism’s bi-ethnic bastion in the Czech lands. As for strikes, which Czech labor and their journalist sympathizers in Cleveland, Chicago and New York had sustained with such effort in 1877, their memory might amount to some diminishing stimulus to class hatred, but revolutionaries did not bother organizing them.74 In fact, anarchists and radicals practiced a syndicalist involvement in labor unions and strikes as a way to revolution. They also kept to their own Czech sections and were deeply enmeshed in the Czech neighborhood, its beer halls, culture and language. But the categorical new rhetoric broadcast in newsprint was louder than such familiar realities.

Working-class mortality and other kinds of attrition also magnified the presence of Kochmann, Mikolanda and like comrades who soon followed them to America. In the same year that Budoucnost entered Czech print culture, Leo Meilbek silenced his own
voice by suicide. He had worked for a different road to working-class betterment: the Socialist Labor Party and election to the Illinois legislature, where he successfully used his rhetorical skills on behalf of building and loan associations. As an exemplary extension student at the venerable Průmyslová jednota trade school, where socialists influenced him, Meilbek was among 264 laborers that the Prague city government and chamber of commerce sent to the Vienna International Exhibition in June 1873. Labor had sought this support, and it was the last major instance of its reliance on the Czech liberal nationalist establishment. The panic was already on, and Meilbek arrived in Chicago on September 13. 75 Socialist labor was still on friendly terms with liberal nationalists in Bohemia, and Meilbek was the last to take that heritage to America. But the diseases of overwork and poverty that shortened working lives in American cities also shortened the life of this heritage. Meilbek entered a hospital with an “incurable disease” and took a razor blade to his throat at the age of thirty-three. 76 Prokop Hudek, another champion of building and loan associations, died three years later, aged forty-three. In New York, Mrs. Dlouhá, one of the two female orators that so captivated Lev Palda in 1877, “fell victim to rapid tuberculosis just after the strike, and Mrs. Haeuslerová did not live long either.” 77 Palda and Zdrůbek drifted away from socialism, which was turning from building and loan associations to calls for assassinations and terrorist cells.

In New York, the port of entry for its new shrill new journalists, J.V. Čapek and František Bartošek (b. 1850) decided in April 1883 to launch Patriot. Their countrymen, they believed, had no allegiance to socialism, yet both Czech dailies in the city were socialist. 78 Dělník americký and new Socialists like Leo Kochmann were the specific target, not František Škarda, who would publish Dělnické listy for just three more months. Škarda and Čapek were brothers-in-law, former business associates and comrades in the Czech community’s great 1877 cigarmaker strike. After Tomáš Čapek, not yet eighteen, left Bohemia to join Jan Valerian in the fall of 1879, he saw editor Škarda and his wife frequently as guests in his eldest brother’s home. J.V. Čapek even
sent his youngest brother to work for Škarda in January 1883 as a reporter on beer-hall debates between nationalists and socialists. But Škarda left New York with his wife on August 25 for obscurity and death as a cigarmaker in La Grange, Texas. J.V. Čapek noted the departure in the second issue of Patriot, dated that day, and he would publish seven letters from his friend that fall. Perhaps J.V. Čapek’s new associate, now a Fifth-Street grocer by the Volkstheater, was another pioneer Socialist. As early as July 1873 he was a cigarmaker in New York, then in Detroit and Toronto with Josef Buňata. Was he also the “F. Bartošek” who cofounded the Bohemian section of the Socialist Labor Party in New York on July 9, 1876?

J.V. Čapek was not happy with his countrymen’s circumstances, and he blamed the socialists. Much of the New York community was from around Ktná Hora and Sedlec (now a suburb), a center of the Habsburg state tobacco industry forty-three miles east of Prague, where a New York firm once recruited. But in a per capita comparison titled “the Czech city and its people,” Čapek calculated that for every seven who were small businessmen in Ktná Hora, barely one in New York had made this “necessary first step up” from “serfdom to the bosses.” Czechs were already unenterprising and envious, and socialists who maligned all social mobility only “condemned them to lifelong misery.”

Two thousand New Yorkers paid at least a thousand dollars in taxes each, and many were Germans. Čapek listed them. On top was Staatszeitung publisher Oswald Ottendörfer (1826-1900), who paid twenty-two thousand and came from Svitavy, Moravia. Czechs were so far behind that just five were among the eighty thousand residents obliged to pay any tax at all. For his part, Bartošek now understood that working-class liberation would follow native traditions in America, where English trade unionism had uses but revolutionary German doctrines did not, as he confessed in reply to past friends who attacked him in Dělník americký. Their own journal, Čapek explained, proclaimed “patriotism” as the effort to “elevate the Czech nationality in its American circumstances” and in the “American working-class family” of which it was part.
to Šimáček, who helped an unprepared peasant people succeed in the liberal order, and it was open to like forms of socialism and to Ango-American influences.

Čapek serialized a biography of George Washington, then one of Josef Jungmann, the icon of Czech linguistic nationalism. When a senate committee questioned Jay Gould on New York working conditions, Čapek devoted three columns to the controversial capitalist’s biography and claim of equal opportunity, all provocatively free of commentary. A series on how to manage money summarized Sam Smiles (1812-1904), the Scottish author of Self-Help, a best-seller whose title was also a byword of the Czech nationalist movement. When F.B. Zdrůbek’s Svornost judged Patriot too American-oriented, Čapek welcomed the criticism like a badge of pride. But Čapek also treated the American establishment as obstacle when he criticized the “princely salaries” of city officials and asked, in a column titled “Workingmen’s notes,” “Could not the state also help the workingmen?” after he quoted how many sheep and goats it gave the Navajo in 1869 and how they had multiplied. He reported on a National Cigar Manufacturers Association meeting because “nothing is more important for a party in struggle than to gain detailed knowledge of the enemy’s intentions,” and so “Cigarmakers’ notes” were another regular column. Here Čapek countered Evarts, the manufacturers’ representative who took $10,000 for his efforts at a two-and-a-half-hour hearing, where he pointed out that the death rate among the 1,964 cigarmaking families in 127 tenements during the previous year was just nine per thousand—far below the city’s thirty-one per thousand. “He could not depict all the beauties of tenement work completely,” Čapek commented, but it was enough to “recommend a restorative tenement sojourn to our aristocracy.” At the start of 1884 Čapek lamented that the “idea of a national hall was long asleep” and that Czech associations and their meetings “enrich with rental payments the enemies of Czechs and workers.” But closing on the previous April’s initial agreement for a building on Fifth Street came on February 1, 1884, and a triumphant community procession followed on March 15. The Národní jednota, or “National Union,” led 26 Czech associations in this purchase, and its capable chairman (A. Hašek) would stay in
office for at least the next quarter-century. That was unity, self-reliance and stability enough to admire.

But otherwise “us” and “them” were no longer as simple for Čapek as they were in 1877, when he was the only Czech voice in print. Socialism, trade unionism and another newspaper had entangled loyalties. “In the past great strike,” Čapek reflected, “all Czech small businessmen went into debt and even ruin, and they deserve labor’s favor.” But now Dělník americký ridiculed Čapek for taking ideas from the “Germans” at the Volkszeitung, for whom even “kings, generals and stock brokers are workers.” Čapek admitted to “many spirited conversations on the labor question with educated Czechs, Germans and Americans,” who called him a socialist. But Čapek was against “casting off one part of humanity,” and wanted no association with that “majority of Czech socialists here who are like religious fanatics,” because they “sanctify some text that they misunderstand.” Dělník americký “reduced” the working class to wage workers and vilified any cigarmaker who became self-employed as a “bourgeois and exploiter.” But for Čapek, casting off the petty middle class, that “supply-and-communications corps of the wage labor army, and its rear guard,” made no sense. So he had turned to the Volkszeitung, where the writers of Dělník americký “like to pick out dough to rebake into Czech chlebičky,” and the Volkszeitung had rendered a definition of the working class that affirmed Čapek’s inclusive, populist spirit.

Čapek exulted over his ideological checkmate of Dělník americký, and when at least six of its typesetters struck (unsuccessfully), he could discredit the eighteen-member cooperative’s egalitarianism and vindicate his ruined friend Škarda: Buňata and other editors took twelve dollars per week but paid the typesetters just six or seven. The durable daily had already survived a fire two months earlier, and Čapek invoked another friend and Socialist against it—Lev Palda—who “condemned incitement to violence and class hatred when methods in the spirit of reconciliation were still not exhausted” in America, where “Russian nihilism, German anarchism and Irish
agrarianism” were “out of place.” This was a reply to Hermann Sigel (1840-1894), editor of Milwaukee’s German-language Sozialist, that Čapek took from Karel Jonáš’s Slavie.98 Čapek also published a letter in facsimile to discredit Buňata, who ascribed his support for the Cigar Makers Progressive Union to personal needs—keeping readers for his paper and patrons for his beer hall. Buňata asked for confidentiality in the letter, but his addressee, a member of the rival Cigar Makers International Union, (and Čapek) considered it public because it discussed “union business.”99 For its part, Dělník americký belittled Čapek for his German wife and affluent in-laws.100 The small and isolated organism of Czech immigrant journalism was prone to ad hominem polemics, but trade union politics was a more profound source of contention for the two papers.

As the Cigar Makers International Union relaxed its exclusive character and took up recruitment, the Czech proportion of newcomers to its New York local, no. 144, by unambiguous surname alone, rose from zero in January 1881 to 13% a year later to a majority by fall 1883. The Internationals even allowed Bohemians to form their own local no. 141 but focused on lobbying governments against tenement work, with press exposes of conditions to move middle-class opinion. The campaign “took the union’s leaders to the halls of power more frequently than to the beer halls of the Lower East Side,” and a German opposition formed at local 144 by late spring 1880. It affiliated with the Socialist Labor Party after its prompt expulsion, but residual opposition at local 144 was strong enough two years later to elect Germans as president and treasurer, plus Czech immigrant Vincent V. Vojtišek as vice president, over the establishment slate. Gompers and Strasser used a technicality to depose the local’s president-elect, and dissidents formed the Cigar Makers Progressive Union (July 16, 1882), with three German-speaking sections, one Czech-speaking and one English-speaking. Like unions in Germany and Austria, the Progressives cultivated class consciousness with lectures and reading societies, and they reinforced Socialist party politics. Vincent Vojtišek did so as a candidate for alderman. The Internationals suited the better-paid Bohemians in semiskilled positions at the large Uptown factories around Eighty-Sixth Street where the
maturing cigar industry made the most of technology and scale, while Progressives welcomed even the tenement workers. They also relied more on strikes and community support to sustain them, but in the month before Čapek launched *Patriot* they encountered the entire National Cigar Manufacturers Association, where by secret pact a strike against one shop committed all shops to lock out their workers. The Manufacturers also defeated a March 1883, Strasser and Gompers-inspired state law that banned tenement cigar making. They did so in court appeals by fall 1884.\textsuperscript{101}

Čapek kept to his belief in small enterprise to social mobility for his countrymen. He sanctioned trade unions as useful vehicles to better working conditions and wages.\textsuperscript{102} He did not voice the resentment of Czech benevolent societies over members lost to the Internationals, with whom he shared reservations about strikes.\textsuperscript{103} But to him the lockout and a quarter million in lost wages meant that countrymen had “denied themselves 24 shops that could have become their property and employed over five thousand.” Čapek provocatively titled this accounting “Let us think!”\textsuperscript{104} All the effort invested toward the tenement work ban was another waste. The Manufacturers were too wily and persistent.\textsuperscript{105} As for the Progressive Union, it intended to displace wage labor with cooperative, something quite “beyond its means.”\textsuperscript{106} Like the *Volkszeitung*, Čapek “stood with labor alone” and above both feuding unions.\textsuperscript{107} He called for a minimalist “union no. 3,” where individuals would “deposit dues to their own savings accounts, and a union treasurer would record the balances.” Did workers want to “pay Strasser to be their second boss”? Did they want the Progressives to “convert them into socialists and boss them around”? “Like potentates, the union bosses make war whenever they please,” Čapek wrote, “but we have to fight them out and bear the costs.”\textsuperscript{108} The Czech Internationals met at Kopta’s Fourth-Street beer hall every Tuesday night but had no paper.\textsuperscript{109} The Progressive had one in *Děník americký* and urged it on.\textsuperscript{110} Their star, Vincent Vojtíšek, blasted Čapek’s “union no. 3” piece at Pospíšil’s beer hall and marched to his print shop for a confrontation face-to-face.\textsuperscript{111} Editor Buňata lectured at the same beer hall for the *Národní jednota* on the “universe and nature, with special
regard to theology.” These were concerns and perspectives that Čapek could share, and he advertised Buňata’s Christmastime appearance. Much more radical personalities were in town and in the Progressive Union.

Norbert Zoula had arrived from Bohemia. On Sunday, September 16, 1883, the Progressives of local no. 1, district no. 5, met at Pospíšil’s and discussed the imminent tenement work ban. Leo Kochmann was for vigilance and reporting violations. Buňata was wary: lawyers would find loopholes, and the Manufacturers would use them. A German (Weigert) also took a position, and Zoula spoke out for “dynamite and dagger,” because “even our great grandfather Žižka,” the Hussite warlord and Czech nationalist cult figure, “settled matters with his mace.” Čapek took Zoula to task in his next issue. And he titled the Progressives’ Sunday, November 25, meeting “Debate between socialists and anarchists.” Buňata, presiding for Vojtišek, who was in Cincinatti on union business, spoke out against killing off the middle classes. It would be inhuman, and the neglected working people could not govern. Bernard Herc (b. 1858) countered that “violence would clear their minds.” He was an organ maker from a south Bohemian village (Mačice), radicalized as an apprentice in Austria and then as a journeyman in Italy for three years before coming to New York (1878), where he worked in piano shops, including Steinway’s. Norbert Zoula contended that the worker did not need to wait for education and better laws: he already had the law of nature and his mind. Josef Jonáš challenged Zoula to explain his call in Děník americký for killing off the middle classes, when workers could use the ballot as their weapon, and he read an article in Slavie from Lev Palda. (Six years earlier, at the Socialist Labor Party’s founding congress, Jonáš had represented the New York Bohemians—with Čapek’s partner Bartošek.) Zoula and the controversy around him took so long that no time remained for other speakers. By the next Sunday Vojtišek was back. He dismissed Zoula and his like, who wanted to keep workers ignorant and put themselves at their head without understanding local conditions. Vojtišek wanted education for the next generation, which would be better equipped to change its circumstances. Zoula proceeded to read
clippings from the English-language press and argue that American capitalists were worse than the Austrians. (He was more fiery in Dělník americký’s account.\textsuperscript{116}) When the chairman tried to limit his time, Zoula overruled him with a majority vote and carried on for several hours. When Buňata took the floor to denounce anarchists and the disrepute they brought on the workers, Zoula openly parodied the speaker. The meeting broke up in disorder, and further discussion was postponed to the next Sunday. But by then Zoula had moved on to Chicago, where he would become editor of Budoucnost.\textsuperscript{117} Jakub Mikolanda was already there, and Čapek had a local reader who denounced that anarchist for subverting a Czech Knights of Labor section with over one hundred members and for passing himself off as a three-year prison veteran, while the reader’s “comrades in Austria” wrote that he had left before indictment.\textsuperscript{118}

More radicals were on the way. Čapek already knew them from the liberal nationalist papers in Bohemia: when he and other New York subscribers that he knew did not receive one issue each of Národní listy and Pokrok, Čapek asked his readers about it.\textsuperscript{119} He also endorsed the Czecho-Slavonic Social Democratic Party’s “reasonable organ,” Spravedlnost in Brno, Moravia. He reviewed the varieties of socialism, and he was for a “socialism of common sense,” not dynamite.\textsuperscript{120} But on January 19, 1884, Čapek stopped Patriot after just twenty-three issues. He had intended to be just a “contributor” for Bartošek, but the typesetter “made Čapek editor” in the leaflet announcing the weekly. Now Bartošek had bowed out and left Patriot entirely to Čapek for several weeks. Perhaps it was all a testament to Čapek’s standing among the Czechs in New York: as his brother Thomas recalled, the two men had launched Patriot at the “urging of friends.”\textsuperscript{121} Now Čapek was tired of the overwork and the seven-mile commute to Daniel Mašín’s Fifth-Street print shop. “He was gone from sunup to sundown,” his wife complained, “and even at home he was all wound up in his wires like a spider in the web or disappeared behind a newspaper.” Patriot left him only Sundays for his “livelihood,” and he needed to prepare “some product of his own” for the electrical exhibit in Philadelphia that year. He thanked his 800 New York subscribers and over 200 in
Cleveland.\textsuperscript{122} (Some 50 copies went to \textit{Národní listy} and other recipients in Bohemia.\textsuperscript{123}) \textit{Budoucnost} in Chicago made it to 750.\textsuperscript{124}

On May 25, 1884, Leo Kochmann launched his own weekly in New York. Its title, \textit{Proletář} (Proletarian), was a polemical counterpoint to Čapek’s recent \textit{Patriot}. Eventually František Hlaváček joined him as editor. Thirty years later Hlaváček could still detail the persecution that radicalized Socialists in Bohemia. In early 1882 the Czecho-Slavonic Social Democratic Party in Vienna directed Hlaváček to reestablish a newspaper in Bohemia. Following instructions from secretary Jakub Mikolanda, he moved to Teplice, where a miner’s strike overtook his efforts to overcome official obstructions. Now the Socialists produced the first issue of \textit{Hlas lidu} (People’s voice) without lawful sanction. The imperial district administration summoned Hlaváček, presented an expulsion order for allegedly instigating the strike, and a dozen soldiers with fixed bayonets immediately marched him out of town, inadequately dressed as he was for the cold and rainy April weather. The forty-five-mile forced march to Slaný took three days, and he had to walk another fourteen to his parental home in Řevničov, where he endured further indignities from the priest and hostile citizens. Exposure and hunger brought on a serious illness. Summarily incarcerated by July in Prague’s New Town prison, Hlaváček awaited trial with over one hundred comrades until December and had to serve his full sentence (with Norbert Zoula) after indictment for unlawful association.\textsuperscript{125} In late September 1883 the party directed Hlaváček to edit \textit{Spravedlnost} in Brno,\textsuperscript{126} but six months later he launched the radical \textit{Duch času} with Josef Boleslav Pecka.\textsuperscript{127}

On February 16, 1884, two months after Norbert Zoula arrived in Chicago from New York, the weekly \textit{Budoucnost} added the title “organ of the Czecho-Slavonic speaking anarchists” to its masthead. The same issue carried a call to arms that lauded the example of Hermann Stellmacher, who had assassinated a policeman in Vienna one month earlier.\textsuperscript{128} Josef Boleslav Pecka was among the Socialists summarily expelled
from the capital, and by June 1885 he followed his old friend Norbert Zoula to Chicago. By then Zoula had offered *Budoucnost* readers an instructive series on explosive substances and praised science for “restoring to mankind the equality that nature took away.” Pecka was a like-minded successor who argued for anarchism because the law is ever partisan. He recommended “guerilla war” and justified “all methods of destruction.”

Deeds, perceptions and punishment followed words. On November 23, 1885, a tenement fire on New York’s Sixty-Fourth Street took three lives. Residents Jindřich and Eduard Kohout received life sentences at Sing Sing for arson. No one had real evidence against them, but Jindřich was secretary of a Seventy-Third Street reading society, and the masthead of Kochmann and Hlaváček’s *Proletář* proclaimed that it was the “organ of Czech radical Socialists, published by an International Working People’s Association section and the Czech workingmen’s reading societies of New York.” In Chicago on May 3, 1886, a policeman surnamed Casey searched a house in Pilsen and had to flee hostile residents: his comrades under Captain O’Donnell had fired into workers assembled at the nearby McCormick Harvester plant that Monday afternoon. Václav Dejmek’s sentence was one year and fellow baker Jakub Mikolanda’s six months for inciting the crowd to hang Casey. Police detained and investigated Mikolanda’s fellow *Budoucnost* editor, J.B. Pecka, and Antonín Hradečný, who had launched *Lampička* (Little lamp) as Czech Chicago’s second radical weekly the previous August. Neither paper survived, but the liberal nationalist papers—*Svornost* in Chicago, *Slavie* in Racine, *Dennice novověku* in Cleveland, and *Pokrok západu* in Omaha—reported on Czech casualties, including two of four dead at the McCormick works and another four deaths at a Czech-Polish confrontation with police in Milwaukee on Wednesday, the day after the bloody Haymarket Square melee. In Wisconsin, Jan J. Jambor got ten years at Waupun State Prison for a June 15, 1886, attempt to assassinate his countryman Matěj Zíka, owner of M.M. Secor Trunk Company and recent mayor of Racine. In Chicago on July 17, 1888, Inspector John Bonfield, who had commanded police at Haymarket
Square, and Captain Michael J. Schaack orchestrated the arrests of carpenter Jan Hronek, typesetter František Čapek and tailor František Chleboun for “plotting the assassination of Bonfield; Judge Joseph E. Gary, who presided over the Haymarket trial; and Julius Grinnell, the prosecuting attorney.” Eight months after the execution of Haymarket defendants, these officers wanted to rekindle public passions with the “arrest of three Bohemian anarchists.” Trial commenced on November 27, “police repression resumed with a public ban on all anarchist gatherings,” and Hronek got twelve years.137

The radicals had a greater effect with their syndicalist strategy of coopting the labor unions. Jakub Mikolanda was the Czech secretary not just in Johann Most’s anarchist IWPA but also in Friedrich Adolf Sorge’s International Labor Union and even Terence V. Powderly’s conservative Knights of Labor.138 In June 1884 Chicago cigarmakers who had reaffiliated from the International to the Progressive union formed the Central Labor Union (CLU). Its leaders came from the IWPA, and in sixteen months they attracted thirteen unions of Germans (and Bohemians) in various trades. When the Cigar Makers International Union’s Samuel Gompers and the Knights of Labor inspired the vast eight-hour strike movement that culminated in the Haymarket tragedy,139 the IWPA and CLU inspired its own following with the bolder demand of ten hours pay for eight hours work. The Lumber Shovers’ Union, with a Bohemian president, “nearly three thousand Bohemians and over three thousand Germans,” was in the CLU.140 The Chicago Tribune called them the “most tenacious strikers” and their neighborhood, Pilsen, the “terror district.”141

Germans were far more prominent in the anarchist movement and the Haymarket drama. Bohemians (like Scandinavians) were their junior partners on the revolutionary side of American labor’s ethnic divide, opposite the reformist Irish and Anglo-Americans.142 But Bavarian-born Frederick Ebersold was the city’s police superintendent, and the Irish were also entrenched in the police hierarchy. The Bohemians were not. They were not even in the Germanic ethnolinguistic family. They were an uncomplicated target for the
police and the press. Czech women protested in person at the mayor’s office as Schaack and Bonfield subjected their neighborhood to special police zeal and advanced their public careers at its expense in the months after Haymarket. Police historian John J. Flinn wrote that Bohemian lumbershovers had marched under red flags and with American flags turned upside down, and the Chicago Tribune blamed the great May upheaval on the “Slavic wolves.” In New York, Jews from Poland and Hungary were the rising new labor force in cigarmaking since early in the decade, yet the Internationals’ local 144 president Daniel Harris still blamed “cheap, half-civilized Slavs” for low wages, union turmoil and resurgent tenement work at a hearing of the House Committee on Immigration.

Haymarket also redirected American nativism against radicals, who lost support and lacked the resources of Catholics, the previous target. But even Czech radical journalists persisted and adapted. J.B. Pecka’s silenced Budoucnost nearly tripled its circulation to some two thousand when it reappeared as Práce (Labor) immediately after the massacre. It ceased just fourteen months later, but Pecka was editor or regular contributor to six more Chicago newspapers before dying of tuberculosis on July 25, 1897. It was just his American reprise of a Socialist tenacity and self-sacrifice already well-practiced in Habsburg lands. In New York, Leo Kochmann’s Proletář became the less radical daily Hlas lidu (People’s voice) on July 1, 1886, which he edited, with others, to the end of his life more than three decades later. In February 1890 Volné listy (Free leaves) commenced in New York and publicized at least eight more new anarchist papers in New York, Chicago and Cleveland over the next eighteen years. In the fall before Haymarket, Jan Rosický dismissed the radicals as the “most dubious and wildest characters” among his countrymen, but J.B. Pecka retorted that it was the liberal journalists who were shady non-entities from Bohemia, where only the poet Václav Šnajdr had achieved recognition, while the anarchists were the “most educated and intelligent workers,” as even the bourgeois papers in Vienna and Prague acknowledged. Indeed, František Hlaváček, Leo Kochmann and Pecka were
accomplished newspaper editors in Bohemia, Moravia and Vienna. At least three of the fourteen delegates who founded the Czecho-Slavonic Social Democratic Party were in America, including Pecka and Norbert Zoula. Four decades after Haymarket, Thomas Čapek, who had assisted his eldest brother J.V. Čapek with Patriot and remained unsympathetic to the radicals, nevertheless acknowledged that in “many ways they excelled over the older and acclimated immigrants.” They were impressive autodidacts, and “sojourns in other countries expanded their intellectual horizons.” Organ maker Bernard Herc eventually parlayed his fluency in German, Italian and Slavic languages into a long and successful career in New York City courts. “And they were orators,” Čapek wrote in reflection.\textsuperscript{151}

In Patriot two years and five months before Haymarket, the mood was quite different. “Our anarchist dynamiters are too weak to make revolution,” wrote J.V. Čapek, “but strong enough to ruin the reputation of Czech labor.”\textsuperscript{152} But to radicals, liberal nationalists and moderate socialists appeared no less despicable. On March 19, 1887, the first and probably last issue of Obrana (Defense) appeared in New York.\textsuperscript{153} In the center of the front newspaper page, like some exhibit no. 1, was a handwritten letter in facsimile. It continued on the newspaper’s other three pages, right in the middle, like a source from which the articles and all their rows of print around it drew water. In it Josef Jonáš, “manufacturer of fine cigars” in Morrisania, New Jersey, wrote to the imprisoned Kohout brothers on his own elegant letterhead paper. He addressed them as “dear countrymen” on May 14, 1886, and brought together gentle words of sympathy and solidarity with them as such: they were “ever on [his] mind.” He acknowledged their letter from the previous day and promised to do as they asked, to employ the community and the former state assemblyman (Clark) with whom he had visited them to work for Eduard’s release. Then he welcomed the wife (Jindřich’s?) to come to his home, asked them to name their closest friends, and urged them to “write more” and include their “views of anarchism and Czech anarchists.” “I am a Socialist,” he avowed and wanted “redress for all the people, but by way of reason and reflection.”
“Merciful knaves” drew the most water from this letter, and the front page alone could not contain it. It alleged that Jonáš and J.F. Vosátka, who was another of his companions on the prison visit and a “big Pinkerton man,” had reported the Kohout brothers as anarchists to the state prosecutor, supplied him with translations from Proletář, and “incited reporters for the capitalist press against Czech workingmen.” Vosátka and Jonáš were in the “national league of spies that came together to consider how to get Czech socialists and anarchists into Sing Sing.” It was a reference to the public meetings in the days after Haymarket, one in New York and another in Chicago, for the Czech community to take a stand against its radicals within and its malefactors all around, in the American press and establishment.154 Since then, “honest workingmen were at war with the false patriots,” and Obrana’s anonymous author(s) could not get past the odium of the latter’s “work of false accusation.” A line from Jonáš’s letter stood as a motto above this reply: “State how far you follow the teaching of Herc and Kochmann, and whether they and Buňata should not be doing your time in Sing Sing.” To Obrana, Jindřich Kohout was a “poor idealist,” but “woe to the poor devil who dares to pay back in kind for all that the propertied class has committed for a thousand years.” Now Obrana addressed a larger enemy beyond the neighborhood: “Let a curse fall on your heads, you hypocrite wretches, for ruining our lives, driving our women to prostitution and sacrificing our children in factories to the god of mammon.”155

“Our national bestiary” pilloried the rogues within, in “alphabetical order” and with character flaws and epithets for each. In Chicago, Sokol activist and Svornost editor Josef Čermák “wore out several pairs of shoes last year from running to state prosecutor Grinnell,” and “Dejmek and Mikolanda’s imprisonment were on his conscience.” In New York, the “great messiah” for the Czechs, J.V. Čapek, merited a more elaborate, five-point indictment among several other residents. Even his publisher, Daniel Mašín, took a blow: he “took the Slavic Linden and Dělník americký for their type.”156 In fact, Mašín took over and scuttled the Dělník americký. On August 9, 1886, he made J.V.
Čapek editor and renamed it Newyorské listy, after Čapek’s old newspaper from a decade earlier. Many more editors would follow, and Newyorské listy would endure as a community mainstay.\(^{157}\) Obrana did share the icons of Czech nationalist history with its opposite side, but it wrote, “If you could rise from your sacred grave to behold these vermin, great Žižka, you could not help but raise your sacred mace in wrath to break the antianarchists’ skulls.” These angry words appeared ten years after a solid Czech community stood against its employers in Cleveland, Chicago and New York. Did their authors and targets reflect on the change?
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CHAPTER VII
SELF-MADE MEN AND BROTHERS

Self-Made Men

When the New York Patriot ceased, Jan Rosický purchased its stock of type. It traveled to Omaha, where Rosický edited and published the weekly Pokrok západo (Progress of the West). The Czech type that traveled thirteen hundred miles, from the Atlantic metropolis into the heart of the continent, is quite an image. Who was it that would pay to have so dubious an artifact there, on the far side of the Mississippi watershed, on the Great Plains, and in their early years of settlement? What could be done with such type? J.V. Čapek used it to convey liberal convictions to the polity of his native language and turn it away from the anarchists who would lead the people astray. He also used it as a stylist, to make literary art in his language and activate its readers. For each issue of Patriot he composed an installment of “Malerika,” a metered and rhymed poem, reminiscent of the popular kramářská píseň form, about a peasant’s misadventures in emigration. The title artfully invoked America and the street word malér (trouble), which migrated into Czech from French and German, where it was Malheur. But Čapek’s career in print was just broken ventures in a series that did not last. What really could be done with Czech type in America? It had nothing of the prospects and economies of scale that accrued to German type. If it was not to quickly produce misery, bitterness and liquidation, it had to be handled with business skill. Jan Rosický had such skill. On February 6, 1884, he offered Čapek’s younger brother Tomáš “$12 to $15 a week to start.” So, a “few weeks after sending off the type,” Tomáš, aged twenty-two, followed it to put his mind and hands to work for Rosický as assistant editor.¹

When Čapek arrived, he marveled at the small size of this piece of Bohemia. Centered on William Street between Thirteenth and Sixteenth, it was “Praha” to its residents but “Bohemian Town” to the city’s Anglos. Čapek found merely “little wooden homes, a
wooden Catholic church ... a wooden nationality hall, a printing house, a few saloons, a
grocery, butcher shops, bakeries and one or two drug stores.” Besides Jan Rosický and
his editor and five typesetters, the “intelligentsia” counted only a “priest, druggist or two
and a lawyer.” Most other Czech speakers were “day laborers at the smeltery,” originally
“peasants from the rugged Šumava,” while skilled workers “found jobs in the [Union
Pacific] railway yards.” The neighborhood would eventually occupy the rectangle
between, clockwise from the north, Pierce, Tenth, Center and Sixteenth, an area of at
least twenty-one city blocks, and another would arise in South Omaha. Yet every week
Rosický was already “printing 3,000 copies” here, three times more than Čapek’s
brother had printed in New York.

After barely two years with Rosický, Čapek enrolled at the University of Michigan. He
earned a law degree two years later and went on to a long career as a New York City
attorney and banker. He also became a prolific historian of his countrymen in America.

Just after the First World War, the national business journal Forbes featured the mature
Thomas Čapek and his story as an installment in its “Successful Immigrants” series.
Then approaching sixty, Čapek recalled that he came four decades earlier for the
“opportunity to fulfill his youthful dream of knowledge and riches,” and he advised
young Czech immigrants to learn English, obtain an education, become citizens, develop
the drive to overcome adversity, and join American society. Forbes never mentioned
that its American self-made man otherwise devoted himself to his own nationality. And
in the years after Forbes he published far more work in Czech, by volume, than in
English, including his monumental history and a memoir, both in Prague. The memoir,
which appeared three years before Czechoslovakia’s demise at Munich, was the
crowning piece of devotion, with its intimate genre, narrative artistry and fine publisher
(František Borový). But even here the “self-made man” was a leitmotif. In fact, it
inspired Čapek to perhaps his only neologism—svojsilan. Self-made countrymen in
America were bankers, politicians and physicians. Čapek even published pamphlets on
the first two groups, the players on the margins of money and power, closer to the
“American palace” and its “street corner” on the positive, opposite end of value from the Bohemian “cottage.” Newspapermen on the forlorn “Robinson Crusoe islets” of Czech speech and community were more often subjects for Čapek’s cautionary tales of influence lost (to rising business and professional classes in the neighborhood) and misery without end.

But to Čapek, newspaperman Jan Rosický was also a self-made man. His career, company and building were the classic pictures of business success, however alarming the balance sheets in the background might be to specialists. Maybe they even quickened the motivation for the energy and innovation that were also in public view, where the larger presence of failure made Rosický’s achievement stand out. “The record for number of journals founded or edited,” wrote the business-minded Čapek, “belongs to Jan A. Oliverius.” He was a “newspaper grave-digger” who “never learned the art of making money,” and his record was sixteen. Čapek could be harsher: at least Oliverius, a “hard but honest Republican,” had a cause, but J.S. Čada’s littered trail of fifteen newspapers was “passionless and purposeless.” And with Klácel, “American Czechs would today be shut into Svojanov communes.” Clear to “whoever examined the old newspaper issues he edited” was that the learned monk and utopian socialist had “no understanding for the vital questions of his time.” Czech readers in America needed someone who “thoroughly understood the political workings of this or that state, who reliably investigated where a farmer could get good land and a craftsman good employment,” someone who combined a “Czech heart with an Anglo-Saxon mind.”

Some could gain the mind and lose the heart. Jan Habenicht, the physician who stayed loyal and poor among his countrymen, mentioned Antonín V. Hromádka (b. 1839), whose Milwaukee luggage factory was among the largest in the country: “His fortune neared a million dollars, but a sincere Czech he never was. His Czech surname was too lowly for him, and he signed it ‘Romadke’.” Ironically, he came from Sedlčany, thirty-six miles south of Prague at Czech-speaking Bohemia’s nearly perfect center.
Čapek admitted that the self-made man easily became a philistine, “intellectually stunted on the small step where he stood when he last closed the door to the village schoolhouse behind him.” But publishers could be different from other men of enterprise. For them serving and sustaining Czech-speaking readers was a business imperative. But employing journalists, authors, typographers and subscription agents to write, print and sell Czech-language newspapers and books was also an innately nationalist project in a period when an emphatically linguistic Czech national identity animated new forms of mass culture in Bohemia and presumably could do so in America as well. To employ also meant to support, and to sell also meant to disseminate. Czech immigrant publishers varied greatly in scale. Václav Šnajdr acquired his own print shop early (1877), but he issued only the weekly Dennice novověku, rarely employed a fellow editor or published a book, and relied more on job printing and wise investments in a local bank and a beer brewery. In Racine, Karel Jonáš printed Slavie in his own shop from March 24, 1865, but he issued little else in the next three decades and made his career in politics. Jan Rosický became a more substantial publisher, one who created an ample space of firm ground for Czech print culture and its workers of various arts. But it was a long and difficult act of creation.

Rosický (1845-1910) was from Humpolec, fifty-eight miles southeast of Prague in the Bohemian-Moravian Highlands and almost halfway to Brno. Factory production was driving the town’s predominant textile finishing trade to ruin and his father’s livelihood as a baker along with it. Rosický’s parents were Protestant and so was his “capable” tutor (J. Sluněčko), whose influence Rosický’s parents evidently enlarged as passionate and outspoken readers. In 1857-1858, Rosický attended the second year of Josef Wenzig’s Prague reála, the only secondary school in Bohemia that taught in Czech. (Recall that Vojta Mašek and Karel Jonáš were also there.) But then the family’s worsening poverty ended Rosický’s education, and he returned to Humpolec as a town clerk. In late April 1861, he accompanied his maternal uncle to Muscoda, on the Wisconsin River some fifty miles upstream from the Mississippi, where they arrived
July 4 and where the first countryman from Humpolec settled eight years earlier. By January, Rosický’s parents arrived and acquired land. They were part of a Protestant minority here, from both Reformed and Lutheran congregations in Bohemia, including the Tábor region, but they stayed “outside the church” in their American years. Rosický helped his uncle and then his parents to farm, a novel preoccupation, until the start of 1865, when he set off for Milwaukee na vandr, as he called it in the Czech journeyman’s phrase for his years abroad to find his skills and see the world.14

By the summer he was in Chicago. Six years later, the great fire consumed his corner grocery store but not the Slavic Linden’s hall elsewhere on Canal Street (at Taylor), where he performed in stage plays and where his signature as the society’s secretary traveled on the shares of stock issued to raise this $30,000 mainstay for the Prague neighborhood. Rosický also trained in the Sokol gymnastic society, sang in Hlahol, wrote in Slavie and even assisted poet J.V. Sládek, who edited Národní noviny the winter and spring before the fire. But the ruins of his hard-won business were too much to bear, and Rosický journeyed on to California and Oregon. By spring 1873, he was the store clerk in Pleasant Hill, Saline County, Nebraska, population fifty, and later that year, with two countrymen for partners, he opened his own general store in Crete, which became the largest town in the county. A year of grasshoppers and another of too much rain ruined him again. But in Pleasant Hill he admired J.V. Čapek’s journalism and found prairie subscribers for his Národní noviny in Cleveland. During a stay with Václav Šnajdr in Omaha, Rosický wrote a “detailed account of Oregon for prospective settlers.” Šnajdr was then editing the weekly Pokrok západu (Progress of the West). Three years later, at the start of 1876, its owner, Edward R. Rosewater (1841-1906), hired Rosický as business manager. By March, he made him editor, and a year later in June he sold him the newspaper.15

Son of Hermann, a Jewish butcher, Rosenwasser migrated with his family from Bukovany, a village fifty miles south of Prague in the Příbram district, to Cleveland,
Ohio, in 1854. On January 1, 1863, he was the War Department telegraph operator who transmitted President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation, and by the fall he was chief operator for the transcontinental telegraph’s eastern terminus in Omaha. On August 1, 1871, the year of his successful campaign for the state legislature, he launched *Pokrok západu* while already publishing the *Omaha Bee* and *Beobachter am Missouri*. Rosewater spoke Czech fluently, and he used the language to address a constituency that he valued as a dominant figure in the state Republican party to the end of his life. Karel Jonáš helped him build that constituency by making *Slavie* a forum for Czech migration to Nebraska’s better prospects for larger, more viable settlements. So did the Burlington & Missouri and the Union Pacific railroad companies, which had land to sell and supported Rosewater’s newspaper. So did his editor, Václav L. Vodička (1844-1917), a real estate hustler. But a lack of literary skills discredited this former carpenter, and Rosewater offered the editorship to Václav Šnajdr, then working for Karel Jonáš, who used it as an opportunity to unload *Amerikán*, his recent attempt to develop and expand into a leisure reading market. Rosewater was already substantial enough to buy off Jonáš and be a reliable paymaster to Šnajdr, unlike his next employer, *Pokrok* in Cleveland. But Rosewater’s Czech paper became a revolving door: Šnajdr arrived in the last weeks of 1872 and disliked “Omaha society.” F.B. Zdrůbek took over by August 1873 and Josef Novinský by May 1875, only to go into saloonkeeping barely nine months later and make way for Jan Rosický.

Rosický was a passionate Republican with convictions that took him into a close association with the rising Rosewater. But the Czech printed word was a larger loyalty, for which Rosický accepted endless debt and risk, and for which he gave endless working hours. He was obligated to pay off Rosewater, whom he also paid as his printer, in four years, but it took “rather longer.” While still in Crete, Rosický married Marie Bayerová (1854-1912), a Catholic furrier’s daughter from Klatovy, and now he had a growing family. “The paper stands on solid ground,” he wrote to New York when he hired the young Čapek, and on October 15, 1884, he launched *Květy americké*
American blossoms) to encourage and present “Czech-American literary creativity.” The first year’s table of contents proudly listed 29 “Novels, short stories, novellas and travelogues,” 36 poems and 17 fine illustrations. The third year’s listed 202 items in ten categories. It was a bold venture, even for its inventive and luxuriant typography and design, otherwise so endlessly bland and monotonous in the Czech-language press. Rosický offered the monthly to his newspaper subscribers at a discounted $0.80 per year and expected to break even with a thousand others at the full rate of $1.50. But those others only amounted to one hundred fifty. After three years Rosický replaced Květy americké with Knihovna americká (American library) to “better please” his countrymen. It was a series for reprints of novels at “64 pages every two weeks, for just a dollar a year.” Subscribers dwindled from 4,000 to 1,800, but Rosický carried on for sixteen years.22

When Thomas Čapek wrote to ask Rosický about his progress two years after leaving Omaha, the reply was that two new weeklies had “interrupted the natural growth” of his Pokrok západu. But that was “alright,” and his assessment of the competition’s circumstances and prospects was admirably well-informed and conveyed a mind intently trained on business challenges. He expected Josef A. Hospodský’s (b. 1855) Omaha Národní listy to fail, and it did so within a month. Rosický bought up its subscription list and print shop. Twenty years later, in spring 1908, Rosický bought out Hospodský again when his fourth paper failed in Oklahoma City. The other competitor, František K. Ringsmuth, had edited Květy americké for Rosický, and his Nová doba (New age) in Schuyler, sixty-five miles west of Omaha, failed within five years.23

Rosický formed a joint-stock company on October 21, 1889,24 leased a two-story brick building and equipped a modern print shop. Two years earlier he built an impressive brick home for the family with his only real estate windfall, but in the Panic of 1893 he had to borrow against it to pay his employees. A best friend from the old stage-play days in Chicago invested in the company and quickly bailed out in horror at the debt burden.
and its precarious refinancing. At the same time Rosický embraced a new way to lose money, as a bookseller with stock ordered from Bohemia. But he could compensate with money-making innovations and his grand business strategy. *Hospodář* (Husbandman), launched March 15, 1891, not only achieved lasting popularity across vast distances; it also required advance payment. Jan Oliverius had issued a farm paper six years earlier, but it was “all theory,” like its models in Bohemia, and failed in four years. Taking note, Rosický balanced his “educated” editors with a “whole staff of collaborators from the ranks of experienced farmers.” By the end of the decade, Rosický sold *Pokrok západu* back to Edward Rosewater after a collection effort that did not even recover one-third of its $10,000 in past-due subscriptions. It was a common cause of failure among less inventive Czech newspaper publishers in America. Rosický sold the old paper because he could no longer march with the Republican Party in a time of American imperialism. He broke with Rosewater and made an impressive display of his old master’s cosmopolitan ways. Rosický reincorporated and recapitalized his *Pokrok Západu Printing Company* as the National Printing Company, moved out of Bohemian Town into a three-story building in Omaha’s central business district, and successfully competed for the American job printing market.

Commercial successes could buy luxuries, and in his final decade Jan Rosický treated himself to more of that troublesome luxury—publishing for the good of Czech letters in America. In November 1900, three months after his divorce from the Republican Party with the sale of *Pokrok západu*, Rosický revived *Květy americké*. More “family-oriented” now than just literary, more frequent (weekly), and still illustrated, the periodical attracted a spectacular body of subscribers, over ten thousand, but still lost money. Advertisers disappointed Rosický, who counted on them to offset his low subscription price. But within three years he bought out his latest competition in town, a daily named *Osvěta* (Enlightenment), and merged it with his own new venture as *Osvěta americká*, which he was content to publish to his death six years later. The transaction showed Rosický off as the Western fixed point of Czech publishing, where in
Omaha no other mass could overcome his gravity. In May 1894, a year into the century’s closing panic, Rosický’s own striking employees launched Dělnické listy (Workingmen’s pages), with the Bohemian Typographical Union no. 21 as publisher. Four years later, Stanislav Kostohryz, a teacher at the English public school in Milligan, bought the failing paper and renamed it Osvěta. When the joint-stock partners that he gathered and left behind turned unanimously to Rosický, the latter was substantial enough to pay a generous price for the bankrupt business. And he could afford to lose two to four thousand dollars per year on Osvěta americká.

By his death at sixty-four and the end of an exemplary thirty-four year career in Czech publishing, Jan Rosický employed “on average fifty workers” in his National Printing Company. A dozen years later in Chicago, the number at work in August Geringer’s firm on his eightieth birthday “reached to one hundred.” The two landmark numbers may not be perfectly comparable, since neither source explained what categories of workers he included, but both sources are respectable. František J. Sadilek (1851-1933) was Saline County’s registrar of deeds, former state legislator, and Rosický’s close friend since the days in Chicago before the fire. R. Jaromír Pšenka was Geringer’s capable chief editor and son-in-law. The largest population of urban Bohemians was in Chicago, while Omaha was at the center of its rural counterpart, and in these cities Geringer and Rosický made the two largest islands on the continent for Czech letters. The young Thomas Čapek worked for both before he left Ann Arbor with the education to make his own career, and he would title them both as the great self-made men of Czech publishing, that coveted but devouring field in America. In 1887, during his summer vacation, Čapek was the law court reporter for Geringer’s daily Svornost and lived with the publisher’s family.

August Geringer (b. 1842) took on the instinct for enterprise in a schoolteacher’s family with eleven children in Březnice, a town forty-seven miles southwest of Prague. His father took a village assignment (Lašovice) for the land it provided, and Geringer
farmed, tended animals, assisted in school and bound books by age fifteen, when he was to study in Prague. But he was more preoccupied with making money in book binding there, and then made leather goods and furniture with relatives in Vienna and did their bookkeeping. By age twenty, he had to replace his declining father in Lašovice, but he also expanded his binding business and hired an assistant. Bohemian schoolteaching was itself something of a business. It included various ceremonial services and required collecting various forms of income directly from the community. August Geringer was putting up a store of worldly ability and also had a heritage of worldliness in his paternal line: a transfer took his schoolteacher grandfather to Březnice from Prachatice, a larger town one hundred miles south of Prague on the Bohemian Forest language divide, where the family name was likely from the other side. Geringer arrived in Chicago on July 16, 1869, with his bride of five months, an innkeeper’s daughter from a stop on his business routes to Prague. He arrived already worldly, and on Lake Michigan he could prosper in another, insular Czech world and make his way as before. Geringer followed a Lašovice musician to De Koven Street, but within a month he established himself on Canal Street, the bigger artery that fronted the Prague neighborhood, overlooked the Chicago River and led into the city. To its Czechs it was the Kanálka. Geringer’s ledger book entries reveal a remarkable business continuity. In Bohemia during the first half of 1869, his biggest receipts were from bindings and prayer books for priests and marketgoers up to ten miles from home (Petrovice, Orlík, Milevsko). In Chicago, he sold six prayer books and five hymnals by the end of July to earn his first $29. He could also move over into the larger German world to get by. When a countryman bookbinder turned out to be a poor paymaster, Geringer found a better one named Geiger. By November, bookseller Eduard Bühler gave Geringer all his binding business, paid out $43.25 for the month, and Geringer went solo. A year later in September, he earned $100.93. It is the sum of twenty-eight ledger entries, and $33 came from Bühler, far more than the $13.35 from Jan Mendlík and the $8 for prayer books from “Mister Vaněk in East Sagenau [sic].” The only Czech society
mentioned that month was the Sokol, which paid $0.80 for a songbook. A year before in August, the Slavic Linden paid Geringer $16.55 for twelve songbooks, almost half his $40.56 income that first full month in America.\(^{36}\)

Publishing was a natural field for expansion, and it was where August Geringer struck the passion that turned his powers from personal livelihood to his community’s welfare. Čeněk Duras (1846-1904) and Josef Langmayer (b. 1829) were printers and Geringer’s consecutive business partners. Neither could keep him interested. After perhaps one year, he got out of job printing with Duras, even before Duras launched his only Czech newspaper, which lasted seven months.\(^{37}\) Duras soon left for Saline County, Nebraska, where he became a banker and Republican politician.\(^{38}\) Geringer next published the weekly *Chicagský věstník* (Chicago herald) for six months with Langmayer, who carried on without him for six more years and then disappeared as a typesetter into the German press.\(^{39}\) By 1874, the Freethinkers asked Geringer to publish a primer that would embody nationalist, American and liberal sentiments. Primers from the “imperial and royal schoolbook depository” in Prague purveyed an offensive “loyalty to the sovereigns by the grace of God and obedience to the Roman Catholic Church.”\(^{40}\) They had served in the Chicago school four years, but now the Freethinkers had their founder back in the Midwest, and F.B. Zdrůbek wrote the new American primer. A product with such specialized and oversized forms of type hardly made business sense, but Geringer published it.\(^{41}\)

And he was still a Catholic. The family’s hereditary schoolteacher’s livelihood kept it on close terms with the clergy. “Thank our Dear Lord that you are gone from Europe,” wrote uncle Ignác, schoolteacher, from Bohemia, where “so-called liberals” wanted to “uproot the holy faith” and ruined souls with their “mad teachings.” Another relative expounded on the faith at the news that “little Miloslav is learning to pray.” It was Geringer’s second child, born December 22, 1870, and baptized February 18, with Geringer’s brother Jan, the schoolteacher at St. Václav’s, for his godfather. Geringer
dutifully recorded the details of baptism with the next two births in his family log—Vladimír on October 25, 1872, and Vlasta on August 2, 1874.  

Geringer’s older brother Karel (1839-1902) was a priest. J.V. Jirsík, the Czech nationalist bishop in the south, ordained him in 1865, and Karel succeeded Václav Řepiš, who became the embattled Cleveland clergyman, at Vodňany, where a private endowment provided for the curate. But two years later, the benevolent Jirsík had to transfer Geringer from his “more than comfortable parish to a purely German district” at the personal request of Anton Hye, Ritter von Glunek, Minister of Culture and Education in Vienna. The imperial government had learned that Geringer addressed a “Panslavic meeting in Belgrade” on the “suffering of the oppressed Bohemian nation.” This Radikaplan from Vodňany belonged to the “extreme nationalist party,” and he spent the next twenty years in Rychnov nad Malší and Frantoly, on the rugged margins of Bohemia. In Frantoly, the population was 182, including 3 Czech speakers. Curiously, two young parishioners became enthusiastic Czech writers in Brainard, Nebraska—Jan Klein (b. 1860), who contributed poetry to Jan Rosicky’s Květy americké, and his priest brother Alois (b. 1866), vicar general of the Lincoln diocese (1909), who worked for the wartime Czechoslovak independence movement. For Pater Geringer, it was the Austrian version of internal exile, and his brother’s Chicago newspaper recalled it as late 1950.

It did not turn August Geringer against the Church, and neither did the liberal, more or less anticlerical press. In Chicago, Geringer promptly subscribed to the Národní listy from Prague, Slavie from Racine, Slovan americký from Iowa and even F.B. Zdrůbek’s Pokrok. But a journey with Zdrůbek did produce or complete the conversion that roused Geringer to his great business act of creation. In May 1875, amidst the school primer project, Zdrůbek left Omaha to “see his friends” on Lake Michigan. He called on Geringer, and Geringer offered to accompany him on to Racine, Caledonia and Milwaukee. As they traveled to exciting ground, into the cultural and demographic
hearth of Wisconsin Slavia, they discoursed on the “obligations that our nationality imposes, the lofty ends that free thought opens to our eyes, and the state and future of Czech immigrants in America.” Geringer had a new weekly in mind, but Zdrůbek and consultations in Chicago emboldened Geringer to launch Svornost, the first Czech daily in America, with Zdrůbek as his editor.49

Geringer was not a writer, and only one brief self-narration of his evolution remains.50 But his liberal conversion and business commitment were genuine. His fifth child, Zdeňka, was the first born after the journey to Wisconsin, on March 13, 1876. “No baptisms or godparents,” Geringer wrote in her entry for the family log and after the last two births—Gustava on June 3, 1877, and Adela on August 27, 1880. When the first child, Augustin—born November 6, 1869, and baptized at St. Václav’s by Father Molitor—had died at eleven months, the Geringers buried the boy at a “Christian cemetery” some “seven English miles” out of town. But on August 25, 1876, they buried Zdeňka at a “common cemetery” (Graceland) and Adela nine years later at Zdrůbek’s Bohemian National.51

The new field of business was also a categorical departure from the old. In six years, Geringer had saved $1,500 for his family. Now the newspaper consumed it all at once, and Geringer still had to send it each day a mile away by horse cart to a printer (Gindeli) at the Staatszeitung. Like Jan Rosický, Geringer took on debt for many years to expand and modernize. He also kept at his profitable book and binding business, and he even hung wallpaper and did other interior work for Czech and German saloons with his four typesetters. In seven months he had a steam-powered printing press. In eleven years he had his own three-story brick building at Clinton and Twelfth, one block off Canal on the southern perimeter of Prague, where the first linotype machine joined his powerful new presses in 1899.52

Geringer could rely entirely on capital in the Czech neighborhood, where much of it was
in the hands of nationalist-minded sympathizers. At $2,400, a generous early lender was the tailor František Honomichl, who became codeveloper of the first Czech-owned Chicago subdivision, in Plzeň.\(^53\) A Czech savings-and-loan provided $16,000 for Geringer to raise his own building, in which Václav Kašpar and Václav Topinka were his “biggest helpers and advisers.”\(^54\) A tailor, Topinka (b. 1832) was an early garment manufacturer and landlord in the Prague neighborhood.\(^55\) Kašpar (b. 1835) was the biggest real estate developer in the Plzeň neighborhood, where he also built Chicago’s largest Czech bank, and he was Geringer’s neighbor from the early days on the Kanálka.\(^56\) August Geringer made other relationships with the rising class of self-made countrymen in Chicago real estate. In 1878, he hired the young František Zajíček (1860-1929) as a typesetter. For four years before, Zajíček had worked for Geringer’s former partner, Langmayer, who paid him up to $10 a week. But Geringer paid $12, paid reliably, and promoted him to foreman. After three years with Geringer and three more at an American printing company, Zajíček went into real estate with $1,800 and opened a mortgage bank on West Eighteenth in the heart of Plzeň. “All these long years I always remained your good friend and admirer,” wrote Zajíček on Svornost’s fiftieth anniversary in 1925, and he counted himself among the many countrymen who worked tirelessly and selflessly to “preserve our mother language in this new” country.\(^57\)

Friendly capital still expected performance, and August Geringer performed steadily. In one year he enlarged Svornost to make room for increasing business advertisements and keep enough space for the “longer articles and essays,” so that Czech readers would “not fall behind” their German neighbors. After another enlargement (1879), Svornost could be proclaimed equal to Národní listy, Bohemia’s daily in Prague. That year Geringer hired a traveling subscription agent, who covered Bohemian territory from the Plains States to New York City in three years. Then he and his successors kept working the circuit.\(^58\) Svornost was for a national audience. It had a weekly edition, Amerikán, from the start and regional editions (Baltimore 1890, Allegheny City 1903, Oklahoma City 1905, Cedar Rapids 1905) later.\(^59\)
Jan Rosický, Geringer’s Western counterpart, added five regional editions to *Osvěta americká* between 1902 and 1909, two for Nebraska and others for Minnesota, Kansas and Oklahoma. Then he acquired a new Chicago weekly, *Rozhledy* (Outlooks), and its subscribers there and further east. *Pokrok západu*, the weekly that Rosický made nationally familiar for nearly a quarter century, had a like constellation of editions eight years after he sold it—two for Nebraska and one each for the Dakotas, Kansas, Iowa and Minnesota. Other Czechs besides Rosický launched some twenty more newspapers in Nebraska by 1913. Most were ephemeral, all remained local, and some merged with larger newspapers, including Rosický’s. Růžena (Rose) Rosická attributed the attrition to the “great Czech dailies of Chicago” and their far-ranging weeklies. It was quite an acknowledgment of August Geringer’s success, which his former employees emulated after they created *Denní hlasatel*, the other daily that Rosická had in mind. Rose (b. 1875), Jan Rosický’s oldest child, was her father’s full-time secretary from age fifteen, and she carried on his business and editorship into the 1950s.

August Geringer had employed at least 62 editors by 1926 and Jan Rosický 26. The next self-made man of Czech-language publishing in its Midwestern heartland, Antonín Novák (1845-1919), employed 12 in the same fifty years. But at least eight of them also worked for Geringer at some time (and four for Rosický), which suggests how much Geringer overshadowed other publishers and not just outdistanced them in scale. Novák came to Milwaukee in 1866, the year of the Austro-Prussian War in Bohemia, to avoid military service (a common motive then) and probably the priesthood, which his parents favored and his first two editors, Juránek and Klácel, had abandoned. He brought his Czech nationalist enthusiasm to the Slavic Linden, to its amateur stage, and to completing the standard complement of institutions for the Wisconsin city—Sokol (gymnastic), Hlahol (choral), ČSPS (fraternal benefit), two savings-and-loans (homebuilding) and a crowning Bohemian national hall (1896). He also brought a good command of literary German, which he used to escape unskilled labor and learn a
business as typesetter for the daily *Herold*. Ten years later he opened his own typesetting shop and besides several short-lived titles published a lasting weekly, *Domácnost* (Household). But Novák had no print shop for the first twenty years, and a dozen years after his death, Geringer, at the end of his own life, bought up the most useful assets in the failing business—the weekly *Domácnost* and its file of subscribers.\(^6^5\)

Geringer did not overshadow Rosický quite as much. As few as 10 of the Omahan’s 26 editors also worked for the Chicagoan at some time. Of his twelve successive *Pokrok západu* editors, at least six did so, and for the *Květy* and *Osvěta* line of journals it was three of seven. *Hospodář*, that working guide and community forum for the separate world in the American interior, was different. As few as three of its ten editors (to 1926) and two of ten columnists and frequent contributors wrote for Geringer in wage-earning Chicago.\(^6^6\) But in the young and bohemian society of the newspaper offices, falling into a peripatetic habit was easy. František J. Kuták was fifteen when he arrived in 1888 Chicago after five years of classical *Gymnasium* in Písek. Three days later, he was a typesetter’s apprentice at J.V. Matějka’s *Chicagské listy*, where the shop was “pleasant” enough but wages sometimes just a “keg of beer and some lunch.” A year later Kuták was at *Svornost*, where the more dependable Geringer paid two dollars more per week. But the workday was ten hours instead of eight, and Kuták went back to Matějka, who folded after the 1890 May Day strike. Nine years later, after turns as editor at *Denní hlasatel, Šnajdr’s Dennice novověku* in Cleveland, Matějka’s next paper back in Chicago, and J.V. Čapek’s old *New Yorské listy* in the East, Kuták went West to edit *Pokrok západu* for Rosický, who sold his alter ego a year later. After another Chicago sojourn, Kuták again worked for Rosický in Omaha (ca. June 1902-September 1905) and then a third time four years later in Chicago, barely six months before Jan Rosický’s death. Both returns were actually rescues that came when the capable Rosický bought out two successive new ventures, *Osvěta* and *Rozhledy*, in which the adventuresome Kuták involved himself.\(^6^7\)
August Geringer did overshadow Jan Rosický and all others in one line of publishing—books. They turned out to be a much diminished part of Czech print culture in America, where its vitality came more from newspapers. But Geringer made books a vital part of something that was much his own creation—Czech-American literature and history. His later chief editor, R. Jaromír Pšenka, understood this deeply: he titled his own addition to Geringer’s brief memoir of youth “Publisher of the greatest Czech almanac and two hundred books.” Entirely in capital letters, it out-emphasized the preceding four section titles like a telling accident of typography. Recently a scholar of the national literature at a Czech university reaffirmed Geringer’s predominance in the first academic book about the “literary creativity of Czech Americans in the period 1880-1939”: he titled it “Czech literature in Chicago.” The realities and prospects for publishing in the Czech language were so unpleasant to nationalist sensibilities that the more natural reaction was denial. And heroism. Why else would so many devote themselves to Czech publishing despite all the misery and failure? The experience from home, where the nation reversed its assimilation and thrived in a foreign state, only encouraged (deluded?) them. August Geringer also lost money and hung saloon wallpaper (heroism), but he accepted realities like a businessman. The high literature was not a commodity worth producing, because no school system existed to produce enough consumers. As their ongoing publisher of primers, Geringer was well-positioned to observe the unimpressive state of Czech schools and their collective effect. But immigration reproduced and increased a commercially viable population of consumers for popular literature.

Czech newspapers in America routinely serialized novels, but August Geringer successfully adapted popular literature’s long-favored vehicle in Bohemia—the almanac. In the first issue of Amerikán, the Civil War and Great Plains were settings for two pieces of leisure fiction, and New York, Chicago and Cleveland the subjects for three illustrated pieces of ethnic history and biography, which became a titled series that was national and socially inclusive in its several (auto)biographies per issue. Geringer could marshal the cadre of writers that he wanted for his almanac and books. He paid
correspondents before fellow newspaper publishers did, and besides editors he had employed at least 16 distributors, 30 office workers and another 179 potential authors and scouts in his print shop. So many individuals came from many places and went on to many more, so that Svornost eventually had a correspondent (former editor) in so unlikely an environment as Alabama. The Geringer formula of variety, American contents and popular appeal evidently paid its way forward. His books in their “thousands of copies,” Pšenka wrote, were among families between “Atlantic and Pacific, Texas gulf and Canadian plain,” a vast “undying monument” of Geringer’s service to the language. His almanac appeared every year, starting 1878, for eight decades.

Antonín Novák launched his Milwaukee almanac just five years after Amerikán. Its title, Nová vlast (New homeland), seemed to promise more than the translations and little else it delivered. Geringer’s local rival, Denní hlasatel, delivered Czech-American, almanac-style fiction aplenty but no biography. New Yorské listy finally produced an almanac equal to Geringer’s in variety and superior in quality, but that was another quarter-century later in 1922. Jan Rosický published no almanacs and took longer to find his book audience. Adolf Heyduk wrote the poem “Nová země” for Geringer’s almanac, but Geringer turned away from such classic writers of Bohemia after Amerikán’s first few issues. Rosický published 41 book titles in the twenty-two years before 1900, and 34 were literary, including ten French novels and Czech classics by Jakub Arbes, Svatopluk Čech and Alois Jirásek. In the next twenty-two years he published another 46 titles, but 33 were handy guides for American farmers by his own editors. He left the classics to a new (and passing) “Bohemian-American Publishing Company” in town, and opened his press to the young Jan Janák (b. 1876) on gardening, butchering, distilling, cement work and poultry diseases. Janák came with experience from a noble estate in Moravia and a seed dealer in Iowa. He translated and adapted most of his twelve titles, evidently from the Anglo-American farm literature, but an old Box Butte County pioneer styled his countrymen’s own dry plains wisdom into a dialog between the farmers Dbal and
Nedbal. Nedbal is a common Czech surname that means “careless.”

August Geringer also turned to young men in America, not agronomists but others of bearing and deeds who could captivate readers. Right at the start, he seated a partner to the well-known F.B. Zdrůbek. Only seventeen, Josef Čermák (1858-1948) came on his own two years earlier and became the “greatest Sokol” (self-)made in America, where he enlivened its circles in Cleveland, Baltimore and New York, shaped its national organization, excelled in competitions, “composed hundreds of original drills,” and wrote books on “physical culture for women and children in Czech and English.” Čermák edited Geringer’s newspapers for fifty-nine years. After hours, he compiled, translated and adapted sources for five volumes on United States history, including one on the Civil War, for which he sought out many Czech veterans and their stories. Geringer employed other young Sokol men, who socialized, trained and acted with many of his early subscribers at the Canal Street TJ Sokol hall. In 1897, Geringer hired Matěj Mašek (1857-1916), whose repertoire ranged from a volume on the Spanish-American War to Wild West stories for the almanac. A seminarian from idyllic south Bohemia who became an Indian fighter during eight years in the U.S. Cavalry, Mašek was an exotic among his countrymen, who liked to see themselves as (Johann Gottfried Herder’s) “dove-like” Slavs opposite martial Germanic peoples, which could include the British and Americans. In 1897, the Czech tropical explorer Enrique Stanko Vráz (1860-1932) married August Geringer’s daughter Vlasta, and four years later Geringer hired R.J. Pšenka (1875-1939) from Paris, who soon married his younger daughter Augusta. A poor civil servant’s son from a south Bohemian town on the language divide (Jindřichův Hradec), Pšenka patroled North Africa with the French Foreign Legion (1895-1899), and in America he “criss-crossed” the continent from Panama to Alaska. After he succeeded F.B. Zdrůbek as chief editor for the Geringer house in 1910, Pšenka wrote a story for the almanac every year for three decades. Some drew on his travels, but most portrayed the “American countrymen, their fight for respect in a sea of foreigners, struggles to preserve their heart as a people,” the work of their associations, and their
native cultural creativity.\footnote{79}

\textit{Brothers}

The journalists and Freethinkers, who thought of themselves as modern, progressive and so also as the most appropriate leaders for the Czech-speaking immigrant ethnic group in America, had more than their own press as a forum for promoting their ideas and leadership. They also had the ČSPS fraternal benefit society, which became the ethnic group’s largest national organization. The leading journalists and Freethinkers described in the preceding chapters had nothing to do with its origins, but they and the ČSPS developed a remarkable symbiotic relationship. For Václav Šnajdr, Jan Rosický, Lev Palda and others, the ČSPS was a large and convenient forum for their leadership. For the ČSPS and its large national membership these men and their press were useful as symbols and speakers for its own cohesion, inspiration and sense of identity.

Tellingly, the ČSPS named a number of its lodges after these men and their newspapers. Earliest was \textit{Ladimír Klácel}, lodge no. 33, in Braidwood, Illinois, established on February 3, 1879. Then followed \textit{Vojta Náprstek}, lodge no. 57, in Boston, Massachusetts (January 12, 1880); \textit{F.B. Zdrůbek}, no. 74, in Minnetonka, Minnesota (January 22, 1882); \textit{Dennice}, no. 81, in Sedlow, Nebraska (June 4, 1882), named for Václav Šnajdr’s Cleveland weekly; \textit{Václav Šnajdr}, no. 92, in Bridgeport, Ohio (early June 1883); \textit{Slavie}, no. 111, in Racine, Wisconsin (August 19, 1884), named for Karel Jonáš’s weekly in the same city; \textit{Karel Jonáš}, no. 122, in Vinning, Iowa (May 10, 1885); \textit{Jan Rosický}, no. 126, in Yankton, South Dakota (January 16, 1886); \textit{Lev J. Palda}, no. 176, in Western, Iowa (May 25, 1891); and \textit{Dennice Jihu} (Dennice of the South), no. 179, in Ennis, Texas (October 31, 1891). \textit{Bratřská Svornost} (Brotherly Concord), no. 188, in Manitowoc, Wisconsin (June 7, 1892), at least echoes the name of August Geringer and F.B. Zdrůbek’s Chicago daily, just as \textit{Pokrok Chicaga} (Progress of Chicago), no. 199, in
Chicago, Illinois (May 5, 1893), does so for the early Freethinker newspaper on which
Zdrůbek, Jan V. Čapek and Šnajdr began their American careers. 

Česko-slovanská podporující společnost (Czecho-Slavonic Fraternal Society) was
originally the name of a fraternal benefit society in St. Louis. Its twenty-six founding
members met on March 4, 1854, in the saloon of fellow Bohemian immigrant Jakub
Mottl. Hynek Vodička recorded their names and proceedings in a minute book. Some
gave German instead of Czech variants of their given names, “Johan” (sic) for “Jan,”
“Franz” for “František,” a legacy of German schools and administration in Bohemia, but
Czech was the language of spoken deliberation and written record. Most members were
from southwestern Bohemia in an American city where Bohemians lived close to earlier
German immigrants and were mostly rural and small-town artisans and day laborers by
origin. Butcher Hynek Vodička was a rare shopkeeper, and as a graduate of the Plzeň
Gymnáziu he was also unusual for having more than a primary education. Both
advantages gave him better access to German St. Louis society, whose experiences with
fraternal benefit and other associations he could transfer to his countrymen, with whom
he associated in Mottl’s saloon. Founding ČSPS secretary Vodička had a counterpart in
chairman Václav Pohl (b. 1818), a cabinetmaker and engraver from the Plzeň area who
took part in Prague’s June 1848 uprising as a member of the Svornost nationalist society.
Vodička and Pohl left the scene after a few years, but another early officer, Karel Roth,
made a long career in the organization. Roth (1823-1912) was a graduate of the
Gymnáziu in Klatovy and a former secretary of a south Bohemian landed estate.

Local fraternal benefit societies later appeared in other urban communities of Czech-
speaking immigrants, including Milwaukee (1862), New York (1863), Cleveland (1864),
Baltimore (1864) and Cedar Rapids (1865). Josef Martínek, author of the most extensive
and critical history of the ČSPS and its successors, mentions their names. The society in
Cleveland was named Táborita after the radical 15th-century Hussite sect of Taborites.
At least two later societies appeared in Cleveland: Bratrská jednota (Fraternal Union,
1869) and Kruh českého lidu (Czech People’s Circle, 1870). By then, the forty-two members of Táborita, which had a $300 balance, joined the Slavic Linden in at a Fourth of July picnic. A complete list of these societies is probably impossible to compile. Some eventually joined the ČSPS during its nationwide expansion. Others became defunct, and their papers did not survive. In Cleveland, the Bratrská jednota bought a city lot, but ČSPS dimmed its confidence, and it disbanded without building a hall.

Perhaps because of its historical primacy and location in what was still the largest urban Czech-speaking community, the St. Louis ČSPS devoted itself to interstate expansion and to the union of local Czech-speaking fraternal benefit societies. In 1862 the society reorganized itself as a coordinating Grand National Lodge with one local lodge, Missouri, no. 2, in St. Louis. Two years later the Grand National Lodge commenced addressing letters to local societies in other cities proposing union. On March 24, 1866, it published an appeal toward this goal in Karel Jonáš’s weekly, Slavie, in Racine, Wisconsin.

But the first lodge to join did so only four years later. It was lodge Svornost, no. 3, in Cleveland, Ohio. And its founder, František Pešek, was a former member of lodge Missouri, no. 2, in St. Louis. Pešek was also the former teacher of the city’s first Czech-language school, at St. Jan Nepomuk Catholic parish, a Union volunteer Civil War veteran in Missouri’s infantry, and briefly published and edited Pozor, a Czech-language newspaper. In Cleveland Pešek influenced existing ideas for forming a fraternal benefit society, and at Svornost’s founding meeting on January 26, 1870, he became its first secretary and successfully proposed that it apply to join ČSPS. The Perun society of young nationalists was on the rise, and the first impulse to ČSPS growth was bound up with the anticlerical energies that it produced in Cleveland. Brother Karel Roth traveled from St. Louis to formally induct Svornost on March 8th. This example and its publicity in the Czech-language press, then hardly more than the weeklies Slavie and Pokrok, encouraged two more lodges to join ČSPS by the end of the year: Svatobor, no. 4, in
Collinsville, Illinois, a community of Bohemian miners not far from St. Louis, and Čechie, no. 5, in Allegheny City, Pennsylvania, near Pittsburgh. The sustained growth of ČSPS coincided with the years of economic hardship after the Panic of 1873. That year a new lodge appeared after a three-year pause, but Slovan, no. 1, was in St. Louis, and its founders were younger members of the existing local lodge with intergenerational grievances. Expansion into new cities and states resumed with lodge Havliček, no. 6, in Detroit, Michigan, inducted on June 7, 1874. At its fifth (and first substantial) convention, in St. Louis on June 5-6, 1876, including a parade and ball, the ČSPS counted eighteen delegates representing ten lodges and 690 members. In 1877 alone, the watershed year of American labor conflict, ČSPS added eleven new lodges. And by 1880, when forty-six delegates gathered in Chicago for the seventh convention (June 21-27), ČSPS had some 3,500 members in sixty-three lodges. All but six of these had formed since 1875 in what was an explosive half decade of growth. Even more remarkably, ČSPS would sustain this expansion in the next decade: by April 1, 1891, it would count 9,502 members in 177 lodges.

Catholics saw it as another challenge but soon contended for the parity that eluded their clergy in journalism and publishing. Fraternal insurance was already a part of business in parish societies, and the laity could learn how to build its own national organization from ČSPS. At St. Jan Nepomuk in St. Louis, the senior American parish, the chairman and secretary of the two decades old St. Václav society drafted a national call to action, and a skeptical Father Hessoun published it in Hlas on September 27, 1876. Ten parish societies from seven states founded the 1. ústřední římsko-katolická jednota (First Catholic Central Union) a year later on the feast day of Prince Václav, Bohemia’s tenth-century patron saint, and with public display. The lay societies had 538 people in total, almost four-fifths the number in ČSPS just a year earlier. By 1886, the Catholic Union had 6,253 members in 120 lodges. Already in its first year, it matched ČSPS in its death benefit payable to widows ($400). Its business terms were competitive and
liberal, but its membership regime ideological: it required a pastor’s “bill of good Catholicity” from each applicant, whose spouse could not be outside the Church, whose children had to attend parochial schools, and whose reading had to heed clerical direction and restriction. More than a device to deflect the ČSPS, the Union became a new center of attraction and discipline in the Catholic camp. One Chicago priest even claimed for it much of the acceleration toward the “well over 300 churches and missions in the United States that Czechs financed entirely” or built with others.

Ironically, the Catholic fraternal produced four secessions before the single one from ČSPS. In Wisconsin, where the Catholic communities were oldest, 829 people in 21 lodges followed the example of 2 Texas lodges (1889) and formed their own state fraternal union (1891). In Minnesota, Reverend Jan Rynda (1859-1928) led the formation of Katolický česko-americký dělník (Catholic Czech-American Worker, 1891) for the cheaper insurance plans needed to compete against the Modern Woodmen and other Anglo-American fraternals. The striking name also suggests influence from liberal, Americanist Catholicism, as Archbishop John Ireland embodied it at St. Paul, whose Bohemian parish Rynda was to build up. In Cleveland, 3 lodges at the West Side St. Prokop parish formed the Česko-slovanská katolická podporující jednota (1884) during the lay rebellion against clerical authority that pater Josef Koudelka’s return provoked in the city. Within ten years, icons from Czech history replaced saints in lodge names, the renamed Česko-slovanská bratrská podporující jednota grew to 51 lodges with over 2,000 people, and anarchist J.B. Pecka wrote its history.

ČSPS not only formed new lodges but also attracted and absorbed older, independent local societies. Lodge no. 86 in Detroit and no. 132 in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, were both named Slovanská lípa (Slavic Linden). The Detroit lodge Havlíček was the former no. 7 of Cleveland-based Kruh českého lidu when it became no. 6 of ČSPS. Five days later that same June of 1874, ČSPS inducted lodge Rolník, no. 7, in Edwardsville, Illinois. This was near the miner’s lodge in Collinsville, but as its name, which means “farmer,”
announced, its founders were of a different social class and one new to the formerly urban and industrial ČSPS. The society also developed a generous and early ability to accommodate ideological and generational diversity. It allowed a younger generation in St. Louis’s Bohemian Literary Association to form its own lodge, *Slovan*, no. 1. And lodge *Karel Marx*, no. 129, in New York, evolved from the early 1870s Bohemian Section of the defunct First International. ČSPS welcomed this lodge on April 2, 1886, with name intact through the coming months and years of anti-radical hysteria.  

In its primary practical purpose of advancing the material security of Czech-speaking immigrants, the ČSPS evoked popular support and participation on a scale that societies devoted to primarily ideological or cultural causes were never able to attract. F.B. Zdrůbek obviously intended his *Jednota svobodomyslných* (Union of Freethinker) to become a mass organization. He already had a national audience for *Pokrok*. By January 1871, three months after his call in this weekly, 300 people formed 31 constituent *Svobodné obce* (Free Communities) from Connecticut to Nebraska and from Minnesota to New Orleans.  

(Even the 1860s Slavic Linden had perhaps thirty-five locals.) Efforts to build effective schools for primary education in Czech never amounted to much. Otherwise, each local had a speaker and met to hear his lectures. For Jan Rosický, who founded the Omaha local, this was a pleasant monthly sideshow to his journalism and other more important business in his company, politics and ČSPS. Another lifelong speaker, F.B. Zdrůbek chartered his Chicago local as the equivalent of a religious body and defended his imitations of Catholic ritual in his Freethinker colleague Václav Šnajdr’s Cleveland newspaper.  

There the Freethinker local joined a local fraternal insurance society and became dormant. The united Freethinkers also made no popular impact with their literature. They venerated Ladimír Klácel as their chief philosopher, but Antonín Novák published his tracts in just 500 copies or less and still could sell no more than half the stock. August Geringer published some nine hundred pages of F.B. Zdrůbek’s theological disputations, but only one or two of Zdrůbek’s nine titles were from the
decades after the 1870s. In June 1907, publicists old and new came together to revive the Freethinker Union, the first national gathering in almost four decades since its founding. It had no home, and its elite met on Chicago’s West Eighteenth at May, in the three-story and three decades old ornate stone edifice of ČSPS.

The Sokols, nationalist gymnasts on the pattern of the German Turners, achieved more popular appeal than the Freethinkers. The Prague Sokol formed in 1862, and its enthusiasts formed its counterparts in twelve American cities and towns over the next fifteen years—St. Louis (1865), Chicago (1866), Milwaukee (1867), New York (1867), Morrisania (now in the Bronx, 1869), Cleveland (1870), Baltimore (1872), Cedar Rapids (1873), Detroit (1875), Kewaunee, St. Paul and Omaha (1877). But gymnastics was no foundation for growth on the scale of ČSPS. In St. Louis, the Sokol quickly attracted over one hundred members, trained twice a week, and quickly disappeared. A revival three years later ended in another dissolution after four years. Only a few men soon made a third start, which at last produced a lasting presence. In Chicago, Milwaukee, New York and St. Paul, the Sokols formed or affiliated as sections of the Slavic Linden, whose equivalents served in Cleveland (Perun) and Cedar Rapids (Reading Society), where each had its own hall and also accommodated choral and theatrical societies imported from Bohemia. But the 1848-1849 Slavic Lindens did not revive in constitutional 1860s Bohemia, and by the next decade their American counterparts mostly expired. Now the Sokols became the most popular society in Bohemia, and the excitement carried across the Atlantic. In Chicago, the Slavic Linden’s Sokol took over the hall and debt that its fading parent society could no longer carry. But physical prowess and athletic skill fostered masculine rivalry and not the mature prudence of ČSPS. Two Sokols each formed in the early Chicago neighborhood (Prague) and Omaha’s even smaller Bohemian Town: they did not coexist easily.

The New York Sokol formed the Národní jednota sokolská (National Sokol Union), and this channeled much youthful masculine exuberance into alternating national
conventions and competitions, officeholding and the Sokol americký monthly published forum. The idea of union arose in August 1877 amidst uprisings of the three largest Bohemian urban and wage-labor communities. Geringer and Zdrůbek’s Svornost, and evidently J.V. Čapek’s Newyorské listy, carried the November call to union. It invoked ČSPS as its example of success but also the “national consciousness” that ČSPS did not directly serve and that still needed its own unifying organization. Here the Sokol Union wanted to succeed the Slavic Lindens, which failed to form a nationwide union despite leadership from Karel Jonáš. A Czech-language press and readership now abounded, so the Sokol Union trained its effort permanently on youth, “those precious treasures yours and ours” in its impassioned proclamation to the public, which it wanted to “turn away from the common current flowing toward assimilation.” Athletics turned out to be no magic lure and avenue to the classrooms and libraries that the Sokols also offered. Still, the Sokol Union achieved a small miracle, later than the ČSPS and shorter. In 1888, at its Cedar Rapids convention, the Sokol Union had 858 brothers in fifteen locals, but five years later in Chicago, where it performed in grand style on Bohemian Day at the Columbian World’s Fair, its locals numbered thirty-five and its brothers (and sisters) some 3,500—one-third the number in ČSPS. By America’s next Bohemian Day, at Omaha’s Transmississippi Exposition (1898), membership dipped below 3,000 while locals proliferated to forty-six, including six in Chicago alone. Now the Sokol Union was also rural, with thirteen Nebraska locals outside Omaha (by 1908) and another four in Kansas.104 It also had a rival after 1890 in Sokol Fügner-Tyrš, which emphasized its orthodoxy in costume and all points of performance, business and education. Named for the Sokol’s founders in Bohemia, it grew from Chicago’s Sokol Slávský to fourteen locals (by 1909), including eight in Chicago, and 1,659 members.105

The ČSPS avoided orthodoxy. When brother František Kříž died on July 15, 1878, just two months after the formation of his Chicago lodge Osvěta, no. 27, his family was ineligible to receive the $650 death benefit, just raised from $400 at the ČSPS convention. But four months later the Illinois state lodge provided $280 anyway, almost
three-fourths of what had recently been the death benefit. Twenty-five of the thirty-one ČSPS lodges nationwide contributed. (Cleveland lodge Svornost, no. 3, gave the most, $25.) The family’s gratitude was recorded in a “Díkuvzdání” (Letter of thanks), something of a feature in the ČSPS organ even in these early years.106

ČSPS was the ethnic group’s primary and representative organization by end of the 1870s. Lodge Missouri, no. 2, organized dances and annual festivals with parades in 1860s St. Louis. As ČSPS locals proliferated across the United States, they built lodge halls that became centers of social life for Czech-speaking immigrant society. At its May 1873 convention ČSPS resolved to stop accepting personal and other disputes unrelated to ČSPS business for arbitration. This decision suggests how early and to what extent ČSPS became more than a mere fraternal benefit society. Its coordinating state grand lodges, some founded as early as the 1870s, became arenas for elite building and self-government in the immigrant community. ČSPS also built cemeteries and carried on fundraising for causes in Bohemia and for striking countrymen in American cities, which fostered a sense of group identity and solidarity with the Central European homeland.107

When New York lodge Komenský, no. 10, published an appeal for ČSPS support to the city’s striking Czech-speaking cigarmakers in December 1877, it noted that Cleveland lodge Svornost, no. 3, and Chicago lodge Praha, no. 13, had already donated. Yet just a month later lodge Praha announced an upcoming social evening to benefit “our national cemetery, striking cigarmakers and a free school.” And lodge Svornost received $50 from a Bohemian tailor’s fraternal benefit society in Chicago for the cigarmakers.108

New lodges often bore the names of iconic figures and places in Bohemia, which the ČSPS organ and speakers at lodge induction ceremonies took as opportunities to dwell on Czech nationalist history and geography for their audiences. The chairman of the Illinois state lodge did so to welcome Chicago lodge no. 41, named for Říp, the hill northwest of Prague on which a legendary sixth-century elder gave his eponymous Czech tribe of wandering Slavs its homeland.109
After 1880, when the Ústřední matice školská was established in Bohemia, ČSPS made donations to this organization devoted to establishing and funding Czech-language minority schools in majority German-speaking districts of Bohemia. ČSPS also embraced a larger Panslavism, which was a definitive part of a defensive Czech nationalism in Bohemia and Moravia, where Czech ethnolinguistic territory was nearly surrounded by German-speaking Central Europe and subject to German-speaking elites and institutions. This reassuring Panslavism, in which Czechs could see themselves as part of a larger, less vulnerable Slavic “nation,” was enshrined in the very name of ČSPS, where “Czecho-Slavonic” gave equal prominence to both aspects of Czech nationalism. But ČSPS also cultivated a practical Panslavism. When Bosnians and Herzegovinans rose against Habsburg Austria in the 1870s, ČSPS sent them generous donations that made news in Prague and Zagreb. And during the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish War, which produced an independent Bulgaria, the ČSPS organ, Dennice novověku, covered what it called the “Slavic war” at great length and with its own sources in the Balkans.110

Closer to home, the growing ČSPS could not avoid dealing with Catholicism and the divisions and controversy that formed around it among Czech-speaking immigrants. ČSPS accommodated both outspoken Freethinkers and non-sectarians who sought to make ČSPS attractive to all Czech speakers by avoiding affinities with all troublesome doctrines, Catholic and Freethinking. But ČSPS was unable to avoid problems with Catholics. In June 1854, just three months after ČSPS was founded, a Catholic minority was expelled for trying to impose its designs on the society. Reverend Jindřich Lipovský, its leader, served the first parish for Czech-speaking immigrants in St. Louis and edited the clerical German Herold des Glaubens, while the anticlerical Anzeiger des Westens and its German readership probably encouraged liberal-minded Czech speakers. The preoccupation with ritual and secrecy in ČSPS aroused Catholic suspicions and the church’s opposition to secret societies. Still, secretary Karel Roth and the national grand
lodge tried to mollify the Catholics. When (1870) the founding members of lodge no. 5 in Allegheny City chose the name *Jan Hus*, leader of the 15th-century Bohemian Reformation, they rejected it and successfully proposed the more neutral name of Čechie.\(^{111}\)

Expansion into Cleveland brought a more partisan, Freethinking turn. There the founding members of lodge *Svornost*, no. 3, were young, educated and assertive. Two years later, on May 4-6, 1872, Cleveland hosted the second convention of ČSPS, where it adopted the local Freethinking and anticlerical weekly *Pokrok* as its official organ.\(^{112}\)

When Václav Šnajdr came to Cleveland to replace Jan V. Čapek as editor of *Pokrok* in September 1873, the city was already a Freethinking bastion in ČSPS. The society was remarkably loyal to Čapek as its journalistic voice and twice endorsed newspapers that he launched, first in Cleveland and then in New York, as its organ. Čapek was a cultivated stylist, once composing a feuilleton criticizing merchants for English-influenced departures from proper Czech grammar in their advertisements, but he lacked the business skills to sustain any of his newspapers.\(^{113}\) By October 1877, when Šnajdr launched his weekly *Dennice novověku*, ČSPS voted it as its organ.\(^{114}\) And by July Šnajdr addressed the sixth ČSPS convention in Cleveland, where he emphasized cultivation of the Czech language, reason and social justice as the means to secure the well-being of the Czech-speaking people in America. With pathos and many historical references, Šnajdr appealed to both Czech nationalist sentiments and to the social grievances of working-class immigrants. As for reason, the Catholic Church was its “grave,” but America was a “free school” where it could be sought.\(^{115}\) The speech was an unwitting prologue to a drama, then beginning, that would intensify Václav Šnajdr’s relationship with ČSPS.

On July 24, 1878, Šnajdr abruptly announced in *Dennice novověku* that he must suspend the weekly newspaper. He had launched it the previous October by buying out the print shop of *Pokrok* with a six-month, $1,400 obligation to its owner, the Bohemian Printing
Company. Šnajdr now claimed, rather unconvincingly, that he expected his father-in-law, František Kořízek, who soon returned home to Wisconsin, to take over what Šnajdr in the same sentence admitted was a “debt quite large for his and my resources.” Perhaps Šnajdr instead expected forbearance from his creditors, countrymen who might admire the obvious journalistic abilities and enthusiasm that he devoted to the new “Freethinking and radical” newspaper. Eventually, the ČSPS, at its convention in Cleveland, not only reaffirmed Dennice novověku as its organ but also resolved to provide Šnajdr the full amount of his now past-due debt. But attorney Josef Václav Sýkora (1840-1915), cofounder of the Bohemian Printing Company, demanded full payment immediately, despite Šnajdr’s plea that “two or three weeks were necessary for the convention delegates to inform their locals and raise the promised funds.” Eventually, Šnajdr obtained more than the required amount from the local ČSPS to meet a three-day deadline, but Sýkora seized his print shop anyway.  

Šnajdr published his July 24th issue, reduced to just two pages from the usual eight, in the print shop of August Geringer in Chicago. There he accused “political charlatan” Sýkora of scheming to sell the former Pokrok print shop at a profit to the Republican Party. In fact, Šnajdr soon reported that the party’s local election committee paid “about $1,500” for the print shop, which promptly launched Rozvaha. But Cleveland’s Socialist and Democratic Czech-speaking immigrants condemned this daily in a mass rally, where Lev Palda, the labor speaker and editor from New York, ridiculed Jan Oliverius, Rozvaha’s editor. By March Oliverius left for Chicago. Sýkora “gave or sold the press,” Šnajdr claimed years later, “to his brother-in-law Eduard Vopalecký,” who published the newspaper Volnost.  

As for Václav Šnajdr, he was soon back in Cleveland, where he used the ČSPS monies to outfit a new print shop and revive Dennice novověku after just three weeks. He would remain its owner and editor, publishing an issue week after week, for more than the next three decades. The “noble” Ohio state lodge, which “bore a special favor for [him],” had
given $450. Four local lodges, most of all Svornost, matched it. And Šnajdr’s “sterling friend” Václav Ryčlík moved “four good and prosperous brothers” to provide another $650. Ryčlík became the first assertive chairman of the grand national lodge, the most powerful officer in ČSPS, after his election at the 1878 convention. The power and favor of the brotherhood made a lasting impression on Václav Šnajdr. Three decades later he recalled the dramatic episode with evident satisfaction in a letter to his old newspaper colleague J.V. Čapek, who wanted to write a history of the Czechs in America: “… and the ČSPS lodges that lent me the money were up in arms that Sýkora confiscated their organ.”

Šnajdr claimed that “leading officers of the brotherhood” encouraged him to join years before Ryčlík convinced him to do so in 1877. Šnajdr feared being accused of joining for gain, but Ryčlík countered that Šnajdr publicly supported ČSPS as Pokrok editor even when this weekly was not its organ. After joining the brotherhood, Šnajdr would take part in its most vital deliberations and decisions as a convention delegate. But most of all he would continue, as editor of its organ and as ceremonial speaker, to be a kind of minister to its identity, imagination and self-confidence. Dennice novověku regularly printed ČSPS news and a running directory of lodges, but it was also a forum where brothers separated by vast American distances exchanged views in letters. Like his predecessor Jan V. Čapek, Šnajdr was a cultivated stylist who drew on a university education in the humanities, so rare among 19th-century Czech speakers in America, for his writing. But Šnajdr was also an orator. He could elaborate a dark and compelling imagery of the Czech-speaking immigrant’s struggle to make a living, which made a forbidding prospect without the brotherhood. This speech at Cleveland’s commemoration of ČSPS’s twenty-fifth anniversary filled more than four newspaper columns. But Šnajdr could be as strikingly brief and bright. In an editorial on the anniversary and the brotherhood’s expansion he declared, “A Slav has brothers everywhere! And what brothers they are!”
Of course, it was easy to smile on the winning side of a great shift in elites. Two distinguished editors had come and gone in Cleveland. Václav Šnajdr stayed. Perun and the Slavic Linden were in decline, the Bohemian Printing Company silenced, and J.V. Sýkora dislodged from his place of prominence among countrymen. In Václav Rychlík’s beer hall, he had called Czech newspaper editors “prostitutes,” as Šnajdr wrote to his predecessor, J.V. Čapek, in New York. That was in 1874, when Sýkora could act almighty and speak scandalously. Three years earlier he had formed a company of thirty-four stockholders to buy a newspaper that had subscription agents in thirty-six locations. Now Father Řepiš and J.V. Čapek were gone and Sýkora stood unchallenged as the Bohemian lawyer who controlled the only Czech-language newspaper in town. But Pokrok was already in trouble, and three years later it ceased after carrying a black-framed appeal from its assignee, who called on delinquent subscribers, who owed $2,500, to rescue the paper from creditors and liquidation.

Early that year (1877), the Slavic Linden disbanded after five years of division, alienation, falling membership and courtroom contests lost to an expelled faction of senior members. Its two-story brick building reverted to a creditor. One František Sýkora led the committee that had built it. Two years after its loss, the city sued Perun, where J.V. Sýkora presided. His society was losing the strength to make payments on the land where its once enthusiastic members had raised its building with their own hands. In July 1886, the city won, confiscated the property and turned the meeting hall of young Bohemian free thought and nationalism into a fire station. Between the end of the Slavic Linden’s long legal demise and the start of Perun’s, on June 30, 1878, Václav Rychlík’s capacious beer hall eclipsed both as Czech Cleveland’s emblem and social center. Local ČSPS brothers, who now formed five lodges, and countrymen and women from up to sixteen other societies in town converged there that day in full regalia with marching bands, banners, carriages and equestrian marshals to welcome the sixth ČSPS convention. The out-of-state majority of twenty-five ČSPS delegates had reserved guest rooms at Rychlík’s establishment, and Václav Šnajdr was the distinguished speaker.
When he first came to Cleveland in August 1870, it was to speak at the dedication of Perun hall, nearby on the same street (Croton), where Rychlik’s place already stood. ČSPS lodge Svornost came too, and by the end of the year its 49 brothers moved their meetings to Perun hall. Perun had 80 and the Slavic Linden 240 by May, when it opened its own hall on Croton to addresses from Rychlik and F.B. Zdrůbek. But they remained isolated societies, and their former members on the West Side formed their own a year later. Named for Jan Žižka, the fifteenth-century nemesis of Catholic armies, it also devoted itself to reading, lectures and free thought. St. Prokop parish formed at the same time, and the zealous young cleric Josef Maria Koudelka arrived in early 1875 to make the West Side Cleveland’s main theater of Catholic militancy and community conflict. Žižka turned to the ČSPS, and the brothers from Svornost, with Václav Rychlik in the lead, assisted in its transformation as lodge no. 9, the second one in Cleveland. ČSPS had replaced Perun and Slavic Linden as the alternative to the Catholic Church in the city.130

By the end of 1875, Svornost moved to Rychlik’s hall, and in the five years to the end of 1878, its numbers increased from 75 to 159. It gained only a dozen or so more by 1895, but by then it was just one of sixteen ČSPS lodges in Cleveland. The brotherhood gained “thirty young free thinkers,” dissenters from a Catholic lodge, when it inducted Břetislav I on August 5, 1883. This lodge, no. 96, resurrected the name of a victorious eleventh-century grand prince of Bohemia in the speech around Broadway, where the largest neighborhood was forming. One year later, in a “more remote part of Cleveland,” fifteen more paid the collective $25 induction fee and joined ČSPS to counter another Catholic lodge. They took the name Sion, fort of the “storied Hussite nobleman Roháč z Dubé,” from a Karel Herloš (Karl Herlossohn) novel serialized in Dennice novověku. Icons of nationalist history and Václav Šnajdr’s newspaper, both anticlerical, were lasting inspirations for the growing brotherhood. So were the twelve beer halls, including Rychlik’s, where the sixteen ČSPS lodges gathered for their meetings. The saloonkeepers were all brothers too.131
The only exception among them was František Šícha, whose name is absent from the rosters for Petr Chelčický no. 56, which he hosted, and all other ČSPS lodges in town. Each lodge prepared an exhaustive roster of its members past and present for a Cleveland volume dedicated to the 1895 Czecho-Slavonic Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague. Six Bohemian lodges of the Ancient Order of Foresters of America also contributed to the volume. Rovnoprávnost (Equality), no. 6350, was the second oldest. It formed (1877) at Šícha’s hall, and Šícha was its member. A defensive introduction on the “international societies,” a euphemism for the Anglo-American fraternals, justified their Bohemian lodges: these countrymen were earning a good reputation among their American brothers, and they were “almost all” also members of some “purely” Czech association, so they did “double duty for the Czech cause.” To Jan Habenicht, they “lacked Czech consciousness,” and so he excluded them from his 777-page history of Czech America. In Bohemia, mutual Czech-German ethnic segregation was profound and social sanctions against “renegades” severe. As late as the 1930s, Rudolf Bubeníček, an admirably critical and objective amateur historian in Chicago, could be reproachful in his treatment of “Czechs in foreign associations.” In 1886, Praha no. 231 became the second of just two Bohemian Odd Fellows lodges in Chicago for nearly three decades. It still managed to produce a Czech-language history on its fortieth anniversary. Bubeníček used it—and judged the lodge “saturated in a spirit of foreignness.”

But the Anglo-American fraternal societies imposed no great or unqualified losses on the ČSPS. The author of the apology in the 1895 Cleveland volume, Karel Felix Tůma (1857-1920), was a Knight of Pythias, lodge Palacký no. 317. But so was Václav Šnajdr and most countrymen in publishing, medicine, law, small business and industry. Tůma edited Volnost, Cleveland’s other Czech newspaper, for its entire 1880-1908 lifetime. Šnajdr stayed on in the ČSPS and also joined Šícha’s lodge of Foresters. František Šícha was not in the ČSPS, but he hosted one of its lodges and a Czech amateur theatrical society in his hall, which he bought soon after the conflict-ridden Slavic Linden lost it.
“SLOVANSKÁ LÍPA” (Slavic Linden) was chiseled in relief on its elegant facade, and the 1895 Cleveland community history volume recorded gratitude to the “progressive and educated” Mr. Šícha for keeping the building in Czech hands. In 1894 Chicago, Bubeníček’s disdained Praha no. 231 successfully resisted its superior Grand Lodge in the International Order of Odd Fellows, which wanted to forbid its use of the Czech language and contributions to a ČSPS-led committee to build a Czech orphans home. Czechs first followed Germans into Anglo-American fraternal societies. The Robert Blum lodge, no. 58, of Odd Fellows formed as early as 1849. The Knights and Ladies of Honor offered lower premiums than the ČSPS and had twenty-three Bohemian lodges in 1890 Chicago, as many as ČSPS. But at least fifteen of the KLH lodges quit three years later over rising premiums, unpaid benefits, high overhead and arrogant treatment. They formed their own Česko-slovanská jednota (Czecho-Slavonic Union). It was the same with the Foresters, whose sixteen Bohemian lodges in Chicago quit by the end of the decade to form their own Jednota česko-amerických lesníků a lesnic (Union of Czech-American Foresters and Lady Foresters).

In 1895 Cleveland, six Bohemian lodges of Foresters and one each of Pythians, Knights and Ladies of Honor, and Odd Fellows totaled 815 members (including 99 women) to the 1,205 men in the sixteen ČSPS lodges. This ratio of just 3:2 in favor of ČSPS would not be impressive. But ČSPS had a companion women’s fraternal society in the Jednota českých dam (Union of Czech Ladies), with 814 sisters in eleven Cleveland lodges. And ČSPS was on brotherly terms with all the non-Catholic Czech fraternals. Only the complicated business of reconciling membership policies, benefit offerings and financial operations delayed their unification to 1932. In 1895, a decade after Catholic dissenters formed it on the West Side, the Česko-slovanská bratská podporující jednota had twenty of its fifty-two lodges in Cleveland, whose share of total ČSBPJ membership (2,153) is unknown. But its parallel women’s fraternal, Sesterská podporující jednota, had 384 sisters in its seven Cleveland lodges, and another 150 Czech women formed two other, local fraternals. Adding all three groups of women raises the ČSPS side to
2,553 individuals. That makes for a more accurate ratio of over 3:1 in favor of ČSPS and against the Anglo-American fraternals in Cleveland, yet it completely discounts the ČSBPJ, which also had a strong presence in the city.

Like Václav Šnajdr, other immigrant journalists and Freethinkers made relationships with ČSPS early. Local lodges made donations to Lev Palda’s Cleveland labor newspaper, *Dělnicke listy*, and bought its shares. In Chicago publisher August Geringer and editor F.B. Zdrůbek launched *Svornost*, the first Czech-language daily newspaper in America, just a month after ČSPS initiated its first lodge in the city, *Věrnost*, no. 8, with great ceremony and participation from St. Louis and Cleveland (September 18, 1875). Chicago gained five more lodges in less than three years before the Cleveland convention, “largely thanks to Svornost’s influence.” Brothers Geringer and Zdrůbek “tirelessly promoted the brotherhood in their newspaper.” Likewise, the appearance of ten new Nebraska lodges in the two years after Omaha’s *Palacký*, no. 19 (July 12, 1877), was “largely the work of brother F.J. Sadílek and especially brother Jan Rosický and his newspaper *Pokrok západu.*”

These journalists were important enough as symbols and promoters, but only Rosický also made a career inside ČSPS to rival Šnajdr’s. Palda only rose to prominence as a delegate to the tenth convention of ČSPS (Cedar Rapids, 1891). Geringer made one appearance as a delegate to the ninth convention (New York, 1886). Geringer also made an appeal for ČSPS to contribute to his publication and distribution of Zdrůbek’s Freethought and anti-Catholic tracts. The Grand National Lodge rejected it, but individual lodges contributed small amounts. Zdrůbek, a familiar speaker elsewhere, made a rare speech to the seventh ČSPS convention (Chicago, 1880). At this convention, Rosický was the delegate for Omaha lodge *Palacký* no. 19, and he would be a delegate at each following convention. Unlike Šnajdr, a delegate and traditionally the orator at these conventions, Rosický was also an officer. As early as 1879 he was secretary of the Nebraska state lodge.
Unfortunately for the brotherhood, for the 1860s generation of liberal journalists and publishers, and for its 1890s attempt to form a lasting and effective “Bohemian voice” in America, Rosický and Šnajdr would be at odds in ČSPS. Rosický wanted the brotherhood to have its own internal and exclusive organ, and he would press the issue doggedly at four conventions to success at Cedar Rapids in 1891. Dennice novověku was, after all, Václav Šnajdr’s personal weekly. He was its owner, publisher and editor, and one who rarely employed any assistant editors. Perhaps Rosický took exception to, among other things, Šnajdr’s anti-Catholic polemics, which could easily appear excessive. As early as February 1878, Rosický’s Omaha lodge Palacký no. 19 complained to the Grand National Lodge that Dennice novověku was an inappropriate new ČSPS organ. Šnajdr’s like-minded Clevelanders were already powerful in the brotherhood, but the complaint did reveal a minority “opposition of conservative members, especially in the West,” who rejected all religious expression in the society, including Šnajdr’s combative Freethought.  

Shortly before the 1880 Chicago convention, Šnajdr published an indignant reply to Rosický, who claimed in his Pokrok západu that Dennice novověku was the ČSPS organ not for its “radical views but for personal reasons.” Šnajdr countered that as a non-delegate he had no access to the previous convention (Cleveland, 1880) and could not be faulted if “some Cleveland delegates spoke some passionate words” and contributed to a resounding reaffirmation of his weekly as ČSPS organ. In Chicago the vote was unanimous save for one abstention, almost certainly Rosický’s, who proposed a separate ČSPS organ. Chicago was another large and powerful bastion of Freethought. It already had the largest number of ČSPS lodges, Geringer and Zdrůbek’s daily Svornost could be as hostile to the Catholics as Dennice novověku, and when Šnajdr complained that fewer than one in four ČSPS members subscribed to their organ, his weekly, his consolation was that a disproportionate number were in Chicago. But the cult of brotherhood in ČSPS could still contain personal rivalries. When the local Czech reading
club hosted a Friday dinner at the Sokol hall, Zdrůbek, Rychlík and Šnajdr spoke, Rosický and a Minnesota delegate received the more dubious honor of droll introductions, but the music, dancing and good cheer lasted past midnight. And the convention adopted a resolution crediting the growth of ČSPS to “our progressive press” and urging brothers to “subscribe and promote the Freethinking Czech-language journals.” This certainly included Jan Rosický and his Pokroč západu.

But for six months after the convention Rosický would publish an unofficial Věstník bratruský, which means “brotherhood herald,” and the Nebraska state ČSPS lodge elected his Pokroč západu as its official organ. And the next two national ČSPS conventions would bring reprises of the Rosický-Šnajdr scenario from Chicago. Three years later, just before delegates gathered in Milwaukee, the “noise” over the organ issue motivated an anonymous observer to offer his view, which Šnajdr printed. No one was a better scholar and so better able than Václav Šnajdr, claimed the author, to counter the Catholic camp. Taking on a mocking tone, he accused priests of asking parishioners at confession what newspapers they read and of making the reading of Dennice novověku an unpardonable sin.

After three more years Šnajdr probably conveyed the apprehensions of many about the imminent convention in New York, which happened to follow the Haymarket events in Chicago by barely one month. Growth had brought divisive and insincere elements into the brotherhood, and Šnajdr complained of factionalism, elitism and snobbery. He spoke of old brothers who now longed for past times, when going to ČSPS meetings was like going to the cathedral. ČSPS “should be our cathedral,” Šnajdr wrote, “but we often make it a saloon.” The convention again voted Dennice novověku the ČSPS organ, 260 to 56, after a debate that was spirited but restrained. Afterward, a local Freethinkers’ club named for Dennice novověku celebrated the journal’s reaffirmation at a reception where Karel Jonáš and ČSPS officers Robert L. Pitte and Karel Drábek joined Snajdr. Despite dark expectations, the convention atmosphere was brotherly
and hard-working, and the farewells emotional.\textsuperscript{159} After the convention, Šnajdr and Rosický disagreed amicably over the rejected proposal for a “second ČSPS” to bring in the cohort of countrymen aged 45-55, which Šnajdr supported.\textsuperscript{160}

Šnajdr and Rosický had much in common as Czech nationalists. In New York, where some delegates voiced the wish for lodges to offer members more educational and personal improvement opportunities, Šnajdr proposed a resolution, unanimously approved, for lodges to commemorate exemplary Czech and other personalities, to establish Czech-language libraries for youth and adults, to carry on Sunday Czech-language schools to prepare a new generation to sustain Czech-speaking immigrant institutions, and for more ČSPS members to subscribe and support the mainstream Freethinking Czech-language press.\textsuperscript{161} Six years before, in Chicago, Rosický had proposed a home for ČSPS orphans (and widows) in the West, where land was still cheap and where they could be raised in the Czech language and educated for a trade.\textsuperscript{162}

But more was beginning to divide the brotherhood than Rosický’s differences with Šnajdr. Healthier brothers in the rural West were beginning to resent the higher mortality and sicknesses of their countrymen in Eastern cities, and in New York Jan Rosický starkly declared, “We will not pay for your consumption sufferers!”\textsuperscript{163}
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CHAPTER VIII
A BOHEMIAN AMERICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

At the end of October 1890, ČSPS lodge Prokop Veliký, no. 46, observed the first stone set in place for its own three-story building in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. It would outclass the Bohemian reading society’s public hall, now two decades old, and challenge St. Václav’s church, five years older. It would raise the name of the early fifteenth-century Hussite general, successor to Žižka, like a patron saint of Czech nationalism on the Cedar River. To outsiders in the Hawkeye State, the name meant nothing. Governor Horace Boies dwelled on the Americanization of naturalized citizens as the fourth and closing speaker at the cornerstone-laying ceremony, where company C of his state militia marched. But a north wind cut the governor short with its cold force and snow. The chairman and secretary of ČSPS both came from Chicago, but a local citizen was the star that day. It was Lev J. Palda. The weather worked for him, and the marchers and dignitaries added brilliance. Public speaking was Palda’s element. His turn came just before the governor, and his “impassioned” speech rivaled the governor’s for prominence in the Cedar Rapids Daily Republican’s narrative of the event, which Karel Jonáš gratefully translated and disseminated from Racine, Wisconsin, to a national audience in his weekly Slavie. It was a grand comeback for L.J. Palda.¹

L.J. Palda came to Cedar Rapids ten years before with his family to live quietly and recover. New York had impoverished the Socialist newspaperman and intensified the mental suffering to which he was prone. For a time, he wrote in Dělník americký from his Iowa refuge to warn against the rhetorical violence of the new Social Democrats from Bohemia. But his “almost pathological sensitivity” could not bear their rough personal attacks in the New York newspaper. He also seemed unable to keep to a private life. In the spring of 1885 he won election to the Cedar Rapids school board, chaired its textbook committee, and promptly won local notoriety and (among Bohemians and Germans) celebrity with a successful one-man resolution, which fearful fellow
comitteeemen declined to co-sign, banning a “women’s temperance society” from the classrooms. Notoriety in the Anglo press and society turned to admittance for his opinion into its newspaper pages and lecture rooms. Palda also joined the Knights of Labor and accumulated more attention there with an open letter to national leader Terence Powderly. It propelled him into an unhappy state senate candidacy for Henry George’s United Labor Party. But labor politics, even in its Anglo mainstream, was still a perishable affair and ČSPS already a lasting and reliable brotherhood. Prokop Veliký no. 46 formed in 1879, the year before Palda arrived. Two more Cedar Rapids lodges formed in 1882. And when lodge L.J. Palda, no. 176, formed six months after Palda’s speech at the foundation-stone ceremony, the constellation of Iowa lodges outside Cedar Rapids numbered ten.  

In town, builders completed their work, and the new Prokop Veliký hall hosted the tenth ČSPS national convention on June 22-29, 1891. The arrival of 175 delegates from the brotherhood’s 177 local lodges made it the largest convention that ČSPS would ever bring together. The previous convention (New York) had chosen Cedar Rapids five years earlier. To disappointment among some of its senior brothers, the host lodge chose L.J. Palda as its delegate. He had a mission: according to his 1911 biography in Geringer and Zdrůbek’s Chicago almanac Amerikán, Palda had “pondered the need for a national Czech organization in America long before and considered the large and popular ČSPS best prepared” to form it.  

He had in mind an organization that would take up the political functions that ČSPS avoided. In New York, the brotherhood had met amidst the frightening political reaction just after the Haymarket Tragedy in Chicago. A faction of delegates wanted ČSPS to take a stand against labor radicalism then, but convention chairman Karel Jonáš blocked them. He was the senior Bohemian politician in America, could recognize a divisive issue, and invoked a decision from the previous convention to exclude politics from ČSPS business. The brotherhood did act politically by collecting American dollars for Czech minority schools in German-speaking districts of Bohemia and for fellow Slavs in Bosnia who rose up against the Austrians, but political
involvements at home in America were risky in the presence of irascible Freethinkers, Catholics and Socialists. And the culture and business of fraternal insurance inclined ČSPS officers to prudence.4

Palda evidently realized both the political limits of ČSPS and its advantages as the most legitimate and ample platform for a political organization. Perhaps he did not come to this realization alone. Karel Jonáš acknowledged in his weekly Slavie that Jan Borecký had contributed a proposal for a political organization as early as February 1890.5 And Borecký claimed that he wrote letters to L.J. Palda and Antonín Jurka before the ČSPS convention, urging them to make a proposal to the brotherhood’s gathering.6 Thirty years had passed since Borecký’s apogee as founder of the Slavic Linden and then editor of the (almost) first Czech-language newspaper, Národní noviny in St. Louis. As a saloonkeeper there and then in Milwaukee and Chicago, he had traversed and inhabited the thick of his countrymen’s America. But in 1877 he went on to prairie farming in Kansas, whether by instinct or necessity, and since 1880 he was in Little Rock, Arkansas. In this final home, where he would live out three decades, Borecký returned to his original tailor’s trade and raised a large family far away from the polity that he so much wanted to elevate.7 But he enriched the Czech-language press in the Midwest as one of its exotic and tireless correspondents.

L.J. Palda presented a simple proposal to the ČSPS convention. The delegates in their great gathering were to “elect fifteen brothers and entrust them with the power and right to collect monies for such aims and projects as the further development of our nationality and our common interest as Czech Americans might call for, and which [sic, who] would have the power and right to undertake anything that the important realization of our unity as a nationality might call for.”8 This formulation opened a broad field for the imagination and initiative of the individuals who were to make up the new body. As part of his remarkable engagement with Anglo-American society during the past decade in Cedar Rapids, Palda had lately read law for eight months with one J.M.
Redmond, attorney. But Palda’s formulation also embodied a remarkably intact belief in the viability of a Czech polity—for someone whose American experience already amounted to a quarter century.

The convention approved Palda’s proposal and elected fifteen brothers to form the Národní výbor, which would call itself the Bohemian American National Committee (henceforth BANC) in English. That was the name printed on its letterhead paper. One-third of the electees were leading journalists—Karel Jonáš, F.B. Zdrůbek, Václav Šnajdr, Jan Rosický and L.J. Palda. This was the durable 1860s generation (or at least its best-known part) that kept the main stream of Czech-language print culture going in America. These were men born in 1840s Bohemia and students or autodidacts there in the late 1850s and 1860s, which was also the decade of their arrivals in America. They belonged to the first generation of Czech speakers who grew to adulthood, who accumulated an education and made sense of themselves and their world—after the liberation. Czech speakers were the freedmen of Bohemia after the peasant emancipation of 1848 and in the two-decade liberal reform of the Habsburg state, a linguistically colored underclass that now turned to making its own, separate modern society, instead of assimilating into the dominant German-speaking one. As the Slavs took over schools, community councils, industries and other modern spaces, they experienced a kind of self-awe and motivation, perhaps like Anglo-Americans in their conquest of transcontinental space. Karel Jonáš and his four junior colleagues grew into consciousness when this excitement was new.

Within this common historical and emotional experience, their differences in education mattered less. Karel Jonáš and the two who joined him in Racine had studied in the highest schools of Prague—Jonáš at the polytechnic, Zdrůbek at the university’s Catholic theological college, and Šnajdr at its college of liberal arts. Jonáš and Šnajdr could not complete their studies because the punitive state drove them abroad for their involvements in nationalist street demonstrations and publishing. Jan Rosický and L.J.
Palda attained only the beginnings of a secondary education, because their families could not afford to keep them in school. This common barrier to talent and diligence even became a theme of the period’s high literature in Vilém Mrštík’s novel *Santa Lucia*, about the sufferings and demise of an indigent student from the provinces in Prague. L.J. Palda had to repeat the first year of *Realschule* in his native Vodňany because the instruction was German. His entry to second-year study in late 1860 coincided with Austria’s constitutional rejuvenation, and teachers in inner Bohemia’s secondary schools began to lead the curriculum in Czech. The new language revealed Palda the shining student for a year, then he became a textile-mill trainee. But he was already a voracious reader by parental influence, had native ability as a stylist and orator, and followed his trade and the culture of self-education to Vienna, Saxony, Bavaria, Switzerland, New York and their workers’ circles. In America the autodidacts rejoined the Prague alumni in the newspaper editor’s prolific years and writing. Palda abandoned his *Dělnické listy* but wrote on as a contributor to other papers, while Jan Rosický kept at his own paper alongside Jonáš, Zdrůbek and Šnajdr.

Of the other ten brothers elected to the BANC in Cedar Rapids, Josef V. Matějka (1855-1904) was another journalist, but he was about a decade younger and less successful. He came to New York in 1873, was one of at least three typesetters at J.V. Čapek’s *Newyorské listy* when this newspaper failed with the great Bohemian cigarmakers’ strike, and stayed on to work for František Škarda and L.J. Palda’s *Dělnické listy*. By 1880 Matějka was in Chicago and two years later launched what soon became his *Chicagské listy*. He made it a daily by 1886, to enthusiastic support from interests who longed for a competitor to August Geringer and F.B. Zdrůbek’s *Svornost*. J.V. Matějka did not develop the business skills to manage this role and lost his paper in the year after Cedar Rapids. But he launched at least two more papers in Chicago and one in Baltimore before his death in poverty. In his history of Czech journalism in America, Thomas Čapek included Matějka in a trio of exemplary failures whose tally of successive efforts measured and suggested the greatness of devotion to what otherwise
seemed a small field of culture and business.\textsuperscript{14}

Bohumil Šimek (1861-1937) was a Cedar Rapids electee of quite another kind. He was born in America, on a farm across the county line south of Cedar Rapids in Johnson County. His parents became landowners there in 1856, five years before his birth. They were from spiritually nonconformist east Bohemia, Bohumil’s mother from Vamberk, home town of Alois Kares, the emigration agent in Bremen who also served Czech nationalist causes and its emigres. Bohumil’s father, a shoemaker from nearby Častolovice, was a freethinker in Iowa who criticized Ladimir Klácel, the utopian ex-Augustinian who began his quixotic American journalism for free thought and communes in Iowa City, county seat.\textsuperscript{15} Bohumil earned a University of Iowa civil engineering degree there and returned by 1890 to teach natural science. He also made an international reputation with his field work and writing. As geologist, zoologist and collector of dry-loving mollusks and their fossils, he introduced an aeolian theory of loess origins with a series of papers that began with “Loess and Its Fossils” (1890) and that challenged prevailing aqueous theories in the literature. Most of all, Shimek came to command scientific authority as a botanist of the prairie, which had captivated him in childhood, even as Americans cleared and broke it. He advanced from state offices to vice-presidency of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1911), and at the 1914 International Scientific Congress in Prague he chaired the geological section. When the University of Iowa launched a Centennial Memoirs series (1947) to publicize those past professors most useful to its image, Shimek was the subject of volume number one.\textsuperscript{16} Today just one or two Czech place names are large enough to appear on common road maps of Iowa, but one protected forest on the Des Moines River, near its confluence into the Mississippi, also bears Shimek’s name.\textsuperscript{17}

Shimek was an exotic and exciting electee in Cedar Rapids. Here was a young American, professor and scientist who not only took his Bohemian patrimony to heart but made its progress a part of his public career. The ageing nationalists with their
imperfections as Americans and fears of irrelevance could admire Shimek as an embodiment of their dreams. With such a shining young example in their midst, perhaps they could change American minds, influence the second generation, and make some more lasting new Bohemia. Of the journalist generation born in the 1840s, J.V. Čapek evidently left such projects behind and tried most to assimilate. He took no part in the BANC and was still intent on fortune as an inventor. “He read scientific literature only in English,” and he and his wife, a New York native, replaced German with English in their home, where they raised a daughter. “He mastered literary English perfectly” in his patent applications, but to Thomas Čapek’s surprise, his older brother “never managed to get rid of his harsh accent.” With the others, like Jonáš and Zdřůbek, who “both compiled dictionaries and English grammars,” it was the same—no escape from harsh accents that only carried louder in a time of nativism. About J.V. Šykora in Cleveland the story went around that a judge tired of straining to understand him sent the Bohemian attorney and “long-time American” by residence out to fetch his Anglo partner. Among the majority in Cedar Rapids, L.J. Palda could only take the floor with a manuscript in hand and keep closely to it. In English he “dared not” soar with his gift for spontaneous public speaking.

Twenty-four miles away Shimek moved easily in the American academy. He was at one with his colleagues by education, and without the coloring of Catholic religion or difficult Bohemian surname, he was well adapted to evade common prejudices. “Šimek” Anglicized easily as “Shimek.” Thomas Čapek devoted two paragraphs, a guide in brief to wayward countrymen, on contortions like Krejčí translated into Taylor and phonological misrenderings like “Kučera” to “Goodsheller.” Čapek pronounced it a practice “not as widespread as popularly believed,” but it inspired a proposal (and no action) emblematic of the BANC in its enthusiasm to strike out in all directions and turn back all perils: “Be it resolved to call on Czech and Slovak associations and dutiful countrymen in the National Committee’s name to send in lists of Americanized Czech and Slovak names, so that these may not be lost to the heritage of the Czech
nationality.” Shimek rose at the University of Iowa with his Bohemian given name intact. In 1886 he married one Anna Elizabeth Konvalinka, had five children, and could lecture in “perfect Czech” at Prague’s university as late as 1914. His work and travels kept him away from the BANC, but he was its prize and embellishment nonetheless. He was the only one of his kind among the electees in Cedar Rapids, but the BANC would involve others like him in its ambition and broad agenda.

The other eight electees in Cedar Rapids were ČSPS men from the Midwest and East. At least two of the four Easterners were Socialists. Vincent V. Vojtišek (b. 1856) was the delegate for two lodges, no. 39 in New York, named for the great physiologist and Czech nationalist Jan E. Purkyně (1787-1869), and Bratři od Šumavy (Brothers from the Bohemian Forest) no. 162 in Bridgeport, Connecticut. (Václav Šnajdr listed all the convention delegates in his newspaper, the brotherhood’s organ, in ascending order by lodge number. Vojtišek was prominent in the political, largely German and Bohemian Cigar Makers Progressive Union that left the Cigar Makers International Union and Samuel Gompers for a few years in the previous decade, but even earlier (1876) he was the one who brought the brotherhood into the city, where he became founding chairman of Jan Amos Komenský no. 10, the first ČSPS lodge in New York. By the time of Cedar Rapids, the brotherhood had eleven lodges in the city alone, one more outside it at Bohemia on Long Island, two more across the water in New Jersey (Newark, Bayonne), two down the coast in Baltimore, three in nearby New England (Connecticut, Massachusetts) and one in Philadelphia. That was twenty lodges on the East Coast between Boston and Baltimore, and Vojtišek was their electee, together with one Josef Šefčík from lodge Jeroným no. 31 and Josef Wirth from Jan Hus no. 47, both in New York City.

The other Eastern electee was František Choura (1852-1921), a miner from lodge Duch nové doby, no. 165, in Woodville, now in the southwest suburbs of Pittsburgh. Founded just one year before the Cedar Rapids convention, it was just the newest of six
Pennsylvania lodges. Only one was on the other side of the state in Philadelphia. Of the other five, the oldest two were across the Ohio River in Allegheny City (now the North Side of Pittsburgh), and two more were in mining towns of neighboring Westmoreland County to the east, in the hills above the Monongahela River. Choura had been a miner in Duchcov, in the coal basin from the Elbe west to Most that started to draw in a Czech-speaking migration in the 1870s. It was the part of German-speaking Bohemia where Czechs encountered the most conflict, because of their numbers, but it was also where they adopted German socialism. Choura was among the fourteen comrades who founded the Czecho-Slavonic Social Democratic Party in Prague, where he was convicted four years later in a December 1882 mass trial. “Often incarcerated,” Choura only turned more radical. An “excellent orator of the people,” he traveled widely in Bohemia and Moravia, “sowing the seed of socialism everywhere” after his expulsion from the northern coal basin. Choura fled to America (1887) as the consequences of a police informer’s murder and the discovery of an illegal print shop disrupted the party’s radical wing.

From the Midwest, the electees to the BANC in Cedar Rapids were Josef H. Štěpán from lodge Čechoslovan, no. 30, in New Prague, the senior lodge in Minnesota; Josef V. Teibel for its counterpart in South Dakota, lodge Dakota, no. 99, in Scotland; and Antonín Klobása from St. Louis. Like the Eastern labor leaders Choura and Vojtíšek, who eventually became an attorney and county official, Teibel (b. 1856) pursued political interests: in 1890-1895 he was auditor of Bon Homme County. Also in this group from the great American interior was Ignác J. Gallia, the delegate for seven of the fourteen lodges in Texas, all formed in just the preceding seven years. Gallia founded the amateur theatrical society in Engle, halfway from Houston to San Antonio, and five miles from the first ČSPS lodge in the state, Texan no. 104. His other lodges were here in Fayette County and in the neighboring counties of Washington, Austin, Colorado and Lavaca to the east and south. The first four of these counties were the “big four” of Czech-speaking settlement in Texas. Gallia represented half of Texas in Cedar Rapids,
and Štěpán and Teibel were secretaries of their respective grand state lodges in Minnesota and South Dakota.\textsuperscript{36}

The ČSPS men elected to the BANC were important in their home states, and they were important at the convention, where committees conducted most of the business.\textsuperscript{37} The committees were elective, but no more than one member could be from any given state, which disadvantaged states with large numbers of lodges and delegates. Václav Šnajdr, who defended this practice, reported to the national membership in his weekly *Dennice novověku* that “some delegates resented being shut out,” which was probably an understatement.\textsuperscript{38} But Vojtíšek was nominated to chair the convention and became vice-secretary when the delegates elected the other nominee, Štěpán J. Heřman, from lodge *Svojan* no. 29 in Wilber, Nebraska. Vojtíšek, Choura, Teibel and Gallia, along with two journalists (Palda, Rosicky) and professor Shimek, won election to the most important committee, the one for revising the brotherhood’s bylaws.\textsuperscript{39} Vojtíšek, Štěpán and Teibel won election to the committee on the divisive issue of whether to launch an independent ČSPS organ or keep Šnajdr’s *Dennice novověku*\textsuperscript{40}; Šefčík to the committee for editing and publishing the convention’s minutes; Vojtíšek, Šefčík and Wirth to the financial audit committee; Vojtíšek to the committee for reviewing complaints; Vojtíšek and Štěpán to the committee for reviewing requests for payment of the death benefit to brothers still living; and Vojtíšek to the resolutions committee.\textsuperscript{41} When Václav Šnajdr returned from the convention and devoted a retrospective paragraph in his paper to its outstanding delegates, he praised Vojtíšek for his “tactical skill,” Choura for command of language and style, Štěpán for his “intelligent moderation,” Teibel for his energy, and the “Texan brothers” for their engaging presence.\textsuperscript{42}

But these fine and important ČSPS men did nothing in the BANC. They were no-shows. At the second BANC convention (November 1892), Robert L. Pitte, Max Kirchman and N.J. Vorel replaced Vojtíšek, Wirth and Klobása, respectively. No replacements arrived for the other five.\textsuperscript{43} And at the third convention (July 1893), which turned out to be the
last, it was the same story: Klobáša, Kirchman and Jan F. Sprostý were the only ČSPS men recorded as delegates present. Vorel sent a telegram on behalf of the “Czechs of St. Louis,” wishing his BANC colleagues in Chicago a successful convention. The replacements were also brothers of importance. Pitte (b. 1846) completed a secondary education at the Písek reálka in south Bohemia. In Chicago, where he arrived in 1867, Pitte directed two choral societies and taught school at St. Václav’s parish (1875-1878) and then for another eight years at the ČSPS, when the brotherhood built its fine hall on West Eighteenth at May. Then he opened an office and made money as a notary and real estate agent. Cedar Rapids was the third consecutive ČSPS convention, after Milwaukee (1883) and New York (1886), that elected Pitte as its presiding secretary and to the same office in the national grand lodge. That meant that he was the brotherhood’s secretary for a remarkable thirteen consecutive years, because in 1883 the ČSPS made election effective to the next convention instead of just one-year terms in the national grand lodge, which it also moved from St. Louis to Chicago for the next thirteen years. Kirchman, another Chicagoan, was elected to the national grand lodge as bookkeeper for those years, and Sprostý, from lodge Žižka no. 9 on Cleveland’s tumultuous West Side, was chairman of the Milwaukee ČSPS convention. At the BANC convention in Chicago ten years later, Sprostý successfully moved that the committee reconvene in Cleveland, and Kirchman successfully nominated no less a brother than Josef Matoušek, the Chicago “clothier from Halsted Street” who was ČSPS national chairman since Cedar Rapids, as another replacement for Vojtíšek. But the BANC did not reconvene sixteen months hence in November 1894—or ever again.

Perhaps distance and its costs kept some brothers away from the BANC. It evidently affected the ČSPS as it expanded into a formidable national organization: its conventions first convened every other year (1876, 1878, 1880), then every third year (1883), and in 1886 New York the brotherhood finally decided to henceforth come together only every five years. On the eve of Cedar Rapids 1891, Václav Šnajdr reported that this largest and longest awaited convention would cost the brotherhood at least $15,000. On the
same page of his paper and for his own benefit, he published the details of an offer from
the “Lake Shore & M.S.” railroad company that would reduce the cost of a Cleveland-
Chicago round-trip ticket by $6.80 to $13.20 for a party of at least ten individuals who
observed the stated restrictions. 49 In Cedar Rapids, the committee for revision of the
bylaws ruled that the states, entitled to one convention delegate for every 250 brothers
eligible for the death benefit, must pay the “costs connected with the election” of the
delegates, while the “brotherhood pays travel costs.”50 Jan Rosický, speaking for the
powerful delegation from remote Nebraska, revived (unsuccessfully) a proposal first
made in 1883 Milwaukee by then vice-chairman, current convention chairman and
fellow Nebraskan S.J. Hefman—that the bylaws committee make the most important
articles subject to change only by vote of the entire brotherhood. Václav Šnajdr, writing
for all the brothers at home in his paper, agreed: “The absolute power, or rather
unlimited whim, of the convention should and must be reduced by basic laws or
constitution. Our union must be democratized if it is not to become the plaything of the
cliques and coteries that form in every society.”51 It was an admirable sentiment and
effort to come from the powerful journalist’s party in ČSPS.

Unmentioned but pervasive and harsh in its discriminatory effects was the rising burden
of travel costs in a brotherhood of struggling immigrants with lodges so far and wide in
the American vastness. Was this why only replacements from Chicago, St. Louis and
Cleveland came to the BANC conventions in Chicago, and why the original electees
from Minnesota, South Dakota and Texas never came? The BANC bylaws stated that
each of its participating associations “pays the travel costs of its own delegates to
conventions.”52 But V.V. Vojtíšek caused such an uproar when he had the ČSPS pay him
$56 to attend the first convention that the brotherhood’s national grand lodge obtained
compensation in full from the BANC, which also “indefinitely postponed” a proposal
from a Národní jednota sokolská (National Sokol Union) delegate “concerning payment
of member travel expenses in the future.”53 Neither Vojtíšek nor any other brother from
New York attended the next two BANC conventions. As for the ČSPS men from
Chicago and its nearest two great cities in the Bohemian Midwest, they showed off no real continuity and reliability from one convention to the next. It was as if they looked to the journalists to make something of the BANC.

Indeed it was their platform and their project. L.J. Palda was chairman, Jan Rosický vice-chairman and F.B. Zdrůbek librarian. The published minutes of the second and third BANC conventions opened with a roster of members present, and in both pamphlets the first five names and their order was the same—Karel Jonáš, Václav Šnajdr, L.J. Palda, Jan Rosický and F.B. Zdrůbek. They were the head of the roster and its constant. Their fellow journalist J.V. Matějka joined them at both conventions and Jan Oliverius, another Chicago colleague, at the second. Active for only three years, the BANC was just an episode in their long careers. But by this time the five journalists were the long-familiar leading personalities of Czech-language print culture and oratory (Palda) in America. They were in their mid-forties to early fifties, and the BANC was the only body that they would ever form together. They seemed to be aware of the moment.

In Cedar Rapids, the convention elected Palda to its bylaws revision committee, and it adopted a purpose that he “stylized” for the brotherhood: “To work for the survival of the Czech language in this country and for the comprehensive advancement of our countrymen, in its spiritual, cultural and material respects alike.” ČSPS had achieved incomparable success among less practical Bohemian spolky (associations) as a fraternal insurance society with prudent habits and a steady focus on its business, but it evidently still yearned for a more heroic, inspirational calling. And to nationalists like Palda, a solid institution like ČSPS was an ideal audience and environment. Šnajdr felt the current too—and wrote about it in his paper. “It will be the largest Czech congress in this hemisphere,” he wrote before the convention: “All Czech America now, in instinctive expectation, looks to that town in Iowa with confidence and hope that the representatives from ČSPS lodges will do good work there, work that will not only assure the beloved fraternal union’s further exemplary flowering but that will also prolong the Czech
nationality’s duration ...." The opening parade on the eve of deliberations excited his prominent poetic register: “At about two o’clock the musical bands let loose, the procession sequenced itself together and a street parade, unlike any that Cedar Rapids or any city west of the Mississippi yet saw, unfolded in great beauty, its glory intensified in the sun, shining from the clearest of azure.” Festive local girls greeted delegates and adorned them with flowers. Seventy-two stately young men from nearby farms led the parade on horseback and with their own ten-piece kapela (brass band). Local brothers and butchers rode and marched by in formation, in sashes and with standard-bearers, carriages, music and the regalia of medieval and Hussite Bohemia. Still captivated back home in Cleveland, Šnajdr wrought the spirit and meaning of the week in Cedar Rapids still more: “That convention was the most democratic of gatherings—laborers in session next to businessmen, ploughmen next to lawyers, notaries, professors, editors, bankers, judges and officials from counties and cities.” Chairman S.J. Heřman even presided over the Nebraska state legislature, yet no one “felt greater than another” at the ČSPS convention. It was a “brilliant test of the democratic American system and brilliant proof of what deep roots egalitarian consciousness and the democratic principle have in Czech nature.”

Solidarity from the enserfed Bohemian village still seemed to endure, and now numbers, organization and social mobility were on the rise in America. Saline County twice elected S.J. Heřman to the Nebraska House (1881, 1891), yet he was an independent. And the ČSPS convention chairman bore another kind of compelling symbolism as a son of the recently departed Jan Heřman (1812-1888), successive patriarch to the resurgent Brethren on the language divide in the Elbe Valley, to the Bohemian revolutionaries of 1848, and to the countrymen in Wisconsin. Cedar Rapids amounted to quite an initiation into the BANC and into a portentous consciousness of mission for the five substantial journalists. They took care to publish the complete minutes of their three conventions. These pamphlets are a magnificent and surviving record, rare for Bohemian societies of the time in America, and for this they make the short-lived BANC more important.
Jonáš, Šnajdr, Palda, Rosický and Zdrůbek—the first two were not officers in the BANC and hence not in its five-member výkoný výbor (Executive Committee). Yet the published minutes still placed them first and second in the roster of attending members, ahead of the officers. Šnajdr was the voice of the ČSPS brotherhood and an admired stylist of the Czech language. Karel Jonáš was the senior, by a few years, among these journalists, both in age and in American experience. Moreover, he was Šnajdr’s and Zdrůbek’s former employer and had provided the journals where they launched their extraordinary American careers. He also had more standing in Anglo society, as a politician, than anyone else. That was true not just in his cohort and small party of colleagues but in all of Bohemian America. Jonáš returned to Racine from Bohemia on December 4, 1871, and his political career began in spring 1874 when the Reform Party of the People rewarded him with an appointment to the board of trustees for the Wisconsin State Industrial School for Boys. Jonáš was disappointed with the Republican Party and turned to support the dissident Liberal Republican movement in his weekly Slavie. Like many Germans, he perceived a rising Anglo-centric cultural intolerance in the Republican Party and ingratitude to the large Central European population for its loyalty and sacrifices in the Civil War era. Jonáš had returned to a Wisconsin where the Republicans targeted the German and Bohemian culture of beer halls and festive Sundays with the so-called Graham Law. But like the Czech politicians in Bohemia, who represented a nationality disadvantaged in both a political and a socioeconomic sense, Jonáš still emphasized “federalism,” the term for local autonomy (and empowerment of the empire’s Slavic majority) in Bohemia, and he resented the Republican Party’s centralism and alliance with the capitalist class in America. By 1876, when he won his first election campaign and became a councilman in Racine, Jonáš embraced the Democratic Party. It was the minority party in Wisconsin, but a year later Jonáš won election to the state assembly and then (1882) to a four-year term in the senate. As a student and publicist in Bohemia, he had spoken out against the Germanized school system and became an emigre because of it. Ironically, his command of German (and his
open-mindedness) now gave Jonáš access to a more solid voter base and to statewide prospects.

But he could also offer the Democratic Party his considerable power to influence a national population of Bohemian immigrants. As an ethnic politician he had an impressive interstate following, a quality beyond the reach of his Anglo colleagues. The weekly Slavie appealed to deep loyalties with its origins in an early popular effort to conceive a Czech-language press, and Jonáš compounded this political capital with his personal credentials. In October and November 1880, a presidential election year, he traveled to address countrymen not just upstate in Manitowoc County but also in Minnesota and Iowa. By 1893, a Charles Jonas Democratic Club appeared on New York’s East Seventy-Third Street. One Frank Opitz corresponded with Jonáš on its behalf, and a Hynek Opic was the delegate from three greater New York ČSPS lodges at the Cedar Rapids convention two years earlier. Jonáš became a protege of the so-called Bourbon faction that dominated Wisconsin’s Democratic Party in the 1880s, and when its William Vilas became postmaster general in Grover Cleveland’s administration, Jonáš used his connections and growing Bohemian lobby across America to win appointment as United States consul to Prague, where he arrived in December 1886. By then twenty months of resistance from the Habsburg government also compelled him to exercise and further develop his political network in Bohemia, where he involved no less than F.L. Rieger, the senior Czech political leader, on his behalf.

Republican succession to the presidency (Benjamin Harrison) sent Jonáš back to Racine by November 1889, but even this was a stroke of political fortune that he used to reach the pinnacle of his career. In April the assembly and senate in Madison unanimously passed, and the Republican governor signed, a law that declared “no school shall be regarded as a school unless there shall be taught therein, as part of the elementary education of children, reading, writing, arithmetic and United States history, in the English language.” This declaration, amidst provisions against truancy and child labor in
the so-called Bennett Law, provoked a culture war that “completely overturned the
government of Wisconsin in the year 1890, elected a Democratic governor and
legislature, sent in the succeeding years two Democratic senators and several
Democratic representatives to Congress, and gave Wisconsin’s vote to Grover Cleveland
at his second election in 1892.” German indignation produced this anti-Republican
revolution, and it came from the religious population, both Lutheran and Catholic, which
had their own large school systems. The Lutheran weekly Germania led the press
insurgency and Columbia, its Catholic counterpart, declared that it “would be well for
German blows to be felt in Wisconsin.” The state’s three German bishops (Milwaukee,
Green Bay, La Crosse) issued a manifesto against the Bennett Law, which provoked
counter-resolutions from the Turner gymnastic societies in the liberal, anticlerical
German camp, some of whose newspaper editors also did not oppose the law.66

The controversy was not vital to the Bohemian population, because it had no real Czech-
language school system to compete with the public, English-language one. Five years
after he came to Wisconsin, Jonáš complained to his readers that in Caledonia Township
only 15 children attended the Czech school—from a population of 150 families.67 And
they attended only “when the wind brings to Caledonia someone from Bohemia” to
teach, wrote J.V. Sládek after his own two-month stint as a Prague university student
waiting out trouble at home.68 Eighteen months later Boleslav Trojan, another passing
student and son of a national politician in Bohemia, did not bother to revive the school
when parents enrolled just 15 children.69 A decade later in town (Racine), Jonáš himself
taught at a Czech school with sixty children, but it only supplemented the public school
with its classes from nine o’clock to noon on Sundays.70 By then Jonáš was also a realist
on the emotional language issue. In an article on “language instruction in the public
school,” he advocated local autonomy, his constant cause, but also English for the sake
of his countrymen’s prosperity. And he invoked the problems of Austria as an argument
against the prospect of a legal and competitive status for other languages in America.71

The Bennett Law that came after another decade was a German issue and a Lutheran-
Catholic one at that, yet it was Jonáš who twice (1890, 1892) became this opposition’s victorious candidate for lieutenant governor of Wisconsin. It was as this high elected officeholder that he served the BANC—until he went to St. Petersburg for the Cleveland presidential administration as United States consul general to Russia in early April 1894. At the second BANC convention, Palda nominated Jonáš for chairman and “urged him to accept.” The lieutenant governor declined because of obligations elsewhere, an explanation that he repeated in his paper when his decision prompted speculation in the Czech press. Palda was reaffirmed as chairman “by acclamation” and so were the other four officers.

Besides the familiar journalists and professor Shimek, these included Antonín Klobása as treasurer. He and Antonín Jurka were the only ČSPS men to play any noteworthy role in the BANC. Its third convention elected Jurka into its ranks after his outstanding field work and report on prospects for a society to aid arriving Czech and Slovak immigrants at Ellis Island. Jurka (1840-1917) was the same age as Karel Jonáš and also attended the Prague polytechnic, but he graduated before following Jan Oliverius to America (1866), where his countryman and friend from Královice had become a journalist. Jurka even briefly edited Czech newspapers in St. Louis and Chicago before he became a St. Paul, Minnesota, public school teacher (1870) for the next twenty-seven years. After the school board abolished separate primary classes for Bohemian children (1876), Jurka taught German, eventually in the high schools, and took his enthusiasm for music and theater into local German society as well as the Bohemian one. When Milwaukee’s Antonín Novák launched Besídku dětská (March 1884) as a novel weekly for children writing in Czech, Jurka was its editor, but it lasted just two years. In the ČSPS, Jurka’s career would culminate in 1899, when he moved to New York as the brotherhood’s elected national secretary.

Antonín Klobása (1848-1936) belonged to the same generation as Jurka and the journalists but had nothing of their Bohemian education or experience. Instead, he came
to Caledonia Township in Racine County, Wisconsin, with his family at the age of six and only in the winter months attended the Czech school there and outside Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where the family farmed three years later. The family’s fortunes only declined further after a move to St. Louis (1860), where Klobáša eventually managed to add three years of night school to his scant formal education. After about a year of unpaid wages as typesetter for the weekly Pozor, an early example of the many unviable Czech newspapers in America, Klobáša wisely moved on to the Rauth Brothers, a German printing company, which he left twenty-three years later as foreman to support his own family as a notary. Klobáša joined the ČSPS (1866) when it was still just a local affair in the St. Louis Bohemian neighborhood with at most fifty members, who were mostly much older. They promptly elected him secretary, and he contributed much personal effort to the national expansion of ČSPS and to its culture of “true brotherly love” in the 1870s, when he traveled as far as Chicago, St. Paul, Iowa City, Cedar Rapids and Kansas City to induct new lodges. During the first of two consecutive one-year terms as chairman of the national grand lodge, Klobáša co-drafted the first system of bylaws (1875) for what was now a proliferating brotherhood of lodges in many localities, for which he borrowed from the various “foreign-language” books of bylaws (English and German?) that came his way as print jobs during his day job. Then he served his beloved ČSPS as national grand lodge secretary to 1880, when embezzlement was discovered on the part of the chairman.77

But the Cedar Rapids convention a decade later elected Klobáša to the BANC, which promptly elected him as its treasurer.78 Like Shimek, whose parents he had known in Iowa before the professor’s birth, Klobáša was extraordinary and inspiring as an example that perhaps Czech nationalism could be transmitted in some meaningful form from the generation formed in Bohemia to the one formed in America. In Klobáša’s case, it was an impressively complete transmission. He began acting in St. Louis amateur theater at seventeen and despite so little formal education, he founded a Bohemian Literary Association there by twenty-two and still wrote masterful Czech at
age eighty, when he published a memoir in Chocen, after a return to that east Bohemian hometown. Klobasa’s father, a tanner and the town’s bookkeeper, had owned a house on the square. A devotee of Karel Havlicek Borovsky and his journalism, the father was also the patriarch of Czech nationalism in Chocen during the Revolution of 1848 before he took the family to America and a long descent into poverty and disappointment. Election to the BANC and its office of treasurer was a great national reaffirmation and comeback for Klobasa, and it empowered the BANC with another capable and devoted personality. Klobasa had spent the past decade making a success of the first Bohemian savings and loan association in St. Louis, which he founded around the time of the 1880 ČSPS chairman scandal that tainted him by association.  

For the BANC, Klobasa presided over a much simpler financial operation. It was a non-profit, political undertaking, not a financial one for making loans, investments and profits, which he had mastered in St. Louis. But the BANC did intend to rely entirely on its own abilities to produce a steady flow of revenues in the form of dues and donations. To the opening of its second convention on Thanksgiving Day, November 24, 1892—so its bylaws declared—the BANC remained simply the body of ČSPS delegates elected in Cedar Rapids. But from that day forward, it was to be a body of “representatives from all Czech associations local or large that agreed with its aims as stated in article one and would monetarily and morally support their achievement.” Representation would be proportional at one delegate for every seven hundred members, and the associations were “expected to contribute at least ten cents annually for every member” in their ranks. Individuals could become “contributing members” at five dollars per year and “honorary members” if they “deposited a ten-year contribution at once or in two annual installments.” For unaffiliated local associations, the bylaws set the bar at ten dollars per year. Both membership categories generated a certificate and made the bearer “eligible in the first degree to election as substitutes for representatives absent” from the annual conventions.
A quarter-century earlier, from December 31, 1865, to January 2, 1866, at the hall of the Chicago Slavic Linden, Karel Jonáš had presided over a convention of twenty-two delegates from six states that formed the *Slovenská jednota* (Slavic Union). That was the first attempt at an indefinitely expandable umbrella organization composed of delegates from existing associations and intended to act on behalf of the Czech-speaking population and its descendents in America. Its even simpler bylaws had called for a more onerous “five cents per month for every member” from each association. This was a requirement, along with a quarterly roster of members, and not merely an expectation. The system of representation was one individual for each association with up to twenty members and two for those with any number over twenty. This suggests that existing associations were small, because otherwise the system would be grossly disproportional. Moreover, the first substantial item among the tasks adopted was to bring about “by all possible means” the formation of like-minded associations in “every locality that our countrymen, no matter how few in number, inhabit.” A year later, per capita dues were reduced by two-thirds to five cents per quarter. Another year later, the Slavic Union had its belated second—and last—annual convention. It was already moribund, and its balance was just $351.84. Total receipts amounted to just $384.29, as Jonáš reported in a long overdue postmortem four years later. This included at least $240 collected separately for a Czech territory never petitioned for from the United States Congress, so barely $100 dues evidently ever came to the Slavic Union in dues.  

And the Slavic Union accomplished nothing. It did not even manage to publish the promised minutes of its first convention, leaving the reports in Karel Jonáš’s *Slavie*—declared the organ in the bylaws—as the Slavic Union’s only authoritative public record. Its *ústřední výbor* (Central Committee) was not nationally representative and lacked any continuity. The small convention simply elected the five men from the Chicago Slavic Linden, the delegation for the hosting association and the largest one there. It also elected the representative from the New York Slavic Linden, but he was evidently also a Chicago resident. Two years later, the second and even smaller Slavic Union
convention elected a completely different Central Committee of five men, all evidently residents of Racine, Wisconsin. Four were not even among the convention’s fifteen delegates—only Karel Jonáš was. He and one J. Smetana, who represented the Slavic Linden in Racine County’s Caledonia Township, were the only delegates common to both successive conventions, another measure of poor continuity in the Slavic Union. Even then Jonáš was not the only journalist. But for J.B. Erben, Jan Borecký and Vojta Mašek, editing a newspaper was just a brief episode in the past when they represented St. Louis (Erben), the Chicago Slavic Linden (Borecký) and its counterpart in Kewaunee and Piertown, Wisconsin, (Mašek) at the first convention. The second convention’s Josef Pastor represented the Perun society in Cleveland and F.B. Zdrůbek the Slavic Linden in Caledonia Township, Wisconsin. Pastor would go on to Germany and only Zdrůbek became a lifelong American journalist. He compiled an account of the Slavic Union in the 1885 issue of Amerikán, the Chicago almanac that he edited for publisher August Geringer to also serve as a historical journal of Czech America. Thirty-nine individuals in all served the Slavic Union as convention delegates or Central Committee members. None were evidently among the local lodge delegates to the Cedar Rapids ČSPS convention a quarter-century later, and only two served in the BANC. But they were Zdrůbek and Jonáš.

A quarter-century on, the BANC took up its predecessor’s ambition to speak for all countrymen but not its compulsion to encourage more Czech societies to form in America. These had proliferated. New economies of scale suggested much improved prospects for success: the Slavic Union had demanded sixty and then twenty cents per year from the societies, to be multiplied by their total membership. Now the BANC asked them to join at just ten cents per year as the membership multiplier. And the result? Five delegates from other societies joined the ten from ČSPS (including the journalists) at the second BANC convention. Three came from the Národní jednota sokolská (National Sokol Union) and one each from two fraternal insurance societies, the Jednota Táboritů and Národný slovenský spolok (National Slovak Society). Seven
months later the BANC reconvened for its third convention, and the athletic National Sokol Union again sent three delegates. No one returned for the Jednota Táboritů, but one each came from the fraternal benefit Jednota českých dam (Union of Czech Ladies) and Rytíři a dámy cti (Knights and Ladies of Honor). And now six came from the National Slovak Society instead of one. That was eleven delegates altogether from other societies, about the same number that represented the ČSPS. This kind of parity was a striking milestone toward success, and the BANC had reached it quickly. Even more impressive, the BANC was now a bi-ethnic, Czech and Slovak venture. But it fell apart before it could bring together more societies and span more of the diversity and conflict in the Bohemian population.

At seven hundred members per delegate and ten cents per member, the original fifteen ČSPS delegates elected to launch the BANC suggests $1,050 per year from the brotherhood alone—and the eleven delegates who came from other societies by the third convention another $770 per year. In fact, the BANC “did not cost the ČSPS even a penny,” wrote BANC chairman L.J. Palda. Donations were up to individual local lodges, but the BANC set out to make fund-raising an ongoing and effective campaign. Its first expense was $2 to treasurer Klobáša’s recent employer, “H. Rauth for 100 postal cards and printing” on March 4, 1892, three months after the BANC’s founding convention. These were probably the “circulars for lodges and affluent individuals” in the chairman’s first public report on BANC activity in Slavie a month later. By the end of the year $2.50 more went to Rauth, $23.50 to the Slovan americký for “paper, envelopes and printing,” and $30 to Rosicky for printing kolky, stamps sold for contributions. But revenues amounted to $1,997.09. “We sent circulars to all Czech and Slovak societies whose addresses we could track down, without regard to their purpose or spiritual orientation,” Palda reported that November in his opening address to the second convention. The “most generous response came from” ČSPS lodges. The Sokols and the Union of Czech Ladies followed with “very honorable” amounts, considering their smaller numbers of locals. And individuals were the fourth leading
source of donations. They gave in amounts from twenty-five cents to twenty-five dollars, which Palda declared the best evidence that “people who care about our higher national interests are in all classes of our society.” And personal donations came to the BANC from twenty-five states, so that “wherever Czechs live in this vast country, at least some hearts responded to its great mission.” Indeed, Palda praised the treasurer’s report as a “document worth studying.” It could reveal where the “true genius of our people is best kept” and bear “abundant useful material” for “our press.”

The press was also an instrument for fund-raising, and its leading editors were in the BANC. Secretary Shimek sent its brief “monthly financial statements,” which quoted new donations, to “Czech newspapers,” and they appeared at least in some of them, including Slavie, as early as February 3, 1892. At its second convention, the BANC formally resolved that the “Czech press in America had already served its aims and efforts well in so many instances.” The BANC confidently expected further “moral support from the press” and declared it essential. The third convention broadcast a similar resolution and even extended its appreciation to the Slovak press. But revenues declined from $1,625.53 in the first half of 1892 to just $371.56 in the second to $351.35 in the first half of 1893. The next—and last—eighteen months were even worse, as the United States endured the severest depression of the nineteenth century: “If I remember correctly,” wrote Jan Rosický over a decade later, “only a most trifling amount came together after the third convention, only about $150.” Rosický succeeded Palda as chairman at that convention, and he evidently did remember correctly, because at the beginning of 1894 he reported in his weekly that the BANC had calculated at the outset that its agenda called for $5,000 per year in revenue, but it had collected only a “little over $2,000 in two years.” Since the treasurer recorded exactly $2,348.44 in receipts for the first eighteen months, this meant that revenues really were at a standstill after the third convention. The frugal BANC still carried a positive balance of $553.68 into 1894, but that and its resolve could only dwindle over that year, its last. By contrast, a single ČSPS lodge in Cleveland, Svornost no. 3, albeit the oldest and largest in the city, with
163 members, had $5,452.32 in revenues and $5,347.09 in expenses during 1893, a typical year and one in which it paid the BANC $3 for one copy of an English-language history of Bohemia yet to be published. The entire brotherhood had $222,389 in assets, and in five years it had paid $638,000 in benefits and a few thousand in donations to various causes, when it came to Cedar Rapids and approved L.J. Palda’s proposed BANC.

After Cedar Rapids, ČSPS gained its own monthly “brotherhood organ,” which would carry on into the second half of the twentieth century. But Václav Šnajdr, whose own Cleveland weekly it replaced, became first editor and publisher of the Orgán bratrstva ČSPS. Here the agenda of the BANC appeared, just days after the latter’s Thanksgiving-time founding convention. And a month later in Slavie, just after New Year’s 1892, chairman Palda and secretary Šimek explained the agenda under the title “Proclamation of the National Committee to the Czech People of America.” They presented six numbered items, whereas in Šnajdr’s brotherhood organ it was nine, but both versions agreed in substance. Item number one was to “establish a correspondence bureau in Prague to supply news to the Anglo-American press by telegraph and thereby weaken the monopoly of German sources.” Item two was to “publish a biography of Komenský as the greatest Czech in a widely disseminated American monthly.” Jan Amos Komenský (1592-1670) led the native Brethren church and the legacy of the Bohemian Reformation into exile during the Thirty Years War, when the Habsburg state Catholicized and pacified Bohemia. He was also a scholar and modernist in Latin, with a pan-European and lasting reputation for his social and especially pedagogical thought. That made him quite a prize to reclaim in America and internationally. He needed reclaiming because of the “de-nationalizing name Comenius,” as Palda and Šimek called it, and the three-hundredth anniversary of his birth on March 28 was a handy opportunity for it. Item three was to launch an English-language monthly and four was to publish an English-language history of Bohemia. Item five was to develop a collection a sources that would serve scholarship on the Czechs and Slavs, to which the agenda version in the
ČSPS organ added the compilation of statistics on the “Czech nation in America” as a separate item. Item six was to “secure a Czech pavilion at the world’s fair in Chicago, mainly as a space for exhibitors from Bohemia.”

In 1866 the Slavic Union wanted to petition the United States Congress for a Czech territory in the West, amidst expectations that the Slavic Union “could expand until in numbered perhaps 50,000 members and that in time it could even become a powerful factor in the politics of this republic.” It also committed itself by bylaw to “work by all possible means” to “establish schools for reading, writing and arithmetic to be taught in Czech and English, along with the geography and history of both countries.” Eight months after the Slavic Union’s founding convention, its Central Committee was still waiting for countrymen to respond and organize, and it at least tried to compile a small guidebook to Czech communities and families in America with a questionnaire and explanation that it published in Slavie. After nine more months, it merged the contributions for a “delegation to Washington” into the Slavic Union general fund, which now was to be “used for literary purposes.” A quarter-century later, the BANC was more realistic from the start. No more Czech territories or school systems. The agenda was all about making an image and contending for American public opinion. So were the bylaws affirmed one year later. Article one defined a seven-point mission for the BANC. Point number one: “To make it easier for the American people to educate themselves about the true political, economic and social conditions in Bohemia and Moravia, as well as among us here in the United States, so that deceptive and incorrect conceptions and views of the Czech people may be refuted and the American public may come to know them in a proper light.” Other points that the BANC actually took up in its agenda were number four, “to support publication of work in English about the Czech nation and its history, and to encourage English translations from Czech literature,” and number seven, for the collection of statistics and historical sources on the American diaspora. Of the points that the agenda bypassed, three stored up inspiration for inward-looking agendas: the BANC was to “encourage” informed American citizenship (point
two) and bilingualism (point three), and it was to be a good adviser to the “Czech immigration” in practical and material matters (point six). Point five obliged it to “support wider commercial and cultural relations between the Czech lands and the United States.”

The bylaws and agenda for the BANC convey a compelling concern for the Czech image. That was the motivation, and the events and mood of the time made it so. In America the mood was anti-immigrant. “For years the memory of Haymarket and the dread of imported anarchy haunted the American consciousness,” wrote John Higham, in a section of his classic history of American nativism that he titled “Beginning of Hysteria.” To the men who made Czech-language journalism in America, nativism was no concern while Catholics were the target. But Haymarket was the great event that turned nativism against the wage workers, and Bohemians were partners to the Germans in the revolutionary-minded immigrant labor movement. Now the journalists paid attention. May 1886 was bad enough, with its violence, casualties and consequences in Pilsen, the largest Czech-speaking neighborhood in urban America. But trials and convictions of arsonists in New York (Kohout brothers) and assassins in Racine (Jambor and Palica) and Chicago (Hronek, Čapek and Chleboun) widened and prolonged the damage. Were more such cases ahead? Were Bohemians becoming known as enemies of the state and social order? How far would the Anglo-American press go in ignorance and hostility? The Bohemians made an even bigger target with their cherished other identity as Slavs, who were less familiar than the Italians and Jews with whom they now dominated immigration statistics and who were subject to the most outlandish conceptions. The Chicago Times described the Slavs after Haymarket as “descendants of the Scythians, Huns and the devil,” and even historian John Higham, writing in the 1950s about the chronic unrest in turn-of-the-century Pennsylvania coal mines, where many Slovaks worked, mentions only “Hungarians.” Eastern intellectuals legitimized prejudices against the new immigrants and used their influence to spread them. Francis A. Walker (1840-1897), president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the
American Economic Association, described the Slavs and other new immigrants as “beaten men from beaten races,” while the Immigration Restriction League saw its literature published in over five hundred daily newspapers within a year of its founding at Boston by Harvard graduates. And in a time of increasing conflict between German and Slavic nationalisms in Central Europe, German academia was a formative influence for growing numbers of American social scientists. Some nine thousand of them studied in Germany between 1820 and 1920.102

The BANC was a timely response or next step for the journalists who made it their collective voice. Karel Jonáš had just become lieutenant governor of Wisconsin because the Bennett school law aroused so much anti-nativist resolve. After Haymarket, Jan Rosický had convinced Edward Rosewater, his Jewish countryman and more powerful Nebraska Republican, to go to Washington and defend the Bohemians against United States congressmen, who debated an anarchist exclusion bill and spoke of them as a subversive element.103 And L.J. Palda, who headed the BANC? He was the earliest Socialist journalist and spoke for the Bohemian working class when it challenged its employers and first came to national attention in 1877 Cleveland and New York. And before he proposed the BANC, Palda wrote open letters in the Anglo-American press to challenge Iowa state secretary McFarland, who had deprecated the Bohemian population.104

But political events back across the Atlantic in Bohemia also excited loyalties and anxieties now—and called for action. Rising self-confidence and expectations among the Czech people produced frustration with a political representation that first boycotted and then joined the imperial and provincial parliaments in Vienna and Prague but never managed to win from the Austrians anything like the autonomy verging on independence which the Hungarians secured for themselves in 1867 and to which the Czechs felt equally entitled. By January 1888, as the Czech contingent in the two parliaments, led by František Ladislav Rieger (1818-1903), appeared increasingly ineffectual, the Young
Czech deputies, who stood for universal suffrage and a more assertive nationalism, openly broke ranks with the more elitist Old Czech majority, to which they had deferred since founding their party in 1874 because the number of Czech seats in both houses was disproportionately small. In July 1889, the Young Czechs won many of these seats away from the Old Czechs in elections to the Bohemian Diet, shocking not just the latter but also Emperor Franz Josef I (1830-1916) and the entire Austrian political establishment, which devised a solution to the interethnic power struggle in Bohemia in an effort to restore the Old Czechs to preeminence among their people. This January 1890 arrangement, known as the *punktace* in Czech, would have partitioned Bohemia to the advantage of the German language and population, and it discredited the Old Czechs and aroused so much popular indignation that the Young Czechs became a mass party by the March 1891 Reichsrat elections, when they took nearly all of the Old Czech seats in Vienna. There Eduard Grégr’s (1827-1907) fiery oratory and such public events as the Centennial Exhibition and the first Congress of Slavic Youth, both in Prague in May 1891, would keep Czech emotions and demands at high tide, while Austrian resistance made the Czech issue high political drama of an order not seen since the years after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867.\footnote{105}

Among the journalists who left for America in that earlier decade, these events could revive the powerful emotions of youth. These men in middle age formed the BANC amidst the drama in Bohemia, so it was no less important to them than the one in Chicago, which was already five years in the past. Karel Jonáš had recently returned as United States consul from Prague. While he was there, L.J. Palda sojourned in Karlovy Vary, addressed the Czech minority’s *Slovenská beseda* association in the famous spa town, and became a subject for press coverage in the capital.\footnote{106} Václav Šnajdr went to Prague for three months in July 1892 and spoke about his youthful radicalism at a “Young Czech *jour fix* on Celetná Street in Meyer’s tavern.”\footnote{107}

But devotion to nationalist causes in Bohemia was just as strong outside the BANC,
among ordinary countrymen in America. Jan Oliverius, who also took part in the BANC,\textsuperscript{108} traveled to Prague as spokesman with an 1885 party of 177 men, women and children. It was a time of pilgrimages to the national theater, built by public subscription, and the special trains even came from Croatia and Russia. But the Americans traveled farthest, and twenty thousand countrymen saw them off from the Grand Trunk tracks on Chicago’s Polk Street, after an almost two-mile march from Pilsen. Oliverius was one of three newspaper editors on the Divadelní lod’ (Theater ship), as the pilgrims called the Westphalia, their New York steamship. But his fellow travelers came from at least twenty-one other trades: they were bakers, butchers, builders, carpenters, champagne manufacturers, cigarmakers, clerks, dyers, farmers, mechanics, midwives, milliners, saloonkeepers, schoolteachers, shoemakers, storekeepers, strapmakers, tailors, tinsmiths, train engineers and weavers. A reception committee from Prague met them in Hamburg. Its speaker was Vojta Náprstek, who had inspired his countrymen to launch a Czech-language newspaper in America after his 1850s sojourn as a student refugee of the revolution. Now he used the occasion to revive a motto inscribed on an 1868 foundation stone from the Chicago Slavic Linden for the National Theater—\textit{Co srdce pojí, moře nerozdvojí} (What the heart binds no sea can divide). In Prague both political leaders, F.L. Rieger of the Old Czechs and Eduard Grégr of the Young Czechs, addressed the Americans. Rieger urged them to be like the Greek giant Antaeus, who “gained new strength and became invincible in struggle against the demigod Hercules whenever he touched the mother of his country.” The capital made the countrymen from America honorees of an extraordinary June week of special events and enthusiasm, so perhaps Rieger anticipated something of the effect that they brought back to their communities in all social classes and in locations from Connecticut to California.\textsuperscript{109}

A remarkable decade of group tours followed. In June 1887, 287 American countrymen, including 120 women and 30 children, arrived in Prague for the second Sokol \textit{slet}. Only 24 of the Americans were Sokol gymnasts traveling to compete at the meet. Two years earlier the Habsburg ambassador to Washington tried to convince the American
secretary of state to investigate the theater tour as a likely anarchist scheme to smuggle literature and explosives into Bohemia. Now Karel Jonáš was United States consul in Prague, and Habsburg minister-president Count Eduard Taaffe, who vilified the Czechs from America as draft dodgers, had Prague authorities impose restrictions to ensure that the slet would be cancelled. But the capital and several towns in Bohemia gave the Americans another resounding reception.¹¹⁰ Four years later the Centennial Exhibition attracted a tour of 64 Americans, and the larger one, with extensive exhibits, for the Czecho-Slavonic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895) was already in preparation at the time of the BANC.¹¹¹ Meanwhile, Prague bookseller František Augustin Urbánek (1842-1919) organized a group tour of about 150 to the World’s Columbian Exposition (1893) in Chicago, and welcoming committees there and in Cleveland arranged festive receptions and lodging with local families.¹¹² By then František Ludvík’s (1843-1910) theatrical company enjoyed the same hospitality on its American tour, which turned into its permanent residence in Chicago, and composer Antonín Dvořák (1841-1904) began his American sojourn as director of the new National Conservatory of Music in New York.¹¹³

American countrymen traveling alone or in small parties were probably more numerous than those in the four well-publicized and politically demonstrative groups, but Vojta Náprstek drew many of them into the same kind of solidarity. He had a reputation as their benefactor in Prague and as the keeper of their documents and history. His family’s wine establishment had a romantic courtyard, overlooking gallery and setting on the little Old Town square where Jan Hus had preached. To linger there was a ritual part of any return visit to Bohemia, and so was the personal story handwritten into the guestbooks that Vojta Náprstek tirelessly recommended over the years. These were an instrument for the countrymen from America, who revealed their diversity and common spirit to themselves.¹¹⁴ The private stream of family visits, the public tours to national events, and the welcoming committees and receptions in Bohemia and America all made the sense of Transatlantic nationalism more real and promising by the time of the
In Prague, the Zemská jubilejní výstava (Centennial Exhibition) was a masterful demonstration of the innocuous public event as nationalist weapon: it showed off Czech cultural and material progress in the century since the last crowning of a Habsburg, Leopold II, as King of Bohemia and so served national pride and demands for the sitting emperor to accede to coronation, a recognition of Czech political rights that Franz Josef I was never to make.115 Two years later, on Thursday evening, August 10, 1893, Chicago mayor Carter Harrison greeted the tourists from Bohemia, who rode among countrymen in forty carriages to a Pilsen neighborhood “awash in festive decorations” and with “streets full of people since noon.” Two days later they rode again, to downtown’s Michigan Avenue, in a parade of twenty thousand with forty brass bands that opened Bohemian Day at the World’s Columbian Exposition.116 Three months later, the city’s Bohemians joined the world fair’s Chicago Day parade (October 9) with a float bearing a large crown of St. Václav and with copies of “The Broken Promise,” Emperor Franz Josef’s 1871 declaration of intent to don it, in English translation for the spectators.117

Contributing to causes in Bohemia was another form of popular Transatlantic nationalism. The Ústřední matice školská (Central School Foundation) was a favorite. To celebrate the one hundredth lodge inducted into the ČSPS, on New Year’s Day 1884, Václav Šnajdr called for a collection, and four months later the brotherhood sent the foundation $909.92.118 Newspapers and almanacs on both continents recorded other donor communities and their agents—Catholics and their senior priest Josef Hessoun, Great Plainsmen and their journalist Jan Rosický, an Americká matice pro školy v Čechách (American Foundation for Schools in Bohemia) and Prague-bound Sokol gymnasts.119 The cause was never-ending, and the total amount that came from America and all its sources are unknown. But when the Vltava River flooded Prague in September 1890, American countrymen gave over $12,000 by the next summer.120 ČSPS contributions to all Bohemian causes were only one-tenth of this amount in each of those two calendar years.121 By then the German effort to partition Bohemia revitalized fund-raising in at least one American city for the Central School Foundation and its cause,
schools for Czech-speaking children in districts with German majorities. New causes also arose: on November 25, 1889, Prince Karl von Schwarzenberg called the fifteenth-century Hussites a “band of looters and arsonists,” and the Young Czechs replied with a campaign for a grand monument to Hus, which is still a favorite Prague landmark in the middle of Old Town Square. The Schwarzenbergs, courted by the Old Czechs, owned vast estates in southern Bohemia. They were well-known in America, and the Ohio state lodge of ČSPS promptly sent $122.15 from its locals, care of Vojta Náprstek. The journalists were in the midst of it all. Slavie, Svornost, the Catholic Hlas and Matějka’s Chicagske listy collected flood relief. Václav Šnajdr examined Prince Schwarzenberg’s later political remarks and reemphasized for his readers the divide at home between Germanized nobility and the Czech population.

And the BANC, with its agenda? As we will see in the next chapter, it did achieve one noteworthy success: that was with its item number three, an “English-language monthly.” But the Bohemian Voice was a separate operation, with its own revenues, expenses and personnel outside the BANC. As for the rest of the agenda, the journalists and their partners in the BANC proceeded most professionally. The minutes of their conventions reveal this in marvelous detail. They formed subcommittees, took action, reported to the full body, debated progress and prospects in good parliamentary order, made decisions and took further action. But the final results amounted to very little. About item two, the Jan Amos Komenský commemoration in several cities, Šnajdr wrote that the Bohemians never had so much positive publicity from the Anglo press, as if that was a difficult achievement. The Chicago Times printed a BANC-commissioned biography of the seventeenth-century thinker, and the BANC bought and distributed two thousand copies of the issue. This great Democratic paper of the Midwest had declared amidst the Bennett school law controversy that the “State of Wisconsin has the right to Americanize its foreign population.” One educational event like the Komenský commemoration could hardly change attitudes. Item six, a Bohemian pavilion for the Chicago world’s fair, was also off the agenda by the second BANC
convention—unaffordable. The other three items moved forward.

Most ambitious was the Prague news bureau. That was a job for the political heavies, Democrat Karel Jonáš and Republican Edward Rosewater, who made a March 15, 1892, agreement with the London bureau of the American Associated Press. By then Jonáš was writing to Julius Grégr (1831-1896), editor of the Young Czech daily Národní listy and brother of the party’s celebrated orator, to Emanuel Engel (1844-1907), chairman of the Young Czech representatives in the Vienna Reichsrat, and to Vojta Náprstek and “two other patriots.” In fact, Jonáš had already sent Engel instructions for two letters per month on Czech politics, business and “especially relations with the Austrian empire,” plus “short news telegrams” on events that “deserved immediate attention abroad.” It was all to be in English, concise and styled to “captivate a foreign audience.” Václav Šnajdr joined Jonáš on the subcommittee to keep the Prague-to-London arrangement going from Racine, Cleveland and also Cedar Rapids and Omaha, since successive BANC chairmen Palda and Rosický also took part, but it produced more frustration than news. London’s interest in Bohemia and patience for letters were vastly smaller than the volume coming from Prague. To learn about this problem and then get Prague to change its product took until the November convention, which approved Jonáš’s about-face to telegrams but reduced the correspondent’s proposed annual salary, payable quarterly, from 500 to 400 gulden, about $165.

The next problem hit soon and hard. In February 1893, an ephemeral weekly in Schuyler, Nebraska, wrote that “Mr. S” was the BANC’s secret Prague correspondent, and he resigned. Was it Josef Václav Sládek (1845-1912)? He belonged to the American journalists around Karel Jonáš by age, education and friendship. At the Old Town Akademické gymnázium, last of three successive Prague secondary schools that Sládek attended, F.B. Zdrůbek was a schoolmate. At the university, Václav Šnajdr was a close friend. Together they belonged to the small Ruch society that achieved a generational succession in Czech literature, and separately they fled to America after
their roles in the student demonstrations of 1868.133 There Sládek wrote for Jonáš’s Slavie and came to know Jan Rosický.134 On the Gulf of Mexico, where Emperor Maximilian and Cuban freedom fighters were on his mind, and en route to Texas, Sládek wrote anti-Habsburg poems and letters home.135 But a quarter-century later, he had a career to lose if he became known as disloyal to the dynasty and state. He was already a leading poet and editor of the Lumír literary journal. He was also close to the Young Czechs. Emanuel Engel had been a schoolmate at the Akademické gymnázium, and Sládek had been Anglo-American affairs editor for Julius Grégr’s Národní listy. But his livelihood was with the state: upon his 1870 return from America, Sládek became lecturer for the English language at the Prague polytechnic and in 1883 also at the university. He was the first Anglicist and Americanist at these flagships of the emerging Czech academy, edited Lumír in part as a journal for these disciplines, compiled an English grammar and reader, and translated to and from the language, notably Longfellow’s Hiawatha, which inspired Dvořák’s New World symphony. Sládek still had much in common with his old comrades across the Atlantic, and who in Prague could be better qualified to write the news dispatches in English to London?136

But now Jonáš was ready to drop the troublesome business of keeping a paid correspondent in Prague, and the July convention approved. Instead, the BANC Executive Committee had found a willing new outlet in James Gordon Bennett, Jr., and would limit itself to interceding for its Bohemian contacts, who agreed to supply essays in French for the Paris edition of Bennett’s Herald.137 This led nowhere, and Václav Šnajdr reproached indolent countrymen at home in his weekly. Jonáš quoted him and commented with approval.138 A year before, Šnajdr had dwelled with pleasure on the first Prague-to-London telegram. The Czech cause was “knocking on the door of world politics,” and the BANC would “help to open it.”139 The Prague news bureau was an emotional ride indeed. Jan Rosický wrote the last word in December 1894. Evidently not compromised after all, “Mr. S” had reconsidered and promised a monthly accounting of his dispatches. That came only once, in January, and Rosický left the matter for the next
convention. It failed to meet, but now Jonáš was going back to Prague as United States consul and could better make arrangements. One year later, as consul in Krefeld, Germany, Jonáš shot himself.\textsuperscript{140}

The next task on the BANC agenda was much simpler—to publish one book in English about Bohemia’s history. A manuscript was ready right at the outset, and the author even had a publisher, but the BANC became the final essential partner as advance buyer of 600 copies at $3 each. It managed to sell 400 copies to countrymen within a week, while the publisher sold just a fraction of that volume in seven months.\textsuperscript{141} Author Robert H. Vickers and publisher Charles Sergel, both in Chicago, were not Bohemian, and the BANC rated that highly in a nativist America. Vickers was a Scotch Irish immigrant and lawyer.\textsuperscript{142} But the BANC was not uncritical. The Bohemian Reformation made Vickers sympathetic to the Czech cause. He studied Latin, German and French sources on Bohemian history for over thirteen years and discovered many sources in England “unknown even to Palacky,” who wrote the definitive national history in the nineteenth century. But Jonáš, first reviewer for the BANC, found Vickers’s style clumsy and his sense for the relative importance of historical facts faulty. The BANC even ordered several recent histories from Bohemia, and its subcommittee made two reports to the third convention—Jan Rosický in favor of translating a Czech text, and F.B. Zdrůbek with Karel Štulík for Vickers.\textsuperscript{143} All the critical scrutiny spooked August Geringer, who withdrew a publishing offer made a year earlier.\textsuperscript{144}

A publication was also to be the first result of agenda item number five, on collecting sources and encouraging scholarship, but the BANC could not compile its statistical handbook of the American diaspora. It sent 2,000 twenty-point questionnaires to 1,008 communities. Only 212 came back completed by the third convention two months later. A deadline allowed eight more months of time and effort, but addressees did not respond, especially in the cities.\textsuperscript{145} Karel Jonáš wrote that money was the problem, because such a complex nationwide project called for paid local assistants.\textsuperscript{146} But was it
also a demonstration of the limits to an aspiring national committee, which had to motivate many doers and undo their misunderstandings? In the very years of the BANC, one Frank Mareš walked 45 Nebraska counties and another 11 in Kansas, compiling a complete census and drafting a marvelous plat map of this large piece of Bohemian America, which Jan Rosický serialized in his weekly H ospodář.\textsuperscript{147}

But the BANC was undiminished in vitality at its third convention in July 1893, and the minutes record no note of concern. On the contrary, the opening status report from the Executive Committee of journalists ran to eleven numbered items, three more than at the previous convention. The most ambitious new prospects were number three, an “immigration bureau” for Czech and Slovak countrymen in New York, and number eleven, a “chair of Slavic languages” at “some leading American university.”\textsuperscript{148} But the distance to the next convention was almost as long as the nineteen months that spanned the first three, and only Peter V. Rovnianek (1867-1933) from Pittsburgh, founder of the National Slovak Society, arrived in Cleveland on Thanksgiving Day 1894. On that day BANC chairman Jan Rosický, in poor health since late August, was on a “marble slab” in Omaha enduring a second operation. But where were all the others? Václav Šnajdr declared the BANC dead in his Dennice novověku, and Chicago satirist Bartoš Bittner (1861-1912) caricatured and lampooned its leaders on the front page of his weekly Šotek (Imp). “Some delegates,” notably Rosický and Palda, objected but aroused “no great public support.”\textsuperscript{149} The will to go on was gone. Šnajdr resigned before the Cleveland convention. “One after another wrote to me that he cannot come,” Šnajdr recalled, and he did not want to be the BANC’s “gravedigger.”\textsuperscript{150} Karel Jonáš had resigned the previous fall for the sake of his health. Rosický asked the national grand lodge of ČSPS to name his replacement—and waited in vain for the brotherhood’s reply.\textsuperscript{151}
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CHAPTER IX

BOHEMIAN VOICE*

On June 15-16, 1896, fifty-one delegates attended the eleventh convention of the ČSPS brotherhood in St. Paul, Minnesota. That was not even one-third the number that came to Cedar Rapids five years earlier, and they came together for just two days instead of eight. Brother Jan Rosický delivered a full report on the BANC as its last chairman. He concluded that above all, “hard times” caused its demise. Indeed, the Panic of 1893 was disappointing all hopes that it would pass lightly and quickly. The diminished ČSPS convention itself reflected that. Contributions to the BANC evidently never recovered, and despite good Bohemian frugality the final financial reckoning was negative—assets $265, obligations $566. The convention praised the BANC for its good work, affirmed that the Bohemian people in America still needed the BANC, and judged the times “unfavorable for its revival.”

Were other circumstances also unfavorable? Were the egos of journalists with the largest audiences in the country too big for a small working group like the BANC? Jan Rosický and Václav Šnajdr brought in the burden of their personal differences in the ČSPS since the 1870s. In Cedar Rapids it seemed that they ended the matter festering between them with brotherly magnanimity. With delegates once again dividing into factions to contend for and against an independent organ, Rosický proposed that its “editorship and publication be entrusted to brother Šnajdr,” who then withdrew his personal weekly from consideration for another term, all for the “good of the brotherhood.” But the Orgán bratrstva ČSPS became a “burning hell” for Šnajdr: some locals refused their obligatory copy and others did not pay the $0.10 per capita quarterly levy, so the treasurer withheld payments to Šnajdr. In private correspondence with others, the two men treated each other harshly. When Rosický was about to launch another journal, Šnajdr expected “something very commercial again, all hype and special offer, that will bring nothing

good to anyone.” And when Rosický recalled the BANC’s Cleveland demise thirteen years on, Šnajdr was the “Pontius Pilate who washed his hands.”

The BANC also inherited the East-West tensions in the ČSPS and its insurance politics. Rosický spoke for the Westerners who believed that they subsidized higher-risk Easterners in the cities. They called for reform in the three conventions before Cedar Rapids, but their prospects only worsened as younger countrymen joined the Modern Woodmen in Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota and other Western states, whose share of ČSPS membership declined, especially after the Panic of 1893. At the St. Paul convention, New York, Ohio and Illinois together had 26 delegates, a majority, and Nebraska just 3. The convention voted 32 to 19 against a proposal to differentiate premiums by age and 40 to 10 against alternative lower-coverage life insurance. It also moved the national grand lodge—in Chicago for the past thirteen years—eastward by electing Clevelanders to the brotherhood’s top offices. But it awarded the brotherhood’s organ to lowest-cost bidder Jan Rosický, and it became a voice for the dissidents. A year later, fifteen of twenty-six lodges in Nebraska, seven of thirteen in Minnesota, five of seventeen in Iowa, all three in North Dakota, two of five in South Dakota, one of five in Kansas and the only one in Colorado all quit the ČSPS and formed the Západní česko-bratřská jednota (Western Bohemian Fraternal Association). (Seven of twenty-six Texas lodges formed the Slovanská podporující jednota státu Texas, abbreviated SPJST, or Slavonic Benevolent Order of the State of Texas.) Of the seventy ČSPS lodges in the seven contiguous states that it affected, all west of the Mississippi, the ZČBJ took away only thirty-four. It took less than one-tenth of ČSPS membership—929 brothers. By its fiftieth anniversary convention in St. Louis (1904), the ČSPS doubled to some twenty thousand, but the ZČBJ had at least one-third that number. And of the twenty-six new lodges that the ČSPS gained since 1897, six were in Chicago, five in Cleveland, five in the mining towns of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, but only three (all in Kansas) in the ZČBJ bloc of states.
Jan Rosický carried on as the voice of the ZČBJ: he launched, published and edited its monthly *Bratřský věstník* to his death. Many in the East called him the “Jeff Davis” of the brotherhood. His old BANC colleague Václav Šnajdr had argued on his side for the same insurance reforms but shared this sentiment. “Civilization favors unification, and he wants to destroy,” Šnajdr wrote, because Rosický had to “be supreme boss of at least the half,” if he could not dominate the whole. Rosický urged what was probably the same mutual friend to propose that his lodge go over to the ZČBJ after he returned from Detroit, where the ČSPS reconvened two years after St. Paul, and where he should expect no reforms from “those same New York anarchists who always come.” That lodge, *Zlatá brána* (Golden Gate) no. 93 in San Francisco, the only one on the Pacific coast, stayed in ČSPS, and the Detroit convention moved the national grand lodge even further East—to New York, whose Vincent V. Vojtíšek it elected the brotherhood’s chairman for the next five years.

Earlier that decade the brotherhood had elected Vojtíšek to the BANC, but he did not attend its conventions. Neither did its other two New Yorkers, and Pennsylvania miner František Choura, a refugee Social Democrat, resigned. New York was also conspicuous for contributing just $45.15 to the BANC—2.3% of the $1,946.69 given nationally in the first year. Ohio, Václav Šnajdr’s state, gave even less ($37), while Jan Rosický’s Nebraska gave $399.36, one-fifth of the total. Chairman Palda complained about Ohio in his opening address to the convention. (The Socialist stayed silent about New York.) Indeed, Palda’s Iowa gave $201.25, Zdrůbek’s Illinois $580.15, Jonáš’s Wisconsin $125.20 and treasurer Antonín Klobása’s Missouri $115.50. Did Palda perceive these numbers as a measure of East-West and interpersonal tensions in the BANC?

Another likely influence on the numbers were the successful and expensive campaigns to build national halls in the two great Eastern cities of Bohemian America. In New York, countrymen were moving uptown, and on December 14, 1890, delegates from
thirty-nine associations, including ČSPS lodges, formed a committee at the Fifth Street Bohemian national hall to build its successor. By May 8, just six weeks before the Cedar Rapids ČSPS convention that adopted Palda’s call to form the BANC, this all-New York committee signed a $21,000 contract for an East Seventy-Third Street lot. Construction, which commenced five years later, was to cost another $150,000. The Sokol gymnasts, who were the second largest Czech delegation in the BANC, raised their own stone hall on East Seventy-First. In Cleveland, the school board evicted Czech Sunday classes from its properties starting in 1889 because the Bohemian ward school committees collected fees. This spectacle and its emotional appeal turned the campaign for a school into one for a grand Bohemian national hall. By March 31, an all-Cleveland committee closed on a $6,700 Broadway Avenue lot. On July 5, 1891, just one week after the Cedar Rapids ČSPS convention, Bohemian Cleveland went on parade with banners and brass bands from that lot to a beer-garden picnic that raised $2,500. Václav Šnajdr and J. Sprostý, his fellow Clevelander in the BANC, delivered the speeches. It was only the biggest of many fund-raising events, and by the time the BANC expired, the Cleveland national hall committee had a paid-off lot and over $10,000 on hand. František Hrubecký was its chairman that year. A year later in St. Paul, the ČSPS elected him secretary and Václav Huml chairman of its national grand lodge, which Nebraskans, Westerners and their leader, Jan Rosický, defied. Šnajdr led the Broadway national hall campaign with Hrubecký, and Šnajdr and Huml were fellow stockholders and presidents of Cleveland’s Pilsener Brewing Company.

The BANC had tensions within but also critics outside. “Over the past year,” said chairman Palda in his opening address to the second convention, “we heard a lot about the futility and uselessness of the National Committee.” František K. Ringsmuth and Václav Alois Jung (1858-1927) were two formidable critics. Ringsmuth was a poet and short story writer of noteworthy talent and editor of Rosický’s commercially unsuccessful literary monthly Květy americké (American blossoms) in the years 1884-1887. But Thomas Čapek remembered him as an “explosive” personality. Three
marriages and a conversion from Freethinker to Baptist pamphleteer and proselytizer would seem to confirm that. On September 10, 1892, Palda wrote to Čapek, “Ringsmuth told me that he must bash the BANC and the Bohemian Voice because of Rosický,” evidently a reference to some grudge against his former employer, and Ringsmuth “spares neither you nor the truth.” Ringsmuth also agitated against Palda with such fervor that in the spring of 1893 the latter fled Cedar Rapids, where his nemesis published the weekly Svit (Light), to become editor of the Chicagské listy (Chicago papers). When this newspaper failed in October, Palda settled in Elgin, a village with no Czechs some ninety miles north of Cedar Rapids, where his oldest son minded the cigar business and its real estate until Palda returned from “exile” in 1902.17

V.A. Jung was a translator of Pushkin, Turgenev, Byron and Whitman who edited Pokrok západu in the early 1880s after arriving in the United States, but he settled in Cedar Rapids after losing a campaign for county treasurer to a fellow Czech backed by Rosický. Thomas Čapek, who knew Jung closely and even shared lodgings with him in Omaha, wrote that Jung never forgave his former employer. In erudite but highly sarcastic and personal polemics with Palda and Čermák in Slavie in the fall of 1892, Jung conceded that the Bohemian Voice was “well-edited” but argued that it could not be viable when even the Parlamentär, a German-language Old Czech journal in Vienna, was not. Instead, Czech-Americans should defend themselves directly on the pages of the Anglo-American press. Even better, they should not “unduly impose themselves on Americans as a separate nationality.” Upon his return to Bohemia after the turn of the century, Jung published the novels Na prahu nového světa and Rodina Petra Běla, which one Czech literary scholar recently rated as the best Czech-American novels of the period to 1914. In the former, subtitled “From Experiences in Czech Journalism in America,” Jung satirizes Rosický and Palda as “Rampouch” (“Icicle”) and “Špulda,” while the latter, subtitled “Novel about the Life of Czech Farmers in Nebraska,” is an admiring portrait of morally robust Czechs on the frontier in counterpoint to his effete “Rampouchs” and “Špuldas.”18
Reputation and opposition were also problems for another leading journalist of the four around Karel Jonáš who wanted their countrymen to affirm the BANC as their voice in America. In fact, F.B. Zdrůbek’s exposure was greater because of his close association with employer August Geringer, the Chicago publisher whose methods or perhaps just his success made him controversial. A decade before the BANC, reports in Chicago’s Anglo and German press compelled the city’s public library to investigate its trustee, Mr. Kadlec, and his brother-in-law Geringer, the library’s vendor for Czech books.19 Geringer’s enemy countrymen ranged from Socialists to Jan Oliverius, the cantankerous and fitful Republican journalist, who produced invoices from Eduard Grégr, the Young Czech politician, Prague publisher and Geringer’s supplier, to show that Geringer charged the library as much as five times more for some titles. Jaroslav Pospíšil (1812-1889) in Hradec Králové offered his titles at retail less 40% to Geringer’s 10%, but disapproving library investigators just wanted to know who had contacted him.20 Geringer prevailed in this “Bohemian broil” but made enemies even in Prague, where F.A. Urbánek, the same bookseller who would lead the group tour to the Chicago world’s fair, issued a broadside addressed to “my esteemed American countrymen” on Geringer’s pricing schemes. In Bohemia, Urbánek styled himself as defender of Czech literary culture against the new publishers of sensational novels (Karel Trachta, Alois Hynek, Zikmund Bensinger, E. Weil), and he vilified Geringer as their American accomplice.21 It was an issue that constantly exposed him to critics at home, never mind that he also published other kinds of books, like František Palacký’s monumental Czech history in a fine edition, which Václav Šnajdr praised, because “nothing so deepens national consciousness and inspires us to further work on the nation’s ancestral field as a knowledge of the nation’s history.”22

But Geringer alienated Šnajdr after the 1883 Milwaukee ČSPS convention, when he used his daily Svornost to accuse the Chicago and Cleveland delegations of making deals on the brotherhood’s offices and the organ, which Geringer evidently wanted for
himself. In fact, Geringer put his editor, Zdrůbek, at odds with several eventual BANC colleagues. L.J. Palda called Geringer and company “black souls,” Šnajdr called the publisher his “archenemy,” and J.V. Matějka chaired a September 23, 1883, protest meeting of 300 against Svornost. Describing the scene that awaited schoolchildren one Monday morning, Zdrůbek denounced Pilsen’s ČSPS hall at West Eighteenth and May as a front for drunken carousing. Ironically, the BANC would hold all three of its conventions there within the next decade. Ten lodges built it in 1879 and named it the Česko-anglická svobodná škola (Bohemian-English Freethought School) for the sake of tax-exempt status. But the sole schoolroom shared the ground floor with a gym, cafeteria and offices. The money-maker was an 84 by 60 foot dance hall with stage, gallery and bar above. And the generous expenditures were for three third-floor meeting rooms with soft carpet, fine tables and chairs, and paintings of Bohemian historical figures and events.

Just as the BANC formed, a new controversy overtook Geringer. In May 1891, the 52-man Bohemian Typographical Union no. 2, formed in the previous year, struck over hours, wages and hiring. It drove BANC member J.V. Matějka out of business. Geringer survived, but strikers launched the Denní hlasatel, which became an enduring rival daily. Karel Štulík (b. 1860), among those who left Geringer, used it to draw attention to donations for the Hus monument and flood relief in Prague that Geringer collected and was still holding. The result was an August 3 public meeting at the old Prague neighborhood’s Sokol hall on Taylor Street, where Geringer faced Štulík and Denní hlasatel editors but had to make a quick escape from passions aroused against him. Just fifteen months later, F.B. Zdrůbek and Štulík met at the second BANC convention, where Štulík was a delegate for the National Sokol Union. He hailed from two families of millers around Slaný, north of Prague, quite a social distinction in Czech-speaking Bohemia, and he studied chemistry at the polytechnic. He was also close to Sokol founder Dr. Miroslav Tyrš (1832-1884), who endorsed him when the National Sokol Union asked for a trainer. F.B. Zdrůbek was the speaker at the elaborate,
August 15, 1886, welcoming concert for Štulík at the Taylor Street Sokol hall. They met as Geringer’s loyal favorite and young hire turned critic. Even so, they worked together on the subcommittee for miscellaneous affairs now and on the one for publications, the BANC’s most successful endeavor, at the next convention. Indeed, they worked at close quarters, because BANC subcommittees had just three members each.

Zdrůbek and Štulík’s collaboration is an emblem of the BANC as a success, at least for its participants, who overcame many public and personal differences to form a working team.

The BANC was an experience in solidarity, which already circulated in the common perceptions and concerns of a larger aspiring elite. “That’s how it always was among our people,” wrote BANC chairman Jan Rosický in 1907 from Omaha to J.V. Čapek, aspiring historian of Bohemian America: “Great enthusiasm at first, then great indifference right after it.” Earlier that year Sokol activist Josef Čermák replied to Čapek’s questions about local Chicago associations. “Czech journalists formed a club about four or five years ago” to “promote collegiality and cleanse the press of mutual baiting,” he wrote. It evidently included a range of print workers, but it “died of our common national affliction, indifference, which commonly follows flares of passion.”

Explaining the demise of two different ventures, two different men in two different places voiced an unwitting harmony of feeling. They even used the same synonym, ochablost, for the pervasive indifference that made their efforts and those of their kind heroic. A month before the BANC’s July 1893 convention, its third one, Karel Jonáš’s Slavie appealed for “all levels and classes of our countrymen” to be represented. The BANC Executive Committee had mailed out invitations in late March, only two replies were in, and Slavie complained about “typical carelessness” in Czech-American “national affairs.” But how did the BANC fare with the diverse groups that it wanted to unite? It was still a small world, but its spiritual divisions were deep: St. Prokop’s Catholic parish was at Allport, just two blocks west of the BANC’s conventions in the
ČSPS hall, and the Pilsen neighborhood Sokol at Ashland was not even half a mile further west on Eighteenth Street.

That was a new hall in 1893, and the Pilsen Sokol was a kindred liberal nationalist body. It was part of the National Sokol Union, the ČSPS brotherhood’s heartening junior partner in the BANC, but it was also a competitor on West Eighteenth Street’s market of identities. It formed a Česká liga (Bohemian-American League), “after the example of the Irish League, to support not just the Young Czech party but the nation itself in its struggle with Germandom,” when the BANC already had such a political agenda.\(^{33}\) It was the destination for the tour group from Prague to the world’s fair, whose reception and procession across Chicago were so triumphant. The Pilsen Sokol hall also hosted meetings of the world fair’s Bohemian Day committee. When twelve committee members marched in that day’s opening parade, three were clerics—two Catholics and secretary Václav Vaněk (b. 1862), who was pastor of the Jan Hus Methodist church.\(^{34}\) This could only highlight the BANC’s failure to attract any participation from the Catholic camp, which the BANC did desire: it wrote to all associations, “without regard to their purpose or spiritual orientation,” as chairman Palda announced at the second convention.\(^{35}\) Of course, the presence of Zdrůbek and Šnajdr in the BANC was a problem. To Catholics, their reputations as archvillains went back a quarter century to the Pokrok weekly and the Father Řepiš trials in Cleveland. But the BANC also had great conciliators in Jonáš and Rosický. Five priests attended the July 1890 Catholic wedding of Jonáš’s daughter Vlasta to Chicago brewer Otto Kubín, and officers of Catholic fraternal benefit societies turned to Jonáš for advice.\(^{36}\)

The Catholic camp was becoming more formidable across America, which had just 14 Czech-speaking priests in 1885 but 102 “priests serving Czech parishes” just fifteen years later and 243 by 1910. At Chicago’s St. Prokop on March 2, 1885, Rev. Nepomuk Jaeger (1844-1924) succeeded Vilém Čoka, founder of this largest Bohemian parish in the city. Jaeger was a Benedictine from St. Vincent in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, some forty
miles east of Pittsburgh. Its archabbot, Bavarian native Boniface Wimmer (1809-1887), founded seven American monasteries, including a Bohemian one with Jaeger at St. Prokop’s over Roman opposition to ethnic priories and ten years after Father Čoka’s 1877 public debate with F.B. Zdrůbek. As Čoka intended, St. Prokop became a growing reservoir of clerics right in the middle of Pilsen. It already had eight at its formation. In 1888 its parishioners formed St. Víť just half a mile to the west, the fourth Bohemian parish in Chicago and the first one in a dozen years. Six St. Prokop Benedictines succeeded each other there in the next two decades. Within four years after St. Víť, four more Bohemian parishes appeared. Our Lady of Good Counsel was in the most tenuous neighborhood of countrymen, four miles to the northwest, and Benedictines filled in between longer-serving priests. Our Lady of Lourdes was almost as far to the west at West Fifteenth and Keeler. A St. Prokop local of the fraternal First Catholic Central Union organized this parish, and four Benedictines succeeded each other in the first four years. Bohemians would form four final parishes in greater Chicago during the first two decades of the twentieth century. At St. Mary of Celle, seven Benedictines succeeded each other in seven decades after founding it in 1910. It was almost seven miles west of St. Víť, in the suburb of Berwyn.

Two decades after Father Hessoun’s St. Louis Hlas, the Benedictines also mounted a Catholic challenge in the field where liberal nationalists were strongest—the press—and they did it on an intimidating scale. If an “apostolate of the press” was not already a reason for being, then the “progressive papers” and their campaign to discredit the Benedictines soon made it a necessity. On July 4, 1893, as the BANC gathered for its last convention two blocks away, the Benedictines launched the weekly Katolík and bought a press. Just seven months later they launched the daily Národ (Nation) in response to idled Czech typesetters seeking work. They even complied when the new hires made a wage demand. It was all quite a demonstration of prowess in the face of the panic, which the BANC did not survive, and a point-by-point answer to August Geringer, the dominant publisher. In 1895, the Katolík almanac appeared, and it
cultivated group history, like Geringer’s *Amerikán*. The Benedictines also matched him in book publishing, by both volume and variety, from novels and theology, which they also distributed in editions from Catholic publishers in Bohemia and Moravia, to translations, school readers and original work from their clerical countrymen in America, whose creative powers they so encouraged.\(^43\) In 1898, they launched *Hospodářské listy*, which competed against Jan Rosický’s *Hospodár* in the crops-and-profit-minded countryside for the next three decades. By 1905, they raised their own press building on South Allport for $19,000 on two lots that cost them $12,300, and by the end of the decade thirty-one editors, clerks and typographers labored there.\(^44\)

Father Prokop Neužil (1861-1946) created this “apostolate of the press.” At thirteen, he accompanied his parents from Bechyně, a south Bohemian town, to Spillville, Iowa, became the Czech priest’s advanced student and a public school teacher there, then went to the Benedictine college at St. Vincent in Pennsylvania.\(^45\) In a “historical sketch” of Catholic Bohemian America to introduce the *Katolick* almanac, Neužil likened the press—those “parcels of print in the Czech language that the mail carries by the thousands”—to blood circulating in the body.\(^46\) In the missions that his Benedictine brothers took to “almost every Czech parish in America,” Neužil was also a leader, at work in Texas alone for more than half of 1901.\(^47\) In three decades, the Bohemian Benedictines in Chicago grew tenfold to a “religious community” of eighty-four.\(^48\) Abbot Jaeger had Pope Leo XIII’s 1891 social encyclical *Rerum novarum* translated into Czech and widely distributed as a pamphlet.\(^49\) Such progressivism could only encourage Neužil, and dynamic young clerics like him came not just to the Benedictines. A bigger Bohemian neighborhood—Lawndale—was forming west of Pilsen, and in 1891 two First Catholic Central Union locals invited Father Matěj Farník (1864-1908) from Volary in south Bohemia to form the first parish there, St. Ludmila.\(^50\)

Fathers Neužil and Farník were the two Catholics on the Pilsen Sokol’s Bohemian Day committee, and they joined the parade to the world fair on August 12, 1893.\(^51\) The
BANC failed to attract such progressive Catholics or even Socialists, who were closer to liberal nationalists in Bohemia and America. After Haymarket, the radical Josef Boleslav Pecka edited J.V. Matějka’s *Chicagské listy* (1887-1892), wrote for Geringer’s *Duch času* (Spirit of the times) and even became secretary of a Jan Hus monument committee. And when Pittsburgh’s Anglo press caused the arrest of miners in ČSPS local no. 165, *Duch nové doby* (Spirit of new times), as alleged anarchists, it was an attack against a liberal nationalist brotherhood. But recall that Socialist delegates František Choura, from this ČSPS local, and Vincent V. Vojtíšek, now managing the *Newyorské listy*, stayed away from the BANC. Leo Kochmann ignored the BANC in his *Hlas lidu* (People’s voice), because “its first public appeal declared anarchism unwelcome,” as he told Antonín Jurka, who came to New York for the BANC to study prospects for a Czech and Slovak immigration bureau. Recall that the BANC did attract Slovaks a quarter-century before the common state of Czechoslovakia appeared in Europe, but it rejected the *Spolek českých židů pro Matici školskou*, because this Association of Jews for the School Foundation in Bohemia had fewer than the seven hundred required for one delegate. With their international church and multiethnic parishes, the Catholics were more open. The Benedictines founded at least two Slovak parishes and even included German Bohemians in their ranks at St. Prokop.

Limited in ideological and ethnic reach, the BANC was more vital in a third dimension—the generational. It was a workplace where journalist masters, products of 1840s-1860s Bohemia, could assemble younger, American-educated professionals and make common cause with them. Recall BANC secretary Bohumil Shimek, the University of Iowa professor. He could lecture on “Freedom among the Slavs” in good English at the ČSPS hall and write in *Harper’s Weekly* about Komenský for the BANC commemoration, but far beyond the small circle of BANC officers and delegates were others like him. Františka Gregorová (1850-1901) wrote the Komenský piece in the *Chicago Times*. She had come to Wisconsin in childhood with her farm-bound parents, graduated with honors after three years at Cornell, spoke about Bohemian poetry at
commencement (1887), then studied for two more years at the university in Prague, where American consul Karel Jonáš befriended her. After a year in Port Huron, Michigan, where she taught high school, she went to the mountains of Colorado (1891), where she fought her eventually fatal asthma. She published two books in English—a translation of Božena Němcová’s Babička (Grandmother), the classic 1855 Czech novel, and her own history of Bohemia—but she also wrote in Czech for Jonáš’s Slavie. Gregorová exemplified the possibilities for bilingual and bicultural achievement in the American-educated generations.

Jan Rudiš Jičínský (1862-1930) was already twenty-two when he took his secondary education to America, where he edited Czech newspapers for August Geringer, Antonín Novák and Jan Rosický in turn, but in 1896 he graduated from Chicago’s Rush Medical College and contributed to the American medical literature even as he edited Sokol americký (1903-1919). Just before commencing medical studies at Omaha’s Creighton College, Jičínský proposed chairs of Slavic languages and literatures at Chicago and other American universities as a goal to the second BANC convention, where he was a National Sokol Union delegate. The BANC Executive Committee asked Thomas Čapek (1861-1950) to write to American “philanthropists and millionaires.” Here was a new use for the American-educated, never mind that Čapek received only rejections. Beyond challenging Anglo attitudes as publicists, they could also more easily make personal relationships and perhaps motivate material support for Bohemian causes. Like Rudiš Jičínský, Čapek was barely thirty, but since graduating in law from the University of Michigan (1888) he had opened a practice in Omaha, served a term in the Nebraska House of Representatives, and made a friend of William Jennings Bryan, who recommended him (unsuccessfully) for the post of United States consul to Prague.

The BANC Executive Committee also turned to the young Čapek because he edited The Bohemian Voice, subtitled “Organ of the Bohemian Americans in the United States.” Jan Rosický published it for the BANC in Omaha on the first day of each month from
September 1892 until November 1894. Čapek edited the first nineteen issues, and an even younger Josef Jiří Král (1870-1951) edited the last eight. It was the first journal in English about the Czechs as a Central European nation and as an American immigrant group. The next one did not appear until February 1917: also a monthly, *The Bohemian Review* (later *The Czechoslovak Review*) lasted seven years. The only other successor in more than a century is the semiannual *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, launched in 1982 and still ongoing. Polish, Ukrainian and Slovenian counterparts long preceded *Kosmas* in the post-World War II political emigration, but the *Bohemian Voice* had no real peers among these Slavic immigrant nationalities from Habsburg Austria. It was the BANC’s most substantial achievement. And as two title words printed large and carried around the country every month anew, the *Bohemian Voice* was another name for the BANC. It reached more people more often, and it was a metaphor for Bohemian America as project, for the old journalists at work for a quarter century, and for the new collaborators they found to keep making and contesting the meanings of “Bohemian” in America.

Chairman Palda proposed an “English-language monthly” to the first BANC convention, but the audience was skeptical, perhaps because his agenda for its editor was so expansive: as the “hand and brain” of the BANC he was also to serve as secretary, librarian and “collector of material on the statistics and history of the Czechs in America” and to earn his entire livelihood from such service. The mission of the journal was to represent the Czechs to the American public and to Czech-American youth undergoing “denationalization,” a constituency Palda emphasized with a characteristically melodramatic metaphor for the journal as “a ship of salvation for that whole issue of ours about to sink into the foreign sea and which is deaf to Czech words.” All this required a self-supporting journal with at least two thousand subscribers at $1 per year, which would allow for the monthly printing of a further three thousand copies and their distribution free of charge in American society at large.
The BANC adopted other priorities and took no action on the journal until June 12, 1892, when Executive Committee members Rosický, Shimek, Zdrůbek and Palda met at the latter’s Cedar Rapids home. Palda was the host but perhaps not the initiator of this meeting, for as he confided by letter to Čapek, he had doubts about publishing the English-language journal “but let himself be convinced.” Perhaps it was Rosický who convinced him and took the initiative at the meeting, where all the necessary decisions were made for launching the journal. Rosický was a gifted editor and a shrewd manager who had transformed an insignificant *Pokrok západu* (Progress of the west) into a powerful weekly fifteen years earlier and had just launched a farmers’ monthly—*Hospodář*—that became the greatest success of his long career. As Palda reported in the opening address to the second BANC convention five months later, the Executive Committee preferred to base the journal in Chicago, in the capital of Czech America, but yielded to Omaha, home of prospective editor Čapek, and delegated the venture to Rosický and a committee in the same city. Rosický presumably recruited Čapek, whom he had employed as an editor in 1884-1886. In an April 25, 1888, letter advising Čapek to launch his legal career in Omaha, Rosický praised his ambition and expected much from him in the future. The Executive Committee now christened the new monthly *The Bohemian Voice*, set its length at sixteen pages, salaries at $50 per issue for the editor and $15 for the manager, and adopted Palda’s original plan, including a subscription cost of $1 per year.\(^{68}\)

That Čapek was already at work gathering material for the first issue is evident in a June 24th letter from Karel Jonáš, who was trying to complete a bilingual dictionary before the start of the election campaign, had politics and his newspaper to mind, and so could write nothing for Čapek. The committee of five that would manage the *Bohemian Voice* first convened on July 17th, accepted a $1,000 security from Chairman Rosický as required by the bylaws, elected Emil Čermák secretary, drafted a flyer urging “Czech-American entrepreneurs and professionals” to advertise in the new journal, and resolved to meet monthly. As druggists, Čermák and fellow committee member St. Beránek
belonged to what Čapek called the Czech “intelligentsia” in Omaha. Čermák’s report on this and the next four meetings is preserved in the published minutes of the second BANC convention.69

As the Bohemian Voice was about to be launched, two consecutive issues of Jonáš’ Slavie promoted it with memorable words. The August 24th issue carried Palda’s official statement on behalf of the BANC, emphatically addressed “Countrymen!” Palda explained that the journal is to “repel attacks made upon us” and to “explain our efforts and those of the Czech nation in the homeland” by disseminating news from the homeland now issuing entirely from unfriendly sources and by “penetrating into all levels of the American press.” There the Bohemian Voice is to “show that we are not the barbarians that those influenced by bad information imagine us to be,” while in Czech-American families it should “supplement the knowledge that parents inculcate in their children about their ancestral land.” One week later, a brief unsigned announcement declared that the Bohemian Voice is to “blaze the trail for correct views among Anglo-Americans on the Czech nation and to be a fount of knowledge on Czech matters for our national youth in America.” Toward the former objective, the journal will “be a means of defending the Czech name against the calumnies it suffers from time to time in the American press, which largely draws its information from murky sources.” For this reason, the Bohemian Voice is to be sent gratis to American journalists, who may then come to prefer it for “reliable elucidation of all matters concerning the Czech nation.” As a “kind of mirror of Czech cultural and economic life in America,” the advertisement section of the Bohemian Voice will also defend the Czechs by serving as “handy proof that we do not lag in any regard behind other nationalities that are settling in the United States.” The variety and character of the advertisements are important, because on them “conclusions will be made about the cultural significance of our nationality in this country.” As for the second objective, the reasonable subscription cost of one dollar per year puts the journal within the means of “every family whose maturing children are
accustomed to reading mainly in English, so that these children may educate themselves in the Czech spirit.”

Meanwhile, the journal’s managers were more concerned about its income and viability. Meeting on August 7th, they proposed accepting advertisements from Czech-American brewers and liquor merchants, and by September 22nd they also wanted to open the journal to non-Czech businesses. By its second issue the Bohemian Voice published advertisements from “F. Korbel & Bros. Wine Growers” and “L.J. Palda, Manufacturer of Fine Havana Cigars,” and in November the “Bohemian Brewing Co. of Chicago” made its debut in a space of appropriate size for this “largest Bohemian brewery in America.” At its convention on November 25th, the BANC resolved unanimously that any “unobjectionable” advertisements should be accepted, and those of Korbel, Palda and the Bohemian Brewing Co. remained in the journal right through its final issue.

On the first day of the second BANC annual convention, Thursday, November 24, 1892, Rosický and Čermák, as “administrator” and secretary, respectively, submitted detailed reports on the Bohemian Voice. Reflecting on the journal’s reception, which was disappointing but improved whenever a Czech-language newspaper promoted the journal, Rosický emphasized that sustained promotion from the Czech-language press was absolutely essential. The journal’s own promotional efforts had been impressive, including promotional distribution of four thousand of the first issue’s five thousand copies and three hundred flyers to potential advertisers. However, Rosický believed that it was the Czech-American press that could move (and this was its “patriotic duty”) the approximately three hundred Czech-American societies and their members to fulfill his revision of Palda’s original plan for the journal: at least two thousand subscribers and a few dozen advertisers (paying $10 per inch per year) to cover expenses, with these subscribers paying for another three thousand copies to Anglo-American “periodicals, public libraries and institutions, leading public servants, etc.,” thus producing a profit of at least $1,000 to make the BANC independent of donations and to pay for all its
activities. As things stood, the print run had been reduced to 3,500 for the third and fourth issues, with 847 subscriptions collected, over four hundred promised, and 1,014 copies sent gratis to Anglo-American addresses.\footnote{72}

Čermák and Rosický emphatically proposed combining the posts of BANC secretary and Bohemian Voice manager and to pay this person enough to make him effective. Rosický also reminded the gathering that “Mr. Čapek accepted the editorship temporarily, just until the convention, with the understanding that he would be more adequately remunerated for his work.” On the next day the minutes record that Čapek was still present and quite active, but the BANC unanimously moved to refer the question of his salary to the Executive Committee. Its Chairman Palda, Vice Chairman Rosický, Secretary Shimek and eight remaining BANC members convened at 5:45 p.m. on Saturday, but the brief minutes of this closing session make no mention of the Bohemian Voice editor or his salary. On December 6th Palda informed Čapek in a delicately-worded letter, “I presented the salary you requested to the other members of the Executive Committee” and “no one found it excessive.” However, they could offer no more than $60 per month until the next convention. By then they believed the journal would produce enough income that “surely no one will grumble if you receive what you are asking.” Pokrok západu co-editor Robert V. Miškovský became the new manager in February 1893, relieving his employer, Rosický. Like Čapek, Miškovský was paid $60 per month and became BANC secretary at its third convention in early July. (Shimek resigned at the end of 1892 to embark on a long scientific expedition to Central America.)\footnote{73} Alas, the sources do not reveal the salary that Čapek wanted, but his performance as editor certainly gave him great stature and clout. On September 10, 1892, after he received the inaugural issue from Rosický’s courier, Palda wrote to Čapek with extravagant praise. Jonáš’ Slavie, reviewing the April 1893 Bohemian Voice on the twelfth, lauded Čapek’s “great circumspection and ant-like industry,” while Rosický’s Pokrok západu wrote on January 10, 1894, “The present behavior of the American press
toward us alone proves that the Voice has served us well.” As we shall see below, Čapek also had Anglo-American admirers.74

Miskovšký’s performance, unlike Čapek’s, was controversial. After the second BANC convention, when the journal’s balance was just $130.89, the Omaha committee’s and others’ efforts to promote the Bohemian Voice began to pay off. After its December 29, 1892, meeting, the committee reported $1,434.10 in cumulative revenues and a healthy $646.67 balance. By mid-June 1893, Miskovšký’s fifth month as manager, paid up subscriptions stood at 2,092, with another three hundred still due. However, after the third BANC convention of July 6-8th, when Miskovšký resigned as Pokrok západu editor to devote himself fully to his new duties, the journal’s financial situation deteriorated. By April 25, 1894, Pokrok západu reported that while urban and rural agents had helped raise subscriptions to 2,600, half of the subscription income for volume two, only three or four issues from completion, remained uncollected. Worse, the Bohemian Voice “had no capital left on hand.” In a report dated November 24, 1894, Rosický, successor of the embattled Palda as chairman, wrote to the BANC on the eve of its fourth convention that as the journal went into debt during the previous winter, it cut costs on its contents and reduced the editor’s and Miskovšký’s salaries, respectively, to $50 and $35 per issue. Thirteen years later Rosický wrote that “the subscribers who paid for volume three amounted to only about a hundred, but over a thousand dollars in unpaid subscriptions left over from volume two remained uncollected. This was the fault of Secretary Miskovšký, who should have sent reminders but did not.” When Rosický made inquiries himself after June 1896 [i.e. 1895?] and received surprised replies from people who had sent in their “obligation,” he found “some fifty letters among Miskovšký’s [papers] which arrived in the spring and which that rascal had not even opened.”75

Rosický also criticized Čapek’s successor as editor, Josef Jiří Král. In the circumspect 1894 report he noted only that under Král the monthly “came out very irregularly,” but
in the 1907 letter he spoke his mind: “Král was awfully lazy. Although the agreement obligated him to send most of the manuscripts by the 20th each month and the rest by the 25th, so that the journal could come out around the 1st, I usually had to remind him by letter around the 1st and by telegram after the 1st, but as I was told in Racine [Wisconsin], my letters and telegrams lay unopened on his desk while he played cards out in Tábor ... at a Czech saloon in the country.” However, the record suggests that Král was anything but lazy. In an August 9, 1893, report on the third BANC convention, Slavie praised Král, a “highly gifted, educated and thoughtful man,” for his leading role in a committee that closely reviewed a manuscript history of Bohemia whose April 1894 publication as the first of its kind in English and subsequent distribution would be the BANC’s last success. (The author, Robert H. Vickers, was a Protestant Irish immigrant, Chicago lawyer and 1897 suicide buried and honored with a monument in the city’s Bohemian National Cemetery.) In a March 21, 1894, report on Čapek’s successor in the editor’s chair, Pokrov západu wrote that Král was also Slavic biographer for Johnson’s Universal Cyclopedia. He had already written some fifty entries just for volumes J-O. Three weeks later Rosický’s newspaper praised Král’s debut issue of the Bohemian Voice, and one week after this it announced that Král had also joined the editorial staff of Jonáš’s Slavie. That year Král also wrote the section on Bohemia for Samuel Porter Putnam’s 400 Years of Freethought, and by 1899 Král published the first volume of his comprehensive guide to American law for Czech immigrants. Clearly Král was not lazy. Rather, his work on so many fronts at once explains his failure to keep the Bohemian Voice coming out on time. Král had been in the United States hardly five years when he took over as editor, but he already had a law degree from Chicago. After Čapek fell in love with his future wife in that city at the World’s Columbian Exposition in August 1893, he saw his salary and prospects as Bohemian Voice editor in a different light. By September 8th, Václav Šnajdr was already advising him on the excellent prospects for a Czech-speaking lawyer in Cleveland. In January 1895, Tomáš and Anna Čapek settled in New York, where he would spend the remaining fifty-five years of his life as an attorney, banker and historian of the Czechs in America.76
Whatever the faults of Miškovský and Král, the persistent economic depression and competition from other Czech-American societies were unambiguous factors and probably the decisive ones in the demise of the BANC and its *Bohemian Voice*. Between November 23, 1892, and following June 28th, when the depression hit, the BANC collected only $130.36 in contributions and would thereafter do no better. Meanwhile, Čapek deplored the founding of two competing societies in the *Bohemian Voice* for December 1893. The Bohemian-American League in Chicago intended to support “Bohemian home rule” in Austria, while the Bohemian Union of America in New York was dedicated to the “union of every Bohemian in this country.” By November 1894, as the *Bohemian Voice* reported in its final issue, the League had a membership of 104 individuals and 42 societies, branches in St. Louis and Wilber, Nebraska, and $570.52 in contributions. Unlike Čapek, editor Král wrote in approving detail on this society preparing for a “holy war upon the house of Habsburg,” and he was even a speaker at its November 8th meeting on the anniversary of the 1620 Czech defeat at White Mountain at the hands of the Habsburgs. (Král’s sympathies for the League could hardly please BANC chairman Rosický.) In the midst of the depression, the BANC had to compete with such societies for scarce contributions. Thus, the ČSPS lodge in Clarkson, Nebraska, as one member wrote in *Pokrok západu* on January 3, 1894, made the following donations for the year: $1 to Czecho-Slovak Association for the Protection of Immigrants (New York), $4 to the BANC and $5 to the Bohemian-American League. Blasting the Czech-language press for indifference to the BANC, this writer also complained that “ordinary almanacs receive more of its attention than the *Bohemian Voice*."

The *Bohemian Voice* sought to inform an English-speaking audience about its subject, the Czechs as a Slavic nation in Imperial Austria and as an immigrant nationality in the United States. Founded in the belief that its intended Anglo-American readers (and assimilated Czech-Americans) were misinformed by Austro-German sources hostile to
the Czechs and by an American press that relied on these sources and that was otherwise ignorant and prone to nativist prejudices, the *Bohemian Voice* was quite polemical. Furthermore, events in America and Austria hardly encouraged it to relax from this posture. In Washington the intellectually and politically powerful Henry Cabot Lodge (1850-1924), a Massachusetts Republican, was leading the first major immigration restriction campaign, one that demanded a literacy test for what were now predominantly Southern and Eastern Europeans. (Only President Cleveland's February 1897 veto finally stopped the Literacy Test Bill.) Meanwhile, in March 1893 the Young Czechs introduced a bill in Vienna to extend voting rights to all men. That summer passions overflowed in Bohemia and collided with Austrian repression. In September the governor imposed a state of siege that would last for the next twenty-six months, and the crisis culminated in the infamous January 1894 *Omladina* trial. Through all this the *Bohemian Voice* also sought to educate its readers about the subject in a comprehensive way as it covered Czech history, biography, literature and arts, answered their letters, and brought them statistical reports on all kinds of matters and translations of Czech literature. Editor Čapek also took pains to make the journal visually attractive and as early as October 30, 1892, moved the administration to order “fine engravings of famous Czechs” from Bohemia. Portraits of five politicians, five writers, three musicians, two spiritual leaders, an artist, a Czech-American, an American Bohemianist and a national landmark graced the front pages of all but seven issues: Komenský, Dvořák, Brožík, Rieger, Smetana, Trojan, Grégr, Němcová, Neruda, Havlíček, Kollár, Náprstek, Ondříček, Čech (October 1892-November 1893), Karlštejn (January 1894), Hus, Vašatý, Náprstek again, Herold and Robert Henry Vickers (July-November 1894).78

The front page of the inaugural September 1892 issue neatly represented what was to come. Under the heading “Notes,” which would precede individually-titled articles in every subsequent issue, this page contains eight one-paragraph statements (and statistics) about Bohemian religion, society, education, ethnography, demography and government and about Austria as a “mosaic of races” with a privileged German minority, all written
so as to counter nativist stereotypes and appeal to cherished American notions of freedom and democracy. Thus, Bohemia might be Catholic, but only because of forced conversion. And the Czechs were a nation of virtuous and highly literate farmers (with a university in Prague) not wretched laborers. They emigrated to escape rural overcrowding, as a credible, English traveler observed, not to sow anarchy. Ignorance among medieval Latin chroniclers caused the “Cechs” and their country to be named for an extinct Germanic tribe. “Like Ireland” the country now chafed under a foreign sovereign, administration and military occupation, and its elected legislature had to submit to the whims of a monarch. As for Austria, the American Census Bureau would “hardly sanction” practices that defraud peoples who “clamor for recognition” and that would count Americans and Irishmen as English if applied in the United States and Great Britain.

A report on the BANC and its program on the next two pages includes a kind of program for the new journal, elegant in style but rather desultory, where Čapek serves notice that it will “present from time to time before the forum of public opinion all the great wrongs perpetrated by the Austrian government upon our brothers living within the confines of the quadrilateral mountains” and that it “does not promise to shield from righteous condemnation and censure those manikins of an impotent government, those merciless traducers of our noblest national aspirations, whether native or not, whose boldness grows with silence.” In fact, this became the main theme. The Bohemian Voice would back the Young Czech campaigns for “home rule” and for the right of all men to vote with relentless energy and conviction, and it would skillfully use Americanisms, Young Czech parliamentary speeches, current events great and obscure, statistics and Anglo-American and French sources to portray the Czechs as a capable people enduring outrageous Austrian oppression but determined to recover their historically-sanctioned independence and to secure modern democratic rights.
As a diligent student of American literature and society since his arrival in New York at age seventeen in 1879, as a graduate of an American university, and as a practicing attorney, Thomas Čapek acquired a command of the English language and a knowledge of America rare in the Czech-American community of his time, and as editor he used them superbly to make the Czech cause more familiar and more compelling to Americans. “Bohemian state rights” was the common Czech term then and is standard in Czech historiography and in American contributions like Garver (1978) today for the legal and political prerogatives of the lands of the Bohemian crown as a distinct, indivisible and independent part of the Habsburg realm before the Thirty Years’ War and before the centralizing reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, prerogatives which the Old Czechs wanted Franz Joseph I and his government to restore ever since the beginning of the constitutional era in 1860. As the Young Czechs took up the cause of “Bohemian state rights” with more insistence, Čapek recognized that such an obscure Old World notion—and one easily associated with the Confederacy—could hardly excite Americans. Instead he borrowed a timely term from the Irish context, one already quite familiar and legitimate to Americans, and used it to great effect right in the inaugural issue above a report on an Eduard Grégr speech in the Reichsrat: “Home Rule Our Demand.” William Gladstone (1809-1898), one of the most eloquent and charismatic figures of the English nineteenth century, then returned to power for the fourth, last and perhaps most dramatic time to lead an Irish Home Rule bill to passage in the House of Commons by the following year. Čapek had followed the Irish struggle for home rule as early as 1884, when he wrote about it with great enthusiasm as an editor of *Pokrok západu*. At the end of “Home Rule Our Demand,” Čapek again showed that he knew how to present the struggle for “Bohemian state rights” to Americans when he wrote, “Bohemia’s statue of liberty is not cast, but the metal is boiling.”

The next two issues described Franz Joseph I’s 1871 rescript acceding to coronation as King of Bohemia, his subsequent disavowal of this pledge, and Julius Grégr’s recent indignant address on this score to the Bohemian Diet. In the Vienna Reichsrat on
February 25, 1893, Eduard Grégr delivered an especially resounding home rule speech that won international press coverage, whereupon the April 1893 *Bohemian Voice* honored Grégr with an engraving and introduction on its front page, likened his home rule oratory to that of Daniel O’Connell (1775-1847) on behalf of Ireland in the British Parliament, printed excerpts from the speech, and drew from a *New York Herald* editorial which portrayed Grégr as “a force of nature.” The next two issues used other means to promote home rule. “How We Grow” was a book review of a kind of who’s who and treatise on the “intellectual advancement of the Bohemian people” that used comparative and historical statistics to argue that the Czechs “excel the Austrian Germans in civilization” and thus deserve “equal political rights,” while the historical article “Hapsburgs and the Bohemian Language” portrayed successive monarchs who confirmed Bohemia’s status by implication as more or less enthusiastic and successful students of its language. After Count Edward Taaffe’s fourteen-year government in Vienna fell in October 1893 and Prince Alfred Windischgrätz, whose grandfather bombarded Prague in 1848, succeeded him, the *Bohemian Voice* reviewed the “Constitutional Struggle in Bohemia” since 1860. Josef Herold’s February 14, 1893, Bohemian Diet speech, which appeared in English on the pages of the *Bohemian Voice* that April, laid out historical validations of Bohemian state rights. Thus, even as Habsburg centralism appeared to reduce Bohemia to a mere province, Prussian King Frederick the Great insisted that its Diet confirm the 1742 cession of Silesia. A later issue explained the state rights significance of a Habsburg emperor’s coronation as King of Bohemia to a skeptical American inquirer and closed with the dates of Franz Joseph I’s three unfulfilled promises to do so.  

If home rule was to restore the Bohemian Kingdom to its erstwhile independence in the Habsburg realm, then the right of all men to vote was to restore the Czech people to their rightful mastery in Bohemia, and the *Bohemian Voice* likewise took up this Young Czech campaign from its inaugural issue, where it presented Austrian discrimination by social and economic class in its system of representational government as a device for
denying the Czechs in Bohemia and the Slavs in Austria their rightful majority, as documented by another article on the monarchy’s ethnic composition. As first the Young Czechs’ and then the Taaffe and Windischgrätz ministries’ bills for electoral law reform dominated Austrian parliamentary events in 1893, the Bohemian Voice used these opportunities to hold forth on the issue. In April the journal compared the parliament’s ethnic composition then to what it might be under equitable electoral laws. In May it introduced its report on the Young Czech bill with a quote in praise of self-government by the famous American statesman Daniel Webster (1782-1852). In November it drew at length from the Young Czech Národní listy on the bill that toppled the Taaffe government. In April 1894 it criticized the Windischgrätz bill for leaving the Czechs and Ukrainians as the most underrepresented nationalities in parliament, as a table showed, and in August it attacked the government’s sincerity on electoral law reform.

Meanwhile, the Bohemian Voice did not neglect the Bohemian Diet, whose ultimate impotence, practical uses (as in defeating the punktace ethnic partition plan), procedures and composition since the 1889 election it capably reviewed in a July 1894 report which also analyzed the electoral discrimination that gave a German city like Reichenberg (i.e. Liberec) three seats but Czech Pilsen (i.e. Plzeň), with two-thirds more inhabitants, only one!82

The background to the parliamentary struggles for home rule and for equal voting rights was an ethnic conflict in which the Czechs suffered systematic oppression and misrepresentation abroad. An editorial titled “Race Conflict in Bohemia” in the second issue of the Bohemian Voice presented Bohemia as a “battle ground between Slav and Teuton” and the latter as innately expansive and covetous colonists who achieved domination, so that now the “Chekh” language must “force its way into every school house, hall of justice, city council, chamber of commerce and the Diet.” (The Kingdom’s other major ethnic group received its due attention only in the October 1894 issue, which portrayed Bohemia’s 94,479 Jews as effective allies of the Germans.) In its next issue the Bohemian Voice commenced to document how Austria systematically oppressed the
Czechs with an analysis of Bohemia’s and Hungary’s relative tax burdens translated, with commentary, from the Národní listy. A list of Austrian diplomats in the United States, all of them German, and the appointment of a German over two Czech candidates to preside over the Prague circuit court documented discrimination in the civil service, while a report titled “Afraid of Schools” used statistics on secondary school and higher education finance in Bohemia and Opava Silesia to document official favoritism toward German-language schools and discrimination against Czech-language ones. After the Austrian governor put Prague under a state of siege on the provocative date of September 12, 1893, the anniversary of Franz Joseph I’s 1871 coronation rescript to the Czechs, the Bohemian Voice became especially eloquent on their oppression. The titles “Liberty of the Press in Austria” and “Imperial Promises a Fraud” fit the sarcastic and indignant tones of reports on press censorship and on the rescript in the first “siege” issue, while “Pancakes and Treason” described the arrest and court hearing of a Czech baker in Louny after gendarmes detected a resemblance between his pancake dough and the material used to put up “seditious posters!” In November the Bohemian Voice disseminated a Young Czech manifesto printed in Leipzig which predicted that the state of siege would fail just as those in 1849, 1868 and 1871 and which condemned the defeated punktace plan to partition Bohemia and other government outrages, while in February it devoted one-third of the entire issue to Eduard Grégr’s defiant speech after the Reichsrat voted to sanction the state of siege. The Omladina conspiracy trial from January 15 to February 21, 1894, gave the Bohemian Voice another sterling opportunity to document Austrian harassment of its Czech population, and its report brimmed with details on the youthful defendants and their sentences. To make its points more sharply, the journal used its “Notes” and “Miscellaneous” sections and its replies to reader inquiries with devastating effect. One especially memorable “Note” was in the October 1894 issue: “During one year’s existence of the state of siege at Prague, the special tribunals have sentenced various persons to varying terms of imprisonment aggregating more than 200 years, of which 96.25 years is the share of those unhappy boys whom the watchful governmental organs declared to be members of an imaginary society called
the Omladina (Young Men). This is a record even for an Austrian court.” However, the Bohemian Voice could also be quite scathing in its articles. When the government seemed set to punish the Young Czechs for one of the inkwell-throwing incidents in the Diet that came to symbolize ungovernable Bohemia in the closing decades of the Habsburg era, the Bohemian Voice wrote: “Can it be that the Austrian eagle, that carnivorous, greedy, plundering, destroying, combating and hateful bird, will again be let loose on fair Bohemia?"83

The Bohemian Voice closely monitored Anglo-American publications of all kinds on the Czechs, reported on them at length, and used them skillfully for its own purposes. In the American press and its coverage of current events in Austria, it sought to expose an anti-Czech bias and to discredit the uncritical reliance on Austrian sources that produced it, as in its critique of “Chekhs Hate the Germans.” The St. Paul, Minnesota, Evening Dispatch printed this story on November 11, 1892, after a mentally unstable man fired at a group of Germans in Prague. After Austrian authorities put Prague under a state of siege the following September, the Bohemian Voice complained that most American newspapers did not support the Young Czechs, that some even “ridiculed” them, and asked again, “Can it be that our newspaper writers cannot distinguish between the news which is manufactured by the government at Vienna and between the news coming from Prague, the very seat of troubles?” However, the journal also knew how to use potentially favorable newspaper reports. When imperious Austrian diplomats demanded Peter Rovnianek’s Amerikánsko-slovenské noviny suppressed and unthinking Pittsburgh policemen almost obliged them, the Illustrated American was moved to disbelief and indignation, and the Bohemian Voice titled its story “American Opinion of Austria.” (It also pointed out that the targeted newspaper was Slovak, not Hungarian.) Scholarly writing also found an attentive reception on its pages. The March 1893 issue’s criticisms of Will S. Monroe’s pamphlet Comenius, the Evangelist of Modern Pedagogy brought rebuttals from the author three issues hence that elucidated several bibliographical facts about the subject. Another issue briefly reviewed an entire class of scholars, British
Bohemianists. Not only in these and other treatments of news reporting and scholarship but even in its reviews of travelogues and novels the Bohemian Voice was a strict guardian of accuracy and the Czech reputation. American actress Lillian Lewis (d. 1899) wrote with sympathy in the Dramatic Times about the hardships of the Czech common people after her visit to Prague, while English gentleman Poulney Bigelow described a “Tcheck” language everywhere “offensively thrust upon” him and home rule demands as “secession, treason, rebellion” in Pall Mall Magazine after his canoe trip down the Moldau (i.e. Vltava). The Bohemian Voice duly corrected both authors’ factual errors but treated the latter much less indulgently, noting that his fame “rests chiefly on his having been a fellow student of the present emperor of Germany.” Two issues after it reprinted an explanation of the various meanings of “Bohemian” from an American periodical, the Bohemian Voice took the popular British novelist Ouida (1839-1908) to task for portraying the Czechs as gypsies in her Strathmore. A note in Czech asking readers to mark the items meant for the editor’s attention in publications mailed to him suggests that they were essential in the journal’s success as a comprehensive review of current Anglo-American Bohemica. Josef Jiří Král introduced French sources and foreign relations as a theme after he succeeded Čapek. For example, the editorial in his second issue is on the significance of France and Russia to Bohemian aspirations and profiles French Bohemianists, while a French analysis of Czech politics and a report on the Young Czech Gustav Eim’s (1849-1897) article on Bohemia as an international problem for La Vie Contemporaine follow.84

Nativism and Czech-American affairs were secondary but important themes in the Bohemian Voice. Čapek defended Czech-Americans against nativist slander. It was a reputation that he made early. His reply to the first major attack, on the “Slav, Bohemian, Italian and the baser Polander” hordes committing “nameless crimes and horrid vices” in the Pennsylvania anthracite coal region, was a tour de force. Čapek used survey responses from one community after another to prove that the Bohemians in the state were numerically insignificant but composed of homeowner families working in
various industries, and he concluded with letters on their behalf from two local police chiefs! Čapek could also use his bare knuckles. When the novelist and Columbia University Germanist Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen (1848-1895) wrote about the Slavic immigrants as dull barbarians and as a peril to America, Čapek recalled that his ancestors had “helped to rifle [Bohemia] of her treasures and works of art.” (Actually, Boyesen was a Norwegian, not a Swede.) Those who relied on facts he treated respectfully. Thus, he published Henry Gannett’s letter using census data to disprove Čapek’s assertion that the Czech immigrants were as rural as the Scandinavians and to rebuff Čapek’s criticism of a Gannett article. (Gannett [1846-1914] was a prominent government geographer who supported immigration restriction.) Čapek would later use a Census Bulletin article on “Nativity and Percentage of Prisoners and Paupers” to defend the Czechs against the Burlington Hawkeye in Iowa. Král showed he could carry on the fight when the Chicago Herald blamed the Czechs for the famous 1894 Pullman strike of the American Railway Union: “It would not do to blame the Irish or the Germans, for they have more votes than the Bohemians and might hit back. Thus it happened one day that we had the pleasure to read about ‘Bohemian rioters’ though among the names of the seventeen leaders arrested the most careful search failed to discover a single Bohemian!” On another controversy the BANC resolved that the Bohemian Voice be “edited impartially as regards the religious issue,” and so Čapek kept to the unspectacular but effective method of critically comparing sources, the eminent historian Václav Vladivoj Tomek (1818-1905) versus a simple church almanac, in a dispute on the Nepomuk legend with the Catholic newspaper Hlas (Voice) in St. Louis. At its second convention the BANC also directed the Bohemian Voice to publish “an article, to be provided by their representatives in this Committee, in the interests and defense of our Slovak brothers.” The journal would defend the Slovaks on numerous occasions but more from Hungarians, whom it called “first cousins of the Turks and Tartars,” than from American nativists. As for Czech immigration history, the Bohemian Voice contributed two general surveys in its early issues but is most valuable for its coverage of the BANC annual conventions, Czech participation in the Chicago World’s
Columbian Exposition and forgotten incidents like Václav Šnajdr’s toast to freedom at an 1893 Cleveland reception for a Czech delegation, which led to a police raid on the *Národní listy* in Prague.\(^8^5\)

Coverage of Czech history, science, arts and literature in the *Bohemian Voice* was substantial, engaging and added stature both to the nation’s home rule demands in Austria and to the immigrants’ claims to respect in America. Each of the first seven issues from September 1892 to March 1893 printed a section of Robert H. Vickers’ manuscript *History of Bohemia*. (The closing November 1894 issue carried a further, post-publication section.) These may be the only surviving source of insights into the work of the BANC subcommittee that presumably made extensive revisions between Karel Jonáš’ report on the manuscript at the November 1892 convention and its publication in April 1894. Jonáš criticized the abstruse style, unbalanced coverage and undocumented sources, and he regretted the author’s inability to read and use Czech-language sources. The *Bohemian Voice* was quite within the familiar tradition of popular nineteenth-century Czech historical writing in its choice of iconic themes and its romantic and nationalistic style, but it is valuable as an attempt to transplant this genre into the English language and into the American context. Typical examples are the articles on early legends, the Bohemian Brethren, the first Czech lecture at Prague’s university in 1792, and the Revolution of 1848. František Martin Pelcl’s (1734-1801) epochal lecture evoked this revealing sentiment: “The modest lecturer would have thought it a phantasy had one of his students told him, at the conclusion of his talk, that one hundred years hence as many will speak and treasure that degraded language *beyond the ocean* [emphasis in *B.V.*], as there were lovers of it at home in 1793!” “The Germans Honored Hus as a Saint” was a translation from *Lumír*, a leading literary journal in Bohemia. Articles like “Anne of Bohemia, Queen of England” (1367-1394), “Bohemian Brethren before the English Parliament,” and a translation from a standard French geographical source, an early contribution from future editor Král, used Western European and American sources and ventured into British and American themes. “Who
are the Hungarians?” was a historical introduction to the Slovaks at a time when they still had no established identity in the American consciousness. Other historical articles recalled precocious cultural achievements and reclaimed technological inventions appropriated by other nations to portray the Czechs as an enterprising and scientifically gifted people. Book printing was especially well suited as a subject on which to cultivate such a reputation, since the Czech tradition, which dated to 1468, was older than the English one. “The Earliest Bohemian Printing” discussed incunables, Biblical translations and the earliest newspapers in a country where culture and scholarship were flourishing. “The First Industrial Exposition” used primary sources to describe the September 1791 Prague exposition on the occasion of Leopold II’s Bohemian coronation as a brilliant attempt to recover for Bohemian industries the competitive primacy they were losing to Prussian Silesia, and the motivation for this article was to prove that this exposition, not its Paris counterpart of 1798, was the world’s first. The August 1893 issue wrote about Josef Ressl (1793-1857), inventor of the screw propeller, whose invention English and American encyclopedias credited to “Shorter, Woodcroft, Smith, Ericsson, etc.,” and whose Bohemian identity on a monument at Vienna’s polytechnic institute was “erased by some zealot.” The May 1894 issue gratefully reprinted a Popular Science Monthly biography of Prokop Diviš (1696-1765) inspired by his absence from the hall of “eminent electricians” at the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago and resurrecting his claim to the lightning rod, whose invention American sources cheerfully attributed to Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790). In its last issue the Bohemian Voice wrote about “The Minerva’s Lyceum for Women” opened in Prague just four years earlier and managed to portray the Czechs as the pioneers of women’s education in Austria and as social and educational innovators with an impressive tradition since the time of Queen Libuše and Jan Amos Komenský.

Coverage of literature included contributions on literary history and criticism, but what distinguished the Bohemian Voice in this regard were its translations of original Czech literature. Frances Gregor (Františka Gregorová) wrote about Czech novelists for the
first two issues, and the final issues brought a serialized translation of French Slavist Louis Leger’s (1843-1923) essay on poet Ján Kollár (1793-1852), an original study of Sir John Bowring (1792-1872), first modern British translator of Czech and other Slavic literature, and Václav Tille’s (1867-1937) critical review of contemporary Czech literature reprinted from the London Athenaeum. Ironically, the first specimens of original Czech literature to appear in the Bohemian Voice were the poems “Nosegay” (Kytice) and “Lark” (Škřivánc) from the Queen’s Court Manuscript (Rukopis královédvorský), which T.G. Masaryk’s Athenaeum had definitively debunked as a forgery in the previous decade. However, the Young Czechs and much of Czech society pretended as if this national icon was still intact, as did the Bohemian Voice, which piously subtitled its specimens “The Most Remarkable Remnant of Bohemian Literature Composed Presumably at the End of the Thirteenth Century” and included two manuscript pages in facsimile as if it were true. Next no less a poet than Josef Václav Sládek (1845-1912), who had lived in America, translated six of his poems into English and three of Robert Burns (1759-1796) into Czech especially for the Bohemian Voice. Then, from May to July and October to December 1893, February to August 1894, and finally in October 1894, the journal published translations of nine short stories by František Herites (1851-1929), Jan Neruda (1834-1891), Svatopluk Čech (1846-1908), Jakub Arbes (1840-1914), Václav Beneš Třebízský (1849-1884) and others. In Herites’ “City Son,” urban success and German influences fill the visiting protagonist with disdain for his simple parents and for their South Bohemian village. In Čech’s “Tailor and the Sparrow” a poor but proud Czech tailor with a small boy returns the well-meaning narrator’s gift of toy soldiers, suggestive of Austrian militarism and oppression. Farmer Krakora in Beneš Třebízský’s story of the same title is a peasant preacher who defies the feudal lords’ threats and jumps to his death in the Vltava to elude a detachment of soldiers after a final sermon. These stories served the political agenda of the Bohemian Voice. Neruda’s two Prague Little Quarter stories, Čech’s “Woes of a Literary Critic,” and Arbes “Solomon of a Country Town” satirize various parts of Czech society, while Ferdinand Schulz’s (1835-1905) “Young Wife” and J.T.Ž.’s “Child
of Prague” are love stories with social overtones. In an assessment of the *Bohemian Voice* printed in *Slavie* on May 31, 1893, Frances Gregor capably criticized the translation of the first story, which she rated as one of Herites’ best. She chastised the presumably male translator ignorant of Czech embroidery for translating šátek se zlatým vyšíváním as “a kerchief with golden trimming,” preferred “Alderman” to the equally clumsy “Mr. Councilor” (*pán radní*), and concluded that the translator could have avoided the numerous awkward Bohemianisms if he had “put his work aside and made a final revision only after he forgot the original text.” By now Frances Gregor’s English translation of Božena Němcová’s classic novel *Babička* (Grandmother) was in print, and she had standing as a critic. All of these forgotten early translations of Czech short stories published in the *Bohemian Voice* deserve study today. The prominence of music in the journal’s scant coverage of the arts was no doubt an effect of Antonín Dvořák’s (1841-1904) presence in the United States, whose duration, from September 26, 1892, to April 16, 1895 (with a May 19-October 26, 1894, absence), closely matched that of the journal itself. The *Bohemian Voice* recorded the great composer’s activity and reception in the United States mostly in brief notes, but after the December 17, 1893, premiere of his New World symphony in Carnegie Hall, it reprinted a *New York Herald* review, with commentary.  

The number of printings, characteristics of subscribers and recipients, reactions of readers, and uses in other contemporary publications and in later writings are all part of a journal’s influence. In the case of the *Bohemian Voice*, the published minutes of the second BANC convention, the contemporary Czech-language press, and the journal itself are the best available sources for the first three indicators of influence. As for the journal’s archive, its fate remains to be discovered. In an August 15, 1907, letter on the BANC to Čapek’s elder brother and would-be historian, Palda wrote that Rosický “doubtless has its papers, assuming he took them from Miškovský.” Perhaps the *Bohemian Voice* archive was among them, but besides Rosický and Miškovský, editors Čapek and Král may have had these papers or a portion of them. Even Palda is a
candidate. After all, in the same letter he instructs Jan Vratislav Čapek to write to Rosický for the surviving BANC bylaws, yet Rosický wrote to Jan Vratislav Čapek only three days earlier, “I sent the bylaws and minutes of all three conventions to Palda several years ago, when he was preparing that article about the [Bohemian American] National Committee for the Osvěta.” The Thomas Capek papers at the Library of Congress contain no recognizable part of the Bohemian Voice archive. As for Miškovský, the likeliest candidate as both BANC secretary and Bohemian Voice business manager, Čapek’s memoirs from the early 1930s have him “living out his last years in an Omaha pauper’s home.” The papers of all these men, if they survive, remain to be discovered.  

As for the contents of the Bohemian Voice archive, a report from the journal’s Omaha committee published in Slavie on April 5, 1893, refers to a book of subscribers with 2,113 entries. The report gives the number of subscribers by state and city: Illinois (413), Nebraska (343), Ohio (212), Minnesota (158), Wisconsin (147), Iowa (140), New York (119), Missouri (114), Michigan (73), California (62), Pennsylvania (55), Texas (54), Kansas (49), Massachusetts (32), Maryland (27), North Dakota (21), Colorado (20), South Dakota (17), Washington (16), Oklahoma (7), another fifteen states with five or fewer, Chicago (369), Cleveland (161), St. Louis (105), New York (97), St. Paul (74), Cedar Rapids (67), Omaha (62), San Francisco (40), etc. Two subscribers in Canada and one in Europe were the only ones abroad. As mentioned above, the number of subscribers, paying or not, eventually rose to some 2,600.  

Most probably an overwhelming majority of subscribers were Czech immigrants of the so-called Freethought faction, the largest one in this ethnic group. The BANC’s officers and the Bohemian Voice editors and managers were Freethinkers, and as early as its sixth issue the journal reported itself under attack from two influential Czech Catholic newspapers, the St. Louis Hlas and Chicago Čecho-Slovan. The latter newspaper categorically declared that the Bohemian Voice “should not be tolerated in any Catholic
family.” Editor Čapek’s eloquent appeals to unity and to the support of all Czech-Americans in the same report suggest that such declarations were not to be taken lightly. As for the American-born children of Czech immigrants, those for whom Palda wanted the journal to be a “ship of salvation,” librarian Eleanor Ledbetter’s (1870-1954) experience suggests that few were subscribers or readers. Reflecting on thirteen years of service to the Czech community in Cleveland in the _Library Journal_, Ledbetter, a national leader in library service to immigrant ethnic groups, wrote of the second generation in 1923: “In their Americanization, they are very apt to leave Europe completely behind them ....” Anglo-Americans, their newspapers and their public institutions were probably also rare as _Bohemian Voice_ subscribers. Secretary Čermák wrote that the journal never intended to depend on American subscribers. Rather, his committee, the journal’s agents, and the Czech-language press were to exhort Czech-American subscribers to buy subscriptions for prominent Americans and American institutions in their localities, as the _Slavie_ did in a May 31, 1893, appeal to its readers to “to spread correct views in American circles about us and about our history and present circumstances” by buying subscriptions for public libraries, reading rooms and public figures. Among numerous reports on readers who answered such calls in _Slavie_ and _Pokrok západu_, one finds a rare report on an American who bought a subscription, a professor Alexander Cumming at the University of Michigan, which was also Editor Čapek’s alma mater! Besides distribution by paid subscription, the _Bohemian Voice_ went to some one thousand recipients free of charge at the time of the second BANC convention in November 1892, when its print run was 3,500, and to some 1,500 by the following May. _Slavie_ reported at the end of that month that the recipients were in the Anglo-American world, but Miškovský wrote four months later that several hundred promotional copies still went to Czech communities with few _Bohemian Voice_ subscribers. Free copies also went to Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, Hungary, Trieste, France, Germany, England, Russia, Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Belgium and Holland.\textsuperscript{90}
Who were the Americans and what were the American institutions for whom Czech-Ameri-
cans paid subscriptions, and what were their reactions to the journal? As early as
November 16, 1892, Čermák reported in Slavie that eager Bohemian Voice readers at the
Omaha library were also asking, in vain, for a history of Bohemia in English. In the
Slavie of September 27, 1893, Miškovský pointed to the ČSPS lodges in Crete
(Nebraska), Sioux City (Iowa) and especially Minneapolis, which bought subscrip-
tions for six libraries in that city, and to Czech-Americans from New London (Connecticut),
Quincy (Illinois) and Wilson (Kansas), who bought a subscription for the local probate
judge, to the wealthy winemaker František Korbel (1830-1920) in San Francisco, who
did so for an artists’ group, a French-American society and three others. In January
1894, Pokrok západu cited a laudatory letter to editor Čapek from the Astor Library in
New York, where Bohemian Voice readers wanted a speaker on the Czechs, and the
weekly Přítel lidu (People’s friend) in Wahoo, Nebraska, credited one Bohemian Voice
promoter for subscribing a normal school, school superintendent, Protestant minister and
Swedish Lutheran college and reported on one American reader, a county judge, who
praised the journal among colleagues and attorneys. Meanwhile, professor Cumming in
Ann Arbor wrote in his letter to Čapek, “The clearest accounts of conditions in Central
Europe, including social and political conditions, are in your journal.” Prominent
feminist Josephine Humpal-Zeman reported three copies of the Bohemian Voice at the
Women’s College, Western Reserve University, in Cleveland, and as late as August
1894 Czech-American societies in New York renewed subscriptions for seventeen
libraries, reading rooms and other institutions in their city. The Bohemian Voice even
had an unlikely admirer in the powerful German-American pro-Republican daily Illinois
Staatszeitung, which was founded by radical émigrés in 1851 and printed 23,000 copies
in the 1890s! The Bohemian Voice also published a mixed opinion from the Polish daily
in Milwaukee, Kuryer polski, which tempered its praise with disapproval of the Czech
journal’s “anti-Catholic bias.” Meanwhile, many Czech-Americans were indifferent to
the Bohemian Voice for lack of reading ability in English, as Čermák discovered two
months after he sent them three thousand of the first issue’s five thousand printings and
received responses from less than a tenth, including letters from Czech societies that
wanted no further issues because no one could read them. However, something of the
responses of others who could and did read the Bohemian Voice is preserved in the
journal’s “Letter Box” section. Thus, the “Letter Box” in the February 1894 issue
contains Čapek’s detailed answers to the queries of nine readers, including at least five
Czechs, from New York to San Francisco.\footnote{91}

As for its success as a source for other contemporary publications and later literature, its
creators rated the Bohemian Voice quite highly. Reviewing the mailing list used for the
inaugural issue, Paldá was satisfied that it included the “leading journals of all America
and Europe.” Two months later Čermák listed the newspapers that were already drawing
from the Bohemian Voice: Omaha World-Herald, Omaha Bee, American (not further
identified), Cedar Rapids Gazette (i.e. Evening Gazette), Scranton Truth, Milligan
Recorder (Nebraska), San Jose Journal (California) and “many others.” By January
1894 Pokrok západu declared that the Bohemian Voice had changed the way the
American press treated the Czechs and that its managers and editor have “countless
proofs of this.” Today the truth would require scrutiny of the American press and the
early literature of immigration, yet such a daunting labor would likely show that the
influence of the Bohemian Voice, perhaps even among the small city newspapers
Čermák listed, was modest. By 1918, when he included a fraction of its articles in his
Bohemian Bibliography, Čapek wrote, “Complete files of this magazine are now
exceedingly rare.” However, today the OCLC Online Union Catalog, the largest
electronic union catalog of American library holdings, documents that this journal is
preserved at the following libraries: Library of Congress, Indiana University at
Bloomington, University of Minnesota at Minneapolis, New York Public Library and on
microfilm at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.\footnote{92}

In June 1885, in the midst of a campaign to elevate a provincial Czech intellectual life
and reputation to a worldly level, Thomas Garrigue Masaryk (1850-1937) published a
program which his biographer and later Communist cultural minister Zdeněk Nejedlý (1878-1962) aptly valued as a “kind of Magna Charta” and which called for, among other items, a representative and “scholarly journal in a world language.” While the *Bohemian Voice* was not a scholarly journal, like the German-language *Čechische Revue* of 1907-1912 in Prague, Masaryk would have doubtless recognized and valued it as an answer to his call. As such and as a forgotten milestone and document of Czech-American and Czech history, it deserves to be reclaimed, as Shillinglaw (1978) did with Masaryk’s lost lectures on the Czechs and the Slavs at the University of Chicago in the summer of 1902. May readers today return to the *Bohemian Voice* with some of the awe that Lev J. Palda felt after reading the first issue, when he wrote to Thomas Čapek: “I cannot convey to you the wondrous feeling that overcame me at the thought that we are speaking to the whole educated world, in a world language, by and for ourselves, and this for the first time in our modern history.”
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CHAPTER X
AFTER THE VOICE

On August 12, 1907, Jan Rosický sat down at his typewriter in Omaha, Nebraska, and wrote a five-page letter to J.V. Čapek in New York City about the BANC, now thirteen years defunct. Rosický’s letterhead occupied the top quarter of every page. It was a triptych: the middle panel proclaimed his establishment, “Národní tiskárna, závod tiskařský, vydavatelský a knihkupecký” (National print shop: a printing, publishing and bookselling company). It had an award from the Paris world’s fair of 1900, and it was the “only Czech print shop in America” so distinguished. The side panels advertised Rosický’s weekly Osvěta americká, with its four local editions from Minnesota to Kansas, and the Hospodář farmer’s journal, issued every other Wednesday. This was the letterhead of a proud and preoccupied businessman.

Čapek once edited and published Czech newspapers too, then pursued other ambitions as an inventor for two inconsequential decades in his home laboratory. Now he wanted to write a history of his countrymen in America, and Rosický was answering his questions. Čapek had taken no part in the BANC, but now he evidently suggested reviving it—whether for nostalgia’s sake or in earnest. “That idea of yours seems useless to me,” wrote Rosický. “Who would you call together? Jonáš is dead. Matějka is dead. Pontius Pilate Šnajdr washed his hands. At best, Zdrůbek, Palda and I could get together. And what for? ... I would never dream of calling once more on that ‘nation’ of ours (or pseudo-nation) to do its duty.”

It was a stark confession of resignation and a dismissal of all the countrymen in America. Yet it clashed with the very letterhead under which Rosický typed it: he still made the Czech printed word his business and livelihood with undiminished commitment and advancing skill. An added line below the letterhead offered “print jobs in all languages, done well, stylishly and cheaply” on one hand, and the “largest
selection of imported books for edification, entertainment and the theater” on the other. Rosický evidently became a competitive, money-making American printer to keep at a compelling but money-losing service to the Czech printed word. “I was constantly in hot water,” replied Rosický after six weeks to Čapek’s first letter, which had caught him “hard at work” on an anniversary issue of Hospodář and a regular, thirty-two page monthly issue of Bratřík věstník (Brotherhood herald) for the Západní česko-bratřská jednota (Western Bohemian Fraternal Association).

But in the same letter, Rosický already had a publishing plan for Čapek’s book, and these four pages may offer the best insight into his last, mature years in the trade. He itemized an eight-step process from typesetting to stitching for a 288-page volume in three fascicles of six gatherings each. With a cover, which he itemized separately, it came to a dime each for a print run of three thousand copies. He would advertise Čapek’s book gratis. Then he discussed his use of sales agents in Chicago, Cleveland and New York, and his sense of the market, where he sold more “phrasebooks, dictionaries and cookbooks than all leisure titles combined.” Rosický was confident that Čapek’s work had “lasting value,” and he could publish successive volumes “every two to three months.” But he dwelled as much on this advice: “If I were in your place, I would also look for a publisher in Bohemia.” One had to face facts in America: “The intelligentsia that came here is a trifling percentage. The older people, who did not read there, don’t read here either. And the young generation, where the publishers there find the most readers, reads English here.” Twenty-one months later, in the last of six letters to J.V. Čapek, Rosický was still ready to publish what was evidently to be a three-volume history and still had shrewd business ideas to propose: “And it would probably be even better if you first printed a sample fascicle, to be sent out free to anyone who sent in two cents for postage.” Hook people on that, and they “will order the rest.” But six months passed, and on June 3, 1909, J.V. Čapek died. Twelve days later a surprised Jan Rosický wrote to Čapek’s younger brother Tomáš: “He last wrote to me about three or four months ago,” they expected to publish a completed manuscript in the summer,
and Rosický even ordered an extra typesetting machine for his shop. Now he regretted that the elder Čapek had “wasted so much time on those experiments in electricity” and that he had even come to America. Had he returned in time to Bohemia, then “we would have had gained one more outstanding writer.” Rosický turned the sense of futility to the whole collective project of Czech letters and print culture in his closing words: “So we old ones now go one after another and little will remain of us here in America!”

Indeed, Rosický would be dead by the next spring. F.B. Zdrůbek and L.J. Palda would follow within three years, while Václav Šnajdr retired from journalism. So the men who made Czech-language journalism in America since the 1860s all departed before the end of their era in 1914, when the First World War ended Bohemian migration across the Atlantic. It would resume for only another half decade after the war until American nativism triumphed in the quota laws that ended the great century of European immigration. Despite their disappointments, the old journalists did not abandon their nationalist faith and continued their work. The twenty years from the BANC to the First World War could encourage Czech nationalists in America. After all, the number of arriving countrymen approached one hundred thousand in the first decade of the twentieth century. That exceeded the 1880s—the earlier high among the seven decades to 1920—by half. And the problems that so motivated the BANC—American nativism, Central European politics, and especially assimilation in the second American generation—all remained. So did the camps and their contention—liberals/Freethinkers, Catholics and Socialists. New and younger arrivals invigorated the nationalist elite in America, but Šnajdr, Palda, Rosický and Zdrůbek worked among them for most of the twenty years to the Great War.

As for J.V. Čapek’s manuscript, it evidently remained unfinished after his death. Certainly it never appeared in print. But his brother Tomáš, younger by twenty years and a capable writer in both Czech and English, was about to become a prolific historian of the nineteenth-century Bohemian immigration. Rosický republished the younger
Čapek’s first book while waiting for the older Čapek’s manuscript. Thomas Čapek and Josef Jiří Král, the two editors of the *Bohemian Voice* and American-educated lawyers, lived and worked another four decades into the 1950s. So Jan Rosický’s 1907-1909 letters to the two Čapeks are an emblem of the doubts, efforts and continuities in the American world of Czech nationalists.

Their senior journalist and politician departed early. On January 15, 1896, as United States consul in Krefeld, Germany, Karel Jonáš shot himself. In two years the Wisconsin lieutenant governorship had turned out to be not worth its small powers and pay, and after the 1892 election Jonáš used the position in a bid to move on to Washington as a senator. He failed, and after the financial panic he was sure that Democrats had no future. To Vojta Náprstek, the elder student radical and Milwaukee journalist who was back in Prague since 1858, Jonáš confided a dream to come home too—and to publish a newspaper. More prudent was to return as United States consul, and Jonáš had the political capital to regain the appointment. But he remembered what it was like to be caught between Czech nationalists and Austrian authorities, between opposing pressures to be outspoken and circumspect. He opted for St. Petersburg—maybe as much from ambition—and promptly won the Russian assignment by mobilizing the ČSPS brotherhood and even Czech Catholic clerics to petition President Cleveland in February 1894. Then he prevailed on his party to reassign him to Prague after all, where in January 1895 he replaced the very countryman whom he had recommended to the president. But the Austrian authorities refused him for all the old reasons in his police dossier and for his Czech nationalist speech to the Chicago world’s fair just two summers earlier. By now he had no political capital left in Washington, which sent him to Krefeld. There he wrote his epitaph, inscribed in stone at Olšany, the prestigious Prague cemetery: “I have a single wish, to be laid to rest in the dear Czech soil for which I so ardently longed and for which I sacrificed everything.” In three letters to the famous poet J.V. Sládek, another fellow student radical who had returned home from America long ago, Jonáš wrote that “every refuge is like a ridicule.”5
Bedřich Jonáš (1846-1926) sold the weekly Slavie rather than to carry on after his elder brother’s death, but he proved the hardiness of the nationalism from Bohemian in his own way. “It’s no crime to be born a German, just as it’s no credit to be born a Czech,” he wrote on September 6, 1920, “but it’s a rascal who comes from a hole as purely Czech as Liegler’s and then tries to be something else.” It was a letter about old countrymen in Racine to a “dear friend,” Václav Šnajdr, who had died just two days before in California. The villain, Liegler, had carried on his furrier’s trade in Racine and was among the founders of the Slavic Linden there. But he “always passed himself off as a German,” sent his children to school in the German parish of St. Joseph, and “married off” his daughters to Germans. He could not read German and only “spoke a terrible Viennese patois that he learned as a journeyman,” yet after his death in Wisconsin, “the family consistently announced in local papers that he hailed from Austria, not far from Vienna.” In fact, he was from south Bohemia and from a family that had “never known a word of German,” as Jonáš learned from one of the several Borovany natives in Racine. Even in death, Liegler “still caused us a troublesome annoyance,” because the old Slavic Linden’s bylaws called for a farewell procession, “and so we went.” But Jonáš enjoyed narrating this experience in the terms of struggle and vindication. At St. Joseph’s the priest demanded a translation of the words on the party’s banners, but their standard-bearer, an “old cannoneer from Bohemia,” made him back down. And as for Liegler’s other fellows, those in the St. Joseph lay society, “not one came to funeral.” “They even laughed,” so Jonáš heard, “that the old donkey wanted to be a German and couldn’t speak the language.” Bedřich Jonáš had lived in America for more than fifty years, and his letterhead said “Fred Jonas,” but he still felt and wrote like the nationalists in Bohemia, whose obsessive struggle for ethnic allegiances deeply affected so many of its natives. He happened to be the brother of the senior Czech journalist and politician in America, but he was one of the ordinary individuals who peopled local Bohemian associations and society across the country.\[6\]
Catholic allegiances mattered less to Bedřich Jonáš. He denounced Liegler as a Catholic and in the same letter praised another Catholic. What evidently mattered was that Mr. Velfl, Jonáš’s informant from Liegler’s home town, shared Jonáš’s disdain for Liegler’s German affectations. Jonáš seemed to carry on his elder brother’s open attitude toward Catholic countrymen. As a Czech liberal nationalist journalist in America, Karel Jonáš avoided anticlericalism, but in the years after his 1896 suicide, his countrymen remained divided into two societies—liberal and Catholic—and the hostilities between them continued. In the arena of newspaper polemics, F.B. Zdrůbek and especially Václav Šnajdr were the familiar voices since their days as editors of the weekly *Pokrok* in Cleveland. Now other voices joined them as the Czech-language press expanded. But in the law courts, new voices took over.

While the BANC still existed, Rev. Nepomuk Jaeger, abbot of the Bohemian Benedictines in Chicago, sued Bartoš Bittner (1861-1912) for libel. Recalling Jaeger’s previous livelihood as a violinist in New York City opera, Bittner had written that the abbot, “who now raises his eyes up at the heavens, used to raise them up from below under the short skirts of plump ballerinas.” It was a piece of predictable irreverence from a satirist, and the jury acquitted Bittner. But this minor lawsuit aroused great passion in both Chicago camps of Bohemians. First, one side raised $20,000 in bail and so defeated the intentions of a hostile judge. Then—aft . . .
this dismissive synonym for “priests” into the Czech-American discourse almost three
decades before, and now “it took two policeman”—named Raggio and Smith—“to
protect [Bartinowsky] from the fury of his countrymen.”

Two Sundays later and just
two blocks away, “800 crowded into” the ČSPS hall for a counter-indignation meeting.
The “Free Thinking Bohemian Association”—as the Tribune called F.B. Zdrůbek’s
_Svobodná obec_—called it. It was the place where the BANC last met barely two years
before, and Zdrůbek was “the principal speaker”—but now Bittner was the star.

Ten years later another newcomer, František Iška (1863-1924), sued managing editor
Father Valentin Kohlbeck, Abbot Jaeger, Prior Prokop Neužil and eleven other clerics
and laymen associated with the Bohemian Benedictine newspapers _Národ_ and _Katolík_
for libel. An attorney drafted his complaint to the “Superior Court of Cook County,
August Term 1905.” Iška sought $10,000 in damages and settled for $200 to cover his
lawyer’s fees, because the defendants “delayed the law-suit for three years and would
put it off further endlessly.” But he declared that he had “attained fully everything [he]
desired through that law-suit,” because it gave “instinction [sic] to the publishers of
Catholic papers to be more prudent for the future in reprinting defamatory news.” And
their willingness to pay money to “forestall the hearing of the trial” vindicated his
character, because “of money they had plenty and readily paid our countrymen from
whom they hoped to find out something bad about Iška.” Certainly Iška did better than
one Carrie Janecek, who sued the Benedictine fathers Kohlbeck, Jaeger and Neužil, in
the same court just two years earlier for insinuating marital infidelity about her in their
newspaper: she agreed to the settlement of “paying to the defendant the sum of $350 and
the costs of the suit.” Iška also had a sense for making himself reasonable and likable, as
in this self-deprecating statement: “Some ‘criticism’ or a teasing remark I will always
forgive them, and if it be at least witty I will heartily laugh over it myself.”

Bartoš Bittner and František Iška were a generation younger than F.B. Zdrůbek and
Václav Šnajdr. Bittner left Milavče, his native village on the rugged Bavarian border, for
nearby Domažlice, where he completed the Gymnasium with distinction. After stints in the seminaries at Linz and Hradec Králové to please his mother, he studied law in Prague but left for Cedar Rapids, where he taught the Czech school in 1884, and then the big cities back East, to pursue his calling as a journalist. Iška, who was from a town (Veřejn) about twelve miles south of České Budějovice, the diocesan seat, did become a Catholic priest—for seven years. Five years later, Iška launched a national Old Catholic church in Prague. This was in 1898, almost three decades after the First Vatican Council, which declared the pope infallible and motivated the formation of Old Catholic churches in Germany, Switzerland and Austria. Iška chose the Old Slavonic language for his new church and aligned with the Russian Orthodox Church. He evidently hoped to tap into popular Panslavism and Russophilia, but it was not enough to overcome indifference to religious innovation in Czech-speaking Bohemia. And the opportunities in some of its localities were unreliable. In Hory Matky Boží, which means “Hills of the Mother of God,” some former councilmen at odds with the village priest called on Iška to proselytize there after their conviction and imprisonment. But Iška’s October 7, 1900, appearance only activated the defensive apparatus of his former diocese against him. That same day, the local priest wrote to the chancery, which four days later referred the matter for investigation to its vicar in Sušice, who reported in eight days. By then, Habsburg authorities from the Sušice captaincy had already started their own investigation with interrogations in Hory Matky Boží. There the dissident councilmen had “promised Iška that most residents would convert to his new faith,” wrote the vicar. But Iška managed to “enter just five new apostates in his notebook” before he took the train back to Prague, and now even these were in doubt as diocesan and state authority intimidated the villagers.

By April 22, 1904, after an earlier sojourn, František Iška was in America for good. On that day, Zdrůbek’s old Jednota svobodomyslných (Union of Freethinkers) formed an Ústřední svobodná obec (Central Free Community) in Chicago. It was an obvious step toward a new try at ideological vigor and mass organization in the liberal camp, and Iška
was the reason for new ambitions. Zdrůbek, now past sixty, was chairman of the new central body. August Geringer’s new son-in-law and editor, R.J. Pšenka, not yet thirty, was secretary. A third major role was “organizer,” and it was Iška’s. \textsuperscript{13} Iška was the new crusader, and he aroused a broader front of hostility than Zdrůbek did thirty-five years earlier. When the Benedictines found themselves in the Superior Court of Cook County answering for libel, the evidence against them was actually a piece that they had reprinted from the \textit{Volnost}. That was a liberal daily in Cleveland, but when Iška spoke there as the Freethinker Union’s organizer, it instead portrayed him as a man of vices—a cardsharp who played all night at Frank J. Truneček’s saloon to make his money and even wanted to visit the local “tenderloin” before he finally took a train back to Chicago. \textsuperscript{14} For their defense, the Benedictines produced an English translation from the Chicago \textit{Spravedlnost}, the new Socialist organ. It was a dismissive biography of Iška as opportunist—one who quit the priesthood to marry a rich widow, took a bogus theology doctorate in Switzerland, where he could not fool his way into appointment as a Protestant minister, and played both sides back in Bohemia, where he wrote for the \textit{Ostdeutsche Rundschau} of Herman Wolf, an anti-Czech German Old Catholic. Iška only became a Freethinker in Chicago, where he parted company with Polish Old Catholic bishop Kozlowski for more lucrative prospects with August Geringer, the self-made publisher—even as his wife and daughter kept the crucifix up at home and attended an Irish Catholic church. \textsuperscript{15}

But both hostile newspapers conceded one positive point to Iška—that he was a good orator. He proved them right with his performance in the new role of organizer for Geringer and successor to Zdrůbek. He paid at least two visits to Cleveland, where he brought in $70 with one lecture, as the Benedictines learned during their libel trial from a local informant. \textsuperscript{16} His efforts culminated in the June 13-15, 1907, founding of the \textit{Svaz svobodomyslných} (Union of Freethinkers). It was another attempt at mass organization, as if to match and counter the Catholic Church and its parishes. Instead, it again revealed that if a majority of Bohemians stayed out of the church in America, it was a majority of
indifference and not one for reformation, positivism or any other grand commitment. The Svaz became another small intellectual club, an unremarkable offspring of Zdrůbek’s Jednota in the coming decades. But it was remarkable in inception, because it brought together 268 delegates at the ČSPS hall on Chicago’s West Eighteenth Street. The ČSPS itself had just 175 delegates at its 1891 Cedar Rapids convention. It never came even close to that number again, and all the other fraternal benefit societies, including the women’s and Catholic ones, had a smaller national membership to represent, as did the Sokol gymnastic societies. So the 1907 gathering to launch the Svaz svobodomyslných was remarkable among representative conventions of Czech-speaking Americans in the half-century before World War I for its scale. It was a big forum for old and new personalities to remake the half-century’s contests and projects before the Transatlantic migration ended.

“Lately I had the opportunity to travel down a long line of Czech communities in the United States and everywhere the wish was set forth, friends, that we should come together.” So declared František Iška in his opening address as chairman of the convention’s organizing committee. A new motivational speaker and a large lecture circuit were the most obvious influences to be credited, but Iška emphasized Omaha’s Svobodná obec, one of the Zdrůbek-inspired locals from the last thirty-five years. In November, at his most recent appearance, Iška had brought the common wish from across the land to the “brothers and sisters there,” local speaker Jan Rosický made a proposal, and they became first to take up work for the convention. Its published minutes acknowledged another 1860s-era immigrant, August Geringer: the organizing committee had to “work against the prejudice” that the convention would serve a “certain Chicago publishing firm” and its ambitions. Indeed, the committee wrote to over one thousand associations and publications, while newspapers announced often that every secular association had the “right to join the convention and should apply in case it was inadvertently overlooked.” The response was a great success, which the published minutes recorded in a listing of delegates that ran to seven pages. First were the
delegates for the ČSPS—for its national grand lodge (then in St. Louis), four state grand lodges (Illinois, Ohio, Minnesota, New York) and forty-three local lodges. Then came twenty-six ZČBJ lodges, those of five more fraternal benefit societies, twenty Svobodné obce, New York’s Národní jednota sokolská, seventeen local Sokols, the Jednota českých dam and three other women’s fraternals. The seventeen “various associations” represented the Bohemian National Cemetery (Chicago), Czechs schools, singers, book lovers, unionized typographers and war veterans. Whole cities—Omaha, Cedar Rapids, Milwaukee, Baltimore and Wilber, Nebraska—sent delegates for their “Federations of Associations.” Seven newspapers sent delegates, and at the list’s end were twenty-nine “Individuals,” who represented their own personal enthusiasm for the convention and its ideas. It was indeed a large and representative convocation of Bohemian liberal nationalist society in America.\textsuperscript{18}

It was also a great and parting meeting of generations before the war. Jan Rosický came for the Omaha Svobodná obec. F.B. Zdrůbek was the choice of Vyšehrad in Niobrara, Nebraska, a lodge of brothers in ZČBJ, Rosický’s western fraternal. L.J. Palda spoke for the federated associations of Cedar Rapids. These three great journalists and public figures of the past half-century would depart in the next six years. The Chicago convention was a late reunion with others of their own generation and some younger colleagues. Josef Buňata (1846-1934), the old New York cigarmaker, journalist and Socialist, came as the delegate for ČSPS lodges in Chicago and Omaha, a Svobodná obec in Sunnyside, Texas, and the Stráž osvojených of unaffiliate Chicago Freethinkers. He would organize countrymen in Texas and Louisiana for the Czechoslovak independence movement, and he would remain a voice in the ČSPS, which he joined in 1875 Detroit, into the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{19} Vincent V. Vojtíšek (1856-1932), another old Socialist, came for the New York state lodge of ČSPS. He took part in every ČSPS convention from 1880 to 1918 as “head of the New York delegation” and chaired the brotherhood in 1899-1904. He would chair its August 1918 Chicago convention before leaving New York, where he was an attorney, to live out his final decade in the new
Czechoslovak Republic. A.J. Čejka of St. Louis topped the great 1907 Chicago delegate list as ČSPS chairman for the 1904-1909 term, and his career in the brotherhood would last at least two more decades. When the ČSPS merged with four other old Bohemian fraternals to form the Československé spolky v Americe (ČSA, Czechoslovak Society of America) in the winter of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s inauguration as United States president, the coordinating committee of five men included three who had been to Chicago in 1907, and they worked on one more decade into World War II. František J. Holman, who came for three of the twelve participating Jednota Táboritů (Union of Taborites) fraternal locals, lived on to be elected vice-president of ČSA in 1934 and even to be the “heart and soul” of the second wartime Czechoslovak liberation in St. Louis until his death before the 1942 ČSA convention.

Jan Rudiš Jičínský (1862-1930) and Josef Jiří Král (1870-1951) were two younger colleagues of the old journalists. Jičínský, a Cedar Rapids physician, had represented the National Sokol Union on the BANC. Král, a Chicago lawyer, was the second and final editor for the BANC’s Bohemian Voice in 1894. Now Jičínský again represented the National Sokol Union, in New York, while Král was delegate for Chicago ČSPS lodge R.H. Vickers, no. 63, named for the Scotch Irish immigrant whose history of Bohemia the BANC had paid to publish. In World War I, Jičínský would devote his skills to the Serbian army and then as an American Red Cross captain to the Czechoslovak Legion in Siberia, where he suffered an eventually fatal head injury. Before death he recovered enough to begin contributing a memoir to the Chicago Svornost and Denní hlasatel.

Král successively edited Šnajdr’s Dennice novověku (Cleveland), the BANC’s Bohemian Voice, Jonáš’s posthumous Slavie (Racine, Wisconsin), the brotherhood’s Orgán ČSPS, and the Socialist Spravedlnost (Chicago) in the two decades between graduating from the University of Michigan and joining the Federal Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce (August 1911), where he worked until retirement three decades later. He was well-placed to serve Professor Thomas Masaryk’s Czechoslovak independence
movement as a Washington specialist on Germany’s and Austria’s wartime trade operations. By then, Král was a prolific publicist for liberal American Bohemia. August Geringer published his criticism of the Bible; the Socialist Spravedlnost press his pamphlets (American labor, Abraham Lincoln) and translation of Charles Darwin; and the Freethinker societies more of his pamphlets—on Ladimír Klácel as their first American philosopher and on Jan Hus for the wartime’s three-hundredth anniversary of his burning in German Constanz at the hands of the Catholic Church. Král’s largest publication was a compilation and translation of “laws and legal commentaries especially important for Czech-American settlers”—not “immigrants”—in almost four hundred pages.

After the war, Král signed his ongoing government publications with the title “commercial economist.” He was indeed a guest of many distinctions when he addressed the first convention of the ČSA as a greater successor to the ČSPS fraternal organization (1934). Five days before the Munich Agreement to appease Adolf Hitler, Král was chief speaker at a mass rally of countrymen in Chicago, and during the war he and Czechoslovak President Eduard Beneš’s elder brother Vojta teamed up as publicists. Král was also a literary voice. He began contributing stories to Geringer’s Amerikán almanac in the first years after his 1889 arrival in Chicago. When the New yorské listy launched a more ambitious almanac—intellectually and typographically—in 1922, Král was a constant contributor until its 1939 demise. He also appeared in its Cleveland counterpart, at the Americké dělnické listy, which published a volume of his stories in 1926 and again twenty years later in an expanded English edition. Six months before turning seventy and at home with pleurisy, Král wrote to his “dear and esteemed friend” Thomas Čapek that the doctor had also found his blood pressure “too low and circulation bad, as if [he] were some kind of newspaper.” It was also a metaphor for a man absorbed in the world of Czech journalism. He used personalized letterhead as an officer of the “Český kroužek ve Washingtoně (The Bohemian Circle of Washington).” It was a month before the fall of France, and he had just published an “almost prophetic
“satire” from the deceased Karel Čapek in the Sunday Washington Post. Half a century after the Bohemian Voice, Král still worked this reverse vector, translating from Czech into English and addressing the great Anglo-American audience.\(^{29}\)

Many other younger men and more recent arrivals from Bohemia came to the ČSPS hall on Chicago’s West Eighteenth Street in June 1907. Some carried on the continuities with the old journalists, fraternal brothers and their world past the 1940s in work, memory and longevity. When 1907 turned into 1970, the Czechoslovak National Council of America (CNCA) in Cicero published Panorama, a book of over three hundred pages subtitled A Historical Review of Czechs and Slovaks in the United States of America. Less then six miles due west from Grant Park on the Michigan shoreline, Cicero is closer to the heart of Chicago than any other suburb, and it was the place that Bohemians made most their own on their twentieth-century westward migration into the suburbs and assimilation as Czechoslovaks and Czech-Americans. The CNCA was the ethnic group’s most inclusive political organization. The BANC was its forerunner—even in the inclusion of Slovaks—but the CNCA joined and outlasted three odboje (resistance movements), the popular term for the different and successive efforts to establish a Czechoslovak Republic after World War I, restore it after World War II and stand against its Communist dictatorship in the Cold War. In the same half-century, the CNCA spanned successive waves of arrivals to America and successive American-born generations. In Panorama, it invoked the Slavic Lindens, the BANC and the small 1860s generation of journalists around Karel Jonáš as part of its rich nineteenth-century American genealogy. Half of Panorama was a collection of biographies that joined all the generations in one alphabet. It “cover[ed] the widest possible range of individuals, from the penniless pioneer farmer and miner to the industrialist and educator.” For many subjects—and not just those deceased—the entries include the lives and work of their children. The American-born evidently contributed, and so the collection is no idealized pantheon but a multi-generational demonstration of living continuity and surviving consciousness. Remarkably, two of the subjects were important figures in the great
convention of 1907: Petr Rabštejnek (1874-1961) was not long deceased, and Rudolf Janda (b. 1878) was still living.\textsuperscript{30}

Rabštejnek came to Chicago all the way from El Reno, west of Oklahoma City, to represent his local ZČBJ fraternal lodge. He was from the sparsely-peopled west of Bohemia, from the same small town on the language divide (Kožlany) as his “close friend” Vojta Beneš (1878-1951), brother of the eventual Czechoslovak president. It was an area of emigration to America, and Rabštejnek left his cottage-weaver parents for an education in New York and Chicago. Instead, he fled the panic into farming in Nebraska and then Oklahoma, where he took up real estate. This work and the ZČBJ made for an association with Jan Rosický, but Rabštejnek was also the Oklahoma correspondent for Geringer, Zdrůbek and their Chicago daily Svornost into the 1940s.\textsuperscript{31} Rudolf Janda was the organizing committee’s secretary in 1907, and his enormous dedication and stamina were largely what made the convention so big.

Rabštejnek and Janda were also threads in a new fabric of publishers, editors and newspaper contributors that this convention showed off. Time and the listing of delegates, who represented associations, largely obscured the contingent from the new “literary” community, but it was there. Rabštejnek exemplifies the ties that wove the old figures and their creations into the larger new fabric. He worked with Rosický, Zdrůbek and Geringer from Oklahoma, a far new island of countrymen. Janda also came from rural Bohemia (around Rokycany) but stayed in Chicago, where he arrived in 1891, worked as typesetter for the Denní hlasatel (Daily herald) to 1903, and “later became foreman and superintendent” at the National Printing Company. So goes his biography in the Panorama of 1970.\textsuperscript{32} It told his life in one small paragraph, but it is enough to connect him with at least three fellow delegates in Chicago a lifetime earlier—František J. Kuták, Rudolf Bubeníček and Jan E. Zárobský.

Typesetters on strike against August Geringer and two smaller Bohemian shops
launched the *Denní hlasatel* on May Day 1891. “Most were unmarried, almost all lived with their parents,” and so the publishing corporation that some forty young men formed had “only a few hundred dollars” for capital. Yet the *Denní hlasatel* endured for a century and became the last Czech daily in America. Kuták (b. 1873), president of Bohemian Typographical Union no. 2, became its first editor and corporate chairman. As we saw in an earlier chapter, Kuták was perhaps the most far-ranging Bohemian newspaperman in America. He worked by turns in Chicago, Cleveland, New York and Omaha for employers that included Geringer, Šnajdr and Rosický. He stayed at the *Denní hlasatel* just eleven months. But with 1,800 subscribers, it already overtook Geringer’s *Svornost* to become the largest Czech daily in America, as its first anniversary issue proclaimed. It was the revolution of a younger generation in New World Czech journalism. Typesetters became editors, owners and managers. In three years the *Denní hlasatel* bought a rotary press, then it soon raised the stone building that became another West Eighteenth Street institution in the decades to come. It faced the Pilsen Sokol hall, which arose in the same years on the intersection with Ashland Avenue. In 1907, F.J. Kuták came to the great convention some eight blocks east as the delegate for a local ČSPS lodge—*Darwin*, no. 61. Rudolf Bubeníček (1887-1958) came for the Chicago *Dělnický Sokol* (Workingmen’s Sokol).

It was only the second year in America for the native from Louny, the largest Czech town on the Ohře River in the developing and contested northwest. Bubeníček became a draftsman for the Western Electric Company in Cicero, which succeeded the lumberyards on the South Chicago River as a common employer among Bohemians. He also became their best historian. No one marshaled more sources about their institutions in the city. He collected them for three decades and subjected them to a level of comparative source criticism that makes his narrative read like the work of a professional. Bubeníček first published his 568-page *Dějiny Čechů v Chicagu* (History of the Czechs in Chicago) as a series in the *Denní hlasatel*. 
Jan E. Zárobský was the delegate for another local ČSPS lodge in 1907—Jan Neruda, no. 181. He also operated the Národní tiskárna (National Printing and Publishing Company), which he founded sixteen years earlier. It had a half-page advertisement in the 1926 volume to commemorate fifty years of Geringer’s Svornost daily. “Secretary-treasurer” Rudolf Janda was one of just six principals named here, and a streetcar with bystanders accentuated the size of their smokestack-topped building on Blue Island Avenue near its intersection with Ashland and Twenty-Second (now Cermak). In the mile beyond this southwest corner of Pilsen, the diagonal Blue Island Avenue passed McCormick’s reaper works, where Bohemian labor took blows in 1886, and turned into West Twenty-Sixth Street, the corridor of Bohemian commerce and affluence across Lawndale and into Cicero and Berwyn. Zárobský’s Národní tiskárna proclaimed itself the largest Czech printer in America in 1926 and again seven years later, when it had a full page in a volume to commemorate the Czechoslovak presence at Chicago’s second world’s fair, the Century of Progress Exposition. It was the lead advertisement, opposite an essay that thanked advertisers for making such a handsome volume possible—in 25,000 copies for just a quarter each amidst the “economic panic.” The Národní tiskárna now “employed over two hundred people in normal times.” Its stockholders and directors were still Czech, and it proudly listed twenty-two past and present periodicals that it issued. The portfolio spanned ideology and even gender, from anticlerical satirist Bartoš Bittner’s Šotek (Imp), radical Socialist František Hlaváček’s Pochodeň (Torch) and feminist Josephine Humpal-Zeman’s Ženské listy (Women’s paper) to the Catholic Jednota (Union), one of five Bohemian fraternal benefit society organs. The company even made a good American business of old Panslavic (or at least Austroslavic) dreams from the European homelands, issuing the fraternal, Catholic and Socialist periodicals of kindred peoples overtaking the Bohemians in urban America and joining them in the Pilsen neighborhood—two in Slovak, two in Croatian and three in Slovenian.³⁵ It could also encourage a broader range of Bohemian voices as a vanity press. Jan Lad. Kuták’s (b. 1868) fiftieth-birthday volume amounted to a hundred fifty pages of his poetry, memories of the Písek Gymnárium, and sketches of countrymen and places between
Minnesota and Texas from his quarter-century as a traveling salesman, briefly for publisher August Geringer and then for the Korbel brothers, California vintners. But the Národní tiskárna also issued some landmark volumes, from the minutes of great Freethinker convention of 1907 to the lavishly illustrated Century of Progress celebration of Czechoslovak America in essays and advertisements a quarter-century later. Son Edward Zarobsky, born in Chicago (1892), led the company on as president from 1920.

We can follow Rudolf Janda like a thread through the delegate list from the great gathering of 1907, which he called together as secretary, to at least one more name in the younger generations that came to cultivate the world of Czech letters after the old journalists—Richard Mejdrich. By 1933, three more Chicago printers advertised in the Century of Progress volume besides the big four—Národní tiskárna, Bohemian Benedictines, Socialist Spravedlnost and Geringer’s Svornost (but not Denní hlasatel). “R. Mejdrich & Co.” on South Lawndale Avenue was one of them. He issued souvenir books for the Sokol gymnastic meets, new printings of Karel Jonáš’s Czech-English dictionary, a fiftieth-anniversary history of F.B. Zdrůbek’s Bohemian National Cemetery, Rudolf Bubeníček’s landmark new history of Bohemian Chicago, but also Berwyn’s city ordinances. Richard Mejdrich evidently died in 1937, but an heir carried on. Even the advertisement mentioned a “Lad. Mejdrich,” who was also prominent in the young generation then revitalizing the ČSA fraternal benefit brotherhood as leaders of English-speaking lodges. As late as 1952, the Mejdrich firm, still at its old address on the block south of West Twenty-Sixth Street, issued a monumental seventy-fifth anniversary history of the Bohemian National Cemetery—and its editor was Rudolf Janda.

In 1907, Richard Mejdrich was delegate for the Svobodná obec in Letcher, South Dakota. Janda, besides his larger role in the convention, was delegate for another such local from Zdrůbek’s old Union of Freethinkers—in Petersburg, Virginia. But Janda and
Mejdrich already collaborated in Chicago’s *Stráž osvojených* (Guard of Freethinkers). This was a new association that arose from probably the worst episode of bad publicity for Bohemians in the Anglo press since the Haymarket era. In 1899, František K. Ringsmuth commenced a “merciless” campaign, as he would recall it, against the “atheist Czech press” for glorifying and encouraging the suicides of desperate countrymen who could not keep up their payments in the fraternal benefit brotherhoods. Earlier that decade, this literary talent—once a Rosický editor—and his weekly *Svit* in Cedar Rapids targeted the BANC. Now “one doctor, two pastors and several Christians” formed a *České bratrstvo* (Bohemian Brotherhood) there and distributed “more than 50,000” copies of Ringsmuth’s manifesto in Chicago alone, reported the *Tribune* on Wednesday, September 20, under the title “War on Suicide Cult.” By Sunday, F.B. Zdrůbek and attorney James E. Cross addressed “one thousand Bohemians” at the ČSPS hall on West Eighteenth Street. Three Sundays later, Cedar Rapids had its mass meeting. Professor Bohumil Shimek spoke for the ČSPS among L.J. Palda, Sokol leader Jan Rudiš Jičínský and other orators. The spokesmen of liberal Bohemian America marshaled exonerating statistics in meetings and in the press, in Czech and in English. The venerable ČSPS and other fraternals were not “suicide clubs,” but who knew if it was enough to scrub away an image like that in Protestant Anglo-America? After all, Ringsmuth’s “doctor” personally delivered it to Congregational minister Charles Monroe Sheldon (1857-1946) during that rising national celebrity’s sensational March 1900 week as guest editor of the *Topeka Daily Capital*. And Sheldon made it front-page news.

Bohemian indignation meetings declared Ringsmuth a “traitor” and boycotted his weekly out of business. The local Cedar Rapids Sokol ended Ringsmuth’s two decades in the nationalist gymnastic society with an ostentatious expulsion ceremony and disgraced him with a public parade. A Guard of Freethinkers formed in Cedar Rapids after Chicago, where Carrie Janecek unsuccessfully sued the Benedictine editor-fathers as its member. Hostility turned easily back to the familiar Catholics, but the “suicide cult” affair of 1900 raised the disturbing new peril of disrepute in Protestant Anglo
society. In the 1880s anarchists and radical Socialists were the villains, and liberal Bohemia could disown them. But now came a direct attack, one not easily forgotten. It could only contribute to the motivations that made the ČSPS and other fraternals send so many delegates to the great gathering of 1907. They made it great: the list of all delegates ran to thirteen printed columns, and those from the fraternals filled eight of them. Two years later, at its convention in Milwaukee, the formerly non-ideological ČSPS declared its allegiance to Freethought.46

The great gathering defined Freethought and launched an organization to interpret and promote it further. It did its work, but it also made quite a stage for old and new voices to contend. They did contend—over Socialism. Some delegates wanted to make it as much a part of Freethought as anticlericalism; others resisted. The antipathy between rural West and urban East, between propertied classes and wage labor, reappeared here. It had strained the ČSPS brotherhood to a break-up ten years earlier. Jan Rosický was patriarch of the Western dissidents and their new ZČBJ brotherhood then, and he was still a chief actor now. His New York nemesis, Vincent V. Vojtíšek, was present but silent. The other side was younger now, so 1907 was also something of a contest between the generations. The Social Democrats became the largest Czech party in the Viennese parliament that year. Their mass appeal both democratized the right to vote, which now belonged to all men at last, and it won the election. In the seventeen years since the Habsburg state gave up persecuting them, the Social Democrats, amidst several new parties and a youth movement, democratized politics, press and culture, so the younger and more recent voices in 1907 Chicago were from a different Bohemia.47

The first clash came just as the convention was about to start off on its agenda. It had reconvened on Thursday, June 13, after a morning of preliminaries, when František J. Sadílek (1851-1933) took the floor to propose that “we express thanks and joy that we live in a free country that gives us the opportunity to gather here and discuss Freethought.” Karel Pergler (1882-1954) welcomed Sadílek’s resolution but called for a
“small addendum”—that “as United States citizens we also protest with utmost resolve against the violation of the guaranties in this country’s constitution, which were violated by the illegal violation of the civil rights of labor leaders Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone.” As Pergler spoke to his countrymen, the state of Idaho was five weeks into its irregular (but ultimately unsuccessful) trial of Big Bill Haywood and his Western Federation of Miners comrades as the alleged murderers of its former governor. And just two years before in Chicago, some two hundred delegates had formed the radically anti-capitalist Industrial Workers of the World, which Haywood addressed as the “Continental Congress of the working class.” Four more delegates joined Sadílek and Pergler’s exchange of views—three of them for Pergler. Rudolf Bubeníček, the marvelously judicious future historian of Czech Chicago, was more radical at this early moment in his American life: “We have no cause to give thanks to a country where they murder workers—and workers we are all.” Former Bohemian Voice editor J.J. Král said, “If ‘country’ is to mean gratitude to the government, then I don’t know why we should thank President Roosevelt. He didn’t give us anything. We are grateful to this republic’s founders for the freedom we enjoy, but we cannot be grateful to a government that tramples the rights of workers and abducts them across state lines.” Amid conflicting calls for what to do with Sadílek’s proposal and Pergler’s addendum, convention chairman Jan Pecha (1857-1932) resorted to the gavel and appealed for interpersonal issues to be avoided. A vote referred the troublesome Sadílek-Pergler item to the Resolutions Committee. But on Saturday afternoon, at the convention’s end, Sadílek and Pergler successively repeated their appeals, then withdrew them in the same order.48

F.J. Sadílek, aged 55, represented the Nebraska town of Wilber. Pergler, just 25, came as an interested citizen. Both men came from tradesmen’s and innkeeping families in remote highland Bohemia, but their times and careers after these common origins were different. Sadílek could only attend school to age fourteen, then completed an apprenticeship in his father’s trade—saddlemaking. His family left Ledeč nad Sázavou in 1868 because it lost its livelihood. Sadílek was seventeen. He took up his trade in
Wilber but also kept up interests and officeholding in politics, banking and the ZČBJ brotherhood, in which he was Jan Rosický’s close friend. Pergler’s butcher father in Liblín, on the Berounka downstream from Plzeň, was a Social Democrat, and persecution motivated the family move to Chicago in 1890. Aged eight, Pergler was young enough for an American education, which continued at the Plzeň Gymnasium after his father’s death (1898) and the family’s return to Bohemia. Pergler followed his father into the party and attracted attention as a talented public speaker. Another influence was his friend and comrade Antonín Pravoslav Veselý (1873-1904), a chief journalist of the youth movement. But conscription awaited in 1903, when Czech youth was sharpening its antimilitaristic reputation and reception in the Habsburg army.

Pergler returned to Chicago and became an editor of the Socialist Spravedlnost. Another Spravedlnost editor, J.J. Král, spoke up for him at the Freethinkers convention in 1907. By the next year Pergler earned a bachelor’s from Chicago’s Kent College of Law and opened a small-town practice in Iowa. In World War I, Pergler was chief American publicist for the Czechoslovak independence movement as director of the Slav Press Bureau in New York, which the České národní sdružení (Bohemian National Alliance) and Slovenská liga (Slovak League) formed in May 1917. By then he was already an effective lobbyist in Congress, where he had connections. But after the war Pergler had a clash of egos with his boss, Foreign Minister Eduard Beneš, and Pergler became something of a political refugee from Masaryk and Beneš’s Czechoslovakia and their lifelong American critic. He earned a civil law master’s from American University and distinguished his career as dean of the National University College of Law (now part of George Washington University) in 1936-1946. As such he would write home that “everything bad that I had to endure always came from Czech hands, while all the best that came to me was from American hands. The result is that for America I have only feelings of gratitude and respect for its firm rule of law.” That was quite a distance traveled since 1907 Chicago.

There Pergler and Sadílek made a dramatic frame for the convention, but the contention
of generations, places and persuasions that they embodied filled much of what happened between their opening and closing standoffs. The convention formed four committees to do its work. In order of importance they were the Committee to Clarify the Nature of Freethought; Resolutions Committee; Committee on Organization, Schools and Press; and Committee for Developing Relations with Other Nationalities. Right after Pergler versus Sadílek, F.B. Zdrůbek opened the question of defining Freethought to the whole gathering. He wanted to simplify the job ahead for his committee, which had received twelve written proposals. The pressure of time was already palpable, but the prospect of turning Freethought to the economic order provoked a six-page debate. Chairman Pecha was ready to return the matter to its committee after this strange, revival-style declaration from Petr Rabštejněk, the Oklahoman, who raised a “thunderous applause”: “So far only big city types have spoken, so now a farmer will have a say. My lodge, which sent me here, has 54 people and not one told me when I set out that the convention should help us build grain elevators. They said, ‘Go and talk to them about how we could best organize, best raise our children, and how we should spread enlightenment, which we need. Go and tell them to send us good speakers, so that these might inspire our spirits’.” It was a thrilling cut to another rhetorical world.

Early on day two, Friday, Jan Rosický presented a single recommendation from the Resolutions Committee—that the “business of this convention and the activity of the Union of Freethinkers, which we intend to found, be limited to the educational field and to religious Freethought.” J.R. Jičínský seconded, and Pergler objected that it would disqualify the Union from its intended membership in the *Fédération Internationale des Sociètes de Libre Pensée*, permanently established in Brussels by an international convention there in 1880. Rosický invoked Rabštejněk, who was on his committee, and Western solidarity against “any working-class demands.” Chairman Pecha admonished participants for poor civility, and debate ran for just two pages. A vote passed the resolution, and Pecha brushed off the reaction: “I cannot give the floor to thirty of you at once.”
Then the Committee to Clarify the Nature of Freethought returned from its own session, and it was also divided. Dr. J.E.S. Vojan, who was its secretary, and Dr. František Iška each read his own “Comprehensive Declaration of the Principles of Freethought.” Vojan wrote three paragraphs—one each on “world view,” “ethics” and “tactics.” To Freethinkers, only indestructible matter and energy made up the universe. The law of evolution ruled it, and modern science and philosophy would completely explain it, eventually. Ethics were another work in progress, based on the common good and historical experience. As to its program, Freethought called for argument and not toleration of “religion, which had a certain justification in past times of lower cultural development, but which lost that justification with the rise of modern science and philosophy.” For all “true supporters of freedom,” this critical imperative was reflexive: “constant self-education” was a must, or dogmatism was inevitable even for them. And they were to apply it everywhere, to all the fetishisms beyond religion, because the “political, economic and social order is not an end in itself but exists for the good of the citizens.” These structures “must evolve” to perfect the common welfare. Iška opened his declaration this way: “We Czech Americans, who reject obsolete clerical views in favor of a purely scientific view of life and reality, do form the Union of Freethinkers in order to better secure—for ourselves, our families and society—freedom, peace, welfare and contentment in this life.” Vojan had opened this way: “Freethinkers substitute modern science, philosophy and ethics for religion.” The two men really did not differ on substance, yet both emphasized their differences, each spoke up for his declaration, and neither discouraged the evident factionalism that others took up around them and carried on for the next five pages. Vojan’s was the majority proposal, with six votes in a committee of nine, and it now got a “large majority” of votes outside it. But even that did not end the matter.52

That afternoon the Committee on Organization submitted its bylaws for the new Union of Freethinkers to debate, and delegates approved parts of it, including membership in
the Brussels-based Freethinker International. Then someone argued that this conflicted with the Rosický resolution adopted earlier. At its 1904 Rome world congress, as one sympathetic delegate had already quoted in Czech translation, that International “saluted all the world’s proletariat” and “declared that intellectual and moral emancipation is only possible along with the material and economic liberation of the working class from capitalist oppression.” Vojan, with an assist from Pergler, checked the challenge: “By legal principle a later law cancels an earlier one.” But after another debate he still felt the need to defend himself, his “purely working-class” New York Freethinker local, and his declaration on Freethought, which the convention had already adopted: “We are recommending no particular social system or order, and we are not declaring ourselves for anything that comes out of working-class circles.” Yet the next day, Saturday, the morning session immediately turned back to the Vojan and Iška declarations and an even longer, ten-page debate. A subtext for the challenge was that Vojan’s version represented socialism. But a new vote evidently produced few changes of mind: it reaffirmed Vojan 120 to 67.\textsuperscript{53}

Sides and generations even clashed in the closing session, on Saturday afternoon. Late in business, the Resolutions Committee reported, so that delegates could vote its five still unresolved draft items up or down. That done, convention secretary Rudolf Janda asked the committee what it had done with a resolution from Chicago’s Bohemian local no. 330 of the International Typographical Union. It declared that “full freedom of thought is unattainable in a society where individuals and entire classes are socially dependent.” It argued that the labor movement, especially those unions that tried to “include all workers of a particular industry,” was “among the best means to the economic and social improvement of the working class and to the spiritual rebirth and freedom of all mankind.” And so ITU local 330 appealed for the convention to “voice ardent sympathy for the labor union movement and for all Freethinkers to support it to their best abilities.” ITU local 330 had already submitted this document to the convention when J.J. Král read it there and “ardently endorsed” it in a two-page speech as early as
Thursday afternoon. “Today people do not leave their homeland for faith,” he said, “but out of poverty, and all of us here are living proof of that economic pressure.” Král the Socialist wanted no collective declaration for socialism, because meaningful allegiance required individual intellectual effort. He just wanted respect and sacrifice for the union label. But Jan Rosický and his Resolutions Committee, which reported to the three-day convention five times, ignored the Chicago typographers and his younger colleague from the days of the BANC and Bohemian Voice. Now Rosický’s reply to secretary Janda’s direct question was to request that the sidelined resolution be referred back to his committee. But that was about to disperse along with the convention, and three delegates spoke up for the resolution, including Chicago’s Dr. Antonín Radešinský (d. 1936), longtime chief physician for the ČSPS brotherhood. Convention chairman Pecha ordered the resolution read aloud, Rosický moved to table it and was defeated 82 to 64, whereupon the resolution passed 112 to 64—and to “shouts of joy from the majority and dismay from the minority amidst demonstrations of support from the assembled observers.” It was a vote quite close to the one that morning for Vojan over Iška and the statement of principles.\[54\]

Dr. Jaroslav Egon Salaba Vojan (1872-1944) came to New York just three years earlier as an editor for both of its Czech dailies, Newyorské listy and Hlas lidu, both founded in the radicalism of 1886. A typographical union still published the former and a “Bohemian Workingmen’s Cooperative Association” the latter. For thirty-five years Cleveland’s Václav Šnajdr had the most distinguished academic career from Bohemia, but now it was Vojan. In 1898, he earned a doctorate in law in Prague, where he was president of the Czech law student society and vice president of Slávie, the main student society. Then he taught at the business college and contributed to the Czech legal and economic literature. Vojan was no student refugee like Šnajdr, but his 1890s generation carried on the next and greater contest with the Habsburg state after the 1860s. And Vojan made his own nationalist career on the central committee of the Ústřední matice školská and as secretary for the Národní jednota severočeská, which both raised funds
for Czech minority schools in German districts.\textsuperscript{55} Vojan invoked Herbert Spencer and his Czech interpreter, philosopher František Krejčí, as influences for his 1907 Chicago declaration on Freethought. Iška claimed that his own declaration came out F.B. Zdrůbek’s “thirty years of work,” that their own Zdrůbek made better sense to the countrymen in America, and that Vojan’s declaration was too sophisticated. Others joined in for and against. Was it really a criticism of Vojan as a young new elitist from Bohemia? When that failed on Friday, Iška claimed on Saturday that Vojan’s declaration endorsed socialism.\textsuperscript{56}

Iška was the favorite of the rural West. Of twenty-six ŽČBJ lodges represented at the convention, Iška was the delegate for five. And all but two of the twenty-nine admirers who signed a successful Saturday afternoon “Recognition for Dr. Iška” resolution were from the vast interior beyond Chicago. “Thanks to his efforts,” they wrote, “our Czech nationality is much revived in the countryside,” where countrymen lacked “opportunity for the education available in the big city communities.”\textsuperscript{57} But during the war Iška criticized the Czechoslovak independence movement and exhausted his means and emotions in an unsuccessful lawsuit against the daily Svornost and other efforts to deliver himself from disrepute as an alleged hireling of the Habsburgs. He died in obscurity in Czechoslovakia, while Vojan kept his standing in Chicago and lived another two decades.\textsuperscript{58}

In 1907 Vojan had a formidable ally in Dr. Theodor Bartošek (1877-1954), a guest from Prague. A declaration of principles, argued Bartošek on Friday afternoon, is not popularization. That comes later. “The two declarations do not differ in substance,” he said, “but to a certain extent in personalities.” Dr. Iška exemplified something of Freethought’s “historical evolution” as a “person who could not fully emancipate himself” from a career in the priesthood. His source, Zdrůbek, deserved “our gratitude” for his pioneering work, but “we must not make fetishes of individuals.” It was time to join the international Freethought movement and rise to its intellectual level, so Bartošek
endorsed Dr. Vojan’s declaration. “I worked on it also,” he said, “and we deliberated on it a long time.”\textsuperscript{59} Iška’s one-page declaration was one-third shorter but had three times as many paragraphs. Bartošek was the first publishing manager for the Volná myšlenka (Free Though), founded in spring 1906 as the Czech section of the Freethinker International in Brussels. His devout parents wanted him to join the priesthood, but Bartošek had a conversion at the Czech Gymnasium in Brno, joined the Social Democratic Party and followed his father into the legal profession, completing a doctorate in Prague five years after Vojan. After the war, Bartošek represented the National Socialist Party in the Czechoslovak parliament, but by 1925 he formed his final allegiance—to the Communist Party.\textsuperscript{60}

In Chicago, Bartošek addressed the convention by invitation right on Thursday morning, and Vojan answered the call for another speaker to fill in until the governing committee of fifteen returned to set the convention off on its agenda. That included two speakers each on Thursday and Friday evening, 8:30-11 p.m. Bartošek was the second speaker each evening. All six addresses took up 46 pages in the published minutes. Vojan filled 2 pages, Rudiš Jičínský 7, Palda 9—and Bartošek 28.\textsuperscript{61} Early in his intellectual tour for the assembled delegates, Bartošek asserted that mankind takes up the difficult work of thought only in times of suffering and peril. And so socialism was the stimulus to thought in the present, just as Protestant theology, now as dogmatic as Catholicism, was in the Reformation. Bartošek ranged in critique even to early Christianity, which he discredited as derivative. In his own address, L.J. Palda welcomed the convention and new organization as a step beyond negation toward positive work. They were evidently like an answer to his pamphlet five years earlier on the poverty of anticlericalism as the inspiration for a new community and on the lessons of Catholic community. Rosický published it, but no one invoked it now. Dialogue was not the most resounding effect even in the other camp: two years after the convention, the Bohemian Benedictines in Chicago republished Palda’s provocative self-critique—selectively and with sarcastic and orthodox commentaries from Rev. František Tichý (b. 1847). This from a priest who
completed his Prague seminary education at Milwaukee’s St. Francis but also made his New Prague parish in Minnesota a bastion of Catholic educational and professional mobility. 62

Younger men and recent arrivals indeed prevailed in 1907. The choice of speakers to address the convention and the amount of space that each took or received was another measure of their intellectual authority. Zdrůbek only gave an opening benediction on Thursday morning—upon Iška’s invitation. It amounted to one paragraph in the published minutes. Barošek’s Prague colleague, Volná myšlenka chairman Julius Myslík (1877-1938), provided the draft bylaws for the new Union of Freethinkers in Chicago. 63 They were a major item of business on Friday and Saturday. J.J. Král and František Iška represented Bohemian America at the Freethinker International’s September 1907 world congress in Prague. 64

The same succession occurred at the monthly organ of the ČSPS brotherhood. The editor of Orgán bratrstva from 1898 was Bohumil Bárta Letovský (1849-1910) of Cedar Rapids, son of Jan, the cofounder of Czech journalism in America. Then Václav Šnajdr returned as editor and publisher—but it was only from September 1904 until the next June. He was the choice of chairman Vincent V. Vojtíšek and his outgoing grand lodge administration in New York, whose contract and jurisdiction the incoming St. Louis administration of A.J. Čejka rejected. J.J. Král and L.J. Pelda were its successive choices for editor. Each resigned in about a year and in protest against overbearing treatment. But for the next forty years the editors were other men from the great gathering of 1907—Václav J. Petrželka in 1907-1909, Dr. J.E.S. Vojan in 1909-1918, F.J. Kuták in 1918-1926 and Rudolf Janda in 1927-1938 and 1943-1946. 65

The gathering of 1907 was indeed great. Eight delegates had the title “doctor.” At least forty-three delegates were women. That was one of every six, and their issues and statements filled a share of the minutes. By residence, 191 delegates, or five of every
seven, were Chicagoans, but many of these represented associations elsewhere. Of the 77 delegates from outside Chicago, two-thirds were from the rural West—counting roughly by state—and one-third from the urban East. A final resolution gave thanks to the ČSPS hall’s board of trustees for the cost-free venue; to the ladies who organized festivities; to amateur stage actors, a brass band, a workingmen’s choir and other entertainers; to three Bohemian beer breweries (Atlas, Garden City, Pilsen) and one winery (Korbel); to the daughters of the ČSPS brotherhood for serving refreshments; to local residents for their hospitality toward out-of-town countrymen; and to the liberal Czech press for its “exemplary attentiveness to the convention and its work.” The delegates, audience and community involvement made it a gathering of such scale—in numbers and sentiment—that it likely made many lifelong impressions. All the more so because nothing quite like it came again.66

The new Union of Freethinkers had its second convention four years later, on September 3-4, 1911, at the Bohemian national hall in New York. Participation was three times smaller, at 86 delegates and private citizens. And except for one Chicagoan, they were all from greater New York and represented only local Bohemian Freethought and its allied schools, Sokol gymnastic clubs, fraternal benefit locals, labor unions and newspapers.67 A rival convention met in Omaha one year later: 91 countrymen deliberated at the Sokol hall on September 15-17, 1912. Half (46) were from Nebraska, including Jan Rosický’s widow Marie, three other Rosickýs, his loyal F.J. Sadílek, and four of his great newspaper editors—daughter Růžena (Rose), Jan Janák, F.J. Kuták and Stanislav Šerpán. Six participants were from Chicago, including František Iška, and the rest represented the vast arc of states from Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota to Texas.68 After Chicago, East and West met separately now. Thirteen hundred miles apart to return to the same discussions—on the nature of Freethought and on organization, youth, schools and cremation. The men and women in Omaha represented the same kinds of associations, minus labor unions. They did not discuss the “relationship of Freethinkers to socialism,” a topic in New York. Instead, one Oklahoman wanted
“science and love” as an official Bohemian Freethinker religion, as he wrote and read it in Czech, so that each could reply, when neighbors asked, as they did, “Our religion is universal knowledge and love!” as he put it in English.  

New York introduced two more young men who would soon lead the American contribution to Czechoslovak independence—Josef Tvrzický (1884-1920) and Emanuel Viktor Voska (1875-1960). In Omaha all rose and eulogized two old men recently deceased—Jan Rosický and F.B. Zdrůbek. Tvrzický was another law student and student organizer from Prague. Right from July 1914, just three years after coming to Chicago, Tvrzický was a key early organizer for the independence movement in America as secretary of the Česko-americká národní rada (Czech-American National Council). Voska came in 1894 after interrogation for an angry speech in favor of organizing state tobacco workers in his native Kutná Hora, whose predecessors started Bohemian cigarmaking and radicalism in New York. He already became a Socialist as a young reader and lecture-goer, but in New York he also became a prosperous marble-quarry entrepreneur. During the war he operated an effective intelligence service for T.G. Masaryk’s independence movement. Barbara Tuchman, historian of the Zimmermann telegram, called him the “most valuable secret agent of the Allies in the United States,” with a network of eighty German-speaking countrymen who were “clerks or waiters or messengers or scrubwomen in German clubs, commercial firms, consulates, and German-American newspapers throughout the country.”

Rosický and Zdrůbek had the funerals of national heroes. Rosický died on Saturday, April 2, 1910, four months after a brain inflammation incapacitated him. By Sunday afternoon a large public meeting at the Sokol hall was organizing his Tuesday funeral, when even non-Bohemian businessmen closed shop in Rosický’s honor. His funeral procession of countrymen, many from afar, and their associations “defied a blinding dust storm” from Sokol hall to cemetery. Obituaries, personal remembrances and routine written condolences filled ninety pages when Rosický’s publishing company collected
them into a memorial volume, which his former editor Thomas Čapek suggested to his daughter Rose. Zdrůbek died from a stroke in September 1911, one week after the convention in New York, where one of the ten letters read out at the opening was his. He thanked the New Yorkers for inviting him, thought the time “not yet ripe” for the reunion of all Freethinkers, but warmly wished them well. His public funeral was like Rosický’s—but on a Chicago scale. Children from Bohemian Freethinker schools and their teachers were among the many countrymen who came to see him as he lay in state at the ČSPS hall on West Eighteenth Street, where so much of his public career took place. As the long funeral procession, including the children and teachers, set out across much of Chicago north to the Bohemian National Cemetery, the bells rang atop St. Prokop’s, bastion of the busy Benedictine fathers. Whether it was by ironic coincidence or in benediction, no one knew.

Another difference between the New York and Omaha conventions is evident in their published minutes. The New Yorkers produced a volume of 135 pages about their two days. The Westerners spent three days in session but issued just 62 pages. Their title page mentioned neither venue, nor printer. The New Yorkers had a title page with all the standard bibliographic details, and their text crossed the Atlantic at least four times in two years, because the stenographer returned to Bohemia after the convention and the eventual printer (Ant. Reise) was in Prague. Editor J.J. Kárník asked in an afterword, “Why so late and why do we even print it now?” The Freethinkers lacked money, and convention proceedings were a sure loser. They still had plenty of the 200-page volumes from 1907 on hand. But intellectual progress was the highest good, poverty honorable and pride evident: “Read the views delivered in 1907, read those from 1911, and compare them. No one can deny our progress.” In the quality of Freethinker schools, the movement for cremation, organizational matters and even in the professionalism of running a convention.

Convention proceedings indeed seem to be a growing and compelling Czech-language
genre of intellectual drama in America after the turn of the century, largely lost or yet to be discovered. Zárobský’s National Printing, then on West Eighteenth, produced one for the 46 delegates who founded the Česká dělnická strana v Americe as the self-governing Bohemian Section of the American Socialist Party on December 26-28, 1901.

Representing labor unions, Socialist ward clubs, fraternal benefit locals and workingmen’s cultural associations (reading, singing, theater) from New York to Racine and St. Louis—but mostly in Chicago—they met on the same street at Center Avenue (now Racine), where they decorated the hall with “portraits of proletarian martyrs and pioneers, including the first 14 Social Democrats elected to the imperial parliament” in Vienna. František Hlaváček (b. 1853) gave the opening address. Since March he was the first editor of Spravedlnost (Justice) in the Pilsen neighborhood, and they made this weekly and the old party journalist from Bohemia and New York their voice. They had a parting evening social at the ČSPS hall and returned there for their third convention on December 28-29, 1903. By now they published their proceedings in their own local print shop, where Spravedlnost would become a daily in eighteen months on July 4. It was a great resurrection for Bohemian Socialists in Chicago amidst new respectability for American socialism.

And they were more successful at Transatlantic political collaboration than Karel Jonáš and the old journalists of the liberal nationalist BANC in the early 1890s. Social Democrat Dr. František Soukup came from Prague in October 1911 to associate the reorganized American comrades with the party in the homeland. In three months and eighteen states, he addressed 95 meetings. Audiences even included Bohemian and German farmers as far west as Nebraska. At the same time, František Hlaváček traveled from Chicago to the Czecho-Slavonic Social Democratic Party congress in Prague as delegate for the American countrymen. Beyond the Elbe River border town of Podmokly, his December 19, 1911, train ride from Bremen became a triumphal procession of mass receptions at every stop. He and his comrades were once a small and despised band here. Now even uniformed railway officials honored him. Václav
Klofáč, head of the rival National Socialists, made two American tours—in 1909 with Josef Scheiner, editor for the allied Česká obec sokolská (Bohemian Sokol Union), and again in 1913. But Social Democrats could be as nationalist as any rival, just like that other “international” camp, the Catholics. Back in Chicago, František Hlaváček wrote that the middle-class parties “expelled Socialists from the nation” but did nothing to stop emigration. And the Austrian government not only did nothing for its Slavic nations but even obstructed their efforts to better themselves and would no doubt be happy to see the entire Czech and Slavic nation emigrate abroad, unlike Germany’s government, which took pains to preserve the national identity of its emigrants. Hlaváček edited Spravedlnost to 1921, and this was in the almanac that his Socialist daily launched in 1910.

Still, Transatlantic politics was a minor issue for the Bohemian voices in America when compared to their Slovak counterparts. On May 26, 1907, at Gray’s Armory in Cleveland, rivals Peter V. Rovnianek, Štefan Furdek and their fraternal benefit brotherhoods formed the political Slovak League, which still exists. Furdek was the Catholic priest who began his Cleveland career in the contentious Bohemian parishes of the early 1880s. Liberal Pittsburgh journalist and banker Rovnianek led Slovaks into the BANC a decade later. But at their own great gathering, just two weeks after the one to launch the nationalist Slovak League, Bohemians had more universal concerns—Freethought, freedom from religion, working people, social justice and their advancement in America. Slovenians came as delegates for their fraternal brotherhoods. German and Anglo-American Freethinkers came to speak for solidarity. But it was all still a part of Czech nationalism, which staked its hopes and efforts on modernism. And while the “rise of the Czechs between the 1860s and 1914 did not meet with any serious opposition from the Austrian state,” Slovaks made no progress against a Hungarian state determined to assimilate them. Right from the start in June 1889, when he established the Slovak literary language in America as the new editor of Amerikánsko-slovenské noviny, Rovnianek contended with countrymen whom he saw as loyalists and even
agents of the state that expelled him from the Budapest seminary for making the request to revive an intramural Slovak literary club. Until his bank failed in June 1911, Rovnianek subsidized writers and journals in Slovakia, where leading nationalists also wrote for his newspaper.⁸⁸

Prague’s Národní rada česká (Czech National Council) formed its own American branch through agent Enrique Stanko Vráz, son-in-law of Chicago publisher August Geringer. It had little to do for the four years to September 2, 1914, when it merged into the Bohemian National Alliance, which expanded to 320 locals in 16 regional districts by the end of the war.⁹⁹ Attorney Thomas Čapek got a fancy certificate from the Young Czech party during a 1903 trip to the Balkans, Slovakia and home. But back in New York the Rovnianek admirer organized a Panslavic lobby for Russia in its war with Japan and published a book about the Slovaks ten years before his Bohemia under Hapsburg Misrule.⁹⁰ The Slovak drama also limbered up the Česko-americká tisková kancelár (Bohemian American Press Association), which Dr. J.E.S. Vojan proposed and Jan Rosický publicized. With the Chicago manager of vintner František Korbel, now retired in Prague, and with Chicago bankers J.F. Štěpina and Frank J. Skala forming the board of trustees with Rosický and Geringer editor Pšenka, the 1909 Press Association was the kind of debut for the business class that the BANC never achieved. Before it merged into the wartime Bohemian National Alliance and before he became advertising manager for Chicago bitter wine manufacturer and countryman Joseph Triner in 1916, general manager Vojan presided over successful campaigns for ethnicity by mother tongue in the United States census, another $10,000 for Czech minority schools in Bohemia, a Karel Jonáš monument in Racine, and better Transatlantic press coverage and exchange.⁹¹ That included challenging the image of visiting Hungarian education minister Count Albert Apponyi and one year later producing a Bohemian count (and historian), Francis Luetzow (1849-1916), whom Vojan and his bankers accompanied on a February to March 1912 lecture tour from the United States Congress to eleven universities—Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Michigan, Chicago, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska,
Western Reserve, Cornell and Princeton.92

A decade earlier another businessman took up a different piece of the old BANC agenda and its example of collaboration across generations. In 1901, the Bohemian Benedictines moved St. Procopius College, which they incorporated fourteen years before, into its own large and academic-looking building at Lisle, outside Chicago.93 A year later, Cedar Rapids drug manufacturer Václav F. Severa (b. 1853) capitalized the Matice vyššího vzdělání (Foundation for Higher Education) to provide interest-free student loans. Iowa professor Bohumil Shimek was chairman and Severa treasurer. He had started his American career at age fifteen in Racine. Other younger countrymen joined him in the Foundation, which had helped 571 individuals from the American generations to achieve college educations and some ancestral consciousness seventy years later, when Czech-Americans published the Panorama volume about themselves. The Foundation used the Czech-language press to publicize its work, aims and nationalist sentiments. Besides regular meetings, it had two conventions before the war. Thirteen delegates for its many participating associations came to the Iowa City ČSPS hall on July 24-25, 1909, and at the Cedar Rapids Bohemian school on September 20-21, 1913, it was twenty-three.94 The Foundation also collaborated with some thirty Komenský Clubs that Bohemian students formed at their universities in one decade, starting at Lincoln, Nebraska, in 1904. Thirty years later a club at the University of Chicago published a biographical dictionary of three hundred younger businessmen and professionals now at work in the still vital Czech (and Slovak) neighborhoods of greater Chicago.95

The pioneering journalists from the times of Karel Jonáš innovated and collaborated differently in the years before the Great War. At his long-expected death, Rosický was still a trustee of Vojan’s Press Association. Another Chicago banker (Emanuel Beránek) replaced him.96 Václav Šnajdr became a more lonely figure but lost none of his marvelous power to narrate the world of his countrymen—and his own moods. The people’s future in Bohemia was uncertain, he wrote in an 1898 letter, but in Cleveland
they “danced, drank and caroused away their senses.” Even saloonkeeper Václav Rychlík’s death was a lesson on the “young generation and new immigrants.” Neither understood or respected the “old leaders.” In the summer of 1907 brothers from the ČSPS and Sokol came to see Šnajdr about arrangements for Professor Masaryk’s lecture tour. Then Dr. Bartošek came. This Socialist’s party now “discredited” Masaryk, its benefactor. But Šnajdr, long labor’s voice in Cleveland, never went “among such people because their socialism is a faith and that’s where vital reason ends.” Three years later Šnajdr sold his Dennice novověku, shop and all, to investors who incorporated as the Svět (World) publishing company, capitalized at $25,000. He and Mrs. Šnajdr retired to California for his health. But he still contributed to the Czech-language press. Chicago’s Socialist Spravedlnost carried his warm memoir of Racine and J.V. Sládek in its almanac. The two student refugees fell into each other’s arms on Lake Michigan around Thanksgiving 1869, and their last reunion was in 1911 Bohemia, as old men. A year after the war, Thomas Čapek sent Václav Šnajdr his book, The Čechs (Bohemians) in America. “It will teach the Americanization fanatics,” wrote Šnajdr, “who act wrongly from ignorance of this country’s various elements from abroad. They mostly see us as spiritless material for them to remake with bare force into any forms that please them.” In such times, another year later on September 4, 1920, Václav Šnajdr died in Pasadena.

For the twenty years to 1896, Václav Šnajdr was the voice that helped to make the ČSPS brotherhood. He never recovered that role and editorship. His own weekly did not long please the business-minded management at Svět publishing company, which turned to its own eponymous newspaper. But the institutions that Václav Šnajdr’s generation made in America lasted. The ČSPS brotherhood still survives as CSA Fraternal Life in the Chicago suburb of Oak Brook—and on the World Wide Web. So does the Bohemian National Cemetery of Chicago. The brotherhood moved up after it united with its smaller counterparts in the Great Depression—to the fabulous new million-dollar Sokol Slávský building in Cicero. The old ČSPS hall on West Eighteenth Street became a
lamp factory. Otherwise it was unchanged as the great meeting place of nineteenth-century Bohemian America and the carrier for its genius loci—until a fire in January 1957. August Geringer’s *Svornost* daily and *Amerikán* almanac ceased that May. That was another career eight decades long—but a vital one right to its Cold War end.

Dr. Petr Zenkl (b. 1884) serialized an account of the Prague putsch in *Svornost*. Deputy prime minister of Czechoslovakia and chairman of its National Socialist Party, no one in the postwar opposition was more senior than this émigré in Washington, where he chaired the *Rada svobodného československa* (Council of Free Czechoslovakia). By his own wish, Zenkl’s remains took their place at Chicago’s Bohemian National Cemetery in 1975. Language and place evoke allegiance even now. In July 2008, an “overwhelming response from the Czech community” moved Universal Pictures to restore stones inscribed with the words *Plzeňský Sokol* on another old West Eighteenth Street hall after its use in an action film. Four months later the Czech Republic reopened New York’s neglected Bohemian National Hall for its consulate, cultural center and the local Bohemian Benevolent & Literary Association that raised that Renaissance Revival landmark in the 1890s. And Prague promised more renovation for what was already a “truly common space for organizing events and presenting the Czech culture to Americans.”

These are some images from a century of survivals and continuities. A century is a good distance for a fair perspective on the project that we tried to reconstruct in these chapters. It was a nationalist or community project about a future for Bohemians in America and about their present day. Many Bohemians became a part of it in the fraternal benefit and leisure-time associations that they made into a local and national social network. Maybe even most Bohemians joined the project just by living and working alongside their countrymen in city neighborhoods and rural townships. But the young men who came from Bohemia in the 1860s to launch and edit newspapers made and became the voices of the project. It was also a business project, a livelihood. Others
could serve the market for the Czech word on newsprint. Others did and failed. It was a tough market even in the half century of mass immigration before the Great War. But for Jonáš, Šnajdr, Zdrůbek, Geringer and Rosický it was more than that. They were skeptical and even bitter about their choice, but they kept at it. And their success gave Czech journalism in America a stability that might have never come in time from others.

They were men of at least some secondary or higher education who took over from the bricklayers and tailors that founded—but could not sustain—the first newspapers in the Midwest. The more educated men from Bohemia half a century later came too late and largely wrote and edited for establishments already proven and available. Like Geringer’s and the competitors that arose around it in Chicago—the Bohemian Benedictine Press, the Denní hlasatel and Socialist Spravedlnost. A national press from New York to Omaha was what the old men from the 1860s gave to the new, Eurocentric nationalist projects of liberation that came from the Great War to the Cold War. Their own effort of this kind—the Bohemian American National Committee of the early 1890s—was as much America-centric in its concern with a second generation that could perhaps be made Bohemian in English. And if their polemics with Catholics and Socialists—camps that would have stayed apart anyway—seemed regrettably divisive in retrospect, they also invigorated Czech printed culture and associations while a real Bohemian America of populous communities was still a bright and growing constellation across the land.
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