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This study explores the lives of four African American and Irish American editors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—Father Peter C. Yorke, T. Thomas Fortune, J. Samuel Stemons, and Patrick Ford—and how they understood and advocated for group interests through their newspaper presses. Unlike other studies of the black and ethnic press, I ask how the medium itself—through illustrations, cartoons, and halftone photographs; as a site of labor and profit; via advertisements and page layout; and by way of its evolving conventions and technology—shaped and constrained editors’ roles in debates over race and citizenship during a tumultuous time of social unrest and imperial expansion. Important scholarship has explored how newspapers helped disparate individuals imagine themselves as members of nation-states; less attention has been paid to newspapers’ role in expanding or, conversely, policing, notions of citizenship within the nation. Yorke, Fortune, Stemons, Ford, and other black and Irish journalists fought fiercely for inclusion within citizenship’s contested boundaries.

In the years following most major studies of these presses, scholars have produced a wealth of work on the fluidity and complexity of race. Historians of religion, furthermore, now argue that religious belief contributed markedly to contested American identities. U.S. imperial expansion in this time complicated American belonging, as new territories in the Caribbean and Pacific produced new
notions of race and citizenship. All editors in this study were acutely aware of these shifting grounds and their stakes, even as they were pulled in conflicting directions by their presses. Ford’s struggle to calibrate Irish nationalism, Catholicism, and labor rights within the columns of the Irish World; Yorke’s clash with big business and his own Catholic hierarchy while at the helm of the Monitor and the Leader; Stemons’s Philadelphia struggle to found a newspaper and address the “Negro Problem”; and T. Thomas Fortune’s investigative journey to Hawaii and the Philippines in 1902-03 help tease out newspapers’ role in the creation of racial, ethnic, and national identities in the long nineteenth century.
Saturday was publication day aboard the British convict ship Hougoumont. Cutting through the waves on a 14,000-mile journey from England to Australia in 1867, the three-masted vessel held 280 prisoners. Among them were sixty-two Fenians—a secret society of Irish nationalists dedicated to the violent overthrow of British rule in Ireland—who each week eagerly awaited the next issue of The Wild Goose, a hand-written and decorated newspaper produced on-board by several of their group. The Irishmen typically read the paper aloud to each other. “Amid the dim glare of the lamp, the men at night would group strangely on extemporized seats,” wrote John Boyle O’Reilly, assistant editor of the journal. “The yellow light fell down on the dark forms, throwing a ghastly glare on the pale faces of the men…”1 O’Reilly would later escape from Australia and travel to Boston, where until his death in 1890 he edited the Pilot, one of the most important Irish American newspapers of the nineteenth century.

The zeal with which a group of captive sailors labored to produce a tiny, on-board journal may seem strange today, when media forms include radio, television, and the near-instantaneous communication of Internet and wireless devices. Some scholars refer to the time between the creation of the printing press in the fifteenth century and the dawn of television in the 1940s as the “era of the printed word”; in the nineteenth century in particular, rising literacy rates and new printing technologies produced an explosion of reading material.2 The printing of periodicals, handbills, and


2 See, for example, Marshall McLuhan, The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962). Most media scholars today find McLuhan too technologically deterministic; Marshall T. Poe’s thesis, following Harold Innis’s work, that new technologies are “pulled” into existence
other materials was a common occupation in the 1800s, and many well-known figures from American history began their writing lives at newspapers, as printer’s devils, reporters, editors, or publishers. In the nineteenth century, for example, abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison pushed for the emancipation of slaves through his weekly, the *Liberator* (1831-65). Radical economist Henry George, advocate of a tax on land and author of the best-selling *Progress and Poverty*, spent his early working years typesetting, writing, and editing at a variety of papers, eventually founding the *San Francisco Daily Evening Post*. Former slave Frederick Douglass, inspired by Garrison’s newspaper, founded the *North Star* in 1847. Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, Theodore Dreiser, and many other poets and novelists began their writing careers at newspapers.³ Philosopher John Dewey and influential early sociologist Robert E. Park hoped to spread their ideas in a newspaper called “Thought News”; Park in fact was a journalist for various newspapers from 1887 to 1898.⁴ Print, in short, was king, and the newspaper medium in particular served as both training ground and sounding board for a wide variety of Americans who hoped to spread their vision for society and the nation at large.

Especially vigorous in the nineteenth century were newspapers created by and for those who, like Douglass and O’Reilly, fell outside of majority, native-born American norms or Anglo-Saxon heritage. African Americans and European immigrants vigorously embraced the newsweekly as a forum to move public opinion and secure a spot for themselves as full citizens of the United States. Black and ethnic

media—defined here as presses produced primarily by and for African Americans or American immigrant groups—educated its readership in the ways of the mainstream population even as it might aggressively push for change. African Americans founded *Freedom's Journal*, the first black periodical, in 1827, and by 1890 more than 600 black papers had been started. Many failed, but more than 150 were operating in 1900, asserting citizenship rights long deferred. Ethnic or immigrant media likewise pushed for group rights, but also linked new Americans to the Old Country. Irish nationalists in particular used the newspaper medium to push for Irish independence from Britain. Foreign news was frequently covered in black and ethnic presses; editors were keenly aware of racial, religious, and national stakes during the years of American “expansion.” Because the newspaper was such a popular forum for these journalists to advocate for their ethnic, religious or racial group, how did activists attempt to use the medium in their struggle for full American belonging?

This study explores African American and Irish American editors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and how they understood and advocated for perceived group interests through their newspaper presses. Unlike most other studies of black or ethnic media, I attempt to tease out how the newspaper medium itself—through illustrations, cartoons, and half-tone photographs; as a site of labor and profit; via advertisements and page layout; and by way of journalism’s evolving conventions and technology—shaped and constrained editors’ roles and thinking in debates over American citizenship during a tumultuous time of racial unrest, economic turmoil, and imperial expansion. Citizenship in this study refers to more than formal, legal rights or responsibilities, and encompasses the broader acceptance of a particular group as part of the American fabric. Much scholarship exists on nationalism and

---

media; most prominently, Benedict Anderson posits that “print capitalism”—the circulation of books, newspapers, and other print media in the vernacular language—was the process through which communities in the Americas and Europe first imagined themselves as nation-states. But concepts of nationhood are not set in stone. They are continually contested, particularly in heterogeneous nations such as the United States, which became the home to millions of descendants of African slaves and experienced multiple waves of immigration. If newspapers helped people imagine the concept of the nation-state itself—a “deep, horizontal comradeship,” according to Anderson—such media also surely played a role in expanding or, conversely, policing, notions of citizenship within the nation. Black and Irish editors fought fiercely for inclusion in citizenship’s more hierarchical “borders of belonging.”

Ultimately, I hope that examining the role that African American and Irish American editors and their newspapers played during a multi-ethnic and multi-regional national reimagining after the Civil War—a period some scholars call the “Era of Citizenship”—might historicize and cast light on the social, political, and even psychological impact of communications technologies today.

7 Ibid., 7.
9 For the concept of an “era of citizenship,” see, for example, Heather Cox Richardson, “North and West of Reconstruction,” in Reconstructions: New
Four editors are studied in depth: two African Americans, T. Thomas Fortune and James Samuel Stemons, and two Irish Americans, the Rev. Peter C. Yorke and Patrick Ford. Each receives his own chapter; another chapter focuses on images—illustrations, cartoons, and photographs—in black, Irish, and mainstream press. The words and experiences of several other black and Irish American newspaper editors are examined throughout this study, but a close, sometimes biographical approach enables me to tease out how newspapering may have affected these four journalists’ thinking. Newspapering was both a personal and political project. Sitting at the helm of a newspaper in the “age of personal journalism” made these editors public figures and public intellectuals with influence in debates around group empowerment. Yet the newspaper forum and marketplace introduced its own rules and priorities; these editors’ thinking cannot ultimately be separated from those influences. Funding a newspaper might require support from an outside party, as when Patrick Ford’s *Irish World* received Republican Party patronage, or when James Samuel Stemons operated under church sponsorship. And while subscription fees or advertising revenues might not make a newspaper profitable, some editors found financial gain through public speaking engagements.

Now is an auspicious time to look again at African American and Irish American newspapers and journalists. Many major studies of black and ethnic media are several decades old. As late as 1987, Sally M. Miller could write that the only major work on ethnic media was Robert E. Park’s *The Immigrant Press and Its Control*, published in 1922. Though scholarship on the black press as a whole


is more current, the sole biography of T. Thomas Fortune, perhaps the top black
journalist of his time, is more than forty years old. A frequently cited study of the
Irish American press dates from 1976, and the most thorough examination of Patrick
Ford, for whom a biography does not yet exist, remains James Rodechko’s 1968 PhD
dissertation.

Yet, since the 1970s, several academic fields have changed dramatically, and
new fields and subfields relevant to this study have emerged. (More primary source
material, too, has been digitized, aiding researchers in accessing far-flung newspaper
archives and tracing particular issues in the press through searchable databases.) In
immigration studies, Oscar Handlin’s metaphor of “uprooted” immigrant groups,
backward-looking and conservative, has given way to scholarship that stresses a
less primordial and more dynamic conception of group culture and boundaries.
I posit that this ongoing “invention of ethnicity” happened frequently through the
newspapers of the ethnic press. In the related field of “whiteness” scholarship,
Matthew Frye Jacobson and other historians traced the evolution of the late
nineteenth century’s “probationary white groups”—Celts, Slavs, Hebrews, Iberics—
into twentieth century Caucasians; David R. Roediger approached the same questions
from labor history, examining white racism and the formation of working class


Emma Lou Thornbrough, T. Thomas Fortune: Militant Journalist (Chicago:
University of Chicago Press, 1972), and Shawn Leigh Alexander, ed., T. Thomas
Fortune, the Afro-American Agitator: A Collection of Writings, 1880-1928

Press, 1848-1883 (New York: Arno Press, 1976), and James Rodechko, Patrick Ford
and His Search for America: A Case Study of Irish-American Journalism, 1870-1913

Oscar Handlin, The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations That
Made the American People (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1951).

See Kathleen Conzen et al., “The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective From the
politics. Whiteness scholarship has been repeatedly debated and refined. Following Eric L. Goldstein, this study does not reveal the Irish “becoming” white so much as *negotiating* and successfully enhancing their whiteness within a field of competing identities.¹⁶

One such identity is religion, a historical field that has blossomed in recent years. Historian Jon Gjerde, looking primarily at conflict between Catholics and Protestants, claims that in the nineteenth century, religion’s role was as central as that of race or ethnicity in the construction of group and national identity.¹⁷ Joshua Paddison goes further, arguing that race and religion were “mutually constitutive” of citizenship during Reconstruction, especially in the American West.¹⁸ Each historian sheds light especially on the Irish American journalists profiled in this study. Catholicism was both an important wellspring and precarious fault line of Irish American identity, yet Patrick Ford strove for a racially egalitarian vision of American citizenship, while Father Peter Yorke advocated economic justice through a religio-racial vision of Christian, white, male supremacy.

The transnational turn in U.S. history—an emphasis on the movement of people, ideas, and things across national or other boundaries, and a de-emphasis on the nation-state as the main unit of historical analysis—also occurred in the years after many formative studies of the black and ethnic press. A transnational approach is key to understanding how empire challenged the “borders of belonging.”


African Americans debated through their presses the role of black soldiers in the Philippine-American War and the race’s proper relationship to Filipinos, with some editors putting racial solidarities over national ones. The Irish, meanwhile, fought Anglo-Saxonism wherever England went, leading to global, cross-racial solidarities. Historians of African America have linked U.S. imperial projects abroad to “uplift” programs—and coercive segregation and disenfranchisement—for African Americans and American Indians at home, a phenomenon some scholars call “Jim Crow colonialism.”

T. Thomas Fortune preaches these uplift pedagogies as he travels to Hawaii and the Philippines, even as he simultaneously turns white civilizationist rhetoric against itself.

Multidisciplinary scholarship in the last several years, often called “print culture,” “Victorian studies,” or “periodical studies,” emphasizes interconnections between periodicals and commerce, literature, and the arts, and to social and political issues of the time. Jürgen Habermas’s theories on the public sphere, so slow to reach the United States, have been hotly debated with newspapers in mind. Newspapers helped African Americans and Irish Americans debate and describe communities based on ideas of fairness and opportunity. Finally, the growing field of visual culture or visual studies, which has emphasized that seeing is “always culturally mediated, chronologically contingent, and interwoven with structures of power,” provides tools for Chapter 3’s analysis of images in black and Irish media.

---


Concentrating only on African American and Irish American newspapers neglects other vibrant late-nineteenth century U.S. presses, particularly the powerful German-language press, and perhaps the smaller but influential Yiddish press in New York. But because most Americans could not read these papers, focusing on English-language media enables me to gauge, when appropriate, black and Irish journalists’ effect on broader public policy debates. Furthermore, a study of two groups with disparate outcomes overall through the turn of the twentieth century may help to contrast the relative importance of each groups’ racial, class, and religious differences to their American citizenship. The Irish still faced discrimination, particularly a nativist backlash against Catholicism, as a Church empowered by Irish immigration flexed its muscle. But the overall trajectory of Irish America was positive, with increasing numbers of Irish moving up the economic ladder, albeit more slowly than some immigrant groups. African Americans, by contrast, saw in this time period the end of government commitment to their welfare with the withdrawal of federal troops from the South in 1877, and lynchings and the onset of Jim Crow toward the end of the century—a period one historian has called the “nadir” of African American history. Black, Irish, and mainstream newspapers alike reported on the so-called “Negro Problem,” and, as with debates over Irish nationalism, intellectual debate might be hard to distinguish from economic competition, as “race men” offered their own solutions in their own newspapers.


Kevin K. Gaines notes a “brutal individualism” and “fierce, often covert competition” among black reformers in the early 1900s. In part because of a dearth
Chapter 1 begins on the nation’s West Coast with Father Peter Yorke, a storied figure in San Francisco history. Editing a newspaper and publishing his own writings in other newspapers enabled Yorke to lend moral suasion to labor struggles and calibrate Catholic doctrine in support of notions of Western and Caucasian civilizational superiority in the face of Chinese labor competition. Simultaneously, it brought him into conflict with the Catholic Church, as increasing channels of print communication blurred lines of Church authority. Making arguments from Catholic perspectives could also foment backlash and incite anti-Catholic anger from the populace at large, in an age when urban reform efforts often had a Protestant, anti-immigrant cast. Despite these hazards, Yorke and other Irish American newspaper editors exercised considerable clout independent of the Catholic church, and, in a campaign to defend a perceived threat to Catholicism in the Philippines, wound up influencing U.S. educational policy in the islands. The American priesthood itself, I will argue, was changed in part by lay and clerical Catholic editors and their newspapers, which brought priests into the public arena. Scholars who have judged Catholic thought as intellectually dormant during these years must not neglect Catholic editors’ creative use of Catholic doctrine as they confronted the issues of the day.

Chapter 2 follows one the most famous black editors of the time, T. Thomas Fortune, on a state-sponsored journey to Hawaii and the Philippines. In 1902, mental and physical exhaustion, financial distress, and the feeling that he deserved a political appointment—combined with aspirations to serve as a broker for the export of African American labor abroad—led Fortune to secure a government appointment to professional opportunities, leadership was “primarily a matter of dominance.” See Gaines, *Uplifting the Race: Black Leadership, Politics, and Culture in the Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
investigate trade and labor conditions in America’s newest possessions. Away from his own newspaper, in territories only just becoming wired to the U.S. mainland via undersea cable, Fortune tried to remain an advocate for African American rights but found himself on unfamiliar ground, his words and ideas translated and debated in forums not his own.

In Hawaii, Fortune publicly allied himself with local business interests and a missionary educational tradition connected to Booker T. Washington. He was treated respectfully by the sons and daughters of abolitionists—as well as by a planter oligarchy eager to end federal exclusion of Chinese so as to obtain cheap field labor—but his hopes for African American emigration were vigorously opposed by most papers connected to this establishment. Hawaii’s robust in-language indigenous and ethnic newspapers, meanwhile, had their own views on black labor in the islands. Fortune did find one outlet to criticize U.S. imperialism: poetry, which still had a place in newspapers of the time.

In Manila, a fiercely independent, entrepreneurial, and militaristic U.S. press, itself at odds with many of the goals of the U.S. commission government in the Philippines, attacked Fortune and his plan. Fortune attempted to survey public opinion on black immigration to the Philippines by circulating a questionnaire, and, on a trek through northern Luzon, used a camera and a portable, painted background to craft a portrait of himself as an intrepid African American explorer and cast the Philippines as a possible home from millions of African Americans. Fortune’s writings during this time reflect a simultaneous mix of criticism of white supremacy and alignment with Victorian notions of culture and civilization—a hybrid stance echoed in both his self-portrait and in the writings and visual elements of black periodicals of the time.

Those visual elements of both the black and Irish American press are
examined in greater detail in Chapter 3. One black cartoonist examined here produced images with stereotypical minstrel forms, but his characters might still critique white power—the genre proved a “pliable sign” for African Americans who worked within it.  

Irish Americans, who like African Americans protested vehemently against racial ridicule in print and on stage, found that, in many cases, by the end of the century they might laugh along with other Irish and non-Irish at softened depictions of comic Irish characters that had lost their derogatory, simian features. Advertisers might even try to link the vigor and righteousness of the Irish fight against discrimination to their own products. The chapter opens with words from the famous black abolitionist and writer Frederick Douglass on the importance of photography to African American advancement. But the medium could be used by whites to produce images mimicking the elements of minstrelsy still popular from mid-century illustrations. Photographic portraits taken by African American soldiers in the Philippines and reprinted in the black press suggest that some editors imagined the islands as fertile ground for black dignity and advancement.

Chapter 4 explores the work of a black editor mostly unknown to scholars, who left behind voluminous notes on the nuts and bolts of publishing a small weekly in early twentieth-century Philadelphia. James Samuel Stemons hoped that through his newspaper he might establish himself as an expert on race relations. Extensive letters between Stemons and his sister reveal the business side of running a weekly African American newspaper, as well as the print economy of other formats, including pamphlet publishing. They portray an economically challenging but, for Stemons and other reformers, enticing arena whereby publishing—essentially self-

publishing—could lead to name recognition and entry into debate over the so-called “Negro Problem,” as well as potentially lucrative speaking engagements. Historians in their investigations have tended to examine newspapers with extensive runs in order to track changes in opinion or emphasis on particular topics through time; less studied are the many hundreds of newspapers, including black newspapers, that lasted just months or even weeks. These intensely personal and competitive ventures influenced public debate even as their operation helped shape the politics of the time; Stemons seemed to have both a political critique and, in modern parlance, one eye toward his Stemons “brand.”

My study ends with Irish American journalist Patrick Ford, who, like Fortune, was well known in his time. The powerful Irish World, with its respectable circulation of more than 100,000 by 1900, was looked upon with admiration and envy by many black and ethnic Americans and even, to an extent, feared by its enemies in Britain and the United States. With Ford the newspaper itself became a locus for the excavation, maintenance, and construction of Irish American history, language, and identity. Social movements discussed within a newspaper frame were lent legitimacy and magnified; Ford’s newspaper could help reveal a movement to itself, as members read about the fund-raising efforts and spirited resistance of like-minded souls across the nation and across the Atlantic. Ford, who started in journalism as a printer’s devil for William Lloyd Garrison, maintained his racial egalitarianism, but his top columnist back-pedaled on African American rights. Throughout, the chapter examines how Ford’s views may have been influenced by the act of running and maintaining a newspaper.

Several themes emerge from the following chapters. Newspapers could pull old institutions, such as the Catholic Church, in new directions, and a vibrant ethnic press united around an issue could even effect policy change at the highest
levels of government. Yet the strife produced by individually empowered activists
directing their own sounding boards could strain and break coalitions, too. Newspaper
weeklies might promote illusions of power, a mirage of influence over a virtual or
at least fleeting public sphere; Stemons’s newspapers, for example, lasted as long as
his investors thought there was any chance of profit, and no longer. Editor-activists
fought against destructive racial ideologies, but found whole discourses, whether
of race and labor or education and uplift, and entire aesthetic sensibilities, such as
minstrelsy, difficult to write or draw or photograph around. The abandonment of
African American rights by Progressives, in fact, was reflected within the newspaper
press of one of Irish America’s most committed racial egalitarians. And while
empire could introduce new possibilities for racial advancement, durable, regional
discriminations might travel to America’s new territories abroad and be magnified and
employed in new ways by local presses with their own, specific agendas.

No simple historical lines can be drawn from our own twenty-first century
world to the lives of Yorke, Fortune, Stemons, and Ford. Yet something of the
vibrancy and vulnerability, brilliance and amateurism, earnestness and arrogance
of these four newspapermen’s enterprises recalls today’s blogosphere, risen from
the ashes of the large, commercial dailies that grew to dominate the twentieth
century. The United States will succeed or fail in defining itself, in creating inclusive
or exclusive American identities, through conversations mediated by modern
communication technologies. To say we’ve gone “back to blogging” probably
collapses important distinctions between our time and the long nineteenth century.
But I hope some wisdom about the promises and perils of very personal media may
be gleaned from this study.
Chapter 1. Father Peter Yorke: A Publisher-Priest in the Fault Lines of American Identity

The American people reads. Perhaps its reading is not deep, but it is wide; moreover, it is impartial…. Every fad, every humbug, every political measure, every social dream has its expounders, has its readers—why not the old Church that gave printing to the world? We hardly realize what a powerful engine the printing press is.

-- Father Peter C. Yorke, The Ghosts of Bigotry, 1894

The priests of all future dispensations shall be members of the press.

-- John Boyle O’Reilly, editor, the Pilot, 1879.

The Rev. Peter C. Yorke, a major figure in San Francisco labor history, left behind a huge amount of written material, from instruction manuals on Catholic education, to fiery editorials in support of workers’ right to strike, to reprinted speeches advocating the expulsion of Chinese immigrants. A bold defender of the Church, Yorke carefully read papal encyclicals and translated them into marching orders for organized labor. Yet through the newspaper medium in particular, Yorke became a public figure in new ways, far beyond what he would have experienced as a more typical parish priest. He entered into political debates and issued immediate rejoinders against his adversaries. His criticism of state-sponsored education, which he felt was anti-Catholic, and his endorsement of some politicians over others led to his appointment to the board of regents of the University of California. His outspoken nature and public presence in San Francisco turned the city’s Catholic hierarchy against him, but when pushed out of the editorship of the city’s official Catholic Church publication, the Monitor, he started his own newspaper, the Leader, which was popularly accepted as the last word on Irish-Catholic opinion in the city.3

3 The best in-depth examinations of Father Yorke are two works by James P.
Much twentieth-century historiography avoided or neglected consideration of religion’s powerful place in American life. This has changed rapidly over the last few decades.\textsuperscript{4} Most recently, several new studies, many of them based on the U.S. West, place religion in alliance with race and class in the production of American citizenship.\textsuperscript{5} In the West, particularly on the West Coast, the racial “others” who were used to help create a unifying “whiteness” were Asians, most prominently “heathen” Chinese. Notions of racial and religious superiority combined to produce a normative whiteness that could encompass, unite, and help make claims for full social and political rights for a diverse group of immigrants of European origin. Father Yorke participated passionately in the production of a white working class identity, skillfully using the print medium to advocate for Irish Americans in San Francisco, sometimes

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{4} For an excellent summation of contemporary scholarship on religion, see Randall J. Stephens, “American Religious History in Context,” in Recent Themes in American Religious History: Historians in Conversation (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2009), 2-10.

\textsuperscript{5} See, for example, Joshua Paddison, American Heathens. Gjerde and John T. McGreevy see a struggle between Catholicism and Protestantism as stretching beyond antebellum America and shaping not just American notions of freedom but the state itself. See John T. McGreevy, Catholicism and American Freedom: A History (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003).
using Asians as a foil for white labor solidarity and Irish American belonging.

Until the 1970s, Yorke’s biographers tended to ignore his racism toward Chinese and Japanese and his bigoted but somewhat more paternalistic views of African Americans. Historian James Walsh discussed those views in some detail, using them to strike back at hagiographic depictions of Yorke and to cast him instead as an “ethnic militant” not above demagoguery in the operation of his own personal press. Walsh even views Yorke’s late-1890s campaign against the anti-Catholic American Protective Association (APA) as a largely media-created furor the priest used to promote himself as an ethnic leader in a city not particularly known for hostility toward Catholics.⁶

Walsh’s work corrects hagiographic depictions of Yorke as a morally unimpeachable protector San Francisco’s downtrodden. Yet, he casts Yorke as part of a “relatively uncommitted intellectually and close-minded” Catholic leadership, his legacy itself “highly consistent with the intellectual history of American Catholicism.”⁷ Walsh faults Yorke for assuming that “Catholic doctrine, as he understood it, contained within its principles the solutions to all problems.”⁸ Historians will continue to debate the relative vigor of Catholic intellectual contribution in nineteenth and early twentieth century America.⁹ But, for example,

⁶ See Walsh, Ethnic Militancy, and Walsh, “Regent Peter C. Yorke.”
⁷ Ibid., 137.
⁸ Ibid., 134.
Yorke’s discomfort with the educational agenda proposed by the largely Protestant reform movement around the turn of the century shows, in a long view of educational debates about standardization, pre-professionalism, and the role of the humanities, some prescience. His critiques of Progressive thought show a creativity that, while informed by his faith, do not adhere strictly or flow automatically from Catholic doctrine. He took Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, for example, as a green light for vigorous labor activism, and adapted it to his purposes. And while Walsh is surely right about Yorke’s penchant for exaggeration and even demagoguery, his and other Irish-Catholic editors’ use of weekly presses to secure political change is impressive, showing not a retreat into ethnic or religious ghettoization, but rather an outward push that packed enough clout to change, for instance, U.S. educational policy in the Philippines. Yorke used the *Monitor* and the *Leader* to bring personal, Irish, and Catholic perspectives into public debate; yet Yorke and other Irish Catholic editors’ embrace of the printed word in turn affected the priesthood, and possibly even changed the faith itself.

*A first battle against anti-Catholic bigotry*

Peter Yorke was born on August 13, 1864, in Galway, an important

Figure 1. The Rev. Peter C. Yorke.

---

commercial center in the west of Ireland. At age eleven he stopped his secular education and began to study for the priesthood in Tuam, in County Galway. In 1882, at age eighteen, he entered the national seminary, St. Patrick’s College in Maynooth, where he studied philosophy, theology, scripture, and Church history. He left for the United States in 1886, to complete his studies at St. Mary’s Seminary in Baltimore. He was ordained there in December 1887 and assigned to the Archdiocese of San Francisco, arriving in early 1888. However, San Francisco Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan soon sent him back to the East Coast for graduate studies in theology at the newly opened Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He returned to San Francisco in 1891, became chancellor of the archdiocese in 1894, and served a variety of parish positions in the Bay Area until his death on April 5, 1925.10

Yorke’s first public battle, against local Protestant ministers associated with the American Protective Association (APA), reveals a Roman Catholic priest using print journalism to counter anti-Catholic bigotry and assert Irish American citizenship. The APA began in Clinton, Iowa, in 1887 with Henry Bowers, who claimed a coalition of Roman Catholics had conspired to defeat him in the town’s mayoral election. The APA sought to remove Catholics from political office and denounced Catholic institutions, especially Catholic schools. Often the organization portrayed itself as the protector of female innocence, allegedly in danger of corruption by Catholic priests and in Catholic group homes for girls and women convicted of crimes.11 By the mid-1890s, the APA had at least half a million members in the

10 Biographical information on Father Yorke comes from Cronin, Father Yorke; Walsh, Ethnic Militancy; Brusher, Consecrated Thunderbolt; and the Rev. Peter C. Yorke Collection, Gleeson Library/Geschke Center, University of San Francisco.
A school textbook published in 1894 sparked the APA fight in San Francisco. Philip Van Ness Myer’s *Outlines of Medieval and Modern History*, adopted for use in city grade schools, was deemed anti-Catholic by Archbishop Riordan. Riordan tried to get the city’s Board of Education to withdraw the book, and the APA responded with a flood of editorials in local papers decrying the influence of “Rome’s Red Hand” on the city’s public schools. Riordan appointed Yorke editor-in-chief of the *Monitor*, by then the official newspaper of the Archdiocese of San Francisco, in the fall of 1894, and tasked him with defeating the APA.

Yorke took up the charge, responding with biting editorials, demands that his adversaries reveal their sources for their supposed Catholic conspiracies, and lengthy theological debates. He went even further, having *Monitor* reporters clandestinely join local APA lodges. He then printed in the *Monitor* the APA’s confidential lodge oath, lists of APA officers and members, and names of businessmen whom the APA was boycotting for their refusal to join the organization. He challenged the *San Francisco Chronicle*, which had printed numerous anti-Catholic sermons and diatribes from APA-associated ministers, to publish his own lectures; when they refused he used the *Examiner*. When the *Examiner* tired of the controversy, declaring it would no longer print letters from either side, Yorke switched to the *Call*. When the *Examiner*’s readership then plummeted, the paper reversed its decision and printed a special supplement containing all the controversial lectures and debate, and let Yorke respond in print to the latest APA lectures, often in the same issue.
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14 Ibid., 30. In other U.S. cities, Anglo Saxons typically dominated the corporate world, but the Irish and other European immigrant groups in San Francisco made in-roads into the higher echelons of the economic structure, including publishing.
How serious a threat to San Francisco’s Catholics was the APA? Historian Joseph S. Brusher calls the APA a “lunatic fringe” denounced by respectable Protestants, including Reverends Washington Gladden, Lyman Abbot, and Elbert Hubbard. The APA certainly traded in conspiracy theories, circulating a bogus encyclical from Pope Leo XIII in which the Pontiff called on Catholics to “exterminate all heretics found in the jurisdiction of the United States of America.”

Walsh sees San Francisco as “unfertile ground indeed” for nativism; in 1900, a full third of the population was foreign-born, with the Irish, numbering about 95,000, making up the second-largest ethnic group after Germans. Walsh estimates that Protestants could have been outnumbered in San Francisco by over five to one. Thus, Yorke’s beating back of the APA in San Francisco appears to Walsh more of a media-created sensation.

But small, late nineteenth-century media’s power to shape public opinion and effect policy is precisely the point, and may be relatively unexplored compared to studies of the large, “yellow” dailies of the Gilded Age or the traditional muckrakers of the Progressive Era. Historian Justin Nordstrom believes anti-Catholic print publications in the early twentieth century remain understudied and significant.

The Spreckels family (Adolph, John, and Rudolph), sons of a German immigrant who made his fortune in Hawaiian sugar, owned the typically anti-labor Call, one of the city’s largest dailies. Though the Chronicle was Republican-aligned and the city’s most conservative newspaper, it was tied by marriage to Irish San Francisco through the Tobin family, which was originally from County Tipperary and friendly with Father Yorke. William Randolph Hearst’s Examiner had the largest West Coast circulation and directed itself toward the common man. Father Yorke may have been popular and newsworthy enough in San Francisco to interest editors across the political spectrum with running his articles. See Michael Kazin, Barons of Labor: The San Francisco Building Trades and Union Power in the Progressive Era (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), 22, 27.
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16 Ibid., 130.
17 Walsh, Ethnic Militancy, 14-17.
sources of anti-Catholic and, important to this study, Progressive attitudes and thought. One nativist paper, *The Menace*, published in Aurora, Missouri, achieved by 1915 a circulation of more than 1.5 million, dwarfing even the largest big-city newspapers of its time. Yorke may have honestly feared a resurgence of anti-Catholic nativism similar to that of the mid-1800s, when Catholics and Protestants battled over the funding of public education. Anti-Catholicism, at least nationally, was still alive well into the twentieth century. In any case, Father Yorke became famous for pushing back the APA in San Francisco; Cronin cites the end of the APA battle in the city as March 1896, when the last Protestant minister to oppose Yorke, Charles W. Wendte, withdrew from the controversy after he and Yorke had quarreled in a twenty-nine letter debate that was printed in local newspapers. Regardless of the level of threat, Yorke at least appeared to have vanquished a formidable foe.

At the close of the APA fight, Yorke published a series of lectures titled, "The Ghosts of Bigotry," which provides an early hint of how he would use Catholic doctrine to suit his purposes, and the tensions present between his public persona and his role as a Catholic priest. In "Ghosts," Yorke announced a "Catholic Truth Society" to explain the faith and combat lies about it. Yet he found it necessary to justify at some length how an empowered laity, promoting these Catholic truths, would not in fact conflict with the Church hierarchy. In Catholic theology, Yorke wrote, the task of preaching the gospel was given to the Apostles and their successors, the bishops and the Pope. These figures decided who may preach the gospel, "[b]ut this oversight does not mean that there is not on each of us the obligation of making our religion known…on the laity, too, rests the duty of giving a reason for the faith that is in them." When the Archbishop of the diocese organizes the laity into these truth
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19 Yorke, *Ghosts of Bigotry*, 16.
societies, “there is no break with the traditions of the Church, nothing opposed to Catholic habits of thought.”

To Yorke, Catholics had a responsibility to publish.

_ Labor, the press and the Pope: Yorke and Rerum Novarum_

Though Yorke’s position as a parish priest made his forays into public life tricky, his Catholicism could empower his reform efforts, not simply inhibit them. In fact, Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical _Rerum Novarum: Rights and Duties of Capital and Labor_, issued from Rome in May of 1891, was reportedly the instigation and frame for Yorke’s labor activism in the 1901 Teamsters’ Strike in San Francisco. The encyclical is a remarkable document of its time and is worth exploring briefly.

The Pope’s support for labor, and importantly, labor unions, was clear and strong in _Rerum_. So was the Church’s disdain for socialism. The Pope began by sketching the era’s trying times. Revolution was in the air:

That the spirit of revolutionary change, which has long been disturbing the nations of the world, should have passed beyond the sphere of politics and made its influence felt in the cognate sphere of practical economics is not surprising. The elements of the conflict now raging are unmistakable, in the vast expansion of industrial pursuits and the marvellous discoveries of science; in the changed relations between masters and workmen; in the enormous fortunes of some few individuals, and the utter poverty of the masses; the increased self reliance and closer mutual combination of the working classes; as also, finally, in the prevailing moral degeneracy.

In such an environment, the Pope wrote, it was difficult “to define the relative rights and mutual duties of the rich and of the poor, of capital and of labor.” In fact,  

David M. Emmons has suggested that _Rerum Novarum_ could be read alongside the nineteenth century manifestos of Karl Marx and Henry George as a key work analyzing capital and labor in the nineteenth century. See Emmons, _Beyond the American Pale_, 327.

“crafty agitators” were taking advantage of the times to “stir up the people to revolt.” Instead, a remedy needed to be found for the “misery and wretchedness pressing so unjustly on the majority of the working class.” The abolishment of “ancient workingmen’s guilds” had left working men “surrendered, isolated and helpless, to the hardheartedness of employers and the greed of unchecked competition.” The Pope wrote bluntly that a tiny elite had burdened the masses of poor with “a yoke little better than that of slavery itself.”

It is here, the Pope wrote, that socialists entered the fray, using the “poor man’s envy of the rich” to their advantage and “striving to do away with private property” by transferring administration of wealth and land to the state. In a lengthy defense of private property, the Pope wrote that those who worked the land should rightfully own the fruits of their labor; those who did not own or work directly on the land were connected to it and paid for their labors through its riches.

Private property was in accord with the “laws of nature,” including human nature. Furthermore, the Pope wrote, socialists would destroy the family by letting the state intrude into the domestic sphere. And their utopian, earthly dreams were dangerous, for to “suffer and to endure…is the lot of humanity.” False promises to the poor would bring forth far worse evils. “Nothing,” the Pope declared, “is more useful than to look upon the world as it really is.”

Instead of anticipating endless conflict between capital and labor, the Pope’s vision was a cooperative one. Christian institutions could help the classes live in harmony and agreement; indeed, “if human society is to be healed now, in no other way can it be healed save by a return to Christian life and Christian institutions.”

\[\text{Rerum Novarum, paragraphs 2 and 3.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., paragraph 8.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., paragraph 18.}\]
\[\text{Ibid., paragraph 27.}\]
The state had a duty to protect private property, and even break up organizations that sought to seize private property. But working men had a concomitant right to form unions; workingmen’s unions, the Pope asserted, were the “most important” method to protect laborers.27

Between the end of his editorship of the Monitor in 1898 and the birth, in January 1902, of the Leader, Father Yorke skillfully used Rerum Novarum, his own writing abilities, and the local San Francisco press to advocate for the rights of labor in the city’s Teamster waterfront strike of 1901. In April 1901, a newly formed Employers’ Association was defeating small unions one after the other in the city. When employers locked out the teamsters after they refused to haul luggage for a non-union firm, waterfront unions joined forces in a strike. Both sides blamed the other for violent confrontations. When the teamsters approached Father Yorke for his help, possibly to represent them should their struggle be arbitrated, he took time to consult Pope Leo’s encyclical.28 The priest believed that Rerum Novarum declared that workers had an inherent right to organize. Yorke first borrowed a tactic from his APA fight a few years before, revealing through articles in the Examiner the membership of the Employers’ Association (Examiner editor Thomas Williams as well as William Randolph Hearst were personal friends of Yorke’s).29 The Examiner would remain the outlet for Yorke’s commentary on the strike and its developments. The paper in September 1901 listed seven forthcoming articles from Father Yorke, and their titles, including “On the Accusations of Violence,” and “On Yellow Journalism.”30

In his third article, “On the Real Question at Issue,” Yorke described the

27 Ibid., paragraph 49.
28 Cronin, Father Yorke, 52-53.
29 Ibid., 56.
30 San Francisco Examiner, Sept. 27, 1901.
employers’ changing positions on the strike, and, while denying that he in any way orchestrated the strife, alluded to his key role in the conflict. Employers, Yorke wrote, first claimed it was their right to run their businesses as they would; then, that the strikers were dangerous; that armies of non-union men wished to work but were prevented from doing so; and finally, that strikers themselves wished to return to their jobs but were brow-beaten by union leaders. And, Yorke noted, “judging from the welcome abuse of which I am the object in certain sections of the press…it would appear that I hatched the strike; that I am maintaining it and that I am the only obstacle in the way of a settlement.”

Such distractions, Yorke wrote, diverted attention from the real purpose of the dispute: that is, the Employers’ Association, “the rich men’s union,” was attempting to destroy the Teamsters, “the poor men’s union.” In between were the middlemen, the Draymen, who owned the teams of horses driven by the Teamsters. The Draymen and Teamsters had both organized, forming unions and entering into an agreement to employ each other and avoid working for non-union employers when possible. But when the Employers’ Association “threatened to ruin the Draymen by starting a rival draying concern,” the Draymen locked out the Teamsters.

Yorke wrote in a simple style, laying out what he called “facts” and letting “the people of California” judge: “Now, in all these changes, in all this turmoil, there are certain facts which stand out clear and distinct…This is a fact that no amount of abuse can get rid of.” “Let us come at it again…” “Let the facts answer.” “This fact cannot be denied.” “…here are two great facts that the people of California should face boldly.” “Look well on that fact, people of California. It is more than a fact, it is a portent.” “A third fact…is the keystone of the arch…”

31 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
Many historians cite this facts-based rhetoric and method as a key marker of Progressive reformers, who sought social amelioration through the “collection, analysis, and dissemination of information to the public.”\textsuperscript{34} Progressives had great faith that information and its exposure, typically through print publication, was key to reform. Catholic newspapers responded to nativist charges in a like manner, challenging their adversaries to provide proof in public forums of their claims of Church treachery. Nordstrom sees Progressives as actors “who used the power of information to enact change on the communities around them.”\textsuperscript{35} Father Yorke was no exception, battling negative portrayals of Catholics and the Irish in print, within a framework, journalism, that privileges evidentiary knowledge.

Yet Father Yorke would have never called himself a Progressive. Historians have documented a Protestant and often anti-Catholic cast to the reform impulses of Progressivism. In addition to the usual charges of Catholics’ slavish mentality—“taking orders from the Pope” and thus threatening American democracy—Progressives in their fight against corruption often put in their crosshairs the political machinery and industrial clout of powerful urban Catholics.\textsuperscript{36} Yorke’s disdain for editor Charles K. McClatchy of the \textit{Sacramento Bee}, whom Yorke considered a traitor to his Irish roots and Catholic faith, shows the late-nineteenth century tension between Progressive reformers and Catholics. McClatchy joined Yorke in taking on the APA, but as he crafted the \textit{Bee} into what one historian calls “a mouthpiece for Progressive reform,” he targeted unassimilated immigrant groups and politicians who

\textsuperscript{34} Nordstrom, \textit{Danger on the Doorstep}, 55.


\textsuperscript{36} Progressives, according to Michael Kazin, “attacked party machines and party loyalty as fundamentally undemocratic methods of rule.” Kazin, \textit{Barons of Labor}, 285.
catered to them, and occasionally took jabs at the Pope. Yorke and McClatchy fought bitterly during the 1898 California gubernatorial campaign, the Teamsters strike of 1901 (McClatchy supported labor but drew the line at violence, which he saw as coming primarily from the strikers and which he accused Yorke of fomenting), and the San Francisco Graft Trials of 1906-09.37

Yorke’s “facts” in the Teamsters strike, in any case, were three: that the Employers’ Association started the strike by locking out the Teamsters; that the Association began the strike to destroy labor unions; and that the Association refused to meet with the workers and strike a deal. He repeatedly called the Employers’ Association “the rich men’s union,” and the Teamsters “the poor men’s union.”38

In the next day’s Examiner article, “On the Mind of the Pope,” Yorke mediated between the pontiff and the city’s laborers. What did the Pope, according to Yorke, have to say about the rights and duties of capital and labor? He “comes out plump and plain in favor of unions.” Unions, the Pope believed, existed “of their own right, not by the permission of the employer, or even of the civil government.” In fact, as Yorke pointed out, the Pope seemed to anticipate employer arguments that no one should speak for individual working men; that is, that employers would repeatedly argue that disgruntled employees should simply seek redress with their employers as individuals, not as a collective force. Yorke quoted the pontiff directly: “Should it happen that a master or a workman believe himself injured, nothing should be more desirable than that a committee should be appointed, composed of reliable and capable members of the labor union... to settle the dispute.” Yet, Yorke said, “this is

what the Employers’ Association of San Francisco will not do.”

Finally, Yorke repeated the Pope’s words on the special consideration the poor must receive from the state. In assuring equal rights to all, the State must not shirk its duty. “Still,” the Pope had written, “where there is a question of defending the rights of individuals, the poor and helpless have claim to especial consideration,” for “the richer class have many ways of shielding themselves” and therefore need the State less. Yorke said that San Francisco city government protects the rich and leaves the poor to be shot by city police or hired “specials.”

The settlement of the strike in October 1901—employers agreed not to discriminate against union men, though they did not agree to a closed shop—was viewed by most as a victory for labor, and union rolls swelled considerably in the months to come. Father Yorke was widely credited with helping earn a victory for labor in the city.

But using an encyclical from the Pope to rally Irish laborers was still a risky strategy for an Irish American leader to employ. John P. Irish (his real name), a U.S. immigration officer, agriculturist, and newspaper editor, watched the labor battle and wrote in the *Oakland Enquirer* of the Pope and Father Yorke, “Standing at the Antipodes of Rome, I salute that venerable institution (The Papacy) and warn it that the propagation of this Yorke cult in its name in the United States will destroy the religious peace and spiritual prosperity which it here enjoyed under our institutions.” Yorke, Irish charged, was introducing the Roman Church into the United States as “a political enemy of the state,” and should he continue and gain more support, “the time will come that he and all like him in un-American spirit, will be deported like
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39 Ibid., Sept. 28, 1901.
40 Ibid.
41 Cronin, *Father Yorke*, 85, 91.
Chinamen who land on forged certificates.” Catholicism at the beginning of the twentieth century was still seen by many as a foreign religion that went against the American grain; Yorke’s use of the Pope’s words to mobilize workers was, to Irish, tantamount to treason.

It was not just Protestants that Yorke as a public figure risked alienating. In citing Rerum so extensively, Yorke was perhaps deliberately ignoring another, more recent encyclical from the Pope and the dispute it centered around. In Testem Benevolentiae, promulgated in January of 1899, Leo XIII addressed “Americanism,” the idea that Catholicism in America was too independent of Rome and too accepting of the separation of church and state. Isaac Thomas Hecker was at the center of the controversy. Hecker, a Protestant convert to Catholicism, one of America’s most prominent Catholics, and founder and publisher of the Catholic World, was never explicitly condemned by Rome. Rather, a French preface to a translated American biography of Hecker, who had died a decade before, stressed his individualism and his modern thinking. French activist priests promptly embraced Hecker, Catholicism in America, which they saw as more closely connected to the people, and American priests, who they saw as public figures allowed greater individual initiative in their faith and in its promulgation. It was these notions, brought together under the rubric

42 Oakland Enquirer, Oct. 9, 1901, in Cronin, Father Yorke, 94-95. Like some other public figures and intellectuals explored briefly in Chapter 2, John P. Irish went against the grain of West Coast anti-Asian sentiment, at least with respect to the Japanese. He staunchly defended Japanese culture and Japanese Americans in California, and would receive a reward for his efforts from the Emperor Taishō. See Lon Kurashige, “Transpacific Accommodation and the Defense of Asian Immigrants,” Pacific Historical Review 83 (2014): 294-313.

43 Emmons believes that American republicanism viewed the hierarchical Catholic Church as something akin to chattel slavery, making the Irish “unwanted strangers” in America, especially in the West. See Emmons, Beyond the American Pale, 13.

“Americanism,” to which conservative Catholics in Europe and Rome objected strenuously, and which Pope Leo XIII likewise rejected in *Testem Benevolentiae*, though with considerably more tact.

In *Testem*, addressed to Cardinal James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, the Pope made clear that individual freedoms can be taken too far in matters of faith; that the Holy Ghost’s promptings are not easily interpreted without direction from the Church; and, in a line that would surely have raised the eyebrows of a publisher-priest such as Father Yorke, that the Vatican was wary of the “dangers of these present times,” which it defined as “the confounding of license with liberty, the passion for discussing and pouring contempt upon any possible subject, the assumed right to hold whatever opinions one pleases upon any subject and to set them forth in print to the world.” All these things demonstrated “a greater need of the Church’s teaching office than ever before.”

Historians are divided on the effect of *Testem* upon Catholic thinking; some see it drastically deadening Catholic intellectual life, while others insist that few laity or clergy even noticed it. It seems likely that Yorke would have read it; a response by New York’s Archbishop Michael Corrigan to *Testem* was front-page news in the San Francisco *Call* on May 1, 1899. Corrigan thanked the Pope profusely for exposing and rooting out the “so-called Americanism” in Catholic life—and then, in another example of the still-somewhat precarious place of Irish Americans in the United States at the turn of the century, professed Catholics’ Americanness:

---


45 *Testem Benevolentiae*, paragraphs 14 and 15, online at: [http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Leo13/l13teste.htm](http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Leo13/l13teste.htm).

And now, with our heads held high, we can repeat that we are Americans, as truly as anyone, whoever he may be. Yes, we are, and we glory in it. We glory in it because our nation is great in its institutions and in its undertakings; great in its development and its activity; but in the matter of religion and the doctrine of discipline, of morality, of Christian perfection, we glory in following implicitly the Holy See.47

The quotation exhibits historian Jon Gjerde’s “Catholic conundrum.” Because in America the Church was largely an immigrant one, Roman Catholics tended to stress elements in American ideology that spoke to a pluralist society. But many Roman Catholics simultaneously believed “theirs was the one true faith.” The resulting, vexing question for Catholics: “How could a pluralist perspective that welcomed a variety of beliefs be integrated into these particularist beliefs?” 48

From the winter of 1898 to November 1899, Father Yorke was traveling and studying in Europe and Ireland; during a trip to Italy, he obtained a private audience with Pope Leo XIII.49 Yorke appears to have used the meeting, with the help of his relationships to San Francisco media, to strengthen his position in San Francisco and bolster the idea, perhaps against the grain of Testem, that priests could be vocal, public figures and publishers. A report in the Call a few weeks after Corrigan’s response to Americanism described the meeting, gleaned from, the paper explained, “private advices from Rome.” Headlined, “Father Yorke Received by His Holiness” and including a subhead, “Pope on Journalism,” the article portrayed a frail Pope in awe of the journalist-priest from America. The Pope took Yorke’s hand “in a fond clasp and held is so during the entire audience”; the Pope “remained motionless”

47 San Francisco Call, May 1, 1899.
48 Gjerde, Catholicism and the Shaping of Nineteenth Century America, 12. Gjerde’s “Protestant conundrum,” in turn, stemmed from Protestants’ own beliefs that their faith undergirded American liberty: “If Catholicism was to be abided in the United States, the Protestant puzzles were both how to integrate Catholicism into the nation and how to incorporate it without endangering religious liberty.” 47.
49 Cronin, Father Yorke, 35-37.
except upon hearing that Yorke had once spoken to an audience of 50,000, at which point “he gesticulated with his hands and arms, throwing them up in the air and wide apart,” impressed with “the immensity of this influence for good.” The article continued, “‘You must wield immense influence,’ said the Pope, as he marveled at the audience of one Catholic journalist. He proceeded to enlarge about the power of the Catholic press.” The Pope’s parting words to Yorke were that he should tell his “friends and helpers” that “the Holy Father is deeply interested in your work and that he showed great interest in it when he spoke to you and that he encouraged you with all his heart.” The “advices” then give the Call a detailed itinerary of Father Yorke’s remaining travels. It seems possible, even probable, that the Call’s main or only source was Father Yorke himself.

The Irish press confronts imperialism

Asserting their American credentials was further complicated for Father Yorke and other Irish Americans during turn-of-the-century American imperialism. Examination of the Irish American press’s response to (briefly) the South African (or Boer) War and the Philippine-American War reveals political, racial, and religious tensions in American citizenship even as the conflicts demonstrated the considerable power wielded by Irish American editors, including Father Yorke, to shape U.S. policy abroad.

Ireland’s impassioned fight against British rule meant Irish American editors often took anti-imperialist stances, expressing sympathy and sometimes outright
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50 San Francisco Call, May 29, 1899.
solidarity with indigenous populations suffering the depredations of British or other European imperial aggression worldwide. When Britain declared war on Paul Kruger’s Transvaal Republic in October of 1899, ostensibly to protect British settlers, the Irish press issued a call to arms to defend the Dutch Boer in southern Africa. To Irish editors, the Boer were heroic, yeoman farmers, comparable to America’s founding fathers in their fight against England. Patrick Ford’s *Irish World* and *Industrial Liberator*, for example, starting in late 1899, reprinted for several months at the top of its editorial page (under the headline “Ho for the Transval!”) a list of ports and steamers that Irish American volunteers could use to travel across the Atlantic to southern Africa to join the fight.52

U.S. “expansion” at the turn of the century likewise drew sharp criticism from much of the Irish American press, which feared that Uncle Sam in the Caribbean was imitating the global aggressions of John Bull, or, in the Philippines, being tricked by Britain into a confrontational quagmire with China in the Pacific. In April 1898, the United States declared war on Spain, ostensibly to help Cubans in their uprising against the Spanish, after the suspicious sinking of the *U.S.S. Maine* in Havana’s harbor and much agitation for war among the public and press. The next month, across the world, U.S. Admiral George Dewey destroyed the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, and prepared to attack Manila. Filipinos revolting against Spanish rule were allies with the United States for a time. After Spanish surrender, a tense standoff between U.S. troops and Filipino rebels outside Manila exploded into fighting on February 4, 1899, and United States began battling Filipino revolutionaries on the archipelago in a brutal war that would kill 4,165 U.S. troops and as many as 20,000 Filipino combatants and 750,000 civilians.53 (Roosevelt would declare fighting over

53 Mortality figures, which for Filipino civilians include death from conditions created or exacerbated by war, such as disease, come from Michael H. Hunt and
on July 4, 1902, though armed resistance to the United States would continue until 1913, particularly on Southern islands.)

As the confrontation escalated, discussion in the Irish American press quickly turned to the preservation of the Philippines’ Catholic character and institutions. U.S. censorship of news in the Philippines could not prevent the leakage of reports of U.S. army desecration of the islands’ Catholic churches. “Outraging A People’s Religion,” the *Irish World* screamed in September 1899, with the subhead, “United States Army Officers, Graduates of West Point, Ruthlessly Trample Upon Sacred Things.”\(^5^4\) The article describes a church altar turned into a makeshift telegraph station. The *Monitor* ran afoul of Gen. Frederick Funston, charging his troops with looting religious items from Catholic churches in the Philippines and selling them in San Francisco.\(^5^5\) Later in the war, the *Irish-American* tracked the story of a Catholic priest, probably Filipino, given the “water cure” three times by U.S. troops from Vermont, and who died from that torture.\(^5^6\)

Though U.S. censorship of the press during the Philippine-American war contributed to the speculative nature of many reports, Irish American editors were surely correct in their assumption that preserving the nation’s Catholic churches was not a top priority among U.S. troops. Senate hearings on U.S. troop atrocities in the Philippines revealed numerous human rights abuses and other violations. A. J. Nicholson, a young San Franciscan who fought in the Philippines in 1898 and ‘99, Seven I. Levine, *Arc of Empire: America’s Wars in Asia From the Philippines to Vietnam* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 57-58.

\(^5^4\) *Irish World*, Sept. 29, 1899.

\(^5^5\) As reported in the *Irish World*, Dec. 9, 1899. Yorke was no longer at the helm of the *Monitor* at this time.

\(^5^6\) *Irish-American*, Nov. 22, 1902. The New York City-based newspaper was edited by Patrick Meehan, who, until his death in 1906, “attempted to reconcile nationalism with Catholicism.” Finding Aid of the Thomas F. Meehan Papers, Georgetown University. Online at https://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/558985/GTM_GAMMS213.html
wrote in his diary on July 3, 1898, while U.S. troops and Philippine rebels were still allied in fighting the Spanish, “There are 5 churches in town, and all have their own jails, but they were very badly used up, at the hands of the American gunners, by chance shots, + what they didn’t do, the Insurgents finished. In all they were badly destroyed….All the Spanish statues in the town have been beheaded. Some were very fine + also valuable.”\(^5\) By February of 1899, after Spanish surrender and the beginning of fighting between Filipino rebels and U.S. troops, Nicholson wrote, “2 companies of Wash. [Washington state regiment] sent across [sic] river, to burn the shacks on river bank. Church and Priests residence found to be arsenals. Blown up by 6th Artillery. Fire jumps the river, burning several houses on our side.”\(^5\) The next day, U.S. troops retreated, “after burning the Church and all shacks….Father McKinnon took an inventory of property in Goudoloupe [sic] church, but Gen. King gave orders to burn it just the same.”\(^5\)

Father Yorke and others in the Irish American press were watching. In an item titled “Priest Hunting in the Philippines,” Yorke’s Leader reprinted an order from General J. K. Bell which declared “every native priest in the provinces of Batangas

---


\(^{58}\) Ibid., Feb. 18, 1899, pp. 33-34.

\(^{59}\) Ibid., p. 37. An entry on February 20, 1899 reveals soldiers’ fears that “insurgents” were disguising themselves as priests: “‘Priest’ crossing the lines below Macati, ordered by sentry to halt, disobeyed, and was killed.” A similar entry a few days later suggests a rapid change in the racialization of Filipinos after they began fighting U.S. troops: “Shortly after 6 a.m. Washington’s left wing, assisted by Wyoming from across [sic] the river, round out a hot-bed of Rebels, + score quite a killing. Lasted till after noon, 45 niggers piled up, + 36 Rifles captured.” (Before this entry, Nicholson’s descriptions of Filipinos tended to be neutral or more mildly patronizing, as when he discovered that many rebels wore amulets they believed would ward off bullets.) “Among the dead,” Nicholson continued, “was a ‘Priest’ caught in the trenches, with a mouser rifle.”
and Laguna” to be “a secret enemy of the Government and in active sympathy with the insurgents,” and called for priests to be brought to trial “whenever sufficient evidence is obtainable,” and even imprisoned and held if “well founded suspicions” but no hard evidence was available. The Leader called the order “disgraceful” and compared it to the penal-law period in Ireland.  

After Philippine rebel leader Emilio Aguinaldo’s capture, debate in the Irish American press soon shifted to how the U.S. should administer these lands, and here many Irish American editors asserted that the nation could learn much from Catholic nations and their experience of colonialism. When some Protestant missionaries

sneered at what they called the dark legacy of Spanish colonization in Latin America and the Philippines, Irish American editors turned this on its head, claiming that America had much to learn from Catholicism when it came to administering foreign peoples. Father Yorke had already sounded this theme frequently; in an 1896 lecture titled “The Dragon’s Teeth,” Yorke compared New World slavery as instituted by Protestant England with that of Spain and Portugal. Yorke found English slavery more planned and malicious than that imposed by Spanish crews, which he described as a more ad hoc affair, “what we might expect from rough men cast away from civilization.”

The next year, in a response to a personal letter from W.B. Crawley, who asked Yorke about the Catholic Church’s role in slavery and in torture during the Inquisition, Yorke wrote Crawley that slavery already existed in Rome when the Church was born, and that the Church “did not preach against it like our abolitionists and thereby stir up a great civil war, and do as much harm as good.” Instead, the Church told the slave to obey his master, and told the master that, before God, the slave was his equal. “At one blow this destroyed chattel slavery,” Yorke wrote Crawley. “The slave’s marriage was recognized. His rights over his children—his right that the little family be not broken up. His right to a superfluity from his earning, to help him save to buy his freedom. The extinction of slavery after this, is a short task. The task was hurried by the unceasing exhortations of the Church that men should not be held in bondage, and that it is a pleasing act to ransom them.”

As will be explored in Chapter 5, stressing a more compassionate Catholic uplift could weaken Catholic editors’ anti-imperialist stances.
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62 Letter from Peter Yorke to W. B. Crawley, Feb. 4, 1897. Yorke Collection, USF, Box 1, Folder 3.
63 After Yorke’s tenure at the Monitor, the paper would continue to stress the Catholic Church’s abilities to civilize more justly. When James “Jim” Smith was appointed Governor-General of the Philippines in 1906, the Monitor claimed the
Yet Father Yorke continued to bluntly call U.S. policy in the Philippines “imperialism” after Roosevelt’s declared end of hostilities. The day after Independence Day 1902, Yorke wrote that “just now” the Declaration of Independence appears to be “a parody,” for the “occupation of the Philippines by American troops against the will of the natives of those islands is diametrically opposed to the teaching” of the Declaration. “The principles of imperialism, which now obtain and are defended, are foreign to the theory on which this government was founded. Everybody knows this and most people are ashamed, but the work goes on.” Atrocities committed by U.S. troops “would put to shame the most despotic government on earth.” The United States “showed its good sense in Cuba. It will do the same in the Philippines. Let it do so quickly.”

Two months prior, Yorke had condemned the war in the Philippines as a “war of extermination” that could swallow “all the good works the United States can do for centuries to come.”

By far the biggest issue for Irish American editors during the American encounter with the Philippines revolved around religion and its intersection with education. The debate was in many ways a continuation and revival of mid-century domestic debates between Catholics and Protestants over public education, a “titanic Catholic graduate of Santa Clara University would treat Filipinos as “equals in a Christian sense and not as an ‘inferior’ brood of mere ‘niggers.’ In this way he gets closer to the native and inspires a higher degree of confidence and respect…” In brief, Governor Smith acts upon the enlightened and humane theory which has given the Spaniard unparalleled pre-eminence in the history of the civilization and Christianization of aboriginal savages.” Monitor, Dec. 8, 1906.

The Leader, July 5, 1902.

Ibid., May 24, 1902. Yorke’s misgivings about war in the Philippines had not stopped him from blessing troops leaving San Francisco Bay in 1898 for the islands; in a diary entry on May 22, 1898, Nicholson, who would set sail on the City of Peking for the Philippines, wrote that “Father Yorke holds forth at head-quarters, assisted by Father McKinnon (?) the Chaplain. Received orders at 9 p.m. that we would go in the morning. Boys cheering + all join in singing ‘The Star Spangled Banner.’” Scrapbooks of the Spanish-American War, Diary of A. J. Nicholson, May 22, 1898, p. 15.
battle,” according to historian Jon Gjerde.66 From the 1840s through the 1870s, American Catholics had charged that public school curricula in the United States were anti-Catholic and taught specifically Protestant religious views, and that rather than teach a secularized, pan-Christian curriculum, the state should financially support Catholic schools.67 A bitter fight between Protestants and Catholics over public education in New York City in 1840 and in Philadelphia in 1844 was followed by relative calm during the Civil War. Then in 1868 in Cincinnati, Catholics challenged the reading of Protestant Bibles in schools. By 1869, cartoonist Thomas Nast had begun skewering Tammany Hall and machine politician Boss Tweed for corruption, and, instigated by Tweed’s clandestine placement of a provision in a tax bill that provided funds for Church schools, Nast began his famous series of anti-popery cartoons.68 Gjerde summarizes the outcome of this domestic face-off over public education:

It did not result in a unified, homogeneous institution that could tutor youth on moral citizenship in urban society as dreamt by the Protestant reformers. It did not provide for religiously separate and state-funded schools as imagined by the Catholic leadership. Rather, it ended with increasingly secularized public schools overseen by a growing educational bureaucracy that provided yet more impetus for Catholic leadership to eschew participation in this very important public institution.69

As fighting in the Philippines lessened and U.S. governance began, American Catholics and the Irish American press generally advocated a formal separation of

66 Jon Gjerde, Catholicism and the Shaping of Nineteenth Century America, 93.
67 Ibid., 144. For an account of the Eliot School rebellion in Boston in 1859, in which Catholic students refused to read the Ten Commandments, see John T. McGreevy, Catholicism and American Freedom, 7-15.
68 See Benjamin Justice, “Thomas Nast and the Public School of the 1870s,” History of Education Quarterly 45 (Summer, 2005): 182-83.
69 Gjerde, Catholicism and the Shaping of Nineteenth Century America, 139.
church and state as existed in the United States. But quickly, Irish American editors became concerned that U.S. plans to institute public education in the Philippines would be dominated by Protestant missionaries intent on destroying 300 years of Catholic education in the islands and converting the overwhelmingly Catholic populace to Protestantism.

Irish and Catholic editors targeted the makeup of the Schurman Commission, a five-man civil body formed by President McKinley to make recommendations on governance and education in the Philippines that had no Catholic members. The Monitor was convinced that continued insurrection in the islands had something to do with the religious makeup and insensitivity of the commission: “Just why Dean Worcester, who had written a book replete with slanders on the Philippine church, and Jacob Schurman, who has given frequent public manifestations of his bigotry, should have been selected to report on the conditions of a Catholic country is indeed inexplicable.” The Catholic World agreed, writing, “We always said that it was a mistake” to put men on the commission who had “no Catholic sympathies.”

Irish and Catholic fears of Protestant missionary activity were not entirely unfounded. The USS Thomas became a kind of icon to American attempts at “uplift” in the Philippines. The 509 teachers on board dubbed themselves “Thomasites,” a term evoking Protestant evangelism that was soon used for all U.S. public school teachers in the Philippines. Arthur Judson Brown, an influential minister and
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71 Monitor, Nov. 18, 1899; Catholic World, August, 1899. In Reuter, “American Catholics,” 368. Reuter incorrectly places Yorke at the head of the Monitor in November 1899; Yorke’s tenure lasted from 1894 to 1898, though he returned from a year-long trip to Europe in November 1899 and may have written or helped to craft the editorial. It was more likely penned by Thomas A. Connelly, who edited the Monitor from 1899 to 1907.
secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, would in 1903 describe the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippines as a “sore” on the country, and the Christianity of the Filipinos as little more than a “veneered heathenism.”

Judson’s vitriol toward the Church was matched by the Presbyterians’ chairman on foreign missions, the Rev. George F. Pentecost, who had written in the spring of 1898, shortly after U.S. victory over the Spanish fleet in the Battle of Manila Bay:

The peace-speaking guns of Admiral Dewey have opened the gates which henceforth make accessible not less than 8,000,000 of people who have for 300 years been fettered by bonds almost worse than those of heathenism, and oppressed by a tyrannical priesthood only equaled in cruelty by the nation whose government has been a blight and blistering curse upon every people over whom her flag has floated, a system of religion almost if not altogether worse than heathenism.

Such writings, combined with alleged anti-Catholic statements by some on the commission, clearly gave American empire a Protestant cast in the eyes of Peter Yorke and other Irish American editors.

In fact, the Schurman Commission recognized that the Philippines was overwhelmingly Catholic, the religion “not only of the majority, but of all the civilized Filipinos.”

But it determined to be inadequate the form and quality of the system of primary education set up by the Spanish colonial state. A survey by the


74 Ibid., 174.


76 Philippine elites were certainly frustrated with secondary and tertiary education; they commonly sent their children to Europe for schooling, and these *ilustrados* had been key in the promotion of Filipino nationalism during Spanish rule. Filipinos also expressed widespread animosity toward several Catholic religious orders, which American occupiers initially mistook for frustration with Catholicism as a whole and
Commission in 1900 found that among the Christian population, about half had had some schooling, though often the curriculum was restricted to religious topics. In crafting a new system, the Commission had to untangle complicated questions of land and school ownership. The close relationship between Church and state under hundreds of years of Spanish rule meant that the Catholic Church claimed ownership of many of the properties that the United States had bought from Spain at the end of the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. U.S. negotiations with Catholic officials in the United States, Manila, and Rome progressed fairly smoothly, even as government officials and their appointments were being pilloried in the Irish American press. William Howard Taft, commissioner of the Philippines and later civil governor, met personally with Pope Leo XIII in Rome and forged an agreement over conflicting property claims in the Islands.77

When the Commission decided that no religious instruction would occur in its new public school system in the Philippines, however, Yorke and others in the Irish Catholic press objected. Taft attempted a compromise involving religious instruction three times per week if requested by students’ parents, under the supervision of school authorities.78 A rule calling for the dismissal of any instructor who tried to influence pupils’ religious beliefs did not placate the Irish American press; the Freeman’s Journal saw this as an attack on Catholicism, not its protection.79 When David P. Barrows, superintendent of Manila schools, removed religious objects including crucifixes, statues, and pictures from classrooms, the Boston Pilot commented, “It is idle to deny that official opposition to the Catholic religion is at the bottom of all this …” McKinley had made that clear when “he appointed no Catholic on the Philippine readiness for conversion. See Kramer, Blood of Government, 42.

78 Ibid., 373-74.
79 Freeman’s Journal, Feb. 2, 1901.
After McKinley was shot and killed in September 1901, pressure from the Catholic press, especially the Irish Catholic press, around education continued. Roosevelt began to make efforts to ameliorate the situation in 1902, placing more Catholics on the Philippines Commission. When Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minn., who had been instrumental in coordinating Roosevelt’s visit to the Vatican to resolve the issue of Church property in the Philippines, sided with the president and criticized in press and from the pulpit lay Catholic editors for finding fault with U.S. policy in the Islands, Yorke was furious. Archbishop Ireland, Yorke wrote in the Leader, should know that protest from Catholics against U.S. policies abroad “comes not from mere editors or Catholic societies,” but “from men as high in the Church as he.” John Ireland was known for promoting the “Americanization” of Catholicism, but according to Yorke, “it is one of the sad commentaries on Americanism of the Pauline kind [a Yorke pun referring to Ireland’s home city], that while on the streets it boasts of freedom, individuality, progress, initiative, the spirit of the age and whatnot; at home it rules with a rod of iron and crushes out the slightest symptoms of these qualities…” And even if criticisms had come only from the laity and from Catholic societies, “has the ordinary lay Catholic citizen no right to an opinion on the affairs of the nation, especially when they touch on his own interests?” All Catholics, Yorke thought, had a responsibility to make their interests known, and in public forums.

Soon another Catholic, G. A. O’Reilly, was appointed superintendent of
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83 The Leader, Aug. 16, 1902.
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schools of Manila in late 1902. Now, Taft wrote to Secretary of War Elihu Root, “I should think that even the wildest Catholic editor ought to curb his fury against you and me.”

Reuter sums up the role of the ethnic press in the debate: Catholic (and Irish) pressure “was not nationally organized, did not represent all of Catholic opinion, and did not get the official support” of the Catholic Church, “[y]et it succeeded in influencing and changing the educational policies established in the Philippines.”

Based on his cautious wording in an introduction he wrote to a book about the Philippines, Taft in late 1903 was still concerned that U.S. governing not be perceived as anti-Catholic (Taft was Civil Governor of the Philippines until February 1904). In the book’s introduction, Taft wrote that although the author, a Protestant minister, had skillfully sought the truth of the situation in the Islands, “deductions and inferences made from observations are a matter of opinion and are much affected by one’s standpoint.” The author “is a Protestant clergyman and looks at the situation from a possibly somewhat different standpoint than that of a Protestant layman or from that of a Catholic layman or a Catholic clergyman…” Taft mentions briefly one chapter on the “critical issue as to the friars,” which “might present some differences of opinion,” before again giving the book his support.

*The press and the priesthood*

Father Yorke, by this time, had fallen out of favor with his own archbishop, Patrick Riordan. Documents from the Archdiocese of San Francisco and from Rome demonstrate a relationship between Riordan and Yorke that progressed from “initial
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85 Taft to Root, Taft papers, Library of Congress, letterpress books, Box 1, Nov. 22, 1902.
cooperation, to conflict, and...coexistence.” Letters from San Francisco to Rome indicate that Yorke’s continued prominence after the APA battle was troubling to the Church, and that his character was deemed as lacking prudence. But Yorke’s popularity after the APA battle and his key role in the Teamsters labor fight had made the priest into a kind of spokesperson for the faith, at least in San Francisco. The confusion was enough for the *Monitor* to take steps to clarify the situation in 1906. The paper quoted Archbishop Montgomery reminding Catholics that Yorke and his *Leader* didn’t represent Church opinion; only the *Monitor* did. The fact that Riordan had never publicly repudiated Yorke probably contributed to the mistaken notion that the *Leader* was official Catholic opinion; Riordan himself admitted to an apostolic delegate that among Catholics in San Francisco, the *Leader* was regarded equally with the *Monitor*.

According to several scholars of the Catholic press, Yorke’s *Leader* published during a transitional stage in Catholic publishing in the United States, one of a soon-to-be diminished breed of independent Catholic presses. Not surprisingly, Catholic newspapers grew initially alongside a burgeoning Catholic population, which climbed from six million in 1880 to ten million by 1900. Forty-six Catholic newspapers and ten magazines existed in the United States in 1880; by 1900 the numbers had grown to seventy-three newspapers and eighty-two magazines. Late-nineteenth century Catholic newspapers “evolved from being perhaps the most unfettered of
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89 Ibid., 4-5.
91 Walsh, “Regent Peter C. Yorke”, 75-76.
Catholic print media to one of the most religiously partisan...”  Many scholars call the first phase of Catholic journalism the immigrant period, when the presses’ main function was “to guard the faith of Catholics and to defend the Church against calumnies.” From the twentieth century until World War II, some observers see a “post-immigrant” phase of greater Church control of the press. Deedy describes overexpansion and duplication of the Catholic press in this period, and new communications technologies that “did away forever with the isolation not only of cities but of the isolation of communities within cities.” Bishops responded by backing or buying a single publication they could control. “The independent,” Deedy writes, “gradually passed away.”

Scholars who see the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a time of diminished Catholic intellectual production must take into consideration the Irish American press and its cadre of editor-priests and Catholic laymen, and not focus solely on more formal, sanctioned Catholic intellectual production. Donna J. Drucker traces an American priestly culture developing in tandem with a “stifled intellectual atmosphere” within the Church, though she distinguishes between a Church hierarchy and the priesthood itself, which she grants could have been more culturally dynamic. Examining priestly advice literature in the United States from the 1880s through the 1920s, Drucker finds first an emphasis on duty, conformity, and hierarchy—the priest
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should be a man set above the laity.\textsuperscript{99} (Drucker views advice literature as proscriptive, not descriptive; that is, it describes things as the writer or institution wishes them to be, not as they are. Priestly advice literature, she says, may stress conformity due to discomfort over the changing and more public role of priests at the time.) Not until after World War I does advice literature encourage priests to become part of a “broad priestly fraternity” and engage in public life, weighing in on current affairs.\textsuperscript{100} Thomas E. Woods pushes back against the notion of Catholic intellectual conformity in the Progressive Era, profiling three priests whose writings incorporated some Progressive notions but who confronted American pragmatism with uniquely Catholic views—a view that matches, for example, Yorke’s writings on education.\textsuperscript{101}

Yorke himself might be described as the foremost editor/priest in the nation around the turn of the century, pulling the Church into discussions from which it might seek more distance or neutrality. Yet early in the Leader’s existence, Yorke claimed the paper was not a Catholic one; the “strong point” in a Catholic paper was “deportment,” something the Leader planned to have none of.\textsuperscript{102} In subsequent issues Yorke carefully distinguished between priest and lay Catholic editors, and the challenges faced by each: clerical editors were “intellectually capable of bringing out a first rate Catholic paper,” but, saddled with duties to their parishes, wound up “trying to do the work of two offices” and doing it badly. Yorke found it “strange” that clerical editors didn’t know how low-quality their papers were, and concluded that “the Catholic newspaper in this country has been made into a kind of sacramental, and, no matter how poor the paper is, the practical Catholic must buy it as religiously as he wears the scapular.” Lay Catholic editors, on the other hand, were faced with

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid., 227.
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 257-58.
\textsuperscript{101} Thomas E. Woods, Jr., \textit{The Church Confronts Modernity}.
\textsuperscript{102} \textit{The Leader}, Feb. 15, 1902.
the task of spreading the faith, but knew little of Church history or Catholic theology; in fact, Yorke wrote, Catholic papers were hurt most by these editors, who used them mainly as “mediums of advertisement.” “Let us do this well or get out,” Yorke concluded.103

This Yorke editorial was commented upon by the New World, a Catholic newspaper that differed from the Leader in two ways: it was edited by a lay Catholic, and it was the official organ of the archdiocese of Chicago. According to an account by Yorke in the Leader, the New World objected to what it saw as Yorke’s suggestion that only Church history and theology were appropriate topics for discussion in a Catholic paper. Yorke rejected such a view as his own, though, in an effort to assert the superiority of clerical editors such as himself, he belittled what he suggested were frivolous editorial topics in the last issue of the New World.104 Yorke used his particular position—as editor and priest, but not the head of an official or (in his view) even an unofficial Catholic newspaper—to his advantage. From this vantage point he criticized lay editors for their lack of knowledge of Catholicism, and yet, no longer constrained as head of the Monitor, the official archdiocese newspaper in San Francisco, he had the independence to criticize official Church pronouncements and actions as well.105

The long history of the Monitor

103 Ibid., Jan. 25, 1902.
104 Ibid., March 1, 1902.
105 The Catholic Sentinel, of Portland, Ore., also addressed the press’s power to do both good and evil. The “only way to neutralize the evil influence of the press is to… fill it with the spirit of goodness. To drive out bad newspapers, you introduce good ones; to counteract the influence of those that are anti-Catholic, you must support and circulate those that are Catholic.” The paper, founded by a grocer and a printer, wrote of religious ministers, “…What preacher ever reached as many minds as the newspaper can reach? The preacher’s word, when once spoken, dies with the echo of his voice; but the printed word remains and men may read it again and again.” Sentinel, Feb. 24, 1872.
The origins of the *Monitor* show the multiple interests of a nominally Catholic newspaper, and point to pressures that Catholic newspapers put on the faith. The *Monitor* was started by Catholic businessmen in 1858, and became an official Church organ only in the early 1890s. James Marks, Patrick J. Thomas, and James Hamill, a teacher, businessman, and miner, respectively, were “pioneers of the Catholic Press on the Pacific Coast.”106

The *Monitor* printed its “prospectus” a few weeks after its first issue. “Although we acknowledge with pride and gratitude that the press of California is in no appreciable measure anti-Catholic; and that it is the most liberal in the whole world, yet we think a Catholic journal free from the rancor of polemics, and devoted to the cultivation of Catholic literature, neither superfluous nor uncalled for….” The paper would bring Catholics in San Francisco and the West into contact with their brethren nationwide “as members of the ‘Household of Faith.’”107 The *Monitor* promised a focus on mining, agriculture, and commerce. “With politics,” its editors wrote, “we have nothing whatsoever to do.”108

In fact, with politics the *Monitor* had much to do. During the Civil War, under the editorship of Thomas A. Brady, the paper was perceived by many to be too sympathetic to the Confederate cause; one letter-writer to the *Daily Evening Press*, who signed his name “Irish American,” called the *Monitor* “treasonable” and demanded that the Catholic Church clarify its relationship to it. The next day, printed in several daily papers, Archbishop of San Francisco Joseph S. Alemany disavowed “articles and statements without [Church] sanction or approbation,” adding that there were Catholic journals in California that were “not always faithful exponents of the

108 Ibid.
doctrines and wishes of the Catholic Church, which in this diocese has no official organ.”

The *Daily Alta California* reported that on the day of President Lincoln’s assassination, a roving mob in San Francisco stormed many presses and cast “their types and presses…into the street.” The *Monitor* offices, at Clay and Montgomery streets, were no exception. “The proclivities of this semi-religious journal are too well known to need explanation here. The office was entered and badly damaged….On the arrival of the Police the same scattering took place as before and the crowd started for another scene.”

Brady for the next several months published a paper called *The Universe*; on June 10, 1865, the *Monitor* returned. Brady sued the city for $7,500 for failing to protect his paper from the mob; he described in his lawsuit the newspaper as “a means of permanent and reliable income” to himself. Three years later in a settlement, the city paid Brady $4, 200.

As late as 1879 the *Monitor* was still not an official Church organ, though Archbishop Alemany now seemed to have warmed to it. “We cheerfully acknowledge the services the Catholic Press has rendered to religion, and also the disinterestedness with which, in most instances, it has been conducted, although yielding to publishers and editors a very insufficient return for their labors…We exhort the Catholic community to extend to these publications a more liberal support…It is our duty to avail ourselves of this mode of making known the truths of our religion…."

It was in 1880 that the Rev. John Harrington bought the paper, bringing in
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111 In Vernier, *A History of the Monitor*, 12-14. A former employee of the *Monitor*, Bartley P. Oliver, described the paper in the 1870s as having editors who worked hard “to procure a fair living for their families. The paper was not an official organ as it was at present. Its circulation varied from year to year. It went some years as low as 2,000,” which meant “just getting by,” and other years as high as 4,000, which “meant comfort and more peaceful slumbers.” From an article reprinted in the *Monitor*, Dec. 16, 1933, in Vernier, 14-15.
other priests to run it. In 1892 the paper was converted into the Monitor Publishing
Company, and became the official organ of the Archdiocese of San Francisco. But
for decades, the accessibility of printing technology had allowed individuals outside
of the formal Catholic hierarchy to define for themselves Catholic responses to the
issues of the day. Or, as in the case of Father Yorke and his newspaper the Leader at
the start of the twentieth century, those within the hierarchy but perhaps stymied in
their rise could maintain or increase their influence with lay Catholics through their
own personal presses.

Print capitalism’s influence on the Catholic Church began long before the
nineteenth century, of course; the democratizing force of print culture had been a
long-standing tension between the Church and lay Catholics. The Catholic Church of
the Counter-Reformation initially tried to review all materials for public use, but had
abandoned such efforts by the mid-1500s. Bishops in nineteenth-century America
had no direct power over publishers of Catholic material, but because canon law
required church approval of any religious text or sacred image directed at Catholics,
publishers seeking the broadest possible audience often sought such approval,
denoted by an imprimatur—Latin for “it may be printed”—on the obverse of the title
page.

Clearly, Catholic newspaper presses in America were not simple conduits for
Catholic doctrine. Invariably they were shaped by local editors and local disputes; in
this sense the Church encountered contemporary issues that might well foster change
in the Church itself. Nor were the lines between official church newspapers and the
broader Irish American press easy to discern; an Irish editor’s support of certain
tactics to achieve an independent Ireland might come to be seen as supported by the
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Church, whether it was or not.

Even as the Church grappled with the conundrums of using the press to spread the word of God, the nature of print, where symbols and images represent real objects in the physical world, may have been slowly changing the faith in another way. Cadegan discusses Catholicism’s sacramentality, “which maintained the belief that everything in the world was potentially revelatory of God’s grace.” Books, magazines, newspapers, and other items of Catholic print culture “were enmeshed in a densely sacramental fabric…” Yet these media may have subtly affected this aspect of Catholicism even as they spread, bolstered, or consolidated the faith. The ephemeral nature of newspapers—the fragility of newsprint and the reproduction of photography into halftone images—make this media an unlikely source of sacramentality. Touch, for example, seems somewhat degraded through newspapers, as compared to the durability and heft of books, with their robust bindings and embossed covers. Stand-alone photographs, printed on paper backing, have a three-dimensional nature; that is, they have a reverse side that may contain hand-written notes, pre-printed vendor identification, or other symbols. Photography reproduced onto newsprint via the half-tone is essentially two-dimensional. Though the sacramental nature of Catholicism is hard to define, measure, and track, it seems likely that newsprint helped to convey some aspects of the faith, but was a poor medium to with which to convey Catholicism’s emphasis on materiality.

_Yorke and the Chinese_

---
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There was one way many Irish Catholic editors on the West Coast found to fill in the fault lines in their American identity: they broadened and generalized both religion and race, emphasizing a common Christian heritage to downplay their religious differences with the Protestant mainstream, and pushed a “white race” conception that encompassed European immigrants who, earlier in the nineteenth century, had commonly been described as separate races. The Chinese on the West Coast were key in this process, serving as a foil, a non-white, heathen “other.”

Just weeks after Yorke’s battle for the Teamsters had concluded in a labor agreement, laborers and politicians met in San Francisco at the California Chinese Exclusion Convention of November 1901. The meeting was called to promote the extension of the 1892 Geary Act, which had made more stringent and extended for ten years the 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act. Examination of Yorke’s speech at the gathering provides further evidence of the intersection of race and religion in the establishment of American citizenship, and the importance of the circulation in print of racially demarcated notions of citizenship in the nineteenth century, particularly on the West Coast.

Yorke was the last to address the convention, and, rising, claimed he was asked to speak “just a few minutes ago.” He described himself as “one who is sincerely in sympathy with your efforts,” who believed that times were “fraught with the greatest and most momentous consequences” to California. Just as Romans

119 The meeting claimed an attendance of 3,000, and included leading figures in labor and politics from around the state. See Elmer Clarence Sandmeyer, *The Anti-Chinese Movement in California* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 107.
demolished a bridge to protect their city from Etruscans, Californians had gathered “to take counsel with regard to this threatened invasion from the West, which invasion threatens our civilization, threatens our institutions, and…if this country is to be saved to Christianity and to the white man, ‘The bridge must straight go down. (Applause)”

Two things, Yorke said, make a country “civilized or uncivilized.” One was “the way men have of looking at life”; the other, “the way we have of treating those who work.” The American way of looking at life was “unreservedly committed” to “the Christian idea.” America was not a colony of Asia or Africa; Europe was its “motherland,” whose races were “practically all of the same blood.” They may differ in “languages,” “institutions,” and “laws,” but “hardly do they enter the gates of Castle Garden than they are fit to take their places in the civilization of America,” and these immigrants’ children “cannot be distinguished from the children of those whose ancestors have been here for the sixth and the seventh generation….” Yorke declared that, “although we may look back with a certain love and sentiment to the land from which we are sprung…when we come here we come here to be Americans in the fullest and brightest sense…” Yorke might fight passionately against Irish assimilation, or stress Irish difference as integral to a kind of American tapestry, but here he would stress (white) American unity through comparison to the alien Chinese.

“Now, then,” Yorke continued, “we are face to face with an immigration
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which is emphatically not Christian. I have nothing to say about the ideals or about the morality of the Chinese. They may be very good in their own place, and this is in China (laughter), but, as somebody has defined dirt as matter out of place, so we may say that the virtues of the Chinese, be they never so great, and never so fitting for their own country, are out of place in this. (Laughter and applause.)”

“Their thoughts are not our thoughts; their blood is not our blood; their outlook is not our outlook,” Yorke continued. And, though obviously inferior, their sheer numbers meant they could act by “brute force” to create something “entirely contradictory to our institutions.” Americans across the land must “demand that a wall be built up against Chinese immigration.”

Yorke sought to bring labor into a definition of American citizenship, and by this he meant more than the dignity of work. His second civilizational element was “the condition of labor.” Yorke told the crowd that a rich man in China was no different than one in America; the wealthy were “the same all the world over…What rich men do, what rich men eat, what rich men drink, what rich men wear, have nothing at all to do with civilization. The test of civilization is how the laborer is treated.” The working man required, in order to be a free man, “that he

---

125 Ibid., 105-06.
126 Ibid., 106.
127 Ibid.
be not the property of any lord of labor, that he be not owned by any man, that he be free to give his labor, or not to give it, as he wished, and that he have some say in the condition of the country.” If Chinese labor were to be amassed in America, laborers who “will not strike and who don’t want to strike,” “who will work for very small wages and who will live on things that the rats would starve on,” would “create great fortunes for certain people…” Freedom-loving people must keep out those “who do not believe in the rights of free men, who do not believe they have a soul to call their own, and who do not care what becomes of this great white civilization that has been built up with such care, with such expenditure of brains and energy... (Applause.)”

To Yorke, Chinese willingness to work for paltry wages was an indication not of desperation, but of immorality.

Yorke filled his speech with biological metaphors. “When a man is in good health, if a foreign body lodges in his anatomy, immediately it sets up an inflammation, the warning of its presence…it must be sought for and cast out. And so it is with this agitation now against the foreign body in our body politic, it is the sign to the whole country that there is something there which is dangerous to our civil life, and which must be cast out.”

A few labor unions added statements of support to the proceedings at the

---

128 Ibid., 106-07.
129 Ibid., 108. Yorke knew this was dehumanizing rhetoric, and refused to back down. “Do not wonder that a Catholic priest should speak thus to you. It has oftentimes been charged that those who speak against the Chinese immigration are forgetful of the brotherhood of man…that their attitude is unchristian…that they should welcome all these nations to their shores and to try to civilize them. Gentlemen, the grace of God is a very powerful thing, but the grace of God, it has been said, never gave any man common sense. (Laughter and applause.) And no doubt the people who urge these…beautiful, high moral principles, are men who are filled with the grace of the Lord, and have nothing but high and holy aspirations; but we would wish that their aspirations would be a little lower, and that they would have a little more common sense. (Applause and laughter.)”
Metropolitan Temple. The laundry workers union no. 55 of Alameda County wrote that, “should the bars of Chinese immigration be lowered and our Golden State invaded by hordes of Mongolians, it is fearful to contemplate the destitution, misery and want that, as a consequence, would naturally follow in its wake...”

Race hatred and a desire to strengthen one’s American identity were tangled up in fears about the threat to working-class livelihoods that the combination of profit-seeking employers and cheap, available Chinese labor could represent. Nearly 5,800 Chinese arrived in California per year between 1861 and 1865; the Chinese in 1860 were the largest foreign-born population in the state, just edging out the Irish at 9 percent (34,933) of the state population. While the majority of Chinese arrivals worked outside cities in mining, agriculture and railroads, one-third found employment in urban areas. By the 1860s and ‘70s, Irish in San Francisco had watched Chinese move into several areas of unskilled or relatively unskilled labor such as digging and grading, restaurants, laundry, and domestic work. Work that paid one dollar an hour in 1850 paid as little as two dollars a day in 1875. The city’s growing industrial sector saw Chinese employed in cigar making at less than $1.40 per day, excluding the Irish and threatening the jobs of East Coast Irish cigar rollers. In 1870, one-half of all shoes and boots made in San Francisco were manufactured by the Chinese.

Gauging the effect of an end to Chinese exclusion on San Francisco’s economy in the early twentieth century is beyond the scope of this study; certainly
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130 Isodore Jacoby, secretary of the cloak-makers’ union, local no. 8, of the International Ladies’ Garment Workers’ Union, claimed that, “[a]ll that is necessary to beguile a San Francisco woman is to put some fancy label beneath the hanger of the garment, and it is sold by a smiling saleslady at prosperity prices as imported direct from Paris, London or New York, with all the germs of disease bred in a Chinatown filth thrown into the bargain.” California Chinese Exclusion Convention, 115-16.
132 Ibid., 72.
wages in several occupations might have been threatened by Chinese labor, as Irish prosperity in the city still depended on the maintenance of high wages for low-skilled work.\footnote{133} Undoubtedly new economic opportunities for U.S. citizens as a whole were also created through Chinese immigration. But Yorke and other labor advocates used racism as more than a simple tool to catalyze Irish labor solidarity.

These activists participated in the construction of what Kornel Chang calls a “militant, racialized class consciousness” that cut across ethnic and even national boundaries.\footnote{134} In Washington State and in British Columbia, for example, after the 1880s immigrants formed a majority of the region’s settlers, coming from continental Europe, the British Isles, Anglo-phone settler societies, and Asia. According to Chang, Europeans of diverse national origin responded to this multiplicity of identities by creating a new one, by “fixing on their whiteness, intensifying their racism,” and “abstracting their ethnicity.” Whiteness in this formulation becomes “the first and most essential marker of social responsibility.”\footnote{135} All of these elements are strong in Yorke’s 1901 speech. Chang and other scholars have shown how practices, theories, and identities traversed globally, from one white settler colony to another, carried most frequently, according to Chang, by English, Scotch, Cornish, and Irish skilled miners, some of whom became known as experts on “coolie labor” or the


“yellow peril.” Anti-Asian racism was key to the formation of this transnational white working class identity on the West Coast. “White labor leaders and workers crisscrossed the western U.S.-Canadian frontiers to engage in race riots, lobby for immigration restriction, and establish anti-Asiatic organizations, forging racial and class bonds across national boundaries.” Yorke was more sedentary, but his notions of civilization and its constitutive elements of whiteness, religion, and working class vigor echo Chang’s transnational actors. The Star Press, run by James H. Barry, printed the proceedings and speeches at the convention. Barry ran his own newspaper, the *Weekly Star*, which he founded to fight government corruption, and was an early supporter of the secret ballot, the referendum, and public ownership of utilities. He was also staunchly anti-Asian labor. While running for the U.S. Senate, James D. Phelan, San Francisco’s former Democratic mayor (and the opening speaker at the Exclusion convention) thanked Barry for positive coverage in the *Star*: “I shall keep our State...a white man’s country, free from the grinding competition of Oriental coolieism.”

Historians have noted that earlier in the nineteenth century, when there was less labor competition between the Irish and the Chinese, there was less ill feeling between the two. Still, the consistency of, for example, the *Monitor’s* anti-Asian sentiments is remarkable and long-standing, across many different editors and decades. In May of 1868, for example, the *Monitor* reprinted an editorial from the *State Capital Reporter* that it called “judicious.” The *Reporter* wrote of “the danger our state would be in were it to invite the vast hordes of Asia to settle in our midst, and at the same time give them control of the Government. Ours is a Democratic
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government, relying for its stability, progress and preservation upon the masses of the people—the laboring classes.” To fill the country with “an inferior race of semi-barbarians” was “dangerous.”\textsuperscript{139} A few weeks later, in an editorial titled “Coolie Immigration,” the \textit{Monitor} stated that “some 700 Celestials arrived in the \textit{New York} recently, and another ship-load is expected shortly...coolie labor may be as efficient in preventing white immigration to the Pacific slope as negro labor has proved in keeping it out of the South.”\textsuperscript{140} The newspaper was a forceful advocate for “white” West Coast labor from its inception.

Nearly four decades later, in 1906, now an official organ of the San Francisco Archdiocese and with Thomas A. Connelly editing, the \textit{Monitor’s} stance toward Asians had changed little. “Some Eastern Methodist ministers have put themselves on record against the anti-Asiatic sentiment of the Pacific Coast,” the newspaper wrote. “The brethren are unsparing of adjectives in condemning the brutal and un-Christian attitude of the California whites who unreasonably object to being crowded off the map by the little pagan brown men, whose standards of living and morality are a menace to Caucasian civilization on this rim of the continent. The same preachers, it may be remarked, are usually among the most ardent advocates of putting up the bars against white immigrants at the Atlantic ports of entry.”\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{Conclusion}

\textsuperscript{139} \textit{The Monitor}, May 9, 1868.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid., May 23, 1868.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., Nov. 10, 1906. Paddison discusses similar East-West splits over Asian immigration among Protestant clergymen in \textit{American Heathens}, p. 150. One month after this editorial, after President Roosevelt had strongly condemned discrimination against the Japanese in America, particularly an effort by San Francisco’s Board of Education to segregate Japanese students into a Chinese school, the \textit{Monitor} scolded Roosevelt for praising the Japanese. The President had “read the people of California a severe lecture on the iniquity of refusing to open welcoming arms to the incoming horde of Asiatic coolies from the militant island empire.” \textit{Monitor}, Dec. 8, 1906.
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Irish Americans in the late nineteenth century faced the complexities of a paradox: asserting their difference might increase their case for acceptance as part of the American grain in a country that told itself it valued pluralism and welcomed immigrants. But emphasizing difference, particularly their religion, could foment backlash in a land where Anglo-Saxon and Protestant heritage still claimed normative status. Father Yorke and other Irish Americans responded, in part, by emphasizing their Christian whiteness through shared notions about Asian racial inferiority and heathenism. Yorke’s racist rhetoric directed at the Chinese and Japanese encouraged European-heritage workers to unite around a white supremacist identity. His words and analogies, particularly concerning an Asian “invasion” of the U.S. body politic, essentially condoned violence against Asians. That Catholic Church publications on the West Coast had been printing similar views for decades is important context, but does not take away from the viciousness of Yorke’s contribution to racial strife around the turn of the century.

Yet, perhaps maddeningly, Yorke remains a compelling figure for positive reasons. He helped win key victories for labor in San Francisco, when employers were uniting to destroy the power of unions. His energy and creativity in pushing back against the APA is rightly legendary. The success of nativist publications in the Midwest several years after the APA controversy and the endurance of anti-Catholicism well into the twentieth century suggests the APA, at least nationwide, was no paper tiger. In the field of education, one Yorke historian criticizes Yorke for failing to use his position as a University of California regent to bring more Irish
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142 Gjerde writes, “We profit from viewing the development of an American nation as a process that triangulated race and religion so that Americans were superior racially (in the context of non-Europeans) and religiously (as Europeans but freed of the European papacy and the Old World).” Gjerde, Catholicism and the Shaping of Nineteenth Century America, 39.
Americans into a growing university.\textsuperscript{143} These criticisms have merit, and Yorke’s tenure as a regent was marked by his silences and his typical absences at regent meetings and university functions. Yet here, too, criticism of Yorke misses some of the consistency of his sympathies and even the prescience of some of his positions. Yorke fought for the least of his fellow Irish Americans, and imagined a religious education for them, in specifically Catholic schools. His priority was not large, secular universities. There, he raised his voice only when he thought the public university was acting in a specifically Protestant way.\textsuperscript{144} The best education for Irish Americans was to focus first on faith and character, not professional skills. “To train the reason and neglect the will is not education, and a university that is compelled to set aside that ancient and only efficacious training of the will, namely, the inculcation of a definite religious belief, is deprived of half its power.” A university, Yorke wrote, “is not a department store. It must have its professional schools, but its real work is done not there, but in arts.”\textsuperscript{145}

Popular accounts of newspapers in the late nineteenth century stress the power of William Randolph Hearst’s “yellow journalism” in pushing the nation toward war in Cuba and the Philippines, but Yorke and other Irish American editors demonstrate the considerable clout of the ethnic newsweekly during this time. Though the anti-

\textsuperscript{143} Walsh, \textit{Ethnic Militancy}, 109-10.

\textsuperscript{144} In a letter to University of California president Benjamin Ide Wheeler on May 10, 1909, for example, Yorke objected to a Protestant minister presiding over baccalaureate services at the university. Though non-sectarianism “in itself is nothing desirable,” Yorke wrote, still the university was bound by it. “Now the trouble about the Baccalaureate sermon is that it is a religious service and that it is a University religious service. Therefore especially when held in the University grounds it is impossible to make the public believe that the University \textit{qua} University is not holding religious services.” Bancroft, Records of the Regents of the University of California, CU-1, Box 66, folder 33.

imperialism of many Irish American editors could not keep the United States from claiming the Philippines as a possession, personal presses such as Yorke’s threatened to embarrass the Roosevelt administration on the issue of public education in the Islands. The administration responded by appointing Catholics to prominent positions, in hopes of silencing the guns of Irish American editors.

When considering the relative vigor of Catholic intellectual production during in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, scholars must include the contribution of Catholic editors, lay and clergy alike, Church-sanctioned or not. Lay Catholic and clerical voices were empowered by newspaper technologies, which extended and simultaneously challenged Church control of Catholic messaging. Newspapers made Catholics, including Catholic priests, increasingly public figures, presaging changing notions of a more public and vocal priesthood.

Irish Catholic editors might be associated with Progressive reform, like the *Sacramento Bee*’s McClatchy. But when top Progressive reformers criticized Tammany Hall for putting in power “a crowd of illiterate peasants, freshly raked from Irish bogs,” Yorke, for one, felt he knew that “reform” surely meant attacks on the Irish poor. Yet he and other Irish American editors employed many of the same journalistic practices as Progressive muckrakers in their own campaigns, privileging the collection and dissemination of “facts” as they probed the weaknesses of their opponents’ arguments.

---

Chapter 2. Forty Acres and a Carabao: T. Thomas Fortune’s Journey to Hawaii and the Philippines, 1902-03

“...we stand largely where they stand—outside of the American Constitution, but under the American flag. The hazards of war make strange bedfellows, but none stranger than this of the Afro-American and Filipino peoples.”

-- T. Thomas Fortune, 1903

“What is liberty for a race, and how is it to be obtained?”

-- Booker T. Washington, 1903

In the spring of 1903, one of the nation’s foremost black journalists paused in the humid air of northern Luzon for a photographic self-portrait. Dressed in explorer’s garb and standing in front of a painted backdrop, T. Thomas Fortune struck a manly pose (Fig. 4). Bandits and cholera stalked the countryside as the Philippines struggled to recover after two years of brutal warfare between Filipino guerrillas and the U.S. army. Yet Fortune ignored warnings and marched for miles northward from Manila accompanied by two black U.S. soldiers, Capt. Wormsley and Robert Gordon Woods, the latter considered an expert on the islands. As an agent of the U.S. Treasury Department, he was tasked with gathering information on trade and labor conditions in each of America’s newest possessions; just weeks previously he had completed a calmer and much more cordial visit to Hawaii. In the back of his mind lay the strained finances of his New York Age, his tense friendship with Booker T. Washington, and perhaps his struggle with alcohol. At the front was the question of whether the
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1 T. Thomas Fortune to a gathering of African Americans in Washington, DC. In the Washington Post, June 27, 1903 (“The Negro and the Filipino – Two Races Outside the Constitution, But Under the Flag – Editor Fortune, Just Returned From the Philippines, Intimates that His Race Could Find a Refuge There”).

Philippines might make a good home for African Americans seeking a new start, away from the violence and poverty of the U.S. South.

This chapter examines the similarities and differences in Fortune’s encounters and experiences in Hawaii and the Philippines, and reveals a fascinating interplay of race, labor, region, and empire, mediated through vibrant and unique local presses. During his trip, Fortune used newspapers, periodicals, and photography to gather information, attempt to gauge his reception, and publicize his plan for black labor on the islands. He circulated a poll, published a poem, and took photographs to portray and attempt to fashion the kind of social, economic and political possibilities he desired for African Americans overseas. Yet in both Hawaii and the Philippines, discussion of race was tightly bound to the needs of labor regimes and was transmitted, amplified, and sometimes resisted through these various local presses. Fortune’s critique of white racism and imperial power was further complicated and constrained by his allegiance to his official post and by his close ties to Booker T. Washington’s educational “uplift” philosophies. Consequently, Fortune’s own speeches and writings on Hawaii and the Philippines reflect a mix of criticism of
white supremacy and simultaneous alignment with Victorian notions of culture and civilization—a stance echoed in both his self-portrait and in the editorial and visual elements of many black periodicals of the time.

Forty years ago, Fortune’s biographer, Emma Lou Thornbrough, looked briefly at his overseas journey, reconstructing it primarily through the papers of Booker T. Washington and Fortune’s own writings about the trip, published in the respected political journal The Independent and in the smaller black journal Voice of the Negro. Very few contemporary scholars have reexamined his travels. New work on labor, race, and empire, and newspaper archives in Hawaii and the Philippines, invite a closer look.3

3 The most comprehensive examination of Fortune’s life remains Thornbrough’s T. Thomas Fortune: Militant Journalist (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972); for Fortune’s overseas trip, see pp. 234-41. Shawn Leigh Alexander provides a brief and excellent analysis of Fortune’s life and writings in her introductory essay in T. Thomas Fortune, the Afro-American Agitator: A Collection of Writings, 1880-1928 (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2008). Jinx Coleman Broussard examines Fortune’s Philippines excursion in a recent study of black foreign correspondents, but does not probe his relationship to the era’s race science and omits his racial stereotyping of Filipinos. See African American Foreign Correspondents: A History (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2013), 32-39. Benjamin R. Justesen gives a detailed account of the rise and fall of the nation’s first nationwide civil rights organization, profiling Fortune, Booker T. Washington, Bishop Alexander Walters, and Congressman George Henry White in Broken Brotherhood: The Rise and Fall of the National Afro-American Council (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008). Michele Mitchell briefly examines Fortune’s photographic self-portrait from Luzon, reproduced here, seeing in the photograph a masculinist, pro-imperialist impulse common among middle class and elite African Americans in the late-nineteenth century. Fortune was “so swept up in romantic ideas about empire that…he posed for formal portraits donning a field costume and hat” that resembled “the outfits worn by the black cavalrymen who saved the day at San Juan Hill.” See Righteous Propagation: African Americans and the Politics of Racial Destiny After Reconstruction (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 65. Other scholars, particularly literary scholars influenced by subaltern and post-colonial studies, emphasize how African American participation in imperial projects, as well as their artistic productions related to such projects, decentered the practices and discourses of U.S. imperialism. By taking up the “White Man’s Burden,” people of...
This chapter will also consider the domestic situation in the United States, for it is vital for a full understanding of Fortune’s travels. Precisely as Fortune made his way by steamer to Hawaii in December 1902, his confidante Booker T. Washington was faced with a riotous South incensed by a president too sympathetic, in its eyes, to African Americans. Yet a speech by Secretary of War Elihu Root seemed to imply the opposite: that the Theodore Roosevelt administration was backtracking on efforts to advance black rights. Washington, in a possible response to Root, delivered his own barbed reflections on race and American empire in a speech to a Bronx audience. Hawaiian, Filipino, and white American newspaper editors in the territories seemed to know intuitively that race matters in the United States would be relevant to the governing of U.S. territories abroad, and watched both the mainland’s racial turmoil, and Fortune’s visit, closely.

Recent scholarship asserts that the Hampton and Tuskegee pedagogies were useful in the justification of U.S. imperialism and in the control of America’s news subjects—the “New South became a global south” as U.S. missionaries, educators, and politicians exported “Jim Crow colonialism” abroad. Such scholarship is convincing and important, but often assumes that powerful political and economic interests duped Booker T. Washington, and, by extension, Fortune, whom W. E. B. DuBois would describe in 1907 as “fallen” and “groveling in the dust” due to his close association with the “Wizard of Tuskegee” in the early 1900s. The Tuskegee color (consciously or not) brought the assumptions of the imperial project into relief, exposing its fallacies. See Gretchen Murphy, Shadowing the White Man’s Burden: U.S. Imperialism and the Problem of the Color Line (New York: New York University Press, 2010), 8.


project may indeed have linked and adapted the racial politics of the U.S. South to imperial projects abroad in ways congenial to Northern imperialists. Fortune, as will be shown, preached the Tuskegee line in both Honolulu and Manila. Yet this chapter suggests that both men were also thinking critically about race and empire, and finds that each hoped U.S. “expansion” would expose not only the power of race, but also its instability and vulnerability. The photograph of Fortune symbolizes the central paradox of his journey across the Pacific—in his sojourn, he seems to both inhabit and unsettle the American imperial project abroad.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Fortune was born into slavery in Marianna, Florida, in 1856, the third child of two slaves, Emanuel and Sarah Jane. His parents each claimed African, European, and American Indian ancestry. After Emancipation, his family was terrorized by white supremacists (Emanuel was active in Reconstruction politics), and the family fled to Jacksonville in 1869. Fortune’s education included time in a Freedmen’s Bureau school and two school terms at Howard University in the 1870s. But he always cited his work as a printer’s assistant for several newspapers as key to his **5-6.**

In several photographic portraits of Fortune, his skin tone appears quite pale; in others it is darker. At least one dissertation on Fortune considers his mixed-race status and its impact on his politics. In my own research, however, I was struck with how infrequently mainstream journalists (or Fortune himself) referred to him as anything other than “black” or “Negro.” One Associated Press cablegram that incorrectly stated that Fortune had been deported from the Philippines after a conflict with police described the journalist as having the appearance of a “cultured Spaniard.” (*Hawaiian Gazette*, May 19, 1903). Ingrid Dineen-Wimberly explores black leadership during this study’s time period and finds that, counter-intuitively, “for many mixed-race people, a Black identity…offered positions of power, upward mobility, and notoriety.” See Dineen-Wimberly, “Mixed-race leadership in African America: The Regalia of Race and National Identity in the U.S., 1862-1916,” (PhD diss., University of California at Santa Barbara, 2009).
education; printer’s offices, he said, were “wonderful schools.” He founded the New York *Globe* in 1881; the paper would become the *Freeman*, and, later, the *Age*. His editorials were often militant; he called upon African Americans to resist white violence with deadly force, and demanded that the government uphold African American social and political rights.

Fortune’s reputation as a race agitator was perhaps greatest during the 1880s and 1890s. In 1884 he published *Black and White: Land, Labor, and Politics in the South*, in which he strongly affirmed the rights of African Americans as American citizens; advocated, as Washington would, a practical, industrial education for blacks; and, citing radical economist Henry George, viewed land ownership as key to African American advance. After Ida B. Wells’s newspaper office was destroyed by a white mob in Memphis, Tenn., Fortune gave her a job on the *Age* and printed numerous anti-lynching articles. Journalist and club woman Victoria Earl Matthews also wrote for Fortune’s newspaper. Fortune first proposed a national black civil rights organization in the *Freeman*, in 1887; he said it should be modeled on the Irish National League. In 1890 he spearheaded the National Afro-American League, which collapsed by 1893 for lack of funds.

By late 1902, however, Fortune’s best days as a race advocate seemed behind him. He was broke, in debt, and in near-daily communication with Booker T. Washington, for which he was fiercely criticized by some black leaders.

The genesis of Fortune’s overseas trip is uncertain, but appears to have come about due to a confluence of interests. General James S. Clarkson, a white, old-time abolitionist and Republican leader, arranged Fortune’s appointment as a temporary Special Immigrant Agent of the Treasury Department to study racial and economic
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conditions in Hawaii and the Philippines. In a letter to Booker T. Washington a month before his departure, Fortune wrote, “I told Gen. Clarkson that I would go as a commissioner on the part of the Government to study the labor and trade conditions in the Philippines and the far East, and had in mind the shunting of our surplus labor to the Orient if I found the conditions such as to warrant such recommendations.” Fortune said he wanted to get out of the country and “make enough money to pay my debts and start fresh in purely literary work,” an astonishing statement from the famed journalist (and considerably less-famous poet). He ended his letter promising the Tuskegee leader that he had stopped drinking for good, and that Washington “need no further fears on that score.” Washington wrote President Teddy Roosevelt that Fortune’s appointment had given him “the greatest general satisfaction,” suggesting he along with Clarkson bent Roosevelt’s ear.

The Washington Post, however, linked Fortune’s journey to the colonization schemes of Alabama Sen. John Tyler Morgan, notorious for his racism even in a
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9 Ibid., 235. Clarkson was a Republican party operative, surveyor for the port of New York, and, according to a New York Times obituary of June 1, 1918, he had “established and operated a twenty-eight mile section of the ‘Underground Railway,’” helping more than 500 slaves from Missouri, Arkansas and Texas flee into Canada.”
10 TTF to BTW, Nov. 3, 1902, in Harlan and Smock, Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. 6, 571-72. Earlier, on June 9, 1902, Fortune had similarly written Washington that he was “inclined to get out of the race journalism and work, and devote myself to truck farming and general literary work.” He then goes on to propose that Washington buy his half interest in the New York Age. Ibid., 478-79.
11 BTW to Roosevelt, Dec. 1, 1902, in Harlan and Smock, Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. 6, 600-01. After securing Fortune’s appointment, Clarkson wrote Booker T. Washington that Fortune “has been in to see me, and, for once, his face has shown happiness.” Clarkson said Roosevelt was “eager” to give Fortune the mission for it “might result to the great good of the country.” A close friend, Clarkson stressed to Washington, “should make Fortune understand that this is his opportunity and that he must keep himself strictly in the middle of the road; if he does and uses the fine ability that he possesses, he will build up a place for himself at the head of some bureau….” Clarkson to BTW, Nov. 20, 1902, in Harlan and Smock, Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. 6, 588-89.
time of vigorous white supremacy. Morgan, the paper wrote, had told Root and Philippines Commissioner William Howard Taft that although Southern farmers still believed they needed the Negro, soon enough “millions” of African Americans might emigrate, be given “homesteads of about twenty acres each,” and be found “working out their own salvation” in the Philippines. Morgan told the Post that his plan would not deprive African Americans of their citizenship—they would “still be under the flag” in a climate “better suited to them”—and that Taft and Root were impressed with his idea. Scholars have not uncovered any correspondence between Washington, Fortune and Morgan.

In the years before his overseas journey, Fortune appeared skeptical but not wholly opposed to voluntary black migration outside the United States. In Black and White, he was sharply critical of white-run colonization schemes. However, in the fall of 1891 in the New York Age, Fortune reprinted the opinion of a journalist critical of schemes by Bishop Henry McNeal Turner and Edward P. McCabe to settle African Americans in Liberia and Oklahoma, respectively. Fortune agreed that such efforts would likely not come to fruition, but took issue with the journalist’s

12 Morgan served as a brigadier general in the Confederate cavalry and played a central role in the overthrow of Reconstruction in Alabama. He thought the South must develop economic independence from the Northern states and supported a Nicaraguan canal, as well as annexation of Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines, which set him apart from many Democrats. See Joseph A. Fry, John Tyler Morgan and the Search for Southern Autonomy (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1992).
13 Washington Post, Dec. 16, 1902. Fry’s biography of Morgan shows communication between Morgan and Secretary Root about black emigration to the Philippines, but makes no mention of Fortune. Willard B. Gatewood concluded in 1975 that Roosevelt and Root, by appointing Fortune, were most likely attempting to mollify both Fortune and Morgan; that is, assure Senator Morgan they were studying his black emigration scheme, and provide a long-wanted patronage position for Fortune. Black Republicans in New Jersey, where Fortune had recently moved, had objected to his consideration for the post of American minister to Haiti. See Gatewood, Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden, 1898-1903 (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1975), 307.
scorn at “improvident Negroes” eager to get to “some promised land where there is no work to do.” “Why improvident?” Fortune asked. Had it not always been the case, for both black and white, that “discontent, caused by hard social conditions,” motivated emigration?\textsuperscript{14} Furthermore, Fortune may have considered black emigration as a possible way to reduce white mob violence in the South. In an 1899 letter to the \textit{New York Sun}, Fortune included a lengthy passage from his longtime friend William A. Pledger, who wrote that “as a solution to the difficulty” of mob rule, “I believe that if the talk about populating the Philippine Islands with Afro-Americans could take tangible shape it would do it. If the Government will furnish the transportation we can furnish plenty of people…They would be strong men, thoroughly imbued with American ideas, who would be a positive acquisition to the population of the Philippine Islands.”\textsuperscript{15} Pledger’s statement and Fortune’s possible endorsement of it hint at two other ideas that Fortune would return to on his journey: that African Americans could help Filipino society develop, and that Fortune himself might help furnish the right black population.\textsuperscript{16}

When Fortune arrived in Honolulu on the steamer \textit{Doric} on December 16, 1902, he landed on a tropical island with an astonishingly vibrant newspaper scene.

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{New York Age}, Oct. 31, 1891. Fortune’s take on African American colonization is complex. In the 1890s he had frequently opposed such schemes, and in Fortune’s 1901 essay “Race Absorption,” printed in \textit{AME Church Review} 18, he criticized Bishop Henry M. Turner’s back-to-Africa campaign, writing that the Afro-American “is an American by birth, education and religious belief. He takes only an American’s interest in Africa and what goes on there. He has no disposition to go to Africa…” Yet, later in his life, he would support Marcus Garvey’s UNIA movement. Reprinted in Alexander, \textit{T. Thomas Fortune}, 241.

\textsuperscript{15} \textit{New York Sun}, May 3, 1899.

\textsuperscript{16} Steven Hahn explores the politics of black-run emigrationist movements in the rural South—and the real concessions from white planters these societies were sometimes able to obtain—in Hahn, \textit{A Nation Under Our Feet: Black Political Struggles in the Rural South From Slavery to the Great Migration} (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003).
Hawaii in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was home to establishment papers, oppositional presses, independent actors, and in-language ethnic presses. The alliance of missionary descendants and white business interests, mainly planters, who overthrew Queen Lilioukalani in 1893 constituted much of the newspaper press; newspapers quoted in this study and not denoted as “nationalist” or “independent” are such establishment, oligarchy-supporting journals. But many outspoken oppositional and nationalist newspapers, published in English, Hawaiian, or both, and staffed by native, mixed-race, or white journalists, still existed when Fortune visited the islands. These were accompanied by in-language ethnic newspapers, as well as independent, pro-labor newspapers. By 1909, Hawaii had about 100 publications in print, and a full 30 percent were published in languages other than English, including Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, Korean, and several Filipino languages.\(^{17}\) Fortune seems to have taken note: “Mr. Fortune was greatly interested in the newspapers of the city,” one Honolulu paper reported shortly after his arrival, “asking many questions about them.”\(^ {18}\)

If the island’s newspaper scene was healthy, its sugar economy was not. As Fortune was shown around by representatives of the planters’ association and the chamber of commerce, “[e]ven the hack drivers talk sugar to me,” he told the press, “and the paramount idea is how to get sugar planting back to the old time basis when everybody, according to all accounts, carried round a hundred or so in his pocket just for change to rattle.”\(^ {19}\) Planters suffered from a shortage of labor and were desperate


\(^ {18}\) *Evening Bulletin*, Dec. 18, 1902.

\(^ {19}\) *Hawaiian Star*, Dec. 30, 1902. Fortune wrote Booker T. Washington upon his arrival, describing a cordial dinner at the Pacific Club with Alfred Steadman Hartwell (1836-1912), a white officer with the 54\(^ {th}\) Massachusetts Infantry during the Civil War, and George Robert Carter (1866-1933), a member of the Hawaii territorial
to find the “right” kind of worker. A report from U.S. Commissioner of Labor Carroll D. Wright, written in 1902 and published in 1903, put it bluntly: “Hardly a locality exists in the world where there is a surplus of unskilled labor that has not been visited and investigated by Hawaiian labor agents.”20 As they brought in workers from abroad, planters hoped they could find a way to gain an exemption from Chinese exclusion for Hawaii and thus import Chinese workers, thought by many to work the hardest and with the least protest.

In pushing for black emigration to Hawaii, Fortune had to engage a planter discourse in the oligarchy’s press that racialized labor. That is, the search for the right laborers for Hawaii’s sugar plantations was the search for the appropriate racial group, whose members were thought to naturally—perhaps via biology, or perhaps through culture; it is not entirely clear in the discourse—possess the proper propensities to handle the difficulties of reliably harvesting sugar cane. It was a long-standing discussion in the Island’s best-funded and most frequently and consistently published newspapers.

In an editorial titled, “Labor Troubles on Maui” two years before Fortune’s arrival, the Maui News described labor strife on a plantation and wound up classifying a whole host of laborers racially with respect to their work characteristics. Japanese at Kahului were striking for better wages and shorter working hours; by “threats and


20 Carroll D. Wright, *Report: Commissioner of Labor on Hawaii, 1902* (Government Printing Office, 1903), 22. Online at https://books.google.com/books?id=YBMZAAAAYAAJ. Wright’s 228-page report for 1902 followed a similar report in 1901. In fact, Wright suggested in the preface that a government stipulation requiring yearly reports on Hawaii be amended. “Once in four or five years would answer every economic and social purpose,” he wrote. The extensive reports, which covered all racial groups on the island including African Americans, suggest that at least with respect to Hawaii, Roosevelt did not send Fortune abroad due to a dearth of information.
coaxing,” they convinced some native Hawaiians to join them; then workers at the Spreckelsville mill joined in. Fortunately for the plantation owner, the News reported, “a large consignment of negroes and Italians had recently arrived”; they were put to work “with gratifying results.” Soon the “foolish terror” of the Hawaiians—the Japanese had supposedly threatened to kill them if they went to work—would abate, and they too would return to work.  

The Spreckelsville blacks, farm hands from Montgomery, Ala., were “giving very good satisfaction.” With another shipment from Alabama, “the day of Japanese domination is gone forever.” On the other hand, although some of the black laborers from Tennessee were “all right,” others were “crap-shooting city darkies who never ought to have been brought here.” A few seemed to have joined the strike, but had found that no other plantation would hire them. “Wiser counsels will probably prevail with them soon, and some of them may turn out all right.” What looked at first like unchanging, essentialized characteristics—no-good “city darkies”—could melt away if one worked without protest. The emphasis on racial or cultural characteristics seemed designed to take the place of a discussion of wages, working conditions, or living conditions.

Commissioner Wright’s 1903 report was filled with more explicit race/labor typologies; the Japanese were vain “like children,” and had to be flattered into working; the Chinaman was, by contrast, “a sort of agricultural automaton.”  

Porto Ricans were apt to carry weapons, drink, and fight, but were slowly settling down and have families due to their possession of “the heredity of the Caucasian.” Planters, Wright wrote, still desired Chinese workers the most, and wanted to “play off” the Chinese against the Japanese to make labor more “tractable.”

22 Wright, Commissioner of Labor on Hawaii, 53.
23 Ibid., 33.
24 Ibid., 53.
When members of the same racial group were perceived as acting in disparate ways, Hawaii’s planter press simply divided the group into sub-types, often based on region. One editorial less than three years before Fortune’s visit, noting that Kohala planters were to “experiment” with African American labor, advised, “it matters very much where you get your negro from.” Those from the agricultural sections of the United States were “sober, quiet and industrious”; if they came with their families, “we could educate their children in our schools.” But there was a “class” of African American from “the vicinity of the towns” who had “no home life, but moves about from one job to another, sometimes working, sometimes loafing, sometimes stealing, poker playing, crap shooting and drinking.” The paper suggested direct recruitment of the best class of black man by those who sought him, rather than relying, remotely, on a labor agent. Though it could be argued that these statements refer to supposed cultural and not imagined racial traits, these traits are frequently described, as in race-based notions, as essential and unchanging.

Rather than resist these race/labor typologies, in laying out his plan for African American labor on the islands, Fortune often echoed them. He told the Builders and Traders meeting, “‘I do not think…that those who object so strongly to the introduction of negro labor here have seen the true plantation laborer.’” He

---

25 *Hawaiian Star*, July 2, 1900. The next summer, a group of African American laborers on Maui apparently tired of charges that they were lawless or “undesirable,” according to a *Star* article titled, “The Negroes Complain – Hold a Mass Meeting at Spreckelsville – Say They are Not a Lawless Crowd – The Feeling Between the Blacks and the Japanese.” The paper said the meeting was the result of the stabbing and robbery of a Japanese man by an African American. “The negroes declared that they wanted fair play and did not want all to be judged by the actions of one ruffian.” The paper continued: “The Japs of Spreckelsville threatened to do up the negroes and there is a good deal of feeling between the camps…” The *Star* said the Japanese threatened to strike unless the African Americans were sent away, then “thought better of it” and, along with all but forty black laborers who left for Honolulu, “both races” returned to work. *Hawaiian Star*, June 12, 1901.
continued:

There are one or two Southerners here who know the class of people I mean, and they will uphold me as to their fitness for the work. The true negro is a different individual from the half breed tinctured with the ambition of the white united to the natural shirking responsibility of the negro. It makes a bad combination. And in a milder degree this is true of the class that has come here and which has been culled from barbers, waiters, touts, dock hands and the riff raff of Southern cities spoiled for work by their closer association with white man’s ways which they imitate but do not emulate.26

In remarks at a Builders and Traders meeting, Fortune told the audience of businessmen that due to organized labor’s success in “the coal strike”—in all likelihood the 1902 anthracite coal strike in eastern Pennsylvania, which Roosevelt had mediated—the power of organized labor to keep out Chinese workers from the United States and all its territories would likely increase. But Chinese exclusion was happening at a time when “discontent among the negro laborers of the South was never greater.” Though Fortune stressed that he had “no fixed opinion on the subject” and had “come to learn,” he laid out his vision: “I believe that from 20,000 to 300,000 negro laborers, not the vicious from the slums, but men who are workers all the time, could be secured to work in the fields of Hawaii and the Philippines and that they would prove the best kind of labor.” Cuba’s and St. Thomas’ sugar industries, after all, had been “built up by black labor,” in contrast to the “failure” that resulted when Italians were brought into Louisiana for the same purpose.27 Like Father Yorke,

26 Hawaiian Star, Dec. 19, 1902.
27 “He Will Investigate Our Labor Conditions,” Hawaiian Gazette, Dec. 19, 1902. Fortune may be referring to the large number of Italian immigrants who worked in sugar plantations in Louisiana in the 1890s, and the strained relations that occurred between them and the native-born. Following the 1890 assassination of a New Orleans police chief, eleven Italian immigrants who had been acquitted of the murder were lynched by a mob on March 14, 1891. See Vincent Scarpaci, “Italian Immigrants in Louisiana’s Sugar Parishes” (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1972), and Barbara Botein, “The Hennessy Case: An Episode in Anti-Italian Nativism,” Louisiana History: The Journal of the Louisiana Historical Society 20 (Summer 1979): 261-79.
Fortune described labor as key plank of citizenship rights for his group. Unlike Yorke, whose readership might be protected by powerful, racially exclusionary unions and the wages they could command, the work on Hawaii that Fortune sought for African Americans was low-wage and grueling.28

Fortune posited himself as the expert who could find the right kind of black laborer for Hawaii, a link between the fields of the U.S. South and those of Hawaii. The “true negro agriculturist,” Fortune said, would “not be easily persuaded to leave” the United States, “but it is a possibility, if you go at it the right way and get men like Booker Washington, myself if you like, and others who have the interests of the race truly at heart, to get the supply for you.”29

Journalism as a practice is tied up with the formation of these race/labor typologies. Fortune’s stated expertise on different “types” of black laborers resembles newspaperman James Samuel Stemons’s (see Chapter 4) similar observations about types of African Americans, as well as Freeman publisher Edward Cooper’s words: “No class of men know the Negro as so well as the editor…Who knows the vain woman, the dude, the barber or the crooked preacher so well? He knows them all for he has dealings with them….”30 Cooper’s urban black editor seems to walk city streets in a kind of detached, classificatory mode reminiscent of Walter Benjamin’s flâneur; “a nineteenth-century social type known for his roving forms of urban

28 Labor commissioner Wright included a description of stripping sugar cane: “Picture to yourself a 50 or 60 acre field of well-grown cane. It stands from 8 to 10 feet high...there is a deadly, muggy dampness everywhere, which renders the heat more oppressive...fine dust rises from the crackling leaves in clouds, which gets into the laborer’s eyes and nostrils, covers his whole perspiring body with streaming dirt, and closes up his bronchial tubes as badly as if he were working a cotton gin in a closed room.” Wright, Commissioner of Labor on Hawaii, 40-41.
Newspapers and newspapering flattered editors that theirs was a particularly privileged viewpoint from which to understand the world (see Fig. 5).

If Benjamin saw the flâneur’s willingness to seek out new and even shocking sights as a sign of his modernity, other scholars studying nineteenth century manners have found countercurrents: the city’s crowd could be perceived as a threat, and middle class conduct manuals, for example, recommended visual withdrawal and tighter differentiation. James W. Cook stresses “the chronic semiotic confusion...” Newspapers and newspapering flattered editors that theirs was a particularly privileged viewpoint from which to understand the world (see Fig. 5).

Figure 5. “Specimens of Afro-American Statesmen,” Freeman (Indianapolis), Sept. 20, 1890. Artist: Moses L. Tucker.
sparked by rapid demographic mobility, market expansion, and urbanization across the nineteenth century,” which produced “a brave new world in which traditional systems of visual identification (based, for example, on dress or bodily comportment) no longer seemed to signify in consistent and reliable ways.”

Newspapers—through editorials, where the editor shared his wisdom on the city; columns that divided life into news, interests, sports, and leisure; and especially images, whether of cartoonish types or documentary-style “news” photography—attempted to make sense of this brave new world and helped encourage the recognition of types and classes of people. Newspapers helped train the eye in particular ways of seeing.

Newspapering seemed to give Fortune some clout with Hawaii’s mainstream press; the Gazette wrote upon his arrival that, “perhaps no negro publicist and orator is better known in the United States.” Reaction to his hopes for African American labor on the islands, however, was mostly negative. Several articles in various Hawaiian establishment papers criticized the proposal; most claimed that black labor was tried before, on Maui, with disastrous results. The Hawaiian Gazette printed

---

32 Ibid., 437. Fortune will describe a well-dressed Japanese “dude,” below.
33 Hawaiian Gazette, Dec. 19, 1902. The Gazette identified Fortune as “editor of the N.Y. Age, president of the National Afro-American Council, of the Negro Business League,” and “a co-worker of Booker T. Washington.”
34 An editorial in the Dec. 19, 1902, Evening Bulletin did express tentative support for the possibility of black labor on Hawaii. If Fortune could come up with a strong, practical plan, he would “find plenty of support from planter and the American population of the islands.” The problem was the planters of the U.S. South, who, “notwithstanding racial prejudice and all the talk of negro domination,” still hoped to keep the upright negro agriculturist and jettison, possibly to the Territories, the “rag tag and bobtail of the country with the riff raff of the city thrown in.” The Maui News, Jan. 3, 1903, wrote that Fortune’s side-trip to Maui would surely profit his study, for negro labor from the Southern U.S. was tried, and failed, on Maui only. Fortune must note two “difficulties,” however: low wages for labor and high food prices, and “the impossibility for such labor to secure and own their own homes on the Islands.” If Fortune still saw land ownership as key to African American advancement, as he did as a younger man in Black and White, this assessment would have discouraged him.
eleven one-paragraph responses from eleven major sugar planters to Fortune’s suggestion of African American labor; almost all rejected it outright. J. A. Gilman, of Castle & Cooke, said that African Americans “who would come from so far away are always the undesirable ones.” F. A. Schaefer and several others noted that the “experiment” failed in the past; W. M. Giffard, for example, said that African Americans had shown “a tendency to fight” with each other and not associate with Hawaiians. W. O. Smith, secretary of the planters’ association, told the paper that such efforts had taken place since 1872, and had always been futile. Perhaps, he said, it could work if whole black communities, along with their preachers, were brought in, so that “they might build new homes.”

But the most sought-after racial group for labor in the fields remained the Chinese.

Fortune’s own words about the Chinese and Chinese labor were frequently garbled in Hawaii’s mainstream press. One article paraphrases Fortune as telling businessmen at the December 18th meeting that, “the future of the Oriental problem was to drive Asiatics out of the United States. The Chinese should be compelled to cut his queue and wear his shirt inside his trousers.” A careful read reveals that Fortune was probably not describing his own views, but characterizing the position of U.S. labor unions. Yet Fortune’s position on Chinese labor is hard to decode also because of the ways in which a discourse of Chinese exclusion evolved partly from antebellum, abolitionist origins. As argued by historian Moon-Ho Jung, in the mid-nineteenth century the coerced labor of the “coolie trade” in the Caribbean was

35 “Fortune Will Look After Local Labor,” Hawaiian Gazette, Dec. 19, 1902. The Gazette reported, possibly paraphrasing Fortune’s own words, that Fortune’s investigation of the possibility of negro labor on the island was “in no way connected to his mission, but it is rather in line with his work for the past quarter of a century, which has been looking to the uplifting of the race of which he is a representative.” This differs from the Washington Post and American newspapers in Manila, which associated the emigration scheme with Sen. Morgan’s plan.

equated with slavery, and Republican efforts to stop the importation of indentured labor paved the way for later Chinese exclusion. This may explain how, in 1902, Fortune could position himself as both a fighter for racial equality and one who might support restrictions on Chinese migration.\textsuperscript{37}

Such a discourse on Chinese labor is found in one independent Hawaiian newspaper known for lambasting the annexationists and calling the planter oligarchy “an American mafia.” The \textit{Independent}—at the time of Fortune’s visit owned and operated by ardent Hawaiian nationalist F. J. Testa, one of seven signers of an anti-annexation letter to President McKinley in October, 1897—urged Fortune to explore the “general inhumanity” of the way in which field labor was employed on the island. If he looked closely, Fortune could surely produce a plan that would “forever remove the Asiatic blot on the industrial progress of this Territory” and help the general community. “Search the methods of the ‘sugar barons,’ Mr. Fortune…and obtain a story yet uncompleted of the how and wherefor of the transmutation of Chinese labor passage money into Hawaiian Territory Treasury warrants.” Testa’s editorial demonstrates the “race-inflected antimonopoly populism”\textsuperscript{38} so common to the time; a concern with inhumane treatment of workers seems to slip inexorably toward excluding “Asiatics.” Yet Testa also defended the Chinese community in Hawaii from charges that its neighborhood was a breeding ground for disease.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{37} Moon-Ho Jung explores how anti-slavery discourse evolved into pro-labor, anti-Chinese rhetoric in \textit{Coolies and Cane: Race, Labor and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).

\textsuperscript{38} The phrase is from April Merleaux, “The Political Culture of Sugar Tariffs: Immigration, Race, and Empire, 1898-1930,” \textit{International Labor and Working Class History} 81 (Spring 2012): 31.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Independent}, Jan. 2, 1903. On the same page, Testa, who also edited the Hawaiian-language newspaper \textit{Ka Makaainana} (“The Commoner”), warned that Hawaii’s “Asiatics” were from the “lower classes,” and implied that the newly constructed transpacific cable might facilitate politicians and planters in bringing in more, to Hawaii’s detriment. But, in another editorial, Testa strongly defended the
In fact, elite discussions of how to best develop Hawaii and the Philippines could involve positive portrayals of Chinese: this time they were not the planters’ docile automatons, or populists’ threatening slave labor, but, to at least two academics, a civilizing force. Such descriptions still followed a hierarchical racial logic. In a third Gazette report on Fortune’s arrival, Fortune told those gathered that his fight against “race distinctions” caused him to “take issue with Prof. Jenks over his recommendations that Chinese be permitted to enter the Philippines.” The paper provides no information on Jenks, who is in all likelihood Cornell political economist Jeremiah W. Jenks, a frequent visitor to Asia who was complimentary of Chinese entrepreneurialism. In other Asian lands such as Ceylon, Burma, Java, and Sumatra, Jenks wrote, Chinese immigrants’ “diligence” and “thrift” had been “practically indispensible” to development. For natives, the Chinese had “raised their standard of living” by “doing the work they were unwilling to do.” Another intellectual, Frederick Wells Williams, agreed, writing in the American Historical Review that Americans must “dismiss old prejudices and learn to consider the Chinaman in our Eastern dependencies as an indispensable means to their economic development.”

The Chinese were “one of the most expert and subtle peoples on the globe.” Chinese in Honolulu against charges that Chinatown was a source of plague.

40 “He Will Investigate Our Labor Conditions,” Hawaiian Gazette, Dec. 19, 1902. The phrasing is peculiar, for “race distinctions” seem to be precisely what Fortune would support in limiting or excluding Chinese from the Philippines, in opposition to “Prof. Jenks.”

41 Jenks is quoted in Arthur Judson Brown, Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., The New Era in the Philippines (Fleming H. Revell Company, 1903), 85. Brown agreed that the Chinese could provide the “toning up of racial fibre” that Filipinos needed. Jenks is mentioned briefly in Kramer, Blood of Government, 295, in connection with his participation in the 1905 Lake Monhonk Conference of Friends of the Indian and Other Dependent Races.

42 Frederick Wells Williams, “The Chinese Immigrant in Further Asia,” American Historical Review 5 (April 1900): 503-517. Williams’s father was Samuel Wells Williams, an American missionary to China who defended the Chinese and wrote
At least one Hawaiian-language newspapers commented on Fortune’s visit, and several had already reported on black labor in the islands prior to his journey. The *Home Rula Repubalika*, run by Robert William Halanihiapo Wilcox, who was nearly hanged for his armed revolt against the white oligarchy, seemed sympathetic to African Americans, at least in 1901, when Booker T. Washington’s visit to the White House provoked Southern outrage. Roosevelt had said he would make himself president of the entire nation, the paper wrote, so what was all the fuss about? The Republican Party in the United States was friendly to dark-skinned people, after all. But, “our Republicans are not like that. They are highly racist against the dark-skinned. Yet they still claim the rights of the Republican name,” something the paper called a “fraud.” But the *Ke Aloha Aina* (“The Patriot”), founded by Joseph Kahooluhi Nawahi, a native Hawaiian legislator and publisher, commented during Fortune’s visit that “it would be outrageous if this dirty labor race is introduced to us in Hawaii in place of the Chinese,” and, the paper warned ominously, “it would not only be us who would witness the bad things of these people…”

Faced with Hawaii’s complicated racial politics, Fortune attempted to turn some of it on its head at the expense of whites while simultaneously performing his duty as a government agent. After a few weeks on the islands, Fortune told the *Hawaiian Star* that he understood why planters desired Chinese labor so strongly: the

---


Chinaman “sleeps on a mat, he wears clothes that cost less for a year than most men’s monthly laundry bill…He smokes no expensive cigars, buys no twenty-five cent drinks, entertains no friend and has got the white man, who spends half his income [on] clothes, entirely out of the race as regards labor competition.” (The Japanese man, Fortune said, also had a “disposition to dress up and be a bit of an American dude, which costs money.”) On the U.S. mainland, laborers feared the Chinese and had “placed a prohibitive tariff, so to speak”—Chinese exclusion—“against this competitive labor.” Fortune said he didn’t think planters would get their exemption to Chinese exclusion.45

Short of Chinese labor and besides black labor, what else might help Hawaii? Fortune recommended the islands diversify their agriculture and grow coffee and vanilla at higher altitudes, and consider rubber and cacao, too. Fortune may not have forgotten his past beliefs in the importance of land; the Star reported that he was “looking largely into the lands which are open for homesteading” for African American workers.46

As Fortune was completing his Hawaii investigation and preparing to set sail for Manila, race relations were deteriorating rapidly in the U.S. South. Attention to the domestic front reveals connections between American empire and a rapidly advancing Jim Crow system and philosophy, its expression and dissemination through newspapers, and provides clues into Booker T. Washington’s and perhaps T. Thomas Fortune’s global thinking in the early 1900s.

Washington wrote Fortune in February 1903, from Tuskegee, hoping his friend had not suffered seasickness during his travels and then stating, “I must confess

45 Hawaiin Star, Dec. 30, 1902.
46 Ibid.
that we are passing through a rather severe trial in the South just now.” At least three things had inflamed Southern politicians and newspaper editors: President Roosevelt had followed Washington’s recommendations and appointed William D. Crum, an African American, to the position of collector of customs in Charleston, S.C.; black public officials in Washington, D.C., had attended a judicial reception at the White House; and, in early January, Roosevelt had shut down the Indianola, Miss., post office after local politicians forced out due to her race its postmaster, Minnie M. Cox, an African American woman and a McKinley appointee. Perhaps as troublesome and vexing for Washington was that Roosevelt’s Secretary of War, Elihu Root, just back from the Philippines, had delivered a peculiar speech on African American rights. “The whole situation is very much mixed and there is a good deal of unrest among our people,” Washington wrote Fortune in mid-February. “Secy. Root’s speech in New York a few weeks ago, which nobody seems to understand, further complicates the matter.”

Root had spoken at the Fortieth Anniversary Meeting of the Union League Club in New York City on February 6. The Union Leagues were black, white, white,

---

48 See Williard B. Gatewood, “Theodore Roosevelt and the Indianola Affair,” *Journal of Negro History* 53 (January 1968), 48-69. Black activists were thrilled with Roosevelt’s refusal to back down on these two black political appointments, though they knew Roosevelt had appointed fewer African Americans to office than his predecessor, William McKinley. They would be hugely disappointed with the President four years later in the fall of 1906, after two events that Louis Harlan describes as shattering the “Washingtonian rhetoric of accommodation and progress”: the Atlanta race riot, and Roosevelt’s dismissal “without even the formality of a court martial” and on “weak” evidence, of three companies of black regular troops accused of involvement in a shootout in Brownsville, Texas. See Louis Harlan, *Booker T. Washington: The Wizard of Tuskegee, Vol. 2, 1901-1915* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983), 295.
50 Root’s speech to the Union League Club can be accessed online at [https://](https://)
and sometimes interracial clubs that became “the political voice for impoverished freedmen” after the Civil War. By 1903, however, few clubs still retained their activist edge. Root began his short speech honoring the “Gentlemen of 1863” present, and hailing the nation’s great accomplishments since the mid-century: the “curse of slavery” had ended and the North and South had reconciled, reunited “with the kindness of true American citizenship.” But now, Root told the gathering, three “problems almost immeasurable” challenged the younger generation. First was the widening gap between rich and poor, which corrupted politics and threatened through envy to provoke a “war of classes.” Next were the ever-more powerful unions, which went beyond defending the working man and now threatened American meritocracy by protecting “sloth,” “incompetency,” and “stupidity.” The third was the so-called Negro Problem, though Root never explicitly named it as such. Root questioned the entire Reconstruction project to grant African Americans full citizenship.

Root summarized the post-Civil War amendments to the Constitution: Give the freedman “citizenship,” “suffrage,” and “equal rights,” the plan went, and “he will rise.” But, Root said, “I fear we are compelled to face the conclusion that the experiment has failed.” Root then described in a straightforward manner the loss of black suffrage rights in the South, and hinted at his exasperation at Southerners’ “loud outcries” against Roosevelt for appointing African American officeholders, when the president had in fact made fewer appointments than McKinley. “Now,” he added hastily, “I am not discussing the question. I am simply showing that the same state of official treatment of the blacks meets a change in the public feeling of the South...And it is probably but a matter of time—not so very long a time—when the overwhelming weight of opinion of the white men will succeed in excluding blacks

---

from all offices in the southern States.” Root repeated that the country must “face
the failure of the plan…to lift the blacks” after emancipation through the strategy of
ing voting rights. He ended quickly, stating that the nation must continue to protect “the
well-being of these men who were held in bondage for so many generations”; yet,
“the new question of what can be done for them, now that the first attempt has failed,
is one that challenges the best thought and the best patriotism of our country.”

Washington must have wondered if some new plan was afoot in the Roosevelt
administration—would it now acquiesce to the continuing disenfranchisement of
African Americans? “[T]he President seems to be standing squarely and so far as I
can get information directly or indirectly, he is with us,” he wrote Fortune.  

Five days after this letter, and two weeks following Root’s speech, Washington
delivered a masterful address to a Bronx audience that touched on African American
and U.S. history in a worldly vein. Root’s recent, ominous words appeared to be on
his mind as he pointedly addressed freedom, race, and empire. He began by reciting
famous people and incidents in U.S. history that revealed the “desire for liberty that
is natural in every human breast,” such as the “Cavaliers of Jamestown” and the
“Puritans of Plymouth Rock.” Freedom was secured through George Washington’s
leadership and the Declaration of Independence, and through “Lexington, Concord,
and Yorktown.” But thereafter in the speech Washington complicated freedom,
bringing the concept into increasingly incongruous situations.

The “growth of the sentiment of freedom,” Washington said, was evident
in the Monroe Doctrine, by which the United States would not only “contend
against the world for its freedom, but for the freedom of all governments upon the
two American continents.” Irony lies just under the surface in this juxtaposition of

52 BTW to TTF, Feb. 17, 1903. In Harlan and Smock, Booker T. Washington
Papers, Vol. 7, 80-81.
freedom and empire; it loomed larger in his next example, as Washington, a former slave, described the Civil War in the way a Confederate leader might, and then zoomed forward in time to the Spanish-American War: “Half a century later we find the Southern section of our country entering into a political and physical war in a contention for freedom in the control of domestic and state policies, and still later we find ourselves demanding, at the point of the sword, the freedom of our neighbors, the Cubans.” Washington was problematizing freedom for his listeners. Next he would put it into conversation with race.

“During all the period that the majority and dominant races were contending for the most complete and perfect freedom and independence,” he continued, “there were living by their side two other races, different in color and different in history—the Indian and the Negro.” Whenever and wherever whites and Indians met, “there either was war between the two or injustice and oppression shown [upon] the original American.” Either due to this oppression, or possibly Native Americans’ “inability to stand the contact with a stronger and more numerous race,” these first Americans were dying out. Washington told his audience, “you have so far practiced absorption, colonization, or extermination” when encountering other races in a quest for freedom. Yet, “you have got the Indian out of the range of your vision. And in this country it seems to be the fashion to consider a problem solved when we get it out of our sight to such an extent that its existence is unobtrusive and our consciences are eased.”

Now, a new race problem loomed, and Washington set his sights on the Philippines:

Our most recent experiment in the way of race accessions—the Filipino—I shall not, on this occasion discuss, for the reason that you seem as yet to be quite undecided as to how and where he shall be classed—that is, whether you will rate him as a black man or a white man. Just now the Filipino seems to be going through the interesting
process of being carefully examined. If he can produce hair that is long enough and nose and feet that are small enough, I think the Filipino will be designated and treated as a white man; otherwise he will be assigned to my race. If I were to consider the question purely from a selfish standpoint, I should urge that our new subjects be classed as Negroes; but if I were to consider unselfishly the peace of mind of the Filipino himself, I should hope that he be so classified that, in addition to all this other trials, he will not struggle through all future generations considered and looked upon as a problem, instead of a man.\(^{53}\)

The speech is fascinating not only for its scarcely veiled anger at white America. What was the “selfish” reason Washington cited for imagining the Filipino as black? Was it a numbers game—that is, that African Americans might gain more allies in their struggles against racial discrimination? Or did it refer to his hopes that Tuskegee might be called upon to work not only in Africa, where its employees were mediating between indigenous Ewe farmers and German colonialists in the growing of cotton, but in the Philippines as well?\(^{54}\)

The two possibilities are not mutually exclusive. It is the contention of this chapter that both Fortune and Washington were attempting to positions themselves as brokers for African American labor and coordinators of Tuskegee-style native “uplift” in the territories, and hoped that American empire might destabilize a white racial order and present new opportunities for black advancement at home and abroad.

According to the Hawaiian Star, Fortune had international connections as a kind of agent for the exportation of black labor. The Star reported that he was attempting to


supply negro labor to “a big rubber plantation on the Congo in West Africa.”55 Earlier in 1902, Fortune and Washington had discussed the Congo with each other and, for Washington, with investors. In June, Washington had written to Fortune, “I also have your circular letter of June 7th asking my opinion regarding the possibility of getting 100,000 Afro-Americans to go to the Congo. I would say briefly that I feel very sure that if you could get Bishop Turner, Col. Pledger and Rev. W. H. Heard to go to the Congo and settle there that you would have little trouble in getting the remainder to follow. What do you think of this scheme?”56 By mid-February of 1903, Washington was being recruited by the powerful Lord Grey of the British South Africa Company in Rhodesia to tour the nation for six to nine months and recommend how best to “raise, educate, and civilize the black man.”57 Newspapers reported the offer and Washington consulted with Roosevelt before deciding that, according to Harlan, “his primary responsibility was to his institution and the American Negro.”58

In 1900, Washington had informed readers of The Century Magazine, the widely read successor to Scribner’s Monthly, that what Tuskegee had accomplished

55 Hawaiian Star, Dec. 19, 1902. Fortune explained that “the native labor on the Congo settlements does not work intelligently, being prone to cut down and destroy the rubber trees altogether at one sapping instead of so tapping them that they will be available the ensuing season.” Washington was appointed head of the American branch of E. D. Morel’s Congo Reform Association in 1904.

56 BTW to TTF, June 15, 1902. In Harlan and Smock, Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. 6, 481. Henry Francis Downing (1846-1928), an African American Navy man, U.S. consul in West Africa, playwright and novelist, wrote Washington in September 1902 as manager of New Cotton Fields Ltd., a London company promoting cotton-raising in West Africa. He told Washington he sought “the services of an expert who would be able to locate areas suitable for the Company’s operations.” In the future, African Americans would settle on company lands. “It is my personal belief that the removing from the Southern States of even a small proportion of its skilled labour,” Downing wrote, “will have a beneficial influence in the way of helping to bring about a better understanding between the various peoples in the Southern States.” Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol 6., Sept. 2, 1902.


58 Ibid.
in the U.S. South “under most difficult circumstances” could be attempted in Cuba
and Porto Rico. Tuskegee was training “a few of the most promising men and
women from these islands…with the view of having them return and take the lead”
in replicating the institute’s “industrial” methods in their lands. But Washington
may have seen more than simple business opportunities for Tuskegee in Cuba. He
wrote that historically, for black Cubans, “only in a few instances [was] the color-
line drawn…Certainly it will place this country in an awkward position to have
gone to war to free a people from Spanish cruelty” only to “treat a large proportion
of the population worse than did even Spain herself, simply on account of color.”
To Washington, a faint color line on the island might highlight and unsettle sharply
drawn racial segregation at home.59

In Honolulu, as he would in Manila, Fortune stressed Washington’s
educational philosophy and a kind of politics of respectability. At the Honolulu
YMCA, Fortune delivered a talk titled “Self-Respect and Its Basis.”60 In that speech,
according to a lengthy write-up in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser (“Fortune at
Y.M.C.A. – Negro Publicist Talks About Character – General Armstrong Was His
Friend – Links Lives of Lincoln, Armstrong, and Booker Washington in Clever
Way”), Fortune spoke to an “unusually large audience” and “drew graphic word
pictures” about the lives and character of the three men. Fortune described Lincoln’s
humble upbringings in a Kentucky log cabin, and the lack of opportunities for
“religious culture” or “mental development”; yet, through his mother and through
contemplation of “nature and nature’s God,” Lincoln rose and became the Great
Emancipator. While the nation mourned his assassination, another man, Samuel C.
Armstrong, “stood on the prow of a vessel headed from Mexico” and “pondered…
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what was to become of these millions of freed blacks.” Arriving in Virginia and “remembering what his father taught in Hawaii before the war,” Armstrong created the Hampton Institute, educating “head, heart, and hands.” Fortune said, according to the paper, that he counted himself lucky to have been acquainted with Armstrong, and gave Hawaii credit for “the part which she has played in the education of the negro race of the southern states through the indomitable courage, sacrifice, and philanthropy” of Armstrong and his Hampton Institute. Finally, Fortune said, Booker T. Washington “walked 300 miles to Hampton Institute from the wilds of West Virginia,” and later toiled day and night to build Tuskegee and “carry out the work of Lincoln and Armstrong.” Fortune ended with words on character, whose basis was “in the home, in the school, in the church,” and without which “no one could have respect.” At least in public, Fortune and Washington were in synch ideologically in 1902-03.

Scholars are zeroing in on the export of these uplift pedagogies and their role in U.S. empire. Jose-Manuel Navarro has documented how the industrial and vocational education model of Hampton/Tuskegee influenced U.S. colonial policy makers in Puerto Rico. Anne Paulet details the beliefs of U.S. policymakers and education commissioners that the experience of educating African Americans and Native Americans would be relevant in the Philippines. American educators debated which “race,” Filipinos or African Americans, needed more vocational verses academic training.

Armstrong, the founder of the Hampton Institute, from which, as Fortune noted, Tuskegee was born, grew up in Hawaii. “It meant something to the Hampton school,

61 Pacific Commercial Advertiser, Dec. 29, 1902.
and perhaps to the ex-slaves of America,” Armstrong said in 1892, “that, from 1820 to 1860, the distinctively missionary period, there was worked out in the Hawaiian Islands the problem of the emancipation, enfranchisement, and Christian civilization of a dark-skinned Polynesian people in many respects like the negro race.”

Historian Gary Okihiro notes incisively that an 1882 letter from Hawaii’s Bureau of Immigration to Armstrong, which asked the famed educator about the feasibility of black labor on the islands, reveals that “the ideas of native education and servile labor for the ostensible uplift of subject races migrated between island and continent, and a seed first cultivated in Hawai’i and transplanted in the American South had found its way back, full circle, to the Islands.” Fortune’s trip to Hawaii represents the continued circulation of educational philosophies intimately tied to racialized notions of civilization and labor, and embraced by expansionists as a method for integration and control of subject races at home and abroad.

Fortune saw Hawaii’s missionary tradition as key to his cordial reception among white people there. Looking back on his Hawaii-Philippines sojourn in the fall of 1903, he would write that he had been “received with open-armed hospitality by the descendants of New England missionaries in the Territory of Hawaii, who had planted there a civilization based on the Christian virtues in which race prejudice had no part…” Joshua Paddison, however, finds that evangelical Protestants on the West Coast U.S. mainland had largely abandoned a multi-racial vision of Christian

---


65 Okihiro, *Island World*, 134. Okihiro writes that attempts to recruit African Americans ended with a prohibition against black labor by the Hawaiian legislature in the 1880s. In fact, as shown in this chapter, recruitment of African Americans was tried again as late as 1900, on Maui.

social harmony by the late nineteenth century. Yet some such hopes endured, and the Hawaiian Islands could inspire them. A writer in *The Missionary Review of the World* of November 1900, after discussing in positive terms Hawaii’s “five principle races” (Polynesian, Japanese, Chinese, Portuguese, and Anglo-Saxon), declared:

> The brotherhood of man, the fact that of one blood God has made all the children of men to dwell together upon the face of the earth, seems to be one of the lessons to be taught on Hawaii. And there is no spot where the race question is being more happily solved -- none, where a man is more regarded for his inherent qualities, rather than for his race affinities; none where the races mix with greater harmony in social, business, and political circles.

The *Review* went on to speak with admiration of Chinese reformer “Leung Chi Tso,” (Liang Qichao) who was staying temporarily in Hawaii while “lecturing to his countrymen in Honolulu.” Establishment Hawaiian newspapers, too, typically spoke respectfully of Liang, who was seen as a modernizing force. Contemporary historians may also note a unique Hawaiian culture, though most are careful to stress that Western notions of the “multicultural” can hide imperial histories; a “multicultural” society, for example, may not come into being “until conquerors conquer and until workers around the world are imported.”

---

69 See, for example, the *Hawaiian Star*, July 2, 1900, and the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, March 21, 1900. In fact, Liang Qichao’s tours of Australia, Hawaii, and the United States—where he met President Roosevelt in 1903—convinced him that the West was corrupt, practiced deadly discrimination against non-whites, and was dominated by industrial trusts bent on imperialist expansion. See Hunt and Levine, *Arc of Empire*, 61-62.
But the astonishing flexibility and ethereality of race suggests that Fortune’s friendly reception had as much to do with planter dreams of cheap, “tractable” labor as with a tradition of racial egalitarianism on the islands, whether indigenous, imported, or some combination of the two. “My idea of a Chinaman has been greatly changed…since my trip on the Doric,” Fortune told one local newspaper, describing Chinese ship-hands on the Doric and perhaps catering to planters’ labor wishes. “They appear to be fine workmen.” Part of planters’ cordiality, certainly, involved Fortune’s position, however peculiar and temporary, as an agent of the U.S. government; planters hoped he might bend Roosevelt’s ear and obtain for Hawaii an exemption to Chinese exclusion. (They would have done well to examine Louisiana sugar producers’ perpetual hopes and disillusionments with Chinese labor in their fields in the 1870s. “In the endless search for an ideal plantation labor force,” Moon-Ho Jung writes of those fields, “race meant everything and, in the end, nothing.”)

As Fortune prepared to leave Hawaii, he published a poem in the *Evening Bulletin* that revealed a more oppositional stance to U.S. imperial power than he had expressed in public on the islands. Titled “The Kanaka Maiden,” the maiden in the poem was Hawaii herself, “made for love, and not for labor.” But her “towering hills” and “slumberous vales” were no longer her own; instead, a “stranger lords it now on the hillsides,” and “even on the restless ocean tides / Are nothing seen but alien sails.” Because poetry still had a home in turn-of-the-century newspapers, Fortune’s sympathies for a Hawaii free of U.S. control had an outlet, and could be printed in the same papers where he had typically expressed conciliation toward Hawaii’s power structure. In this way, perhaps Fortune’s poem resembles Hawaiian *mele*

---

72 Moon-Ho Jung, *Coolies and Cane*, 214.
(chants, songs, or poems) that Hawaiians, according to Amy Ku’uleialoha Stillman, increasingly printed in late-nineteenth century Hawaiian-language newspapers as a way to voice political and nationalist desires. The same romantic style that helped cloak the poem’s critique, however, also constrained its subversiveness. “The Kanaka Maiden” evoked a nostalgic, sentimental view of a lost land that dovetailed with late-nineteenth century sympathies for American Indians and other indigenous peoples as

---


---

Figure 6. Fortune’s poem “The Kanaka Maiden,” Evening Bulletin, Dec. 27, 1902.
“dying races.”

In a press beholden to powerful interests, and as a temporary agent of the U.S. government, the longtime activist’s militant voice was muted. Furthermore, Anti-Asian sentiments that can’t be squarely pinned to Fortune in Hawaii will be more clearly his own in his writings on the Philippines, while his reception there would be remarkably less courteous. Booker T. Washington seemed prescient about this latter fact, and warned his friend in a letter sent as Fortune was en route to Manila, “I advise you to be very careful about what you say to newspaper men, especially in the Philippines, as they are rather treacherous.”

_Fortune in the Philippines_

By February 1903, when Fortune arrived in the Philippines, the black press in the United States had already engaged for several years in a lively debate about the Spanish-American and Philippine-American wars. Many black newspapers stood staunchly against the conflicts. Some drew affinities along lines of color; the Salt Lake City _Broad Ax_ declared that, “no Negro possessing any race pride can enter heartily into the prosecution of the war.” Others stressed the hypocrisy of bringing democracy to Asia while African Americans were being disenfranchised at home, as the _Richmond Planet_ did when it editorialized, “A man who is not good enough to vote for a government is not good enough to fight for it.” In an editorial titled “Reflections,” editor Sol Johnson of the _Savanna Tribune_ worried that war was

---

76 Gatewood, _Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden_, 204.
77 The _Richmond Planet_, May 28, 1898. The _Planet_ also saw race affinities; it wrote about the Boer and the Philippine-American wars, “England has sent black men to fight for white men’s rights in South Africa, and the United States has sent black men to take away black men’s rights in the Philippine Islands. In both cases, the blacks get the worst end of the job.” (Oct. 21, 1899)
unifying white people at home and abroad:

The Spanish American war has drawn the Anglo Saxons together. The Union can scarcely be called national alone but international as well. All of the branches of this great race felt a deep sympathy for the American branch of the family in her armed contention with Spain…. The stars and stripes and the Union Jack are blended together on festive occasions and men’s faces grow red and their throats hoarse in exulting and exhilarating utterances of love, friendship and union for the united race...\(^78\)

The *Tribune* feared that Anglo Saxons were “intoxicated with the wine of success” and had forgotten that “victory belongs to the American people, not to the Anglo Saxon race.” The outburst was “pernicious, full of mischief and broods no good to the republic...”\(^79\) Johnson and some other black editors had supported U.S. intervention in Cuba or the Philippines from the start, pushing for African American enlistment and fighting for black soldiers’ fair treatment. But now, the *Tribune* saw race and nation merging treacherously.

Black soldiers in the islands also wrote letters home to the black press, using African American newspapers as a forum to express their opinions on the war and occupation. Black newspapers reprinted letters originally printed in other papers, circulating opinions on life in the Philippines from a black perspective. Fortune would have followed these soldiers’ letters, which showed a range of responses, from pride at serving one’s country to outrage at white soldiers’ racism toward black U.S. troops and Filipinos.\(^80\)

The contours of black editors’ critiques of Anglo-Saxonism and the extent of the affinities they felt with Filipinos and with Southern Africans in the Boer War

\(^78\) *Savannah Tribune*, March 18, 1899.
\(^79\) Ibid.
were shaped and constrained partly by their domestic fight against Bishop H. M. Turner and other advocates of black migration to Africa. In describing both Africans and Filipinos, the black press could critique the racialized binary of civilization and savagery, but might also employ that framework with little modification, to stress, for example, how unsuited African Americans were for migration schemes to “savage” Africa. The Indianapolis Freeman wrote in February 1899 that Filipinos were “possessed with much pride and independence of spirit and have some notions of government,” but, “the bushmen of today cannot be the legislator of tomorrow” and hence must be under U.S. control until “the staying hand of America might be withdrawn.” As we shall see, in his writings about the Philippines upon his return from the islands, Fortune would sometimes employ such racialist constructions without comment, and at other times invert them to strike against white racism.

When Fortune reached the elegant Hotel de Oriente in Manila late one night in February 1903, an American porter had left on his table “a large batch of Manila newspapers, saying that he had saved them against the day of my coming and that he was sure I would find many things in them to interest me.” Fortune was shocked at

Freeman, Feb. 4, 1899.
the racist vitriol he found within their pages; one newspaper called upon its readers to send Fortune back to the United States, since he and any other African American was unwanted on the Islands. Examination of the *Manila American* and other American-run newspapers available at the National Library of the Philippines reveals the negative reception afforded to Fortune.

Shortly before Fortune’s February arrival, the *Manila American* published an editorial titled, “Chinese are wanted, but no negroes.” Sen. Morgan of Alabama, the paper reported, planned to reduce the black population of the United States by “unloading them on the Philippines.” Morgan had learned of the shortage of labor on the Islands, due to the fact that “the natives will not work, and…the Chinese are not allowed to enter themselves.” He “has reached the President’s ear,” and Roosevelt had sent “special envoy” T. Thomas Fortune to investigate the plan’s feasibility. On Hawaii, the paper reported, Fortune had “told the planters that 100,000 southern negroes could be landed…within six months.”

The *Manila American* was sharply against the plan, for two reasons. The first was fear of crime:

> Now, to put the matter as plainly as it is possible to put it, we do not want any more negroas [sic] in the Philippines. He is here now, and we are having all sorts of trouble with him. It is true that there are quite a number of men with African blood in their veins in Manila and the provinces who are shining example of what the colored man

---

83 Anglo-American newspapers include the *Manila American*, the Manila *Freedom*, and the Manila *Cablenews*. By 1901, many revolutionary Filipino newspapers had closed their doors. There was less unity in the Filipino press, which was split into three groups: a pro-annexation group, a weak conservative Hispanic faction, and an original party of Nacionalistas. See Purisima Kalaw Katigbak, “The Press, Propaganda, and Twelve years of American Sovereignty, 1898-1910: A Study of the Filipino and American Newspapers Published in the Philippines,” Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1962, p. 87.
84 The *Manila American*, Feb. 10, 1903.
can do for himself when he wants to be a success. But on they [sic] other hand, there are several hundred men of the same race scattered throughout the provinces who are also shining examples... of a different character... They are vagrants, to say uo [sic] more. They live off of the native women whom they terrorize into supporting them. They have been known to belong to the bands of highwaymen who infest almost every section of the archipelago, and who are commonly called “ladrones.” In a word, they are worthless.85

The other was related to labor. African Americans, the paper claimed, “cannot and would not work for the wage that is considered high pay for a native or a Chino. One dollar, or even $1.50 Mexican per day would have no allurements for the colored man, while it is considered mighty swell pay for a Chinaman,” who is “industrious.” Therefore, “[e]very effort should be made to have the Chinese immigration laws amended so that Chinese will be allowed to enter the islands.”86

As in the establishment press in Hawaii, a refusal to work for extremely low wages might be explained as laziness, while Chinese willingness to work for the same wage demonstrated that race’s industry. The paper called on all employers in the Philippines to protest Senator Morgan’s scheme and to “meet Mr. Fortune upon his arrival in the islands, and vehemently protest against the importation of negroes.”87

The Manila Freedom, though it did not comment on Fortune’s visit, also favored Chinese labor, due to what it characterized as the racial inferiority of Filipinos. “We are here, supposedly” the paper wrote around the time of Fortune’s visit, “to help the Filipino climb up the ladder of success. We do not have much faith in their abilities. We have seen their shortcomings so often that we have rather grown to despise the little brown man, with his timid ways... The Filipino is a Malay, and will never get over that crowning misfortune.”88 To the Freedom and many other

85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
87 Ibid.
88 Manila Freedom, Feb. 23, 1903.
white American newspapers in Manila, any experiment in “uplift” was futile.

Fortune explained the American media’s aggressiveness as a function of what he thought were its roots in the American South. The press was dominated by “race hatred and personal vituperation” and was “as violently Democratic and race-hating as those of Memphis or Atlanta,” due to President McKinley’s “fatal weakness for appointing Southern Democrats to controlling positions in the civil and military establishments in the insular territories.”

Fortune fired off an angry letter to Booker T. Washington: “No southern white man should be allowed to hold office in the Philippines. Their conduct towards off-color people will always cause more or less trouble. The Filipinos hate the whole tribe of southerners here, and so do I.”

Fortune’s notion of a particularly Southern character to the American presence in Manila is plausible. A Southern Democrat, Luke E. Wright of Tennessee, would succeed Taft as governor-general in 1904. A few years later, then-Gov. General William Cameron Forbes would attribute discrimination against Filipinos to the large “proportion of Southerners found in the Government service of the Philippine Islands.” However, troop regiments in the Philippine Islands were from all parts of the United States, as were, of course, racist attitudes toward African Americans. Top posts in the Philippines Commission—also known as the Taft Commission, the legislative body appointed by the President to govern in the Philippines—were not dominated by Southerners. The racist character of Americans in Manila was indeed

89 T. Thomas Fortune, “Politics in the Philippine Islands,” 2266-68.
92 In 1907, a bicameral Philippine Legislature was established, with the Commission as the upper house and a popularly elected Philippine Assembly as the lower house.
remarked upon by some black soldiers; one wrote to the Richmond Planet that “the
whites have begun to establish their diabolical race hatred in all its home rancor in
Manila, even endeavoring to propagate the phobia among the Spaniards and Filipinos
so as to be sure of the foundation of their supremacy when the civil rule that must
necessarily follow the present military regime, is established.” The soldier did not
distinguish whites by region, however.93

Another possible reason for the American press’s dislike of Fortune and his plan
for black emigration could have been the specter that greater black presence in the
Philippines might, as Amy Kaplan suggests, reopen, instead of heal, the wounds of
the Civil War, recasting it as a “global race war,” and destroying the sense of white
unity that the Savannah Tribune editor described earlier.94 A small number of African
American troops did defect to the rebels, including David Fagen of the Twenty-fourth
Infantry, who became a captain in the rebel army and led several guerilla attacks on
U.S. forces.95 Philippine rebels appealed to African American soldiers to join the
insurgency, and, their eyes on the U.S. South, even evoked lynching victim Sam Hose
in their propaganda materials. Flyers encouraged black U.S. troops to “consider your
history,” “take charge that the blood of Sam Hose proclaims vengeance,” and defect.96

93 John W. Galloway, Twenty-fourth Infantry, San Isidro, Philippines, Dec. 30,
1899, in Gatewood, Smoked Yankees, 252.
94 Amy Kaplan, “Black and Blue on San Juan Hill,” in Cultures of U.S.
Imperialism, ed. Donald Pease and Amy Kaplan (Durham: Duke University Press,
1993), 235.
95 Michael C. Robinson and Frank N. Schubert, “David Fagen: An Afro-American
96 Matthew Frye Jacobson, Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters
Foreign People at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917 (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001),
252. Also see Gatewood, Smoked Yankees, 259. Historians alternately describe
this propaganda material as placards, flyers, or pamphlets, and quote the passage
referencing Sam Hose with a variety of wordings; see, for example, Cheryl Beredo,
Import of the Archive: U.S. Colonial Rule of the Philippines and the Making of
American Archival History (Sacramento, Calif.: Litwin Books, 2013), 46.
Afro-Asian alliances were a possibility, but not easy, as Fortune’s reception in *La Democracia*, quoted below, suggests.

Fortune was not the only target of the American press in Manila. These newspapers were aggressively opposed to the Philippines Commission. In fact, the American press appeared as much a thorn in the side of the Roosevelt administration as the Irish American press, before Irish American editors were at least partially appeased by the addition of Catholics to the Commission and to the Manila schools system. The diary of Daniel R. Williams, personal secretary of Philippines Commissioner Bernard Moses, shows the commission government’s frustration and inability to control American newspapers in Manila. Williams wrote on August 11, 1901, that the “American papers of Manila” had from the start “antagonized and obstructed the work of the civil authorities.” Objecting to the appointment of Filipinos to government posts, they have called the natives “treacherous, untrustworthy, etc.” Williams called Filipinos “morbidly sensitive to criticism,” and wrote that he hoped they could learn that “the attacks of a few disgruntled American papers do not express American sentiment.”

Two years later, Head Commissioner William Howard Taft echoed Williams’s assessment, lashing out several times at the “young lions of the American press” in a speech before the Union Reading College in Manila on December 17, 1903. These editors had “no patience with the policy of attraction, no patience with attempts to conciliate the Filipino people, no patience with the introduction into the government as rapidly as their fitness justifies of the prominent Filipinos… They insist…that the welfare of the Americans and American trade should be regarded as paramount.”

---

97 Williams’s diaries were reprinted in 1913, in Daniel R. Williams, *The Odyssey of the Philippine Commission* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1913), 287-88.

It was the close relationship between the military and “those venturesome business spirits that thrive best in times of trouble and excitement,” Taft said, that accounted for these attitudes. Because military men had fought a guerilla war marked by “treachery and cruelty,” current and former soldiers held strong grudges against all Filipinos. “The Anglo-Saxon is not noted for his courtesy,” nor “for his consideration for races which he considers inferior to his,” Taft said. With 70,000 troops in the Philippines in 1900, merchants found profits “very great indeed” from selling food and drink. “It was only natural that the newspapers, whose editorial staffs were largely composed of men recently in the battlefield and whose subscription lists were largely swelled by the names of soldiers, whose advertising columns were filled by the advertising of these American merchants, should reflect the opinion which the American merchant and the American soldier had of the Filipinos.” And as long as business was good, there was no need to “cultivat[e] the taste or the good-will of the Filipinos for business purposes.” But now, with the American army reduced to 15,000 men, “the pinch is being felt,” and “with the lack of logic, so characteristic of human nature,” the merchant blamed the Civil Government and its policy of “encouraging the native as far as it could.”

Manila editor William Crozier’s reminiscences about his days at the Manila American support Taft’s view of close ties between merchants and soldiers. Crozier’s memories are replete with journalists’ nicknames, practical jokes, battles with the censor, and other war stories, some of them literal, since much of the paper’s staff were current or former U.S. soldiers. (Crozier described a tense moment when the paper ceased production in February 1899 while its soldier-journalists were called Devins, An Observer in the Philippines, 393-95.

upon to push back a Filipino rebel attack on Manila.) In addition to race hatreds they arrived with or seized upon during months of brutal guerilla warfare, American newspapermen in Manila may have felt the need to defend American merchants’ territory from a slowly growing Filipino-led government. The Cablenews American wrote that, “benefits afforded the Filipinos are proper as long as these do not coincide with American rights in the islands.”\(^{101}\) Crozier resembles Donna Gabbacia’s “mobile Americans”: investors, businessmen and missionaries who developed American empire as they pursued private agendas and interests abroad and clung to their own customs, languages, and religions.\(^{102}\) Whether or not Fortune could pin Manila’s aggressive racism on Southerners, he seems close to the mark on the importance of regional differences in the projection of U.S. power abroad. Different histories and different media landscapes contributed to very different racial politics in two of the nation’s new territories.\(^{103}\)

Despite his poor reception in the American press, Fortune pursued his exploration of the feasibility of black emigration to the Philippines. He composed a questionnaire for Filipinos, to gauge public opinion on the topic of African American laborers on the islands. The questionnaire appeared in the Spanish-language La Democracia, a newspaper run by Filipinos and which advocated for gradual independence for the Islands, as opposed to other Filipino newspapers, which were


\(^{103}\) In her work on Manifest Destiny and gender, Amy S. Greenberg finds among nineteenth-century white anti-annexationists in Hawaii a “restrained manhood,” a “manly Christian” who had the upper hand, at least in the mid-1800s, over the more aggressive “martial manhood” style of filibusterers in Central America and the Caribbean. See Greenberg, Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 232; 254-61.
more forceful. Fortuné’s first four questions were for identification purposes. The next five got to the heart of the matter:

5. What, in your opinion, are the needs for workers in the Philippines?
6. Are you pro Chinese immigration?
7. Please name your reasons.
8. Are you pro immigration of negroes to the Philippines?
9. Please give all your views.

The newspaper, in an editorial on Fortuné’s questionnaire and plan, strained to remain polite toward the struggle of African Americans in the United States, but admitted a “rare stupification” (nuestra estupefacción raya en lo insolito) at the thought of how “we Filipinos shall be entitled to the blessings of humanity by the work of redeeming a people.” Fortuné’s questionnaire, the editorial stated, came at the worst time possible; Filipinos were struggling with the very necessities of life and famine still loomed, not to mention the need to address vital political questions. Fortuné’s questionnaire had, in fact, “ponderously stoked the fire of racial discord” (atizar muy ponderosamente el fuego de las discordias de raza).

Fortuné took his assignment seriously in the Philippines, embarking on a dangerous, six-week trek through northern Luzon as a cholera epidemic raged, a trip “few Americans had ever attempted.” Two African American soldiers, Capt. Robert Gordon Woods and a “Capt. Wormsley,” accompanied him. Throughout the journey, recounted a year later in a series of articles for Voice of the Negro and in one article in the mainstream journal The Independent a few months after his return, Fortuné alternately employed and sometimes critiqued the prevailing civilizationist discourse


\[^{105}\] La Democracia, “La colonizacion negra – El cuestionario de Mr. Fortune,” March 2, 1903.

\[^{106}\] Ibid., “El cuestionario de Mr. Fortune,” March 4, 1903.

\[^{107}\] Thornbrough, T. Thomas Fortune, 237.
of the times.

Toward Asia Fortune frequently adopted an Orientalist frame, starting with his first installment on his trip for *Voice of the Negro* in March 1904. Fortune began by praising poetry, which called forth the “finer feelings” and could be an antidote to “the worries of bread-winning and the relentless strivings after place and power,” perhaps echoing his letter to Washington about his plans to drop journalism and write poetry instead. “’Ah for some retreat / Deep in yonder shining Orient,’” Fortune wrote, quoting Tennyson’s “Locksley Hall,” though stopping before the line, “I shall take some savage woman / She shall rear my dusky race.” He then quoted Byron (“Know ye the land where the cypress and myrtle / Are emblems of deeds that are done in their clime?”), and wrote that “the Orient is wrapped in mystery…its people…have no thing in common with the strong thinking and death killing efforts after material things of the whiter races: for they think languidly and labor only when is necessary.” Yet, he then defended Filipino work habits, which he said were the most-discussed topic among whites in the
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109 Online at http://www.poetryfoundation.org/poem/174629
110 From Byron’s “The Bride of Abydos,” 1813.
islands, who constantly denounced “the laziness of the Filipino.” Fortune recounted breaking into one such conversation and silencing it: “I have been in the Philippines two months and have not seen a white man working with his hands; they were all working with their mouths,” he told a group of white Americans on a “coastwise steamer.” “Why do you expect the Filipino to do what you will not and cannot do?”

Yet, in Fortune’s third installment in *Voice of the Negro*, he complained that, “The average Filipino appears to have been born tired.” He described the incredible dusk-til-dawn din of Manila—roosters crowing, brass bands playing in the early morning, Catholic church bells pealing—and concluded that Filipinos must have no nerves. “People without nerves do not think much, rapidly or profoundly, and the basic elements of their character are superficiality.” That he then attributed the same characteristics to “eighty percent of American negroid people” and much of mankind in general softened the blow only a little. Fortune appears to have stood uncomfortably within dominant, racialized discourses of civilization, attempting to adopt aspects that might bolster his standing as an American while also scrambling the logics of white supremacy. In his Philippines articles he alternately employs the era’s race science to explain his encounters, sometimes turns it back against the dominant race, or advocates racial equality outright. Of one white general whom he and Capt. Woods stayed with, who was uncomfortable around Fortune’s “brothers in black and yellow” and who was later convicted of embezzling public monies, Fortune wrote, “His race prejudice will wear itself out in Bilabid prison, where he must consort on terms of equality with all the race colors of the globe.”

---

112 Ibid., 94.
114 Ibid., 240.
115 Ibid., 241.
Fortune’s Philippines journey almost ended in ignominy when, upon returning from his Luzon trek, he, Capt. Woods, and possibly as many as three other African Americans were arrested after a dispute with police, described with equal parts glee and contempt in the *Manila American*. The *American* claimed that Fortune stopped his carriage in the middle of the street to speak with another African American, blocked traffic, and talked back to a police officer. The paper reported that Fortune, taken to the police station, kept yelling, “I am T. Thomas Fortune. I am the special agent of the U.S. Treasury. That’s who I am.” The newspaper dubbed Fortune, “T. Thomas Titmouse,” though two days later it reported that Vice Governor Wright had intervened to get the case dismissed.\(^{116}\)

Fortune summed up his recommendations for the Philippines in his final installment for *Voice of the Negro*. Luzon’s rich farmland is not being exploited by Filipinos, who “do not seem to care to work”; the land could support up to seven million more people, five million of whom “could be Negroes.” “The Negro and the Filipino get along splendidly together,” and emigration from the Southern U.S., “where [African Americans] are wronged and robbed…would be good for them, good for the Filipinos, who badly need rejuvenation of blood, and good for the United States,” which could “take a long step in solving the Filipino and the Negro problem,” and avoid coming bloodshed on both accounts. The United States had not given the black man “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” and in fact “seems now to be on a policy of crushing out entirely his manhood and citizen rights.” He was owed. “Give the American Negro a chance in the Philippine Islands, if he wants to go there,” Fortune ended.\(^{117}\) That the voluntary nature of the migration needed to be stressed demonstrates the dire situation of African Americans, especially those in the South, in
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\(^{116}\) The *Manila American* articles are reprinted in the *Evening Bulletin* (Honolulu), June 5, 1903.

the early twentieth century.

Fortune would be disappointed in his hopes for a government position; upon his return to the United States on June 24, the Treasury Department informed him his appointment had been for only six months and had been terminated on May 16. He would not be paid for his final weeks of travel. Fortune protested, withholding his final report on the trip; there is no evidence it was ever completed or published.\footnote{Thornbrough, \textit{T. Thomas Fortune}, 240.} He did publish an article for the national journal \textit{The Independent}, wherein he described three major political groups in the Philippines: the main group of nationalist Filipinos, whom he said regarded Taft as their “saint”; white Americans on the islands, dominated by a Southern mentality; and a tiny, heterogeneous third group composed of “the best Filipinos,” a few white Americans and Europeans, and all three hundred African Americans. The last group was the Philippines’s only hope for a harmonious and prosperous future, for it believed that the islands should be governed “in the interests of all the people, native and foreign born, with justice for all and special favors for none.” Fortune hoped it would succeed, though the tiny group had, he admitted, “no acknowledged leader and no newspaper organ.”\footnote{T. Thomas Fortune, “Politics in the Philippine Island,” \textit{The Independent} 55 (Sept. 24, 1903): 2268.}

This chapter’s emphasis on the black press’s ability to promote and imagine a better life for African Americans in Hawaii or the Philippines is not meant to suggest that such hopes were absurd or naïve. Capt. Gilmer, the dignified black soldier pictured in Chapter 3, may have found in Manila some relief from American racial mores and perhaps obtained real opportunities for professional advancement. The \textit{Colored American} certainly hoped so, writing that “the race question is rapidly solving itself in the [Philippine] islands, is the verdict of those capable of judging.”\footnote{\textit{The Colored American}, Jan. 16, 1904.}
Booker T. Washington, too, hoped for black advancement abroad, advertising adjacent to Gilmer’s photograph Tuskegee programs in “several foreign countries.” Many of the authors of Gatewood’s collected letters from black soldiers in the Philippines chafed at white racism they encounter in the islands; others made no mention of race at all. One soldier, Chaplain T. G. Steward of the Twenty-fifth infantry, was cursed by white soldiers on a street in Manila, but apparently had the authority to stop, intimidate, and reprimand his antagonists: “I…read them a lecture.”

For this soldier, military rank trumped social rankings based on skin tone, and the black officer reveled in his ability to dress down three foul-mouthed white privates.

Fortune’s guide for his Luzon trip, Capt. Robert Gordon Woods, seems to have had a long and relatively successful career in administrative positions with the Philippines Constable and Army. In fact, Woods appears decades later at the close of World War II in a profile in the Chicago _Afro-American_ newspaper. Age seventy-two in 1945, Woods was still living in the Philippines. At the start of Japanese occupation, according to the _Afro-American_, when first approached by a “hissing, bowing Jap,” Woods survived the encounter and his eventual imprisonment by “playing dumb.”

Woods might remain in the islands after the war, the _Afro-American_ wrote “because he has come to love the little brown people.”

The newspaper’s profile, along with the aforementioned articles on Fortune in the Hawaiian-language press, reflect also the various racial discourses available to African Americans and Asians encountering U.S. imperial power—each group might draw upon different strains of a contradictory and ultimately nonsensical mix to make claims about their sophisticated nature. The accessibility of an Orientalist discourse...

121 _The Gazette_ (Cleveland), April 21, 1900, in Gatewood, _Smoked Yankees_, 263-64.

to African Americans at mid-twentieth century (and perhaps its resurgence during times of war) is shown in Fortune’s writings in *Voice of the Negro*, where he posited himself as a Westerner visiting the strange, indolent East. In the ideology of the Hampton Institute, in fact, African Americans were expected to help “civilize” Native Americans—even as the tenets of industrial education “situated the black labor force at the bottom of the Southern economy.”

But to many white Americans, African Americans had no secure claim on Western heritage, which was viewed as Anglo-Saxon even as the Irish and other European immigrants worked to broaden it to encompass themselves. Hawaiians and Filipinos could employ other contemporary race theories or popular biases to assert their own civilized nature in opposition to blacks. Perhaps someone translated the *Ke Aloha Aina* article for Fortune, for he wrote upon his return that the “Hawaiian Kanaka” was like the American Indian, “think[ing] himself better than the black man.”

A Filipino student publication at the University of California at Berkeley two years after Fortune’s return to the United States also sought respectability through racial rankings when it printed a poem about a “little nigger” and a crocodile as filler at the end of an article on education. In fact, “white space” in newspapers and magazines of the time was often a literal kind of Caucasian space for race humor. Even the *Voice of the Negro* printed a dialect joke at the bottom of Fortune’s last article on the Philippines—a reprint from the *Atlanta Constitution*, notorious at the time for its racism. Different race conceptions were circulated in a medium with its

---

123 Gaines, *Uplifting the Race*, 34.
126 The joke at the bottom of Fortune’s third Philippines installment reads, “Many er my race gits the idee dat dey got a call ter preach de gospil des ez soon ez de farmers is needin hands in de fiel’s en its 100 in de shade!” *Voice of the Negro*, June 4, 1903,
own rules, ones that might stand in uneasy juxtaposition to editors’ political projects.

Fortune still held out hopes for some sort of black and Filipino solidarity, however, writing in his articles on the Philippines that Filipinos didn’t seem to share other non-whites’ disdain for black people. Two years after his journey and back at the helm of the *Age*, he was still optimistic about empire’s unintended effects on domestic race politics. He wrote about a group of Filipino students in America who, “believing that ‘benevolent assimilation’ means what the term implies,” enrolled in a state college in Illinois. The chilly reception the “innocent, dark-skinned” students received at the school must be, the students decided, “one of the peculiarities of benevolence.” Believing “that all things would work out benevolently,” the Filipinos went to get a haircut at a barbershop in town, which caused outraged white students to threaten a boycott of the business. “It mattered not that the students from the Orient were Malay, not Negroes; it was sufficient grounds for objection that they had the color of the American Negro.” Fortune concluded: “There are hopeful signs that the battle of the ‘color line’ is not to be fought out by the Negro race alone.”
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p. 246. Within the pages of a black magazine, written for black readers, laughter at African American preachers naturally might have less racist sting. The ubiquity of racist jokes in filler cartoons of the era is explored in greater detail in Chapter 3.

127 *New York Age*, Oct. 8, 1905.
Chapter 3. White Space: Illustrations, Ads, and Photographs in Late Nineteenth Century Print Media

In view of the very stupendous contest of which this country is now the theater, this fierce and sanguinary debate between freedom and slavery, between republican traditions and a remorseless oligarchy...it may seem almost an impertinence to ask your attention to a lecture on pictures.

-- Frederick Douglass, “Pictures and Progress,” delivered around 1865.¹

Douglass’s 1865 audience must have been disappointed. As Union victory in the Civil War became certain, those gathered to hear the famed abolitionist writer, orator, and activist surely anticipated a talk on slavery and its looming defeat. Instead, Douglass suggested to his listeners that they might be weary of the constant drumbeat of war news and commentary, and eager to turn their attention elsewhere. He spoke of photography’s potential to present realistic pictures of black Americans, to aid in their self-creation, and on the tricky relationship between selfhood and perception. Douglass returned to the topic of photography throughout his life, one of many African American intellectuals and activists to explore the medium’s liberatory potential.²

This chapter will examine images of Irish Americans and African Americans in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including illustrations, cartoons, and photographs. Douglass was particularly hopeful that photography’s realism might compete with hand-drawn illustrations, which make up the bulk of the images in this chapter. As both African American and Irish American editors advocated

for their group’s interests through their presses, many strove to incorporate in their weeklies the same pictorial elements found in the mainstream dailies. The popularity of illustrated periodicals such as *Harper’s Weekly* and *Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Magazine* surely caught their eye.\(^3\) Black and Irish American cartoonists offered their own humor and political critique. And, starting in the 1880s, new technologies enabled photographic images to be reproduced onto newsprint, opening up new possibilities to present, Irish and African American editors hoped, the race as it truly was. This “halftone revolution” dramatically increased the circulation of both illustrations and photographs.\(^4\) As black and Irish editors used images to further group rights and interests, many advertisers, freelancers, and others from dominant groups were busy themselves producing images that sustained older, derogatory conceptions of minority groups, often for humorous effect. At the same time, a few advertisers also promoted new, more positive images of ethnic Americans—“Paddy” the Irishman might have been a little daft, for example, but he knew good pig feed when he saw it. Even the Irish struggle against discrimination could be borrowed by advertisers to suggest the resilience of their wares, as will be shown.

A focus on images in black and Irish American presses, as well as images of African Americans and the Irish in mainstream newspapers and magazines, can illuminate tensions in each group’s American identity, strategies black and Irish editors employed in promoting their group interests, and their effectiveness in battling stereotypical images. Many of the themes in other chapters of this study—the Irish strategy of claiming their Americanism by giving U.S. history an Irish or
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Catholic cast; African Americans’ attempt to work for black rights within the tenets of racial uplift ideology—are mirrored in the following images. Yet, in cartoons and advertising, the minstrel depiction of African Americans persisted, while change can be noted in Irish caricatures. How the Irish “became white”—and the nature and extent of their perceived racial difference in the nineteenth century—has been hotly debated by historians. All agree that images of the Irish became less derogatory over time; the simian features of drawn Irishmen in the 1800s jar contemporary eyes. The late nineteenth century was a transitional stage for visual depictions of the Irish, as Paddy slowly shed his ape-like features and Irish farmers and brick-carriers gained admirable, if still laugh-worthy, traits. A rising class of Irish felt distance from such characterizations.

Some African Americans were also making economic progress, despite living within the “nadir.” But mainstream presses portrayed visually and in text a small and rising urban class of “New Negroes” in Southern cities as ostentatious “dandies” putting on airs, while antebellum and minstrel forms remained favorites of mainstream cartoonists and even some photographers. Some African American cartoonists would employ these same minstrel forms in their own drawings. In the previous chapter, it was asserted that the newspaper medium flattered journalistic “race men,” who felt they occupied a special vantage point to make sense of rapidly shifting demographics and accompanying variations in human styles and comportments. Attention to images troubles editors’ assertion of assurance and control, for their words shared the page with advertisements and cartoons that worked

in and through their own particular genres and agendas. The endurance of such iconography in the black press attests, in part, to the financial and careerist needs of black cartoonists, who felt the need to work within pre-existing aesthetic worlds even while they critiqued them.6

The endurance of such forms in mainstream publications, this chapter asserts, is linked to the construction and performance of whiteness itself. Martin Berger cautions that white scholars seeking to understand and expose racism by examining derogatory images of African Americans risk reproducing a white fascination with black bodies, and may contribute to the circulation of images that do real harm. Sustaining attention to the construction of white identity, he suggests, can partially mitigate this problem.7 Mainstream cartoonists, photographers, and advertisers, in addition to assuring white viewers that they understood African Americans bodies and cultural practices, presented images of the old plantation south “as a symbol of white leisure,” abundance, and order.8

Images do not push their viewers into new modes of perception so much as they “confirm meanings for which the discourses and structures of our society have predisposed us.”9 Uncovering how observers of the past interpreted particular images is difficult; historical context is key. Yet ways of seeing do develop over time. The end-of-century emergence of transatlantic magazines aimed at a new professional

6 Black and Irish cartoonists’ labor within discriminatory systems of meaning closely matches, of course, the experience of black and Irish entertainers performing in plays and vaudeville acts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. See Kibler, Censoring Racial Ridicule, especially pp. 21-50.
7 Martin Berger, Sight Unseen: Whiteness and American Visual Culture (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 2-4. A more comprehensive approach, as demonstrated in Sight Unseen, involves uncovering ideologies of whiteness in images that do not depict non-whites at all.
9 Berger, Sight Unseen, 1.
middle class helped foster new visual forms even while such magazines continued
to employ older, racialized tropes. For example, E. W. Kemble, famous for his
illustrations of Mark Twain’s *Huckleberry Finn*, could, in the Gilded Age, draw upon
mid–nineteenth century minstrel forms to depict African Americans as buffoons, or
borrow from the more individualized and dignified character types of abolitionism for
Northern publications, decisions he made as he “catered to audiences that had a stake
in seeing [his] characters as unique personalities or as radicalized ‘types.’”

Print
culture studies’ emphasis on the “publics” of a publication can help illuminate how
“perceptual adaptation often went hand in hand with new modes of class formation
and aesthetic innovation.”

Finally, national and racial constructions and discourses are often challenged
at points of cultural contact and conflict. Though the United States declared no
allegiances during the South African War, Irish American editors detected a pro-
British and anti–Dutch Boer bias, and portrayed in images the Boer as patriots
akin to American revolutionaries. U.S. imperial excursions into the Caribbean
and the Philippines could help generate new formulations of race, or require new
translations of old ones. Photographs in the black press suggest that some African
Americans editors imagined the Philippines as a place where old racial constructs

Adam Sonstegard, “Artistic Liberty and Slave Imagery: ‘Mark Twain’s
Illustrator,’ E. W. Kemble, Turns to Harriet Beecher Stowe,” *Nineteenth Century

History* 95 (2008): 437. Rather than use the term “print culture,” Lisa Gitelman
suggests scholars would do better to “admit that no medium has a single, particular
logic, while every genre does and is.” She follows the history of the document (a
genre, in this formulation), for example, across several mediums, including the pdf.
See Gitelman, *Paper Knowledge: Toward a Media History of Documents* (Durham:

Paul Kramer argues against an “export” model of colonial racial construction and
posits a more interactive and dynamic process between colony and metropole in *The
could be cast off and where African Americans could achieve full manhood rights—a phrase pointing to gender’s importance in imperial constructions. But mainstream publications kept using older tropes, such as characters from the best-selling mid-century novel *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, to explain events on the islands.

This chapter first addresses images of the Irish, as well as those produced by them, and then examine images of and by African Americans. It ends with an analysis of political cartoons about the U.S. annexation of the Philippines from *Puck* and *Judge*, two popular illustrated weeklies of the time.

**The Irish image**

Within the covers of magazines and newspapers of the nineteenth century were what Roger Fischer calls filler cartoons: black and white drawings that “exploited stereotypes and situations that comprised the pro forma running gags of the era,” including “decadent society fops” desperately miming London fashion; “college louts” competing on Ivy League gridirons; “wily farmers fleecing vacationing city tenderfoots”; and most of all, ethnic immigrants, American Indians, and African Americans, cast as hopeless cases for assimilation. Fischer finds that, in *Puck* and *Judge*, popular illustrated weeklies in the late nineteenth century, these filler cartoons often sharply contradicted the messages of the large, colorized cover illustrations. For example, *Puck* often portrayed the foolishness of discrimination against Jews in its cover art, while inside the magazine, anti-Semitic filler cartoons depicted Jews as greedy Shylocks. The ethnic joke existed in a kind of free-floating way, in variety of mediums.

at New York University contains hundreds of postcards, greeting cards, trading cards and ephemera, and provides an excellent resource to study images of the Irish that circulated across mediums in the late nineteenth century. Many ethnic gags on the cards are reprints from *Puck* or *Judge*, showing the circulation of ethnic cartoons beyond their birth in periodicals. Others are trading cards with Irish American figures on the front, and advertisements on the back that may or may not possess an obvious connection to the front image. Though many advertising and trading cards in the collection are undated, enough dates and legible postmarks exist to outline a gradual visual shift in Irish caricature from negative, stereotypical images earlier in the nineteenth century to more positive portrayals in the twentieth. “Parental Authority,” (Fig. 9) is a trading card released by the Arbuckle Bros. Coffee Co., most likely in 1888 or 1889, in a series of 100 satirical cards that reprinted cartoons originally published in *Puck*, *Judge*, and *Texas Siftings* in 1887 and 1888.\(^{14}\) It is No. 20 in the
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\(^{14}\) See, for example, [http://www.arbycards.info/arbsat1.htm](http://www.arbycards.info/arbsat1.htm).
series, identifiable by the number on the lower-left corner of the back of the card. The father is drawn in the simian style first used by British cartoonists and popularized in the United States largely by Thomas Nast, a political cartoonist for *Harper’s Weekly*. L. Perry Curtis Jr., author of perhaps the most extensive study of the Irish image in British and American publications, places the most notable rise of the Irish simian image in the 1860s in Britain, when a convergence of Fenian violence and scientific speculation about humanity’s primate origins compelled privileged British and Scottish classes to posit Irish Celts, half-seriously, as a kind of “missing link” between animal savagery and civilization. The ad copy on the back of this card (Fig. 10) makes no reference to the front-side cartoon. “Pat’s Prevention,” (Fig. 11) in which an Irish wagoner pulls the tail of his charging horse to keep it from running right through the harness, follows a similar pattern. The product’s supposed virtues (Ariosa Coffee, Fig. 12) are not directly related derogatory ethnic gag on the front. Here the corporation may simply hope to profit from the popularity of ethnic jokes and their circulation.

In “A New Vehicle,” (Fig. 13) an ad card for Dr. Joseph Haas’s Hog and Poultry Remedy, which most likely comes from the late 1890s, Pat’s appearance retains some monkey-like features, but his contraption, though jury-
Figure 11. “Pat’s Prevention,” from *Judge*. An ad card for Ariosa Coffee.

Figure 12. Reverse side, “Pat’s Prevention.”
Figure 13. “A New Vehicle.” Ad card for Doctor Joseph Haas’s Hog and Poultry Remedy.

Figure 14. Reverse side, “A New Vehicle.”
rigged, has a certain ingenious quality, and the tone of the text on the back of the card is not mocking (Fig. 14). In Pond’s Extract (Fig. 15, “Bound for Donnybrook Fair”) from 1892, the Irishman, bound for the fair with a container of the product, also shows somewhat milder stereotypical features. The sales pitch on the reverse side (Fig. 16) is straightforward, listing all the ailments that Pond’s soothes.

Several cards in the collection also show this transitional style between advertising via racist gag verses ethnic pride. In fact, Fig. 17, a card advertising soap produced by the R.W. Bell Manufacturing Company, hints at anti-Irish discrimination. It depicts a self-contained, if somewhat stereotypical Irish worker (he retains the broad upper lip) and asks in its ad copy, “Would you believe that there are in this nineteenth century prejudiced people?” (Fig. 18) The joke here is that this prejudice is against the “truth” of the company’s superior soap; between the lines is the truth that
the Irish, too, are maligned.\textsuperscript{\text{16}}

In the card for Schultz’s Irish Soap (Fig. 19), prejudice is more explicitly linked to the Irish. The advertisement suggests a battle for legitimacy on the part of the product that evokes a gallant story of the Irish experience (Fig. 20):

The history of Irish Soap is brief; yet suggestive, as it teaches how true merit wins against all opposition. First, then, it was born in obscurity; abused, buffeted and ridiculed through its early infancy; denounced, libeled and slandered throughout its youth and up till to-day. But in the face of all this, Irish Soap grew and prospered….this success was not attained by heavy advertising, but by its own merits, almost unaided. Its many friends have been gained and retained by its own intrinsic worth.

\textsuperscript{\text{16}} The R.W. Bell Co. also circulated cards that depicted Jewish stereotypes. See Wendy A. Woloson, \textit{In Hock: Pawning in America from Independence through the Great Depression}, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2009), 48.
Here, the very struggle of the Irish against negative stereotypes itself shows Irish strength of character, something the manufacturers hope will be transferred to their product.

Susan L. Mizruchi has observed that Americans have often assumed that “social mobility required giving up ethnic attachments.” Contemporary historians are better versed in how the creation of accepted American ethnicities often involved stressing cultural differences, and well as similarities, to mainstream U.S. society. Yet historical writing on advertising often focuses exclusively on advertisers’ use of negative racial stereotypes. In addition to demeaning portrayals of black and ethnic Americans, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Mizruchi writes, “there was in fact much productive fusion of ethnic identities and economic aspirations.” Though capitalist aspirations could produce demeaning stereotypes, “American capitalist energies also sponsored nuanced and creative conceptions of cultural difference.” Mizruchi tracks the interplay of the rapid growth of U.S. corporate capitalism in late nineteenth century with the era’s explosive rates of immigration to America, and concludes that both
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17 See, for example, Conzen et al., “The Invention of Ethnicity.”
forces produced the world’s first “multicultural, modern capitalist society.”

Perhaps no card in the collection demonstrates the shift from images of Irish mishap to Irish success—and the continued importance of hierarchies in the era’s race science—than Fig. 20, depicting a Native American and an Irishman, and sent by U.S. mail to an address in Brownsville, Penn., in April 1908. “The Indian with his pipe of peace has slowly passed, away,” the card reads, “But the Irishman with his piece of pipe has come prepared to stay.” Irish success could be contrasted to supposed losers and perceived unassimilables of American society. The postcard recalls T. Thomas Fortune’s “Kanaka Maiden” poem, with its wistful evocation of native Hawaiian loss; Social Darwinist thought ranked perceived racial groups and cast them in a winner-take-all fight for survival.

By 1911, when cigarette company Royal Bengals began producing its “Heroes of History” trading cards, Irish Americans were well on the way toward respectability in mainstream society. Figures 22 and 23 show some of the Irish heroes
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in the series, including Irish nationalist patriots Charles Parnell and Daniel O’Connell, and sports figures Tom Collins and George Gardiner. Here, Irishness is about moral and physical strength and perseverance. By 1900, approximately one-third of major league baseball players were of Irish origin.\(^{19}\)

Beyond sport, Joshua Brown suggests that Irish American participation in the labor movements of the 1880s helped dispel imagined racial characteristics and led to more realistic portrayals, for “[s]igns of difference now settled on the new wave of immigrants from Italy and Eastern Europe,” with physiognomic codes now more commonly applied to

Italians and Polish, for example. T. Thomas Fortune’s encounter with the Hawaiian planter press showed the strong links between race-making and labor needs; James Samuel Stemons, too, sought African American inclusion in unionized, factory labor. The exclusion of African Americans from labor unions and their segregation into different sporting leagues during the era may have helped to freeze their “signs of difference” in circulated images of the time.

That the cards were designed for collecting recalls the “dances between people and things,” and the meanings produced therein, in Robin Bernstein’s *Racial Innocence.* Bernstein’s “scripted things”—dolls, for example, or playing cards for the game “Uncle Tom and Little Eva”—issue a “culturally specific invitation” to their holders to perform actions and meanings. In this vein, if postcards with Irish in-jokes tended to stop once they reached their particular destination, Irish trading cards had a life of longer movement. Such cards might circulate beyond an initial economic transaction, where one consumer received the card along with his or her purchase of a pack of cigarettes. The cards’ own nomenclature offers an implicit suggestion: find other sympathetic collectors and trade one card for another. In Bernstein’s formulation, the cards themselves might be said to “script” the circulation of Irish pride.

*The Irish draw the Boer*

Wars of imperialism around the turn of the century produced a huge number of images in U.S. newspapers and magazines. Though the Irish American press, as discussed previously, followed closely the Philippine-American war, the conflict that produced the most images in the Irish press was the South African (or Boer)
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22 Ibid., 11.
War. The Irish cast the Dutch Boer as freedom fighters, in print and illustration.

“Freedom’s Fight Begun in Africa,” the Irish World announced at the start of the war. Seeing parallels to Irish history, editors admired the rural existence of the Boer, and juxtaposed that life against “capitalist” aggression. \(^\text{23}\) When a British general suggested that England was fighting the Boer to protect not only British settlers, but also the Boer themselves (from black revolt), the Irish World responded in disbelief. “Those who have read the history of the English in Ireland need no prompters to tell them what all this British fear of a black outbreak against the Boers means! We have of the numberless Mullaghmasts [a sixteenth-century massacre of Irish clan leaders by a British army] to which Irish chieftains were invited,” only “to be murdered, while their pious British conferees were saying grace!” \(^\text{24}\)

But the Irish press was also quick to draw parallels between U.S. history and the Boer’s struggle. The Kentucky Irish American compared the Boer to patriots in the American Revolution in an extended analogy. The South African War was “beginning to assume the features of the American Revolution in its second year,” with both the Boer and the American patriots of the past harrying British troops, “defeating or eluding pursuers, disappearing and then bobbing up always stronger…” \(^\text{25}\) By comparing the Boer to both Irish rebels and to American patriots, Irish American editors laid claim to a key aspect of U.S. identity: the right to self-government. Irish Americans, united as a group around this principle, expressed essential American principles when they threw their support behind the Boer, as well as when they advocated Irish independence. Irish newspapers, with their frequent columns praising the independence heroes of the past, provided a space to

\(^\text{23}\) Irish World, Oct. 21, 1899.
\(^\text{24}\) Ibid., Nov. 4, 1899.
\(^\text{25}\) Kentucky Irish American, Jan. 19, 1901.
make Old World nationalisms empower New World identities. Boar fighters were “like our Minutemen of ’76” (Figure 24). Frequently drawn with beards, guns, and formal attire, they can resemble the *Irish World*’s many illustrated profiles of Irish nationalists of old. One drawing in particular combines elements of American and Irish history and mythology: a portrait of South African Republic leader Paul Kruger, (Figure 25) his profile stamped onto a coin, evoking the origins of republicanism. Small drawings in the corners depict scenes of life in the Transvaal; many illustrations in the *Irish World* stress the working of the land by the Dutch Boer, aligning with American veneration of the yeoman farmer. Even the depiction of Johannesburg, though not especially detailed, could pass for parts of Dublin, with its tall stone buildings and wide streets.

The above images suggest a softening of the Irish American joke, advertisers’ use of positive portrayals of the Irish, and Irish Americans’ ability to assign the
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iconography of democracy across disparate cultures—Irish, Dutch Boer, ancient Rome—to claim solidarities against common enemies and emphasize Irish American belonging. Yet the absence of Africans, in both text and image, in Irish American coverage of the South African War suggests whiteness is the bridge or primary principle of inclusion across these differences. Turning to images of African Americans in both the black and mainstream press bolsters this view.

**The African American image**

The “productive fusion of ethnic identities and economic aspirations” that Mizruchi describes advertisers creating did not extend to all Americans. Advertisers did not typically embrace positive images of African Americans in the late nineteenth century. Because newspapers are a merger of interests and voices that may sit uncomfortably next to each other on the page, African American journalists and cartoonists made claims about African American strength and beauty that commerce might undo, through advertising’s relentless appeal to mainstream (white) fears or vanities.

Ironically, the widespread white racism that limited black economic prospects created small economic niches that proved highly profitable for some African American entrepreneurs. Black undertakers could take advantage of social mores that dictated that only blacks could bury blacks; Pullman porters, likewise, came into being in part due to stereotypes of African American servility. Beauty products became another economic niche for African Americans in the late nineteenth century. But the links between appearance, identity, and self-worth within a white supremacist society placed the marketing of such products on treacherous ground. The juxtaposition of one black cartoonist’s work with advertisements for African American hair products reveals how newspapers could sometimes be a inconsistent
Currently, little is known about the cartoonist “Hoffmann” beyond his cartoons themselves, which appear in the *Colored American* newspaper of Washington, D.C., around the turn of the century. Hoffmann typically depicts Uncle Sam, the American flag, or other symbols of democracy in ways that reveal the hypocrisy of a democratic discourse that was limited to one “master” race. Yet the advertisement “Black Skin Remover” consistently dogs Hoffmann’s cartoons from nearby on the page, offering his black characters another way out, one that may not depend upon resisting white racism and demanding enforcement of the Constitution. “Can the Leopard Change Its Spots?” Hoffmann asks of the Democratic Party donkey, draped in a sheet to disguise itself as a Republican elephant (Fig. 26). “Could African Americans change theirs?” the nearby “Black Skin Remover” ad seems to inquire. Again, in Figure 27, the same Crane and Co. advertisement seems to offer another option to the fleeing black man in another Hoffmann political cartoon: Hide your race, attempt to pass, and possibly thus avoid white anger and violence.

It is highly unlikely that such ironies were lost on Hoffmann. “A Father’s Blessing,” Hoffmann’s illustration of Uncle Sam holding a black and white child in his lap (Fig. 28), seems to mimic the ever-present Crane and Co. hair tonic advertisement in its placement of the children opposite one another. The white child’s hairstyle in particular resembles the African American woman after her transformation via the company’s skin cream. Another cartoon, printed first on August 31, 1901, and titled, “In the Land of the Free, etc.” (Fig. 29) is even more explicit about products that promise to ease the color line. The cartoon’s caption begins, “A policeman studied a Negro’s face, pronounced him a ‘suspicious character,’ and attempted his arrest.” He winds up “dragged from the jail and hanged from a tree in the Court house yard.” Uncle Sam studies a sign explaining that the man was “hanged
Figure 26. “Can the Leopard Change Its Spots?” Colored American newspaper, June 22, 1901.
Figure 27. “Is this the American Ideal?” *Colored American* newspaper, Sept. 7, 1901.
Figure 28. “A Father’s Blessing.” *Colored American* newspaper, Jan. 4, 1902.
Figure 29. “In the Land of the Free, etc.” Colored American newspaper, Aug. 31, 1901.
because he was not good looking.” In the background of the cartoon, next to the lynched man, hangs another, barely legible sign: “Use Dr. White’s Face Bleach.” If one assumes Dr. “White” is a “black” man selling skin products, yet another white/black binary is set up. Hoffmann, it seems, was only too aware of the advertisements that typically accompanied his political cartoons. In Hoffmann’s cartoons, the mirror images, black/white binaries, and sheets removed to reveal something different underneath hint that racial identity, including whiteness itself, is a kind of veil or deception.

The black press as a whole vigorously debated hair straighteners and skin lighteners. Sol. C. Johnson, editor of the Savannah Tribune, refused to run such ads, writing, “We look with pitying eyes upon the person who endeavors to undo nature by straightening his hair or bleaching his skin…they are encouraged in it by a number of race journals, the pages of which are covered with these kinds of ads.” But the success of black commercial culture around cosmetics, and the civil rights activism of black cosmetics entrepreneur Madam C. J. Walker, the first female self-made millionaire in U.S. history, complicates the picture. Furthermore, the Boston Chemical Co., Ozono, and the Richmond, Virginia-based Crane and Co. were white-owned firms that promised to turn dark skin lighter. Madam Walker, by contrast, whose empire was just beginning in 1900, spoke out against skin bleaching and denied that her hair product was a straightener; she called it a hair grower.

Scholar Kathy Peiss acknowledges a “contradictory rejection and embrace of Euro-American aesthetic standards” in the African American construction of the “New Negro” woman, who would claim the moral ground seen as the sole province of white

27 The Savannah Tribune, July 7, 1900.
womanhood.29 “While many (African American women) fashioned their appearances by following in some measure the aesthetic of European beauty,” Peiss writes, “they frequently understood their beauty rituals in ways that modified, undercut, and even challenged the charges of white emulation.”30 Visual culture would change slowly, however; by the 1920s, although text in Madam Walker’s advertisements might praise the “matchless browns” and “glossy dark skin” of African American women, the accompanying illustrations still typically depicted women with decidedly European appearances.31

Moses L. Tucker

Hoffman of the Colored American drew characters that did not typically conform to the minstrel style. Tucker’s did, though the cartoonist would still poke fun at whites from within the genre. On June 8, 1889, the Freeman introduced, with some trepidation, Tucker’s debut:

The work of Mr. Moses L. Tucker which appears in this issue does not do him justice. His special work on the “Georgia Cracker” was the caricaturing of colored people, and his ability in this line has been thoroughly demonstrated. While we are averse to “poking fun” at the Negro, still there are many traits and characteristics which will bear criticisms, and which should be eliminated. This phase of the race problem will receive more attention hereafter and Mr. Tucker’s gifted pen will do a share of it.

The Freeman was sensitive to white ridicule of African Americans, yet its uplift ideology sought the “elimination” of certain “traits and characteristics” embarrassing to the race. The “politics of respectability” will be more closely examined in Chapter 4.

Little is known about Moses Tucker’s life. He was born in 1868 in Fulton
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30 Ibid., 204.
31 Ibid., 218-20.
by 1889 he was living in Indianapolis, where at the "Freeman" he joined cartoonist Henry J. Lewis, who left the paper soon thereafter. The 1910 census lists Tucker as an inmate of the Marion County Hospital for the Incurably Insane in Indiana. The time of his death is unknown.\(^{32}\)

Figures 30 and 31 are a kind of visual representation of minstrelsy, with

Tucker essentially performing in blackface; that is, portraying with ink and paper Anglo-Americans’ imagined and desired ideas of blackness. In the first image (Fig. 30), two black men stand in front of a closed bank; one dresses in floppy clothes, while the other is a black dandy complete with top hat and cane. Not only the

![Image](image1)

**Figure 31. “Uncle Sam and the Negro,” Freeman (Indianapolis), Sept. 13, 1890. Moses L. Tucker, artist.**
clothing, but the back-and-forth dialogue of these Tucker cartoons match the minstrel genre, where an interlocutor, a kind of straight man, would commonly ask questions of a blackface performer, whose daft answers provided the humor (Fig. 31, another Tucker cartoon, repeats this style). Eric Lott calls “cultural appropriation” the “central fact” of the minstrel show, though he detects strains of white (particularly working class) sympathy and envy for African Americans’ talent, culture, and physical embodiment.33

Yet the minstrel aesthetic was still somewhat “pliable”; in “Just Like White People,” much of the joke is on white people and the series of financial booms and busts of the 1890s.34 In this fashion, minstrel-like cartoons in the black press could be called a reworking of a cultural appropriation. However, pearls of wisdom delivered by exoticized “black” performers were not uncommon to stage minstrelsy; the performance genre could accommodate some agency and intelligence on the part of its typically debased black characters. Class may be at work here, for the illiterate and ragged African Americans of minstrelsy may be largely alien to a black editorial elite, as they mostly were to the white Northerners who developed blackface minstrel shows. It seems possible that the black bourgeoisie could enjoy some forms of minstrelsy, or at least softened forms of it.35 Yet the very non-elite J. Samuel Stemons, as shown in Chapter 4, also seemed to adopt and enforce some white stereotypes of African Americans in his writings.

As with African American participation in U.S. imperialism, dislocations
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34 Kevin Gaines describes the genre as “pliable” in *Uplifting the Race*, 197.
35 Editors at *Voice of the Negro*, for example, filled space at the bottom of T. Thomas Fortune’s last article on the Philippines with a negro dialect joke about black preachers, borrowed from the Atlanta Constitution. See Fortune, “The Filipino: Some Incidents,” 246.
of white supremacist discourse appear even as African Americans adopt and adapt the genres and discourses of white supremacy. Tucker’s cartoon, “Just Like White People” suggests as much. The cartoonist, consciously or not, brings attention not just to an economic system that encompasses all races, but also to whiteness itself. Not just the bank, but presumably the figures in the cartoon are also, in a sense, just like white people. The cartoon exhibits several of the features scholar Monica Miller has identified with the history of black dandyism, which she defines as “the story of how and why black people became arbiters of style and how they use clothing and dress to define their identity in different and changing political and cultural contexts.”

The “dandy’s signature method,” according to Miller, is “a pointed redeployment of clothing, gesture, and wit.” This produced not a small amount of derision and anxiety among whites, who during times of slavery passed sumptuary laws designed to curtail or forbid black extravagance. African Americans, Miller writes, “understood intuitively that identity can be performed, that race is a fiction, and that both are culturally and historically based.”

Yet analyses that stress African American agency within minstrel aesthetics risk downplaying the consequences of working within the form. Whites finding enjoyment from dialect-speaking African Americans on stage or in fiction would likely miss veiled critiques of white supremacy and instead recognize only ignorance and deference, reinforcing their own racial biases. The Freeman editor’s misgivings about Tucker’s aesthetic style are clear in his introductory bio of the cartoonist. Charles Chesnutt, whose complex “story-within-a-story” plantation tales “play on
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37 Ibid., 5.
38 Ibid., 92.
39 Ibid., 90.
the mutability of identity,” deliberately abandoned the black vernacular form, only to be forced by Houghton Mifflin to return to his conjure tales in order to get a book of stories accepted. African Americans would strongly protest minstrel cultural productions, including black entertainer Ernest Hogan’s song “All Coons Look Alike to Me.” Black protest over racist caricatures would become particularly vehement a bit later in the twentieth century, with the 1915 release of the film Birth of a Nation.

Black newspapers and a new technology

The halftone revolution of the 1880s did more than increase Americans’ exposure to circulated visual images. It contributed to an ongoing anxious, gendered debate about art and perception. Examination of a series of hybrid portraits in the Indianapolis Freeman—for a time in the early 1890s, the newspaper printed halftone photographs of African Americans surrounded by an engraver’s depiction of laurels, curtains, and other paraphernalia—reveals newspapers a site of aesthetic and possibly occupational tension.

Edward E. Cooper founded the Freeman in 1888 and published it until 1892, when he sold it to George Knox. Knox, a former slave and successful black businessman, wanted a “national race paper,” and, partly due to successful job printing, achieved a circulation of 16,000 in 1903. Booker T. Washington was close with Knox, and provided occasional financial support. Knox supported the Tuskegee leader’s industrial education program. He nonetheless maintained much editorial

42 See Kibler, Censoring Racial Ridicule, 28-30.
independence from Tuskegee; he rarely hesitated to criticize lynching, for example.\(^{44}\)

The mastheads of the *Freeman*, which described itself as “a national
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Figure 32. Mastheads of the *Colored American* and the *Freeman*.

illustrated colored newspaper,” and the *Colored American* (Fig. 32) demonstrate the “cluttered eclecticism” and “densely decorative style” of middle-class homes in the late Victorian era.\(^{45}\) The *Colored American* in particular resembles the popular *Harper’s Weekly* in its depiction of a books, a globe, telescope and possibly compass or sextant.

Figure 33 shows the *Freeman’s* typical front-page illustration style before

\(^{44}\) Ibid., 31-40.

\(^{45}\) Miles Orvell, *The Real Thing: Imitation and Authenticity in American Culture, 1880-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 48. Orvell sees in the late-nineteenth century a mixture of Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, and invented styles imitative of aristocracy, “objects rich in narrative signs suggesting allegorical fantasy and far-off places—leaves, claw feet, embellished figures.” 48. The description helps explain the tiny, toga-clad (white?) man pulling back the curtain on the portrait of the Rev. Jos. A. Booker (Fig. 34).
the onset of halftone photographs. The *Freeman* typically ran engraved portraits of African Americans within drawn picture frames, the picture itself set on a table.

Figure 34, three years later on Oct. 21, 1893, is one of the first halftone photographs in the paper. The *Freeman* has continued its longstanding style of surrounding a portrait with the accoutrements of taste, refinement, and intellectual bearing. Here a halftone photograph merely replaces the art of the illustrator, who himself may have worked from a photographic portrait of an African American leader in political or
cultural life.

Figure 34. A halftone photograph, surrounded by engraving. Freeman (Indianapolis), Oct. 21, 1893.

To modern eyes, this hybrid or mashup of illustration and photographic reproduction appears jarring. Another halftone on the cover of the Freeman three weeks later (Fig. 35) uses less illustrated accompaniment, but still surrounds its halftone with garlands and other paraphernalia of respectability. Does this show a discomfort with a new technology—as if the halftone alone cannot transmit an individual’s gravitas? Or, to be more cynical, is the illustrator hanging onto his job
for dear life, arguing visually about his worth to a newspaper in danger of adopting a more “realistic” medium for its portrayal of race leaders?

It is a difficult question to answer, for several reasons. Commentators and critics did argue about photography and its use and nature in the late nineteenth century, and engravers and other illustrators did worry about the threat the new technology might pose to their professions. Nancy Martha West explores the gendered
anger and alarm of engravers in the mid-1880s. “The most talented engravers,” wrote engraver W.J. Linton in 1884, “are hampered and crippled by [photography]…they waste their powers on an effeminate excess of fineness and other girl-nonsense… Only the artist-engraver, while he upholds the dignity of his manhood, can assure the future of engraving. Beware of photography!”\(^{46}\) Linton objected to engravers working from a photograph rather than a drawing; photography, he thought, privileged accuracy over the symbolism and spirit of an original artwork, which demanded *translation* from the engraver, not mechanical reproduction. West mentions English art critic John Ruskin and English novelist and poet Thomas Hardy as two influential Victorians who similarly feared that “art had lost its object, its privileged methods and categories, and its institutional security” to photography.\(^{47}\)

In these three *Freeman* images, the power of the portrait in the nineteenth century is suggested; it projected propriety, self-control, and self-possession. Photography and portraiture were embraced by African Americans, particularly by race leaders who hoped to push back against racist portrayals. Frederick Douglass was optimistic about photography’s potential to empower African Americans even while recognizing its power to promote false imaginings. Douglass and other African Americans, behind or in front of the camera, increasingly challenged representations of blacks in the late nineteenth century. Ginger Hill finds Douglass deliberately and self-consciously posing for numerous portraits. He guarded his respectability religiously, carefully regulated the angles of his sittings, and on the lecture circuit


always received from his wife Anna a freshly pressed shirt, sent ahead.\textsuperscript{48} Shawn Michelle Smith dissects W.E.B. Du Bois’s photographic exhibit on African Americans for the American Negro Exhibit at the 1900 Paris Exposition, finding conscious subversion of the format of scientific race photography—the exhibit begins with the full frontal and side portraits common to anthropological and phrenological studies of “savages,” and moves from there into nuanced, dignified, and particularized profiles of African American families.\textsuperscript{49} Michael Scott Bieze and Marybeth Gasman have begun to detail Booker T. Washington’s artistic philosophies and endeavors, including his interest in Ruskin and the Arts and Crafts movement. Bieze sees Washington’s work as presaging the Harlem Renaissance. Washington did not shy away from photography in the slightest, employing A. P. Bedou and other black and white photographers for various Tuskegee projects.\textsuperscript{50}

Americans in the 1800s did not immediately rush to use photographic images to depict the world “realistically.” Scholars of Victorian aesthetics suggest that our current taste in photography is a conservative one, stressing realism and seeking an “honest” use of the medium. Nineteenth-century Americans, on the other hand, reveled in the many forms photography could take, one moment embracing its ability to seemingly freeze and portray reality and the next celebrating its ability to create fantasies or trick the eye.\textsuperscript{51} In this respect, the \textit{Freeman’s} mixture of photography

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{48} Ginger Hill, “’Rightly Viewed,’” 48.
\textsuperscript{51} Orvell, \textit{The Real Thing}, 77. Jennifer Green-Lewis largely concurs with Orvell, but stresses more tension between two modes of seeing in Victorian times: “positivist realism” and “metaphysical romance.” Both schools embraced photography as a medium that, alternatively, validated empiricism “in its surface documentation of
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and engraving may not have perplexed its readers at all, who were used to seeing the
photography employed as an expressive rather than an unembellished medium.52

*Images of African Americans in magazine advertising*

Of course African Americans were not the only Americans interested in
photography. A rising white middle class was also intrigued by the possibilities for
self-creation posed by the camera. The turn of the century saw the beginnings, in both
Britain and the United States, of a new kind of magazine aimed at a new audience:
a largely suburban “professional middle class” that based much of its self-definition
on the consumption of consumer goods.53 For the most part, the magazines presented
a sanitized view of American race relations, keeping their readerships isolated from
racial strife. But a closer look reveals a relationship between white identity and
consumerism that formed a key component of whiteness since antebellum times.54

In Walter Johnson’s influential study of the slave market, slave owners
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52 Shawn Michelle Smith examines a retouched photo in Du Bois’s compilation for
the 1900 Paris Exposition, in which an image of two African Americans at a piano
is superimposed with an elegant Victorian room. Smith, *Photography on the Color
Line*, 111. Nancy West, however, thinks that a clear aesthetic preference for “exact
reproduction” existed by the 1880s.

53 The term, which he abbreviates as “PMC,” is Richard Ohmann’s; see *Selling
Culture*, 118-19.

54 Ohmann writes that the new magazines made an “implicit offer” to their readers
to mediate culture—to make sure they were “reading the right fiction, seeing the
new paintings, knowing who counted as a celebrity,” etc. (*Selling Culture*, 245).
Particularly in fiction printed in the mass market magazines, Ohmann finds flattered
that they are in control. It should be noted that Ohmann finds, overall, very little
mention of African Americans in his survey. He finds no article explicitly on race or
“the Negro problem,” and writers alluded to no controversy surrounding it, which he
takes as indicative of a shared white supremacy and complacency. (255-57) African
Americans appeared tangentially in fiction printed in the magazines, as smiling and
non-threatening.
“imagined who they could be by thinking about whom they could buy.” Johnson in fact calls slave ownership the most effective way to understand class differences among whites in the antebellum South. Less experienced buyers would bring along “friends, physicians, even slave dealers” to the market to help them choose the right slave. “The presence of these slave-pen guides hints at a masculine world in which being ‘a good judge of slaves’ was a noteworthy public identity,” a hierarchical white identity based on “shared participation in the inspection and evaluation of black slaves.” The court records in New Orleans that Johnson examines point to public performances whereby buyers mingled and watched each other as they inspected rows of slaves, moving slaves’ joints, fingering gums, and palpitating muscles.

Perhaps images of African Americans in periodicals of the late nineteenth century performed

Figure 36. *Strand* magazine, May 1902.
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56 Ibid., 242, fn. 7.
57 Ibid., 137.
identity-making work similar to the antebellum slave market. In heady prose, one writer for the *Strand*, Thomas E. Curtis, describes illustrator E. W. Kemble’s skills at depicting African Americans (Fig. 36). Kemble is called an expert in the black form, an artist with a “subtle touch.” Here the cartoonist’s skill in depicting black bodies seems comparable to the coveted expertise of the experienced slave owner. Johnson believes what first-time slaveholders were buying was the notion of a “white household” where female manual labor in the fields would become unnecessary.

M. M. Manring finds advertisers in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century United States presenting images of the plantation South as a symbol of white leisure and abundance. Products themselves, in the new middle-class household, were the time-saving entities that could help bring into being a longed-for, leisurely life. Thus it is not surprising that advertisers often paired their products with images of black domestic helpers to evoke such longings. Positive images of African Americans in advertising lagged behind those of other ethnicities because African Americans still had too much work to do in the production of white identity—literally through sharecropping and other coercive work arrangements post-emancipation, and on the page, through cartoon jokes, “local color” stories, and staged photo spreads.
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60 M. M. Manring, *Slave in a Box*, 11.
61 Though he finds little reference to race in non-fiction articles in the major mass-market magazines around the turn of the century, Ohmann finds several advertisements depicting charming black and white babies, posed together, to sell products. To Ohmann, the non-threatening nature of blacks in turn-of-the-century magazine advertisements not only reassured mostly Northern readers that racial strife was over, but also flattered them that they possessed a newer, sophisticated ability to enjoy interracial images that might offend a more backward and aggressively racist Southerner. This observation bolsters somewhat Natalie J. Ring’s argument that, despite cultural productions promoting Reconciliation of North and South after the Civil War, a discourse of the South, both domestic and global, as a “problem”
“The Coon’s Content,” (Fig. 37) a 1903 article in the Strand, demonstrates this point. Some of the photos are clearly staged to emphasize clownish humor. Photography would slowly become more “realistic” in form, especially as reformers like Jacob A. Riis, who frequented alleyways and tenement houses to document urban poverty, achieved popularity in the 1890s. Yet Riis himself can be seen as a transitional figure in the move toward greater photographic realism; he often posed his subjects. More important, the photos pictured here show that, as a technology, photography had no inherent pull toward empiricism—or, at least, no pull strong enough to prevent it from being used to portray minstrel themes in need of economic and social reform was common around the turn of the century. Ring suggests this “problem” discourse and its accompanying political projects has been underplayed in scholarship focusing on reunion of the sections. See Ring, The Problem South: Region, Empire, and the New Liberal State, 1880-1930 (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2012).

Figure 37. “The Coon’s Content,” Strand magazine, June 1903.
service of white supremacist identity.

The author of the article, Frederick Moore, claimed expertise on the “coon,” who still lived in “circles of the old South, of which you would be surprised that so much yet exists.” Moore explained to his reader the social mores, superstitions, and class relationships of his subject. At least three times in the narrative, Moore essentially told racist jokes about African Americans as if they came about through real encounters on his travels in the South. These essentially staged jokes mirror the visual elements of the article: posed or staged photographs of African Americans by “Russell Bros.” and “F. L. Howe,” who is Fred L. Howe (1857-1903), a commercial photographer and staff photographer for the Atlanta Constitution. Moore’s descriptions of African Americans in the article are always patronizing and frequently cruel, and involve stereotypes well explored in the literature on racism in America. They need not be reproduced at length here, other than to point out the parallels between the narrative and the process of race-making in Johnson’s slave market.

Moore casts himself as an expert on the black body, describing how distinct facial features betray particular emotions as rural African Americans eat watermelon. In an anthropological vein, this expertise expands into questions of sociology and religion, including African Americans’ ambitions or lack thereof, levels of contentment, and propensity to superstition. Almost every paragraph is based on a joke, or on the accompanying photos, which are typically jokes themselves. One photo, “The Bicycle Race at the Coonville Wheel Club,” is acknowledged as staged; it is described as

63 See https://www.flickr.com/photos/60606308@N08/sets/72157631585423728/.
“barely an exaggeration.” (Fig. 38) The photo of an elderly black woman at the beginning of the article, “Ole Mammy,” greets the reader at the start of a sentimental journey of white supremacy.⁶⁴

The *Strand* article in its exaggerations reveals the work being done by racist filler cartoons and the jokes of minstrelsy. They are more than expressions of fear or hatred, or examples of the black image in the white mind, though they are those things. The black or ethnic joke, with or without illustration, is a performance of whiteness, a demonstration of expertise and superiority. Its action can be seen in its cartoon figures, which evoke the movement of blackface theater and vaudeville, and understood in another word for joke: a “put-down.” The less visible action is the building up, the bolstering of white identity.

⁶⁴ For an analysis and historical look at the black mammy, see chapter two of M. M. Manring’s *Slave in a Box*, 18-59.
African Americans and empire

How did African Americans respond to the challenges of empire with images of their own? Smaller newspapers and magazines routinely reprinted images from mainstream sources. T. Thomas Fortune protested against the black press’s reprinting from Southern newspapers such “patent back” material—ready-made copy purchased by weeklies, often from the Associated Press newswire, to bulk up the paper. Freeman owner George Knox prided himself on printing little patent material. Figure 39 shows a close-up of the illustration “Native Insurgent Soldiers,” from the Freeman, which is reprinted material. The date is May, 14, 1898, just two weeks after Admiral George Dewey’s decimation of the Spanish fleet in Manila Bay, and several months before U.S. and Philippine troops would clash—a tense period of U.S. occupation of

Figure 39. Indianapolis Freeman, May 14, 1898.
Manila, when both Philippine rebel leader Emilio Aguinaldo and the United States were engaged in “competitive state-building.” The illustration essentially explains “the Filipino” to the newspaper’s readers, with accompanying text that resembles the anthropological rhetoric of a natural history museum diorama. The identical illustration appears in both mainstream and ethnic media of the time (see, for example, Figure 40, the same image as it appeared in the Salt Lake Herald about one month later), suggesting strongly that it originated with a news service, possibly the Associated Press. The illustration, along with reprinted maps of the Philippines with accompanying text, dovetail with a popular rhetoric of national manhood and aggressiveness common at the turn of the century.

How can we understand the appearance of “Native Insurgent Soldiers” in 
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Historian Bonnie M. Miller notes that Freeman editor George Knox often reproduced images originally printed elsewhere; the black press in particular faced financial constraints that led to their use of reprints and subscription services for illustrations. E-mail communication, Feb. 15, 2012. See also Bonnie M. Miller, *From Liberation to Conquest: The Visual and Popular Cultures of the Spanish-American War of 1898* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011).

the *Freeman*? The editor’s decision to reprint the illustration appears to mark in a straightforward manner this “race paper’s” support of U.S. imperial efforts and ideology. Indeed, the *Freeman* did back U.S. annexation of the islands and merely urged Philippine independence as soon as the United States deemed Filipinos ready for self-rule. Though the late-nineteenth century imperial drive held a strong component of white superiority, it also contained other notions, such as American exceptionalism, which some African Americans might embrace. Darwinian ideas about competition between living organisms were frequently applied to human society at large, and this too might have had some appeal to many black writers and thinkers; that is, an emergent black middle or upper class especially might flatter itself through notions of a kind of societal “survival of the fittest.” Efforts to appear modern might involve distancing themselves from “dark” or “heathen” parts of the world.

Yet even the most pro-war black newspaper at least critiqued justifications for expansion, especially notions of a “white man’s burden.” The *Freeman*, for example, reprinted a letter from a Private Fulbright in the Twenty-fifth Infantry, who wrote, “If we are to unfurl our flag on these islands let us make these natives joint heirs in our citizenship.”⁶⁹ The “Native Insurgents” image and text sits uncomfortably with these messages of support for Filipino rights. But how the *Freeman’s* readers interpreted this image may have been more complex. Sometimes African American editors reprinted outrageously racist excerpts from mainstream newspapers with little or no accompanying commentary, or perhaps with ironic headlines. Such excerpts seem to be offered as examples of particularly virulent white racism; editors trusted that readers could decode these passages for themselves. The black press, pro-imperialist or not, like much of the liberal white press, routinely turned the discourse of “savage” vs. “civilized” peoples around, noting that atrocities in the Philippines,

⁶⁹ The *Freeman*, August 3, 1901.
or, at minimum, lynchings in the U.S. South, brought into question who was civilized and who was not. Sol C. Johnson, editor of the *Savannah Tribune*, particularly liked to suggest that white Southerners, through their lynch mobs, were degenerating into “cannibals”; *Freeman* editor George Knox was no exception.70 Thus, loyal readers might supply their own quotation marks around the terms “savage” and “civilized” that appear beneath the “Native Insurgents” illustration, for this discourse had already been extensively problematized in the paper. The possibility the image presents for dual perspectives, of racial identification or a more class- or culture-based dismissal, mirrors T. Thomas Fortune’s hybrid rhetoric in his *Voice of the Negro* articles, where he alternately attacked Anglo-Saxonism or elevated African Americans over Filipinos by asserting blacks’ membership in a broader American cultural superiority.

Fortune’s self-portrait has already been discussed in Chapter 2. Another portrait, this one of a black lieutenant in the Islands, helps shed light on African American strategies with respect to media technologies and the Philippines. The *Colored American* newspaper of Washington, DC, presented a profile on Lt. David J. Gilmer (Fig. 41), declaring that “colored officers speak well of the treatment they received” in the Philippines, from both “natives” and white teachers and civilian clerks alike. The latter “seem to forget their American prejudice, when they meet a colored officer, and are usually glad to talk with him. The race question is rapidly solving itself in the islands, is the verdict of those capable of judging.”71 Standing proudly in front of what appears to be a painted backdrop, the photograph depicts autonomous, composed, and dignified manhood.

The photograph serves to reinforce the claims of the text accompanying it. The Philippines is presented as an escape from American racism, where African

70 See, for example, *The Savannah Tribune*, June 11, 1898.
American talent and manhood are freely expressed and adequately rewarded, and where white Americans forget their racial animus. That there may be opportunities for African Americans abroad is reinforced on the same page by an advertisement from the Tuskegee Institute that describes a whirlwind of opportunities for African American men trained in scientific agriculture, both domestic and “in several foreign
countries.” Scholars now know many of the details of Booker T. Washington’s efforts in West Africa to assist German colonialists in the growing of cotton. The year 1904 would be approximately mid-way through that eight-year experiment, a time when German desire to diversify its cotton imports so as not to rely so exclusively on the United States, and Washington’s desire to make African Americans indispensable to world markets coalesced.

In both Fortune’s and Gilmer’s portraits, each man stands in front of a painted backdrop. Media scholar Lisa Gitelman notes that the sale of such backgrounds in Sears and Roebuck catalogs of the early twentieth century for portrait photographs “suggests the wide circulation of different and uniquely personal portraits, all with identical, impersonal backgrounds.” Gitelman suggests that the mass marketing of these painted screens can help focus scholarly discussions of the “age of mechanical reproduction” by troubling assumptions of the uniqueness of painting vs. the mass production of images, “or that painting and photography always form antithetical sources of meaning.” In this study, the self-conscious, constructed nature of these photographs aligns with the personal use of newspapers to produce meaning and assert one’s self while advancing the well-being and future of one’s race.

**Empire in images: mainstream periodicals**

Wars of imperialism around the turn of the century produced a huge number of images in U.S. newspapers and magazines. Many political cartoons depicted American “expansion” with a globetrotting Uncle Sam or President William McKinley confronting indigenous peoples from Cuba, Hawaii, or the Philippines.

Political cartoons from this period are often analyzed by historians as examples of a
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73 See Sven Beckert, “From Tuskegee to Togo,” 498-526.
new Manifest Destiny, a drive and duty to uplift perceived inferior races that helped push the United States abroad in the late 1800s. But racism also powers isolationist sentiment, and more than one historian has found that, particularly in Congressional debate around the Philippines in 1899, notions of Anglo-Saxon superiority and Filipino (or Hawaiian or Puerto Rican) savagery were employed primarily by anti-imperialists, and typically avoided by pro-annexationists. What should historians make of this? Did notions of race supremacy encourage or debilitate empire? If many expansionists did stress an Anglo-Saxon duty (or “burden,” in the words of Rudyard Kipling’s famous poem, printed in *McClure’s* in February 1899 and subtitled “The United States and the Philippine Islands”) to uplift “inferior” races, just how could a policy of moral and economic betterment for non-white others abroad be justified during continued Chinese exclusion, and the very height of African American disenfranchisement at home?

---


76 Studies that Paul Kramer places within a “cultures of United States imperialism” strain of scholarship describe a cultural push toward the possession of colonies abroad, a new, turn-of-the-century moment where social Darwinist philosophies and religiously inspired notions of Manifest Destiny and racial uplift worked together to push America outward toward the “uncivilized” world. See Paul Kramer, “Power and Connection: Imperial Histories of the United States in the World,” *The American Historical Review*, 116 (2011): 1348-91. Though such scholarship may acknowledge that anti-imperialists played the race card with more vigor than the imperialists, the overall effect still can be to downplay many Americans’ racially based, grave misgivings about “expansion.” A difference in sources may be at work here; Lasch, Love, and Hilfrich tend to favor diplomatic and Congressional documents, and may discount a pro-expansionist “white man’s burden” atmosphere in the nation at large. Meanwhile, “cultures of imperialism” scholars draw upon fiction, art, advertising, plays, and world’s fairs, but often exclude political or diplomatic sources.
An examination of political cartoons in magazines and newspapers reveals, even in pro-imperialist cartoons, deep racial anxieties about America’s new possessions. The U.S. encounter with peoples from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines would challenge popular racial categories, as well as those of race scientists, who struggled to describe the origins of the “Malay race” in the heterogeneous Philippines. Cartoonists sometimes gave “the Filipino” the stereotypical marks of savagery in much the same way they drew American Indians; at other times the dark skin, white eyes, kinky hair, and large lips of minstrelsy identified him. Amid the confusion, however, a certain iconographic logic emerges, one that involves schooling in the arts of civilization for races deemed inferior but perhaps, like children, able to learn. This section will examine mainstream, widely circulated cartoons about the Philippines. One particular cartoon, “School Begins,” (Fig. 42) distils many themes of this chapter and, indeed, the dissertation, and will be examined in detail.

“School Begins”

In today’s image-saturated culture, it may be hard to grasp the power that nineteenth-century illustrated magazines like Puck, Judge, and Life wielded in distilling political, ideological and moral positions for the American populace. Some scholars suggest that Puck and Judge in particular may have been more influential in the late 1800s than all daily newspapers combined. Each magazine accompanied its articles with pen-and-ink and watercolor drawings, including color front covers and centerfold cartoons. Cartoonists of the time put in visual form the major news of the day, and the first three years of the Philippines-American War (1899-1902) counted as


167
a top story of the time. Illustrators often drew Uncle Sam alongside England’s John Bull and figures representing other European powers; America had “joined the big boys” in imperial adventuring.

Annexation and war were controversial. Many Americans opposed to the taking of foreign territories thought the United States was reneging on its republican traditions of self-government, as explained on the classroom blackboard appearing in “School Begins.” Many more Americans, out of a mix of racism and anxiety over potential competition for jobs, opposed “expansion” due to fear of immigration from the newly acquired territories. Surely, these anti-imperialists believed, constitutional rights traveled with the American flag, and new, non-white citizens abroad might come to the United States and damage its traditions and culture with their innate inferiority.78 Pro-imperialists, on the other hand, cited economic benefits to annexation (coaling stations, expanded markets for U.S. goods), and might draw upon a kind of new Manifest Destiny powered by the ideology of Anglo-Saxonism: the belief that characteristics of the “Anglo-Saxon race” were both biologically and culturally determined, were superior, and included “industry, intelligence, adventurousness, and a talent for self-government.”79

“School Begins” appeared just days before the February 6, 1899, vote by the U.S. Senate to approve the Treaty of Paris and annex the Philippines. In the illustration, Puck cartoonist Louis Dalrymple depicts a headmaster, Uncle Sam, in a kind of expansive one-room schoolhouse, teaching American civilization to four dark, disheveled children: Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Hawaii.80 Behind these

78 For an early, succinct analysis of the anti-imperialists, see Christopher Lasch, “The Anti-Imperialists,” 319-331.
80 Dalrymple, considered one of the better cartoonists of the day (though not as
four, but ahead of them in grade level, are older children with the names of U.S. states (California and Texas), territories (New Mexico and Arizona), and the district of Alaska. All are orderly, and, with the exception of Alaska, light-skinned. Behind this scene are three more prominent figures: a Chinese child, poised outside the doorway of the schoolhouse; a Native American, sitting just within the room, his speller held upside-down; and an African American, drawn in true minstrel fashion, smiling and washing windows on a ladder several feet in the air. For legibility, the text underneath highly regarded as, for example, Eugene Zimmerman or Frederick Opper), was born in 1861 in Cambridge, Ill. He graduated from the Pennsylvania Academy of Art and in 1886 submitted drawings to Joseph Keppler, founder and art director of Puck, and was employed there for 15 years. See Maurice Horn, ed., The World Encyclopedia of Cartoons (New York: Gale Research Company, 1980).
the cartoon, and within it on both the blackboard and placard, are reproduced in the footnote at the end of this paragraph.  

The cartoon’s four children, and Uncle Sam’s reassurance that they will soon be grateful to be enrolled in his course on civilization, represent Dalrymple’s depiction of “benevolent assimilation.” President McKinley described this official U.S. policy toward the Philippines in December 1898, after the Treaty of Paris earlier that year ended the Spanish-American War (the United States would pay Spain $20 million for the possession of Guam, Puerto Rico and the Philippines). In his address, McKinley laid claim to the entire Philippine archipelago. He took pains to instruct military officers to “win the confidence, respect and affection” of Filipinos by “assuring them in every possible way that full measure of individual rights and liberties which is the heritage of free peoples.” This would “prov[e] to them that the mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule.” According to Vicente Rafael, “[c]olonization as assimilation was deemed a moral imperative, as wayward native children cut off from their Spanish fathers and desired by other European powers would now be adopted and protected by the compassionate embrace of the United States.” Rafael’s conception of “white love” captures the (tough) “love” Uncle Sam

81 Cartoon caption: “Uncle Sam (to his new class in Civilization)—’Now, children, you’ve got to learn these lessons whether you want to or not! But just take a look at the class ahead of you, and remember that, in a little while, you will feel glad to be here as they are!’ On the blackboard: “The consent of the governed is a good thing in theory, but very rare in fact. England has governed her colonies whether they consented or not. By not waiting for their consent she has greatly advanced the world’s civilization.” On the placard: “The Confederate States refused their consent to be governed but the Union was preserved without their consent.”
82 William McKinley to the Secretary of War, Dec. 21, 1898, quoted in Kramer, Blood of Government, 110.
must show to his new wayward, youthful charges. But Uncle Sam’s wooden rod, and
the folklore about sadistic schoolmasters it evokes, remain as allusions to the very
real violence inherent in the imperial project.

In fact, Dalrymple’s chosen symbol for his depiction of race, empire and
civilization—the iconic, one-room schoolhouse—was at the heart of a debate on
education in the late nineteenth century led by Progressives. During the industrial
boom of the Gilded Age, according to historian of education Jonathan Zimmerman,
“poets started to celebrate the one-room school as the locus of America’s lost rural
simplicity.” Yet in the late 1890s and early twentieth century, many Progressives
wanted to close its doors. To reformers, modern society demanded not just forest
conservation, prohibition, and food inspection, but school consolidation. Education
officials distributed postcards depicting dilapidated one-room schoolhouses as
the “Old Way,” along with the alternative: shiny, multistory buildings (“The New
Way”). The cartoon school’s ceilings are lofty; the architecture suggests grandiosity
and perhaps harkens back to the fabled birthplace of democracy, ancient Greece, in
the vaguely Doric columns of the doorframe and the large, blocky threshold at the
doorsill. This is no ramshackle Little Red Schoolhouse.

The ubiquity of schoolhouses and children in cartoonists’ depictions of
American “uplift” in the Philippines (Figs. 43 and 43) suggests that the schoolhouse
represented the policy solution to these racial tensions and democratic conundrums:
a kind of “Jim Crow colonialism” would be practiced abroad, with full democratic
rights contingent on the achievement of political and cultural milestones deemed
sufficient by the occupiers. As discussed in Chapter 2, two very well known
educational models were recommended for America’s new wards in the Caribbean

Jonathan Zimmerman, Small Wonder: The Little Red Schoolhouse in History and
Ibid., 80-81.
and Asia: those offered by the Hampton and Tuskegee institutes. In “School Begins,” then, the African American and Native American figures are key, but not simply as foils to highlight perceived Anglo-Saxon superiority. Instead, each may signal a late-nineteenth century consensus around a kind of neo-Reconstructionist reform, a new and supposedly wiser effort to constrain and control aspirations of those deemed not yet ready for full citizenship.

“Our New Topsy”

That there is no Irish figure in “School Begins” suggests the Irish were figuratively in the schoolhouse already, and needed no whitening like the rows of children behind the unruly brown boys. Whiteness was a key aspect of American belonging, and the absence of European immigrants in the cartoon—or their presumed incorporation into the rows of studious pupils—suggests that Catholicism by the twentieth century was moving toward becoming less a dangerous rupture
in their citizenship status and more an ongoing tension for Catholics in Protestant-majority America. African American citizenship was on shakier ground; American cartoonists frequently depicted Filipinos essentially in blackface (the other chosen caricature for Filipinos resembled Native Americans). And as the image below demonstrates, even the more sympathetic characters from abolitionist fiction could be employed in ways suggesting African Americans—and Filipinos—lacked the stuff of civilization.

Topsy is the unruly, well-meaning black child from Harriet Beecher Stowe’s immensely popular anti-slavery novel, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, published in 1852. Eva, the angelic child daughter of a slave owner in the novel, treats Topsy with kindness and love, transforming her self-hatred and wicked ways, which Stowe relates to the institution of slavery, not biology. But the Topsy of popular culture, the one commonly performed on stage in the popular “Tom shows” of the nineteenth century, was played for laughs and could not

---

Welke writes that although religion could be a cause of discrimination, the U.S. Census “never inquired as to religious identity,” the Constitution “specifically proscribed religious tests for office holding,” and the First Amendment protected the free exercise of religion. Though many Americans viewed America as not simply a white nation but a Protestant one, Protestantism “was not fundamental to individual legal capacity, to legal personhood.” Welke, *Law and the Borders of Belonging*, 11.
change; Bernstein writes that this Topsy “was essentially unfit for citizenship.” This is the Topsy of Figure 45. A put-upon and feminized Uncle Sam (dressed as “Miss Feeley,” Stowe’s anti-slavery Northerner with ambiguous feelings toward African Americans) is tormented by Topsy-like, Iloilo-based Filipino rebel leader Emilio Aguinaldo. Stowe’s egalitarian vision, however much it was replete with racist stereotypes, has receded.

A study which traced the origins of European race-making might posit the Irish as the original, paradigmatic European model of the savage. Several historians back this view, locating the birth in the European mind of a wild and bestial “other” in twelfth-century British encounters with the Irish, who then became the template through which American Indians and Africans were understood and described. “It was not…that Africanness was mapped onto Irish bodies, as historians have often suggested, but rather that the

87 Bernstein, Racial Innocence, 51.
category of the ‘Negro’ was constructed in relationship to, and built upon, that of the ‘Celt,’” writes Nadja Durbach. But via some combination of America’s greater distance from Fenian violence, its looser class structures, the efforts of Irish American activists and editors themselves, and advertiser’s embrace of positive Irish images, the Irish in America slowly escaped their racialization as the nation moved to a biracial scheme with overtones of white European solidarity. The beginning images in this chapter traced some of those changes. For African Americans, on the other hand, even as black editors used illustrations and photography to portray black dignity, either at home or abroad in the nation’s new territories, minstrel forms and the hierarchies of race science proved hard to shake. The construction of whiteness still required others, and images in periodicals drew literally citizenship’s “borders of belonging.”

---


“We have had weeklies that lasted a week and a daily that had a name though the paper itself never came.”

-- Wendell P. Dabney, Cincinnati’s Colored Citizens, 1926

“It is really remarkable…There is a great big sign under the window: ‘The Pilot, James Samuel Stemons, Editor,’ the same sign hangs overhead; the same is…on three doors. Graham’s name only appears in the paper in one place, and yet he comes to my office, and works like a slave—and advances all the money.”

-- James Samuel Stemons, 1907

James Samuel Stemons (1870-1959) was not one to set his sights low. In 1906, the former farm worker, railroad track-layer, and janitor was convinced he was on his way to becoming a major force in African American life. As a Philadelphia newspaper editor and race activist, he would solve the “Negro Problem”—defined variously as how to, or even whether to, more completely integrate blacks into mainstream American life. Neither the agriculturally focused and separatist vision of Booker T. Washington, nor W. E. B. Du Bois’s emphasis on higher education and political rights appealed to Stemons, who instead imagined blacks working alongside whites in skilled industrial jobs at decent wages. The question, to Stemons, was how to get whites to open both their hearts and their union shops to allow African Americans entry. He was convinced he had the answer, and the means to promote it in print and in person, in Philadelphia and nationwide.

The papers of J. Samuel Stemons are extensive and understudied by historians. Several boxes of materials, mainly hand-written and typed letters between


2 James Samuel Stemons (JSS hereafter) to Mary Stemons (MS hereafter), March 4, 1907, Box 1, Folder 9, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP).
Stemons and his sister, Mary, in Kansas, afford a rare, inside look at the nuts and bolts of operating a weekly black newspaper in the early twentieth century. Historians in their investigations of both mainstream and black and ethnic presses have tended to examine newspapers with extensive runs, in order to track changes in opinion or emphasis on particular topics through time. Less studied are the many hundreds of newspapers, mostly weeklies, that lasted a year or two, or perhaps just months or even days—despite the fact that these short-lived papers are increasingly representative of contemporary publishing patterns. Stemons did not become a leading figure in debates over the “Negro Problem,” and no known copies of his two brief newspaper efforts, the Courant and the Pilot, exist. But, for a brief time through these newspapers and the pamphlets and essays that he circulated, Stemons successfully branded himself an expert on African American affairs and attracted interest from some of the leading lights in black politics and culture. Precisely because he doesn’t fit perfectly into historians’ theories about the purpose and function of the black press, Stemons’s experience can be used to probe the utility of those theories. Ultimately, his political views and his strategies for success in print cannot be separated, and thus he provides clues into the influence that print as a medium and an economy had on questions of race in the early twentieth century.

Called to help his race

Stemons was born of former slave parents in 1870 in Clarkesville, Tennessee; when he was six, he and his family moved to Kansas. Little is known of Stemons’s

---

3 Biographical material on Stemons comes from, in addition to what can be gleaned from his many letters to his sister, the biographical note in the James Samuel Stemons papers at the HSP and two of Stemons’s published works: The Key: A Tangible Solution of the Negro Problem (New York: Neale Publishing Co., 1916), and As Victim to Victims: An American Negro Laments With Jews (New York: Fortuny’s, 1941). The HSP also holds Stemons’s 750-page, handwritten autobiographical novel Jay Ess.
early years, but in 1893, after he was refused a job due to his race, he decided that his life’s calling was to advocate on behalf of African Americans. He set out toward Boston on a journey of speaking to church congregations and publishing in local newspapers. In at least one letter to his sister later in his life he mentions seeing a bright light before this journey; the calling appears to have been spiritual in nature.\textsuperscript{4} From Boston in 1894 he traveled for three years through New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, delivering addresses that focused on the industrial discrimination blacks faced in the North. Stemons estimated he made more than 300 speeches, mostly in white churches.\textsuperscript{5}

From the start, Stemons sought to be both a speaker and a writer, and for several years churches would be an important but problematic venue for his reform efforts. Stemons reported that when he did secure speaking engagements with white clergymen, he was usually treated respectfully. Financially, however, he barely kept body and soul together “through the voluntary contributions that were made at my lectures,” which were, in Cleveland from 1895 to 1896, typically less than two dollars, with about one speaking gig per week. If one considers “that I had to dress, pay my lodging, subsist, and send a little money, at least once a month, to my aged parents and a sister at my home in Kansas,” Stemons wrote, “…the fact will be better appreciated that my entire work among the white churches of Cleveland was retarded, and finally abandoned” due to Stemons’s inability to raise twelve dollars to print even the bylaws of an organization he wished to start.\textsuperscript{6}

Stemons kept himself going by working as a waiter for $4.50 a week and typically ate “either a pound of broken crackers or a stale loaf of bread” each day. For two to three months in spring of 1895, he was forced “literally to take to the

\textsuperscript{4} JSS to MS, Jan. 19, 1907. Box 1 Folder 8, HSP.
\textsuperscript{5} Stemons, \textit{The Key}, 85.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 91.
proverbial tall timber,” sleeping in various forests “with a bunch of leaves for a bed and a fire of broken branches to prevent my freezing.” He struggled to keep a respectable appearance, washing himself and his clothes in forest streams. Stemons reported that one white pastor “placed his hand affectionately on my shoulder and said: ‘Mr. Stemons, you must not feel in any way humiliated by what I am about to say, for you are doing a very noble and heroic work…But tell me; am I right in believing you to be on the verge of starvation?’”

Stemons spent the winter and spring of 1897 in Buffalo, New York, “one of bitterest and most depressing periods of my entire life.” Journalists there seemed to like him—the Buffalo Express, Stemons said, followed his efforts and editorialized “on the necessity of diversified employment for Negroes”—but most clergymen gave him the cold shoulder. One sympathetic pastor, however, himself “a publisher on a small scale,” agreed to finance the printing of Stemons’s manuscript, “A Cry From the Oppressed,” in booklet form (the race of the pastor is not mentioned in Stemons’s account, but was presumably white). Stemons called the booklet a “flat failure,” but by selling it door-to-door he paid back the publisher and raised enough money to leave Buffalo. His sights set on Philadelphia, he stopped over in Rochester, where he received excellent newspaper coverage and secured several speaking spots in area churches, both black and white. Stemons claims several reformers of both races in Rochester begged him to stay, but he moved on.

Philadelphia, like Buffalo, was unwelcoming, at least at first. White pastors wouldn’t let Stemons speak to their congregations, and although black preachers were more receptive, Stemons claimed “their universal custom of excluding all

---

7 Ibid., 93.
8 Ibid., 94.
9 Ibid., 98-99.
10 Ibid., 98-100.
secular topics from their pulpits on the Sabbath” prevented Stemons from gaining “an adequate hearing among the colored people.” Although his vision for change did not involve agitating for immediate social and political equality for African Americans, Stemons’s confrontational stance against racism in the workplace may still have put him at odds with many black churches after Reconstruction. By the late nineteenth century, churches were “the largest and most powerful institution in the black community,” owing property worth $26.6 million in 1890 and more than twice that by 1906. Church membership among African Americans grew from 2.6 million in 1890 to 3.6 million in 1906. One historian of the black church in the South writes that although it remained a source of emotional and material support and a “theme of protest” can still be detected, the black church overall in the early Jim Crow years did not resist the prevailing values of separation and accommodation and “came to be seen more and more as a social rather than a political institution.” Yet different denominations had different characteristics; Robert Gregg explores black Methodist Churches in Philadelphia, one of which Stemons would work with, and finds a complex “uplift” ideology that could encompass both accommodation and protest. For Stemons, Philadelphia churches would remain a source of both support and frustration.
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11 Ibid., 101.
12 William E. Montgomery, Under Their Own Vine and Fig Tree: The African American Church in the South, 1865-1900 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), 342.
13 Ibid., 339.
14 Ibid., 336.
15 Robert Gregg, Sparks From the Anvil of Oppression: Philadelphia’s African Methodists and Southern Migrants, 1890-1940 (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993), 4-5. Sparks finds the black Methodist church in Philadelphia was almost exclusively composed of a “middling” class African Americans; that is, a working class of laborers and servants of more means than the highly impoverished, but below the city’s black businessmen.
Despite his initial poor reception in Philadelphia, Stemons made his stand there, and became for a short time a known reformer in the city. Philadelphia in the late nineteenth-century had one of the largest populations of African Americans of any city in the nation, and was home to a liberal Quaker tradition as well as black institutions catering to black migrants out of the South. In fact, Stemons’s association with one black Methodist church newspaper would place him amid an area known for its crime and poverty—as well as its zeal for experiments in social reform.\textsuperscript{16}

The bulk of the letters in the Stemons collection begin with Stemons’s acceptance of the position of editor in 1906 at the \textit{Courant}, which had been up to then a church newspaper focused only on church affairs. Before Stemons took the helm, the \textit{Courant} had been edited by A. P. Caldwell, who ran what Stemons called “perhaps the strangest colored church in the city.” (It is uncertain what Stemons found so strange about Caldwell’s church, Wesley A.M.E. Zion. Started in 1820, “Big Wesley” was one of the city’s largest black churches, with a congregation of around 2,000 in 1907.\textsuperscript{17} At Fifteenth and Lombard streets, it lay within the Seventh Ward, home to one in five Philadelphia African Americans around the turn of the century and the focus of W. E. B. Du Bois’s famous sociological study, \textit{The Philadelphia Negro}.)\textsuperscript{18} Stemons said he sought the \textit{Courant} out “because it has no real personality; it is no positive force and has no positive character behind it. Yet, strange to say it has pretty good backing.” Caldwell, Stemons wrote Mary, was an impressive young man,

\begin{footnote}{16}Muhammad, \textit{Condemnation of Blackness}, 146, 148.\end{footnote}
\begin{footnote}{18}W. E. B. Du Bois, \textit{The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study} (1899; New York: Schocken Books, 1967).\end{footnote}
but “he has utterly failed to infuse The Courant with the force which is so manifested in him as an individual.”

Weeklies like the *Courant* remained vital sources of information for many Americans, especially rural Americans, until well into the twentieth century. Frank Luther Mott places the high point of weekly newspapers in 1914-15, and notes that weeklies in rural areas held their own for some time against daily papers that started free rural delivery. In fact, weeklies became more local in nature, and editors found that “small items, using hundreds of names, increased circulation.” Mott calls the late-nineteenth century the age of “personal journalism.” Nineteenth and early twentieth century black weekly newspapers would have shared many similarities with their white or mainstream weekly counterparts. Thomas Clark writes of Southern “country editors” after the Civil War and up to the early 1900s,

Just as no extensive education was necessary in the editing of a weekly, so also only a limited amount of mechanical training and equipment was needed. It was possible to compose and print a paper in a remarkably small building space. A single room was frequently adequate housing. A Washington or Franklin hand press, a few cases of type, a foot-treadle job press, a pair of type sticks, a couple of iron chases, one or two galleys, a proof press, a supply of ink, a bundle of ready-print pages, a roller towel and wash pan were sufficient equipment.

But how accessible was newspaper publishing to someone like Stemons, marginalized due to his race and of very limited means? The economics of the black press mystified even Booker T. Washington, who carefully watched and in many cases partially funded and shaped the black press. In one revealing letter, Washington wrote in the summer of 1904 to Robert Curtis Ogden, a white philanthropist who

---

19 JSS to MS, Jan. 18, 1906. Box 1 Folder 6, HSP.
sat on the board of the Hampton Institute. Ogden appears to have been interested in funding the \textit{Colored American Magazine}, but had balked. Washington that summer was engineering the ouster of Pauline Hopkins from the magazine’s editorship, to be replaced by Fred R. Moore, who was much more of a Washington loyalist.\footnote{Lois Brown, ed., \textit{The Encyclopedia of the Harlem Literary Renaissance} (New York: Facts on File, Inc., 2006), 350. Online at \url{http://www.owlasylum.net/owl_underground/pdf_library/61368841-Encyclopedia-of-the-Harlem-Literary-Renaissance.pdf}. Hopkins would be ousted by September 1904; see Alisha R. Knight, “Furnace Blasts for the Tuskegee Wizard: Revisiting Pauline Elizabeth Hopkins, Booker T. Washington, and the \textit{Colored American Magazine},” \textit{American Periodicals 17} (2007): 41-64.} Washington attempted to reassure Ogden that the venture, with his backing, could work out. “Permit me to say that I appreciate the advice which you have given [Moore], but I do not think you know all the circumstances,” Washington wrote. “In the first place, the magazine has been kept alive for six or seven years and already has a circulation of between four and five thousand.” Washington thought Ogden might have been “unconsciously” comparing “the cost of such a magazine as Mr. Moore is publishing with the white magazines. It would surprise you to know how cheaply many of the publications are published and kept alive; just how it is done in all cases I confess I do not know…” Washington speculated that because Moore had his own printing press and frequently paid nothing to contributors, “I am of the opinion that the figure which he gives would put the magazine upon its feet.” Washington closed by mentioning T. Thomas Fortune and his \textit{New York Age}, which “started years ago with practically no capital behind it. At the present time that paper clears above expenses about $50 a week.” Perhaps, Washington wrote, the fact that African American publications have “not as severe competition as among the whites may have something to do with their opportunities of succeeding.”\footnote{Washington to Robert Ogden, Aug. 9, 1904. In Harlan and Smock, eds., \textit{Booker T. Washington Papers, Vol. 8}, 42-43.} Washington’s view
might have been too rosy, or designed to appease a potential investor who was getting cold feet, for Fortune’s *Age* was frequently in financial trouble.

Washington’s nemesis W. E. B.

Du Bois also struggled to secure funding for a black periodical. In the summer of 1903, he and renowned black author Charles Chesnutt discussed the idea of a national black journal. “What the Negro needs more than anything else,” Chesnutt wrote Du Bois, “is a medium through which we can present the case to thinking people, who after all are the arbiters of our destiny…” Chesnutt also thought a national black newspaper would be a good idea.24

Du Bois tried to get financing from white banker Jacob Schiff, but Schiff may have spoken with Washington, who may have nixed the project.25 Washington did not directly control editorial content at many, or possibly any, black publications; black newspapers that took some funding from Tuskegee, for example, often criticized lynching in the strongest terms possible, while Washington was much more circumspect on the issue. But Washington’s money gave him influence over editorial direction, and he stymied some black publishing ventures and black journalists with

---


which he disagreed by redirecting white philanthropy elsewhere. Because Du Bois, in 1905, had charged that several black newspapers were subsidized by Washington, and that their editorial independence had been compromised, when word got out that Du Bois himself was seeking support from wealthy whites for a race journal, T. Thomas Fortune was quick to accuse the intellectual of hypocrisy.  The Moon failed by the summer of 1906; four years later Du Bois would begin to make his mark on history in part through his editorship of The Crisis, the magazine of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).

The J. Samuel Stemons papers provide further clues to how black newsweeklies thrived, failed, or just scraped by in this period. To take the helm of a newspaper in early twentieth-century Philadelphia, Stemons would need the support of either churches or white investors. Stemons started his editorship of the Courant with no set salary. “I will receive but little renumeration for my services to the Courant, at first, and that will be on a percentage basis,” he wrote Mary. But Stemons, demonstrating a high, sometimes haughty self-confidence found throughout his letters—he often told Mary that he would soon be the most prominent spokesperson on the race issue—predicted he would soon be making at least $10 a week, “based on the increased circulation which my work on the paper will bring…” He expected to “spend every moment, night and day writing editorials” and correcting those written by Caldwell.

A month later, Stemons wrote Mary that he tried to sever his relationship.
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with the *Courant*, but Caldwell pleaded with him to stay. So Stemons submitted a proposal—he would receive seventy-five percent of the net increase in the money from circulation and advertising since he came aboard, with an income of $10 a week; fifty percent of the increase until income amounted to $15 a week, and ten percent of all increases over $15 a week. Later, Stemons would similarly have to tie his *Pilot* salary to his abilities to grow the paper.\(^{28}\)

Yet just a few weeks later, even with church sponsorship, the costs associated with publishing the *Courant* appeared to stymie its growth. Stemons and Caldwell agreed to seek funds from white philanthropists in order to expand circulation. “We are just sending out a letter to a number of monied white men asking them to grant me an interview, in order that I may interest them in my work on the *Courant*, and my desire to make of it the mouth-piece of the colored race, and also a medium for giving employment to colored youth,” Stemons wrote his sister in March of 1906, reflecting his continued interest in diversified employment for African Americans. Stemons hoped he could borrow at least $1,000 from these men, to add to the funding of the printing press. “Of course if I succeed, this will be enough money to give me a controlling interest in the Company, and will also enable me to devote my entire time to newspaper work.” Stemons told Mary he would rather ask to borrow the money, so as not to be “handicapped by charity.”\(^{29}\)

*The experience of Ida B. Wells*

Achieving part ownership in black newspapers had worked for some black journalists and reformers. It was precisely the strategy of anti-lynching activist Ida B. Wells, who found great synergy between lecturing and journalism. Born a slave in Mississippi in 1862, Wells at age 14 became the head of a household of six children

\(^{28}\) JSS to MS, Feb. 21, 1906, Box 1 Folder 6, HSP.
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after her parents died of yellow fever. She became a schoolteacher and moved her family to Tennessee and continued to teach. Wells took courses at Fisk University, and began writing for local newspapers and church weeklies under the name “Iola.” Journalism did not yet pay the bills, but it did become an important part of Wells’s identity: “The confinement and monotony of the primary [teaching] work began to grow distasteful,” she wrote in her autobiography. “The correspondence I had built up in newspaper work gave me an outlet through which to express the real ‘me’ and I enjoyed my work to the utmost.”

Yet when offered a staff writing job in the local Memphis Free Speech and Headlight, Wells, in a move she would make more than once in her life, refused and instead bought one-third ownership in the paper and became its editor (she soon shortened its name to the Free Speech). “[Every] chance she got,” writes Barbara Diggs-Brown, Wells “leveraged these offers into equity investments in publishing organizations.” She more than doubled subscriptions to the Free Speech, traveling across the Mississippi Delta to solicit subscribers and correspondents. “In nine months time I had an income nearly as large as I had received teaching and felt sure that I had found my vocation,” Wells wrote in her autobiography. “I was very proud of my success because up to that time very few of our newspapers had made any money.” For Wells, written work and public speaking worked in tandem; when Frederick Douglass was unable to raise enough funds to produce a book protesting the denial of African American participation in the Chicago World’s Fair of 1893, Wells

---

32 Duster, Crusade for Justice, 39.
raised the funds on the lecture circuit.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{Stemons and the Pilot}

Stemons, however, continued to struggle to earn a living in the print world. He soon fell out with Caldwell and the \textit{Courant}, and in early April announced his split.\textsuperscript{34} But by late 1906 he wrote his sister about a new venture, the \textit{Pilot}, which he would produce along with a white benefactor. Stemons estimated putting out an eight-page paper would cost about eighty-five dollars per week, “and that by securing ads, the paper might soon be able to bring in a little more than that weekly.” The investor agreed to put up all the money to run the paper for three months, “about $3,000,” Stemons estimated.\textsuperscript{35}

Stemons was thrilled at the prospects of independence from a church publisher, and eager to make his mark on the world, telling Mary of his new partnership with “Warren C. Graham, attorney at law (white),” nephew of ex-Philadelphia district attorney George S. Graham, a Republican and reformer.\textsuperscript{36} At first, through Graham’s financial backing, it appeared that Stemons would earn a salary. “At first my salary will be but $15 a week, with raises dependent on business,” Stemons wrote his sister. “…I have at last been taken up and placed on my feet on the strength of my individual worth.”\textsuperscript{37} In the next letter, however, the terms appear worse—Stemons would receive no salary at all, but get half the profits of the paper
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for two years, “at the end of which time, the same contract can be renewed.”

Stemons described the contract as “a most excellent arrangement, because the paper ought to soon be making a big profit,” though he admitted, “it may not run more than a month or two.” Still, that would be enough time to “do much good, and to do much to change public opinion on the race and other questions.” Optimistically, Stemons told Mary that he had quit waiting tables. He reflected upon his long fight to reach his new position, and thought back to his itinerant days in the Northeast: “Through all this I look back to that light which I saw years ago, and think of the feeling which then possessed me that there was great work laid out for me to do. Through what thorny and stony paths my bleeding feet have since been lead, no mortal will ever know. But, unworthy and unfaithful as I have been, I still feel that I have been piloted by the God of Nations.”

The paper launched some time in January 1907. In early February, Stemons wrote Mary, “Mr. Graham is just as proud of the Pilot as I am, and spends from two to six hours in the office every day working right by my side.” The Pilot was bringing in “$18 a week from our advertising. Of course this does not begin to pay our expenses. But we have two men in the field all the time, one of whom does little besides solicit advertisements.” Stemons described the paper as “creating a great sentiment throughout the city, and, I suppose, in every place where it is known. But I see there is a disposition on the part of all would be leaders to freeze me out.” Stemons sent subscription letters “to every colored preacher in the city,” but none had yet replied.

A week later, “subscriptions are coming in slowly, a few every day—not as fast as we expected, but comparatively fast. Better, I am sure, than any other colored paper does. But I had thought the unusual qualities of the Pilot would make people
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subscribe for it much more rapidly than they do.” Yet, in the next sentence, as if to renew his confidence, Stemons wrote, “But the people read it. They buy it off the newsstands. Its fame is rapidly spreading.” One problem, Stemons wrote, is that people may “fear we do not intend to continue after the February election,” a clue that, although the age of newspapers as political organs may have waned, campaign material masquerading as newsprint was still circulated.\footnote{JSS to MS, Feb. 14, 1907. Box 1, Folder 9, HSP.}

Just a few weeks into publication, Stemons feared he might not see any money from the paper. As it turned out, “the terms of the agreement is that I receive no money till after all money paid out by Graham is recovered. We now have a deficit of about $200.00. Our total expenses for publication are in the neighborhood of $50.00 a week. Our income from the paper is now about $25 a week.” Stemons wrote that he could, as a last resort, borrow money from Graham for living expenses.\footnote{Ibid.}

What were Graham’s motivations in this business arrangement? Mary must have written Stemons about Graham, perhaps being too complimentary of him for Stemons’s tastes, for in late February Stemons wrote Mary that she was “very, very much mistaken with reference to Mr. Graham,” who was “connected to this paper for business reasons, pure and simple.” (Stemons’s response also reads logically if Mary had accused her brother of being too trusting of Graham). Graham, Stemons wrote, has “no special regard for the colored race.” If Graham did not foresee a profit, “he would not continue in it one week.” Despite this fact, Stemons wrote, he rather enjoyed being associated with someone “who appreciates the fact that my talents have a commercial value.”\footnote{JSS to MS, Feb. 23, 1907. Box 1, Folder 9, HSP.}

By the end of March, Stemons wrote Mary that the \textit{Pilot} was “just paying
expenses.” Graham desired a printing press to achieve financial viability. Because, according to Stemons, a printing press cost about $2,000 and it cost about twenty dollars a week to have the paper printed, “so it can be seen that a press would pay for itself in one year, to say nothing about the job work we would do on the side.” Graham would borrow money from his uncle to get the press. “He is still elated with the prospects of The Pilot. It is really remarkable when one comes to think. There is a great big sign under the window: ‘The Pilot, James Samuel Stemons, editor.’ The same sign hangs over head; the same is is [sic] on three doors. Graham’s name only appears in the paper—in one place, and yet he comes daily to my office, and works like a slave—and advances all the money. There are but few colored newspapers which have their own plants—but I think we will be almost sure to get one.”

*Job printing*

Graham’s desire for a printing press makes sense. Many of the most successful and longstanding black newspapers in the nineteenth century were run by publishers who owned their own printing presses. In this way, a newspaper could be funded in large part by profits brought in from printing bureaucratic forms, accounting ledgers, and blank books for others. Job printing, according to a 1904 survey of the publishing industry, accounted for thirty percent of all profits (newspapers and other periodicals were fifty percent, and books and pamphlets just eleven percent). By the late-nineteenth century, however, job printing had become increasingly specialized, requiring different printing technology and techniques than newspaper printing.
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Still, the capacity to print forms, pamphlets and other materials could have made the
difference for Stemons.

By June of 1907, Mary had apparently suspected that the Pilot had folded
(it had not; “Oh, ye of little faith,” Stemons admonished his sister). “I did have to
borrow $25 from W. C. Graham to-day,” Stemons admitted, “or I would have been in
trouble about my rent and the paper too.”\(^48\) It appears that Graham either had already
left the paper, or would soon; Stemons got a new, African American investor, W. W.
Rourk, around mid-June of 1907.\(^49\) Stemons agreed to give Rourk half ownership of
the paper for several installments totaling $300, and a long-running advertisement
that would pay Stemons $10 a week. The Pilot was still alive in October of that year;
Stemons was working full-time at the U.S. Postal Service (he took the civil service
exam a few months previously), which made finding time to work on the paper
exceedingly difficult. It did, however solve his financial problems; Stemons, who
fought in vain for good jobs in the private sector for African Americans, apparently
worked for the post office for most of the rest of his long life. He immediately
promised Mary he would resume sending her money.\(^50\)

\textit{Pamphlet publishing}

The desire to further spread his ideas and profit from their circulation led
Stemons to pamphlet publishing, another example of the print economy of the late-
nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Here, the church connections forged through
his reform work were vital. In May of 1907 Stemons breathlessly wrote his sister, “I
have just written the crowning article of my life so far—THE NORTH HOLDS THE
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KEY TO THE NEGRO QUESTION.” Stemons sketched out for Mary the economics of distributing his text. “I can have 1,000 printed for less than $10, perhaps for $5. I can sell them in churches, that is I can have agents. Dr. Tindley will sell 500 in his church in little or no time, and there are other preachers who will do the same. Then I will have agents in this and other cities.” Stemons was upbeat; he thought the article would surely “revolutionize thought on the race question. It follows a line of reasoning never before, so far as I know, taken up by any other person.”

About a month later, Stemons informed Mary that he had chosen a syndicate to distribute “The Key.” “There is as you doubtless know, syndicates who place all kinds of reading matter before the traveling public—in depots and railway trains,” Stemons wrote. “In Philadelphia that syndicate is known as the Union News Co.” Stemons had visited the manager, who had offered him about five cents a sale. But this manager, Stemons wrote, stressed that the pamphlet would be “in the hands of no less than 250 agents…in all railway depots in charge of the Union News Co. … [and] placed directly in the hands of every traveler by the news boys in trains.”

Though Stemons was optimistic about the Union New Co., he told Mary that too many “petty white news dealers…turn up their noses at the book as soon as they see it.” Stemons saw “a giant conspiracy throughout the country among newspaper and magazine editors to foster sentiment against the Negro.” He had received a letter from “one of the best known white editors in the country,” who he said intimated to him, confidentially, that white editors would no longer publish anything sympathetic to
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black rights.  

Could this have been true in the “nadir” of African American rights, marked by the end of voting rights in the South, lynching, and the birth of Jim Crow? Though it would be hard to define a particular “worst” year for African Americans during the period, the end of 1906 shattered many black hopes for strong federal action in defense of civil rights, when President Theodore Roosevelt summarily dismissed black soldiers dubiously accused of fomenting a riot in Brownsville, Texas. A search of “the negro problem” in Google’s Ngram Viewer (Fig. 47), which uses a database of approximately 1.16 million books published in the United States between 1800 and 2000, shows that the frequency of the phrase skyrocketed in print in the early 1900s, reaching a preliminary peak in 1907 and topping out in 1911. Other search terms, such as “negro,” “the negro race” and “negro citizenship” all show peaks in the early twentieth century right around 1907 (other high points are predictably during the Civil War and during the civil rights movement), the very moment of Stemons’s forays into newspaper publishing. Whether Stemons is right or wrong about white publishers turning against African Americans in 1907, Google’s Ngram Viewer makes a strong case for the year as a high point for sheer volume of writing about African Americans, at least in book publishing. With African Americans
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and their relationship to the nation at large in the news, Stemons would try to lift his
own ideas to prominence over others.

Figure 47. Google’s Ngram Viewer shows the phrase “the negro problem” peaking
around 1907.

Historians on the black press

How does Stemons’s experience support or modify scholarly analyses of the
black press? Stemons, in the early twentieth century, entered into a long tradition of
African American agitation in print. The first African American newspaper, Freedom’s
Journal, was published in New York in 1827 by Samuel Eli Cornish and John Brown
Russwurm. Its editors sought to provide an authentic black voice, for others had
“too long spoken for us.”57 Thousands of black newspapers have been published
since, though many are lost. A comprehensive bibliography of African-American
newspapers and periodicals, published in 1998, contained more than 6,500 entries,
many of which were newspapers.

From Garland Penn’s The Afro-American Press and Its Editors in 1891,
the first historians of the black press generally described it as a “champion” of an
“oppressed people,” as a “fighting press.”58 Vishnu V. Oak wrote that no other black

57 James P. Danky, ed. African American Newspapers and Periodicals: A National
58 William G. Jordan, Black Newspapers and America’s War for Democracy, 1914-
institution “has helped so whole-heartedly in the acceleration of the social, economic, and political progress of the Negro as its press.” Later scholars looked more closely at black newspapers’ role in black communities, and found greater room for criticism. “The people who publish and write the Negro newspapers belong to the upper class,” Gunnar Myrdal wrote in 1944. To Myrdal, this gave the Negro press an “essential conservatism.” He appears to mean in social matters, however, for the reliance of the black upper classes on lower-class readers and consumers gives the press, according to Myrdal, a politically and economically “radical” stance. “The importance of the Negro press for the formation of Negro opinion...for Negro leadership and concerted action generally, is enormous.” Myrdal called the black press an “educational agency” and a “power agency” that promotes “an intense realization on the part of the Negroes of American ideals,” but simultaneously “makes them realize to how small a degree white Americans live up to them.”

Other studies also described most nineteenth-century black editors as economic and cultural elites compared to the masses of black Americans. African American sociologist E. Franklin Frazier labeled the press the “mouthpiece” of the black bourgeoisie and key to the propagation of a “myth” of a secure, black middle class. The black press, in Frazier’s view, touted the achievements of this small, economically and psychologically insecure class in an attempt to compensate for this group’s collective insecurity. Albert Lee Kreiling viewed the black press through the cultural or anthropological lens of media theorist James W. Carey. Kreiling saw
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newspapers as “arenas of symbolic action.” The black press has been a major force in creating race consciousness and in “making The Race into a symbolic entity with of life of its own…. [A] personal identity rooted in the nationwide collective life of The Race has joined the identification with church and local community life characteristic among southern blacks immediately after Emancipation.” Kreiling criticized the Northern black press for painting too pretty a picture of Northern freedoms, but thought the press successfully reoriented small-town African American migrants toward a broader, collective black identity in an rapidly urbanizing, secular society.

Historian William G. Jordan concentrates on the time period (1914-1920) just after James Samuel Stemons’s newspaper venture, yet accurately describes many rhetorical techniques and notions characteristic of Stemons’s publishing efforts. Jordan seeks to move beyond the “accommodation/protest,” “Booker T./Du Bois” dichotomies, for there was a “profound ambivalence” in the black press as a whole in this time period, as well as idiosyncrasies and indeterminacies. Black ambivalence is not cloudy thinking or indecision, in this view; rather, “it flows from writers’ efforts to use language to motivate powerful white reader to attempt to improve race relations in America,” without promoting white backlash. In this ever-shifting field, black journalists should be “judged by the impact of their words rather than by the logical consistency of their arguments.” Editors cast themselves as arbitrators
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between black and white worlds, and were accepted as such. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century black newspapers developed “a balance between militancy and accommodation shaped by... [the] personality and ideology of publisher, the state of race relations in the local area, the relationship of the publisher to local political parties, recent events, and the requirements of a particular situation or moment.” Jordan finds that southern black papers did become less militant and more interested in social and economic advancement of individuals after withdrawal of federal troops in the South. Three factors contributed: Jim Crow, ascendancy of ideology of industrial capitalism (and its individualism), and the escalation of vigilante violence.

Stemons did hope to become an arbitrator between black and white, and some of his thinking straddled the protest/accommodation divide that Jordan wisely critiques. And as has already been shown, casting Stemons as an “elite” is problematic. Stemons’s single-minded determination to make his own mark in reform efforts, to establish himself as an expert on black-white relations and the “Negro Problem,” does fit well with analyses of the late-nineteenth century as a time of heightened individualism. But as will be seen, for Stemons, the drive to be heard involved entering into prevailing discourses of race and poverty, which weakened his critique of personal and institutional white racism.

Politics in an economy of words

What were Stemons’s ideas for African American success and improved race relations? Stemons’s letters and his occasional articles printed in other newspapers reveal his arguments at the heyday of the so-called Negro Problem.

Stemons’s vision was different from that of Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. Du Bois, the leading, and conflicting, African American thinkers and activists of
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the time. Stemons objected to the demand for immediate political and social rights for African Americans, and in this way he supported part of Washington’s vision against that of Du Bois. Such protests would spark white backlash; they would “only result in increased friction between the races.” Stemons had always said, he wrote Mary, that African Americans must “withdraw from politics in some parts of the south” or “race hatred and riots would be the inevitable result...Time has proved that I was right.” Furthermore, putting political rights before the economic put the cart before the horse, according to Stemons. Like Washington, Stemons believed that earning a livelihood and creating wealth were the only things that could secure full citizenship rights for African Americans.69

Yet attempting to advance African American economic well-being in a sphere separate from the mainstream U.S. economy struck Stemons as absurd. “[T]he strange and pernicious doctrine that Negroes should create their own opportunities, instead of seeking to share in the common opportunities of a common country, has spread with such frightful rapidity as to make it appear presumptive and far-fetched to urge for Negroes any opportunities other than such as they personally create,” Stemons wrote in the Chicago Broad Ax.70 This critique of Washington’s program might stand today as a description of a certain political conservatism at the heart of black separatist and self-help philosophies. Stemons continued:

The fact that the gifted few among Negroes have not the means… to thus in one generation, or in a dozen generations, develop industries and enterprises sufficient to furnish adequate employment to the millions who are not gifted, matters not to the voteries of this perversive doctrine of race exclusion, separation, and self-sufficiency—a hardship which no one even thinks of entailing upon the nearly one million of aliens who annually come to these shores. Indeed, so well have an element of Negroes succeeded in establishing
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the idea that they are a distinct and separate part of the social fabric
that the average philanthropist, employer or what not, feels that he
has fulfilled his highest possible duty to the race when he gives a few
hundred, or a few thousand dollars to some Negro institution, any
opportunity which he may offer the Negro of working to make an
honest living being regarded by him as a superfluity…

Jobs in industry would save African Americans; the seemingly endless debates over
what type of education blacks should receive—Washington’s more rudimentary
agricultural and vocational curriculum, verses Du Bois’s classical schooling for a
“talented tenth”—were, to Stemons, a distraction. “The hypothesis that education and
a certain degree of civil and political freedom must of themselves either convert the
Negro into a high and noble type of citizen or prove conclusively that he is incapable
of attaining to such development,” Stemons wrote in a 1907 essay, “is a sophistry
which seems to be gaining in popularity.” Stemons sought African American
advancement in stable, secure, and fairly reimbursed jobs with white Americans
in, for example, manufacturing; this would uplift the race, and differed from the
“industrial” focus in Tuskegee’s curriculum, which was designed to train teachers to
teach farming and various trades.

Stemons saw one opportunity for industrial jobs for African Americans when
the steel industry in Pennsylvania put out a call for more workers. In the spring of
1907, as he was busy at the helm of the Pilot, Stemons clipped an article from the
Philadelphia Public Ledger (daily, 1846-1942) concerning an offer to Pennsylvania
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the liberal arts question precisely because a black future in the professions or in
thriving private enterprise or in expanding corporate management was completely
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working men from steel magnate Charles M. Schwab, the owner of the Bethlehem Steel Company. Schwab proposed to “pay apprentices living wages while [they received] technical training at the steel works”; he sought to create “the greatest manual training school in the world.” Archibald Johnston, president of Bethlehem Steel, in the article urged young people in Pennsylvania’s Lehigh Valley to take up Schwab’s offer and move into financial security, “equipped to hold [their] own against the best workers the rest of the world can produce,” lest they “become the poorly paid store clerk, the common laborer, one of that vast army of men whose pitiful story of poor wages, restricted opportunities, with the far more dreadful story of little children forced into mills and sweatshops, is all summed up in the few words, ‘He has no trade.’”

Stemons’s own long, difficult hours as a waiter and janitor no doubt shaped his beliefs in the importance to African Americans of just such opportunities. Stemons wrote Johnston on April 29, according to a letter in the Stemons files dated May 4. Stemons must have asked Johnston if he could arrange for young African Americans of Philadelphia to attend such a school, for Johnston’s assistant wrote back, “There being practically no Negroes in our community, I am afraid that the surroundings would not be any too congenial to the boys of your race.” No positions could be given to African Americans because few African Americans lived nearby, a racial Catch-22 that Stemons no doubt anticipated.

Stemons and the politics of respectability

Though Stemons’s background was hardscrabble, his ideas could be elitist. Stemons’s key to getting Northern industry to hire blacks involved encouraging better behavior on the part of a certain element of the black community; if such people could become more respectable, or could be isolated so that whites could
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distinguish them from the majority of upright African Americans, Stemons believed, whites would be more likely to hire blacks. Chapter Thirteen of Stemons’s *The Key* is titled “The Obtrusive Negro.” Stemons considered the charge that “a class of American Negroes” have “an irrepressible fondness for attracting attention and making themselves obnoxiously conspicuous,” and concluded that it is “persistent and, it must be admitted, well founded.” Who in the North, Stemons said, has not seen “a crowded street car hushed to everything save the vociferous babblings of a half-dozen ignorant and uncouth Negroes?” Taking these observations as a given, and separating this class from the “quiet and well-bred deportment” of the “intelligent Negro,” Stemons asked why some African Americans should act in such a fashion. He blamed race prejudice; the consistently polite “European Negro,” after all, “regards his social freedom as a matter of course,” while “three centuries serfdom” had taught black Americans that they were viewed as inferior to whites. This caused an uncouth element of African Americans to “feel called upon to be ever on the alert to force the impression that they are the equals of white men.” This was an entirely human reaction, Stemons concluded; white men kept down for ages would similarly puff up their chests and declare their manhood when given new freedoms. In a qualified call for change, Stemons wrote: “So long as [the African American’s] social status (and the word *social* is here used as applied to democracy) alternates between absolute segregation and the most scant and reluctantly accorded freedom, so long will he revel in and exploit that freedom in a way repulsive to those who have never known such restraints.”

Stemons fingered white racism as the cause of such obtrusiveness, but his division of African Americans into good and bad groups blunted his critique, which veered toward the essentialism of the era’s race science.
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Stemons’s parenthetical caveat in the quote above already suggested he would not push for “social equality” and would instead be willing to leave much of Jim Crow intact. In fact, his next paragraph, the penultimate paragraph of The Key, is ambiguous; Stemons called again for white men to make “rigid distinctions” between two classes of Negro, the “vicious” and the “upright,” the “refined” and the “uncouth,” which would stress to African Americans that “any recognition of their race…is a recognition solely of individual worth…” This, until “the time when all distinctions because of race or color shall be relegated to the dark and dismal past.”

The passage reflects the ambiguity of the era’s politics of respectability, a discourse in which Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham finds both accommodation and resistance. In her study of black Baptist churchwomen from 1880 to 1920, Higginbotham shows that in addition to chastising the poor for immoral behavior, the laity, in their focus on respectability and propriety, could challenge white power structures for their failure to live up to their professed ideals of equality and justice.

Khalil Gibran Muhammad, one of a few historians to write about Stemons, focuses on his 1909-10 activism, after his newspaper editorships ended and he engaged in what Muhammad calls a kind of hybrid campaign for both black economic empowerment and black crime reduction. Muhammad writes that Stemons’s rhetoric about, essentially, good and bad African Americans, “crossed the line into criminalizing jobless and underemployed blacks, diluting the strength of his attack on industrial repression.” He writes:

which consistently pushed against environmental or societal explanations for health and crime disparities between blacks and whites, and toward biological causes. Muhammad examines Hoffman’s enduring influence in The Condemnation of Blackness.
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For black writers and reformers…highlighting black criminality was a double-edged sword. At the same time that it carved out space to create a dialogue with liberal whites about racism’s consequences and middle class blacks about their duty to the race, it defended the conservative self-help solution that dominated the pace of racial reform before Washington’s death in 1915 and the onset of the Great Migration. This conservative edge was not what Stemons or Du Bois had intended to use…

Stemons was not the only black thinker to alternate between racialist thinking and an emphasis on more environmental and economic explanations for black poverty and crime. Scholars have long noted the same in W. E. B. Du Bois’s early writings. In The Philadelphia Negro, written less than ten years before Stemons’s writings explored here, Du Bois alternately echoes and attacks aspects of Social Darwinist thought. “The Negro is as a rule,” he writes at one point, “willing, honest and good-natured; but he also is as a rule, careless, unreliable and unsteady.” The passage recalls T. Thomas Fortune’s remarks about African Americans in Chapter 2.

While Stemons may have indeed contributed to what Muhammad describes in his book as the association of crime with blackness, Muhammad may still

81 Muhammad’s important study is not ultimately an in-depth look at Stemons’s life or politics. “This book asks,” he writes, “how did European immigrants—the Irish and the Italians and the Polish, for example—gradually shed their criminal identities while blacks did not? In other words, how did criminality go from plural to singular?” (p. 5) Muhammad traces how “ideas of racial inferiority and crime” became attached to African Americans, while “ideas of class and crime”—notions more productive of state-based anti-crime efforts—became associated with European immigrants and the white working class (p. 6).
underplay Stemons’s vigorous, longstanding belief that distinguishing between upstanding and venal African Americans was the key to improved race relations, producing greater white acceptance and hiring of blacks that would lead to economic empowerment. Stemons’s conservatism is not merely tactical; it may emerge from his work with the black Methodist church, and as suggested in Chapters 2 and 3, the newspaper medium might have encouraged stereotyping of ethnic “others” through intimations of the editor’s privileged gaze and through its incorporation of minstrel humor in visual forms. As late as 1941, Stemons retained a strong attraction to racial and ethnic stereotypes. In that year he published *As Victim to Victims: An American Negro Laments With Jews*. Describing in the first pages his decades-long battle for better race relations, Stemons summed up his two-part vision: justice for African Americans must include “economic freedom”; that freedom in turn would “hinge largely on the ability of Negroes to confute and confound their traducers” by “mak[ing] themselves synonymous to all that America means in human happiness and social advancement”—an allusion to some combination of societal conformity and bootstraps-pulling self-help.\(^{82}\) Indeed, the key to black advancement lay in African Americans addressing their two biggest faults: “obnoxious and often deliberately insulting deportment in public,” and blind involvement in the country’s most “vile, corrupt, and conscienceless political machines.”\(^{83}\) Stemons wrote that his two biggest foes had always been, on the one hand “those who insist the Negro has no legitimate place in the American scheme of civilization,” and, on the other, “those who insist he ought to be accorded an immediate and unqualified share in all that America has to offer.” (The most “unscrupulous” and “blind” opposition to Stemons’s vision, he wrote, came from African Americans themselves, though he noted the black clergy
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\(^{82}\) Stemons, *As Victim to Victims*, Introduction (no page number).

\(^{83}\) Ibid., 15.
had often been an ally.\textsuperscript{84}

In \textit{As Victim to Victims} Stemons related at some length others’ critiques of anti-Semitism, including a long excerpt from black Communist James W. Ford,\textsuperscript{85} and found he agreed in general with the absurdity of anti-Jewish arguments, especially the “floundering” and “blind” suggestion that Jews were simultaneously the world’s most rapacious capitalists and its most nefarious socialists.\textsuperscript{86} But, in a chapter titled “Evaluations,” he still found “pro-Semites” too glowing in their description of Jews. They were “determined to ignore all except the most flattering facts regarding these sorely distressed people.”\textsuperscript{87} His solution to the problem of anti-Semitism was similar to his approach to the so-called “Negro Problem”: Jews must “take an inventory of their most objectionable features, and make a move to remedy them.”\textsuperscript{88} Stemons saw this approach as realistic and not derogatory of Jewish Americans. Anticipating opposition, Stemons related Abraham Cahan’s insistence that, as a Jew, he would “not be held responsible for the shortcomings of individual Jews, any more than other groups are held responsible for the antisocial forces among them.” This, to Stemons, was “just, sane, and logical,” but, “history and experience” showed that Jews and Negroes would indeed be “judged and dealt with” based on the “lowest” among them.\textsuperscript{89} After a lengthy recounting of his positive and negative experiences with Jewish merchants—some Jews, according to Stemons, had cheated him—Stemons concluded that Jews, too, should “draw a line of demarcation between themselves and the element which provides anti-Semitism with the food on which to thrive.”\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., Introduction.
\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., 144.
\textsuperscript{86} Ibid., 227.
\textsuperscript{87} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 228.
\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., 247.
As Victim to Victims received at least one mainstream review, by Richard Dewey, a sociologist at Butler University. Dewey found “refreshing” Stemons’s suggestion that blacks and Jews find reasons within their own control for their respective groups’ “unfortunate positions in American society.” Dewey found Stemons’s black typology appealing, and listed the types of African American “offenders” in Stemons’s crosshairs: “the political pawn, the prostitute, the exploiting gambler,” and those who offend by their “blatant deportment in public.” Stemons’s and his sister’s apparent attempts to develop an African American doll (alluded to in his letters to her) suggest attempts to put forward positive portrayals of African Americans, but his classificatory regime matched white notions of rigid black types.

Stemons’s individualism

Stemons never seemed to imagine mass black collective action, or even a coalition with either Booker T. Washington or W. E. B. Du Bois after bringing them over to his way of thinking. Instead, he sought to carve out his own special take on the “Negro Problem” and promote that view through media, securing a living—via subscriptions or sales, advertising revenue, and probably speaker fees—as he helped his race advance. The newspaper and his other published writings were an assertion of his views; his individual success was simultaneously an example of achievement for his race. It becomes impossible to pull out Stemons’s thinking from the print economy within which it resides. In Stemons’s mind, as long as the “Negro Problem” was a top news story of the day, competing against other black newspapers would require distinguishing one’s critique or platform from others’. Stemons was convinced his particular strategy for black advancement would “revolutionize thought on the race question.” It follows a line of reasoning never before, so far as I know, taken up

92 Biographical/historical note, J. Samuel Stemons collection, HSP.
Stemons’s specific political take on the Negro Problem was a part of providing a better product as much as attention to the quality of the newsprint, the creativity of the layout, or the amount and nature of paid advertisements.

Analyses of the black press that see its self-promotional aspects only in narrow business terms—say, how publishers might use their presses to promote their own personal enterprises—miss this relationship. Black individual success promoted black advancement and thus fought against racist views. Failure, likewise, reflected poorly on the race as a whole, adding even more stress to an already stressful occupation.

Individual achievement, of course, reflected the tenor of the times. Heather Cox Richardson interprets Washington’s biography, *Up From Slavery*, as claiming for African Americans the nation’s “free labor” ideology, which emphasized the opportunity of wage earners to rise to property-owning independence. According to Richardson, Reconstruction lost support with the broader society because African Americans began to be associated with labor interests that believed class conflict to be inevitable and who demanded government redistribution of wealth. Washington’s well-received 1895 speech at the Cotton States and International Exposition in Atlanta, known as his “Atlanta Compromise” speech, served a purpose similar to *Up From Slavery*. “Cast down your buckets where you are,” Washington repeatedly implored African Americans, and asserted that “whatever sins the South may be called upon to bear…when it comes to business pure and simple, it is in the South
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94 Scott A. Sandage has looked at “losing” in America. “Failure,” whose antebellum definition was “breaking in business,” became according to Sandage more of an identity in the nineteenth century, a marker not of circumstances largely out of one’s control, but rather of an inner lack: “I feel like a failure.” Ambition, on the other hand, was “the holy host in the religion of American enterprise.” Sandage, *Born Losers: A History of Failure in America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), 5, 11, 14.
that the Negro is given a man’s chance in the commercial world…

Stemons’s marked individualism and entrepreneurialism is reflected also in his efforts as an inventor.

In the first decades of the twentieth century Stemons designed a street indicator for use on trolley cars, a noise-making toy, and a black doll. He appears to have received patents for the indicator (Fig. 48) and the toy. His letters suggest the indicator was never constructed, partly due to lack of funds—his patent lawyer delicately discusses payment for his services in one letter in the collection—and because he struggled to find a suitable magnifying glass, presumably to enable passengers to read the street names.

New Thought’s influence on Stemons

Even Stemons’s spiritual beliefs seem to stress personal achievement over collective worship. Of course Stemons’s intense ambition, self-promotion, and


Figure 48. The 1906 patent for Stemons’s trolley car street indicator.
optimism should not be reduced to a simple product of its time—a “Gilded Age” outlook, say—any more than it should be seen as conforming to some overarching African American point of view in the “nadir.” But his letters do reveal his and Mary’s avid interest and participation in “New Thought,” a late-nineteen-century health and spirituality-centered movement roughly akin to today’s New Age philosophies. New Thought was a metaphysical belief system that peaked around the turn of the century; it could meld spiritual goals with material ones. The three figures most prominent in the movement were Phineas Quimby (1802-1866), Christian Science founder Mary Baker Eddy (1821-1910), and Emma Curtis Hopkins (1849-1925). New Thought practitioners believed in a unity of God and mind, which could heal disease and bring about prosperity.

In the spring of 1906, Stemons wrote to Mary that although “I do not get as much New Thought as I should, because…I am built [?] more in the intellectual than in the spiritual plane,” he had had great success with a new breathing technique outlined by Elizabeth Towne in her article, “Just How to Wake the Solar Plexus.”

(In a book of the same title published the following year, Towne describes how, in her life, she kept asking the “Son of God” to grant her emotional health, to no avail. Finally, she realized she was herself a “Sun” of God, built to radiate goodness outward from the body’s core, the solar—or sun—plexus). New Thought pamphlets were widely available on newsstands around the turn of the century.

Though much of New Thought involved invoking positive thoughts in order to maintain good health and fight disease, many of its followers also linked economic prosperity to a mind trained to focus on success. Towne, for example, also wrote How

JSS to MS, April 22, 1906. Box 1, Folder 7, HSP. Towne’s article is still available today; see http://newthoughtlibrary.com/towneElizabeth/solarPlexus/.

to Grow Success (1903), in which she described the “law of attraction.” Stemons’s sister appears to be the family’s chief practitioner of New Thought. “You will understand that from now till June 1st I will need all of the help that you can possibly render me through New Thought methods,” Stemons wrote his sister in the spring of 1909, hoping she would send positive thoughts his way so that he might secure a speaking position at an upcoming conference on the political and social status of African Americans in the nation. Aside from such occasional, outright calls for her metaphysical expertise, Stemons may have more typically and deliberately crafted his letters with positive affirmations to evoke his and his sister’s shared spiritual affinities and to attempt to conjure his professional aspirations. Viewed in this light, Stemons’s frequent predictions of his imminent success are less pompous litany and more hopeful mantra.

New Thought itself was, of course, a product of its time. In fact, when Stemons admonished his sister, who had begun writing a column for the Pilot, not to express “surprise and chagrin” that no reader had responded to her Popular Opinion column, his reasoning may well have been influenced by New Thought—or it may simply reflect the market ideology of the early 1900s. The two overlap. “You of course know that it is a psychological fact that if you desire to draw support to yourself you must keep up an appearance of success in your undertaking,” Stemons wrote Mary. “Just as soon as you complain and scold, that is notice to the public that you are failing in the particular of which you complain.” He added that many newspaper columnists simply respond to their own columns using pseudonyms, though he didn’t recommend this scheme to Mary.
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The Stemons brand

In the spring of 1907, after Graham left the *Pilot*, Stemons told his sister that the Rev. Tindley had said the *Pilot* was “too great a paper to let go down…He said that he saw very plainly that I am to be to the Negro question what Garrison, and Phillips, and Lovejoy and Sumner was to the slavery question, before the war. He said that the entire country will in a short time accept me as the true sentinel, to direct thought and action on this great question.”

One wonders whether Tindley might be humoring Stemons, appealing to his vanity in order to appease or manipulate. And yet, publication of the *Pilot* did bring Stemons, however briefly, local and even some national recognition. Stemons was thrilled by letters and visits he received from prominent African Americans. “’The Big Boys’ of the race have already begun to court my favor,” he wrote Mary a few weeks after the *Pilot* began publishing in early 1907. William A. Sinclair, the author of *The Aftermath of Slavery*, one of the first books to push back against Redemption histories of emancipation and Reconstruction, called the office to congratulate Stemons on publication of the *Pilot*. Sutton E. Griggs, a Baptist minister, activist, and author of the utopian novel *Imperium in Imperio* also dropped by, missing Stemons but telling Graham “that he represented some association the object of which is to promote harmony between the races.” Stemons said Griggs had planned to publish a newspaper, but thought the *Pilot* might be better able to represent his cause. The *Courant* had also given Stemons some clout; in the spring of 1906, with Stemons at the helm, he had a dust-up with Reuben Archer Torrey, a well-known white American pastor and author who conducted revival meetings throughout the country in 1906-07. Stemons had somehow torpedoed a plan
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of Torrey’s for a special revival meeting for African Americans, apparently objecting
that setting aside a race-based meeting would make African Americans think they
were not welcome at regular ones. In a curt letter, Torrey called Stemons’s view
“altogether illogical…We have had special meetings for men, but they did not think
on account of that that they would requested not to attend meetings where women
were. We have had meetings in other places for working girls, but that did not make
them think they would not be welcome at other meetings.” Torrey repeated the same
phraseology with university students, soldiers, cabmen, and policemen. “I did want
some fruit among the colored people. Their souls are as precious in God’s sight as
white people…I noticed that they were not getting to the other meetings in any large
numbers….now such a meeting is impossible. It is too late.”

According to Stemons’s letters, the nation’s two most prominent race leaders
also took note of the *Pilot*. Booker T. Washington wrote Stemons in the summer
of 1908, “On many matters you and I do not agree, but I always read your paper,
because when you do not agree with a person, you argue and do not abuse.”
Washington wrote to praise a recent Stemons editorial, “Let Southern Representation
Alone,” about calls by some (more militant) African American leaders to reduce
Southern states’ representation in Congress should they continue to deny the vote
to African Americans. Stemons mentions in 1908 at least one other letter from
Washington, on an “insignificant matter,” which Stemons took as a sign that the great
leader was threatened by him: Stemons’s book, Stemons surmised, had “already sent
Booker T. ‘up in the air.’” Earlier, in February of 1906, W. E. B. Du Bois apparently
mentioned favorably a Stemons editorial in the *Courant* and reprinted it in his
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publication, *The Moon*.107

* * * * * * * * * * *

The constant percolation of new but soon-to-disappear media ventures during the long nineteenth century deserves scrutiny. This chapter has attempted to describe this entrepreneurial landscape of newspaper startups, and its impact on debates about race and citizenship. For a short time in the first decade of the twentieth century, J. Samuel Stemons could claim the title of “race man.” He attracted the attention of African American race leaders and black and white funders. Debating race in a difficult publishing landscape could mean for African Americans casting one’s arguments in ways attractive to white philanthropists or a broader white audience. But the desire to make a name for one’s self also encouraged new thinking, even while it might encourage competition, not co-operation, with other race advocates engaged in their own print ventures. The so-called “accommodationist” black politics of the time may have emerged not exclusively from fears of white violence or from a grievous underestimation of the depth and durability of white supremacist ideologies and institutions. For activists and race leaders hoping to enter debate around the “Negro Problem,” an eye toward marketability pulled one toward crafting new, purchasable critiques and agendas. Stemons’s experience suggests that the terms “individualist” or “entrepreneurialist” could also help describe a trying, experimental era of black thought and resistance.
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Chapter 5. Patrick Ford and the Writing of Irish America

*The storm-bell of the Irish World boomed across the Atlantic with a very audible note of alarm indeed, that was heard in every mountain-glen in Ireland. There was scarcely a cabin in the West to which some relative in America did not despatch a weekly copy of the Irish World...It was as if some vast Irish-American invasion was sweeping the country with new and irresistible principles of Liberty and Democracy.*


*In appearance and manner, the editor of the Irish World is quite the opposite of the man you would figure to yourself after reading his dynamite appeals and exordiums in his own journal. Quiet and unobtrusive alike in look and speech, he is as mild a mannered man as ever scuttled a ship.*

--Major Henri Le Caron (Thomas Beach), *Twenty-Five Years in the Secret Service; the Recollections of a Spy*, 1892.

Patrick Ford made his reasons for publishing the *Irish World* clear from its 1870 start. In the newspaper’s first several years Ford printed a 1,300-word mission statement on page four, the editorial page—a kind of preamble to the paper. Though Ford’s political views would evolve over the years, much of the spirit of the statement accurately reflects the *World*s outlook, emphasis, and priorities over all four decades of Ford’s guidance of the paper.

The Irish, according to Ford, were a people, and a global one. Under the words “Read—Reflect—Act,” the mission statement first linked the newspaper to individual Irishmen, and those Irish to others worldwide. “Every journal worthy of an existence should have an aim... More, every man, whose life is not a lie, has an aim...” What is true of individuals “is true likewise of peoples.... All Irishman, and all Irishman’s sons, the world over, are part of one mighty whole.” Constant “forces

---


of attraction” drew the race “instinctively together, and knit them into an integral body.”

Religion, Ford wrote, was one unifier of the Irish. They were a “providential people,” guided by God’s right hand “through the ages, a cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night.” And the Irish were united by a common mission, which was the mission of the Irish World: first, “to achieve, in this our day, self-government for Ireland”; second, “to bear aloft…the standard of the Cross” into “every nook and corner of this land”; and third, to “hold the state true to the principles…of the Declaration of Independence” and to “confront the pretensions of Anglo-Saxon ascendancy,” which violated the Constitution and the role played by “our predecessors in the Revolution” who “won with the sword our right to citizenship.” The World would fight “a floating prejudice in this country, imported from England, that the Irish are an inferior race,” which had particularly impacted the young, who had become “weak-kneed.” The Irish are “not on this soil as intruders. All races meet here on equal footing; and no race can, with any legitimate pretensions, monopolize for itself the name American.”

The Irish World, Ford wrote, would engage in much educational work, for “an imperfect knowledge of ourselves and of our early history in this country,” forgetfulness of a “sense of self-respect which all people should retain” has enabled “vainglorious and supercilious upstarts of other nationalities to ride rough-shod over us.” Ford described the paper as “a Vehicle of News,” and listed its weekly sections, which included biographical sketches of Irish poets and other historical figures, “full of fire, spirit, and patriotism”; news from “32 counties of Ireland,” which Ford
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All this would help the Irish “assert themselves. Let them walk before the world such as they are—such as nature and grace have made them.” Anyone who agreed with these principles, Ford added, should “signify his assent by sending in his name and subscription, and getting his neighbor to do the same.” Ford ended with a final pitch, inviting “all who think with us, and share in our faith, to act with us also, and grow their faith by their works”—in other words, subscribe, at $2.50 for a full year.6

For Ford, the newspaper itself was to be a touchstone of Irish American identity. But the components of Irish American identity that Ford described in his mission statement, or would go on to embrace in the coming years—Catholicism, trans-Atlantic and worldwide solidarities, labor rights, “race,”—would prove difficult to, in his words, “knit…into an integral body.”

* * * * * * * * * *

Patrick Ford was born in Galway, Ireland, in 1837, the son of Edward and Ann Ford. The family emigrated to the United States in 1845, when Ford was a young boy. Obituaries of his parents in the *Irish World* in 1870 and 1880 claimed they were compelled to leave Ireland due to the potato famine. Ford said he had few memories of Ireland, and considered himself shaped by America and the city of Boston, where the family settled. When he was fifteen, Ford worked as a printer’s devil for famed abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison’s *Liberator*. He would cite, as an early formative moment, watching Federal troops escort fugitive slave Anthony Burns through the streets of Boston to be shipped back into slavery. Ford edited an anti-
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slavery newspaper in Boston briefly, enlisted with the Ninth Massachusetts Volunteers and fought in the battle of Fredericksburg in 1862, and after the Civil War edited a Reconstruction newspaper in South Carolina before moving to New York in 1870, where he founded the *Irish World*. Ford controlled the newspaper every year until his death in 1913, except for a brief ownership dispute with John T. Hoag in 1883. The paper remained a Ford family operation well into the twentieth century; it ceased publication in 1951.\(^7\) (Historians often describe either the *Irish World* or the Boston *Pilot* as the leading Irish American newspaper of the time; circulation figures suggest that Ford’s paper overtook the *Pilot* by the turn of the century and may explain the discrepancy.)\(^8\)

Most historians describe Ford as, for a time, a “radical” advocate of Irish independence from Britain and of the rights of the industrial worker in the United States. Scholars trace a growing conservatism in Ford’s positions as he became dismayed by labor violence and adopted more moderate positions consistent with the Catholic Church and the nation at large. Detailed examination of the *Irish World* suggests that this view is largely correct, particularly if advocacy of militant,\(^7\) The most complete biographical material on Ford and most detailed study of the content of the *Irish World* is James Rodechko’s *Patrick Ford and His Search for America: A Case Study of Irish-American Journalism, 1870-1913* (New York: Arno Press, 1976). Unusually with respect to most biographical sketches of Ford, Timothy J. Meagher reports that Ford was orphaned at an early age and that his guardians brought him to America. See Meagher, *The Columbia Guide to Irish American History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), p. 255.\(^8\) Rodechko suggests that John Boyle O’Reilly’s *Pilot* rivaled Ford’s paper in terms of influence, at least in the 1870s and possibly ‘80s. Eric Foner calls the *Irish World* the “most important” Irish American newspaper by the early 1880s; Cian McMahon cites circulation figures that put the *World* at 100,000 by 1884, surpassing the *Pilot*, though all scholars agree that such figures are rough estimates. See Rodechko, *Patrick Ford*, 42; Foner, *Politics and Ideology in the Age of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 157; and McMahon, *The Global Dimensions of Irish Identity: Race, Nation, and the Popular Press, 1840-1880* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 170-71.
organized struggle against capitalist control is one’s primary test for radicalism. Ford’s severance from the economist Henry George, advocate of a single tax on land to fight economic inequalities, was bitter and final, and by the end of his life he would denounce socialism and militant trade unionism (Ford would also end up entertaining anti-Semitic notions of Jewish financial conspiracy).

By some measures, however, Ford’s trajectory, from start to finish, is more ambiguous, and suggests space for different or additional analyses of Ford, his newspaper, and the complexities of Irish American identity. Ford’s fierce anti-imperialism remained a constant in the *Irish World*, and involved repeated, passionate calls for solidarity with (typically non-white) victims of colonialism around the globe. Simultaneously, to complicate the picture, Ford’s leading columnist, an Irish-American Protestant minister and professor, would in the late 1890s turn his back on full African-American citizenship rights, and call the Fifteenth Amendment a “mistake.” And,
importantly, elements of a more conservative Catholic outlook were present in the
*Irish World* from the start; Ford’s long-running “Temperance” column is one case in point.

This chapter will attempt to bring new light to Ford and his newspaper through attention to the newspaper medium itself, and how it both enabled and constrained Ford’s efforts to calibrate various aspects of Irish American identity. Through various sections of his paper, and via the legitimacy that a news medium lent to the actions of a network of Irish activists at home and abroad, Ford advocated for what he felt was best for the “Irish race.” If stretching Irish sympathies around the globe threatened to dilute a vigorous Irish American identity based largely on Ireland’s quest for independence, perhaps a Gaelic-language column could refocus the Irish on their roots. On the other hand, if Catholic German-Americans were pushing for German-language priests and dioceses—a plan Ford perceived as threatening Catholicism, and perhaps Irish ascendency in Catholic America—Ford might defend the dominance of the English language in America. Separate races and cultures across the globe should unite against empire based on their common human rights—but defending Catholicism might also mean promoting it as a better “civilizer” of “savages” than Protestantism. In the *Irish World*, the benchmarks of Irish American identity orbited around each other in constant, sometimes conflicting interplay.

*Imagined communities*

Media influence on racial and ethnic identity should not be taken for granted. Can the press really create identities, or does it merely respond to, or at most magnify or modify, group and individual self-conceptions that stem from other sources? Especially since Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, many scholars seem confident that print media is historically and intimately tied to notions of nationhood
and race.9 Jeremy Popkin writes convincingly of the explosion of print media in Revolutionary France, which “altered the basic framework for daily life for much of the population and created new frameworks for social interaction.”10 In fact, Popkin stresses the speed with which media can prompt new forms of identity. Print media, Popkin agrees, performs the roles described in Anderson’s “imagined community” and James W. Carey’s ritual view of communication, with its maintenance of a structured reality. But each theorist stresses gradual processes of identity formation. According to Popkin, studying media in the French Revolution “directs attention to sudden processes of identity transformation,” not just maintenance; media can “restructure identity and redefine community boundaries” with surprising speed.11

Kevin Kenny, in a discussion of the challenges posed to scholars when speculating on the sensibilities of historical groups such as the Irish, cautions historians to resist taking the views of elite nationalists and their publications as a stand-in for those of their whole group, especially the poor and minimally literate. “Themes of banishment, exile, and regeneration can certainly be found in the Irish American ethnic press and in popular literature and culture,” Kenny writes, but “projecting onto the mass of ordinary migrants such a conception, especially a transnational identification with Irish settlers elsewhere,” can be a mistake.12 Ford’s fundraising efforts, through campaigns in the newspaper, may provide one way of gauging among Irish Americans the depth and scope of identification with Ford’s solidarities and viewpoints, and will be discussed below.

In the 1870s and through much of the 1880s, Ford sought to combine Irish nationalism with domestic, radical social reform. To understand this time period, Kenny writes, “it is necessary to think of the American Irish in a trans-national setting, a single, complex and diverse Irish culture that existed simultaneously on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.”\(^\text{13}\) Ford and his newspaper stood at this nexus. But other Irish American activists had their own ideas of who the Irish were and what they stood for—and many of them had their own newspapers.

Three major and competing strains of Irish American nationalism existed in the late 1870s. The revolutionary Fenians, who, in an attempt to hurt Britain had launched several abortive raids on Canada shortly after the Civil War, had by the late-1870s become overshadowed by the secretive Clan na Gael, founded in New York City and led by John Devoy, strong-willed editor of the *Irish Nation* (1881-85) and the *Gaelic-American* (1903-28). (A leader of the Fenians, New York-based Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, was himself the editor of a newspaper, the *United Irishmen*.)\(^\text{14}\)

In 1877, the Clan bound itself to the Irish Republican Brotherhood in Dublin. A more popular but far less militant strain than these “physical force” nationalists was the constitutionalism of Charles Stewart Parnell (1846-91) and his mass Catholic movement for Home Rule, which sought constitutional autonomy rather than complete independence for Ireland.\(^\text{15}\)

Finally there were the radical social reformers, chief among them Michael Davitt in Ireland, who would visit New York in 1878

\(^\text{14}\) Ibid., 173.
on a successful fundraising tour, and, in New York, Patrick Ford. These activists combined concerns with land ownership and labor rights in both America and Ireland with their quest for Ireland’s independence.

In the first two or three years of the World, Ford did not seem particularly focused on labor or social issues. After the depression of 1873 and into the 1880s, however, Ford’s sympathy for the working class comes through strongly. He was particularly concerned that repression in 1877 against the Molly Maguires—a secretive group of coal miners in Pennsylvania’s Schuylkill region who fought violently against mine owners—would fall upon Irish Americans as a whole. A Pinkerton detective had tied the group to the

Figure 48. Irish World front page, March 11, 1877.
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Davitt (1846-1906) was born during the Great Famine to a farming family in West Ireland. The family was eventually evicted and settled in East Lancashire. Davitt lost his right arm as a child, while working at a spinning machine in an English factory. Imprisoned on weapons charges related to his membership in the Irish Republican Brotherhood, Davitt upon his release traveled to New York, where he met Henry George. See T. W. Moody, Davitt and Irish Revolution, 1846-1882 (London: Oxford University Press, 1982), and Laurence Marley, Michael Davitt: Freelance Radical and Frondeur (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).
Ancient Order of Hibernians, an Irish American fraternal and aid organization. When eleven men, allegedly members of the group, were hanged on June 21, 1877, Ford doubted they received a fair trial, or even if the Molly Maguires existed at all. If the men were indeed guilty, Ford asked, what caused them to commit the crimes? “The grinding tyranny of the coal ring!” he answered. “Drive a rat into a corner and he will fight back.” As tough times for workers continued, and massive strikes by railroad workers in 1877 rocked the nation, Ford became increasingly concerned with the lives of workers. He denounced an economic order of railroad barons, “coal rings,” and other business interests that tyrannized workers. In rejecting a militia law in Illinois that he said forbade workingmen in Chicago from marching with muskets, he went so far as to hint at armed resistance: “There might arise circumstances in which the ballot-box would need support of the cartridge box.”

In the final weeks of December 1878, Ford added “and American Industrial Liberator” to his newspaper’s masthead. In an article titled, “The Irish World’s Sub-Head,” Ford reprinted the “outline” of a conversation he had with a friend, who wished the *World* had a name that sounded “more American.” When Ford objected, “Is not the Irish World a good enough American paper?” the friend insisted that it was one of the best American papers in the country, but that too many were missing its excellent coverage of “the Money Question and the Labor Question” because they thought the *World* must deal only with “Ireland and sad Irish news.” Ford claimed, “many others have spoken and written to the same effect,” and agreed to add the subhead. “How do you like it, reader? How does our subhead satisfy you?”

It would take the threat of famine to solidify the different strains of Irish
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17 *Irish World*, June 3, 1877.
18 Rodechko discusses whether Ford embraced socialism in *Patrick Ford*, 74-76, and determines he did not.
20 Ibid., Dec. 12, 1878.
nationalism into what was dubbed the New Departure. Two successive crop failures in Ireland in 1879 threatened another famine and increased agitation among farmers for decreases in rents, and Davitt’s organizing led to the Land League, which the constitutionalist Parnell led and which demanded a halt to evictions and “the land for the people”—the institution of laws to enable Irish tenants to fairly purchase the land they worked. Parnell’s 1879-80 trip to the United States to raise funds for the Land League was a huge success—he gathered $300,000—and Ford “found himself at the vanguard of a radical movement headed by Michael Davitt on one side of the ocean and the trade union movement of New York City on the other.”21 In January 1881 Ford declared, “Every wage slave in America—every workingman—has a direct and vital interest at stake in this movement. Liberate the soil and you liberate the loom and the forge. Destroy the occupation of the landlord in Ireland and you sound the doom of the factory lord of America…The cause of the poor tenant in Donegal is the cause of the factory slave in Fall River.”22 Such rhetoric, and Ford’s and Davitt’s friendship with radical economist Henry George and adoption of a plan to eliminate private property in land in Ireland, brought backlash, however, from conservative clergy, who objected to what sounded like socialism, and from Devoy and other Irish nationalists, who feared that the primacy of Irish independence was being sacrificed on idealistic altars of social revolution. Conservatives cut Ford out of the loop, attempting to channel all Land League funds directly to counties in Ireland. Ford formed his own group, and raised $350,000 for the league, but the New Departure was all but over by 1882.23

Without a doubt, Ford’s ability to raise significant funds for “physical force”

---

22 *Irish World*, Jan. 8, 1881. Fall River, a Massachusetts textile town that was the largest in America, saw several spinners’ strikes in the 1870s.
nationalism in Ireland in the mid-1870s, and, during the New Departure, for the Land Leagues in the late ‘70s and early ‘80s, demonstrates that many “ordinary” Irish Americans did indeed identify strongly with much of Ford’s trans-Atlantic sympathies and political views. In 1876, Ford headed the Skirmishing Fund, which would raise money for armed conflict, including dynamite bombings of British targets. The World frequently pitched readers to send in money and regularly listed recent contributors. A Skirmishing Fund column in March 1877 is typical, listing donations from groups called “The Trans-Atlantic Club,” and “The Skirmishing Sons of Liberty,” from the Wisconsin towns of Trimbelle and Ellesworth, respectively. “We have not forgotten the artificial famine of ’48, or the men judicially murdered,” wrote Bernard Casey of Trimbelle. “$15 to aid in demolishing the broken arch of London bridge,” wrote Michael O’Shea, of McAlister, Indiana. Most listed donations were three dollars or less, often just one dollar. Eric Foner has examined Ford’s Land League lists in the Irish World and determined that here too, working class support was widespread for Ford’s fundraising.

**Ford in the 1890s and beyond**

In broad outline, historians agree on the factors influencing Ford’s move away from militant support for labor and land reform in the 1880s. After the Haymarket Affair in 1886, when a dynamite bomb thrown by someone in the crowd during a labor protest killed several police and reinvigorated a nativist backlash,
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24 For a discussion of Ford and the financial disputes over the Skirmishing Fund, see Joyce, *Editors and Ethnicity*, 167-68.

25 *Irish World*, March 3, 1877. More recently, Niall Whelehan has pinpointed support for skirmishing and revolutionary violence in general as coming from first-generation working class Irish Americans originally from Western and Southern Ireland, the areas hardest hit by the Famine. See *The Dynamiters: Irish Nationalism and Political Violence in the Wider World, 1867-1900*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Irish Americans risked being associated with anarchists and a “foreign element.” Ford began to disfavor labor strikes and physical force nationalism in favor of parliamentary tactics.\textsuperscript{27} Henry George’s criticisms of the Catholic Church, and his failure to support the tariff, also dismayed Ford.

Scholars might also consider Ford as a publisher. Though the lack of personal papers makes it difficult to get behind the scenes at the \textit{Irish World}, some insights can be gleaned from existing sources. The 1880s were a particularly difficult time financially for Ford. John Devoy harangued him to repay a $12,000 loan attained years earlier from the Skirmishing Fund. Ford lost control of the paper briefly in 1883, and other investors claimed that they lost money and that Ford used fundraising campaigns for Ireland fraudulently, to support his newspaper.\textsuperscript{28} Ford neither ran many advertisements in the \textit{World}, nor used a family publishing company to print anything but the \textit{World}. With his early circulation figures below 50,000 in most of the 1870s, financial strain might be expected.\textsuperscript{29}

Ford’s solution was Republic party patronage, starting in 1884. He was not alone among New York Irish nationalists. The Republican and Democratic parties were in “unstable equilibrium” in the early 1880s, and Irish nationalists and reformers saw an opportunity to gain Republican patronage and influence in return

\textsuperscript{27} Discussion of Ford’s break with George and his move to the center can be found in Rodechko, \textit{Patrick Ford}, 92-93 and 183-95, and Bruce Nelson, “Irish Americans, Irish Nationalism, and the ‘Social Question,’ 1916-1923,” \textit{boundary 2} (Spring 2004): 155-56.

\textsuperscript{28} Rodechko, \textit{Patrick Ford}, 38-39. Rodechko’s source for the fraud claim is Patrick Meehan’s \textit{Irish-American}, a competing newspaper; Ford denied the charges in the \textit{Irish World}. But the claims are likely at least partially true; when Ford acted as a distributing agency for Henry George’s \textit{Progress and Poverty}, George received several complaints that Ford was mishandling money from sale of the book. See Rodechko, 42.

\textsuperscript{29} Rodechko, 41-42; McMahon, \textit{Global Dimensions}, 171; Joyce, \textit{Editors and Ethnicity}, 168.
for pulling enough Irish away from their longtime party, the Democrats, to allow Republican presidential candidate James G. Blaine to defeat Grover Cleveland in national elections. Ford, Devoy, and other Irish American nationalists aligned with the Republicans. Competing Irish American papers claimed Ford received anywhere from $24,000 to $50,000 from the party during and after the election. Cleveland won the election anyway, but many observers at the time thought the strategy would have worked had it not been for the remarks of a Presbyterian clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Burchard, who, with Blaine present, described the Democrats as the party of “rum, Romanism, and rebellion,” a slight against the Irish that checked their move to the opposite party.30

It is also likely, but harder to trace, that Ford’s positions relate in part to how he perceived the Irish World’s subscriber base. A strong labor position in the paper’s early years would have matched New York City’s Irish demographics. Though conditions after the 1846 Famine improved in Ireland, most emigrants arrived in the city looking for unskilled, menial labor.31 The majority of Irish drove horses, unloaded ships on the docks, hauled bricks (or hods) on constructions sites, served patrons in bars and restaurants, or cleaned houses and took care of children. Could such a group provide Ford’s readership? It seems possible. By 1900, ninety-five percent of emigrants leaving Ireland were literate.32 Furthermore, Ford surely observed New York’s German-American community and its response to labor unrest around the time he started the World. German piano-makers joined a movement for an eight-hour workday in the spring of 1872; William Steinway responded by forming an employers’ association and used the conservative New Yorker Staats-Zeitung to

32 Ibid., 215.
portray the workers as militant communists promoting class war. The *Staats-Zeitung* became the voice of New York’s German middle and upper classes, but another paper, the *New Yorker Volkszeitung*, achieved success as the voice of New York’s socialist movement. Its first editor, like Ford, had run an abolitionist press in the Civil War.\(^\text{33}\)

At first glance, changing demographics suggest no need for Ford to tone down his support for labor; by 1900, about sixty-five percent of New York’s Irish were still unskilled or semi-skilled workers. Yet the Irish were making economic progress, and an increasing number of foremen, engineers, firemen, conductors, carpenters and electricians could be seen on the streets, railways, and worksites of the city. The Irish were drawn to journalism and other professions; in 1890s the number of Irish white-collar professionals more than doubled, from 4.3 percent to 10.3 percent.\(^\text{34}\) The Irish were becoming better integrated into American life, marked by their presence in show business and sports and the move of upper-working class and lower-middle class Irish from Brooklyn to Manhattan and the Bronx. Ford added a women’s section to the paper in 1890s, reduced the size of the labor section (which disappeared entirely in the early 1900s), and increased coverage of Church news.\(^\text{35}\)

Whatever the combination of events, opportunities, and pre-existing tendencies that contributed to Ford’s movement away from advocacy of wide-ranging economic and social reform, the *Irish World* moved into the 1890s with no shortage of vitality and causes to rally behind. New causes meant new connections and sometimes new columns. The “Irish world” of the newspaper’s title was still a global one, with affinities toward others who fought empire’s treachery, wherever they might

\(^{33}\) Peter Conolly-Smith, *Translating America*, 39-40.

\(^{34}\) McCaffrey, “Forging Forward,” 229-30.

\(^{35}\) Ford read the Pope’s 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum* with a different emphasis than Father Peter Yorke; he acknowledged the Pope’s support for labor unions but stressed that the Gospel held the key to harmony between workers and bosses. See the *Irish World*, May 23 and 30, 1891.
be. And an outward thrust of Irish identification might be balanced by a look to the past, a grounding in Irish history and language that could ensure that the tribe knew its roots.

_A Gaelic revival_

Preservation of the Irish language seems a natural strategy for coalescing and promoting Irish American identity, especially for a community that many historians describe as viewing itself, at least until the twentieth century, as “exiled” in America.³⁶ Yet Ford expressed initial skepticism about initiatives to revive Gaelic, the Celtic language of Ireland and Scotland. Perhaps, as with a minority religion such as Catholicism, Ford sensed that promoting an aspect of an immigrant community’s uniqueness risked marginalizing or estranging that community. Nevertheless, a Gaelic column became a long-running section of the _World_ sometime after 1896.

In pre-Famine Ireland (before 1845), about half the population could speak Irish; by the turn of the century that number was reduced to roughly 14 percent, with less than one percent claiming to speak only Irish. International economies of scale and their impact on traditional production—a shift away from tillage farming, and an influx of factory-made goods—hit Irish-speaking districts such as Connacht and Munster particularly hard (nearly seventy percent of Irish immigrants in America at the turn of the century came from these two provinces, which together constituted only forty-two percent of the Irish population). Ironically, the rapid loss of native Irish speakers from Ireland did not necessarily mean a concomitant increase in the United States; frequently, adults in Ireland were so adamant that their children learn English to increase their prospects for successful emigration that they refused to speak to them

³⁶ The most prominent exponent of the view of an “exile” sensibility among the Irish is Kerby A. Miller’s seminal and much-debated _Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America_ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).
in their native tongue.\(^{37}\)

Gaelic societies appeared in the United States decades before the Gaelic Revival emerged in Ireland in 1893.\(^{38}\) Letter writers to the *Irish World* debated the importance of maintaining the language in the United States. Ford himself doubted that many Irish Americans would learn Gaelic, but supported its acquisition as a point of pride and self-esteem, to help counter Anglo-Saxon claims of Irish cultural inferiority.\(^{39}\) Notices in the *Irish World* for Gaelic study groups suggest that these societies were in large part social gatherings, isolated from each other and focused on entertainment along with language acquisition and practice.\(^{40}\)

It was not until the late 1890s that Ford devoted an entire column to the language, “Our Gaelic World,” and “Gaelic Notes.” By this time the Gaelic Revival had begun in Ireland. In these later years the Revival was linked to statehood for Ireland. “History shows that the revival of the language of a people precedes any permanent national re-awakening,” claimed an announcement in the *Irish World* heralding a Gaelic League fund-raising drive in America. “[N]o country altogether losing its language can hope to preserve its historic individuality….the future of the language is the future of the race.”\(^{41}\)

The Irish language was frequently linked to race in the *Irish World* and other publications. An article by the Rev. Thomas J. Shahan of the Catholic University of America described Gaelic as a kind of essence that held secrets of the race’s history and character. “The Gaelic tongue is the oldest in Europe,” he wrote in the
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\(^{39}\) Ibid., 32-33.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 41-44, 47.

\(^{41}\) *Irish World*, Jan. 28, 1899.
World. It “contains the answers to a hundred perplexing problems,” including the “origin of the nations of Europe” and the “nature of ancient law and institutions in the common Oriental land from whence we have all come.” Gaelic, like its relative Sanskrit, Shahan wrote, was one of “the oldest forms of that mysterious Aryan speech which we once had in common.” (By “Aryan,” Thomas refers to speakers of the Indo-European language, not a racial group). Thomas made it clear that he did not expect Gaelic to become widely used in America, only Ireland; and that the broader battle was to infuse English, which through “God’s provenance” was “destined to be sovereign over more millions,” with Gaelic’s vitality. He was also concerned that other peoples were the experts in the Irish language, not the Irish themselves. The best Irish dictionary, Shahan lamented, was produced by a German; the best Gaelic journal written in French—all “foreigners,” Shahan wrote, “who are not of our blood and who cannot feel as we do upon this subject.”

Bhroiméil describes an Irish American dependence on a “transmuted ethnicity,” rather than once received through a “daily ethnic way of life,” which in turn may have ideologized language maintenance and wedded it to other Irish American nationalisms.

**Cahenslyism and German American Catholics**

Yet language use, because it draws boundaries and can exclude, by its nature divides as well as unites. Ford and other Catholic Irish American editors feared for the unity of their Church—and possibly feared the power of German America—when Peter Paul Cahensly, an activist German merchant and immigrant to Minnesota, began pushing for German-speaking parishes and priests in the late 1880s. Cahensly and other German Catholics claimed that German immigrants were losing their
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42 Ibid., Nov. 24, 1894.
Catholic faith, and their children losing their language, due to a lack of German-speaking priests, bishops, and teachers in the United States. At an 1888 meeting of German Catholic societies in Minnesota, Archbishop John Ireland, long favored by Ford, cracked down. Ireland announced that he was in no way against the continued use of German, but advocated a home-based, not school-based bilingualism: “Yes, speak the German language and teach it to your children. But….see that your children learn well, and speak well, the English language…Through an exaggerated love of old habits and of Trans-Atlantic lands are you to forget the present and the future and reduce to social inferiority your sons and daughters?” By educating German children in schools in which German was predominant, German-Americans would “push back [their] children in the race of life; keep them out of the higher professions, close to them legislative halls, narrow down their business prospects, for the sake of a land they have never seen and will never see.” Ireland feared for Church unity—“confusion and chaos would reign”—if “all our separate nationalities had their separate clerical unions, and their separate conventions.”

Cahensly and other German Catholics kept up the pressure, petitioning the Holy See for national parishes presided over by priests of the same nationality, and for in-language parish schools. They claimed that Ireland’s plan for some state support for parish schools in St. Paul (the “Faribault Plan”) was in fact an “Irish Plan” to eliminate the teaching of German and the German-language teaching of all subjects in German-American parochial schools.

The strength of the German-American press is evident in the dispute over Cahenslyism. German-language newspapers, according to Ireland, were using the term “Americanization” as an approbation. Some Catholic Germans, Ireland wrote, 44 La Vern J. Rippley, “Archbishop Ireland and the School Language Controversy,” U.S. Catholic Historian 1 (Fall 1980): 3-5. 45 Ibid., 2.
“hate America, and they hate me for being an American. It is difficult for one who does not follow the German Catholic newspapers to realize how fearfully foreign and un-American the leaders of Catholic thought among the Germans have been and are.”

Ford in the 1890s ran several glowing portraits of archbishop Ireland and hailed his defeat of Cahenslyism, which Ford described as a movement “favor[ing] the dissolving into distinct and separate branches the organization of the Church in America rather than to work in harmony with the spirit of American institutions for its unification and cosmopolitan harmony.” Here, Ford stressed American unity:

“The United States is not, and has not been for a century, a group of European colonies. It is a Nation, with a national spirit, national institutions, national unity, and a national population. Colonial disintegration is contrary to its instinct…so thoroughly is this American spirit of unity and nationality infused into the hearts of American Catholics that they would regard any seeming departure from that patriotic instinct as a grave and unfortunate calamity.”

The importance of language retention to the unity and self-worth of a people or “race” had less sympathy among the English-speaking and Catholic-hierarchy dominating Irish if the strength of the (largely Irish) Catholic Church in America seemed in jeopardy.

The biases of communication

Ford’s attempt to balance forces of Irish American uniqueness, such as language, with a broad-based American nationalism may be reflected in the
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46 Ibid., 10. Ireland told the German Catholic societies at the Minnesota gathering that whoever did not “thank God he is an American should…betake his foreign soul to foreign shores, and crouch in misery and abjection beneath tyranny’s scepter…” Rippley, “Archbishop Ireland,” 5.
47 *Irish World*, March 26, 1892.
48 Ibid.
newspaper medium itself, which Canadian political economist and communications
theorist Harold Innis thought of as a “space-biased” medium: a communications
technology that, through its ease of dissemination but relative lack of durability,
facilitated communication over distance. Innis contrasted such media with “time-
biased” media, which tended to be durable and immobile, such as script in clay
tables or on stone monuments. Time-biased media, according to Innis, tend to
“favor” an emphasis on custom, genealogical continuity, and the sacred; this
“impedes individualism as a dynamic for innovation, but permits it to flourish in
terms of expressive communication.” Orality, therefore, had a time bias, and although
Innis thought that Western society was far too space-biased, he also recognized the
hierarchical, custom-bound nature of oral societies.

Though such constructions have struck many scholars as simplistic,
deterministic, or contradictory, recent scholarship recognizes more complexity in
Innis’s work, and to some extent that of his colleague Marshall McLuhan.49 Menahem
Blondheim, for example, defends Innis as not contradictory and not a technological
determinist. He responds to Innis’s apparent contradiction with the oral medium—
Innis saw it as time-biased, but spoken words seem the least durable of all media—by
showing how the effervescence of oral communication biases forms of preservation
that stress the internalization, repetition, and transmission of the message.
“[P]recisely the limitations on the durability of oral knowledge bind and bias an oral
society to its past.”50 Blondheim interprets Innis as saying that “if a socio-political

49 See, for example, Charles R. Acland and William J. Buxton, eds., Harold Innis in
the New Century: Reflections and Refractions (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University
Press, 1999); Paul Heyer, Harold Innis (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003);
and Marshall T. Poe, A History of Communications: Media and Society from the
50 Menahem Blondheim, “Innis and His Bias of Communication,” in Canonic Texts
in Media Research: Are There Any? Should There Be? How About These? ed. Elihu
system is shaped to be effective in its control over, say, space, its problem becomes
time; it is threatened by discontinuity through time.” Time-biased systems with time-
binding media in place, on the other hand, may focus on expanding the reach of their
communications through space. A bias generates “a counter-bias as a corrective, in
the cause of equilibrium.”

From this perspective, many of the *Irish World*’s initiatives make sense. The
dislocations of the Irish might require knitting together through both time and space.
The masthead, naturally, suggests the newspaper’s attempt to connect Ireland and
the United States through space. Ford’s transnational, (space-biased) identifications
with victims of empire are “balanced” by time-biased, custom-bound considerations:
calendars tied to Irish history, an Irish language column with some Irish script. The
phenomenon of time and space biases is reflected in the Church’s approach to media;
while the Church was excited about the Catholic press and its ability to spread the
faith, it feared loss of continuity and hierarchical control.

“News” from Ireland

The news format itself allowed Ford throughout his tenure at the *World
to lend a certain fact-based authenticity to his interests and viewpoints. Through
the framework of newspaper sections, including letters to the editor, calendars of
Irish history, and news dispatches from other U.S. states and from Ireland, activist
movements and political perspectives gained a certain currency.

In an “Irish World Calendar” column, particular days of the month might draw
from any year to list an important date in Irish history, including British outrages,
Irish patriot actions, or world events. An entry for Monday the 13th might include
“Slavery Abolished in Mexico, 1825” and “O’Connell’s First Speech Against the
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51 Ibid., 168-69.
Union, 1800.” Ford’s “Answers to Correspondents” column allowed him to stress Irish American political positions and pride. To Terrence Walsh, of Montreal, Ford replied, “We have no disposition to question your sincerity. Many others, too, think with you, that the moral-suasion policy is best for Ireland, and that that country might get along very well under ‘liberal English laws.’ We are not of such. We are thoroughly satisfied that no ‘laws’ made in London can ever suit the Irish nation.” And to Mary, in Boston, “It is quite allowable for your mistress to dictate to you in household affairs; but she has no right to throw obstacles in the way of your attending your religious duties.” Naturally Ford was inclined to select letters that engaged his special concerns for Irish America.

“News from Ireland” often corresponded to particular movements Ford was engaged with at the time. In July 1890, a letter from John MacPhilpin, editor of the Tuam News (County Galway) on the “Irish Type Fund” was printed on the front page in a column format. MacPhilpin wrote that the Irish language was making progress in national schools, and thanked specific contributors to a Gaelic column in the News that would soon be printed in Irish characters. “English letters and English accent, however grand they may appear to some, are, to say the least, quite un-Keltic, and therefore most unfit to display the natural grace and energy of the Irish language.” A few months later, the Irish news section of the Irish World, now called “Tidings from the Old Country—Recent Happenings in the Various Towns and Countries Throughout Ireland,” printed a news item about the same editor, now spelled “McPhilpin,” to get the Tuam town commissioners to print advertisements of the board in both English and Irish. Even without the language of commentary in the item—“No wonder the Irish language is dying out. This is a public example of how it

52 Irish World, Jan. 11, 1890.
53 Ibid., March 18, 1871.
54 Ibid., July 19, 1890.
is treated in private”—the unsigned listing was in all likelihood sent in by McPhilpin himself. This does not disqualify it as “news,” but demonstrates how the journalistic medium and its airs of neutrality and simple observation could imply a broader-based nature to what might have been, in fact, a small network or movement of like-minded Irish nationalists.

An objection could be raised that readers of newspapers in the nineteenth century did not possess any expectation of “objectivity” in the first place. The contemporary notion of objective news—and the concept itself has been under fire for a few decades, as philosophers and cultural theorists have emphasized the impossibility of perspectives uncolored by subjectivity—took time to develop in U.S. newspapers. But scholarship suggests that journalism in the late-nineteenth century was expected to conform to relatively similar notions of fairness. Most journalism scholars agree that most U.S. newspapers began to shed their strict political party orientation in the 1830s; the “penny press” might pride itself on its nonpartisan reporting. Other facets of more modern notions of “objective” journalism came into place during the nineteenth century; one scholar cites “balance” along with the inverted pyramid structure and “facticity”; another “impartiality.”

55 Ibid., Sept. 6, 1890.
56 David T. Z. Mindich finds the “application of an ethic of ‘objectivity’” by the 1890s, with precursors of “fairness, detachment, nonpartisanship, and balance” valued from well before the 1830s; Hazel Dicken-Garcia is more cautious, situating “non-partisanship” in the era of its use and finding greater differences between its present-day and older connotations. Still, Dicken-Garcia finds a move toward formulating journalistic guidelines in the 1870s and ’80s that emphasized accuracy and impartiality. See Mindich, Just the Facts: How “Objectivity” Came to Define American Journalism (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 10-11; and Dicken-Garcia, Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth Century America (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 219-22. Michael Schudson sees the press placing a particular emphasis on uncovering truths “realistically” during the 1890s, as “part of the broader Progressive drive to found political reform on ‘facts.’” In Michael Schudson, Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers (New York: Basic Books, 1978), 71.
Ford appeared to regard the *Irish World* itself as a kind of diplomat of Irish America. In 1890, Ford realized than many of the Ireland-based papers in his newspaper exchange had not been receiving the *Irish World* for four or five years. He found through investigation that British officials had seized the *World*. Ford wrote that he did not want to contact the U.S. government about the matter, for fear of appearing to use the issue to publicize his paper. Yet, this was not a simple business matter but “a matter of law and justice, involving the rights of a great nation.” Ford implied that his newspaper’s unimpeded circulation was an international issue—that the *World* was in a sense an organ of the United States.57

*Ford and the Church*

Ford described his break with Henry George as based around religion, and he would increase his coverage of religion into the 1890s. An important study of the late-nineteenth century Irish in Worchester, Massachusetts, describes the community’s turn toward a more rigorous Catholicism, one that mirrored Protestant values of self-discipline and self-improvement and quelled much conflict between the two Christian faiths. In this view, turn-of-the-century economic depression and a new influx of immigrants from Southern Europe broke an uneasy truce between Protestant and Catholic.58 During this upswing of religious observance, Ford continued to write favorably about America’s more liberal Catholic leaders. The *World* profiled Thomas Hecker’s St. Paul parish in June 1895, noting positively Father Hecker’s “innovation,” “love of experiment and enterprise,” and “Yankee touch,” as well as his emphasis on publishing books and newspapers to spread the faith.59 But Hecker and

57 *Irish World*, Jan. 11, 1890.
59 *Irish World*, June 15, 1895.
other American Catholics would come under increasing scrutiny from Rome.

The same year, the Pope would release his encyclical *Longinqua* to the bishops and archbishops of the United States. The Pope wrote in much the same vein regarding the press as he would four years later in *Testem Benevolentiae*—he was optimistic about its ability to do good and concerned about its potential for evil. He admonished Catholic writers “who waste their strength by discord,” and who criticized the Church. “The bishops, placed in the lofty position of authority, are to be obeyed, and suitable honor befitting the magnitude and sanctity of their office should be paid them.”

The “Catholic conundrum” discussed in Chapter 1 can be seen in Ford’s response to *Longinqua*. One section in particular concerned him. The Pope had written in *Longinqua* that although he celebrated the “equity” of law in the United States, which had helped the Church to grow, “it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced.” In fact, the Church would grow stronger still in the United States, the Pope wrote, if, “in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.”

Ford, writing in the *World*, feared that “anti-Catholic bigots” would read the Pope’s words and conclude that the pontiff was conspiring “to establish a union between Church and State” in the United States. “While there is no possibility of such a union in this country,” Ford wrote, “there is no doubt that if Catholic teachings molded our legislation great benefits would accrue to the country.” The Pope’s words were ambiguous enough to require clarification from Catholic Irish American


61 Ibid., paragraph 6.


63 Ibid.
editors, who, when writing about the Pope, had to tread a careful line, preempting nativist arguments while taking care not to cross the pontiff. A week before, when printing for his readers the entire encyclical on the front page of the *World*, Ford printed a speech by Francesco Satolli, an apostolic delegate to the United States. Satolli, speaking at the Gridiron club in Washington, D.C., praised the press as a kind of fourth estate that kept government in check, hailed journalists as engaged in “high and noble work,” and even called the press “a kind of social priesthood.”\textsuperscript{64} High-ranking Catholics in the United States and the Vatican did, it would seem, remain optimistic about the power of Irish newspapers to spread the one true faith. (Unlike Father Yorke, Patrick Ford seems to have not written in his newspaper about *Testem Benevolentiae*, the 1899 papal encyclical addressed to Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore that sought to rein in “Americanism,” the more liberal American Catholicism that stressed individuality and press freedoms.)

*Ford and race*

At first glance, Patrick Ford appears to remain staunch in his espousal of racial egalitarianism through his tenure at the *Irish World*—a marked contrast to Father Peter Yorke and other Irish Americans on the West Coast, and in many ways a departure from the history of Irish Americans and race in the United States. Scholars have long examined Irish American and African American relations, finding both co-operation and conflict. However much scholars debate how “white” the Irish were considered, or sought to be, most conclude that the Irish distanced themselves from African Americans throughout the nineteenth century to gain acceptance in mainstream society. Whether the trans-Atlantic Irish movement to repeal the parliamentary union between Ireland and Great Britain fizzled due to Daniel O’Connell’s repeated calls for abolition, or broke apart only after his fiery 1945 speech in which he allied

\textsuperscript{64} Ibid., Feb. 2, 1895.
Ireland and Britain against the “American eagle,” sixth an attempt to “construct an Irish identity that required opposition to slavery and other forms of oppression as one of its essential components” had failed at mid-century. Vicious, Irish-led anti-draft and anti-black riots in New York City in 1863, and Irish American political machines and their control of civil service positions such as fire and police enhanced Irish America’s position as an enforcer of a white racial order. Some scholars think Irish cultural traits that helped make them targets of British oppression worked in their favor across the Atlantic:

The very qualities of the ‘mob’ that led to [the Irish] being despised and discriminated against—their clannishness and their readiness for violence, their loyalty and organizational capacities—were nonetheless the very ones that enabled them to play a foundational role in both the construction of America, and in its policing…Considered ‘not yet ready’ for citizenship in Britain, in the United States they exercised their organizational strength to contain, on behalf of a white racial state, a Black population regarded as never to be ready even after their formal emancipation.

Obviously such broad overviews miss important alliances and affinities between the Irish and non-white races. Ford would still mention with reverence the legacy of his former mentor, William Lloyd Garrison, and give much coverage to Garrison’s namesake son, who also spoke for racial justice and anti-imperialism, throughout the 1890s. “Leaving out the Indians, the veritable Americans…there

Angela F. Murphy contends that the repeal movement could have survived the abolition controversy, but split due to O’Connell’s defense of England. See Murphy, American Slavery, Irish Freedom: Abolition, Immigrant Citizenship, and the Transatlantic Movement for Irish Repeal (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2010).


See, for example, the Irish World, April 12, 1890; Dec. 28, 1895; and Sept. 9, 1899.
are the Anglo-Americans, the Franco-Americans, the Irish-Americans, the Spanish-Americans, the German-Americans, and the African-Americans,” Ford wrote in the summer of 1871.\(^6^9\) The newspaper’s editorials typically condemned lynching without hesitation, particularly in the 1890s.\(^7^0\) The *Irish World* even once hinted that Southern governors who did not provide protection to African Americans fleeing lynching gangs—notably Gov. Benjamin Tillman of South Carolina, who had sent John Peterson, a black man who fled to the statehouse for protection, back to his town to face the mob—might be made accessories to murder.\(^7^1\) Ford called lynching “terrorism” and wrote that if “every man who takes part in lynching were regarded and treated as a murderer it would be a good beginning” in the fight against mob rule.\(^7^2\)

Ford tried to address Chinese exclusion without the rampant racism expressed by many West Coast Irish. He opposed the importation of Chinese laborers “not because of the color of the Chinaman’s skin, nor because of his language, or his religion, but because that people are brought hither en masse virtually as bond slaves by speculating combinations…” Racial hostility to the Chinese, he insisted, was “unchristian, undemocratic, and uncivilized.”\(^7^3\)

**Anglo-Saxonism and empire**

Imperial moves at the turn of the century brought a new emphasis on race,

---


\(^7^0\) See the long editorial, “The Southern Problem,” *Irish World*, Feb. 8, 1890, where Ford stated that “the wrong done to the negro at the South is not simply a local evil nor does it affect merely the black men of that section; but it is all-pervading and concerns us all,” and suggested that Southern Congressional representation be reduced by three-sevenths until African American suffrage was assured.

\(^7^1\) *Irish World*, May 13, 1893, “Making a Governor Responsible for Lynching.” Ford’s first article on the Peterson case was May 6, 1893.

\(^7^2\) Ibid., Aug. 19, 1893.

and religion, as the Irish suspected something particularly Protestant about American uplift efforts abroad. Historian Stuart Anderson sees the late 1890s through the early 1900s as a period when “American Anglophobia” and British condescension toward the United States gave way to friendlier relations, powered by the doctrine of Anglo-Saxonism. Many scholars, leaders and commentators held that the civilization of the English-speaking nations was the most advanced, “largely due to the innate racial superiority of the people who were descended from the ancient Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain.” The superior characteristics of the “Anglo-Saxon race” were both biologically and culturally determined and included “industry, intelligence, adventurousness, and a talent for self-government.”

Ford and others in the Irish American press attacked these notions with a passion. “‘Anglo-Saxon,’ Humbug,” read a typical headline in the *Irish World*. “The Hyphenated Term ‘Anglo-Saxon’ Has no Proper Application to American People or to Anything American.” Those who used the term “deliberately invite a division among 70,000,000 of Americans on racial lines. German-Americans have already formed a national organization for the purpose of teaching a necessary lesson to the Anglomaniacs. Irish-Americans ought not be behind our German-American friends in this good work.” Under the headline, “Wanted—A Definition,” the *World* laughed off an attempt by a Protestant minister who suggested that “Anglo-Saxon” referred to anyone who used the English language. The “8 million negroes of the South…our colored brethren” would be surprised to learn “that the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ blanket can be

---


75 *Irish World*, April 22, 1899.
so stretched as to cover them too.”

Ford’s fight against imperialism and Anglo-Saxon notions of American racial identity brought in many non-white peoples as potential allies. The Irish World scoffed at any association between British rule and liberty: “There are no good spots in England’s treatment of conquered peoples—it is blood-red and unmerciful throughout Ireland, America, India and South Africa.” In an editorial sarcastically titled, “‘Civilizing’ the Filipino,” Ford wrote, “If your skin is not white and you do not belong to the ‘Anglo-Saxon race’ you are entitled to no consideration.” While much of the U.S. press did an about-face on Filipino leader Emilio Aguinaldo, describing him as dignified and intelligent when he was fighting the Spanish, and treacherous and weak when war broke out between Filipino rebels and U.S. troops, Ford remained positive toward him throughout the war and its aftermath.

New scholarship stresses transnational, multiracial identities stemming from Irish nationalists’ battles against imperialism. Cian McMahon is careful to list anti-black and anti-Amerindian Irish Americans such as John Mitchel and Thomas Francis Meagher alongside racial egalitarians such as Ford, John Boyle O’Reilly, and James A. McMaster. He notes that, “sticking up for the Maori carried few political liabilities for people living thousands of miles away.” But to McMahon it is important that the Irish, particularly the Young Irelanders of the mid-nineteenth century, “situated their Celtic identity in a transnational context.” The Irish may indeed have helped to
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76 Ibid., June 4, 1898. Nearly thirty years earlier, Ford had similarly attacked the notion of America as an Anglo-Saxon nation, going so far as to declare in a headline, “The True American Type Celtic, not Anglo-Saxon.” Indeed, Ford wrote, “we doubt whether there would have been any rebellion…of the colonies against the mother country, but for the Fenian spirit of the Irish element in the colonies. The Quaker and English sentiment was opposed to the Declaration, and the war. The American Revolution was the work of Irishmen.” Irish World, March 18, 1871.
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79 Cian McMahon, Global Dimensions of Irish Identity, 163. Young Ireland was an
expand modern parameters of citizenship and identity, as McMahon contends. Yet this study and others have shown that, on the West Coast of North America, some working class Irish were key participants in the creation of transnational identities exclusive to white people.

Furthermore, in addition to the Irish encounter with Asians and the labor competition that inspired transnational white working class nationalisms, in the domestic fight against the notion of America as an Anglo-Saxon nation, race pluralism might also stop at white ethnic borders. “[W]e repudiate any suggestion that American civilization or progress is materially indebted to any supposed Anglo-Saxon element in our composition,” said a former president of the American-Irish Historical Society in the World. “On the contrary, we assert that all European nationalities have contributed to our advancement and magnificent citizenship.”

Ford’s newspaper often included “African-Americans” or “Afro-Americans” in the American family, but reports he reprinted from other presses frequently did not.

Religion, race, and empire

Though Ford remained against U.S. occupation of the Philippines—unlike, for example, liberal archbishop John Ireland, who worked with American authorities to smooth the withdrawal of Spanish clergy from the island—anti-imperialist sentiments in the Irish World co-existed with pro-Catholic viewpoints that might lend support to imperial projects. A sustained, searching and intellectually consistent critique of imperialism—consistent across geography and time—seemed impossible for Ford, as long as American nativists threatened to regard Catholics as less than

---

Irish nationalist movement of the 1840s.

80 Irish World, Jan. 28, 1899.

fully American. Catholicism needed shoring up, and thus Ford and other Irish American editors were pulled into defending the Church’s past. Inevitably that meant at least some embrace of a racialized, civilizing mission.

“Can the Indian Be Civilized?” one headline in the *World* asked. “Catholicity is the Only Agency Capable of Solving the Indian Problem.” The article, by “Father de Smet,” is typical of many in the *Irish World* and the Irish American press. It defends the humanity of the indigenous, especially against the depredations of Protestant explorers and missionaries, but does so within the racialized discourse of savagery and civilization of the time. The Rev. Smet praised Christopher Columbus as a “missionary bearer of peace and truth,” and the Catholic church as a force that “cured [Amerindians in South America] of their natural indolence and depraved habits….”

Ford’s own editorials tended to be significantly less derogatory in their description of the indigenous, who still, however, might need civilizing. In the Philippines, Ford wrote, the Catholic Church had “succeeded so well that the natives are thoroughly civilized instead of being wiped off the face of the earth” as in Hawaii, due to Protestant missionaries.

In the Boer War, today called the South African War, Irish American editors’ commitment to indigenous peoples worldwide faltered. Typically, the only indigenous the Irish press detected in the region were the Dutch Boer, whom it cast as freedom fighters. When a British general suggested that England was fighting the Boer to protect not only British settlers, but also the Boer themselves (from black revolt), the *Irish World* was right to respond cynically. But the *World*’s take on race relations in Southern Africa was highly dubious. “There will be no black uprising,” Ford wrote, “although we see no reason why the Boers…should not invite the black man, who in
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82 *Irish World*, May 3, 1873.
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five cases out of six trust the Boer rather than the British, to fall in and do his portion of the fighting.”84 Other Irish American newspapers portrayed Southern Africa’s indigenous population as more akin to enemy than ally. Rather than examine Boer brutality toward black Africans, Irish journalists sometimes stressed longtime British collusion with non-white “savages.” The Pilot wrote that British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain “threatens to arm and enlist the African savages against the Boers,” and that British politician A.J. Balfour “goes him one better by suggesting the use of barbarous Sikhs and Ghorkas from India for the same purpose.”85 Irish nationalist and feminist Maud Gonne, on a U.S. speaking tour, claimed that the English had armed black Africans, “and these savages had outrage [sic] Boer women.”86 The anti-British element of Irish American identity raised the Boer to the status of near-saints, and trumped other possible alignments.

Domestically, without a British element involved, Ford and some other Irish American editors continued to defend African Americans and denounce lynching. In the late 1890s and early 1900s, lynching was increasingly spoken about in the World in terms of its violation of moral law.87 But Ford also drew connections between lynching and imperialism. Ford found it “more than a coincidence that lynchings have become more frequent than ever since the inauguration of the policy of imperialism, which inspires a feeling of contempt for that sort of human equality proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence.”88

84 Ibid., Nov. 4, 1899.
85 The Pilot, Feb. 24, 1900. Editor John Boyle O’Reilly died in 1890.
87 See, for example Irish World, August 29, 1903, “Revival of Moral Law the Only sufficient remedy for Lynching and other evils of the day,” and July 27, 1901, “Our Moral Degeneracy.”
88 Ibid., August 15, 1903, “The President on Lynching.”
Another headline asked, “Reaping What We Sowed—Does American Lawlessness and Barbarity Abroad Not Increase American Lawlessness and Barbarity at Home?”

When Sam Hose was lynched near Atlanta, Georgia, in April 1899, Ford included in the article’s headline, in outrage, “And We Are Carrying Civilization to the People of the Philippines.” But Ford’s prolific columnist Robert Ellis Thompson, who would also link violence in the South to violence abroad, would not support full citizenship rights for African Americans.

_Robert Ellis Thompson and Reconstruction’s ‘mistake’_

Rodechko suggests that Patrick Ford held the _Irish World_ firmly under his control. “When writers failed to express the changing attitudes of the paper, they were replaced by men more in sympathy with Ford’s opinions.”

Some “wiggle room” surely existed, however; Ford and Henry George always disagreed about the tariff, and, as Rodechko points out, Robert Ellis Thompson and Ford split briefly in the 1912 presidential election (Ford supported Roosevelt; Thompson went with Taft).

A Presbyterian minister and professor of sociology, Thompson began writing for Ford in 1884 and quickly became his leading columnist, penning columns for more than twenty-five years. Despite his Ulster origins, he supported Irish nationalism. Thompson was born in Ireland in 1844, came to the United States at age thirteen, and graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 1865, becoming an instructor there in 1868.
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94 See James H. S. Bossard, “Robert Ellis Thompson—Pioneer Professor in Social Science,” _American Journal of Sociology_ 35 (Sept. 1929): 239-49. Russell A. Kazal explores Thompson’s ethnic cosmopolitan vision, in which different ethnicities contribute to a strong national whole, in “The Lost World of Pennsylvania Pluralism:
On the subject of empire, Thompson, like Ford, combined his faith with a staunch anti-imperialist stance. “The nation is the creation of the will of God,” he announced in a column in early 1900, “an empire the creation of the will of man seeking to destroy the work of God.” Thompson felt that “in the fight against the evil tendencies President McKinley has introduced into our Government,” those who stood against wars of empire might call themselves something other than “Anti-Imperialist.” Instead of stressing “negation,” Thompson wrote, why not stress positive truths and beliefs? “We stand for the rights of nations, which have been bestowed upon them by the Almighty God, and against wicked denial of those rights by any and every power on earth.” The nation is the “great instrument of human advance,” improving upon the imperfect, tribal organization of “Family and Magistrate” that preceded it. Empire destroys this divine plan of nationhood; the Irish “know what harm have been done to the Irish mind and spirit by the alien rule of England…and they are desirous to save the Filipinos, the Boers, the Poles, the French Canadians and every other people from the same evils.”

When he turned his attention to the American South and lynch mobs, Thompson saw the lawlessness there as an outgrowth of the “perversion” of human relationships wreaked by slavery. Yet more trouble arose during Reconstruction, according to Thompson, for social equality for black Americans was “a blunder,” and political equality was of “no use” to them. Legal equality, however, by which Thompson seemed to mean the right to a fair trial, was “indispensable,” and something that the government must assure to African Americans if Southern states would not. Thompson went so far as to call for changing the Fifteenth Amendment so as not to “force the ballot into the negro’s hand,” but to “throw round every man, 
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white and black, citizen and alien, the protection of just law justly enforced.”

Thompson would compromise full African American citizenship for a more limited conception of rights, in order to maintain order in the South.

Five years later, Thompson again expressed outrage at lynching, but repeated his stance against black suffrage. In an article titled, “Our Brother in Black,” Thompson took to task Charles Darwin, Herbert Spencer, Thomas Carlyle, and Republican imperialists for lessoning notions of “natural rights” and promoting instead a philosophy of might makes right, which hurt African Americans more than perhaps any other people in the world. After all, Thompson wrote, if America had “gone into the business” of “putting down and keeping down the Filipinos,” why worry about a few lynch mobs “not more lawless than major Quinn and his fellows in Luzon?” But Thompson agreed that African Americans had shown cultural and moral “deterioration” since slavery, due to their separation from white society; they voted in lock-step for the Republican party, “like a certain class of Irishman who must vote the Republican ticket forever.”

The next year in another column, Thompson suggested that Southerners might end lynching if the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments were repealed.

Thompson repeated this theme in greater detail in his book The Hand of God in American History, published in 1902. In a quick recounting of U.S. history that periodically paused to note divine reward and retribution in the American past, Thompson addressed Reconstruction’s failure. In Thompson’s view, in the face of
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Southerners’ attempts to re-establish something akin to slavery in the South, the Republican Party had lost Lincoln’s faith that the war was God’s plan and had pushed too hard and too quickly to secure African American voting rights, and, by extension, their party’s political standing, which was on shaky ground after the president’s assassination. Lincoln, according to Thompson, would have proceeded more gradually and with more religious faith.99

Thompson’s columns gave the impression that the *Irish World* was backsliding on support for African American rights. Through Thompson and his prominently displayed writing, the *Irish World* had at least in part adopted a hierarchical and racialized vision of democracy that put African Americans at the bottom, in need of further civilizing. To the extent that the *Irish World* weakened its commitment to African American rights, its decades-long campaign against “Anglo-Saxonism” became less an expansion of American pluralism and more the securing whiteness, of race-based privileges.100

**Conclusion**

A rich scholarship and active debate continues on the relationship between Irish nationalism—the assumption that the Irish are a nation, and one that must gain independence from Britain—to broader themes in U.S. history, including race relations, class conflict, assimilation, and the creation of ethnicity.101 Historian
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Thomas N. Brown would describe Ford’s intellectual and political legacy in this way: Irish American nationalism was a response to the pressures put on immigrant Irish, including nativism; though its rhetoric could be radical, nationalism’s aims were ultimately conservative. Irish Americans sought respectability, and as more and more transformed themselves into “lace-curtain” Irish, their radicalism waned.  

Eric Foner modified this view, positing that Irish American nationalism and Land League activism did indeed help the Irish assimilate into America—but not solely as respectable members of the middle class. Instead, through their identification with abolitionists such as Wendell Phillips and radical economists like Henry George, many Irish Americans sought to “transform their society even as they became a more integral part of it.” These views are not incompatible, of course; the Irish in America may have invigorated a labor movement and, through attention to British and U.S. imperial efforts and their victims across the globe, broadened conceptions of citizenship even as the Irish themselves moved toward more normative American viewpoints. Perhaps Ford’s experience with Robert Ellis Thompson moves the scales back toward assimilation and consent, at least with respect to African American’s loss of rights in the decades-long American toleration of Jim Crow, a kind of codified, regional apartheid. One factor in the waning of the more racially egalitarian views of some Irish nationalists could be their encounter with Protestant reformers and Progressives like Thompson, who seem to have used segregation as a kind of “shield” between groups, to halt social discord that threatened their overall project of reform.  

Media studies and the “invention of ethnicity” can be brought together

productively. “Much of what seems the venerable survival of ancient customs turns out to have been shaped or even created wholesale by nineteenth-century nationalists intent on establishing a pedigree for a certain cultural group,” writes historian of technology David E. Nye, mentioning Scottish tartans, which did not represent clans until the 1800s. Central to this process, Nye says, are communication technologies. “[N]ewly invented traditions are almost always disseminated and discussed through the media.” So many of the debates of Irish nationalists, the most prominent of whom produced their own newspapers, had at their heart the maintenance and shaping of Irish American identity. Through the newspaper medium, however, they had to constantly calibrate their own notions of what was best for the Irish with the economics and social and ethical expectations of newspaper publishing. Subscribers, and patrons, had to be sought. Columnists could not, ultimately, be told what to write, and changing conditions in America brought new debates over what to maintain, heighten, contain, or leave behind from Irish culture. Ford and other publishers were negotiating, not controlling, Irish identity in America.

Ford’s primary motivation was to ensure the Irish were regarded as fully American. The lessoning of anti-Catholic bigotry and anti-English sentiment makes, from today’s vantage point, the nineteenth-century Irish seem a bit sycophantic in their protestations of patriotism, or paranoid in their dread of British or nativist plots. But federal response to immigrant communities during World War I tells a different story. In January 1918, less than five years after Ford’s death, Ford’s son and other Irish editors would find their newspapers censored by the U.S. government. The administration investigated the Irish World under the Espionage Act, and would exclude from the U.S. mails five editions, despite the fact that the World, under
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the direction of Ford’s son Robert, supported the U.S. war effort after April 1917. Ford’s colleague and sometime critic John Devoy, editor of the *Gaelic-American*, was investigated in 1917 for alleged pro-German activities. An August 1917 edition of Father Peter Yorke’s *Leader* was withheld from circulation. In fact some Irish nationalists in Ireland and the United States actively sought arms from Germany for an attack on British forces in Ireland—any time Britain went to war, Irish America was prepared to strike. Yet it appears that U.S. censors argued, essentially, that simple support for Irish self-determination was tantamount to disloyalty to the U.S. war effort.106 Robert Bowen, a federal attorney charged with reviewing the Irish American press, questioned Robert Ford’s patriotism in a letter to William H. Lamar, solicitor general of the post office: “There is no genuine Americanism on the right side of his Irish hyphen,” Bowen claimed.107 The comment would surely have made Robert’s father fighting mad. Yet one imagines the elder Ford sitting down at his desk and coolly reaching for a pen.
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Conclusion: Wired for Connection—and Conflict

During T. Thomas Fortune’s overseas journey, the trans-Pacific cable reached Hawaii and, a few months later, the Philippines, connecting these new U.S. territories with San Francisco. American newspapers in both Hawaii and the Philippines announced the cable as the dawn of a new era of trade, expressing excitement at the prospect of immediate stock quotes and other news reports. One “Cable Day” speaker in Hawaii breathlessly announced that the cable had “close[d] one of the finest stanzas in the epic of action. Through the eternal harmonies, God has again spoken to His creatures. The invisible force, that is the nearest symbol of life, has once more struck the note of universal brotherhood, and everywhere the human soul responds to the electric appeal.”

African American journalists had long hoped for heightened solidarity and strength through media networks. The masthead of the *Richmond Planet* put such longing into graphic form, depicting an array of electric-like lines stretching out from a closed fist. (Fig. 51) But the desire for African American networks of communication was particularly acute because the first domestic U.S. newswire, which started as a cooperative of New York City dailies in 1846 and later became the Associated Press, did not strike a tone of “universal brotherhood,” as the Cable Day speaker hoped. As Fortune put it in 1891, the AP was frequently “an engine of misrepresentation and oftentimes libel” against African Americans. It distressed Fortune to see black newspapers reprint such material: “By means of plate matter and patent-backs selected and prepared by white men,” he wrote, “our own newspapers become
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1 *Independent* (Honolulu), Jan. 2, 1903. The *Manila Cabelenews* was similarly romantic, writing, “The Children of Israel never had greater cause for rejoicing at sight of the Promised Land than have the people of the Philippines at the completion of the American Pacific cable.” July 6, 1903.
oftentimes a circulating medium for error and wrong.”\textsuperscript{2} The AP depended upon
Southern editors for news from the South—including Clark Howell, a director of
the Associated Press, editor of the \textit{Atlanta Constitution}, and ardent supporter of Jim
Crow—and those editors frequently censored or distorted the news according to their
racial animus. Republican journalists in the South often complained that telegraph
operators “did their best to quash or color dispatches sent out.” And the AP wire
almost never quoted African American newspapers.\textsuperscript{3}

But newswire dispatches did more than simply spread, or counter, prejudice.
This study has explored newspapers of all kinds as key sites in the “creation of
ethnicity.” African American and Irish American newspapers, as used by the editors
in this study, were battlegrounds in efforts to expand and secure—and sometimes
police—citizenship’s “borders of belonging” for their readership.

Policing was obvious on the West Coast, where Irish American editors such as
Peter Yorke sought to “build up a wall” against Chinese immigration. In the process,
Yorke tried to place white, Christian laborers at the core of American belonging.

\textsuperscript{2} “Danger in ‘Patent Backs’ – Southern Misrepresentation by the Associated Press,”
\textsuperscript{3} Mark Wahlgren Summers, \textit{The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics, 1865-1878},
(Chapel Hill, 1994), 218-22. Summers believes Reconstruction could have turned
out differently had the AP wire been less biased. His examples are primarily from the
1870s, but Fortune’s comment about patent backs suggests that the bias continued at
least into the 1890s.
The American Federation of Labor practiced a similar tactic, warning in 1902 that capital and labor had not secured “a permanent industrial peace.” Going forward, employers and employed needed “greater trust and confidence” than ever before, something that could “never be fulfilled between individuals of races so alien to one another as ourselves and the Chinese.” The threat of labor discord was intimately linked to exclusionary regulation. Many Progressive reformers, whom Yorke did not trust, likewise supported anti-Asian efforts, but from a different angle: like urban, ethnic political machines, big business also needed to be reined in, and should not be allowed to amass power by importing “servile labor.”

In the East and West, Progressive policy looked to quell disputes between capital and labor by supporting or at least not challenging segregation and/or exclusion policies. The defeat of Senator Charles Sumner’s hopes for naturalization of the Chinese in 1870, “predicted the abandoning of Reconstruction” for African Americans; the end of Reconstruction, in turn, “would seal the fate of the Chinese in the West.”

In fact, Yorke, Fortune, Stemons, and Ford all had tricky relationships to the era’s Progressive reform efforts. All four were, in a very real way, reformers themselves. Newspapers were useful in their project to calibrate group identity within American norms and promote national belonging. Black and ethnic editors and publishers could bring their own facts to bear in newspaper-mediated debates that privileged evidentiary knowledge and muckraking exposés. But for the Irish, Progressive attacks on “corruption” might mean a campaign against Irish power in the nation’s cities. Progressive educational reforms also struck Irish Catholics as at odds with their faith.

Yet the gap between the nation’s leading reform movement and African
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5 Alexander Saxton, The Indispensable Enemy, 105.
Americans was even larger. In this study, Elihu Root’s speech on the “failure” of voting rights for African Americans, Robert Thompson’s similar outlook in his columns in the *Irish World*, and Stemons’s and other black Philadelphia reformers’ difficulty in integrating industrial workforces suggest that most Progressive “reform” stopped at the borders of African American communities and aspirations.

The risks and possible rewards to both Irish Americans and African Americans in their struggle for full citizenship were particularly heightened during the nation’s imperial adventures at the turn of the century. Because the schoolhouse was seen as a pillar of republicanism, Irish Americans couldn’t afford to back out of debates about Catholic education and governance in the Philippines. The Irish American press, worried about Protestant evangelism in the Islands, flexed its muscles and gained concessions from the Philippines Commission. Again, for African Americans, the stakes were higher. In fact, regimes of pedagogy and segregation were intimately linked, at home and abroad, in their deferral of full democratic rights for both African Americans and Filipinos.6

An excellent explication of such Jim Crow colonialism comes from reformer Charles Denby, who, in an article titled “What Shall We Do with the Philippines?” and published in a major Progressive forum, attempted to reassure Southern anti-imperialists regarding Progressives’ plans in the new territory:

We, who are a trifle progressive, are called “imperialists,” because we are not going to allow the poor Filipinos to vote…but…when the time comes that the islanders are qualified to exercise the right of suffrage they will get it. In all human probability they will secure it sooner than some of the negro population in some of the Southern States. Gentlemen of the South, gentlemen of Dixie—some of us imperialists
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do not blame you at all for taking all possible legal measures to protect your cherished rights. Will you not forgive us, if we pursue the same policy with regard to a new and untried race?”

As explored in Chapter 3’s examination of Louis Dalrymple’s 1898 “School Begins” cartoon, many anti-imperialists of the time, particularly those from the South, opposed U.S. annexation of tropical territories on the presumption that the non-white inhabitants of those lands must be given American citizenship and the right to settle on the mainland, where they would corrupt American life and democracy. Denby, in the above passage, endorses citizenship restrictions until races suspected of being inferior prove themselves worthy of democracy. Denby’s intellectual position, as well as his political prominence, matches John Cell’s description of segregation as a modern, urban movement—not one borne of “pre-modern,” rural America—and as “an ideological umbrella that enabled whites to agree while continuing to conflict.”

Emphasis on the territories and colonies as a testing ground for forms of segregation and control should not blind us to the complicated local manifestations of racial rule-making in those new U.S. possessions, of which newspapers played a prominent role. T. Thomas Fortune and others in the black press were not necessarily naive to hope for new openings for African Americans abroad. Progressive journalist Stannard Baker visited Hawaii in 1911, and, like Fortune, felt the “New England conscience” of a planter class of missionary descent. (As a Progressive, however, he was horrified by the sugar companies’ use of low-wage Asian labor, which he felt pushed out any possibility of the idealized, free white worker. “I have rarely

---


visited any place where there was as much charity and as little democracy as in Hawaii,” he wrote in *American Magazine*. 9) Certainly, “Whites Only” barbershops, saloons, and brothels quickly sprang up in Manila after 1898; 10 Fortune’s run-in with police, which some accounts placed in a bar, not on the street, could have involved an attempt on his part to defy segregation in Manila. But simultaneously, as Paul Kramer has shown, a more relaxed interaction could develop between Philippine elites and white Americans in Manila. When, at the 1904 World’s Fair and Exposition in St. Louis, white women were seen fraternizing with Philippine Scouts (a Filipino army organized by the United States), the city’s press exploded with rants against interracial mingling. New racial rules had developed in the colony that the metropole could not abide. Empire involved a “racial remaking of empire and the imperial remaking of race” that Fortune and Booker T. Washington hoped to capitalize on. 11

Newspapers were key sites in these local battles over race, rights and responsibilities. The “Lions of Manila”—Taft’s words for the former U.S. soldiers staffing much of the American press in the city—practiced unvarnished white supremacy, using, for a time, lucrative advertising aimed at U.S. troops to fund newspapers that pushed back against the “Filipinization” of governance on the islands. Had U.S. troop levels remained high, or if more white Americans had flocked to the nation’s newest possession, perhaps a larger “public” centered around these newspapers might have more sharply threatened or shaped the American agenda in

10 For a description of black soldier’s lives in Manila, see Gatewood, *Black Americans and the White Man’s Burden*, 261-92.
11 Kramer discusses the Philippine exhibit at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis in *The Blood of Government*, 229-84. The quote on race and empire is from p. 3.
the Philippines.

Finally, the newspaper medium itself came with existing or expected conventions and styles, whether it was the need to court and display vendors’ wares, or the visual genres of advertising and cartooning, which, as in the minstrel form, might reflect dominant cultural attitudes and biases. Stemons and other editors’ written descriptions of black and ethnic types seemed in dialogue with these visual typologies, and sometimes with the labor needs of agriculturalists still desperate for field labor in the years following emancipation. Images in the black and ethnic press supported, contested, or more subtly “shadowed” dominant national iconographies of race and gender and the imagined international “burdens” of white men.12

Though this study touched upon newspaper censorship in the First World War, it mostly leaves its editors earlier in the twentieth century, as a new medium, film, was only just beginning to be marketed to the public. In the years to come, Irish Americans and African Americans would once again struggle over race and representation, as motion pictures dramatically increased the power of images to reflect and shape society. As mobile communication systems proliferate and our society experiences new realms of words and images, questions concerning how medium and message interact remain—and advocates for social justice continue to respond to, and employ, media representations of our world.

---

12 See Murphy, “Shadowing the White Man’s Burden,” 2-3.
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