

Slovak-Americans in the Great Steel Strike

M. Mark Stolarik

Professor of History and Chair in Slovak
History and Culture, *University of Ottawa*

One of the ironies of American history is that the Great Steel Strike of 1919, which the superintendent of the Homestead Steel plant labelled “a Slovak strike,” has not yet been studied by historians of the Slovak experience in America¹. The fullest account we have of Slovak participation in this great strike is twelve pages of text in Thomas Bell’s novel *Out of This Furnace*.² Apart from that, Slovaks were only mentioned in passing by American observers or professional historians, and because the latter did not read Slovak, they were often misled by their informants.³ In this paper I will first describe the dynamics of Slovak communities in the United States, analyze the reaction of three Slovak-American newspapers of national scope to the Great Steel Strike, and try to verify later accounts of this event.

At the time of the Great Steel Strike, the formative period of Slovak community-building was over. In the previous 40 years or so, about 650,000 Slovaks had emigrated to America from their homeland in the Kingdom of Hungary and about 500,000 had settled down to stay. By 1919 the United States Census counted 619,866 first and second generation Slovaks in this country, with 296,219 (almost half) in Pennsylvania⁴. Other major Slovak settlements appeared in Ohio, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Indiana, and Illinois. With the passage of the Immigration Restriction Acts by the United States Congress in the 1920’s, the era of massive Slovak emigration to the United States came to an end.⁵

Between the 1880’s and 1919, Slovaks immigrated to the United States in great numbers in search of work. Most were former peasants or agricultural laborers who could not make a living in their native land due to a population explosion among them, lack of farmland, and lack of industry. They found unskilled jobs principally in the newly-emerging coal, steel and oil industries of America. The Dillingham Commission reported that, at the turn of the century, Slovaks provided 13.1% of America’s steelworkers and 12.8% of its bituminous coal miners. That put them in first place among workers in these industries. In the Pittsburgh region, Slovaks had an even higher proportion: 15.3% of the steel workers and 20.3% of the miners.⁶

Shortly after the Slovaks began to arrive in the United States in large numbers in the 1880’s, they realized that they were on their own. At that time the United States provided virtually no social services for its people. Thus, if an immigrant fell ill, had an accident, or died, no-one paid him or his family any relief or compensation. Therefore, in the 1880’s Slovaks across the country

established 50 local fraternal-benefit societies that provided support in case of accident or illness, or death benefits to the survivors.⁷ Starting in 1890 these local fraternal societies began to federate into larger bodies such as the National Slovak Society, which was headquartered in Pittsburgh, and the First Catholic Slovak Union, with its headquarters in Cleveland. By 1919 there were twelve large, nation-wide Slovak fraternal societies in America with a total membership of 212,241.⁸

Most Slovak immigrants to America were also very religious. Wishing to worship in their own tradition, and finding no Slovak churches in the United States, they proceeded to create them, in most cases with the help of the already existing fraternal-benefit societies. The first Slovak Roman Catholic parishes arose in Hazleton, Pennsylvania and in Streator, Illinois in 1885 while the first Lutheran and Calvinist parishes appeared in Streator in 1884 and in Mount Carmel, Pennsylvania in 1892. By 1920 the Catholics had built 176 churches, the Lutherans 29 and the Calvinists six.⁹ As June Alexander and I have shown, these parishes served not only as places of worship for Slovak immigrants, but also as the centers of their community life.¹⁰

The third most important component of the newly-emerging Slovak communities in America was its newspaper press. Slovak immigrants were naturally curious about events in their homeland, as well as job opportunities in the United States. Starting in 1885, with the establishment in Pittsburgh of a weekly *Bulletin*, which was re-named the *Amerikánsko-slovenské noviny* in 1886, a small group of Slovak intellectuals in the next four decades created over 100 newspapers for their largely working-class readers, and 41 of these newspapers were still in business in 1918. Almost half were published in the Pittsburgh region.¹¹

While fraternal societies, parishes and newspapers formed the bedrock of Slovak communities in America, they also reflected the many divisions among them. About 80% of Slovak immigrants were Roman Catholics, approximately 15% were Lutherans, and the rest were Greek Catholics or Calvinists.¹² Each group created its own parishes and, while these may have existed in the same neighborhoods, there was very little cooperation between them. Indeed, some of the larger Slovak settlements, such as in the Cleveland or Pittsburgh regions, saw the creation of several Roman Catholic parishes based on the regional origins of their parishioners, who spoke different dialects of the Slovak language.¹³

The fraternal societies, meanwhile, revealed even greater divisions among the Slovaks. Many of the local fraternal societies were based on the regional origins of their members. Others were craft-oriented. Still others were formed on the religious or national orientation of their members. The national fraternal societies, meanwhile, split along religious and other lines. Ironically enough, the splintering of fraternal societies started in 1890 when the ex-seminarian and newspaper editor

P.V. Rovnianek proposed that all the local fraternal unite into a National Slovak Society. Representatives of four local lodges did meet with Rovnianek in Pittsburgh on March 15, 1890 and established such a Society. However, the preeminent Slovak Catholic leader in America, the Rev. Stefan Furdek of Cleveland, rejected Rovnianek's appeal. Furdek feared that the National Slovak Society, which was non-denominational, might quickly turn into an anti-clerical association, as had the Czech Slavic Benevolent Society headquartered in St. Louis. Furdek was pastor of the Czech parish of Our Lady of Lourdes and had experienced first-hand the anti-clericalism of some of the members of the Czech Society. Therefore, on September 4, 1890 Furdek persuaded a group of Catholic-oriented fraternal to federate in the First Catholic Slovak Union headquartered in Cleveland. Thus began a rivalry for membership between a secular and Catholic fraternal that the First Catholic Slovak Union would win by 1898 when the latter had 10,547 members while the NSS trailed with 9,573. By the time of the Great Steel Strike, the National Slovak Society had grown to 52,000 adult and junior members while the First Catholic Slovak Union blossomed to over 72,000.¹⁴ Slovak Lutherans, meanwhile, either joined the National Slovak Society or their own Slovak Evangelical Union which arose in Freeland, Pennsylvania, in 1893 and the Calvinists set up their Slovak Calvin Presbyterian Union in Mount Carmel, Pennsylvania, in 1901. Militant nationalists, meanwhile, who found the National Slovak Society too meek for their taste, established the Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol in 1896 in New York City, while their more devout countrymen split off and created the Slovak Catholic Sokol in Passaic, New Jersey in 1905. Even American regionalism played a role in the establishment of the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union in Wilkes-Barre in 1893, and the Slovak Wreath of the Free Eagle in Bridgeport, Connecticut, in 1896.

The fraternal also reflected a gender division among American Slovaks. The men had taken the lead in organizing the first fraternal, and they initially excluded women from membership. Therefore, Slovak women established parallel fraternal to the men: in 1891 a group of women in New York City established the 'Zivena' Slovak National Women's Benefit Society, which was the female counterpart of the men's National Slovak Society; in 1892 Roman Catholic women established the First Catholic Slovak Ladies' Union in Cleveland, Ohio; and in 1898 Slovak women in Hazleton, Pennsylvania established the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union.

The Socialist movement also had a minor impact upon the Slovak-American community. A tiny group of Slovak Socialists set up a Slovak Workers' Society in Newark, New Jersey, in 1915. When it held its first convention in 1917, it had enrolled only 507 members. Since the Slovak Workers' Society did not establish a branch in the Pittsburgh region (in Braddock) until 1922, it would have a minimal impact upon Slovaks in this area.¹⁵ Thus, Slovak

fraternals reflected the class, political, gender, religious, and regional differences among Slovaks.¹⁶

The Slovak newspaper press, meanwhile, mirrored all of the above divisions, especially the political ones. By the late 19th century Slovak leaders in both the Old World and in the New were divided on their future direction. A minority in both Slovakia and the United States remained loyal to the Kingdom of Hungary and were dubbed 'Magyarones' by their opponents. The latter were divided into nationalists and 'Czechoslovaks'. The nationalists hoped to achieve home-rule in the Kingdom of Hungary, or, failing that, some sort of union with the Russian Empire. The 'Czechoslovaks', on the other hand, hoped to affect a union with the linguistically-related Czechs. There were great debates in the Slovak-American press before and during World War I about which course to follow. By 1919 the 'Czechoslovak' idea seemed to have triumphed, 'Magyaronism' was on the run, and the autonomists were re-grouping for their future conflict with the Czechs over home-rule in the newly-created (since 1918) Czecho-Slovakia.¹⁷

This, then, was the situation among American Slovaks in 1919. When the Great Steel Strike broke out, the Slovak strikers would have a support system in their fraternals, in their parishes, and in their newspaper press. I will now look at how three leading Slovak-American newspapers reacted to the Great Steel Strike.

Of the 38 newspapers published by Slovak-Americans in 1919,¹⁸ three stand out in importance: *Jednota*, *Národné noviny*, and *Slovenský sokol*. The first of these was the weekly of the First Catholic Slovak Union, the largest Slovak fraternal-benefit society in America; the second was the weekly official organ of the National Slovak Society; and the third served as the semi-monthly of the secular Slovak Gymnastic Union Sokol, headquartered in Perth Amboy, New Jersey. The latter had over 14,000 members.¹⁹ These newspapers represented the broadest range of opinion in the Slovak-American community, from Roman Catholic, to non-denominational nationalist, to militantly secular nationalist. Unfortunately, files of the Slovak labour newspaper *Rovnost' iudu* (Chicago, 1906-1935), which might have supplied us with a militant labour perspective on the steel strike, have not survived for the year 1919.²⁰

As one might expect, the three Slovak-American newspapers that I surveyed took differing approaches to reporting on the strike. *Slovenský sokol* published only one editorial about this event and never mentioned it again. The editors, who were ardent 'Czechoslovaks', were more interested in reporting on conditions in the newly-created Czecho-Slovakia than they were in American labour disputes. Nevertheless, their editorial proved to be both revealing and prophetic. After having characterized the strike as a battle between workers and capitalists, the editors reminded their readers that foreigners had always lost out in similar previous strikes because "they had enemies in

both the capitalists and in fellow-American workers,” and the latter did not want foreigners to have the same rights as Americans. Furthermore, the editorial prophesied, whether the workers won or lost the strike would not matter to the foreign-born because they would simply be pushed aside by the “Americans (really the Germans and Irish) [who] have many friends and relatives among the bosses and foremen, and therefore, they are always forgiven.” That is why, the editorial warned, if Slovak workers went on strike, they had better be careful and not let themselves be talked into any illegal activities, which they would live to regret.²¹ Thus, the editors of *Slovenský sokol* were pessimistic about the strike’s outcome, and cynical about America’s labour and ethnic hierarchy.

The editors, and contributors to *Jednota*, on the other hand, had much more to say about the strike. In a front-page story, the September 24 issue of *Jednota* reported that after having polled their members, all 24 AFL member unions had agreed to strike against United States Steel on September 22, 1919. The strike, they continued, had been sanctioned by John Fitzpatrick, Chairman of the National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers, and not even Samuel Gompers, the president of the AFL could stop it, because the workers had voted in its favor. The workers were demanding, among other things, an eight-hour day, better working conditions, and the right to collective bargaining. *Jednota* ended its report by fully endorsing “this just strike.”²²

Shortly thereafter, *Jednota* reported some very troubling events. In an October 1st editorial on the strike, the writers accused American capitalists of always trying to find “Bolsheviks” or “anarchists” behind every labour conflict, and of having inflamed the “capitalist press” against the strike.²³ These charges were forcefully repeated on October 15, 1919, by A.J. Pirhalla, president of the First Catholic Slovak Union, in his editorial on this “Terrible Strike.” He again deplored the fact that the English-language press was attacking the striking workers as “Bolsheviks” and “radicals,” and he accused the Pennsylvania State Constabulary of “breaking the law” in its zeal against the strikers. Pirhalla perceived the situation of the workers to be so grave that he called on other Slovak-American leaders to meet with him to discuss taking a common stand in favor of the strike.²⁴ No such meeting ever took place, probably because of the rivalry among the many Slovak fraternalists then in existence. Meanwhile, a striking worker from Steelton, Pennsylvania, accused certain fellow-Slovaks of “scabbing” and thereby hurting the overall cause.²⁵

Only two more articles about the steel strike appeared in *Jednota*, and both were written by a Roman Catholic priest who supported the strike. The Reverend V.A. Chaloupka, pastor of Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Parish in Cleveland, not only perceptively analyzed the causes of the strike, but also reported some interesting facts about it. First of all, he reminded his readers that for years the capitalists had treated foreign workers “like livestock”,

that they had always favored English-speakers with the best jobs and given foreigners the worst, but that World War I had changed everything. During the war, Slovak workers had bought United States War Bonds, and had sent their sons to fight in the United States Army. The war had “Americanized” the Slovaks and, therefore, they now demanded equality with the “English”. He also reminded his readers that America’s Roman Catholic Bishops supported the right of workers to collective bargaining. On the other hand, Father Chaloupka deplored the lack of support for the strike by most Slovak and Polish Roman Catholic priests in America.²⁶ He found this puzzling because, he continued, now that the Slovaks were on strike, they attended Mass regularly and contributed twice as much to Sunday collections as before. He accused Judge Elbert H. Gary, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of United States Steel, of preventing his workers from worshipping on Sundays because he insisted on preserving the twelve-hour seven-day work-week in his mills. Therefore, Chaloupka concluded, Judge Gary should negotiate with his workers because the latter were the source of all profits for capitalists.²⁷ Thus, *Jednota* supported the Great Steel Strike, reported on its causes and difficulties, but after November 26, 1919, did not mention it again.

The most comprehensive coverage of the Great Steel Strike of 1919 appeared in *Národné noviny*. While the editors did not initially concern themselves with the causes of the strike, they did lash out at Sam Gompers who, when testifying before a Senate Committee, did not repudiate the charge that this was a strike by “foreigners.”²⁸ Indeed, in a rare English-language editorial, they accused Sam Gompers of having made foreigners the “scapegoats” of this strike.²⁹

In reporting on the Industrial Conference convened in Washington on October 6, 1919, at the behest of President Woodrow Wilson, however, the editors changed their tune. They eased up on Sam Gompers and instead lashed out at the capitalists who had rejected Gompers’ suggestion that the strike be mediated by a six-member arbitration board.³⁰

Then, in another hard-hitting English-language piece on October 16, 1919, the editors of *Národné noviny* once again upbraided America’s capitalists. Entitled “Americanism or Industrial Submissiveness,” the editorial began with the famous quote from Dr. Samuel Johnson: “Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel.” The authors then accused America’s capitalists of trying to divert the real issue of the strike from capital versus labour to “Americanism versus lawlessness” with foreigners being the chief scapegoats. “It is a cheap trick of the steel interests to stir up the race question when their dividends are in danger,” the editors continued. Finally, the editorial writers accused America’s capitalists of having lured foreign workers to the United States during the previous forty years, and then having turned against them, just as they did against the Molly Maguires forty years previously. Meanwhile, in an appeal to

Slovak steel workers on the same page, the executive of the National Slovak Society, including its President Albert Mamatey, called upon Slovak workers to join the union, support the strike, and help remove “the black mark of Cain” from the heads of foreign workers.³¹

While the executive of the National Slovak Society, and its weekly newspaper, solidly supported the 1919 steel strike, the anti-foreigner activities of the local, state and federal governments took their toll upon the editorial writers. Thus, after the infamous raids of “radical” organizations by agents of the United States Attorney-General A. Mitchell Palmer, *Národné noviny*, probably in fear for its own future, approved of the raids and called for the immediate deportation of the “anarchists” Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman.³² And, yet, in their final analysis of the failure of the steel strike, the editors of *Národné noviny* once again repudiated “Americanization” in an English-language editorial. They likened the “Americanization” drive then in progress to the “crucifixion” of immigrants, to “industrial submissiveness,” and to “Know-Nothingism”.³³ Thus, the editors seemed to have had a schizophrenic reaction to the pressures put upon them and the Slovak-American community by the capitalists and their government allies. This may explain why Albert Mamatey, in later interviews, denied that he or the National Slovak Society, and its newspaper, had supported the strike. Mamatey’s later denials misled David Saposs, an investigator of the Great Steel Strike for the Interchurch World Movement, as well as the historian David Montgomery, who relied too much on Saposs for his information on the role of Slovaks in the Great Steel Strike. Both Saposs and Montgomery reported that Albert Mamatey, the National Slovak Society, and *Národné noviny* had either refused to take a stand on the strike or had warned against it.³⁴

At first glance, the above reports on the Great Steel Strike of 1919 by three different Slovak-American newspapers seem to square with what Thomas Bell wrote about it. Upon closer inspection, however, a few differences do emerge. First of all, Bell mentioned William Z. Foster as the chief organizer of the strike (which he was),³⁵ while the Slovak press gave that credit to John Fitzpatrick.³⁶ Bell never mentioned Fitzpatrick by name, and the Slovak press never mentioned Foster. This discrepancy can be explained by Bell’s personal philosophy, and by the anti-radical hysteria sweeping across America in the fall of 1919. Bell sympathized with radicals such as Foster and granted interviews to the American Communist newspaper *L’udový denník*. Indeed, *Out of This Furnace* was translated into Slovak and published in Communist Czechoslovakia in 1949.³⁷ This did not endear Bell to the vast majority of American Slovaks. Therefore, until he was re-discovered in the 1970’s by William Demarest, and his novel was re-printed by the University of Pittsburgh Press, Bell was either shunned or forgotten by the Slovak-American community.³⁸

Meanwhile, as David Brody pointed out, *Iron Age*, the trade magazine of

the American steel industry, revealed William Z. Foster's former ties to the syndicalist and radical Industrial Workers of the World in its September 18, 1919 issue. This was just four days before the Great Steel Strike broke out and the mainstream American press seized upon these ties to denounce the strike as having been inspired by radicals and anarchists. Foster made the situation even worse when he testified before a Senate Committee on October 3rd and gave evasive answers regarding his radical past.³⁹ Therefore, Foster's name became anathema to Slovak-American editors, who were already reeling under nativist attacks by the mainstream press.

Another interesting difference between Bell's description of the Great Steel Strike and the Slovak-American press is their treatment of the pastor of St. Michael's parish in Braddock, Pennsylvania. Bell portrayed the Reverend Adalbert Kazinczy as very sympathetic to the strikers and to the union.⁴⁰ He may have gleaned this information from William Z. Foster's account of the strike.⁴¹ Slovak-American editors, on the other hand, never even mentioned Kazinczy. This silence can probably be explained by the fact that the Reverend Kazinczy was one of a small group of Slovak-American pastors who, before World War I, supported Slovak loyalty to the Kingdom of Hungary and its government and was, therefore, labelled a "Magyarone" by Slovak nationalist leaders. As such, he was shunned by most Slovak-American editors.⁴² That may also explain why the editor of *Jednota* published accounts of the steel strike by Father Chaloupka of Cleveland, but nothing at all about Kazinczy.

Another puzzling omission in both Bell's account and in the Slovak-American newspapers surveyed is the role of the Reverend C.V. Molnar, a Lutheran pastor identified by Foster as one of "the clergymen who worked with him [Kazinczy]."⁴³ Since both Saposs and Montgomery used Molnar's testimony in trying to understand the role of Slovak leaders in the Great Steel Strike, Molnar's activities, as well as that of fellow-Lutheran pastors, also bears investigating.⁴⁴

Finally, Thomas Bell was very critical of the role of the Roman Catholic church in the strike. He accused the Irish pastor of St. Brendan's parish in Braddock of having denounced the strikers as being "animals" with whom one could not reason, but only "knock down," and Bell also accused Bishop Regis Canevin of the Diocese of Pittsburgh of having opposed the strike.⁴⁵ In view of Father Chaloupka's accusation that most Roman Catholic priests in Slovak and Polish parishes also did not support the strike,⁴⁶ I would be inclined to believe Bell's charges, but with some reservations. On September 26, 1919, just four days after the strike began, the Conference of United States Catholic Bishops issued a Pastoral Letter which reaffirmed Pope Leo XIII's 1891 encyclical "Rerum Novarum." In this encyclical Leo had stressed the primacy of community over individual rights; he defended the right of labor to organize; he defended the principle of arbitration in labor disputes, he affirmed the

right of laborers to a living wage, and he called for a more equitable distribution of wealth.⁴⁷ These were points with which the strike leaders, and their followers, would have heartily agreed, and which the capitalists rejected out of hand.⁴⁸ Therefore, the role of the Roman Catholic Church in the steel strike needs further clarification.

Indeed, overall Slovak “grass-roots” support for, or opposition to, the strike also needs further study. Recall the complaint by a striking Slovak in Steelton that some of his colleagues were “scabbing”.⁴⁹ How many Slovaks actually went on strike? We don’t know. What we need is a community-by-community study of Slovaks, and other ethnic groups, during the great steel strike of 1919. Such studies might be modeled on Paul Krause’s recent history of the Homestead Steel strike of 1892.⁵⁰ In this fine book, Krause, among other things, re-constructed the Slovak community of Homestead by going to original Slovak-American sources, and he discovered who its leaders were, who among them supported the strike, and how Slovak and American workers cooperated in this strike.

Furthermore, since both Bell and the editors of the three Slovak newspapers which I surveyed accused non-Slovaks, particularly the Irish and Germans, of having been their enemies in the Great Steel Strike, the role of the various ethnic groups in this industrial conflict merits further study. If Bell and the Slovak editors are correct, then why did the labor solidarity that Paul Krause discovered in Homestead in 1892 vanish by 1919?⁵¹

These are just a few of the many questions about the Great Steel Strike of 1919 that remain unanswered. May more Paul Krauses will appear in the future to try to answer them!

Notes

*Paper Presented to the Symposium on the Great Steel Strike of 1919, Allegheny College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, September 22-24, 1994.

1. The quotation is from David Brody, *Labor in Crisis: The Steel Strike of 1919* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1965), 132. June Granatir Alexander, in *The Immigrant Church and Community: Pittsburgh's Slovak Catholics and Lutherans, 1880-1915* (Pittsburgh: U. of Pittsburgh Press, 1987), described the formation of Slovak communities through fraternal-benefit societies and parish churches, but she did not get into the story of Slovaks in the labor movement. M. Mark Stolarik, who studied Slovaks in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, over a much longer period of time, skipped over the story of the 1919 steel strike because it did not affect the Bethlehem community. Cf. *Growing Up on the South Side: Three Generations of Slovaks in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, 1880-1976* (Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 1985). Paul Krause, who recently retold the story of the Homestead Steel Strike, and the participation of the Slovak community in it, ended his story in 1892. Cf. *The Battle for Homestead, 1880-1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992).

I am grateful to David Montgomery for his textual and bibliographical comments which helped to strengthen this essay.

2. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1941, 239-250.

3. In this paper I will cite William Z. Foster, one of the strike's organizers, who wrote *The Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons* (New York: B.W. Huebsch, Inc., 1920; reprinted by Arno Press and *The New York Times*, 1969); David J. Saposs, who interviewed some Slovaks for his chapter on "The Mind of Immigrant Communities" in *Public Opinion and the Steel Strike: Supplementary Reports of the Investigation of the Interchurch World Movement*, Francis J. McConnell, Chairman (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921) 224-242; and David Montgomery, who mentioned aspects of the strike in his chapter on "Nationalism, American Patriotism, and Class Consciousness among Immigrant Workers in the United

States in the Epoch of World War I," in Dirk Hoerder's edited volume "*Struggle a Hard Battle: Essays on Working-Class Immigrants* (De Kalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986), 327-351.

4. *Fourteenth Census of the United States, 1920, Population* (Washington: United States Printing Office, 1922), 2:973.

5. For details regarding these Acts see E. P. Hutchinson, *Legislative History of American Immigration Policy, 1798-1965* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), 171-213.

6. William P. Dillingham, Chairman, *Reports of the Immigration Commission*, Vol. 8, 61st Congress, 2nd Session, Senate Document No. 633 (Washington, 1911), 198-99; and Vol. 6, 34-36.

7. Stefan Veselý, "Prvé slovenské spolky v Spojených štátoch Amerických" (The First Slovak Fraternals in the USA), *Slováci v zahraničí*, 4-5 (Martin: Matica slovenská, 1979), 5-57.

8. Thomas Capek, Jr., *The Slovaks in America* (New York: Czechoslovak Section of America's Making, Inc., 1921), 88-9.

9. Kenneth D. Miller, *The Czecho-Slovaks in America* (New York: Council of Women for Home Missions, 1922), 96; and *Kalendár pre slovenských Kalvinov, 1927* (Pittsburgh), 97-127.

10. Alexander, *Immigrant Church*, 28-46; Stolarik, *Growing Up*, 44-62.

11. M. Mark Stolarik, "The Slovak-American Press," in Sally M. Miller ed., *The Ethnic Press in the United States: A Historical Analysis and Handbook* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1987), 363-5.

12. Anton Štefanek, in *Základy sociografie Slovenska (Fundamentals of Slovak Sociology) [Slovenská vlastiveda III]* (Bratislava: Slovenská Akadémia vied a umeni, 1944), 180, reprinted government statistics that listed Slovakia as being 70.92% Roman Catholic, 12.70% Lutheran, 6.46% Greek Catholic, and 4.80% Calvinist in 1921. However, these percentages included non-Slovaks such as 85,000 Rusins, who were all Greek Catholics, and 637,000 Magyars, about 40% of whom were Calvinists, as well as an undetermined number of Czechs. I suspect that, if the non-Slovaks were

removed from these figures, the religious percentages would be closer to my estimate. Since the United States does not collect statistics pertaining to the religious composition of its peoples, we may never know the exact religious composition of the Slovak-American community.

13. For details see Alexander's *Immigrant Community* and M. Mark Stolarik, *Immigration and Urbanization: The Slovak Experience, 1870-1918* (New York: AMS Press, 1989), 83-99.

14. Juraj J. Nižnanský & Vendelín Plátek, compilers, *Dejiny a pamätnica Národného Slovenského Spolku, 1890-1950* (A History and Jubilee of the National Slovak Society, 1890-1950), (Pittsburgh: National Slovak Society, 1950), 214, 219; Jozef Pauco, *75 rokov Prvej Katolíckej Slovenskej Jednoty* (75 Years of the First Catholic Slovak Union), (Cleveland: First Catholic Slovak Union, 1965), 143; David Montgomery, in the book chapter cited above, erroneously identified the National Slovak Society as "America's largest and most influential Slovak fraternal body by 1910" (p.331). He was misled by Monika Glettler's *Pittsburgh-Wien-Budapest: Programm und Praxis der Nationalitätenpolitik bei der Auswanderung der ungarischen Slowaken nach Amerika um 1900* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980), 40-47, which relied too heavily on Hungarian sources, and ignored Slovak-American sources.

15. Ján Šimún, "Z pôsobenia Slov. Rob. Spolku odboru 56 v Braddock, Pa." (The Functioning of Branch 56 of the Slovak Workers' Society in Braddock, Pa.), in Ján Vrabel, ed., *Pamätník Slovenského Robotníckeho Spolku, 1915-1925* (Chicago: Rovnosť l'udu, 1925), 142-4; For an overview of the Slovak Socialist movement in the United States see M. Mark Stolarik, "Slovak Immigration to the United States and its Relation to the American Socialist and Labor Movements," *Slovakia*, 33 (1987-88), 47-62.

16. For more on Slovak fraternal-benefit societies see M. Mark Stolarik, "A Place for Everyone: Slovak Fraternal-Benefit Societies," in Scott Cummings ed., *Self-Help in Urban America: Patterns of Minority Business Enterprise* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1980), 130-41. On those in Pennsylvania see

my "Slovak Fraternal-Benefit Societies in Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Folklife*, 44 (No.2, Winter, 1994-1995), 78-83; I also provided a comparative analysis of Slovak fraternal societies in the United States and Canada in "Slovak Fraternal-Benefit Societies in North America: An Overview (1883-1993)," in Matja Klemčič ed., *Ethnic Fraternalism in Immigrant Countries* (Maribor, Slovenia: University of Maribor, 1996), 147-59.

17. An analysis of the Slovak-American press can be found in M. Mark Stolarik, "The Slovak-American Press," cited above. For the political divisions among American Slovaks see my "The Role of American Slovaks in the Creation of Czecho-Slovakia, 1914-1918," *Slovak Studies*, VIII (Rome, 1968), 7-82; a more recent treatment is Gregory C. Ference's *Sixteen Months of Indecision: Slovak American Viewpoints toward Compatriots and the Homeland from 1914 to 1915 as Viewed by the Slovak Language Press in Pennsylvania* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press, 1995).

18. M. Mark Stolarik, "Slovak-American Newspapers, 1885-1975: A Preliminary Listing," *Slovakia*, 32 (1985-1986), 43.

19. Thomas Čapek, Jr., *The Slovaks in America*, 88.

20. I searched for the files of this newspaper in various American archives, in the holdings of the University Library in Bratislava, Slovakia, and in the archives of the Matica slovenská in Martin in May of 1994. While I did find a few years of this newspaper in the Slovak repositories, I could not find any trace of 1919.

21. *Slovenský sokol*, September 30, 1919, p.8.

22. *Jednota*, September 24, 1919, p.1.

23. *Ibid.*, October 1, 1919, p.4.

24. *Ibid.*, October 15, 1919, p.4.

25. *Ibid.*, October 8, 1919, p.6.

26. *Ibid.*, November 5, 1919, p.4.

27. *Ibid.*, November 26, 1919, p.4.

28. *Národné noviny*, October 2, 1919, p.1.

29. *Ibid.*, p.4.

30. *Ibid.*, October 16, 1919, p.1.

31. *Ibid.*, p.4.

32. *Ibid.*, November 13, 1919, p.1; December 11, 1919, p.4.

33. *Ibid.*, January 1, 1920, p.4.

34. Saposs, David J., "The Mind of Immigrant

- Communities," in *Public Opinion and the the Steel Strike: Supplementary Reports of the Investigators to the Commission of Inquiry, The Interchurch World Movement*, Francis J. McConnell, Chairman (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1921), 235-37; Montgomery, 331.
35. Bell, 239.
36. *Jednota*, September 24, 1919, p.1.
37. Ján Trachta translated the novel and published it as *Dva svety* (Two Worlds)[Bratislava: Obroda, 1949].
38. John F. Berko, "Thomas Bell (1903-1961): Slovak-American Novelist," *Slovak Studies*, XV (1975), 148, 151. *Out of This Furnace* was reprinted by the University of Pittsburgh Press in 1975, with an Introduction by William Demarest.
39. Brody, 136-42.
40. Bell, 241.
41. Foster, 117-18.
42. Bela Vassady, Jr., "Mixed Ethnic Identities among Immigrant Clergy from Multiethnic Hungary: The Slovak-Magyar Case, 1885-1903," in *The Ethnic Enigma: The Salience of Ethnicity for European-Origin Groups*, edited by Peter Kivisto (Philadelphia: The Balch Institute Press, 1989), 58-9.
43. Foster, 118.
44. Montgomery, 347, footnote 14.
45. Bell, 241-2.
46. *Jednota*, November 5, 1919, p.5.
47. Hugh J. Nolan, ed., *Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops, Vol.1 (1792-1940)* (Washington: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1984), 314-18.
48. For the attitudes and beliefs of the steel magnates, see Brody, 14-42.
49. *Jednota*, October 8, 1919, p.6.
50. Krause.
51. Paul Krause, "Labor Republicanism and 'Za Chlebom': Anglo-American and Slavic Solidarity in Homestead," in Hoerder ed., *cit.*, 143-69.