

Finding “Yiddishland” in America: Chicago’s Yiddish-Language Press and the Challenges of
Americanization, 1918-1932

By

Alexandra C. Price

Presented to the Department of History
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the BA Degree

The University of Chicago
May 1, 2020

Abstract:

This thesis explores the ways in which Chicago's Yiddish-language press responded to the challenges posed by assimilation between 1918-1932. Focusing on two specific Chicago dailies, the Orthodox and Zionist *Daily Jewish Courier* and the secular and socialist *Chicago Jewish Forward*, this thesis highlights the diversity of opinions represented in the press and the variety of their responses to the question of Americanization. This thesis ultimately argues that despite their differences in orientation, the *Courier* and the *Forward* alike played a dual role in the lives of immigrants; by constructing unique Yiddish-speaking spaces for the immigrant community, Chicago's Yiddish-language press both *challenged* the demands of Americanization and *facilitated* the process of Yiddish speakers becoming "at home" in America. In this way, this thesis adds to the long-standing historiography on role the Yiddish press played in Americanization and provides a much-needed close examination of the Yiddish press in Chicago, which is largely absent in studies of the American Yiddish press.

Introduction

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, waves of Central and Eastern European Jews fled the pogroms that ravaged their native villages and sought new homes in Chicago. Upon arriving in Chicago, these immigrants faced the immediate question of how they should build their new community in a young nation that was radically different from those they had left behind. Should they try to reconstruct the tight-knit yet isolating community structure of Eastern European *shtetls*?¹ Should they retain the language of the Old Country (Polish, Russian, German, Yiddish), or seize the expanded economic and social opportunities promised by the adoption of English? Finally, and most broadly, what defined their new community, and how should it fit into the broader American society?

There was little agreement about how to answer these questions. Some believed that Jewish immigrants should maintain a distinct way of life and favored insular communities that would allow them to easily obey religious laws, such as kosher dietary restrictions. Others supported varying degrees of assimilation, and a growing number of Jews—especially in New York—aligned their efforts with other working-class immigrants in support of secular ideologies such as socialism and anarchism. Yet regardless of where they stood on questions of schooling, religious practice, socialism, or Zionism, one aspect of cultural heritage remained central to many immigrants' understanding of themselves: their *mame-loshn*, or mother tongue, Yiddish. Despite the social and economic pressures to assimilate, a significant number of Eastern European Jewish immigrants in Chicago continued to choose Yiddish as a means of retaining their ties both to the past and to their local immigrant community, whether by attending shows at the Yiddish theater, sending their children to a Yiddish-language day school, or subscribing to a

¹ Shtetls were small towns in Eastern Europe inhabited mostly by Jews, existing from the 13th century through the mid-twentieth century, when shtetl life in Eastern Europe was completely destroyed as a result of the Holocaust.

Yiddish newspaper. In doing so, they embodied the words of Yiddish journalist and anarchist Arne Thorne, who said in an interview near the end of his life: “Yiddish is my homeland.”²

In an immigrant community that lacked a territorial homeland to call its own, language was a central element in constituting a cohesive identity. Yiddish had a particular draw—unlike Hebrew, which was then seen as a primarily religious language, Yiddish was the “language of the secular, the home, and the street.”³ As such, it provided Eastern European Jewish immigrants with a unique linguistic space where they could retain their ties to the old world through language while simultaneously locating their debates squarely in their new American setting. Another reason Yiddish was uniquely equipped to help immigrants navigate their new environments was because it was ever-changing, adapting to its speakers’ new environments and adopting words from local vernaculars. By the early twentieth century New York’s Yiddish dialect had become a “jargon” unto itself, incorporating English words such as “typewriter,” “fountain-pen,” and “movies” instead of their Yiddish equivalents (to the chagrin of famous Yiddish writers such as Isaac Bashevis Singer).⁴ In other words, the use of Yiddish allowed Jewish immigrants to exist in two spaces at once—in the “Old Home” of “Yiddishland” on the one hand, and in the physical and social reality of their chosen new home on the other.

It is no coincidence that Arne Thorne, the man who spoke about Yiddish as homeland, was a member of the Yiddish press. Indeed, no other public organization participated so fully in the construction of “Yiddishland” while also providing maps for immigrants to navigate daily life in the new country. In his book about the Yiddish press, *Bad Rabbi*, Eddy Portnoy jokes that

² Claire Ehrlich, “The Lost World of Yiddish Anarchists,” *Jewish Currents*, January 15, 2019. <https://jewishcurrents.org/the-lost-world-of-yiddish-anarchists/>

³ Cristina Stanciu, “Strangers in America: Yiddish Poetry at the Turn of the Twentieth Century and the Demands of Americanization.” *College English* 76, no. 1 (September 2013): 60.

⁴ Isaac Bashevis Singer and Robert H. Wolf, “Problems of Yiddish Prose in America (1943),” *Prooftexts*, vol. 9, no.1 (January 1989): 6.

journalism was “the national sport of Yiddishland.”⁵ The sheer number of different periodicals on Yiddish newsstands reflected the diversity of the Jewish immigrant community—from anarchist manifestos to Zionist fundraisers, satirical cartoons to religious op-eds, and even information about vegetarianism, Jewish gangs, local business, and new literary debuts, all of it could be found in the pages of the Yiddish press.⁶ These pages provide an unparalleled historical record of Jewish life during the late nineteenth- and early-twentieth centuries, giving readers a glimpse into how these immigrants lived, what issues were important to them, and how their communities negotiated the threats and opportunities of assimilation.



Fig. 1. Newspapers in Yiddish, Russian, German, and English are displayed in Chicago’s Maxwell Street neighborhood, ca. 1925. Photo sourced from Irving Cutler’s *Jewish Chicago: a pictorial history*.⁷

The issue of assimilation became particularly acute after the First World War, when the United States lurched into a period of nativism and isolationism, beginning with the country’s

⁵ Eddy Portnoy, *Bad Rabbi: And Other Strange but True Stories From the Yiddish Press* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017), 2.

⁶ Portnoy, 2-5.

⁷ Image from: Irving Cutler, *Jewish Chicago: a pictorial history* (Chicago: Arcadia, 2000), 22.

refusal to join the League of Nations. In 1924, Congress adopted the first restrictions on European immigration to the United States when it passed the Johnson-Reed Act (also known as the Immigration Act of 1924). This legislation significantly limited the number of immigrants allowed each year from Southern and Eastern Europe. The lack of “annual, monthly, weekly infusions of Yiddish speakers” into the United States meant that the effects of assimilation were more acutely felt by the Yiddish press, as rates of assimilation in the Jewish community climbed and there were no new immigrants to replace lost readership.⁸ In the mid-1920s, the Ku Klux Klan grew to a membership of over four million, demonstrating the disturbing extent to which hate groups—including anti-Semitic groups—had gained prominence in the United States beginning at the turn of the century and continuing through the 1920s.⁹ As the growing prevalence of anti-Semitism increased pressures to assimilate and restricted immigration limited the number of Yiddish speakers entering the country every year, the landscapes of Yiddish-speaking communities in New York, Chicago, and elsewhere began to change dramatically. Yiddish newspapers had no choice but to respond to the challenge of heightened assimilation, formulating new ideas of what the Yiddish-speaking community in America should look like.

This paper will analyze the Yiddish-language press in Chicago in the critical years of 1918-1932 and will argue that the press ultimately played a dual role in the lives of Eastern European Jewish immigrants: it challenged the demands of Americanization by keeping its readers connected to the broader linguistic territory of “Yiddishland,” while at the same time actually facilitating the process of immigrants’ assimilation into American society through an increased focus on American topics and a slow shift towards English-language content, among

⁸ Dan Libenson and Lex Rofeberg, hosts, “American History of Yiddish - Tony Michels,” Judaism Unbound, podcast audio, January 30, 2020, <https://www.judaismunbound.com/podcast/episode-207-tony-michels>

⁹ Beth S. Wenger, *The Jewish Americans: three centuries of Jewish voices in America* (New York: Doubleday, 2007), 201.

other trends. My analysis will focus on two Chicago-based Yiddish-language newspapers, the *Daily Jewish Courier* and the Chicago edition of the *Daily Jewish Forward*. I will argue that both of them, despite their enormous differences regarding politics, religion, and what American-Jewish identity should look like, performed the dual function of contesting and facilitating Americanization in the Chicago Jewish community. I will look in depth at two ways in which they performed these roles: 1) in their explicit arguments about Americanization and the extent to which the American Jewish community should assimilate; 2) in their debates about education and language, two topics that were central to both newspapers' overarching vision for the future of the American Jewish community.

Historiography

Countless scholars have engaged with the history of the Yiddish press over the years, many of them particularly interested in the ways in which Jewish immigrants negotiated the process of Americanization. The first scholars to study the immigrant press were contemporaries of the newspapers' readers and columnists who were fascinated by the transformation in urban landscapes caused by immigration. In his landmark 1922 study, *The immigrant press and its control*, University of Chicago sociologist Robert Ezra Park described this historical moment and the unique role that the press played within it: "Our great cities, as we discover upon close examination, are mosaics of little language colonies, cultural enclaves, each maintaining its separate communal existence within the wider circle of the city's cosmopolitan life," Park wrote. "Each one of these little communities is certain to have some sort of co-operative or mutual aid society, very likely a church, a school, possibly a theater, but almost invariably a press."¹⁰

¹⁰ Robert Ezra Park, *The Immigrant Press and its Control* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922), 7.

The Yiddish press in particular captured Park's attention. Specifically, he was intrigued by the journalistic methods of Abraham Cahan, the editor-in-chief of the New York *Forward*. The *Forward* was the most popular and enduring of all Yiddish periodicals—indeed, it exists to this day, albeit in an exclusively online format since 2019.¹¹ What most fascinated Park about Cahan was the specific dialect of Yiddish that Cahan's *Forward* used. Rather than using a standardized form of Yiddish, or a common Eastern-European dialect, Cahan eliminated “unnecessary” Russian, Lithuanian, and German elements, simplifying the language and incorporating the Anglicisms of New York Jews. Soon, “Die boys mit die meidlach haben a good time”¹² was considered “excellent American Yiddish.”¹³ Cahan insisted that his staff use this Americanized Yiddish, which he argued was the language “spoken in the street, the shops, the factories, and the homes of the people it desired to reach.”¹⁴ The *Forward*'s linguistic inventiveness proved effective; soon, the daily paper had a circulation of over 140,000.¹⁵ Furthermore, Park argued, Cahan's choice made the *Forward* a uniquely American creation—a publication specifically aimed at helping New York's working class immigrants organize, assimilate into American society, and learn about socialism.

Ultimately, Park argued that the immigrant press—through its Americanized topics and language—promoted assimilation in the long-term, acting as an entry point into American society for newly arrived immigrants. Mordecai Soltes, Park's contemporary, agreed that the Yiddish press was an “Americanizing agency,” and he highlighted the ways in which the Yiddish

¹¹ Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “The Forward, 122-year-old Jewish Publication, Ends Its Print Edition, *Haaretz*, Jan. 17, 2019. Accessed April 14, 2020. <https://www.haaretz.com/us-news/the-forward-122-year-old-u-s-jewish-publication-ends-its-print-edition-1.6849712>

¹²“The boys have a good time with the girls.”

¹³ H.L. Mencken, *The American Language* (New York: Knopf, 1919), 155-157; cited in Robert Ezra Park, *The immigrant press and its control* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922), 81-83.

¹⁴ Park, 101.

¹⁵ Park, 91.

press helped its readers navigate the maze-like complexity they found in the United States. For many working class Jews in New York, the Yiddish press was “practically the only source of information to which most of them [had] access...[guiding] them in the early stages of their process of adjustment to the new and complex American environment.”¹⁶ Ido Joseph Dissentshik makes a similar argument in his 1966 study of two New York Yiddish dailies, in which he contends that Yiddish newspapers instilled their readers with a uniquely American spirit, helping them to assimilate into their new society while maintaining a distinctly Jewish identity.¹⁷

Although they were originally published almost a century ago, Park’s arguments about the immigrant press’s assimilative function continue to be reflected in scholarly accounts of the Yiddish press to this day. In a 2016 article titled “Revisiting the immigrant press,” Andrea Hickerson and Kristin Gustafson argue that many aspects of Park’s characterization of the immigrant press remain relevant, particularly the ways in which the immigrant press aids processes of assimilation.¹⁸ Prominent American Jewish scholars have echoed these arguments as well, especially in their analysis of Cahan’s New York *Forward*. In *The Jewish Americans*, a documentary history of American Jewry, historian Beth Wenger echoed the consensus about the role that the *Forward* played in Americanization: “Under its editor Abraham Cahan,” she states simply, “*The Jewish Daily Forward* was an Americanizing agency.”¹⁹ She gives several examples of this, including an amusing article in which the *Forward*’s editors tried to explain the rules of baseball to its readers.²⁰ Deborah Dash Moore similarly focuses on the New York

¹⁶ Mordecai Soltes, “The Yiddish Press—An Americanizing Agency,” *The American Jewish Year Book* 26 (September 29, 1924, to September 18, 1925): 174.

¹⁷ Ido Joseph Dissentshik, “New York’s Two Yiddish Dailies: ‘The Day Morgen Journal’ and ‘Forward’ – A 1966 Study,” *Kesher*, no. 6 (1989): 45e-52e.

¹⁸ Andrea Hickerson and Kristin L. Gustafson, “Revisiting the Immigrant Press,” *Journalism* 17, no. 8 (November 2016): 956-958.

¹⁹ Wenger, 155.

²⁰ Wenger, 155.

Yiddish press in her sprawling 2017 history of the city's Jewish community, paying special attention to the *Forward*.²¹

Wenger and Moore have been careful, however, to avoid Park's tendency to generalize. While they focus most of their attention on the *Forward*, they are careful to qualify their statements about the Yiddish press in general and to acknowledge the lack of consensus in the early twentieth century Jewish community on most issues. Wenger notes the more complex dual function of the Yiddish press in her commentary, stating: "The Yiddish press ... emerged as a medium that expressed and fortified immigrant Jewish culture while helping Jews adapt to American society."²² However, beyond listing the vast array of orientations represented in the press—anarchist, conservative, Zionist, and more—Wenger does not examine much of the content of the Yiddish press outside of the *Forward*. Additionally, while she provides a nuanced look at the question of Americanization among the Yiddish-speaking Left and "is...careful to acknowledge that [they] had a more ambiguous stance toward the Americanization project"²³ than is often recognized, Wenger's scope remains limited to the New York-based, socialist context and does not incorporate the voices represented in other types of Yiddish publications. Jerome Chanes has a similar critique of Deborah Dash Moore's *Jewish New York*, arguing that while "Moore rightly emphasizes the role of the socialist *Forverts*,²⁴ the regnant Yiddish newspaper in this arena...she ignores the role and impact of another important newspaper, the *Freiheit*,"²⁵ which competed with the *Forward* in political ideology and its views on

²¹ Deborah Dash Moore, et al, *Jewish New York: The Remarkable Story of a City and a People* (New York: NYU Press, 2017), 136-138.

²² Wenger, 98.

²³ Daniel Soyer, "Reviewed Work: History Lessons: The Creation of American Jewish Heritage by Beth Wenger," Review of *History Lessons: The Creation of American Jewish Heritage*, by Beth Wenger, *Journal of American Ethnic History* 32, no. 2 (Winter 2013): 119.

²⁴ The Yiddish name of the *Forward*.

²⁵ *Freiheit* means freedom.

Americanization.²⁶ Chanes' comment captures, in a word, the most significant limitation of the existing scholarship on the Yiddish press in the United States, specifically in regards to its response to Americanization—namely, that it is relatively narrow in scope, with the vast majority of scholars focusing on New York City and the *Forward* in particular.²⁷

While this paper builds upon the work of all of these scholars, contributing to the literature on the Yiddish press' role in facilitating Americanization, it will also use close readings of Chicago's newspapers to show the extent to which assimilation did *not* appear inevitable to many. It will demonstrate that even when Yiddish-language newspapers were contributing to the process of Americanization, they were not always doing so willingly or knowingly like the *Forward*. Indeed, many newspapers—conservative, socialist, and otherwise—were explicit about the ways in which they sought to be a part of “Yiddishland,” whether through their ties with a transnational Yiddish community, their membership in Yiddish revolutionary movements, or their commitment to a Yiddish-language education for their children. While most scholars acknowledge the deeper complexity in the Yiddish press' engagement with the issue of assimilation, little work has been done to explore it, and to bring out the voices of Yiddish writers who pushed back against assimilation or attempted to negotiate its demands.

This paper will therefore fill the following gaps in the scholarship on the Yiddish press in America. First, it will focus attention on Chicago, a city with a rich Yiddish-language history that is underrepresented in scholarship. A study of Chicago's Yiddish press will complement the

²⁶ Jerome A. Chanes, “Review,” Review of *Jewish New York: The Remarkable Story of a City and a People*, by Deborah Dash Moore, *American Jewish History* 103, no. 3 (July 2019): 386.

²⁷ It should be noted that there are many incredibly robust studies of the Yiddish press (still mostly limited to the New York context) that focus on issues other than the question of assimilation, Americanization, and American-Jewish identity. Tony Michels, one of the foremost scholars on the Yiddish press, has mostly focused his work on Yiddish socialists in New York, looking at the ways in which they engaged in transnational networks of revolutionary Yiddish thought and highlighting the role of the press in speaking to New York's Jewish working class. Rebecca Margolis focuses on many of the same issues that are featured in this paper, but in the Canadian context (focusing on Montreal).

extensive scholarship on New York's, providing examples of the ways in which Chicago's newspapers addressed Americanization, often in less explicit and more nuanced ways than Cahan's *Forward*. In this way, this paper will build on scholarship about the Yiddish press as an Americanizing agency but will emphasize the different approaches that publications took to this process. My paper will also showcase the voices of the Yiddish writers who sought to limit the reach of Americanization, demonstrating the ways in which they dwelt in "Yiddishland" while simultaneously creating new homes in America.

Throughout this paper, I use the terms "assimilation" and "Americanization" frequently, reflecting the ways in which both scholars and immigrants have referred to the issues at the heart of this paper. Both are intended to refer, generally speaking, to "the process through which individuals and groups of differing heritages acquire the basic habits, attitudes, and mode of life" of the United States.²⁸ However, some Yiddish immigrant writers pushed back on these terms by insisting that it was possible to simultaneously "Americanize"—to participate actively in American politics and society—while retaining strong cultural and personal ties to the immigrant community. In other words, these immigrants defined "Americanization" as exercising one's citizenship rights, celebrating the Fourth of July, or watching baseball, and used the term "assimilation" to indicate a more complete social, cultural, and linguistic integration into American society.

American Jewish historian Deborah Dash Moore has also taken issue with the terms "assimilation" and "Americanization." In her 2006 essay, "At Home in America? Revisiting the Second Generation," she critiqued the ways in which contemporary American historians have continued to use terms like "assimilation" to judge the extent to which immigrants have "become

²⁸ *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, s.v. "assimilation," accessed April 29, 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assimilation>.

American.”²⁹ This framework of understanding immigrant experiences, she claims, is far too simplistic, and moreover, it leaves second-generation immigrants in a particularly poignant position—they are at home “neither in the parental world nor in the United States,” lacking deep ties to their homeland but unable to ever fully assimilate.³⁰ Moore argues that this framework also ignores the creative ways in which second generation immigrants creatively adapted the institutions of their parents to the society around them, finding ways not to *become* American, but to “be at home in America.” Moore’s concept of being “at home” in the United States allows for a much more nuanced understanding of assimilation, making space for a wide range of experiences and degrees of assimilation. The idea of “Yiddishland” also fits snugly within Moore’s theory. As the first, second, and later generations of America’s Yiddish-speaking Jews searched for ways to carve out small “Yiddishlands” in their American communities, they participated in the institutional innovations that Moore wrote about, making the traditions of the Old World compatible with the new home.

Thus, while I will use the term “assimilation” to refer to the general process of adjusting to life in the U.S., I will use the term “Americanization” to refer to Moore’s idea of immigrants becoming “at home” in America. This framework allows for a more optimistic, individual-oriented understanding of the immigrant experience. Ultimately, this is what I will argue the Yiddish press facilitated—it allowed Chicago’s Eastern European Jews to create their own unique community in a new land; to remain a part of “Yiddishland,” but also to become “at home” in America.

²⁹ Deborah Dash Moore, “At Home in America?: Revisiting the Second Generation,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 25, no. 2/3, Immigration, Integration, Incorporation and Transnationalism: Interdisciplinary and International Perspectives (Winter – Spring 2006): 160.

³⁰ Moore, “At Home in America?”, 160.

Chicago's Two Yiddish Dailies

When Eastern European Jews first arrived in Chicago in the late nineteenth century, many of them had had little exposure to secular Yiddish literature; there were few such publications in the Russian Empire at the time due to strict governmental restrictions on minority publications.³¹ Because of this, it took several years for the Yiddish-language press in the city to take off, and the 1880s were littered with failed publications that went under in a matter of years or months. As the immigrant population of Chicago increased, however, the Yiddish-language press became a central part of Eastern European Jewish life in the city, representing the voices of the newly-arrived immigrants from Russia whose outlook and lifestyle contrasted starkly with that of German-Jewish and Anglo-Jewish populations living on the South and North sides, who were largely Americanized by the 1880s.³² Most German-Jewish newspapers—of which there were relatively few—were religious in nature, with religious figures as their editors; Yiddish newspapers, by contrast, spanned the breadth of the ideological spectrum. Their publications were edited “by a diverse group of union leaders, printers, business owners, and journalists.”³³ While Yiddish bound all of these individuals together, their understandings of Yiddish—of its function in the community and of its relative importance compared to Hebrew, for example—differed greatly.

By 1920, there were two prominent competing Yiddish dailies in Chicago that make up the majority of the source material for this paper: the *Daily Jewish Courier*, which represented an

³¹ Irving Cutler, *The Jews of Chicago: From Shtetl to Suburb* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996), 138; Eddy Portnoy, *Bad Rabbi: And Other Strange but True Stories From the Yiddish Press* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017), 3-4.

³² These groups of immigrants had arrived much earlier, in the mid-nineteenth century, and were therefore largely assimilated by the time the Eastern European Jews arrived. The conflicts between the two groups ranged from religious disagreements to class antipathy, with the earlier arrivals generally looking down upon the working class Jews from Eastern Europe.

³³ Cutler, *The Jews of Chicago*, 138.

Orthodox, Zionist perspective, and the Chicago edition of the *Jewish Daily Forward*—a regional branch of the famous New York daily—which was socialist and secular in outlook.³⁴ The *Forward* opened its Chicago branch in 1919, but its New York counterpart was well-known in the city long before then as one of the primary periodicals representing the Jewish working class. According to an article printed in the Chicago *Forward* in 1929, there had been a campaign set up in the years before the *Forward* came to Chicago that had rallied to open a branch in the city in order to support the labor movement there.³⁵ In his history of Chicago's Jews, Irving Cutler describes the *Forward*'s reputation in the city: “[it was] known for its warm, often argumentative style, which produced coverage that was frequently punctuated with razor-sharp wit and barbs.”³⁶

The Chicago *Forward* participated in processes of Americanization rather explicitly, as it had in New York; in Abraham Cahan's own words, published in the Chicago *Forward* in 1927, “the *Forward* was called into being for a double purpose: (a) To organize the Jewish workers into trade unions and disseminate the principles of Socialism among them. (b) To act as an educational agency among the immigrant Jewish masses in the broadest sense of the word, and to spread among them high ideals of humanity.”³⁷ By encouraging its readers to embrace secularism and socialism, while also retaining a firm focus on Jewish readers through the choice of Yiddish and through news related to the state of the American Jewish immigrant community

³⁴ The Chicago *Forward* seems to have been relatively independent from the originally New York edition, publishing a significant amount of content about the local Chicago context, which comprises the source material of this paper. However, it is unfortunately difficult to tell to what extent the Chicago *Forward* reprinted materials from the New York context.

³⁵ *Forward*, “Ten Years of the Forward in Chicago Editorial,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, January 1, 1929, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1 IE. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0811/

³⁶ Cutler, *The Jews of Chicago*, 140.

³⁷ *Forward*, “Our Thirtieth Anniversary By Abraham Cahan, Editor-in-Chief of Forward,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, May 1, 1927, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.b2.d1 IE, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0820/.

and workers, the *Forward* sought to influence identity construction for the growing American Jewish community. It recognized the importance of Yiddish to Jewish immigrant identity while pushing Jews to engage with the larger community rather than isolate themselves as they had done in the *shtetls* of Eastern Europe. The *Forward* wanted them to engage with the world as socialists, citizens, and workers—it chose Yiddish because it saw Yiddish as the secular Jewish language, a language of the working class, and a language that could speak to Jewish immigrants' hearts.

Over the years, however, the *Forward*'s commitment to the Yiddish language expanded beyond the language's role as the working-class vernacular. Beginning in the 1920s and continuing into the 1930s, the *Forward* joined ranks with cultural organizations such as the Workmen's Circle which were dedicated to preserving the Yiddish language and culture through education. The *Forward* began to promote evening classes such as "Jewish history" and "Yiddish reading" as a means of connecting Chicago's secular Yiddish-speaking community to a broader idea of "Yiddishland."³⁸ This shift was a result both of the increasing pressures of assimilation and of the *Forward*'s ties to broader, transnational Yiddish socialist movements, specifically the Bundist movement. The Bundists, who had originally formed Yiddish socialist parties across Eastern Europe, had also agitated for the right to what they called "cultural autonomy"—essentially, the ability to practice their culture and speak their language in peace. When many of them left Eastern Europe due to political turmoil, they brought this powerful ideology of identity centered on "Yiddishkayt" and "doikayt"³⁹ with them to the United States,

³⁸ *Forward*, "[Classes of the Educational Committee of the Workmen's Circle]," translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, October 6, 1920, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.f. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1508/

³⁹ "Yiddishness" and "here-ness"

launching a revival of “Yiddish culture” in American Jewish immigrant communities (especially those aligned with the socialist cause).⁴⁰ The *Forward* was deeply involved in these efforts.

The perspective of the *Daily Jewish Courier*, which branded itself as the voice of Chicago’s Orthodox community, contrasted greatly with that of the *Forward*. Despite these differences, the *Courier*, too, simultaneously encouraged Americanization in some ways while articulating a traditionally Eastern European Jewish identity in others. Having started publishing in 1887, the *Courier* was among the oldest Yiddish periodicals printed in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, and it was one of few Jewish newspapers in Chicago that survived from the late nineteenth century into the twentieth. Furthermore, it was the first Yiddish daily to be published—and to achieve success—outside of New York City.⁴¹

From the start, the *Courier* attracted the attention of other Jewish newspapers. In 1894, *The Occident*, an English-language newspaper that associated itself with Reform Judaism (and proudly declared itself the “first Jewish reform paper to come into existence in the world”⁴²), took note of the *Courier* in an article discussing four prominent Jewish newspapers in Chicago. Three of the four were published in English; only the *Courier* had the distinction of being printed in Yiddish, or, as *The Occident* put it: “in Hebrew characters in the Russian and Polish dialect.”⁴³ It circulated, according to *The Occident*, “among the 25,000 Russian and Polish Jews of the city,”⁴⁴ making it the primary periodical for Chicago’s Eastern European Jewish population. Throughout the 1920s, the *Courier* was also featured, albeit rather unfavorably, in the Chicago

⁴⁰ Frank Wolff, “The Home That Never Was: Rethinking Space and Memory in Late Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Jewish History,” *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 38, no. 3 (145) (2013): 202-203.

⁴¹ Arthur A. Goren, “The Jewish Press in the U.S.” *Kesher / נאום*, no. 6 (1989): 13e. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23901046>.

⁴² *The Occident*, “Jewish Publications of Chicago,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, April 6, 1894, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1.

⁴³ *The Occident*, “Jewish Publications of Chicago.”

⁴⁴ *The Occident*, “Jewish Publications of Chicago.”

Forward. In 1921 the *Forward* accused the *Courier* of lying about its circulation—while the *Courier*'s official 1921 circulation was 42,040, the *Forward* insisted that its true circulation was closer to 8,000.⁴⁵ Regardless of what the circulation numbers really were, there is no doubt that the *Courier* was prominent among Chicago's Yiddish periodicals, and that it remained so—in the minds of its supporters and detractors—for the first half of the twentieth century, as most other Yiddish newspapers failed.

The *Courier* published articles about education, international news, Yiddish cultural activities throughout the city, various religious institutions in Chicago, and much more. Alongside editorials, they published fiction, poetry, and advertisements. Like many Yiddish newspapers, the *Courier* was unique in the sheer extent of genres that it published, which allowed it to play an outsized role in the cultural life of Chicago's Orthodox community.

The *Courier*'s editorial staff was proud to call itself a particularly Yiddish paper. In 1923, they wrote an editorial in English explaining what they considered to be the defining qualities of the Yiddish press. In this editorial, they claimed to be responding to the criticism that the Jewish press was “old-fashioned.”⁴⁶ Other newspapers, they claimed, accused Yiddish newspapers of focusing too little on “the human side of things,” calling them dull because they “carry no social column, do not publish stories relating to crime and divorce scandals, and carry no bedroom stories and so forth.”⁴⁷ The *Courier*'s response was that they did not publish such stories simply

⁴⁵ *Forward*, “[No headline],” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, May 14, 1921, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1, <http://flps.newberry.org/article/542397250892/>; *Forward*, “The Truth about the Courier Circulation, translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, May 15, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1, <http://flps.newberry.org/article/542397220574/>

⁴⁶ *Reform Advocate*. “The Growth of Jewish Chicago: Forty-Two Years’ Recollections.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. June 13, 1931. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0796/.

⁴⁷ *Reform Advocate*, “The Growth of Jewish Chicago: Forty-Two Years’ Recollections.”

because their readers would not enjoy them; their readers had different, unique tastes. Yiddish readers, they wrote, “want their newspaper to be a political, literary, social, economic, and religious world history of yesterday.”⁴⁸ The editors pointed out that in shaping their content to the tastes of their readers, the Yiddish press was not unique. Many foreign presses catered to the interests and needs of their particular readership. The editors concluded: “If the Yiddish daily is old-fashioned, then one might say that the French, English, or Italian dailies are also old-fashioned because they are so fundamentally different from the average American daily, yet no one claims that they are old-fashioned, because they serve the purpose of their readers and fit their taste.”⁴⁹ The arguments made by the *Courier*’s editors were not, in fact, true of the Yiddish press as a whole—the *Forward* certainly couldn’t be accused of lacking articles on cruder topics such as crime, sex, and scandal.⁵⁰ What these assertions about the Yiddish press *do* show, however, is how the editors of the *Courier* envisioned the role of the Yiddish press in the community, and why it carried special significance for its readers. This self-image contrasts sharply with that of the socialist, “Americanized” New York *Forward*; the *Courier*, instead, catered to the tastes of Yiddish-speakers from the Old Country. It was a piece of “Yiddishland” in America.

While it was much more committed to the traditions and continuities of “Yiddishland” compared to the *Forward*, the *Courier* supported Americanization in its own way as well. While it emphasized Jewish news, taking a particular interest in the Zionist cause, it also encouraged Chicago’s Jewish immigrants to take an active role in the political life of their new community.

⁴⁸ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Is the Jewish Press Old-Fashioned?” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, May 27, 1923, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0859/

⁴⁹ *Daily Jewish Courier*. “Is the Jewish Press Old-Fashioned?”

⁵⁰ Portnoy, *Bad Rabbi*, 79, 131.

During WWI, the *Courier* highlighted the war effort, encouraged Jews to buy liberty bonds, and criticized federal anti-immigration legislation. In one 1918 article, the *Courier* encouraged readers to show their loyalty by participating in Fourth of July parades.⁵¹ Unlike the *Forward*, the *Courier* expected its readers to retain their commitment to the Jewish faith and traditions. Yet, it did not seek isolation, either. By educating its readers about American political and social life—and by even promoting patriotism in readers—the *Courier*, too, nurtured the process of becoming “at home” in America.

Both the *Courier* and the *Forward* facilitated Americanization while advancing their unique articulations of Jewish immigrant identity in the United States and the role that Yiddish should play in constituting this identity. The *Forward* urged Jewish immigrants to become more secular and socialist, engaging with their communities politically and economically. For the *Forward*, Yiddish was largely chosen for practical reasons—it was the language of the Jewish working class that the editors hoped to reach, and it had the added benefit of being a “secular” Jewish language—not the language of the Torah, but the language of the street and the home. Yet, in the 1920s and early 1930s, a redefined idea of Yiddish culture became increasingly important to the *Forward*’s vision of the immigrant Jewish community, as evidenced by their evolving commitment to the transnational Yiddish socialist community. The *Courier*, on the other hand, maintained a more traditional, Orthodox standpoint on Jewish identity, and saw Yiddish as a central part of this identity. Yiddish was the language of the home and community, as well as a potential language for religious instruction. The *Courier* encouraged Americanization—a becoming “at home” in America—without desiring cultural assimilation; it

⁵¹ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “On the Community Stage by J. Leibner Fourth of July Celebration,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, June 23, 1918, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.b3.a, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_1391

saw its readers as individuals who lived distinctly Jewish (mostly Orthodox) lives, and many of the national and international political issues covered in the newspaper displayed these loyalties.⁵²

The Issue of Americanization in the Press

“Jewish life in the United States has entered a new phase,” the *Forward* announced in 1926. “With the sudden cessation of immigration and the practical disappearance of the green horn,”⁵³ the Jewish masses are rapidly becoming Americanized.”⁵⁴ Indeed, the mid-to-late-1920s presented new challenges to Chicago’s Jewish immigrant community caused by the end of mass immigration and the increasing abandonment of Yiddish among immigrants who had been living in Chicago for a few decades. Yet the solution to these challenges was elusive, and few members of Chicago’s Yiddish-speaking community completely rejected “Americanization” or embraced isolation.

Indeed, of the immigrant groups that had come to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Jews of Eastern Europe were one of the groups that had shown the deepest feelings of loyalty to the United States early on. After all, unlike most other immigrant groups, the Jews who had emigrated from the Pale Settlement had no state to call their own back in Europe and spoke a different language from surrounding nationalities, whose increasing violence and persecution had led Jewish immigrants to flee to the “Golden Land.” In

⁵² Specifically, the *Courier*’s Zionist activism. The *Courier* was an active supporter of Zionism, running frequent fundraisers for Zionist causes and providing coverage on Zionist conferences that occurred in Chicago, which was hub for Zionist activity at the time.

⁵³ New arrival.

⁵⁴ *Forward*. “Workmen’s Circle to Win Jewish Youth.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. February 7, 1926. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III E, III G. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_1367/

America, many found opportunities for work and education that would have been impossible to achieve or even imagine in the Old Country. In the words of one columnist writing in the *Reform Advocate*:

“The Jewish American, I am quite sure, experiences feelings of pride and patriotism on seeing the flag, only very much intensified. Reviled, hunted, and persecuted even to death for centuries by all the world, the Jew comes to America where he is accorded freedom, protection, and the same rights as are granted to people of other creeds. America has become the haven of refuge for our persecuted co-religionists and has granted them an equal chance to rise in the world. The flag of the United States should awaken within his bosom, feelings of love, loyalty and devotion to the flag and to the country which it represents.”⁵⁵

At the same time, however, the Yiddish-speaking Jews in Chicago were one of the immigrant groups most concerned about maintaining their distinct identity in the face of increasing assimilation, and the pressures to assimilate were multiplying rapidly in the early 1920s, creating a sense of urgency for many in the Yiddish press. The working-class Jews who had originally settled in the *shtetl*-like environment of Maxwell Street on Chicago’s Northwest Side were gradually entering the middle class and moving out of the city’s lower-class Yiddish-speaking quarter. While some of them moved to the largely Yiddish-speaking neighborhood of North Lawndale, others relocated to less distinctly Jewish communities on the North and West Sides. Learning English brought with it incredible economic and social benefits, causing many of Chicago’s Jews to abandon their *mame-loshn*, exacerbating the blow to Yiddish newspapers’ readership. Another more harrowing factor spurring increased Jewish assimilation was the intensification of anti-Semitic sentiment in the United States during the 1920s, not only among hate groups such as the Ku Klux Klan, but also among upper-class Americans such as Henry

⁵⁵ *Reform Advocate*, “The American Flag by Leopold Deutelbaum,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, June 13, 1931, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish I.C, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_2_0415/

Ford.⁵⁶ In 1923, in the face of these mounting challenges, the *Courier*'s editorial board reflected: "If we do not attempt to create new boundaries in the Jewish life of America, if we do not establish certain principles for our life as a whole, it is difficult to see how the American Jewry can have a future."⁵⁷

The Yiddish-speaking press in Chicago responded to the increasing pressures of assimilation in two ways. The first response was to reinforce the community's commitment to old traditions and values, and to emphasize their connection to "Yiddishland" as a means of establishing continuity in the Jewish community and forming the next links in the "golden chain." This "conservative" approach was often invoked by the *Courier*, which identified with a more traditional form of Orthodox Judaism.

A second response was less concerned with tradition and continuity, focusing instead on fostering a sense of common purpose that would unite the community in both present and future. The most significant difference between the two approaches is the question of *what* the community organized itself around. In general, writers from the *Forward* encouraged Jewish immigrants to let go of the old-fashioned traditions of the Old Country, particularly religious traditions, and instead to coalesce around a secular Jewish identity grounded in the experience of being Jewish in America or being a part of a transnational Yiddish socialist movement (in other words, rooted in the Bundist ideals of "Yiddishkayt" and "doikayt.") While writers from the *Courier* were less willing to cast aside tradition, they, too, had a series of "future-minded" ideals that they hoped would unite American Jewry. For the *Courier*, the primary ideal was Zionism,

⁵⁶ Wenger, 201.

⁵⁷ *Daily Jewish Courier*, "What Are the Principles? (Editorial)", translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, May 18, 1923, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: III.C, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_0482/

which led to increased enthusiasm for Hebrew language education among some of the *Courier*'s columnists.

Regardless of the particular response that a writer chose, these responses took a similar form in articles from the *Forward* and the *Courier*. Throughout the 1920s, columnists from both papers wrote opinion pieces that followed a common structure: they defined the problem of assimilation, then proposed a form of community engagement—often focused on the youth—in order to rekindle the flames of connection between members of Chicago's Yiddish-speaking community.

The *Courier* wrote such an op-ed in 1923, entitled “Build a Dam.” In the piece, the problem of assimilation was described metaphorically as a “threatening deluge” or flood.⁵⁸ The article lamented that the community seemed less and less engaged in Jewish institutions and that the youth seemed to be slowly drifting away from its Jewish roots. In response, the article called for the construction of a “dam,” which it claimed was more necessary than ever before due to the unprecedented threat of assimilation.⁵⁹ Thankfully, the article continued, this dam was already being built by a community organization called Adath B’nai Israel, a group that sought to “attract the youth to Jewish traditions; [organize] the youth on a religious and nationalistic basis; [and]...restore the Sabbath and all the other great institutions of the Jewish religion.”⁶⁰ For the *Courier*, religious and cultural traditions were absolutely central to the continuation of Jewish identity as they knew it.

⁵⁸ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Build a Dam,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, March 23, 1923, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III E, II D 6, III A.

http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_1394/

⁵⁹ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Build a Dam.”

⁶⁰ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Build a Dam.”

The *Courier* saw Zionism as a natural extension of the “dam building” in the United States. As laudable as it was to strive to preserve Jewish cultural institutions in the Diaspora, argued an English-language editorial, it would ultimately not be enough, “for the forces of assimilation are as irresistible as their operation is universal.”⁶¹ In order to preserve the traditions of the Jewish community in the long term, a country and language of its own was necessary.⁶² Beyond this larger argument about the necessity of Zionism, the *Courier* used Zionism as a means of bringing Chicago’s Yiddish-speaking community together, as well. The *Courier* covered the Zionist Congresses that took place with some frequency in Chicago, promoted Zionist youth groups such as Young Judea Clubs, and advertised programs hosted by the Chicago Zionist Organization, such as a course that they ran on the history of Zionism in 1931.⁶³ By bringing the Chicago Yiddish community—especially its youth—together around traditional Jewish institutions and the Zionist cause, the *Courier* hoped to prevent the community from being “washed away” by the tides of assimilation.⁶⁴

While the *Forward* was less protective of tradition than the *Courier*, it was similarly committed to engaging Chicago’s Jewish community, particularly its youth, and renewing their commitment to Yiddish culture. In a 1926 editorial entitled “Workmen’s Circle to Win Jewish Youth,” the *Forward* begins by defining the complex processes affecting Jewish immigrants:

the Jewish masses are rapidly becoming Americanized; not assimilated, [but] acclimatized best describes what is going on...[however], we have little to fear from acclimatization in America. The American Jews will doubtless look, talk, and act

⁶¹ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “A Definition of Zionism (Editorial in English),” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, April 19, 1923, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III A, I A 2 b, III H, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_0500/

⁶² *Daily Jewish Courier*, “A Definition of Zionism (Editorial in English)

⁶³ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Zionists Announce Interesting Course on Zionism,” translted and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, January 10, 1931, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II B 2 f. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1185/

⁶⁴ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Build a Dam.”

differently from their Polish and Russian brethren, but only outwardly. Intrinsically and essentially the Jew in the United States will be just as Jewish as the Polish or Russian Jew.⁶⁵

By stating their indifference towards retaining the traditions and mannerisms of Eastern European Jewry, the *Forward* rejected a Yiddish identity grounded in its connection to the Old Country. Whereas an outward appearance of continuity and religiosity was important to the *Courier*'s writers, as it was for many Jews living in Eastern Europe, the *Forward* seemed to accept social assimilation, identifying Yiddish identity as something internal. The *Forward* emphasizes this further, stating that although Jews had changed their language, manners, occupations, and ideas many times in the Diaspora, “the golden chain was not broken...[and] they did not cease to be Jews.”⁶⁶

However, the *Forward* also did not believe that Yiddish culture would continue to flourish of its own accord. Using similar metaphorical language to that of the *Courier*, the *Forward* called the Yiddish-speaking community to action. “A bridge must be built to open the river of time which separates the European-born fathers from their American-born sons.”⁶⁷ Lest this sound too similar to the *Courier*'s calls for commitment to Eastern European traditions, the *Forward* makes it clear in the next sentence that they are referring to the long tradition of Yiddish secular socialism, asserting that “a technique... must be evolved, a way found, to unite present day American-Jewish life with the idealism of the older generation of Jewish radicals.”⁶⁸ The solution to this dilemma was the Workmen's Circle, which was dedicated to keeping the Yiddish language and culture alive in the United States. Through educational programs and

⁶⁵ *Forward*, “Workmen's Circle to Win Jewish Youth.”

⁶⁶ *Forward*, “Workmen's Circle to Win Jewish Youth.”

⁶⁷ *Forward*, “Workmen's Circle to Win Jewish Youth.”

⁶⁸ *Forward*, “Workmen's Circle to Win Jewish Youth.”

community gatherings, the Workmen’s Circle engaged in the noble task of creating the “bridge between generations” that the *Forward* called for.

These two orientations—conservative and Orthodox versus secular and socialist—are apparent in the ways in which writers from the *Courier* and the *Forward* spoke about their commitment to the Yiddish language, as well. When columnists from the *Courier* wrote articles supporting Yiddish language education, they usually argued that Yiddish was important specifically because it helped the children of Jewish immigrants remain connected to their parents’ culture and religious traditions. When columnists from the *Forward* wrote about Yiddish, on the other hand, they situated it less in relation to long-standing Jewish traditions; instead, they saw it as one means of fostering cohesion among the American Jewish community in the present and future and as a means of uniting the international Yiddish socialist movement. However, many argued that the Yiddish language was not necessary to accomplish these goals, as long as Jewish youth were being educated about Yiddish culture and communities around the world. Indeed, one *Forward* columnist argued in 1931 that there was little use in trying to force the “familiar mother tongue” onto the youth; did any such thing even exist anymore, after the immigrants had left Europe? Furthermore, the *Forward* writer acknowledged that the socialist and secular educational initiatives of the Workmen’s Circle schools were probably Americanizing the children just as much as anything else, teaching them “to love the America of Debs and Lincoln—the America of idealism.”⁶⁹ For them, teaching Yiddish was thus not as much about preventing Americanization, but about continuing to foster growth and beautification of the Yiddish language and culture, even within their new Americanized setting.

⁶⁹ *Forward*, “Jewish Education in America,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, March 14, 1931, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.B.2.f, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1173/

The question at the heart of these debates about politics, Yiddish, and Americanization was the question of belonging in the new home. Despite all of their disagreements, the *Courier* and the *Forward* both envisioned a Jewish community that was committed to Yiddish, Jewishness, and finding a place for itself within the new home—in other words, both were seeking ways to truly be “at home” in America, to feel at once connected to their heritage and to their surroundings. What the papers contested was the extent to which Yiddish was connected to Jewish religious traditions and the importance of outwardly appearing “Jewish” or “American.” For the *Courier*, being “at home” in America meant being free to participate in American politics and society while remaining firmly rooted in Jewish culture and religion, which could be accessed through Yiddish and Hebrew, respectively. The *Forward*, by contrast, encouraged its readers to become more outwardly “American,” to cast off religion and tradition, and to retain Yiddish primarily as a means of cultural autonomy and community cohesion.

How Will We Educate Our Children? The Centrality of Education and Language in Journalists’ Conceptions of Jewish Immigrant Identity

While Chicago’s Yiddish journalists wrote explicitly about assimilation on occasion, more often, they would debate other, more specific topics that were important to their communities, doing so in ways that reflected their broader ideas about Americanization and the future of the Yiddish community in Chicago. Education was by far one of the most contentious and prominent topics debated in Chicago’s Yiddish press. Over the course of several years, hundreds of articles were penned by columnists and laypeople alike to debate the importance of a Jewish education, the proper form of such an education, the importance of language in an immigrant’s upbringing, and more.

Both the *Courier* and the *Forward* featured debates about these topics in editorials and letters to the editor, the *Courier* in the early 1920s and the *Forward* in the early 1930s. These debates provide glimpses into two distinct moments in the history of the Eastern European Jewry in Chicago—in the early 1920s, which forms the early time boundary of this paper, immigrants were still arriving in Chicago in waves (albeit in smaller numbers than before the war). Additionally, just a few years before the publication of the *Courier*'s education debate in January 1922, the Balfour Declaration had made official the United Kingdom's support of the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This event had energized Zionists around the world, but especially in Chicago, which *Courier* columnist J. Loebner proclaimed was “the first place to begin organizing Jews on behalf of Zionism.”⁷⁰ The *Courier* was particularly outspoken in its support of Zionism, and many of its most prominent columnists, such as Philip P. Bregstone, were known across the Midwest for their active support of Zionist causes. The *Courier*'s debate reflects its historical moment; its contributors seem concerned about Americanization, but not yet to the extent that they would be in later years, once immigration had nearly ceased and increasing numbers of Jews had stopped speaking Yiddish. Instead, those writing in 1922 seemed more concerned about immediate questions, such as how to foster support for Zionism among Chicago's Jewish youth or how to foster a deeper connection between children and their parents. In these opinions, the *Courier*'s self-description as the voice of Chicago's Orthodox community also shows through.

By contrast, in the early 1930s, concerns about assimilation were felt much more urgently by those in the Yiddish community. Due to lower rates of immigration and the movement of

⁷⁰ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “When Petty Politicians Make Statements by J. Loebner,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, June 11, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish III.B.4. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_1685/

Maxwell Street's Jews to disparate areas of the city, it was becoming increasingly difficult for the Yiddish press to retain its audience and relevance. By 1930, Chicago's Jewish community was much less divided in terms of class and geographical location; Eastern European Jews had settled in North and West Side neighborhoods such as Albany Park, Rogers Park, Lake View, Uptown, Humboldt Park, and North Lawndale.⁷¹ Because they were no longer so geographically isolated, Eastern European Jews began to assimilate more into the communities around them, both the Reform communities that had formerly been made up mostly of German Jews and the broader, non-Jewish communities in Chicago. Ultimately, the *Forward* would take a lighter approach to the situation than the *Courier* had even years before, a result of the differences in the two editorial staffs' conceptions of American Jewish identity. While the *Courier* emphasized the importance of religion, language education, and Zionism to maintaining a coherent Jewish identity in the face of Americanization, the *Forward* was less concerned about Jews becoming culturally American and becoming less religious. In contrast to the *Courier*, the *Forward*'s columnists emphasized the importance of cultural activities and community organizations that would help Chicago's Yiddish-speaking Jews to retain ties to the Jewish community as a whole.

The Courier Education Debate, 1922

On January 3, 1922, a person writing under the pen-name "Ger Ve-Toshav"⁷² launched a lively debate about language and educational policy in Chicago's Jewish community. In his letter

⁷¹ Irving Cutler, "Jews," *Encyclopedia of Chicago*, updated 2005, <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/671.html>

⁷² This is a play on words in Hebrew – "Ger" means alien, and "Toshav" means resident. According to a translator for the Chicago Public Library Omnibus project (the Foreign Language Press Survey), the nickname implies that the writer is a resident of Chicago, but is an outsider in the realm of Hebrew school politics.

to the editor, he levelled a number of critiques at the Grenshaw Street Talmud Torah,⁷³ arguing that in order to “tear [the Jewish child] away from the abyss of assimilation and self-contempt,” the school would need to reconsider its teaching methods.⁷⁴ Specifically, they needed to stop teaching the Pentateuch in Yiddish translation, a method which left Jewish children with “no understanding of Hebrew, [no knowledge] of our history, and...not the slightest knowledge of our literature, either old or new.”⁷⁵

To illustrate his concern, Ger Ve-Toshov described an incident that he witnessed one day during a visit to the Grenshaw Street Talmud Torah. At the time, the students were being led through a recitation exercise, in which the instructor read out a passage of the Pentateuch first in Hebrew, and then in Yiddish, and the students were to repeat after him. The teacher read the Hebrew passage, “זִיקְרָה מִתְּהִלָּה בְּשָׁלוֹם”, which translates to English as, “and they went away from Him in peace.” After reading it in Hebrew, the teacher repeated the passage in Yiddish: “*un zey zaynen avekgegangen fun ihm in frieden.*” Upon hearing the Yiddish word “*frieden*,” the student performing the exercise—who spoke only English with his fellow students—believed that he had heard the English word “freedom.” He repeated after the teacher, “and they went away from him in freedom.”⁷⁶ After the lesson, Ger Ve-Toshov confronted the student.

I asked the child what the Hebrew word Sholem meant. At first, he did not know what to answer, but when I told him the entire sentence, he exclaimed: “and they went away from him in freedom.” I asked him what freedom meant, and he replied, “don’t you know?

⁷³ A Talmud Torah is a religious school where children are taught the scriptures. These schools are meant to prepare students to continue their studies in a more serious manner at yeshiva, if they so choose. While this type of religious school would nowadays almost certainly include an emphasis on Hebrew language education, in early-twentieth-century Chicago, many Talmud Torahs were based on the Ashkenazic model and were taught in Yiddish instead of Hebrew.

⁷⁴ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “About Old-Fashioned Schools,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, January 3, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.B2.f, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1462/

⁷⁵ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “About Old-Fashioned Schools.”

⁷⁶ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “About Old-Fashioned Schools.”

Washington fought England and won our freedom.” This is only one illustration out of many which could be used against the practice of translating Hebrew words into Yiddish to an American child.⁷⁷

Using this anecdote, Ger Ve-Toshov hoped to illustrate his overarching argument: that without a proper Jewish education, which would include intensive training in Hebrew, an emphasis on Zionism, and extensive reading of famous Jewish literary and religious works, the American Jewish community was doomed to succumb to the “poisonous gases of assimilation and indifference,” and to lose the distinctions that connected them to their past.⁷⁸ Although Ger Ve-Toshov was writing about education—and specifically about the methods used in one specific religious school—his argument tapped both explicitly and implicitly into larger discussions about assimilation and Americanization in the Chicago Jewish community.

Six days later, N.S. Herman, an instructor at the Talmud Torah in question, responded to Ger Ve-Toshov in a column of his own. Herman did not dispute the point that a Jewish education was necessary to combat assimilation, nor did he dispute that it was important to inculcate Zionist sympathies in American Jewish students as a means of connecting them to a larger Jewish community. Regarding the language question, however, he strongly disagreed with Ger Ve-Toshov and launched an impassioned defense of Yiddish in his response.

“Once and for all, we must recognize the fact that as long as we, in America, have strict, Orthodox, synagogue Jews, who maintain the Jewish traditions and do not speak any other language except Yiddish; as long as the American-Jewish press—which brings us Jewish news, and everything about the Jews in which we are interested, their achievements, their ambitions—is printed in Yiddish; as long as the rabbis, preachers and speakers of our Orthodox synagogues deliver their speeches in Yiddish; as long as the parents wish their children to preserve their Judaism and not to become estranged from them; as long as parents and children strive to understand one another so that they won’t

⁷⁷ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “About Old-Fashioned Schools.”

⁷⁸ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “About Old-Fashioned Schools.”

feel themselves to be strangers—just so long will the Pentateuch, and only the Pentateuch, with a Yiddish translation, be taught in our Talmud Torah, which was founded and is being maintained by Orthodox Jews.”⁷⁹

For Herman—as well as for many of the *Courier*’s writers and readers—Yiddish was seen in precisely this way: it was the language of the Old World, the language of Orthodoxy, and the language of a proper Jewish education. For Ger Ve-Toshov, however, Yiddish education was part of the problem. On January 22, 1922, the *Courier* published a second letter from Ger Ve-Toshov in which he responded to Herman. In it, he pushed back against Herman’s argument about the importance of Yiddish to Chicago’s Orthodox community by pointing out that most of Chicago’s Talmud Torahs had already switched to the Ivrit Be-Ivrit system (Hebrew taught through Hebrew). Yiddish may have been the language of the parents—many of whom had themselves stopped speaking the language regularly by this point—but Hebrew was the language of the Torah, as well as Jewish literature, history, and folktales.

Ger Ve-Toshov concluded his response by attacking the Workmen’s Circle and their “pseudo-socialist comrades”—a reference meant to refer, among others, to the readership of the *Forward*. Ve-Toshov associated Yiddish with these groups’ socialist mission, pointing out the fact that these groups had founded schools to “teach American children Socialism in Yiddish, so that they won’t become estranged from their parents.”⁸⁰ Hebrew education, by contrast, retained a purely Jewish mission, untainted by socialism—to connect Jewish children to their heritage.

⁷⁹ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “A Reply to Ger Ve-Toshav,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, January 9, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.f.
http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1449/

⁸⁰ *Daily Jewish Courier*, “Once More on the Old-Fashioned School,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, January 22, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.B.2.f,
http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1433/

The Forward Education Debate, 1931

Interestingly, just a decade later, when the *Forward* launched its own op-ed debate about education, they began with this very issue: the estrangement of children from their parents. In response to a series of opinion articles from the Workmen's Circle community that had argued for the importance of teaching Jewish children Yiddish in order to bring them closer to their parents, a columnist from the *Forward* argued that Yiddish-language education was not the answer. Instead of teaching the Yiddish language to American-Jewish children—which would only serve to alienate them further by teaching them a language not even their parents continued to speak—the Workmen's Circle and American Jewish schools needed to focus on “the nourishing of a spiritual development” that would bring parents and children together.⁸¹ In other words, they needed to foster a deeper love for “Yiddish *culture*,” which the this columnist insisted could exist without Yiddish, in an entirely American context.

By eliminating Yiddish from the American Jewish schools, Jewish education could focus instead on “a complete understanding of American life,” and a Yiddish culture that would be attuned to this new way of life—a culture that would be “nearer to our present environments and conditions.”⁸² Such a shift, the author argued, would be better for both the Workmen's Circle and for the Socialist movement, which many of the *Forward*'s readers found even more important than connections to Jewish tradition; for many, socialism in America was merely a new phase in Jewish life, following after the many different phases that had come before it in many different lands. For the *Forward* and the Workmen's Circle, in contrast to the *Courier*, Yiddishkayt was not about maintaining ties to the Old Country as much as it was about

⁸¹ *Forward*, “The Jewish Immigrants and Their Children,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, March 7, 1931, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: I.B.3.b, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_2_0053/

⁸² *Forward*, “The Jewish Immigrants and Their Children.”

maintaining a sense of community and direction. As long as Yiddish was effective in making the Chicago Jewish community feel cohesive, then it was worth supporting. As soon as it lost its appeal, however, the *Forward* was more willing than the *Courier* to abandon tradition and to foster an entirely new kind of Jewish identity in English, in Chicago.

One week later, on March 14, 1931, the *Forward* published another article on the issue of Yiddish-language education entitled “Jewish Education in America,” which appears to have been written by a member of the Workmen’s Circle (or by someone involved with its Yiddish educational activities). The author concedes several of the points made in the March 7 article, namely that it did not make sense to try to teach immigrant children the “language of their parents,” since immigrant parents each spoke distinct dialects that were no longer taught.⁸³ However, that did not make Yiddish-language education un worthwhile. Rather, advanced Yiddish-language education was necessary to connect young Jews with the literature of Sholom Aleichem, Sholom Asch, and others—this education was necessary because it would allow the Yiddish language to “grow and become enriched and beautified to the greatest extent.”⁸⁴ This was a crucial part of the secular Yiddish education that the *Forward* was increasingly committed to, and in the author’s view, would only serve to enrich and deepen students’ commitment to the secular Yiddish culture that the *Forward* was constructing.⁸⁵

The *Forward* was not alone in its support for more secular Yiddish-language education—another organization that embraced the ethos of “Yiddish as homeland,” where the Yiddish language itself constitutes a claim and connection to a larger identity, is the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute, which ran several Yiddish-language secular schools in Chicago and New York.

⁸³ *Forward*, “Jewish Education in America.”

⁸⁴ *Forward*, “Jewish Education in America.”

⁸⁵ *Forward*, “Jewish Education in America.”

The schools were based on four central principles: secularity, Yiddish, everywhereness, and child-centeredness. Their founders believed that “the first place in the curriculum should be assigned to language (Yiddish), to Yiddish literature and Jewish history. Jewish religion was considered from the cultural-historic viewpoint—the child was told about Jewish customs and beliefs.”⁸⁶ In this way, they emphasized the choice of the Yiddish language over all else—for them, Yiddish was not seen as a way to connect to the Jewish religion or to Eastern Europe, but rather to maintain a connection to their forefathers and to the “language of the Jewish secular milieu” which for 1900 years had facilitated the flourishing of Jewish culture in the Diaspora.⁸⁷ In other words, the choice of Yiddish was based on its connection to some sort of unique cultural space that could only be accessed through the language; what students chose to do with the language once they learned it—in their religious practice, in political engagement, or otherwise—was less important, as long as they engaged with the language and through it, contributed to Jewish life in some way.

In this way, the Sholem Aleichem Folk Schools, like the press, both contributed to Americanization and strengthened students’ sense of a unique, separate Jewish identity—it fostered a feeling of connection to the transnational Jewish community while also encouraging students to actively engage with the world around them in Chicago, whether through their support of socialist causes or through their engagement with the Jewish community in the city. Saul Goodman echoes this argument in his 1972 essay “The Path and Accomplishments of the Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute,” which was published in a historical survey looking at the first fifty years of the Institute’s existence. He writes: “the Sholem Aleichem ideology...affirmed

⁸⁶ Saul Goodman, *Our First Fifty Years: The Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute* (New York: Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute, 1972), 50.

⁸⁷ Goodman, 50.

America, and it strove to ‘harmonize general American, and Jewish secular educational ingredients.’ In present terms, this implies secular Jewishness should be integrated with American culture in order that we develop as a creative, unique people in America.”⁸⁸ In their attempts to help their students become a “creative, unique people *in America*,” the Sholem Aleichem schools both fought against assimilation while promoting a specifically Jewish approach to Americanization.

Overall, the debates surrounding education constituted a large portion of the debates around Americanization in Chicago’s Yiddish-speaking community. The various opinions that were printed in the press aligned with the general perspectives on Jewish immigrant identity to which the *Courier* and *Forward* adhered: some favored an approach that prioritized connection to tradition and Orthodox values, and which valued language education first and foremost as a means by which to connect children to their traditions and (more immediately) to their parents; others preferred to experiment with new models of Jewish immigrant identity, casting off the religious traditions of the Old Home in favor of new (often socialist) definitions of Jewish values. The latter approach tended to value language learning not for the connection to the past, but for its ability to create a cohesive community in the present and future. Both, in their debates, attempted to define new ways of relating to their heritage, to the Yiddish language, and to the larger Jewish immigrant community in America.

Conclusion

There exists a popular narrative of the history of Yiddish in the United States that focuses on the ultimate demise of the Yiddish press, viewing Yiddish periodicals as victims of American

⁸⁸ Goodman, 50.

Jewish assimilation. Indeed, while the Yiddish press was remarkably resilient, outlasting most other foreign-language presses from the early twentieth century, the challenges that the Yiddish press faced throughout the 1920s only increased in the 1930s and 1940s. Due to a variety of factors that gradually led Chicago's Jews away from Yiddish, the *Courier* ceased publication in 1944, with the Chicago edition of the *Forward* following in 1951. To many, this seemed to confirm the assertions of scholars like Robert Park, who claimed that the immigrant press was, whether willing or unwilling, doomed to take part in the process of Americanization and ultimately to cease to exist.

Yet, to view this history as one of decline would be to take a simplistic and overly pessimistic perspective, and to disregard the vibrant debates and passionate appeals that characterized the Yiddish press in the period following its golden age and preceding its decline. Yiddish writers and readers engaged with debates about community in the pages of the Yiddish press because these debates mattered—they helped the community to navigate the unique challenges of immigration to the United States while remaining committed to their communities and to one another. These newspapers guided Chicago's Yiddish-speaking community through the process of “Americanization” while allowing them a space in which they could debate what they wanted “Americanization” to look like and continue to cultivate their ties to “Yiddishland.” The story of the Yiddish press in Chicago is not a story of decline; it is a story of remarkable resilience and creativity, and one that continues to this day as young people are reviving Yiddish, whether for personal or scholarly purposes. While it is true that no Yiddish periodicals exist in Chicago today, Yiddish speakers in Chicago have access to the Yiddish edition of the *Forward* online and to contemporary Yiddish podcasts such as the Massachusetts radio program “Yiddish

Voice” or the feminist Yiddish podcast, “Vaybertaytsch” that continue to engage in debates over the role of Yiddish in American Jewish identity.

The Yiddish press demonstrates the ways in which Chicago’s Yiddish-speaking immigrants were not passive spectators to the process of Americanization—rather, they were active agents who negotiated the terms of their new home, finding creative and unique ways to combine elements of the language and culture of the Old Country with their new lives in America. In the pages of the press and beyond, Yiddish Chicago debated and ultimately invented its own ways of being “at home” in America.

Works Cited

Newspapers and Periodicals:

1. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “About Old-Fashioned Schools.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus. January 3, 1922. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.B2.f, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1462/
2. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “A Definition of Zionism (Editorial in English).” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. April 19, 1923. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III A, I A 2 b, III H. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_0500/
3. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “A Reply to Ger Ve-Toshav.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. January 9, 1922. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.f. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1449/
4. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “Build a Dam.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. March 23, 1923. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III E, II D 6, III A. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_1394/
5. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “Is the Jewish Press Old-Fashioned?” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. May 27, 1923. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0859/
6. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “Once More on the Old-Fashioned School.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus. January 22, 1922. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey. Jewish: II.B.2.f, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1433/
7. *Daily Jewish Courier*. “On the Community Stage by J. Leibner Fourth of July Celebration.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, June 23, 1918, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.b3.a, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_1391/
8. *Daily Jewish Courier*, “What Are the Principles? (Editorial)”, translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, May 18, 1923, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: III.C, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_0482/
9. *Daily Jewish Courier*, “When Petty Politicians Make Statements by J. Loebner,” translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, June 11, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish III.B.4. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_8_1_1685/

10. *Forward*. “[Classes of the Educational Committee of the Workmen’s Circle].” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. October 6, 1920. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.f. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1508/
11. *Forward*. “Jewish Education in America.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus. March 14, 1931. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey, Jewish: II.B.2.f. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_1173/
12. *Forward*. “[No headline].” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. May 14, 1921. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.f1. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0892/
13. *Forward*. “Our Thirtieth Anniversary By Abraham Cahan, Editor-in-Chief of Forward.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. May 1, 1927. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.b2.d1 IE, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0820/
14. *Forward*. “Ten Years of the Forward in Chicago Editorial.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. January 1, 1929. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1 IE. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0811/
15. *Forward*. “The Jewish Immigrants and Their Children.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus. March 7, 1931. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey. Jewish: I.B.3.b, http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_2_0053/
16. *Forward*, “The Truth about the Courier Circulation, translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project, May 15, 1922, Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1 http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_2_0574/
17. *Forward*. “Workmen’s Circle to Win Jewish Youth.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. February 7, 1926. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, III E, III G. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_9_1_1367/
18. Goodman, Saul. *Our First Fifty Years: The Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute*. New York: Sholem Aleichem Folk Institute, 1972.
19. *The Occident*. “Jewish Publications of Chicago.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. April 6, 1894. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1.
20. *Reform Advocate*. “The American Flag by Leopold Deutelbaum.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus, June 13, 1931. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish I.C. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_2_0415/

21. *Reform Advocate*. “The Growth of Jewish Chicago: Forty-Two Years’ Recollections.” Translated and edited by the Chicago Public Library Omnibus Project. June 13, 1931. Chicago Foreign Language Press Survey: Jewish, II.B2.d1. http://flps.newberry.org/article/5423972_5_0796/.

Secondary Sources:

1. Chanes, Jerome A. “Review.” Review of *Jewish New York: The Remarkable Story of a City and a People*, by Deborah Dash Moore. *American Jewish History* 103, no. 3 (July 2019): 385-387.
2. Cutler, Irving. *Jewish Chicago: a pictorial history*. Chicago: Arcadia, 2000.
3. Cutler, Irving. “Jews.” *Encyclopedia of Chicago*. Updated 2005. <http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/671.html>
4. Cutler, Irving. *The Jews of Chicago: From Shtetl to Suburb*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996.
5. Dissentshik, Ido Joseph. “New York’s Two Yiddish Dailies: ‘The Day Morgen Journal’ and ‘Forward’ – A 1966 Study,” *Kesher*, no. 6 (1989): 45e-52e.
6. Ehrlich, Claire. “The Lost World of Yiddish Anarchists.” *Jewish Currents*. January 15, 2019. <https://jewishcurrents.org/the-lost-world-of-yiddish-anarchists/>
7. Goren, Arthur A. "The Jewish Press in the U.S." *Kesher / קשֶׁר*, no. 6 (1989): 4e-22e. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23901046>.
8. Hickerson, Andrea and Kristin L. Gustafson. “Revisiting the Immigrant Press.” *Journalism* 17, no. 8 (November 2016): 943-960.
9. Jewish Telegraphic Agency, “The Forward, 122-year-old Jewish Publication, Ends Its Print Edition, *Haaretz*, Jan. 17, 2019. Accessed April 14, 2020.
10. Libenson, Dan and Lex Rofeberg. “American History of Yidish - Tony Michels.” *Judaism Unbound*. Podcast audio. January 30, 2020. <https://www.judaismunbound.com/podcast/episode-207-tony-michels>
11. Mencken, H.L. *The American Language*. New York: Knopf, 1919.
12. *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, s.v. “assimilation,” accessed April 29, 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assimilation>.

13. Moore, Deborah Dash. "At Home in America?: Revisiting the Second Generation." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 25, no. 2/3, Immigration, Integration, Incorporation and Transnationalism: Interdisciplinary and International Perspectives (Winter – Spring 2006): 156-168.

14. Moore, Deborah Dash, Jeffrey S. Gurock, Annie Polland, Howard B. Rock, and Daniel Soyer. *Jewish New York: The Remarkable Story of a City and a People*. New York: NYU Press, 2017.

15. Park, Robert Ezra. *The Immigrant Press and its Control*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1922.

16. Portnoy, Eddy. *Bad Rabbi: And Other Strange but True Stories From the Yiddish Press*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2017.

17. Singer, Isaac Bashevis and Robert H. Wolf. "Problems of Yiddish Prose in America (1943)." *Prooftexts*, vol. 9, no.1 (January 1989): 5-12.

18. Soltes, Mordecai. "The Yiddish Press—An Americanizing Agency." *The American Jewish Year Book* 26 (September 29, 1924, to September 18, 1925): 165-372.

19. Soyer, Daniel. "Reviewed Work: History Lessons: The Creation of American Jewish Heritage by Beth Wenger." Review of *History Lessons: The Creation of American Jewish Heritage*, by Beth Wenger. *Journal of American Ethnic History* 32, no. 2 (Winter 2013): 117-119.

20. Stanciu, Cristina. "Strangers in America: Yiddish Poetry at the Turn of the Twentieth Century and the Demands of Americanization." *College English* 76, no. 1 (September 2013): 59-83.

21. Wenger, Beth S. *The Jewish Americans: three centuries of Jewish voices in America*. New York: Doubleday, 2007.

22. Wolff, Frank. "The Home That Never Was: Rethinking Space and Memory in Late Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Jewish History." *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung* 38, no. 3 (145) (2013): 197-215.
www.jstor.org/stable/23644532.